

‘Bound up in one small poesie’: Material Intertextuality and the Early
Modern Poetic Collection (1557-1601)

Craig Farrell

PhD

University of York
English

January 2017

Abstract

This thesis explores the essentially composite nature of early modern printed books, and how the material configurations of individual volumes were used for a variety of literary ends. It contends that modern scholarship on early modern printed poetry has focused on individual texts, and has largely overlooked the tendency of books in this period to gather more than one major text in a single volume. This thesis aims to recover the creative design exercised by the poets, editors, and publishers who selected and arranged multiple works in one book. It argues that texts presented in a shared material context present readers with the opportunity to read between the poems (thematically, formally, narratively, etc.), and describes this phenomenon as ‘material intertextuality’. By reading early modern collections of poetry in this way, it proposes specific new readings of a number of canonical authors – George Gascoigne, Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser, and Samuel Daniel – as well as providing a methodology for reading other writers in this period. Reading the text within the context of the book has a number of ramifications for the study of early modern literature more generally, including recovering an early modern structural and organisational imagination, challenging canonical boundaries (by attending to the multiple authorship of many texts), revitalising the study of ‘minor’ works by major literary figures, and informing editorial practice in modern editions of these texts.

Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Abstract | 2 |
| Contents | 3 |
| Acknowledgements | 4 |
| Author's Declaration | 5 |
| Introduction | 6 |
| Chapter 1. '[I]n some good order': <i>Songes and Sonettes</i> , George Gascoigne, and the Editing of Poetry in Print | 30 |
| Chapter 2. <i>Astrophel and Stella</i> and the Textual Identities of Sir Philip Sidney | 78 |
| Chapter 3. 'In mirrours more than one': Edmund Spenser and the Collection as Form | 114 |
| Chapter 4. Samuel Daniel and the Poetics of Evolving Material Context | 161 |
| Conclusion | 203 |
| Appendices | |
| Appendix A: Spenser's Publications, 1569-1611 | 212 |
| Appendix B: Structures of <i>Delia</i> , 1592-1601 | 215 |
| Appendix C: Daniel's Publications and Contents, 1591-1601 | 216 |
| Bibliography | |
| Manuscript Primary Sources | 218 |
| Printed Primary Sources | 218 |
| Printed Secondary Sources | 225 |

Acknowledgements

This thesis has been many years and many crises in the making; that it exists at all is largely due to the unwavering support I've received from colleagues, friends, and family. My first thanks go to Victoria, George, and Patricia Chadfield, without whose financial support and personal encouragement my studies could not have even have begun. Their belief in my ability despite many difficult circumstances has meant a great deal to me and has left a deep impression on my work.

My supervisors, Bill Sherman and Helen Smith, have demonstrated superhuman levels of patience and compassion. Their intellectual generosity has shaped my studies over the last few years, and I can think of no better scholars to have learned from during my time at York. I have also been lucky enough to benefit from discussions with Kevin Killeen and Claire Canavan, both of whom have provided sage advice at key moments.

Emma Kennedy has seen this thesis grow almost from start to finish, and the many debts I owe her (intellectual, personal, emotional) are too many to list here. It is extremely unlikely that this thesis would ever have been completed without her unflinching support, and my gratitude extends far beyond what it is possible to express here in a few sentences.

Finally, both my parents, Elizabeth and John, and my siblings, Paul and Karen, have borne this project and its circumambulatory journey with good grace and good humour. They have made a difficult process easier in many ways, and I owe them many thanks for the million small kindnesses they have shown in the last few years.

I have been saved from many embarrassing errors by those listed above; all remaining oversights are mine.

Author's Declaration

I declare that this thesis is a presentation of original work. This work has not previously been presented for an award at this, or any other, University. All sources are acknowledged as references.

Introduction

In 1560, John Day published *Sermons of John Calvin, upon the song that Ezechias made after he had been sicke*. This short octavo volume is entirely typical of a mid-sixteenth-century publication: overtly religious, a translation from a continental text, and composed by an anonymous writer who signed his or her name only as ‘A.L.’ in the dedicatory epistle. A reader who had not thoroughly examined the text they had purchased may have been surprised to find that the final section of the book appeared to be an entirely different work. Immediately following Calvin’s sermons, they would have encountered a long verse preface, and a sequence of twenty-one sonnets. This material was not mentioned on the title page, where its inclusion could be explained as a motivation for potential buyers. The presence of these poems is addressed only by a short note on the makeshift title page to the sequence, which explains that it had been included in the volume ‘not as a parcell of maister Calvines worke, but for that it well agreeth with the same argument’ (2A1r)

The text in question is *A Meditation of a Penitent Sinner*, now ascribed to Anne Locke and acknowledged to be one of the most important works of poetry of the mid-sixteenth-century, providing an example of the sonnet sequence several decades before the form’s more celebrated examples.¹ Despite the scholarly attention now given to this particular work, its original printed context tends to be mentioned only in passing, and the interaction of Locke’s and Calvin’s texts is rarely examined in detail.² Yet Locke’s poetry clearly has a relationship with the rest of the book in which it was originally published. As well as sharing a Reformist outlook, the two works are both elaborations on, and interpretations of, biblical texts. In particular, both texts deal with ‘literary’ passages in the Bible: Calvin’s sermons explore the

¹ Locke’s authorship is generally assumed, but Rosalind Smith has provided a nuanced discussion of the complexities of this attribution in *Sonnets and the English Woman Writer, 1560-1621: The Politics of Absence* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

² The best exception to this rule (and most substantial study into the sources and theology of Locke’s work) is June Waudby, *Text and Context: A Re-evaluation of Anne Locke’s Meditation* (PhD Thesis, University of Hull, 2006). For a general overview of recent scholarship on the sequence, see Robert C. Evans and Jeff Moody, ‘The Religious Sonnets of Anne Vaughan Lock: An Overview of Scholarship, 1989–1999,’ *Ben Jonson Journal* 22, no. 2 (2015): 269-281 and the essays collected in *Ashgate Critical Essays on Women Writers in England, Volume 3: Anne Lock, Isabella Whitney and Amelia Lanyer*, ed. Micheline White (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

‘song’ from Isaiah 38:9 and Locke’s poems are an extended amplification of Psalm 51. It may be for these reasons as much as their shared theological perspective that the sonnets were described as ‘agreeing’ with the rest of the volume. At the same time, as noted above, Locke’s sequence is not mentioned on the title page, nor is it referred to in any of the other paratextual materials. While this pairing is present in both surviving copies, the printing signatures are not continuous, indicating that Locke’s poem may have been a last-minute addition rather than one carefully planned in advance.

This thesis addresses the questions raised by a volume like Calvin’s *Sermons*. What are we to make of the choice to sell these two works together? Was the decision prompted by ‘literary’ intentions, economic motives, or a combination of both? What part did the author, editor, publisher, or printer have in these decisions, individually or in cooperation with any other agent(s)? What should be our approach to editing this book and its constituent texts? Most importantly, what readings become available if we consider these works in their original material context, rather than as two distinct and unrelated units? In order to explore these questions, and argue for their interpretive ramifications for the study of early modern literature, I examine four important authors whose works appear as ‘collections’ of one form or another: George Gascoigne, Sir Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser, and Samuel Daniel. I will also trace developments within the publication of poetry in the sixteenth-century, moving from Richard Tottel’s *Songes and sonettes* in 1557 to the explosion of literary texts in the 1590s, suggesting that this decade witnessed a major shift in the way that poetry was written, published, and read.

The history of the book and early modern literature

The central premise of this thesis is that early modern printed texts were frequently produced and encountered as part of larger, aggregate structures composed of discrete works in a shared material context. That is to say, many of the texts now read and analysed as isolated textual units were encountered by their contemporary readers alongside one or more other works within an individual book. While important work by Alexandra Gillespie and Jeffrey Todd Knight (discussed below) has demonstrated the prominence of this gathering from the perspective of readers, I

will argue that these practises were adapted by authors and stationers as the print trade developed throughout the sixteenth century. The interpretive interplay between all of the texts of a book is what I label ‘material intertextuality’. Before addressing the theoretical assumptions and critical antecedents of this term, it is necessary to place this project in the broader context of current scholarship, particularly in regards to recent developments in the history of the book and the role of readers in creating early modern texts.

Following the publication of *L'apparition du livre* (1957) by Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, and *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* (1980) by Elizabeth Eisenstein, scholarship has increasingly turned its attention to the material conditions of early modern printed books and the social contexts that conditioned them.³ These influential works argued for the historical impact of the printed book on early modern Europe, and though some of their broader conclusions have been qualified, their focus on the book as a form prompted wider examination of how, in Donald F. McKenzie's words, ‘forms effect meaning’.⁴ Theorists including McKenzie, Roger Chartier, David McKitterick, and Adrian Johns have argued in different ways that written texts are mediated by their production as physical objects, each of which possess a range of semiotic registers that shape the process of reading.⁵ Chartier emphasises that ‘restoring the fluid and plural signification of texts’ can only occur if we are alert to ‘variations in the readers’ resources and in

³ Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, *L'apparition du livre* (Paris: Éditions A. Michel, 1958). Translated as *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing 1450-1800* by David Gerard (London: New Left Books, 1976); Elizabeth Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* [2 volumes] (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980). This work was later updated in an abbreviated form as *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

⁴ Donald F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (London: British Library, 1986), 4; Eisenstein's ‘Afterword’ to *The Printing Revolution* (315-358) provides an excellent overview of challenges to her conclusions, as well as her counterarguments.

⁵ Roger Chartier, *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, translated by Lydia G. Cochrane (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994); David McKitterick, *Print, Manuscript, and the Search for Order, 1450-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

textual and formal mechanisms'.⁶ This reading is rooted in Jerome J. McGann's distinction between the linguistic and bibliographical 'codes' of a text.⁷

Chartier's 'mechanisms' and McGann's 'codes' have been one of the primary sites of book historical research in an early modern context. Research into early modern materials texts has emphasised the variations in material form during print's introduction and development into an economically and culturally significant industry. Individual studies have focused on a variety of features found in printed texts, from the cultural associations of typefaces,⁸ title pages,⁹ paper,¹⁰ and a range of paratextual material not typically replicated in modern reproductions.¹¹ While this research has provided increasing detail about the printing practices of the period and their attendant cultural semiotics, there has also been significant interest in the practises of figures other than the author in the construction of the text and its subsequent interpretation. Zachary Lesser, for example, has emphasised the centrality of the publisher and his business interests to decisions both about which texts were published, and the forms that they took.¹² Other scholars such as Elizabeth

⁶ Chartier, *The Order of Books*, 6.

⁷ Jerome J. McGann, *The Textual Condition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 48-67.

⁸ For example, M.B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Mark Bland 'The Appearance of the Text in Early Modern England,' *Text* 11 (1998): 91-154; Zachary Lesser, 'Typographic Nostalgia: Play-Reading, Popularity, and Black Letter,' in *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers and Readers in Early Modern England*, ed. Marta Straznicky (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006), 99-126.

⁹ Margaret M. Smith, *The Title Page: Its Early Development: 1460-1510* (London: British Library 2000); Tiffany Stern, "'On each Wall and Corner Poast": Playbills, Title-pages, and Advertising in Early Modern London' *English Literary Renaissance* 36 (2006), 57-89; Alan B. Farmer and Zachary Lesser, 'Vile Artes: The Marketing of English Printed Drama 1512-1660' *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 39 (2000), 77-165.

¹⁰ See for example Joshua Calhoun, 'The Word Made Flax: Cheap Bibles, Textual Corruption, and the Poetics of Paper.' *PMLA* 126, no.2 (2011): 327-344.

¹¹ The best introduction to the range of paratextual material in early modern print are the essays in Helen Smith and Louise Wilson (eds.), *Renaissance Paratexts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

¹² Zachary Lesser, *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication: Readings in the English Book Trade* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2007).

Evenden, Stacy Erikson, and Richard Melnikoff have taken particular stationers as their focus (John Day, William Ponsonby, and Richard Jones respectively), demonstrating how the texts they produced reflected the personal, religious, or social interests of these individuals, rather than being neutral conduits for literary works.¹³ One of the ways that these case studies interact with my own work is the centrality of publisher and printers in the construction of the text encountered by readers. In the chapters on Edmund Spenser and Samuel Daniel their close working relationships, with William Ponsonby and Simon Waterson respectively, inform my discussion of their work and allow for greater speculation about the author's role in the final structure than is true of Philip Sidney, who did not live to see his works in print (if that was ever his intention).

One of the other consequences of focusing on texts in their original forms as opposed to more idealised constructs is that early modern texts could, and did, change radically between editions. This has had its most far-reaching impact on the scholarship of Shakespeare, where a division between 'good' and 'bad' quartos has been replaced by a more nuanced set of distinctions that resist these simple categories.¹⁴ In tandem with a revisionist editorial approach exemplified by McGann and D.C. Greetham, there has been an emphasis on the individuality of texts, leading to multiple 'versions' exemplified by modern editions of *King Lear*, among others.¹⁵

¹³ Elizabeth Evenden, *Patents, Pictures and Patronage John Day and the Tudor Book Trade* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2008), Kirk Melnikoff, 'Richard Jones's Pen and Marlowe's Socks: Richard Jones Tamburlaine the Great (1590), and the Beginnings of English Dramatic Literature' *Studies in Philology* 102, no.3 (2005): 184-209. Stacy Erikson, "'I do more confidently presume to publish it in his absence': William Ponsonby's Print Network," in *The Early Modern Book Trade* eds. John Hinks and Victoria Gardner (London: British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 2014), 45-60. See also the recent work on stationers handling Shakespeare's works in Marta Straznicki (ed.) *Shakespeare's Stationers, Studies in Cultural Bibliography* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

¹⁴ The literature on Shakespeare's publications is impossibly large, even in summary. Laurie Maguire provides one of the most wide-ranging discussions of the 'bad' quartos in *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The "Bad" Quartos and Their Contexts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), but see also Paul Werstine, 'Narratives about Printed Shakespeare Texts: "Foul Papers" and "Bad" Quartos,' *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41, no.1 (1990): 65-86.

¹⁵ For Jerome J. McGann's arguments, see *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983) and *The Textual Condition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991); for D.C. Greetham see *Theories of the Text* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999). Lear was

Though scholarship on this topic has hotly debated the advantages and disadvantages of parallel texts and hypertexts for different audiences, there has nonetheless been a wide-ranging revision to historical notions of a reconstructed ‘ideal’ text.¹⁶ These issues will be highlighted in Chapters 2 and 4, where the substantial differences between editions of Sidney and Daniel are central to the arguments advanced in my analysis. I will also return to the implications of my arguments for editorial practice in the conclusion to this thesis.

Alongside these trends in book historical research has arisen an interest in mediating figures such as translators, editors, and commentators, who may or may not have been the same figures involved in writing and producing the texts. Examples such as Terence Cave’s work on Sir Thomas More’s *Utopia* in its various continental editions demonstrates the degree to which texts could be transformed by the addition of commentaries or (printed) marginal annotations.¹⁷ Sonia Massai has recently emphasised the editing that took place in the printing house, with some texts undergoing ‘correcting’ in a more or less drastic sense.¹⁸ This is mirrored by the active ‘social textuality’ of manuscript practise that will be explored more fully in

famously printed in two parallel texts in *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works* gen. eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford, 1986) and has been followed by other parallel-text editions including the three texts of the Arden Third Series *Hamlet*, eds. Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006).

¹⁶ For a discussion of editorial approaches for different audiences, see John Lavagnino, ‘Reading, Scholarship, and Hypertext Editions,’ *Text 8* (1995): 109-124 and the essays in *Texts in Multiple Versions: Histories of Editions* eds. Luigi Giuliani, Herman Brinkman, Geert Lernout and Marita Mathijsen (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2006).

¹⁷ Terence Cave, *Thomas More's Utopia in Early Modern Europe: Paratexts and Contexts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008). Other work specifically addressing printed marginalia includes Evelyn B. Tribble, *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England* (Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1993); William W.E. Sights, *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001); and Jane Griffiths, *Diverting Authorities: Experimental Glossing Practices in Manuscript and Print* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

¹⁸ Sonia Massai, *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). See also Markio Nagase, *Literary Editing of Seventeenth-Century English Drama* (PhD Thesis, University of Birmingham, 2012) and Paul Werstein, *Early Modern Playhouse Manuscripts and the Editing of Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Chapter 1.¹⁹ The importance of these editorial figures to printed texts is most relevant to Chapter 2 of this thesis, which explores the posthumous publication of Sir Philip Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*, and its substantially different forms.

In a more general sense, the focus on the full range of contents of a book also reveals that collections of poetry in this period frequently include the work of more than one author. Many of the texts explored in this thesis, including *Songes and Sonettes* (Chapter 1), Q1 of *Astrophil and Stella* (Chapter 2) and *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (Chapter 3) contain the work of more than one poet. This focus also emphasises that regardless of who gathered and organised the material in each volume, readers frequently encountered the work of poets alongside others. This intersects with the interest in collaboration that has emerged from scholarship on the early modern theatre, including the work of Jeffrey Masten, Heather Hirschfeld, and David Nichol.²⁰ In summary, my examination of early modern collections of printed poetry participates in, and is indebted to, a larger reorientation within scholarship to recognise the role that material forms played in the interpretive possibilities of texts. Broadening the focus from text or author to a holistic view of the book and its contents has ramifications for individual texts, but also for our sense of sixteenth-century authorship, which was more frequently collaborative or collective than individual.

Structures of books and structures of thought

A focus on non-authorial agents is one part of what McKenzie called 'the sociology of texts', which describes 'the full range of social realities which the medium of print

¹⁹ The term is from Arthur Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), Chapter 3, though it appears in various forms in editorial scholarship.

²⁰ Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Heather Hirschfeld, *Joint Enterprises: Collaborative Drama and the Institutionalization of the English Renaissance Theater* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2004); David Nichol, *Middleton and Rowley: Forms of Collaboration in the Jacobean Playhouse* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012). See also the recent collection of essays on Shakespeare edited by Peter Holland, *Shakespeare Survey 67* (2014).

had to serve' and the 'human motives and interactions which texts involve at every stage of their production, transmission and consumption.'²¹ The importance of readers in this network of textual production and consumption can be seen most readily in the ascendancy of humanism as the dominant educational paradigm in the period. This model of reading and composition placed particular importance on the commonplace book, which acted as a material nexus for textual fragments culled from a variety of sources.²² The work of Anne Moss has demonstrated the importance of this model to the cognitive outlook of the entire period: each reader understood the necessarily patchwork nature of many texts, and how the combination and arrangement of disparate fragments could tease out oppositions, reveal sympathies, and connect with original material to form something entirely new.²³

Though this approach usually took place in the manuscript commonplace books of individual readers, our modern notions of the stability of the text are further challenged by the distinctly material methods of some individuals. Ann Blair has noted that before the advent of sophisticated ways of storing and retrieving information, some books were literally cut up into strips, and organised around a particular scheme inside a convenient container, like a cabinet.²⁴ Possibly the most extreme example of cut-and-paste reading and composition techniques is that of the 'harmonies' of Little Gidding, where the men and women of that community

²¹ McKenzie, *Bibliography*, 7

²² Mary Thomas Crane, *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995). For a discussion of early modern prescriptions on commonplacing, see also Peter Beal, 'Notions in Garrison: The Seventeenth-Century Commonplace Book,' in *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1985–1991*, ed. W. Speed Hill (Binghamton, N.Y.: Renaissance English Text Society, 1993), 131-148.

²³ Anne Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996). See also Fred Schurink, 'Manuscript Commonplace Books, Literature, and Reading in Early Modern England,' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 73, no.3 (2010): 453-469.

²⁴ Ann Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2010). Also see the essays in 'The Renaissance Collage: Toward a New History of Reading', eds. Juliet Fleming, William Sherman, and Adam Smyth, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 45, no.3 (2015).

engaged in the laborious process of cutting up the printed text of the four gospels, and pasting them together into a single, continuous narrative.²⁵

Some early modern writers, at least, were conscious of the effects that order and placement had on individual parts of the text, and the relationship between part and whole, directed their readers to balance their perception of parts against the whole. The humanist Johannes Sturm advocated that one should digest the text ‘by peecemeale’ only after one had ‘runne over the whole’.²⁶ In Sturm’s tripartite model of reading, one must understand the sense and purpose of each individual sentence, perceive the stylistic ‘handling of the matter’, but also apprehend the ‘order and placing of things.’²⁷ In a similarly inclined instruction in the introduction to his translation of Anton Doni’s philosophy, Thomas North warns his readers:

He that beginneth not to reade thys Booke from the beginning to the ende, and that aduisedly followeth not the order he findeth written, shall neuer profite any thing thereby. [...] Moreouer, the similitudes and comparisons doe (as they saye) holde hands one with the other, they are so linked togethers, one still depending of another: which if you seuer, desirous to reade any tale or storie by it selfe, not comparing the Antecedent with the Sequele: besides that, you shall be farre from the vnderstanding of the matter.²⁸

North’s ideal reader not only reads sequentially in order to understand the progression of the argument, but perceives the intratextual fabric that connects each part of the text. Each ‘tale or storie’ can only be understood correctly by perceiving its place within the larger structure of the book.

²⁵ One of these harmonies has been digitised by the Harvard University Library [<http://pds.lib.harvard.edu/pds/view/45243608>]. Adam Smyth has written extensively about the harmonies, and the process of cutting and pasting, most recently in ‘Cutting and authorship in Early Modern England,’ *Authorship* 2, no.2 (2013). Web: <http://www.authorship.ugent.be/>.

²⁶ Johannes Sturm, *A ritche storehouse or treasure for nobilitye and gentlemen*, trans. Thomas Browne (London: Henry Denham 1570), D4v.

²⁷ *Ibid*, D5r-v.

²⁸ Anton Francesco Doni, *The morall philosophie of Doni*, trans. Thomas North (London: Henry Denham 1570), A1v.

Together, these examples demonstrate the widespread interest in collecting as a personal or social practice, as well as the attitudes, both conceptual and physical, compilation encouraged towards texts themselves. This culture of gathering and compiling finds a particularly relevant counterpart in the creation of reader-generated collections of printed texts. As has been frequently remarked, early modern books were usually sold unbound, with the understanding that buyers would pay to have their edition bound individually or with other works according to the tastes and finances of the customer.²⁹ Binding works together offered a cost-effective way of providing some protection to the contents, but also offered the possibility of creating collections that shared some principle of organisation, whether through authorship, theme, or simply idiosyncratic preference. These reader-generated collections, or *Sammelbände*, have generated substantial scholarly interest in recent years. Alexandra Gillespie, for example, has drawn attention to the strategies of William Caxton, Wynkyn de Worde, and Richard Pynson to encourage purchasers to buy and gather the works they printed.³⁰ She suggests that these composite volumes ‘suggest a remarkable openness on the part of printers and owners to the malleable, multiple forms of books’, challenging older notions of print’s stability and finality.³¹ Seth Lerer similarly remarks that books in this period were ‘fluid entities’ whose meaning ‘remained a relational, personalizable, and shifting category’.³²

While Gillespie and Lerer focus primarily on early Tudor texts, Jeffrey Todd Knight has explored the same phenomenon across the early modern period, including

²⁹ See for example Paul Needham, *The Printer and the Pardoner: An Unrecorded Indulgence Printed by William Caxton* (Washington: Library of Congress, 1986), 17 and Mirjam M. Foot, ‘Bookbinding,’ in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume IV: 1557-1695* eds. John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 620-631.

³⁰ Alexandra Gillespie, *Print Culture and the Medieval Author, Chaucer, Lydgate, and Their Books 1473-1557* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

³¹ Gillespie, ‘Early *Sammelbände*,’ 207; For Walter J. Ong, see *Orality and Literacy* (London: Methuen & Co., 1982. Reprint, New York: Routledge, 2002).

³² Seth Lerer, ‘Bibliographical theory and the textuality of the codex: toward a history of the premodern book,’ in *The Medieval Manuscript Book: Cultural Approaches*, eds. Michael Johnston and Michael Van Dussen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 17-33; see also his case study of one such volume in ‘Medieval Literature and Early Modern Readers: Cambridge University Library Sel. 5.51—5.63,’ *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 97, no.3 (2003): 311-332.

the years in which this thesis will concentrate.³³ Knight suggests that the textual flexibility evident in early printing is identifiable across the period; rather than print promoting finality it ‘multiplied the possibilities for text assembly, accelerating and diversifying habits of the book that nourished a more continuous, developing early vernacular textual culture’.³⁴ Knight’s account is valuable not only for challenging a desire to see a stark divide between manuscript and print practices, but for his analysis of the effect that these reader-oriented practises had on the writers of the period, promoting a conception of writing that was ‘flexible and contingent’ and ‘closer to what we would call repurposing or recontextualization’.³⁵ In addition, Jason Scott-Warren has demonstrated that individual copies of printed texts could be modified and personalised for individual recipients, suggesting once again that caution needs to be applied in our assumptions of uniformity across all copies of early modern books.³⁶

These studies provide an important challenge to less nuanced views of the divisions between manuscript and print, and the role of readers in shaping their books, and emphasises Joseph A. Dane’s argument that even printed copies of texts are fundamentally individual and unique.³⁷ At the same time, however, it is clear that even in the early years of the print industry in England, publishers saw the opportunity to offer ready-made collections to their customers. Gillespie notes that there is evidence that some early printers offered ‘trade *Sammelbände*’, works sold

³³ Jeffrey Todd Knight, *Bound to Read: Compilations, Collections, and the Making of Renaissance Literature* (Philadelphia, P.A.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

³⁴ *Ibid*, 12.

³⁵ *Ibid*, 9; on the binding of manuscript and printed material in the same volume, see Eva Nyström, ‘Codicological Crossover: The Merging of Manuscript and Print,’ *Studia Neophilologica* 86, no.1 (2014): 112-133 and Julia Boffey, ‘London, British Library Add. MS 18752: A Tudor hybrid book,’ *English Manuscript Studies 1100–1700* 15 (2009): 41–64.

³⁶ Jason Scott-Warren, *Sir John Harington and the Book as Gift* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

³⁷ Dane makes the important distinction between ‘the book’ as an abstract conception of a text which stands for all of the texts similar to it, and the ‘book copy’, or the individual instance of a text with all of its textual and material idiosyncrasies not reproduced elsewhere. See *The Myth of Print Culture: Essays on Evidence, Textuality, and Bibliographic Method* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005) and *What is a Book? The Study of Early Printed Books* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2012).

together and perhaps even pre-bound by the publisher.³⁸ She highlights the publications of Richard Pynson, and argues that the regularity of contents and structure across a substantial number of copies ‘suggests a significant, coordinated effort to market them together’.³⁹ In a study of later printing practises, Stuart Bennett also suggests that trade bindings occurred more frequently than has been suggested by many studies of print culture.⁴⁰

One of the central premises of this thesis is that practices of compilation were adapted by both writers and publishers as the print trade developed across the sixteenth century.⁴¹ Recognising the habits of their buyers, many stationers advertised the multiple contents of their books on title-pages, promoting the copiousness of the volume as well as indicating helpful chronologies, lists, and indices and glossaries that aided in the understanding of the material. One striking example is Thomas Vautroullier’s 1577 edition of the Ecclesiastical histories attributed to Eusebius, Socrates and Euagrius. The title reads:

The auncient ecclesiasticall histories of the first six hundred yeares after Christ, wrytten in the Greeke tongue by three learned historiographers, Eusebius, Socrates, and Euagrius. Eusebius Pamphilus Bishop of Cæsarea in Palæstina vvrote 10 bookes. Socrates Scholasticu of Constantinople vvrote 7 bookes. Euagrius Scholasticus of Antioch vvrote 6 bookes. VVhereunto is

³⁸ Gillespie, *Print Culture*, 90.

³⁹ *Ibid.* note 58, 127. See also See Alexandra Gillespie, ‘Bookbinding and Early Printing in England,’ in *A Companion to the Early Printed Book in Britain, 1476-1558*, eds. Vincent Gillespie and Susan Powell (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer 2014), 75-94 (93) and Alexandra Gillespie ‘Poets, Printers, and Early *Sammelbände*,’ *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67, no.2 (2004): 189-214 (206-9).

⁴⁰ Stuart Bennett, *Trade Bookbinding in the British Isles, 1660–1800* (London: British Library, 2004).

⁴¹ In the sixteenth century, the term ‘stationer’ referred to individuals working in the print industry, and did not make distinctions between the roles of publisher, printer, and bookseller typically used in modern scholarship. Throughout this thesis I will use the term ‘publisher’ to refer to the individuals who financed the production of an edition, and ‘printer’ to refer to the individuals responsible for the manufacture of the book copies making up an edition. Though publishers are frequently seen as having ultimate control over the appearance and format of an edition, the examples described in the following four chapters will suggest that the production of early modern books involved a degree of cooperation between author, publisher, and printer.

annexed Dorotheus Bishop of Tyrus, of the liues of the prophetes, apostles and 70 disciples. All which authors are faithfully translated out of the Greeke tongue by Meredith Hanmer, Maister of Arte and student in diuinitie. Last of all herein is contayned a profitable chronographie collected by the sayd translator, the title whereof is to be seene in the ende of this volume, with a copious index of the principall matters throughout all the histories.

In this instance, the principle of organisation is clear: the volume offers a substantial overview of early ecclesiastical histories, as well as extensive appendices that allow for navigation across the volume. Other volumes seem to focus on the variety of their contents, without the thematic or structural coherence of Vautroullier's publication. In 1589, Richard Jones published *Scillaes metamorphosis* by Thomas Lodge, whose title page boasted a similarly broad, but less focused set of works:

Scillaes metamorphosis: enterlaced with the vnfortunate loue of Glaucus. Whereunto is annexed the delectable discourse of the discontented satyre: with sundrie other most absolute poems and sonnets. Contayning the detestable tyrannie of disdaine, and comicall triumph of constancie: verie fit for young courtiers to peruse, and coy dames to remember. By Thomas Lodge of Lincolnes Inne, Gentleman.

The conceptual coherence of this publication appears to lie primarily in the literary nature of the contents, and in the diversity which makes the book suitable for multiple readers. While the work of Gillespie and Knight suggests that readers were active in creating customised structures in their books, it nonetheless appears clear that publishers increasingly engaged in reader-oriented practices in shaping their own publications. In this respect, the development of the material-intertextual collection mirrored the development of commonplace books in print, beginning as a practice among readers, before appearing in ready-made printed compilations.⁴²

⁴² See Moss, *Printed Commonplace Books*, and Adam Smyth, *"Profit and Delight": Printed Miscellanies in England, 1640-1682* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2004).

Material intertextuality and its antecedents

As the summary of related scholarship above has suggested, there has been an increasing awareness that abstracting texts from their original contexts – physical, visual, and structural – risks eliminating or distorting the range of interpretive possibilities available to early modern readers. My own study focusses on the interaction of multiple texts presented together in a shared physical context, whether identifiable as the intention of their writer(s) or of the other figures involved in the production of early modern printed texts. The terminology I have adopted for this interaction is ‘material intertextuality’, which deserves to be unpacked in terms of its theoretical underpinnings as well as its relationship to scholarship focusing on similar issues.

Intertextuality has developed into a diffuse topic within literary studies, broadly describing ‘conditions [...] which affect and describe the relations between texts’.⁴³ Though writers have always been acknowledged to build on and borrow from their contemporaries and predecessors, intertextuality as a distinct field of literary studies is a more recent phenomenon.⁴⁴ The term was coined by Julie Kristeva as a paradigm for combining Ferdinand de Saussure’s view of language as a system of mutually-supportive ‘signs’ and Mikhail Bakhtin’s study of ‘dialogic’ relationships between texts.⁴⁵ The focus of early studies of intertextuality was the participation of words and phrases within the larger structure of language and discourse, with the ‘literary word’ for Kristeva being an ‘intersection of textual surfaces rather than a point (a fixed meaning), [...] a dialogue among several

⁴³ Helen Regueiro Elam, ‘Intertextuality’ in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* eds. Alex Preminger and T.V.F. Brogan (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1993), 620-22 (620).

⁴⁴ See, for example, the useful summary of intertextual theories throughout history in the introduction by Judith Still and Michael Worton in their edited collection *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices* (Manchester and New York: University of Manchester Press, 1990), 1-44.

⁴⁵ Julia Kristeva, *Semeiotiki: Recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Paris: Seuil, 1969); Ferdinand de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale* eds. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye (Paris: Payot, 1916), first translated to English by Wade Baskin as *Course in General Linguistics* (New York: The Philosophical Library, 1959); Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1981).

writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character) and the contemporary or earlier cultural context'.⁴⁶ This focus on the fundamental connection of texts (in terms of language, narrative, structure, etc.) constituted a revision to structuralist notions of a text as a sequestered, self-sufficient unit. In the work of poststructuralists like Roland Barthes, texts are seen as a 'mirage of citations' where the authority of the writer is dissolved into both the creative work of readers and a vast network of prior texts.⁴⁷

Modern studies of intertextuality outside of a theoretical setting tend to identify particular interactions between texts, from broad conceptions of 'influence' between writers in the work of Harold Bloom to connections between two or more texts that share a specific relationship.⁴⁸ My own approach suggests that interactions between texts can occur as a result of them being placed in physical proximity to one another, and specifically when they are written or printed as part of a single material unit. 'Material intertextuality' in the course of this thesis refers to the interpretations that can be generated from works falling into this category but, as mentioned in the discussion above, is not limited to those of demonstrable authorial intent. This question is addressed most directly in Chapters 1, 3, and 4 due to the nature of the works explored, but the input of editors and publishers features prominently throughout the thesis.

The crucial difference in my own version of intertextuality is the qualification 'material'. Within this paradigm texts which bear no evident relationship to one another can function as intertextual partners within the book as object rather than relying on formal, linguistic, or generic categories to act as the point of communication. 'Material' also indicates the prominence of book historical awareness in the discussion that follows, with attention paid to questions of format,

⁴⁶ Julia Kristeva, 'Word, Dialogue, and Novel,' in *The Kristeva Reader* ed. Toril Moi (New York: University of Columbia Press, 1986), 34-61 (36).

⁴⁷ Quoted in Jonathan Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (London and New York: Routledge, 1981; rpt. 2001), 113.

⁴⁸ See Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, 2nd Edition (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

typography, paratexts, and other features that interact with individual texts, and that speak to or mediate their relationships to one another in a shared physical context.⁴⁹

This subject has been addressed by previous scholars, though in infrequent and very different ways. The most substantial of these contributions comes from Neil Fraistat, both in his monograph on Romantic collections of poetry, *The Poem and the Book: Interpreting Collections of Romantic Poetry* (1985), and as editor of a collection of essays on the topic, *Poems in Their Place: Intertextuality and the Order of Poetic Collections* (1987).⁵⁰ In the first of these works, Fraistat examines what he refers to as ‘contexture’, ‘larger wholes fabricated from integral parts’ in relation to collections of poetry produced by Romantic poets, especially Wordsworth, Keats, and Shelley.⁵¹ Fraistat produces a persuasive account of the prominence of this structural imagination in poets from Callimachus to Walt Whitman, and my discussion of these texts is deeply indebted to his model. This model does, however, tend to foreground the individual author rather than other agents involved in the production of a printed book. Fraistat qualifies this by noting that as readers we are frequently involved in the production of ‘unity [...] even when no formal principles of structure are apparent’⁵², though ‘contextural critics ought to prefer over other arrangements an authorially-sanctioned ordering’.⁵³

In the early modern period specifically, the privileging of the author can present some problems. Any discussion of Q1 of *Astrophil and Stella* (explored in

⁴⁹ As such, my work will share an approach with some older scholarship, such as Wendy Wall’s excellent *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993) as well as the more recent scholarly drive to read material form and poetic form as mutually informing. For a useful overview, see Elizabeth Scott-Baumann and Benjamin Burton (eds.), *The Work of Form, Poetics and Materiality in Early Modern Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); and Allison K. Deutermann and Andras Kisery (eds.) *Formal Matters: Reading the Materials of English Renaissance Literature* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013).

⁵⁰ Neil Fraistat, *The Poem and the Book: Interpreting Collections of Romantic Poetry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985); Neil Fraistat (ed.), *Poems in their Place: Intertextuality and the Order of Poetic Collections* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009).

⁵¹ Fraistat, *The Poem and the Book*, 4.

⁵² Fraistat, ‘Introduction,’ in *Poems in their Place*, 3-17 (11).

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 9.

Chapter 2), for example, needs to confront the clear uncertainty as to whether the inclusion and organisation of its constituent works, as well as the presence of works by other authors, can be considered authorial. My primary reason for selecting ‘material intertextuality’ rather than ‘contexture’ as the primary term in my discussion stems from this problem and a desire to provide a neutral term for this phenomenon. Reading in a material-intertextual sense focuses attention on the specific physical form of a text, which includes the presence of multiple authors as well as non-authorial agents in many works of the sixteenth century.

A closer approximation of my model is the recent work of Matthew Zarnowiecki, who also focuses on early modern collections of poetry.⁵⁴ The overall aim of Zarnowiecki’s project is an exploration of ‘reproduction’, both in a textual sense but also in the sexual and parental metaphors that are present in the work of early modern poets. Key to Zarnowiecki’s analysis is his methodology of ‘medium-close reading’, a paradigm that recognises poems ‘rather than being single, static instantiations, they vary and mutate when reproduced’.⁵⁵ In addition to this focus on the multiple forms poems take in the hands of readers and editors, Zarnowiecki recognises ‘at times the radical dependency of a poem’s meaning on those poems adjacent to it’ and ‘that a poem’s subject and concerns should be mutually informed by its material instantiations’.⁵⁶ There are many points of contact between Zarnowiecki’s work and my own which will be addressed in Chapters 1 and 3 in particular, and our models are in broad agreement on the importance of context and material form. At the same time, the object of our focus differs: my own work is interested in the larger structures that emerge from considering the entirety of books, Zarnowiecki’s on individual poems with only occasional shifts of focus to larger textual units. To adopt the biological terminology that runs throughout Zarnowiecki’s work, his interest is mainly genetic, mine, phenotypic.

Other, less specific, models have also influenced my thinking on this topic. Richard C. Newton, for example, notes that in this period ‘authors’ sometimes

⁵⁴ Matthew Zarnowiecki, *Fair Copies: Reproducing the English Lyric from Tottel to Shakespeare* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014).

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, 7.

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, 7; Matthew Zarnowiecki, ‘Reading Shakespeare miscellaneously: Ben Jonson, Robert Chester, and the *Vatum Chorus of Love’s Martyr*,’ in Deutermann and Kisery (eds.) *Formal Matters*, 34-54 (34).

became ‘editors’ as their short lyrics were gathered in collections.⁵⁷ Kirsten Gibson, likewise suggests that in John Dowland’s *First Booke of Songes or Ayres* (1597) ‘the inclusion and positioning of Dowland’s songs in a printed book, a material object with its own logic of “order”, might have impinged on the ways in which they were read and understood’.⁵⁸ Anne Ferry is one of the few critics to focus on the emergent interpretive possibilities of non-authorial collections, particularly the anthology, which she notes ‘makes a new whole which is not identifiable with its contents’.⁵⁹ For the medieval period, collections of essays by Stephen G. Nichols and Sigfried Wenzel, Stephen Kelley and John Thompson, and Michael Johnston and Michael Van Dussen each discuss the problems and interpretive opportunities offered by texts encountered in the same codex.⁶⁰ While the circumstances of production are difficult to relate to early modern print, this research nonetheless testify to the importance of material intertextual readings for writers and compilers beyond the boundaries of the early modern period.

The final area of scholarship which touches on similar issues to those addressed in this thesis is the study of paratexts. The term derives from the influential work of the same name by Gérard Genette, who explores the effects of textual units relating to, but distinct from, the texts of a book itself (titles, dedications, prefaces, etc.).⁶¹ Together these form ‘thresholds’ and ‘vestibules’

⁵⁷ Richard C. Newton ‘Making Books from Leaves: When Poets Become Editors,’ in *Print Culture in the Renaissance*, eds. Gerald Tyson and Sylvia Wagonheim (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1980), 246-64.

⁵⁸ Kirsten Gibson, ‘The order of the book: materiality, narrative and authorial voice in John Dowland’s *First Booke of Songes or Ayres*,’ *Renaissance Studies* 26, no.1 (2012): 13-33; see also Kirsten Gibson, *John Dowland’s Printed Ayres: Texts, Contexts, Intertexts* (PhD Thesis, University of Newcastle, 2005).

⁵⁹ Anne Ferry, *Tradition and the Individual Poem: An Inquiry into Anthologies* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 24. See also her discussion of sequence and relation between the poems of *Palgrave’s Golden Treasury* in Chapter 2 of the same work.

⁶⁰ Stephen G. Nichols and Siegfried Wenzel (eds.), *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997); Stephen Kelly and John Thompson (eds.), *Imagining the Book: Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepolis, 2005; Johnston and Van Dussen (eds.), *The Medieval Manuscript Book*.

⁶¹ Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1997).

between the reader and the text, conveying a range of information as well as conditioning some of the responses that readers may have to the text itself.⁶² This relates to Genette's broader project of transtextuality, or the description of the various ways in which a text relates to others, which includes intertextuality but enumerates a far larger set of relationships than those designated by that term alone.⁶³ Genette's demonstration that one part of the total textual unit that is the book could shape or influence our understanding of another has clear relevance for the project outlined in this thesis, though he dismisses the notion that material collections can generate the same effect: 'the effect of sequence or progression is usually very weak, and the order of the constituent parts is most often arbitrary'.⁶⁴ I hope to show in this thesis that this is certainly untrue of early modern texts, though the fundamental insights of Genette's work will be evident in many of my discussions of the paratexts to the materials discussed in each chapter. In a specifically early modern context, work by Kevin Dunn, Helen Smith and Louise Wilson, Brian W. Schneider, and Michael Saenger all extend and nuance Genette's insights, and provide localised examples of the kind of meaning I will argue extends between texts themselves, as well as between text and paratext.⁶⁵

Chronological range

A brief justification needs to be given for the restricted chronology of this thesis: though I will briefly explore other works in the course of each chapter, the majority of my examples come from the 1590s, with the major exceptions being *Songes and*

⁶² *Ibid.*, 2. For a discussion of both 'entries' and 'exits' from early modern texts, see William H. Sherman, "'The Beginning of "The End": Terminal Paratext and the Birth of Print Culture,' in Smith and Wilson (eds), *Renaissance Paratexts*, 65-87.

⁶³ See in particular Gérard Genette, *The Architext: An Introduction*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

⁶⁴ Genette, *Paratexts*, 312.

⁶⁵ Kevin Dunn, *Pretexes of Authority: The Rhetoric of Authorship in the Renaissance Preface* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1994); Smith and Wilson (eds.), *Renaissance Paratexts*; Brian W. Schneider, *The Framing Text in Early Modern English Drama: 'Whining' Prologues and 'Armed' Epilogues* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011); Michael Saenger, *The Commodification of Textual Engagements in the English Renaissance* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

sonettes (1557) and George Gascoigne's *Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (1573), both addressed in my first chapter. This is partly due to the limitations of space, and a desire to provide in-depth discussions of a few influential texts rather than a broad overview of many. At the same time, I believe there are reasons for seeing the 1590s in particular as a transformative period for English literature, both in the number of writers who appeared in print during this time, and the vast expansion of literary works produced by publishers.⁶⁶ Though scholarship is generally wary of narratives that propose punctuated equilibria rather than gradual development, there is substantial evidence to suggest that this decade differed in a pronounced sense from the rest of the sixteenth century.

A brief overview of the number of writers who first appeared in print, or had the majority of their works published between 1590 and 1600 testifies to the centrality of this particular decade to early modern literary history. They include Bacon, Barnfield, Campion, Chapman, Daniel, Davies, Drayton, Fraunce, Harington, Jonson, Kyd, Lodge, Marlowe, Marston, Middleton, Nashe, Shakespeare, Mary and Philip Sidney, Southwell, and Spenser, as well as a large number of less-studied authors. In addition to this list, several other important literary events took place in these years, including the Harvey-Nashe feud, the first salvoes in the 'war of the theatres', the vogue for sonnet sequences, the publication of major poetic anthologies,⁶⁷ and the first translations of major classical and continental poets into English.⁶⁸ Also notable is the marked increase in works that we might think of as nascent literary criticism, including those of George Puttenham (1589), Sir John

⁶⁶ In a broader social and cultural sense, Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins describe the 'long 1590s' (between 1588 and 1603) as: 'a heady mixture of euphoria, panic, an unprecedented flowering of literary talent, plague, bad harvests, and fin-de-siècle malaise [... It was] the formative decade for the shaping of English literary and historiographical self-consciousness, and left an aesthetic legacy that underpinned literary endeavour and notions of literary value for well over a century', 'Introduction', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, Special Issue 16 (2007), paragraph 1.

⁶⁷ Primarily 'R.S.', *The Phoenix Nest* (London: John Jackson, 1593); 'N.B', *The arbor of amorous deuises* (London: Richard Jones, 1597); John Bodenham, *Bel-vedère* (London: F.K. for Hugh Astley, 1600) and *England's Helicon* (London: J. Roberts for J. Flasket, 1600); and Robert Albott, *Englands Parnassus* (London: For Nicholas Ling, Cutherbert Burby and T. Hayes, 1600). Just outside of this decade was Robert Chester, *Love's Martyr* (London: Richard Field for E. Blount, 1601)

⁶⁸ Including Ariosto (by Sir John Harington in 1591), Tasso (by 'R.C' in 1594), Boiardo (by 'R.T.' in 1598), Homer (by George Chapman in 1598) and Lucan (by Christopher Marlowe in 1600).

Harington (1591), and Francis Meres (1598). Together with the burst of miscellanies at the turn of the century, these suggest a growing self-awareness of a vernacular literary tradition, as well as the value inherent in these works.

This list might be qualified by the fact that many of these works were composed much earlier than the date of their first publication; it also neglects the bustling manuscript culture of universities, court, and noble households. Nonetheless it demonstrates that these years marked a distinct acceleration and expansion of English literature in print.⁶⁹ Recent statistical work by Zachary Lesser and Alan Farmer on the print industry as a whole supports this argument. They note that between 1559 and 1602, the total number of publications tripled, a huge increase that is also accompanied by changing market shares for various genres. Their revision of longstanding figures provided by H.S. Bennett has significant repercussions for many of our assumptions about the relative presence of particular genres across time, with literature in particular shown to have had a larger market share than previously thought, especially in the 1590s.⁷⁰

It will be my argument across this thesis that the expansion of the book trade as a whole and the increase in literary works in particular was also accompanied by a rise in aggregate volumes containing more than one work. As a result, the broad narrative of this thesis moves from an exploration of early experiments with this form before exploring some of the most influential examples from the 1590s.

Chapter summaries

Chapter one explores two important works in the history of published poetry in the sixteenth century, Richard Tottel's *Songes and sonettes* (1557) and George Gascoigne's *Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (1573), as well as discussing the social,

⁶⁹ An additional corroboration of this decade's importance can be found in the discussion of 1594 as a year of major change for early modern drama in the essays of *Shakespeare Quarterly* 61:4 (2010).

⁷⁰ Alan B. Farmer and Zachary Lesser, 'What is Print Popularity? A Map of the Elizabethan Book Trade,' in *The Elizabethan Top Ten: Defining Print Popularity in Early Modern England*, eds. Andy Kesson and Emma Smith (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 19-54; H.S. Bennett, *English Books and Readers 1558-1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965) and *English Books and Readers 1603-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

manuscript origins of many works of this period. I will argue that *Songes and sonettes*, despite often being described as miscellaneous, is sensitive and responsive to the effects of order and interaction between texts, especially in the sections attributed to Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and Thomas Wyatt. In transferring poems from a fluid, social environment to print, Tottel's volume attempts to provide its readers, unlikely to be acquainted with the poems or their circumstances, with keys to understanding the poems through information encoded in titles. Especially in the case of Henry Howard, there is clear evidence that at least some readers interpreted the poems as providing a biographical narrative of sorts, and this is also true of many mid-century collections which promote themselves as records of their authors' lives, professions, and relationships. George Gascoigne provides a playful parody of many of these conventions through his fictional editor, G.T., who is supposedly responsible for gathering, organising, and commenting on the poems of his collection. I argue that G.T. is also an examination of the dangers inherent in publishing personal poetry, as he frequently demonstrates his lack of knowledge, misreadings, and gossipy speculation about the biographical narrative that lie behind the poems. Reading the entirety of the volume suggests that Gascoigne was keenly aware of material-intertextual readings; moreover, I argue, he provides one of the key bridges between mid-century collections and the works of the 1590s that continue to explore and expand the effects of gathering and organisation.

Chapter two examines the three versions of Sir Philip Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*: the 'unauthorised' 1591 volumes and the 1598 edition of his works. Specifically, it argues that these two years present two different identities for Sidney in print: the first as a 'traditional' English writer whose poetry veers towards the misogynistic, and the latter as a 'continental' writer who ironises Astrophil and provides a strong rebuttal of Petrarchan convention in the character of Stella. I argue that despite its poor reputation among literary critics, the 1591 texts demonstrate in their ordering and inclusion of other writers a coherent vision, and need to be taken seriously to understand the full ramifications of the battle for Sidney's identity in print.

Chapter three discusses Edmund Spenser's *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (1595) and *Fowre Hymnes* (1596), and argues that the full range of contents in these publications, rarely examined by scholars, presents a subtle exploration of the collection as a form. In *Colin Clouts*, Spenser reintroduces his pastoral persona

seventeen years after his last appearance in order to criticise the mechanics of censorship, a subject relevant to Spenser after the calling-in of *Complaints* (1591). Spenser gestures to the capacity for smaller textual fragments to speak to larger issues through their interaction while avoiding direct censure. In acting as the guide through a series of works by other authors, he also constructs a community of likeminded poets around their shared respect for Sir Philip Sidney. I go on to analyse *Fowre Hymnes* in dialogue with *Daphnaida*, which was reprinted in the same volume. I argue that Spenser revisits his older work in order to explore the transformative effect of placing poems in proximity to one another. In a volume whose dedicatory narrative discusses the ability for new work to contain and modulate older writing, Spenser can be seen to interrogate the process of interpretive reading itself; as a result, I argue, these ‘minor’ works are far more important to understanding Spenser’s later career than we have often appreciated.

Chapter 4 discusses Samuel Daniel’s *Delia* (1592 onwards), a work of enormous importance and popularity that has received relatively little critical attention. I argue that rather than the single text that is often discussed, *Delia* can be seen as four separate texts, each of which is marked by global changes across the poems of the collection for particular thematic purposes. Against Daniel’s reputation as a reviser-without-purpose, I argue that *Delia* demonstrates not only the way in which the global meaning of the text can change with alterations made to small sections, but an evolving philosophy of ‘reception’ by readers. I discuss the inclusion of Daniel’s verse drama *Cleopatra*, beginning with Q4, and the complexities that emerge when reading this work alongside Daniel’s sonnet sequence. Finally, I explore how Daniel’s ‘works’ of 1601 position the sonnets, and how that volume tells a thematic story about Daniel and his perception of his place in literary history.

Finally, my conclusion gestures to the continuation of this phenomenon in the seventeenth century, and explores the ramifications of reading in a material-intertextual sense for both editorial approaches and studies of early modern poetry as a whole. Taken together, the evidence surveyed in this thesis indicates that material intertextuality was a widespread phenomenon that directly affected readers’ interpretation of early modern literary texts. Returning our attention to its use by both authors and publishers offers new readings on a number of important texts, and indicates a frequently-overlooked ‘structural imagination’ on the part of early modern readers and writers.

Chapter 1: ‘[I]n some good order’: *Songes and Sonettes*, George Gascoigne, and the Editing of Poetry in Print

I haue thought good (I say) to present you with this written booke, wherein you shall find a number of *Sonets*, layes, letters, Ballades, Rondlets, verlayes and verses, the workes of your friend and myne Master *F. I.* and diuers others, the which when I had with long trauayle confusedly gathered together, I thought it then *Opere precium*, to reduce them into some good order. The which I haue done according to my barreyne skill in this written Booke, commending it vnto you to read and to peruse, and desiring you as I onely do aduenture thus to participate the sight therof vnto your former good will, euen so that you will by no meanes make the same common: but after your owne recreation taken therin & you wil safely redeliuer vnto me the originall copie.

(George Gascoigne, *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (1573), A2r)

In 1573 Richard Smith published *A hundreth sundrie flowres bounde vp in one small poesie*, a book presented as anonymous, but containing several letters describing the events leading to the work’s publication. They begin with the printer ‘A.B.’ declaring that he had been passed the work by ‘H.W.’ who in turn had received it from ‘G.T.’, who had originally collected and annotated the work of many poets. H.W. gave A.B. the volume to publish against the wishes of G.T., though A.B. himself raises the possibility that this story may be untrue. In 1575, much of the same work was republished in a new order and with a new title, *The poesies of George Gascoigne Esquire*, which admitted authorship of the *Hundreth* as a whole. Some readers may already have arrived at this conclusion through a careful analysis of *Hundreth*, which advertised its playfulness in its paratexts, and identified Gascoigne as the author of many poems.

Of all the personae adopted by Gascoigne in *Hundreth*, however, ‘G.T.’, whose letter to H.W. is quoted at the head of this chapter, is the figure who dominates the book. He is responsible not only for gathering the materials that make up the volume, but for having ‘reduce[d] them’ into their current order ‘according to my barreyne skill’. One of the most original aspects of Gascoigne’s paratextual

fiction is that the volume becomes one shaped by an individual who makes his intervention (gathering, ordering, editing) transparent. We are not reading the works of many poets, but many poets as filtered through the interpretive judgement ('skill') of an individual reader. In the fiction of *Hundreth*, this reader has collected works in the context of an exclusive coterie that embraced a 'social textuality' that Arthur Marotti and Margaret Ezell have identified as crucial to writing in this period.⁷¹ The result is a work that presents itself to the reader as a personal project of compilation removed from its original social coordinates, and plays on the potential salaciousness of private activity being made public.

In this chapter I argue that the poetic collection in print became a distinct literary genre that articulated its existence and organisation with reference to manuscript circulation, but developed new textual strategies in presenting its contents to a public readership. Gascoigne's meta-fiction responds acutely to these conventions, and explores the ramifications of reading poems when those texts were isolated from the circumstances, events, and individuals that shaped them. Specifically, I contend that Gascoigne identifies a desire in readers to generate coherent frameworks for reading poems gathered together under the notion of a single author – with biographical assumptions foremost among them. The paratexts to *Hundreth* reveal an interest in how material form and organisation shape interpretation, and how these interpretations shape the responses of individual readers in their own collection and editing of texts. In order to describe Gascoigne's approach, I will begin by exploring the context of sixteenth-century poetry in manuscript culture. Following this, I discuss the influential *Songes and Sonettes*, published in 1557, and a number of poetic collections of the 1560s and 1570s that clearly responded to its innovations, before turning to *Hundreth* and the way that Gascoigne complicates this incipient genre and anticipates the experiments in material intertextuality of the 1590s.

⁷¹ Arthur Marotti, *Print, Manuscript, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: University of Cornell Press, 1995); Margaret Ezell, *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press 1999). See also the seminal works by Jerome J. McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983) and D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (London: British Library, 1986).

1557: Poetry in Manuscript and Print

Songes and sonettes, written by the ryght honorable Lorde Henry Haward late Earle of Surrey, and other was published in 1557 by Richard Tottel and quickly became a bestseller, with two further editions in 1557 and at least eleven before 1600. The volume opened with a preface ‘to the reader’ that framed the volume as proof that English poetry was on an equal footing with its continental peers:

That to haue wel written in verse, yea and in small parcelles, deserueth great praise, the woorkes of diuers Latines, Italians, & other, doe proue sufficiently. That our tong is able in that kinde to do as praise worthelye as the rest, the honorable stile of the noble earle of Surrey, and the weightinesse of the depe witted sir Thomas Wiat the elders verse, with seuerall graces in sondry good Englishe writers, do show abundantly. It resteth now (gentle reder) y^t thou thinke it not euil don, to publishe, to y^e honor of the english tong, and for profit of the studious of Englishe eloquence, those workes which the vngentle horders vp of such tresure haue heretofore enuied the.

(A1r)

Though frank and direct in comparison to the loquacious and playful paratexts of other literary works, this preface immediately makes clear that this is a volume of some importance to both ‘the studious’ and ‘the english tongue’ more generally. Wendy Wall has argued that part of the volume’s success was due to its use as a model for writing ‘for the serious students of poetry as well as those interested in the overlapping activities of courtship and courtiership.’⁷² In the figures of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, and Thomas Wyatt, these readers would have found technically-accomplished noble writers who were among the first to import modern continental forms and subjects into English verse. George Puttenham, for example, described Surrey and Wyatt as ‘hauing trauailed into Italie’ and brought back a continental poetics which ‘greatly polished our rude & homely maner of vulgar Poesie, from that it had bene before, and for that cause may iustly be sayd the first

⁷² Wendy Wall, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 29.

reformers of our English meetre and stile.⁷³ Both had died years before their work appeared together in print, and Tottel's preface makes clear that the current volume has rescued them from the 'horders up' of their works, democratising what had previously been selfishly reserved.⁷⁴

Tottel's words gesture to the manuscript origins of the material that now appears in the printed book, and by extension, offers entry into a socially-restricted network whose dynamics were often played out in textual forms. Work by Arthur F. Marotti, Peter Beal, Henry Woudhuysen, and Harold Love laid the groundwork for the current understanding of socially transmitted verse, and had a defining effect on our understanding of early modern poetry.⁷⁵ This includes the intensely social nature of composition and circulation for the majority of early modern verse which, in Marotti's formulation, 'was embedded in specific social situations, and writers and audiences responded to it both within the immediate context and in terms of shared sociocultural assumptions.'⁷⁶ Poetry, and especially shorter forms that might comfortably be contained on the 'separate' that Harold Love identifies as the basic unit of manuscript transmission, offered a flexible tool through which to conduct a range of social interactions.⁷⁷ This is particularly marked in social settings in which communication and networking were already of primary importance: the court, the universities, the Inns of Court, and noble households. Stephen Greenblatt's work on 'self-fashioning' and authorial roles has been subject to extensive critique, but his

⁷³ George Puttenham, *The arte of English poesie Contriued into three bookes* (London: Richard Field, 1589), 48-9.

⁷⁴ Tottel's comments come from a tradition of 'heroic' Humanist editors. See Sonia Massai, *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), especially Chapter 1. See also W.A. Sessions, 'Surrey's Wyatt: Autumn 1542 and the New Poet,' in *Rethinking the Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts*, ed. Peter C Herman (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 168-192 for an extended discussion about the reception of both Surrey and Wyatt.

⁷⁵ Arthur F. Marotti, *Print, Manuscript*; Peter Beal, *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998); H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); Harold Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Amherst, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998).

⁷⁶ Marotti, *Print, Manuscript*, 7.

⁷⁷ Love, *Culture and Commerce*, 13.

account of socially-mediated textual identity nonetheless remains important in assessing the importance of ‘roles’ to early modern authors.⁷⁸ Tottel’s preface presents the book as liberated from just this kind of network, which he frames as inaccessible to the likely readers of the volume.

One of the important activities that was practised alongside writing and circulating texts was the flexible approach to texts that has been noted by several scholars. Poems were copied, altered, answered, and parodied alongside a range of material that was not limited to literary works.⁷⁹ Instead, as Anne Moss and Ann Blair have shown, readers were active in creating their own repositories of information and enjoyment culled from the full range of texts that they encountered.⁸⁰ One of the more interesting aspects of this individual editorial activity is the incorporation of both manuscript and print work into composite volumes, some of the more idiosyncratic of which are described in detail by William Sherman.⁸¹ Jeffrey Todd Knight has also shown that the material side of this collecting activity involved some books being literally sewn together from a patchwork of texts and fragments.⁸²

⁷⁸ Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980). See particularly Greenblatt’s discussion of Wyatt, 115-156.

⁷⁹ On this collaborative social aspect of poetry, see Arthur F. Marotti, *John Donne, Coterie Poet* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986). For a discussion of the adaptation and recontextualising of poems, see Joshua Eckhardt, *Manuscript Verse Collectors and the Politics of Anti-Courtly Love Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

⁸⁰ Anne Moss, *Printed Commonplace Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); see more recently Fred Shurink, ‘Manuscript Commonplace Books, Literature, and Reading in Early Modern England’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 73:, no.3 (2010): 453-469; Anne M. Blair, *Too Much To Know: Managing Scholarly Information Before the Modern Age* (New Haven, NJ: Yale University Press, 2011).

⁸¹ William H. Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Pennsylvania, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007). See also some of the case studies in in Joshua Eckhardt and Daniel Starza Smith (eds.) *Manuscript Miscellanies in Early Modern England* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

⁸² Jeffrey Todd Knight, ‘Needles and Pens: The Work of Sewing in Early English Books,’ *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 45, no.3 (2015): 523-542; for additional work see also Piers Brown, ‘Donne, Rhapsody, and Textual Order,’ in *Manuscript Miscellanies*, ed. Eckhardt and Smith, 39-56.

Through this flexible approach to the material forms and content of the works they handled, individuals and groups created heterogeneous documents that represent the fragmentation of texts, and their creative recombination to articulate individual responses. A noticeably smaller number of sixteenth-century collections contain mostly or only poetry. Julia Boffey has noted that, unlike France, England did not develop the same interest in gathering lyrics in organised collections.⁸³ Instead, poems were largely recorded alongside a range of other material in the personally-owned manuscripts or commonplace books that Marotti sees as the primary ancestor for the poetic collections of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁸⁴

Though it is clear that there was a rapid acceleration of writing, copying, and circulating manuscript poetry in the seventeenth century (much of it centred on the poetry of John Donne) several key manuscripts from the early sixteenth century record a developing consciousness of material-intertextual readings. BL Add 17492, more commonly known as the ‘Devonshire’ manuscript, records a number of short lyrics that circulated among a group of upper-class men and women connected to the household of Anne Boleyn.⁸⁵ The poems appear in a number of different hands, lack titles, and have infrequent or unclear attribution, all of which testifies to the context of production and consumption facilitated by manuscript. At the same time, the active choices made about which verse to transcribe, and how to order it reveals the effect that individual readers as editors had on the poetry that came into their hands. Elizabeth Heale argues that at least one reader actively changed the sense of the material she inscribed, selecting stanzas praising women from Chaucer’s *Troilus and Creseyde*, and editing one stanza to invert its meaning.⁸⁶ Another example that testifies to the social nature of the collection is the sequence of poems (ff. [26r]–

⁸³ Julia Boffey, *Manuscripts of English Courtly Love Lyrics in the Later Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Brewer, 1985), 134-5. See also Julia Boffey and John J. Thompson ‘Anthologies and Miscellanies: Production and Choice of Texts,’ in *Book Production and Publishing in Britain, 1375-1475*, eds. Jeremy Griffiths and Derek Pearsall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989) 279-316.

⁸⁴ Marotti, *Print and Manuscript*, 19.

⁸⁵ An edition edited by Julia Boffey is forthcoming. The collaborative edition by the ‘Devonshire MS Editorial Group’ (https://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/The_Devonshire_Manuscript) remains the only edited version of the text.

⁸⁶ Elizabeth Heale, *Wyatt, Surrey, and Early Tudor Poetry* (London: Longman, 1998), 42-46.

[29v]) that appears to capture an exchange of love poetry between Lady Margaret Douglas and Lord Thomas Howard.⁸⁷

The Devonshire manuscript, alongside a small number of other manuscripts such as the Egerton (BL Ms Egerton 2711) and Arundel-Harington, demonstrates the immediate antecedents for Tottel's volume. Verse circulated in a social network, and was endlessly adapted and recombined by readers in their own self-made collections, as well as those of groups. Tottel's volume offered an equivalent gathering in print, but necessarily removed the volume from the social context that explained many of the allusions and narratives present in the poems. The question of how best to deal with this changed readership and knowledge occasioned a number of innovations and experiments by authors and publishers of the 1560s and 1570s. In the next section I will explore the influential model provided by *Songes and sonettes*, and argue that its methods for organising the text and providing a biographical framework were quickly adopted by authors of mid-century poetic collections. In short, the original social identity of the poems was replaced by a cohesive material and textual identity that constituted a distinct genre of poetic texts in these years.

The structure of Songes and sonettes

Publishing the poems of *Songes and sonettes* may have been presented as a heroic act of service to country and language, but transferring works that were intensely responsive to their original social environments presented a problem thanks to their readers' unfamiliarity with the circumstances of their composition. Our manuscript sources for the poems in *Songes and sonettes* indicate that intensive editorial intervention was made to many poems before printing, particularly focused on smoothing the meter into regular iambic pentameter, as well as some changes to vocabulary. Stephen W. May notes the extent of these changes, and argues that

⁸⁷ Edward A. Bond, 'Wyatt's Poems,' *The Athenaeum* 2274 (1874): 654-55; see also Helen Baron, 'Mary (Howard) Fitzroy's Hand in the Devonshire Manuscript,' *The Review of English Studies* 45, no.179 (1994): 318-335; the most substantial analysis of this sequence is Bradley J. Irish, 'Gender and Politics in the Henrician Court: The Douglas-Howard Lyrics in the Devonshire Manuscript (BL Add 17492),' *Renaissance Quarterly* 64, no.1 (2011): 79-114.

Tottel himself is the likely editor, having demonstrated an interest in literary works and in editing his texts through his other publications.⁸⁸

The most apparent way that *Songes and Sonettes* transformed its material is in the addition of titles that do not appear in manuscript, and gesture to some form of context in terms of the poem's speaker, addressee, or occasion. Most of the titles are short, descriptive, and composed of recurring phrases such as 'a lover' and 'a gentlewoman'. Others clearly demonstrate a familiarity with the poem, and provide specific details; 'Complaint that his ladie after she knew of his loue kept her face alway hidden from him' (poem 13) is a good example, and clearly attempts to provide details that locate it within its original social context.⁸⁹ One piece of evidence that suggests these titles were intended to supply contextual information rather than identifying the poems individually is the index that appears at the end of the volume. Rather than the titles forming the basis for cataloguing the poems, it is their first line that identifies them, testifying both to the generic nature of many of the titles, and also to their precise function in relation to the poems.

Despite this clear evidence of editorial intervention, the degree to which Tottel's volume exhibits any larger or more comprehensive structure has been a subject of some debate. Wall, for example, reads the volume as offering 'no readily comprehensible generic, authorial, or structural order', while Christopher Warner sees any relationships as existing only locally between pairs of poems rather than extended across the volume.⁹⁰ As a counterpoint, Paul A. Marquis has demonstrated

⁸⁸ Stephen W. May, 'Popularizing Courtly Poetry: Tottel's Miscellany and its Progeny,' in *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature 1485-1603*, eds. Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shank (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 418-436. See also Hyder Edward Rollins (ed.) *Tottel's Miscellany, 1557-1587* (2 Volumes) (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1928-9), who agrees that Tottel is the likely editor. Grimald has frequently been put forward as a plausible candidate, see for example H.J. Byrom, 'The Case for Nicholas Grimald as Editor for 'Tottel's Miscellany,' *Modern Language Review* 27, no.2 (1932): 125-143 and Christopher Warner, *The Making and Marketing of Tottel's Miscellany, 1557: Songs and Sonnets in the Summer of the Martyrs' Fires* (Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013), who raises doubts about Tottel's direct editorial involvement.

⁸⁹ See Anne Ferry, *The Title to the Poem* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996) for an interesting discussion of the relationship between titles and poems, including a discussion of *Songes and sonettes*.

⁹⁰ Wall, *Imprint of Gender*, 24; Christopher Warner, *Making and Marketing*, 95-158.

that *Songes and Sonettes* exhibits marked changes in structure between Q1 and Q2.⁹¹ In Q2, the Surrey and Wyatt poems that had been appended to the end of the volume are reinserted into the main body of those poets, with a clear consciousness of the tone and themes that justified their new positions.

In at least one respect, we can see that the volume does have a structural quality. From Q2 onwards, the volume was split into three distinct units: the poems of Surrey, the poems of Wyatt, and a final section of ‘uncertain authors’. As the most socially distinguished of the poets in the collection, Surrey was given prominence by being first, as well as having his name included in the title. A distinguished nobleman and soldier, recently executed for treason, Surrey provided a certain ‘romantic notoriety’ that undoubtedly helped the volume to find an audience as well as conferring a degree of glamour to a collection of poetry that had few precedents and whose reception was by no means guaranteed to be positive.⁹² Though much of the volume offers local interactions which are fascinating, my argument is that the Surrey section provided a broad thematic movement, which, coupled with a small number of seemingly ‘biographical’ poems, suggested the biography of the poet as a model for authors of the mid-century collections. Evidence from later writings by Thomas Nashe and Michael Drayton will show that at least some readers made connections between the poems in this section, and structured a larger biographical narrative for Surrey.

At the outset of the Surrey sequence, we are immediately given at least one indication that the editor has carefully selected the first poem to form a bridge between the preface and the rest of the collection. In poem 1, a standard Petrarchan lament that compares the change of seasons to his own state, the speaker hopes his words will have an effect on their addressee:

[...] I may plaine my fill
Unto my self, vnlesse this carefull song

⁹¹ Paul A. Marquis (ed.), *Richard Tottel's Songes and Sonettes: The Elizabethan Version* (Tempe, AZ.: Renaissance English Text Society, 2007), xxxix-liv. Also see Marquis' chapter 'Printing History and Editorial Design in Tottel's Songes and Sonettes,' in *Songes and Sonettes: Tottel's Miscellany in Context*, ed. Richard Hamrick (Burlington, VT.: Ashgate, 2013), 1-40.

⁹² Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print*, 216; see also W.A. Sessions, *Henry Howard, The Poet Earl of Surrey: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), Part 3.

Print in your hart some parcell of my tene (l.49-51)⁹³

‘Print’ is a word that appears only three times in *Songes and sonettes*, always in Surrey’s poems (poems 1, 4 and 18), with ‘imprinted’ appearing twice, once in Surrey’s section (poem 33). ‘Parcell’ occurs only twice: in this poem, and the preface that immediately precedes it. The effect creates a cohesiveness between paratext and poetry, and emphasises the importance of the word ‘parcell’ in the preface. As Wendy Wall has noted, the word ‘straddles seemingly contradictory formal positions (“parcelled” meaning both an assemblage of diverse parts and a constituent portion of the whole)’. Tottel, she argues, ‘names poetry by its placement within coterie circuits: as “parcelles” to be sent.’⁹⁴

The larger trajectory of the section begins with staple Petrarchan themes: the world around the poet teems with life and moves through its seasons while the poet is trapped in stasis and dissatisfaction on account of his beloved. A number of poems tackle themes and narratives that would become standard for the sonnet sequences of the later sixteenth-century, from a detractor of love being forced into love by an offended Cupid (5) to the contrast of natural harmony to inward turmoil (1, 2, 11), and assurances of constancy despite ill treatment (25). The tone grows combative, however, despite the posture of submissiveness struck in many of the poems. In ‘A song written by the earle of Surrey to a ladie that refused to daunce with him’ (29) the speaker responds with an aggressiveness not apparent in the preceding poems:

Sith that a Lions hart is for a Wolfe no pray,
With bloody mouth go slake your thirst on simple shepe I say,
With more dispite and ire than I can now expresse... (l.71-73)

This rejoinder contrasts sharply to the tone of the poems around it, a disjuncture which prepares us for the movement of the poems from the subject of love to a more diverse range of topics. From poem 31 (‘The meanes to attain happy life’), the Surrey section turns to a number of non-amatory subjects, including praise of the mean estate (32), the happiness of childhood (38), and a classical example of an evil

⁹³ All quotations are from Marquis (ed.) *Songes and Sonettes*, with line numbers cited parenthetically in the text.

⁹⁴ Wall, *Imprint of Gender*, 25.

ruler (37). Poem 39 ('Bonum est mihi quod humiliasti me') not only includes a Latin title (unlike the majority of the volume), but adapts the Vulgate rendering of Psalm 118:71, demonstrating how far the sequence has moved from the constant references to 'a/the lover' in the titles of the opening poems.

This section includes two elegies on Wyatt (34, 35), which praise him in elaborate terms and prepare us for the transition to Wyatt's own poems in the next section. The elegies here transform what has been a repeated (and melodramatic) reference to the speaker dying, or expressing his wish to die, into a sober reflection of actual death rather than psychological discomfort. Poem 30, for example, ends with a hyperbolic gesture of loyalty to the beloved: 'And when thys carcas here to earth shalbe refarde, / I do bequeath my weried ghost to server her afterwarde' (1.59-60). A few poems later this metaphor is transformed in the second of Surrey's elegies (35), lamenting that a paragon of virtue had not been recognised as such while alive: 'Thus, for our gilte, this jewel have we lost: / The earth his bones, the heavens possesse his gost' (1.37-38). By virtue of their proximity, this conclusion (both quoted lines terminate their respective poems), drives home the sharpness of the contrast between the hyperbolic language of the individual lover and the sobering finality of Wyatt's death. The relocation of the 'ghost' from a metaphor for service to a religious reality reinforces the moral force of the poems with which the Surrey section concludes. '[T]hose daies / In vayn were spent' (1.8-9) the speaker laments in the final poem, casting the early, amorous poems as distractions from the more serious world where virtue goes unrewarded and the worthy die unheralded.

Though fragmented and imprecise, the poems of the Surrey section can be seen to present what Earl Miner has described as 'plotless narratives': sequences of thematically related material that exhibit connections between poems, but do not develop any of the more precise narrative features expected of more established genres.⁹⁵ Instead, we can observe a gradual but distinctive shift from Petrarchan poems of love and rejection at the start of the section to primarily moral and philosophical works at the end. While perhaps a result of the need to save space, the unity of these poems as a continuous sequence which is ongoing and organic rather

⁹⁵ Earl Miner, 'Some Issues for Study of Integrated Collections,' in *Poems in Their Place: The Intertextuality and Order of Poetic Collections*, ed. Neil Fraistat (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 18-43 (24).

than episodic is enhanced by the layout of the poems on the page: headings are separated from their poems, single lines creep onto the next page, and there are no attempts at typographical division between poems.

Individual poems in both the Wyatt and ‘Uncertain Auctors’ sections seem to provide hints of biographical detail; Surrey’s poems go much further, pointing repeatedly towards their author’s life, with more provocative detail. Unlike Wyatt, who mentions no less than three female addressees, Surrey’s ‘Description and praise of his love Geraldine’ (8) contains the only woman’s name that appears in his sequence, creating a fixed addressee that informs the rest of the poems addressed to or about women. In this respect, the lack of additional names allows for the illusion that the poems describe a single relationship with a single woman. The biographical details in this poem – that Geraldine was first presented to him at Hampton (l.11), and that Windsor separated him from her (l.12) - return in subsequent poems, creating a narrative through repeated references that is not evident in the other poems of *Songes and Sonettes*. Poem 11 opens, in fact, with a description of ‘Windsor walles’ (l.1), where the speaker’s unhappiness leads him to stand ‘halfbent to throw me down’ from them. With these hints already presented to the reader, poem 15 explicitly mentions in its title that the speaker is ‘Prisoned in windsor’. The network of place names that runs through the sequence offer the suggestion of a narrative that develops and builds on Surrey’s place as a controversial, well-known figure in the imagination of readers of the time. The constant mentions of death, defeats, and the vicissitudes of fortune take on a particular charge in this setting, and transform what elsewhere in the collection are hyperbolic gestures of Petrarchan conceit into prescient comments on the writer’s eventual downfall.

These points are necessarily speculative. I am not arguing that *Songes and Sonettes* somehow intended to present a complete narrative with identifiable historical figures, places, dates, and a ‘plot’. Rather, the inclusion and arrangement of poems, the attempt to tie in the preface to Surrey’s own writing, Surrey’s position as a cultural icon, and the prominent location of him as the central author of the book all hint at an underlying interest in tying seemingly autobiographical comments together to unify the group of disparate poems. A similar, though less precise, narrative can be traced for Wyatt, but the importance of Surrey’s reception has made him the focus of this discussion. One aspect of the physical layout of the text that makes this sequence both more and less cohesive is the lack of an author’s name at

the start of the Surrey or Wyatt sections, unlike the ‘Uncertain Auctors’ and ‘Songs by N.G.’ sections which make up the rest of the volume.⁹⁶ Rather, the two sections are undersigned after the conclusion of the final poem. The only suggestions that the poems within the sections belong to the same author are one poem in each group which mentions the author by name (29 for Surrey; 126 for Wyatt), but these occur near the end of the sequence and say nothing about the authorship of surrounding works.

That authorship is announced retrospectively rather than from the outset is curious. These concluding names seem to ‘sign’ the poems in a much more personal way than a heading: the poet’s name appears (SVRREY; T. WYATE the elder) without an editorial addition to indicate authorship (‘written by’, etc). That both ‘signatures’ appear in a different type to the italic titles and gothic texts provides something of a personality to the two subscriptions, an attempt to reproduce a handwritten ‘signature’ by typographical means. Harold Love and Jonathan Goldberg have both noted the importance of the personality attached to individual written hands, and in this sense the ‘personal’ nature of these signatures may have encouraged readers to apply a biographical gloss to the previous poems.⁹⁷

In the case of at least two readers of Tottel’s miscellany, we can see the biographical narrative sketched above being explored. Those readers are Thomas Nashe in *The Vnfortunate Traueller* (1594) and Michael Drayton in his *England’s Heroicall Epistles* (1597-9).⁹⁸ In both of these works Surrey reappears principally as an idealised image of ‘the poet’ as an institution, and both writers go to some length to praise Surrey’s writings. Both also present Surrey principally through the prism of his romance with Geraldine, and the biographical details mentioned in *Songes and*

⁹⁶ ‘Songs by N.G.’ is only present in Q1; see Marquis (ed) *Songes and Sonettes*, xxxix-liv for discussion.

⁹⁷ Love, *Culture and Commerce*, 93; Jonathan Goldberg, *Writing Matter: From the Hands of the English Renaissance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990); on the question of seeing Surrey as the speaker of some or all of the poems in the collection, see Elizabeth Heale, *Authorship and Autobiography in Renaissance Verse: Chronicles of the Self* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003), 20.

⁹⁸ Thomas Nashe, *The Vnfortunate Traveller* (London: Thomas Scarlet for Cuthebert Burby, 1594); Michael Drayton, *England’s Heroicall Epistles* (London: Peter Short for Nicholas Ling, 1598).

Sonettes seem to be the primary materials used in both narratives.⁹⁹ Nashe presents Surrey as cartoonishly romantic, but, as Elizabeth Heale describes:

The story was taken up more soberly by Michael Drayton in *Englands Heroicall Epistles* (1597–9), two of which relate to a supposed affair between Surrey and Geraldine. Surrey is imagined writing to Geraldine from Florence, once again composing verse from an overflowing heart and carving his lines (of Drayton’s composition this time) on the trunk of a tree. In his notes to the poems, Drayton claims that a number of Surrey’s poems from *Tottel’s Miscellany* refer to his love for Geraldine. Even Wyatt’s ‘Tagus, farewell’ is tentatively purloined as evidence of the sentimental patriotism of his semi-fictional Earl.¹⁰⁰

The Surrey poems did not form a precise narrative sequence with coherent characters, setting, or plot. Nonetheless, my reading, supported by the readings of Nashe and Drayton, suggests that when a number of short lyrics that originally responded to specific social relationships and events were printed, the material relationship and order of the poems was tentatively used to give these poems a coherent identity. Readers who lacked an understanding of the social environment of the original author and occasion faced a necessary gap in their understanding of the work. Part of that gap was supplied by the titles, which typically provided the most general of indicators to a reader. The other part was supplied by grouping the poems under the principle of single authorship, and providing the slimmest of thematic trajectories to give each section a movement from one set of themes to another. In the case of Nashe and Drayton, we can see at least two readers responding quite precisely to these cues: both read certain poems autobiographically, and began to use this autobiographical framework to make connections between poems that may have extended beyond the expectations of its printer.

That Michael Drayton used the material of *Songes and sonettes* as a creative basis for his own work testifies to the continuing importance of the book long after 1557. At the same time, Drayton’s admixture of his own work and that of Surrey

⁹⁹ Elizabeth Heale, *Authorship and Autobiography*, 16.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*, 16.

demonstrates how readers continued to apply the flexible models of authorship, extraction, and recombination even to (notionally) more stable printed texts.¹⁰¹ This mode of reading would generate some anxiety in the authors of the mid-century, who developed strategies to provide a biographical and bibliographical framework to resist this kind of re-appropriation, and potentially, misreading.

Mid-century Authorial Collections

One clear indication of the influence of *Songes and sonettes* is the number of works published in the years following 1557 that modelled themselves on Tottel's collection. This group includes Barnaby Googe's *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* (1567), Thomas Howell's *The arbor of amitie* (1568) and *Newe sonets, and pretie pamphlets* (1570), George Turberville's *Epitaphs, Epigrams, Songs and Sonnets* (1567), George Gascoigne's *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (1573) and *Poesies* (1575), Isabella Whitney's, *The Copy of a Letter* (1567) and *A Sweet Nosegay* (1573), and George Whetstone's *The Rock of Regard* (1576).¹⁰² Though disparate in terms of their contents, each of these collections shares a material form, gathering a number of works in short forms by a single author, with a title that either indicates the generic diversity of the text, or unites the works under a single name (*A Sweet Nosegay; Arbor of amitie*).

One of the other ways in which these volumes take shape as a group is in their continued attempts to frame themselves in reference to a socially-exclusive world of manuscript circulation. Googe's *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* is a pertinent example; in his dedicatory letter to William Lovelace, with whom he was acquainted from Gray's Inn, Googe reveals his discomfort that 'these tryfles of mine [have] come to light' (A5r). He recounts his resistance to publication despite his friends' requests, only to find that one friend with a manuscript copy of his works

¹⁰¹ See Jeffrey Todd Knight, *Bound to Read: Compilations, Collections, and the Making of Renaissance Literature* (Philadelphia, P.A.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013) for substantial discussion, as well as the example of *Liber Lilliati* in Chapter 3.

¹⁰² Lists vary among scholars who have discussed one or all of these works. For the only monograph on many of these publications as a group, see Elizabeth Pomeroy, *The Elizabethan Miscellanies: Their Development and Conventions* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975).

has delivered it to a printer, for whose sake and expense Googe has reluctantly agreed to the publication, a modesty topos which was widely used in the period. While Googe makes reference to the pre-history of his book in his preface, the poems also declare their social origins in both form and content. One of the crucial differences between publications in the middle decades of the sixteenth century and those of the later 1580s and 1590s is that despite sole authorship being indicated by the title page, the majority of these collections contain work by other poets, often framed as part of a correspondence with the author in question. In Googe's *Eglogs*, for example, we encounter in sequence 'To L. Blundeston' and 'The Answere of L. Blundeston to the Same' (F2r), followed immediately by 'To Alexander Neuelle' and 'Alexander Neuelles Answere to the Same' (F2v-F4r). In Whitney's *Sweet Nosegay*, the final section of the work is entitled 'Certain familier Epistles and friendly Letters by the Auctor: with Replies' (C6r).

Taken as a group, these volumes articulate their identity in reference to the socially-inscribed, manuscript culture of their authors, replicating forms of exchange and collaboration even in their new medium. Wendy Wall has described such volumes as 'literary pseudomorphs' that attempt to replicate many of the forms and conventions of manuscript in print.¹⁰³ The defining aspect of these volumes is their use of a biographical framework through which a wide variety of forms and genres could form a cohesive group. While *Songes and sonettes* bracketed the Surrey and Wyatt material from the other works and brought the first formal, though hesitant, touch of biography to the English poetic sequence, there is nonetheless also a sense in which they are shown to be part of a much larger world of poetic exchange among the 'uncertain authors'. In the mid-century collections, however, we are presented with an *individual's* point of view in a coterie network. If *Songes and sonettes* is the relocation of a social document like the Devonshire manuscript to print, then the mid-century collections can be seen as personal manuscript collections, comprised of an author's work and the exchanges in which they took part.

Early modern studies of biographical and autobiographical fiction have been fraught with difficulties, including the dangers of teleological thinking, asking genres of writing to conform to the expectations of modern self-expression, and failing to adequately account for the 'performative' aspect of many texts, whether in coterie,

¹⁰³ Wall, *Imprint of Gender*, 232.

social, or print settings. Nonetheless, scholars have repeatedly called attention to the existence of modes of thinking that explored biographical or self-revelatory impulses.¹⁰⁴ As Peter Goodall reminds us, ironic and complex relationships between author and speaker are a recurrent factor in much late medieval literature, especially in Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate, all of whom appeared regularly in print during this period.¹⁰⁵ The mid-century was another period in which the biographical collection of short poems became a serious vehicle for expressing *a* self, but a public face usually constructed with care and with particular aims in mind (which may or may not have been successful).

In providing a controlling imaginative structure for the book in the shape of biography, the mid-century authors also gave rise to textual-biographical roles used in order to safely frame material that could be seen as dangerous, whether politically or morally. Mary Thomas Crane, Richard Helgerson, and Lorna Hutson have all identified the need to balance two opposing modes of writing during this period, what Helgerson has called the balancing of ‘civic humanism’ and ‘courtly romance’ in a ‘dialectic of opposites’.¹⁰⁶ That is, poets sought to find a balance between an audience who appreciated technical continental forms with a focus on romance, and a more serious-minded (and politically powerful) set of readers for whom

¹⁰⁴ Though there is a vast literature on this subject, a number of works have provided a substantial understanding of biographical and autobiographical modes in this period. See, for example, Henk Dragstra, Sheila Ottway, and Helen Wilcox (eds.), *Betraying Ourselves: Forms of Self-Representation in Early Modern English Texts* (New York: Palgrave, 2000); Ronald Bedford, Lloyd Davis, and Phillipa Kelly (eds.), *Early Modern Aubiobiography: Theories, Genres, Practises* (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2006); Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (eds.), *Writing Lives: Biography and Textual identity in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Kevin Pask, *The Emergence of the Author: Scripting the Life of the Poet in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Meredith Anne Skura, *Tudor Authorship: Listening for Inwardness* (Ithaca: University of Chicago Press, 2008).

¹⁰⁵ Peter Goodall, ‘The Author in his Study: Self-Representation as Author and Reader in the Medieval and Early Modern Periods,’ in *Early Modern Autobiography*, eds. Bedford, Davis, and Kelly, 104-114; Alexandra Gillespie, *Print Culture and the Medieval Author, Chaucer, Lydgate, and Their Books 1473-1557* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

¹⁰⁶ Richard Helgerson, *The Elizabethan Prodigals* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976), 41; Mary Thomas Crane, *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993); Lorna Hutson, *The Usurer's Daughter: Male Friendship and Fictions of Women in Sixteenth-Century England* (London: Routledge, 1994).

demonstrable submission to modes of learning and internalising humanist wisdom remained a crucial condition of responsibility. Mid-century authors used a number of tactics, but the most frequent is the ‘prodigal’ framework identified by Helgerson, in which youthful works of the poet are presented alongside a ‘repentance’ represented by works of a moral and religious nature. That is to say, the life of the poet and reference to a public ‘biography’ became a way of gathering a disparate series of poems and providing a cohesive identity for them in print. This was not always precisely articulated, and our notions of clear, sequential, biographical narratives need to be tempered with the discontinuous nature of short poems.

The presence of these biographical fictions as framing devices has led to much scholarly focus on the practical nature of the volumes as public *curricula vitarum*. Daniel Javitch reads the volumes as aiming squarely at employment, with their generic variety being a device to demonstrate the wide-ranging capabilities of the author.¹⁰⁷ Robert Maslen sees these publications through the lens of ‘spying’, noting the substantial numbers of poets who worked in diplomatic roles at least once, and arguing that these volumes advertised a capability in this line of work.¹⁰⁸ Elizabeth Heale has also noted the prominence of biographical fictions, and argues these are ‘flagrantly opportunist and self-promotional,’ but also attempt to present narratives of loss and misfortune that entail wisdom and experience.¹⁰⁹

The one consistent anxiety across many of the prefatory materials to these volumes is the fear of being misread or misinterpreted. To return to Googe, whose narrative of reluctant publication is actually the exception among these volumes, we can see that his primary fear is potential misreading:

For I both consydered and wayed with my selfe, the grosenes of my Style:
whiche thus commytted to the pasynge shewe of euery eye shuld forth with

¹⁰⁷ Daniel Javitch, ‘The Impure Motives of Elizabethan Poetry,’ *Genre* 15 (1982): 225–38; see also his *Poetry and Courtliness in Renaissance England* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978).

¹⁰⁸ Robert W. Maslen, *Elizabethan Fictions: Espionage, Counter-espionage, and the Duplicity of Fiction in Early Elizabethan Prose Narratives* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997). For a similar argument concerning later Elizabethan fiction, but with importance for earlier works, see Richard Rambuss, *Spenser’s Secret Career* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), especially 5-28.

¹⁰⁹ Elizabeth Heale, *Authorship and Autobiography*, 3.

disclose y^e manifest foly of the Writer I feared and mistrusted the disdaynfull myndes of a nombre both scornfull and carpynge Correctours, whose Heades are euer busyed in tauntyng Iudgementes. Least they shuld otherwyse interprete my doyngs than in deade I meant them. (*Eglogs epytaphes, and sonettes*, A5v)

This complaint is a familiar one in early modern literature: examples include Spenser's 'Letter to Raleigh' attached to his *Faerie Queene* (1590). Googe's reference to 'correctors' can be taken to mean those who wish to levy charges of immoral behaviour, but perhaps also to the active set of readers who interacted with the text on an intellectual and physical level. In this passage, Googe worries that his 'doyngs' will be interpreted incorrectly, hence the need to publish his works in an organised format that made clear the circumstances in which each poem was composed.

These anxieties can in some part be attributed to a social paradigm that J.W. Saunders famously described as 'the stigma of print'.¹¹⁰ Some of Saunders' conclusions have been tempered by the work of Henry Woudhuysen and Steven May, but it is nonetheless true that the volumes express concerns about this 'public' exposure. Wendy Wall has explored these questions in depth, and demonstrated that many of these anxieties were expressed through gendered and sexual language.¹¹¹ But the 'stigma' needs to be seen as an evolving phenomenon rather than a static prohibition, and its precise valence changed in response to social events and important publications. In the work of the mid-century authors, there were genuine legal and political ramifications for politically-sensitive topics, as the work of Cyndia Clegg and Annabel Patterson has made clear.¹¹² These biographical fictions

¹¹⁰ J.W. Saunders 'The Sigma of Print: A Note on the Social Basis of Tudor Poetry,' *Essays in Criticism* 1, no.2 (1951): 139-164; Steven May, 'Tudor Aristocrats and the Mythical "Stigma of Print,"' *Renaissance Papers* 10 eds. Leigh A. Deneef and Thomas M. Hester (Durham, NC, 1980), 11-18; Woudhuysen *Sir Philip Sidney*, 14. See also Daniel Trasiter, 'Reluctant Virgins: The Stigma of Print Revisited,' *Colby Quarterly* 26, no.2 (1990): 75-86.

¹¹¹ Wall, *Imprint of Gender*, especially Chapter 1.

¹¹² Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984). See

have a particular importance to the authorial collection as a genre, as a direct result of transferring short lyric forms from manuscript to print. The social and occasional contexts open to the earliest readers of the poems have in print been replaced with a biographical and bibliographical context. The model of Surrey gave mid-century writers a vehicle for gathering occasional works and reframing them in a fiction relating to the poet, be it Heale's poetics of loss or Helgerson's repentant prodigal.

The printed book attempted to provide a controlling framework in which its readers encountered and understood their text, but authors and compilers were necessarily anxious about being misread by readers who speculated on the meaning and relationships of texts to one another, and to the architext of the poet's life. This is to argue for a different form of what Lindsay Anne Reid has described as 'bibliofictions', describing the use of Ovid's poetry to meditate on the nature of material production and consumption.¹¹³ While Reid focuses on the role of Ovid's reception in these bibliofictions, my own reading sees the mid-century authorial collection as responding to the recreation of social contexts with new, bibliographical contexts that took the author's identity as their organising principle.

While these works have represented a consistent group for scholarship on this moment in Tudor poetry, they represent only a fraction of the ways in which poetry was making its way into print. These include editions of medieval authors such as Chaucer, Gower, Lydgate, Hawes, Lindsay, and Henryson; a reissuing of Henrician poets like Alexander Barclay and John Skelton; book-length translations of Ovid, Horace, Mantuan, and Stellato; collaborative works on larger poetic projects like William Baldwin's *Mirror For Magistrates* and Jan van der Noodt's *Theatre For Worldings* (featuring a 16 year-old Edmund Spenser); and a large number of shorter ballads and songs. In their shared use of short, varied lyric forms organised (with more or less complexity) in reference to the biography of the poet, these volumes constitute a separate genre from this extensive poetic activity in print. It is in response to this genre, and the terms in which it used structure and biography to frame their contents that Gascoigne's *Hundreth* needs to be examined.

also Andrew Hadfield (ed.), *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001).

¹¹³ Lindsey Anne Reid *Ovidian Bibliofictions and the Tudor Book: Metamorphosing Classical Heroines in Late Medieval and Renaissance England* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2014).

A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres (1573)

A hundredth sundrie flowres shares many features of the mid-century collections explored above, and in some cases appears to be satirising some of the conventions that had developed in these volumes. Like them, *Hundreth* identifies itself as the record of poetic activity among a coterie of young men; describes the unauthorised publication of the work; justifies its contents with reference to a prodigal narrative; and boasts of its generic and formal diversity. The (fictional) printer, A.B., who addresses the reader at the outset of the volume suggests that although *Hundreth* may contain works considered frivolous:

[...] you shall not be constreined to smell of the floures therein contened all at once, neither yet to take them vp in such order as they are sorted: But you may take any one flowre by it selfe, and if that smell not so pleasantly as you wold wish, I doubt not yet but you may find some other which may supplie the defects thereof. (A2v)

The imagery of books and texts as gardens and flowers has a long history, and found particular resonance within humanist educational discourse, which encouraged its pupils to produce wisdom by culling many sources as bees do honey from many flowers.¹¹⁴ The full title to the whole collection suggests that the book is the end result of just this sort of collection and organisation, being gathered from the ‘fyne outlandish gardens’ of classical and continental literature and ‘fruitfull Orchardes’ of English works. While these metaphors gesture to the generic diversity of the contents, other features suggest a more ordered structure to the volume than the reading process imagined by ‘A.B.’ The title also describes the entire work as being

¹¹⁴ On the garden metaphor in Gascoigne see Susan C. Staub, ‘Dissembling his art: ‘Gascoigne’s Gardnings,’ in *Locus Amoenus: Gardens and Horticulture in the Renaissance*, ed. Alexander Samson (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 95-110; for a more general discussion of the metaphor in early modern thought and culture, see Leah Knight, *Of Books and Botany in Early Modern England: Sixteenth-century Plants and Print Culture* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007) and Randall L. Anderson, ‘Metaphors of the Book as Garden in the English Renaissance’, *Yearbook of English Studies* 33 (2003): 248-261.

‘bound up in one small poesie’, which, as Matthew Zarnowiecki has noted, suggests that the entire volume can be read as an organised whole, both in a metaphorical sense (‘poesie’ as a woven group of flowers) and in a material sense, with the book ‘bound up’ as a discrete physical object.¹¹⁵ This image of the book as a self-enclosed object may have been reinforced by the physical form of the book as it was sold; Megan Heffernan, following on from work by Aaron T. Pratt, suggests that it is likely that *Hundreth* was sold pre-stitched as a complete unit.¹¹⁶

While the title gestures to a more unified organisation for the volume, it is the extensive paratexts that make *Hundreth* unique among the mid-century collections. Though A.B. and H.W. feature in the metanarrative that these paratexts tell, it is the activity of Gascoigne’s G.T. that provides the connections between most of the texts of *Hundreth*.¹¹⁷ G.T. is, as Penelope Schott puts it, ‘the clearinghouse or filter for all poems and additional details’.¹¹⁸ Though the paratexts are disrupted due to the placement of the plays (which will be discussed below), the editorial insertions by G.T. connect the rest of the works together, describing the reader’s movement in the volume as if reading alongside him or her. ‘I will begin’, ‘[a]nd let vs peruse his other doings’ and ‘[f]rom this I will skip’ are just some of the prose links that G.T. inserts between poems, seeming to imagine a linear reading on the part of at least some of those who purchased the volume.

The interconnected nature of *Hundreth* has been often acknowledged, but rarely studied in the scholarship on Gascoigne. *The Adventures of Master F.J.* has received a great deal of attention, but few discussions explore this text’s relationship to others in the volume, or the continuing metanarrative of G.T. further into the

¹¹⁵ Matthew Zarnowiecki, *Fair Copies: Reproducing the English Lyric from Tottel to Shakespeare* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 51.

¹¹⁶ Megan Heffernan, ‘Gathered by Invention: Additive Forms and Inference in Gascoigne’s Poesy,’ *Modern Language Quarterly* 76, no.4 (2015): 413–445, citing Aaron T. Pratt, ‘Stab-Stitching and the Status of Early English Playbooks as Literature,’ *The Library*, 7th series, 16, no.3 (2015): 304–328.

¹¹⁷ The number of fictional figures involved in the book is Gascoigne’s depiction of a very different sort of collaboration from manuscript culture, and it is H.W. rather than G.T. who is responsible for the title *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*.

¹¹⁸ Penelope Scambly Schott, ‘The Narrative Stance in “The Adventures of Master F.J.”: Gascoigne as Critic of His Own Poems,’ *Renaissance Quarterly* 29, no.3 (1976): 369–37 (370).

book. It will be my argument in this section that attention to this metanarrative across the full range of texts in *Hundreth* reveals a subtle and complex portrait of an enthusiastic reader and editor, whose activities nonetheless led to dangerous autobiographical assumptions about the fictional authors of the collection.

This argument will occasion some navigation across Gascoigne's diverse book, and it will be useful to give a brief account of *Hundreth*'s organisation. To reproduce Pigman's collation:

Contents. A1^r (Title), A2^r ('The contents of this Booke'), A2^r-A3^r ('The Printer to the Reader'), A3^v ('Faultes escaped'), A4^f-K1^v (*Supposes*), K2^f-X4^v (*Jocasta*), ²A1^r-M3^r (*A discourse of the adventures passed by Master F.J.*), ²M3^v-2E2^v ('The devises of sundrie Gentlemen'), ²2E2^v- 2I3^r ('Dan Bartholomew of Bathe'), ²2L3^v-I4 blank (xxxi)

The volume can be divided into roughly three sections: the plays, *Master F.J.*, and 'The devises of sundrie Gentlemen' and 'Dan Bartholomew of Bath'. I will return to the plays at the close of the chapter, since the oddities of their placement and scholarly reception will be better understood in the light of my reading of the rest of the volume. I begin, however, with the texts that most directly convey the G.T. metanarrative, *The Adventures of Master F.J.* and 'Devises'.

The Adventures of Master F.J.

The narrative of *Master F.J.* is relatively straightforward: a young man comes to stay in the household of a nobleman, and proceeds to seduce Lady Elinor, the nobleman's wife, through letters, poems, and conversation. Shortly after their affair begins, Elinor's passion wanes, and after his advances are rebuffed several times, F.J. rapes Elinor. From this point, the two become further estranged, and the work concludes abruptly with F.J.'s departure from the house. This simple plot is made endlessly more complex by the voice of G.T., who acts as anything but an uninvolved or

impartial narrator.¹¹⁹ His description of how the volume came to be introduces us to the primary character in a narrative played out between and across the texts of this collection:

When I had with no small entreatie obteyned of Master F. I. and sundry other toward young gentlemen, the sundry copies of these sundry matters, then aswell for that the number of them was great, as also for that I found none of them, so barreyne, but that (in my iudgment) had in it *Aliquid Salis*, and especially being considered by the very proper occasion whereuppon it was written (as they them selues did alwayes with the verse reherse unto me the cause thatt then moued them to write) I did with more labour gather them into some order, and so placed them in this register. Wherein as neare as I could gesse, I haue set in the first places those which Master. F. I. did compyle. And to begin with this his history that ensueth, it was (as he declared unto me) written vppon this occasion. The said F. I. chaunced once in the north partes of this Realme to fall in company of a very fayre gentlewoman whose name was Mistresse Elinor, unto whom bearinge a hotte affection, he first aduentured to write this letter following. (A3r)

From the outset, G.T expresses many of the sentiments familiar from other mid-century collections: the present works are taken from an exclusive social network, and have their composition and meaning intimately bound up in the personal circumstances of their authors. G.T. is not only responsible for gathering the works, but also for ordering them, providing details that relay the social context and

¹¹⁹ Though the plot is essentially the same, it reappeared in the 1575 *Poesies* with substantial changes, including most of the characters being renamed and the setting relocated to Italy. See Pigman, 'Editing Revised Texts: Gascoigne's *Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* and *Posies*,' in *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts II*, ed. W. Speed Hill (Tempe, Arizona: Renaissance English Text Society, 1998), 1-10 for discussion. For rare positive accounts of the 1575 text, see Wolfgang Müller, 'The Modernity of the Second Version of George Gascoigne's *Master F.J.*' in *Narrative Strategies in Early English Fiction*, eds. Wolfgang Gortschacher and Holger Klein (Lewiston, N.Y. and Salzborg: Edwin Mellen, 1995), 87-102; and Amina Alyal, 'Italian weeds and English bodies: translating 'The Adventures of Master F.J.' in *Travels and Translations in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Mike Pincombe (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 104-119.

meaning of the poems, and annotating the poems with some of his aesthetic judgements. *F.J.* is in many respects a dramatization of the kind of social exchange of texts often conjured by the mid-century collections; poems and letters are slipped into pockets, left in chambers, exchanged through intermediaries, and returned with responses.¹²⁰ The choice of typeface here also replicates something of the ‘personal’ quality of manuscripts mentioned above – poems are set in italics, written communication is in roman, and G.T.’s prose is set in blackletter. Taken together, these typographic markers help to replicate some of the material distinctions between the letters and pamphlets G.T. is supposed to have collected together.

Even in his introduction, however, G.T.’s understanding of his materials and grasp of their social origins never seems as convincing as he initially boasts. Although he claims that the poets ‘always’ shared the reasons for the poems being written, and that F.J. has personally communicated his story, he admits that he is not entirely certain about the authorship of all the pieces, having ordered them ‘as neare as I could guess’. These could be seen as conventional editorial apologies, but at the same time this is only the first of many occasions when the reader is led to suspect the fictional editor is less capable and less knowledgeable than he boasts. One other clue from this introductory letter to H.W. is his assessment of contemporary poetics:

And the more pitie, that amongst so many toward wittes no one hath bene hitherto encouraged to followe the trace of that worthy and famous Knight *Sir Geffrey Chaucer*, and after many pretie deuises spent in youth, for the obtayning a worthles victorie, might consume and consummate his age in discribing the right pathway to perfect felicitie, with the due preseruacion of the same. (A2r)

As well as placing Chaucer as the archetypal repentant prodigal, this betrays G.T.’s unfamiliarity with the many examples of this motif in this moment of literary history. Despite his confident tone, G.T. is a poor reader of contemporary poetry, and this is borne out in his inelegant observations on poems later in the volume.

¹²⁰ See James Daybell, *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-Writing, 1512-1635* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012) for a wide-ranging discussion about the place of the letter in Early modern culture and literature.

As a testament to how quickly G.T.'s annotations come to dominate proceedings, the first poem of *Master F.J.* occurs after nearly two full pages of exposition. From the short titles of the mid-century collections that gesture to providing social context, G.T. has developed a detailed and inquisitive attitude towards the poems. The work in question, 'Fayre Bersabe the bright', concerns the first adulterous thoughts of David, and so forms a thematically-appropriate prologue to the narrative that follows. 'Lenvoie' declares: 'To you these fewe suffice, your wittes be quicke and good, / You can coniect by change of hue what humors feede my blood' (l.9-10). The couplet addresses an imagined reader and asks him or her to speculate on the reasons for the writer's blushing; in this narrative context a reader might make the assumption these verses were addressed to Elinor. It is surprising, then, to find that the poem is entirely irrelevant to the plot of F.J.'s courtship. Immediately afterwards, G.T. declares that this is the first poem in this mode that FJ has ever written. But the poem itself was apparently conceived on the spot, and never recorded: 'before he coulde put the same in legible writinge, it pleased the sayd mistresse *Elinor* of her curtesie thus to deale with him...' (A4r). Not only are we presented with an improbable story about the poem's origins, but it is not even transcribed by F.J., let alone passed to Elinor. In a metanarrative that has concerned itself with being a record of socially-transmitted manuscript texts, its first text is described as being neither recorded nor transmitted, raising questions about the authorship of the piece and the truthfulness of the narrative that follows.

G.T.'s control of his materials is shown to be equally as fragile as the narrative unfolds. His comments on the actual poetry range from basic statements about the poem ('The meetres are but rough,' X3r) to unconvincing analysis ('This sonnet treateth of a strange seede, but it tasteth most of *Rye*, which is more common amongst men nowadays,' G1r). Perhaps the most telling annotation that G.T. makes on proceedings is in relation to 'Beautie shut up thy shop', in which the addressee of the poem is named 'Helen'. Though the name Eleanor is etymologically derived from Helen, and the use of mythological themes is a staple of verse in this period, G.T. admits total confusion as to the meaning of the poem. He writes:

I have heard him declare that she grew in jealousy that the same were not written by hir, because hir name was *Elynor* and not *Hellen*. And about this point haue bene diuers and sundry opinions, for this and diuers other of his

most notable Poems, have come to view of the world, although altogether without his consent. (F3r)

As is typical in G.T.'s responses to poems, he initially declares some form of access to the actual circumstances of composition (here, talking directly with F.J.), only for the illusion of first-hand knowledge to collapse. John Kerrigan takes this example to be one of many that demonstrate G.T.'s habit of 'recommend[ing] responses, but conceding that his readers cannot be constrained.'¹²¹ G.T.'s gesture to wide-ranging interpretation of the poem drastically undercuts his claims, and rather than being able to provide a clear reading of the poem, he is as uncertain as any other reader.

Josephine Bloomfield also reads *F.J.* as a narrative primarily about the deficiencies of G.T. as an interpreter, cataloguing his idiosyncratic way of connecting the poems:

[...] he offers his own opinions and advice about love and lovers, tells allegorical stories to demonstrate his point of view, serves as a literary critic and glossator of F.J.'s poetry [...] departs quite obviously from objectivity in describing characters whom he strongly likes or dislikes, ignores evidence that he himself has presented when it does not lead to his desired conclusions, foreshadows coming events, enters omnisciently into the minds and motivations of all the major characters, attempts (or seems to attempt) to bend judgment in favor of F.J., and in general becomes almost as much a character in the work as the protagonists themselves.¹²²

As a result of these and other problems with G.T.'s narrative, critics have frequently seen G.T. as representing a parody of one type of reader or another. Staub sees him as an attempt to 'ridicule the historian' who 'boasts of his factual accuracy even as he selectively interprets his facts'.¹²³ Using similar evidence, Gillian Austen

¹²¹ John Kerrigan 'The Editor as Reader: Constructing Renaissance Texts' in *The Practice and Representation of Reading in England*, eds. James Raven, Helen Small, and Naomi Tadmor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 102-124.

¹²² Josephine Bloomfield, 'Gascoigne's 'Master F.J.' as a Renaissance proto-novel: the birth of the judicious editor as narrator,' *Essays in Literature* 19, no.2 (1992): 163-172 (164).

¹²³ Staub, 'Fictionality in Gascoigne's *Adventures of Master F.J.*' 115.

condemns G.T. as: ‘a ‘disloyal confidant, a poor editor, an inept critic.’¹²⁴ While I agree that Gascoigne’s portrayal of his fictional editor tends towards satire, I argue that his concern is with the reader engaged in a game of identifying the real-world circumstances of poems. His inadequacies demonstrate the dangerous habits of such readers to read between and across poems, and to use biography as a central idea to unite these disparate texts. G.T. in some senses parodies readers with more enthusiasm than knowledge, but is also a representation of the kinds of material intertextual readings that have already been explored in relation to *Songes and sonettes*, having gathered his materials, arranged them in sequence, and created links between them.

Indeed, as Rowe has suggested, we can see that *Master F.J.* is a work obsessed with uncovering patterns, decoding ambiguities, and explaining individual poems. From the outset the characters appear to be locked in a battle for interpretative control of their exchanges; despite a poem’s strongly-worded declarations of passion, Elinor admits ‘she could not perceyve therby any part of his meaning’ (A3v). This initial failure of interpretation sets the tone for much of the narrative that follows: Elinor fails to understand (or feigns misunderstanding) of F.J.’s poems; F.J. is constantly ‘wondering’ at the speeches of his mistress; is confused by the advice of his accomplice and friend, Frances; and much of the communication between the parties is carried out in full view of others not privy to the real significance of the words. F.J. makes barbed jokes about cuckoldry to the lord of the house after sleeping with his wife, and Elinor herself appears at dinner following their initial tryst with the word ‘*Contented*’ placed on her headdress (E3v). Even the most direct question elicits indirection, as when Elinor asks F.J. who authored the ‘tyntarnell’, and F.J. refers to himself as his ‘fathers sisters brothers son’ (166). This ambiguity is extended by the uncertainty even about the authorship of many of the written exchanges between the various parties: F.J. immediately suspects that one letter comes not from Elinor, but from the pen of her secretary, given that ‘by the stile this letter of hers bewrayeth that it was not penned by a womans capacitie’ (147). This letter is signed ‘SHE’ (matching F.J.’s own use of ‘HE’ as his pen-name) and the reader is left in a genuine state of uncertainty as to

¹²⁴ Gillian Austen, ‘Gascoigne’s *Master F.J.* and its Revision, or, “You aint heard nothing yet!”’ in *Narrative Strategies*, eds. Gortschacher and Klein, 67-85 (77).

whether these letters are always written by the secretary, or sometimes the secretary and sometimes Elinor herself. Similarly, F.J. and Frances communicate under allegorical pseudonyms, F.J. taking the name 'Trust', and Frances 'Hope'.

As if communicating something of their editor's anxieties, it is noteworthy that the characters frequently engage in acts of gathering, sorting, and editing. As well as the semiotic uncertainty that surrounds all communication in the narrative, some important pieces of written correspondence literally need to be reconstructed from fragments. The first letter that Elinor passes to F.J. has been torn into piece, and requires F.J. to reconstruct the original 'as orderly as he could'. Later in the volume, he describes F.J.'s act of writing as 'sorting'. Later still he uses the curious phrase 'well sorted this sequence' to describe the act of composition. That F.J.'s active role as a writer is described in terms of 'sorting' suggests something about G.T.'s conception of his own role as editor. This is also true when he describes Elinor's reading as having 'turned ouer & retossed euey card in this sequence', which emphasises the material nature of such correspondence in manuscript. At every turn the characters of *F.J.* appear to dramatize anxieties about generating order out of chaos, 'sequences' from a cacophony of textual fragments.

Devises of sundrie gentlemen

The Adventures of Master F.J. ends abruptly, with its narrator asserting that he could 'wade further' into the doings of F.J., but that he would rather 'leave it unperfect than make it to plaine'. He promises to limit his annotation of the rest of the volume, 'adding nothing of myne owne, but onely a tytyle to euey Poeme, whereby the cause of writinge the same maye the more evidently appeare'. Given that he promised a similar restraint for F.J., the addition of titles is anything but a neutral intervention for G.T. What follows is a section entitled 'The Devises of Sundrie Gentlemen', which collects seventy-seven poems of varying meters and lengths and presents them as the work of several authors, each of whom is identified only by the Latin motto attached to each poem, with the exception of the character 'George Gascoigne' himself. It is suggested in G.T.'s prose link between *Master F.J.* and *Devises* that each motto corresponds to a single author, a hint that is echoed in the poem titles that

announce we are moving to a ‘new poet’, with a corresponding new motto introduced for the next group of poems.

The first two poems of ‘Devises’ are unexceptional in the context of mid-century poetry: the titles (‘Ariosto Allegorized’, ‘Written uppon the reconciliation of two freendes’) describe the source for the first poem, and the social occasion of the second. As we have seen in Tottel and the other mid-century collections, these are thoroughly conventional, and would have been familiar to readers of these volumes. The third poem, however, marks a radical editorial intervention that immediately recalls those in *F.J.*. The ‘title’ to the poem reads:

Two gentlemen did roon three courses at the ryngge for one kysse, to be taken of a fayre gentlewoman being then present, with this condicion· that the winner shold haue the kisse, and the loser be bound to write some verses vppon the gayne or losse therof. Now it fortunèd so that the wynner triumphed saying, he much lamented that in his youth he had not seene the warres. VVhereuppon the looser compiled these following in discharge of the condicion aboue rehearsed. (M4v)

Though titles in earlier poetic collections could be quite specific about the occasion of the poem, this provides much more concrete narrative detail. Much of this detail is unrelated to the poem that follows, which is a conventional exploration of the ‘*bellum dulce inexpertis*’ topos.

Despite G.T.’s protestations otherwise, it is clear that his intervention has radically oriented the text for the reader. This is particularly clear in the next poem, which uses the title as a vehicle for much larger narrative connection than was ever the case in the mid-century collections. The poem immediately announces its relationship to the one before it:

Not long after the writing hereof: he departed from the company of his sayd friend (whom he entirely loued) into the west of England, and feeling himselfe so consumed by womens craft that he doubted of a safe retorne: wrote before his departure as followeth. (N1r)

Here, G.T. signals not only that this poem has a chronological relationship to the others in this group, but that the poems present consistent characters (the author, the friend) and relationships that persist across poems. That is to say, through his fictional intermediary G.T., Gascoigne has transformed the title from a tool to provide the immediate social context for the poem to one that indicates narrative relationships between poems. We saw in the case of the Surrey section in *Songes and sonettes* that some readers did make connections between poems, and saw some cohesion between the speakers of different poems; similarly in 'Devises', we see G.T. assuming a continuity of character between the speakers of his poem. In this respect, we need to see the 'story' of G.T. continuing from F.J., as the editor continues to piece together fragments into arrangements that he believes are made according to their authorship. The uncertainty in G.T.'s introduction stands in stark contrast to the detail in the titles, which have a similar function to his long prose links between poems. The shortening of those links makes clear the actual function of F.J.

G.T.'s connection of the poems in a shared imaginative landscape has some repercussions for our understanding of the sequence. Insisting on concrete characters and chronology across each section of poems proves problematic when the poems themselves are addressed to lots of women. That is to say, while many mid-century collections play on the ambiguity of the connection between poems, *Hundreth* insists that each new poem, usually addressed to a new woman, all come from the same source and are composed in sequence. The result is either to present the implied young man as erratic, passionate, and insincere, or to make apparent the incongruity of GT's approach to his material.

In this respect, G.T.'s claim to have reduced the poems into 'good order' bears investigating. If G.T. has taken control over how the materials are arranged, what structuring pattern has he used in the course of organising his materials? The crucial phrase here is 'good order'. The phrase occurs frequently in pre-1573 literature, rarely in a literary sense, but very frequently in works stressing either civil or religious obedience. Erasmus, writing in 1529, suggests that the aim of reading scripture is at least in part that 'evyll men' might be reformed and brought into good ordre' (H3r). Similarly, Nicholas Ridley laments in *A pious lamentation* (1566) that the various abuses of Catholic religion had led to 'dispensations & immunities from all godly discipline, laws, and good order...' (B1r). Many more examples might be

added: the phrase almost universally appears in connection with the behaviour of individuals or communities in line with the morals laid out by biblical precept and filtered through the civil framework of law. The pattern to which G.T. has made the various poems conform, then, is not simply one that reflects personal taste or miscellaneous assignation of possible authorship, but one that specifically conforms to the ‘good order’ of moral behaviour.

As a result of Gascoigne’s reshaping of this collection in the 1575 *Posies*, it has been typical to read that collection as portraying the stance of a reformed prodigal. Close attention to the 1573 paratexts suggest that this model is precisely how G.T. has already chosen to organise the various sequences of poems. In his letter to H.W., noting the addressee’s interest in ‘good letters’, G. T. states:

The which [...] do no lesse bloome and appeare in pleasaunt ditties or compendious Sonets, devised by green youthful capacities, than they do fruitefully flourish unto perfection in the ryper works of grave and grayheared writers. For as in the last, the younger sort maye make a mirror of perfecte life: so in the first, the most frosty bearded *Philosopher*, maye take just occasion of honest recreation, not altogether without holsome lessons, tending towards the reformation of manners. (A2r)

Youth and enthusiastic literary productions eventually give way to more sober works, but these early works can nonetheless provide enjoyment as well as genuine spurs to the ‘reformation of manners’. Paradigmatic of this model for G.T. is Chaucer, who, as we have seen, ‘after many pretie devises spent in youth’ nonetheless reformed his behaviour and spent his later years ‘describing the right pathway to felicitie’ (A2r). The word ‘devises’ here acts as a key link between the works of Chaucer and those of the poets gathered together in *Hundreth*. As we have seen, this section of poems can be read as suggesting clear thematic trajectories from youth to age, and a gradual disillusionment about amorous pursuits which results in rejecting women for the company of likeminded men, reproducing what Lorna

Hutson has demonstrated was one of the central themes of homosocial writing in this period.¹²⁵

If we engage in the fiction of the volume, it is clear that these patterns are generated not from the poems in isolation, but by the way they are framed as a chronological sequence, with interpretive jumps made between each poem in thematic and narrative terms. If G.T.'s extended prose links between poems gesture to the extreme lengths one might go to in order to create a chain of relationships between individual poems in a sequence, it is also clear that in *Hundreth* we encounter a sequence that has been organised according to precise expectations about the progression of poets from youth to age.

In the poems of the first Latin motto, 'si fornatus infoelix', we can see one example of this structure: Poem 1 describes the speaker seeing his absent beloved in a dream; poems 2-6 are written to his friend, frequently cursing the behaviour of women; poems 7-20 describe his unsuccessful or clandestine relationships with a number of women; poem 21 describes another scene of parting; and poem 22 concludes the work of this 'author' with a seemingly incongruous poem in praise of a Gentlewoman named Phillip, written 'at his friend's request'. Though the poems do not explicitly announce their arrangement as part of a carefully-designed sequence, they nonetheless demonstrate a type of movement, with a single writer moving from initial unhappiness in love into a kind of rehabilitation via his friendship with another man, back into a series of affairs, and ending once again on a parting from another lover. Indeed, poems 1 and 21 are suggestive as evidence of a cyclical thematic movement in the sequence, given that both are dream visions lamenting the absence of the beloved. In both poems, sleep offers a place in which relationships (and situations) can be redesigned by the speaker into something more favourable than is possible in reality. In both poems, however, that 'which me pleased [...] was dreames which fancy drew' (1, 1.7), and which collapse after waking. In poem 1, the speaker articulates his own situation by describing that of Bradamant from Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, voicing his own longing through a

¹²⁵ Lorna Hutson, *The Invention of Suspicion: Law and Mimesis in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama* (Oxford: University of Oxford Press, 2007), 185-216. On Gascoigne's verses to other men, see Laurie Shannon, 'Poetic Companies: Musters of Agency in George Gascoigne's Friendly Verse,' *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 10, no.3 (2004): 458-9.

female speaker. In poem 20, the situation is reversed, with almost the entire poem dedicated to imagining how his beloved misses him, remarking that ‘In dreames I might behold how thou wert loth / With troubled thoughts to part from thy delight’ (20, l.3-4), and subsequently describing her as waiting on the banks of the Thames for his return: ‘Thine evening walks by Thames in open wind / Did long to see my sailing boat arrive.’ (l.7-8). In both poems, day collapses the fantasy of mutual feeling and reconciliation, giving the sequence a circular movement from despair to hope, and back to despair once again.

For all of the attention given to prodigal structures by G.T., the ‘repentance’ offered by these young men seems partial or entirely absent, something also true of *F.J.*, where the moral of women’s untrustworthiness stands in stark contrast to the actions of its characters. One exception to this failed production line of young prodigals is the character George Gascoigne himself. Readers would already have encountered the name as the author of *Supposes* and *Jocasta*, as well as in the contents page. ‘Gascoigne’ emerges from the textual chaos of the coterie poets as a fully-fleshed poet, and with a demonstrable arc of repentance throughout the poems of his section. Unlike the nameless writers of previous poems, Gascoigne appears fully confident in standing by his literary productions, and a brief survey of the poems might demonstrate why. Virtually all of the poems deal with non-amorous themes, and many are written for members of the nobility, including ‘Gascoigne’s praise of Bridges, nowe Lady Sanders’, ‘Gascoigne’s praise of Zouche, Late the lord Greye of Wilton’, and the long ‘deuise of a mask’ for Lord Mountacote. In addition to these poems written directly for a noble audience, there are a range of witty but serious poems, including a gloss on a biblical text and a translation of the psalm known as *De Profundis*.

The shift in tone in Gascoigne’s section is marked when compared to the four speakers preceding him: the language of love, sexual escapades, and the resulting bitterness against woman is present only in the vaguest sense, replaced instead by a series of more ‘respectable’ subjects. That movement is clearly indicated by the few poems that do touch on the theme of love, each of which is written from the perspective of a man leaving behind that discourse, having learned the error of his ways. The first poem of the section, ‘Gascoigne’s Anatomie’ consists of a reverse blazon, in which the speaker’s body is dissected and each part demonstrated to have

been damaged in the course of loving. The poem, coming after four other groups of poems mostly describing romantic engagements, seems to address those previous poets, addressing as it does ‘You lovers all that list beware’ (49, l.2) and concluding with the damning assessment of love’s effect on him: ‘a just reward for love so dearly bought, [...] lo, this was he, who love had worne to nought.’ (l.27-28). Similarly, ‘Gascoigne’s Passion’ concludes with a desire for his mistress to grant that ‘Gascoigne’s passion past’ (53, l.60), and ‘Gascoigne’s Lullaby’ attempts to finally put each one of his youthful follies to rest, including his ‘youthful years’ (l.9), ‘gazing eyes’ (l.17), ‘wanton will’ (l.25), and ‘loving boye’ (l.33). This movement towards a final break with youthful folly comes to a head in the following poem, ‘Gascoigne’s Recantation’ (poem 57). As the title might suggest, this poem sees Gascoigne turning from each of his youthful endeavours, having come to the realisation that ‘Women’s vowes are nothing else but snares of secret smart, / Their beauties blaze are baytes which seeme of pleasant taste’ (l.12-13). In renouncing his vocation as a lover, Gascoigne mentions many of the poems that the reader has just encountered, including his ‘Anatomie’ and ‘Arraingment’, concluding finally that ‘All which I nowe recant, and here before you burne’(l.27).

In structuring the poems in this fashion, Gascoigne’s section enacts once again the thematic trajectory that we have seen in Tottel and in the previous sections of ‘Devices’: the poet begins with discourses of love, and finally recants after coming to understand the foolishness and folly of his youth. Unlike in many other narratives of this sort, however, the character Gascoigne is not abandoned at the moment of his reformation, but goes on to explicitly demonstrate the difference that the recantation of love as a theme makes to his character and writing. Immediately following this poem, Gascoigne proceeds to present poem after poem on serious topics, with much of the verse being among the most technically accomplished in the entire volume, including a crown of sonnets and verses said to have been composed *ex tempore* while riding with his fellows. The latter of these is an interesting demonstration of the change of topic from that of love; poem 58 is introduced by a headnote suggesting that five members of Grey’s Inn proposed five topics to Gascoigne, challenging him to provide a poem on each topic before being allowed to join their company. Each theme is delivered in the form of a short Latin motto, showing not only Gascoigne’s capacity to transform classical quotation into useful knowledge, but also demonstrating the difference between the use of the mottos in

respect of romantic relationships and the friendship of men. In the former, the mottos were necessary to conceal identity for fear of discovery, especially by the husbands and family members that seem to people the romances of his characters. In the latter, however, the knowledge is returned to sober and witty discourse, all with the aim of solidifying social ties through a shared appreciation and use of humanist learning

Just as we might view each individual group of poems as possessing a thematic trajectory, particularly that moving from youth to age and folly to wisdom, we might also see the entire 'Devises' section demonstrating a progression through its separate speakers. While each of the previous speakers demonstrated a growing dissatisfaction with the romantic engagements of their youth, the Gascoigne section shows the alternative: familiarity with the company of men, poetry addressing biblical and classical themes, and writing that expresses noble sentiment, often directed at figures of nobility. 'Gascoigne's Woodsmanship', possibly the most famous poem of the entire collection, has an increased importance when read in this context. The poem can be seen to describe not only the individual failures of Gascoigne's persona, but the repeated failures of all the poetic personae adopted until this point.

On the one hand, then, the fictional George Gascoigne represents another of the acts of self-portraiture that Gillian Austen sees as the hallmark of Gascoigne's writing, and shows his versatility in yet another mode.¹²⁶ On the other hand, the character also represents something different to the socially-focused texts of the rest of the collection, and explores the biographical impulse announced/personified by G.T. in a new way. Even in the clumsy hands of G.T., George Gascoigne cannot be made into anything less than a sincere and diligent poet, and our repeated exposure to G.T.'s failed prodigal arrangements makes this coherent character stand out even further. Rearrange his *oeuvre* however one wishes, Gascoigne still emerges as the same sober and serious poet.

This is in part due to the forcefulness with which Gascoigne takes charge of his poems and their ascription. G.T. remarks that Gascoigne has 'never been daynte

¹²⁶ Gillian Austen, 'Self-portraits and Self-presentation in the Work of George Gascoigne,' *Early Modern Literary Studies* 14, no.1 (2008). Of interest to the biographical speculation I attribute to G.T. is Austen's observation that Gascoigne had at least ten portraits produced, and may have been responsible for some of the woodcut images in his printed works.

of his doings', and his own name frequently appears in the title ('Gascoigne's Arraignment', 'Gascoigne's Lullaby', etc.). Furthermore, in poems like 'Gascoigne's Woodsmanship', Gascoigne famously takes control of his own disastrous misadventures by describing each one as an evolution of his character and skill.¹²⁷ Elizabeth Heale notes that Gascoigne echoes many poets of this period, who used personal experience (and failure) as the grounds upon which to create a more forceful, controlling image of themselves for the reader.¹²⁸ This is especially true when we see that Gascoigne's titles are no longer firmly rooted in their social context – though some do refer to specific occasions – but occasionally take on a life of their own. Rather than recalling particular events and circumstances, Gascoigne's works call out to one another, naming themselves, and seeing themselves as part of a larger imaginative substrate. It is not just Gascoigne the repentant prodigal who emerges from the textual flux of this social document, but Gascoigne the author, whose poems are less tied to social circumstance than verse has ever been. While the appearance of 'Gascoigne' among other anonymous authors demonstrates his affiliation with coterie circles, he also proclaims a very confident form of authorship that articulates a more abstracted, and self-confident image. In the language used by Richard Helgerson for two very different conceptions of authorship, Gascoigne in *Devises* is a laureate among prodigals.¹²⁹

While 'George Gascoigne' announces a new and confident form of authorship, the section also gestures to the same textual instability that we have traced in G.T.'s commentary so far. As has frequently been noted by scholars, Gascoigne's authorship of other parts of the book can be inferred through a number of different clues. 'Gascoigne's Arraignment' mentions a poem, 'I bathe in Bliss', that appears in F.J.; 'Eyes' refers to its author as G.G.; and the Latin motto of the

¹²⁷ In *Trials of Authorship, Anterior Forms and Poetic Reconstruction from Wyatt to Shakespeare* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), Jonathan Crewe has influentially read this poem as a summary of Gascoigne's 'self-fashioning' in a textual as well as psychological sense. See also Catherine Bates, *Masculinity and the Hunt: Wyatt to Spenser* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) for a more recent assessment.

¹²⁸ Elizabeth Heale, 'The fruits of war: The voice of the soldier in Gascoigne, Rich, and Churchyard,' *Early Modern Literary Studies* 14, no.1 (2008): 1-39.

¹²⁹ Richard Helgerson, *Elizabethan Prodigals; Self-Crowned Laureates, Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the Literary System* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983)

first poet, ‘*si fortunatus infoelix*’, appears in *Jocasta*, a work that also openly declares Gascoigne’s authorship.¹³⁰ Part of *Hundreth*’s appeal is the playfulness with which these intertextual hints are given, and its connection to a broader culture of anonymity and self-revelation, as has been explored by Marcy L. North.¹³¹ At the same time, this game reveals how readers reorient their perception of the author depending on which works fall inside or outside of his canon.¹³² In piecing together the scattered hints of *Hundreth*, the reader is placed in the same role as G.T., sifting through signs of authorship and connection, and constantly adapting our understanding of the author and the collection. In some respects, scholarship has continued to respond to Gascoigne in exactly the way he imagines here, with much criticism concerned with his biography and the ‘sincerity’ of his reformation, which becomes a running refrain of his printed works.¹³³

I have been making the case here for the importance of G.T. to a metafiction that responds acutely to contemporary practices in writing, collecting, and ordering poetry in both manuscript and print. G.T. as a fictional reader responds to his materials with an intense interest in their circumstances of composition, fuelled by an understanding that groups of poems could be connected through their shared authorship and read as expressing something of a narrative sequence. In doing so, he exhibits a practice we have already seen played out in Nashe and Drayton, and described with worry (real or feigned) by many writers whose works were appearing

¹³⁰ Curiously, Pigman, ed. *Hundreth* (518) records that Gabriel Harvey’s annotation to his copy of *Poesies* (1575) indicates that the phrase had recently been used by Sir Christopher Hatton. Speculation about Hatton’s relationship to Gascoigne or the character represented in these poems has not yielded any significant discoveries.

¹³¹ Marcy L. North, *The Anonymous Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor-Stuart England* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

¹³² Peter Kirwan has recently explored the continuing interest in this canon-making through the example of Shakespeare in *Shakespeare and the Idea of Apocrypha: Negotiating the Boundaries of the Dramatic Canon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

¹³³ Gillian Austen exemplifies this approach, suggesting that Gascoigne’s works have ‘to be seen against the background of his broader quest for employment and patronage,’ to the detriment of the texts as objects of interest in their own right, *George Gascoigne* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2008), 4. See also Felicity A. Hughes, ‘Gascoigne’s Poses’ *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 37:1 (1997), 1-19 and Gregory Kneidel, ‘Reforming George Gascoigne’ *Exemplaria* 10 (1998): 329-70 for broader surveys of this question.

in print. His curiosity is not matched by his skill or his access to knowledge of the events in question, as is shown in repeated slippages, admissions of uncertainty, and misreading of the materials he is handling. Gascoigne's G.T. is a symbol of the material complexity of the poetic collection and the generation of coherence by readers, culling texts from various sources and fashioning them into a continuous narrative in a shared imaginative landscape. Through this fiction, Gascoigne acknowledges his own lack of control over the texts of his collection, but offers up *Hundreth* as an example of something more unified and coherent than the romantic lyrics of the mid-century manuscript culture had achieved.¹³⁴ It is a fitting irony then that the final text may have been the result of non-authorial decisions in the placement of *Supposes* and *Jocasta*, and it is to these I will turn to explore the effects of the resulting volume.

Supposes and *Jocasta*

As mentioned above, *Hundreth* can be regarded as two bibliographic units welded together; the first of these contains the two plays, *Supposes* and *Jocasta*, which ends on signature X4v. Immediately following this is H.W.'s letter to the reader, which precedes the letter of G.T., *Master F.J.* and 'Devises', which begins on A1r and runs uninterrupted until signature II3r. In addition to the bibliographic disjunction of these two sections, it appears that the paratextual materials may have been divided from their 'intended' places in the volume. The volume opens with an address by 'the printer' (which, as Megan Heffernan notes, immediately reveals itself as fictional given the real printer's name on the title page), which gives a summary of the various works contained in the book, as well as introducing the reader to the fictional correspondence between H.W. and G.T.¹³⁵ In the course of this introduction, A.B. seems to suggest that the next work will be the letter by H.W., coming 'in the beginning of this worke' (3). In the volume as it would have been

¹³⁴ It is worth noting, as Stephen Hamrick does, that Gascoigne carried out two quite separate lives in manuscript and print, creating complex collections specifically for each medium, clearly attentive to the facilities of both media. See Hamrick, "Thus Much I Adventure to Deliver to You": the Fortunes of George Gascoigne', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 14, no.1 (2008).

¹³⁵ Megan Heffernan, 'Gathered by Invention', 418

encountered by early modern readers, the writings of A.B. and H.W. are in fact separated by some 169 pages: for many scholars this demonstrates that the work has been distorted from Gascoigne's original intentions.

Outside of the immediate textual evidence, Adrian Weiss' extraordinary bibliographic investigation into the volume has allowed for rather precise dating of the work.¹³⁶ As well as identifying that the printing of the work was shared between Henry Middleton and Henry Bynneman (with the latter printing the majority of the book), Weiss has demonstrated that the book took approximately eight months to be printed – a long period of time even for a relatively large text like *Hundreth*. Combined with our knowledge that Gascoigne was almost certainly in the Netherlands during the time that the work was being printed, it is clear that he is unlikely to have had input on the final organisation of the text, despite the elaborate paratextual framework for the volume.¹³⁷ Our knowledge of Gascoigne's likely whereabouts and the clear disjunctions in both textual and bibliographic terms have meant that scholarship has often distanced Gascoigne from the final design of the volume, or at the very least suggested that its final organisation cannot be taken as authorial.¹³⁸ Some readers, including Austen, suggest that 'it is little surprise that without the supervision of its author the plan failed' and that this 'disordering' of materials explains Gascoigne's revisions two years later.¹³⁹

Partly driven by the suspicion that the volume did not represent Gascoigne's intentions, critical editions of Gascoigne's works have responded with different solutions to the bibliographic 'problem' of the plays. J.W. Cunliffe chose to ignore *Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* altogether, seeing *Posies* as a complete (and

¹³⁶ Adrian Weiss, 'Shared Printing, Printer's Copy, and the Text(s) of Gascoigne's *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*,' *Studies in Bibliography* 45 (1992): 71-104.

¹³⁷ Pigman (ed), *Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, lvii.

¹³⁸ These questions are complicated by the account Gascoigne gives in *The Poesies* (1575), which contains most of the works of *Hundreth*, but in a new format. Gascoigne suggests the work was censored, but the Stationer's Register is missing for the years in question, leaving scholars without evidence of this event. Gillian Austen, *George Gascoigne* exemplifies one of the major ways of reading Gascoigne's account as truthful, but see Susan Cyndia Clegg, *Elizabethan Censorship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) for a more sceptical assessment.

¹³⁹ Gillian Austen, 'The Adventures Passed by Master George Gascoigne: Experiments in Prose' in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Prose, 1500-1640*, ed. Andrew Hadfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 156-170 (158-9).

authoritative) revision of that work.¹⁴⁰ Charles Prouty, preferring *Hundreth* as his copy-text nonetheless believed the addition of the plays to be entirely the responsibility of the printer, and so did not include the plays in his volume.¹⁴¹ Weiss, assessing the evidence for the position of the plays, suggests that they were undoubtedly intended to be included in the volume, but that ‘a critical edition must include the two plays, but in the order representing the latest stage of Gascoigne’s plan – after the four sub-texts of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*’.¹⁴² Pigman, Gascoigne’s most recent editor, reflects modern editorial comfort with both ‘versions’ of texts and with non-authorial intentions, and chooses to print *Hundreth* without major structural changes to the volume, presenting the plays in the order encountered by the 1573 text.

While the question of Gascoigne’s intentions is, of course, valid in certain lines of critical inquiry, one of the more interesting questions raised by a focus on the material organisation of the text is what the resulting structures may have signalled for readers who handled the volume. There are several reasons that returning our attention to the plays and asking what might be the effects of their proximal relationship to the other texts is an important step in Gascoigne criticism. This arrangement of texts was that encountered by the book’s first readers. Though reconstructing the volume to create seamless paratexts may appear aesthetically pleasing, or represent the ‘latest stage’ of Gascoigne’s plan, inquiring into the interpretive possibilities of the book as it existed appears more important than exploring alternative configurations that did not. Secondly, there is a tendency in these arguments to suggest that the publisher and printers involved in the production of the volume have little input outside of directly reproducing the author’s manuscript in print: differences are not ‘choices’ but ‘errors’. In the case of Richard Smith, the publisher, we have relatively little information about his publications or general interests, though the fact that Gascoigne chose to use him once again for

¹⁴⁰ J.W. Cunliffe (ed.) *The Complete Works of George Gascoigne in Two Volumes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910).

¹⁴¹ Charles T. Prouty (ed.), *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1942).

¹⁴² Weiss ‘Shared Printing,’ 104.

Posies in 1575 might suggest that any unhappiness on Gascoigne's part was sufficiently forgotten to allow a continued working relationship.

In the case of Henry Bynneman, the printer of the majority of the work including the plays, we have a figure with demonstrable experience of working on literary texts. Among his earliest productions were the *Eclogues of Mantuan* (1567), Boccaccio's *Filocolo* (1567), and other works prior to the *Hundreth* include the second volume of William Painter's *Palace of pleasure* (1567), the *Theatre for voluptuous worldlings* (1569), featuring a young Edmund Spenser, and the works of Virgil in Latin (1570). In short, Bynneman is one of the major figures in the print trade regularly working with literary texts during the 1560s and 1570s, and assumptions of incompetence or disinterest need to be tempered by an acknowledgement of his proficiency with many other literary works. Just as Smith worked with Gascoigne again on his revisions to the volume, Bynneman was also reemployed to print the 1575 *Posies*. Given Gascoigne's absence, however, the eventual decision about the distribution of materials may have offered a real problem to the publisher and printers involved in the project.

Rather than reading the plays as symbols of erroneous decisions in the print shop, I will suggest here that *Supposes* and *Jocasta* perform an important function for *Hundreth* that connects to the larger concerns I have been exploring in this chapter. Prefacing the G.T. metanarrative that structures the rest of the volume, the plays together offer a dramatic diptych that explores the two possible outcomes of the interpretive games that are the grounding fiction for *Hundreth*. While its ordering is perhaps different than Gascoigne's intentions, understanding the structure of the book as encountered by contemporary readers nonetheless offers a coherent framework for reading the entire volume in its diversity.

Supposes declares its interest in interpretation from the outset in 'The Prologue or argument', in which the reader (described here as a member of the audience) is told:

I Suppose you are assembled here, supposing to reape the fruit of my travalyes: and to be playne, I mean presently to present you with a Comedie called Supposes, the verye name wherof may peradventure drive into every of your heades a sundry Suppose, to suppose the meaning of our supposes.
(B2v)

The reader is immediately confronted by the linguistic confusion that will be the major theme of the play, with one word being made to straddle several meanings in the course of a single sentence. Indeed, the preface goes on to list the ways in which the play might be read, including for pleasure or to pass the time, to deliver aphoristic wisdom, or to display ribald humour, with the word ‘suppose’ continuing to rack up increasing numbers of interpretative possibilities.¹⁴³ Eventually, the preface offers one way of mediating this confusing mass of potential readings: ‘our Suppose is nothing else but the mystaking or imagination of one thing for an other’.

Though this preface is an enjoyable catalogue of wordplay, its focus on the ambiguity of a single word does connect with the larger themes of *Hundreth* described above. Like the poems, the word ‘supposes’ remains the same, but alters its meaning depending on the precise context of grammar and the other words of the sentence. For Gascoigne, words, like poems, are fundamentally slippery, and rely on their place within a larger structure to give them meaning. In the narrative of the play, the mis-reading of action, character, and utterance forms the basis for the play’s creative confusion: Erostrato and Dulipo switch identities; Dulipo’s identity as Cleander’s son remains undiscovered until the close of the play; the Sienese gentleman is misinformed about his safety, and poses as the father of Dulipo / Erostrato; and Phylogano, Erostrato’s real father, is roundly rejected by each of the characters until the entire plot is resolved. In addition to these major plot points, the play brims with the same linguistic ambiguity that abounds in much Renaissance comedy: the slaves frequently appear more intelligent than their masters, characters reveal their true intentions in polysemic statements, and double-entendres are some of the most often recurring jokes in the play.

For all of the amusing action that this misidentification precipitates, it is important to recognise that *Supposes* enacts exactly the same kind of focus on interpretation and misreading that we have already seen to be present in *Master F.J.*

¹⁴³ This focus on the word and its many meanings is in large part Gascoigne’s own addition to his source, Ariosto’s *I Suppositi* (1509). For a more thorough discussion of the relationship to the original text, see Pigman’s commentary, and Jill Philips Ingram, ‘Gascoigne’s *Supposes*: Englishing Italian “Error” and Adversarial Reading Practices,’ in *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare & His Contemporaries: Rewriting, Rewriting, Refashioning* (ed.) Michele Marrapodi (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 83-96.

and the 'Devises'. In both of those sections of the book, as here, situations frequently arise as a result of one or more character being uncertain as to the meaning of the things they are seeing or reading. For much of the play, however, the threat of revelation carries with it serious implications for all of the characters, and the need to retain secrecy is paramount in the various discussions between conspirators. The opening lines of the play feature the discussion of Balia, the nurse to Polynesta, Erostrato's lover and cause for the central act of identity swapping. Balia remarks:

Come forth *Polynesta*, let us looke about, to be sure least any man heare our talke: for I think within the house the tables, the plankes, the beds, the portals, yea and the cupbords them selves have eares. (1.1-4)

Despite the hyperbole of Balia's anthropomorphising, this effectively introduces the atmosphere of conspiratorial secrecy that follows. Much like the framework of *Hundreth* as a whole, Erostrato's fiction involves several levels of duplicity: the role-reversal of master and servant, the duping of the Sienese gentlemen, and the engagement of both of these fictions in order to convince Polynesta's father to reject Cleander as a suitor for his daughter. Indeed, one might take the text itself to be a participant in this duplicity in respect to the reader: the speech prefixes for both Erostrato and Dulipo refer to their assumed roles rather than their 'real' identities within the fiction.

Balia's caution foreshadows the eventual collapse of the conspiracy: upon learning that his daughter has been romanced by Erostrato, in the guise of a servant, Damon has him restrained in his basement in a bid to limit the possible scandal. This is thwarted by Pasiphilo overhearing the truth of Erostrato and Polynesta's relationship, leading Damon to lament:

Alas, it greeveth me more that Pasophilo knoweth it, than all the rest: he that will have a thing kept secrete, let him tell it to Pasiphilo, the people shall knowe it, and as many as have eares and no mo: by this time he hath tolde it in a hundreth places. (5.6.20-24)

The community represented by *Supposes* is one in which every character, and even the scenery, is seen as a potential site in which scandal might be multiplied and

extended. In the particular instance of the narrative of *Supposes*, however, this quick communication of news is the vehicle for the eventual unravelling of the various complications of the plot. Pasiphilo, rather than being the instrument for publicising Damon's misfortune, brings him news of Erostrato's true identity, setting up a chain of revelations that bring about the various happy endings of the play.

While *Supposes* appears to replicate much of the atmosphere of gossip and interpretive ambiguity present in *Hundreth* as a whole, its happy ending stands in stark contrast to the tragic narrative of *Jocasta*. Though the plays have occasionally been considered as separate works, there is much to be gained from seeing them as a dramatic diptych, with their contrary views of secrecy, revelation, and the outcomes of interpretive effort demonstrating two possible outcomes of the act of reading. Encountered sequentially, the plays enact the trajectory that has been outlined in the rest of the volume: the youthful, amorous exploits of *Supposes* give way to the serious themes of *Jocasta*, enacting a progression in generic terms that is carried out in thematic terms in the 'Devises' sequences.

Jocasta relates the tragic consequences of Oedipus' incestuous marriage, as his two sons fail to share kingship amicably, leading to war, both of their deaths, and Jocasta's suicide. Much of the intervening narrative focuses relentlessly on the question of interpretation, especially of portents, omens, and natural signs of the gods' favour or intentions. The blind sage Tiresias describes his abilities as an interpreter of signs:

Know, Creon, that these outward seemely signes
By that the Gods have let me understand
Who understandeth al and seeth secret things...

Tiresias represents one of the few characters who expresses any kind of certainty about the signs he observes, and his interpretation proves crucial to the unfolding of the play's plot. At the same time, Tiresias also exemplifies the danger of this interpretive behaviour. Though he does not mention the cause of his blindness, the most common version of the myth has this being a punishment for revealing the secrets of the gods. This blindness means that even the most competent reader of the play requires an interpretive intermediary, in a direct parallel to Antigone leading the blind Oedipus at the end of the play. Tiresias not only bears the marks of punishment

for one set of interpretations, but has actively feared similar punishment from the current king, Etocloes, leading him to have ‘tyed this trustie tounge of mine / From telling truth’. In the context of *Hundreth*’s themes of over-eager interpretation by readers, Tiresias represents the possible consequences of a poet exposed to the punishment of the state.¹⁴⁴

Though Tiresias is one important representation of interpretive reading, the rest of the play brims with similar worries about correctly interpreting the words and actions of others. In one sense, the play also records a performative set of interpretive puzzles in the shape of the ‘dumb shows’ before each act. These ‘visually sumptuous’ performances, as Bruce R. Smith puts it, are described in prose, and feature interpretations of the action that do not make it clear whether these readings were offered to the original audience, or whether they were expected to draw their own conclusions.¹⁴⁵ Even readers offered an explanation are still left to connect each allegorical action with those of the other dumb shows, and the narrative of the play itself. It is noteworthy that despite the dumb shows containing plenty of on stage-action, the rest of the play retains the classical convention of action occurring offstage. The result is to reduce the play’s central cruxes to a series of reports, which necessitate interpreting the character’s account in the context of the play’s narrative.

Much of *Jocasta*’s action appears to directly invert the situation of the previous play. Where *Supposes* ended on a note of discovery and the revelation of identity, *Jocasta* opens with the same revelation: the entire play deals with the bloody aftermath of Oedipus’ discovery of his ancestry and incestuous marriage. And, where the younger characters in *Supposes* precipitate the confusion and ambiguity of the play which must be resolved by their elders, *Jocasta* sees the younger members of the play being forced to confront the terrible actions of their parents. In addition, it is possible to read the two plays as demonstrating two possible outcomes regarding the act of interpretation: in *Supposes*, the action

¹⁴⁴ It is worth noting that Gascoigne transforms his supposed censorship resulting from *Hundreth* into yet another authorial pose in *Posies* (1575). See particularly, Richard C. McCoy ‘Gascoigne’s “Poëmata castrata”: The Wages of Courtly Success,’ *Criticism*, 27, no.1 (1985): 29-55.

¹⁴⁵ Bruce R. Smith, *Ancient Scripts and Modern Experience on the English Stage, 1500-1700* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988), 217.

resolves itself into a series of happy outcomes, with families reunited and both new and old relationships reaffirmed. In *Jocasta*, however, the same recognition of kinship that led to a happy ending in *Supposes* leads to the ruin of family and state; the entire play is an examination of how one family falls to fighting and bloodshed as a result of uncovered identity. If G.T. teases the identity or actions of the young poets he presents, a reader moving through the volume sequentially would have one powerful example already in mind of the ways in which that activity could be devastating for individuals and their society.

Conclusion

Six years after *Hundreth* was published, another work appeared that shared many similarities with Gascoigne's collection. Also anonymous, the work featured an opinionated and vocal editor who introduced and annotated the poems, as well as explicitly connecting the poems of the collection together in a chronological and thematic sequence. The work also featured a complex interplay of typefaces and short Latin mottos for each character at the end of each section. That work is of course Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar*, a text that is justly praised for its imaginative play with literary and textual conventions. These points of similarity suggest that Spenser had been a careful reader of Gascoigne, who is praised by name by E.K. in 'November' as 'a wittie gentleman, and the very chefe of our late rymers'. Though the importance of Gascoigne's experiments to later poets is one point of interest for *Hundreth*, the previous discussion has made the case for seeing this work as acutely responsive to the material conditions of poetic writing in its moment. In the fictional character of G.T., Gascoigne explored ideas of sequence and narrative woven from short and independent poems, and how readers connected works together in a shared imaginative fabric. Taken alongside the warnings of *Supposes* and *Jocasta*, *Hundreth* can be seen as a volume that satirised the conventions of other mid-century collections, but in doing so also demonstrated the dangerous ways in which authors could be misread or in which readers might seek to impose a coherent biographical framework. In many respects, the construction of this elaborate fiction for the book, with all of its intertextual references and emphasis on attentive connections by its readers, offered one possible road forward: constructing larger imaginative landscapes between poems than was typically the case in a

manuscript culture. If *The Shepheardes Calender* is often regarded as a bellwether for changes to the early modern conception of literary authorship and poetry in print, then Gascoigne is their harbinger, creating a complex interplay of poetry, typography, and metanarrative that led to the equally complex publications of the 1590s.

Chapter 2: *Astrophel and Stella* and the Textual Identities of Sir Philip Sidney

The preceding chapter made a case for a sophisticated range of interpretations open to early modern readers, both in the visual minutiae of a text's presentation, and in the material intertextuality generated by aggregate structures of books fashioned from smaller textual units. In the introduction to this thesis, I suggested that Tottel and Gascoigne provide one way of tracing the development of material-intertextual effects that blossomed in the 1590s. More importantly, however, I have suggested that these experiments, the interpretive possibilities they offer, and the fundamentally aggregate features of the early modern book are often obscured by the author-centric interests of modern editing, particularly as the verbal is often emphasised over the visual or structural. This and the following two chapters will attempt to provide evidence for these claims by focusing on particular publications or series of publications, in order to investigate how returning our attention to these contexts reveals a culture keenly interested in the ways in which meaning and interpretation could be reshaped by the tools of *mise en page* and physical order.

Before exploring how two authors keenly interested in print (and with long-running relationships with individual publishers) made use of these features, I wish to turn to Philip Sidney, and the competition over his textual legacy following his death in 1586. With the author literally as well as figuratively dead in this instance, I argue that attention to matters of visual presentation and especially structural arrangement offer the possibility of recovering two very different Sidneys presented to early modern readers. I argue not only that scholarship examining this early period of Sidney's reception needs to reconsider the narrative of his textual identity, but that the editorial history of *Astrophil and Stella* has obscured an alternative, and equally interesting, form of the poem that was the first encountered by contemporary readers. It is necessary to briefly survey the poems' editorial history, before addressing in turn the quartos of the 1590s and the 1598 folio to demonstrate how the presentation and arrangement of the material offer very different interpretive possibilities. Read in this way, we can see the quarto texts fashioning Sidney as a 'traditional' English poet characterised by the presence of other writers and a bitter attitude towards women, while the 1598 folio presents Sidney as a modern, continental poet with a more complex attitude towards Petrarchan conceits.

Astrophil and Stella (1591, 1591, and c.1597)

In 1591, Thomas Newman published *Sir P.S. His Astrophel and Stella* (hereafter Q1), where Sidney's sonnet sequence is introduced by a dedication to Francis Flower and a prose address by Thomas Nashe, and followed by the work of a number of other authors, including several sonnets that would appear in a revised form in Samuel Daniel's *Delia* the following year. Sometime later in 1591 a second edition (hereafter Q2) was published, partially editing the text of the sonnets as well as removing the front matter and the poems by other authors. Subsequently, a third edition (Q3) was published by Matthew Lownes, again lacking the front matter of Q1, but restoring the additional poems by other authors. This volume is undated, but the editors of the *Short Title Catalogue* suggest 1597, based on the assumption that the volume preceded the folio text of the following year.¹ Finally, 1598 saw the publication of the folio text of *Arcadia*, which included *Astrophil and Stella* in the form with which modern readers will be familiar, alongside the majority of Sidney's literary works without any of the additional material present in the quartos.

The added complication to this unusual situation is that Q1 and Q2 appear to descend from different manuscript lineages, Q1 from the lineage Ringler designated 'Z' and Q2 from 'Y'. Despite the ascendancy of the 1598 text as the 'authorial' version, no extant manuscript contains all of the songs and sonnets in the order of 1598. The closest version is the Drummond manuscript, which contains the complete 1598 sequence but for the twenty sonnets and eight songs between sonnet 66 and song 9.² Two other substantial manuscript sources are extant: the Bright manuscript, which contains sonnets 1-24, 105-108, and songs 8 and 9, and the Houghton

¹ John Buxton, 'On the Date of *Syr P. S. His Astrophel and Stella*...Printed for Matthew Lownes,' *Bodleian Library Record* 6 (1957-61): 614-16, identified the printer as Felix Kingston on the basis on the title-page ornament, and suggested that a date of 1597-8 was likely. J.A. Lavin, 'The First Two Printers of Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*,' *The Library*, 5th Series 26 (1971): 249-55 disagreed, noting that two of the ornaments used in Q3 do not occur in Kingston's works before 1620, and as a result doubted not only the attribution, but also the dating.

² Woudhuysen suggests: 'The missing poems would have filled five gatherings of four leaves and one additional leaf: the only plausible explanation to account for the manuscript's current collation is that it once contained the full text of *Astrophil and Stella*.' See *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 357.

manuscript, which contains which contains one hundred sonnets in a unique arrangement and no songs.³

As well as suggesting that the 1598 sequence was only one of several variant structures that *Astrophil and Stella* took in this period, the evidence that Q1 and Q2 used manuscripts from separate lineages necessarily raises the question of access to these documents. That Newman had access to more than one manuscript of the sequence suggests his source may have been close to the network of circulation, though as will be discussed below, this still includes a large cast of potential conduits.

The convoluted history of this work's publication, though not unique in this period, is made murkier by the two well-known notes in the Stationer's Register regarding the 'calling in' of the work. The first only mentions books by Newman being taken to the Company Hall, while the second records a payment made to John Wolfe (one time agitator turned Company Beadle) 'when he ryd with an answeare to my Lord Treasurer [...] for the taking in of books intituled Sir P:S: *Astrophell and stella*.'⁴ These enigmatic notes have prompted many attempts to recreate a sensible narrative of events, not uncomplicated given the paucity of corroborating information.

In general, the assumption has been that a figure of sufficiently high standing was able to lobby for the book to be 'called in', though the precise reasons behind such an action, or the figures responsible, have proved much harder to pin down. *Astrophil and Stella* was not the first of Sidney's works to invoke reactions from those in power: a letter from Fulke Greville to Francis Walsingham (Sidney's father-in-law) discusses an attempt to print Sidney's *Arcadia*, and how to go about preventing the work from being published, citing his possession of a better quality

³ The 'missing' sonnets are numbers 24, 25, 28, 35, 37, 40, 45, 46. Discussion of the order, and the resulting interpretive consequences for the Houghton sequence can be found in Joel B. Davis, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia and the Invention of English Literature* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011), 85-7.

⁴ Edward Arber (ed.), *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London 1554-1640 A.D.* (London: Privately Printed, 1875), Volume I, 555.

text as well as religious works that better represented Sidney's character.⁵ While we lack some information about the proposed edition (if indeed one existed), this should alert us to the possibility of figures with significant social and political status using their influence to intervene in the publication process, especially in the case of an individual who had attracted no little attention since his death in 1586. Beyond these basic facts, opinion diverges wildly. William A. Ringler, editor of the most recent scholarly edition of Sidney's poetry, suggests that Sidney's 'friends' insisted on the recall of Q1, and that Newman was subsequently 'ordered' to publish the corrected text of Q2.⁶ This has not been seen as a particularly satisfying explanation, not least because, in the words of J.A. Lavin, such an action hardly seems to make 'the punishment fit the crime, considering the pecuniary advantage that was likely to accrue to the pirate'.⁷ In addition, such a theory rests primarily on Ringler's belief that Q1 represents an extreme corruption of Sidney's text, a view I will return to at some length below.

Germaine Warkentin has alternatively suggested that the dedication to Francis Flower M.P. upset Mary Herbert (nee Sidney)⁸ on account of Flower's questionable character (an 'unattractive petty functionary') and his attachment to a 'vulpine administrative world' that contrasted unfavourably with the noble, aristocratic virtue Mary cultivated in her circle.⁹ While the variant state of Q1 and the fact that neither prefatory work is reprinted in Q2/3 does seem to connect the reason(s) for censorship to this material, Warkentin's hypothesis involves a degree of romanticism in respect to the 'courtly' aspects of Mary Herbert's behaviour and contacts, and rather overemphasises the degree to which Flower's career would have

⁵ This letter has been discussed in numerous publications, but most recently at length by G. A. Wilkes, 'Left ... to Play the Ill Poet in My Own Part': The Literary Relationship of Sidney and Fulke Greville,' *Review of English Studies* 57, no.230 (2006): 291-309.

⁶ William A. Ringler, Jr. (ed.) *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 545.

⁷ Lavin, 'The First Two Printers,' 250.

⁸ Scholarship tended to variously identify Mary either by her family's surname, or that adopted on her marriage to Henry Herbert in 1577. For the sake of clarity and in order to prevent confusion between Mary and her brother, I will be referring to her by her married name throughout this chapter.

⁹ Germaine Warkentin, 'Patrons and Profiteers: Thomas Newman and the "Violent Enlargement" of *Astrophil and Stella*,' *Book Collector* 34 (1985): 461-87 (481).

been seen to violate this decorum. Henry Woudhuysen has soberly suggested that, ‘[t]o modern eyes, Flower's self-seeking career under Hatton's wing may appear unsavoury, but there was little in it which would have shocked his contemporaries’.¹⁰ Indeed, he notes that Warkentin’s hypothesis leaves us an additional problem: if the objection to Q1 rested on its dedication, why was Thomas Nashe’s introduction also removed and not included in subsequent editions?

Though the specific circumstances surrounding Q1 and Q2 look unlikely to be explained satisfactorily without the discovery of additional information (‘a tangled editorial web, almost incapable of being sorted out,’ in the words of Christopher Wilson), the almost uniform scholarly response has been to regard Q1 as illicit or piratical.¹¹ Indeed, it is rare to find any critical work on *Astrophil and Stella* that does not append some form of pejorative description to these quartos, most commonly ‘unauthorised,’ but also ‘pirated,’ ‘illegal,’ or ‘surreptitious’.¹² Even outside of these direct adjectival challenges to the legitimacy of the quartos, there is a frequent underlying assumption that the quartos represent an illegitimate enterprise, usually involving the narrative of at least one stolen manuscript. Even Woudhuysen, who is otherwise a model of sceptical scholarship on the question of the quartos, turns from a critique of narratives about their publication to ‘try to identify the thief and to work out how many manuscripts he purloined, and from what sources.’¹³ Shortly afterwards he again refers to ‘the pirated printing of Sidney's sequence,’ moving from a cautious account of the confusing set of affairs in 1591 to an outright accusation of theft.¹⁴

¹⁰ Woudhuysen, *Circulation of Manuscripts*, 369.

¹¹ Christopher R. Wilson ‘*Astrophil and Stella*: A Tangled Editorial Web,’ *The Library*, 6th Series, 1, no.4 (1979): 336-346 (346).

¹² See as illustrative examples Matthew Woodcock, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Sidney Circle* (Devon: Northcoate House Publishers, 2010), 49; Gavin Alexander, *Writing After Sidney: The Literary Responses to Sir Philip Sidney 1586-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 17; and Alan Hagar, *Dazzling Images: The Masks of Sir Philip Sidney* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1991), 65.

¹³ Woudhuysen, *Circulation of Manuscripts*, 371.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

Narratives of theft or piracy are undoubtedly suggested in part by Nashe's preface and its suggestive flirtations with illegitimacy, which have not helped the reception of the quartos:

[...] I hope [they] wil also hold me excused, though I open the gate to his glory, & inuite idle eares to the admiration of his melancholy.

Quid petitur sacris nisi tantum fama poetis?

Which although it be oftentimes imprisoned in Ladyes casks, & the president bookes of such as cannot see without another mans spectacles, yet at length it breakes foorth in spite of his keepers, and vseth some private pen (in steed of a picklock) to secure his violent enlargement. (A4r)

This is Nashe at his oblique best, but the combination of the personal responsibility taken before the quotation from Ovid, and the suggestion of thievery or works escaping without their owner's consent has led to some reasonable questions about the source of the printer's text, and Nashe's part in obtaining it. And while there is undoubtedly a sense in which Nashe seems happy to suggest that the reader might be holding something that others have tried to prevent him or her seeing, we must be cautious in reading this as an admission of guilt rather than as canny salesmanship, which deliberately imitates older claims of the same type. As well as the numerous prefaces that point to the lack of authorial control when it came to manuscripts entering the hands of printers, one might look to an example like that of *Songes and Sonettes* whose preface (explored in Chapter 1) declares:

It resteth now (gentle reder) if thou thinke it not euil don, to publishe, to the honor of the english tong, and for profit of the studious of Englishe eloquence, those workes *which the vngentle horders vp of such tresure haue heretofore enuied the.* (A.ir) [Italics mine]

In both prefaces we can see the same insinuation: that what had previously been 'imprisoned' or 'hoarded-up' in manuscript circulation was being released to a much wider readership.

Songes and Sonettes might have been a suggestive model for Newman's Q1, since both published for the first time the work of a recently-deceased English nobleman (or noblemen), and were presented as works that were not only pleasing in their own right, but constituted an important step in the development of the language and its capabilities. Indeed, the metaphors of the preface to *Songes and Sonettes* were still potent in the culture of the 1590s to the extent that one was adopted on the title page to the 1593 and 1598 *Arcadia* in the shape of the marjoram plant that appears at the foot of the page, nodding to Tottel's plea to the 'unlearned' to 'purge that swinelike grossnesse that maketh the sweete maierome not to smel to their delight' (Air).¹⁵ As I will suggest below, there are some suggestive structural points of contact between *Songes and Sonettes* and Q1, but for now it will be sufficient to note that Nashe's preface should not immediately make us assume he is 'admitting' to an actual theft, which in any case would also seem to sit rather curiously with his later fulsome praise of Mary Herbert. Indeed, Steven Mentz sees Nashe's approach as evidence of the 'disorienting frequency with which formulaic pleas for patronage shared front matter in Elizabethan books with overt grabs at market share.'¹⁶

Though Nashe's preface might be responsible for raising suspicions, the blame for the perceived offence has not been universally assigned to him; Woudhuysen has pointed to the suspicious proximity of Daniel to events, while Steven May has recently suggested that Abraham Fraunce may have been well positioned to act as a link between the narrow circuit of the poems' manuscript circulation and the world of print.¹⁷ Part of the difficulty in unlocking this

¹⁵ Michael Mack discusses the role of this woodcut, suggesting that while it appears to promote exclusivity, the Latin tag 'is not so much to keep readers *out* as to give them the pleasure of feeling *included* among an elite' [Italics in original]. See *Sidney's Poetics: Imitating Creation* (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press 2005), 50-53 (50). See also the discussion of this woodcut and its afterlife in Adam G. Hooks 'Sidney's Porcupine,' [<http://www.adamghooks.net/2011/04/sidneys-porcupine.html>] (accessed September 2016).

¹⁶ Steven Mentz 'Selling Sidney: William Ponsonby, Thomas Nashe, and the Boundaries of Elizabethan Print and Manuscript Cultures' *TEXT* 13 (2000): 151-174 (154). It is worth noting that Mentz later refers to Q1 as 'printed illegally' (162) and a 'pirated edition' (163), despite admitting that these conclusions do not stem from 'any firm proof' (164).

¹⁷ Woudhuysen, *Circulation of Manuscripts*, 371; Steven W. May, 'Marlowe, Spenser, Sidney and – Abraham Fraunce?' *The Review of English Studies* 62 (2011): 30-63. John Pitcher, editor of the

bibliographical puzzle is not simply the lack of evidence but the lack of context for that which we do have. Does the order recorded in the Stationers' Register apply to both 1591 quartos, or just to Q1? Did the order only aim at recalling the existing copies of Q1 to eliminate the prefatory material, explaining the two states of Q1? When was Q3 published, and what was the response by the Pembroke/Sidney estate to it (if any)? If there was no response, what changed between 1591 and this later date? Are Nashe's words a sly admission of his part in obtaining a manuscript against the wishes of its owner, or are we only alert to their suggestiveness in light of the action subsequently taken by the Stationers' Company?

Put simply, I do not believe there has yet been a satisfactory solution to the puzzling situation of the quartos, but in lieu of further evidence we should retain some wary scepticism about narratives of this sort, however convenient they may be. This is not simply a matter of urging caution in the process of interpretation: the effect of these explanations has been to obscure from critical study an crucial moment in literary history. Davis describes a critical 'dogma that the 1591 quarto arrangement must be ignored', to the detriment of our understanding of this work and its influence.¹⁸ This situation is reminiscent in more than one way of the situation of 'good' and 'bad' Shakespeare quartos. Randall McLeod remarks of these terms that '[b]ad and good tends to structure textual evidence before the reader has a chance to see it', relying as it does on underlying assumptions about exactly what constitutes a 'good' or a 'bad' text.¹⁹ More recently, Laurie Maguire has provided a robust reassessment of the evidence in the case of Shakespeare, and expertly dissected the way in which the language of description, and the circular logic of methodology, led the New Bibliographers to dismiss and castigate a number of texts that were interesting in their own right, not only as textual productions, but as candidates for 'versions' or 'stages' of the works in question.²⁰ The result has been to

forthcoming Oxford edition of Daniel's works, also has suspicions that Daniel was involved (personal communication, September 2014). See also the excellent summary by Davis, *Invention*, 81-85.

¹⁸ Davis, *Invention*, 91.

¹⁹ Randall McLeod (as Random Cloud), 'The Marriage of Good and Bad Quartos,' *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33, no.4 (1982): 421-431 (421).

²⁰ Laurie E. Maguire, *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The Bad Quartos and their Contexts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

pluralise what had previously been singular, enriching our understanding of those works, and of Shakespeare as a dramatist.

Editorial and critical reception

Perhaps because poetry (and especially a sonnet sequence by an author whose biography looms large in the reading of his works) retains for modern readers some sense of approaching a more ‘personal’ piece of writing than dramatic material written for the public stage, editorial methodology now common in Shakespeare studies and elsewhere has not filtered through to scholarship on Sidney. Ringler assigns the writing of the entire sequence to the summer of 1582, noting that it ‘is possible that the composition of the poems extended into the year 1583, and even later’ but concluding that such an idea is ‘scarcely probable.’²¹ His evidence is the text’s perceived qualities, with Ringler seeing it as ‘carefully planned’ and ‘the result of a single creative impulse’.²² It should be noted that whenever Ringler discusses the text, it is specifically the 1598 edition he is referring to, since it is the only ‘complete’ text in his analysis.²³ His conclusions thus appear to have been reached in a roundabout fashion that recalls the process of finding ‘bad’ quartos: the text of 1598 must be complete and as the author intended it, since it seems to us the most aesthetically pleasing of those that remain. With a certainty that the 1598 text represents the ‘final intentions’ of its author, and that the text was written in a short burst and ‘never subsequently revised’, the resulting stemma is inflected by conceptions of aesthetic quality as well as textual variation through the various manuscripts.²⁴ It is worth noting that despite Ringler’s championing of the 1598 version, it represents a structure that does not occur in any of the manuscript versions of the sequence that have survived. The tendency for the extant manuscripts to combine sonnets and songs in an eclectic manner should give us reason to be suspicious of any claims to the inherent primacy of the 1598 version. Ringler’s

²¹ Ringler (ed.), *Poems*, 439.

²² *Ibid.*, 440.

²³ *Ibid.*, 456.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 455.

vitriol against the quartos in part descends from his dismissive account of their quality: he describes Q1 as a ‘bad quarto’, for its publication was unauthorised and its text extremely corrupt’,²⁵ and the work of the compositor of Q2 as ‘about as inaccurate as it is possible to get.’²⁶

At the time of writing Ringler’s edition is more than fifty years old; that it still forms the basis of scholarship on Sidney’s poems is a testament to his efforts and scholarship. At the same time, editorial theory has moved on sufficiently far to make some of Ringler’s methodologies and underlying assumptions feel distinctly unhelpful when analysing Sidney’s texts. Woudhuysen, reflecting recently on Ringler’s edition, suggests some of the features of those changes:

[...] since his edition appeared, we have become less confident that texts are always as fixed and certain as he may have thought they generally are. Our distrust of authors as natural authorities is supposed to have made us more aware of the indeterminacy that affects texts — their lack of fixity, their adaptability to different places and circumstances, whether as written, remembered, or performed poems.²⁷

With the insights of Jerome McGann’s socialised picture of textual production, and of Arthur Marotti and Harold Love into manuscript culture, the narrative of Sidney’s spontaneous creation of a perfectly structured sequence which he subsequently abandoned feels less than convincing.²⁸ Indeed, there have been infrequent but intriguing suggestions that Ringler may have been mistaken in some respects, particularly in dismissing the possibility of revision. Michael Saenger in particular has put forward a robust defence of Q1, noting that many of the moments criticised as ‘errors’ in Ringler might easily be seen as ‘variants’, and going so far as to

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 544.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 451.

²⁷ Henry R. Woudhuysen, ‘Sidney’s Manuscripts (again)’ *Sidney Journal* 30, no.1 (2013): 117-125 (121-2).

²⁸ Jerome J. McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Charlottesville, VA.: University Press of Virginia, 1992); Arthur F. Marotti, *Print, Manuscript, and the Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995); Harold Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998).

describe Q1 as ‘mostly authorial’.²⁹ Though the full detail of Saenger’s argument is too long to repeat here, the substance is very much that put forward by Leah Marcus in her manifesto for ‘un-editing’ a text: by removing our assumptions about adherence to a single ‘correct’ text and reading textual cruxes in context, we can often make plausible readings, especially when reading a text holistically rather than locally. Thus, where in many cases Ringler sees printing-house corruption, Saenger sees a different but equally compelling logic that may well represent a stage or version of Sidney’s poem.

The most famous example that may point towards revision, originally noted by Woudhuysen and repeated by Saenger, is the appearance of ‘the *Caconians*’ in Q1 against the ‘cutted Spartanes’ of 1598 in Sonnet 92, l.3. As both note, ‘Caconians’ makes most sense when seen as a straightforward misreading of ‘Laconians’. The importance of that word can be recognised when we realise that Sidney regularly uses ‘Laconians’ as a synonym for ‘Spartans’ throughout the *New Arcadia*; it is extremely difficult to imagine this fortuitous misreading being generated purely by an error from the compositor. In short, it may represent a moment of revision (or an earlier text) by Sidney, given his usage of it elsewhere within his works, and the fact it does not appear within the 1598 text. Thus, even if we choose to accept Ringler’s stemma, we must be open to the possibility that the three textual lines he describes represent moments in a process of writing and revision rather than fragmentary shadows of Sidney’s lost original. More radical still is the argument of Rudolph Almasý, who suggests that the songs of *Astrophil and Stella* may not have been written at the same time as the sonnets between which they are interspersed, and may have been introduced either by authorial revision, or by alterations made after his death by one or more editors.³⁰ Though I will return to this argument and its significance in the next section, Almasý raises yet another set of questions that Ringler’s hypothesised stemma and its underlying assumptions seem ill-suited to deal with.

²⁹ Michael Baird Saenger, ‘Did Sidney Revise *Astrophil and Stella*?’ *Studies in Philology* 96, no.4 (1999): 417-438 (418).

³⁰ Rudolph P. Almasý ‘Stella and the Songs: Questions about the Composition of *Astrophil and Stella*,’ *South Atlantic Review* 58, no.4 (1993): 1-17.

The result of the foregoing analysis is to suggest several problems with the scholarly reception of *Astrophil and Stella* in the wake of its last major edition. First, Ringler's edition represents several methodologies and underlying assumptions that have elsewhere been revised within early modern editorial scholarship, and many of his conclusions feel untenable given our improved attention to the nuances of manuscript circulation, composition, and the process of texts' transfer to print. Indeed, as mentioned above, the extant manuscript record of *Astrophil and Stella* suggests that the structure of 1598 is unique in ways that arguments to its 'authorised' status do not normally admit. Second, partly because of a complicated publication history, and partly because of Ringler's severe opinion of the quartos, modern scholarship has largely ignored these editions, commonly branding them as 'unauthorised' and occasionally even insisting on their illegality.

The remainder of this chapter will suggest that returning our attention to the quarto and folio editions, and the specific forms these take, allows us to reassess their importance in the early reception of Sidney as his poetry enjoyed printed circulation. As Joel B. Davis, one of the few scholars to study the quartos for their own merits, has suggested:

[...] the 1591 quartos of *Astrophel and Stella* influenced the development of aesthetic principles in Elizabethan sonnet sequences far more than the "authorised" edition of the sequence printed in the 1598 folio of Sidney's works.³¹

For the seven-year interval between 1591 and 1598, the version represented by the quartos was the *only* version of Sidney available to any but the small number of individuals who participated in the manuscript circulation of his poetry. Regardless of any judgements we may make about either the quality of the publications or the suspicions we might hold regarding their path to print, these works are a crucial moment in the history of early modern literature, and deserve sustained attention. I will first turn to the quartos, and suggest that the structure of these works (both of the sequence itself, and the works printed with it) present a Sidney of a very different sort than is celebrated in modern editions of his works. Following this, I will

³¹ Davis, *Invention*, 79.

examine how the 1598 folio radically revises Sidney's textual image, transforming not only the text itself, but the way in which it presents its author as part of a very different poetic movement than do the quartos.

The structure of the 1590 quartos

Astrophil and Stella has proven remarkably amenable to a range of theoretical approaches – more so than many other early modern sonnet sequences – and this is undoubtedly in response to Sidney's own interests in form, speaker, and the complexities of interpretation.³² A summary of the sonnets renders the narrative of the sequence rather unremarkable: a male speaker falls in love with a married woman, struggles with his feelings, and unsuccessfully attempts to woo her, before the sequence ends with something of a dissatisfied whimper. Quite in opposition to Petrarch's narrative of spiritual regeneration, Sidney's speaker appears to have learned little by the end.

The sequence as it is read today, however, is not simply a collection of sonnets but contains eleven poems scattered unevenly throughout. It is these songs that appear to carry far more of the narrative 'weight' of the sequence, and have been central to the ways in which Sidney's poems have been interpreted by modern criticism, especially numbers 2, 4, 8, and 11. It is not difficult to see why: readers are confronted with moments where rhetorical violence veers dangerously close to physical violence (4); the speaker kisses his beloved while asleep, cursing his failure to go further (2); and on more than one occasion we hear the voice of Stella herself (4, 8, 11) taking on what seems to be a determining role in the outcome of the relationship (8, 11). In the context of a vernacular tradition, certainly, such moments demonstrate Sidney's experimental approach to the form, still appearing surprisingly innovative despite being one of the points of origin for the 'sonnet craze' of the 1590s.

³² Janet H. MacArthur, *The Critical Contexts of Sidney's Astrophil and Stella and Spenser's Amoretti* (Victoria B.C.: University of Victoria, 1989) offers a useful summary of *Astrophil and Stella's* amenability to modern critical approaches.

It is particularly the last of these innovations, the expansion of a traditionally monologic form to include an oppositional voice of the beloved, which has inspired much contemporary scholarship. Nora Fienberg's discussion of Stella's 'emergence' has been particularly influential, seeing the sequence (specifically the songs) as marking the development of an increasingly confident voice for Astrophil's beloved, 'an affective presence, with a poised, articulate voice [...] who is not simply a projection of the speaker's desires.'³³ To paraphrase Fienberg's detailed argument, the sequence sees the growth of Stella as a character in her own right, shifting from mute Petrarchan mistress to a figure who upbraids Astrophil for his behaviour. Likewise, Katherine Roberts suggests that Stella can be seen as a three-dimensional, 'realistic' depiction of a woman through an argument grounded in the songs.³⁴ In this respect, Fienberg and subsequent feminist critics have drawn Stella into a prominent position in a narrative that, in a remarkably long-lasting scholarly consensus, is seen to present Astrophil as a figure who loves 'incorrectly'. Various, he has been seen as a figure who reforms himself through this abortive romance,³⁵ who acts in a manner that should repulse readers (and encourages them to condemn him),³⁶ and as a figure who symbolises the failed ambition of a courtier in a cultural setting of necessary submission to a female monarch.³⁷ Regardless of the precise emphasis, there is remarkably little dissent from the view that Astrophil's actions

³³ Fienberg, Nora, 'The Emergence of Stella in *Astrophil and Stella*,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 25, no.1 (1985): 5-19 (7).

³⁴ Katherine J. Roberts, 'Realism in Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*: The Creation of Stella,' *Sidney Newsletter* 12, no.2 (1993): 30-41.

³⁵ J.W. Lever *The Elizabethan Love Sonnet*, 2nd ed. (1956; repr., London: Methuen, 1966), 81-91; A. C. Hamilton, *Sir Philip Sidney: A Study of His Life and Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 14, 105.

³⁶ Thomas P. Roche, '*Astrophil and Stella*, A Radical Reading,' *Spenser Studies* III (1982): 139-191; Alan Sinfield, 'Sexual Puns in *Astrophil and Stella*,' *Essays in Criticism* 24 (1974): 341-55; 'Sidney and Astrophil,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 20 (1980): 25-41; Margreta de Grazia, 'Lost Potential in Grammar and Nature: Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 21 (1981): 21-35; Lisa M. Klein, *The Exemplary Sidney and the Elizabethan Sonneteer* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998).

³⁷ Arthur Marotti, '"Love is Not Love": Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order,' *English Literary History* 49 (1982): 396-428; Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, 'The Politics of *Astrophil and Stella*,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 24 (1984): 53-69.

represent an unwholesome and unsuccessful strategy of wooing, and that the songs provide some of the most powerful evidence for this interpretation. Even widely divergent readings such as Andrew Strycharski's investigation into the cultural status of learning literacy, Margaret Simon's reading of the sequence as engaging in a meditation on poetic form, or Melissa E. Sanchez's 'sex-positive' reading of Stella all fundamentally rely on detailed readings of the songs, and specifically the narrative force of a few songs located at specific points among the sonnets.³⁸

It is with some surprise then, that a reader familiar with the 'accepted' text and scholarly interpretation of *Astrophil and Stella* might encounter any of the three quarto editions introduced above. In these volumes, readers would have encountered 107 sonnets in sequence (sonnet 37 being omitted), followed by 'Other Sonnets of variable verse' (G3v), which contains the first ten of the eleven songs present in 1598, printed here together as a unit after the sonnets. Rather than ending with sonnet 107, we are presented with a decorative line that separates the sonnets from the songs, which begin overleaf. While this illustrative divide might notionally indicate some kind of break or halt in the narrative of the sequence, it is not until after the songs (I3r) that the volume declares the Sidney section of the book to be over, again suggesting that reading these poems as a continuation of the narrative of the sonnets may well have been a strategy which suggested itself to contemporary readers. The previous chapter has also demonstrated that visual devices of this sort are not always necessarily indicative of thematic or narratological breaks.

If we are to consider the quartos as texts read and interpreted by Sidney's contemporaries, as I have argued above, then we must also be prepared to consider the possibility that this arrangement of material allows for a different narrative to emerge than that with which we are familiar from the 1598 structure. Given that the scholarship on Sidney's sonnet sequence rests its interpretations so crucially on the songs and their position in the sequence, this radically alternative organisation offers the possibility of a very different set of readings.

³⁸ Andrew Strycharski 'Literacy, Education, and Affect in *Astrophil and Stella*' *Studies in English Literature*, 48, no.1 (2008): 45-63; Margaret Simon 'Refraining Songs: The Dynamics of Form in Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*,' *Studies in Philology* 109, no.1 (2012): 86-102; Melissa E. Sanchez, 'In My Selfe the Smart I Try': Female Promiscuity in *Astrophil and Stella*' *English Literary History* 80, no.1 (2013): 1-27.

What narrative might be suggested by the placement of the songs in a unit rather than dispersed among the sonnets?³⁹ It will be helpful to run through in extremely brief terms the content of the ten poems before suggesting how we might begin to read these poems as offering a ‘conclusion’ to the narrative of the sonnets. The section opens with the first song identifying Stella as the inspiration for the narrator’s writing, and the dedicatee of his works, formally insisted upon by the repetition of the final line of the first and last stanzas: ‘Onely in *you* my song begins and endeth’ (1.4 / 36).⁴⁰ From this interest in poetry we move to the infamous song 2, in which Astrophil ‘steals’ a kiss from a sleeping Stella. While that movement from lyrical praise to physical violation may seem incongruous, it is a movement that is repeated in the following two poems, with song 3 meditating on the abilities of Orpheus to ‘persuade’ nature to operate differently, and song 4 staging a dialogue between Astrophil and Stella, with the repeated exchange ‘Take me to thee, and thee to me / No no no no, my Deare, let bee’, offering us another glimpse of what might be read as a physical imposition being repulsed by Stella. While, then, these first four poems may seem disorganised in both form and subject, it takes relatively little interpretive work to see them as a unit staging in dramatic narrative terms the themes that underwrite the entire sequence: the power of writing to persuade, and the inability of that persuasion to effect the speaker’s desires. These are lyrical offerings repeatedly repulsed in the moment those desires are translated into physical action.

In this context, the songs – some of which have previously been described as having a puzzling or uncertain place in the sequence – begin to take on a more unified structure. Song 5, for example, in which Stella is variously upbraided as a ‘murthering Tyrant’ (1.85), a ‘Rebel runaway’ (1.86), a ‘Lady untrue’ (1.86), a ‘witch’ (1.87) and a ‘Divel’ (1.88), seems perhaps even more appropriately placed here after two failed advances than in the 1598 arrangement, where sonnets on other themes

³⁹ James Finn Cotter considers the songs as a unit, though working from the 1598 rather than 1591 version. He concludes that the songs together represent an *ars poetica*. See ‘The Songs in Astrophil and Stella,’ *Studies in Philology* 67 (1970): 178-200. Davis suggests that the songs represent a series of metrical experiments, whose metrics suggests an evolving attitude towards composition on the part of Astrophil, *Invention*, 93-99.

⁴⁰ Though referred to as ‘Sonnets’ in the quarto texts, I will refer to the poems as ‘songs’ throughout, firstly to allow for more clear reference to the standard editions of Sidney’s works, and also to prevent confusion when referring to the sonnets that preceded these poems.

interrupt this run of verbal and physical approaches. Songs six and seven continue the debate between ‘music’ and ‘beauty’, with the first instigating a mock debate between the two, while both call witnesses and plead for reason, the ‘Princess hie’ (l. 49), to adjudicate which deserves to be ranked above the other. Given that this poem ends with the plea to reason, the following song, which treats the voice (stanza 1), beauty (stanza 2) and their combination in Stella (stanza 3), could be read as reason’s answer, and a repetition of the matter of the songs so far. With Stella once again confirmed as the ‘solution’ to the opposition of lyrical and physical elements, song 8 again returns us to a seemingly narrative event in which Stella finally (in this structure) repels Astrophil.

It is here, perhaps, that we might see the quarto texts as offering a more straightforward narrative than their folio counterpart: both songs 9 and 10 seem to suggest a story of decline, and quite possibly death following this final parting of the two characters. Song 9 imagines Astrophil as a shepherd, turning his sheep away and lamenting his ‘refus[al]’ (l.21) by Stella. In turning loose his flock, he commands them to retell their master’s ruin should they encounter Stella: ‘Tell her in your piteous blaying / Her poore Slaues just decaying’ (l.49-50). Following this, we encounter Astrophil addressing himself in terms that may well be read as fatal, especially given the position of the poem as the final one of the entire sequence: ‘My life fleetes with too much thinking: / Thinke no more, but die in mee...’ (l.27-28). Indeed, one might see something of a bibliographic joke or suggestion of this possibility, with the text immediately after the conclusion of this poem declaring ‘Finis Syr P.S.’ (l3r). While notionally a declaration that the work has ended, the truncated title might leave us wondering whether we are reading the last words of the text, or the more abstracted voice of the *book*. As I suggested in my introductory chapter, there is often a fundamental ambiguity about the separation of textual and bibliographical voices in this period, and the editorial desire to recover the singular voice of the author can often limit readings available to modern readers. Though perhaps fanciful in some respects, the uneasy line between the biographical or fictional nature of Sidney’s personae – something that has generated no small amount of scholarship in itself – and the particularly forceful way in which the

volume has claimed Sidney's authorship as vital to its interpretation, makes this suggestion more powerful than it may at first seem.⁴¹

Finishing a series of sonnets almost always addressed to a single recipient in an (almost) regular form, the speaker begins to address Stella with increasing urgency, with a thrice repeated pattern of praise and repulsed physical action. Following the last of these repulses, the tone shifts from one of persuasion to one of lament, and the reader sees Astrophil move to a position of isolation and disillusionment. Finally, the sequence ends on what could be seen as a more 'final' and certainly more dramatic note than the 1598 arrangement: rather than accepting the continuing inspiration and desperation that Stella causes, Astrophil in this version is left without hope, and appears to have accepted his defeat in more final terms – quite possibly with an acceptance of his own demise. In some respects this disillusionment, the semi-pastoral setting invoked by song 9's references to sheep, and the narrator's possible death all gesture towards other works following the same pattern, such as Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar* (1579).⁴²

If we read this group of poems as providing a narrative conclusion to the sequence, we might also begin to make more sense of Nashe's metaphor for the volume, which suggests that the volume should be read as being structured by a movement from enthusiasm to defeat: 'the Prologue hope, the Epilogue despaire' (A3r). Nashe identifies the governing muse of the sequence as Melpomene, dressed in 'dusky robes dipt in the ynke of teares' (A3r). It is possible to argue against the specifics of the reading presented above, of course. But importantly, the sequence does behave quite differently from the 1598 structure, with the 'narrative' action of the songs located at the end of the sequence, following a pattern of verbal then physical assault, and ending with a far bleaker picture than that encountered in 1598.

⁴¹ On Sidney's complex attitude to self-presentation and personae, see as illustrative examples A.C. Hamilton, *Sir Philip Sidney*, 1-16; Alan Hagar, *Dazzling Images*; and Edward Berry, *The Making of Sir Philip Sidney* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998).

⁴² Though the relationship between Sidney and Spenser is complex, *The Shepheardes Calender* (which was, of course, dedicated to Sidney) is one of the few contemporary works of poetry to receive any praise in Sidney's *Defence of Poesie* (London: Thomas Creede for William Ponsonby, 1593). See Kevin Pask, *The Emergence of the Author: Scripting the Life of the Poet in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 93-112 and Jean Robertson, 'Sidney,' in *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, ed. A.C. Hamilton (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 1719-1721.

And in the case of Nashe we have one reader whose brief summary of the sequence does seem more fitting for the quarto than the folio text. Nearly all of the scholarship I have outlined above needs to be qualified as discussing readings applicable to a particular *version* of *Astrophil and Stella*, and not necessarily the one most familiar to the first readers of the sequence.

On purely structural grounds we need to be alert to the possibilities that the quarto texts offered for imitation or adaptation by contemporary poets. To suggest at least one other way in which reading the quarto texts might prompt us to rethink Sidney's early reception, I will now discuss what this sonnet/song divide might have suggested in terms of organisational possibilities. Rather than the familiar 1598 text, we have a sequence that bifurcates into two formal approaches, the first restricted to a number of poems in a regular form, and the second a much more disparate collection of works that appear to 'break' with previous comparable works both in terms of narrative and lyrical form. Although the case might be difficult to make on direct grounds, this offers an earlier and more influential version of the structure that John Kerrigan (and others) have often claimed as originating in Samuel Daniel's *Delia*, in which the 'Complaint of Rosamond' counterbalances the sonnets that proceed it.⁴³ This 'Delian' model, to which Kerrigan originally called attention in order to argue for the place of 'A Lover's Complaint' at the conclusion of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, might be seen to have its roots instead in Sidney's sequence.

Increasingly in the period, sequences of sonnets are completed with single or multiple poems in different forms as a way of concluding the narrative (as in Spenser's *Epithalamion*), or counteracting or complicating the preceding poems (Daniel, Shakespeare). Seeing the quarto texts as works in their own right that were also contemporaries' first engagement with Sidney's sonnet sequence offers the possibility that this structural arrangement offers a proto-Delian model whose influence has yet to be appreciated. Joel B. Davis has argued along similar lines, though he attributes the development of the tripartite form of many sonnet sequences (with a short poem or poem between the sonnets and longer narrative poem) to the

⁴³ John Kerrigan (ed.), *The Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1999). Kerrigan also developed this argument in his edited collection of 'Delian' structured poetry, *Motives of Woe: Shakespeare and 'Female Complaint'* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).

model provided by Q1.⁴⁴ While agreeing with his conclusion about the volume's importance, this argument overlooks the fact that the songs of Q1 are followed by more sonnets, and a concluding set of poems in various forms. As a result, it may be safer to see the broad influence of Q1 as a material-intertextual model for other poets rather than triangulating specific structural debts.

The quarto texts do not only differ in structure from the folio text, with the narrative repercussions discussed above, but the text of the songs differs slightly from that from the more familiar 1598 text. In particular, and vitally, in the light of the critical history outlined above, Stella does not 'emerge' but remains a fragmented, barely present voice in the text. Of three songs in which Stella might be seen to take a partial or primary role, only song 4 is present in the same form in the quarto and folio texts. Song 8, the infamous third-person narration, does not contain the 'response' of Stella to Astrophil's pleading: Stella's hands literally do the talking here, as the narration immediately moves from 'her hands his hands expelling' (l.67) to describing her exit, '[l]eaving him with passion rent' (l.70). This stands in sharp contrast to the 1598 version, which separates these two moments by eight stanzas of speech from Stella. Finally, song 11, in which Stella banishes Astrophil from her window in 1598, is not present at all in the quartos.

Not only do we have a far darker story, then, moving from concentrated verbal persuasion to physical acts of violence towards Stella's person, but we also have a narrative in which Stella never develops or offers the same rhetorical defence of her position that is familiar to us from the folio text. Given the centrality of Stella's presence in the sequence as the basis for modern readings, it should be clear what a radically different narrative the quarto texts present. If Stella's perspective is not offered, there is far less explicit condemnation of Astrophil's actions from within the text; unlike in the 1598 version we are not granted an opportunity to see Stella's 'cruelty' exposed as a Petrarchan fiction, and the songs no longer function as the medium in which we see Astrophil's development as an unreliable narrator. In direct contrast, the quartos offer the possibility that we could continue to read Astrophil as being 'unfairly' rejected by his mistress, with his slide towards isolation and desolation the inevitable consequence of her refusal. To return to Nashe again, if his reading of 'despair' seems more appropriate in reading the songs as the culmination

⁴⁴ Davis, *Invention*, 101-2.

of the narrative of the sequence, so too might we consider that his suggestion that ‘[t]he argument [is] cruell chastitie’ (A3r) presents an entirely reasonable reading of the sequence I have outlined above. To the first readers of *Astrophil and Stella*, the theme may not have been the incongruity of Petrarchan ideals with lived reality, or the gradual condemnation of Astrophil’s behaviour, but a far more regular censure of Stella and her unyielding behaviour.

This is corroborated by the version of the sonnets appearing in Q1: Davis notes that sonnets 84-86, which deal with Astrophil’s journey to Stella’s home, lack song 4, which occurs between sonnets 85 and 86.⁴⁵ That song, as mentioned above, appears to dramatise an encounter in which Astrophil applies rhetorical (and perhaps physical) force to Stella, which leads to her refrain for each stanza: ‘No, no, no, no, my Deare, let be.’ If the song is read in this position, Stella’s ‘change of looks’ (86.1) appears entirely reasonable. If the song is removed, Stella’s change of attitude appears unprompted by the action of Astrophil. Davis notes that ‘the Stella of this part of Q1 is more changeable than the Stella of the 1598 folio,’ and agrees with my sense that the sequence differs from the ‘authorised’ version not as a result of sloppy handling of the manuscript materials, but as the result of a coherent, holistic narrative in the volume.⁴⁶ In Q1, Astrophil does not suffer from what Paul Allen Miller describes as a ‘profound internalised conflict’, but is rather subject to the changeable whims and finally rejection of an unfeeling mistress.⁴⁷ Succinctly, Astrophil and Stella are different characters and interact in different ways in the 1591 and 1598 versions of their story, and those differences come from intentional changes made throughout the sequence.

‘Oft turning others leaves’

The quarto texts, partly because of the perceived illegitimacy of the publications, have usually been seen as offering a poor-quality transcription of the source

⁴⁵ Davis, *Invention*, 89-90.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 89.

⁴⁷ Paul Allen Miller, ‘Sidney, Petrarch, and Ovid, or Imitation as Subversion,’ *English Literary History*, 58, no.3 (1991): 499-522 (503).

manuscript, but a reading of the book rather than the text offers some suggestions either that agents involved in the printing made some careful choices in its arrangement (such as the celebrated omission of sonnet 37), or that they read and responded to the themes it presented. Readers of Q1 and Q3 would not have encountered Sidney's work in isolation, but would have found him in company with a number of other poets.⁴⁸ In many respects, as has been suggested in the first section of this chapter, we might see the quartos as attempting to cultivate the same structural and thematic concerns as Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes* (1557, and many subsequent editions). There too a single named author is followed by a number of other voices, creating the impression of the book as a replication of manuscript culture, and placing the individual's work within a broader, communal poetic milieu. Sidney's work is followed by a series of sonnets by Samuel Daniel (revised the following year as *Delia*), and by a number of other poets, whose identity is unclear or disputed.

What is clear in reading these poems is that they share the 'argument' identified by Nashe: the majority of them take an established, misogynist position against the women to whom they are addressed, with complaints against their inflexibility or cruelty occurring frequently. Daniel's sonnets are some way from the carefully-balanced work of the following year (explored in detail in Chapter 4), and even further from the complicated readings that can be generated by his adding 'The Complaint of Rosamond' to the end of his sequence, balancing the male perspective of the preceding poems with a witty reversal of gender and viewpoint. Much like the narrative of Sidney's poems in quarto, Daniel's speaker does not manage to extract even the smallest degree of sympathy from his beloved, and the poems increasingly tend towards a situation of emotional as well as physical separation from the addressee. The speaker writes of bidding 'my cruell Faire adieu' (24.14), and describes himself as 'exil'd from mirth' (25.9), and 'Pensive alone' (25.10). Similarly again to the poetry of Sidney, the sequence ends with a gesture towards death, with a similar bibliographic voice emerging from the note that with the end of the poems 'finis Daniel'.

⁴⁸ Q2, did not have these additional poems, though did retain the sonnets / songs division, though with the text of the sonnets up to sonnet 97 revised.

The next sequence of poems seems altogether more hopeful, a series of cheerful songs which suggest the possibility of happiness, though with definite nods to the possibility that such pleasures may be transitory or fanciful. After the end of these five songs (which have no heading or indication of authorship), the sequence ends with the curious note 'Finis. CONTENT.' If indeed the sequence has provided a momentary respite, a possibility of recovery, the close of this section seems to speak firmly to the end of that hope, with this otherwise unexplained section speaking to the possibility of 'content' being the state of the reader or speakers, rather than the author of the works. And though the section as a whole might strike us as incongruous, if we consider Q1 and Q3 to be divided into two halves, we see a series of almost regular sonnets followed by irregular songs in the Sidney section, and exactly the same pattern in the section of 'other authors'. Indeed, as in the Sidney songs, we initially encounter the possibility of happiness: a switch to less regular and more flexible stanzaic forms seems to offer a chance for 'content' that failed in the sonnets. But like those songs, the sequence quickly turns to despair once again. 'Faction that ever dwells at court' again enforces a sense of isolation, with the speaker fleeing the court and rueing the fact that his love appears incompatible with his 'fortune'. And finally, the last poem of the sequence, 'If floods of teares', offers the most desolate statement of perhaps any poem in the book: hopes are withered, plans are finished, and the speaker speaks from a position of utter isolation and ruin. Here, as throughout the book, the 'FINIS' that follows this poem seems to speak from an ambiguous position within and without the text, hovering on the liminal point of declaring the text, the narrative, and the physical format of the 'book' complete. The Sidney of the quartos, then, resembles less the aloof Philisides of the *Arcadia*, and more a poet involved in a network of other writers exploring similar themes, working within a tradition of multi-authored poetic collections stretching back to Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes*.

There is some evidence that this text has been shaped to fit with the other publications coming from the Newman press in the late 1580s and early 1590s. Newman's rather short career began in 1587, and seems to have ended in 1593.⁴⁹ A

⁴⁹ Dates from STC and R.B. McKerrow (ed.), *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640* (London: The Bibliographic Society, 1910).

brief survey of his publications reveals an interest in literary works, with seven of his thirteen publications being fictional works split between prose and poetry. Of these, three are by Abraham Fraunce: ‘a man of letters to be reckoned with in London society: Master of Arts from Cambridge, barrister of Gray’s Inn, a successful publishing author, and above all, a highly favoured client of the Sidney-Herbert family’.⁵⁰ At the very least, this should alert us to the fact that Newman possessed an interest in publishing literary works, and that modern assessments of his reputation as a result of the Sidney quartos may not accurately represent the views of his contemporaries, given that in at least one instance a relatively respected poet connected to the Sidney-Herbert circle was willing to have him publish his works. The other noticeable presence in Newman’s list of publications is Robert Greene, three of whose prose works (along with the *Astrophil and Stella* quartos) formed nearly the entirety of Newman’s publications from 1590 until the end of his career.

If, following Zachary Lesser, we identify a publisher’s output as at least broadly inclining to fit with the expectations of a set of readers (speculation of capital being a less dangerous proposition if the work might interest a known set of potential buyers), then we might see *Astrophil and Stella* quartos as sharing rather odd company in the translated elegiac hexameters of Fraunce and the prose fictions of Greene.⁵¹ But in the work of both these authors, there is a distinct pattern of relatively moralistic complaints against love. In the case of Fraunce the focus is less love itself, but the destructive and consuming state of mind generated by the loss of the lover. Greene’s work offers a set of a more pointed narratives: a set of ‘prodigal son’ motifs which gesture towards a repentance of worldly diversions, particularly amorous affairs that distract his protagonists from more serious callings. This is a motif that Richard Helgerson has shown to have held considerable sway in late sixteenth-century literature.⁵²

⁵⁰ May, ‘Marlowe, Spenser, Sidney and – Abraham Fraunce?’ 31 For further assessments of Fraunce’s reputation, see also Katherine Koller ‘Abraham Fraunce and Edmund Spenser,’ *English Literary History* 7 (1940): 108–9.

⁵¹ Zachary Lesser, *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2004).

⁵² Richard Helgerson, *The Elizabethan Prodigals* (Berkeley; London: University of California Press, 1976).

Though Greene is more than a little duplicitous in his use of the trope (and became a one-man industry in seemingly always having something to repent), these works nonetheless fit neatly with my suggestion that Newman's publications are often concerned with love, and frequently carry at least the hint of a negative or moralistic attitude. Love is perhaps the most prominent among the temptations to be eschewed, and while the resolution proves happy, Greene's *Ciceronis Amor* (1589) several times gestures towards misogynistic complaints of women's unfairness in love, with male characters swooning into near-death states because of the 'cruelty' of their mistresses. This is not the place to dissect Greene's work, but, at least to the casual reader, the productions of Newman's press in the late 1580s and 90s cohere around a broad set of themes to which *Astrophil and Stella* could be said to conform in many respects. Like the protagonists of other works published by Newman, Stella rebuffs Astrophil's advances, with none of the sympathy or understanding with which readers are familiar from the 1598 text. The small sample size of Newman's publications necessitates some caution about drawing too precise conclusions about his choice of texts, but the broad thematic texture of his other publications does give added weight to my argument that the arrangement of the 1591 text is more intentional than is typically assumed in recent scholarship.

As a result of the above analysis, we might begin to draw some conclusions about reading the quarto texts of *Astrophil and Stella* in the context of their original publication, suspending longstanding questions about their publishing history. *Astrophil and Stella*, in its quarto format, can be read as radically different in tone and narrative from the 1598 text that has become the standard version of the sequence. Given the structure of the book as a whole and the repeated tone and structure of both the Sidneian and non-Sidneian material, it appears clear that the print agents involved in the book's production were interested in presenting a particular type of Sidney: a more conventional Petrarchan figure whose poetry insists far more on the cruelty of the addressee than the limitations or errors of the male poet. In this respect, Sidney is presented as a thoroughly conventional, though also exceptional, vernacular poet. In both the structure of the books and the terms of Nashe's address, we can see a kinship with the 'miscellaneous' collections that emerged in the wake of 1557, with Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes* chief among its models. As suggested above, it is clear that Newman saw the work fitting more neatly into the output of his press than we might expect; the readings which make

this possible are primarily generated by the structure of the book and the material intertextual readings generated both by the interaction of Sidney's own poems and his placement with other poets. In the shape of Sidney's text, the content of the songs, and his amalgamation with other contemporary poets, the Sidney of the quartos has a number of differences from the Sidney who emerges in the 1598 text, which the next section explores at length.

1598 and the Creation of a Legend

In 1598 William Ponsonby published what effectively forms the 'first folio' of Philip Sidney's works, *The Countess of Pembrokes Arcadia* [...] *Now for the third time published, with sundry new additions of the same Author*, which collected together the majority of Sidney's literary works as they are now known and studied. There are several aspects that might puzzle the modern reader about this book, which brought to an end almost a decade of editions vying to present the definitive image of Sidney and his works. In the first instance, there is virtually no indication on the title page that this volume was a 'collected works' in any sense; the title, custom-made woodcut, and prefatory materials are all reproduced exactly from the 1593 *Arcadia*, and the only indication that this book contains extra material (despite being almost twice the size of the 1593 edition) is the innocuous claim that it contains 'sundry new additions'.

A second surprising point is the relatively subdued presence of Sidney himself. The typographical hierarchy of the title page feels uncomfortable to a modern reader expecting the author to be prominently identified. Instead, the most prominent name on the page is that of Sidney's sister, to the extent that the full title of the book, 'The Countess of Pembrokes Arcadia' is broken up, leaving the final word relegated to a line of its own, in a smaller font than the genitive that precedes it.⁵³ Sidney's name doesn't appear until half-way down the page with a similar

⁵³ The prominence of Herbert's name relative to Sidney's is noted by Suzanne Trill, "In Poesie the mirrois of our Age": The Countess of Pembroke's "Sydnean" Poetics,' in *A Companion to Tudor Literature*, ed. Kent Cartwright (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 428-443 (437); and Francis

distribution of emphasis: ‘Philip Sidney’ appears in the smallest text encountered in the journey down the page so far, smaller even than the ‘Sir’ of the previous line. Opening the book would not immediately dispel this confusion: the first text one encounters is Sidney’s dedicatory letter to his sister, her title once again at the head of the page. Both there and in the subsequent address ‘To the Reader’, Mary Herbert (née Sidney) takes centre stage. Sidney writes: ‘But you desired me to do it, and your desire, to my heart is an absolute commandment. Now, it is done onely for you, onely to you [...]’ (¶3r). A variation of the same phrase, ‘done, as it was, for her: as it is, by her’ (¶4r), appears in the introduction by Hugh Sanford (secretary to Mary’s husband), transforming Mary’s editing and publishing into an act of authorship in itself.⁵⁴

In the context of the 1593 edition, these paratexts and their emphasis on Mary Herbert’s authority and ownership make much more sense. Sanford’s letter has long been understood to take aim at the 1590 edition of *Arcadia*, edited by Sidney’s long-time friend Fulke Greville and his associates. Sanford laments that the ‘disfigured face’ of previous publications had marred the work to the extent that ‘the beauties thereof were unworthely blemished’ (¶4r), before proceeding to outline Mary Herbert’s work in reediting and publishing her brother’s work.⁵⁵ Given this contest over the representation of Sidney and his works, the prominence of Mary’s name and title as part of the work, the appearance of the Sidney family crest at the head of the

X. Connor, *Literary Folios and the Idea of the Book in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014), 46-7.

⁵⁴ Modern scholarship’s view of Herbert’s precise editorial role has varied widely. See the discussions in Suzanne Trill, ‘Sydneyan Poetics’, and Margaret P. Hannay, ‘The Countess of Pembroke’s agency in print and scribal culture,’ in *Women’s Writing and the Circulation of Ideas: Manuscript Publication in England, 1500-1800*, eds. George L. Justice and Nathan Tinker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 17-49. See also Chapter 4 of Davis’ *Invention*, 145-178, which discusses Herbert’s role in detail.

⁵⁵ While I will not be dealing extensively with the 1590 and 1593 editions of *Arcadia*, this chapter will be effectively relocating many of the same issues raised in the scholarship on these texts to *Astrophil and Stella*. Prominent among this scholarship are Joel B. Davis, ‘Multiple Arcadias and the Literary Quarrel between Fulke Greville and the Countess of Pembroke,’ *Studies in Philology* 101, no.4 (2004): 401-430; Victor Skretkowitz, ‘Building Sidney’s Reputation: Texts and Editions of the *Arcadia*,’ in *Sir Philip Sidney: 1586 and the Creation of a Legend*, eds. Van Dorsten *et al* (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 1986), 111-124; and Woudhuysen, *Circulation of Manuscripts*, Chapter 10.

title-page, and the internal echoes between the introductions of Sidney and Sanford, collectively seem aimed at constructing an overwhelming authority for the edition and providing a definitive version of the *Arcadia* in print.

Arcadia is not the only work in the collection, however, and in this new context, Sanford's letter can be read to apply more holistically to the works in the volume. In this respect, to borrow a metaphor from the biological sciences (whose terminology seems rich ground for editorial practice), it might be helpful to make a distinction between the gene and the phenotype: the former might be identical, and located in a number of different organisms, but its expression in an individual can be radically different as a result of the other genetic material and environmental factors present. Both *An apologie for poetrie* (1595) and *Astrophil and Stella* (1591) had previously appeared from publishers other than William Ponsonby, who seems by the start of the 1590s to have become the Sidney family's 'official' agent for producing their work in print.⁵⁶ It might thus be argued that the title-page emphasis on the *Arcadia* is the result not only of it being Sidney's most marketable literary work, but also a marker of the extent to which it allowed Mary Herbert to emphasise her authority over Sidney's literary remains. Under the title of *Arcadia*, and the authoritative position Sidney's letter invested in her, the entirety of Sidney's corpus could be collected and protected under the aegis of her editorship.

Aside from one Edinburgh edition of 1599, the project appears to have been a success: this edition forms the basis for Sidney's 'works' for the remainder of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, and continues to have an unrivalled prominence in the preparation of modern editions. The 1598 folio is, of course, where we also find the first and only 'complete' (in Ringler's view) version of *Astrophil and Stella*, with the 108 sonnets, and 11 songs dispersed among them, with some of those songs now longer than their previous printings. And it is here, I will argue in the final section of this chapter, that we can measure the effect of Sidney's repositioning from courtly, 'traditional', English poet to one positioned as innovative, continental, and ground-breaking, a change in identity carried out not only through the verbal differences between the two texts, but also the structure of the work, and the organisation of the folio in which it appears.

⁵⁶ Michael Brennan, 'William Ponsonby: Elizabethan Stationer,' *Analytical and Enumerative Bibliography* 7, no.3 (1983): 91-110.

The 1598 folio has in many respects been overlooked in comparison to the more celebrated examples of Jonson and Shakespeare.⁵⁷ Jeffrey Knapp has usefully challenged some of these notions, citing the number of ‘works’ produced before the infamous 1616 Jonson publication, though Jeffrey Knight has challenged this on a number of fronts.⁵⁸ Sidney provides one telling example considered by neither, however: a single-author collection without interpolation by other authorial voices (not the case with Spenser’s 1611/17 folio, as the next chapter will mention), printed continuously without separate title pages to facilitate separate circulation and reconstitution. Though lacking the word ‘works’ on the title page, the 1598 folio makes one of the most insistent claims for the importance and self-sufficiency of the author’s works, helped in no small part by the growing Sidney legend in the wake of his death. Stephen Galbraith has identified Sidney’s work as a ‘folio of luxury’, consciously presenting an elaborate degree of expense on each wide-margined page.⁵⁹

In short then, the 1598 folio is important in a number of respects, but its distance from the economical quarto texts of the 1590s, some of which happily share bibliographic space with authors other than Sidney is striking. The text itself is different from the quartos: the irregular ‘continuous’ printing has been replaced by a careful scheme of three sonnets to a page, a scheme re-established even when coping with the irregular lengths of the interspersed songs. And in one of the most striking changes from quarto to folio, we can see that the traditional ‘English’ style of indentation (in which all lines adhere to the left margin, except those indicating importance) have been replaced by an ‘Italian’ style (in which all lines are offset from the left margin, except those indicating importance). This change in visual style presents a Sidney who makes a direct claim to continental, and specifically Italian,

⁵⁷ The major exception to this is Connor, *Literary Folios*, 23-59.

⁵⁸ Jeffrey Knapp, ‘What is a Co-Author?’ *Representations* 89 (2003): 1-29; Jeffrey Todd Knight, *Bound To Read, Compilations, Collections, and the Making of Renaissance Literature* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

⁵⁹ Stephen K. Galbraith, ‘English Literary Folios 1593-1623: studying shifts in format,’ in *Tudor Books and Readers: Materiality and the Construction of Meaning*, ed. John King (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 46-66.

innovations, in sharp contrast to the more traditional approach taken in the quartos.⁶⁰ This is one of the few moments at which Ringler prefers the quarto texts to that of the folio, noting that the continental indentation of the folio:

[...] is singularly inappropriate for most of Sidney's sonnets, because it divides the sestets three and three where rhyme and sense divide most of his sestets four and two.⁶¹

So strongly does he feel this that in his edition the poems are rendered in the visual form of the quartos, even as he prefers the structural and verbal content of the folio. Curiously, he notes that this pattern of indentation 'must derive from the author's holograph'.⁶² If this is the case, then we might look to the degree of change suggested by this relatively minor cosmetic difference: no longer do we have a poet looking inwards, reproduced in what was effectively a vernacular, multi-author form of publication, but a single-author gathering of works that have been reframed in a visual language that suggests a connection with the newly-fashionable Italian forms, rather than kinship with older, English traditions.⁶³

The placement of *Astrophil and Stella* in the 1598 folio demonstrates a great deal of care, I argue, and my -- ultimately unprovable -- suspicion is that Mary Herbert had a central role in assigning the distribution of the materials. After the *Arcadia*, previously published in 1593, the folio's contents are as follows: *Certain Sonnets*, the *Defence*, *Astrophil and Stella* and *The Lady of May*. While I do not wish to argue for any kind of 'narrative' running throughout this volume, I believe that the material intertextuality of these works in this order offers interesting possibilities for

⁶⁰ Sidney is not the only author to undergo a transformation of stylised indentation: between the first and second editions of *Delia* (both 1592), Daniel's sonnets similarly transition from an 'English' to 'Italian' style.

⁶¹ Ringler, *Poems*, 448.

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ An illustrative measure of developing 'languages' of indentation can be seen in the translation of Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata* by 'R.C': on the verso of each leaf is the original Italian (printed with 'Italian' style indentation), with the corresponding translation on the recto of the next leaf (printed in 'English' style). *Godfrey of Bulloigne, or The recouerie of Hierusalem* (London: John Windet for Thomas Mann, 1594).

demonstrating how *Astrophil and Stella* was reappropriated from its earlier forms, and how Sidney the poet was refashioned from the image that was generated by the structure of the quarto texts discussed in the previous section.

In the first instance, the position of *Astrophil and Stella* immediately following *The Defence* largely inaugurates the tradition of urging a separation of speaker and self, and particularly of arguing for the necessity of seeing *Astrophil* as a performance, with Sidney ventriloquizing the position of a lover needing to be re-educated. But quite apart from its discourse about the nature of fiction and the purposes of poetry, *The Defence* provides us with a gesture preparing us for *Astrophil and Stella*, indicating that one's ability in poetry was crucial to the gaining of 'favour', with the word 'Sonnet' literally appearing just before an entire sequence of poems in this form. Sidney is therefore pushed away from the slightly more biographical terms of the quartos, effectively making the first step in the readings that are now commonplace of the sequence.

If we consider *Certain Sonnets* as an interesting, but rather less experimental offering than *Astrophil and Stella*, we might identify a movement across the volume: a standard treatment of amorous poetry, followed by a critical account of contemporary literary practise (with relatively little vernacular work singled out for praise), followed by the innovative *Astrophil and Stella*, complete with its new structure and complex interplay between gendered perspectives and positions. Bringing these works into proximity, and arranging them not generically or formally (in which case *Certain Sonnets* and *Astrophil and Stella* would offer themselves as logical neighbours), the editors of the 1598 folio therefore reposition Sidney's sonnet sequence as one that breaks from tradition, providing a new and innovative take on older (and less successful) conventions of vernacular verse. When coupled with the change in indentation, we begin to see the poems as being radically reoriented in terms of both cultural capital (continental, innovative) and theme (Stella's perspective, Astrophil's behaviour condemned 'within' the text). In short, following the extensive efforts to revise the 1590 edition of *Arcadia* in order to limit the possibilities for 'reading' Sidney in light of the editorial decisions of that volume, it appears that *Astrophil and Stella* was not only revised in terms of its content, but carefully positioned within the larger structure of the folio in order to reorient and revise the Sidney of the quartos into the Sidney we are familiar with today.

Raising the question of spatial semiotics for a moment, despite the pattern of three-sonnets-to-a-page being rigorously maintained, even in the face of several poems whose length complicates that decision, there is an intriguing moment after sonnet 86, after which follows songs 5-9, concluding with the third-person song 8 (in which Stella speaks extensively) and the lament of song 9. At the conclusion of song 8 the speaker declares '[t]hat therewith my song is broken' (l.104). This collapse from third- to first-person narration has been variously interpreted, but in the context of the 1598 arrangement this disjuncture is followed by the lament of song 9 and a sequence of poems complaining of the speaker's absence from Stella. This theme is also emphasised by the visual layout of the poems: after this moment, the sonnets regularly break across pages, violating a visual structure that has been rigorously maintained until this moment. Given that there seems to have been little concern to keep the poems of the *Arcadia* or *Certain Sonnets* fixed within page boundaries, the adoption of this regular format seems entirely intentional on the part of the individuals involved in preparing the text, and its subsequent abandonment at a crucial moment in the sonnets seems equally planned. To build on Gavin Alexander's identification of Mary Herbert as not only editing her brother's remains, but taking an active hand in amending or 'perfecting' them, there is the possibility both on this occasion and throughout of editorial design in the folio text.⁶⁴

Given that a more prominent voice for Stella is one of the major changes to the text of *Astrophil and Stella* itself, it is also relevant to note that this work is followed by *The Lady of May*, in which Elizabeth, while on progress, is asked to intervene and decide between two possible suitors to a young woman. The choices, the harmless but unadventurous Espilus and the vigorous Therion, have usually been read in a political light, either referring to the courtship of Elizabeth by Alençon, or the promotion of a more aggressive foreign policy by the Sidney-Leicester circle.⁶⁵ While I have no intention of disputing these readings, when this work is placed next to *Astrophil and Stella*, especially in the context of Stella's 'emergence' and rather

⁶⁴ Alexander, *Writing After Sidney*, 76-127.

⁶⁵ Two influential readings in this respect, both of which suggests Elizabeth picks the 'wrong' suitor in the view of Sidney are Stephen K. Orgel 'Sidney's Experiment in Pastoral: The Lady of "Lady of May",' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 26 (1963): 198-203, and David Kalstone, *Sidney's Poetry: Contexts and Interpretations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965).

forceful control over the final stretch of poems, further possibilities emerge. Moving to *The Lady of May*, we have a woman put in complete control of the situation, both in the sense that the May Lady can choose between suitors, and that Elizabeth herself is given control of the text in deciding its outcome. The choice of Espilus seems to replicate the action of *Astrophil and Stella*, as Therion in a number of respects echoes some of the more problematic characteristics of Astrophil's wooing:

Therion doth me many pleasures, as stealing me venison out of these forests,
and many other such like pretty and prettier services, but withal he grows to
such rages that sometimes he strikes me, sometimes railes at me. (3B4v)

We might thus consider *The Lady of May* as a reinforcement of the final movement in *Astrophil and Stella*, continuing the development of the woman's perspective from the end of that poem, until Therion's behaviour can be 'punished' in unambiguous terms. Both of these final sections to the folio are unique in not having line numbers running either side of the margin. The signatures of both sections are continuous, so there do not seem to be any grounds for speculating that they were appended from an older or lost edition, but, quite apart from the material reasons for this omission, visually the two are tied closely together by lacking a bibliographic format reproduced continuously elsewhere throughout the folio. Regardless of this moment of bibliographic similarity, reading this work immediately after the conclusion of *Astrophil and Stella* creates the possibility, through the material intertextuality of the two works, of seeing *The Lady of May* as providing a confirming, shaping conclusion to the work that precedes it. If, indeed, there has been a growth and acknowledgement of female perspective and a gradual demolishing of male Petrarchan agency, the *Lady of May* provides a resounding climax to that movement.

Conclusion

In light of the broad set of readings and ideas introduced above, it might be helpful to review the evidence before suggesting the repercussions that rehabilitating the quarto texts might have on Sidney scholarship, and the broader context of criticism on early modern poetry. In the first instance, it has been my intention to suggest that

vestiges of New Bibliographic practices linger on in scholarship on some of the major literary figures from this period; alongside the benefits that scholarship has brought us, it has also led to value judgements on groups of texts that are not necessarily reflective of their contemporary reputation or importance. Quite distinct from any individual interpretation of the quarto texts, they should be considered as vital in tracing Sidney's early reception and influence, particularly given the evidence of later quotation from these volumes and the seven-year gap between Q1 and the 1598 folio text. Even Ringler has noted that our name for the sequence is indebted to the quartos, with the poems remaining untitled in manuscript.⁶⁶ That even the 1598 text, which offers the 'authorised' text in the view of modern scholarship, felt compelled to retain a title not necessarily given to the poems by Sidney himself gestures towards how influential these publications were in fashioning the early reception of Sidney's work. Woudhuysen has additionally noted that at least as late as 1600 the quarto texts (specifically Q1 or Q3) were used as the source for quotations from Sidney in *England's Parnassus*, also suggesting that, at least for some readers, the 1598 text did not instantaneously replace the earlier version.

Secondly, building on the themes identified in the first part of this thesis, I have suggested that the structure of both quarto and folio books are vital factors in the possible readings generated by those texts. More importantly, I have suggested that the editorial and print agents involved in the production of both texts were alert to these readings, and used the interpretive potential of material intertextuality to shape the texts towards particular ends. In respect to current editorial practice, in which the verbal is rigorously documented and variations noted, there is not a corresponding level of documentation for issues of space or structure, which may distance us as readers from the interpretative possibilities which material conditions and decisions allow. In the case of the texts examined in this chapter, the quarto texts gesture towards a Sidney who represented a continuation of a vernacular tradition, printed with traditional indentation patterns, appearing in a multi-authored work, adopting a relatively uncontroversial Petrarchan style, and joining a chorus of texts that positioned the Petrarchan mistress as unyielding and cruel.

⁶⁶ Ringler, *Poems*, 548.

In 1598 this image was radically revised, presenting a poet who was unique and innovative, his works separated from those with which he had earlier appeared and presented in an up-market folio production. Moreover, the text of *Astrophil and Stella* shows a shift towards a playful interrogation of Petrarchan convention, and is positioned in a larger structure of Sidney's works that emphasises this aspect of the text, as well as reinforcing the 'emergence' of Stella by concluding the volume with *The Lady of May*. Given the involvement of Mary Herbert in the 1598 volume, this may, in line with Patricia Pender's recent arguments on the same theme, offer the possibility of revising our understanding of Mary's role in shaping and presenting her brother's works, as well as gesturing towards the role editorial activity could play for literary texts in this period.⁶⁷

Even without the determining presence of the author and his or her relationship with a network of print agents (as we will see in the following chapters on Spenser and Daniel), the minutiae of visual presentation and structural arrangement are fundamental to the way in which literature is transferred to print. In both the quarto and the folio texts as read above, we can see that the reader-centric practises identified by Alexandra Gillespie and Jeffrey Knight in the production of *sammelbande* were adopted by the print industry at a time when the trade was bifurcating into stationers concerned with publishing and those concerned with printing, and when the market for vernacular literature rapidly expanded.⁶⁸ In quarto and folio texts we can see the textual image of Sidney being manipulated by a consciousness of the potential for material intertexts to generate and shape interpretation. In this respect, it is interesting to note that *both* the quarto and folio

⁶⁷ Patricia Pender, 'The Ghost and the Machine in the Sidney Family Corpus,' *Studies in English Literature* 51, no.1 (2011): 65-85. Margaret P. Hannay makes a similar claim in "'This Moses and This Miriam": The Countess of Pembroke's Role in the Legend of Sir Philip Sidney,' in *Sir Philip Sidney's Achievements*, eds. M. J. B. Allen *et al* (New York: AMS Press, 1990), 217-226. See also the discussion of women as editors in Helen Smith, *'Grossly Material Things': Women and Book Production in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012), 40-49.

⁶⁸ Though it is to be treated with some caution, Zachary Lesser and Alan Farmer's statistical picture of the period does suggest that the 1590s are approximately the point at which 'literary' texts rapidly increase in number in 'What is Print Popularity? A Map of the Elizabethan Book Trade,' in *The Elizabethan Top Ten: Defining Print Popularity in Early Modern England*, eds. Andy Kesson and Emma Smith (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 19-54.

texts can be said to have developed themes and potentials already existing within Sidney's poetry. From the perspective of the quartos, the poems are filled with imaginary addresses not only to Stella herself, but to friends, other members of court, and the works of 'other's leaves' that Astrophil explores in looking for material to use to woo Stella. In short, in presenting Astrophil within the traditional multi-author format inaugurated by *Songes and Sonettes*, the quarto texts develop the embryonic ideas of community and coterie already embedded in the text, while the folio develops the dismissive and mocking tone of many of the sonnets deriding the work of others, pushing towards the image of Astrophil as a singular innovator.

The quarto and folio texts of *Astrophil and Stella* demonstrate not only the importance of reading the works with an appreciation for the effect of the text's structural and visual elements, but the valuable interpretive possibilities that can be recovered by doing so. In *Astrophil and Stella* we see a work with radically divergent emphases in its two forms, building into larger textual structures that gesture towards fundamentally different readings of Sidney during this crucial formative period of his identity in print. In the following chapters, I will demonstrate that this awareness was not limited to editors and print agents, but was used by authors themselves to explore some of the interpretive possibilities offered by their works.

Chapter 3: ‘In mirroures more than one’: Edmund Spenser and the Collection as Form

The rugged forehead that with grave foresight
Welds kingdomes causes, and affaires of state,
My looser rimes (I wote) doth sharply wite,
For praising love, as I have done of late,
And magnifying lovers deare debate;
By which fraile youth is oft to follie led,
Through false allurement of that pleasing baite,
That better were in vertues disciplined,
Then with vaine poemes weeds to have their fancies fed.¹

A reader opening the second instalment of *The Faerie Queene* in 1596 might have been surprised to read this opening stanza in the proem to Book IV. The first three books of Spenser’s epic were published in 1590, and had met with praise from his contemporaries as well as a substantial reward from Elizabeth herself.² As a result, readers may have expected a confident return to the imaginative world of Spenser’s Faery Land; instead, the poet begins with an acknowledgement that the ‘rugged forehead’ of a senior politician has already judged his work frivolous and harmful. The politician in question has frequently been identified as William Cecil, with whom Spenser had clashed on a number of occasions, as will be explored below. These criticisms appear to have stung Spenser, and while he pledges himself to the task of pleasing Elizabeth alone in the proem, we can see across many of his later works a recurrent interest in defining, and defending, the role of poetry. I argue in this chapter that Spenser’s responses to the (real or perceived) criticism of his *Faerie*

¹ Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, ed. A.C. Hamilton (Harlow: Longman, 2007), Proem to Book IV, 1.1-9. All quotations from *The Faerie Queene* will be from this edition, cited parenthetically in the text.

² For example, Sir John Harington praised Spenser in his own translation of Ariosto in 1591. See Robert B. Cummings (ed.), *Spenser: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge, 1971) for this and other contemporary responses to Spenser.

Queene were several works that offered defences of poetry while also reflecting on the printed book as form.

Though he is typically presented as a poet interested in the opportunities offered by print, book-historical studies of Spenser have overwhelmingly focused on *The Shepheardes Calender*.³ Joseph Loewenstein has also noted that in contrast to the new material and textual theories developed in relation to Renaissance drama, ‘inquiry into the nature of Spenser’s texts [...] was stunted’.⁴ A brief survey of Spenser’s shorter works testifies not only to the range of his writing, but to the way in which the majority of his writings were published as ‘collections’ in one sense or another. *A Theatre for Worldlings* (1569) not only has illustrations above each poem, but concludes with a prose treatise that utterly dwarfs Spenser’s poems in length; *The Shepheardes Calendar* (1579) insistently reminds us it is the work of more than one author (regardless of the accuracy of that claim); *Familiar Letters* (1580) is a collaboration between Spenser and Gabriel Harvey; *Complaints* (1591) takes the form of a single-author anthology of both old and new works; *Amoretti and Epithalamion* (1595) combines three texts (if we include the shorter ‘Anacreontics’) which are intimately bound together in content and narrative; *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (1595) includes not only other Spenserian works, but texts by other authors; and *Fowre Hymnes* (1596) includes the second edition of *Daphnaïda*. A table of all of Spenser’s publications and their contents in this period can be found in Appendix A.

³ See, for example, Ruth Samson Luborsky ‘The Illustrations to *The Shepheardes Calender*,’ *Spenser Studies* 2 (1981): 3-53; S.K. Heninger, Jr., ‘The Typographical Layout of Spenser’s *The Shepheardes Calender*’ in *Word and Visual Imagination*, eds. Karl Holtgen et al. (Erlangen: Erlangen-Nurnberg, 1988), .33-71; Evelyn B. Tribble, *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1993); Richard A. McCabe, ‘“Little booke: thy selfe present”: the Politics of Presentation in *The Shepheardes Calender*,’ in *Presenting Poetry: Composition, Publication, Reception*, eds. Howard Erskine-Hill and Richard A. McCabe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 15-40. Jason Scott-Warren has also noted the stark simplicity of *The Faerie Queene* in contrast to the dense annotations of *The Shepheardes Calender* in his discussion of readers’ annotations in ‘Unannotating Spenser,’ in *Renaissance Paratexts*, 153-164.

⁴ Joseph Loewenstein, ‘Spenser’s Textual History,’ in *The Oxford Handbook to Edmund Spenser*, ed. Richard A. McCabe (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012), 637-659 (656).

Even this cursory overview of Spenser's publications suggests several things. The first is the frequency with which other voices appear alongside Spenser; for a poet sometimes seen as initiating a self-conscious 'laureate' role, Spenser's books frequently combine his writing with that of others.⁵ That combination, as has already been explored in relation to the early collaborations with Harvey and will be discussed at length below, frequently tends towards the presentation of a 'print coterie', advertising Spenser's works as part of a community rather than as isolated and singular. The second conclusion is that the form of the collection takes a persistent and central role in the shape of his work: only the first editions of *Daphnaïda* (1591) and *Prothalamion* (1596) can really be seen as works that do not include other texts or other authors.

In the discussion below I will examine two of these collections: *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* and *Fowre Hymnes*. The former presents a critical view of courtly behaviour, and uses the book as a form to 'gather' a community of shepherds around the memory of Sir Philip Sidney. This community creates a counterweight to the Cecil faction, and seems to locate authority in the combination of its members, in opposition to Cynthia and her court. *Fowre Hymnes* continues this reflection on poetic practise by narrating in neoplatonic terms narratives of both textual and cosmological creation. This transcendental vision of the poet's role is put in sharp contrast by *Daphnaïda*, which problematizes the more optimistic conclusions of the preceding four poems. Taken together they represent a mature Spenser interrogating the medium in which he worked, and using the book as a material and conceptual tool to reflect on the role and mechanics of poetry.

'[I]nto many parts': Spenser's Poetic/Textual Community

If, as I have suggested in the introduction to this chapter, Spenser's publications might be better understood as 'gatherings' of separate texts, *Colin Clouts Come Home Again* (1595) exemplifies this as Spenser's most 'collaborative' and self-reflexive use of the collection as a form. As well as the substantial titular poem (955

⁵ The term comes from Richard A. Helgerson's influential *Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton and the Literary System* (California: University of California Press, 1992).

lines), the volume also features *Astrophel* and five other poems by different authors, all of which are elegies for Sir Philip Sidney. These are surprising companions for Spenser, whose individual achievements are often stressed at the expense of his work with others. Whether described as inaugurating a ‘laureate’ tradition, in Richard Helgerson’s influential phrase, or as carving out a unique Virgilian-inspired role as a ‘national poet’ in the framework of Patrick Cheney, the dominant readings of Spenser are as an individuated writer, alongside figures like Ben Jonson and Milton.⁶ At the same time, his work with others on *A Theatre for Worldlings*, *Three Witty and Proper Letters*, (likely) *The Shepherdes Calender*, and the other poets present in *Colin Clouts* suggests Spenser was a poet who at times valued collaboration.⁷

The collection known as *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* is unique in Spenser’s editorial history in that its multiple parts – including non-Spenserian material – have been printed together since the sixteenth century until very recently, with Ernest De Selincourt’s influential edition in 1910 being the last scholarly edition to do so.⁸ Despite this, the critical response to this collection has focussed almost exclusively on the Spenserian material (and rarely all of it at any one time).⁹ Raphael Falco is one of the few scholars who discusses the non-Spenserian material,

⁶ Richard A. Helgerson, *Self-Crowned Laureates*; Patrick Cheney, *Spenser’s Famous Flight: A Renaissance Idea of a Literary Career* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993).

⁷ Spenser’s association with Ponsonby across the majority of his career constitutes another instance of collaboration, though the precise input of both on particular volumes remains a point of contention. See as an illustrative overview Wayne Erickson, ‘William Ponsonby,’ *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, 170 (1996): 204–212; Michael Brennan ‘William Ponsonby, Elizabethan stationer,’ *Analytical and Enumerative Bibliography*, 7 (1983): 91–110; Sidney Lee, ‘Ponsonby, William (1546?–1604),’ rev. Anita McConnell, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008) [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22503>], accessed 20 Aug 2014; Wayne Erickson, ‘Spenser’s Patrons and Publishers,’ in *Handbook to Edmund Spenser*, ed. McCabe, 106–124.

⁸ *Spenser’s Minor Poems*, ed. Ernest De Selincourt (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910). Neither current scholarly edition of *Colin Clouts* reprints the non-Spenserian material: see *The Shorter Poems*, new edition, ed. Richard McCabe (London: Penguin, 1999) and *The Yale Edition of the Poems of Edmund Spenser*, eds. Oram *et al.* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989).

⁹ Dennis Kay, *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1990), 53–66, does discuss the volume as a whole, and describes it as a turning point for the elegiac collection.

but connects these works with *Colin Clouts* only fleetingly.¹⁰ Patrick Cheney perceptively identifies this critical tendency as a modern preference for ‘individuated authorship’ that has ‘occluded an early modern principle that prints individuation comfortably within the space of collaboration’, though he does not discuss the non-Spenserian material in any depth.¹¹

In contrast to this critical tendency to examine the works of the collection separately (and to ignore the non-Spenserian material), I argue not only that the collection functions as an organic whole but also that the material form the collection takes is crucial to our interpretation of the works individually and together. In a book largely discussing ‘community’, Spenser not only makes a number of pointed assessments of the poetic community and its detractors in the mid-1590s, but attempts to construct a larger ‘Shepherds nation’ made up of virtuous poets and patrons. In the changing political circumstances surrounding Spenser and the patrons he was attached to, *Colin Clouts* enacts a critique of courtly culture and erects a community of like-minded individuals around the memory of Sir Philip Sidney.

‘how great a losse / Had all the shepherds nation by thy lacke?’

The first work a reader encounters in the volume is the titular *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, a long and digressive poem that sees a return to the pastoral world left behind at the close of *The Shepherdes Calender* in 1579. The protagonist, Colin Clout, reappears as the principal speaker, and many of the other shepherds, Hobbinol and Cuddy chief among them, return. But, while these surroundings may be familiar, it is clear that much has happened in the intervening period; John Hughes in 1715 noted that ‘we find him less a Shepherd than at first [...]’ with ‘a quite different Sett of Ideas’.¹² The majority of the poem is taken up by Colin’s extended question-and-answer session with the other shepherds about his voyage to Cynthia’s court, but

¹⁰ Raphael Falco, *Conceived Presences: Literary Genealogy in Renaissance England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994).

¹¹ Patrick Cheney, ‘*Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, *Astrophel*, and *The Doleful Lay of Clorinda* (1595),’ in *Handbook to Edmund Spenser*, ed. McCabe, 237-255 (238).

¹² Cummings (ed.), *Critical Heritage*, 272.

includes political allegories, an assessment of recent poetic activities, and a ‘prophetic’ discussion of Love in a cosmic, neoplatonic sense.

A large section of Colin’s narrative is given over to praises of Cynthia’s court in excessive terms; at the climax of his praise, however, the assembled shepherds point out an obvious problem: if the court was indeed as bountiful and pleasant as he describes it, why has he returned home to the ‘barrein soyle’ (l.656) of the allegorical Ireland?¹³ Colin’s response unleashes a criticism that has not been a feature of the poem so far:

[...] it is no sort of life.

For Shepheard fit to lead in that same place,
 Where each one seeks with malice and with strife,
 To thrust downe other into foule disgrace,
 Himself to raise: and he doth soonest rise
 That best can handle his deceitful wit,
 In subtil shifts, and finest slights devise,
 Either by slaundering his well deemed name,
 Through leasings lewd and fained forgerie:
 Or else by breeding him some blot of blame,
 By creeping close into his secrecie;
 To which him needs, a guilefull hollow hart,
 Masked with faire dissembling curtesie,
 A filed tongue furnisht with tearmes of art,
 No art of schoole, but Courtiers schoolery. (l.688-702)

The invective continues at some length, pointing out that success at court comes at the cost of learning and moral standing. While Cynthia herself is insulated from this aggressive assessment of court life, the section nonetheless strikes a dangerous note, placing a series of deeply problematic political realities at the heart of an institution supposedly emblematic of good and virtuous governance. Criticising vice in a

¹³ *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* in *Spenser’s Minor Poems*. Ernest De Selincourt.

Subsequent quotations are from this edition, cited parenthetically in the text. This edition was selected for its inclusion of the non-Spenserian material.

general sense had a long tradition in literature, whether on the model of the harsher Juvenal or more serene Horace.¹⁴ Indeed, Spenser would have had to look no further than Colin's namesake in John Skelton's work to find a model for satirising the court.¹⁵ At the same time, the political circumstances of the 1590s had changed significantly, enough for these years to be sometimes described as Elizabeth's 'second reign'.¹⁶ Where older critical trends saw Spenser as a largely unquestioning champion of Elizabeth, modern scholarship has outlined a complicated relationship which demonstrates a modulation of tone in the works dating from 1595-6.¹⁷ Colin's criticism at times veers close to Spenser's description of Lucifera's palace (*FQ*, 1.IV.1-37), the treatment of Artegall (V.xii.38-43), and to the 'Blatant Beast' of Books V and VI. Read alongside politically-charged episodes in *The Shepheardes Calender*, the blunt conclusions of *A View*, several troubling episodes in Book V, and the scandal of *Complaints*, these comments seem part of a larger project of critical intervention into political matters rather than purely conventional flourishes.

Spenser's precise allegiances, to patrons, political causes, and religious ideals have always been a cause of some speculation, which his complex attitude to self-presentation and the elusive nature of his allegorical writing has only encouraged.¹⁸

¹⁴ For a discussion of the generic conventions of early modern satire, and its major literary precedents, see Anne Lake Prescott, 'Humor and Satire in the Renaissance,' in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume III, The Renaissance*, ed. Glynn P. Norton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 284-293.

¹⁵ On Spenser's relationship to Skelton, see Robert Starr Kinsman, 'Skelton, John,' in *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, ed. Hamilton, 1729-32.

¹⁶ For an excellent overview of the 1590s, see John Guy (ed.), *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

¹⁷ For examples of works presenting this earlier image of Spenser, see as illustrative examples H.S.V Jones, *A Spenser Handbook* (New York: Crofts, 1930) and Frances Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London and Boston: Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1975). On the perception of Spenser's hostility to, or at least disillusionment with, Elizabeth, see for example Tobias Gregory, 'Shadowing Intervention: On the Politics of *The Faerie Queene* Book 5 Cantos 10-12,' *English Literary History* 67, no.2 (2000): 365-397; Louis Montrose, 'Spenser and the Elizabethan Political Imaginary,' *English Literary History* 69, no.4 (2002): 907-946. See also the useful discussion of these critical trends by Andrew Hadfield, 'Politics,' in *The Critical Companion to Spenser Studies*, ed. Bart van Es (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006), 42-57.

¹⁸ For a discussion of Spenser's political positions, and a survey of previous scholarship, see David J. Baker, 'Spenser and Politics,' in *Handbook to Edmund Spenser*, ed. McCabe, 48-64 (55). On

At the same time, the works highlighted above suggests an active engagement with Elizabethan politics. Assessing Spenser's works, David J. Baker describes Spenser as 'constrained by the dwindling possibilities of Elizabeth's reign,' and the poet as 'agnostic to Spanish imperialism and sympathetic to the cause of trans-national Protestantism'.¹⁹ To that list we can probably add a desire for further (aggressive) action in Ireland, given the serious presentation of the issues in *A Viewe*.²⁰ In short, while the exact degree of Spenser's beliefs are open to question, he appears to have been anything but slavishly attached to the Elizabethan regime, and came within the orbit of the larger circle surrounding the Earl of Essex. Essex inherited Leicester's role in promoting of active, military Protestantism and of his role as chief opposition to Burghley's 'fear of fiscal and military overextension'.²¹ While not named in the poem, it is likely that Burghley and those promoting his interests may have been Spenser's target in these lines, especially given the accusations of guile and deception levelled at Burghley in *Mother Hubbard's Tale*.²²

Burghley's perceived role in the calling in of *Complaints* may be hinted at, given that Colin highlights vices that are explicitly about the wilful misinterpretation or misrepresentation of other individuals at court. With the aim of preferment at the expense of others, the courtiers described in this section use their 'schoolery' to slander others' reputations, or to dissemble themselves into others' 'secrecie', and so betray them. In addition to these vices, Colin raises serious concerns about how this

Spenser's religious beliefs, with a particular emphasis on the complicated personal theologies of individuals in this period, see Daryl J. Gless, *Interpretation and Theology in Spenser* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). On Spenser's complex 'autoreferentiality', see the 'Introduction' to *The Shorter Poems*, ed. Richard McCabe. (London: Penguin 2000), xi-xxxi.

¹⁹ Baker, 'Spenser and Politics,' 55.

²⁰ On Spenser's engagement with Irish politics, and its impact on his views, see Andrew Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser's Irish Experience: Wilde Fruit and Salvage Soil* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997); Richard McCabe, *Spenser's Monstrous Regiment: Elizabethan Ireland and the Poetics of Difference* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); and Thomas Herron, *Spenser's Irish Work: Poetry, Plantation and Colonial Reformation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

²¹ John Guy, 'The 1590s: Elizabeth's Second Reign?' in *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, ed. John Guy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 1-19 (3).

²² Bruce Danner has argued that Spenser's relationship with Burghley was overtly hostile across the length of his career in *Edmund Spenser's War on Lord Burghley* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011).

group misuse poetry. Rather than as the vehicle for imaginative expression of moral virtue or the conveying of sincere romantic sentiment, that faction:

[...] with lewd speeches and licentious deeds,
 His mightie mysteries they do prophane,
 And use his ydle name to other needs,
 But as a complement for courting vaine. (l.787-90)

The ‘licentious deeds’ here, paralleled a few lines later by ‘sordid uses’ (l.792), are the demonic inversion of Spenser’s hope that poetry would ‘fashion a gentlemen’, as his ‘Letter to Raleigh’ put it.²³ Rather than a vehicle for improvement, poetry acts here as a cover for immoral behaviour and dangerous motives.

While this section is surprising, following as it does so closely the praise of Cynthia’s court, the dedication to Raleigh (who appears in a prominent role as ‘The Shepherd of the Ocean’ in the poem) introduces these themes and frames the entire volume as an examination of the dangers posed by the court.²⁴ In his dedication, Spenser notes that while the poem might be embellished in a pastoral style, it is nonetheless ‘agreeing with the truth in circumstance and matter’. As well as suggesting that Colin’s observations (however critical) are grounded in fact, Spenser makes doubly clear his intentions, hoping that Raleigh will continue to shield him ‘against the malice of evil mouthes, which are alwaies wide open to carpe at and misconstrue my simple meaning,’ a worry that William Oram has linked to the ‘Letter to Raleigh’, which voices the same concerns about how allegory may be misunderstood. Fear of misreading was, of course, a perennial concern for early modern writers: we have already seen in Chapter 1 that the transition from the

²³ ‘A Letter of the Authors’ in *The Faerie Queene*, ed. Hamilton, 714-8 (714).

²⁴ On the question of Raleigh in *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, see Andrew Zurcher, ‘Getting it Back to Front in 1590: Spenser’s Dedications, Nashe’s Insinuations, and Raleigh’s Equivocations’, *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 38 (2005): 173-98, who reads the dedication as ‘backhanded’ (184). See also Hadfield’s assessment of the coolness between the two in *A Life*, 232-5. For a more optimistic assessment of the dedication and the relationship of Spenser and Raleigh, see Wayne Erikson, ‘Spenser and Raleigh: Friendship and Literary Patronage,’ in *Literary and Visual Raleigh*, ed. Christopher M. Armitage (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2013), 89-99.

controlled circulation of manuscript circulation to the ‘public’ setting of print offered significant dangers. But the ‘misconstruction’ of ‘simple meaning’ was a particularly sensitive topic for Spenser in the wake of the *Complaints* controversy.²⁵

Spenser published *Complaints* in 1591, as a wide-ranging collection of old and new works. Though some poems, such as *Virgil’s Gnat*, hint at political themes, it was *Mother Hubbards Tale* that appeared to level direct criticism towards Burghley and his family, and resulted in the book’s being ‘called in’.²⁶ Though the exact nature of the censorship has been debated, contemporary references and the disappearance of certain poems from the Spenserian canon until the deaths of both William and Robert Cecil (the two principal figures satirised) suggest that the poems were read as libellous, and that action was taken to limit their circulation. Dating the dedicatory letter 1591 insulates Spenser from possible speculation about the political allegories of *Colin Clouts*, but also suggests a certain kinship with *Complaints*, especially given the pointed references to wilfully misconstrued interpretations.

‘all the shepherds nation’

The reappearance of Spenser’s Colin Clout persona helps to direct the reader towards an aggressive, satirical reading. Critics have tended to read the appearances of Colin Clout from the perspective of Spenser’s entire career, seeing his initial appearance in *The Shepherds Calender* as balanced by the later portrayals in *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* and Book VI of *The Faerie Queene*.²⁷ In reality, Colin was seemingly dispensed with at the close of the ‘December’ eclogue in 1579. While the Yale editors’ claim that ‘with the eclogue’s last line he dies’ is an overly literal reading,

²⁵ William Oram, ‘Spenser’s Raleghs,’ *Studies in Philology*, 87, no.3 (1990): 341-362.

²⁶ On the history of the *Complaints* volume, and its aftermath, see Danner, *War On Lord Burghley*, 151-185. On Spenser’s later engagement with the mechanisms of state censorship, see Andrew Hadfield, ‘Censorship in Renaissance England: The Fate of Edmund Spenser,’ *Journal for Literary Studies*, 21, no.2 (2008): 44-60.

²⁷ Richard Mallette, for example, while denying any comprehensive plan on the part of Spenser nonetheless connects the earlier and later portrayals of Colin into an unproblematic continuum. See his ‘Spenser’s Portrait of the Artist in *The Shepherdes Calender* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*,’ *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 19, no.1 (1979): 19-41.

the proem to *The Faerie Queene* in 1590 nonetheless puts aside his ‘lowly Shepherds weeds’ (Proem to Book I, l.2) in favour of a new, epic vocation. In 1595, Colin had been absent for some sixteen years, and Spenser’s return to the persona as well as to the genre in which he was introduced can only strike us as surprising, an aggressive reversal of a career that had until then seemingly been modelled on a Virgilian pattern.²⁸ The ‘Home Againe’ of the volume’s title is not only an expression of the geographical return of Colin from his adventures, therefore, but an aggressive assertion of a return to a mode that had been abandoned, and was now being picked up in order to continue the critical impulses of Spenser’s early career.²⁹

This ‘satirical’ section of the poem is consistently identified as crucial to the interpretation of the work as a whole, though the ways in which it is read in respect to that larger narrative have differed wildly. Richard McCabe, for example, sees it as part of a bitter survey of Spenser’s disillusionment with the court, while Christopher Warner locates it as a more gentle critique of excessively literal Petrarchanism.³⁰ However one sees the satire, it is clear that Spenser offers an antidote for the evils of the court in the community of shepherds who are described immediately before this section of the poem. The description of immoral courtiers is immediately preceded by a list of twelve poets, ‘better shepherds be not under skie’ (l.377), and a complementary list of twelve ‘[r]ight noble Nymphs’ (l.577). Together, these groups appear to form a poetic and moral bulwark against the threats offered by their dangerous opposites. If we consider the totality of the *Colin Clouts* volume, however, it appears that Spenser has not only gathered an imaginative community in his poem but also a poetic one in the material space of the collection. What the

²⁸ Cheney’s *Famous Flight* sees a Virgilian pattern continuing unbroken across Spenser’s entire career, but explicitly excludes *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* from analysis. The difficulty of conforming this collection to the model he invokes demonstrates some of the difficulties in reading Spenser’s career along too restricted lines.

²⁹ The political thrust of Spenser’s *Shepherdes Calender* (and the pragmatic reasons for its anonymity) have long been recognised, though not always mentioned in respect to the cynical ‘turn’ of his works later in his career. References to the treatment of Edmund Grindal and Elizabeth’s flirtations with Duc D’Anjou, and the known polemical bent of the volume’s publisher, Hugh Singleton, all identify the work as speaking directly to the controversial politics of the time.

³⁰ McCabe, *Monstrous Regiment*, 165-176; Christopher J. Warner, ‘Poetry and Praise in “Colin Clouts Come Home Againe,” (1595),’ *Studies in Philology* 94, no.4 (1997): 368-381.

volume idealises as the counter to the vices of court is in effect carried out in gathering together the poets of *Colin Clouts*, and this interplay between conceptual and actual communities is one of the crucial aspects of the way in which the book functions.

The entire narrative is predicated on one such act of communal generosity, with ‘the Shepheard of the Ocean’ transporting Colin to Cynthia’s court and introducing him there. Colin follows his account of his own singing with a detailed list of other poets, generously indicating that ‘better shepheardes be not vnder skie’ (l.377). The use of ‘shepheard’ as an identifier for the range of figures that follow (ranging from the courtly Arthur Gorges and Sidney to the lower-status Samuel Daniel and Thomas Churchyard) is an important description in the fashioning of this community, as the transformation allows for this range of poets, Colin himself, and the less learned group in ‘Ireland’ to be considered as part of a single poetic community despite clear differences in status and influence.³¹ One of the more subtle points made in including this list of shepherds is how Cynthia participates in the same communal generosity. After concluding his list of shepherds by invoking the memory of Astrophel, Colin notes:

All these do flourish in their sundry kynd,
And do their Cynthia immortall make:
Yet found I lyking in her royall mynd,
Not for my skill, but for that shepheardes sake. (l.452-455)

This praise of Cynthia marks the end of the section discussing the shepherds, and the beginning of that discussing the nymphs, suggesting she is a member of both groups as well as the link between them. In addition, the quatrain makes clear the interdependence of Cynthia and her shepherds. They ‘Cynthia immortall make’, while Colin’s account of his reception and ‘lyking’ makes it clear that Cynthia understands the value of their writing and reciprocates with her own support. The interlocking ABAB rhymes that make up this stanza make the point formally by

³¹ On the simultaneous admiration for and distrust of Irish bardic traditions, which undoubtedly formed an imaginative antecedent to Spenser’s print coterie, see McCabe, *Monstrous Regiment*, 28-56.

using two independent and unrelated rhymes to function together to create a harmonious pattern. Cynthia is said here to appreciate Colin not for his own abilities, but for his relationship with Astrophel ('that shepherd' in the passage quoted). That is to say that Cynthia, like the Shepherds, recognises the importance of Astrophel, and is willing to assist other individuals identifying themselves as belonging to his community.

The return to the pastoral genre, and the revival of the Colin Clout persona, is key to the interpretation of this collection of poetry. Pastoral has long been recognised as a genre that can speak with some directness to a political situation seemingly absent from the discussions between shepherds; it serves 'to insinuate and glance at greater matters' in the words of George Puttenham.³² Modern scholarship has reaffirmed the deeply political nature of many early modern pastoral works, and Louis Montrose in particular has emphasised this aspect of pastoral for Spenser's poetry.³³ In an extension and broadening of these purely political terms, Colin Fairweather has outlined a more expansive taxonomy of pastoral forms, drawing a division between what he calls 'inclusive' and 'exclusive' pastoral, with the former rendering the entire world in a pastoral setting and the latter insisting on a division and distance between country and city.³⁴ Fairweather identifies *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* as moving from an inclusive to an exclusive mode, with the latter explicitly coming into play during the satirical section outlined above.

In short, returning to pastoral as a genre and doing so in a manner that explicitly draws out its potential for critique helps to emphasise the distance between communities. In setting up a pastoral community of 'shepherds', Spenser is able to recruit a range of figures from varying positions on the social scale and group them together within an ideological space that stands in opposition to the courtly 'backbiters' (whether Cecil, or those opposed to the political interests of Spenser).³⁵

³² George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (London: Richard Field, 1589), F4r.

³³ See particularly 'Of Gentlemen and Shepherds: The Politics of Elizabethan Pastoral Form,' *English Literary History* 50, no.3 (1983): 415-459.

³⁴ Colin Fairweather, 'Inclusive and Exclusive Pastoral: Towards an Anatomy of Pastoral Modes,' *Studies in Philology* 97, no.3 (2000): 276-307.

³⁵ David R. Shore reads the poem as less critical than I do, emphasising that the praise given by Colin is a self-reflexive meditation on the unattainability of the ideal world it represents. See *Spenser*

Reading the poem in this sense recalibrates some difficult questions about the place of Ireland in the poem, which has variously been read as a source of power for Spenser (in the work of Richard Rambuss and Sue Petit Starke) or a symbol of Spenser's disillusionment with both the court and his own surroundings (exemplified by Richard McCabe's assessment).³⁶ Rather than insisting on the importance of geography alone, I suggest that Spenser shapes a poetic, and moral, community that cuts across physical boundaries as well as rank. In the view of John Huntington, the later sections of the poem insist on just this point, using poetic 'inspiration' as a way of insisting on the importance of the poet's role and flattening social barriers to the poet delivering 'truths'.³⁷

This extended analysis of *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* has attempted to position the poem as a work that self-consciously returns to a previously abandoned genre in order to criticise negative aspects of the court. The criticisms of courtly dissimulation have conventional overtones, but clearly touch on issues close to Spenser's interests given his movement towards alternative sources of patronage and the censorship of *Complaints* in 1591. Whether these dangerous political forces were meant to be identified directly with the Cecil faction remains unclear, but Spenser's solution in the poem is to construct a poetic community as a counterweight to these subversive and immoral factions.³⁸ That 'community' is not only represented by the poets and nymphs praised in the poem, but by the extended act of 'gathering' mourners in the second half of the book around the memory of Sir Philip Sidney.

and the Poetics of Pastoral: A Study of the World of Colin Clout (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1985), 105-140.

³⁶ Richard Rambuss, *Spenser's Secret Career* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 96-103; Sue Petitt Starke, 'Briton Knight or Irish Bard: Spenser's Pastoral Persona and the Epic Project in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*', *Spenser Studies* 12 (1988): 133-50.

³⁷ John Huntington, 'Furious Insolence: The Social Meaning of Poetic Inspiration in the 1590s,' *Modern Philology* 94, no.3 (1997): 305-326.

³⁸ Even scholars who emphasise the neoplatonic aspects of the poem note that these gesture to a removal of Cynthia / Elizabeth as sole source of authority. See John D. Bernard, *Ceremonies of Innocence: Pastoralism in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 106-134, who notes that Spenser rejects 'the pastoral of courtly service to Gloriana in favor of one centering on love and personal devotion to a transcendent sense of moral and poetic values' (110).

As a gathering of poetry and also of poets, *Colin Clouts* can be seen to participate in a culture familiar with using collections of poetry to make statements of affiliation around shared ideals or models. Michelle O’Callaghan has analysed how Elizabethan and Jacobean miscellanies were used to generate ‘print coteries’: open poetic networks that nonetheless emulated the forms of manuscript exchange in order to appeal to a feeling of ‘social and cultural exclusivity’.³⁹ O’Callaghan notes that this was particularly true of a number of publications following the death of Sidney, where his public persona as a Protestant military hero provided a beacon around which to gather likeminded writers. Patrick Cheney notes that the total number of lines of the seven elegies for Sidney (955) matches that of *Colin Clouts*, a thematically-interrelated ‘diptych’ that link the figure of Colin Clout and his circle.⁴⁰ In light of the criticism of courtly behaviour in *Colin Clouts*, and the associations between Spenser and the Earl of Essex, it may appear particularly pointed that *Astrophel* is dedicated to Sidney’s widow, Frances Walsingham. Frances had married Essex in 1590, a move which by accident or intention helped to solidify his position as the successor to Sidney.⁴¹ Though he is not named directly, the celebration of Sidney’s character can be seen as indirect praise of Essex, towards whose circle Spenser appears to have been moving in the mid-1590s.⁴²

³⁹ Michelle O’Callaghan, ‘Textual Gatherings: Print, Community and Verse Miscellanies in Early Modern England’ <http://emc.eserver.org/1-8/ocallaghan.html> (accessed 10/03/16), Paragraph 15.

⁴⁰ Patrick Cheney, ‘*Colin Clouts*,’ 238.

⁴¹ Sidney famously gave Essex his sword in his will, in what was read as Essex’s symbolic inheritance of Sidney’s political and military zeal. For a full discussion of Essex’s character, and his turbulent political relationships at court, see J. P. G. Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex 1585–1597* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) and ‘Patronage at Court, Faction and the Earl of Essex’ in *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, 65-86; Alexandra Gajda, *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); and Annaliese Connolly and Lisa Hopkins (eds.), *Essex: The Cultural Impact of an Elizabethan Courtier* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2016).

⁴² On Spenser’s relationship to Essex, see John Pitcher, ‘Essex,’ in *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, 254; Andrew Hadfield, ‘Was Spenser a Republican?’ *English* 47 (1998): 169-82; and Roy Eriksen ‘Spenser’s Mannerist Manoeuvres: Prothalamion (1596),’ *Studies in Philology* 90 (Spring 1993): 143-75. On the evidence that Essex paid for Spenser’s Funeral in 1599, see Verne Underwood, ‘Who Paid for Spenser’s Funeral?’ *Spenser Newsletter* 27, no.2 (1996): 22-24.

As O’Callaghan suggests, in the poems that follow *Colin Clouts*, it is ‘the community’ that is consistently emphasised, even in the process of supposedly mourning an individual. Spenser opens *Astrophel* with a direct address to ‘Shepherdess’, asking them to ‘hearken’ to his poem, as well as, crucially, to ‘place my doleful plaint your plaint among’ (l.5-6). Directly emerging from the shepherd community established in *Colin Clouts*, the group as a whole is asked to turn their attention to the matter of Sidney; that the six poems all speak to this theme makes clear the principle for gathering them together. Most curiously, and to my knowledge almost uniquely in the printed poetry of the time, the narrator of the poem seems alert to the material contexts in which the poem is situated, not only breaking his speech to allow for ‘The lay of Clorinda’, but resuming after this poem to directly introduce the poems that follow:⁴³

Which when she ended had, another swaine
Of gentle wit and dainte sweet device [...]
Height Thestylis, began his mournfull tourne[...]

And after him full many other moe [...]
The which I here in order will rehearse,
As fittest flowres to deck his mournful hearse. (l.97-108)⁴⁴

It is important at this stage to recognise that the community is not only constructed by bringing together a range of poets writing on the same theme: after all, Sidney

⁴³ Critics have frequently discussed a part of *Astrophel*, the so-called ‘Doleful Lay’ as a separate poem, partly because of the change of speaker and the occasional suggestion that this section may represent a contribution by Mary (Sidney) Herbert. Given the lack of title in the volume and the fact that *Astrophel* resumes after the ‘Lay’, it seems to me more profitable to discuss this poem as a whole rather than bifurcate it unnecessarily. On the authorship question, see Pamela Coren’s excellent summary of the issue in ‘Edmund Spenser, Mary Sidney, and the Doleful Lay,’ *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 42, no.1 (2002): 25-41.

⁴⁴ Symptomatic of the problem mentioned above, the De Selincourt edition (and those of McCabe and Oram *et al*) begins the ‘Lay’ with the attributed title in brackets, and begins the numbering of lines afresh. Quite apart from being an unnecessary editorial intervention, it also has the unhappy effect of bracketing the final stanzas, in which the *Astrophel* narrator appears to return, as part of the ‘Lay’ and not *Astrophel*.

had been the recipient of several volumes of elegies dedicated to him. Rather, the interesting aspect of the *Colin Clout* volume is the extent to which the community takes centre stage in the act of mourning – to the extent that the community itself is seen as more important than Sidney.⁴⁵ Matthew Zarnowiecki has recently emphasised this ‘participation in a larger poetic community’, against the pessimistic readings of Colin’s satire of court.⁴⁶ The so-called ‘Lay’ ventriloquised by Spenser is a case in point: the speaker spends some time in a state of absolute dejection, mourning Sidney’s loss and anthropomorphising the landscape as a demonstration of the devastation his absence causes. Yet towards the end of the poem the standard image of Christian consolation in the face of death appears: though Sidney’s body may have died, his spirit nonetheless lives in bliss in heaven:⁴⁷

Ah no: it is not dead, ne can it die,
But lives for air, in blissful Paradise [...] (l.67-8)

This prompts a section detailing those blisses; in a delicate parallel to the description of the grieving landscape, Clorinda rehabilitates the mourning of the natural world with a celebration of the spiritual world. Her conclusion, however, reinforces the need for mourning in the community, despite the happiness now enjoyed by their object:

But live thou there still happie, happie spirit,
And give us leave thee here this to lament:
Not thee that doest thy heavens joy inherit,
But our owne selves that here in dole are dent.
Thus do we weep and waile and wear our eies,

⁴⁵ Lisa M. Klein has noted that Spenser’s eulogising of Sidney is problematic, and that ‘the poem’s deeply ambivalent attitude towards Sidney is difficult to overlook’, *The Exemplary Sidney and the Elizabethan Sonneteer* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998), 171-185 (179).

⁴⁶ Matthew Zarnowiecki, *Fair Copies: Reproducing the English Lyric from Tottel to Shakespeare* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 94-107 (99).

⁴⁷ On the interrelated project of consolation between the ‘Lay’ and *Astrophel*, see Michel O’Connell, ‘Astrophel: Spenser’s Double Elegy,’ *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 11, no.1 (1971): 27-35.

Mourning in others, our owne miseries. (l.91-6)

The last line of the poem in particular emphasises what will emerge as a crucial point in the elegies that follow: the community is necessary to hear and engage in the act of mourning, with the ultimate realisation that the poems of mourning are *for* the community, not the supposed object of their lament.⁴⁸

In *The Shepherdes Calender* speakers are neatly grouped in pairs or threes, with only a handful of characters appearing more than once. For all that the poem represents a pastoral community, that community is segmented and of limited fluidity. In comparison with this, *Colin Clout's* sprawling narrative is full of shepherds (and shepherdesses), with no fewer than eleven speakers other than Colin, occasionally striking up conversation among themselves. The majority of the poems in the collection were written before 1595, and the various authors may have had no input into the publication of their work. The final three poems of the *Colin Clouts* volume were printed in *The Phoenix Nest* in 1593, where, curiously, they were positioned as the three opening poems. The 'Mourning Muse of Thestylis' by Lodowick Bryskett that directly follows *Astrophel* was entered into the Stationers' Register by John Wolfe in 1587, and may well appear unrevised from that date.⁴⁹ While these points have often led to scholars ignoring these poems, this thesis has several times argued for the creative work involved in the process of editing in this period: in this instance for the gathering of poems of similar themes and content, and the structuring of them into a thematically consistent, imaginative landscape (if not a seamless narrative). Regardless of the dates of composition, or even their previous

⁴⁸ This is supported by the reading of Peter J. Sacks, who argues that the 'Lay' represents a successful example of mourning, against the unsuccessful mourning of Stella, *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), 51-63.

⁴⁹ Despite analysis by Frederic B. Tromly that strongly suggests that 'A pastorall Aeglogue' (the third poem of the collection) was written at a date contemporaneously with the Spenserian material, other critics have continued to insist on an earlier date for the poem. This is important insofar as the analyses of many critics – Danielle Clarke among them – rest on the fact that all of the poems bar Spenser's were old poems collected and reused for this collection. See Tromly, 'Lodowick Bryskett's Elegies on Sidney in Spenser's *Astrophel* Volume,' *The Review of English Studies* 37, no.147 (1986): 384-388.

appearances in print, the new contexts in which the poems were gathered and arranged necessarily generated a new set of readings.

The non-Spenserian poems emphasise the same themes that also appear in Spenser's work, and the directness of their continuation of those themes (as well as the seemingly-Spenserian stanzas introducing them) means there is little reason to read them as separate from the poem that precedes them. 'The mourning Muse of Thestylis', directly following Spenser's *Astrophel* and its Clorinda section, is similar in its structure: a long section detailing the ways in which the natural world mourned Sidney's death, followed by an examination once again of the pastoral community left to mourn Sidney.

The Shepheards left their wonted places of resort,
 Their bagpipes now were still; their louing merry layes
 Were quite forgot, and not their flocks, me might perceive
 To wander and to straie, all carefully neglect.
 And in stead of mirth and pleasure, nights and dayes
 Nought els was to be heard, but woes, complaints & mone. (l.164-9)

One common feature in all of the elegies for Sidney is the representation of the community of shepherds. Given the extensive effort to construct a community demonstrating the virtues identified by Colin in the initial poem of the volume, each of these recurrences, regardless of the authors' intentions, repeats and emphasises the thematic point made by Spenser: that the community can be identified by its mourning of Sidney, and its respect for the virtues that he represented. Like the preceding 'Lay', this poem ends on a note of Christian consolation, which, while common in elegies of this time, is nonetheless a structural repetition that ties these poems together.

This theme of communal mourning takes perhaps its most literal turn in another poem by Bryskett that follows 'Mourning Muse': 'A Pastoral Aeglogue upon the death of Sir Philip Sidney knight, &c'. In this poem, two speakers, Lycon and Colin, engage in a poetic duet that recalls many of the poems in *The Shepherdes Calender*, and may be either a collaboration with Spenser, or one of the

longest and most direct emulations of Spenser during his lifetime.⁵⁰ As should be clear from the structure of the poem, however, the joint mourning of the two poets brings to a climax this run of poems dealing with the nature of mourning in a community, moving from the monologic expression of internal grief to the examination of these problems in dialogue. From the Clorinda narrator's realisation of the importance of community to the literal collaboration between speakers within a single poem, the collection has moved continuously towards a vision of a poetic community thoroughly engaged with one another and gathering around a central poetic endeavour. In an almost precise repetition of the concluding verses of Clorinda's section, Lycon addresses the spirit of Sidney:

O happie spirit,
 That now in heau'n with blessed soules doest bide:
 Looke down a while [...]
 Where we thy name recording, seeke to ease
 The inward torment and tormenting paine,
 That thy departure to vs both hath bred,
 Ne can others sorrow yet appease. (l.135-141)

Once again, there is a movement from desolation to consolation, and from sorrow for the deceased to sorrow for and with one another. And once again, Sidney's death is central not only in allowing the community to rally around a focal point, but in allowing them to engage in a set of poetic consolations designed to reinforce that community even in the face of the loss of one of its members. Indeed, that Sidney is chosen as the subject for the sequence of poems seems hardly coincidental following his position in Colin's list of poets in *Colin Clouts*. As both a prominent member of court (or at least mythologised as one) and a poet, a collection which takes him as its theme offers the possibility not only of demonstrating the 'usefulness' of poetry, but an appropriate site in which to gather the community.

⁵⁰ The possible Spenserian collaboration has been hypothesised for some time. See for example Tromly, 'Elegies for Sidney', Katherine Duncan Jones, 'Astrophel,' in *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, 192-197. Jones and Matthew Zarnowiecki both note that 'Colin' and 'Lycon' are anagrams, with the fluidity of early modern spelling in mind. See Zarnowiecki, *Fair Copies*, 101.

Colin Clouts takes a distinctive approach to the process of elegising Sidney. As Raphael Falco has demonstrated in his analysis of the poems produced following Sidney's death, the volume is almost unique in praising Sidney as a poet rather than as a patron or courtier. In Falco's analysis, this stems from a desire on the part of Spenser (and potentially his collaborators) to fashion Sidney as a poetic progenitor who justifies and authorises their own poetic practise. This analysis is absolutely in keeping with the thematic approach of the elegies as they emerge from the community-construction of *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*.⁵¹

The final three poems are, admittedly, less congruous with the rest of the collection than the poems analysed above, and given that the group was imported from a recent publication, this is perhaps not a surprise. Nonetheless, the opening poem, 'An Elegie, or friends passion for his Astrophil' by Matthew Roydon, connects to the preceding poems not only in the use of Sidney's literary identity, but in the descriptive pastoral landscape explored in the poem: an aspect that mirrors the poems before it, but is lacking in those which follow. In this bizarre and occasionally contradictory narrative, the speaker sees a nameless figure gathered before a host of real and mythological birds, lamenting Sidney's death. At the climax of the poem, after a by-now familiar picture of both personal grief and a landscape in mourning, the vision suddenly disappears:

All things did vanish by and by,
And disappeared from my looke,
The trees, beasts, birds, and groue was gone,
So was the friend that made this mone. (l.225-228)

Several interesting things happen when this poem is placed in proximity with the interlocking sections that precede it. In the first instance, the anonymous 'friend' could be taken to gesture to one or any of the poets from the first run of elegies, or he could take on a more general function: the unnamed figure who emerges from a dreamworld pastoral landscape seems at once to be a particular figure and to voice generalised anxieties that allow the reader to assume the mantle of mourner for the length of the poem.

⁵¹ Falco, *Conceived Presences*, particularly Chapters 1 and 2.

More significantly, placing the poem directly after a far more ‘literary’ set of poems, and before a pair of more straightforward elegies for the ‘real-world’ Sidney (‘An Epitaph on the right Honourable Sir Philip Sidney’ and ‘Another of the same’) has the effect of fashioning it as a literary fulcrum: just as the mourner of the poem vanishes, so too does the collection move from a pastoral set of elegies to ones that (appropriately) acknowledge the real-world loss of Sidney. The awakening of the speaker from the dream vision that took up the majority of his poem in some senses mirrors the experience of the reader moving through the elegies for Sidney, beginning with allegorical accounts of Sidney as a mythological figure, before transitioning to more traditional praise for a courtier and politician.

The overall effect, as this analysis has attempted to suggest, is that the entire collection is shaped to materially emphasise the thematic point of the poem that opened the collection. Faced with immoral and untrustworthy courtiers at the heart of power, and significant dangers of misinterpretation, the construction of a poetic community not only allows a consolidation of power from the point of view of the poets involved, but also the creation of a standard from which the immoral court can be judged and censured. Just as in *The Faerie Queene* the allegorical representations of vices or actions have their evils highlighted by the presence of their corresponding morals, so too does the construction of this poetical/textual community position the individuals Colin praises in a demonstrably superior position.

While the importance of community is explored in depth and replicated at length by the gathering of the literal community of poets that make up the collection, there is an additional theme which is explored in the gathering of fragments. Spenser frequently engages in a metaphoric that represents a view of the process of writing; perhaps the most interesting allegory for the purposes of this thesis occurs near the beginning of *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* in the shape of the Bregog myth. The river Bregog is in love with Mulla, the daughter of Mole, who has promised her to another suitor she does not love. To this familiar narrative, Spenser adds a note about how Bregog circumvents the careful stewardship of Mole over his daughter:

First into many parts his streame he shar'd
 That whilst the one was watcht, the other might
 Pass unespides to meet her by the way;
 And then besides, those little streams so broken

He under ground so closely did convey,
 That of their passage doth appeare no token,
 Till they into the Mullaes water slide. (l.138-144)

Though the Bregog / Mulla myth is often read as a direct allegory for Raleigh's marriage to Elizabeth Throckmorton and his subsequent punishment by a furious Elizabeth, I believe there are good reasons to read it as a discussion about the circumvention of censorship and control. As previously noted, this was a topic relevant to Spenser after the problematic publication of *Complaints* in 1591.⁵² And indeed, in an allegory that promises the possibility of meaning being conveyed without detection, it seems something of a joke on Spenser's part to have a shepherd cheerfully summarise the section as a 'mery lay' (l.157) and proceed to ask questions about his journey without further interrogation. At least one reader has already missed the point.⁵³

I have argued above that the *Clout* volume several times brings the issues of interpretation and punishment to the fore: directly in the dedication, and once in the description of the morally corrupt community at court, a group of readers ready to misinterpret for their own gain. In addition to these, we might also gesture towards the destruction of Bregog at the hands of Mole, and the punishment of the nameless poet by Helen at the end of the poem. Kreg Segall has recently examined both of these episodes, and suggested they represent together an attempt to demonstrate the two equally difficult options open to Colin for his self-expression.⁵⁴ While I agree with Segall that these episodes are important, his analysis of the 'Mulla mode' of writing could be vastly expanded by an examination of the volume as a whole. The notion of division into many parts gains more force when considered in the context of a volume which begins with sole authorship, then gradually diffuses out to multiple other speakers.

⁵² On the reading of the episode as a Raleigh-themed allegory, see Oram, 'Spenser's Raleighs.'

⁵³ On the complex interplay between the competing codes of criticism and censorship from writers and readers, see Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984).

⁵⁴ Kreg Segall, 'The Precarious Poet in *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 53, no.1 (2013): 31-51.

On this note, Danielle Clark's analysis of 'The Doleful Lay', while perhaps overly generous in its Sidneian attribution for the poem, nonetheless raises interesting questions about 'authorship' in relation to the volume as a whole.⁵⁵ She rightly notes that authorial attributions dwindle to a minimum in the elegiac section of the collection, with Spenser himself reduced to initials in the dedication, and the only other mark of authorship being the 'L.B.' (almost certainly Lodowick Bryskett) following 'A pastorall Aeglogue'. In this respect, the diffusion of Bregog into multiple unidentifiable sections seems to be emphasised in a material sense: not only does the author get lost among the community in which he writes, but the act of ventriloquism becomes increasingly important. Spenser ventriloquises 'Mary Sidney', Bryskett ventriloquises Spenser/Colin, Roydon's poem ventriloquises a nameless speaker to perform the act of mourning; arguably, in bringing together these works from different times and publications, Spenser and/or Ponsonby is performing a larger act of textual ventriloquism, making works found in other contexts speak to the present purposes of the volume.

The community as constructed by the book is not only one that literally allows a number of voices to come together and speak to the same theme, adding their backing (willing or not) to Spenser's poetic manifesto. It also represents a subversive group who convey their meanings by breaking into smaller segments, evading detection by moving in different directions and diffusing the general thrust of their poetry. If we can, with William Oram, see a movement away from the court as Spenser's audience and primary interest by 1591, the volume entitled *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* offers the possibility of seeing Spenser at work in constructing an alternative audience against both the questionable morals of a faction at court, and the fear of misreading that emerges as a primary concern in the second three books of *The Faerie Queene* in 1596.⁵⁶ In considering the volume as a whole, we can see that the poems by Spenser and those by other authors work intertextually in their new material surroundings, offering a vision of a community brought together by the

⁵⁵ Danielle Clarke, "'In sort as she it sung': Spenser's "Doleful Lay" and the Construction of Female Authorship' *Criticism* 42 (2000): 451-68.

⁵⁶ William Oram, 'Spenser's Audiences, 1589-91,' *Studies in Philology* 100, no.4 (2003): 514-533.

death of one of their members, as well as a manifesto for how this group could continue to voice opinions even in the shadow of potential punishment.

Fowre Hymnes, Daphnaïda, and Poetic Authority

Fowre Hymnes occupies a peculiar place in Spenserian scholarship. On the one hand, the titular poems' focus on metaphysical and philosophical themes links it to much of Spenser's later work, including sections of Book VI of *The Faerie Queene* (1596) and the posthumously-published 'Mutability Cantos'.⁵⁷ At the same time, the dense neoplatonic imagery⁵⁸ and unclear relationship between the four poems have prompted questions about Spenser's intentions for the volume and whether it represents a new direction for his poetry.⁵⁹ This uncertainty has been exacerbated by the slippery language of Spenser's dedication, and by the inclusion of *Daphnaïda*, a poem quite unlike the four hymns, in the same volume.

My argument will be that the volume as a whole can be read as a self-reflexive examination of poetic practice. I suggest that the poems establish the authority of the poet, both in presenting the creative acts of man and God as analogous, and in the control exerted on older works that have been transformed by

⁵⁷ On the relationship of *Fowre Hymnes* to Spenser's other works, see Kenneth Borris, 'Reassessing Ellrodt: Critias and the *Fowre Hymnes* in *The Faerie Queene*,' *Spenser Studies* XXIV (2009): 453-480; Jon A. Quitslund, *Spenser's Supreme Fiction: Platonic Natural Theology and the Faerie Queene* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001); and Carol V. Kaske, 'Neoplatonism in Spenser Once More,' *Religion & Literature* 32 (2000): 157-69. Jeffrey Knapp has also made the case for this metaphysical and theological interest across the length of Spenser's career in 'Spenser the Priest,' *Representations*, 81, no.1 (2003): 61-78.

⁵⁸ Much of literature on these poems has been focused on exploring Spenser's direct and indirect use of neoplatonic sources. The most important studies are Robert Ellrodt *Neoplatonism in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser* (Geneva: Droz, 1960) and Elizabeth Bieman, *Plato Baptised: Towards an Interpretation of Spenser's Mimetic Fictions* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988). For a fuller account of the debates, see *Spenser Studies* XXX (2012) edited by Kenneth Borris, Jon Quitslund, and Carole Kaske, which focuses on Spenser's neoplatonism.

⁵⁹ Patrick Cheney for example has argued that the volume represents Spenser's conscious adaptation of the Virgilian rota to a Christian context in *Famous Flight*, 195-224. A. Leigh DeNeef also sees the volume as a triumphant conclusion to Spenser's career as an epic poet, calling it his 'most optimistic poetic effort', *Spenser and the Motives of Metaphor* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1982), 88.

their new material context. These authorities converge in the image of heavenly ‘rewriting’ that closes the sequence, concluding the poems with a strong identification of Spenser’s own practise with that of God himself. Despite this confident image of authority, Spenser complicates this reading through the inclusion of *Daphnaïda*. Reading the poems in this light demonstrates the anxieties encoded in that text; in a crucial moment, an act of rewriting fails, and the poem concludes with an admission that the narrator does not know how to finish the narrative. Taken together, these poems mark Spenser negotiating his public image, offering one of his strongest defences of poetry, but also a spectre of failed authority.

Aside from any other intentions Spenser may have had for the volume, *Fowre Hymnes* and *Daphnaïda* served a number of practical purposes for Spenser in 1596. The situation in Ireland had worsened in the course of the 1590s, culminating in the Nine Years’ War (1594-1603), an Irish rebellion led by Hugh O’Neill, Earl of Tyrone. Spenser’s political position in Ireland gave him significant insight into the developing turmoil, and the latter three Books of *The Faerie Queene* and *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (probably composed between 1595-6) are heavily inflected by his alarm at this dangerous situation.⁶⁰ Spenser himself was in London during much of 1596, involved in what Andrew Hadfield describes as ‘complicated lawsuit’ concerning the will of his second wife’s recently-deceased father.⁶¹ In addition to the difficult situation in Ireland and this legal suit, 1596 also saw pressure from King James VI of Scotland to have Spenser punished for what James took as ‘dishonourable effects [...] against himself and his mother deceased’ in the second edition of *The Faerie Queene*.⁶² Though there is no evidence of further action being taken, Spenser may have had justifiable worries for his future in Ireland as well as of

⁶⁰ On the larger historical circumstances of Tyrone’s rebellion, see Hiram Morgan, *Tyrone’s Rebellion: The Outbreak of the Nine Years War in Tudor Ireland* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1993).

⁶¹ Hadfield, *A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 334.

⁶² Quoted in Hadfield, *A Life*, 333. For a discussion of Spenser’s allegory of Mary Stuart, and James VI’s response, see Richard McCabe, ‘The Masks of Duessa: Spenser, Mary Queen of Scots, and James I,’ *English Literary Renaissance* 17, no.2 (2008): 224-242.

having offended a powerful political figure whose claim to the throne loomed over the England of the elderly Elizabeth.⁶³

In this context, the publication of *Fowre Hymnes* (dedicated to the sisters Margaret Clifford, Countess of Cumberland, and Anne Russell, Countess of Warwick) alongside *Daphnaïda* (dedicated to Helena, Marchioness of Northampton) may have indicated Spenser's search for patronage, and perhaps also employment outside of Ireland.⁶⁴ Jon Quitslund and Andrew Hadfield, building on work by Rosamond Tuve, have provided a detailed picture of the dedicatees of *Fowre Hymnes*; as well as belonging to powerful families, the sisters were both known patronesses of writers, including of literary works.⁶⁵ Quitslund argues that it was the known devoutness of Margaret that encouraged Spenser's dedication in this volume, while Hadfield notes that Anne was 'closer to the centre of power' and was one of Elizabeth's favourite ladies-in-waiting.⁶⁶ Gathering three powerful women patrons in a single volume made a statement about Spenser's current connections, a fact emphasised by the dedication to *Fowre Hymnes*, which signalled that it was

⁶³ Jonathan Sawday is one of the few critics to read the poems politically, seeing them as a careful insult to William Cecil, Jonathan Sawday, 'Poison and Honey: The Politics of the Sacred and the Profane in Spenser's *Fowre Hymnes* (1596),' in *Sacred and Profane: Secular and Devotional Interplay in Early Modern British Literature*, eds. Helen Wilcox, Richard Todd, and Alasdair McDonald (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1996), 79-92.

⁶⁴ Hadfield suggests that these works, as well as the dedication of *Prothalamion* to the Earl of Essex, indicate an 'angling for patronage, and [...] a position away from Ireland, at least in the short term,' *A Life*, 350. See also Jon A. Quitslund's account of Spenser's need for patronage in these years, 'Spenser and the Patronesses of *Fowre Hymnes*: "Ornaments of All True Love and Beauty,"' in *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*, ed. Margaret P. Hannay (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press 1985), 184-202 (185).

⁶⁵ Quitslund, 'Spenser and the Patronesses'; Rosamond Tuve, 'Spenserus,' in *Essays in English Literature from the Renaissance to the Victorian Age, Presented to A.S.P. Woodhouse*, eds. Millar Maclure and F.W. Watt (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), 3-25. For a discussion of Helena, Marchioness of Northampton, see C. A. Bradford, *Helena Marchioness of Northampton* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1936).

⁶⁶ Quitslund, 'Spenser and the Patronesses', 192; Hadfield, *A Life*, 193. Quitslund also records a number of pieces of evidence that Spenser enjoyed direct contact with the family: an inscription, 'Spenserus' in the family's copy of Gower's *Confessio amantis*, and the purchase of his monument in Westminster by Margaret's daughter, Anne Clifford, 186.

composed in Greenwich, the current site of the royal court.⁶⁷ Addressing them together in a ‘neat quarto with expensive paper’ can be read as the public ‘self-fashioning’ of a writer of significant prestige writing from within the seat of power, and addressing powerful political figures.⁶⁸

Though these pragmatic concerns may have been Spenser’s primary purpose, the dedication to *Fowre Hymnes* provides a narrative of the volume’s composition that is complicated by its ambiguous language:

Having in the greener times of my youth, composed these former two Hymnes in the praise of Loue and beautie, and finding that the same too much pleased those of like age & dispositiōn, which being too vehemently caried with that kind of affection, do rather sucke out poyson to their strong passion, than hony to their honest delight, I was moued by the one of you two most excellent Ladies, to call in the same. But being vnable so to doe, by reason that many copies thereof were formerly scattered abroad, I resolued at least to amend, and by way of retractation to reforme them, making in stead of those two Hymnes of earthly or naturall loue and beautie, two others of heauenly and celestiall. (A2r)

This preface has occasioned a great deal of speculation, with some critics taking a sceptical view of Spenser’s narrative. This reading tends to stress the unlikelihood of republishing work that caused offence (and is already widespread), and sees Spenser presenting a fictitious history for entirely new poetry (for whatever reason).⁶⁹ Robert Ellrodt, for example, claims that the lack of references to these poems in other works (specifically the Spenser-Harvey correspondence of 1580) and the ‘maturity of its style’ mean that ‘Spenser’s apology [...] cannot be taken at face value.’⁷⁰ Josephine W. Bennett and Einar Bjorvand have made arguments that on the basis of the clear structural and verbal similarities, the four poems need to be seen as a unit, whether

⁶⁷ This is noted by Sawday, ‘Poison and Honey’ 84.

⁶⁸ Hadfield, *A Life*, p.193

⁶⁹ On this particular point, see Cheney, *Famous Flight*, 197-8.

⁷⁰ Ellrodt, *Neoplatonism*, 14.

composed together or as the result of revisions to earlier works.⁷¹ More recently, Kenneth Borris has provided a strong rebuttal to this interpretation, citing the peculiarity of Spenser including his dedicatees in a fictitious narrative, especially in a public setting.⁷² My own reading suggests that whether we choose to see the offensive works as entirely new (Ellrodt), the *Complaints* (Hadfield), manuscript versions of the first two hymns (Borris), or sections of *Epithalamion* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (Quitslund), Spenser has drawn attention to the act of rewriting in which he is engaging. Close attention to Spenser's language sees him outlining a subtle argument for his current rewriting, without actually suggesting that the poems were at fault.

As both Mary I. Oates and Elizabeth Bieman have suggested, 'retractation' expressed a different sense to 'retraction'; specifically, that an author might return to an earlier work, re-examining the same theme without necessarily repudiating the previous text.⁷³ Augustine's *Retractation* provided an authoritative Christian example, with that text defending his works against detractors towards the end of his career. Bieman goes slightly further than Oates in suggesting that much of Spenser's vocabulary can be read as less apologetic than it may appear on first reading. As well as noting that 'stead' could also mean 'the place designated by the context', she argues that: 'lewd can mean simply untutored; 'reforme' can bear the root sense of reshaping or refashioning without imputing moral deficiency onto the first pair; 'amend' can signify [...] the surpassing of something good for something better.'⁷⁴ Ayesha Ramachandran has also noted the prominent role that the palinode played in lyric poetry throughout history, with the form 'simultaneously a sign of humility and

⁷¹ Josephine W. Bennett, 'The Theme of Spenser's *Fowre Hymnes*,' *Studies in Philology* 28 (1931): 18-57; Eimar Bjorvand, 'Spenser's Defence of Poetry: Some Structural Aspects of the *Fowre Hymnes*,' in *Fair Forms: Essays in English Literature from Spenser to Jane Austen*, ed. Maren-Sofie Røstvig (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer 1975), 13-53. See also the summary of positions collected in *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition*, eds. Greenlaw *et al*; Volume VII, *The Minor Poems, Part One*, ed. Charles Grosvenor Osgood and Henry Gibbons Lotspelch (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1943), Appendix V, 656 ff.

⁷² Borris, 'Reassessing Ellrodt', 456-461.

⁷³ Mary I. Oates, '*Fowre Hymnes*: Spenser's Retractions of Paradise,' *Spenser Studies* 4 (1984): 143-69; Elizabeth Bieman, *Plato Baptised: Towards an Interpretation of Spenser's Mimetic Fictions* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 50.

⁷⁴ Bieman, *Plato Baptized*, 155.

ambition'.⁷⁵ Quitslund has noted that Spenser was a poet 'whose idea of reformation was not corrective but additive', and so connects *Fowre Hymnes* with his practise across many of his works.⁷⁶

Jonathan Sawday reads this narrative as primarily aimed at providing Spenser with a 'plausible deniability' about the serious political conclusions one might draw from the poems.⁷⁷ Indeed, Sawday suggests 'whatever is being retracted is not just a literary text or texts [...] it is any notion of authorial responsibility.'⁷⁸ My reading of this is entirely the opposite: while Spenser does present himself rewriting older works, it is due to the failures of readers who extract 'poison' rather than 'honey' from the poems. If the vagaries of manuscript circulation had caused the poems to be 'scattered abroad' beyond recall, then republishing them with new material represents an attempt to wrest authority back to the writer. Though developed in the very short text of the dedication, these themes of authorial control, misreading, and rewriting will feature prominently across the poems of the collection, and together function as a crucial way for understanding Spenser's sometimes ambiguous intentions.

'on his workes to looke'

The universe presented by Spenser is one of a complex series of relationships between divine and human conceptions of 'love' and 'beauty'. Though ranging through vocabularies of neoplatonism and Christian mysticism, across the four poems the interactions of Gods, elements, and men are described as fundamentally textual. In both 'An Hyme in Honour of Love' and 'An Hymne in Honour of Heavenly Love', for example, Cupid and Christ are described as 'authors' (l.131; l.256). Humans in Spenser's universe perceive the presence of the divine by

⁷⁵ Ayesha Ramachandran, 'Edmund Spenser, Lucretian Neoplatonist: Cosmology in the *Fowre Hymnes*,' *Spenser Studies* XXIV (2009): 373-411 (375).

⁷⁶ Jon Quitslund, 'Thinking about Thinking in the *Fowre Hymnes*' *Spenser Studies* XXIV (2009): 419-517 (502).

⁷⁷ Sawday, 'Poison and Honey', 86.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 89.

‘reading’ it. In the invocation to ‘An Hymne in Honour of Heavenly Beautie’, Spenser’s narrator gestures to the vast scope of creation:

Then looke who list, thy gazefull eyes to feed
 With sight of that is faire, looke on the frame
 Of this wyde *vniuerse*, and therein reed
 The endlesse kinds of creatures, which by name
 Thou canst not count, much lesse their natures aime:
 All which are made with wondrous wide respect,
 And all with admirable beautie deckt (1.29-35; italics in original)

The universe in this depiction is a collection of endlessly varied forms that can be perceived visually (by ‘gazefull eyes’) and intellectually (‘reed’).

‘Reed’ is an archaic form that occurs throughout Spenser’s works, but which hovers between the more traditional meanings of ‘read’ alongside its use as a noun indicating ‘counsel’ or a discourse or narrative.⁷⁹ In the latter sense, the narrator describes Christ’s teachings (and Christ himself) as ‘his most holy reede’, again invoking the fundamentally textual nature of the universe presented by these poems. Readers are repeatedly asked to ‘read’ the life of Christ: ‘read through loue his mercies manifold’ and ‘thence reade on the storie of his life’. The image of God-as-word echoes the sentiments of John 1:1, and in a similar sense Spenser depicts God and universe as a written text.⁸⁰ Perhaps the most explicit example is in *An Hymne of Heavenly Beauty*:

Him to behold, is on his workes to looke,
 Which he hath made in beauty excellent,

⁷⁹ Definitions 1, 8a and 8b, ‘rede, n.1’. OED Online. September 2016. Oxford University Press. [<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/160221?rskey=8XOmyl&result=1&isAdvanced=false>] (accessed October 02, 2016).

⁸⁰ On Renaissance ideas of Christ as *logos*, especially in Spenser, see Åke Bergvall, ‘Formal and Verbal Logocentrism in Augustine and Spenser,’ *Studies in Philology*, 93, no.3 (1996): 251-266.

And in same, as in a brasen booke,
 To reade enregistred in euery nooke
 His goodnesse, ... (l.128-132)

The image of the ‘book of nature’ is one that occurs frequently across the history of European poetry, of course, but employed alongside the other depictions of reading and writing, it takes on a particularly charged focus in this context.⁸¹ It is not only that nature is composed like a book, but that its writer, God, can be perceived through his text. As will be explored further in Chapter 4, the term ‘works’ also has a key role in the print culture of the 1590s, with (usually posthumous) collections of authors’ ‘works’ appearing as major productions in literary culture. The word’s use here reinforces the authorial aspect of God, and hints at his role as a *printed* author with terminology that had particularly elevated literary connotations at this moment in print culture.

In addition to this explicit textual metaphor, the four poems consistently imagine the creation in terms of printing. Beauty, we are told, fundamentally transforms the lover, its ‘image printing in his deepest wit’ (‘Love’, l.197). Later, the image is taken up again with the word ‘impress[ion]’, which was also used to signify printing in the period (albeit not exclusively).⁸² After describing the effects of beauty on lovers, the narrator wonders whether beautiful natural sights could ‘[w]orke like impression in the lookers vew?’ (‘Beauty’ l.81). Similarly, the speaker describes the shaping of the human body from the pattern of their soul:

Through euery part she doth the same impresse,
 According as the heauens haue her graced,
 And frames her house, in which she will be placed,
 Fit for her selfe (‘Beauty’, l. 115-118)

⁸¹ See for example Klaas van Berkel and Arie Johan Vanderjagt (eds.), *The Book of Nature in Early Modern and Modern History* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006) and Peter Harrison, *The Bible, Protestantism, and the Rise of Natural Science* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

⁸² See as illustrative examples Edmund Coote, *The English Schoole-maister* (London: Widow Orwin for Ralph Jackson and Thomas Dexter, 1596), M3r; and Robert Cawdrey *A Table Alphabetically, conteyning and teaching the true writing, and vnderstanding of hard vsuall English wordes* (London: J. Roberts for Edmund Weeuer, 1604), C6v.

Taken together, these images across *Fowre Hymnes* depict creation, whether on a cosmic or individual scale, largely as a textual activity. The obvious benefit for Spenser is the eliding of divine creativity with his own poetic activity, which is mentioned throughout the poems. This is a point made by the term ‘frame’, which appears both as noun denoting a work or structure – ‘this mortal frame’ ‘Love’ l. 116), ‘this worlds great frame’ (‘Heavenly Love’, l. 22) – and as a verb used to describe Spenser’s own writing: ‘This simple song, thus fram’d in praise of thee’ (‘Love’, l. 307), ‘An honourable Hymne I eke should frame’ (‘Beauty’, l. 10). Rayna Kalas has explored the significance of this word in early modern culture, and identifies it as a primary vehicle for understanding language as material.⁸³ She notes that ‘a predominant strain of poetic language and theory in the English Renaissance recognised poesy as *techne* rather than aesthetics, and figurative matter as framed or tempered matter, rather than as verablised concepts.’⁸⁴ Frame operates as one of the most materially suggestive of all the terms used for poetic composition, and Spenser’s use of the term suggests a fundamental identification of the poet’s work with that of the divine author.

‘tempering goodly well’

This elision of poetic and divine creation is not just presented through the images and terms mentioned above, but is implied in the cosmological theme of the poems. Fernard Hallyn has outlined the strong connection between poetics and cosmology from the classical period to the Renaissance, and suggested that it found prominence in literature, but also in works on music (Augustine) and Philosophy (Plato).⁸⁵ He suggests:

⁸³ Rayna Kalas, *Frame, Glass, Verse: The Technology of Poetic Invention in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2007).

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, xi.

⁸⁵ Fernard Hallyn, ‘Cosmography and poetics,’ in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume III, The Renaissance*, ed. Glynn P. Norton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 442-448.

Cosmography or the description of the constitution of the world, comprising astronomy as well as geography, is related to poetics either by analogy (poems being taken as metaphors of the cosmos, the object of cosmography) or by exposition (in poetry aiming partially or totally at practising the writing of cosmography). (442)

The same type of material and intellectual overlap that Kalas identifies in ‘frame’ is also apparent in more general terms across the period. Sir Philip Sidney’s famous argument for the superiority of the poetic imagination to reality, with the poet ‘freely ranging in the Zodiac of his own wit’, also encodes this cosmological and poetic overlap. Hallyn cites George Chapman and Arthur Golding as contemporary examples of Spenser’s approach in *Fowre Hymnes*, while work by S.K. Heninger, Marie-Sofie Rostvig, and E.N. Tigerstedt has also highlighted the basic equivalence of poetic and cosmological writing across the period.⁸⁶ Spenser was clearly working within a genre that self-reflexively saw poetic creation as analogous to divine creation, and the poet’s activity by extension as close to that of God.

The dedication to *Fowre Hymnes* suggests that Spenser was unable to ‘call in’ his earlier works due to them being ‘scattered abroad’. While often read as a conventional gesture to manuscript circulation (whatever the real-world circumstances of the poems’ composition), the poems can also be seen to respond keenly to this particular problem. While Spenser laments the lack of control he has over poems that have dispersed so widely, the re-publication of the works in a new context, with poems that fundamentally refigure them, represents a significant claim to his ultimate authority over their meaning. Indeed, many of the modern scholarly debates about the interaction of the poems with one another seem directly prefigured by Spenser’s own accounts of creation.⁸⁷ He notes that (earthly) Love’s act is the

⁸⁶ *Ibid*, 443; S. K. Heninger, Jr., *Touches of Sweet Harmony: Pythagorean Cosmology and Renaissance Poetics* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1974); M. S. Rostvig, ‘Ars aeterna: Renaissance poetics and theories of divine creation’, *Mosaic* 3 (1969–70): 40–61; E. N. Tigerstedt, ‘The poet as creator: origins of a metaphor’, *Comparative Literature Studies* 5 (1968): 455–88.

⁸⁷ Whether the four poems interact individually, if they function as a sequence, as a pair of pairs, or some other configuration has been the subject of much debate. For an excellent summary, see

separation of ‘great *Chaos*’ into distinct elements:

The world that was not till he did it make;
 Whose sundrie parts he frō them selues did seuer,
 The which before had lyen confused euer, (‘Love’, 1.78-80)

These elements war against one another, and constantly threaten the stability of creation. Love, however, acts as a solidifying force in the universe:

He then them tooke, and tempering goodly well
 Their contrary dislikes with loued meanes,
 Did place them all in order, and compell
 To keepe them selues within their sundrie raines,
 Together linkt with Adamantine chaines (88-92)

In a volume clearly preoccupied with poetic creation, and prefaced by a ‘creation myth’ from the author, the image of four distinct forces with complex relationships being placed in a controlled context in which the destructive energies of each force are made to cohere harmoniously, appears pointed. My suggestion is that Spenser is at least in part meditating on the ability of context to determine meaning, in much the same way one half of his book ‘retractated’ the other half.

Later in the sequence Spenser describes how the earth was formed ‘[a]mid the Sea engirt with brasen bands’ (‘Heavenly Beauty’, 1.37), linking it to the previous description of the universe as a ‘brasen book’. The precise relationship of the four elements in individuals explains each material instance of their appearance and character:

So euer since they firmly haue remained,
 And duly well obserued his beheast;

Fiesal G. Mohamed, *In the Anteroom of Divinity: The Reformation of the Angels from Colet to Milton* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 45-50. For a radical suggestion that the poems should be read backwards, see Gordon Teskey, ‘A Retrograde Reading of Spenser’s Fowre Hymnes,’ *Spenser Studies* XXIV (2009): 481-97.

Through which now all these things that are contained
 Within this goodly cope, both most and least ('Love', 1.96-99)

This relationship, in the neoplatonic world of Spenser's cosmos, is a reflection of a 'goodly Paterne' ('Beauty', 1.32) that exists beyond the physical realm.⁸⁸ In a work that conceives of these relationships in a primarily textual sense, it is curious that Spenser describes the resulting beauty of man as so perfect that 'nought may be amended any where' ('Beauty', 1.35). While on the one hand pointing out the perfection of man, this phrase also hints at the unchanging nature of the pattern: while mortal works may need to be emended, the platonic forms exist without the need for revision.

As I have suggested in the preceding analysis, several aspects of Spenser's volume demonstrate a careful defence of poetry, identifying it as similar to the divine acts of creation, exploring deep patterns in the universe, and capable of 'taming' destructive forces into order. As mentioned above, 1596 was a crucial year for Spenser, and his difficult personal circumstances may have motivated both the appeal to new patrons and this aggressive act of public self-fashioning. Ayesha Ramachandran sees this as part of a larger project to establish an authority outside of the court, 'modulated by an increasing turn away from the dirty business of governance towards cosmic allegories and philosophical speculation'.⁸⁹ Richard McCabe similarly sees *Fowre Hymnes*, as part of a larger project of authorial representation which includes the second part of *The Faerie Queene* in the same year. In both works, McCabe sees Spenser responding to criticisms about the 'corrupting' nature of fiction, particularly from the figure of William Cecil whose part in the censoring of *Complaints* (1591) loomed large over the rest of Spenser's career.⁹⁰ In *Fowre Hymnes*, Spenser 'defend[s] epic and amatory verse through the very genre of "hymn" that Plato permits in the well-governed state.'⁹¹ Further to

⁸⁸ Though Spenser's precise use of this idea is put to original ends, viewing the proportions between the four elements as the foundation for differences in matter appears long before the early modern period, including in Bartholomeus' *De proprietatibus rerum* (c.1240).

⁸⁹ Ramachandran, 'Lucretian Neoplatonist,' 379.

⁹⁰ Richard A. McCabe, 'Spenser, Plato, and the Poetics of State,' *Spenser Studies* XXIV (2009): 433-452.

⁹¹ *Ibid*, 444.

McCabe's argument, I argue that Spenser uses the fiction of the dedication and the poems themselves to construct a strong authorial role for the poet, performing feats analogous to the divine, and operating to create beauty in the world.

For all of the positive comparisons Spenser suggests between poet and God, the physical world suffers from being 'misread' in exactly the same way as written texts. The vision of love put forward by Spenser's narrator makes every effort to separate it from the 'lust' which is seen as a nightmarish counterpart, repeatedly invoked in the poems. Love may prove transcendental for some, but others are trapped by their 'dunghill thoughts, which do themselues enure / To dirtie drosse' ('Love', l.94-5). While 'louers eyes more sharpely sighted bee' ('Beauty', l.232), they are also prone to become delusional readers:

The feare whereof, ô how doth it torment
 His troubled mynd with more than hellish paine!
 And to his fayning fancie represent
 Sights neuer seene, and thousand shadowes vaine,
 To breake his sleepe, and waste his ydle braine;
 Thou that hast neuer lou'd canst not beleue,
 Least part of th'euils which poore louers greeue.
 The gnawing enuie, the hart-fretting feare,

The vaine surmizes, the distrustfull showes,
 The false reports that flying tales doe beare,
 The doubts, the daungers, the delayes, the woes,
 The fayned friends, the vnassured foes,
 With thousands more then any tongue can tell,
 Doe make a louers life a wretches hell. ('Love', l.252-265)

A lover, in Spenser's universe, is the best and worst of readers. On the one hand their attraction to others is a reflection of harmonies on a universal scale, motivated by pure and abstract impulses. On the other, their reading of their own situation as well as their surroundings can be fundamentally delusional. Though Spenser's poems present an optimistic image of love, the negative image of these

praises occur throughout the sequence. Moreover, the narrator himself demonstrates the ease of misreading; as he describes the sympathy between souls and bodies, the former shapes the latter, so ‘where euer that thou doest behold / A comely corpse’ you can know ‘for certaine, that the same doth hold / A beauteous soule’ (‘Beauty’, l.34-37). Despite the notional correspondence of body to soul, neither is a guarantee of the other. The narrator laments that ‘many a gentle mynd / Dwels in deformed tabernacle drownd’ (‘Beauty’, l.141-2), and that ‘goodly beautie’ is made ‘but the bait of sinne, and sinners scorne’ (‘Beauty’, 149-152). Though appearance and character should be reflections of one another, reading one from the other is not as straightforward as the narrator’s description first implies.

The threat of misreading is not only present for earthly love and beauty, but also for their heavenly counterparts. In a creation myth of ‘An Hymne of Heavenly Love’, which develops from and rewrites that in ‘A Hymne in Honour of Love’, God is seen to construct the universe, including populating it with Angels.⁹² These creations, however, feeling:

[...] pride impatient of long resting peace,
 Did puffed them vp with greedy bold ambition,
 That they gan cast their state how to increase,
 About the fortune of their first condition,
 And sit in Gods owne seat without commission (‘Heavenly Love’, l.78-82)

The rebellion in heaven may in a distant sense echo Spenser’s presentation of the political turmoil in Ireland, which he similarly presents in *A View* as an uprising against a lawful ruler motivated by pride and personal gain.⁹³ Nonetheless, God as an author has been misread despite the obviousness of his goodness. God’s solution

⁹² On the relationship of these two poems, see Bjorvand, ‘Some structural aspects’ and John Mulryan, ‘Spenser as Mythologist: A Study of the Nativities of Cupid and Christ in the *Fowre Hymnes*,’ *Modern Language Studies*, 1, no.1 (1971): 13-16. Spenser’s use of angels is examined by Fiesal G. Mohamed, *In the Anteroom of Divinity*.

⁹³ See also his description of man as ‘A new vnknown Colony therein’ whose ‘root from earths base Groundworke shold begin’ (‘Heavenly Love’, l.104-5). Man supplanting rebellious angels, and having their ownership reinforced by being literally composed from the earth, seems to hint at a subtle articulation of English claims to Ireland.

happens to be the same as Spenser's: to engage in an act of rewriting by repurposing his creation for a new set of inhabitants. 'Now seeing left a waste and emptie place / In his wyde Pallace' ('Heavenly Love', l.102), God creates man in his own image, 'According to an heauenly patterne' (l.108). Despite the many gifts given to mankind, they prove no better readers than their angelic antecedents:

But man forgetfull of his makers grace,
 No lesse then Angels, whom he did ensew,
 Fell from the hope of promist heauenly place,
 Into the mouth of death to sinners dew,
 And all his off-spring into thraldome threw:
 Where they for euer should in bonds remaine,
 Of neuer dead, yet euer dying paine ('Heavenly Love', l.120-6)

God's response is again to engage in an act of rewriting, fashioning himself a human body 'in fleshes fraile attyre' (l.137).

Matthew Zarnowiecki, though approaching the poems from a theological perspective, reads this moment in a similar manner to my interpretation, noting that '[t]his is perhaps Christianity's first version of divine "retractation," a revision of creation, to be followed by the flood and then ultimately by God's intervention to amend human sin through Christ.'⁹⁴ From universe to angels to man to god incarnate, Spenser's divine author is one who continually adapts as his readers fail to understand his works properly. Even in this final state, Christ suffers misreading and mistreatment from the people he came to save:

He taken was, betrayd, and false accused,
 How with most scornfull taunts, & fell despights
 He was reuyld, disgrast, and foule abused ('Heavenly Love', l.240-242)

⁹⁴ Matthew Zarnowiecki, 'Spenser's Angels: Salvation, Retracting, and Superhuman Poiesis in *Fowre Hymnes*,' *Spenser Studies* XXX (2015): 75-104 (82).

Across *Fowre Hymnes*, Spenser elides physical and poetic creation, effectively positioning poetics as a subgradient of divine work. Given Spenser's position in 1595-6, this careful defence of poetry may have satisfied several needs: against Burghley and James I's dislike and the difficult politics of Ireland, the appeal to new patrons in a new mode attempted to say something about the position of poetry in late Elizabethan culture. The ultimate comparison between poetry and divinity is God himself, and it is in this character that we can see Spenser presenting his manifesto for poetic recontextualisation. God continually suffers misreading, and each time he presents a new and refashioned deal for humanity. *Fowre Hymnes* touches on many topics, and is a work steeped in neoplatonic and theological intricacies. At the same time, the dedication clearly sets out interpretation, authorial control, and authority as major issues that are played out in the four poems that follow. Spenser raises these problems to highlight the textual nature of the world at large, and the difficulty of reading correctly, but ultimately the author's control over those works by continuing to refashion them. *Fowre Hymnes* may or may not have represented a new direction in Spenser's poetry, but in 1596 it formed a strong argument for Spenser's continuing vocation.

Let reade the ruffull plaint herein exprest,

Fowre Hymnes ends on a hopeful note, with the speaker hoping his 'straying thoughts henceforth for euer rest'. A reader may have been surprised to find that around a third of the volume remained, and was made up of a single work that was unmentioned on the title page to *Fowre Hymnes*, but printed on the same stock of paper and with continuous signatures. That work was *Daphnaïda*, a poem which has largely been overlooked in modern Spenser scholarship. William Oram diplomatically calls it 'one of [Spenser's] most experimental and least-loved works' but Jonathan Gibson describes its reputation as 'a grotesque authorial miscalculation, an embarrassing failure to obey generic rules.'⁹⁵ The poem is a pastoral elegy and a

⁹⁵ *The Yale Edition*, 487; Jonathan Gibson, 'The Legal Context of Spenser's *Daphnaïda*,' *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, 55, no.218 (2004): 24-44 (24). The poem's 'failure' remains a

rewriting of Chaucer's *Book of the Duchess*, and differs in several respects from its predecessor. While both texts see the narrator meeting with a widower, Chaucer's text offers a widely-argued consolation for death, and his speaker awakes from his dream feeling happier. Spenser's text sees its mourner launch into an incredible diatribe, then vanish into the night with neither his grief nor the narrator's 'troubulous thought' mitigated by the text.⁹⁶

Readings of *Daphnaïda* as it was published in 1591 have varied widely.⁹⁷ William Oram and G.W. Pigman III have suggested that the poem represents a warning about excessive grieving, with Pigman describing the text as 'a picture of excessive mourning as a counterexample to moderation.'⁹⁸ Ellen Martin and Patrick Cheney interpret Alcyon (Arthur Gorges) more sympathetically, as a study in poetic melancholia and as a frank and human discussion of death respectively. In another vein entirely, Jonathan Gibson reads the poem as providing public support for Gorges during the difficult legal troubles that followed his wife's death.⁹⁹

The presence of this poem in the *Fowre Hymnes* volume presents a problem: Spenser's intentions for either work individually are uncertain, together they prove a genuine interpretive puzzle. Quitslund makes a case for the situation of Gorges being of deep interest to Margaret Russell, Countess of Cumberland, given the similar legal challenges both had dealt with in the 1590s.¹⁰⁰ David Lee Miller notes that the

constant topic in scholarly works; for a recent discussion of the poem as 'intentionally bad', see David Lee Miller, 'Laughing at Spenser's *Daphnaïda*,' *Spenser Studies* XXVI (2011): 241-250.

⁹⁶ For a more substantial discussion of the relationship between the two texts, see Glenn Steinberg, 'Idolatrous Idylls: Protestant Iconoclasm, Spenser's *Daphnaïda*, and Chaucer's *Book of the Duchess*,' in *Refiguring Chaucer in the Renaissance*, ed. Teresa M. Krier (Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 1998), 128-143; and D. Harris and N. L. Steffen, 'The Other Side of the Garden: An Interpretative Comparison of Chaucer's *Book of the Duchess* and Spenser's *Daphnaïda*,' *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 8 (1978): 17-36.

⁹⁷ In addition to this summary below, see Mark David Rasmussen, 'Complaints and *Daphnaïda* (1591),' in *Handbook to Edmund Spenser*, 218-235.

⁹⁸ William A. Oram, '*Daphnaïda* and Spenser's Later Poetry,' *Spenser Studies* II (1981): 141-158; George W. Pigman III, *Grief and the English Renaissance Elegy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 75.

⁹⁹ Gibson, 'Legal Contexts'.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid*, 194.

contrast between the two parts of the volume speaks to what he sees as the intertextual model for Spenser's work, Petrarch's *Trionfi*, and, in a separate argument, that the 1596 *Daphnaïda* mocks the 'cynical posturing' of the Gorges/Raleigh faction.¹⁰¹ Finally, Matthew Zarnowiecki has read the poem as providing a reminder that human salvation was not as easy to attain as the hopeful visions that closed the preceding work might suggest. In contrast to these previous accounts, I will argue that *Daphnaïda* offers a typically Spenserian complication on the defence of poetry (and poets) offered by the previous poem. Where *Fowre Hymnes* presents rewriting as a divine process of forgiveness in the face of misreading, *Daphnaïda* provides a clear case of authorial revision failing. *Fowre Hymnes* asserts the authority of the poet to adapt his image by recontextualising old works in new material contexts, and *Daphnaïda* worries that these efforts will collapse on closer inspection.

The poem, as its dedication makes clear, was written as an elegy for Douglas Howard, the young wife of Arthur Gorges, an associate of Walter Raleigh, who is represented in both *Daphnaïda* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* by the pastoral persona of Alcyon.¹⁰² In this poem, the narrator is interrupted from his consideration of 'the miserie, / In which men live, and I of many most' (l.36-7) by the appearance of the shepherd Alcyon, dishevelled and dressed in attire that 'mourning did bewray' (l.46). After some pleading on the part of the narrator, Alcyon reveals the reason for his distress, at first providing a story about his love for a lioness only for this to be revealed as an allegory for the death of his wife. Alcyon follows this revelation with a lament that gradually extends to a bitter invective against the heavens, nature, and his fellow man in a heavily structured complaint in seven sections, each containing seven stanzas (the beginning of each section is numbered in both the first and second edition of the poem).¹⁰³ Finally, after Alcyon's complaint ends, the poem abruptly

¹⁰¹ David Lee Miller, 'Fowre Hymnes and Prothalamion (1596),' in *Handbook to Edmund Spenser*, 293-313; 'Laughing at Spenser's *Daphnaïda*', 250.

¹⁰² On Arthur Gorges, see Gibson, 'Legal Contexts'; H. E. Sandison, 'Arthur Gorges, Spenser's Alcyon and Raleigh's Friend,' *PMLA* 43 (1928): 645-74; and Jonathan Gibson, 'Sir Arthur Gorges (1557-1625) and the Patronage System,' (PhD Thesis, University of London, 1997).

¹⁰³ Marie-Sophie Røstvig has suggested an intricate numerological structure that ultimately gestures towards the consolation of the Sabbath in *The Hidden Sense and Other Essays* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1963), 83-7.

concludes without either a response by the narrator to Alcyon or a more generalised moral response on the part of Spenser or his speaker.

The poem, in short, removes the hope and spiritual comfort that are the hallmark of the elegy: Alcyon instead begins with a delusional attempt to render his grief into allegory, and moves into unmediated and unrestricted hyperbole when this fiction is shattered, before finally breaking off altogether.¹⁰⁴ Rather than the answer to Alcyon's grief that readers might expect (either from convention or recognising the rewriting of Chaucer), Spenser's narrator is unable 'longer him intreat with me to staie' (l.562), and we are denied even the possibility of a moralising conclusion in the shape of the narrator's enigmatic admission that 'what became of him I cannot weene' (l.568). On every level, *Daphnaïda* is a challenge to the reader, with narrative, generic, and structural expectations each overturned by its unconventional conclusion. When Alcyon laments that life itself appears unfairly brief, uncertain, and 'neuer standeth in one certaine state' (l.430), the poem appears to be commenting on its own textuality as much as on the grief of the speaker.

But while *Daphnaïda* on its own stands as a confusing and disconcerting piece of work, its combination with the ascendant, visionary mode of *Fowre Hymnes* offers a brutal contradiction to the conclusions of the poems that precede it. In more subtle ways, however, *Daphnaïda* continues the textual games begun by *Fowre Hymnes* in its teasing and allusive dedication. While that dedication indicates that two later works are republished alongside two written earlier, it is difficult to ignore the fact that whatever the actual circumstances of composition for *Fowre Hymnes*, the four poems are demonstrably presented alongside an earlier work in a new context.

Given that the volume as a whole opens with an argument that material intertextuality can shape the reading of a work (in my terms), it seems entirely reasonable to suggest that *Daphnaïda* is expected to be subject to exactly the same forces in being brought into contact with these poems. In terms of the arrangement offered to the reader, the result is the opposite of the narrative presented in the dedication: an early poem placed in new surroundings adapts itself to provide a

¹⁰⁴ On the elegy as a form in this period, see Pigman III, *Renaissance Elegy*, and Dennis Kay *Melodious Tears*, and Peter Sacks, *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985).

challenge and contradiction to the more hopeful ideologies of the poems it follows. In short, an early work is brought to bear on a later one, which is challenged as a result, rather than a youthful work being subject to the containing energies of a later, more restrained one. In addition, one cannot help but notice the provocative way in which Alcyon presents a fiction that explains his current situation, only to have that fiction overturned by the narrator:

Yet doth not my dull wit well understand
 The riddle of thy loved Lionesse;
 For rare it seemes in reason to be skand
 That man, who doth the whole worlds rule possesse
 Should to a beast his noble heart embase,
 And be the vassal of his vassalesses:
 Therefore more plaine aread this doubtfull case. (l.176-182)

Much as the dedication to *Fowre Hymnes* introduced a narrative of composition that at the very least appears incomplete, and at worst can be assessed as ‘awkward’ and ‘implausible’,¹⁰⁵ Alcyon’s allegory is shown to be insufficiently convincing to the individual to whom it is presented, allowing for it to be exposed as fictional. The reason for Alcyon’s allegory is uncertain: once it is abandoned it is never returned to. But the effect of this episode is to return us to the focus of *Fowre Hymnes*, which confidently presented a poet rewriting his own reception. Here, Spenser’s narrator attempts to reconstruct his narrative in an allegorical guise only to have this reconstruction questioned by his only reader. In a poem of ‘failures’ that banishes *utile et dulce* in its invocation,¹⁰⁶ denies Christian consolation, and refuses to conform to generic expectations, the failure of Alcyon’s rewriting is part of a systematic deconstruction of poetic convention by two characters existing within it. One might also see the problematic adaptation of Chaucer as another instance of failed rewriting: the broad structural aspects of Chaucer’s poem are adopted, but the narrative trajectory and moral conclusions are utterly ignored. The poem ends with

¹⁰⁵ Miller, ‘*Fowre Hymnes and Prothalamion* (1596),’ 294.

¹⁰⁶ Noted by Miller, ‘Laughing at Spenser’s *Daphnaïda*,’ 241.

the narrator admitting ‘what of him became I cannot weene’ (l.567), another instance of authorial failure to provide closure to the narrative.

Daphnaïda has a complex relationship with *Fowre Hymnes*. Though the latter work highlights the recontextualisation of older works, the presence of an indisputably earlier piece of writing seems to immediately draw it into the larger exploration of poetic authority and control conducted in the volume. At the same time, given that the bitter invectives launched by Alcyon stand in stark contrast to the neoplatonic splendour of *Fowre Hymnes*, the question stands: of many possible works, why choose *Daphnaïda*? My reading suggests that the volume as a whole is concerned with poetic authority in the face of censorship (the calling in of *Complaints*), Spenser’s political offence to Burghley and James VI, and continuing debates about the misleading ethics of fiction. Richard McCabe describes *Daphnaïda*, like much of Spenser’s work, as a response to ‘perceived pressures of shaping, and even justifying, a literary career at a time when aristocratic patronage appeared to be in decline and market forces threatened to vulgarise Humanist idealism.’¹⁰⁷ *Fowre Hymnes* presents a careful defence of poetry, linking it to the transcendental actions of God, and positing rewriting or retraction as a resource for the poet to reframe his works with new, authoritative contexts. *Daphnaïda* is the sinister image of failure to *Fowre Hymnes*’ triumph, and a sign of human frailty in the face of divine action as well as a series of authorial failures from both characters. Spenser faced a number of personal and political challenges late in 1596, and while *Fowre Hymnes* seems part of a larger project of defending poetry while speaking truth to power, its coupling with *Daphnaïda* also communicates Spenser’s anxieties about failing in his project. Rather than seeing the volume as Patrick Cheney does, as the culmination of a life-long project, *Fowre Hymnes* reveals one of Spenser’s most careful negotiations of his public persona, and also a stark anxiety about the limitations of his ability to control his reception among hostile readers.

¹⁰⁷ Richard McCabe, ‘Shorter Verse Published 1590-95,’ in *A Critical Companion to Spenser Studies*, ed. Bart van Es (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan 2006), 166-186.

Conclusion

This chapter has suggested several ways in which reading Spenser's works through the lens of material intertextuality offer new possibilities in understanding his poetry. In particular, it has attempted to outline the importance that the collection as a form held for Spenser, and the ways in which his shorter poetry throughout his career returns to the interpretive possibilities made available by bringing together separate texts. From his first published work, *A Theatre for Worldlings*, in which short poems are placed in a larger theological perspective by van der Noodt's prose treatise, to the complicated textual games of *Fowre Hymnes* and *Daphnaïda*, Spenser repeatedly experiments with the ways in which the collection as a whole could offer a more complex set of possibilities than the sum of its parts.

In keeping with one of the major themes of this thesis, this chapter has also explored how modern editorial approaches, which favour analyses of verbal differences over questions of structure or arrangement, risk obscuring important aspects of Renaissance literature, especially in respect to a poet as interested in these matters as Spenser. Part of the reason for the relative neglect of some of Spenser's shorter poetry is the tendency to extract poems from their original contexts, or to arrange those works in an order that reflects chronology rather than how they were seen by Spenser's earliest readers. That extraction necessarily presents works without the provocative textual surroundings that can offer radically different interpretations, as the example of *Fowre Hymnes* suggests. The recognition of Spenser's interest in structure and arrangement also helps to explain the apparent conventionality of his publications in the wake of the extraordinarily innovative *Shepherd's Calender*; rather than abandoning his interest in the possibilities of print and material form to convey meaning (and indeed, to explore multiple readings), Spenser's approach modulates over time towards exploring the aggregate nature of the early modern book that this thesis has identified as an area of increasing interest towards the end of the sixteenth century.

In the *Colin Clouts* volume we not only see the insistent focus on community and the way that the book can actualise a thematic concern, but also the meditation on the collection as a subversive form, capable of splitting itself 'in many parts' to convey its possible meanings while minimising the risks of detection. So too in the *Fowre Hymnes* volume we see Spenser's most complicated assessment of the

collection as a form: the works gathered there offer a cosmological identity for poetic creation, and argue for recontextualisation or ‘retractation’ as a way of controlling misreading. This enthusiastic vision is undercut by *Daphnaïda*, which challenges these conclusions while providing a very human face for the virtues urged in *Fowre Hymnes*. Taken together, these works represent significant acts of self-reflexive collection that show Spenser continuing to experiment with his published work, with the form of the collection at the heart of that enterprise.

Finally, this approach may change our appreciation of *The Faerie Queene*, which, in its strange and miscellaneous gathering of narratives, and incongruous movements between genres, connects far more strongly with Spenser’s shorter poetry than is often appreciated. Rather than a poetic enterprise separate from Spenser’s other work, *The Faerie Queene* might be more helpfully seen as the crowning achievement of a poet who continually experimented with the fertile generation of meaning from arrangement and structure: an epic of provocatively arranged miscellaneity rather than one of consistent and linear narrative.

Chapter 4: Samuel Daniel and the Poetics of Evolving Material Context

Spenser's *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* (1595) provided an overview of recent English poets, both living and deceased. Each of the writers is given a pastoral pseudonym, some of which (Astrophel for Sidney, Alycon for Arthur Gorges) refer to those used by the poets in their own work, while others are apparently Spenser's own creations, and have led to much speculation about which writers Spenser was referring to. On only two occasions does Spenser name a poet directly; one is William Alabaster, composer of the Latin epic *Elisaeis*. The other is Samuel Daniel, introduced as the most promising of all the living poets listed:

And there is a new shepheard late vp sprong,
The which doth all afore him far surpass:
Appearing well in that well tuned song,
Which late he sung vnto a scornfull lasse.
Yet doth his trembling Muse but lowly flie,
As daring not too rashly mount on hight,
And doth her tender plumes as yet but trie,
In loues soft laies and looser thoughts delight.
Then rouze thy feathers quickly Daniell,
And to what course thou please thy selfe aduance:
But most me seemes, thy accent will excell,
In Tragick plaints and passionate mischance. (l.416-427)

Spenser's enthusiastic assessment of Daniel's writing and potential is echoed by a number of other contemporary writers, all of whom express particular admiration for the 'well tuned song': Daniel's sonnet sequence *Delia*, published three years before Spenser published his praise.¹ Spenser suggests that although Daniel's romantic

¹ See as illustrative examples William Covell, *Polimanteia, or, The meanes lawfull and vnlawfull, to iudge of the fall of a common-wealth* (Cambridge: Legate, 1595), R2v-R3r; Francis Meres, *Palladis tamia* (London: P. Short for Cuthbert Busbie, 1598), 280-1; Richard Barnfield, *Lady Pecunia* (William Jaggard, 1605), G2r. Francis Davison regards Daniel as having surpassed even

work was excellent his talents could be better put to use in ‘Tragick plaints’, possibly seeing *The Complaint of Rosamond* and *Cleopatra*, which had appeared in 1592 and 1594 respectively, as promising works in this direction.

Though Spenser encourages Daniel towards more ambitious works, *Delia* and *Rosamond* had a profound effect on the literary landscape of late Elizabethan literature. As the first full Petrarchan sequence by a living poet, Daniel provided a key bridge between Sidney’s posthumous *Astrophil and Stella* (with which twenty-eight of Daniel’s sonnets had been printed in 1591) and the sonnet boom of the 1590s.² One example of this influence is the ‘eternizing topos’, which Lisa M. Klein has noted is ‘distinctly un-Petrarchan’, and appears to have been one of Daniel’s innovations.³ Daniel’s clearest contribution to the sonnet sequences of his contemporaries, however, is the placement of *The Complaint of Rosamond* after *Delia*, providing a counterpoint to the preceding poems from a female perspective. This ‘Delian’ structure has been referenced most frequently in discussions of Shakespeare’s *A Lover’s Complaint*, but acted as a model for a wide range of writers in this period.⁴

Despite Daniel being frequently relegated to a footnote in Shakespeare studies, *Delia* and *Rosamond* do much more for our understanding of early modern

Spenser, describing him as the ‘Prince of English Poets,’ *A poetical rapsody* (V. Sims for John Bailey, 1602), E9v.

² Appreciation for Daniel was not limited to writers, as can be seen from the frequency with which copies of his works have been annotated by readers. John Pitcher notes that based on his research ‘[c]opies of Daniel may well have been annotated by his contemporaries to an appreciably greater extent than other English poets of the early modern period’, ‘Benefiting from the Book: The Oxford Edition of Samuel Daniel,’ *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 29 (1999): 69-87 (80).

³ Lisa M. Klein, *The Exemplary Sidney and the Elizabethan Sonneteer* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998), 149.

⁴ The importance of this ‘Delian’ structure was forcefully put forward by John Kerrigan in his edition of *The Sonnets and A Lover’s Complaint* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986) and by Heather Dubrow, “[Lending soft audience to my sweet design]: Shifting Roles and Shifting Readings in Shakespeare’s ‘A Lover’s Complaint,’” *Shakespeare Survey* 58 (2005): 23-33. See also Shirley Sharon-Zisser and Stephen Whitworth ‘Generating Dialogue on Shakespeare’s *A Lover’s Complaint*,’ in *Critical Essays on A Lover’s Complaint: Suffering Ecstasy* ed. Shirley Sharon-Zisser (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 1-53 (21-25). John Kerrigan (ed.) *Motives of Woe: Shakespeare and Female Complaint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991) provides a useful overview of the generic history of the female complaint, as well as its relation to sonnet sequences in this period.

poetry than simply illuminating an important model for other writers. Much scholarship discusses Daniel's sonnet sequence as a single, stable structure, treating the 1592 volume as representative of the numerous editions published between 1592 and 1611.⁵ In the most recent comparison of Daniel and Shakespeare, for example, Kenji Go describes *Delia* as containing fifty sonnets, despite this number being present in only one of the seven surviving editions.⁶ In some respects this speaks to the longstanding scholarly and editorial interest in initial publications over revisions, but in the case of *Delia* it risks wildly underestimating the complexity of Daniel's volumes, as well as misrepresenting the structure that early modern readers would have encountered. No scholarly analysis, for example, discusses the ramifications of *Cleopatra* being added to *Delia* and *Rosamond* in the 1594, 1595 and 1598 editions, despite the many alterations made to those earlier poems to reflect their new relationship with this third work.⁷ Nor is there any recognition that in the 1601 and 1611 versions *Rosamond* precedes *Delia*, complicating our understanding of the relationship between these two poems. These changes to Daniel's works have at times been described as neutral or unimportant: Danijela Kambaskovic-Sawers for example suggests that Daniel is 'concerned with stylistic improvement', which vastly understates the number of changes and their holistic nature across the volumes in which they appear.⁸

⁵ As well as the 28 sonnets printed with Q1 of *Astrophel and Stella* (1591), *Delia* went through two editions in 1592, and one in 1594, 1595, 1598, 1601, 1602, 1611 and 1623. *Rosamond* was printed after *Delia* in 1592 (both editions), 1594, 1595 and 1598, appeared before *Delia* in 1601, 1602, 1611 and 1623, and was printed without any of the sonnets in 1599, 1605, and 1607. For a full list of Daniel's publications and their ordering, see Appendix B.

⁶ Kenji Go, 'Samuel Daniel's *The Complaint of Rosamond* and an Emblematic Reconsideration of *A Lover's Complaint*,' *Studies in Philology*, 104, no.1 (2007): 82-122 (83).

⁷ John Pitcher, editor of the forthcoming Oxford edition of Daniel's works, provides the fullest account of the printing history of these various editions, though his focus is on their editorial rather than literary repercussions. See his 'Editing Daniel', in *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts, Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1985-1991* (Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Text Society, 1993), 57-73. The fullest account of Daniel's publications remains H. Sellers, 'A Bibliography of the Works of Samuel Daniel 1585-1623,' *Oxford Bibliographical Society: Proceedings and Papers* 2, no.1 (1927): 29-45 supplemented in 2, no.4 (1930): 341-2.

⁸ Danijela Kambaskovic-Sawers, *Constructing Sonnet Sequences in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance: A Study of Six Poets* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2010), 131.

It is the evolving textual relationship between *Delia*, *Rosamond*, and *Cleopatra* that I explore in this chapter. I argue that Daniel repeatedly revises the content and structure of these works in order to explore his own anxieties about appearing in print, and how ‘fame’ (an idea present in all three works) had both positive and dangerous repercussions. In doing so, I discuss the four primary structures present in the seven editions, and chart the evolution of Daniel’s work and thought throughout the 1590s and early 1600s. I also argue that attending to these variant bibliographic structures in relation to the textual changes across the editions reveal multiple *Delias*, each one part of an ongoing and fluid negotiation of Daniel’s own career, as well as experiments with material intertextuality which chime with the formal innovations of the other poets examined in this thesis. Together, the four editions discussed below – those of 1592 (Q1), 1592 (Q2), 1594 (S1) and 1601 (F1) - demonstrate that reading *Delia*, *Rosamond*, and *Cleopatra* without an understanding of their shared material and thematic links risks distorting our understanding of these works, and of Daniel as a poet.

A Note on the Texts of Delia

As mentioned above, and as will be made clear in the discussion below, *Delia* has an exceptionally complex textual history, and as I will be dealing with several versions of this work, I have adopted an approach that will allow as much clarity as possible in referring to the variant structures of Daniel’s sonnet sequence. To begin with, it will be useful to outline the evolution of *Delia* between 1591 and 1601.

In 1591, twenty-eight sonnets by Daniel were attached to *Astrophel and Stella*. These sonnets lack a title for the sequence as a whole, make no reference to *Delia*, and do not possess the same thematic or narrative trajectory as the later editions. Twenty-five of these sonnets appeared the following year in the first edition of *Delia* (Q1), though they had been heavily revised and appeared in a different order. Taking these differences together, I will not be discussing the 1591 sequence as a version of *Delia*, though as per the discussion of these sonnets in Chapter 2, they possess significant interest as a work in themselves. Later in 1592, *Delia* was republished (Q2), with four sonnets added to the sequence. In 1594, *Delia* was published again in sextodecimo (S1), and was the subject of significant changes.

Four poems were removed, and five added, bringing the new total to 55. Elsewhere in the volume, a significant amount of material was added to *Rosamond* in the only major textual change to the poem in Daniel's lifetime, and *Cleopatra* was also added to the volume. The same structure and arrangement of texts was published again in 1595 (in octavo, O1) and 1598 (in duodecimo, D1) with minor changes to spelling and punctuation. In 1601, however, *Delia* was again republished as part of *The works of Samuel Daniel newly augmented* (F1), with two new sonnets added, and a large number of small changes made to individual sonnets.⁹ As part of an ambitious retrospective of Daniel's publications in the 1590s, this text of *Delia* occupied an interesting position: it came last in the volume (excepting the short 'An Ode' and 'A Pastoral'), and was preceded directly by *Rosamond*, the text which had so often appeared after it.

Delia was published only once more during Daniel's lifetime, in 1611, with the text and its ordering in relation to Daniel's other works unchanged from 1601. As a result, we have four versions of the sequence: 1592a (50 sonnets), 1592b (54 sonnets), 1594 (55 sonnets), and 1601 (57 sonnets). Though the sonnet count increases slowly across the decade, this slight increase obscures the radical reworking that took place between editions; despite only increasing by a single sonnet, the 1594 edition deleted four, and added five sonnets to the 1592b edition, for example. These versions present an obvious problem, as additions or subtractions from the sequence necessarily require the re-numbering of the sonnets which follow the change. As a result, I have included an overview of the individual sonnets included in each volume in Appendix B. Though individual sonnets appear and disappear across the versions, the structure of the sequence remains virtually unchanged. This allowed for a synoptic approach with a single consistent numbering of the sonnets included in the editions between 1592 and 1601. All references to sonnet numbers will be in respect to this scheme, unless indicated otherwise.

⁹ John Pitcher notes that just as Daniel wrote in almost every genre open to him, so too was his work published in most of the formats used in early modern print culture. For a more thorough analysis of the varying formats and states of Daniel's work, see Pitcher 'Essays, works and small poems: divulging, publishing and augmenting the Elizabethan poet, Samuel Daniel,' in *The Renaissance Text: Theory, Editing, Textuality* ed. Andrew Murphy (Manchester and New York: University of Manchester Press, 2000), 8-28.

Though this will involve mis-numbering the sonnets as they may appear in individual volumes, the varying structures of *Delia* necessitate a clear distinction between versions, while also allowing some discussion of the same poem in different sequences, sometimes occupying different positions. This approach allows for one clear system of numbering across all of the versions, as well as allowing for a much quicker visual assessment of the structural differences between the versions. In addition, Appendix C provides an overview of Daniel's publications until 1601, including the arrangement of each volume's contents.

'Nor graver browes have judg'd my Muse so vaine'

The narrative of *Delia* can be briefly summarised, as the sequence contains few of the clear narrative developments present in contemporary works like Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*, or Spenser's *Amoretti*. The sequence opens with the speaker already in love with the eponymous *Delia*, and though she is disinclined to reciprocate his feelings, the speaker appears to have hopes that she may relent. As the sequence continues, the speaker uses a range of arguments to persuade her, though with an increasing tone of bitterness as it becomes clear that no amount of pleading will change her mind. Late in the sequence, the speaker's attention turns to the project of immortalising her in verse, even if she will not relent. Finally, the sequence ends on a note of disappointment, with the speaker wondering what, if anything, has been achieved by his efforts.

Many of the standard tropes of Petrarchanism appear in the sequence, particularly those articulating the relationship between the poet and the beloved. The poet's love is frequently represented as a kind of religious devotion, with *Delia* described as a 'temple of the proudest frame' (12.2) in which the poet's 'faith' (appearing some fourteen times in the sequence) attempts to make itself apparent. For all of the poet's devotion, however, *Delia* seems to have little interest in reciprocating his advances, responding with something between a lack of interest and anger at his attempts to woo her. On a number of occasions, she is represented as directly refusing his actions or promises: while the poet offers to 'sacrifize my youth, and blooming yeares', *Delia* 'respects not it' (21.5-6).

The quasi-religious imagery and the unrelenting nature of the beloved construct what is familiar as a Petrarchan power dynamic: the poet is in a position of absolute submission, without any means to effect real change in the mind of a beloved who is distant, silent, and unrelenting. In this respect, *Delia* is typical of the narrative that is found in most of the other sonnet sequences of the early modern period. *Delia* does, however, offer one innovation within this standard model; rather than being totally dependent on his words to ‘persuade’ Delia to love him, the poet returns repeatedly to the threat that his writing poses to her. In a gesture to the potential readers of the poems, the poet suggests that those in a similar predicament will immediately understand his writing:

You blinded soules whom youth and errors lead,
 You outcast Eglets, dazled with your sunne:
 Ah you, and none but you my sorrowes read,
 You best can judge the wrong that she hath dunne. (3.9-12)

Delia’s actions in the poem are frequently described as unfair, ‘cruel’ or ‘wrong’, and there is a recurring suggestion that in the face of the poet’s clear devotion, her continued disdain approaches the category of a moral error. At the same time, however, this sonnet appears to look outside of the standard two-character Petrarchan narrative and suggest that others will be reading this sequence and passing judgement on Delia as a result. This threat runs throughout the entire sequence, with the poet repeatedly invoking an imaginary readership who will join the speaker in condemning her responses to his love. In sonnet 15, for example, the speaker makes this threat directly to Delia: ‘Let this suffice, the world yet may see, / The fault is hers, though mine the hurt must be.’ (l.13-14)

While this gesture to an audience for the poems outside of Delia alone appears to offer a position of power for the speaker, it also acts as a potential source of anxiety concerning his own reception by those readers. From the outset of the sequence, the speaker presents an image of his work and character as already having been judged by those who have seen the poems; if Delia had not been so beautiful, then the poet would not have written:

O had she not beene faire and thus vnkinde,
 Then had no finger pointed at my lightnes:
 [...]
 Then had no Censors eye these lines suruaide,
 Nor grauer browes have iudg'd my Muse so vaine;
 No sunne my blush and errour had bewraide,
 Nor yet the world had heard of such disdain. (7.2-3,5-8)

Rather than Delia, it is the poet who suffers from the act of having his poems exposed to a wider audience. As a result of writing the poems for her, he can be accused of youth and folly by those who would expect more serious behaviour, a reading made more forceful by the feminine rhyme 'lightness' in line 3: just as the unaccented hypermetrical syllable seems to extend beyond the proper confines of the pentameter, so too does the poet's behaviour appear to range beyond the acceptable parameters of social expectation.¹⁰ It is not only the act of writing that is here considered inappropriate ('so vaine'); the pursuit of love itself is seen as an 'error' on the part of the poet. This word appears repeatedly in the sequence, each time attached to the poet's pursuit of love: in sonnet 5 the poet blames his 'youth and error' (l.1) for bringing him to his present unhappy state, while sonnet 46 admits of his readers that 'th'error of my youth they shall discover' (l.13). This amorous enterprise is never defended by the poet: he, like his readers, is conscious that his work is considered far less important than the more weighty topics that his verse might address, a thread picked up by Spenser in his discussion of Daniel in *Colin Clouts*, cited at the opening of this chapter.

Perhaps the most interesting word in the section of sonnet 7 quoted above is 'Censors', a word that occurs only once in the entire sequence. Though we might immediately imagine these readers to be related to the 'grauer browes' that pass judgement on the topic of his poetry, reading the volume as a whole suggests that Daniel may be referring to an actual act of censorship in which he was involved: the publication of the 1591 quarto of Philip Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella*. As mentioned

¹⁰ This connects closely with the prodigal motif explored in Chapter 1, though unlike many works of this period, these anxieties are not present in the paratexts of the volumes, but within the poems themselves.

in Chapter 2, Daniel's work is the largest contribution to the volume other than that of Sidney himself, and appears to echo the distinctive bitterness and anger I suggested was a feature of *Astrophel and Stella* in the structure that volume presented. Though this sequence of poems bears little resemblance to *Delia*, it nonetheless acted as Daniel's first appearance (as a poet) in print, and elicited an act of censorship by the Stationers' Company shortly afterwards. Daniel directly refers to this event in his preface to his dedicatee, Mary (Sidney) Herbert, a paratext that appears only in the two 1592 quartos:

Right honorable, although I rather desired to keep in the private passions of my youth, from the multitude, as things vtterd to my selfe, and consecrated to silence: yet seeing I was betraide by the indiscretion of a greedie Printer, and had some of my secrets bewraide to the world, vncorrected: doubting the like of the rest, I am forced to publish that which I neuer ment. (A2r)¹¹

Though assuming the rhetorical position of a reluctant author was by the 1590s a conventional, and almost expected, feature of prefatory material, Daniel in this case is referring to a real event. His case for being 'betraide' in this fashion is strengthened by reminding Mary Herbert that he appeared alongside her brother (pointedly referred to as 'Astrophel' here, part of the title given to the work by the 1591 volume) in a volume that was almost certainly published without her consent.

While mentioning this set of circumstances offers the occasion for dedicating the volume to Herbert, the particular terms in which Daniel does so seem to have deep resonances with the language of the poems themselves. He laments that his

¹¹ Scholars have been divided about the possible involvement of Daniel in the printing of the 1591 volume. Henry Woudhuysen notes that the question is not just Thomas Newman's 'access to a stolen manuscript of Sidney's poems but also to an unauthorized transcript of Daniel's sonnets' (*Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 372). He suggests that Daniel is one of the likely candidates for providing the materials to Newman, and notes that the printer of the 1591 volume (John Charlewood) was also chosen to print Q1 and Q2 of *Delia*. Klein suggests that Daniel had 'nothing to lose everything to gain' by appearing alongside Sidney (*Exemplary Sidney*, 138). For a more sympathetic view, and a suggestion Daniel was abroad when the volume was published, see Mark Eccles 'Samuel Daniel in France and Italy,' *Studies in Philology* 34 (1937): 148-67.

poems have been ‘bewraide’ to the world: a word repeated in sonnet 7 in which the speaker mentions the ‘Censors’ who have read his work. Similarly, the language of the preface emphasises the personal nature of the poems: they are the ‘private passions of my youth’ which were written for the poet alone, not for ‘the multitude’. As has been mentioned above, the poems repeatedly meditate on their own erroneous nature, often linking their themes and passions with the ‘youth’ of the writer. Lisa M. Klein reads Q1 as constructed to appeal specifically to Mary Herbert, for whom ‘Delia’ was a fictional cypher.¹²

Klein’s reading has much to commend it, and it is certainly true that as his relationship with Herbert changed, so too did the tone and content of his paratexts, as we will see below. Mary Ellen Lamb notes, however, that the image of Herbert’s patronage and her ‘circle’ at Wilton are less persuasive than often imagined in earlier scholarly assessments, and that works were frequently dedicated to noble recipients on a prospective basis, rather than being carefully coded at every step to appeal to a single reader.¹³ Helen Smith echoes this sentiment, noting that the possibility of adding dedications to individual presentation volumes ‘highlights the multiplicity and adaptability of the printed book, and reminds us that dedications may be less enduring or specific than they appear’.¹⁴ Our knowledge of Daniel’s later activities demonstrate that he was conscious of the flexible nature of his dedications, with several copies of his work surviving with unique dedications to particular individuals. One such example is the copy of his 1601 *Workes* presented to Thomas Bodley, which contains a unique dedicatory poem that presents Daniel’s book as cooperating in Bodley’s aims for his library.¹⁵ In another celebrated case, Daniel can

¹² Klein, *Exemplary Sidney*, 139.

¹³ Mary Ellen Lamb, ‘The Countess of Pembroke’s Patronage,’ *English Literary Renaissance* 12, no.2 (1982): 162-179. See also Lamb’s forceful dismantling of the more exaggerated accounts of Herbert’s patronage in *Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), 68-71.

¹⁴ Helen Smith, *'Grossly Material Things': Women and Book Production in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012), 62.

¹⁵ The poem is discussed by Francis X. Connor, *Literary Folios and the Idea of the Book in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 90-92. John Pitcher notes that Daniel rarely inscribed these poems by hand, instead having them printed and bound with the individual copies (‘Editing Daniel,’ 59).

be seen reworking a verse epistle to Margaret, Countess of Cumberland as a poem for Lady Elizabeth Hatton.¹⁶

An alternative way to read this dedication, and the poems which share its language, is as Daniel's real or feigned uncertainty about launching a career as a public poet. Though he was a poet who made frequent use of both manuscript and print, John Pitcher notes that a distinct note of anxiety is present throughout Daniel's writings, especially those in public view:

Such sensitivity is rooted in his personality, but it is also the anxiety of a poet moving from a world of aristocratic patrons and manuscripts into a world of print: from songs to open letters, from silence to Babel (his major trope), from the fit audience though few to the half-educated mass public that raises its hydra heads in Musophilus.¹⁷

Whether sincere or conventional, constructing the preface by means of a vocabulary that occurs directly in the poems promotes an identification of Daniel with the speaker of the sequence. Like his speaker, he has been 'betraide', and his indiscretions opened to the judgement of the common reader and the 'censor[s]' who for one reason or another saw fit to remove the book from circulation. Rather than the preface acting as a plea for patronage alone (though undoubtedly this was one of his aims), I argue that this is a careful exploration of the risks and dangers of appearing in print by an author entirely uncertain of his reception.

In Q2, also published in 1591, four poems were added to the sequence as it appeared in Q1, in a single block between sonnets 29 and 30 in the Q1 numbering. These sonnets emphasise precisely the themes I have suggested the first version of *Delia* concerns itself with: the reception of the poems and the poet by current or future readers, and particularly the anxiety that the poet will be judged both for his themes and for the quality of his poetry. Sonnet 30 (in my numbering) begins conventionally, lamenting the 'tormented thought' (l.1) that consumes the speaker,

¹⁶ The poem is described by Arthur Freeman, 'An Epistle for Two,' *The Library* 5th Series, 25 (1970): 226-36. See also Margaret Maurer, 'Samuel Daniel's Poetical Epistles, Especially those to Sir Thomas Egerton and Lucy, Countess of Bedford,' *Studies in Philology* 74, no.4 (1977): 41844.

¹⁷ Pitcher, 'Benefitting from the Book', 79.

and his accusation that Delia is acting unfairly towards him. In the third quatrain, however, the speaker moves in a different direction, threatening: 'Ile tell that world that I deseru'd but ill, / And blame my self for to excuse thy heart' (l.9-12). As the sequence gradually retreats from the threats of exposure that appeared earlier in the sequence, the prominence of the poet's reputation among future readers becomes one of the central concerns of the sequence. Sonnet 31, an otherwise conventional poem on Delia's eyes, returns the reader to a focus on the poet's reception, noting that her eyes, like stars, lead the poet into 'endles errors whence I cannot part' (l.12).

Sonnet 32 is perhaps the crucial addition to the sequence in Q2. It is the only poem in the first two editions to carry a subtitle: 'To M.P.' Though there is no direct information as to the addressee in the text of the sonnet, I will suggest that the most likely candidate is M[ary, Countess of] P[embroke].¹⁸ This was the title by which she was addressed in the preface, and this poem only appears in Q2; when the dedication to Mary Herbert is removed from the volume, so too is this poem. If we accept Mary Herbert as the likely addressee, some puzzling aspects of the poem take on new significance. As this is a crucial poem in the sequence, it will be useful to quote the sonnet in its entirety:

Like as the spotlesse *Ermelin*, distrest,
 Circumpas'd round with filth and lothsome mud:
 Pines in her grieffe, imprisoned in her nest,
 And cannot issue forth to seek her good.
 So I, inuiron'd with a hateful want,
 Looke to the heauens, the heauens yeelde forth no grace,
 I search the earth, the earth I finde as skant,
 I view my self, my self in wofull case.
 Heauen nor earth will not, my self cannot worke
 A way through want to free my soule from care:
 But I must pine, and in my pining lurke,

¹⁸ Samuel Daniel's editors, as early as John Morris, *Selections from the poetical works of Samuel Daniel* (Bath: C. Clark, 1855), have likewise suggested Mary Herbert as the likely addressee. Alexander Grosart suggests that the same 'M.P.' mentioned in Daniel's earlier *Worthy Tract of Paulus Jouious* (1585) is a more likely candidate.

Lest my sad lookes bewray me how I fare.
 My fortune, mantled with a clowd obscure,
 Thus shades my life so long as wants endure. (32.1-14)

The ‘ermelin’, or ermine, was a creature proverbially said to be extremely protective of its purity, to the extent of preferring death to staining its white fur.¹⁹ The poet compares himself directly to an ermine, burdened with a ‘hateful want’ that threatens to be harmful to himself. The central lines of the poem (lines 6-8) emphasise this internal constriction with their own grammatically restricted phrases, each employing an anadiploitic repetition to replicate the poet’s own inability to move beyond this desire. Crucially, however, the speaker is also concerned about his desire being revealed to others, fearing that his looks will ‘bewray’ him.

Once again, the speaker is concerned not only with his feelings, but the way in which those feelings might cause him to be judged by others. The fear that his physical appearance might betray his inner thoughts transforms the speaker into a kind of text, which might be ‘read’ by those around him. This theme is frequently alluded to elsewhere in the sequence, and forms the central metaphor of sonnet 47 (‘Read in my face a volume of dispaire,’ l.1). The ermine is the subject of a few scattered literary references in the decades before Daniel’s publication, but the most recent poet to invoke the creature had been none other than Philip Sidney, in sonnet 86 of *Astrophil and Stella*. In addition, one of the *imprese* described in Sidney’s *Arcadia* shows an ermine, with the motto ‘Rather dead than spotted’.²⁰ Given the context of the ‘M.P.’ dedication, this seems like a pointed reference once again to the real-world publication of Sidney’s, and as a result, Daniel’s, poems.

The final poem added in Q2 again touches on the theme of reputation and reception, and, as in sonnet 30, the poet appears determined to accept the judgements of future readers in order to allow Delia to escape unbesmirched. He promises to ‘hide her sinne’ (l.10), in order that, even if the world might ‘seeme her deede to

¹⁹ One literary example is Thomas Lodge’s *Euphues Shadow* (London: Abell Ieffes, for Iohn Busbie) in which one character rails against woman, describing them ‘as full of despights [i.e. ‘scorn’ or ‘distain’] as the Ermine of spots,’ H4r.

²⁰ Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia* (London: William Ponsonby, 1590), L1v-L2r.

blame' (l.13), he can nonetheless prevent her being recognised in the afterlife by the 'Elisian ghosts;' (l.14). As a result of these four poems added to Q2, we can see Daniel focusing on the theme of reception that was already present in both his dedication to Mary Herbert, and in the sonnets of Q1. That these poems all discuss the theme of reception suggests that Q2 aimed to emphasise and explore further the fears of the speaker concerning publication and readership. On the one hand, they offer a potential weapon against Delia, given the scattered threats to expose her cruelty to the world. On the other, this position of strength quickly descends into a tortuous state for the poet, since he himself is subject to the same judgement. And as a young man educated in a humanist tradition, his pursuit of love might seem vain at best, or indicative of a juvenile state at a time of life when such things should be relegated to the past.

Taken as a whole, it is clear that Daniel made some efforts to remind his readership of his prior appearance in print; rather than attempt to excuse that publication at too great a length, he reshaped the sequence to meditate precisely on the theme of unwanted exposure to the world. In *Delia*, the poet is constantly working in reference to two audiences: Delia herself, and the general mass of readers who at various points appear to be imagined as discovering, or as having actually read and 'judged' his poems. From the early threats to Delia, the speaker can be seen as gradually accepting that his 'youth and error' have been exposed, and that while he cannot control his poems' reception, he can nonetheless work to transform the volume into one which allows Delia's beauty to persist after her death. In many respects the volume appears to be a battle over reading, with the poet attempting to control at least part of his reception in the face of a hostile audience.

'The spot wherewith my kinde, and youth did staine it'

In both Q1 and Q2, *Delia* is immediately followed by *Rosamond*, a long poem in rhyme royal stanzas that recounts the story of Rosamond Clifford, mistress to Henry II. Rosamond was frequently mentioned in sixteenth-century histories of Henry II, with the emphasis falling upon the King's adultery and its disastrous consequences; John Stow records that Rosamond was the first of several affairs that prompted the King's thoughts of divorcing his wife, Queen Eleanor, which led to 'great discord

betwixt the Kings of England and France'.²¹ Similarly, Holinshed records that this affair not only prompted marital discord, but that 'for a further reuenge, she by means of hir sonnes [...] caused warres to be sturred and raised against the king to his great vnquietnesse'.²² Though the truth of the story that this liaison produced children is disputed, Rosamond's contemporary reputation was as a source of marital and political agitation. It is in this context that Daniel's Rosamond laments that she 'hath little left her but her name, / And that disgrac'd, for time hath wrong'd the same' (l.20-21).

The narrative of *Rosamond* sees the eponymous Rosamond appearing before the poet of *Delia*, and asking that he take up her story in verse '[t]o forme my case, and register my wrong' (l.35) as others had done for less deserving women of British history.²³ In other words, *Rosamond* begins by picking up precisely the themes that were so prominent in the final sequence of poems in *Delia*. Rosamond has been the subject of much speculation by interpreters of her life, and thus stands as a terrifying realisation of the fears expressed by the poet in *Delia*: regardless of the context of her actions, she has been unfairly judged and rendered into an emblem of the sins of which she has been accused. In reading *Rosamond* as a poem primarily concerned with the idea of reception, I will suggest that Daniel continues and expands themes broached in *Delia*, and that, within the narrative of his volume, he uses the poem as a space for his speaker to rehabilitate Rosamond as a mirror for the speaker's own fears about his reception by readers.

From the outset of the poem, it is clear that it is the question of her 'fame' that summons Rosamond from the 'horror of infernall deepes' (l.1). She arrives still

²¹ John Stow, *The chronicles of England from Brute until this present yeare of Christ* (London: Ralph Newberry, 1580), O3v.

²² Raphael Holinshed, *The Second volume of the Chronicles* (London: John Harrison, George Bishop and others, 1587), D4r.

²³ The female complaint became an unexpected site of literary competition in this period: Rosamond bitterly points out that Jane Shore 'passes for a Saint' (l.26), acknowledging Thomas Churchyard's contribution to *A Mirror for Magistrates* (London: Thomas Marsh, 1559). Daniel in turn received a critique from Michael Drayton in the voice of Matilda (*England's Heroicall Epistles*. London: Peter Short for Nicholas Ling, 1598). See the introduction to Kerrigan, *Motives of Woe*, and Götz Schmitz *The Fall of Women in Early English Narrative Verse* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 105-152 for further discussion. See also Kambaskovic-Sawers, *Constructing Sonnet Sequences*, 166-7 for a discussion of the intertextual nature of sonnet sequences in this period.

contaminated by the sins she committed in her life: ‘A sheete could hide my face, but not my sin, / For Fame finds neuer tombe t’inclose it in’ (l.3-7). In terms reminiscent of the Delia-poet, Rosamond identifies her ‘youth’ as one of the causes for her ill-repute: errors committed in the course of love are seen to spring directly from her inexperience and lack of maturity. Other words establish an immediate thematic continuity with *Delia*. ‘Fame’ connects with a number of poems in the final third of *Delia*, and in this respect it is important to note that ‘fame’ was not an unambiguously positive word in Elizabethan England. Stemming from the Latin *fama*, the word could suggest:

Public opinion, idle talk, rumour, and reputation as well as fame; both a good name and a bad name were called *fama*; and while *fama* indicated information or news, at the same time it meant the image formed of a person by that information.²⁴

As a result, we can see Rosamond extending and complicating the ‘fame’ mentioned in *Delia*: while the poet represented the fame he could bestow on Delia in universally positive terms, Rosamond offers a darker alternative: without some form of controlling influence, positive fame risked degenerating into negative fame.

This is emphasised by Rosamond’s contrast between her physical grave and her lack of a fixed and stable ‘tombe’ for her reputation. In sonnet 36 (40 in Q2), the poet promises that his ‘papers’ (l.1) will achieve immortality for Delia despite her fears that they will ‘[b]ewray’ (l.2) her to the world. At the climax of this promise, the poet declares that Delia will be ‘[u]nburied in these lines reseru’d in purenes; / These shall intombe those eyes ...’ (l.10-11). Rosamond seems to be making an explicit comparison between her state and that of Delia, with the crucial difference that she lacks a poet to help her control her reception. She laments: ‘No Muse

²⁴ Thelma Fenster and Daniel Lord Smail, ‘Introduction’ in *Fama: The Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe*, eds. Thelma Fenster and Daniel Lord Smail (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 2. One illustrative contemporary definition is Thomas Thomas in his *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae* (Cambridge: Richard Boyle 1587) who defines *Fama* as ‘Fame, bruit, a common talke, rumor, or noise of a thing: report, tydings, renownm, praise, good name or reputation: also an old and settled opinion (though vncertaine) in mens mindes’ (Z2r).

suggests the pittie of my case, / Each penne dooth ouerpasse my iust complaint'
(1.23).

Until now the poem has been written as if entirely in Rosamond's own voice, and it is precisely at this moment when she reveals her lack of 'muse' to defend her that we learn the Delia-poet is involved in this enterprise. Rosamond speaks directly to the Delia-poet, begging him 'To take this taske, and in thy wofull Song / To forme my case, and register my wrong' (1.34-5), with the potential benefit to him being that 'Delia may happe to deynge to read our story' (1.43). The slip into 'our' here might be seen as referring to Rosamond herself, but more tellingly it might be read as Rosamond encouraging the poet to sing on her behalf, with the 'story' coming to stand for both of them, given the anxiety about reception already voiced in his sonnets.

Rosamond's story can be broken into three distinct sections. In the first, she describes her happy youth under the watchful protection of her Parents, whose 'eye did guide / The indiscretion of my feeble wayes' (1.85-6) at their country home. Arguing that her beauty was more suited to grander venues than these surroundings, her 'frindes mine honour sought to rayse, / To higher place' (1.89-90) and helped her relocate to the court, where she attracted great attention and learned that she was capable of both attracting and controlling the interest of the men there. Most notable of these was King Henry II, who in sharp contrast to his military victories elsewhere was 'vanquisht by a glaunce' (1.164), and immediately fell to persuading Rosamond to be his lover. This attempt to persuade Rosamond might be seen as the second stage of the narrative, with Rosamond holding firm against his attempts until the intervention of a courtly lady, 'A seeming Matrone, yet a sinfull monster' (1.216), who argues for her capitulation in terms that are disturbingly reminiscent of those used by the Delia-poet. She submits to Henry's advances and is placed in a secret bower within a maze in order to keep the affair hidden.²⁵ Finally, in the third phase, Queen Eleanor discovers the affair, tracks down Rosamond, and forces her to drink poison, after which Rosamond dies.

²⁵ Jason Lawrence notes the rich intertextual nature of this episode, which draws on Ovid's tale of Dedalus's labyrinth and Tasso's *La Gerusalemme liberate* ('Samuel Daniel's The Complaint of Rosamond and the arrival of Tasso's Armida in England,' *Renaissance Studies* 25 (2011): 648-665).

In the course of this narrative, Rosamond continually refers to her ‘fame’, and laments her lack of control over it. Even during her lifetime, it is fame that is blamed for the ultimate uncovering of her affair; after she has begun her relationship with Henry and been placed in a maze in order to escape detection, Rosamond notes that ‘nothing can be done but Fame reports’ (l.560). Continuing, she suggests:

Fame doth explore what lyes most secrete hidden,
 Entring the closet of the Pallace dweller:
 Abroade reuealing what is most forbidden,
 Of trueth and falshood both an equall teller (l.561-564)

The trochaic force of ‘Entring’ reinforces the thematic concern of this stanza: despite Henry’s best efforts to sequester Rosamond from the world, fame nonetheless uncovers their affair. Again, Rosamond notes that fame has both positive and negative repercussions.

Upon finding Rosamond’s body, Henry promises to ensure that Rosamond’s memory will live on, but focuses on conveying her beauty, not her identity or virtues: ‘after ages monuments shall find, / Shewing thy beauties title not thy name’ (l.691-2). This curious emphasis on the physical aspects of Rosamond might be explained by Henry’s single-minded interest in Rosamond’s charms, but it draws our attention once again to the division made between the body and fame at the start of the poem. Though Rosamond is buried with ‘all the rites pomp could devise’ (l.702) and is ‘richly tomb’d’ (l.704), no provision is made for recording the difficult circumstances of her seduction to allow for a more balanced appraisal of her actions. Ironically, even these attempts to memorialise her physical beauty proved ineffectual, since her tomb was destroyed during the Dissolution (l. 701-721).

Until this point, the relationship between Rosamond and the Delia-poet has been relatively straightforward, with Rosamond requiring his aid in rehabilitating her reputation. In this respect, poetry is placed in sharp contrast with other, more physical ways of recording information for posterity, and its effectiveness in doing so is unquestioned. But in the precise moment when Rosamond turns her attention back to the Delia-poet, a very different view of poetry is suddenly made apparent:

And were it not thy fauourable lynes,
 Reedified the wracke of my decayes:
 And that thy accents willingly assignes,
 Some farther date, and giue me longer daies,
 Fevve in this age had knowne my beauties praise.
 But thus renewd by fame, redeemes some time,
 Till other ages shall neglect thy rime. (l.715-21)

The argument that poetry sustains (positive) fame proceeds unproblematically until the final line, when the memorialisation that has seemed poetry's power is suddenly revealed to be as transitory as the physical objects that it supposedly improves on. Just as the Catholic builders of her tomb 'esteem'd so holy, /The wiser ages doe account as folly', so too does Daniel's poetry run the risk of being displaced by changes of taste and fashion. Though it might continue to communicate fame longer than physical equivalents, poetry is nonetheless subject to decay, and cannot offer the kind of immortalising power that has been suggested so far. The appearance of this line in the terminal position of the stanza violently reinforces its message: just as we learn that poetry itself cannot guarantee survival, the line, sentence, and stanza are all brought to a halt.

Architectural metaphors occur frequently in Daniel's writing about poetry. In his most celebrated example, 'To the Reader' which prefaces his 1611 *Certaine small workes*, Daniel compares the act of writing to that of building:

[...] I refurnished out this little frame,
 [...] Some rooms enlarged, made some less than they were;
 Like to the curious builder who this year
 Pulls down and alters what he did the last (l. 2-7).

Francis X. Conner reads this poem as illustrative of Daniel's conception of the printed book as an ongoing process rather than fixed and unalterable object.²⁶ Conner's reading emphasises Daniel's interest in print as a collaborative medium,

²⁶ On this poem, see also Maren-Sofie Rostvig, 'A Frame of Words: On the Craftsmanship of Samuel Daniel,' *English Studies* 60 (1979): 122–37.

the value of books lying in their use rather than their form. Daniel uses images of print, reading, and the book trade to offer a model for the socially beneficial use of books, and his repeated poetic tropes of order, balance, and harmony—particularly as expressed in his architectural metaphors—reiterate the importance of the collaboration necessary in the production and use of books.²⁷

Rosamond is not simply about a sympathetic retelling of Rosamond's story, or a subtle critique of Petrarchanism from the position of a woman, though both of these are certainly true.²⁸ Rather, *Rosamond* continues to explore the anxiety voiced at numerous points in *Delia*, where the poet worries about the judgements that might be passed about his character and work as it is made public. The conclusion of *Delia* hoped that, even if he might attract personal censure, his verse would nonetheless manage to convey Delia's beauty and his love to future readers beyond their natural lives. *Rosamond* suggests that even this cannot be guaranteed: poetry simply operates on a different time-scale to material memorialisation, rather than entirely transcending it.

If we read *Rosamond* with this in mind, certain puzzling features of the poem begin to make sense. One episode that has attracted much commentary is the long speech by the courtly woman (l.225-301) which replicates many standard Petrarchan tropes in the course of convincing Rosamond to acquiesce to the King's advances. Some of these bear a striking resemblance to those used by the *Delia*-poet. In sonnet 31, he warns Delia:

No Aprill can reuiue thy withred flowers,
Whose blooming grace adornes thy glorie now:
Swift speedy Time, feathred with flying howers,
Dissolues the beautie of the fairest brow. (l. 9-12)

The courtly lady makes a very similar argument with the same imagery:

²⁷ Connor, *Literary Folios*, 89. For further discussion of this architectural interest, see Pitcher, 'Divulging', especially 26-7.

²⁸ This is the most frequent reading of *Rosamond*. See as an illustrative example David Ian Galbraith, *Architectonics of Imitation in Spenser, Daniel, and Drayton* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 84.

Thou must not thinke thy flowre can alwayes flourish,
 And that thy beautie will be still admired:
 But that those rayes which all these flames doe nourish,
 Canceled with Time, will haue their date expyred... (l. 239-242)

The logic and conclusion of these two sections are almost identical; in the latter case it proves part of a rhetorical argument that actually succeeds in convincing Rosamond to love, with the disastrous consequences outlined above. The reuse of the Delia-poet's language and specific metaphors does more than simply offer a critique of Petrarchanism: it suggests that poetry not only lacks the stable and eternising function that the sequence claims, but that the text itself might be wrenched beyond all recognition, and put to uses far less savoury than their initial function. In this respect, the fact that the two passages above discuss decay might be seen to apply to poetry as much to physical beauty; as much as the text might strive for coherence and a stable identity, it can nonetheless degenerate into authorising (and even facilitating) immoral behaviour.

In my discussion of *Delia* above, I suggested that one of the primary themes of the sequence is the question of reception, and that the Delia-poet's fear about how his readers might judge his behaviour and character is fundamentally intertwined with the real-world circumstances of the volume. The preface to Mary Herbert reproduced many of the key words and phrases used throughout the sequence, and as a result fostered a strong auto-referential connection between the real-world Daniel and the poet of the sonnet sequence. In doing so, Daniel transformed his unauthorised publication in the 1591 *Astrophel* volume into the fiction of the sonnet sequence published under his own name, but also used it as a means to explore the anxieties of entering into print, and what readers might come to believe about the work's author. In *Rosamond*, we see something similar happening: Rosamond is deeply anxious about her reputation, and complicates the 'fame' of the Delia-poet by pointing out that fame might have negative as well as positive connotations. The poem also suggests that the language of poetry might be twisted to other ends, and that even if it survives longer than physical objects, it ultimately risks falling into obscurity. At the end of the volume, Rosamond's salvation is unclear because it entirely depends upon how readers of Daniel's collection judged it: much like the

fate of Daniel himself. His continued success as a writer depended on the approval of Mary Herbert, but also on the unnamed ‘lovers’ he imagines reading his work; in this regard both he and Rosamond remain in an uncertain state as the volume closes and is sent into the world.

Delia and *Rosamond* together form a highly self-conscious work; regardless of whether the real Daniel shared the anxieties of his fictional counterpart, it nonetheless is clear that his entry into print replicates and complicates his own experience of having his work read, and possibly disapproved of, by audiences beyond his control. The same epigraph from Propertius, ‘aetas prima canat veneres postrema tumultus’ [Let the poet’s first age sing of love, his last of war] appeared on the title page to both Q1 and Q2. If this might seem to suggest more epic ambition from the new poet, it appears that that trajectory relied entirely on the love poems’ favourable reception by readers, though this was something neither the *Delia*-poet, nor Daniel, could control, despite their best attempts.

‘What glory or disgrace here this world lends’

In 1594, the third edition of Daniel’s *Delia* and *Rosamond* was published, featuring some substantial differences in format, content, and structure. In the first place, the book is a small, thick sextodecimo rather than the quarto form of the first two editions. This may have been a decision designed to capitalise on the evident popularity of *Delia*, given that even with the smaller space available for type, the edition would only have required 12.5 full sheets, the same as required for Q2, even with the substantial addition of material in S1. At the same time, the effect of this smaller format is to create a heightened sense of the intensely private and personal nature of the work it contains. As well as this change in format, the book also contains *Cleopatra*, a classical verse drama that immediately follows *Rosamond* and accounts for around 40% of the material in the volume. Both *Delia* and *Rosamond* also feature new material, and each of these changes seem to be directly related to the themes explored in *Cleopatra*. With the addition of the neoclassical drama to the volume, the change in format may also have indicated its association with humanist editions of classical literature, what Martyn Lyons calls a ‘*Libretto da mano*’ in his

classification of format types.²⁹ Zachary Lesser suggests that Simon Waterson oriented both his publishing, and titles held in his bookshop, towards works that can be broadly described as humanist or educational in focus, including eventually acting as the London agent for John Legat, the Cambridge university printer.³⁰ As such the small format may have been intended to tie Daniel's volume into Waterson's publishing strategy, as well as promoting Daniel as a 'modern classic'.

The title page outlines the content of the volume as: DELIA | *and* | ROSAMOND | *augmented*. | CLEOPATRA, making clear that the former two works have been altered, while the third is a new addition. Such claims were conventional, and not always truthful, but in the case of Daniel, as mentioned above, each new edition did provide a revised text. It will be my argument that the addition of *Cleopatra* and the changes to *Delia* and *Rosamond* can be seen to reorient the argument presented in Q1 and Q2, and that the same works are made to articulate a very different discussion as a result of their new material contexts. In this volume we can see Daniel's earlier work being manipulated into new forms as he established himself in the print culture of the 1590s.

One of the most immediately obvious changes to the 1594 *Delia* is the excising of the prose dedication that was so crucial to the reading of the 1592 texts provided above. In place of Daniel's prose dedication, there is instead a single sonnet addressed to Mary Herbert which takes a far more confident tone than had previously been the case.³¹ Rather than pleading for Herbert's protection, the

²⁹ Martyn Lyons, *A History of Reading and Writing in the Western World* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 68–70.

³⁰ Zachary Lesser, 'Shakespeare's Flop: John Waterson and The Two Noble Kinsmen,' in *Shakespeare's Stationers: Studies in Cultural Bibliography* ed. Marta Straznicky (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 177-195 (179). Lesser also highlights the fact that Waterson published playbooks as 'literary texts for reading rather than records of performance' (182), suggesting that Daniel's *Cleopatra* found a natural place among the other texts in the Crown bookshop.

³¹ Klein reads this as evidence of Daniel's newfound confidence, having secured Herbert's patronage. In a different approach, Jason Lawrence suggests that the more confident tone is noticeable throughout the sequence, and that it relates closely to Daniel's increasing fluency with Italian, as measured by the number of Italian sources used in comparison with the largely French models for Q1 and Q2. See Jason Lawrence, '*Who the Devil taught thee so much Italian?*': *Italian language learning*

dedicatory sonnet declares the poems to have been partially composed by her, so important has her support been to Daniel. He asks that she ‘vouchsafe now to accept them as thine owne, / Begotten by thy hand and my desire’ (l.6-7). Rather than the cautious description of the sonnets as ‘private passions’ revealed to the public and requiring defence, the genesis of the work is reframed to make Mary Herbert, not Daniel’s personal experience, the point of origin for his work.³²

As I have argued above, the prefatory material in the 1592 volumes helped to construct an auto-referential relationship between the Daniel of the dedication and the speaker of the sonnets, both of whom appeared to be engaged in a battle for their interpretation by a reading public. This potential ambiguity of identity and the emphasis on paralleling biographical and narrative fictions are utterly absent from the 1594 volume; instead, Mary Herbert is credited with almost the entire process of bringing the poems into existence. Daniel does, however, mention one aspect in which he is still important in bringing the poems into existence: the ‘travail’ of actually writing them, punning between the senses of ‘suffering’, ‘child-birth’ and ‘travel’.³³ Though almost the entire sonnet focuses on Mary Herbert’s contributions, the terminal couplet brings their respective functions into focus: ‘the travail I may challenge mine, / But yet the glory (Madam) must be thine.’ (l. 13-14).

This emphasis on labour is extremely important in the context of the 1594 *Delia*, which takes on a rather different shape than had emerged in Q1 and Q2. As discussed above, Q2 added four sonnets to the sequence, each of which emphasised the theme of reception, and particularly the poet’s worries about being read in a negative light by a readership beyond his control. In the 1594 edition, sonnets 27, 32,

and literary imitation in early modern England (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 62-106.

³² Marta Straznicky, ‘Reading through the Body: Women and Printed Drama,’ in *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England* ed. Marta Straznicky (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006), 59-79 reads Daniel’s representation of Herbert’s influence as largely passive. Helen Smith notes that this underemphasises Daniel’s description of Herbert setting him the task of writing, and assigning her ‘masculine agency’ in shaping the work (‘*Grossly Material Things*’, 191).

³³ "travail, n.1, 4, and 7". OED Online. June 2016. Oxford University Press. [<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/205252?rskey=hv9mTK&result=1&isAdvanced=false>] (accessed September 01, 2016).

and 33 are removed, while sonnets 17, 35, 52, and 56 are added. The result is that the 1594 *Delia* has 55 sonnets in total compared to the 54 of Q2, with the changes mostly located in excising three central sonnets and adding four more spread throughout the sequence. As has been argued in the case of Q2, each of these four added sonnets has a thematic similarity that suggests Daniel is reshaping his work to a particular end rather than simply altering it because of a dissatisfaction with his earlier versions; there is a global consistency to the added material that suggests a particular aim on the part of the writer.³⁴ To properly explore the interpretive effects of these changes, it will first be necessary to explore the changes made elsewhere in the volume, with the new stanzas in *Rosamond* and the addition of *Cleopatra*.

Cleopatra, a long verse-drama, is the single biggest change introduced in S1, making up a substantial proportion of the total length of the volume. In the introductory poem to Mary Herbert, Daniel makes it clear that the work is a successor to Herbert's own *Antonius*, published the previous year. In the course of the narrative we also find that the work engages with the neo-stoical themes of Herbert's work, as well as her translation of Philippe du Mornay's *A Discourse of Life and Death*, which was published with *Antonius*.³⁵ *Cleopatra* poses an interesting problem as a character within the narrative, especially with respect as to how a reader is supposed to judge her behaviour. Various characters, including *Cleopatra* herself, point out the sins of which she is guilty, with the most frequent (and most damning) being her pursuit of private love, which ultimately brings about the ruin of her kingdom and the Ptolemaic dynasty. Even in Daniel's 'argument' that prefaces the play, he summarises the misery wrought by her actions: 'And so hereby came the race of the Ptolomies to be wholly extinct, & the flourishing ritch Kingdome of Egipt utterly over-throwne and subdued' (I1r).

³⁴ Daniel had a consistent habit of revising his work, altering around two fifths of his output in Pitcher's estimation, with some lines revised three or more times ('Editing Daniel', 18). See also Gillian Wright, 'The Politics of Revision in Samuel Daniel's *The Civil Wars*,' *English Literary Renaissance* 38, no.3 (2008): 461-483 for a discussion of the ideologically-motivated revisions to Daniel's longest work.

³⁵ Margaret P. Hannay reads Daniel's play as continuing both the narrative and the moral assessment of Herbert's *Antonie*, *Philips Phoenix: Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 128-9.

Nearly all the characters in the play rehearse similar sentiments, including Cleopatra herself, who appears to admit her own culpability from the outset. In the first scene, consisting of a long soliloquy, she suggests:

But what know I, if th'heavens haue decreed,
 And that the sinnes of Egipt haue deseru'd,
 The *Ptolomeyes* should faile, and none succeed,
 And that my weakeness was thereto reseru'd.
 That I should bring confusion to my state,
 And fill the measure of iniquitie:
 Licentiousnes in mee should end her date,
 Begunne in ill-dispens'd libertie. (I4r)

Though phrased in the abstracting language of 'fortune' and the will of 'th'heavens', Cleopatra nonetheless seems to recognise that the general ruin experienced by her people has resulted directly from her private sins, as she joined Antony in military conflict with Octavian (titled 'Caesar' in the play) as a result of their relationship. Much of the language surrounding their relationship touches on the question of sin, and though the characters rarely address the topic directly, they allude to the fact that their affair is adulterous; Antony was of course married to Octavian's sister Octavia, and his alliance with Cleopatra is cast as one that transgresses moral as well as political boundaries. This confusion of personal and political is one of the recurring ideas of the play, with 'Egipt' in the above quotation clearly encompassing Cleopatra's own self as well as her embodiment of her country.

Despite this criticism, the reader is given several reasons to regard Cleopatra as a more sympathetic character. In the first instance, her devotion to Antony is clearly sincere. In her long monologue that opens Act 1, Cleopatra compares her devotion to Antony to the situation that was frequently the case during the height of her reign:

[...] now I am taught,
 In death to love, in life I knew not how.
 For whilst my glory in that greatnes stood,
 And that I saw my state, and knew my beauty,

Saw how the world admir'd mee, how they woode,
 I then thought all men, must love me of dutie,
 And I love none [...] (I5r)

Like Rosamond, Cleopatra admits to being fully aware of her physical beauty, as well as of the advantages given to her by her royal status. She was frequently the object of devotion, but it was a devotion shaped both by a superficial acknowledgement of her beauty, and by political expediency. Cleopatra's own love is represented as being equally superficial, believing not only that she deserved to be the object of adoration (borne from 'dutie'), but that she was destined to 'love none' in response.

Over the course of the play many characters remark that Cleopatra is significantly less beautiful than was the case in her youth, including Cleopatra herself. As a result, she sees Anthony's devotion as sincere in a way that other suitors never were: '[w]hilst others fayn'd, thou fell'st to love in earnest' (I5r).³⁶ Daniel presents Cleopatra as reciprocating with equal sincerity: at the outset of Act 5, we are told that Dolabella, a Roman nobleman, has sent offers of love to Cleopatra. At a moment in which Cleopatra is most in need of support, she declines his advances, noting that her affections belonged to Anthony, and so are not hers to give to anyone else. Many of the scenes in the play that do not feature Cleopatra contain characters who play no further part in the drama, and so seem designed specifically to comment on individual aspects of the narrative, or Cleopatra herself. This particular scene seems to demonstrate the gulf between the political expediency that has governed Cleopatra's previous behaviour and her new appreciation for love in her relationship with Anthony. That this scene immediately precedes the account of Cleopatra's death makes clear that her decision comes with the knowledge that she might still obtain a measure of reprieve and freedom, emphasising the self-determining aspect of her suicide.

³⁶ Loyalty was clearly a subject close to Daniel's heart, judging from his close relationships to his patrons, and with Simon Waterson, with whom he published all but one of his printed works, lived with for a short time, and named as one of the overseers of his will. See Connors, *Literary Folios*, 202 and John Pitcher, 'Daniel, Samuel (1562/3–1619),' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online edition, ed. David Cannadine (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7120>] (accessed September 2, 2016).

Act 2, scene 1 is another occasion in which two characters appear for the only time in the play. In this case, two philosophers, Philostratus and Arius, discuss the ongoing calamities of Egypt, as well as debating the ethics of suicide. In particular, Philostratus notes that despite his learning, he found himself begging with ‘servile breath’ for his life (K4v). He states that despite the rhetorical praise given to stoicism in the face of death, it is exceptionally difficult to overcome our very human desire to live at all costs:

And yet what blasts of words hath learning found,
To blow against the feare of death and dying
What comforts unsick Eloquence can sound,
And yet all fayles us in the poynt of trying. (K4v)

The unstressed final syllable of ‘trying’ reiterates his point: suicide is an exceptionally difficult act to carry through despite one’s convictions, and the artificial extension of the line beyond its base metrical form mirrors the extension of Philostratus’ life beyond what he believes it should have been. As mentioned above in respect to Dolabella, this scene seems unnecessary to the narrative of the play except to place Cleopatra’s own suicide in context. Cleopatra *does* manage to overcome her instinctual desire to live, placing her decision in stark contrast to the wise but all too human speakers of this scene. Daniel takes pains to demonstrate Cleopatra’s hesitation just before she kills herself with the asps smuggled into the palace, in language that seems to mirror that of the philosophers. In short, despite the criticism levelled at Cleopatra for her disastrous military alliance with Anthony, she is shown to possess great self-control and bravery. Only the Chorus mounts anything like a serious criticism of her suicide: Caesar is fully aware of this possibility, the philosophers suggest it is likely, and Nuntius (the character who relates her death) describes her suicide as ‘that act / That hath so great a part of glory wonne’ (N4v).

As a result, the reader is given ample opportunity to recognise both positive and negative aspects of Cleopatra’s character, and the characters of the play seem equally balanced between praise and blame. It should also be noted that the destruction of the Ptolemaic dynasty, for which Cleopatra is blamed, actually results from the actions of Octavian, who bribes her son’s tutor to kill him. In any case, Cleopatra seems fully aware that she will leave a difficult and contradictory image

for history. In the first scene of the play she has already decided on suicide, and notes:

Though life were bad, my death may yet be prais'd,
That I might write in letters of my blood,
A fit memorial for the times to come:
To be example to such Princes good
That please themselves, and care not what become. (I4r)

Cleopatra here not only notes the polysemic nature of her life, but that her negative example might have a positive function: demonstrating to future rulers the danger of indulging in personal pleasure to the detriment of the state they govern.

Cleopatra's suggestion that she will 'write [...] a fit memorial' for herself in history is more than an assertion of her own self-determinacy, however. The play not only rehearses a debate between life and death, but the battle between Octavian and Cleopatra for the 'meaning' of Cleopatra in a wider sense. From the outset it is made clear that Octavian plans to take Cleopatra to Italy in order that 'Rome should see my scepter-bearing hands, / Behind mee bounde, and glory in my teares' (I3v). Several references are made to the happiness that the ladies of Rome will have in seeing Cleopatra reduced to a prisoner, and Octavian himself describes her as his 'greatest Trophay' (L2r). In short, Octavian is keen to inscribe Cleopatra with a particular reading: that of his own military success, and the superiority of Rome over her rival nations, as well as Cleopatra's own fall from grace. Cleopatra's suicide, then, is her determined intervention in this act of inscribing meaning, and prevents Octavian from having free play to determine how she will be 'read' by the world. In this respect, it is crucial that the play begins with Cleopatra locked in a monument, and Octavian trying by force and entreaty to remove her: the word 'monument' is important thanks to Daniel's use of it in both *Delia* and *Rosamond*, and in his dedicatory poems to Mary Herbert. Metaphorically, the physical battle of the monument replicates the thematic battle between Cleopatra and Octavian, with both

determined to construct the meaning of Cleopatra for the wider world and posterity.³⁷

In this light, *Cleopatra* addresses many of the themes already explored in my discussion of Q1 and Q2 above. Cleopatra is guilty of personal indiscretions, and those errors (the word performs an important function here as in *Delia* and *Rosamond*) form the basis for her public exposure and judgement by the world. In the case of *Cleopatra*, however, we can see Daniel making a crucial evolution in his view of fame and interpretation. As suggested above, Cleopatra is a polarising figure who attracts equal amounts of praise and blame from the characters in the play: she is guilty of placing her private passions above the welfare of her state, but also possessed of significant bravery, and genuine love for Anthony. Cleopatra's final speech suggests a consciousness of the divided legacy she will leave after her death: 'What glory or disgrace heere this world lends, / Both have I had, and both I leave behinde me' (N5r). In place of the resignation of the 1592 *Delia*-poet, or the uncertain attempt of *Rosamond*, *Cleopatra* seems to argue for a more complex aspect of fame; rather than a single holistic judgement, an individual might be better seen as a complex series of positive and negative acts and characteristics, and might also have more say in their future interpretation than was the case in the 1592 volumes.

Sign'd with my blood, subscrib'd with Conscience pen

When we examine the rest of the 1594 volume with an understanding of this subtle evolution in Daniel's conception of fame many of the changes to *Delia* and *Rosamond* begin to appear as thematically consistent alterations rather than examples of Daniel's restless editing of his earlier work. The majority of the text of *Rosamond* is virtually unchanged from that presented in Q1 and Q2, but has a substantial

³⁷ Thomas P. Roche highlights the importance of the monument in *Delia* and *Rosamond*, and makes a case for the shaping of the 1592 volumes with this structure in mind, Thomas P. Roche, *Petrarch and the English Sonnet Sequences* (New York: AMS Press, 1989), 343-379. The many changes to *Delia* after 1592, as well as the addition of *Cleopatra*, however, make it very difficult to argue for a numerological patterning in these volumes in the way that Roche suggests.

addition at the moment of Rosamond's death. Unlike the quarto texts, in which Queen Eleanor was a silent presence taking revenge on Rosamond, S1 dwells on this moment of confrontation. Eleanor abuses Rosamond with a series of invectives: 'thou impudent uncleane, / Base graceles strumpet ...' l. 605-6.

Giving Eleanor a voice in the text emphasises the similarity of Rosamond and Cleopatra's relationships with their respective partners: both are complicit in acts of adultery, and in both cases the wives are keen to see justice brought on their rivals. We are told that of all the women of Rome who look forward to seeing Cleopatra in captivity, Octavia will take the greatest satisfaction, while in Rosamond's case, Eleanor is the crucial figure in forcing her death. In addition to the similarity in situation, Daniel also draws a parallel between their respective deaths: both women kill themselves with poison, and in both cases their method of death is referred to as an 'arte'. Cleopatra repeatedly uses the term in convincing her servant to fetch the asps, while Eleanor uses the term in describing the poison to Rosamond (l.606).

Although the additions draw out the parallels between Cleopatra's and Rosamond's 'crimes' and their deaths, the majority of the additions in 1594 focus on Rosamond's self-recrimination as she lies dying. As described in the previous section, Rosamond in 1592 is concerned to emphasise the difficulty of her situation, caught between her desire for chastity and the seductions of both King Henry and the court woman.³⁸ In 1594, by contrast, Rosamond offers a far more self-aware account of her life and actions, outlining in detail the incorrect choices that she made in betraying her chastity for worldly advancement. The crux of the additions are the eleven stanzas addressed to other women, particularly those 'that proude with liberty and beautie [...] / Glitter in Court [...]' (l.657-659), to whom she intends to 'Speake what I feele, to warne you by my woe' (l.661). In the course of these stanzas, Rosamond argues for the fundamentally sinful nature of feeling pride in one's beauty, or valuing the opportunity for advancement, above a proper acknowledgement of chastity as the primary virtue for a woman. Among Rosamond's targets are the cynical and immoral women ('Vilde Orators of shame,'

³⁸ Roche suggests that Daniel did not intend a 'sympathetic' view of Rosamond, and that her desire to have lovers sigh her name has hints of Catholic sentiment that mark her as idolatrous in an early modern Protestant conception (*Sonnet Sequences*, 344-5).

l.714) who attempt to persuade young woman to use their sexuality for profit, just as she has been misled by the older courtly woman earlier in the poem. Indeed, the eleven stanzas dedicated to Rosamond's advice are a direct parallel to the speech given by the courtly woman, which also numbers eleven stanzas.

In drawing this direct parallel, it appears that Daniel is demonstrating an evolution in Rosamond's position in the text; rather than simply being a young woman misled by the cynical inhabitants of the court, Rosamond emerges as a moral counterweight to the previous arguments advanced in favour of sexual profligacy. From her new position, experienced in the ways of the court, Rosamond offers a robust critique of the cynical sexuality of the nobility, and uses her experience not to induct new members into her sins, but to offer the possibility of a more morally acceptable way of mediating between political intrigue and sexual morality. Like Cleopatra, Rosamond is aware that her life and actions will be used as a negative example by history, and while the 1592 texts sought to excuse her from blame, Rosamond in 1594 accepts her errors, but also points out that these are balanced *both* by her situation and by her repentance. She laments of herself that:

[...] thy wrongs unseene, thy tale untold,
 Must heere in secrete silence buried lie.
 And with thee, thin excuse together die.
 Thy sin reveal'd, but thy repentance hid,
 Thy shame alive, but dead what thy death did. (l.633-637)

Rather than urging total exculpation, Rosamond adopts a similar position to that which we find explored in Cleopatra: one's reception need not consist of a single, monolithic reading, but might consist of a mixture of both praise and blame.³⁹ The neat parallelism of the couplet expresses this sentiment forcefully, suggesting that only one aspect of Rosamond's life and character has been revealed, while the other information that would help to balance this has died with her.

³⁹ Klein notes that Rosamond's acceptance of some culpability was added after the criticism of Drayton in *Matilda*, and sees this as a direct response to Drayton's accusations that Rosamond was not the innocent party portrayed in 1592 (*Exemplary Sidney*, 158).

Indeed, one might read the 1594 *Rosamond* as arguing less for complete exculpation, but for a balanced and reasonable view of Rosamond's failings and of the moral message that she offers to women in a similar situation. Rosamond's final lines makes this connection with Cleopatra even more apparent:

This, and much more, I would have uttered then,
 A testament to be recorded still,
 Sign'd with my blood, subscrib'd with Conscience pen,
 To warne the faire and beautifull from ill. (l.750-753)

These lines immediately recall Cleopatra's desire to 'write in letters of my blood', which, I have suggested, acts as a crucial fulcrum in the debate over 'meaning' that occurs between her and Octavian. Similarly, Rosamond enacts the same kind of intervention into her interpretation, fashioning her repentance as both made from her ('Sign'd with my blood') and part of her ('Conscience pen').

In both *Rosamond* and *Cleopatra* then, Daniel's view of fame and reputation has undergone some subtle changes from those put forward in 1592, which are reflected in his addition of one text and his changes to another. The changes to *Rosamond* are thematically consistent, occurring in only one part of the poem, and providing a structural and thematic balance to the 1592 text. Rosamond positions herself not as an utterly abused figure who has been unfairly treated by history, but an individual who accepts her culpability and undergoes a genuine repentance which also urges for a similar change for future women in her position. The historical perception of Rosamond is no longer entirely unfair, but one that is partial, acknowledging her failures without also recognising the positive aspects of her character. The addition of *Cleopatra* extends and complicates exactly these ideas, with Cleopatra herself fully aware of the divided picture she will leave to posterity. The changes to *Rosamond* demonstrate that the two works function together, presenting a significantly more complex relationship to fame than was apparent in the 1592 volume. *Cleopatra* is rarely mentioned in discussions of *Delia* and *Rosamond*, but has clear thematic connections to those works. It would appear in this arrangement on three occasions (1594, 1595, and 1598) compared to the two occasions of *Delia* and *Rosamond* appearing together alone, suggesting that at the very least, we need to reconsider the importance of these works as a triptych, rather

than resorting to the earliest versions of Daniel's work as the basis for critical discussion.

Returning to *Delia* with an understanding of the themes explored in *Rosamond* and *Cleopatra*, we can see that the changes made to the sonnet sequence also conform to this new approach to fame and reputation. In the first instance, as mentioned above, Daniel has removed the auto-referential fiction of the dedication, and also excised sonnets 27, 32, and 33. Removing sonnet 27 does not appear to have an immediate impact on the sequence, though given that this sonnet could be seen to suggest some active attempt on the part of Delia, excising it does keep the narrative firmly focused on the speaker. Sonnets 32 and 33, however, crucially emphasised the themes of public exposure and shame that were so prominent in Q2; removing them, along with the dedication, reorients the entire volume.

The first poem added to the sequence is sonnet 17, 'Why should I sing in verse', one of the few changes Daniel ever made to the first third of the sequence. In this poem, the speaker directly questions his purposes for writing, wondering '[w]hy should I strive to make her live for ever, / That never deignes to give me joy to live?' In many respects, this is a poem that is entirely at home in the sequence of 1592, with the speaker contrasting his own fidelity and beneficial poetic work with the far cooler response of his beloved. On the other hand, it also begins to explore the same themes we have already seen in *Rosamond* and *Cleopatra*: that negative characteristics or actions can be explored as well as their positive counterparts. The third quatrain begins to suggest just this:

If her defects have purchast her this fame,
 What should her vertues doe, her smiles, her love?
 If this her worst, how should her best inflame?
 What passions would her milder favours move? (l.9-12)

That the word fame should occur here, as it does in three of the four sonnets added in 1594, indicates that the new material has a particular interest in this concept. The centrality of the word to the sonnet is emphasised by the fact that the '-ame' rhyme occurs not only in lines 9 and 11, but also in lines 1 and 3 (frame / name), an unusual moment for Daniel, who rarely strays from the 'English' structure of three quatrains (with two interlocking rhymes each) and a terminal couplet.

At the same time, these lines clearly draw our attention to the fact that Delia has both ‘defects’ and ‘vertues’, which amounts to a far clearer exposition than was provided in Q1 and Q2. ‘Defects’ is a particularly strong word; although Delia has been criticised for her coldness and lack of reciprocity before, these aspects of her character have never been abstracted into evidence for actual failures of character. The effect of including this sonnet is to bifurcate Delia’s character into positive and negative aspects, mirroring those themes I have already explored in relation to *Rosamond* and *Cleopatra*. The sonnet also addresses an important issue for the 1594 *Delia*: how to justify the speaker’s effort on a topic he knows will be regarded as juvenile by his social circle, and expended on a beloved who shows absolutely no sign of interest across the entire breadth of the sequence. The initial question posed by the first two lines is never answered in the rest of the sonnet: the speaker imagines the even greater praise that might be given if Delia changed her mind, but no justification for the act of writing is forthcoming.

One of the other sonnets added to the sequence, sonnet 35, might be seen to provide one kind of answer, and is worth quoting in full:

And yet I cannot reprehend the flight,
 Or blame th’attempt presuming so to sore,
 The mounting venter for a high delight,
 Did make the honour of the fall the more.
 For who gets wealth that puts not from the shore?
 Danger hath honour, great designs their fame,
 Glorie doth follow courage goes before.
 And though th’event oft answers not the same,
 Suffice that high attempts have never shame.
 The Meane-observer, (whom base Safety keeps,)
 Lives without honour, dies without a name,
 And in eternall darknes ever sleepes.
 And therefore DELIA, tis to me no blot,
 To have attempted, though attain’d thee not.

This sonnet is a curious one when compared to the sequence as it appeared in 1592: only the final couplet mentions Delia at all, while the rest of the sonnet meditates on

the difference between high attempts and the resulting success of those ambitions. The sonnet argues that while '[m]eane-observers' might castigate individuals for their failures, 'th'attempt' means that their 'fall' might be seen to possess more worth than more humble successes. This separation of the act from its success has crucial implications with respect to the evolving attitude to fame demonstrated elsewhere in the volume; unlike the 1592 sequence, where the speaker attempts to justify his failure by changing his objectives (praising Delia instead of seducing her), the 1594 sequence argues for the importance of effort rather than placing the interpretation squarely on the resulting success or failure. The 1592 sequence struggled to excuse the 'error' of the speaker's ways, and in this context the statement that the speaker considers his failure 'no blot' demonstrates a remarkable change. Rather than seeing his poetic mission as a failure, he argues for the worth of the poetry quite apart from its eventual inability to convince Delia: the 'honour' of the work emerges as a consequence of his ambitious attempt.

As a result of removing the auto-referential fiction that framed the 1592 volume, with its many defensive protestations, the 1594 volume strikes a far more confident tone. The speaker, of course, still voices his concerns about his youthful indiscretions being made public, but this sonnet acts as a crucial counter-argument that speaks both to Daniel's evolving ideas about fame and to his growing confidence in the value of his work. A similar note is struck by the final sonnet added in 1594, number 56, which also ties the sequence to *Cleopatra*. The speaker compares himself to the 'noble Roman that would free his land' (l.1), who fails, and in failing attains greater renown than 'if he had the Tyrant over-throwne' (l.4). Though the allusion is oblique, it appears that Daniel is referring to Mucius Scaevola, who intended to kill Porsenna, King of Clusium during a siege of Rome, but killed his secretary in a case of mistaken identity.⁴⁰ The speaker goes on to draw a direct parallel:

So DELIA hath mine error made me knowne,

⁴⁰ This story is repeated in a number of early modern literary sources, praising Scaevola and regarding him as a symbol of bravery and liberty in the face of tyrannical power. See for example Thomas Floyd, *The picture of a perfit common wealth* (London: Simon Stafford, 1600), 132-3, and Thomas Scott, *Vox Dei* (London: 'I.L.' for Richard Rounthwait, 1623), 35-6.

And my deveys'd attempt, deseru'd more fame,
 Then if I had the victory mine owne (l.5-7)

As with sonnet 35, these lines clearly demonstrate a substantial change from 1592: no longer is the speaker entirely condemned for his love, instead he achieves his own 'fame' as a result. That the speaker directly references his 'errour', a word already shown to have importance in the thematic trajectory of Q1 and Q2, demonstrates the extent to which the sequence has changed. In using the very word that was the most crucial indicator of his failure, the Delia-poet instead modifies the framework in which he is being interpreted.

It is clear that the 1594 volume makes significant changes to the themes explored in 1592. The addition of *Cleopatra* is the most substantial, and the longest engagement with the problems of fame and reception that had already been examined in the 1592 volumes. Here, however, Daniel articulates a far more complex relationship, suggesting that fame need not be a single, global reading of an individual or situation, but a network of individual characteristics and actions. Each of those things might be judged as good or bad, but the result is to draw out the complexities of an individual's reception; even in the case of *Cleopatra*, who receives no small amount of criticism for her disregard for her kingdom, her actions in the wake of her capture are regarded as brave and noble by all of the characters in the play.

Both *Rosamond* and *Delia* respond to their new textual partner, demonstrating a continuity of argument across the three texts, as well as changes to the trajectories of the works in themselves. Both texts show the complicating of fame apparent in *Cleopatra* in practise: *Delia* in that the beloved is now seen to have both positive and negative aspects to her character that can be justly praised or blamed in themselves, and *Rosamond* in that the eponymous speaker presents her failure and moral repentance with equal honesty. In *Delia*, however, we can see the importance of this development for Daniel most clearly as it responds to his own poetic practise. Rather than adopting the position of a reluctant author, Daniel strikes a far more confident note, arguing forcefully in his dedicatory sonnet for the eternizing power of poetry. Similarly, the speaker in the sequence offers a counter to the pessimistic vision of his reception present in 1592. Rather than accepting a negative reception predicated on the frivolity of the topic, the speaker articulates a more complex

position: even if the poetry is unsuccessful in execution or intent, the poet might still be praised for his ambition. As a result, we need to be conscious in our reading of Daniel's works that these three texts show clear signs of undergoing targeted revision in order to together explore a single theme. Not only do the three works function as a holistic textual triptych, but the changes to *Delia* and *Rosamond* show demonstrable changes in their approach to fame, deepening and complicating their interactions with this idea, as Daniel himself evolves as a poet, and a successful one, in the landscape of the 1590s.

'Whereto if these my labors shall attaine'

In 1601, Simon Waterson published *Workes of Samuel Daniel newly augmented* in what is believed to be the first volume by a living author with the title 'works', fifteen years before Ben Jonson's more celebrated volume. Many scholars have noted the importance of this volume as one of the last collections of new work by Daniel, before his interests appear to have shifted to prose history. John Pitcher in particular sees it as a definitive transformation in Daniel's own thinking about poetry in print, embodied in the metaphors of his poetry; the 1592 *Delia* is characterised as 'flowing from one source to another' while the folio *Workes* are a fixed and monumental 'made dwelling, pressed into place'.⁴¹ Similarly, Mark Bland reads the folio as laying claim to Daniel as 'the foremost poet of his generation', particularly following the death of Spenser in 1599, a view echoed by Stephen Galbraith.⁴² Certainly, *Workes* seems to acknowledge both Spenser and Sidney.

Recent work has demonstrated that the 1601 volume may have been less monumental than some critical accounts suggest. Francis Connor points out that the cost of a book relates closely to the use of paper rather than format alone, and at only

⁴¹ Pitcher, 'Editing,' 66.

⁴² Mark Bland, 'Appearance of the Text in Early Modern England,' *Text* 11 (1998): 91-154 (121); Stephen K. Galbraith, 'English Literary Folios 1593-1623: Studying Shifts in Format,' in *Tudor Books and Readers: Materiality and the Construction of Meaning* ed. John N. King (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 16-66.

91 sheets Daniel's volume is likely to have cost as much as a large quarto.⁴³ Connor also notes that the volume is actually composed in three distinct units, each with a separate register; as such it 'does not necessarily insist upon a conventional way to organize the included texts'.⁴⁴ Jeffrey Knight has demonstrated that the volume was bound in a variety of formats, and in this respect appears to follow the same strategy used for Spenser's 1611 folio, creating distinct units that could be bought and reconfigured according to the taste of the reader.⁴⁵

This material fluidity matches in many ways the textual history of the *Delia* volumes, outlined above. The work is continually reshaped and edited in order to reorient the themes of the volume as part of Daniel's own exploration of his reputation in print. That his monumental folio was equally fluid is the most appropriate testament to his concerns. Its contents are almost identical to the 1598 *Poeticall Essays*; the only works added in the folio are Book VI of *The Civil Wars*, the short poems 'An Ode' and 'A Pastoral' and *Delia* in its fourth and final form.

Despite the ambitious claims made by the folio as to Daniel's place in English literary culture, his poetry betrays an ongoing uncertainty about the reception it might find. The closing stanzas to Book VI show Daniel's 'muse' as 'weary of blood and slaughter' (115.3) and 'unwilling to proceed' (115.4). In the final line of the unfinished poem, Daniel writes that he 'knowes not yet what to resolve upon, / Whether to leave off heere, or else go on' (115.8). In *Musophilus*, the eponymous character offers a hopeful defence of poetry and learning against the despairing worldview of Philocosmus, Daniel's devil's advocate in the dialogue. At the same time, the poem seems to give voice to the fears that Daniel had expressed so many times before. Many of his countrymen do not even recognise the names Sidney or Spenser (l.441), and readers are quick to criticise poets for their failings:

⁴³ Connor, *Literary Folios*, 67. Connor elsewhere notes that four quartos in 1598 used more than 80 sheets, bringing them very close to the amount used for the 1601 edition (note 22, 199).

⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 70.

⁴⁵ Knight suggests that individual works have been bound without the others of this volume, and that the variation between copies differs to such an extent that 'it is difficult to find two identical editions', *Bound to Read: Compilations, Collections, and the Making of Renaissance Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 2013), 172. On Spenser's 1611 and 1613 editions, see Steven K. Galbraith, 'Spenser's First Folio: the Build-It-Yourself Edition,' *Spenser Studies* 21 (2006): 21–49.

‘Your Vertues by your Follies made your crimes / Haue issue with your indiscretion ioynd’ (l.450-1). This sense of public exposure and ridicule are acknowledged even by Musophilus in the course of his defence of poetry, longing for the day it was no longer possible to be ‘Privately made and publikely undone’ (l.886).

Though all of the parts may not have been bought by every reader, or collected in the same order, it appears that Daniel once again revised *Delia* to cohere with its potential textual partners.⁴⁶ From the structure of S1 (also maintained by O1 in 1598), two new sonnets are added (20 and 23). Sonnet 20, ‘What is it to breathe’, gestures to *The Civil Wars*, with which it would have appeared for the first time. The speaker describes a series of contradictions that emerge from his love for Delia, describing how he is ‘pale with anguish, red with feare’ (l. 2), nodding to the red and white iconography of the houses of Lancaster and York described in *The Civil Wars*. The following line seems to invert the martial situation of Daniel’s epic, in which characters frequently long for peace while being forced to war; the Delia-poet by contrast has ‘peace abroad, and nought within but strife’ (l. 4). The sonnet also seems to reflect on the theme that runs throughout all of the poems that make up the 1601 folio, the fear of articulating himself in a public setting: ‘How to be bold far off, and bashfull neare: / How to think much, and have no words to speake:’ (l. 5-6). Sonnet 23, ‘Tyme cruel time’ once again laments that Delia appears untouched by age, and ‘betraies / Beautie and youth t’opinion and distaine’ (l. 12). Once again, Daniel’s additions to his sonnet sequence focus on the worries articulated across the length of the works collected in 1601.

The final poem added to the 1601 folio from the 1598 collection is ‘A Pastoral’, which as Jason Lawrence has noted, is a translation of the first chorus of Tasso’s pastoral play *Aminta*.⁴⁷ Lawrence reads this poem as participating in a literary debate that was later articulated in greater depth in Daniel’s *A Defence of Ryme* (1602), as well as gesturing towards the growing interest in Italian drama that became his primary literary occupation after 1601.⁴⁸ At the same time, ‘A Pastoral’ once again brings the question of public reception to the fore, with ‘honour’ seen as the primary reason for the decline of the golden age outlined nostalgically in the

⁴⁶ For a discussion of the variant forms of the volume, see Knight, *Bound to Read*, 166-73.

⁴⁷ Lawrence, *Italian Language Learning*, 91.

⁴⁸ *Ibid*, 92-97.

poem. Honour in this setting is an: ‘Idle name of winde: / That Idol of deceit...’ (l.15-16). As the concluding poem to both the bibliographic unit that begins with *Delia*, and the volume as a whole, ‘A Pastoral’ seems to undercut many of the more ambitious aspects of the folio. Rather than presenting Daniel as a confident successor to Sidney and Spenser, the material added in 1601 reinforces anxieties that have been present throughout the Delian structures examined above, concluding mournfully that in the context of the sun’s rising and setting, human life is a ‘short light’ that ‘Comes once to set, and makes eternal light’. (l.67-8). This conclusion is emphasised by the ‘FINIS’ that immediately follows these lines, providing a bibliographical finality to Daniel’s words that closes the poem, the section, and the book.

Conclusion

In the quotation that opened this chapter, Spenser highlighted Daniel’s ‘trembling muse’ (l.420), before urging him to grander projects. In the light of my reading of the *Delia* volumes above, I want to suggest that Spenser may have been a more attentive reader of Daniel than previously noticed. Rather than reading his encouragement as a desire for Daniel to fulfil a similar path along the Virgilian rota that he had previously traced, Spenser’s highlighting of Daniel’s anxieties about his public reception identified one of the primary themes of *Delia*, as well as the material that accompanied it. Daniel more than any other poet of this period appears to have created his most sustained examination of his own reputation and reception through the interaction of multiple works brought together in a shared material context. Each time the sequence appeared alongside other works, Daniel made changes that acutely reflected on their new textual surroundings, quietly advancing new conceptions of fame and reception that mirrored his developing sense of his identity as a printed poet. *Delia* moves from a sequence that expresses a sense of betrayal and public scorn, to a subtle negotiation of the positive and negative aspects of fame, to a final, bleak view of honour and fame.

It is tempting to read these changes in biographical terms; Daniel is a poet who appears to have been sensitive to criticism given the changes made to *Rosamond* following Drayton’s critique, and in *A Defence of Ryme*, which responds directly to Thomas Campion’s *Observations in the Arte of English Poesie* (1602).

Daniel's subsequent progression to drama and prose history also seem to accord with the uncertainty expressed throughout the material added in 1601. Nonetheless, I believe that the evolving structure of *Delia* and its companion poems expresses Daniel's own interest in the ways in which material intertextuality allowed his work to speak across and between its constituent parts. At each stage of Daniel's career, *Delia* appears as a constant source of self-reflection, articulated less in any individual poem than by the intertextual relationships that emerged from each new material context. Reading *Delia* as a single structure, or even as a changing structure without reference to its relationship with the other works with which it was published, drastically misrepresents Daniel's major poetic achievement, as well as his subtle and inventive use of material intertextuality to achieve these aims.

Conclusion

George Herbert's *The Temple: Sacred Poems and Private Ejaculations* was published posthumously in 1633. In this small and intimate volume, readers moved through a series of organisational structures, 'the temple', 'the church', and through a large number of formally diverse poems that together represent an intricate picture of human life and Christian thought. While the volume as a whole refuses to present a coordinated narrative, poems bearing sequentially numbered titles ('Love I,' 'Love II,' etc.), clear verbal parallels between poems, cross-references, and thematic developments all gesture towards a complex relationship between its parts.¹ In 'Holy Scriptures II,' the speaker of the poem meditates on one other example of rich internal intertextual references: the Bible.

OH that I knew how all thy lights combine,
And the configurations of their glorie!
Seeing not onely how each verse doth shine,
But all the constellations of the storie.

This verse marks that, and both do make a motion
Unto a third, that ten leaves off doth lie:
Then as dispersed herbs do watch a potion,
These three make up some Christians destinie:

Such are thy secrets, which my life makes good,
And comments on thee: for in ev'ry thing
Thy words do finde me out, & parallels bring,
And in another make me understood.

¹ The question of what structure, if any, is apparent in *The Temple* has been heavily debated. See as illustrative examples Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979) and Harold Toliver, *George Herbert's Christian Narrative* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University, 1993). See also the useful overview in the introduction to Helen Wilcox (ed.), *The English Poems of George Herbert* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), xxii-xxvi.

Starres are poore books, & oftentimes do misse:
 This book of starres lights to eternall blisse.²

Herbert's image of the Bible is a vast network of interrelated units, each of which 'marks' another, even if the relationship is not made clear until 'ten leaves' later. In the cosmological metaphor of the poem, each verse functions individually, but also combines into grander 'constellations' that trace larger themes and narratives. In at least some respect, this description of the Bible also seems to function as Herbert's meditation on his own 'verse', providing a constant interplay between the forms, language, and metaphors of individual poems in the collection.³

Herbert's provocative metaphor acts as a fitting encapsulation of the structural imagination that this thesis has argued underlies many early modern collections of poetry. Reading these works with an attentiveness to the material-intertextual relationship between their contents offers the possibility of recovering new readings for these texts, and allows a greater appreciation of the formal and bibliographical creativity of early modern writers. In this thesis, I have demonstrated that poets, publishers, and editors in the sixteenth century were keenly aware of the interpretive possibilities of presenting works in a shared material context, and used this technique to achieve particular literary effects.

As explored in the introduction to this study, earlier writers and publishers were certainly conscious of material-intertextual readings, evident in both manuscript and early attempts to encourage reader-directed *Sammelbände*. I have argued, however, that the expansion of the print industry, the development of a burgeoning vernacular literature, and the movement towards shorter poetic forms converged to create a fertile atmosphere of experimentation with 'collections' of more than one text. This is nowhere more apparent than in *Songes and sonettes*, which, while not the first collection of shorter English poems, nonetheless had a

² Text taken from *The English Poems of George Herbert*, ed. Helen Wilcox.

³ On the importance of local relationships between poems in *The Temple*, see Joseph Summers, 'From "Joseph's Coat" to "A true Hymne."' *George Herbert Journal* 2 (1978): 1-12, and Alison Knight "'This verse marks that': George Herbert's The Temple and Scripture in Context' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in Early Modern England, c. 1530-1700*, eds. Kevin Killeen, Helen Smith, and Rachel Willie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016): 518-532

marked effect on the landscape of printed literature.⁴ Tottel's collection presented a large number of poems in a wide variety of forms, and has long been appreciated as providing a model for other writers in the sixteenth century. The organisational structure of the volume has, however, been less appreciated, and particularly in the case of the Surrey section I have suggested that we can see the broad outlines of a narrative trajectory, moving in a standard Petrarchan arc from hope to disillusionment. These hints were taken up by at least two writers later in the period, suggesting that these links were apparent for the volume's early readers.

Songes and sonettes marks a recontextualisation of occasional verse, in which individual poems are tied to their (real or imagined) social context through their titles, and also to one another in a larger textual network of shared themes, images, and language. That scholars have frequently described Tottel's collection and the other mid-century collections as 'miscellanies' vastly underestimates the care with which these volumes were designed by their authors, publishers, or both.⁵ This is nowhere more apparent than *Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, in which Gascoigne dramatizes exactly this process of readers gathering poems and teasing out links between them (whether real or imagined). Gascoigne's collection is the most imaginative of the early responses to *Songes and sonettes*, and satirises many of the conventions that had arisen in the developing genre of the poetic collection. Alongside this playfulness, I have also shown that the texts of Gascoigne's collection can fruitfully be read together, against the critical tendency to explore individual works (particularly *The Adventures of Master F.J.*) in isolation.

Reading the collection as a whole shows Gascoigne's sensitivity to material-intertextual effects, particularly as they pertain to readers' desires to create narratives from unconnected short poems, and to speculate on the biographies of their authors. G.T. emerges as a character across the volume, and his editorial work betrays a

⁴ Though the importance of Tottel's collection has been widely discussed, see also 'The Court of Venus', the most important English example before *Songes and sonettes*. *The Court of Venus*, ed. Russel A Fraser (Durham, N.C., Duke University Press, 1955).

⁵ Edward Arber's edition of *Tottel's Miscellany: Songes and Sonettes* (London, 1870) is generally considered the source of the volume's more popular name. This title persists in modern editions, for example in *Tottel's Miscellany: Songes and Sonettes of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, Sir Thomas Wyatt and Others*, eds. Amanda Holton and Tom MacFaul (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2011).

dangerous mishandling and misreading of his materials. For Gascoigne, G.T. represents both the ingenuity of readers, and the dangers inherent in providing fuel for their speculation, threatening misinterpretation or dangerous assumptions about the life of the writer as a result.

The evidence that Gascoigne's collection may have undergone last-minute changes by the publishers and/or printers also highlights one of the major suggestions from my methodology: that although material-intertextual effects can be authorial, they can also arise from the intervention of print agents, editors, or as an emergent phenomenon from presenting works in a shared material context. Though the editor of *Songes and sonettes* may or may not have intended Surrey's poems to be read biographically, it is clear that some readers did so, and we need to be alert to these possible interpretive effects for readers, even in the absence of clear authorial design. In the case of *Supposes* and *Jocasta*, a number of reasons may have prompted the placement of the plays, but read in the context of the collection it is possible to see them as presenting two examples of 'misreading' with very different consequences. Taken together, they offer a coherent thematic introduction to the themes of *Hundreth*, and reinforce the necessity of dealing with texts as they originally appeared, against the desire to refashion the volume based on our assumptions about Gascoigne's original plans.

Though *Songes and sonettes* and *Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* provide key moments in the development of both vernacular printed poetry and the collection as a form, the majority of this thesis has been dedicated to publications from the 1590s. I have argued that this decade represents an explosion of literary publications, and also sees publishers and poets experimenting with the effects of combining works in a single volume. In the case of *Astrophil and Stella*, I have argued that we can see two radically different visions for Sidney's literary identity. These differences are apparent both in the organisation of the sequence in each volume, and in the placement of the sequence alongside other works. In the original 1591 edition, which placed the 'songs' together after the sonnets, and included poems by other writers, we can see a very different Sidney than in the more familiar structure of 1598. Though almost universally disparaged for being an 'unauthorised' or 'pirated' text, the volume presents a coherent Sidney who appears to be a poet on the model of *Songes and sonnets*, appearing alongside other writers just as Surrey and Wyatt had, and whose poems strike an increasingly misogynistic tone as the volume progresses.

Appreciating that this volume was for seven years the only version of *Astrophil and Stella* available in print is important for assessing Sidney's reception by both readers and writers. It offers one explanation as to why few sonnet sequences that appeared in the 1590s (and inspired at least in part by Sidney's example) possess the same subtle deconstruction of the Petrarchan speaker that occurs in the 1598 version of *Astrophil*. The 1591 version lacks the key verses in which Stella emerges as more than a silent Petrarchan mistress, and the placement of the songs following the sonnets seems to suggest a more tragic narrative for *Astrophil* than Stella's firm but reasonable repudiation in the 1598 edition. This later volume effectively presented a 'first folio' of Sidney's works, and the organisation of the volume speaks to an attempt to assert Sidney's identity as a modern, continental poet in line with the more celebrated examples of Italy and France. Disregarding the 1591 edition risks misunderstanding Sidney's early reception, and the importance of his example to contemporary writers. It also risks reducing the edition to an artless example of profiteering, rather than a coherent construction of a Sidney that differs markedly from that of modern scholarship.

While Sidney's volumes were the product of editorial interventions rather than the author's own wishes, Edmund Spenser represents a poet at the opposite end of the spectrum. Spenser was actively engaged with print as a medium, and experimented with different forms over the length of his career. *The Shepheardes Calender* is often presented as Spenser's most imaginative engagement with the resources of print culture, but I have argued that in both *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe* and *Fowre Hymnes*, we can see him utilising material-intertextual readings to very different ends. In the first of these works, Spenser gathers the long titular poem, and pairs it with a collection of elegies for Sidney. Scholarship has tended to regard these separately, and has very rarely discussed the relationship between Spenser's work and that of the other poets in the collection. I, however, have argued that reading both together shows Spenser acting as the locus for a politically-aligned group of poets and patrons to stand in opposition to the Cecil faction (or those representing their interests) at court. The memory of Sidney acts as an icon for the political, religious, and poetic agreement of the 'Shepheardes nation', and provides the elegies with greater political impetus than has been typically assumed. In *Fowre Hymnes* we see a similar attempt to think with and through the collection as a form, this time responding to criticisms of his own poetic practise, and arguments against

poetry more generally. The evasive dedication to the volume, and the correlation of poetic and divine creation seem designed to provide a defence of poetry, though the addition of *Daphnaïda* represents a typically self-reflexive, Spenserian interrogation of these conclusions. Taking both of these examples together, it is clear that Spenser's use of the collection is more consistent across his works than has been acknowledged, and that material-intertextual links were a key part of his poetic imagination. Separating works from their original context is to the detriment of our assessment of the poems themselves, and risks overlooking a major aspect of Spenser's poetic practice.

If Sidney's works represent the ways in which the same text could be presented to different ends, and Spenser the direct application of material intertextuality to address larger political and poetic themes, Daniel represents a more subtle application in his various versions of *Delia*. In the case of the two former poets, I have demonstrated the dangers in extracting works from their larger material context; in the case of Daniel, I have explored the dangers of reducing differences between editions to variation in language alone. Across the multiple editions of *Delia*, we can see Daniel consistently revising the structure of his sequence, adding and subtracting poems as well as paratextual material and other works. Attending to the holistic nature of these changes shows Daniel's evolving attitude towards his own identity as a printed author, as well as a complex understanding of 'fame' in its historical and contemporaneous context. A number of scholarly works have emphasised the rich intertextual play between *Delia* and *The Complaint of Rosamond*, but none have explored the ramifications of printing both alongside *Cleopatra*, a work I argue addresses similar themes to these two texts. Reading such volumes holistically, and with an awareness of the material-intertextual relationships between their constituent parts offers a more complex picture of Daniel as a poet, which risks being radically understated if any one edition of *Delia* is taken as representative of what was an evolving structure with very different manifestations across the volumes in which it appeared.

Ramifications for future research

Though the four authors considered at length above represent case studies in the importance of reading early modern books as the composite volumes presented to their earliest readers, my research has a number of other implications for future scholarship on early modern poetry. In the first instance, it suggests the presence of a larger ‘formal imagination’ on the part of poets and publishers, which encompasses the structural design and organisation of books as well as an interest in particular literary forms. In this sense, my work overlaps with ‘new formalist’ scholarship, which attempts to reintroduce considerations of form and genre in respect to early modern literary texts.⁶ My work shares the bibliographically and materially-inclined nature of such work, but suggests that our conceptions of ‘form’ may need to extend to larger structures, and that the literary effects of arranging poems is no less important than the arrangement of rhymes for stanzas or poems.

One of the other important ramifications of my work is how frequently early modern readers would have encountered now-canonical authors in the presence of other poets. Gascoigne’s other authors were, of course, fictional, but Sidney and Daniel appeared together (alongside others) in pre-1598 editions of *Astrophil and Stella*, and Spenser fashions himself as the lynchpin of a larger print coterie in *Colin Clouts*. The tendency of literary scholarship to focus on major literary figures has often led to an exclusion of other works that may have appeared alongside canonical texts, and risks overlooking the ways in which poets actively collaborated with others (as in the case of Spenser) or were presented together to early readers (as were Sidney and Daniel). While early modern drama has benefitted from an understanding of the collaborations between playwrights, companies, and publishers, poetry has retained a greater sense of poems as individual creations. In the examples mentioned above, it is clear that a more nuanced understanding of relationships between poets,

⁶ The two most recent and substantial publications dealing with early modern texts in particular are Elizabeth Scott-Baumann and Benjamin Burton (eds.), *The Work of Form, Poetics and Materiality in Early Modern Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); Allison K. Deutermann and Andras Kisery (eds.) *Formal Matters: Reading the Materials of English Renaissance Literature* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013). For a broader overview of New Formalism within literary studies, see *New Formalisms and Literary Theory*, eds. Verena Theile and Linda Tredennick (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

and between poets and publishers, may allow a similar set of new readings to emerge.⁷

The other major implication to emerge from my research is the importance of variant structures and collected texts to the field of editorial studies. As explored in the introduction, influential works by Jerome J. McGann and D.C. Greetham, among others, have encouraged an acceptance of variants and ‘versions’ over an older desire for eclectic, idealised texts. Frequently, however, editorial projects are framed around authors rather than texts, and this can involve the extraction of poems from their context, and the marginalisation or exclusion of works by other writers from modern editions.⁸ The examples of Sidney, where the 1591 text has been largely neglected; Spenser, where the other poets of the *Colin Clouts* volume are dropped and *Daphnaïda* and *Fowre Hymnes* presented individually; and Daniel, where individual versions of *Delia* are preferred over multiple-text editions all testify to the necessity of broadening our editorial horizons to properly appreciate these writers.⁹ If the study of paratexts has demonstrated the importance of reading texts alongside their prefatory materials, my work suggests that this inclusive model of reading requires us to embrace other works in our reading and editing of early modern texts.

Finally, my work also offers a paradigm for reading that can be extended to many other authors in this period. The examples of the mid-century poetic collections by Whitney, Googe, and Turberville (among others) offer one such site of investigation, and the focus on material-intertextual reading may aid in the recovery of the structural artistry of ‘minor’ poets whose formal and verbal dexterity may be more limited than more canonical authors. Though I have terminated my study in 1601 for the purposes of space and a desire to explore the 1590s in detail, a number of later works testify to the ongoing importance of the collection in the seventeenth

⁷ One recent study that emphasises the collaboration between poets and publishers is Stacy Lyne Erickson, *Collaboration in the Marketplace: Writers, Publishers, and Printers in Early Modern London* (PhD Thesis, University of Iowa, 2007).

⁸ The most extreme example is for editions of Shakespeare’s poetry to present ‘The Phoenix and the Turtle’ as an isolated work, extracted from its place in the complex collection *Love’s Martyr* (London: Richard Field for ‘E.B.’ 1601). See for example *The Complete Sonnets and Poems*, ed. Colin Burrow (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

⁹ Forthcoming editions of Spenser and Daniel by Oxford University Press may offer correctives to these complaints.

century. As well as Richard Crashaw and Christopher Harvey, whose works imitated Herbert, one could point to the number of important single-author collections from Robert Herrick, Richard Lovelace, Sir John Suckling, and Abraham Cowley, each of which demonstrate a sensitive approach to organisational texture. John Milton clearly received and transformed the examples of his predecessors, and his 1645 *Poems* and the pairing of *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes* demonstrate a continuing interest in organising collections, and presenting multiple works in a shared material context.

In this study I have argued that early modern books retain much untapped potential, and that a more nuanced approach to their forms and content can recover an aspect of the early modern imagination that has been largely overlooked by modern scholarship. Material intertextuality occurs across the period, and was used by a large number of poets to achieve a wide variety of effects; much more work remains to be done to understand this aspect of early modern writing and I hope that this thesis forms an initial step in such a project.

Appendix A: Spenser Publications, 1569-1611

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Title</u> | <u>Publisher</u> | <u>Other contents</u> |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1569 | <i>A Theatre wherein be represented [...] Voluptuous Worldlings</i> | Henry Bynneman | Epigrams before Spenser's poetry. Long prose treatise following. |
| 1579 | <i>The Shepheardes Calender</i> | Hugh Singleton | Extensive paratexts by 'E.K' |
| 1580 | <i>Three proper, and wittie, familiar letters</i> | Henry Bynneman | Letters by Gabriel Harvey |
| [1581] | <i>The Shepheardes Calender</i> | John Harrison II | Extensive paratexts by 'E.K' |
| 1586 | <i>The Shepheardes Calender</i> | John Harrison II | Extensive paratexts by 'E.K' |
| 1590 | <i>The Faerie Queene</i> | William Ponsonby | Varying numbers of dedicatory sonnets. 'Letter to Raleigh' |
| 1591 | <i>Complaints</i> | William Ponsonby | Collection of Spenser's poems in various genres and forms. |
| 1591 | <i>Daphnaida</i> | William Ponsonby | |

| | | | |
|------|--------------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1591 | <i>The Shepheardes Calender</i> | John Harrison II | Extensive paratexts by 'E.K' |
| 1592 | <i>Axiochus. A most excellent dialogue</i> | Cuthbert Burby | |
| 1595 | <i>Amoretti and Epithalamion</i> | William Ponsonby | <i>Amoretti</i> (sonnets), Anacreontics, <i>Epithalamion</i> |
| 1595 | <i>Colin Clouts Come Homes Again</i> | William Ponsonby | 'Astrophel' and 5 other, non-Spenserian elegies |
| 1596 | <i>The Faerie Queene</i> | William Ponsonby | Books I-III and IV-VI, in separate volumes |
| 1596 | <i>Fowre Hymnes</i> | William Ponsonby | <i>Daphnaida</i> follows titular poems |
| 1596 | <i>Prothalamion</i> | William Ponsonby | |
| 1597 | <i>The Shepheardes Calender</i> | John Harrison II | Extensive paratexts by 'E.K' |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| [1599: Spenser Dies] | | | |
| 1609 | <i>The Faerie Queene</i> | Matthew Lownes | Books I-VI, followed by 'Mutabilite' |
| 1611 | <i>The Faerie Queene: The Shepherd's Calender: Together with other works of England's Arch Poet</i> | Matthew Lownes | Almost all of Spenser's poetry. <i>Axiachus</i> not included. |

Appendix B: Structure of *Delia*, 1592-1601

‘X’ indicates the presence of a sonnet in the sequence, a blank, its absence.

| <u>Number</u> | <u>First Line</u> | <u>1592a</u> | <u>1592b</u> | <u>1594</u> | <u>1601</u> |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Unto the boundless ocean of thy beauty | X | X | X | X |
| 2 | Go wailing verse, the infants of my love | X | X | X | X |
| 3 | If it so hap, this of-spring of my care | X | X | X | X |
| 4 | These plaintive verse, the Posts of my desire | X | X | X | X |
| 5 | Whist youth and error led my wandering mind | X | X | X | X |
| 6 | Faire is my love, and cruel as she is faire | X | X | X | X |
| 7 | O had she not been fair, and thus unkind | X | X | X | X |
| 8 | Thou poor heart, sacrificed unto the fairest | X | X | X | X |
| 9 | If this be love to draw a wearie breath | X | X | X | X |
| 10 | Then do I love, and draw this weary breath | X | X | X | X |
| 11 | Tears, vowes, and prayers win the heardest heart | X | X | X | X |
| 12 | My spotless love hovers with white wings | X | X | X | X |
| 13 | Behold what hap <i>Pigmalion</i> had to frame | X | X | X | X |
| 14 | Those amber locks are those same nets | X | X | X | X |
| 15 | If that a loyal heart and faith unfained | X | X | X | X |
| 16 | Happy in sleep, waking content to languish | X | X | X | X |
| 17 | Why should I sing in verse, why should I frame | | | X | X |
| 18 | Since the first look that led me to this error | X | X | X | X |
| 19 | Restore thy tresses to the golden ore | X | X | X | X |
| 20 | What is it to breathe and live without life | | | | X |
| 21 | If beauty thus be clouded with a frown | X | X | X | X |
| 22 | Come death, the anchor-hold of all my thoughts | X | X | X | X |
| 23 | Tyme, cruel time, come and subdue that brow | | | | X |
| 24 | These sorrowing sighs, the smokes of mine annoy | X | X | X | X |
| 25 | False hope prolongs my ever-certain grief | X | X | X | X |
| 26 | Look in my grief, and blame no not to moan | X | X | X | X |
| 27 | Oft and in vaine my rebel thoughts have ventured | X | X | | |
| 28 | Reign in my thoughts faire hand, sweet eye | X | X | X | X |
| 29 | Whilst by her eyes pursued, my poor heart flew it | X | X | X | X |

| <u>Number</u> | <u>First Line</u> | <u>1592a</u> | <u>1592b</u> | <u>1594</u> | <u>1601</u> |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 31 | Oft do I muse, whether my <i>Delias</i> eyes | X | X | X | X |
| 32 | Like as the spotless <i>Ermelin</i> distrest | | X | | |
| 33 | My cares draw on my everlasting night, | | X | | |
| 34 | The star of my mishap imposed this paining | X | X | X | X |
| 35 | And yet I cannot reprehend the flight | | | X | X |
| 36 | Raising my hopes on hills of high desire | X | X | X | X |
| 37 | O why does <i>Delia</i> credit so her glass | X | X | X | X |
| 38 | I once may see when years shall wreck my wrong | X | X | X | X |
| 39 | Look <i>Delia</i> how we steeme the half-blown Rose | X | X | X | X |
| 40 | But love whilst that thou maist be lov'd again | X | X | X | X |
| 41 | When men shall find thy flower, thy glory pass | X | X | X | X |
| 42 | When winter snows upon thy golden hairs, | X | X | X | X |
| 43 | Thou canst not dye whilst any zeale abound | X | X | X | X |
| 44 | O be not griev'd that these my papers should | X | X | X | X |
| 45 | <i>Delia</i> , these eyes that so admireth thine | X | X | X | X |
| 46 | Fair and lovely maid, look from the shore | X | X | X | X |
| 47 | Read in my face, a volume of dispairs | X | X | X | X |
| 48 | My Cynthia hath the waters of mine eyes | X | X | X | X |
| 49 | How long shall I in mine affliction morne | X | X | X | X |
| 50 | Beauty, sweet love, is like the morning dew | X | X | X | X |
| 51 | I must not grieve my Love, whose eyes would read | X | X | X | X |
| 52 | O whether (poor forsaken) wilt thou go | | | X | X |
| 53 | Draw with th'attractive virtue of her eyes | X | X | X | X |
| 54 | Care-charmer sleep, son of the sable night | X | X | X | X |
| 55 | Let others sing of Knights and Palladines | X | X | X | X |
| 56 | As to the Roman that would free his land | | | X | X |
| 57 | Like as the lute that joys or els dislikes, | X | X | X | X |
| 58 | None other fame mine unambitious Muse | X | X | X | X |
| 59 | Unhappy pen and ill accepted papers | X | X | X | X |
| 60 | Lo here the impost of a faith unfaining | X | X | X | X |

Appendix C: Daniel's Publications and Contents, 1591-1601

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Title</u> | <u>Contents</u> |
|-------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1591 | <i>Astrophel and Stella</i> | Astrophil and Stella 27 sonnets by Daniel poems by other authors |
| 1592 | <i>Delia [...] with the Complaint of Rosamond</i> | Delia (50 sonnets) An Ode Rosamond |
| 1592 | <i>Delia [...] with the Complaint of Rosamond</i> | Delia (54 sonnets) An Ode Rosamond |
| 1594 | <i>Delia and Rosamond Augmented</i> | Delia (55 sonnets) An Ode Rosamond Cleopatra |
| 1595 | <i>Delia and Rosamond Augmented</i> | Delia (55 sonnets) An Ode Rosamond Cleopatra |
| 1595 | <i>The first fowre bookes of the civile wars</i> | Civil Wars (1-4) |
| 1598 | <i>Delia and Rosamond Augmented</i> | Delia (55 sonnets) An Ode Rosamond Cleopatra |
| 1599 | <i>Poeticall Essays</i> | Civil Wars (1-5) Musophilus Octavia to Antonius Cleopatra Rosamond |
| 1601 | <i>Works of Samuel Daniel</i> | Civil Wars (1-6) Musophilus Octavia to Antonius Cleopatra Rosamond Delia (57 sonnets) An Ode A Pastoral |

Bibliography

Primary Manuscript Sources

British Library

Additional MS. 17492

Additional MS. 15232

Additional MS. 61822

Edinburgh University Library

MS Drummond De.5.96

Printed Primary Sources

Albott, Robert. *Englands Parnassus*. London: For Nicholas Ling, Cutherbert Burby and T. Hayes, 1600.

Arber, Edward, ed. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London 1554-1640 A.D.* London: Privately Printed, 1875.

Ariosto, Lodovico. *Orlando furioso in English heroicall verse*. Translated by Sir John Harington. London: Richard Field, 1591.

B., N. *The arbor of amorous deuises*. London: Richard Jones, 1597.

Baldwin, William, ed. *A myrroure for magistrates*. London: Thomas Marsh, 1559.

Barnfield, Richard. *The encomion of Lady Pecunia*. London: G. Shaw for William Jaggard, 1605.

Bodenham, John, ed. *Bel-vedére*. London: Felix Kingston for Hugh Astley, 1600.

———. *England's Helicon*. London: J. Roberts for John Flasket, 1600.

Boiardo, Matteo Maria. *Orlando innamorato, the first three bookes*. Translated by 'R.T.'
London: Valentine Sims, 1598.

Cawdrey Robert. *A Table Alphabeticall, conteyning and teaching the true writing, and
vnderstanding of hard vsuall English words*. London: J. Roberts for Edmund
Weever, 1604.

Chester, Robert, ed. *Love's martyr: or, Rosalins complaint*. London: Richard Field for
Edward Blount, 1601.

Colonna, Francesco. *Hypnerotomachia. = The strife of loue in a dreame*. Translated by
R.D. London: William Holme, 1592.

Coote, Edmund. *The English Schoole-maister*. London: Widow Orwin for Ralph
Jackson and Thomas Dexter, 1596.

The Court of Venus. Edited by Russel A Fraser. Durham, N.C., Duke University Press,
1955.

Covell, William. *Polimanteia, or, The meanes lawfull and vnlawfull, to iudge of the fall
of a common-wealth*. Cambridge: John Legate, 1595.

Daniel, Samuel. *Delia. Contayning certayne sonnets: with the complaint of Rosamond*.
London: John Charlewood for Simon Waterson, 1592a.

———. *Delia. Containing certaine sonnets: with the complaynt of Rosamond*. London:
John Charlewood for Simon Waterson, 1592.

———. *Delia and Rosamond augmented. Cleopatra*. London: James Roberts and Edward
Allde for Simon Waterson, 1594.

- . *Delia and Rosamond augmented. Cleopatra*. London: James Roberts for Simon Waterson, 1595.
- . *Delia and Rosamond augmented. Cleopatra*. London: Peter Short for Simon Waterson, 1598.
- . *The poeticall essayes of Sam. Danyel*. London: Peter Short for Simon Waterson, 1599.
- . *The works of Samuel Daniel newly augmented*. London: Valentine Sims and W. White for Simon Waterson, 1601.
- . *Selections from the poetical works of Samuel Daniel*. Edited by John Morris. Bath: C. Clark, 1855.
- . *Poems and a Defence of Rhyme*. Edited by Arthur C. Sprague. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.
- Davison, Francis, ed. *A poetical rapsody containing, diuerse sonnets, odes, elegies, madrigalls, and other poesies*. London: Valentine Sims for John Bailey, 1602.
- Doni, Anton Francesco. *The morall philosophie of Doni*. Translated by Thomas North. London: Henry Denham, 1570.
- Drayton, Michael. *England's Heroicall Epistles*. London: Peter Short for Nicholas Ling, 1598.
- Floyd, Thomas. *The picture of a perfit common wealth*. London: Simon Stafford, 1600.
- Gascoigne, George. *A hundreth sundrie flowres bounde vp in one small poesie*. London: Henry Bynneman and Henry Middleton for Richard Smith, 1573.
- . *The posies of George Gascoigne Esquire*. London: Henry Bynneman for Richard Smith, 1575.

———. *Complete Works of George Gascoigne in Two Volumes*. Edited by J.W. Cunliffe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910.

———. *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*. Edited by Charles T. Prouty. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1942.

———. *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*. Edited by G.W. Pigman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Herbert, George. *The Temple. Sacred poems and private ejaculations*. Cambridge: Thomas Buck and Roger Daniel, 1633.

———. *The English Poems of George Herbert*. Edited by Helen Wilcox. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Holinshed, Raphael. *The Second volume of the Chronicles*. London: John Harrison, George Bishop and others, 1587.

Homer. *Seauen bookes of the Iliades of Homere, prince of poets*. Translated by George Chapman. London: John Windet, 1598.

Lodge, Thomas. *Euphues Shadow, the battaile of the sences*. London: Abell Jeffes for Iohn Busby, 1592.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Lycans first booke translated line for line, by Chr. Marlow*. Translated by Christopher Marlowe. London: Peter Short for Walter Burre, 1600.

Meres, Francis. *Palladis tamia*. London: Peter Short for Cuthbert Burby, 1598.

Nashe, Thomas. *The Vnfortunate Traveller*. London: Thomas Scarlet for Cuthbert Burby, 1594.

- Puttenham, George. *The arte of English poesie Contriued into three bookes*. London: Richard Field, 1589.
- . *Richard Tottel's Songes and Sonettes: The Elizabethan Version*. Edited by Paul A. Marquis. Tempe, AZ: Renaissance English Text Society, 2007.
- S., R., ed. *The Phoenix Nest*. London: John Jackson, 1593.
- Scott, Thomas. *Vox Dei: iniustice cast and condemned*. London: I.L. for Richard Rounthwait, 1623.
- Shakespeare, William. *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*. General Editors Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- . *The Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint*. Edited by John Kerrigan. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1999.
- . *Hamlet*. Edited by Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006.
- Sidney, Philip. *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia*. London: John Windet for William Ponsonby, 1590.
- . *Sir P.S. his Astrophel and Stella*. London: John Danter for Thomas Newman, 1591a.
- . *Sir P.S. his Astrophel and Stella*. London: John Charlewood for Thomas Newman, 1591b.
- . *The defence of poesie. By Sir Phillip Sidney, Knight*. London: Thomas Creede for William Ponsonby, 1593.
- . *Syr P.S. his Astrophel and Stella*. London: Felix Kingston for Matthew Lownes, c.1597.

- . *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia*. London: Richard Field for William Ponsonby, 1598.
- . *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*. Edited by William A. Ringler, Jr. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- . *Sir Philip Sidney: The Major Works*. Edited by Katherine Duncan-Jones. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Songes and sonettes, written by the ryght honorable Lorde Henry Haward late Earle of Surrey, and others*. London: Richard Tottel, 1557.
- Spenser, Edmund. *The shepheardes calendar*. London: Hugh Singleton, 1579.
- . *Three proper, and wittie, familiar letters*. London: Henry Bynneman, 1580.
- . *Faerie Queene, The faerie queene. Disposed into twelue books*. London: John Wolfe for William Ponsonby, 1590.
- . *Complaints. Containing sundrie small poemes of the worlds vanitie*. London: William Ponsonby, 1591.
- . *Daphnaïda. An elegie vpon the death of the noble and vertuous Douglas Howard*. London: Thomas Orwin for William Ponsonby, 1591.
- . *Amoretti and Epithalamion*. London: Peter Short for William Ponsonby, 1595.
- . *Colin Clouts come home againe*. London: Thomas Creede for William Ponsonby, 1595.
- . *The Faerie Queene. Disposed into twelue bookes*. London: Richard Field for William Ponsonby, 1596.

- . *Fowre hymnes, made by Edm. Spenser*. London: Richard Field for William Ponsonby, 1596.
- . *Prothalamion or A spousall verse made by Edm. Spenser*. London: J. Orwin for William Ponsonby, 1596.
- . *The Faerie Queen: The Shepheards Calendar: together with the other works of England's arch-poët*. London: Humphrey Lownes for Matthew Lownes, 1611.
- . *The Faerie Queene*. Edited by A.C. Hamilton. Harlow: Longman, 2007.
- . *Spenser's Minor Poems*. Edited by Ernest De Selincourt. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- . *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition*. Edited by Edwin Greenlaw *et al.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1943.
- . *The Yale Edition of the Poems of Edmund Spenser*. Edited by Oram *et al.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989.
- . *The Shorter Poems*. Edited by Richard McCabe. London: Penguin, 1999.
- Stow, John. *The chronicles of England from Brute until this present yeare of Christ*. London: Ralph Newberry, 1580.
- Sturm, Johannes. *A ritche storehouse or treasure for nobilitye and gentlemen*. Translated by Thomas Browne. London: Henry Denham, 1570.
- Tasso, Torquato. *Godfrey of Bulloigne, or The recouerie of Hierusalem*. Translated by R.C. London: John Windet for Thomas Mann, 1594.
- Thomas, Thomas. *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae et Anglicanae*. Cambridge: Richard Boyle, 1587.

Tottel's Miscellany: Songes and Sonettes of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, Sir Thomas Wyatt and Others. Edited by Amanda Holton and Tom MacFaul. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2011.

Tottel's Miscellany: Songes and Sonettes. Edited by Edward Arber. London, 1870.

Secondary Sources

Alexander, Gavin. *Writing After Sidney: The Literary Responses to Sir Philip Sidney 1586-1640.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Almasy, Rudolph P. 'Stella and the Songs: Questions about the Composition of *Astrophil and Stella.*' *South Atlantic Review* 58, no.4 (1993): 1-17.

Alyal, Amina. 'Italian weeds and English bodies: translating 'The Adventures of Master F.J.' In *Travels and Translations in the Sixteenth Century.* Edited by Mike Pincombe, 104-119. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Anderson, Randall L. 'Metaphors of the Book as Garden in the English Renaissance', *Yearbook of English Studies* 33 (2003): 248-261.

Armitage, Christopher M., ed. *Literary and Visual Raleigh.* Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2013.

Gillian Austen, 'Gascoigne's *Master F.J.* and its Revision, or. "You aint heard nothing yet!"' In *Narrative Strategies in Early English Fiction.* Edited by Wolfgang Gortschacher and Holger Klein, 67-85. Lewiston, N.Y. and Salzberg: Edwin Mellen, 1995.

———. *George Gascoigne.* Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2008.

———. 'Self-portraits and Self-presentation in the Work of George Gascoigne', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 14:1 (2008).

- . ‘The Adventures Passed by Master George Gascoigne: Experiments in Prose.’ In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Prose 1500-1640*. Edited by Andrew Hadfield, 156-170. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Baker, David J. ‘Spenser and Politics.’ In *The Oxford Handbook to Edmund Spenser*. Edited by Richard McCabe, 48-64. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- Baron, Sabrina Alcorn, Eric N. Lindquist, and Eleanor F. Shevlin, eds. *Agent of Change: Print Culture Studies After Elizabeth L. Eisenstein*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007.
- Barnard, John, and D.F. McKenzie, eds. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume IV: 1557-1695*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Baron, Helen. ‘Mary (Howard) Fitzroy's Hand in the Devonshire Manuscript.’ *The Review of English Studies* 45, no. 179. (1994): 318-335.
- Bates, Catherine. *Masculinity and the Hunt: Wyatt to Spenser*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Beal, Peter. *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Beal, Peter. ‘Notions in Garrison: The Seventeenth-Century Commonplace Book.’ In *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1985–1991*. Edited by W. Speed Hill, 131-148. Binghamton, N.Y.: Renaissance English Text Society, 1993.

- Bedford, Ronald, Lloyd Davis, and Phillipa Kelly, eds. *Early Modern Autobiography: Theories, Genres, Practises*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2006.
- Bennett, H.S. *English Books and Readers 1558-1603*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- . *English Books and Readers 1603-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Bennett, Stuart. *Trade Bookbinding in the British Isles, 1660–1800*. London: British Library, 2004.
- Bennett, Josephine W. 'The Theme of Spenser's *Fowre Hymnes*.' *Studies in Philology* 28 (1931): 18-57.
- Bergvall, Åke. 'Formal and Verbal Logocentrism in Augustine and Spenser.' *Studies in Philology*, 93:3 (1996): 251-266.
- Berkel, Klaas van and Arie Johan Vanderjagt, eds. *The Book of Nature in Early Modern and Modern History*. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.
- Bernard, John D. *Ceremonies of Innocence: Pastoralism in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Berry, Edward. *The Making of Sir Philip Sidney*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- Bieman, Elizabeth. *Plato Baptised: Towards an Interpretation of Spenser's Mimetic Fictions*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.
- Bjorvand, Eimar. 'Spenser's Defence of Poetry: Some Structural Aspects of the *Fowre Hymnes*.' In *Fair Forms: Essays in English Literature from Spenser to Jane Austen*. Edited by Maren-Sofie Røstvig, 13-53. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1975.

- Blair, Anna M. *Too Much To Know: Managing Scholarly Information Before the Modern Age*. New Haven, NJ: Yale University Press, 2011.
- Bland, Mark. 'The Appearance of the Text in Early Modern England.' *Text* 11 (1998): 91-154.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, 2nd Edition. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Bloomfield, Josephine. 'Gascoigne's 'Master F.J.' as a Renaissance proto-novel: the birth of the judicious editor as narrator.' *Essays in Literature* 19, no.2 (1992): 163-172.
- Boffey, Julia. *Manuscripts of English Courtly Love Lyrics in the Later Middle Ages*. Woodbridge: Brewer, 1985.
- . 'London, British Library Add. MS 18752: A Tudor hybrid book,.' *English Manuscript Studies 1100–1700* 15 (2009): 41–64.
- Boffey, Julia and John J. Thompson 'Anthologies and Miscellanies: Production and Choice of Texts.' *Book Production and Publishing in Britain, 1375-1475*. Edited by Jeremy Griffiths and Derek Pearsall, 279-316. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Bond, Edward A. 'Wyatt's Poems.' *The Athenaeum* 2274 (1874): 654-55.
- Borris, Kenneth. 'Reassessing Ellrodt: Critias and the *Fowre Hymnes* in *The Faerie Queene*' *Spenser Studies* XXIV (2009): 453-480.
- Bradford, C. A. *Helena Marchioness of Northampton*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1936.
- Brennan, Michael. 'William Ponsonby: Elizabethan Stationer,' *Analytical and Enumerative Bibliography* 7, no.3 (1983): 91-110.

- Brown, Piers. 'Donne, Rhapsody, and Textual Order.' In *Manuscript Miscellanies in Early Modern England*. Edited by Joshua Eckhardt and Daniel Starza Smith, 39-56. Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.
- Buxton, John. 'On the Date of *Syr P. S. His Astrophel and Stella*...Printed for Matthew Lownes.' *Bodleian Library Record* 6 (1957-61): 614-16.
- Byrom, H.J. 'The Case for Nicholas Grimald as Editor for 'Tottel's Miscellany.' *Modern Language Review* 27, no.2 (1932): 125-143.
- Calhoun, Joshua. 'The Word Made Flax: Cheap Bibles, Textual Corruption, and the Poetics of Paper.' *PMLA*, 126, no.2 (2011): 327-344.
- Cartwright, Kent, ed. *A Companion to Tudor Literature*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Cave, Terence. *Thomas More's Utopia in Early Modern Europe: Paratexts and Contexts*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008.
- Chartier, Roger. *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Translated by Lydia G. Cochrane. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.
- Cheney, Patrick. *Spenser's Famous Flight: A Renaissance Idea of a Literary Career*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
- . 'Colin Clouts Come Home Againe (1595).' In *The Oxford Handbook to Edmund Spenser*. Edited by Richard McCabe, 237-255. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Clarke, Danielle. "'In sort as she it sung": Spenser's "Doleful Lay" and the Construction of Female Authorship.' *Criticism* 42 (2000): 451-68.

- Clegg, Cyndia Susan. *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Connolly, Annaliese and Lisa Hopkins. 'Introduction', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, Special Issue 16 (2007).
- . eds. *Essex: The Cultural Impact of an Elizabethan Courtier*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2016.
- Connor, Francis X. *Literary Folios and the Idea of the Book in Early Modern England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Coren, Pamela. 'Edmund Spenser, Mary Sidney, and the Doleful Lay.' *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 42, no.1 (2002): 25-41.
- Cotter, James Finn. 'The Songs in *Astrophil and Stella*.' *Studies in Philology* 67 (1970): 178-200.
- Crane, Mary Thomas. *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Crewe, Jonathan. *Trials of Authorship, Anterior Forms and Poetic Reconstruction from Wyatt to Shakespeare*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Culler, Jonathan. *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. London and New York: Routledge, 1981.
- Cummings, Robert B., ed. *Spenser: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge, 1971.
- Dane, Joseph. *The Myth of Print Culture: Essays on Evidence, Textuality, and Bibliographic Method*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- . *What is a Book? The Study of Early Printed Books*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2012.

- Danner, Bruce. *Edmund Spenser's War on Lord Burghley*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011.
- Davis, Joel B. 'Multiple Arcadias and the Literary Quarrel between Fulke Greville and the Countess of Pembroke.' *Studies in Philology* 101, no.4 (2004): 401-430.
- . *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia and the Invention of English Literature*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011.
- Daybell, James. *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-Writing, 1512-1635*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012.
- DeNeef, A. Leigh. *Spenser and the Motives of Metaphor*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1982.
- Deutermann, Allison K. and Andras Kisery, eds. *Formal Matters: Reading the Materials of English Renaissance Literature*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013.
- Dragstra, Henk, Sheila Ottway, and Helen Wilcox, eds. *Betraying Ourselves: Forms of Self-Representation in Early Modern English Texts*. New York: Palgrave, 2000.
- Duncan-Jones, Katherine. 'Astrophel.' in *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. Edited by A.C. Hamilton, 192-197. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Dubrow, Heather. "'Lending soft audience to my sweet design': Shifting Roles and Shifting Readings in Shakespeare's 'A Lover's Complaint.'" *Shakespeare Survey* 58 (2005): 23-33.
- Dunn, Kevin. *Pretexts of Authority: The Rhetoric of Authorship in the Renaissance Preface*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1994.

- Eccles, Mark. 'Samuel Daniel in France and Italy.' *Studies in Philology* 34 (1937): 148-67.
- Eckhardt, Joshua. *Manuscript Verse Collectors and the Politics of Anti-Courtly Love Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Eckhardt, Joshua and Daniel Starza Smith, eds. *Manuscript Miscellanies in Early Modern England*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 2 volumes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- . *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Elam, Helen Regueiro. 'Intertextuality.' In *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Edited by Alex Preminger and T.V.F. Brogan, 620-622. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Ellrodt, Robert. *Neoplatonism in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser*. Geneva: Droz, 1960.
- Erickson, Stacy Lyne. *Collaboration in the Marketplace: Writers, Publishers, and Printers in Early Modern London*. PhD Thesis. University of Iowa, 2007.
- . "'I do more confidently presume to publish it in his absence": William Ponsonby's Print Network' in *The Early Modern Book Trade*. Edited by John Hinks and Victoria Gardner, 45-60. London: British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 2014.
- Erickson, Wayne. 'William Ponsonby.' *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, 170 (1996), 204-212.
- . 'Spenser's Patrons and Publishers.' In *The Oxford Handbook to Edmund Spenser*. Edited by Richard McCabe, 106-124. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

- . ‘Spenser and Raleigh: Friendship and Literary Patronage.’ In *Literary and Visual Raleigh*. Edited by Christopher M. Armitage, 89-99. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2013.
- Eriksen, Roy. ‘Spenser's Mannerist Manoeuvres: Prothalamion (1596).’ *Studies in Philology* 90 (1993): 143-75.
- Erskine-Hill, Howard and Richard McCabe, eds. *Presenting Poetry: Composition, Publication, Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Evans, Robert C. and Jeff Moody. ‘The Religious Sonnets of Anne Vaughan Lock: An Overview of Scholarship, 1989–1999.’ *Ben Jonson Journal* 22, no.2 (2015): 269-281.
- Evenden, Elizabeth. *Patents, Pictures and Patronage John Day and the Tudor Book Trade*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.
- Ezell, Margaret. *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Fairweather, Colin. ‘Inclusive and Exclusive Pastoral: Towards an Anatomy of Pastoral Modes.’ *Studies in Philology* 97, no.3 (2000): 276-307.
- Falco, Raphael. *Conceived Presences: Literary Genealogy in Renaissance England*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994.
- Farmer, Alan B. and Zachary Lesser. ‘Vile Artes: The Marketing of English Printed Drama 1512-1660.’ *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 39 (2000): 77-165.
- . ‘What is Print Popularity? A Map of the Elizabethan Book Trade’ in *The Elizabethan Top Ten: Defining Print Popularity in Early Modern England*. Edited by Andy Kesson and Emma Smith, 19-54. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.

Febvre, Lucien and Henri-Jean Martin. *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing 1450-1800*. Translated by David Gerard. London: New Left Books, 1976.

Fenster, Thelma and Daniel Lord Smail. 'Introduction' in *Fama: The Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe*. Edited by Thelma Fenster and Daniel Lord Smail, 1-13. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

———. Eds. *Fama: The Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Ferry, Anne. *Tradition and the Individual Poem: An Inquiry into Anthologies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.

———. *The Title to the Poem*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Fienberg, Nora. 'The Emergence of Stella in *Astrophil and Stella*.' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 25, no.1 (1985): 5-19.

Fleming, Juliet, William Sherman, and Adam Smyth, eds. 'The Renaissance Collage: Toward a New History of Reading', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 45:3 (2015)

Foot, Mirjam M. 'Bookbinding.' In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume IV: 1557-1695*. Edited by John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie, 620-63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002..

Fraistat, Neil. *The Poem and the Book: Interpreting Collections of Romantic Poetry*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985.

——— ed. *Poems in their Place: Intertextuality and the Order of Poetic Collections*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

Freeman, Arthur. 'An Epistle for Two.' *The Library* 5th Series, XXV (1970): 226-36.

- Galbraith, David Ian. *Architectonics of Imitation in Spenser, Daniel, and Drayton*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.
- Galbraith, Steven K. 'Spenser's First Folio: the Build-It-Yourself Edition.' *Spenser Studies* 21 (2006): 21–49.
- . 'English Literary Folios 1593-162: studying shifts in format.' In *Tudor Books and Readers: Materiality and the Construction of Meaning*. Edited by John N. King, 46-66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Gajda, Alexandra. *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Genette, Gérard. *The Architext: An Introduction*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- . *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1997.
- Gibson, Jonathan. 'Sir Arthur Gorges (1557-1625) and the Patronage System.' PhD Thesis. University of London, 1997.
- . 'The Legal Context of Spenser's *Daphnaïda*.' *The Review of English Studies*, New Series, 55, no.218 (2004): 24-44.
- Gibson, Kirsten. *John Dowland's Printed Ayres: Texts, Contexts, Intertexts*. PhD Thesis. University of Newcastle, 2005.
- . 'The order of the book: materiality, narrative and authorial voice in John Dowland's First Booke of Songes or Ayres.' *Renaissance Studies* 26, no.1 (2012): 13-33.
- Gillespie, Alexandra. 'Poets, Printers, and Early *Sammelbände*.' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67, no.2 (2004): 189-214.

———. *Print Culture and the Medieval Author, Chaucer, Lydgate, and Their Books 1473-1557*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

———. 'Bookbinding and Early Printing in England.' In *A Companion to the Early Printed Book in Britain, 1476-1558*. Edited by Vincent Gillespie and Susan Powell, 75-94. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2014.

Gillespie, Vincent and Susan Powell, eds. *A Companion to the Early Printed Book in Britain, 1476-1558*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2014.

Giuliani, Luigi, Herman Brinkman, Geert Lernout and Marita Mathijsen, eds. *Texts in Multiple Versions: Histories of Editions*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2006.

Gless, Daryl J. *Interpretation and Theology in Spenser*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Go, Kenji. 'Samuel Daniel's *The Complaint of Rosamond* and an Emblematic Reconsideration of *A Lover's Complaint*.' *Studies in Philology*, 104, no.1 (2007): 82-122.

Schmitz, Götz. *The Fall of Women in Early English Narrative Verse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Goldberg, Jonathan. *Writing Matter: From the Hands of the English Renaissance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Goodall, Peter. 'The Author in his Study: Self-Representation as Author and Reader in the Medieval and Early Modern Periods.' In *Early Modern Autobiography: Theories, Genres, Practises*. Edited by Ronald Bedford, Lloyd Davis, and Phillipa Kelly, 106-114. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2006.

Gortschacher, Wolfgang and Holger Klein, eds. *Narrative Strategies in Early English Fiction*. Lewiston, N.Y. and Salzberg: Edwin Mellen, 1995.

- Grazia, Margreta de. 'Lost Potential in Grammar and Nature: Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*.' *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 21 (1981): 21–35.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Greetham, D.C. *Theories of the Text*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Gregory, Tobias. 'Shadowing Intervention: On the Politics of *The Faerie Queene* Book 5 Cantos 10-12.' *English Literary History* 67, no.2 (2000): 365-397
- Griffiths, Jane. *Diverting Authorities: Experimental Glossing Practices in Manuscript and Print*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Griffiths, Jeremy and Derek Pearsall, eds. *Book Production and Publishing in Britain, 1375-1475*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Guy, John, ed. *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- . 'The 1590s: Elizabeth's Second Reign?' In *The Reign of Elizabeth I*. Edited by John Guy, 1-19. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Hadfield, Andrew. *Edmund Spenser's Irish Experience: Wilde Fruit and Salvage Soil*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- . 'Was Spenser a Republican?' *English* 47 (1998): 169-82.
- . ed *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.
- . 'Politics.' in *The Critical Companion to Spenser Studies*. Edited by Bart van Es. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006: 42-57.

- . ‘Censorship in Renaissance England: The Fate of Edmund Spenser’, *Journal for Literary Studies*, 21, no.2 (2008): 44-60.
- . *Edmund Spenser: A Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Prose 1500-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Hagar, Alan. *Dazzling Images: The Masks of Sir Philip Sidney*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1991.
- Hallyn, Fernard. ‘Cosmography and poetics.’ In *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume III, The Renaissance*. Edited by Glynn P. Norton, 442-448. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Hamilton, A. C. *Sir Philip Sidney: A Study of His Life and Works*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- . ed. *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Hammer, J.P.G. *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: The Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex 1585–1597*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- . ‘Patronage at Court, Faction and the Earl of Essex.’ In *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*. Edited by John Guy, 65-86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Hamrick, Stephen. ‘Thus Much I Adventure to Deliver to You’: the Fortunes of George Gascoigne’ *Early Modern Literary Studies* 14.1 (2008).
- . ed. *Songes and Sonettes: Tottel’s Miscellany in Context*. Burlington, VT.: Ashgate, 2013.

- Hannay, Margaret P. *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1985.
- . “‘This Moses and This Miriam’: The Countess of Pembroke’s Role in the Legend of Sir Philip Sidney.” In *Sir Philip Sidney’s Achievements*. Edited by M.J.B. Allen et al, 217-226. New York: AMS Press, 1990.
- . *Philips Phoenix: Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- . ‘The Countess of Pembroke’s agency in print and scribal culture.’ In *Women’s Writing and the Circulation of Ideas: Manuscript Publication in England, 1500-1800*. Edited by George L. Justice and Nathan Tinker, 17-49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Harris, D. and N. L. Steffen. ‘The Other Side of the Garden: An Interpretative Comparison of Chaucer’s Book of the Duchess and Spenser’s Daphnaïda.’ *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 8 (1978): 17–36.
- Harrison, Peter. *The Bible, Protestantism, and the Rise of Natural Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Heale, Elizabeth. *Wyatt, Surrey, and Early Tudor Poetry*. London: Longman, 1998.
- . *Authorship and Autobiography in Renaissance Verse: Chronicles of the Self*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.
- . ‘The fruits of war: The voice of the soldier in Gascoigne, Rich, and Churchyard.’ *Early Modern Literary Studies* 14, no.1 (2008): 1-39.
- Heffernan, Megan. ‘Gathered by Invention: Additive Forms and Inference in Gascoigne’s Poesy.’ *Modern Language Quarterly* 76, no.4 (2015): 413–445.

- Helgerson, Richard. *The Elizabethan Prodigals*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
- Heninger, S. K., Jr. *Touches of Sweet Harmony: Pythagorean Cosmology and Renaissance Poetics*. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1974.
- . ‘The Typographical Layout of Spenser’s *The Shepheardes Calender*.’ In *Word and Visual Imagination*. Edited by Karl Holtgen et al. 33-71. *Word and Visual Imagination*. Erlangen: Erlangen-Nurnberg, 1988.
- Herman, Peter C., ed. *Rethinking the Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994.
- Herron, Thomas. *Spenser's Irish Work: Poetry, Plantation and Colonial Reformation*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- Hill, W. Speed, ed. *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1985–1991*. Binghamton, N.Y.: Renaissance English Text Society, 1993.
- . *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts II: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1992-1996*. Tempe, Arizona: Renaissance English Text Society, 1998.
- Hinks, John and Victoria Gardner. *The Early Modern Book Trade*. London: British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 2014.
- Hirschfeld, Helen. *Joint Enterprises: Collaborative Drama and the Institutionalization of the English Renaissance Theater*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2004.
- Holland, Peter, ed. *Shakespeare Survey 67* (2014).
- Holtgen, Karl et al, eds. *Word and Visual Imagination*. Erlangen: Erlangen-Nurnberg, 1988.

- Hooks, Adam G. 'Sidney's Porcupine.'
 [<http://www.adamhooks.net/2011/04/sidneys-porcupine.html>] (accessed September 2016).
- Hughes, Felicity A. 'Gascoigne's Poses.' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 37, no.1 (1997): 1-19.
- Huntington, John. 'Furious Insolence: The Social Meaning of Poetic Inspiration in the 1590s.' *Modern Philology* 94, no.3 (1997): 305-326.
- Hutson, Lorna. *The Usurer's Daughter: Male Friendship and Fictions of Women in Sixteenth-Century England*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- . *The Invention of Suspicion: Law and Mimesis in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama*. Oxford: University of Oxford Press, 2007.
- Ingram, Jill Philips. 'Gascoigne's *Supposes*: Englishing Italian 'Error' and Adversarial Reading Practices.' In *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare & His Contemporaries: Rewriting, Rewriting, Refashioning*. Edited by Michele Marrapodi, 83-96. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- Irish, Bradley J. 'Gender and Politics in the Henrician Court: The Douglas-Howard Lyrics in the Devonshire Manuscript (BL Add 17492).' *Renaissance Quarterly* 64, no.1 (2011): 79-114.
- Javitch, Daniel. *Poetry and Courtliness in Renaissance England*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978.
- . 'The Impure Motives of Elizabethan Poetry', *Genre* 15 (1982): 225-38.
- Johns, Adrian. *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*. Chicago, Il.: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

- Johnston, Michael and Michael Van Dussen, eds. *The Medieval Manuscript Book: Cultural Approaches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Jones, Ann Rosalind and Peter Stallybrass. 'The Politics of Astrophil and Stella.' *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 24 (1984): 53-69.
- Jones, H.S.V. *A Spenser Handbook*. New York: Crofts, 1930.
- Kalas, Rayna. *Frame, Glass, Verse: The Technology of Poetic in the English Renaissance*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2007.
- Kalstone, David. *Sidney's Poetry: Contexts and Interpretations*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Kambaskovic-Sawers, Danijela. *Constructing Sonnet Sequences in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance: A Study of Six Poets*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press 2010.
- Kaske, Carol V. 'Neoplatonism in Spenser Once More.' *Religion & Literature* 32 (2000): 157–69.
- Kay, Dennis. *Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Kelly, Stephen and John Thompson, eds. *Imagining the Book: Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepolis, 2005.
- Kerrigan, John. *Motives of Woe: Shakespeare and 'Female Complaint.'* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- . 'The Editor as Reader: Constructing Renaissance Texts.' In *The Practice and Representation of Reading in England*. Edited by James Raven, Helen Small, and Naomi Tadmor, 102-124. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

- Kesson, Andy, and Emma Smith. *The Elizabethan Top Ten: Defining Print Popularity in Early Modern England*. Farnham: Ashgate 2013.
- Killeen, Kevin, Helen Smith, and Rachel Willie, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in Early Modern England, c. 1530-1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Kinsman, Robert Starr. 'Skelton, John.' In *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. Edited by A.C. Hamilton, 1729-1732. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Kirwan, Peter. *Shakespeare and the Idea of Apocrypha: Negotiating the Boundaries of the Dramatic Canon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Klein, Lisa M. *The Exemplary Sidney and the Elizabethan Sonneteer*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998.
- Knapp, Jeffrey. 'What is a Co-Author?' *Representations* 89 (2003): 1-29.
- . 'Spenser the Priest.' *Representations*, 81:1 (2003): 61-78.
- Kneidel, Gregory. 'Reforming George Gascoigne' *Exemplaria* 10 (1998): 329—70.
- Knight, Alison. "'This verse marks that': George Herbert's The Temple and Scripture in Context' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in Early Modern England, c. 1530-1700*. Edited by Kevin Killeen, Helen Smith, and Rachel Willie, 518-532. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Knight, Jeffrey Todd. *Bound to Read: Compilations, Collections, and the Making of Renaissance Literature*. Philadelphia, P.A.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- . 'Needles and Pens: The Work of Sewing in Early English Books', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 45:3 (2015): 523-542.
- Knight, Leah. *Of Books and Botany in Early Modern England: Sixteenth-century Plants and Print Culture*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

- Koller, Katherine. 'Abraham Fraunce and Edmund Spenser.' *English Literary History* 7 (1940): 108–9.
- Krier, Teresa M., ed. *Refiguring Chaucer in the Renaissance*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 1998.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Semeiotiki: Recherches pour une semanalyse*. Paris: Seuil, 1969.
- . 'Word, Dialogue, and Novel.' In *The Kristeva Reader*. Edited by Toril Moi, 34–61. New York: University of Columbia Press 1986.
- Lamb, Mary Ellen. 'The Countess of Pembroke's Patronage', *English Literary Renaissance* 12, no.2 (1982): 162-179.
- . *Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990.
- Lavagnino, John. 'Reading, Scholarship, and Hypertext Editions.' *Text* 8 (1995): 109-124.
- Lavin, J.A. 'The First Two Printers of Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*.' *The Library*, 5, no. 26 (1971): 249–55
- Lawrence, Jason. *'Who the Devil taught thee so much Italian?': Italian language learning and literary imitation in early modern England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.
- . 'Samuel Daniel's The Complaint of Rosamond and the arrival of Tasso's Armida in England', *Renaissance Studies* 25 (2011), 648-665.
- Lee, Sidney. 'Ponsonby, William (1546?–1604).' Revised by Anita McConnell. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004. Online Edition, Jan 2008) [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22503>] (Accessed 20 Aug 2014).

- Lees-Jeffries, Hester. *England's Helicon: Fountains in Early Modern Literature and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Lerer, Seth. 'Medieval Literature and Early Modern Readers: Cambridge University Library Sel. 5.51—5.63.' *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 97, no.3 (2003): 311-332.
- . 'Bibliographical theory and the textuality of the codex: toward a history of the premodern book.' in *The Medieval Manuscript Book: Cultural Approaches*. Edited by Michael Johnston and Michael Van Dussen, 17-33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Lesser, Zachary. 'Typographic Nostalgia: Play-Reading, Popularity, and Black Letter.' In *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers and Readers in Early Modern England*. Edited by Marta Straznicky, 99-126. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.
- . *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication: Readings in the English Book Trade*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2007.
- . 'Shakespeare's Flop: John Waterson and The Two Noble Kinsmen' in *Shakespeare's Stationers: Studies in Cultural Bibliography*. Edited by Marta Straznicky, 177-195. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- Lever, J.W. *The Elizabethan Love Sonnet*. 2nd Edition. London: Methuen, 1966.
- Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Love, Harold. *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998.

- Loewenstein, Joseph. 'Spenser's Textual History.' In *The Oxford Handbook to Edmund Spenser*. Edited by Richard A. McCabe, 637-659. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Luborsky, Ruth Samson. 'The Illustrations to *The Shepheardes Calender*' *Spenser Studies* 2 (1981): 3-53.
- Lyons, Martyn. *A History of Reading and Writing in the Western World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- MacArthur, Janet H. *The Critical Contexts of Sidney's Astrophil and Stella and Spenser's Amoretti*. Victoria B.C.: University of Victoria, 1989.
- Maclure, Millar and F.W. Watt, eds. *Essays in English Literature from the Renaissance to the Victorian Age, Presented to A.S.P. Woodhouse*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964.
- McCabe, Richard A. "'Little booke: thy selfe present': the Politics of Presentation in *The Shepheardes Calender*.' In *Presenting Poetry: Composition, Publication, Reception*. Edited by Howard Erskine-Hill and Richard McCabe, 15-40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- . *Spenser's Monstrous Regiment: Elizabethan Ireland and the Poetics of Difference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- . 'Shorter Verse Published 1590-95' In *A Critical Companion to Spenser Studies*. Edited by Bart van Es, 166-186. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.
- . 'The Masks of Duessa: Spenser, Mary Queen of Scots, and James I.' *English Literary Renaissance* 17, no.2 (2008): 224-242.
- . 'Spenser, Plato, and the Poetics of State.' *Spenser Studies* XXIV (2009): 433-452

McCoy, Richard C. 'Gascoigne's "Poëmata castrata": The Wages of Courtly Success.' *Criticism*, 27, no.1 (1985): 29-55.

McGann, Jerome J. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

———. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

McKenzie, Donald F. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. London: British Library, 1986.

McKerrow, R.B. *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640*. London: The Bibliographic Society, 1910.

McLeod, Randall (as Random Cloud). 'The Marriage of Good and Bad Quartos' *Shakespeare Quarterly* 33, no.4 (1982): 421-431.

———. 'Enter Reader.' In *The Editorial Gaze: Mediating Texts in Literature and the Arts*. Edited by Paul Eggert and Margaret Sankey, 3-50. New York: Garland, 1998.

McKitterick, David. *Print, Manuscript, and the Search for Order, 1450-1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Mack, Michael. *Sidney's Poetics: Imitating Creation*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2005.

Marotti, Arthur F. *John Donne, Coterie Poet*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986.

———. *Print, Manuscript, and the English Renaissance Lyric*. Ithaca: University of Cornell Press, 1995.

- Maguire, Laurie E. *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The Bad Quartos and their Contexts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Mallette, Richard. 'Spenser's Portrait of the Artist in *The Shepheardes Calender* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*.' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 19, no.1 (1979): 19-41.
- Marquis, Paul A. 'Printing History and Editorial Design in Tottel's Songes and Sonettes.' In *Songes and Sonettes: Tottel's Miscellany in Context*. Edited by Stephen Hamrick, 1-40. Burlington, VT.: Ashgate, 2013.
- Marotti, Arthur. "'Love is Not Love': Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order.' *ELH* 49 (1982). 396-428.
- . *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Marrapodi, Michele, ed. *Drama of Shakespeare & His Contemporaries: Rewriting, Rewriting, Refashioning*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- Maslen, Robert W. *Elizabethan Fictions: Espionage, Counter-espionage, and the Duplicity of Fiction in Early Elizabethan Prose Narratives*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Massai, Sonia. *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Masten, Jeffrey. *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Maurer, Margaret. 'Samuel Daniel's Poetical Epistles, Especially those to Sir Thomas Egerton and Lucy, Countess of Bedford.' *Studies in Philology* 74, no.4 (1977): 418-444.

- May, Steven W. 'Tudor Aristocrats and the Mythical 'Stigma of Print.''' *Renaissance Papers* 10. Edited by Leigh A. Deneef and Thomas M. Hester, 11-18. Durham, NC, 1980.
- . 'Popularizing Courtly Poetry: Tottel's Miscellany and its Progeny.' In *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature 1485-1603*. Edited by Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shank, 418-436. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- . 'Marlowe, Spenser, Sidney and – Abraham Fraunce?' *The Review of English Studies* 62 (2011): 30-63.
- Melnikoff, Kirk. 'Richard Jones's Pen and Marlowe's Socks: Richard Jones *Tamburlaine the Great* (1590), and the Beginnings of English Dramatic Literature.' *Studies in Philology* 102.3 (2005): 184-209.
- Mentz, Steven. 'Selling Sidney: William Ponsonby, Thomas Nashe, and the Boundaries of Elizabethan Print and Manuscript Cultures.' *TEXT* 13 (2000): 151-174.
- Miller, Paul Allen. 'Sidney, Petrarch, and Ovid, or Imitation as Subversion.' *English Literary History* 58, no. 3 (1991): 499-522.
- Miller, David Lee. 'Laughing at Spenser's *Daphnaïda*.' *Spenser Studies* XXVI (2011): 241-250.
- . '*Fowre Hymnes and Prothalamion* (1596).' *Oxford Handbook To Edmund Spenser*. Edited by Richard McCabe, 293-313. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Miner, Earl. 'Some Issues for Study of Integrated Collections.' In *Poems in Their Place: The Intertextuality and Order of Poetic Collections*. Edited by Neil Fraistat, 18-43. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.
- Mohamed, Fiesal G. *In the Anteroom of Divinity: The Reformation of the Angels from Colet to Milton*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

- Montrose, Louis 'Of Gentlemen and Shepherds: The Politics of Elizabethan Pastoral Form.' *English Literary History* 50, no.3 (1983): 415-459.
- . 'Spenser and the Elizabethan Political Imaginary.' *English Literary History* 69, no.4 (2002): 907-946.
- Morgan, Hiram. *Tyrone's Rebellion: The Outbreak of the Nine Years War in Tudor Ireland*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 1993.
- Moss, Anne. *Printed Commonplace Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Müller, Wolfgang. 'The Modernity of the Second Version of George Gascoigne's *Master F.J.*' In *Narrative Strategies in Early English Fiction*. Edited by Wolfgang Gortschacher and Holger Klein, 87-102. Lewiston, N.Y. and Salzberg: Edwin Mellen, 1995.
- Mulryan, John. 'Spenser as Mythologist: A Study of the Nativities of Cupid and Christ in the *Fowre Hymnes.*' *Modern Language Studies*, 1, no.1 (1971): 13-16.
- Murphy, Andrew, ed. *The Renaissance Text: Theory, Editing, Textuality*. Manchester and New York: University of Manchester Press, 2000.
- Nagase, Markio. *Literary Editing of Seventeenth-Century English Drama*. PhD Thesis. University of Birmingham, 2012.
- Needham, Paul. *The Printer and the Pardoner: An Unrecorded Indulgence Printed by William Caxton*. Washington: Library of Congress, 1986.
- Newton, Richard C. 'Making Books from Leaves: When Poets Become Editors' in *Print Culture in the Renaissance*. Edited by Gerald Tyson and Sylvia Wagonheim, 246-264. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1980.

- Nichol, David. *Middleton and Rowley: Forms of Collaboration in the Jacobean Playhouse*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012.
- Nichols, Stephen G. and Siegfried Wenzel, eds. *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on the Medieval Miscellany*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Nohnberg, James. *The Analogy of The Faerie Queene*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- North, Marcy L. *The Anonymous Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor-Stuart England*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Norton, Glynn P. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume III, The Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Nyström, Eva. 'Codicological Crossover: The Merging of Manuscript and Print.' *Studia Neophilologica* 86, no.1 (2014): 112-133.
- Oates, Mary I. 'Fowre Hymnes: Spenser's Retractions of Paradise.' *Spenser Studies* 4 (1984): 143-69.
- O'Callaghan, Michelle. 'Textual Gatherings: Print, Community and Verse Miscellanies in Early Modern England.' [<http://emc.eserver.org/1-8/ocallaghan.html>] (Accessed May 2016).
- O'Connell, Michel. 'Astrophel: Spenser's Double Elegy.' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 11, no.1 (1971): 27-35.
- Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy*. London: Methuen & Co., 1982. Reprint, New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Oram, William A. 'Spenser's Raleghs.' *Studies in Philology* 87, no.3 (1990): 341-362.
- . 'Daphnaïda and Spenser's Later Poetry.' *Spenser Studies* II (1981): 141-158.

———. ‘Spenser’s Audiences, 1589-91.’ *Studies in Philology* 100, no.4 (2003):514-533.

Orgel, Stephen K. ‘Sidney's Experiment in Pastoral: The Lady of 'Lady of May.’’ *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 26 (1963): 198-203.

Parkes, M.B. *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1993.

Patterson, Annabel. *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.

Pask, Kevin. *The Emergence of the Author: Scripting the Life of the Poet in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Pender, Patricia. ‘The Ghost and the Machine in the Sidney Family Corpus.’ *Studies in English Literature* 51, no.1 (2011): 65-85.

Pigman, George W., III. *Grief and the English Renaissance Elegy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

———. ‘Editing Revised Texts: Gascoigne’s *Hundreth Sundrie Flowres and Posies*.’ In *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts II*. Edited by W. Speed Hill, 1-10. Tempe, Arizona: Renaissance English Text Society, 1998.

Pincombe, Mike, ed. *Travels and Translations in the Sixteenth Century*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Pincombe, Mike and Cathy Shrank, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature 1485-1603*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Pitcher, John. ‘Essex.’ in *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. Edited by A.C. Hamilton, 254. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

- . 'Benefiting from the Book: The Oxford Edition of Samuel Daniel.' *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 29 (1999): 69-87.
- . 'Editing Daniel.' In *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts*. Edited by W. Speed Hill, 57-73. Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Text Society, 1993.
- . 'Essays, works and small poems: divulging, publishing and augmenting the Elizabethan poet, Samuel Daniel.' In *The Renaissance Text: Theory, Editing, Textuality*. Edited by Andrew Murphy, 8-28. Manchester and New York: University of Manchester Press, 2000.
- . 'Daniel, Samuel (1562/3–1619).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Online edition. Edited by David Cannadine. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7120>] (Accessed September 2, 2016).
- Pomeroy, Elizabeth. *The Elizabethan Miscellanies: Their Development and Conventions*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.
- Pratt, Aaron T. 'Stab-Stitching and the Status of Early English Playbooks as Literature.' *The Library*, 7th series. 16, no.3 (2015): 304–328.
- Preminger, Alex and T.V.F. Brogan, eds. *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Prescott, Anne Lake. 'Humor and Satire in the Renaissance.' In *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: Volume III, The Renaissance*. Edited by Glynn P. Norton, 84-293. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Quitslund, Jon A. 'Spenser and the Patronesses of Fowre Hymnes: "Ornaments of All True Love and Beauty."' In *Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*. Edited by Margaret P. Hannay, 184-202. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1985.

- . *Spenser's Supreme Fiction: Platonic Natural Theology and the Faerie Queene*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.
- . 'Thinking about Thinking in the *Fowre Hymnes*' *Spenser Studies* XXIV (2009): 419-517.
- Ramachandran, Ayesha. 'Edmund Spenser, Lucretian Neoplatonist: Cosmology in the *Fowre Hymnes*.' *Spenser Studies* XXIV (2009): 373-411.
- Rambuss, Richard. *Spenser's Secret Career*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Rasmussen, Mark David. 'Complaints and Daphnaïda (1591).' In *The Oxford Handbook to Edmund Spenser*. Edited by Richard McCabe, 218-235. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2012.
- Raven, James, Helen Small, and Naomi Tadmor, eds. *The Practice and Representation of Reading in England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Reid, Lindsey Anne. *Ovidian Bibliofictions and the Tudor Book: Metamorphosing Classical Heroines in Late Medieval and Renaissance England*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2014.
- Roberts, Katherine J. 'Realism in Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*: The Creation of *Stella*.' *Sidney Newsletter* 12, no.2 (1993): 30-41.
- Robertson, Jean. 'Sidney.' In *The Spenser Encyclopedia*. Edited by A.C. Hamilton, 1719-1721. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Roche, Thomas P. '*Astrophil and Stella*, A Radical Reading.' *Spenser Studies* III (1982): 139-191.
- . *Petrarch and the English Sonnet Sequences*. New York: AMS Press, 1989.

- Rollins, Hyder Edward, ed. *Tottel's Miscellany, 1557-1587* (2 Volumes). Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1928-9.
- Røstvig, Marie-Sophie. *The Hidden Sense and Other Essays*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1963.
- . 'Ars aeterna: Renaissance poetics and theories of divine creation.' *Mosaic* 3 (1969-70): 40-61.
- . ed. *Fair Forms: Essays in English Literature from Spenser to Jane Austen*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1975.
- . 'A Frame of Words: On the Craftsmanship of Samuel Daniel.' *English Studies* 60 (1979): 122-37.
- Sacks, Peter J. *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- Saenger, Michael Baird. 'Did Sidney Revise *Astrophil and Stella*?' *Studies in Philology* Vol. 96, no.4 (1999): 417-438.
- . *The Commodification of Textual Engagements in the English Renaissance*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Samson, Alexander, ed. *Locus Amoenus: Gardens and Horticulture in the Renaissance*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
- Sanchez, Melissa E. '“In My Selfe the Smart I Try”: Female Promiscuity in *Astrophil and Stella*.' *English Literary History* 80, no.1 (2013): 1-27.
- Sandison, H. E. 'Arthur Gorges, Spenser's Alcyon and Raleigh's Friend.' *PMLA* 43 (1928), 645-74.

Saunders, J.W. 'The Stigma of Print: A Note on the Social Basis of Tudor Poetry.'

Essays in Criticism 1, no.2. (1951): 139-164.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Cours de linguistique générale*. Edited by Charles Bally and

Albert Sechehaye. Paris: Payot, 1916. Published as *Course in General Linguistics*.

Translated by Wade Baskin. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1959.

Sawday, Jonathan. 'Poison and Honey: The Politics of the Sacred and the Profane in

Spenser's Fowre Hymnes (1596).' in *Sacred and Profane : Secular and Devotional*

Interplay in Early Modern British Literature. Edited by Helen Wilcox, Richard

Todd, and Alasdair McDonald, 79-92. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1996.

Schott, Penelope Scambly. 'The Narrative Stance in 'The Adventures of Master F.J.':

Gascoigne as Critic of His Own Poems.' *Renaissance Quarterly* 29, no.3 (1976):

369-37.

Schneider, Brian W. *The Framing Text in Early Modern English Drama: 'Whining'*

Prologues and 'Armed' Epilogues. Farnham: Ashgate, 2011.

Schurink, Fred. 'Manuscript Commonplace Books, Literature, and Reading in Early

Modern England.' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 73, no.3 (2010): 453-469.

Scott-Baumann, Elizabeth and Benjamin Burton, eds. *The Work of Form, Poetics and*

Materiality in Early Modern Culture. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Scott-Warren, Jason. *Sir John Harington and the Book as Gift*. Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 2001.

———. 'Unannotating Spenser.' In *Renaissance Paratexts*. Edited by Helen Smith and

Louise Wilson, 153-164. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Segall, Kreg. 'The Precarious Poet in *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*.' *Studies in*

English Literature, 1500-1900 53, no.1 (2013): 31-51.

- Sellers, H. 'A Bibliography of the Works of Samuel Daniel 1585–1623.' *Oxford Bibliographical Society: Proceedings and Papers* 2, no.1 (1927): 29–45.
- Sessions, W.A. 'Surrey's Wyatt: Autumn 1542 and the New Poet.' In *Rethinking the Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts*. Edited by Peter C Herman, 168-192. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994.
- . *Henry Howard, The Poet Earl of Surrey: A Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Shannon, Laurie. 'Poetic Companies: Musters of Agency in George Gascoigne's Friendly Verse.' *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 10, no.3 (2004): 458-9.
- Sharon-Zisser, Shirley, ed. *Critical Essays on A Lover's Complaint: Suffering Ecstasy*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Sharon-Zisser, Shirley and Stephen Whitworth. 'Generating Dialogue on Shakespeare's *A Lover's Complaint*. In *Critical Essays on A Lover's Complaint: Suffering Ecstasy*. Edited by Shirley Sharon-Zisser. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. 1-53.
- Sharpe, Kevin and Steven N. Zwicker, eds. *Writing Lives, Biography and Textual identity in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Sherman, William H. *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England*. Pennsylvania, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- . 'The Beginning of "The End": Terminal Paratext and the Birth of Print Culture.' In *Renaissance Paratexts*. Edited by Helen Smith and Louise Wilson, 65-87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- . 'On the Threshold: Architext, Paratext, and Early Print Culture.' In *Agent of Change: Print Culture Studies After Elizabeth L. Eisenstein*. Edited by Sabrina Alcorn Baron, Eric N. Lindquist, and Eleanor F. Shevlin, 67-81. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007.

- Shore, David R. *Spenser and the Poetics of Pastoral: A Study of the World of Colin Clout*. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1985.
- Simon, Margaret 'Refraining Songs: The Dynamics of Form in Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*.' *Studies in Philology* 109, no.1 (2012): 86-102.
- Sinfield, Alan. 'Sexual Puns in *Astrophil and Stella*.' *Essays in Criticism* 24 (1974): 341-55.
- . 'Sidney and Astrophil.' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 20, no.1 (1980): 25-41.
- Skretkowitz, Victor. 'Building Sidney's Reputation: Texts and Editions of the *Arcadia*.' In *Sir Philip Sidney: 1586 and the Creation of a Legend*. Edited by Van Dorsten et al, 111-124. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 1986.
- Skura, Meredith Anne. *Tudor Authorship: Listening for Inwardness*. Ithaca: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Slights, William W.E. *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001.
- Smith, Bruce R. *Ancient Scripts and Modern Experience on the English Stage, 1500-1700*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Smith, Helen. *'Grossly Material Things': Women and Book Production in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Smith, Margaret M. *The Title Page: Its Early Development: 1460-1510*. London: British Library, 2000.
- Smith, Helen and Louise Wilson, eds. *Renaissance Paratexts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

- Smith, Rosalind. *Sonnets and the English Woman Writer, 1560-1621: The Politics of Absence*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.
- Smyth, Adam. *"Profit and Delight": Printed Miscellanies in England, 1640-1682*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press 2004.
- . 'Cutting and authorship in Early Modern England', *Authorship* 2, no.2 (2013) [<http://www.authorship.ugent.be/>] (accessed July 2016).
- Starke, Sue Petitt. 'Briton Knight or Irish Bard: Spenser's Pastoral Persona and the Epic Project in *A View of the Present State of Ireland* and *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*.' *Spenser Studies* 12 (1988): 133-150.
- Staub, Susan C. 'Dissembling his art: 'Gascoigne's Gardnings.'" In *Locus Amoenus: Gardens and Horticulture in the Renaissance*. Edited by Alexander Samson, 95-110. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
- Steinberg, Glenn. 'Idolatrous Idylls: Protestant Iconoclasm, Spenser's *Daphnaïda*, and Chaucer's *Book of the Duchess*.' In *Refiguring Chaucer in the Renaissance*. Edited by Teresa M. Krier, 128-143. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 1998.
- Stern, Tiffany. "'On each Wall and Corner Poast": Playbills, Title-pages, and Advertising in Early Modern London.' *English Literary Renaissance* 36 (2006): 57-89.
- Still Judith and Michael Worton, eds. *Intertextuality: Theories and Practises*. Manchester and New York: University of Manchester Press, 1990.
- Straznicky, Marta, ed. *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers and Readers in Early Modern England*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.
- . 'Reading through the Body: Women and Printed Drama.' In *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England*. Edited by

Marta Straznicky, 59-79. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press 2006.

———. ed. *Shakespeare's Stationers, Studies in Cultural Bibliography*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Strycharski, Andrew. 'Literacy, Education, and Affect in *Astrophil and Stella*.' *Studies in English Literature* 48, no.1 (2008): 45-63.

Summers, Joseph. 'From 'Joseph's Coat' to 'A true Hymne.'" *George Herbert Journal* 2 (1978): 1-12.

Teskey, Gordon. 'A Retrograde Reading of Spenser's *Fowre Hymnes*.' *Spenser Studies* XXIV (2009): 481-497.

Theile, Verena and Linda Tredennick, eds. *New Formalisms and Literary Theory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013.

Tigerstedt, E. N. 'The poet as creator: origins of a metaphor.' *Comparative Literature Studies* 5 (1968): 455-488.

Toliver, Harold. *George Hebert's Christian Narrative*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University, 1993.

Trasiter, Daniel. 'Reluctant Virgins: The Stigma of Print Revisited.' *Colby Quarterly* 26, no.2 (1990): 75-86.

Tribble, Evelyn B. *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England*. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1993.

Trill, Suzanne. "'In Poesie the mirrois of our Age": The Countess of Pembroke's "Sydneyan" Poetics.' In *A Companion to Tudor Literature*. Edited by Kent Cartwright, 428-443. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

- Tromly, Frederic B. 'Lodowick Bryskett's Elegies on Sidney in Spenser's *Astrophel Volume*.' *The Review of English Studies* 37, no.147 (1986): 384-388.
- Tuve, Rosamond. 'Spenserus.' In *Essays in English Literature from the Renaissance to the Victorian Age, Presented to A.S.P. Woodhouse*. Edited by Millar Maclure and F.W. Watt. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964: 3-25.
- Tyson, Gerald and Sylvia Wagonheim, eds. *Print Culture in the Renaissance*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1980.
- van Es, Bart, ed. *A Critical Companion to Spenser Studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan 2006.
- Underwood, Verne. 'Who Paid for Spenser's Funeral?' *Spenser Newsletter* 27, no.2 (1996): 22-24.
- Wall, Wendy. *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Warkentin, Germaine. 'Patrons and Profiteers: Thomas Newman and the 'Violent Enlargement' of *Astrophil and Stella*.' *Book Collector* 34 (1985): 461-87.
- Warner, Christopher. 'Poetry and Praise in "Colin Clouts Come Home Againe" (1595)', *Studies in Philology* 94, no.4 (1997) 368-381.
- . *The Making and Marketing of Tottel's Miscellany, 1557: Songs and Sonnets in the Summer of the Martyrs' Fires*. Farnham and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013.
- Waudby, June. *Text and Context: A Re-evaluation of Anne Locke's Meditation*. PhD Thesis. University of Hull, 2006.
- Weiss, Adrian. 'Shared Printing, Printer's Copy, and the Text(s) of Gascoigne's *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*.' *Studies in Bibliography* 45 (1992): 71-104.

- Werstine, Paul. 'Narratives about Printed Shakespeare Texts: "Foul Papers" and "Bad" Quartos.' *Shakespeare Quarterly* 41, no.1 (1990): 65-86.
- . *Early Modern Playhouse Manuscripts and the Editing of Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- White, Micheline, ed. *Ashgate Critical Essays on Women Writers in England, Volume 3: Anne Lock, Isabella Whitney and Amelia Lanyer*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Wilcox, Helen, Richard Todd, and Alasdair McDonald, eds. *Sacred and Profane: Secular and Devotional Interplay in Early Modern British Literature*. Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1996.
- Wilkes, G. A. 'Left ... to Play the Ill Poet in My Own Part': The Literary Relationship of Sidney and Fulke Greville.' *Review of English Studies* 57, no.230 (2006): 291-309.
- Wilson, Christopher R. 'Astrophil and Stella: A Tangled Editorial Web.' *The Library* (Sixth Series) 1, no.4 (1979): 336-346.
- Woodcock, Matthew. *Sir Philip Sidney and the Sidney Circle*. Devon: Northcoate House Publishers, 2010.
- Woudhuysen, Henry R. *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- . 'Sidney's Manuscripts (again).' *Sidney Journal* 30, no.1 (2013): 117-125.
- Wright, Gillian. 'The Politics of Revision in Samuel Daniel's *The Civil Wars*.' *English Literary Renaissance* 38, no.3 (2008): 461-483.
- Yates, Frances. *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*. London and Boston: Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1975.

Zarnowiecki, Matthew. 'Reading Shakespeare miscellaneously: Ben Jonson, Robert Chester, and the *Vatum Chorus of Love's Martyr*.' In Allison K. Deutermann and Andras Kisery, 34-54. *Formal Matters*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013.

———. *Fair Copies: Reproducing the English Lyric from Tottel to Shakespeare*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

———. 'Spenser's Angels: Salvation, Retraction, and Superhuman Poiesis in *Fowre Hymnes*.' *Spenser Studies* XXX (2015): 75-104.

Zurcher, Andrew. 'Getting it Back to Front in 1590: Spenser's Dedications, Nashe's Insinuations, and Raleigh's Equivocations.' *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 38 (2005): 173-98.