

Copyright

by

Carol Dawn Blosser

2005

The Dissertation Committee for Carol Dawn Blosser certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Making “English Eloquence:” *Tottel’s Miscellany* and the English Renaissance

Committee:

Frank Whigham, Supervisor

Wayne Rebhorn

Michael Winship

Dolora Wojciehowski

Brian Levack

Making “English Eloquence:” *Tottel’s Miscellany* and the English Renaissance

by
Carol Dawn Blosser, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

the University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2005

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the help of many wonderful colleagues, family, and friends. To begin with, I owe a debt of gratitude to my dissertation committee: my director, Frank Whigham, and my committee members, Wayne Rebhorn, Michael Winship, Dolora Wojciehowski, and Brian Levack. They are inspiring scholars and teachers, and I can only hope that my work reflects the standards of intellectual curiosity and rigor they imparted to me. Secondly, my dissertation reading group — Vimala Pasupathi, Paul Sullivan, Suzanne Penuel, Doug Eskew, and Lois Kim — read draft after draft of this project from its very beginning and tirelessly offered support, feedback, and camaraderie. Vim, Paul, and Suzanne also offered the support of friendship through the roughest times of this process. Without their strength, kindness, integrity, and intellectual understanding, I would not have been able to complete this dissertation, nor would I have known what it is to have a scholarly community: *et in Arcadia ego*. Thank you.

My friends and family also have been there all along, cheering me on and providing their own forms of support, moral and otherwise. My parents Fred and Donna, my sister Susan, my grandmother Mozelle, and my aunts, uncles, and cousins never once doubted that I could do this. I believe they are as proud of me as I am of them. My fellow graduate students at the University of Texas at Austin, my colleagues at the Undergraduate Writing Center (especially Scott Blackwood, Vince Lozano, and Michele Solberg), and my “real world” friends have made the last seven years joyful, wonderful

ones, both the good times and the bad. Finally, I must thank Doug for putting up with the poets and my obsession with them for the last two years and for making the rest of my life so rich. In the words of Lady Mary Wroth, “His sight giues life vnto my loue-rould [eyes], / My loue content, because in his loue lies.”

Making “English Eloquence:” *Tottel’s Miscellany* and the English Renaissance

Publication No. _____

Carol Dawn Blosser, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2005

Supervisor: Frank Whigham

The 1557 edition of *Tottel’s Miscellany* is commonly known as the publication event that began the Renaissance in England. This project regards the 1557 publication of this early and influential poetry anthology as a watershed moment in the formation of the English literary canon. It revises received accounts of Renaissance literary history by revealing the social and political processes behind the dissemination of courtly lyric poetry, as well as by interrogating the book’s canonization of courtly authors, such as Sir Thomas Wyatt and the Earl of Surrey, and of elite poetic forms, such as the sonnet. I argue that in the unstable political context of the 1550s, the *Miscellany’s* poems became desirable tools with which non-courtly readers could negotiate their own changing social and religious identities using poetic language and forms endowed with the authority of the court. After the iconoclasm of the Henrician Reformation and during the violence of the Marian Counter-Reformation, the *Miscellany* offered English readers new icons of cultural coherence – the courtier poets – and a new cultural identity, as members of a learned community dedicated to cultivating “English eloquence.” Nevertheless, I suggest, the book’s print features reveal how carefully it constructed literary values that favored the

elite forms and authors, and its multiple voices and perspectives challenge the division between elite and popular culture it helped to construct. By understanding the relationship between this landmark book's textual composition and its cultural context, we can appreciate more fully how the critical judgments of Tottel and his readers still actively shape the modern academic canon.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter One.....	32
Chapter Two.....	87
Chapter Three.....	144
Chapter Four.....	246
Conclusion.....	329
Appendix A: Chapter Three Poems.....	352
Appendix B: Chapter Four Poems.....	364
Works Cited.....	376
Vita.....	394

Introduction
The Beginning of Modern English Verse? *Tottel's Miscellany* and the English Renaissance

Works are produced within a specific order that has its own rules, conventions, and hierarchies, but they escape all these and take on a certain density in their peregrinations — which can be a very long time span — about the social world.

Roger Chartier, *The Order of Books* (x)

“It is my belief that culture is more important to people than political institutions.”

Norman Davies, “The Breakup of the United Kingdom”

On June 5, 1557, a law printer named Richard Tottel published the first edition of *Songs and Sonnets, written by the right honorable Lord Henry Howard late Earl of Surrey, and others*, a poetic anthology that included poems by Surrey, Sir Thomas Wyatt, Nicholas Grimald, and a host of anonymous poets. The book went through at least eight more editions until 1587, and all but the last two were produced by the original publisher (Rollins 2.6). By the nineteenth century the book was known more commonly as *Tottel's Miscellany*, after its printer, and since that time it has been widely regarded as the book that heralded the beginning of the English Renaissance. In his 1929 edition of the *Miscellany*, still the standard critical edition (rev. 1965), Hyder Rollins calls the book

“epoch-making” (3) and “one of the most important single volumes in the history of English literature,” a judgment supported by numerous critics (4). Even earlier than Rollins, John Berdan identified the *Miscellany* as “the gateway through which the courtly poetry of Henry VIII passed on to the Elizabethans” (343). More recently Roland Greene has referred to the book as a “canon-making anthology of mid-century English verse” (250); Wendy Wall agrees “it certainly was *the* handbook for Elizabethan poets” (24). Regardless of how they regard its contents, these critics all acknowledge the impact that the book had on its culture.

Alongside this picture of the book as an epochal text, however, runs the commonplace that the publication of the *Miscellany* was little more than an act of poaching, the theft of poems that rightfully belonged to the aristocracy and were released to a gossip-hungry and status-worshipping readership of social upstarts. One of the seminal works to take this position, J.W. Saunders’s classic essay “The Stigma of Print: a Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry,” claims that the aversion gentlemen had to printing their literary works created a culture in which “the printer was able to take unscrupulous advantage of a Court poet by piracies which could not with dignity be prevented” (140). According to Saunders, an example of this kind of situation is the publication of *Tottel’s Miscellany*, through which the “unimportance of the printed-book audience is proved conclusively by the time-lag between the composition of most Tudor

poetry and its appearance in print” (139). Saunders notes that “Wyatt died in 1542, but... the bulk of his work remained in manuscript until the publication of Tottel’s *Miscellany* in 1557” (139). For Saunders, the fact that some of the poets in this monumental book were dead before they were published, while others were satisfactorily anonymous, supports his hypothesis that all Tudor poets scorned print and his implication that the *Miscellany* itself was an act of misappropriation and deception.

To be sure, Tottel’s act of publishing poems that aristocrats may have felt belonged to them carried certain risks. We do not know for certain how Tottel acquired the poems he printed in the *Miscellany*; no surviving source manuscript conveniently groups the poems of Surrey and Wyatt with those of Nicholas Grimald and anonymous courtly poets. The probability remains that Tottel acquired the poems from a variety of sources, either by purchasing them or through outright theft, and invented the arrangement and framing material. Understanding how even Tottel’s purchase of the poems may have been perceived by those in the court as an act of theft, however, requires us to look more carefully at the concepts of privacy, purchase, and piracy that circulated in sixteenth century manuscript and print culture, as I do in the first chapter of this study.

The risks that Tottel ran in printing poems that were, at least according to some, “pirated” were substantial. In the sixteenth century and particularly during the religious violence of the 1550s, books were regularly recalled and suppressed; as the printer

assumed the bulk of the responsibility for publishing controversial material, a lack of circumspection could be serious. Although not a printer, the stationer James Bainham was burned at the stake in Smithfield in 1532 for espousing William Tyndale's radical Protestant ideas (Blayney 32). Perhaps it was for this reason that it was not until the late 1530s and 1540s, when the climate was safer, that English printers began to produce Protestant works in London (Hellinga and Trapp, "Introduction" 26-27). In 1553, however, Tottel's father-in-law, the Protestant printer Richard Grafton, was deprived of his office as royal printer for printing a proclamation under the name of Queen Jane Grey (Neville-Sington, "Press, Politics, and Religion" 602). Tottel himself published the writings of people who, however their reputations had been reclaimed by changes in regime, had either committed treason, been accused of committing it, or were related to people who had. Surrey had lost his head in 1547, ten years before the *Miscellany*, and only three years before the book came out Thomas Wyatt the younger, son of the poet, had been executed for his part in the uprising against Queen Mary's Spanish marriage. As is already known to many readers, the pages of the *Miscellany* itself are filled with images and experiences of treason, betrayal, and political and sexual violence.

However careful Tottel was to remove the most obvious points of contention, then, he still ran the risk of committing treason simply by circulating verses that could be interpreted, in the words of a 1557 proclamation against treasonous materials, as

“seditious and most false surmises” (Loades, *Chronicles of the Tudor Queens* 22). Or he simply could have found himself the target of powerful aristocrats who felt that poems that belonged to them had been poached and who were capable of taking action against his person or property. To be sure, as Marotti and Wall have noted, Tottel’s preface to the reader does display some anxiety about making courtly lyrics available to non-courtly readers. It seems far more likely, however, that fear of a resentful nobility responding specifically to his publication rather than anxiety about a free-floating “stigma of print” was responsible for his disclaimers.

Nor would such a “stigma,” if it was one indeed, necessarily have been motivated by a vague sense of snobbery, as critics from Saunders onward have implied. A courtier’s disapproval of publication would not necessarily have stemmed from an abstract understanding that “print could damage rather than enhance social status,” as Wendy Wall mentions (26). Instead, we should understand their reluctance as deriving at least in part from aristocratic notions of privacy and fear of royal reprisal. As the *Miscellany* and surviving manuscript miscellanies reveal, at its most innocuous much courtly poetry deals with the sexual politics of the elite — which, given the political and dynastic implications of sexual relations in the court, was not that innocuous at all. At its most dangerous, the poetry responds to the ups and downs of life in the court and the political pitfalls that sometimes proved fatal. A Wyatt poem printed by Tottel as no. 72,

“The lover hopeth of better chance,” confidently proclaims, “He is not dead, that sometime had a fall” (no. 72, 52.28). Another Wyatt poem, however, no. 102, laments, “The piller perished is whereto I lent” (no. 102, 70.32). This translation from Petrarch possibly made on the fall of Wyatt’s patron, Cromwell, reminds the reader of all of Wyatt’s unlucky associates (Rebholz 357). Cromwell, Anne Boleyn, Catherine Howard, and even the poet earl Surrey lost their lives to the power struggles of the Tudor court.

Given the conditions under which many of the poems were written, it is not surprising that some courtly poets would have been dismayed at the publication of their verses. What may be surprising though is that not only did Tottel pull off his act of appropriation, he profited from it and created a text that influenced the next fifty years of English poetry. These decades saw the writing and publication of poems by non-courtly writers such as Shakespeare and Marlowe, as well as by courtiers such as Sidney, all of whom owed some kind of debt to Tottel’s efforts. With this legacy, we return to a central question: how could such an important book, one that ushered in the age of Sidney, Spenser, and Shakespeare, have been little more than an act of piracy?

Within the apparent contradictions of the *Miscellany* as decisive book of the Renaissance and unethical act of larceny, however, lie questions about it that have yet to be satisfactorily answered: why was this monumental book published in 1557, a decade after its courtier poets had died? How was Tottel’s book able to make such an impact on

its culture, not only spawning a craze for printed poetic miscellanies that lasted a half-century but also circling back to become indispensable to the court that had once supposedly scorned it? If, as critics from Edward Arber, C.S. Lewis, and John Berdan onward to Steven May, Arthur Marotti, and Wendy Wall have all argued, the English Renaissance effectively began with the publication of the *Miscellany*, then the issues surrounding this single book have implications for the field of English Renaissance studies as a whole.

This project attempts to shed light on these questions without resorting to one causal explanation such as the “stigma of print.” It offers an argument that, looking at multiple factors, both takes seriously the idea that what Tottel was doing could have had serious implications for his career and examines how, for a variety of reasons, he was able to insulate himself from serious consequences such as imprisonment or deprivation of his royal privilege. I propose that the appearance of *Tottel’s Miscellany* in summer 1557 was in many ways an accident, the result of a confluence of social, political, and religious factors that not only made such a book possible but also virtually assured its success. To begin with, the London Stationers Company’s consolidation of power over the English book trade put into place the apparatus of print culture necessary to give Tottel’s book credibility, which I attempt to define in the context of this print event. Secondly, the emergence of a well-educated and upwardly mobile readership primed to

consume courtly poetry made such an endeavor profitable, while the religious unrest of Mary's reign made it a useful vehicle for negotiating the ongoing conflict of Reformation and counter-Reformation. In the following chapters, I turn to each of these subjects in order to illustrate how these conditions enabled Tottel to print a book that drew upon the textual authority of the Stationers Company, as well as how in turn access to the poetic discourse of the elite served the social program of a "middling" set of readers and helped to establish a new cultural coherence that was able to help counteract the divisive effects of Reformation and political turmoil.

In other ways, however, the appearance of the book in 1557 and its ongoing success for over three decades was no accident. It owed its existence in part to the business acumen and social ambitions of one printer, Richard Tottel, who was able to seize the opportunities presented to him by his cultural moment. Throughout this study, I examine the individual poets represented in the *Miscellany* and discuss how they are representative of their respective socio-cultural places in Tudor England. I begin the dissertation with Tottel, however, because not only was he instrumental in creating and continuing the *Miscellany*, he enacted in his own life the kinds of changes I discuss theoretically in relation to the poets and poems. In the end, Tottel himself is the strongest piece of evidence supporting my claim that the *Miscellany*, with its project of elevating "English eloquence" and making it available to a wider readership, had material effects

on people's social, economic, and intellectual lives and the phenomenon we call the English Renaissance.

If the question "why then?" is valid, though, so too is the question "why now?" Just as the cultural context of the 1550s helped produce the *Miscellany*, so to does the current climate of literary, textual, and cultural studies demand a reassessment of its conditions of publication and the significance of its reception. Hyder Rollins's edition of the *Miscellany*, published in 1928 and revised in 1965, remains the standard, and indeed the only, critical edition. Rollins's edition, complete with detailed notes and introductory material, is an impressive scholarly endeavor; however, much has happened in literary studies since its publication, creating a need to revisit Tottel and bring to bear on this pivotal text the insights and understandings gained in the last forty years.

To begin with, in the last thirty years since Rollins's edition, New Historicism has changed the way critics view the relationship between a text and its historical and cultural context. While Rollins's notes and commentary situate the text in relation to other literary texts, they downplay its relationship to other, "non-literary" texts. This approach sets the *Miscellany* apart in a space of privileged, literary language, a distinction that New Historicism set about to break down. The *Miscellany*'s contributors had numerous courtly, scholarly, and print trade connections, making the diplomatic documents and letters in the *Calendar of State Papers*, the state and ecclesiastical documents relating to

the Reformation, and the archives of the Stationers' Company valuable texts to read with the *Miscellany's* poems. The *Miscellany* should be seen as helping to construct the social, political, and religious discourses more commonly located in these "non-literary" texts, rather than as simply responding to or mirroring them.

Furthermore, the last few decades have seen significant changes in the historiography of the English Reformation that should be taken into account when considering the *Miscellany*. Christopher Haigh, Eamon Duffy, and Diarmaid MacCulloch, among others, have questioned the extent to which Protestantism had taken root in England by Mary's accession in 1553, and as well they have complicated our notions of the role that traditional religion continued to play in English culture long into Elizabeth's reign.¹ These revisionist historians have contributed invaluable insights into

¹ For specific readings, see Christopher Haigh's *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society Under the Tudors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Eamon Duffy's *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400-c.1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); and Diarmaid MacCulloch's *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (London: Allen Lane, 1999) and *Thomas Cranmer: a Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996). Susan Brigden's *New Worlds, Lost Worlds: the Rule of the Tudors 1485-1603* (New York: Penguin Books, 2002) and "Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey and the Conjured League" (*The Historical Journal*, 37.3, 1994) specifically address the religious leanings of the *Miscellany's* aristocratic poet, Surrey. Brigden argues that "in Surrey's poems the guiding themes of his own life are disclosed: of his religious faith and political morality" ("Henry Howard" 508). Like Brigden, I believe that Surrey's poems are texts as valuable as historical documents for understanding how the Reformation impacted the poet's life and ideas. Unlike Brigden, however, I read the poems not as straightforward statements of belief,

the nature of religious identity in Reformation England that help to illuminate the *Miscellany*'s religious context. Now that this scholarship has been done, Rollins's almost dismissive statement that the *Miscellany* was published "to the accompaniment of fire and martyrs' shrieks," while it acknowledges the centrality of religious violence to English society in 1557, no longer seems to adequately capture the depth and subtleties of the relationship between the *Miscellany*'s lyric poetry and the religious turbulence of the period (3).

Finally, the changes that have perhaps most made this project necessary are the new theories of textuality and book culture that examine how printed books engage in dialogue with their readers. Most centrally, these theories posit that literary values are dynamic constructions that change as their authors' and readers' social situations change. The formerly definitive work on print culture, Elizabeth Eisenstein's *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* (1979), argued that the technology of print itself enabled readers to compare texts and allowed new ideas to proliferate, transforming the collective mentality of Western Europe. However, Eisenstein's position that print culture was inherently stable, uniform, and therefore authoritative runs counter to that of Michel Foucault, who contested the "great man" theory of the author and instead posited the

but rather as intellectual and spiritual explorations tempered by the formal demands of Petrarchan lyricism. I explore in more detail the use of the Petrarchan sonnet as a tool for religious insight in chapter four and the conclusion of this study.

author as a “function of discourse” (124). Foucault suggested that agency is not technologically determined; instead, textual authority is a fluid construct produced in the complex social processes of a text’s production, circulation, and appropriation.

Foucault’s theory shares an affinity with the recent work of bibliographers such as Roger Chartier, D.F. McKenzie, and Adrian Johns that calls for an understanding of the social and economic processes, as well as the technological, that create textual meaning. Johns, for example, contends that print does not constitute a “technological order of reality,” but that instead, “the very identity of print itself has had to be *made*” through complex social process across the centuries (2). Chartier emphasizes the role of the reader in creating a text’s meaning; for Chartier, the “plural and mobile significations” are “constructed in the encounter between a proposal and reception” (ix). In the *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, McKenzie questions the notion of analytical bibliography as strictly indexical, or unconcerned with the symbolic meaning of a text (10). He seeks to expand the purview of bibliographers by describing bibliography instead as the “study of the sociology of texts” (13), or a discipline that

directs us to consider the human motives and interactions which texts involve at every stage of their production, transmission, and consumption. It alerts us to the role of institutions, and their own complex structures, in affecting the forms of social discourse, past and present. (15)

McKenzie then, contrary to Eisenstein, posits that it was not the technological capabilities of print that determined its impact so much as the social processes of production, circulation, and consumption that accompanied it. This theory of textuality suggests new ways of interpreting and expanding the more descriptive bibliographical work done by Rollins et al.

However dated Rollins's edition might be, though, it provides a solid foundation for any current work on the *Miscellany*. As Heather Dubrow and Richard Strier emphasize, in the introduction to *The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literary Culture*, the “new historicism is in a sense dependent upon the old” (4), upon the archival work and scholarly groundwork laid by generations of scholars from Arber through Rollins. What work has been done on the *Miscellany* and its relatives (both in manuscript and print) by recent scholars has not discovered any new texts, but instead has offered new ways of looking at the texts the nineteenth and early twentieth-century antiquarians so carefully catalogued and preserved. By reading these “old texts” with an eye to “new meaning,” informed by the theories of Foucault, Chartier, and McKenzie, we discover that phenomena scholars have located in much later periods — such as Foucault's first stage of the “author-function,” the time when the system for

determining ownership of texts began to develop —actually had their genesis much earlier, in the mid-sixteenth century.²

This project, then, seeks to make use of the archival ground work done by antiquarians and early bibliographers, while supplementing it with more recent archival work, my own as well as others', and incorporating the recent textual and cultural theories of the new bibliography, New Historicism, and revisionist historiography on religion and society. A brief survey of the critical work done on the *Miscellany* in the last thirty years reveals how indebted modern scholars have been to the efforts of their predecessors, particularly those who, like Rollins, were committed to preserving and making accessible texts that had been neglected for hundreds of years. This survey also highlights the need for a critical study of the *Miscellany* that incorporates bibliographical, historical, and sociocultural perspectives to flesh out our understanding of the volume and its place in the early modern literary tradition and the history of books.

Aside from Rollins, critical works that have addressed Tottel and the *Miscellany* or made substantial arguments about the book and its publisher comprise a short list.³

² For a comparison of the various modes of critical and textual theory and their implications, see Chartier, *The Order of Books*, chapter 2.

³ I do not include here the substantial body of work done on Surrey and Wyatt. With the exception of William Sessions in *Henry Howard, Poet Earl of Surrey: a Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), most Surrey and Wyatt scholars have treated the *Miscellany*'s publication as a merely notable postscript to their subjects' lives. Only

Elizabeth Pomeroy's *The Elizabethan Miscellanies: Their Development and Conventions* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973) includes a chapter on Tottel's *Miscellany* and discusses its relationship in style and content to the poetic anthologies that followed. Pomeroy's primary purpose is to "shed light on the history of taste and on the directions of change in poetic theme and technique," and the attention she pays to the *Miscellany*'s cultural context is correspondingly restricted to a discussion of metrical and stylistic development and subject matter (vii, 4).

Barbara Benedict's more recent work, however, draws upon Roger Chartier's and Mikhail Bakhtin's theories of readership to paint quite a different picture of the history of literary taste. In *Making the Modern Reader: Cultural Mediation in Early Modern Literary Anthologies*, Benedict takes a sociocultural rather than a formalist approach to the history of literary anthologies and argues that these books "mediate between individual readers and cultures," and that this mediation "redefines readers' subjectivity by representing literature as art and reading as a critical activity" (3). Rather than viewing the history of literature as shaped primarily by poets and writers, as Pomeroy

Sessions makes the argument that Tottel played a crucial part in fashioning Surrey as a published author and cultural icon. As for Wyatt's contributions, critics have largely only shown interest in the ways Tottel modified Wyatt's meter; for an example, see O.B. Hardison Jr., *Prosody and Purpose in the English Renaissance* (Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986). Other relevant arguments about Surrey and Wyatt appear appropriate sections in chapters three and four of this study.

does, Benedict sees readers and editors as contributing to the formation of cultural values. She does not, however, see Tottel's anthology as "attempt[ing] to mediate [its] fine literature for a wider readership" (14). Instead, she argues, in contrast to reader-compiled commonplace books and miscellanies, Tottel presented the book as "an authoritative edition of new, approved verse, not a readers' compilation," a distinction the subtleties of which I contest in the first two chapters of this project (38).

Arthur Marotti and Wendy Wall, writing after the advent of New Historicism, also contribute new insights gained from feminism and textual studies to examine how ideologies of gender and modes of transmission helped to construct a text's meaning in the printed marketplace. In *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*, Marotti identifies Tottel's publication of the *Miscellany* as a key moment in the shift from coterie, manuscript methods of textual transmission to print transmission. By reading printed anthologies alongside manuscript collections, Marotti demonstrates that coterie methods of circulation and consumption thrived long into the period when print dominated the market, and that these two forms competed as authoritative mediums for lyric verse. He also emphasizes the ways in which Tottel followed the composition and arrangement of the manuscript anthology and marketed his book as a socially desirable object (214).

Although Marotti also touches upon some of the features of the *Miscellany* that were unique to the printed book, he seems to privilege the manuscript as a more authentic vehicle of transmission than the printed book. He does assert that Tottel was not “simply a transporter of texts from the restricted social circulation of manuscript transmission to the more public environment of print” (217) but rather an active agent in transmission, pointing to Tottel’s regularization of poetic meter and “practice of providing special titles” for the previously untitled poems (218). However, Marotti’s interest in the social dynamic of manuscript transmission leads him to describe Tottel’s practice as a “recontextualizing process” in which “the works lost their vivid particularity of meaning and began to speak a language whose general and abstract terms were a hybrid of poetic conventionality and culture-specific code words” (218). His discussion of Tottel’s editorial practices is insightful, but by focusing on the titles’ “(usually flawed) efforts to recreate social context,” Marotti misses the opportunity to investigate how poetic “conventionality” itself could have been socially motivated, how and for whom those “culture-specific code words” gained meaning, and what cultural work they were able to do (219).

Wall builds on Marotti’s work but challenges its implications that print represented an

“inexorable march toward stability and order” (Wall 10). Instead, she contends, “sixteenth-century poetic practices interrupt and complicate the evolutionary logic of this development,” creating a dynamic of interaction that was much more complicated than Marotti’s argument allows (10). Instead of being inevitable, the apparent differences between print culture and manuscript culture, she proposes, are often “an effect of the very language and forms created by writers and publishers” (11). Tottel’s *Miscellany*, she argues, is important because it demonstrates that textual and social issues had points of connection in the practices of poetic transmission; furthermore, the *Miscellany* shows us that the “idea of the book” and the “book commodity” were entities being negotiated and fashioned both through their material format and through the rhetoric that writers and publishers used to identify the social place of writing (29). Wall identifies the *Miscellany* as a “publishing event that raises crucial questions regarding the social stakes of print” (30), in that it registers the “controversial nature of print” (26) and rewrites publishing as a noble gesture, both in the sense of claiming the aristocratic value of generosity and in the sense of moral improvement.

While my position aligns with Marotti’s and Wall’s on a number of foundational points, I take issue with some of their secondary claims about the nature of the relationship between manuscript and print, and I believe those claims have larger

implications for our understanding of how print functioned in early modern society.

Marotti devotes part of a chapter to what the *Miscellany* tells us about the construction of textual authority but still maintains that manuscripts of lyric verse are better sources for information about the social practices that produced them; printed texts, he argues, “yield a distorted picture of literary history or of the place of literary texts in the life of the society that produced and consumed them,” while manuscripts “better reveal the socioliterary dynamics of particular texts and the social history of literature” (xiii). In making this claim, Marotti perpetuates the very “stigma of print” that he discusses in his study, continuing to privilege manuscript texts as more authentic vehicles for lyric poetry than printed volumes.

Admittedly, Marotti’s project aims to redress an earlier critical imbalance that privileged print’s “edited ‘ideal’ forms” over “texts in their material specificity,” and to recover the manuscript tradition that had been ignored by previous scholars (xii). The very theories he founds his argument upon, however — particularly those of Chartier and McKenzie — invite a reconsideration of just how socially informative printed texts can be. If Marotti’s purpose is to consider how the picture looks from the “other framework” of manuscript transmission, then mine is to shift that perspective yet again, to think of texts themselves as complicated units interacting in ways that are fixed in neither manuscript nor print. Indeed, the practices of the print circulation were just as varied and

socially determined as the practices of manuscript circulation, and therefore the sociocultural positions of print producers and readers help to determine a text's meaning as legitimately as those of manuscript coterie readers.

Wall does not underestimate the sociological value of printed books in the same way, but her claim that the *Miscellany* “offers no readily comprehensible generic, authorial, or structural order” (24) jars with her careful reading of the book “both as a typographical printed object and a socially embedded manuscript text” (25). Neither Wall nor Marotti seems interested in reconstructing the community of readers who might have bought the printed book, the very readers for whom, I suggest, Tottel organized the book in a very effective way.⁴ By dividing the book into authorially determined sections (one each for Surrey, Wyatt, Grimald, and the anonymous poets) Tottel was able to draw upon the named poets' reputations as courtiers while still maintaining the open-ended feel of a manuscript miscellany, both of which would have appealed to non-courtly readers hungry for gossip and social information. Additionally, the book's hierarchy of poets offers a wealth of information for modern readers about the way the *Miscellany* constructed the relationship between printed poetry and social status.

⁴ Marotti does identify Tottel's readers as “a larger audience of educated and fashionable gentlemen and gentlewomen” (214), and he has a great deal to say about these readers as participants in the manuscript system of transmission. Understandably, given the limits of his study, he does not pursue the question of how they read and circulated printed texts.

Moreover, bringing early modern print readers into the picture more fully slightly alters the narrative of how lyric poetry was received in print. Both Marotti and Wall are primarily concerned with how status functions in the text, yet they do not question the nuances of the received “myth of the stigma of print,” as Steven May calls it. By filling in some of the gaps of our knowledge about the book’s reception, I suggest that Tottel’s book helped to create the “stigma of print” because it revealed material ways in which the appropriation of elite poetic forms threatened the established social hierarchy. Not only did it enabled non-courtiers to make money off of courtly poetry, as has been established, but also as a kind of courtesy manual it enabled them to infiltrate the landed gentry and challenge the entitlements (land and social power) that had traditionally belonged to the nobility. In order to understand how such a little, seemingly frivolous book was able to offer such a challenge, it is necessary to look closely at the institutional power that backed it, as well as the growing cultural influence of the readers who bought it.⁵

My project, therefore, does not focus on the dynamic between manuscript and print as systems of transmission per se, but rather, on the tension between the growing institutional power of the book trade and *other* institutions in Tudor society, namely the

⁵Frank Whigham’s *Ambition and Privilege: the Social Tropes of Elizabethan Courtesy Theory* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984) examines the ways in which courtly behaviors and discourse became available to the socially ambitious through printed texts.

court, the church, the aristocracy, and the city elite. This dissertation regards the *Miscellany* as a bibliographical artifact produced and shaped by a complex social, political, and religious matrix. By considering the Stationers' Company and its members, including Richard Tottel, as functioning within and often representing an institutional position, I hope to avoid the trap of falling into some of the very assumptions that recent scholarship wished to challenge but instead ended up endorsing. Regarding the Stationers' Company and printers as powerful players in the struggle for textual authority acknowledges the legitimacy of their interests and provides a more well-rounded picture of the power struggles taking place in the 1550s. I do not deny that manuscript and print competed for legitimacy in the marketplace; I only wish to suggest that actually looking at that marketplace, particularly its conventions, producers, and customers, enhances our understanding of what was at stake in these debates.

What was and is at stake in most of these debates, I have found, is the question of canonicity, the value that a society places on a particular text and the cultural work that it does. The issues surrounding the *Miscellany* prompt us to consider why some texts achieve a higher cultural status than others, and what factors affect the meaning readers imbue texts with and the value they place on them. I aim to shed light on these questions and offer some tentative answers through this study of the *Miscellany*, a text whose

publication history suggests that social, political, and religious forces affect the process of textual production, circulation, and consumption in both material and immaterial ways.

By looking at these factors individually in relation to a single textual body, one that is in fact comprised of many texts, we can see that readers and publishers play as crucial a role in formulating a text's meaning as the authors do. Indeed, in the case of the *Miscellany*, I would suggest that the publisher and readers exercise *more* agency in creating the book's cultural identity and value than the poets, most of whom were deceased at the time of publication or whose identities were concealed from contemporary readers and from posterity. In order to understand how the *Miscellany's* readers — who, like the poets, were largely anonymous — helped to create the book's meaning, I have considered the volume as a material artifact that demonstrates how Chartier's "dialectic between imposition and appropriation, between constraints transgressed and freedoms bridled" functioned in print (viii). That is, unlike Wall and Marotti, I suggest the physical appearance of the *Miscellany* offers a way to read how Tottel mediated courtly lyric texts for non-courtly readers in a way that drew upon the lyrics' courtly origin to open them up to a new host of potential (and socially significant) meanings.

Chartier cautions, however, that the "first aim of a history of reading that strives to grasp...communities of readers and their 'arts of reading'" is recognizing that

dialectic's "diverse modalities and multiple variations" (viii). In this case, a history of reading the *Miscellany* must recognize not only the particular conditions of reading and writing in the 1550s, but also the ways in which those conditions changed between the 1530s, when many of the poems were originally written, and the 1550s, when the first editions of the *Miscellany* were printed. This is therefore not a publication history of Surrey and Wyatt, or even a study of courtly poetry and politics; indeed, I hope that the most original contribution this project makes is to the study of the "uncertain" poets, whose work receives much of the attention here, and of the ways anonymity functioned in print. It is instead an exploration of what happened to the courtiers' poems after they left the court and were appropriated by a printer and readers whose social positions were quite different, but who were able to adapt courtly language and rhetorical tools to their own purposes.

As this dissertation addresses textual appropriation and the dissemination of cultural values, it also touches upon the question of how our own modern literary canon came into being. The readers we are most intimately acquainted with and concerned about, in the end, are ourselves, and I suggest that we can trace our habits of reading Tudor poetry and the high value we place on certain works and authors back to Tottel and his publication of the *Miscellany*. We are the inheritors of Tottel's project to promote the study of "English eloquence," and we have continued his efforts by canonizing Surrey

and Wyatt in numerous modern anthologies and including them on course curricula. In order to give a sense of how this trend came about, I begin with the printer himself, Richard Tottel, and examine the details of his cultural context; I end with Surrey and Wyatt, created in print by Tottel as the icons of a new English poetics and cultural age, many values of which we still share.

Chapter layout

My dissertation focuses on the state of English culture and society in 1557, the year that the *Miscellany* was first published. Although the book enjoyed a long and successful run between 1557 and 1584, I have chosen mostly to restrict my scope to the first two editions, published on June 5 and July 31, 1557 respectively. Hyder Rollins and Elizabeth Pomeroy have thoroughly described the shape of the *Miscellany*'s publication history; my purpose here is not to repeat their findings but rather to look more closely at the conditions that produced the landmark first edition and the substantial changes to the second. After the second edition, few noteworthy changes were made to the text or its layout, and so, I suggest, it is the first two editions that reveal the most information about the sociocultural conditions of the book's production.

The first half of this study looks at the institutional changes that took place in the English book trade in 1557 and the way those changes manifest themselves in an

important text printed that year, Tottel's *Miscellany*. Without understanding the forms of power and authority that were contested in that historical moment, it is impossible to understand why the *Miscellany* looks the way it does and how it may have been received by its readers; conversely, by reading the book as a typographical artifact, we can gain a clearer understanding of how the politics of the Stationers' Company, the trade guild that controlled the English book trade, and the interests of its individual members helped to shape the products of the press and determine their appearance.

In the first chapter then, I begin by discussing the terms of the royal charter that the Stationers' Company received from the crown in May of 1557. I argue that the granting of the charter represented a moment when the needs of the crown and the goals of the Stationers' Company appeared to be in harmony but were actually dramatically divergent. Rather than fulfilling the crown's interests in censorship and propaganda, the charter allowed the Company to pursue its own agenda, which was primarily economic. The effects of this event were twofold: on the one hand, the terms of the charter began to shift the source of textual authority away from the royal court and to the Stationers' court, and on the other hand, it allowed the privileged members of the Company to achieve a level of financial success that enabled them to move into the landed gentry. Richard Tottel was able to take advantage of his privileged position in the Company to increase

his social status, and at the same time he was granted the authority to produce texts — legal and literary — that validated and normalized this kind of social advancement.

The *Miscellany* offered a challenge to the traditional social structure in other less tangible ways, as well. In the second chapter, I turn from the life and career of Richard Tottel to consider the ways in which the bibliographical features of the book, determined by the politics of print, in turn enabled its readers to use lyric poetry as a tool for social mobility. In contrast to Wendy Wall, I consider the book's structure to be organized around clear principles of authorship, which help to construct the figure of the courtly author in print even as other features of the book — the titles, index, and preface — undermine the poet's authority with that of the reader. By reading the printed *Miscellany* with the Devonshire Manuscript, a collection of coterie lyric poetry that circulated in Henry VIII's court, I emphasize the *Miscellany*'s uniquely printed features and analyze the rhetorical meanings attached to them. These features, I suggest, organize and mediate the reader's experience to familiarize them with the rhetorical practices of the court, offering lyric poetry as a means for learning skills necessary to social advancement. I also reconstruct the *Miscellany*'s reading community and examine the ways in which Tottel's preface attempts to shape their reading practices.

In the second half of the dissertation, I bring close readings of the poems themselves to bear on the bibliographical and book history perspectives of the previous

chapters. To the end of understanding the conditions of reading in the period, I believe it is crucial to take into account the social situation of the book's poets and readers as well as the political turmoil and religious violence that marked the 1550s. That context provided more than simply a backdrop for the *Miscellany*'s appearance, as Hyder Rollins characterized the relationship. Instead, the struggles over religious and social identity are woven into the fabric of the book itself, both into the language of the poems and their presentation on the page. Bringing historical and social research together with more traditional methods of close reading helps us to be more sensitive to the nuances of social and religious meaning transmitted through poetic forms and practices.

The third chapter accordingly looks at the ways in which the *Miscellany*'s poems adapt courtly epideictic forms to negotiate and alter a variety of social relationships. In this chapter, I examine Surrey's well-known elegies on Thomas Wyatt alongside lesser known elegies and praise poems written by the *Miscellany*'s non-courtly poet, Nicholas Grimald, and by the volume's anonymous poets. I argue that these comparisons reveal that Grimald and the "uncertain authors" used the epideictic genre to elevate and commemorate a range of non-aristocratic subjects, such as soldiers and lower-ranking gentlewomen, by appropriating and adapting traditionally aristocratic forms and language. In particular, I consider Grimald's elegy for his school friend and fellow poet, William Chambers, reading it as a literary pre-cursor to Milton's *Lycidas* and Donne's

elegies in its intensely personal honoring of scholarly, communal ties. Anticipating these later works, Grimald's elegy demonstrates the capacity of the form as a vehicle of social mobility for the poet as well as the subject of his verse.

In the fourth and final chapter of this study, I end by considering the *Miscellany's* relationship to the religious violence of the 1530s-1550s. The previous chapters all emphasize the book's work of mediating a variety of social forces, and I suggest that it performs a similar function in moderating the extremes of Catholic and Protestant thought. In contrast to John King and Stephen Hamrick, who identify strong strains of Protestant and Catholic thought respectively in the poems, I argue that the poems instead reveal how English worshipers reconciled a variety of spiritual and theological ideologies to the shifting official doctrines they were expected to follow. The Petrarchan form, Hamrick suggests, was a useful form for subverting the dominant Protestant position; I modify Hamrick's argument to offer the possibility that the form was flexible enough, when adapted by English poets, to express the nuances of a changing religious identity. Neither wholly Catholic nor wholly Protestant, the *Miscellany's* Petrarchan lyrics instead reveal individual responses to religious change that align lyric development with the developing position of the English church. Much as the so-called Protestant settlement under Elizabeth synthesized traditional ceremonies and new doctrines in a way that is largely moderate and wholly English, so too did poets, readers, and publishers shape and

promote a poetics that accreted native forms to foreign modes, stylistic choices that were motivated by social, political, and religious forces as much as by aesthetics.

Indeed, the *Miscellany* exemplifies the ways in which the culture of the middle part of English society mediated among various factors, economic and social as well as religious. As the book mediated between manuscript and print systems of lyric transmission, so too did it adapt aristocratic values and behaviors for a more middling audience and modify religious extremism for a large part of the population that did not aspire to martyrdom. More than just courtly poetry, Tottel offers his readers a *via media*, a way to forge a cultural identity that derives from aristocratic values but draws in a wider range of beliefs, behaviors, and perspectives. At a time of political, social, and religious instability, he gave his readers new icons of cultural coherence, the courtier poets, and a new sense of community, one dedicated to cultivating what he calls “English eloquence.”

Above all, then, this project is a study of communities — communities of poets who were also readers of each other’s works, and of readers whose exposure to the courtly lyric tradition inspired them to become poets themselves, giving rise to the explosion of creative activity outside the court later in Elizabeth’s reign. It explores how religious communities responded to the crisis of the Reformation, reshaping their interactions with each other and with the divine in order to negotiate a bewildering series

of official pronouncements meant to govern private belief and public devotion. It looks at how institutions, city trade guilds as well as universities, churches, and courtly coteries, fostered a sense of community among their members and how participants satisfied their need to belong to that community while still maintaining individual ideologies and identities. Finally, it offers a particular take on how the printed book in general, and the circulation of printed poetry in particular, affected all of these dynamics and created a new community of readers — those devoted to cultivating “English eloquence” and promoting a new ideal of cultural stability and unity. The summer of 1557 truly was a watershed moment, for in that moment these forces converged in a little book called *Songes and Sonnets*, a collection of “small parcels,” as the printer calls them, whose delivery to readers outside the court changed the course of English lyric poetry and the shape of the literary canon.

Chapter One —
**“Pirated” Poems and Textual Authority: Tottel, the *Miscellany*, and
the Stationers Company**

Summer 1557 was a difficult time for Londoners. The English were embroiled in “the most disastrous war of the century” with France, fighting on the side of the hated Spanish under the leadership of Queen Mary’s consort, Prince Philip of Spain (Elton 394). In only six months, they would lose Calais, the last of the English possessions in France (Prescott 415). In England itself, a series of bad harvests had strained local resources, a problem compounded by currency debasement and a severe influenza epidemic. The agricultural problems in the countryside had in turn caused economic strain for the craftsmen and laborers living in cities such as London; prices soared while the demands for their services went down (Wrightson, *Earthly Necessities* 55). G.R. Elton speculates that between 1556 and 1558, one fifth of England’s population died from the famine and its accompanying scourges of bubonic plague and influenza (393). Meanwhile the religious divisions between the Catholic authorities and the Protestant martyrs sent nearly 300 Protestants to their deaths between 1555 and 1558 (Brigden, *New Worlds* 208), many of them at Smithfield Market in London, only a short walk from Fleet Street within Temple Bar where the law printer Richard Tottel had his shop.

Whether or not modern English verse properly began with the publication of *Tottel's Miscellany* in summer 1557, the year was a crucial one for the development of lyric poetry. The *Norton Anthology of English Literature: the Major Authors* (seventh edition) begins its section on the sixteenth century with selections from Wyatt and Surrey and notes their appearance in the *Miscellany*, continuing the long association between the poets and the 1557 anthology into the present day (337). This common connection emphasizes that the canonization of these poets for a wider reading public would not have been possible without Tottel's publication, but it also smoothes over the social changes that had to take place for courtly texts to achieve credibility outside the court. If, as Saunders claims, the poetry of courtiers was printed largely "without authority," then how did Tottel establish his text as a credible one in the eyes of his customers (140)? Furthermore, what sort of authority was at stake in such a publication? Adrian Johns suggests that in order to understand how a printed text established itself as credible, we look at the full "woof" of its origin, the issues of production and usage that surrounded its creation and circulation (19). When we look at the "woof" of the *Miscellany's* publication, encompassing sixteenth century English print culture and the political climate of 1557, it is possible to untangle the issues of property and piracy and shed light on how textual authority was established outside the royal court, in the hall and court of the Stationers Company and by Richard Tottel, the *Miscellany's* printer.

The year 1557 might have seemed an inauspicious one in which to print a luxury item such as a small book of courtly love poetry, but while the rest of the country was experiencing hardship, the guild to which Richard Tottel belonged, the London Stationers Company, was experiencing an upswing in its fortunes. On May 4 1557, one month before Tottel published *Songs and Sonnets*, the crown granted the Company a charter of incorporation. This charter marked a monumental step in the history of the Stationers' Company. Although the Company had existed in one form or another for nearly two hundred years, the royal charter codified for the guild an unprecedented level of control over the English book trade and made its most privileged members, Tottel among them, powerful players in the shaping of English print culture.

Indeed, as I argue in this chapter, Richard Tottel's fortunes as a publisher and printer were closely tied to those of the Stationers' Company. I propose that it was no coincidence that *Tottel's Miscellany* first appeared shortly after the Company received their royal charter. While the charter in many ways simply made official practices that had been in place for hundreds of years, it nevertheless promoted a favorable atmosphere for younger printers, such as Tottel, to achieve financial success and even to take some publishing risks. I suggest in particular that the privilege that the Company granted Tottel for the sole publishing of certain law books gave him the capital to print a book of courtly lyric poetry, but more importantly, that his status as England's leading law printer

protected him from any repercussions that might come from publicly circulating what had once been other people's private poems.

As Steven May has proposed, the entire "mythical stigma of print" originates with the publication of the *Miscellany* (12); therefore, how we understand the issues of property and textual authority at stake in this act of publication can help illuminate attitudes towards courtly printed works in the wider culture. I suggest that Tottel's privileged and therefore somewhat protected status derived in part from his royal privilege and in part from the Company's control over the book trade, which began to expand the center of authority over printed texts from the royal court to the Stationer's court, where the Company defined issues of property and propriety related to the book trade and settled them internally. There were in essence then two courts and two centers of textual authority, and Tottel's preface to his readers implies that in the case of the *Miscellany*, the Company's definition of property conflicted with that of the courtly world from which he had taken the poems he published.

Rather than viewing Tottel's publication from the courtly angle as a simple act of piracy, however, I propose that we look at it from the perspective of the Stationers Company and their competing model of textual authority. The influential bibliographer W.W. Greg claims in *Some Aspects and Problems of London Publishing Between 1550 and 1650* that the history of the English book trade at this time is synonymous with the

history of the Company itself (1), a statement that allows us to shift the focus of discussion about textual authority from the royal court to the Stationers Court and its attempts to establish new definitions of property and ownership. We can then regard the *Miscellany* not as simply an act of piracy — which technically, according to the Company’s rules, it was not — or on the other end of the spectrum as an uncomplicated and inevitable act of literary canonization. Instead, it appears as a textual event that highlights the clash between aristocratic notions of property and an emerging and increasingly dominant bourgeois one, and that allows us to examine how these issues of print culture and textual authority were tied up with complicated and hotly contested questions of social identity and mobility.

My position throughout this chapter rests on Adrian Johns’ now widely accepted theories about the socially constructed nature of the so-called “print culture.” Where Elizabeth Eisenstein emphasizes print’s “impersonal processes involving transmission and communication” and depicts the resulting print culture as both monolithic and inevitable (xv), Johns argues that these processes are never impersonal. He instead contends that “what we often regard as essential elements and necessary concomitants of print are in fact rather more contingent than is generally acknowledged” (2). While Johns’ study focuses on how printing presses legitimized scientific discourse specifically, the implications of his argument are equally applicable to the relationship between print

and courtly lyric poetry. The records of the Stationers' Company, which I examine in the following sections, and the wealth of interpretations made by W.W. Greg, Edward Arber, Cyprian Blagden, and other bibliographers support Johns' claim that "veracity in particular... is extrinsic to the press and has had to be grafted onto it" (2).⁶ The Company's royal charter, which I examine in the following section, the Company's archives, and the documents relating to Richard Tottel's life and career all reveal the ways in which the Company and its members "grafted" credibility and authenticity onto the products of their presses, as well as the social stakes they had in the legitimization of printed books.

The Crown and the Company

⁶ Between 1875 and 1894, Edward Arber edited the *Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London 1554-1640*, a monumental five volume work that published for the first time many of the extant documents dealing with the Company's early history from 1554 on. The *Transcript* includes a copy of the 1557 charter, the Wardens' Accounts (1554-96), Entries of Copies (1554-1640, except 1571-76), Enrollment of Apprentices (1554-1605), Star Chamber decrees of 1566, 1586, and 1637, Fines (1554-1605), and others not immediately relevant to the present study. W.W. Greg and E. Boswell added to Arber's work by editing and publishing the *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company 1576-1602* (1930), and William Jackson completed Greg and Boswell's work with the *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company 1602-1640* (1957). However, as Cyprian Blagden notes, many records remain in manuscript form only, notably the record book known as Register A, the earliest surviving book of transactions (from December 1554) (Blagden 19, 301).

I turn now to the charter granted to the Stationers' Company and the provisions that most affected the career of Richard Tottel and the appearance of the *Miscellany*. Although Queen Mary intended to create a partnership between the crown and the Company to help the royal government in censoring objectionable printed material, the Company had more economic goals in mind, and its interests did not always line up with the crown's. The charter stated that only members of the Company could engage in printing and bookmaking in England, that the Company would have full control over its own internal workings, and that the master and wardens could seize any material printed contrary to the Company's regulations. By granting the Company this full scope of powers, the crown in fact created an entity that could (and at times did) rival the crown as a source of textual authority. It is no overstatement to say, as Greg and others have made clear, that with the 1557 charter the Stationer's Company assumed a central role in the making of English print culture.

Richard Tottel was only twenty-seven in 1557, but the guild proper to which he had been admitted as a full member in 1552 (Blagden 34) was over a hundred and fifty years old.⁷ Scriveners (who wrote the texts of medieval books) and limners (who illuminated them) banded together in a craft guild as early as 1357, but it was only in

⁷ On p. 34, Blagden notes that Tottel was made free of the city in 1552; in the chart on p.296, he lists the date as 1547.

1403 that the scribes, illuminators, book-binders, and booksellers joined forces to form what would eventually be known as the Stationers' Company (Blagden 22). There were, then, successful printers before Tottel — chief among them such pioneers as William Caxton and Wynken de Worde — and there were a few publications of English vernacular poetry, particularly the works of Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate that found favor with readers outside the court (Pitcher 359; Boffey and Edwards 557).

The particular project that Richard Tottel undertook, however, the publication of miscellaneous lyrics that had hitherto circulated in manuscript in the Tudor court, had as far as we know only one precedent, a lyrical anthology called the *Court of Venus*. The *Court*, which survives only in small fragments, may have been published a full twenty years before the *Miscellany*; Russell Fraser dates the earliest fragment to sometime between 1536 and 1539 (19). This anthology printed three Wyatt poems later published by Tottel (nos. 65, 79, and 87) and, if it is indeed as early as Fraser claims, represents the earliest publication of Wyatt. While the *Court of Venus* may have been enormously popular and so “read to pieces,” as Fraser hypothesizes (76), and while it inspired a handful of imitators, both admirers and those that sought to counter its secular tone with a more religious one (Pomeroy 5), it has not been as strongly linked to the poetic explosion later in the century as the *Miscellany* has been.

I suggest that the *Miscellany* was able to leave a more lasting mark on modern and early modern readers than the *Court*, not only because more and complete copies happened to survive, but also because it benefited from the post-charter conditions of print culture that aided its printer's marketing strategies. Fraser's work indicates that the *Court of Venus* was probably printed by at least three different printers, Thomas Gibson, William Copland, and Thomas Marshe (Huttar 182). A fourth printer, Henry Sutton, entered a *Court of Venus* on the Stationers' Register on July 9, 1557, a move that R.H. Griffiths speculates was made "to protect [Sutton's] copyright" against Tottel's perceived poaching of the three Wyatt poems for his *Miscellany* (700). Sutton's edition of the *Court* does not survive, but the *Miscellany* does, and its continuous association with Tottel raises the possibility that its survival was due in part to its proprietary printer's ability to control its publication, perhaps because he benefited from a more stabilized and centralized print culture.

The different publication histories of the *Court of Venus* and the *Miscellany* can perhaps, then, be ascribed in part to the conditions before and after the May 4, 1557 charter, which D.F. McKenzie proposes were dissimilar in slight but important ways. McKenzie argues that by 1557 the Stationers' Company "had had almost a century's experience of new forms of book production and their economies of scale, and while continuing their trade in the dissemination and sale of manuscripts, they had also evolved

marketing structures better adapted to handle the range and number of printed books” (554). The surviving fragments of the *Court* indeed make clear that printers had already experimented with packaging courtly lyric poetry for book readers, but the anthology’s chaotic publication history also implies that no one had yet figured out how to make printed poetry a commodity that was both stable and culturally prominent.

With the charter, however, some conditions were put into place or solidified that allowed the Company, and especially certain members, to perfect their practices of production and dissemination. For the successful production and circulation of courtly lyric poetry, the printed book’s ability to establish textual authority seems to have been crucial, and the certain kind of authority Tottel drew on to support the *Miscellany* depended in part on the authority given to the Company by the terms of the charter. Peter Blayney, more than McKenzie or Blagden, emphasizes the nature of the change wrought by the charter. Blayney argues,

In and after 1557...the experience of being a free Stationer would have changed distinctly since 1547. Blagden, of course, might not have considered such changes ‘fundamental,’ but the most significant difference of all simple cannot be ignored. In 1557 the Stationers were given a virtual monopoly of printing in England; a mere ten years earlier, such a prospect could hardly have seemed within reach. (47)

According to Blayney, while in some ways the charter simply confirmed powers that the Company already exercised, its act of codifying and making legal those powers marked an important moment in which the Company was publicly recognized by the Crown as a key agent in regulating print culture. As authority and ownership are largely symbolic, created through social contracts and public agreement, we should not underestimate the representative power of such a moment. With the charter the Crown officially and publicly granted the Company the authority to make and circulate texts without physical or legal punishment and to determine ownership of them; a crucial shift in the conditions of textual authority had taken place.

The charter makes it clear that the Crown regarded the Company as a tool for extending and consolidating its power and authority. Its language indicates that Queen Mary had a very specific intention in mind when she granted the Company incorporation, namely that the Company would help the crown in its project to stamp out and suppress all heretical and treasonous writings. A royal proclamation dated April 30, 1557, declaring the treason of one Thomas Stafford, indicates the crown's concern over the spread of such writings:

Thomas Stafford and others...have, persisting in their said malice, devised and attempted divers times to stir seditions and rebellions within this realm to the great disturbance of the quietness, peace and

tranquility thereof, by sending hither into the realm divers books, letters, and writings, both printed and written, farced and filled full of untruths and seditious and most false surmises of things said to be done and devised by the king our sovereign lord and his servants...

(Loades 83)

The marriage of Mary to Prince Philip of Spain had created agitation among those wary of Spanish control as well as among Protestants (Harbison 320), and this document indicates that the crown viewed print as a dangerous weapon in the hands of those opposed to the presence of the Spanish in England. The printing and importing of Protestant writings also threatened Mary's program to return England to the Catholic Church. When the Stationers approached her with a charter of incorporation, Mary must have viewed the contract as an opportunity to get the print trade on her side.

Accordingly, the charter sets forth the crown's perspective on the situation that led to incorporating the Stationers' Company. It explains the reasons for incorporation as being primarily religious and political and motivated by the need for censorship:

The king and queen to all whom etc., greeting. Know ye that we, considering and manifestly perceiving that certain seditious and heretical books rhymes and treatises are daily published and printed by divers scandalous malicious schismatical and heretical

persons, not only moving our subjects and lieges to sedition and disobedience against us, our crown and dignity, but also to renew and move very great and detestable heresies against the faith and sound Catholic doctrine of Holy Mother Church, and wishing to provide a suitable remedy in this behalf..

(Arber 1.xxviii)

The “remedy” of course was that the crown would grant the Stationers listed below and their successors a series of powers that would make the Company a partner in the fight against treason and heresy. Stephen Greenblatt points to William Tyndale’s 1525 English translation as a culturally central example of the printed word’s force; Greenblatt calls Tyndale’s book a “*form of power*,” one “invested with the ability to control, guide, discipline, console, exalt, and punish” (97). Even Tyndale’s execution in 1536 did not stop the circulation of the fifty thousand copies of his book in existence (Greenblatt 96). If the crown could not beat the print trade, it would join with it, or at least attempt to appropriate print’s power for its own purposes.

The purposes of the Company, however, were rather different. The nature of the crown’s role in the book trade was long misinterpreted; contrary to the notion that the Stationers were puppets of the crown’s censorship machine, they seem to have regarded the charter primarily as a way to protect their financial interests in the book trade. The

bibliographer Edward Arber, who in the nineteenth century compiled and published the documents of the Stationers' Register, first raised this possibility, asserting that Mary and Philip had not in fact provided the impetus for incorporating the Stationers' Company. Instead, Arber claims, "it was the printing and publishing trade which had long been organized as a City Craft that sought the royal incorporation and the civic liberty for its own great honor and importance." Indeed, Arber goes on to propose, "the incorporation was a mere matter of money" (Arber 1.xxvi). The Stationers actually sought a royal charter to protect their financial interest in the print trade and to secure the powers that would guarantee them control of their own affairs; any political motivations were secondary to the economic ones.

Increasingly in Tudor England, however, and particularly in the mercantile world of London, economic and political power were intertwined though not yet synonymous. In fact, the charter gave the Company a legal status with political implications, concentrated in its "power to plead and be impleaded and answer and be answered in all and several matters, suits and complaints, actions, demands and causes before any judge and justices, and in any courts and places" (Arber 1.xxix). Along with establishing itself as an entity that could sue or be sued, the Company also stipulated that it should have the power to make rules and regulations pertaining to its trade, provided those regulations did not run counter to the laws of the land. Although this term acknowledges the crown as

the highest authority in the land, it nevertheless establishes for the Company a set of powers over the book trade that rival the crown's.

This last provision may indicate a source of tension between the crown and the Company. Indeed, Cyprian Blagden notes that the Company had approached Henry VIII as early as 1542 with a similar charter, which Blagden speculates the king probably rejected because it gave the Company powers of extraordinary scope (28). Not only did the agreed upon, 1557 charter allow the Company a monopoly over printing, it gave the Master and Wardens of the Company rights of “search and seizure” to enforce that monopoly; by this term, the master and wardens were permitted to enter any grounds where they suspected illegal printing was going on and to seize the products of the illicit press (Arber 1.xxx). Adrian Johns reminds us that in practice this policy was far more complicated than the legal documents might suggest, and that it is only from individual cases that we can glean information about “the extent and severity of such enforcement” and “tactics of evasion” (234). Even so, for the crown to grant and legally back such a right endowed the Company with a great deal of power.

The net effect of these terms was that the Stationers' Company acquired far more control over English printing than their continental counterparts exercised in their own countries. Rudolf Hirsch remarks that printing guilds in the German cities often made agreements and arrangements with city officials, and that certain Italian and French

printing houses received certain types of privileges and trade favors from the civic authorities, but these agreements were not nearly as extensive as those made with the London Stationers' Company (Hirsch 28). This centralized control made the Stationers' Company unique among print guilds. In Germany, the lack of central control meant that presses multiplied and the print trade flourished, while in England the long standing concentration of the trade in the hands of the Stationers' Company kept the book trade confined to London and the university towns:

It was this rather unique continuity from medieval to modern book trade organization in one and the same corporation which made privileges more meaningful in England than elsewhere, which permitted better protection by the crown against unfair competition and unwanted importation, and which promoted the concentration of the book trade in comparatively few localities.

It also retarded the spread of printing.

(Hirsch 29)

By requiring that any person who wanted to practice the "mystery" of printing be a member of the Stationers' Company, and by reserving the freedom of the city for guild members, the Company effectively absorbed or stamped out its competition in London and the provinces. Only the presses at Oxford and Cambridge, which were operated by

the universities, were allowed to print books outside of London (Pollard 17).⁸ The result was a trade guild that enjoyed a level of autonomy and authority that was unmatched elsewhere in Europe.

This is not to say that with the charter the royal government relinquished control over the book trade entirely to the Stationers' Company. On the contrary, the series of ordinances and decrees passed by the monarch and the Star Chamber from 1559 onward suggests that the crown and the Company frequently clashed over what constituted properly regulating the print trade. The official system of licensing and authorization was made up of a seemingly arcane series of steps that involved both the government and the Company, and the change in regime between Mary and Elizabeth must have complicated the process of defining what was permissible printed material and what contradicted the government's currently official policies.

Indeed, hard on the heels of confirming the Company's charter, Elizabeth's government issued the *Injunctions* of 1559, which indicated dissatisfaction with the way the Company was licensing books. These pronouncements criticize the printers for

⁸ The universities formally had this right but did not exercise it. Blagden mentions that, although a royal charter of 1534 granted Cambridge the right to own a press and employ stationers to run it, the university had not produced a book for over forty years. They therefore did not represent a threat to the Stationers' Company, nor did the other licensed university, Oxford. The subject of printing did not come up again for Cambridge until 1583, for Oxford 1632 (102). The resulting struggles with the Stationers' Company are beyond the scope of this present study.

allowing (out of alleged “covetousness”) to go to press a number of objectionable books, perhaps those that violated the new Crown’s project to overturn Mary’s Catholic policies, and the *Injunctions* propose a number of steps to correct the problem. Greg interprets the regulations as follows: “New books in general are to be licensed either by the Queen herself in writing, or by six members of the Privy Council, or by two of the following: the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishop of London, the Chancellors of Oxford and Cambridge, and the Bishop and Archdeacon of the place of printing” (*Some Problems and Aspects* 6). Although the Stationers had their own system of registration, publishers were still required to license books through the royal or ecclesiastical authorities.

That these problems and conflicts continued even after the 1557 charter and the 1559 *Injunctions* worked out the power share between Crown and Company is evidenced by the Star Chamber decree of 1586, which revised the 1559 *Injunctions* and stated that any book had to be approved by either the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of London. It also protected certain books authorized by Letters Patent and the Company’s ordinances and was thus, as Greg argues, “designed to uphold privileges and copyrights” (*Some Problems and Aspects* 9). Since the system of copyright was largely the Company’s own internal method of regulation, the decree of 1586 acknowledges and upholds certain of the Company’s rights while also reinforcing those of the crown.

As these regulations illustrate, the ways in which the crown and the Company interacted to license books were complicated, and they sometimes produced conflicts between the two forms of authority. Nevertheless, even though these pronouncements mark significant attempts on the crown's part to rein in the Company, the records of the Company's daily operations suggest that, for the most part, the Company was allowed to conduct its business on its own (Bennett 57). Despite the government's sporadic attempts to bend the power of the press to its own agenda, the Company was remarkably successful in securing for itself autonomy and authority.

This autonomy and authority was symbolized materially in the form of the Stationers Hall, and more specifically, by the court located in the hall. According to Blayney, the purchase of the Hall anticipated the Company's incorporated status and was one of several signs that they expected their charter to be accepted by the crown (50). The court in the Hall served the primary function of monitoring internal relations, or what Graham Pollard calls "harmony and good order," among the members of the Company by hearing and ruling on disputes (Pollard 17; Johns 196). As Pollard argues, the Company's monopoly over the book trade would have crumbled if it were not able to maintain internal order and the standards of the trade. The Company solved this problem by adopting a system of copyright (in the forms of the Stationers' Register and of patents and privileges, which I will discuss further in the next section) and by enforcing the

system through its own court. The court, which was presided over by the elite assistants of the company, primarily sat in judgment of disputes over property rights between different members of the company. Adrian Johns stresses that unlike other courts, the Stationers' court mediated instead of punished and attempted to reach a settlement that would satisfy all parties involved (221). Only if the court was unable to reach a satisfactory solution could either party appeal to the outside legal system (223).

What made this entire system run smoothly most of the time was that its members agreed to the Company's definitions of order and propriety and acknowledged the court and its officiators as authorities — a principle that McKenzie describes as “the corporate sense of a common cause” (554). Johns remarks on how surprising it is that, nearly all the time, the decisions of the court seem to have been accepted by all parties concerned, and he identifies the “social authority of the court” and the Company's sense of community as being responsible for this order (223). The language of the charter encapsulates the Company's sense of itself as a commonwealth: after the listing of names (of which Tottel's appears sixty-seventh out of ninety seven), the charter declares the above “one perpetual community incorporated of one Master and two Keepers or Wardens in the community of the same Mistery or Art of Stationery of the foresaid city” (Arber 1.xxviii).

The word “community” subsequently appears sixteen more times in the charter, and the Company's records show that the concept was taken seriously. When conflicts

arose from time to time between more successful printers and those who were struggling, the court made an effort to see that work was shared and that less fortunate members of the community were cared for (Bennett 68). As Johns suggests, the Stationers knew that the methods of organization in place maintained the order and good reputation of their trade, and they depended on that good reputation for continued business (188). It was therefore in everyone's best interest to uphold the Company's ideals of community and harmony, which ensured that both the crown and the readers of printed books trusted the Company to regulate a credible print culture.

As community-minded as the Company was, however, it was by no means egalitarian; it still had a very clearly defined hierarchy of membership, with the Master and Wardens at the top and the "commonalty," or the ordinary body of freemen, at the bottom (Johns 202). This hierarchy also enabled the Company to function and uphold its good reputation, but for those who were lower down on the ladder, the system sometimes seemed unfair. As we shall see in the next section, holding a privilege enabled some printers to monopolize the publication of certain profitable titles, sometimes at the expense of those printers who did not. The higher status of privileged printers was thus tied to their greater economic power, and the internal politics of the Company, the jostling for status and position, in turn affected the Company's ability to define

ownership and credibility of specific texts and by extension affected the stability of print culture as a whole.

As I hope this section has demonstrated, some book historians have viewed the 1557 charter as merely a ceremonial acknowledgment of existing powers, but as others have suggested, it actually conferred on the London Stationers Company a significant new status as a legally legitimate maker of print culture. The provisions of the charter established the overall dominance of the Company in the field of print and codified specific forms of power such as the ability to grant ownership of texts, a power that had implications for the dissemination of certain kinds of controversial texts, not only religious but secular as well. After 1557, the records of the Company survive in more complete form, and although there are still gaps, the picture emerges of a more institutionalized and carefully regulated trade than in earlier years. I suggest that the success of Tottel's *Miscellany*, in contrast to the earlier circulation of the *Court of Venus*, stemmed in part from the Company's more secure position, particularly its continually developing control over the definition of textual ownership and its ability to regulate ownership both among its own printers and in the culture at large. As I discuss in the following section, we can see in the career of Richard Tottel and in the specific case of the *Miscellany* how this new definition of property was established in the print culture and how it contributed to a new version of textual authority, the nature of which

depended both on the reputation of the individual printer and the authority of the Company as a whole.

Richard Tottel and the Politics of Privilege

The Company's ability to produce printed texts that readers found credible and authentic depended heavily on the stability it was able to ensure within its ranks. The members of the Company, which achieved liveried status under Elizabeth, were in Adrian Johns' words "acutely conscious of their place in a larger, City-wide, order— and through that, of their place in the universal ranking" of contemporary England, a status they confirmed for themselves and for others by performing public ceremonies and rituals (209). Within the Company, the master printers were the most powerful members, because most often they were the ones who initially invested in producing a book (Blagden 40). A printer who was professionally and perhaps even socially ambitious could climb through the ranks of the Company and, by doing so, make a public reputation for himself not only among his fellows, but also in the civic life of London. Moreover, because the Company regulated the production of print culture and decided its terms, that

printer's reputation helped to determine the credibility and authority of the texts he published. The *Miscellany* affords us the opportunity to examine what kind of credibility and authority was at stake in the printing of courtly lyric poetry in particular and to establish how crucial Tottel's reputation as a leading member of the Stationers' Company and the privilege holder for law books was to establishing the *Miscellany* as an authentic and authoritative text.

Tottel's name is sprinkled liberally throughout the records of the Stationers Company. According to H.J. Byrom's biographical sketch, Richard Tottel was born around 1530, the son of William Tothill, a well-to-do citizen of Exeter who was made mayor in 1552 (199). Like many of his contemporaries, whom Pollard calls "ambitious country children," Tottel sought a future in London; according to calculations reported by Pollard, between 1562 and 1640, 2860 (or 82%) of the apprentices to the London companies came from outside of London, while only 678 came from the city itself (16).

At the time, the right to live and work a trade in London came only through membership in one of the city's companies, and membership came only through apprenticeship, patrimony (from a father who had been a freedman), or redemption (freedom secured through the intervention of a patron or recommendation by the Warden of the guild) (Pollard 17). Tottel was apprenticed first to William Middleton, a fishmonger and stationer around 1540; when Middleton died and his widow married the

printer William Powell in 1547, Tottel completed his apprenticeship under Powell (Byrom 200). By 1553, Tottel was operating his own shop, the Hand and Star on Fleet Street, just inside Temple Bar (Greening “Tottel”). Sometime before 1560 he married Joan Grafton, the daughter of the Protestant printer Richard Grafton, and from the surviving Tottel family papers it appears that the relationship between the Graftons and the Tottels was close for the next few generations (Byrom 218, Greening, “A 16th-Century Stationer” 5).⁹

The records of the Stationers’ Company show that Tottel enjoyed a long and successful career. During the course of his career, Tottel climbed through the ranks of the Company, becoming a renter in 1558 and a warden in 1561, 1567, 1568, and 1573 (Blagden 296-297). In 1578 and again in 1584, he served as Master (Greening “Tottel”). Between these offices, he served on the court of assistants, the tribunal that sat in judgment in the Stationers’ court. Johns notes that the Master was “the most honored and

⁹ In his biographical sketch of Tottel, H.J. Byrom argues that, because he was prosperous under Mary and associated with Catholic lawyers, Tottel himself must have been a Catholic (204). However, he also notes that Tottel was close to Richard Grafton, his father-in-law, who was a notable Protestant printer, and that Tottel also did well financially under Elizabeth (218, 213). Byrom does not address this discrepancy in his argument, and Rollins accepts without question this conjecture (2.97). Although I address the question of religion in the *Miscellany* in depth in Chapter 4, I feel compelled here to present a counter argument to Byrom’s position. Because of his family connection to the Graftons, I find it far more plausible that Tottel was a Protestant. Regardless of his religious sympathies, though, I think it is safe to say that a circumspect craftsman and merchant could be successful under a monarch of either persuasion.

powerful individual in the Company. He held the casting vote in the court of assistants, and, less formally, the Table routinely endorsed his suggestions” (206). Along with the two wardens, the assistants elected him at the end of June every year, on the basis of precedence (205). Although candidates were usually chosen based on seniority rather than personal qualifications, Johns suggests that the concept of precedence was loose enough to allow for some maneuvering on the part of individual members (207). Tottel may have viewed his elevation as a routine matter of duty, or he may have seen it as an opportunity to enhance his personal honor and that of his family.

The other records of the Stationers’ Company, particularly the records of the court, and the terms of Tottel’s will suggest that his career advancement was at least informed by personal ambition. The single most important fact of Tottel’s career, aside from the fact that he published the *Miscellany*, is that for most of his forty-year career, he held the patent for publishing law books. This lucrative patent gave him publishing rights over all legal books except those signed to the Queen’s printer, and Tottel made good use of it (Bennett 65). Evidence suggests that he may have engaged in some maneuvering to obtain this patent, and as we shall see, once he had it, he fought to hold on to its privileges.

Before looking at Tottel’s patent in particular, it is necessary first to lay out the system of property rights operating in the 1550’s and to examine how the crown and

Company used the system to different ends: the crown as a method to monitor the presses and the Company as a way to keep the trade economically healthy and its reputation sound. At times in the Company's history, its recognition of two different forms — copyrights, which were granted internally, and privileges, which were granted by royal letters patent — sometimes led to conflicts between printers who fought over the same materials (Johns 248). The Company used both forms, however, because together they helped to prevent piracy. Early copyright regulations were not in place to prevent anything like intellectual property rights; that concept had not yet developed in this period.¹⁰ Instead, copyright was invented simply to discourage piracy, or the practice of stealing books that were already in print and publishing them under one's own name. Because a pirate did not have to bear the overhead cost of setting fair type from a manuscript copy, and because he could avoid financial risks by reprinting books that had sold well, he could make a great deal of money, at the expense of the printers who had actually put up the capital in the first place (Pollard 18).

The practice of piracy threatened both the financial security of honest printers and the good name of the trade. As Adrian Johns points out, in addition to stealing labor pirates often obscured the illicit origin of texts by forging title pages and publication

¹⁰ Greg notes that the Stationers' notion of copyright was not the modern concept that gives default ownership to the author. That kind of copyright was not invented until the Copyright Act of 1709 (63).

information (147). The credibility of manuscripts came from small networks of circulation and long-established methods of attribution, but printed books could be produced in greater numbers and circulated more widely. The character and reputation of the Stationer who produced the text was therefore essential to establishing it as legitimate: “Whether a book contained safe, reliable knowledge could be questioned by asking whether it had been produced in conditions of propriety, or affirmed by asserting it had” (Johns 128). Johns’ use of the term “propriety” in relation to questions of both ownership and responsibility highlights that in sixteenth-century print culture “property” and “propriety” were closely related concepts. The Stationers Company determined a stationer’s ownership of a text, and along with ownership, conveyed the responsibility to produce a correct and reliable text; “by such decisions was the identity of a text established, its stability guaranteed, and its authorship fixed” (Johns 223).

The Stationers Company’s definition of property, then, encompassed both rights of ownership and the responsibility to ensure accurate and careful circulation of knowledge. In order to combat the destabilizing and damaging effects of piracy, the newly chartered Company made use of the existing system of royal privilege as well as established its own internal copyright system. Royal letters patent could confer any number of rights on individual printers; for example, the King’s or Queen’s Printer, an office which Tottel’s father-in-law Richard Grafton had held under Edward VI, was alone

entitled to print all official proclamations and publications (Greg, *Some Aspects and Problems* 95). Certain other printers were granted rights to all books they printed first (Greg, *Some Aspects and Problems* 65). Another type of patent, such as the one Tottel possessed for law books, covered an entire category of books. Still another, rarer kind of patent granted by the crown gave a printer an exclusive right to print or reprint a particular work (Bennett 66).

In conjunction with the privilege system, the Stationers' Company also developed its own internal system of copyright registration. This system, which centered on the Stationers' Register, required a Stationer to present to the wardens a copy of the work he intended to publish and an ecclesiastical license to verify that it was not objectionable material; this rule was in place prior to incorporation and carried a significant fine if broken (Blagden 32).¹¹ Once the clerk of the court entered the work in the handwritten register, the entry represented the Stationer's customary right to that work. Johns argues that the "decision to enter a title was in effect an act of civility by the Stationer to his or her community" and "testified to a willingness to abide by the Company's conventions" (220). As the Stationers' Court did, the register operated on the honor system and the agreement that its authority worked for the good of the community.

¹¹ Johns, on the contrary, argues that it was "not until 1682 did the court stipulate compulsory entrance" (220).

Despite the sway of custom and tradition, some printers sought royal privileges instead of simply registering their books because privileges seemed more secure (Johns 248). Tottel seems to have made use of both systems, recording in the 1583 Stationers' Register the titles of twenty-five law books included under the umbrella of his law privilege (Bennett 157), but it is his privilege to print common law books that appears most often in conjunction with his name in the Stationers' records. In Tottel's case, the nature of the patent he held for legal texts not only helped to make him wealthy but also may have helped insulate him against any repercussions for printing a book of surreptitiously obtained lyric poetry.

It is not entirely clear how Tottel managed to establish what J.H. Baker calls “virtually a *de facto* monopoly” over the entire production of common law books, but by 1553 he was the only printer producing them (427). Baker suggests that Tottel acquired the legal stock and connections previously held by his former master, William Powell, which Powell may have lost during a devastating lawsuit (427). Byrom notes that the genealogy of Tottel's legal stock can be traced back to Robert Redman, the prominent law printer of the 1520s and 30s, and mentions that Tottel seems to have had connections to the Inns of Court from his earliest days as a printer (202). By 1553, Tottel's only remaining competitor in the legal trade, Thomas Berthelet, lost the position of King's Printer and encountered financial difficulties; the same year, Powell's business folded

(Baker 427). The only other source of competition, William Rastell, was at the time in exile on the continent (Byrom 221). Tottel then appears to have secured his status by obtaining a privilege that gave him the right to print all common law books for seven years, except for the titles already held by other printers (Baker 428).

Tottel's acquisition of such a lucrative trade may have involved more than just luck; indeed, it may have resulted from the already impressive reputation he had managed to build his first years in business, as well as from some maneuvering on his part. Baker raises the possibility that the judges presiding over Powell's lawsuit "intervened to rescue law printing from disarray by securing the advancement of a prominent youngster," Tottel, who was around twenty-three at the time (428). In 1582, Thomas Norton, counsel to the Stationers' Company, reported that Tottel had obtained his patent "at sute of the Judges" (Byrom 220). The image of a young, enterprising craftsman and tradesman, quick to learn the politics of the profession and to capitalize on the legal connections he had already made, fits well with the image Tottel presents in the *Miscellany's* preface of an ambitious printer eager to advance "the honor of the English tongue" for his reader's profit — as well as his own ("The Printer to the Reader," l.13).

By obtaining his privilege, Tottel attained the elite status that patent holders were beginning to enjoy within the ranks of the Stationers' Company, but this status also involved him in a conflict that for the next hundred years would threaten to rip the

Company apart (Johns 250). Privileges made their holders extremely wealthy and the target of unprivileged printers' jealousy, and Tottel's privilege was a particularly lucrative one. The cost of producing a law book was extremely high, because setting and proofing the legal French was labor intensive (Johns 315), but the demand was steady, particularly the demand for the casebooks published yearly that made up the body of written common law. Because of the peculiarities of the English legal system, which developed independently of the Roman system and required its practitioners to be familiar with native precedents, its practitioners had to learn through the yearbooks and study at the Inns of Court (Baker 411).

Tottel was therefore practically guaranteed a steady stream of customers, an advantage that was undoubtedly enhanced by his shop's location in Temple Bar, close to the Inns of Court, and he would have had a wide range of titles to supply their needs. The stock list of a publishing house involved in litigation in 1553 (possibly that of Wynken de Worde's successor, Edward Whitchurch, and possibly the same inventory involved in the Powell case) lists over 1500 year books, around 50 copies of each title, as well as 50 copies of the perennial legal bestseller, Littleton's *Tenures* (Baker 427, Plomer 131). Since sixteenth-century printers usually only prepared as many copies as they were confident of selling, these numbers suggest a thriving trade in legal texts, and by 1559 Tottel controlled the entire interest (Baker 429).

Privileges were not only lucrative, though, they also touched upon the sensitive issue of a printer's reputation. Of all the issues that produced internal conflict within the Company, the question of privileges most threatened to disrupt its harmony because it led to stationers undermining each other's reputations (Greg, *Some Aspects and Problems* 94). In 1577, for example, a group of unprivileged "printers, glass-sellers, and cutlers" complained "of privileges granted to private persons... alleging that privileges lately granted to individuals will be the overthrow of the 175 Stationers of the City and their families, besides raising the price of books and tending to their false printing" (Greg, *Companion to Arber*, 40). The complaint specifically named Richard Tottel, as well as John Jugge "the Queen's Printer," John Day, and others as malefactors who they claimed abused the system. This attack on the professional honor not only of Tottel but also of others could have had serious consequences, for the reasons I discuss below.

In the case of legal texts, the printer's ability to produce clean, accurate, and up-to-date copies affected not only his personal reputation but also the legal stability of the land. The restriction of certain kinds and categories of books to specific printers in theory meant that their reliability could be more closely monitored, since that printer had to answer directly to the crown if there was any question as to a book's acceptability (Bennett 64). Quality control was undoubtedly a key reason behind assigning the large catalogue of law titles to one printer; the repercussions if the books' reliability was called

into question were huge. After Tottel's career, in the seventeenth century, the fight between privileged printers and those pirating their works, according to Johns "rendered the printed law of the land entirely untrustworthy," so much so that the Privy Council was forced to intervene and "ban the printing of legal works altogether" (315). This later situation makes clear that what was at stake much earlier, in Tottel's printing house, was not only personal honor but the written foundations of England's legal system.

The responsibility attached to such a printing privilege was not lost on all of Tottel's contemporaries, particularly those who held privileges themselves. In 1582 the Queen's Printer Christopher Barker presented a report to Lord Burghley that defended the existence of royal privileges and argued that they were beneficial to the trade as a whole. Barker, whose report is preserved among Burghley's papers and transcribed by Arber, explains that the custom of royal privileges actually originated in a dispute between booksellers and printers. He argues that booksellers were getting so much profit from the more intensive work of the printers that printers were "more and more unable to provide letter and other furniture, requisite for the execution of any good work, or to give maintenance to any such Correctors as are behoveful," a problem that he claims "will in time be an occasion of great discredit to the professors of the art, and in mine opinion prejudicial to the common wealth" (Arber 1.41-42). In this case, ownership is linked to labor, and any profit is justified payment for careful and accurate work. Privileges

compensate their holders for the service they do for the “common wealth,” not just for their customers or the “art” of printing.

Barker also tries a different line of argument, claiming that Tottel’s privilege in particular is “of much less value then before, and is like to be rather worse than better, except a man should with exceeding charge take another course therein, then hitherto hath been observed and as these days require” (Arber 1.42b). Perhaps his undervaluing of the legal privilege is a rhetorical tactic, designed to distract his audience from Tottel’s success, but it also points out the printer’s vulnerability to changes in the market. Tottel’s privilege is a duty that he carries out even when he is not compensated as he deserves; for someone else to do better, Barker implies, would take such “exceeding charge” that the rewards would not even be worth the effort.

Traces of the privilege controversy also survive in the prefaces printers attached to their texts, “apparently peripheral features” that “are more than merely self-indulgent ornamentation,” as well as in the records of the Stationers Company (Anderson 637). In the preface to his edition of the *Magna Carta*, first published in 1556, Tottel fashions himself in print as a purveyor of accurate, up-to-date printed texts, who is more concerned with their reliability and the needs of his customers than with his profit. He defends the integrity of the texts he produces and argues that his efforts have benefited the common law:

Only touching myself, and my labors in this and other, I pray ye suffer that I may somewhat use your patience, as ye shall always use my diligence... How unperfect the books of the laws of England were before, what price the scarceness had raised, the most part marvelously mangled, and no small part no where to be gotten, there be enow, though I rehearse it not, that do freshly remember & can truly witness. Likewise how, since I toke in hand to serve your uses, the imperfections have been supplied, the prices so eased as the scarceness no more hindreth but that ye have them as cheap (notwithstanding the common dearth of these times) as when they were most plentiful, the print much pleasanter to the eye in the books of years than any that ye have been served with, paper & margin as good & as faire as the best, but much better and fairer than the most, no small number by me set forth newly in print that before were scant to be found in writing.

(STC 9306, sig i^v)

We should, of course, take this preface as an expression of Tottel's own perspective and interests, not as an objective statement of how the trade stood, but it does reveal in detail the issues of ownership and reputation at stake in these disputes. Tottel prides himself on his ability to produce correct, affordable texts that are easy to read and

printed on good quality paper. He emphasizes the labor it took to provide them, a rhetorical move that stands in sharp contrast to the aristocratic value placed on *sprezzatura*, or the ability to do something effortlessly. The amount of effort it took to produce these texts, in relation to the money the readers will save and the profit they will gain from the book, is precisely what determines their value.

Tottel's expression of propriety is in many ways a strikingly modern one, consistent with the Stationers Company's mercantile definition of property, and also notably at odds with the values of the courtiers whom he markets in the *Miscellany*. Tottel defends his ownership of England's legal texts by pointing out the amount of work he has put into perfecting them, and in offering them in turn to his customers for a fair price, he operates on their shared understanding that his labor and the value of the texts can be translated into monetary terms. As the disputes between privileged and unprivileged printers make evident, however, this seemingly stable definition of property was subject to questioning even by members of the Company, who in theory all agreed on the same basic laws of ownership. How much less certain must the definition of property have been in the case of the *Miscellany*, a book whose contents were caught between this mercantile, capitalist version of property and an aristocratic paradigm that placed value on property that was immovable, symbolic of hereditary ties, and therefore could not be sold. In order to establish his authority over this text, I

suggest, Tottel attempts to straddle the two worlds and translate those very courtly notions of value into the language of the marketplace, an approach that would work quite effectively with the urban, non-aristocratic audience he was trying to reach.

“The Printer to the Reader” 1: Profit, Pleasure, and the Value of Courtly Lyric Verse

In “The Language of Property in early Modern Europe,” Martha C. Howell posits that the sixteenth century witnessed a tremendous shift in definitions of property. The medieval system, Howell argues, was characterized by a conception of property as “immovable — not just immovable in law but immovable in fact. It was land or the appurtenances of land,” and it could only be transferred by inheritance or gift, never sold (20). As it was so closely tied to systems of kinship and hereditary networks of ownership, such property was deeply felt to be an extension of social identity. Even the movable goods allowed by property laws were not for sale, not “marketable” (21). This system, however, Howell goes on to suggest,

was deeply disturbed by the emergence of the market, a process visible most clearly in urban centers, the capitals of a newly emergent consumer society. There, the old conceptual categories inscribed in law —

immovable and movable, patrimonial goods and nonpatrimonial goods — were preserved, but nowhere could the wealth that constituted this society be easily accommodated by these categories. (21)

If we read the publication of the *Miscellany* as a conflict between two definitions of property, competing models of ownership, and therefore two different versions of textual authority, the kind of textual authority at stake in this particular act of publication becomes a bit clearer.

The *Miscellany*'s imprint and colophon mark the physical object as Tottel's, according to the Stationers Company's definition of property. In his lecture on patents and imprints, Greg introduces the two subjects as being "quite unrelated topics" (*Some Aspects and Problems* 82); however, in the case of Tottel's *Miscellany*, the imprint and colophon provide valuable information about how Tottel leveraged his patent on law books to establish ownership over other products of his press, as well.¹² They *Miscellany*'s imprint and colophon identify Tottel as the printer and suggest that the book falls under the protection of Tottel's royal privilege, an impression that the colophon supports. The imprint reads simply, "Apud Richardum Tottel. / 1557. / *Cum privilegio.*"

¹² The imprint, as Greg explains, was the publication information that gave the printer's name, the location where it could be purchased, and sometimes the date, to let customers know that the item was a fresh commodity and therefore more desirable. The colophon followed at the end of the book and supplied any publication information not covered by the imprint (83).

The colophon, which provides more information, reads, “Imprinted at London in flete strete / within Temple barre, at the sygne of the / hand and starre, by Richard Tottel / the fift day of June. / An. 1557. / *Cum privilegio ad impri-/ mendum solum.*” The “*cum privilegio*” in the imprint may serve as shorthand for the fuller statement of property right in the colophon, which states that Tottel has the “sole right of printing,” but the language of both phrases, referring to Tottel’s “privilege,” suggests that the book is covered by the same privilege he holds for law books.

The imprint and colophon, however, offer an impression of ownership that the archival records do not support. In fact, although we know a great deal about Tottel’s law patent, there is no evidence that Tottel held a patent for the *Miscellany*, nor do we know whether it was even entered in the Stationers’ Register. John Day had acquired the rights to the book sometime between 1574 and 1583, when he turned his privilege over to the Company’s common stock, but it is not clear how Day acquired the rights to the *Miscellany* from Tottel or what form those rights took (Greg, *Some Aspects and Problems*, 90).

If Tottel did acquire a patent to cover the *Miscellany*, he would have had to have gotten it directly from the sovereign, and single-title privileges were unusual; it seems more likely that Tottel wanted to *imply* that the book was closely linked to, and therefore protected by, the court. As mentioned previously, the monarch did occasionally grant a

patent for one title, as Elizabeth in 1559 granted John Day the sole right to print *The Cosmological Glass*, but such single-title patents were rare (Bennett 66). Blagden offers some simple reasons for the popularity of privileges that covered entire categories and not single volumes, one being that a patent for a group of books could be expanded as more titles of that kind were issued. A privilege that encompassed an entire type of book, whether prayer books, almanacs, or Tottel's law books, was more profitable than other kinds (Blagden 164). It seems unlikely that Tottel would have gone to the trouble of seeking a privilege for one title, the *Miscellany*, when he was not even certain that the book would be a success and therefore vulnerable to piracy.

One possibility for the language of the publication information is that Tottel may have wanted to give the impression that the *Miscellany* was covered under his royal privilege to print law books in order to cover the tracks of a possible act of piracy on his part. In 1557, just after the *Miscellany*'s first publication, the *Court of Venus*'s current printer, Henry Sutton, purchased a license for his anthology. R.H. Griffith believes that Sutton acted on his perception that Tottel's book of lyric poetry poached three Wyatt poems from his own (700). If Tottel did unlawfully borrow poems from a book that was Sutton's property, perhaps he felt that referring to his privileged status would make his action seem less like piracy and more like fair competition. At the very least, even if he

did not commit piracy himself, he may have wanted to protect the book just in case it was a success and someone else wanted to pirate it.

However, we do not need to speculate about possible acts of industrial espionage in order to explain plausibly what the *Miscellany*'s status as protected property was. Another, less sensational but far more complex, explanation is that Tottel suggested his book was covered by a royal patent — even though it probably was not — because a privilege would make it seem to the readers as though the royal court endorsed the publication of the book. Indeed, Henry VIII was so worried about the print reading public misunderstanding the implications of the phrase *cum privilegio* that in 1538 he issued a proclamation demanding that the phrase must be followed by *ad imprimendum solum*. This addition was meant to clarify that the patent holder had the sole right to print the work but that the work itself had not necessarily been licensed by the crown (Greg, *Some Aspects and Problems* 65). Tottel's colophon at the end of the *Miscellany* does include the complete phrase, even though the imprint does not, so he follows the letter of the rule. Removed from the context of his law books, however, the spirit of the rule seems a little vague. It is not at all clear that Tottel held a royal privilege *per se* for the *Miscellany* itself, and so we must consider the possibility that Tottel wanted to suggest that his privileged status extended to this new publishing project, and that, despite the

careful Latin phrasing, he also hoped readers would think that the book was licensed directly by the crown.

Perhaps instead he was eager to counter the perception that he *had* poached the poems, but from the court itself, not from another printer. Tottel after all was operating under the Company's definition of property, in which case (provided Sutton's fears of piracy were unfounded) he had not stolen the poems, but the courtiers whose works he published may have felt differently. The printer's preface seems to betray such an anxiety when Tottel begs the reader to "think it not evil done, to publish, to the honor of the English tongue, and for profit of the studios of English eloquence, those works which the ungentle horders up of such treasure have heretofore envied thee" ("The Printer to the Reader," 2.12-16). Wendy Wall and Arthur Marotti have both located in this preface an attempt to "reverse" the accepted standards of gentility and to align print with gentility rather than the more "ungentle" and greedy system of coterie circulation, a move that Wall attributes to Tottel's anxiety about the "stigma of print" (26).

The nature of this "stigma," however, as well as even its existence, has been challenged by recent critics, most notably Steven May. May points to the examples of Lord Berners, Sir Thomas Elyot (13), Sir Francis Bryan, and Queen Katherine Parr (14), among others, to challenge the idea that all Tudor aristocrats held the idea of printing in contempt as "outgrowth of a scorn for all mechanical arts, or as a corollary to the idea

that it would be degrading for a gentleman ‘to sell the products of one's labour, whether of hands or brain’” (11). Indeed, May locates the origin of the “mythical” stigma in Edward Arber’s “attempt to account for [the] wide gap of time in the preface to his edition of Tottel” between the deaths of Wyatt and Surrey and the appearance of the *Miscellany* in print (12). May instead suggests that any anxieties had more to do with the uncertain status of poetry than with the relationship between print and aristocratic status (17).

If there were courtly anxieties about the appearance of Tottel’s book, as the printer’s preface intimates there may have been, I suggest that perhaps the conflict had more to do with aristocratic notions of property and privacy than with the idea that manual labor was degrading for nobles. There were good reasons for courtiers to keep their verses private; as I shall discuss in the next chapter, courtly verses such as those contained in the Devonshire Manuscript often served as vehicles for covert, forbidden communication that could be construed as treasonous. Upon hearing of Wyatt’s imprisonment, Anne Boleyn allegedly commented that he “might make ballads well now,” making explicit the implicit connection between the figure of the disappointed lover and the political commentary he could make in his lyrics (Thomson 38). The Earl of Surrey’s pointed critique of Henry VIII in Surrey’s praise of Wyatt’s psalms (no. 29 in the *Miscellany*) was not used as evidence of treason in Surrey’s trial, Susan Brigden

points out, but it very well could have been, as “its implications for all princes, and surely for one in particular, [were] inescapable” (509). Certainly in the tightly knit world of the court even anonymous poems could be linked to specific personages and used as evidence of disloyalty.

Equally as powerfully as this practical need for privacy did, aristocratic or at least traditional notions of property also may have contributed to courtiers’ discomfort with seeing their verses in print. At the time the *Miscellany* appeared, the idea of cultural capital in a market economy was still in its infancy. Cultural capital, which Henry Turner defines as the “strategic use of knowledge for social advancement, personal advantage, and power,” had one meaning in the court and a very different meaning in the marketplace (4). Tottel and the other members of the Stationers Company may have had very clear ideas of what monetary value courtly texts had in the marketplace and to whom they belonged, but we should not underestimate how disconcerting this idea would have been for the courtiers themselves. The very idea of buying and selling status was destabilizing to their world view; indeed, the “transformation of land, labor, and capital into commodities exchanged in the marketplace” was a process that was only beginning, and the transformation of lyric poetry into a marketable commodity was merely a small version of what Robert S. DuPlessis describes as a larger, “uneven...and often violent” culture-wide change (28). It was not clear to whom these poems belonged, or who was

entitled to profit from them; surely Tottel, according to the definition of property laid out by the Company, felt that he was, while the aristocrats who wanted to protect their privacy would not have wanted anyone to.

The kind of textual authority that Tottel sought to establish over the *Miscellany*, though, seems to have depended more on the trust of his non-courtly readers than on the opinions of socially distant aristocrats. Tottel's reference to his royal privilege may be seen as an attempt to draw on *both* sources of authority, the crown and the Company, to protect himself from disgruntled courtier poets but also to convince his readers that they were getting an accurate, authentic glimpse into courtly life. By implying that his book is endorsed by royal letters patent, Tottel emphasizes his connection (however slight) to the court and advertises that he is utterly trustworthy, because the stability of the laws of the land rests on his shoulders. An angry courtier might hesitate before attacking someone of Tottel's status, protected not only by his trade connection to the queen but also by his standing in the powerful Stationers Company.

Tottel's advertisement of his shop in the colophon, in conjunction with the statement of privilege, also indicates a sense of propriety stable enough to entice the reader. Books were often sold outside St. Paul's, in the Churchyard, but they were equally likely at this time to be offered for sale by the person who printed them (Bennett 259-260). The location of Tottel's shop near the Inns of Court made him accessible to

his customers and added to his credibility as a law publisher; since he was close to his customers, he could communicate with them about their reading needs and habits. The advertisement of his shop's location serves as shorthand for his proximity to the Inns of Court and his insider knowledge of their legal language, social order, and fashions.

Indeed, the location of Tottel's shop provides key evidence for determining the identity of his readers and the reasons behind his decision to publish the *Miscellany*. Adrian Johns argues that "Stationers' virtues were conventionally appraised in terms of the qualities of the locations in which they lived and worked — in particular, bookshops and printing houses" (60). Not only did Tottel keep his print shop among lawyers, Byrom tells us that Tottel was long associated with an eminent group of lawyers in London that included William Rastell, More's son-in-law William Roper, Richard Heywood, and William Cholmeley (202). His father's business and personal connections must have been strong if they influenced William Tothill's decision to enter the Inns of Court when he came of age. As well as being the "main gateway to a career in the common law," the Inns of Court were in the mid-to-late sixteenth century a finishing school of sorts for upwardly mobile young men, a place to make social connections and learn just enough law to protect one's estates from litigious neighbors (Prest 21, 23). The younger Tottel's presence in the Inns announces the family's social ambitions as clearly as the land they acquired by the end of the century.

Forging legal ties would have familiarized Tottel not only with the needs of his customers, but also with the skills needed to edit and set the difficult law French that the year books were written in. His ability to produce quality books, as the *Magna Carta* preface suggests, would have made or broken his reputation among the lawyers of the Inns of Court and the “wealthy and demanding students of what was often spoken of as a *de facto* university” (Johns 71). A compositor had to be as learned as a “Scholler,” according to the seventeenth-century printer Joseph Moxon, and proofreaders often knew several languages (Johns 87). Tottel may not have performed all of these tasks himself, but he would have needed to be learned enough to oversee them and sharp enough to employ workers who were able to discharge their duties well. Jasper Heywood later charged in print that Tottel was sloppy and introduced errors into his *Troas* (1559), and Heywood declared, “within these doors of thine / I make a vow shall never more / come any works of mine.” Textual scholars have since suggested that Tottel merely corrected errors in Heywood’s manuscript, but regardless of whether Tottel made mistakes with that particular text, his reputation did not seem harmed by Heywood’s accusations (Rollins 2.6).

Since Tottel’s customers were primarily lawyers, they would have demanded accurate, up-to-date legal texts, as the preface to the *Magna Carta* shows, and Tottel’s thriving business and successful cornering of the market seem to indicate that he was able

to satisfy their professional needs. Furthermore, his decision to publish the *Miscellany* indicates that he aspired to fulfill their leisure reading needs, as well. Arthur Marotti's work on the coterie circulation of poetic manuscripts has shown that, outside of the royal court, the universities and the Inns of Court produced many of the surviving lyric poetry manuscripts (*Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* 35). Lawyers were a highly literate group, and, for the most part, the profession appealed to the upwardly mobile; it is not surprising then that they participated in writing and circulating lyric verse. Tottel, knowing his customers as well as he did, must have recognized a business opportunity in their appetite for courtly lyric verse and responded to it by publishing his print collection.

He also may have recognized an opportunity to disperse in print some tools of social mobility for readers who were, as he was, engaged in trade and the professions. In the next chapter, I explore in more detail the reading community that Tottel's preface constructs and discuss the ways in which the *Miscellany's* paratext fashions the book and its contents as tools for social advancement. Here, however, I end this chapter with a brief discussion of Tottel's career after the *Miscellany* and propose that in Tottel's life and career we can see enacted in material ways the kinds of social advancement that the *Miscellany* offers in theory to its readers.

When Tottel in the *Miscellany*'s preface promises his "gentle" readers that "thine own profit and pleasure" will defend his project and repay their efforts, he constructs in print a reader whose social aspirations are quite similar to his own. Tottel's acquisition of properties and land in London and counties outside London reveals his ambition to live like a country gentleman. The records that survive from the inquest held after Tottel's death in 1593 stand in sharp contrast to the will of the printer John Rastell, who died in 1536 and was of the generation of printers before Tottel. Rastell's will simply leaves to his wife Elizabeth, the sister of Sir Thomas More, their house, press, and the contents of his shop. To the rest of his family and friends, including Thomas Cromwell, he leaves cash bequests (Plomer 5-6). Rastell was a successful stationer with lofty connections, but his career and legacy look quite different from Tottel's. As Tottel's will does, those of Thomas Berthelet (1555), Joan Wolfe, widow of Reynald (1574), and John Harrison the elder (1616) also provide careful instructions for the disposal of substantial properties.

In contrast to Rastell's will and like those of Berthelet, Wolfe, and Harrison, Tottel's legacy reveals the deceased to have been a tradesman who turned his business capital into diverse holdings of land and properties.¹³ Although no will survives, the

¹³ In her article "Fictions of the Early Modern Probate Inventory," Lena Cowen Orlin cautions that both changing notions about property and outright deception on the part of executors make these records less than clear reflections of what property people actually possessed and how it was disposed (53). Furthermore, Plomer acknowledges

inquisition held in Buckingham County at Tottel's death (on September 1, 1593) divulges the material wealth the printer was able to amass from trade. In addition to his shop in Fleet Street, Tottel owned "divers houses and cellars in Topham in the said county of Devon," as well as a manor in Lapfold and a "capital messuage called Greenlich," all also in Devon. Outside of Devon, he owned houses and land in Wedon Hill, Chessham, Amersham, Little Missenden, and Wendover (county Buckingham) (Plomer 34). This document and the records of the Tottel family's business dealings indicate that Richard Tottel ended his life as many crown servants did, able to pass on to his heirs a patrimony that might secure them a place in the landed gentry.

Tottel's real estate dealings also point to royal and courtly connections. The inquisition reported that "the aforesaid manor of Mantells was held of the Queen for great serjeantry that is to say to act as naperius at her coronation" (Plomer 34), indicating that Tottel acted as naperer, or the official in charge of the royal linen, at Queen Elizabeth's coronation (*OED n.1*). The Earl of Oxford and the Countess of Warwick had also granted land to Tottel, "but for what service the jury could not say" (Plomer 34, 35). Later in his career,

that his collection of forty stationers' wills and probate records does not by any means represent the entire trade. Printers such as Tottel's father-in-law Richard Grafton, for example, probably died outside London and so are not to be found in the London archives (iii). Nevertheless, the stationers' wills that do instruct the executors to divide up substantial real estate holdings offer a valuable glimpse into the ways in which Tottel's fellow tradespeople participated in a wider pattern of social mobility, converting mercantile capital into the status symbols favored by the gentry.

Tottel used these courtly connections in an attempt to expand his business ventures. In 1583, Tottel wrote a letter directly to William Cecil, Lord Burghley, asking him to contribute to Tottel's plan to build a paper mill in England. The project never seems to have aroused any interest in Burghley or any other courtiers, but the surviving letter, in which Tottel proposes to provide the venture capital to start the mill if Burghley will supply the land on which to build it, shows him to have possessed substantial wealth (Byrom 215). From her work on the Tottel family papers, Anna Greening surmises that Tottel's choice of a family settlement over the typical will and testament may have been meant to exercise discretion regarding the "ramifications of his business relationships or the exact extent of his wealth" as well as to protect his estate from taxes ("A 16th-Century Stationer" 3). Richard Tottel was able to use his knowledge and reputation as a law printer not merely to expand his publishing activities, but also to acquire land through complicated and sometimes deceptive legal proceedings, cleverly working around the facts that usury was illegal and land tenure was still technically feudal (Greening, "A 16th-Century Stationer" 4). The Tottels wanted into the landed gentry, and they used every means at their disposal to assure that their ambitions would be realized.

Prior to my study of Tottel's career, no one has seen the *Miscellany* as anything but an interesting side note to these activities and to Tottel's primary role as a law publisher. However, the printer father's acquisition of land and the son's entry into the

Inns of Court indicate that the Tottel family was engaged in the sort of social mobility that challenged the traditional bases of the aristocracy's social identity. The transformation of mercantile wealth into landed property unsettled the aristocratic and gentlemanly association of land with hereditary identity, while the education of young men such as William Tothill taught them how to behave as if they were born into the leisured ranks of society.

Other tools and manifestations of status and power, the *Miscellany* suggests, could also be bought and sold. The circulation of lyric poetry in manuscript form, among small groups of courtiers, functioned as a way to hone their linguistic skills and keep close the power of language. Tottel challenged aristocratic hegemony in this area by delivering their "small parcels" directly to his non-courtly readers, a maneuver that revealed how vulnerable the privacy of the elite's closed ranks really was ("Printer to the Reader" 2.3-4). The printer's preface may pay lip service to the aristocratic idea that he stole these poems, but the dominant tone is one of confidence and authority. Tottel feels entitled to circulate courtly lyric verse because the poems embody qualities that are not based in birth and breeding, but rather in skill and labor, as I will explore in the next chapter. His credibility, his readers' belief that the commodity he provides for them captures in a transferable form the innermost workings of courtly life, comes in part from his courtly connections. He is able to pass the book off as an "insider" production

because he is royally charged with producing in a stable way the printed laws of the land, a role that gives him a reputation for dependability and also a network through which to acquire courtly manuscripts that he can then pass on to his readers.

The book's insider status, by the very nature of its material form, is a fiction, albeit one supported by the Stationers Company's institutional authority, as I have discussed in this chapter, but so too does it reveal the fictions upon which aristocratic entitlement was based. Tottel's ability to print the poems comes both from his royally privileged position and from his status as a culture maker, a leading member of the Company entrusted with the power to oversee all printing and book making in England. The very foundations upon which the *Miscellany's* textual authority is based, then, challenge the traditional social order. Not only does the book dispute aristocratic notions of property and privacy, its very existence points to forces that were already eroding the crown and court as sole centers of authority; people not born to status and power were acquiring and expressing it, slowly but surely, through the tangible medium of money and the less tangible conduit of influence.

In fact, Tottel's preface to the *Miscellany* ultimately defers to the reader as the social authority: "It resteth nowe (gentle reader) that thou think it not evil done, to publish, to the honor of the English tongue, and for profit of the studious of English eloquence, those works which the ungentle horders up of such treasure have heretofore

envied thee” (2.11-16). The “gentle reader[s],” though, as Tottel full well knows, are unlikely to think badly of Tottel’s enterprise; as Wendy Wall notes, the preface “reverses the class distinctions generated by coterie circulation,...inscribing the reader as the truly ‘gentle’ kind of textual consumer” (26). When appealed to in this way, these readers, already elevated in status by the preface, were likely to have realized how powerful these rhetorical tools could be for their own acts of social mobility. In the next chapter, I turn to the printed features of the book that were shaped by the practices and authority of the Stationers Company and the individual printer. By examining how these print features attempt to guide the reader’s experience with the text, I hope to demonstrate how serious a challenge to aristocratic social hegemony lyric poetry truly posed when it was disseminated to readers outside the court.

Chapter Two

Reading the Paratext: Print and Social Purpose

As the previous chapter suggests, one possible reason for the *Miscellany's* popularity, beginning in the tumultuous summer 1557, is that its readers saw it as being instrumental to their social advancement. In that chapter, I explored the institutional developments behind the *Miscellany's* publication, in particular, the chartering of the Stationers Company and the development of the privilege system of intellectual copyright. These changes directly affected not only Richard Tottel's ability to publish a book of courtly lyric poetry but also the book's material form. Indeed, just as the typographic presentation of the text was shaped by the social practices of the Stationers Company and the ambitions of the individual printer, the print features in turn directed the readers' experience with the text and taught them how to use the *Miscellany* for their own purposes. By reading social context and bibliographical text together in this way, it is possible to gain a deeper understanding of how the institutionalization of the book trade assisted lyric poetry's shift from the court to the city, and therefore how this development opened lyric poetry to a new host of readers and meanings.

Tottel's Miscellany, among printed miscellanies, offers a unique perspective on these changes for two reasons. To begin with, a single printer, Richard Tottel, published

the book continuously for almost twenty years, providing an opportunity to examine how the objectives and practices of one printing house helped to shape the development of lyric poetry as a literary form and endowed it with a new kind of authority, that of the publisher and the book trade. Additionally, only six weeks after the first edition was published, a second edition appeared on July 31. This book was not merely a reprint, but was in fact an entirely new edition, to which new poems and an index were added, and from which a noteworthy number of poems were removed. The bibliographical features of these two editions reveal editorial attempts at directing the reader's experience and offer clues about the cultural work the book was capable of performing. The changes to the second edition, in particular, consolidate an editorial practice that was begun in the first. The active role that the printer played in the creation of the first edition offers a dynamic look at the ways in which the business concerns of the early modern English book trade influenced and shaped aesthetic decisions and reading practices, while the changes made between editions suggest that the printer in turn responded to readers' actual practices and incorporated them into the new edition. This encounter between what Roger Chartier calls "proposal and reception," the printer's presentation of a set of reading practices and readers' modification of those practices, profoundly changed the meaning of lyric poetry by making it available and attractive as a tool for social mobility (ix).

Examining the book's printed nature and how print audiences read it is essential to understanding its place in the poetic tradition, particularly its contribution to the formation of the modern, English literary canon. Arthur Marotti, for all of his detailed and insightful work on the *Miscellany*, nevertheless argues in *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* that printed texts "yield a distorted picture of literary history or of the place of literary texts in the life of the society that produced and consumed them" (xiii). My project maintains that printed texts such as the *Miscellany* offer a multitude of clues about the social dynamics of texts in circulation; attention to all forms of transmission also reminds us of the ways in which we as modern critics variously privilege one form, manuscript or print, over another.

This chapter therefore builds on the previous chapter's focus on the Stationers Company and Richard Tottel by examining how the text structures reading as a social practice for the readers Tottel imagines in the printer's preface. In the first part of this chapter, I focus on the bibliographical features that made *Tottel's Miscellany* such a strikingly different kind of book from its predecessors, and even from its successors. While it mimics or adopts certain features of the manuscript miscellany, those of the printed book — the printer's preface, the organization and identification of poems by author, the addition of titles, and the use of an index in the second edition — set the *Miscellany* apart from both manuscript and printed verse collections seen previously in

English. While Wendy Wall claims that the *Miscellany* “by virtue of its published form necessarily subsumes the social within the typographical” (25), I suggest that the typographical is in fact as social as the handwritten. In the case of the *Miscellany*, the print features known as the paratext all work together to guide the reader and create an experience that is both practical and flexible, open to a number of different social uses.

Moreover, the book’s construction of authorship, its claims about the value of the English vernacular, and its appeal to non-courtly readers signal an important moment in the histories of both lyric poetry and the printed book. At this time, courtly lyric poetry met the nascent English printed book trade and developed in a new direction, reaching a broader readership and helping to create a literary canon that reflected the social values of that readership. This chapter suggests that the printing of courtly lyric verse enabled non-courtly readers, in this case primarily the lawyers, merchants, and other urban professionals identified in the previous chapter, to learn how to read and perhaps even imitate elite poetic forms in order to enhance their own intellectual and social status. The bibliographical features of the book directed and supported this practical purpose, mediating unfamiliar material for the reader and providing them with valuable information about the rhetorical practices of their social superiors. The following sections explore the ways in which Tottel mediated the text for his readers, as well as the ways in which the text reveals its social purpose to modern readers.

“The Printer to the Reader” 2: The Purpose of Paratext in *Tottel’s Miscellany*

My primary claim in this section is that the *Miscellany*’s paratext signals the reader to use the book for practical purposes, as a kind of courtesy manual. Although the book does not explicitly offer instructions on how to write poetry, it does instruct the reader on how to read it, and it suggests that readers might use it as a tool for their own intellectual and social elevation. As a physical object, the book itself was a status symbol; by merely owning it, readers signaled that they had access to elite texts. As a social tool, moreover, the book provides an organization, preface, and titles that fashion courtly texts and poets as published texts and authors, setting them up as models in socially specific rhetorical situations. Readers could learn from these models of language and rhetorical positioning how to act like courtiers. According to the preface, those who followed the printer’s instructions and became “studious of English eloquence” would “profit” from their efforts (2.12,14). In the case of some professionals, such rhetorical skill might translate into monetary profit, but for many of Tottel’s readers, the rewards were social: enhanced personal status, and the ability to “pass” as those born to a higher social rank.

Perhaps the most valuable information *Tottel's Miscellany* offers about its function in print comes in the form of its printed characteristics, the features such as a preface, titles, sections, and index added by the printer and now known as the paratext.¹⁴ Recent work on the paratext of the printed book, including publisher-authored prefaces and dedications, has called attention to the rich variety of rhetorical approaches early modern printers used to appeal to their customers. Randall Anderson emphasizes that these “subliminal – or, if you like, transliminal – features of the book significantly encode in bibliographical artefacts the essential issues of patronage, dissemination, demographics, and stylization of audience status” (643). In his work on dramatic texts, David Bergeron remarks that “these paratexts...provide a point of hospitable entrance into the text...Printers and publishers can thus serve as gatekeepers to the text, protecting and directing an approach” (131). Many bibliographers thus have come to the agreement that the printed-ness of a book offers a great deal of information about why and how it was produced and how it may have been read.

However, this method of reading bibliographical features is shared only sporadically by literary critics. Modern critics who have written on the *Miscellany* often comment on its jumbled nature and apparent lack of an organizing principle, or they

¹⁴ This term was coined by Gerard Genette in *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* translated by Lydia G. Cochrane (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

glean important information about the social transactions embodied in the book while still maintaining that printed books are inferior to manuscripts for this purpose. Wendy Wall and Barbara Benedict exemplify the former kind of critical response to the *Miscellany*.

Wall, for instance, in *The Imprint of Gender*, asserts that

Tottels seems to be neatly divided into four sections that are classified by author... But the book's four sections provide an organizational framework, which by its extraordinary permeability disorganizes and confuses the reading experience. Poems by various writers seep into these seemingly compartmentalized and categorized sections, and the book ends by recounting poems that were inadvertently omitted from the primary sections. The effect is a makeshift, authorially determined cataloguing format that fails to respect fully the classification system it offers. (24)

In her summary of the book's presentation Wall concludes, "the text thus offers no readily comprehensible generic, authorial, or structural order." Barbara Benedict, in *Making the Modern Reader*, primarily a study of eighteenth-century anthologies, seems to concur with Wall's assessment of the *Miscellany*'s structure. She claims that "earlier anthologies like *Tottel's Miscellany*...do not attempt to mediate their fine literature for a wider readership" (14). Benedict acknowledges that editors often attempted to shape readers' responses to printed anthologies — indeed, her entire project rests on this claim

— but evidently she does not see Tottel’s presentation of the *Miscellany* as constituting this level of editorial intervention.

Arthur Marotti, who exemplifies the latter, manuscript-centered critical approach, does attribute to Tottel a formative kind of editing practice and reads in the *Miscellany*’s titles in particular a wealth of information about the book’s social purpose. Marotti’s position, however, carries its own internal biases and contradictions. On the one hand, he recognizes that Tottel “took an active role” in presenting courtly lyric texts to a non-courtly readership, and that his editorial interventions mark an important stage in the “recontextualizing process” through which these texts changed hands, eyes, and meanings (218). Marotti pays particular attention to the titles Tottel provided for the poems and argues that they fall into two categories, titles that present “real-world occasions” and titles that represent “conventional” situations that are “associated with the experience of the poetic ‘lover’” (219). On the other hand, Marotti also claims that “printed texts of lyric verse,” because they are removed from the poems’ original social contexts, yield a distorted picture of literary history, or of the place of literary texts in the life of the society that produced and consumed them.” He therefore maintains that manuscripts “better reveal the socioliterary dynamics of particular texts and the social history of literature,” even as he places the *Miscellany* within that history and mentions some socioliterary dynamics it embodies and reveals (xiii).

Marotti's treatment of the *Miscellany* reveals and perpetuates a bias against what he sees as a monolithic print culture; at the least, he does not fully explore the significance of the bibliographical evidence he presents. Granted, his cornerstone study of lyric poetry and its methods of transmission aim to reverse a prior critical position that largely ignored the significant place of manuscripts in the history of lyric poetry. In doing so, however, I believe that it underestimates how informative the printed book can be. Likewise Wall's project, for all of its insightful readings of how social rank and gender are inscribed in Tottel's preface, also reveals a similar discomfort with the way the book is poised between manuscript and print culture. While both critics attribute this anxiety to the printer's attitude in the paratext, it is my belief that such anxiety stems just as much from our need to reconcile various critical categories as it does from the text itself.

I do not argue that no tension existed between manuscript and print systems of circulation; the critical debate about the existence of a "stigma of print," which I touched upon in the previous chapter, testifies to the sometimes vexed relationship between the two methods of transmission. However, by perpetuating that stigma in the present day, Marotti and Wall are prevented from examining why and for what purpose the *Miscellany* recontextualizes its courtly poems for non-courtly readers. Far from being a less valuable source of information about the socioliterary dynamics, the printed book —

and the *Miscellany* in particular — provides not only for early modern readers a social code, but also for modern readers the key to deciphering that code.

In order to make sense of the conventions being transcribed, though, it is necessary to venture into the realm of intentionality, a path that makes some literary critics nervous but which the “sociology of texts” embraces. D.F. McKenzie, for example, urges bibliographers and literary critics alike to “consider the human motives and interactions which texts involve at every stage of their production, transmission, and consumption” (15). Furthermore, Chartier argues that the book “always aims at instilling an order, whether it is the order in which it is deciphered, the order in which it is to be understood, or the order intended by the authority who commanded or permitted the work” (viii). In the previous chapter, I examined how the institutional intentions of the Stationers Company shaped the appearance of the *Miscellany*, and in this chapter I explore how the paratext of the *Miscellany* offers a great deal of encoded information about the order of reading the printer intended.

I begin with the preface because it is the means to understanding how Tottel designed his book, whom he designed it for, and how he wished those readers to use it. It is, in short, the guide to what Seth Lerer calls the “anthologistic impulse, a kind of meta-anthology that enables us to see the idea of the compilation and the literary, social, or historical purposes to which such a collection might be put” (“Medieval English

Literature” 1255). In this case, Tottel’s social purpose, I claim, is to foster the reader’s identification with the courtly poets and thus closely to correlate poetic skill with higher social status. The preface constructs the act of reading as a critical practice and as a social transaction, a step beyond the financial transaction conducted between the printer and the reader.

The preface is the first obvious editorial intervention readers encounter when they open the book, and it offers the most explicit instructions on how to read the accompanying texts. Tottel, in the tradition of English printer-editors since Caxton, inserts his editorial voice immediately and makes clear to the reader that having bought this book, the reader has entered into a social contract:

That to have wel written in verse, yea & in small parcelles, deserveth great praise, the workes of divers Latines, Italians, and other, doe prove sufficiently. That our tong is able in that kynde to do as praiseworthy as the rest, the honorable stile of the noble earl of Surrey, and the weightinesse of the depewitted sir Thomas Wyat the elders verse, with severall graces in sondry good Englishe writers, doe show abundantly. It resteth nowe (gentle reder) that thou think it not evill doon, to publish, to the honor of the Englishe tong, and for the profit of the studious of English eloquence, those workes which the ungentle horders up of such

treasure have heretofore envied thee. And for this point (good reader) thine own profit and pleasure, in these presently, and in moe hereafter, shal answer for my defence. If parhapps some mislike the stateliness of stile removed from the rude skill of common eares: I aske help of the learned to defend their learned frendes, the authors of this work: And I exhort the unlearned, by reding to lerne to be more skilfull, and to purge that swinelike grosseness, that maketh the sweet maierome [marjoram] not to smell to their delight.

(“The Printer to the Reader,” 2.3-25)

In this preface, the printer identifies himself as both the mercantile purveyor of the courtly texts and the architect of a new social project: the elevation of the “unlearned” into a new community of readers and writers, and the elevation of the learned to an even greater status, as contributors to the reputation of English eloquence. Such elevation requires some effort on the part of the reader, in order to fulfill his end of the contract, but Tottel assures the “gentle” reader that he will “profit” from his engagement with the text.

Both Wall and Marotti, as I have mentioned, have identified some of the ways in which Tottel’s preface marks the *Miscellany* as a text indebted to the manuscript method of transmission, and they have noted the social distinctions that the preface addresses and attempts to reverse. The customarily “gentle” aristocrats, owners of the manuscript texts,

become ungentle, while the open exchange of those texts in the printed market renders the non-courtly reader gentle (Wall 25, Marotti 215). What these critics have not fully addressed, however, is the question of what exactly the reader will gain from this exchange, aside from access to formerly unavailable courtly texts. What exactly is the “profit” that will reward those who are “studious of English eloquence?” How does reading the book transform a non-courtly reader into a gentleman?

I suggest that the “profit” can be considered as a social reward, but only if we consider the reader’s role as more than voyeuristic and the book as imagining a vital role for poetry outside of the court. On the one hand, the reader could passively absorb courtly culture and encounter the poems at the level of gossip. As William Kennedy suggests in his study of Petrarchan adaptations, the English sonnet sequences of Tottel and later “surely rewarded those audiences with a gossipy glimpse into courtly worlds they could only fantasize about” (196). Lerer also claims for the book a voyeuristic appeal, proposing that Tottel “invites his readers into the previously closed chambers of court poetry and, but for the price of the volume, will present them with the secret sights of the coterie poets” (*Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII* 165). Undoubtedly the impulse to see into that inner sanctum, to break down the barrier of privacy that separated the elite from those who were not born to high rank, motivated Tottel’s readers. Moreover, at a

more material level, the book itself is a status symbol, and simply owning it signals a certain amount of disposable income and leisure time.

Voyeurism, however, was only part of the appeal. More than simply inviting readers to watch, the preface also encourages them to actively enter into that world and provides the tools with which to do so; consumption here is constructed as being not only material, but also intellectual and social. Tottel's preface imagines his target readers as being interested in doing something with these texts; he hopes that the "unlearned" will learn to read skillfully and for appreciation of the poetic skill of others, and that the "learned" will gain a certain mastery of poetic texts by absorption and perhaps even poetic imitation and application through their own social behaviors.

The distinction between these two types of readers, the learned and the unlearned, is one way in which the printer correlates eloquence with status. The learned reader whom Tottel hopes to enlist in his project of poetic dissemination is demonstrably not a courtier, as he is interested in the "profit" that literary learning can bring him and as he does not have access to these poems in their manuscript form. The printer's reference to the "workes of diverse Latines, Italians, and other" suggests that this reader at least will be aware of the classical and continental traditions, if not intimately acquainted with them. These readers may not be courtiers, but neither are they of lowly social rank;

instead, they are well educated and capable of reading poetry that is purportedly lofty in content and style.

The reader's level of education also marks the boundary between the book's sense of exclusivity and the possibilities it offers for inclusion. These "learned" readers have more than a functional level of literacy and will be able to understand the "stateliness of stile" used by the courtly poets. The "unlearned" readers, on the other hand, suffer from "that swinelike grossnesse, that maketh the sweet maierome not to smell to their delight." If the poems presented are not pleasing, or if they are too removed from the reader's experience to be understood the preface argues, the fault lies with the reader and not the text. Fortunately, the preface also offers a remedy; "by reding" this reader can "lerne to be more skillful," and by doing so, can elevate his status to membership in a kind of print coterie, one whose membership is defined not by social rank but by a mastery of reading and that is dedicated to the cultivation of "English eloquence" among all its readers.

This print coterie invoked by the preface mimics the exclusivity of a manuscript coterie in that a certain level of ability is necessary to belong, and it centers on the courtly poets, models who correlate poetic skill with elevated social status. The preface begins by calling attention to the "honorable stile of the noble earle of Surrey" and "the weightnesse of the depewitted sir Thomas Wyat the elders verse," instructing the reader

to take these poets as guides for style and content, respectively. It becomes apparent later in the preface that these poets are meant to serve both as models for the reader's own intellectual efforts and as fellows in the creation of a literary community that will encompass all learned Englishmen: "If parhapps some mislike the stateliness of stile removed from the rude skill of common eares, I aske help of the learned to defend their lerned frends, the authors of this work" (2.18-25).

The preface here invites the reader into the coterie, arguing for an affinity between the courtly author and the non-courtly reader, an intellectual and by extension even a social connection. Being "learned" enough to appreciate this poetry elevates the reader above those with "common eares" and places the "learned" on a level nearer to that of "their learned frends, the authors of this work." Moreover, the printer calls on the reader to "defend" the courtly poets, which would require that the reader be able to argue for the value of the poets' stylistic decisions. The reader thus in effect takes up where the courtly poet has left off in this vernacular poetic enterprise, helping to develop the reputation of the English language. Tottel figures reading as an activity that asks the reader to make and defend aesthetic judgments, a process that carries moral and social, even patriotic, implications.

Both the moral and social implications are present in the way the preface sets up its socioliterary hierarchy: the hierarchy has distinct levels, but the preface also indicates

that one is able to move between levels. Being presently “rude” does not condemn one to a lifetime of ignorance. The very act of reading the book can elevate someone from the “swinelike,” unlearned commons to the intellectual elite, a group whose bonds are strengthened by the obligation each reader has to defend its value. Inclusion in this reading community, however, requires action on the part of the reader, both the action of reading and perhaps also of imitating the poetic models presented in the book. The community is exclusive, in that its boundaries are clearly articulated and criteria for membership defended, but it is also somewhat inclusive, as membership is attainable through money (buying the book) and work (reading it).

The overall effect of this preface is to fashion Surrey and Wyatt as both the reader’s social superiors, distant courtly poets, and as fellow intellectuals working toward a common goal. Marotti reads Tottel’s preface as making “democratic arguments” about the civilizing power of print, but he also sees these arguments as contradicting the way Tottel advertises the book as Surrey’s and capitalizes on the glamour of the aristocratic poet. I, on the other hand, read the preface’s delicate balance between aristocratic exclusivity and “democratic” availability not as a contradiction, but as a blending of the dictates of the marketplace. Tottel has to make the book seem exotic, in order to satisfy the customer’s demand for something new and different, in this case the socially distant world of the court. However, he also has to make the book seem accessible and

applicable to the reader's life outside of the court, and therefore he must find some way to establish a sense of shared identity between the reader and the poets.

The preface does both; it elevates Surrey and Wyatt and suggests to the readers that they can achieve similar elevation, by defending the works of these poets and "learning to be more skilfull." Concurrently as it fashions the courtier poets as distant icons, the preface's stated purpose and the intimate act of reading itself work to establish a sense of identification between the reader and the courtly poet that might undercut the distanced position of the voyeur. The physical proximity of the words on the page, made possible by print, brings the reader social proximity to the courtly poets. Building on this sense of closeness, the kind of critical reading Tottel calls for asks the reader to participate wholly in the project, by supporting and further disseminating the poets' achievements, not just observing from a distance.

Creating the Author in Print: *Tottel's Miscellany* and the Devonshire Manuscript

The *Miscellany's* method of organization also strengthens this sense of authorship as a collaborative enterprise, fashioning Surrey and Wyatt simultaneously as courtier poets, located in the socially distant courtly world, and as published writers, virtually located in the same print culture world as the reader. Although the term "author" or

“auctor” was common throughout the Middle Ages, Tottel’s usage in the preface indicates a shift in conceptualization of the term. Chaucer and other medieval writers did use the term to refer to the creator of a written work; in medieval theological and medical treatise, especially, the author’s name signifies the treatise’s authenticity and authority. Editors were also often named in patristic and scholastic works for the same reason (Hellinga 86). However, during Chaucer’s time and well into the *Miscellany*’s period, the author as a professional figure who primarily earned a living from writing did not exist (Hellinga and Trapp 2). Even as late as 1644, authorship is acknowledged in only forty percent of the extant works from that year, indicating that those who did publish were hesitant to have their names associated with printed works (McKenzie 564).

Nevertheless, Douglas Bruster points out that by the 1590s the professional writer does become a lively figure in printed controversies and pamphlet wars. Bruster argues that the “bestseller phenomenon” of the later Elizabethan period “speaks to a profound, even structural transformation of print culture,” in which the “making of an author’s style into a thing (and the naming of that thing after the author)” and “the celebrity of authors... all suggest a personalization of print that changed what and how printed matter meant” (63).

For literary figures such as Harvey, Nash, and Greene to achieve prominence, print culture first had to link texts with personal identities in a way that made both text and author desirable.

We can see Tottel's publication as, if not an originating moment, at least an important and prominent step in this process of selling authors as personalities and texts as embodiments of those personalities. By citing Surrey and Wyatt as "authors" in his preface, Tottel brings the courtly poets, as a voice of authenticity and authority about courtly literary styles and practices, into the realm of trade and commerce. They did not print their poems for profit, but he does, and in doing so, he draws upon what Foucault calls "the author-function" (123). That is, the names of Surrey and Wyatt serve to classify and differentiate these texts from other texts circulating in print, and they help to characterize courtly lyric poetry as "a particular manner of existence of discourse" (Foucault 123). Moreover, their names provide Tottel's text with a high social status that it could not have achieved without them. Tottel's publication of courtly poems, advertised under the names of Surrey and Wyatt, use this social value to persuade readers that the book has corresponding monetary value. For the price of the book, the reader can become acquainted with the poets' skill and may even be able to learn such skill by absorption and imitation.

This recontextualization of courtly figures as authors quite possibly enabled a particularly strong identification on the part of the reader. Creating authors in print meant creating performers and disseminating their performances, in this case rhetorical ones, to a wider audience. Twentieth-century sociologists and psychologists have

theorized that the identification of a spectator with a performer, peculiarly made possible by forms of mass communication, can powerfully enable the spectator temporarily to take on the performer's identity mentally and behave accordingly (Giles 157). When, as in the case of the *Miscellany*, the shared project sold to the reader involves his or her mastering of the art of rhetorical performance, and when rhetorical performance can assist one in advancing socially, the line between observation and imitation becomes even more blurred.

The transformation of courtier poets into authors not only enables the initial identification between poet and reader, it also organizes the reader's approach to the material. The usefulness of the book's structure for the reader similarly depends on a balance between the reader's feeling simultaneously distant from and close to the poet. No manuscript miscellany that I have found was organized along such clearly authorial lines as Tottel's *Miscellany*, with the possible exception of the Arundel-Harington manuscript, which nevertheless does not name the authors it groups together (North 178). The *Miscellany*'s construction of authorship clearly marks the book as a product of a new kind of reading culture. The frontispiece shows a portrait of Surrey, and the book's title page advertises only Surrey as the author, identifying the collection as "SONGES AND SONETTES / written by the ryght honorable Lorde / Henry Haward late Earle of Sur- / rey and other," but the preface mentions Wyatt and the anonymous poets as well.

Surrey's name, then, functions as the hook, luring readers to buy the book in order to vicariously experience the courtly life of a well-known aristocrat, while Wyatt's name draws on the reputation of a courtier who had already been constructed in print as an author by the elegies of Surrey and John Leland (Thomson, *Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background* 74). Nicholas Grimald, the third named poet in the volume, stands closest to the reader in terms of social status, as I discuss in the next chapter, and models how poetry can help forge social ties that extend beyond the court.

The book's organizational structure does more than simply introduce these poets as famous names; it links those names to different poetic styles, different social ranks, and therefore to specific sets of rhetorical behaviors available to someone at that social rank. In the preface, Tottel calls Surrey's style "honorable," associating his poetic practice with the social rank ascribed to him on the title page. Surrey's style is honorable and worthy of esteem because Surrey himself holds a distinguished social position that is reflected in his mode of expression. Wyatt's verse, on the other hand, is "weighty" or serious because Wyatt himself is "depewitted" and draws on his profound knowledge and insight into his courtly world to construct his poems. From the beginning, then, each poet is presented as a model for a distinct kind of poetic practice and offers different examples of poetic choices. If readers wish to read for reflective or moral content, they should consult Wyatt's poems. If readers are more interested in aristocratic style, Surrey's

poems are separated out and identified as models of style. The “sondry good English writers” also display the “severall graces,” or the variety of ways in which English poetry can be refined and decorative. In the manner of a handbook, the *Miscellany*’s preface sets up identity-based categories and encourages the reader to pick and choose poems based both on who the poet is and what sort of poetic skill that poet has mastered.

The *Miscellany* does not just *seem* to be clearly organized along authorial lines, as Wendy Wall describes it; it *is* clearly organized, with the beginning and each section marked for the reader and the poet’s name at the end, and this organization facilitates the kind of usage I have been discussing. Thirty-six of Surrey’s poems begin the book, ending with “The fansie of a wearied louer” and the attribution at the end of folio D³, “SURREY.”¹⁵ This designation signals the end of Surrey’s poems and the beginning of the next section, ninety-one poems that begin with “The louer for shamefastenesse hideth his desire” and end with “The song of Iopas unfinished” and the name “T.WYATE the elder.” At the beginning of the next section, on the facing leaf, the inscription “Songes written by Nicholas Grimald” immediately informs the reader that Grimald is the author of the poems from “A trueloue” through “Of M.T. Cicero,” where the initials “N.G.”

¹⁵ All bibliographical references to Tottel’s editions of the *Miscellany* come from Hyder Rollins’s standard edition of the book (*Tottel’s Miscellany 1557-1587*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965) and from my own examination of the single extant copy of the June 5 first edition (BOD Arch. G.f.12(1)).

signal the end of Grimald's contributions, thirty-nine poems in all. At the top of the next leaf, Q1, the section heading "Uncertain auctors" begins with "The complainte of a louer with sute to his loue for pitie" and ends ninety-three poems later with "An answeere to a song before imprinted begynning, To walke on doutfull ground." This poem's title is particularly significant, as it calls attention to a dialogue among poems carried out in print and indicates the possibility of a wider dialogue in this medium.

The book ends with four "Other Songes and Sonettes written by the earle of Surrey" and six "Other songes and sonettes written by sir Thomas wiat the elder," extra poems that have led Wall to conclude that the volume was poorly organized. I suggest, however, that just as the title of "An answeere to a song before imprinted" self-consciously distinguishes the *Miscellany* from manuscript miscellanies, so too are these additional poems meant to make the printed book seem fresh and immediate and as flexible as a manuscript miscellany. Although "finis" follows the repetition of material from Surrey, and another "FINIS" follows Wyatt's, the double ending need not indicate that Tottel lacked an organizational framework. Rather, it seems to me to indicate the opposite, a strong desire to preserve the authorial principle of organization in the face of an uncertain supply of manuscript copy, as it clearly delineates the end of each poet's additional contribution.

Furthermore, I believe that the double ending also offers us a clue about how Tottel put the collection together. No manuscript miscellany has yet been discovered that possesses the same structure as Tottel's printed *Miscellany*; that is, no manuscript source copy is known to exist.¹⁶ This absence of a source and the strikingly different appearance of the *Miscellany* indicate that Tottel was creating a new form in print. He was not working from one complete manuscript but was instead compiling his type from at least two manuscripts, one of which may have come into the shop after the original type had already been set. In the spirit of making a virtue of necessity, Tottel added the new poems and enhanced the impression that the collection was full of — indeed, bursting at the seams with — desirable verse, fresh from the court.

The apparent organizational inconsistency, then, affords us an opportunity to glimpse the sorts of material conditions under which Tottel was working. Likewise, the title page's sole attribution of authorship to Surrey encodes the legal and political pressures, such as the threat of censorship, that the printer-editor was subject to. Surrey's

¹⁶ Both Ruth Hughey (2.58, 66) and Marcy L. North (173) suggest that a coterie of prisoners — Princess Elizabeth, John Dudley, Robert Dudley, and John Cheke — incarcerated with John Harington the elder in the mid-1550s may have produced the manuscript source for *Tottel's Miscellany*. North argues that there are similarities in shape between the Arundel Harington and *Tottel's Miscellany* — both are divided into single author groups followed by a miscellaneous section, and they share certain poems (178). Enough differences remain in both form and content, however, that it seems likely Tottel compiled the printed book from at least two manuscript sources, one of which may have been the Arundel Harington Manuscript.

thirty-six poems to Wyatt's ninety-one, Grimald's thirty-nine, and the anonymous ninety-three hardly seem to entitle Surrey to headliner status. In addition to being more prestigious, Surrey's aristocratic name and title were also safer. In 1554, only three years before the *Miscellany* was published, Thomas Wyatt the younger, son of the poet, had been executed for leading a rebellion against Queen Mary and King Philip. The Wyatt name was a dangerous one in 1557, whatever the poetic achievements of the father, and the astute Tottel was unlikely to blatantly advertise a name that would bring down royal disfavor. Surrey, while also an executed traitor, had been dead for ten years, and in that time the Howards — ever a conservative dynasty — had proved themselves staunch supporters of Mary's Catholic regime (Sessions, *Henry Howard* 271). Furthermore, in 1557 Tottel had published Surrey's translation of Books Two and Four of the *Aeneid*. As the printer John Day had published Book Four in 1554 (Hardison 130), Tottel may have also been attempting to monopolize Surrey's name for his own printing projects.

The extent to which Tottel co-opts the social identities of the *Miscellany's* poets and uses them to organize his book helps to create a new and complex idea of authorship. In manuscript miscellanies such as the Devonshire Manuscript, authorship is not an organizing principle. The Devonshire Manuscript, now in the British Library (BL MSS Add 17492), is a collection of poems, both original and copied, perhaps originally owned by Surrey's sister, the Countess of Richmond, and passed about the court of Henry VIII.

It has provided no less than seventy-three examples of Wyatt's poetry, even by the most conservative canonical estimates (Remley 59). Only one of Surrey's poems appears in the manuscript, which is surprising given his close association with the alleged guardians of the volume.

Most of the poems in the manuscript however, are unattributed, indicating the functional anonymity of coterie poetry. The current hypothesis, persuasively put forward by Paul Remley, is that the Devonshire Manuscript served as a place for its coterie to exchange poetry not just as an expression of aesthetic appreciation, but also as a tool for covert protest. One of the hands has been identified as that of Henry VIII's niece, Lady Margaret Douglas, who secretly was betrothed to Surrey's uncle, Lord Thomas Howard, in 1536; when the king found out about the marriage, he separated the lovers and imprisoned them in the Tower. Someone, probably Queen Anne Boleyn's cousin Mary Shelton, served as a go-between and carried the copybook between the lovers, who communicated through a series of plaintive love poems (Remley 51). This group of eight poems, both original and imitations of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, is striking in its thematic unity. Most of the poems, like this stanza, protest the unjust treatment of the separated lovers and swear undying love:

My luvē truly shall not decay

for thretnyng nor for punyshment
for let them thynke and let them say
toward you alone I am full bent
therefore I wyll be dylygent
our faythful love for to renew
and styll to kepe me trusty true.

(27r., transcription mine)

Anonymity was not only possible, as the coterie was a small group whose members were all personally acquainted, but it was also useful as a cover for poets like Howard and Douglas to express potentially treasonous opinions. Marcy L. North notes that “many of the authors included in the Devonshire were probably well known to the compilers, but that knowledge finds expression in anonymity more often than in attribution” (161). As a collection of poetry meant to be passed among friends, the verses did not need authorial identification; as a safe place for courtiers to express their dissatisfaction and dissent, authorial identification would have been a liability.

Scholars have primarily been interested in volumes such as the Devonshire, Egerton, and Arundel Harington Manuscripts thus far for their usefulness in establishing the boundaries of various poets’ canons. Arthur Marotti cautions against an “author-

centered focus on the Devonshire Manuscript” which “distorts its character” (3) as a document with a very malleable notion of literary appropriation, but it is also beneficial for our purposes to look at how authorship *is* constructed in the volume. Where poets are identified, some two dozen out of more than a hundred and fifty (North 161), the identification seems to be a gesture of respect for poetic talent. Some of Wyatt’s poems are attributed to him, for example, as on 19v. (“Ryme of Wyatt”), a sign that some poets such as Wyatt did enjoy a greater reputation and serve as poetic models within the group.

Other names and signatures are scattered throughout its leaves – Mary Howard or “madame de Richemont,” Anthony Lee, “A.J.,” “J. [John] H.” and “G Rochford,” or George Rochford, Anne Boleyn’s brother (18v.). These signatures may signify either that the person was the original author of the poem, or that they have appropriated someone else’s verse to express details of their own situation, as Margaret Douglas and Thomas Howard adopted excerpts from Thynne’s edition of Chaucer and transcribed them in the manuscript (Remley 55). North cautions that we should not assume such attributions “functioned strictly as proprietary or artistic claims to the content of the manuscript,” but rather that they are “better understood as records of participation and response in the circle represented by the manuscript” (163).

Thus, although authorship is not a consistent or primary means of organization, the places where authors are named seem to signal an acknowledgment that some verses

derive their status from association with their author, even as the transcriber adopts the verses for his or her own communicative purpose, and that even in coterie circles some poets were already “names.” Sometimes the association was well enough known in coterie circles that not all poems needed names attached for recognition. North suggests that places where Margaret Douglas has clustered a set of Wyatt’s poems but only attributed some of them are markers of a practice in which she “demonstrates an awareness of authorship, then, but chooses not to use the name as a marker of authorship” (166). The places where authors sign their own names to original verses suggests that individual writers wished to be associated with their poems, whether to make a certain claim of authenticity or even possibly to ensure a lasting reputation for themselves. The attribution of poetic ownership then, even in the Devonshire Manuscript, seems to work against the received notion of lyric verse as strictly ephemeral.

What Tottel does differently, however, is to elevate authorship and make it a selling point for his collection, and in the process he creates “authors” in a more modern sense. Where a manuscript collection like the Devonshire Manuscript does not operate on Foucault’s “author-function,” *Tottel’s Miscellany* does, to a certain extent. By grouping texts under certain names, Tottel “implies that relationships of homogeneity, filiation, reciprocal explanation, authentication, or of common utilization [are] established among them” (Foucault 123). The function of authentication, not necessary

in a manuscript context, is particularly crucial in the print context. Tottel's readers did not personally know Surrey, Wyatt, or possibly even Grimald, and the emphasis on their names sets apart their poetic discourse from the works of other poets and marks that discourse as "authentic," a true rendition of the poetic practices of the elite. Even the poems by the "uncertain authors" become glamorous through their association with the courtier poets. In the next section, I examine how Tottel's system of titling the poems helps to give the *Miscellany* a sense of coherence across the authorially marked sections and strengthen the sense of identification between the courtly poet and the non-courtly reader.

Tottel's Titles: Cracking the Coterie Code

The very title of the whole collection – *Songes and sonnets written by the right honorable Lord Henry Haward and other* – situates the *Miscellany* in between the "high" literary culture of the court, signified by the term "sonnet" with its courtly, Petrarchan overtones, and the popular culture of the broadside ballads. As Natascha Wurzbach points out, until the eighteenth century "the term 'ballad' referred exclusively to street ballads printed on broadsheets," and since these broadsheets were cheap, they were primarily intended for a lowbrow audience (2,4). Tessa Watts, however, cautions against too monolithic a conception of ballad audiences, citing the common appearance of

popular ballads in manuscript miscellanies kept by seventeenth-century gentlemen (3). By advertising the book as containing courtly sonnets and by also using the more culturally neutral term “songs,” Tottel may have intended to appeal to a wider audience.

Tottel’s system of titles likewise serves to mediate its unfamiliar content for new readers. In their new print context, unlike in manuscript miscellanies, all of the poems acquired titles such as “Complaint of a dying louer refused upon his ladies iniust mistaking of his writing” (Surrey, no. 18), “The lover compareth his state to a shippe in a perilous sea” (Wyatt, no. 50), “Marcus Tullius Ciceros death” (Grimald, no. 166), and “Of the mutabilitie of the world” (anonymous, no. 180). Tottel’s practice of assigning titles crosses authorial lines, potentially disrupting the book’s organizational principle, but it also serves the purpose of enhancing the reader’s identification with the courtly poet by recoding courtly language strategies into strategies that a non-courtly reader can understand.

For readers unfamiliar with court life to be able to interpret the poems in the *Miscellany* as encoding courtly desires and behaviors in the way a volume such as the Devonshire Manuscript does, however, they need to be able to understand the code. Furthermore, for the poems to do similar work for this new reader, they might need to be translated into a new code. In *Distinction*, Pierre Bourdieu explains the consumption of art as “a stage in a process of communication, that is, an act of deciphering, decoding,

which supposes practical or explicit mastery of a cipher or code.” Someone who lacks such knowledge “feels lost in a chaos of sounds and rhythms, colours and lines, without rhyme or reason” (2). Tottel’s titles, and his practice of regularizing metrical patterns, assist the reader in cracking the code, or at least in finding a way into the poems. They are therefore practical, but they also employ conventions that are pleasing as well as practical. In this regard, they reveal what Bourdieu calls an “aesthetic disposition,” an objective distance from entirely practical necessity (29). They represent a way to “neutralize ordinary urgencies and to bracket off practical ends,” and because they do so, they in turn recode their new contextually determined meaning (54).

Marotti has recognized the nature of this process and has described Tottel’s practice as part of “a recontextualizing process... in which the works lost their vivid particularity of meaning and began to speak a language whose general and abstract terms were a hybrid of poetic conventionality and culture-specific code words” (218). However, while he regards the poems as having lost meaning in this process, I propose to shift the focus to the meanings the poems *gained* in the print context. I suggest that by looking more closely at those “culture-specific code words” we can recover the possible meanings the poems had for this new set of readers. The meanings are not immediately apparent to a modern reader unfamiliar with Tottel’s code, but if we read the titles as doing what the rest of the paratext does — providing a practical reading experience that

attempts to profit the readers by elevating them intellectually and socially — they become clearer.

The titles generally fall into three general categories, as Marotti and Wall have noted: those that refer to what the editor perceives as the original social situation, those that deal with “the Louer,” and those that refer to philosophical or moral commonplaces. Each sort of title does a certain kind of work. Those that refer to the poet or that reference an incident in the poet’s life do seem to offer a more voyeuristic glimpse into a socially distant and therefore exotic world: titles position the reader as a more passive observer of courtly situations and experiences: “Prisoned in Windsor, he recounteth his pleasure there passed” (Surrey, no. 15), “Wiat being in prison, to Brian” (Wyatt, no. 116), “Of the courtiers life written to Iohn Poins” (Wyatt, no. 125) and “A song written by the Earle of Surrey by a lady that refused to daunce with him” (Surrey, no. 264).

The two other categories of titles, however, the “lover” titles and the philosophical ones, enable the reader to practice the sort of active reading advocated in the printer’s preface. These titles help orient readers to the social practices of the courtly poet’s world, so that they may learn rhetorical behaviors that will help them in their own social relations, while others translate courtly concepts and philosophies into concepts applicable to the readers’ own lives. All of these titles suggest to readers ways in which mastering certain rhetorical strategies and behaviors can aid them in their social

mobility. At times, the generality of the titles is in tension with what modern critics have identified as very specific social situations in the poems' original context, but we should not read these titles as inaccurate or misleading. Rather, we can read those titles as keys to the code, working to translate the poem from its courtly setting into a non-courtly context.

The first practical function the titles serve is to orient the non-courtly reader in the world of the courtly poets. The titles that refer to "the Louer" offer the greatest help to a reader unfamiliar with either courtly social behaviors or elite poetic practices. They help to unify the text, by offering a figure that recurs throughout the book's sections; the lover's problems and triumphs seem to transcend social boundaries. These titles preserve the formal conventions of courtly love, which were most likely familiar to a reading public that had already been exposed to Chaucer (Boffey 559). However, they also draw on the dramatic language of the popular, printed ballad tradition and through the more familiar figure of the ballad lover make the courtly love tradition more accessible. For example, Surrey's first poem is titled "Descripcion of the restlesse state of a louer, with sute to his ladie, to rue on his dying hart," a title that plays on the convention of the courtly mistress as cold and unpitying. Other titles are more general: frequently the lover is "forsaken," as in the title of poem 52, "The louer sheweth how he is forsaken of such as he sometime enjoyed" (more commonly known as Wyatt's "they flee from me"). A

sampling of the Stationer's Register shows a ballad printed in 1557 titled "A ballett of the lover and of the bird" and one published in 1569 called "A lover extending the ingratitude of his lady," suggesting that love and misfortune were favorite subjects of the ballad writers as well as of the courtly tradition (Rollins, *An Analytical Index to the Ballad Entries*, 138).

Strikingly, the lover appears in more titles in Surrey's and Wyatt's sections than in either Grimald's section or the "uncertain authors" section. This clustering suggests that the lover translates the rhetorical concerns, positions, and strategies of the courtier poet, specifically, for the non-courtly reader. Two of the titles given to Grimald's poems mention the lover, and the figure recurs throughout the entire volume. Of the book's two hundred and sixty-seven poems, one hundred and forty-one have titles that mention love or the lover in the title. The preponderance of lover titles has contributed to the book's reputation as a volume of courtly love poems, even though, as we shall see, the poems are neither specifically courtly nor always simply love poems.

The figure of the lover works to unify the text and the poets with the readers because, presumably, it relies on a commonplace that the experience of love is one shared by people across social ranks. As we know from work done on poems such as no. 52, however, these poems in their original contexts carried meaning about very specific and complex social interactions; the experience of love was not uniform across social groups.

I stress that the poems in the non-courtly context carry meanings as nuanced as those of the original context, and the new meanings are accessible if we consider the lover as something more than a popular, generalized figure. The lover only seems to transcend social boundaries; in actuality, this figure actively elides social categories, acting as a cipher and serving as a common term between one social context (the courtly) and another (the non-courtly). The titles enable the courtly varieties of wooing, persuading, and demonstrating rhetorical and stylistic mastery to translate into more generalized behaviors of wooing, persuading, and self-assertion.

The instances where the poem's title diverges from the courtly meaning of the poem offer specific instances of how this kind of translation operates. For example, Tottel titles Wyatt's poem 70 as "complaint for true loue unrequited" and his poem 72 as "The louer hopeth of better chance," but these poems are better known by their first lines, "what vailleth troth?" and "He is not dead that sometime had a fall." Both of these poems in their original courtly context dealt with the dangers and uncertainties of life at court, and while the conclusion of poem 70 briefly mentions love, poem 72 does not contain any romantic or erotic content. Instead, no. 72 was written after the fall of Wyatt's patron, Thomas Cromwell, and expresses hope that Wyatt can recover from this politically damaging loss. When shared with other coterie readers at court, the poem would have demonstrated to Wyatt's audience the ways in which his rhetorical prowess

could enable him to recover from his setback. In practical terms, Wyatt's skill with language was indispensable to Henry's diplomatic efforts on the continent, during the charged years during and following the king's break from Rome. The poem reminds its courtly readers of this skill, and as importantly, it performs his political recovery. In an act that demonstrates rhetorical power, it imagines this recovery and so wills it into being.

Such a situation was not likely to be immediately transparent to Tottel's readers, who, while they may have known of Wyatt's general reputation, may also have been unfamiliar with the challenges of life at court and the poetic strategies that Wyatt used to process such experiences. But the image in poem 72 of "The willow, eke, that stoupeth with the winde, / Doth rise againe, and greater wood doth binde," expresses a sentiment of hope and resilience, qualities common to the courtier's experience and the lover's (no. 72, 52.35-36). That is, the way in which Wyatt the courtier responds to a political setback resembles the way in which he responds to trouble with his mistress in other poems. Tottel's title thus highlights and universalizes for the reader a certain aspect of the poem, its rhetorical display of confidence and the ability to recover from a romantic setback, in language that any of his readers could understand. The vocabulary Wyatt uses could refer to a situation of courtly disgrace or, as Tottel recodes it, to a lover who has failed to win over the object of his affections. On a simple level, it therefore offers a certain interpretation of the poem and a way to understand Wyatt's poetic technique.

For the more “skillful” reader, the title provides poems like no. 72 with an even more subtle, contextually determined meaning. Readers who understand Wyatt’s poetry as a rhetorical display can apply the techniques Wyatt uses, such as striking and timely usage of well-known proverbial sayings and deployment of rhyme to underscore his point that he will rise from his setback more powerful than before, to their own rhetorical situations. As I mentioned earlier, the language used to describe the courtly behaviors of wooing and persuading could also be used to describe non-courtly instances of the same behaviors. If we assume that Tottel’s readers were primarily lawyers, clerics, merchants, and civil servants, then we can imagine their rhetorical needs ranging from being able to argue a case before a hostile judge or jury, to being able to sell wares to a skeptical public, to dealing with a financial or social setback. The vocabulary is general enough that it could be used to describe any charged or disastrous situation; for example, Wyatt expresses the hope that “when Fortune hath spit out all her gall, / I trust, good luck to me shall be allowed” (no.72, 52.30-31). The title, “The louer hopeth of better chance,” picks up the catchword of fortune and recasts the poem’s subject as romantic “chance,” but if this chance can be considered specifically romantic, then the title also opens the poem to a whole host of specific meanings, in particular, the reader’s own experience with misfortune.

The personification of chance as Fortune also carried another specific set of connotations in existing English literary culture. Margaret Lane Ford notes that among English books owners of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, merchants and professionals as well as nobles, Boethius's *Consolation of Philosophy* was one of the most popular titles (220). Readers of the *Miscellany* might very well have been familiar with Boethius's tumultuous career and the role of "faithless fortune" in the *Consolation*. Thus, they would be able to fit Wyatt's poem not only into the framework of the lover's experience, but also into a richly intertextual classical and medieval literary tradition, in which writers such as Boethius process their anxieties about their public and private lives through the figure of fortune. Both "chance" and "fortune" were terms that would resonate with readers seeking to make their fortune in a world of commerce, trade, and litigation.

In these poetic situations then, erotic and social desire share many of the same metaphors, and Tottel's recurring use of the "lover" as a focus and code for these desires points out how intertwined they were. For both the courtier and the non-courtly reader, who was buying Tottel's book in order to express an affinity with elite taste, the experience of social mobility involved jockeying for position and status, just as wooing did. Moreover, the ability to move up in the world sometimes depended on the ability to woo a higher status mate. This confluence of romantic and social ambition is typified by

Shakespeare's character Master Slender, the socially ambitious cousin of Justice Shallow in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*.

We know that Elizabethans may have read the *Miscellany* in the socially conscious way that I am describing because Shakespeare comically models this kind of usage in Master Slender. Slender is quick to note his cousin Justice Shallow's social prominence, reminding him and the parson that Shallow is "In the county of Gloser, justice of the peace" and "a gentleman born, master parson; who writes himself *Armigero*; in any bill, warrant, quittance, or obligation – *Armigero!*" (1.1.5-6, 8-11).¹⁷ His interest in Mistress Anne Page appears to stem from his understanding that she stands to inherit seven hundred pounds, and that marrying her would substantially increase his status. When the opportunity to woo her arises, he laments, "I had rather than forty shillings I had my Book of Songs and Sonnets here" (1.1.199-200). Here, Slender assigns the *Miscellany* a specifically monetary value; in his rhetorical situation, courting Mistress Page, the book's contents are more valuable to him than a considerable amount of cash, because they are an investment in his social future. He sees Tottel's book as a handbook that will help him woo a young lady, by providing him with verses that will

¹⁷ References are taken from the *Riverside Shakespeare* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974).

make him look courtly, learned, and romantic, and he sees the young lady as the key to increasing his position in the world.

Wealth, status, and “courting” are here intertwined; indeed, Tottel's book may have helped to popularize the idea of courting as “to pay amorous attention to, seek to gain the affections of, make love to (with a view to marriage), pay addresses to, woo” (*OED*, v.4). The *OED* does not record any examples of this usage prior to Lyly's 1580 *Euphues*. The non-courtly lover can imitate the courtly lover in a variety of rhetorical situations, whether they involve love alone, love triumphant or rejected, or love and money. The figure of the courtly lover, then, would be attractive to the non-courtly reader not only because he represented a high status courtier, and therefore the reader could vicariously experience life as that courtier, but also because “the lover” offered the reader a variety of potential responses in his own efforts at romance and social mobility.

The third category of titles, which identifies the poem as a meditation on a philosophical or moral subject, also works to translate courtly concerns into those of the print reader or, in some cases, to highlight the ways in which the two are analogous. The titles that identify the poems as elegies on famous subjects do more than just recreate the social world of the court; indeed, for the most part, they inscribe in print the elevated status of people who began in spheres closer to the reader's than to Surrey's or Wyatt's (a function of the printed elegy that I examine in more detail in the next chapter). A subset

of this category, which I call the “golden mean” poem, appears most commonly in the “uncertain authors section.” The golden mean poem provides a nuanced example of how the titles employed catchwords that were particularly meaningful in a courtly context and that could be equally, though differently, meaningful to non-courtly readers.

Courtly poets appear to have found philosophical meditations on the idea of the “golden mean” especially useful as a way to process the vagaries of fortune, and Tottel’s titles highlight the notion of “mean” as a philosophical devotion to moderate and measured living that could help one avoid disaster. In all, six titles actually include the word “meane” or “measure:” Surrey’s poem 28, “Praise of mean and constant estate,” Wyatt’s “Of the meane and sure estate written to Iohn Poins,” Nicholas Grimald’s 150, “Praise of Measure keeping,” and the anonymous poems 170, “They of the meane estate are happiest,” 191, “The meane estate is best,” 194, “The meane estate is to be accompted the best.” Those titles that include the terms “mean” and “estate” introduce a concurrent and equally active meaning for the adjective “mean.” Together, “mean” meaning middle and “estate” meaning status or position connote the idea of a middle rank in society. “Estate” also links these poems to other poems that explicitly deal with social rank. Poem 200, “The pore estate is to be holden for best,” an acrostic on the downfall of Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset, completely eliminates the idea of the middle of society. Instead, as I discuss in greater detail in chapter three of this study, it idealizes the

world of the rustic poor as a preferable alternative to the dangerous and unpredictable world of the court.

What these examples reveal is that the term “mean” was one that carried multiple meanings in Tudor society, and most likely different meanings for people at different points along the social spectrum. It could even signify low or base, but this connotation is phased out in the *Miscellany*, and especially in poem 200, in favor of the more moderate association. In this connotation, it was an ideal word with which to catch the attention of a certain type of reader, the socially “middling” and upwardly mobile reader. In terms of content, these poems fall in more generally with the volume’s classical translations and poems dealing with finding and maintaining virtue in an unstable world, but as these examples show, the definition of virtuous behavior shifts with the reader’s perspective. The idea of moderation logically seems attractive in the world of the court, which was rarely moderate materially or politically, and the poems themselves seek to locate where the middle is, whether they advocate maintaining a low profile at court or trying to find the smoothest path in seeking to improve one’s position — a path which, unsurprisingly, is found to be the moderate one. Don’t aim to rise too high, these poems say, and you will get where you want to be. But these ideas also seem to have been current among a set of non-courtly readers who were engaged in risky professions such as

litigation and trade, and who could use advice as to how to succeed modestly in the professional world without courting disaster.

For the most part, then, Tottel seems use the phrase “the meane estate” as a way to appeal to his readers, who were undoubtedly keenly aware of their own “middling” social status, outside of the landed gentry, and possessed of a desire to improve it. Mary Thomas Crane, situating the *Miscellany* within the humanist practice of gathering and framing moral sayings, claims that in the *Miscellany* and later verse anthologies such as the *Paradise of Dainty Devices*, “many of the poems are moralizing” and “carry a uniform moral message, one which denigrates upward mobility, ambition, and imagination” (169). The overall “effect of the poems,” Crane goes on to argue, “is to judge the rich and famous by middle class standards and find them wanting” (170). Crane also argues for the presence of a cultural ambivalence that transmits “stylistic matter in the form of fashionable schemes, tropes, and other devices that would enable [readers] to imitate their social betters” while tending “to confirm the superiority of their own unambitious way of life and frugal values” (170). Certainly envy and a sense of moral superiority played into the voyeuristic desire to read about and imitate the behaviors of the social elite while avoiding their more disastrous mistakes, but I suggest that the paratextual features I have been discussing complicate the idea of observation and imitation.

Indeed, for Tottel's readers the courtly poems' treatment of ambition may have done more than provide biographical examples and confirm "middle class" values; on a deeper level, though, the poems must have resonated with the readers' own experiences of social mobility. As these poems in *Tottel's Miscellany* suggest, the philosophy of the golden mean may have thrived in the Tudor courts, and been so popular with non-courtly readers, because it was so flexible and easily adapted. In the pages of the *Miscellany* the virtuous "golden mean" does become a warning against the risks of social mobility, but alternately it transmits knowledge that makes such mobility possible. Its exact meaning is always relative and maddeningly elusive, as multiple meanings of the word "meane," from "middle" to "method," are simultaneously in play in any given context. The golden mean lies wherever the reader can locate his own halfway point, whether it is a sense of moral moderation or a location along a social spectrum, and that may be precisely its appeal.

In conclusion, by looking at how Tottel's titles use cultural code words that acquire different shades of meaning depending on the readership, we can see how the titles serve a very practical function: they translate specifically courtly situations into more general concepts that then enable readers to apply the poem's content or moral lessons to their own situations. Perhaps most significantly, though, for some readers they offer a way to approach each poem as a set of rhetorical strategies that those readers can

actively apply to their own purposes, whether by appropriating the text itself, as in Master Slender's case, or modeling their rhetorical self-presentation on the poet's in an analogous social situation. In a society as status conscious as Tudor society was, and as fond of pageantry and display, a merchant or city leader surely would have had numerous opportunities to display poetic skill gleaned from the *Miscellany*, whether at a guild dinner or in pursuit of a higher-status mate. At the very least, their knowledge of the poems would mark readers as someone in the know and someone who was up on all of the literary fashions at court.

We can, therefore, regard the *Miscellany* as a kind of courtesy manual, instructing readers in social behaviors and practices through poetic examples. Although the volume does not explicitly announce itself as such, its paratext enables and indeed even encourages this kind of usage. Just as a good fencing or gardening manual does, the *Miscellany* offers its readers models of behaviors that, when followed correctly, mark a practitioner as someone of high social status; the printer's intention alone, however, cannot guarantee that the reader will use the book correctly. In the preface, Tottel differentiates between the "unlearned" and the "learned" reader, as if the categories exclude from the start those who will not be able to follow the script. He destabilizes these categories, though, by offering the "unlearned" the tools with which to alter their

status, and this undermining requires that he fortify the feature of the book that direct its usage.

The paratext therefore attempts to guide the reader's usage, but at the same time it also betrays anxiety about the reader's ability to follow the script without assistance. In particular, the changes made between the first edition of June 5 and the second edition of July 31 may reveal the printer's attempt to reinforce his authority as an arbiter of poetic taste, even as he offers the readers choices and the opportunity to define their own social identities. These changes raise the larger question of to what extent the printer is providing a social identity that is pre-determined, and to what extent it is possible for readers to participate in the formation of their common culture.

Editorial Intervention: Changes and Revisions Between June 5 and July 31

The immediate success of the *Miscellany* can be inferred from the fact that, only weeks after the June 5 first edition appeared, a second edition was published. We do not know how large the first edition's print run was, but enough copies were sold and enough interest expressed that Tottel issued more copies. Moreover, this second edition was not merely a reprint; it was an entirely new edition, with new poems added, some old poems dropped, and an index and page numbers added. The surviving copies of the second edition show some cosmetic changes; for example, the preface "The Printer to the

Reader” becomes simply “To the reader,” and the section heading “Uncertain auctors” becomes “Songes and Sonnettes of / uncertain auctors.” In this section I focus on the more substantial changes mentioned above. These changes suggest that the decision to make these changes came not from an outside editor, but from a printer who knew his customers and was able to mediate between his own purpose and practices and those of his customers.

The most significant changes to the second edition, for the purposes of my argument, are the addition of an index at the end of the book and correlating pagination throughout the volume. Hyder Rollins has located five copies of the second edition, three of which are different enough from the first two that some disagreement has arisen over whether they represent duplicate settings or two successive editions, B and C (2.13). The differences Rollins discusses are beyond the scope of the present study, but for its purposes it is enough to point out that Rollins notes, “the Tables [of B and C]... are exactly alike in the arrangement of pages and lines” (2.16). Regardless of whether B and C represent duplicate settings of the same edition or two separate editions, the addition of a table at all between the first and second editions is noteworthy indeed. The addition of the table, a functional index, strongly indicates that the *Miscellany* was intended for practical reference, and perhaps that readers of the first edition were having a difficult time using the book in the manner Tottel intended. Devices intended to help the reader

efficiently find material in a book had been used in manuscript miscellanies since the late Middle Ages and printed books from the late fifteenth century (Keiser 475). The sorts of texts that included such reference tools, however, primarily seem to have been miscellanies that contained legal treatises, herbals, equine medical manuals, cookbooks, and the like (Keiser 477-478). When applied to a printed poetic miscellany, this kind of functional index enabled poetry to be read in a variety of ways. As Barbara Benedict explains, “while commodifying literature into usable and reusable elements,” the printed anthology “allows both the traditional, intensive study of a few texts, and the new, comparative survey of many that a burgeoning literary market would increasingly promote” (35). Where the *Miscellany’s* authorial organization enables the former kind of reading, the table allows the reader to compare poems throughout the volume and to make individual judgments about quality and relevance.

The table’s format might seem disconcerting to a modern reader, but assuming Tottel’s readers familiarized themselves with the book, it would have been relatively straightforward. One of two surviving copies of Rollins’s edition C, Pforz 506, now in the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas, contains a complete table. Under each alphabetical heading (A, B, C, D, etc.) the table records the first few words of the first line of each poem, in order of appearance. For example, under A, the poems are presented thus:

A	
Alas so all thinges now	5
Although I had a check	10
As oft as I behold	12
Avising the bright	22
Alas madame for steling	23
Accused though I be	29
As in thy loke my life	34
A face that should content	35
A lady gave me a gift	42
A spending hand	47 [...]

The list continues with all of the poems beginning with an “a” word and then starts over again at B. It may seem surprising that an editor would bother to title the poems and then use a different system to organize the index, but clearly this index serves a function that differs widely from the function of the titles. Where the titles are explanatory and meant to lend a sense of coherence and narrative to the volume, the index enables a reader to pick and choose individual poems and generally treat the volume in a more piecemeal way — as a handbook. Along with the index, the second edition also added folio numbers; each folio is clearly numbered, and the poem can be found on either the recto or verso of its indicated folio.

This system does not adhere to the authorial method of organization, but neither does it particularly disrupt it. As the poems are included in order of appearance, a reader could figure out which page numbers correspond to Wyatt poems and which to Surrey,

for example. The index does highlight the rich variety of verses contained in the volume; while mid-sixteenth century verse has commonly been regarded as formulaic and repetitive, the *Miscellany's* index reveals that no two poems begin with the same first line or approach their subjects in quite the same way.

Moreover, Tottel's index is significant not only because it organizes lyric poetry, a somewhat unusual purpose, but also because it points to Tottel himself as the guiding force behind the book's purpose. Of his contemporaries, Tottel appears to have been particularly concerned with making sure his readers knew how to use indexes. In 1554, Tottel published an edition of Lyttleton's *Tenures*, one of the most popular law books of the day, for which he negotiated sharing the publication rights with the Rastell family and other law printers. As J.H. Baker notes, Littleton's "*New Tenures* was an enormous success in the age of printing; there were more than sixty editions in the sixteenth century alone" (412). Prior to Redman's 1540 edition, few of the editions contained tables or indexes to facilitate reference. Both Redman and Tottel included brief indexes in their English translations of Littleton, but only Tottel's 1554 edition of the book contains a detailed explanation of the table:

A breife declaracion of the table to the reders.

When you wyl desire to finde any case in this boke. Fyrst you muste
consyder wyth your selfe in what letter or tytyle the case is moste apt or

mete to stande in that done turn to the same letter in the table and therein seke out the title in the which when you haue serched and founde out your tyle of the case desyred, you shal haue after the same a number of algyrme that dyrecteth you strayght to the lefe in the boke where the case is, after which numbre in the sayde table always folowith. one of these letters, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, or H, whyche (after the nombre of the lefe founde) sheweth the parre or place of the page or syde of the lefe where you shall rede your desyre. It must be notyd that the page or syde of the lefe contayneth 32 lynes which is 4 times 8. And A. signifiyeth the fyrst lynes in the fyrste page or syde of the lefe B. the seconde 8 lynes followyng. C. the thyrde 8 lynes and D. the the last and lowest 8 lynes of the fyrst syde of the lefe, lykewyse. E. betokeneth the fyrst 8 lynes of the second page or syde of the lefe. F. the next 8 lynes followynge G. for the thyrde 8 lynes and H. for the last and lowest lynes of the second syde as for example in a fewe of the fyrst lefes in the beginning of this boke you shal see these letters playnly set forth in the margyne (STC 15737, A1r).

The table offered in the *Miscellany* is by no means as complicated as the one in Tottel's edition of the *Tenures*, but both tables require some skill on the part of the reader. The

readers of the *Tenures* must be familiar enough with the common law to be able to figure out “in what letter or tyle the case is moste apt or mete to stande in,” just as the readers of the *Miscellany* must be familiar enough with the *Miscellany* to know the first line of the poem they wish to look up and possibly the author of the poem as well. As the majority of Tottel’s customers were probably lawyers, they would have been accustomed to oral memorization and transmission and could have used the *Tenures*’s index with relative ease. Likewise, just as the *Miscellany*’s titles serve to translate courtly practices into language the non-courtly readers can understand, so too does the index make use of practices to which Tottel had already introduced his readers in the law manuals published previously.

Aside from the meticulous nature of Tottel’s indexing system in the *Tenures*, his explanation of how to use it is equally striking. The detailed explanation seems to reveal some anxiety on the printer’s part about the readers’ ability to figure out the system for themselves. In the end, however, the preface is confident that the system is clear, since the letters are “playnly set forth in the margyne,” and perhaps even one that will revolutionize the way lawyers use their books. The full title Tottel gives the edition emphasizes the book’s usefulness: “Lyttletons tenures newly revised and truly corrected with a table, after the alphabet to finde out briefly the cases desired in the same, thereto added very necessary to the readers.” Tottel’s edition of the *Tenures* is meant to facilitate

looking up and referencing individual cases, just as the *Miscellany*'s index does the same for its poems. Moreover, the printer considers this a selling point that makes the printed book indispensable to the practice of law and his edition superior to others.

In the case of the *Tenures*, Tottel's fussiness over how his readers will use the new features he has provided seems to stem from his need to differentiate his edition of Littleton from the many that have come before it. In the case of the *Miscellany*, however, it is the printed verse anthology that is relatively new to the book market, not simply a particular edition. The index seems to represent the printer's attempt to govern how his readers will consume printed poetry, even as it offers them a tool that makes different ways of reading and multiple poetic narratives possible. This tension brings us back to Benedict's claim, as I mentioned in the introduction to this study, that Tottel does not "attempt to mediate fine literature for a wider readership" (14), and yet does present the book as "an authoritative edition of new, approved verse, not a readers' compilation" (38). Presenting the book as an authoritative edition is an act of mediation, I suggest, but not one that precludes reading as a critically selective activity. On the contrary, features such as the index allow readers to choose their own poetic narrative — and therefore, their own social script — from the many possibilities presented in the volume. The features that to Wall and Marotti signify the text's disorder, such as the addition of more poems at the end of the volume, instead further signify the text's openness and the

continually changing shape of the canon of approved verse. Moreover, the tools that Tottel gives his readers enable them in certain (albeit limited) ways to participate in making that canon, by selecting the poems that speak to their experiences and putting them to use in their own social lives.

Of course, the textual boundaries that Tottel establishes do exclude certain poems and poets from the forming canon, as I touch upon in the next chapter, just as all of the paratextual features I have discussed limit reading practices as they define them. Marotti is correct in insisting that the poems lose certain particular meanings as they move from smaller, more closed coterie groups to a larger and more inclusive readership. The poems did not have the same meanings for Tottel's readers as they did for Wyatt's. The meanings that they gain, however, speak to the changes taking place in Tudor society and offer us valuable information about how people outside the court actually used poetry to help construct social identities at a time when the old markers of status and power were changing.

In the next chapter, I turn to poems by Surrey, Nicholas Grimald, and the "uncertain authors" to examine the social relationships they inscribe and model. In addition to scripting certain kinds of relationships, particularly those between social ranks, the poems also reveal how poetic skill can work to disrupt or rewrite the power dynamics in the relationships. Just as the entire book participates in the negotiation of

new concepts of property, as I discussed in the previous chapter, so too do individual poems and groups of poems register tensions between aristocratic ideas about the bases of social status and new, merit-based ideas about social identity. The poems themselves, as much as the career of Richard Tottel or the ideas the preface offers, indicate the multiple ways in which non-courtly members of Tudor society were already using poetry to not only advertise their membership in certain social groups but to also to attempt to forge new social ties and create new communities.

Chapter Three

“As we long upward, all:” Poetry and Social Place in *Tottel’s Miscellany*

In the first edition of *Tottel’s Miscellany*, published on June 5, 1557, the poet Nicholas Grimald beseeches the subject of his encomium “To L.I.S.” to “spare, to read a rurall poet’s rhyme: / Take here his simple sawes, in briefe” (no. 139, 100.11-12). It is not clear whether the lady in question, Lady Jane Seymour, daughter of the executed Duke of Somerset, ever did take the time to read Grimald’s homage to her wit and learning. What is clear is that the poem, with its heavily classical allusions and rhetorically sophisticated appeals to aristocratic patronage, voices an entirely different perspective on court life than the poems of Surrey and Wyatt do — that of the outsider trying to gain access to the court through his poetic efforts.

With these poems, Grimald — a sometime Oxford scholar, chaplain to Bishop Nicholas Ridley, and alleged “Judas of the Reformation” — perhaps hoped to establish a lucrative connection to the Seymour family by submitting these poems in manuscript, while also making a more public name for himself by having them published in *Tottel’s Miscellany*, alongside poems by Surrey, Wyatt, and the anonymous poets. Sadly, his second gambit failed, as the majority of his poems curiously were removed from the second edition, published only three weeks later. Although the *Miscellany* is still

regarded as one of the most influential books of the English Renaissance, and Surrey and Wyatt are still widely anthologized, few people remember the name of Nicholas Grimald.

I have begun this chapter with Nicholas Grimald because, as the *Miscellany*'s only identifiably non-courtly poet, his presence in the volume concretely links the book's courtly character to a broader social picture. His "failure" to achieve modern canonization, I suggest, was tied in part to the cultural moment in which he sought literary fame and to the complicated social changes happening at that moment. When viewed in the context of this wider social change, Grimald's own ambitions, successes, and failures can be seen to parallel those of others' of his social rank and even of those whose social positions varied widely from his, even as his publication in the *Miscellany* consigned him to a unique and rather peculiar place in literary history as the poet that the *Miscellany*'s success left behind.

For these reasons, Grimald's contributions provide an intriguing starting point for exploring how the *Miscellany*, as a book that publishes courtly and non-courtly poets together, adds to the culture's discourse about social identity and mobility. In this chapter, I examine poems by Grimald, the Earl of Surrey, and several anonymous authors in order to explore the personal and professional relationships and acts of social mobility inscribed in *Tottel's Miscellany*. To begin with, I suggest that simply by including Grimald alongside Surrey, Wyatt, and the anonymous courtly poets, the *Miscellany* alters

the shape of the poetic community for readers of the printed book and extends the possibilities of poetic language beyond the court. Thus, the book reveals that not only does the vernacular offer poets a means with which to demonstrate the artistic possibilities of the English language, it can also act as a powerful tool for social negotiation.

At one level, *Tottel's Miscellany* enacts this change by dispersing the poetic tools the elite used in their discourse about social status for the “middling sort” to use. According to Keith Wrightson, the “gradual incorporation of literacy into the popular culture of England” was one of the hallmarks of the sixteenth-century educational revolution (*English Society* 191). The people outside the court, however, did not simply incorporate the mere skills of reading and writing into their lives; they imbibed the literary language and forms of the ruling elite, appropriated them for their own social purposes, and helped to create a literature that began to constitute a culture shared across social groups. Felicity Heal and Clive Holmes have argued that the adaptability and flexibility of the English ruling elite were largely responsible for their survival as a social group (381). Similarly do I suggest that the adaptability and flexibility of the elite’s literary forms, as exemplified by the sonnets and lyrics of Surrey and Wyatt, were the characteristics that enabled those forms to become popular and appropriated by readers and poets outside the court. The *Miscellany* thus signifies a shift towards what Keith

Wrightson calls “a degree of cultural cohesiveness which went over and beyond common consciousness of rank,” a cohesiveness that, if still restricted to a fairly limited segment of society, at least marks an important step in the development of a shared, literate culture (*English Society* 192). When courtly lyric poetry that had previously been restricted to the social elite was opened up for a new readership, new readers and writers found that they could use those forms to assist them in their acts of social mobility. They in turn contributed their own perspectives to the body of English imaginative writing.

The above argument requires one crucial qualification, one that brings us to the second level at which the *Miscellany* registers attitudes towards and acts of social mobility. While some poetic forms were sold to Tottel’s readers as particularly courtly forms, continental in origin, others in the volume — particularly the epideictic and elegiac — were in fact part of a tradition that extended back to the classical poets. Other, non-courtly poets in the early modern period, such as those in the universities and the Inns of Court, shared classical and medieval forms with the courtly poets and identified themselves as a longstanding part of the ancient tradition. In this chapter, I focus a great deal on the life and poems of Nicholas Grimald, who, as the only non-courtly, scholarly poet identified in the *Miscellany*, functions as a figure analogous to Tottel’s reader, someone who stood just outside courtly circles but who connected to them through acts of reading and writing. Grimald’s epideictic poems to the Duke of Somerset’s daughters,

which I examine in the chapter's first section, demonstrate how such a poet writing outside the court adapted the classical poetic form to participate in courtly behaviors, such as "wooing" a higher status female subject, that otherwise would have been closed to him. These poems operate within the rules of social hierarchy, employing terms of social obedience and deference, but they also suggest that a love of language and learning could create a community of intellectual equality between poet and patron.

The epideictic poems for the Seymour sisters form only part of the broader picture of how poems perform social functions in the *Miscellany*. By including the Seymours as poetic subjects, Grimald also links them to the elegiac tradition as manifested in the *Miscellany*; in praising the daughters as living subjects, Grimald reverses some of the indignities of the father's death. The disgraceful execution of the Duke of Somerset provides the subject matter of the anonymous poem 200, an acrostic whose critical yet sometimes sympathetic tone echoes the society's ambivalence towards both the subject's ambitious life and his spectacular death. Grimald's use of the epideictic form reclaims the Seymours as examples of social virtue, offering the daughters poetic immortality to counter the effects of the "anti-elegy" commemorating the father's traitorous end. These poems therefore not only register individual acts of social mobility — Grimald's as well as the Seymours' — they connect to a wider cultural discussion about the dangers of attempting to move up in the world.

The *Miscellany's* elegies proper, particularly those written by Grimald and Surrey, go even further than the epideictic poems do in transforming the finality of death into social regeneration. Just as epideictic poems celebrate their subjects' lives and make powerful statements about their social place, so too, as Matthew Greenfield has noted, do elegies "register the social importance of the deceased," making an argument about the structure of society before the subject's death and attempting to reconstitute it in their absence (81). A collection of elegies such as that found in the *Miscellany*, then, had the potential to re-imagine the social structure in surprising ways, which the *Miscellany* indeed does. In the second and third sections of the chapter, I examine the volume's elegies and the ways in which they commemorate the deeds of largely self-made men and gentlewomen. The several elegies to Sir James Wilford (two written by Grimald) and the elegy to Lady Margaret Lee, the two examples I address in this chapter, praise the merit of their subjects and inscribe them onto the physical body, thus naturalizing them. More importantly, however, they ascribe to their subjects a textual place that was not necessarily proportional to the subjects' social place in life, reordering the courtly community around a focal point that is decidedly "middling" and creating a new sense of community among those who might not necessarily have been personally touched by the deaths, but who are now certainly imaginatively included.

It is in three elegies for two dead poets, however — one famous, one relatively insignificant — that the *Miscellany* makes its most striking argument about the impact poetic practice can have on ordering society. These poems re-imagine not only the shape of society itself but the role that the poet has within that society. Surrey's famous pair elegies on Wyatt, nos. 30 "Of the death of sir T.w." and 31 ("Of the same") strike out at Wyatt's enemies and argue for Wyatt and in the end Surrey himself as poetic keepers of cultural memory. Grimald's poem to his late school friend, "w.Ch," completes the work that Surrey's elegy on Wyatt begins, inscribing what W.A. Sessions calls "the new poet of honor and nobility," or the poet whose social value is determined by his skill not his birth ("Surrey's Wyatt"169). By claiming for his school friend a special place in the poetic tradition, and by taking the deceased's place as the poetic speaker for their social group, Grimald transforms a personal loss into a cultural one and refocuses society around the figure of the living poet and his text. The ancient elegiac form, then, serves in the *Miscellany* as a medium for legitimizing more fluid social relationships and creating a new social body, one whose members are linked by ties of learning and poetic skill rather than blood and inherited rank.

Collectively these examples of encomium and elegy in the *Miscellany* demonstrate that just as the courtly poets appropriated and translated classical and Continental models and influences to write about their experiences with social mobility in

the court, so too did non-courtly poets and readers appropriate those same forms and use them for *their* social purposes. Those purposes varied from individual to individual, but together the poems engage more generally with some of the significant social trends of the period, particularly the rise of an educated bureaucracy, as well as the accompanying emphasis on classical and humanist learning across several social groups and the infiltration of the aristocracy by this educated group, the so-called “new men.”¹⁸

Finally, at the end of this chapter, I conclude by suggesting that the effects of this literary and social appropriation can be seen in the lyric explosion of the later Elizabethan poets. For this succeeding generation the *Miscellany* became not only a sourcebook for poetic forms, as it has commonly been recognized, but also through those forms a manual for social practice and a medium for rewriting social identity, a function that has so far escaped critics’ attention. I bring to the forefront Barnaby Googe’s “An Epitaph on the death of Nicholas Grimald,” a poem that does for Grimald what Grimald did for the Seymours and, more personally, for William Chambers. In the first single-authored poetic

¹⁸ In all of these discussions we should remember that, as Keith Wrightson points out, true nation-wide literacy did not come about in England until the nineteenth century, when schooling became mandatory (194). The educational developments of the mid sixteenth century were limited in scope and scale (186). Nevertheless, during this period, important changes in the fluidity of the social structure and in the educational system helped make the success of a book like *Tottel’s Miscellany* possible.

anthology in English, Googe erases the dishonor of Grimald's own traitorous act of betrayal and shameful death, mourning his loss as a cultural one and attempting to rescue Grimald's memory from what Googe terms the "deep oblivious ground" (1.49). To a certain extent Googe was successful, but more importantly, his act of publication carried on Grimald's poetic legacy. With the publication of Googe's poetic anthology and later with the elegies of Jonson, Donne, and Milton, the literary infiltration of the poetic "new men" was fully legitimized by print culture.

In the section that follows, I turn to the life and career of Nicholas Grimald, the only identified poet in the *Miscellany* who was not born into the aristocracy or the gentry. As a non-courtly poet, Grimald represents from a non-courtly angle the enormous changes taking place across Tudor society and provides a window into the vibrant poetic traditions that developed in the universities, the Inns of Court, and among the clergy, the "middling" ranks of society for whom the *Miscellany* would hold such appeal. Moreover, a prose tract that was likely authored by Grimald, the *Institution of a Gentleman*, helps to situate the *Miscellany*'s epideictic poems and elegies in the culture's discourse of social mobility. I will briefly examine this tract and the ways in which it illuminates the *Miscellany*'s foundational proposition that social rank could be based on merit and skill, particularly with language, as well as the ways in which it amplifies the social tensions that the *Miscellany* works to conceal. When we read the *Miscellany* with

a greater understanding of what was at stake for social players like Grimald, and with an eye to the *Institution*'s suggestions about the power of language to maintain or alter the social order, the *Miscellany* begins to look less like a simple volume of courtly poetry and more like a book engaged in a protracted and sometimes bitter culture-wide struggle for status and power.

Scholarship and Social Status: Nicholas Grimald and the Place of the Scholar-Poet

One of the most remarkable things the first edition of the *Miscellany* does is print the poems of cleric and scholar, Nicholas Grimald, with those of Wyatt, Surrey, and the anonymous courtly poets, giving Grimald's poems equal space and status in the volume. As I have suggested in the previous chapter, the book's framing material and organization present the lyrical contents as courtly in origin and character, but Grimald's presence complicates the notion of "courtliness" in the *Miscellany*. As a whole, the book does not simply give its readers a glimpse into a small and closed section of society, equating prestige with a high and unattainable rank; instead, it presents social status as a more elastic construct, one that can be acquired through poetic status as either a respected poet or an honored subject. In particular, the details of Grimald's life and career and his association with an anonymous courtesy manual, the *Institution of a Gentleman*, place the

Miscellany squarely in the middle of contemporary debates over whether social status could (and should) be achieved or could only be inherited.

Like his co-religionist and contemporary, Hugh Latimer, Grimald was the son of a yeoman farmer and thus came from a rural family of “moderate means” (Merrill 6). Grimald went to Cambridge at the age of fifteen and obtained a B.A. there in 1539-1540, then went on to earn an M.A. from Oxford University in April of 1542 and another M.A. from Christ’s College, Cambridge, in 1544 (Merrill 9, 12). According to Grimald’s eulogy for his mother Anne and the dedicatory epistle to his play *Christus Redivivus* (published 1543), his education was made possible by his parents’ early training and support, particularly his mother’s, and by the financial support of the cathedral cleric in Lincoln, Gilbert Smith (Merrill 9). Keith Wrightson characterizes yeomen farmers of the period as among the most prosperous members of rural society, often owning their own land; most likely then Grimald’s family lived comfortably but not spectacularly (*Earthly Necessities* 138). The social ambition of the yeomen as a group seems to have been widely acknowledged; Sir Thomas Smith, attempting to lay out the structure of English society in the 1560s, referred to yeomen who “are able and daily doe buy the lands of unthrifty gentlemen, and after setting their sons to schools, to the Universities, to the laws

of the realm, or otherwise... do make gentlemen of their sons" (74).¹⁹ If Grimald's parents were typical of their rank, they may have had high hopes for their only son's future.

Placing a son in the clergy was one sure way to advance the family socially. Although it was difficult for sixteenth and seventeenth century theorists such as Smith to describe the clergy's place in the social hierarchy, most placed them nearer to the gentry, as the skills of reading Latin and writing required to be a cleric differentiated them from the laboring masses (Cressy 37). The education required for such an endeavor was expensive; nevertheless, some parents regarded this kind of expense as a necessary investment and "a means of upward, and geographic mobility, worth purchasing at considerable cost to the rest of the family" (Heal and Holmes 245). The Grimald family's aspirations seem to have paid off. Grimald did well in his clerical career, eventually gaining the position of chaplain to the renowned Protestant bishop, Nicholas Ridley, sometime around 1551 or 1552 (Brennan "Grimald"). He also produced numerous plays and poems that were published in England and abroad and, according to John Bale, he

¹⁹ Smith further describes yeomen as follows: "This sort of people confess themselves to be no gentlemen but give honor to all which be or take upon them to be gentlemen, and yet they have a certain preeminence and more estimation than laborers and artificers, and commonly live wealthily, keep good houses, do their business, and travail to get riches" (74).

enjoyed a reputation as a learned scholar and writer (Merrill 16).²⁰ In terms of mobility, Grimald was fortunate enough to have socially ambitious parents as well as a clerical patron who recognized his literary talent early in life. The resource of patronage was one that he was to depend upon heavily for most of his career, as we shall see.

The educational and professional “revolution” during which Grimald came of age also expanded the career options of young men of his rank and brought them within the orbit of the politically powerful elite.²¹ For a host of mid sixteenth-century Oxford- and Cambridge-trained scholars and clerics, of whom Grimald was a notable example, the confluence of courtly employment, university learning, and the potential of print to circulate writings among wider audiences must have offered exciting opportunities for professional success and social advancement. The Tudors, more than any dynasty before them, drew from the universities as well as from the ranks of the nobility and gentry for their advisors and civil servants, and this professionalization of the court opened up new

²⁰ Bale lists thirty-nine separate translations, plays and poems (written in both Latin and English) attributed to Grimald in the *Index Britanniae Scriptorum* (Merrill 27).

²¹ The question of how much of society saw a substantial change in their options is, admittedly, a vexed one. Lawrence Stone calls the period between 1540 and 1600 “one of the really decisive movements in English history by which the propertied classes exploited and expanded the higher educational system” (Stone 303) and an “educational revolution”(Stone 331). Wrightson takes issue with the term “revolution,” questioning the extent to which it benefited the lower orders of society, but both historians agree that it offered at least some new advantages for members of the lower gentry and the most prosperous of the rural middle (Wrightson, *English Society* 186).

career paths for the “middling sort,” gentleman second sons and the offspring of lesser gentry, burghers, and merchants. Many of Grimald’s Oxbridge colleagues capitalized on their humanist learning to make courtly connections, and those connections led to more and less spectacular ways to make a living.

Scholars such as John Cheke and Roger Ascham, for example, became tutors to the royal children, while the majority of their contemporaries used their connections to obtain clerical livings and lower-profile teaching positions of various sorts. Lawrence Stone has found evidence of “the scholars and sizars from professional, mercantile, or clerical backgrounds struggling to obtain a degree and a country parsonage” seeking education at the universities and the Inns of Court, young men whose socially modest career goals were surely most typical for their rank (308). Farther towards the other end of the social spectrum, William Butts, physician to Henry VIII and, according to Maria Dowling, the “most eminent middleman in scholarly patronage,” is a prime example of the sort of figure who kept the wheels of the courtly patronage system smoothly turning. Butts, a graduate of Cambridge himself, was notable for supporting evangelicals such as Thomas Smith and Hugh Latimer, whom Butts brought to court to preach before Henry VIII (Dowling 4). Although most Oxbridge graduates never got quite that close to the inner circles of courtly power, the examples of Butts, Ascham, and Cheke must have been tantalizing for socially ambitious university students.

Thus, the nascent civil service, church livings opened up by the reformation, and the increasing fashion for educating young aristocrats formed an employment network that ran between the court and the universities. So too did the relatively new technology of print open up a middle channel of communication between the elite and those outside of courtly circles. Roger Ascham's educational manual, *The Scholemaster*, inspired by his years as tutor to the Princess Elizabeth, gave non-courtly educators access to the educational program used by royalty. Likewise Baldassare Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier*, translated into English by Sir Thomas Hoby and published in 1561, brought to the English reading public a manual of courtly manners that had long circulated in the Tudor courts. Not only could the members of rising social groups take advantage of the formal educational system, thanks to the growing book trade they also had increasing access to the same books read by their social superiors. In this period, as Frank Whigham argues, "the received sense of personal identity, seen as founded on God-given attributes such as birth, was slowly giving way to the more modern notion that the individual creates himself by his own actions" (x). The growing body of courtesy manuals not only helped to reconfigure identity as a set of acquired traits, it also provided the socially ambitious with the instructions for how to acquire them (Whigham 7).

Nicholas Grimald may have had a theoretical interest in the concept of social identity and mobility, as well as a practical one, and he may have contributed to the body

of courtesy literature circulating in print, as his name has been linked to a courtesy manual that makes some charged observations about the power of language to regulate the social hierarchy. Joseph Hunter's nineteenth-century *Chorus Vatum Anglicanorum* names Grimald as the author of the *Institucion of a Gentleman*, anonymously published in London in 1555, an attribution that Michael G. Brennan, in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, contests ("Grimald"). Granted, it is impossible to be certain on stylistic grounds that Grimald wrote the *Institution*; nevertheless, the book shares with Grimald's poetry a nuanced perspective on the relationship between language and social rank. The author carefully praises the established social order and defends the right of gentlemen to rule, maintaining that this kind of government is in the commonwealth's best interest. However, he also calls the reader's attention to less positive implications of rule by birth and ultimately implies that a more flexible and beneficial system is possible.

In the *Institution*, the relationship between language and power is presented as a vexed one. By subtly revealing the ways in which the vernacular incorporates the inequalities that can be observed in social relations, the author is able to comment on the power of language to inscribe and perpetuate social difference and even prejudice. In one side remark, he trenchantly notes that the difference between a "ruffian" and a "roister" is one of status, just as "Chaucer maketh betwene a common harlot and a gentlewoman of like condicion." He goes on to say,

If she be a poore woman and misuseth her bodye, then she is called a whore (sayeth he), but if a gentil woman be of such disposicion, then she is called a lemande or a paramour.

(B3v).

A whole host of social implications underlie this apparently neutral etymological observation: the English language and courtly literary tradition romanticize the sexual trafficking of the elite, while they condemn the practice (and therefore the practitioners) in those of lesser privilege. Granted, wealth and rank did not always go together in the sixteenth century, but the reference to a “leman” taken from Chaucer echoes with the courtly poetry of Wyatt and Surrey and thus suggests both rank and economic privilege.²² As the author is concerned with morality and virtue, the remark hardly reflects unqualified approval either of the behavior of the privileged or of the ability of language to enforce proper conduct.

Moreover, the author makes clear that not only can language in the hands of the high-born and powerful institutionalize double standards of behavior, it can also be used as a tool of oppression, or at least as a means to keep the social order static. He jumps into the center of the conflict between those who felt that social rank should only be

²² This use of “leman” also appears in Spenser’s *Faerie Queen* (III.viii.40). (*OED* n1.)

inherited and those who believed that it could be earned, taking the side of what he calls the “ungentle gentle” and arguing for their right to the higher status they earn. Pointing out the ways in which those born to high rank use language to jealously guard their position, he addresses directly those who criticize an individual of “a poore stock” who “by his vertue, wyt, pollicie, industry, knowledge in lawes, valliency in armes, or such like honest means becometh a wellbeloved and high esteemed man” (C4r). He claims that the term “upstart” was “a term lately invented by” those jealously guarding their inherited status, “such as pondered not the groundes of honest meanes of rising or commyng to promotion,” and he chastises them for not believing that virtue is legitimate grounds for social promotion (C4v). Instead of using terms like “upstart,” the author of the *Institucion* prefers to divide the two groups in question into the “gentle ungentle,” those who are born to their position but display disgraceful manners and behavior, and the “ungentle gentle,” or those who rise through their merit. For him, the latter are not only legitimately gentle. They are in some ways superior to the born gentry who fail to live up to their social and moral responsibilities to be sober and upstanding leaders of society.

However, the book does not despair of a society led by “ungentle” aristocrats. Instead, it implies that because language inscribes social conduct and hierarchy, in the hands of the educated and virtuous, the “ungentle gentle,” it can serve as a handy tool for altering the order of things. Furthermore, by renaming the social order and by reclaiming

derogatory terms, the author uses language to enact the very change he wishes to see come about. For example, the author observes elsewhere that the new fashion for education has created a situation in which some born to their high rank actually might be at a disadvantage. In the section on hunting and hawking, the author claims that the gentry's enthusiastic pursuits of these sports "are the cause of so many unlearned gentlemen whiche (as some say) they understand not the inkhorn terms that are lately crept into oure language" (H3v). The message here is doubly significant. At a basic level, the author argues that those who are born to rank ought to live up to it; born gentlemen, in order to be truly gentle, "ought to be learned, to have knowledge of tongues" (B5v). Gentility is not only determined by birth but should be supported by an education, a proposition with socially progressive implications. If learning equates to gentility, as the passage proposes, then gentility is a quality that can be acquired. Moreover, on another level, by clearly displaying his fondness for the "inkhorn" terms that should be part of a gentleman's education and that most certainly did constitute the education of many aspiring gentry, the author reclaims a derogatory term and remakes it into a badge of honor for the educated and upwardly mobile. He both argues for the change and enacts it himself using language in innovative and powerful ways.

The largely unspoken claim throughout these passages is that if social inequalities were powerfully inscribed in the vernacular, then equally powerfully could the vernacular

be used to reveal and possibly even affect those differences. Granted, a book such as *Institution of a Gentleman*, like many courtesy manuals, does not go so far as to subvert the social order. Indeed, the writer approves of the notion of hierarchy. However, he does suggest that learned skills and merit should be factors in determining one's place in the hierarchy, thus legitimizing more fluid movement. In moments such as those above, we can see a new irritation to the social order, an understanding of the flexible role that language plays in determining social relations.

While *Tottel's Miscellany* does not openly address the conflict between the "haves" and the "want to haves" in the same way the *Institution* does, it does make evident the power not only of language generally but also of poetic forms specifically to alter social relations. In the *Miscellany*, Grimald and the anonymous poets display their mastery of "inkhorn" terms and the potential of rhetorical forms, particularly the epideictic and elegiac, as tools for re-imagining the shape of society. In his epideictic poems to the Seymour sisters, for example, Grimald turns to living subjects both to secure material reward and to demonstrate how, in the hands of the "ungentle gentle," the poetic form can rewrite a past social downfall as a future possibility that is mutually beneficial to poet and subject alike. These poems therefore present the possibilities of the epideictic form as being mutually beneficial to the social aspirations of poet and subject alike.

“Set Forth Your Noble Name:” Lady Jane Seymour and the fashioning of a patroness

While Grimald may not have been the author of the *Institution*, his encomia to the daughters of the executed Duke of Somerset, published in the first edition of the *Miscellany*, display a similar combination of explicit social deference and an implicit belief in the ability of learning to alter the balance of power in the social order, however slightly. The five verses written to the Duke of Somerset’s daughters Jane, Margaret, Mary, Katherine, and Elizabeth (nos. 139, 142, 143, 144, and 145) function as performances of a specific social role, that of the poet seeking a patronage relationship with a higher ranking patron.²³ The poems appear to have been presented as or been intended for public presentation as New Year’s gifts, as three of the poems express wishes for health and good fortune in the coming year.²⁴ This New Year’s custom

²³ The titles of poem 142, “a neew yeres gift, to the I.M.S.” and that of 143, “An other to I.M.S.,” are ambiguous in their dedication. Neither poem refers to its recipient explicitly by name, so it seems likely that no. 142 was intended for Mary Seymour and no. 143 for Margaret Seymour, who with her sisters Jane and Anne wrote a book of verses celebrating Marguerite of Valois.

²⁴ Alistair Fox notes that New Year’s Day was a traditional occasion for writers to present themselves as potential clients to the monarch or other important courtiers. This

provided an appropriate occasion for Grimald to display his rhetorical skill and persuade the Seymours of its benefit to them; furthermore, when printed in the *Miscellany*, the poems work to restore the family's damaged reputation in an even more public way.

The poems written for Lady Jane and Lady Margaret stand out among the group, praising as they do at length their subjects' wit and learning; the poem to Lady Jane in particular, no. 139, describes at length her intellectual and artistic achievements while modeling for a socially ambitious reader the rhetorical strategies available to someone seeking patronage. The poem is striking not only in the way it uses the epideictic form to gain social access to a female subject who otherwise may have been off-limits, but also in the way it rewrites the social fortunes of the Seymours. When read with a poem about the Duke of Somerset that appears in the "uncertain authors" section of the *Miscellany*, no. 200 ("The pore estate is to be holden for best"), Grimald's set of poems to the Seymour sisters evinces the socially regenerative power of the epideictic by countering the infamy of a dead poetic subject with the virtues of a living one.

While it was customary for an encomium to follow the format prescribed by Athonious's *Progymnasmata*, in the case of poem 139, "to L.I.S.," the rules are somewhat problematic. They require poets to treat the subject's education, good deeds,

occasion was doubly important during a regime change, when clients hoped to be brought on or retained by the newly prominent (12).

and physical, mental, and spiritual characteristics, as well as lineage (Fox 21), which Grimald's poem successfully does. The subject of this particular subject's lineage, however, was a vexed one. Jane Seymour's father had been executed as a traitor only a few years before Grimald penned his New Year's verses, a disgraceful end that another poem in the *Miscellany* responds to and attempts to moralize. In order to fully appreciate the rhetorical sleight of hand that Grimald performs, it is useful first to look at poem 200 and the hostility that it registers toward the Seymour family's rapid ascent, as well as the ambivalence that it shows toward its subject's equally rapid descent.

Poem 200, "The pore estate to be holden for best," alludes to contemporary aristocratic hostility to the Duke of Somerset's career. The first lines of the poem spell out the name EDWARDESOMERSE, thus identifying the poem with a specific case of fatal ambition, and the poem offers a seemingly pious commentary on Somerset's spectacular rise and to his downfall and execution in October of 1549 (see Appendix A for text). An old landowning family, the Seymours entered the court's inner circle when Jane Seymour, the namesake of Grimald's subject, became Henry VIII's third wife and bore Henry's only living son, Edward. Queen Jane's elder brother Edward Seymour, first Earl of Hertford and then Duke of Somerset, worked his way onto the Privy Council and

finally into the office of Lord Protector to his nephew, the boy king Edward VI.²⁵ His rapid advancement was viewed with satisfaction by some and with envy and disdain by others, particularly old-family aristocrats such as the Earl of Surrey.²⁶

Indeed, Somerset's example of social climbing is so extreme that the poem about him collapses the intricacies of the Tudor social structure; in the poem's pastoral fantasy, the middle of society disappears entirely, leaving only the very high (Somerset) and the very low, the "pore." The poem can be read as an expression of envy and resentment, an attack on the pretensions of the new nobility, an attempt to rewrite social "failure" as a moral victory, an idealistic yearning for the simple life, or all of the above. Its attitude towards its subject is ambivalent — sometimes sympathetic, as when it recognizes that "Deceived is the bird by the sweetness of the call" (no.200. 157.9) and sometimes judgmental, when it declares that for those who seek courtly advancement, "Excess doth breed their woe, they sail in scillas coast," which implies that their troubles are in part self-chosen (14). The poem's social message is clear. Reaching for status that one is not entitled to by birth is not merely unwise, but a sin, and even a nobleman and uncle to a

²⁵ For recent discussions by historians of Somerset's career and contemporary reputation, see Diarmid MacCulloch, *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (New York: Palgrave, 2001) and Ethan Shagan, "'Popularity' and the 1549 Rebellions Revisited," *English Historical Review* (February 2000).

²⁶ Susan Brigden touches upon the turbulent relationship between Somerset and Surrey in her article "Henry Howard, earl of Surrey, and the 'Conjured League,'" *The Historical Journal* 37, 3 (1994), 520

king courts disaster if he overestimates his power. According to this anonymous poet, such a fate is completely avoidable: “Eschew the golden hall,” the poem confidently advises its readers; “thy thatched house is best” (17).²⁷

Poem 200 holds Somerset up as a moral example of the kind of tragic end that unchecked ambition could bring, reading his fate as one ordained by a divinely determined natural order: “Experience now doth show what God us taught before, / desired pomp is vain, and seldom doth it last” (no. 200.157.4-5). Its tone in places is conservative and pious; the political events of the unstable years following Henry VIII’s death have, according to this poet, proven the wisdom of the scriptures, however much people might ignore them. Desiring “pompe” in the form of material goods, power, and worldly advancement is “vaine,” both sinful and ultimately fruitless. Somerset may be an extreme example, but his transgression, aiming beyond his rightful place in the natural order of things, cautions restraint to anyone who might contemplate advancing in the social pecking order: “Who climbs to reign with kings, may rue his fate full sore. / Alas the woeful end that comes with care full fast” (6-7). Not only is ambition dangerous, the

²⁷ Even Seymour’s assumption of the title Duke of Somerset can be seen as signaling royal pretensions. The title was previously held by Henry VIII’s illegitimate son, Henry Fitzroy, also known as the Duke of Richmond, by Henry VIII himself in his youth, and before that, by his great-grandfather (Casady 33).

poem suggests, but both God's law and worldly experience have already shown and continue to show that social hubris will be punished.

As poem 200 makes clear, Somerset's end was as dramatic as his rise, and the repercussions for his family were serious. Indeed, internal discord within the family seemed to be partly responsible for the blackening of their reputation. Somerset's younger brother Thomas, jealous of Somerset's influence over King Edward, was arrested after attempting to kidnap the boy; he was soon executed for treason (Seymour 240). Some in the court blamed Somerset for failing to save his brother.²⁸ When he fell victim to the Duke of Northumberland's bid for the Protectorate and was himself later executed on what may have been spurious charges of treason, reactions were mixed (Jordan 96). Some courtiers, such as Sir Richard Morison, chalked up Somerset's downfall to a lack of political tact and an inability to judge character, severe failings in a politician.²⁹ According to the diary of Henry Machyn, however, the citizens of London

²⁸ The strangeness of the Seymours' family relations is captured by Edward VI's reaction to Sir Thomas Seymour's death. Edward, who it should be remembered was a Seymour on his mother's side, wrote coolly in his *Chronicle* of his younger uncle's execution: "Also the Lord Sudeley, Admiral of England, was condemned to death and died the March ensuing" (Jordan 10-11).

²⁹ Morison wrote of Somerset in a letter to Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, "If he meant once again to clamber higher than the present state of the realm could give him leave; if ambition had so huddled him that he neither could see benefits wrongly bestowed upon him, nor foresee the dangers that men seduced fall into, *aetatem habet*, let him make his own answer" (*Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series* 16.196).

rejoiced at Somerset's arraignment, "for they thought he had been acquitted, for they threw a hundred caps on high for gladness;" they must have been disappointed when they found instead that he had been condemned (12).

Somerset's supporters soon turned to their own public relations campaign to restore the duke's reputation. According to Scott Lucas, the moral exemplum of *Edmund, Duke of Somerset* in the 1563 edition of the *Mirror for Magistrates*, written by Somerset partisan George Ferrers, is actually a political fable on Edward, Duke of Somerset's downfall, with its details altered to fit the sixteenth-century duke's story (54). Nicholas Grimald's most substantial contributions to the effort to restore the family's reputation, the poems to Lady Jane Seymour and her sisters, appear in the first edition of the *Miscellany*. Grimald apparently did not see Somerset's disgraceful end as a barrier to seeking patronage from the duke's daughters. On the contrary, he seems to have seized the rhetorical moment as an opportunity to demonstrate for them the socially regenerative power of the epideictic form, which in his hands has potential beyond even that of the exemplum.

By the time Grimald wrote these poems, the family's fortunes had been restored somewhat, but not to the level they had been at before Somerset's execution; the reference in the opening lines of no. 139 to "the quenes most noble grace" dates the poem after Somerset's execution (October, 1553) and during the reign of Mary Tudor, when

Jane Seymour, namesake of her aunt Queen Jane Seymour, served as a maid of honor to Mary.³⁰ That the Seymours were renowned pillars of the Protestant party at court makes the daughters' devoted service to the staunchly Catholic monarch seem unlikely. The Duke of Somerset, however, had maintained respectful and cordial relations with Mary when she was princess and had showed her kindnesses such as allowing her to hear mass privately when it was outlawed for all others (Loades 148).

Furthermore, the restoration of the Seymours also depended upon Queen Mary's mutual hatred of their political enemies. It had been Somerset's successor, Northumberland, who had at Edward VI's death attempted to deprive Mary of her right to the throne, so the favoritism Mary showed to the Seymours may have operated on the political strategy of "the enemy of my enemy is my friend." It is also possible that Mary had an especially soft spot for Jane, named as she was after the stepmother who had tried to reverse the indignities Mary had suffered under Anne Boleyn. Remembering all of these past decencies, upon her accession Mary restored much of Somerset's property to his widow and son and brought his daughters to her court, where apparently they carried on their father's reputation for patronizing learning and the arts (Seymour 368).

³⁰ At the time of the 1965 edition of the *Miscellany*, Rollins could not find evidence that Jane Seymour was in the service of Mary as she was of Elizabeth, but J.D. Alsop later found manuscript evidence of a gift Mary made to Jane, one of her favorite maids (113).

In poem 139, “to L.I.S.” (see Appendix A for text), Grimald appeals to the love of classical learning and poetry that he shares with his subject both to praise Lady Jane and to persuade her to new deeds of poetic achievement, which presumably include sponsoring his poetic efforts. Nicholas Grimald’s homage to Lady Jane appeals to the Seymour family’s renown in order to fashion the perfect aristocratic patroness, with all of the challenges and opportunities such a project would entail. A sympathetic and well-placed patroness could provide both financial support, in the form of money or gifts, and connections with other wealthy potential patrons who might themselves sponsor the aspiring writer or artist. Grimald’s goals surely were partly practical; the examples of fellow scholars Cheke and Ascham indicated the dizzying level of material success literary learning and skill could earn a poor scholar in the court, and Grimald undoubtedly knew from experience that good connections more commonly could earn one a university position, parishes and clerical livings, or a chaplaincy in a noble household (Fox 21).

Succeeding at such a project, as all pleas for patronage do, requires the poet to strike a delicate rhetorical balance between emphasizing her exalted position, and thus the distance between them, and calling on the similarities between them, in this case their roles as poets and lovers of learning. Throughout most of 139, Grimald employs the appropriate language of hierarchy and humility, emphasizing the great social distance

between Lady Jane the aristocrat and him, the humble poet, and yet his language strives to establish common ground between them. Grimald uses classical references to situate Jane's socially, at once placing her high above other mere mortals, even other aristocratic women, while using vocabulary that is meant to link him with Jane as a member of the same scholarly community. She is "Charis the fourth, Pieris the tenth, the second Cypris," a maiden in the classical model "whom Phebus fere, Diane, / Among the nymphs Oreades might well vouchsafe to place" (100.1-3). The discourse identifies her as a grace, a Muse, a goddess, and a handmaiden to a goddess, positions that are at once remote from the poet and suggestive of an interdependent relationship with those around her. All of these roles are supportive; as lady-in-waiting she serves the needs of the queen, and as patron she functions as Grimald's Muse as well, both the inspiration for the verse and the desired source of more concrete support. This language pays tribute, furthermore, to Seymour's own extensive education and the close intellectual ties between Jane Seymour the student of humanism and Nicholas Grimald the classical scholar. By comparing her to these figures, Grimald makes them both an equal part of the literary tradition stretching back into the Greco-Roman past.

Indeed, the majority of the lines in the poem belie the initial impression of social prostration and humility as Grimald establishes their membership in a literary community by emphasizing their mutual love of learning. The perfect patroness, it seems, is one who

has the means to reward poetic efforts, but even more so, one who can herself appreciate the craft and artistry of the verses dedicated to her. Grimald spends much of the first half of the poem invoking Jane the scholar and poet:

Allhayle, and like Tersipchor, much melody you make:
Which if the field, as doth the court, enjoyed, the trees wold shake:
While latine you, and french frequent: while English tales you tel:
Italian whiles, and Spanish you do hear, and know full well.

(no.139, 100.7-10)

These lines pay tribute to the extent of the Seymours' education; a Tudor noblewoman would have been well versed in dancing, music, and perhaps a little in reading in the vernacular, but the education the Seymour daughters received was unusually thorough (King 167). As the lines indicate, Jane Seymour and her sisters learned Latin as well as an impressive array of vernacular languages, a sure sign of a thoroughly humanist educational program. In 1543, the writer Thomas Becon dedicated the *Governance of Virtue* to Lady Jane, mentioning her learning in literature. Perhaps most significantly for Grimald's purposes, Jane, Margaret, and Anne had written Latin verses in honor of Margaret of Valois, sister of the king of France, wife to the King of Navarre, and the author of the *Heptameron*. Their work was highly praised by the French poet Ronsard (Dowling 241). Grimald then, in praising her "melody" which "if the field, as doth the

court, enjoyed, the trees would shake,” appeals to Lady Jane the humanist trained fellow poet, who is in a particularly good position to appreciate his poetic efforts.

Most importantly, perhaps, the poem suggests that the sisters’ accomplishments, and particularly Lady Jane’s and Lady Margaret’s, are the key to restoring their family’s tarnished reputation. In the absence of any similar poems to their brother, the level of intellectual agency that Grimald ascribes to the sisters seems almost masculine; the poem dedicated to Lady Jane’s sister Lady Margaret (143, “An other to I.M.S.,” see Appendix A for full text) also emphasizes more masculine virtues:

Sharp wit may you, remembrans redy fynde,
Perfect intelligence, all help at hand:
Styll stayd your thought in frutefull studies stand.
Hed framed thus may thother parts well frame,
Divine demeanour wyn a noble name.

(143.102.14-18)

As the poems in the *Miscellany* written to male figures such as James Wilford do, the verses to Jane and Margaret Seymour locate their worth in their achievements, in this case intellectual efforts, rather than in their birth.

The characteristics Grimald praises are typical for praise poems, but less typical in poems written to female subjects, which concentrate on the womanly virtues of

modesty, piety, and skill at the domestic arts (see, for example, Grimald's no. 140, "To maistres D.A." and no. 159, "Upon the tomb of A.w.," or the anonymous no. 214, "Of the ladie wentworth's death"). Lady Jane and Lady Margaret are not primarily beautiful, like the ladies of the Petrarchan sonnets; above all, they are intelligent. Rather than emphasizing Margaret's physical beauty, hair, eyes, or skin, as in the typical blazon, the poem identifies her "hed" as the feature that orders the rest of her being, resonating with Surrey's description of Wyatt's "hed, where wisdom misteries did frame" (no. 31, 28.7). Even more strikingly, Grimald charges her to live "By hert unthirld, by undisoomfite chere, / And brest discharged quite of cowardly fere," as though she were a soldier about to go off to war, rather than a young woman writing poetry (143.102.21-22). As the other poems in the volume suggest, though, living a virtuous life at court required uncommon courage and moral strength. Perhaps Grimald alludes to the same dangers as are mentioned in the acrostic on the Duke of Somerset and warns the duke's daughter against the forces that could once again derail the family's social advancement.

The sense that dynastic honor is at stake is strengthened by the poems' references to the sisters' marriages. As poetic subjects, the Seymour sisters are not merely passive vessels meant to carry on their family's reputation by bearing children; like men, they can secure a good reputation through actions and achievements. In 139, Grimald hopes that Jane's "worthy feates that now so much set forth your noble name, / So haue in ure, they

still increast, may more increase your fame” (no. 139, 100.15). The double sense of “setting forth” as “placing on a foundation” and “putting down in writing” stresses the active role that Lady Jane’s literary accomplishments can play in enhancing her family’s status, rather than the other way around (*OED* v.¹ †11a., 21a). Even her future role as wife may have opportunities for literary patronage. Grimald’s choice of the word “bachelor” to describe Lady Jane’s future husband has multiple layers of meaning; a “bachelor” was not only a young, unmarried man, but also in other contexts a scholar who had earned the lowest degree but still had more education to acquire before he could become a master. Even the prospect of Jane’s marriage has overtones of scholarship and learning and may provide a context in which she can further her literary achievements.

However, the references to their “noble name” remind the Seymour sisters that they and their family are vulnerable, poetically and socially. Unlike Ben Jonson’s later epigram to Philip Sidney’s daughter, the Countess of Rutland, Grimald’s poem does not explicitly identify either Jane’s father or her family, perhaps because the name was still tainted by the Duke of Somerset’s execution. Lady Jane’s vulnerability then is simultaneously socially imposed and fashioned by the text; as an intelligent, self-sufficient female subject, she possesses powers of self-representation that early modern male writers typically found unsettling.

As Harry Berger argues about Castiglione's female courtiers, also well educated and rhetorically sophisticated, "a program for managing women by giving them more autonomous powers of self-representation is also a program for raising the level of anxiety and suspicion in males who want to retain control of the power they alienate" (Berger 92). Lady Jane Seymour may occupy a higher social rank than Grimald, but his goal to persuade her to patronize him paradoxically requires that, as he humbles himself, he even the playing field by proving that he can do something she by herself cannot. His anxiety about controlling this patroness he has invoked creates some tension of the poem, and he channels Lady Jane's power by emphasizing her youth — and therefore relative poetic inexperience — and her family's need to bolster their honor and status.

In part, then, Grimald emphasizes her dependence on him by assuming a teacherly role and offering to present her to the world. Grimald sets up the mutually beneficial relationship in the first half of the poem by suggesting that her reputation is as of now limited. Despite Lady Jane's reputation among continental poets, Grimald figures her sphere of influence as confined within the English court: "much melody you make: / Which if the field, as doth the court, enjoyed, the trees would shake." As Becon and Ronsard both praised Jane's learning, clearly her reputation did reach at least as far as the French court, but Grimald's agenda requires making her reliant on him in some way, and accordingly the "if" offers a tantalizing promise. If the world outside of the court were

fortunate enough to read her verses, she could make a truly stunning impact, a comment that would surely play effectively on a young woman's vanity and literary ambition.

In the closing lines of the poem, Grimald ties their literary fates together by claiming that it is his poetry that can help advertise her merits. He is the first to discover her, but if he is allowed to do his work, more acclaim will follow. Grimald subtly claims in the second half of the poem that her own deeds and achievements, such as they have been, are not enough to secure her reputation for posterity:

For though divine your doings be, yet thews with yeres may grow:

And if you stay, streight now adayes fresh wits will overgo.

Wherefore the glory got, maintayne, maintayne the honour great.

So shal the world my doom approve, and set you in that seat,

Where Graces, Muses, and Ioves ymp, the ioyful Venus, raigne:

(no. 139, 100.15-21)

Jane has accomplished great things, the poem argues, but she cannot rest on her laurels; instead, she needs to ensure that other, "fresh wits" do not surpass her achievements. Grimald cleverly plays on the scholar's double-faceted desire to surpass one's own feats and the fear that someone else will surpass them — she has done great things, and she is still doing them, and so her reputation *may* increase, but a "glory got" and an "honour great" need to be maintained; they do not maintain themselves. If she does continue to

accomplish “worthy feates,” she certainly will secure not only her good reputation but also her family’s honor. Presumably those deeds include sponsoring his poetic efforts so that he may advertise her virtues to the world (“so shall the world my doom approve”). Most importantly, then, Lady Jane needs to become Grimald’s patron because doing so, according to his argument, will inspire her to new deeds even as he produces more poems that ensure her reputation will survive.

The poem thus constructs a kind of fantasy of a mutually supportive coterie, one in which nobles and scholars can assist each other in the project of advancing English letters, even as it model for Tottel’s readers a mastery of a poetic form that lubricates the wheels of a particular social relationship. Grimald’s familiarity with the format of the praise poem and his personalization of certain details show an aspiring client how to conduct such a relationship, even as the product suggests the kinds of rewards for poet and patron that can be earned for a good performance. The rhetorical strategies displayed in poems 139 and 143 propose a powerful role for the client poet, one that not only could help him gain access to those of higher status but also help him improve his status and that of his patron at the same time. They also imply that epideictic poetry could have a wider-ranging social effect as well. The genre could help inscribe a different kind of social system, one in which poets of different rank worked together to improve and decorate English letters. Lady Jane, and to a lesser extent her sister Lady Margaret, are

ideal patrons in Grimald's eyes not only because they have money and connections, but also because they too are poets. They will appreciate his writings, and they will produce their own that will serve as contributions to the advancement of English learning.

Of more immediate interest to the Seymours, however, would have been the poems' ability to restore their reputation as a great house. The effect is somewhat limited in publication by the fact that neither the Seymour family nor the individual daughters (with the exception of Lady Jane) are explicitly named in the *Miscellany*, while their father's identity is all too easy to discern from poem 200. The Londoners who would have read the book — perhaps some of the same Londoners who had witnessed Somerset's execution — may have recognized, however, the references to the learned sisters and connected them to the acrostic in the "uncertain authors" section. It is perhaps unfortunate that they had Grimald as their poetic champion, as his own reputation carried hints of scandal and betrayal, and that the poems praising their learnedness and virtue disappeared from the second edition of the *Miscellany*. For a brief moment in print, however, Lady Jane's encomium and those of her sisters served to remind Tottel's readers that the family's star could and would rise again.

The subject in whom Grimald invested such hope, Lady Jane Seymour, died in late 1562, and the family continued to invite controversy into Elizabeth's reign when Lady Jane's brother, the Earl of Hertford, made a series of clandestine and politically

dangerous marriages (Seymour 368). When he died in 1621, however, his elaborate tomb in Salisbury Cathedral commemorated the statesman he had become and contrasted sharply with his father's ignominious death and burial (Seymour 369). All of this was beyond the horizon of the *Miscellany's* readers, but nevertheless the book captured for them an understanding of the continually shifting sands of courtly politics, which they could compare to their knowledge of the rise and fall of figures such as Somerset, observing these examples from a safe distance and weaving them into their own experiences of life and death in the 1550's.

“Farewel, may England say:” the *Miscellany's* Elegies and the Social Order

It is in the poems for dead subjects, however, and moreover for those who died fairly ordinary deaths, that the *Miscellany* offers the most inclusive possibilities for social revision. Grimald's encomia for living subjects are tied to fleeting social occasions, and not everyone participated in the quest for courtly patronage or attempted to restore dwindled family fortunes. Everyone in Tudor society, however, dealt with a more permanent occasion, that was in its own way a deeply social one — death. If the encomia for the Seymour sisters can be understood as “anti-elegies” of a very particular and limited sort, attempting to counteract the disgrace of their fathers' death, then the

Miscellany's elegies offer a glimpse into the ways Tudor culture mediated the experience of death for a wider section of society. These poems commemorate the deaths of people who did not die as traitors but as ordinary people; the elegies for these subjects display the power of the poetic form to transform the lives and deaths of these subjects closer in rank to Tottel's readers into culturally significant moments, ones in which print enables a greater number of readers to participate.

The most famous examples of early modern elegiac poetry were not written until the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries; most students of early modern verse are familiar with Donne's lamentations and Milton's *Lycidas* (Bloomfield 152). Less familiar are earlier examples such as those by Surrey, Grimald, and the anonymous poets, but scholars such as Dennis Kay and GW Pigman have recognized the contributions of the *Miscellany*'s poets, particularly Grimald, to the genre. Indeed, Kay calls Grimald the "first recognizably 'modern' elegist," and extols his innovative forms and approaches (13).

Building upon Kay's work, I suggest that Grimald's innovation can only fully be appreciated in the context of the *Miscellany*, a remarkable collection of mid-century funerary verse. No fewer than twenty funeral poems appear in the *Miscellany*, and with the exception of Surrey's two elegies on Wyatt, all of them commemorate lesser-known

subjects who were of middling to “common” rank.³¹ Furthermore, almost half of the elegies are located in the “uncertain authors” section, from which authors such as Sir John Cheke, John Heywood, Thomas Norton, and Thomas, Baron Vaux have been identified (Rollins 2.81). John Harington the elder has been identified as the author of no.169, “Of the death of master Devereaux, Lord Ferrers son,” and William Gray even provided his own epitaph, no. 255 (“An epitaph written by w.G. to be set upon his own grave”) (Rollins 2.80). These examples suggest that the mid-sixteenth century elegy thrived among minor courtiers, the lesser nobility, university scholars, clerics, and the gentry, groups represented by these poets in the “uncertain authors” section.

Morton Bloomfield argues that no critics have satisfactorily explained the surge in the production of the early modern lamentation poem (152), but the elegies in *Tottel's*

³¹ Nicholas Grimald alone contributed nine eulogies or elegiac verses: No. 156 “An epitaph of sir Iames wilford knight,” no.157 “An other of the same knightes death,” no. 158 “An Epitaph of the ladye Margaret Lee,” no. 159 “Upon the tomb of A.w. [Anne Wentworth], no. 160 “Upon the deceas of w. Ch. [William Chambers], no. 161 “Of N. Ch. [Nicholas Chambers], no. 162 “A funerall song, upon the deceas of Annes his moother,” no. 163 “Upon the death of the lord Mautrauers, out of doctor Haddons latine,” no. 164, “Upon the sayd lord Mautrauers death.” The rest appear in the “uncertain authors” section: No. 169 “Of the death of master Deuerox the lord Ferres sonne,” no. 182 “Upon sir Iames wilfordes death,” no. 189 “Verses written on the picture of sir Iames Wilford,” no. 205 “A praise of Audley [Captain Thomas Audley], no. 209 “Of the death of Phillips” [Philip van Wilder], no. 213 “Of the ladie wentworths death,” no. 227 “Upon the death of sir Antony Denny,” no. 248 “Of the death of the late county of Penbroke [Anne Parr, Countess of Pembroke], and no. 253 “An epitaph of maister Henry Williams,” and no. 255 “An epitaphe written by w.G. to be set upon his owne graue,” a parody of the genre.

Miscellany may shed some light on what social function the elegy performed that made it so popular in this period. Following the lead of Pigman, Kay, Peter Sacks, and Matthew Greenfield, I believe that the answer lies in the form's social function of transforming private grief for public mourning and the way it fills the need, at the moment of the *Miscellany*'s publication, of a new sense of cultural community. As Greenfield says of Donne in the *Anniversary* poems, the *Miscellany*'s poets have "appropriated a public occasion for the working through of a private melancholy" (93). This seemingly simple process, however, is complicated by vexed cultural attitudes towards death and mourning and, in the particular case of the *Miscellany*, by the social implications of print publication. The *Miscellany*'s publication appropriates the losses of particular communities and uses them to fashion a wider sense of community. By presenting the loss of its "middling" subjects as a loss for all readers, it imagines a social body held together by common modes of experience — death and mourning — and shared through the medium of poetic expression.

Once again, Nicholas Grimald's poems provide a convenient starting place for examining how elegies function in the *Miscellany*, as we can hypothesize about the relationships with his subjects in ways we cannot always do for the anonymous poets. Three elegies written by Grimald, two for Sir James Wilford (nos. 156, "An epitaph of Sir James Wilford knight" and 157, "An other, of the same knight's death") and one for

the Lady Margaret Lee (no. 158, “An epitaph for the Lady Margaret Lee”), manipulate the conventions of the elegiac form to commemorate lower ranking courtiers and attribute traditionally “noble” characteristics to them. As Peter Sacks interprets elegiac conventions, “many... should be recognized as being not only aesthetically interesting forms but also the literary versions of specific social and psychological practices” (2). I believe that we can read these as socially innovative elegies, as in these poems Grimald chooses specific conventions that help him rewrite the code of status and honor as being based in deeds, rather than birth, implying that talent in various manifestations could help the socially ambitious change their status.

Curiously enough, Grimald’s first subject, Sir James Wilford, has four poems about him included in the *Miscellany*, the two by Nicholas Grimald and two by anonymous poets (no. 182 “Upon sir Iames wilfordes death,” and no. 189 “Verses written on the picture of sir Iames Wilford”). Wilford was one of the self-made men whose professional achievements were fairly typical for the mid-sixteenth century; what is atypical for what should have been a volume of courtly love poetry is that the *Miscellany’s* poets pay those achievements such close attention. Born around 1516, Wilford came from a family of local officials and scholars and served as a captain in the Duke of Somerset’s wars against the Scottish. Somerset made Wilford provost-marshal of the English army and knighted him in 1547, after Wilford led the English to victory at

Pinkie Clough and Roxburgh. As a reward for his services, Wilford received money, land, and the manor of Otford in Kent (Also “Wilford”). He died in 1551 and was given a grand funeral, at which the evangelical cleric Miles Coverdale presented the sermon.³² That Grimald wrote two elegies for Wilford suggests that he wished to pay tribute to someone who enjoyed a similar position as client to the Seymours.

Wilford, then, was a soldier whose extraordinary skill in warfare elevated him to gentle status, but he was by no means as famous a courtier as Wyatt or a born aristocrat, as Surrey was. Grimald’s no. 156, “an epitaph of sir Iames Wilford knight” (see Appendix A for full text), however, works to legitimate Wilford’s achieved position by locating traditionally aristocratic values in his body, thus naturalizing them:

The worthy Wilfords body, which alyve,
Made both the Scot, and the Frenchman sore adrad:
A body, shapte of stomake stout to strive
With forein foes: a corps, that coorage had

³² Henry Machyn, the merchant-tailor whose diary meticulously recorded the various funeral services that took place in London, has this to say of Wilford’s funeral: “The xiiii day of November was bered the nobulle ca [ptayn] ser James Wyllford knyght, sum tyme captayn of Franse and... and ded at Cruchydfrrers, and was cared beryng from [thence] unto lytyll saynt Bathellmuw besyd sant Antonys, with a standard, a penon, and a harold carehyng the cott armur, and mony m[ourners], and bered in the sam tombe that hys grett unckulle M. James [Wyllford]. Ther was at ys bereyng my Lord Gray and the f Wyllford... captaynes, and the comany of the Clarkes. Mylles Coverdalle dyd [preach] (3).

So full of force, the like nowhere was ryfe:

With hert, as free, as ere had gentle knight:

(no. 156, 108.3-8)

Grimald's poem locates Wilford's virtue in his "body, shapte of stomach stout," and in his "heart, as free, as ere had gentle knight," thus implying that the traits that distinguish him and make him gentle are inborn.

The use of "free" in particular acts as a strong signifier of Wilford's "natural" gentility and high social rank. The sense of the line is that Wilford has a good and generous heart, but in the period these traits were strongly associated with noble birth. The *OED* lists the third meaning of the adjective "free" as being "noble, honourable, of gentle birth and breeding," and the fourth as "hence in regard to character and conduct: Noble, honourable, generous, magnanimous." Logically, then, Wilford is generous and chivalrous *because* he is "of gentle birth and breeding," although not an aristocrat.

At the same time, the poem reveals that this naturalization is employed to mask an achieved status rather than a natural one. Grimald's elegy differs slightly in this respect from Harington's poem on the death of Walter Devereaux, the son of Baron Ferrers (no.169, "Of the death of Master Devereaux the Lord Ferrers son") that appears in the anonymous authors section. Harington invokes Devereaux's family and bloodline in the same stanza as he announces the young man's death:

Lo Deverox where he lieth: whose life men heeld so deare
That now his death is sorowed so, that pitie it is to hear.
His birth of auncient blood: his parents of great fame:
And yet in vertue farre before the formost of the same.

(no.169, 122.10-13)

By placing closely together the status marker of the deceased's "ancient" house and the reference

to those who mourn for him, Harington associates Devereaux's social status with the amount of grief his death causes. Despite its insistence that Devereaux's "virtues" are even more important than his name, the poem nevertheless suggests that men mourn for Devereaux because he was a member of such a noble house.

Likewise, Grimald's translation of a Latin elegy on the death of Lord Maltravers also begins with a reference to the departed's family: "The noble Henry, he, that was the lord Maltravers named: / Heyr to the house of th' Arundels, so long a time now famed" (163.113.37-38). The poem opens by acknowledging social importance; the heir to a socially significant family deserves an elegant tribute, which the survivors can take comfort in. Greenfield describes the "fear and grief of the mourners during the liminal stage" as "reflect[ing] the social importance of the deceased while still alive, and the difficulty of reordering society around the absence," and the same holds true for elegies

(81). The deaths of heirs to aristocratic houses such as Devereaux and Maltravers caused trauma for their families and anxieties about the continuation of the line. The tribute is therefore proportional to the deceased's status in life and attempts to give the surviving community a sense of continuity.

In the absence of status markers such as family and place of birth, which provide obvious communities of mourning, Grimald's elegy on Wilford instead invokes a list of actions that narrates Wilford's ascension from client of Somerset to national hero in his own right. This list of achievements also invents a community of mourning, in this case the whole of England:

Of largesse great, of manhod, of forecast
Can ech good English soldiour bear record
Speak Laundersey, tell Muttrel marvails past:
Crye Musselborough, prayse Haddington thy lord,
From thee that held both Scots, and frekes of Fraunce:
Farewel, may England say, hard is my chaunce.

(no. 156, 108.9-14)

The poem here uses the trope of personification to create a new community to celebrate the deceased, calling upon the conquered towns to pay tribute to their conqueror, whom it elevates to the status of their "lord." By also calling on the English soldiers to bear

witness to Wilford's "forecast," the poem credits him with the strategy and foresight that won these battles.

Wilford owed his social elevation partly to the Duke of Somerset's patronage, but Grimald's elegy skips over that connection and figures Wilford's status as more independent, almost a kind of feudal border lord who protects England's interests against both the Scots and the French, the "forein foes" that threaten all Englishmen. In actuality, Wilford was only the commanding officer after Haddington, when Somerset made him governor of the fortress there. In France he served under the Duke of Norfolk, and in Scotland under Protector Somerset (Alsop, "Wilford"). The scene Grimald describes, however, invokes memories of England's medieval conflicts with these longtime enemies and inserts Grimald alone into this military tradition. In the absence of commanding officers, he serves England directly, and his death leaves all English people bereft and vulnerable: "Farewel, may England say, hard is my chaunce."

Indeed, the poem implies that Wilford's status as national hero ultimately makes him the social equal of those noble generals and a "lord" in his own right. Wilford stands as an intermediary figure between a noble courtier such as Surrey and Tottel's non-courtly reader, providing a nice balance with the aristocracy worship that can be found in the portrait of Surrey that decorates the frontispiece and the title that mentions only the poet earl. Military service was a traditional route to honor for the nobility, as the career

of Surrey's father the Duke of Norfolk reminds us, but Wilford's example demonstrates that a non-noble also can find glory, reputation, and status through soldiery. This example, by rewriting this kind of honor as merit-based rather than birth-based, suggests the possibilities for new routes for social mobility. Moreover, the poem honors Wilford's record of national sacrifice, reminding readers that "Englishness" and the ability to increase England's glory are qualities that transcend limits of inherited rank and status.

The anonymous poem 189, "Verses written on the picture of sir Iames Wilford," argues even more explicitly that Wilford's deeds should earn him an exalted social place.³³ It sets Wilford up as the champion of all England:

Alas that ever death such virtues should forlet,
As compast was within his corps, whose picture is here set.
Or that it euer laye in any fortunes might,
Through depe disdain his life to traine yt was so worthy a wight
For sith he first began in armour to be clad,
A worthier champion then he was yet Englande never had.
And though recure be past, his life to have agaiane,

³³ I have omitted Grimald's no. 157, the epitaph "An other, of the same knightes death," and the anonymous no. 182, "Upon sir Iames wilfordes death." Grimald's poem is an English translation of a Latin elegy on another subject, and no. 182 is a generalized elegy without any individualized details.

Yet would I wish his worthiness in writing to remaine.
That men to minde might call how farre he did excell,
At all assayes to wynne the praise, which were long to tell.
And eke the restlesse race that he full oft hath runne.
In painfull plight from place to place, where service was to doon
Then should men well perceive, my tale be of trouth,
And he to be the worthiest wight that ever nature wrought.

(no. 189, 146.33-36, 147.2-11)

In this poem, it is the active quality of Wilford's life, the "restlesse race" run "in painfull plight" that should earn him the reader's respect and a place as England's champion. Quite noteworthy, however, is the suggestion that Wilford overcame "depe disdain" to achieve more positive renown. While the reference to ill fortune is rather characteristic of poems in the *Miscellany*, in this context the reference seems to signify Wilford's self-made rise to a higher social status. Disdain can refer simply to dislike, but it also carries connotations of being looked down upon, as Surrey uses it in his elegy on Wyatt. The poem rewrites this disdain and instead elevates its subject, holding him up to be the "worthiest wight that ever nature wrought." This specimen of true nobility should stand as an example to all, the poem argues, of a life properly lived in service to one's country.

True nobility, another elegy intimates, also can be located in how voluntarily the subject surrenders earthly rank. While the notion of dying well is common in the elegiac form, particularly when the poet employs religious tropes and commonplaces, in poem 158 this concept works to unsettle the Tudor obsession with social status. Grimald's poem 158, "An Epitaph of the ladye Margaret Lee," like no. 156, pays tribute to aristocratic notions of blood nobility even as it undermines them. It attributes its subject's virtues (this time, female) to her birth, but it also claims that her true virtue lies in her indifference to earthly status:

Man, by a woman lern, this life what we may call:

Blod, frendship, beauty, youth, attire, welth, worship, helth & al

Take not for thine: nor yet thy self as thine beknow.

For having these, with full great prayse, this lady did but show

Her self unto the world: and in prime yeres (bee ware)

Sleeps doolfull sister, who is wont for no respect to spare,

Alas, withdreew her hence: or rather softly led:

For with good will I dare well saye, her waye to him shee sped:

Who claymed, that he bought: and took that erst he gaue:

More meet than any worldly wight, such heavenly gems to have.

Now wold shee not return, in earth a queen to dwell.

As shee hath doon to you, good frend, bid Lady Lee, farewell.

(no. 158, 109.2-13)

Grimald's subject, Lady Margaret Lee, was the sister of Sir Thomas Wyatt and the wife of Sir Anthony Lee.³⁴ She was born into the middling gentry, and her father and brother were career bureaucrats and courtiers in the Henrician court. We can regard Lady Lee, then, as we would Lady Jane Seymour: as a woman born to a family that had risen in status under Henry VIII, but who was not of the ancient blood nobility. Additionally, unlike the Seymours, the Wyatts never rose to the peerage, and despite Sir Thomas Wyatt's courtly reputation, the family remained firmly grounded in the ranks of the landed gentry.

Simply by being a member of a family so closely connected with the court, however, Lady Lee had ties to the world Grimald was so fascinated with. The poem accordingly locates part of Lady Lee's worth in the advantages of birth, blood, and wealth she had, her "blod, frendship, beauty, youth, attire, welth, worship, helth & al." The second half of the poem, however, makes clear that what really distinguishes her is her graceful surrender of her worldly goods; the qualities listed are not the measure of a good life. Instead, Lady Lee is notable because she went "with good will" when death,

³⁴ Patricia Thomson notes that Sir Anthony Lee also contributed verses to the Devonshire Manuscript; Lady Lee was thus not only the sister of a poet, but the wife of one as well (14).

“Sleeps doolfull sister,” came for her. The poem cautions the reader that Lady Lee truly sets the example to “take not for thine” the enviable qualities of rank and possession, “nor yet thy self as thine beknow.” Not only are one’s possessions and worldly status not completely ones’s own, but one’s self and body belong to God as well.

This is perhaps the most overtly religious of Grimald’s poems, and while it lacks the strident overtones of social criticism that mark the sermons of Grimald’s co-religionist Hugh Latimer, the social message that “you can’t take it with you” rings with righteous Protestant piety. The insistence that things and earthly regard cannot measure a person’s worth runs counter to the activities that marked the daily existence of many of Grimald and Lady Lee’s contemporaries, and indeed perhaps even of the poet and subject themselves: obsessive pursuit of status and frantic accumulation of wealth. The poem reminds the reader, though, of the uncertainty of life and the certainty of death, where social rank does not matter. Furthermore, the “heavenly gems” that await in heaven, it promises, are so great that “Now wold she not return,” not even “in earth a queen to dwell.” Even the highest status in the social hierarchy is no compensation for turning away from the gifts of heaven.

Of course, the Christian insistence on valuing the life to come over the pleasures of life on earth was not a new idea. What is new here, and in the other elegies I have discussed, is that in the hands of poets such as Grimald, at a time when increased

mobility caused tensions between the nobles and the ranks below and when the reformers called for aristocrats to give up some of their economic practices for the good of the commonwealth, the message takes on new urgency. During Edward's reign, Latimer preached against the practice of enclosure and proclaimed from the pulpits, " 'too much,' which these rich men have, causeth such dearth that poor men which live of their labor cannot have a living" (66). Addressing directly his "lords and masters," Latimer further stated boldly that enclosure and "such proceedings...do intend plainly to make the yeomanry slavery and the clergy shavery" (67). I have already mentioned the ambitions of the yeomanry, the social group from which both Latimer and Grimald came. Here in Latimer's sermons we get a taste of the bitterness engendered by such clashes between the hereditarily privileged and those underneath who felt that their aspirations — and more basically their survival — were being trampled upon.

Grimald's elegies and those of the anonymous poets do not have the same open fire as Latimer's sermons; the more dangerous religious climate in which the *Miscellany* appeared, as well as the cultural suspicion of immoderate mourning noted by Pigman, make restraint a more attractive option (27). The funeral elegy did, though, share a common function with the funeral sermon, as Kay argues, a function that I will address in more depth later in the chapter (5). Latimer's own funeral sermons, for example, attempted to regulate the conduct of the survivors and prescribe proper modes of

mourning (Pigman 32). So too, do I suggest, did Grimald's elegies and those of the *Miscellany*'s anonymous poets propose a proper cultural response towards the deaths of their subjects.

In adopting the language of Christian community, Grimald's elegy for Lady Margaret Lee blurs the boundaries between the living and the dead, as well as the boundaries between different social groups. It replaces the traditional Catholic institution of founding chantries to pray for the dead with communion between the reader and the subject: "As she hath doon to you, good frend, bid Lady Lee farewell." The intimate tone of this final line insinuates that Lady Lee's death is a personal loss for the elegy's reader. Furthermore, in the context of the *Miscellany*, among other elegies for lower-ranking courtiers and those not even associated with the court — such as Grimald's elegy for his mother, the anonymous 205 "A praise of Audley" for the soldier Captain Thomas Audley, and no. 209 "Of the death of Phillipps," for the musician Philip van Wilder — Lady Lee's poem is only one of many commemorating a non-aristocratic, even in some cases non-courtly, subject. The net effect of these poems, scattered as they are throughout Grimald's section and the "uncertain authors" section, is to shift the focus from the higher, more distant sections of society to ones closer to Tottel's readers. They counter the Surrey section's obsession with courtly status and aristocratic privilege with the argument that these people, too, are worth remembering. The lives of these people

are exemplary and their deaths losses for a greater reading community, not just for those who knew them. Indeed, because the poets use individual details and personal touches, the reader comes away feeling as if he or she did know these subjects.

Arthur Marotti, writing on the Elizabethan sonnet sequences, argues that Sir Philip Sidney “made sonnet sequences the occasion for socially, economically, and politically importunate Englishmen to express their unhappy condition in the context of a display of literary mastery” (“ ‘Love is not Love’ ” 408). If this is the case for the sonnet, then the mid-Tudor elegy, which also dealt with an “unhappy condition,” that of death, used the form to imagine a culture that celebrated lives whose worth was found not in their beginnings but in their accomplishments and their gracious ends. The elegy writer then, ironically, can be seen as happier than the sonnet writer, or at least more hopeful of future social and perhaps even economic and political status. His task, however, is complicated (as I have alluded to) by cultural prohibitions against mourning and the uncertain role of the poet in responding to loss. In the case of personal grief, the task becomes even more fraught as the poet attempts to mediate private loss for more a public forum, as in the case of Surrey’s elegies for Wyatt and Grimald’s poem on the death of his friend, William Chambers.

“Some work of fame:” Social Place and Poetic Identities in Tudor England

Grimald's use of the elegiac form does more than shift the definition of nobility for courtly individuals. In addition to redefining the terms on which a “good life” is lived, the elegies in the *Miscellany* as a group and Grimald's contributions in particular suggest that poetry can play an integral part in celebrating the identities of communities as well, and non-courtly communities at that. Grimald's most striking and innovative elegy, no. 160, “Upon the death of w.Ch.,” written after the death of his school friend William Chambers, elegantly displays the poet's ability to resolve what Greenfield has identified as the tension between the private and public functions of elegy (76). By working through his private loss in a public medium, Grimald is able to transform his personal grief into consolation for his community. Furthermore, by accepting the poetic task at hand and publicly celebrating the life of a friend who was also a scholar-poet, Grimald demonstrates the value of the poet's role in maintaining and celebrating those ties.

In order to fully understand the innovative nature of Grimald's elegy on William Chambers, it is necessary that we read it with a more famous pair of elegies contained in the *Miscellany*, the Earl of Surrey's poems on the death of Sir Thomas Wyatt. Both Surrey's elegies and Grimald's are poems written by one poet to another, and both

struggle with finding an appropriate poetic voice with which to articulate personal loss. The difference between the two poems lies in the way that each poet manages ambivalent cultural feelings about grief, as well as the way each uses the occasion of the subject's death to imagine a new role for the poet in Tudor society. While Surrey sublimates his grief into anger at Wyatt's political enemies and doubt about how Wyatt's poetic legacy will be received, Grimald works through the grief and anger to model for his community the poet's ability to offer consolation and celebrate social ties that survive death itself.

Three of the four poems written by Surrey on Wyatt's death are included in the Surrey section of the *Miscellany*: no. 29, "Praise of certain psalmes of Daud, translated by sir T.w. the elder" ("The great Macedon, that out of Persie chased"), no. 30, "Of the death of the same sir T.w.." ("Dyvers thy death do diversely bemone"), and no. 31, "Of the same" ("W. resteth here, that quick could never rest"). The fourth, no. 263, "A praise of sir Thomas wyate the elder for his excellent learning" (known more commonly by its first line, "In the rude age when knowledge was not rife"), appears in the section at the end of the first edition headed, "Other songes and Sonnettes written by the earle of Surrey." Poem 31 was the only one of Surrey's poems to appear in print while he was alive; it was published as *An excellent Epitaffe of syr Thomas Wyat* in 1542, the year that Wyatt died and the same year that John Leland published his elegies on Wyatt (Thomson, *Wyatt: The Critical Heritage* 24, 28). Tottel's readers therefore may have already been

exposed to Surrey's idea that greater honor should be accorded the courtier poet, but in the context of the *Miscellany*, the idea of the courtier poet begins to expand to the idea of the English poet as a teacher and model whose skills bring honor to his entire kingdom.

As the elegies for Sir James Wilford do, Surrey's elegies for Wyatt argue for the value of status based on skill and achievement (see Appendix A for full text). They also further Tottel's project of linking status to poetic skill, in particular, and of eliding the two courtly poets as models for poetic achievement. The essence of Wyatt's "virtue," Surrey's poem argues, derived from his skills and inspired a new sense of English identity. According to the poem, Wyatt possessed

A tongue, that served in foreign realms his king:
Whose courteous talk to virtue did enflame.
Each noble hart: a worthy guide to bring
Our English youth, by travail, unto fame.

(no. 31, 28.19-22)

The skill of "courteous talke" is courtly, in that Wyatt used it in diplomatic service for his king,

but Wyatt's service in "foreign realms," is also juxtaposed with the way he modeled "virtue" for "English youth." The poem thus identifies Wyatt's talents with a particularly English set of accomplishments, opening up the possibility that he could inspire not only

“noble heart[s]” but also non-noble hearts as well. Wyatt’s head, Surrey says earlier in the poem, was the site “where that some work of fame / Was dayly wrought, to turne to Britaines gayne,” again emphasizing that Wyatt’s achievements belong to a national mythology, not just a courtly one (no. 31, 28.9-10).

Moreover, Surrey suggests that Wyatt’s particular kind of virtue is not solely the product of birth and breeding, but of “heavenly gifts encreased by disdayn” (no. 31, 28.4). That is, although he was gifted with these talents from birth, his experiences and the opposition he encountered from his political enemies sharpened his skills. Wyatt’s famed “hand that taught, what might be sayd in ryme” was itself taught and improved by his political experience, and it in turn instructed others in the English vernacular’s potential (no. 31, 28.15). As in the case of Wilford’s elegy, Surrey’s elegy links Wyatt’s virtues to his physical body, both naturalizing them and grieving that the death of that body has robbed England of Wyatt’s example.

Indeed, Surrey’s grief and anger over Wyatt’s death indicate that he doubts the extent to which Wyatt’s poetic legacy will survive his physical loss. Pigman argues that the Wyatt elegies, particularly no. 30, “Of the death of Sir Thomas Wyatt,” reveal Surrey’s inability to express pure grief and sorrow, because of cultural taboos against excessive grief and Surrey’s own anxieties about the propriety of mourning. This conflict produces a poem that “enacts the split of ambivalence into an idealized dead person and

vilified survivors” (71). I suggest further that Surrey’s grief, sublimated into anger, undermines his faith in Wyatt’s poetic legacy as he lashes out at the “vilified survivors” who hounded Wyatt when he was alive and cannot possibly appreciate what he has left behind after his death.

In the poem 30 in the *Miscellany*, “Of the death of the same Sir Thomas Wyatt” (see Appendix A for full text), unpublished until the *Miscellany*, Surrey sublimates his grief into an anger that undercuts the force of the tribute, so that the poem becomes less about Wyatt and more about Surrey’s antagonism. As Jentoft, Sessions, and Tromly each point out, Surrey attacks Wyatt’s enemies more openly in this poem, perhaps, I suggest, because it was not originally intended for public consumption and he could thus speak more freely.³⁵ If this poem begins as a tribute to Wyatt, it quickly degenerates into a blatant attack on Wyatt’s (and Surrey’s) political enemies, culminating as Pigman has argued in a bizarre metaphor in which Surrey compares himself to Pyramus and Wyatt to

³⁵ Tromly argues that in contrast to this funeral sonnet, the published epitaph emphasizes Wyatt’s battles with “larger, impersonal forces” over human enemies (382). I agree with Jentoft (27) and Sessions (247), however, that the poems should be read as a sequence — particularly as they appear as such in the *Miscellany*, and I add that therefore it is impossible not to read courtly politics into poem 31.

Thisbe: “As Pyramus did on Thisbe’s breast bewail” (no. 30, 27.36).³⁶ Surrey’s grief emerges as sideways anger at those

... that watched with the murders knife,
With egre thirst to drink thy giltlesse blood,
Whose practise brake by happy ende of lyfe,
Wepe enuiuos teares to heare thy fame so good.

(no. 30, 27.23-30)

Surrey savagely points out the hypocrisy of those who publicly mourn Wyatt’s death even as they waited eagerly to drink his “giltlesse blood.” In contrast, he sets himself up as Wyatt’s only true mourner: “But I, that knew what harbred in that hed / ... / Honour the place, that such a iewell bred” (31, 33). Wyatt is presumably guiltless because of the “vertues rare [that] were tempered in that brest,” namely the poetic virtues elaborated upon in poems 29 and 31. By recognizing those virtues when others in the court did not, and by writing his own poem about them, Surrey here aligns himself with Wyatt against

³⁶ Pigman is puzzled by the Pyramus reference: “Pyramus sheds tears for Thisbe because he misinterprets her bloody veil as a sign that a wild beast has killed her; his tears are the prelude to his suicide” (72). It is therefore according to Pigman “difficult to understand why Surrey would want to associate his grief for Wyatt with this macabre story,” and the critic hypothesizes that “discomfort with the expression of grief prevents Surrey from thinking through the implications of his comparison” (73).

the courtly enemies of poetry and sets himself up as the inheritor of Wyatt's poetic mantle.

We know from no. 30 that the "disdayn" Wyatt endured came from his courtly nemeses; Surrey goes to great pains to criticize those adversaries in both poems, and his fashioning of Wyatt as marginalized and unappreciated has implications for his survival as a poetic prophet and cementer of social ties. Jentoft claims that both poems 30 and 263 are more appropriately categorized as "satiric elegy," as they aim to criticize the dead subject's enemies as equally as they praise the subject (27). Criticism infiltrates the less angry of the two elegies, poem 31, as well. Aside from the reference to "disdain," in the final stanza of no. 31 the poet calls Wyatt the "Witness of faith, that never shall be dead: / Sent for our health, but not received so," presumably by the enemies who worked against him, but also by his supporters (no.31, 28.38-39). Surrey furthermore implies in these lines and the next that Wyatt's death is a punishment visited on Wyatt's supporters and for not appreciating him fully: "Thus, for our gilt, this jewel have we lost" (no. 31, 28.40). In no. 31 Surrey's "we" and "our" identifies the living poet with the guilty survivors, but in the companion poem Surrey distances himself from them and attempts to carry on Wyatt's poetic legacy, an attempt that his emotional response somewhat hinders.

The need to publicly attack Wyatt's enemies which emerges from this ordering reveals Surrey's anger to be rooted in courtly power plays as much as poetic admiration. If he has not thought through the connotations of his metaphors, neither has he thought through how his anger keeps him from bolstering Wyatt's poetic reputation. Elegizing and modeling the new English poet, in this sequence, bleed together with Surrey's personal need to strike out at Wyatt's enemies; poetry and courtly politics here are inseparably intertwined, and the courtier poet, however he may desire purity and non-involvement, is always a courtier as well as a poet. Whatever applicability Surrey's model of Wyatt as the new English poet has for those outside the court must take a back seat, at least in this context, to its role as tool for courtly invective.

Surrey's position as the embodiment of the old nobility, both in his own mind and in the way he functions in the *Miscellany*, also keeps his tribute to Wyatt from making quite as revolutionary an impact as previous critics might have us believe. William Sessions has argued that the publication in 1542 of Surrey's "W. resteth here" (in the *Miscellany* no. 31, "Of the same") was the "moment of origin" in which the new role of the poet was imagined for Tudor society ("Surrey's Wyatt" 172). From Sessions's perspective,

As a result of this act in the autumn of 1542, the role of the poet in society changed. The Vergilian and Horatian figure both humanist poets inherited became a newly English model involved in a new georgics or concept of labor that took mastery of language into the fashioning of a new social order... It is Surrey who makes this act of subversion and intervention with his elegy on Wyatt, identifying Wyatt as the new representation for English society of a specially powerful honor, as a master of language in the classical tradition of Vergil and Horace. He intends to establish a new cultural hegemony, and it was this the later Renaissance understood, blurring fiction and historical fact but seeing clearly in the hegemony the exalted place of the poet.

("Surrey's Wyatt," 169)

Sessions notes the crucial role of Tottel, Philip Sidney, and Puttenham in establishing this new hegemony, and he acknowledges that the cultural shift would not have been possible without dialectical "middle" men like Tottel and Puttenham. Nevertheless, I believe that Sessions's argument does not fully account for the essential conservatism of Surrey's poems and thus overstates their subversive nature.

If Surrey's discomfort with the public requirements of mourning color his elegies, so too do his aristocratic position and identity pervade the poems and influence their

structure and language. In his book *Henry Howard, Poet Earl of Surrey: a Life*, Sessions reads poem 31, the more purely elegiac of the two, as an erotic progression, the poem “like the hand of a lover, moving from the head to the breast that acts as synecdoche for the whole body” (250). While the Petrarchan *blazon* is undeniably erotic, expressing the poet’s intimate relationship with his subject, its impulse to dismember its subject more strikingly works to enact a power dynamic. Renaissance elegies commonly employ the trope of synecdoche, but none of the elegies in the *Miscellany* dismember their subjects quite as thoroughly as Surrey’s poem to Wyatt does. This difference in Surrey’s elegy may have to do with the influence of the Petrarchan *blazon*, the language of which permeates his poems even when they are not Petrarchan sonnets.³⁷

The result of the Petrarchan influence in this poem is that Surrey honors his social inferior, Thomas Wyatt, by cataloguing Wyatt’s list of poetic virtues and arguing that those virtues should accord Wyatt — and hence, the poet — a special place in Tudor society. In doing so, however, he emphasizes in a particularly disjointed way Wyatt’s parts rather than the whole. Wyatt exists in the poem as “A hed,” “A visage,” “A hand,” “A tounge,” “An eye,” “A hart,” and “A valiant corpse,” but because he is absent, not as a coherent whole. The voice that narrates the poem is Surrey’s, not Wyatt’s, however

³⁷ See, for example, Pigman’s discussion of Surrey’s “So cruel prison,” which appears as no. 15 in the *Miscellany* (68-70).

closely Surrey may try to model his language on Wyatt's. Both Sessions and Tromly read these poems as pure encomia and as acts of deference to Wyatt so extreme that they, in Tromly's words, "required the forfeiture of his [Surrey's] own poetic identity and resulted in a remarkable act of negative capability... Surrey pays Wyatt the greatest tribute one poet can bestow upon another: to write the epitaph that the speechless poet might have written for himself" (387). The forfeiture of Surrey's own poetic identity is somewhat suspect, however, as he identifies himself as the only survivor who can properly honor Wyatt's reputation and bequest and writes a poem proclaiming as much.

Moreover, feminist scholars such as Nancy Vickers and Elizabeth Cropper (175) have discussed the *blazon*, in the context of later Elizabethan sonnets and Renaissance portraiture, as the poet's attempt to control the unruly body of the mistress by taking it apart. As Vickers argues, "bodies fetishized by a poetic voice logically do not have a voice of their own; the world of making words, of making texts, is not theirs" (277). Living, Wyatt may have been an inspiration to the noble youth of England, but dead he is a silenced voice. Perhaps the whole of Wyatt's importance is too daunting for Surrey to face following, or perhaps the poet earl still stubbornly clings to the system of belief that honors blood nobility over achieved.

Perhaps for these reasons or others, Wyatt the poet does not accomplish the transition to the new poetic order Surrey tries to envision. Wyatt's poetic achievements

suggest the possibility of a new kind of poet, one whose status is based on skill rather than birth, but he did not live long enough to see the change happen. Nor does Surrey seem particularly invested in attributing this kind of shift to Wyatt. The end of Surrey's tribute lacks the consolation one would expect from a Renaissance elegy; instead, Wyatt is a Christ-like figure, but one whose sacrifice was made in vain:

But to the heavens that simple soul is fled:
Which left with such, as covet Christ to know,
Witnesses of faith, that never shall be dead:
Sent for our health, but not received so.

(no.31, 28.35-38)

The suggestion that Wyatt's soul and possibly his verses will live on, is hopeful, but the next line qualifies that sense of hope. His poetry may still exist, but Surrey seems to have little faith, here and in the other places I have mentioned, that readers will properly appreciate it; if Wyatt was not received well in his lifetime, why should he be so after his death? Wyatt's influence is as fractional and scattered as his actual body, spread out before Surrey; if it is concentrated, it is focused in the aristocratic person of Surrey, who assumes the mantle of poetic prophet. But because he is a poet working in an environment where verses circulate piecemeal, Surrey is unable to envision a medium like the *Miscellany*, a textual body that will bring multiple poetic parts together and

present them as a functional whole. In the *Miscellany*, both Surrey and Wyatt are reconstituted and presented with other poetic voices, courtly and otherwise, that help to round out the picture of English poetic achievement.

While the *Miscellany* celebrates Surrey's blood nobility and high social place, making his literary and social conservatism in some ways more pronounced, its other voices help to carry his more progressive ideas even further. Indeed, the other voices help to contextualize Wyatt and Surrey's poetic within a wider tradition. One voice in particular, Grimald's, is more hopeful about the ability of poetry to survive the physical death of the poet and to model the kinds of achievements that identify and hold together a community. The fact that he is not of the nobility — or even of the gentry like Wyatt — makes his display of poetic confidence an intervention in the courtly tradition. While Sessions takes the rather romantic view that “it is Surrey who makes this act of subversion and intervention with his elegy on Wyatt, identifying Wyatt as the new representation of a specially powerful honor, as a master of language in the tradition of Vergil and Horace” (“Surrey's Wyatt” 169), I argue that it is more properly in the *Miscellany* that an intervention can occur. In the *Miscellany* the more optimistic strains of Surrey's ideas about poetic honor can come to fruition, while at the same time they gesture towards application beyond the court.

This application is even clearer in Grimald's poem 160, "upon the deceas of w. Ch." In this poem Grimald, like Surrey, presents a lament on the death of a poet and friend, but there the similarities between the two acts of commemoration end. With its fusion of classical and Christian learning, Grimald's elegy for William Chambers celebrates the achievements and mourns the death of the scholar poet, rather than the courtier poet. It also establishes a distinctly different path for the English poetic tradition, one that is rooted in a classical background removed from the political world of Wyatt and Surrey, and it invokes a vision of community that is both more cohesive than the court, and it is more hopeful about the ability of social ties to survive death.

Both in subject matter and tone, Grimald's poem 160, "upon the deceas of w. Ch" (see Appendix A for full text), anticipates a later and more famous elegy, Milton's *Lycidas*. As Milton does in *Lycidas*, Grimald mourns the death of a close school friend and the loss of an individual poetic talent. Poem 160 is as structurally orderly as Surrey's poems for Wyatt, but it also allows some poignant moments of naked grief. This open acknowledgment of how painful the personal loss is allows the poem to move towards the final consolation, which answers crucial questions running throughout the poem as well as many other elegies: what is the proper relationship between poetry and mourning? How do these poems for the dead benefit the community of the living? Grimald's answers to these questions configure a dual purpose for elegies: in praising the

achievements of the deceased, such poems convert grief into comfort, but they also publicly reinforce the beliefs and values that help a community hold together in a traumatic moment and encourage its members to see continuity between the living and the dead.

For modern readers, who value complexity and subversion over simplicity and earnestness, a poem such as Grimald's "on the deceas of w. Ch." presents a number of challenges to understanding and appreciation. John Berdan, for example, pronounces that Grimald's poems, even those that purport to grieve, "have all the fire of a classical dictionary" (352). Rather than dismissing Grimald's use of classical models and references, however, I propose that we examine those conventions in the context of sixteenth-century elegiac poetry and try to understand what function they served for both poet and audience. As Paul Alpers says in his reading of *Lycidas*, convention "suggests an arbitrary and inflexible practice, established by widespread usage and imposed from without." He goes on to argue, however, that custom and convention instead can be seen as "constitutive and enabling" (469). In the case of poem 160, the fusion of classical and Christian references constitutes a meaningful system of belief for the poet and, equally importantly, for his community of scholars and their families. His public affirmation of those ties enables him to establish a bond with the non-courtly community he invokes in the elegy.

Poem 160, according to Rollins, was likely written on the death of William Chambers, a fellow student of Grimald at Christ Church College, Oxford. Rollins, in contrast to Berdan, remarks that the poem “has more feeling than is usually shown in Elizabethan elegies,” and indeed, the poet’s personal investment in the subject seems greater than in the elegies I have previously discussed, probably because this was the community to which he himself belonged (2.243). The fact that Grimald was an Oxford student and Chambers’s personal friend makes his task in some ways more difficult, as he must manage his personal grief enough to offer comfort to others, but in other ways his advantages — an understanding of the psychology and needs of his audience — help make his address more effective.

One way in which Grimald performs his social identity is to use easily the language that helps bind the group together. In this poem, the classical allusions and rhetorical devices constitute the shared vocabulary of young, male, Oxford scholars, whom Grimald establishes as the primary mourners. He addresses the deceased but singles out those who mourn, among whom he includes himself:

Our studiemates great hope did hold always,
You would be our school’s ornament, one day.
Your parents then, that thus have you forgone,

Your brethren eke must make their heavy moan:

Your loving feres cannot their teares restrain:

But I before them all have cause to plain:

(no. 160, 110.2-5)

Some of his contemporaries could well have accused Grimald of indulging in excessive mourning, but here his strong language serves to demonstrate the strength of the group's ties. It is unclear whether the "studiemates," "brethren," and "loving feres" are separate clusters of people or whether Grimald's descriptors build in intensity as his grief does, but the effect is the same either way. Schoolmates become as close as family members and most cherished friends, and they join with his blood kin in an act of mourning.

The poem also establishes that as well as having suffered a personal loss, these family members and friends have lost someone whose skills and talents could bring honor to their community. That Chambers's fellow students hoped he "would be [their] school's ornament one day" establishes the institution as the focal point for the group's identity, but the hope reflects their belief that the school's reputation is only as good as the scholars it can produce. As an example of its highest achievement, Chambers would have gone into the wider world and enhanced not only his own reputation but also those of his kin and social groups. His parents have not only lost him, they have "foregone"

him, in the sense that he was necessary to them in some vital way and that his function — perhaps increasing the family's social prestige — has been lost.

Moreover, the poet further identifies himself as a member of the social group by the form of praise he uses for the deceased. The qualities he praises are the ones that are most prized by the Oxford scholars:

Oh, with that wit, those manners, that good heart,
Worthy to live old Nestors years thou wert.
You wanted outward eyes: and yet aright
In stories Poets, orators had sight.
Whatso you heard, by lively voice, expressed,
Was soon repose within that mindefull brest.
To mee more pleasant Plautus never was,
Than those conceits, that from your mouth did passe.

(no. 160, 109.31-38)

Grimald here references Nestor, the wise and long-lived king of Pylon who appears in Homer's *Odyssey* and whom Chambers should have lived to emulate (*OCD* 31). More significantly, he alludes to Homer himself, the emblem of the Greek poetic tradition, and possibly to Tiresias, the seer who was blinded by the goddess Athena but given the gift of prophecy as compensation (*OCD* 18). The emphasis on Chamber's blindness locates him

in a long tradition of poetry as prophecy, even as Grimald also draws in the lighter comedic tradition of Plautus. These are the highest compliments the poet can pay his departed friend, and ones that will carry weight for those who are left behind. Grimald places his friend in the classical tradition while also managing to make a contemporary social statement, arguing that Chambers was the ideal poet and rhetorician and the embodiment of Sir Thomas Wilson's injunction that men should "be well accepted among the wise, not for their bodies but for their virtues" (149.1). His body was literally flawed, but such imperfection only enhanced – and perhaps even enabled – his virtues.

Being able to identify with the mourners and to express the excessive grief that his culture so distrusted and avoided seems to be what enables Grimald to gain enough clarity to complete the work of mourning. His own crisis of poetic confidence, which I will discuss shortly, partly seems to be brought about by his close relationship to the deceased. He claims for himself a privileged role among the mourners, addressing the deceased and lamenting that he "in pure love was so conjoined with thee, / An other Grimald didst thou seem to be" (110.8-9). The image anticipates the doubling of poet and subject that Milton employs in *Lycidas*, as he recalls how he and his friend were "nurs't upon the self-same hill, / Fed the same flock, by fountain, shade, and rill" (l.23-

24).³⁸ Isolated, Grimald's image subjugates the subject to the poet and smacks of narcissism, but it is positioned in the poem as the beginning of a lament that builds to a crescendo:

But I, before them all, have cause to playn:
Who in pure love was so conioyned with thee,
An other Grimald didst thou seem to be.
Ha lord, how oft wisht you, with all your hart, (110.10)
That us no chaunce a sonder might depart?
Happy were I, if this your prayer tooke place:
Ay mee, that it dothe cruell death deface.
Ah lord, how oft your sweet woords I repeat,
And in my mynde your woonted lyfe retreat? (110.15)
O Chambers, O thy Grimalds mate most dere:
Why hath fell fate tane thee, and left him here?

Given the amount of grief Grimald feels over his friend's death, we can perhaps forgive him the self-indulgent expression of sorrow that builds to and culminates in the age-old manifestation of survivor's guilt, "Why did death take you and not me?" Indeed,

³⁸ Quotations from *Lycidas* are taken from Merritt Hughes's edition of *John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose* (New York: Odyssey Press, 1957).

Grimald's pain is so sharp that he cannot even speak in the first person but must resort to the third person ("and left him here") to obtain some distance from it.

The moments of poignancy are contained within the bounds of the poem's structure, which works to manage the poet and community's grief. In contrast to Surrey's elegies, this poem openly expresses sorrow and so does not devolve into the outbursts of anger that according to Pigman can result from suppressing grief. It breaks down neatly into seven verse paragraphs and two concluding couplets that move from lament, praise, and lament to a transition into consolation, beginning at 110.18, but this strict adherence to form need not signify lack of genuine sorrow. On the contrary, Grimald uses poetic form in an attempt to impose order on the randomness of life and the arbitrariness of death. Taking refuge in the demands of meter and rhyme allow him to organize and express his reaction to his friend's untimely death and to ultimately find meaning in the loss.

In order to move towards acceptance and comfort, though, the poet must answer the significant questions about the value of poetry in such a time of grief that arise from his experience of mourning. Inconsolability reigns in the first half of the poem, and the extent of his grief leads the poet to question the purpose of attempting to give coherent voice to these turbulent emotions. As Donne and Sidney would later do (Greenfield 89, Kay 47), Grimald asks, "But whereto these complaintes in vaine make wee? / Such

woordes in wyndes to waste, what mooueth me?" (110.18-110.19). These lines signal confusion and doubt, as he simultaneously questions the effectiveness of his expression ("such words in wind") and the motivation behind the act. This moment of doubt, however, also marks a shift for the poet into a new understanding of his role for his community and the role of poetry.

In addition to the admission of doubt, the doubling of poet and subject ("an other Grimald") also marks the poet's movement towards a greater understanding of his task. It is as if the intensity of this doubling is all that can convey the power of his loss, but it also allows Grimald to clarify his own poetic capabilities. The doubling provides a moment of catharsis, an emotional release that allows him to get on with the business of comforting the rest of the survivors. In reassuring them he takes as his model the deceased, who was also a poet as well as a prophet, and argues that Chambers, a model of faith while living, now enjoys eternal rewards: "You, that of faith so sure signes here exprest, / Do triumph now, no dout, among the blest" (110.26-27). Grimald's purpose in making this point surely must be not only to praise the deceased but also to express his own sign of faith, the public assurance that Chambers is reaping the rewards of a Christian life well lived. In place of Chambers the poet-prophet, then, the survivors have Grimald the poet-pastor, who comforts his flock by reminding them that life is not the end but rather the beginning of a far greater existence.

Indeed, it is the dual role of poet and preacher that Grimald has embraced by the last third of the poem, which completes the process by creating what Peter Sacks describes as “a consoling figure for an ongoing, if displaced, generative power,” necessary for the resolution of mourning (102). By the end of the poem, Grimald not only confirms Chambers’s ascendance to a greater existence and his own faith, he avows the common religious convictions that the entire group shares. Although the poem throughout addresses the deceased directly and not the survivors, it does invoke the entire community in its triumphant conclusion:

Live, our companion once, now live for aye:
Heavens joyes enjoy, whyle we dye day by daye.
You, that of faith so sure signes here exprest,
Do triumph now, no dout, among the blest:
Have changed sea for porte, darknesse for light,
An inn for home, exile for countrey right,
Travail for rest, straunge way for citie glad,
Battail for peas, free raign for bondage bad.
These wretched erthly stounds who can compare
To heavenly seats, and those delites most rare?
We frayl, you firm: we with great trouble tost,

You bathe in blisse, that never shall bee lost.

Wherefore, Thaley, reenew thy feastfull layes:

Her doolfull tunes my chered Muse now stayes.

(110.24-37)

Although this section distinguishes between the sad condition of the living and the blissful state of the deceased, it preserves a sense of company and suggests continuity between life and death. Grimald converts grief for a personal loss into sadness that he and the other survivors cannot yet reach those “heavenly seats” and “delights most rare,” but the implication remains that some day they will. Chambers is therefore not lost to them forever; on the contrary, he “never shall be lost.” He is always with them, and if they maintain the same faith and hope, they will be with him again as well. Moreover, only in death will they find their true “home” and their “country right.”

Grimald’s role as a poet, moreover, is inextricably tied to his role as a priest, for his identity as expressed in the poem embraces both religious and poetic shepherding. As well as affirming the common beliefs that bind a community’s members together even beyond death, the final couplet works with the opening lines of the poem to situate this elegy in the larger tradition of the pastoral elegy. Unlike *Lycidas* or Spenser’s eclogue’s in *The Shepherds Calendar*, “upon the decease of w. Ch.” is not strictly pastoral, but it does respond to and situate itself within the pastoral tradition. The muse Grimald

addresses in the opening, “Now, blythe Thaley, thy feastful lays lay by: / And to resound these doleful tunes apply” (109.23-24) is Thalia, the muse of comedy and idyllic poetry, not Euterpe, the muse of lyric poetry. The pastoral eclogue or idyll, which used a rustic setting often with shepherds as the primary players, could as Puttenham says “under the veil of homely persons and in rude speeches...insinuate and glance at greater matters” (38). It was thus not only a medium for “feastful lays” but also one in which more serious subjects could be treated. Peter Sacks argues that the elegy’s adaptation of pastoral conventions allow the mourner to both express “his attempted mastery of and vengeance against nature, or more precisely change” (21) and to present through “the past and its landscape,” as in *Lycidas*, “versions of a lost self” (99).

Under the guise of rejecting the sweeter elements of the pastoral, Grimald is able to exploit the pastoral conventions and reveal their function in a time of mourning. In another poem in the *Miscellany*, no. 133 “The Muses,” Grimald says of the idyllic muse, “Delightful talk loves comical Thaley: / In fresh green youth who doth like laurel last” (no. 133, 97.11-12). His address to her in the elegy for Chambers allows him to move back in memory to an idealized past, but the death of his close friend also forces him to realize a break with that past, and he asks his muse to change her tune. As Spenser’s Thenot does in the “November” eclogue, Grimald’s invocation asks that cheerful songs be set aside in favor of verses that suit the solemn moment: “Now, blythe Thaley, thy

feastfull layes lay by: / And to resound these doolfull tunes apply” (no. 160, 109.23-24).

He does not reject the muse, though, but only her happier songs. In effect, he calls attention to the flexibility of the pastoral and its weightier function as a tool of mourning, acknowledging the usefulness of poetry in a time of crisis.

Grimald accordingly frames the entire process of grieving as a shift from one function of the pastoral to another, and the doubt that he expresses about fitting words to the occasion serves as the climax of the poem, which represents the most intense phase of mourning.³⁹ In doubling poet and subject, the poem allows the speaker not only to acknowledge the intensity of his grief but also to assume his friend’s poetic mantle. By momentarily setting aside the celebratory role of the pastoral, Grimald enacts the death and resurrection of the poet. As Sacks suggests, the “heir apparent...must also wrest his inheritance *from* the dead. More than a mere ingestion, some act of alteration or surpassal must be made, some device whereby the legacy may be seen to have entered a new successor” (37). Grimald announces his inheritance to his audience in the concluding couplet: “Wherefore, Thaley, renew thy feastful lays: / her doleful tune my cheered Muse now stays” (110.36-37). The muse is cheered, and the cycle of life is renewed with a new poet and a new sense of purpose.

³⁹ For a discussion of the elegy’s relationship to the psychological stages of mourning, see G.W. Pigman (5-10).

The final verse paragraph and concluding couplets do achieve a state of moral certainty and comfort, then, though not by sacrificing Grimald's own poetic identity. On the contrary, his belief in the regenerative power of poetry contrasts sharply with Surrey's perhaps because Grimald's fusion of religious and cultural consolation was informed by his self-identification as poet and Protestant priest. His confidence in poetry's ability to instill in his social group a sense of cultural belonging and continuity responded to a real crisis. As Dennis Kay and Keith Thomas each argue, the Reformation disrupted the traditional cult of the dead; the dissolution of the chantries and the monasteries swept away the institutional ties that bound the living and the dead (Kay 2, Thomas 605). With the destruction old practices, however, the needs they filled did not simply disappear; instead, new rituals had to take their place.

As a Protestant, Grimald probably would have welcomed the destruction of what he perceived as superstitious ceremonies, but he also seems to have recognized the need for individuals to provide the care that institutions once did. In a letter written to Sir William Cecil around 1549, Grimald demanded that the pastors "in name only... be recalled from their halls to their sheepfolds, that is, from their colleges to their parishes," suggesting that he regarded study and religious leadership as necessary parts of a clergyman's role, perhaps particularly necessary now that the structures of Roman Catholic ritual, which bound communities together, had been dismantled. In Grimald's

eyes, priests were to minister as well as think and ideally to put their thinking to the service of ministering. Moreover, the elegy for William Chambers suggests that poetry might also be able to take up some of the functions once served by the chanceries and parish, at least in the service of the dead. “Protestant doctrine [might have] meant that each generation could be indifferent to the spiritual fate of its predecessor,” as Keith Thomas argues, but Grimald’s elegy reveals that Protestant practice was not necessarily as indifferent as doctrine allowed or one might think (603). The poem celebrates the bonds between the living and the dead and, as a private act of mourning made public, offers its consolation to strengthen the community of survivors.

Grimald, then, shows that a poet priest can do cultural work that is just as crucial as that a poet earl might do. Moreover, he is an accessible figure because his faith is not always as unshakeable as the tight structure of 160 might suggest. The companion poem, no. 161, the much briefer tribute to “N.Ch.,” Chamber’s brother Nicholas, plaintively laments, “Why, Nicolas, why doest thou make such haste / After thy brother?” (no. 161, 110.39-40). It ends in a qualified statement, shortened by grief that resists expression: “If our farewell, that here live in distresse, / Avayl, farewell: the rest teares do suppressse” (no. 161, 111.10-11). It is not always possible or beneficial, this poem seems to admit, to control grief or make it fit elaborate forms and structures. But the important thing for

Grimald is that the poet tries, and that he leaves a fitting tribute that will live on when he, like the subject, is gone.

Collectively Grimald's elegies, Surrey's, and those of the anonymous poets show that the need to leave a lasting monument, to "shine more bright in these contents / Than unswept stone, besmear'd with sluttish time," in the words of Shakespeare's sonnet 55, is one that transcends rank and status. Grimald's elegy for William Chambers, in particular, does what Surrey's elegy on Wyatt is unable to do: it situates poetry in a wider context, outside of the court, and celebrates the achievements of ordinary people who were able, at least in the eyes of their friends and families, to do extraordinary things.

Grimald's entire body of poetry in the *Miscellany*, from his personal elegies to those poems written for patrons and their families, conveys the broad range of ways in which poems helped to articulate, cement, celebrate, and sometimes alter social ties. Unlike the poems of Surrey the poet earl, who is able to imagine but not enact what a poet could do outside the court, Grimald's poems offer us a glimpse into the poetic activity operating outside the court, in the universities, Inns of Court, and households that were not so mighty. In many cases they and the anonymously authored poems locate the poet and/or subject in the peripheries of the court, as a minor courtier or aspiring client, but in other cases they show us that poetry played an equally vital role in lives (and deaths) that were not at all courtly. Indeed, once we take into account the contributions

of poets who are not Surrey or Wyatt, the *Miscellany* takes on a decidedly “middling” tone.

Because it included works that articulated the perspectives of non-courtly poets and subjects, it is easy to see how *Tottel’s Miscellany* appealed to readers who lived their daily lives in the middle ranks of society, or who worked to move between social stations. Even the book’s glamorization of the court and the examples of noble subjects and of houses that, like the Seymours, experienced stunning advancements and setbacks in their fortunes, served to appeal to middling readers by offering moral and practical lessons in social mobility writ large. Most significantly, though, we know that the *Miscellany* served as a model for poets outside the court who wanted to position themselves socially and culturally because its possibilities are realized by poets in succeeding generations. In the work of Barnaby Googe, for example, and specifically in his elegy for Nicholas Grimald, we can see the sociocultural continuity that the *Miscellany*, with its aristocratic, courtier, and scholar poets, helped to create.

Postscript for a Poet: Literary (Im)Mortality and the “Judas of the Reformation”

Grimald’s influence and that of the *Miscellany* as a whole can be seen most clearly in a work that appeared six years after the first edition appeared, Barnaby Googe’s

Eclogues, Epitaphs, and Sonnets (1563). In this first single-authored poetry anthology in English, the precocious Googe — who was only twenty-three at the time — with youthful enthusiasm pays tribute in “epitaphs” to four men whose ideas or legacies shaped him. These four subjects not only link Googe’s book to the poetry that appeared in the *Miscellany*, they also identify further for us the interlocking social circles that radiated beyond the court and help us to see how crucial a tool poetry was for making and honoring those social ties.

Googe imitated and responded to many of the poems in the *Miscellany*, but more importantly, he used his poetry to identify personally and vocationally with his subjects. While his sonnet 45, “Coming homeward out of Spain,” for example imitates Wyatt’s no. 121, “Of his return from Spain” and makes obvious the strong influence of the *Miscellany* as a source book (Judith Kennedy 179), his epitaphs for Lord Sheffield, M. Shelley, Thomas Phaer, and Nicholas Grimald convey the strength of his personal identification with their subjects. The epitaphs for Lord Sheffield, who was killed in 1549 while helping to put down the rebel forces in Kett’s Rebellion, and for Edward Shelley, who died at the battle of Musselburgh, commemorate soldier heroes (Kennedy 158-159). These subjects are also associated with the *Miscellany*, Sheffield as a possible contributor (Rollins 2.84, Kennedy 158) and Shelley as a soldier in the Scottish campaigns under Somerset and with Sir James Wilford.

While Judith Kennedy and others feel that these two epitaphs were motivated more by general “patriotism and religious fervor” than emotional attachment (Kennedy 160), the poems for the other two subjects celebrate achievements closer to Googe’s own experience. Both the epitaph for Thomas Phaer, who published a translation of the *Aeneid* in 1558 (Kennedy 161), and that for Nicholas Grimald lament the loss of the subject’s intellectual light. Grimald’s epitaph is particularly notable for our purposes, as his reputation was somewhat tarnished by the time Googe’s book appeared. In order for us to fully appreciate the work of recovery that Googe’s poem performs, it is first necessary to follow Grimald’s career just before and after the publication of the *Miscellany*’s first edition.

It is unclear whether Googe and Grimald knew each other personally, or whether the younger poet simply emulated the elder from afar. They may have known each other through William Cecil, that archetypal Tudor statesman and model of social mobility. In 1571, under Elizabeth, Cecil was elevated to the peerage as Baron Burghley (Usher 123), but before that he was made Master of the Court of Wards and held the guardianship of Barnabe Googe, among others (Kennedy 11). Before this lucrative appointment, however, he was a graduate of Cambridge, and he continued to maintain ties with the university and its scholars throughout his career. Cecil was a notable literary patron and so would have been invested in supporting the university’s intellectual output; it is also

possible that, during the heady days of the Edwardian Reformation, he was paying Cambridge scholars to spy on each other and report Catholic activity to the government (Merrill 39).

Merrill suggests that Grimald was on Cecil's payroll as one such spy, but a 1549 letter from Grimald to Cecil does not shed light on whether theirs was a clandestine association. Instead, Grimald uses the language of patronage and clientship, apparently thanking Cecil for placing Grimald "in a situation not only most desirable, but most advantageous for my literary progress." This correspondence suggests that Cecil, who served Somerset before going on to become Secretary of State in his own right at the time of the letter, had acted on Grimald's behalf and had secured him some sort of living or financial support (Merrill 39). Throughout the letter, which I quoted from in the previous section, Grimald emphasizes how important it is for powerful men such as Cecil to support and enable scholarship:

Nay, if you Master Cecil, and all those like you, do not fall to, body and soul, and work with all zeal and rivalry to bring about that honor may maintain upright workers, that drones may be kept in disgrace from the hives, that the idle, the negligent, the pastors in name only shall be recalled from their halls to their sheepfolds, that is, from their colleges to their parishes, I do not see what zeal can be inspired in the studious, what

honest examples can be set before tender age, what fruits of literature can come to the common people, or how we may look to it and prevent ourselves from leaving to posterity a heritage of barbarism, as proof of our lack of diligence, and from handing down, as it were, perturbation of life and great confusion along with savagery.

(Merill 43, translated from Latin)

What this letter does reveal is that for Grimald, as for many of his background and position, the purity of learning is inextricably bound up with the purity of religious belief. Grimald's own religious convictions were shortly to become the subject of much debate, a debate that endangered the good literary reputation he had worked so hard to achieve.

At this time, however, what is striking is his insistence that literature benefits "the common people [*qui literarum fructus ad vulgus hominem*]" as well as the privileged. He sees himself as a part of a literary tradition stretching back to the ancients and, in the present day, encompassing the lowborn as well as the high. He reserves his scorn not for the socially base but for the "drones," the "idle" and "negligent" people who do not work to contribute to their society. "For my part," Grimald says earlier in the letter, "I condemn the ability of no one, however mediocre, as long as he shows the diligence that he ought." In contrast he attacks those "who have so little regard for the fate of the wretched men from whose labor and at whose expense they live, that they dwell

heedlessly far away from them,” clearly a reference to aristocratic landlords who preferred to live away from their estates in London (42). His greatest concern, or so he implies to Cecil, is not that the society preserve a rigid hierarchy, but that all groups work together to ensure that the tradition they hand down to posterity be improved — or at least not degenerated — from the one they inherited. This letter is closest to Latimer’s sermons in terms of its social critique, and it is telling that for Grimald, social injustice is so closely tied to a lack of learning and piety.

Although the letter was written as part of the discourse of the patron-client relationship as the poems to the Seymour sisters were and presumes similarly on a shared set of interests between writer and recipient, Grimald speaks more freely to Cecil, perhaps because both men shared similar backgrounds of merit-based advancement. Clearly Grimald views himself as a part of the educated elite and therefore as someone who plays an important part in culture making, but he also displays an awareness that his position is not as powerful, in terms of influence, as Cecil’s. His responsibilities and Cecil’s complement each other; from their respective social positions, each can play his part to glorify English letters. Grimald’s conceptualization is undeniably hierarchical, but it is a hierarchy that is more subtle in its workings, and more flexible in some ways, than from a much later perspective might be expected: the basic structure of society had not changed in his lifetime, but the opportunities for moving around, for considering

oneself to be in some fundamental ways equal to someone born several rungs higher, had changed. Education, or so it appears from Grimald's example, was a fundamental element of that change.

A hundred years before, it might have been unthinkable for an obscure cleric to lecture an up-and-coming statesman on his duty to preserve learning and culture. The opportunities afforded to Grimald and his sort in the early and middle years of the Tudor period, however, made this kind of communication not only possible, but also even more common. Cecil, after all, came also from the middling ranks of society and owed his advancement to skill and connections rather than birth. The shape of his career, however, which was vastly different from Grimald's, reminds us of the variety of ways in which someone could move up, down, or sideways in the social structure.

Success in such an endeavor seems to have been uncertain. This kind of movement was often fraught with material, physical, and psychological dangers: as an anonymous elegy on Master Deveraux, the son of Lord Ferrers, succinctly claims, "For though it lift some up: as wee long upward all: / Such is the sort of slipper welth: all things do rise to fall" (no. 169, 123.6-7). The examples of the *Miscellany's* poets and subjects, from the sudden and violent end of Surrey to those of Somerset and Thomas Wyatt's Anne Boleyn, bear witness to the truth of this observation. All "things," whether queen, duke, or poet earl, do "rise" only to fall again; indeed, as the poem for Somerset

argues, the higher climb does seem to make the fall that much harder. Those who succeeded as Cecil did seem to have done so through a blend of political acumen, hard work, patience, and luck, a difficult combination in any age; in Cecil and Grimald's world, however, the inability to achieve it could be fatal.

The *Miscellany* reminds us, furthermore, that neither the impulse to "long upward" nor the experience of sudden downfall was restricted to the upper echelons of society. Grimald's own reputation did not survive entirely in the way that he seems to have wanted it to. Only three weeks after the first edition of the *Miscellany* appeared, the book's popularity prompted Tottel to issue a second edition. In this edition, however, thirty of Grimald's forty poems have been removed, including his elegies and the poems to the Seymour sisters. His name has been struck from the book, and all that remains are ten poems on strictly classical subjects and the initials "N.G."⁴⁰ Several theories have been advanced to explain these abrupt and surprising alterations. Rollins finds plausible Gladys Willcock's conclusion that Tottel removed the bulk of Grimald's poems because

⁴⁰ The poems that remain, attributed to "N.G.." are the first edition's no. 133, "The Muses," no. 134, "Musonius the Philosophers saying," no. 149, "Description of Vertue," no. 150, "Praise of measure-keeping," no. 151, "Mans life after Possidonius, or Crates," no. 152, "Metrodorus mind to the contrary," no. 154, "Of friendship," no. 165, "The death of Zoroas, an Egiptian Astronomer, in the first fight that Alexander had with the Persians," no. 166, "Marcus Tullius Ciceroes death," and no. 167, "Of M.T. Cicero" (Pforz 506).

they were simply out of tune with the courtly poems that took up most of the volume (2.87).

Alternately, Rollins also suggests that Grimald himself, feeling a gentlemanly discomfort at seeing “intimate verses... published for the delectation of vulgar readers,” required more anonymity in the second edition, or that Grimald was the editor of the first edition and had a falling out with Tottel (2.88). Merrill proposes a more sensational theory, that Tottel lessened Grimald’s presence in the volume because Grimald had “become *persona non grata*” after allegedly recanting Protestantism and betraying Cranmer, Latimer, and his master Ridley to the Catholic authorities. Tottel, Merrill thinks, “fearing Grimald’s name would injure the sales of the book, removed all poems with personal allusions” and replaced Grimald’s name with his initials (366).

Whether events transpired exactly as these accounts report and whether Grimald’s religious reputation impacted his literary in quite this way, the times in which he sought social advancement and literary recognition did not help his efforts. The tense atmosphere of suspicion and violence that pervaded London during the Protestant persecutions seems to have affected many relationships, even close, personal ones.

While imprisoned by the Marian authorities,

Bishop Nicholas Ridley wrote to Cranmer and Latimer, who were also imprisoned, that his brother had been arrested. Ridley relates that his brother had passed on a set of the

bishop's writings to Grimald that had somehow wound up in the hands of the authorities, and he expresses disbelief that Grimald might be untrue to their shared cause: "All these things [Ridley's books and writings] they have gotten of Grimbold, as my brother doth suppose; not that Grimbold hath betrayed him, but (as is supposed) one which my brother trusted to carry his letters unto Grimbold; for it will not sink into my head to think that Grimbold would ever play me such a Judas's part" (361).

By January of 1555, however, Ridley reports growing suspicion of Grimald's fidelity: "Grimbold was caught by the heel and cast into the Marshalsea, but now is at liberty again; but I fear me he escaped not without some becking and bowing (alas) of his knee unto Baal" (391). When even those closest to Grimald left behind conflicting testimony, it is nearly impossible to put together a clear version of events from the textual evidence. John Bale continued to praise Grimald's learning and constancy, but the Protestant martyr John Bradford related that the Catholic cleric Doctor Weston tried to persuade him to recant by telling him that Grimald had already secretly recanted and been released (Foxe 7.188). Weston's claim that he had released Grimald and would do the same for Bradford smacks of psychological coercion, but the story was widely enough repeated that it might have had some kernel of truth.

We will probably never know for certain what role, if any, Grimald played in the imprisonment and later execution of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, or if he did betray

them and other members of the Protestant cause, why he did so. We do know that the 1550s, particularly during the height of the Marian persecutions, was a time when some men and women found that the strength of their convictions could lead them to act courageously and defiantly; others, however, buckled under the pressure of imprisonment and torture, both physical and psychological. It is easy to pass judgment from the vantage point of five hundred years later and far more difficult to understand any individual's actions and motivations. My purpose here is neither to act as judge nor apologist for Grimald, but to understand how his reputation was constructed in print and how it might have helped to prevent him from achieving the a higher level of literary renown.

Grimald's questionable activities did seem to have implications for his career, as I shall address shortly, but as an explanation for the changes to the second edition of the *Miscellany* the *persona non grata* theory is somewhat vexed. Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley were executed in 1555, well before the first edition of the *Miscellany* appeared. If Tottel feared that Grimald's name would be a liability, he probably would not have attached it to the first edition; he certainly would have already seen whether Grimald's reputation would prevent the printer from selling more books, as Tottel had printed Grimald's translation of Cicero's *De Officiis* the year before. Gladys Wilcox's theory that Grimald's poems as identified and presented in the first edition of the *Miscellany*

were simply not “courtly” enough is a less sensational answer but a more satisfying one. Their eagerness to praise and their delight in the language of scholars and intellectuals is slightly “out of harmony,” as Rollins puts it, with Surrey’s aristocratic sense of entitlement and Wyatt’s self-conscious and ironic treatments of courtly life (2.87). For all of his lyrical skill, Grimald seems a bit out of his element among the courtier poets, as if he is simply trying too hard.

The uncomfortable juxtaposition of Grimald’s poems with Surrey’s and Wyatt’s seems to capture at a lyrical level the uneasy coexistence of their respective social groups, and together with the documents from outside the *Miscellany* it sheds light on the convergence of personality and circumstance that might have determined Grimald’s fate, both personal and literary. The image of a treacherous coward that emerges from the Ridley letters is not impossible to reconcile with the earnestness and passion that ring through the letter to Cecil; even at its most confident, Grimald’s poetry and prose is often tinged with a note of insecurity. Even as he suggests that his poetic and rhetorical skills are indispensable to his social superiors, his deference reinforces the gap in their positions. Only when he is honoring a social equal, such as his friend William Chambers, does he seem more comfortable occupying the place in which he finds himself, poised between the old system of birth-based status and the possibility of a more flexible one.

Two different poems, one that may have circulated in manuscript during Grimald's lifetime and one that was published after his death, offer contrasting versions of Grimald and the relationship between poetry and reputation. The first, a Latin poem that has been preserved in the Bodleian MS Duke Humphrey, is translated into English by Merrill in his *Life of Nicholas Grimald* as:

You meet everybody at the cross-roads, the churches, the theaters,

That you may gain brief praise, O Grimald.

You have praised few, but many have branded you with infamy,

That you may gain brief praise, O Grimald.

Those whom you have just blamed you now praise, O deceiver!

That you may gain brief praise, O Grimald.

A grammarian, a rhetorician, a detractor, a crier, a poet,

That you may gain brief praise, O Grimald.

Since you do all things with a desire for transitory praise,

May the gods give you praise, but brief praise, O Grimald.

(37)

The poem, which seems to have been written during Grimald's lifetime, expresses skepticism about the "brief" nature of fame ("laudem brevem") and is scathing in its condemnation of what Grimald will do for such a prize. It questions the honesty of

Grimald's own acts of praise and visits a peculiar curse on the poet: that the gods may give him exactly what he wants, but only if the rewards are so temporary. Furthermore, the anonymity of the poem's author, writing in a coterie manuscript, suggests that he considers himself above such pettiness as pursuing literary fame, even as the poem's curse lets slip a deeply held belief in the power of language to break a reputation.

Equally powerful, however, is the emerging sense in another work — this time one in print — that poetic work can help ensure a positive, lasting reputation. Barnabe Googe's 1563 epitaph for Grimald contests the judgment left by the anonymous poet; moreover, his poem circulated in print, a public monument to the poet he so admired. Googe emphasizes the equal opportunity of death, the "greedy gripe" that "doth no estate respect, / But where he comes he makes them down to fall" (83.10). He laments that if qualities such as wit or eloquence "could move him to forbear, / O Grimald then thou hadst not yet gone hence" (13-14). Googe's thoughts on Grimald's career are decidedly different from those of the other poet:

If wisdom might have fled the fatal hour,
Thou hadst not yet been suffered for to go.
A thousand doltish geese we might have spared,
A thousand witless heads death might have found,
And taken them, for whom no man had cared,

And laid them low in deep oblivious ground.

But fortune favors fools, as old men say,

And lets them live, and takes the wise away.

Finis.

(19-27)

The closing couplet poignantly captures the extent of Googe's respect for Grimald and perhaps offers a jab at the "witless heads" that did not appreciate the deceased's contributions. His poem is an act of defiance against death and the "deep oblivious ground." Death may have robbed the world of Grimald's talent, but Googe will see to it that the memory of his contributions is not lost forever. In essence, then, he does for Grimald what Grimald did for Somerset, creating a poetic legacy that will reverse the disgrace of his end and reclaim his reputation.

Moreover, Googe's open admiration for both scholar poets and courtiers, as well as his easy handling of both the epitaph and the sonnet, suggests that he moved between worlds more easily than Grimald did. Googe's poems betray none of the social self-consciousness that Grimald's do; for Googe, poetry truly does seem to be an equalizer, one that opens doors and helps him to understand his social and cultural place more clearly. Googe's book weaves together in the work of one poet the pieces of poetic forms and social identities that the *Miscellany* offered to the reading public. His single-

authored anthology shows us that however uneasily these elements coexist in the *Miscellany*, Tottel's book was successful in creating for the next generation of poets a more seamless cultural character. Perhaps the differences in Googe's poems and Grimald's can be traced to differences in temperament or in social origins; Googe after all had blood ties to the landed gentry so perhaps enjoyed a more secure sense of social place.

Perhaps, though, the dissimilarities are also due to variations in their historical moments. Googe came of age during the early years of Elizabeth's reign, during which Judith Kennedy argues a "spirit of renewal and change...breathed energy into the intellectual life of the times" (3). This is perhaps an overly simplistic view of the transition from Mary's reign to Elizabeth's; the new queen had her own set of political complications to contend with. Undeniably, however, certain things did change, most notably the religious and political climate. The final years of Mary's reign were ones of open religious bloodshed, and the summer of 1557, when the Protestant martyrs were being burned at Smithfield, was particularly violent. However problematic religion was during Elizabeth's reign, the closing years of the sixteenth century did not witness nearly the level of open brutality seen in the marketplaces and town squares during Mary's reign.

We should not, then, underestimate religion as a centrally complicating factor in the lives of the *Miscellany*'s poets, from Wyatt in the early years of the Reformation to Grimald and the anonymous poets in the 1540s and 1550s. In the next and final chapter of this study, I turn to the question of religion and its relationship to the *Miscellany*. Through the poems we can see that the conflicts of the Reformation were more than simply a backdrop to the book's literary achievements. On the contrary, the conflicts and conciliations are woven into the fabric of the verses and fundamentally affect not only the language of social relationships but also the ways in which people viewed their relationships, both earthly and divine.

Chapter Four –
**“In martirs tunes:” Freezing Hearts, Burning Bodies, and The Lyrical Conversion
Narrative of 1557**

Among the erotic and philosophical verse of *Tottel's Miscellany*, one poem stands apart in its overtly religious content. Poem 184, “The repentant sinner in durance and adversitie,” eludes the editor’s careful attempts to remove all potentially dangerous or controversial religious or political content. The opening lines of the poem make the reader privy to what seems to be a very private moment of confession between the poet and his God: “Unto the living Lord for pardon do I pray, / From whom I grant even from the shell I have run still astray. / And other lives there none (my death shall well declare) / On whom I ought to grate for grace, as faulty folks do fare” (136.28-35). Anonymously authored, bracketed by verses whose titles lament the “wretchednes in this world” (no. 183) and “diuers ioyes and adversities in loue” (no. 185), perhaps the poem’s potentially controversial theology simply slipped by the editor and the censors. Any reader who did pay closer attention to it in the summer of 1557, however, surely would have noted its evangelical flavor and its appeal to a “living” God who spoke the language of grace favored by the Protestant martyrs. For such a reader, and for modern readers, poem 184 is a stark reminder that, even in a fanciful world of courtly lovers and cruel mistresses, the religious violence of the 1550s was inescapable.

Indeed, religion and violence appear together throughout the *Miscellany*, and often in ways that reveal how closely they were intertwined with the erotic discourse of the Tudor courts. Poem 184 is the most overtly religious of the *Miscellany's* lyrics, but the volume bears multiple traces of the controversies that divided England in the wake of Henry VIII's break with Rome. To begin with, the poets named in the volume were all involved to varying degrees with the reformations of the 1530s, 1540s, and 1550s. As I discussed in the previous chapter, Nicholas Grimald, the only named poet still alive at the time of publication, was a Protestant cleric and a chaplain to Bishop Nicholas Ridley, burned at the stake with Hugh Latimer only two years before, in October, 1555 (MacCulloch 582). Nor was Grimald the only one of the named poets with controversial religious leanings. Surrey's epitaph on Wyatt (Tottel no. 31) and his "Praise of certain psalmes of David, translated by sir. T.w. the elder" (Tottel no. 29) were both inspired not only by Surrey's admiration of the older courtier's poetic ability, but also by his affinity with Wyatt's reformed theology.

Surrey's adherence to evangelical doctrine and teachings was unstable and fleeting at best, as Susan Brigden has persuasively argued ("Henry Howard" 532), but there is no reason to doubt that Surrey's description of Wyatt's psalms as painting "the lively faith, and pure" was genuinely felt (no. 29, 27.13). Wyatt's own religious leanings, however, insofar as they can be categorized in the theologically fluid 1530s, were more

Lutheran than his sovereign liked. In 1541, the year before Wyatt died, his longtime adversary Edmund Bonner accused him of having “papist” tendencies and consorting with Cardinal Reginald Pole; Wyatt replied that he thought he “shulde have much more adoe with a great sorte in Inglonde to purge myself of suspecte of a Lutherane than of a Papyst” (Muir 195-196). Wyatt’s wording, as Alexandra Halasz notes, reveals the elasticity of Reformation thought as well as the need for caution in voicing religious affiliations (198). Wyatt may have been careful about making his leanings public, but after his death the 1549 publication of his version of the *Penitential Psalms* made him more widely known as a poetic voice of evangelical thought.

Even as these poets were involved in political and personal reformations to varying degrees, events in the mid-1550s highlighted the complicated relationship between erotic verse and the religious and political conflicts dividing the English. At the time of the *Miscellany*’s first publication, the Wyatt name was as likely to signify treason as courtly poetry. In February of 1554, the poet’s son, Thomas Wyatt the younger, raised a rebellion against Queen Mary’s proposed marriage with Philip of Spain, a revolt that was significant for a number of reasons. Most importantly for the subject of religion, E. Harris Harbison cites Wyatt’s rebellion as the turning point in Mary’s reign, the moment at which the queen abandoned her previously tolerant religious policies and embarked on the program of persecution that earned her the nickname “Bloody Mary” (137).

However, historians' inability to clearly attribute the revolt to either political or religious motivations points to the difficulty of separating the two forces when analyzing Tudor society.

When we consider that all of these factors were operating in the 1550s, it becomes more difficult to consider the *Miscellany* apart from its historical and religious contexts, but for a long time scholars seemed uncertain what to make of the relationship between text and context. In the introduction to his edition of the *Miscellany*, Hyder Rollins touches upon but does not pursue the connection, depicting the Marian persecutions as a colorful backdrop to the *Miscellany*'s publication and stating that the book

was concerned chiefly with love; and the rhymes, doleful or airy, in which fictitious lovers wail their supposed woes and recount their supposed joys were eagerly read by the very people who watched the burning of the martyrs — were read so eagerly that in some seven weeks' time two other editions were composed and published. The martyrs' fires died down with the death of the old queen and the coronation of Elizabeth on November 17, 1558, but the poetic fire started by the *Songs and Sonnets* burned more brightly than ever in Elizabeth's reign. (2.3)

Rollins' account seems to express a disjunction between the book's popularity and the religious violence taking place around it; it implies that there was an incongruity between readers consuming courtly poetry and watching the flames consume Protestant martyrs but does not delve into the idea, perhaps because Rollins found the association disturbing. The martyrs' fires become simply a metaphor to describe the lasting popularity of the book.

In more recent years, however, following a long period of disinterest in the book as well as in the broader subject of the religious conflicts of the 1550s, a few scholars have attempted to clarify the *Miscellany's* relationship to its contemporary religious context. They have, however, come to widely diverging conclusions. Arguing for the book's importance among the poetic, dramatic, and prose works that appeared in the 1540s and 1550s, John King identifies "many poems attributed to Grimald and 'Uncertain Authors'" as "a collection of Reformation courtier poetry" (242). King's important work fills a gap in our understanding of the relationship between mid-century verse and the religious changes taking place in the period; nevertheless (though understandably) his focus on the Protestant tradition risks recasting Tottel's entire collection as one that displays a predominantly "Protestant" poetics.

Stephen Hamrick, on the other hand, argues that "some writers encoded a Catholic poetics within that text," and that other poets "inscribed conflicting Catholic and

Protestant pieties in their poems to renegotiate the Reformation conflict over ‘true religion’ on a battlefield of the Petrarchan lyric” (330). For Hamrick, this conflict defines the poetic discourse of the *Miscellany*. While several aspects of Hamrick’s argument are convincing, such as his correlation of the worship of the Petrarchan beloved with Catholic veneration of the saints, his bias towards the poems’ Catholic strains of thought lead him to conclude that such Catholicism is intentionally subversive. For example, he claims that the “continued inclusion of [poems displaying Catholic tendencies] in subsequent editions of *Tottel’s Miscellany* published during the Protestant reign of Elizabeth” expresses a “conservative ritual mentality,” and that such inclusion “could alternately be read as a rejection of the ostensible Protestant ‘settlement’ of religion eventually achieved under the new Queen” (343). Hamrick sees the function of such poetry as primarily one of criticism, and regards the “strategic placement of Catholic poetics by editors and printers” as a central and conscious attempt to keep traditional religious practices alive in English culture even after the state outlawed them (344).

Like both King and Hamrick, I believe that the *Miscellany* is intricately linked to its religious context, and that that context was often (though not exclusively) one of conflict. However, I believe that we should consider how both the Catholic and Protestant strains of thought, as both are present, operate and intersect in the poems. Considered from this angle, the Petrarchan lyric seems less a “battleground” and more a

safer textual space in which theologically confused English poets could work out their newly uncertain relationships to church and state. Furthermore, if we consider the dates during which Tottel's customers bought successive editions of the book, and the Protestant settlement that the state church arrived at during that period, we can see that the growth of a uniquely English poetics paralleled the development of a uniquely English religion, one that synthesized traditional, Roman Catholic pieties and the newer religion of the word.

The early modern dates of publication for Tottel's *Miscellany* (1557-1587) almost exactly correspond to the years during which the Church of England settled and consolidated its official position, making the book's lyrical perspective a distinct one from which to view these changes. When we consider in addition that Surrey's and Wyatt's poems were written in the early days of the Reformation, during and immediately following Henry's split from the Church of Rome, the textual life of the *Miscellany* corresponds to an even wider slice of English Reformation history. What distinguishes the *Miscellany* from the many overtly religious tracts and pamphlets, letters, and state documents produced at the same time are its affinities with the manuscript miscellany. Since many of the poems originally circulated in manuscript form, or at least are presented to the *Miscellany*'s readers as having done so, they seem to give voice to private conflicts, offering poets the safety of both the fictional veil of poetic discourse

and anonymity. Therefore, for modern readers they might be able to provide a glimpse into what Elizabeth claimed to have no interest in – the hearts and souls of her subjects, and the individual consciences that grappled with, and sometimes clashed with, the external authorities that attempted to govern them.

Moreover, the *Miscellany*'s format, one that brings together multiple voices in one place, makes it a distinct site at which to view the process of conversion that England experienced during the Reformation. Historian Ethan Shagan has argued that we should “see the Reformation not in globalizing terms but as a more piecemeal process in which politics and spiritual change were irrevocably intertwined” (7). So too, I suggest, can we see in the *Miscellany* and its collection of distinct voices how this “piecemeal process” played out on more local level, as well as how poetics and spiritual change were also irrevocably intertwined with politics. The cacophony of perspectives represented in the book resists ideological categorization and reveals the limitations of trying to assign modern, coherent labels to early modern experience.

In the first part of this chapter, I situate the *Miscellany* within its political context, focusing on several poems that illustrate the book's connection to the political climate of fear and rebellion in the 1550s. These poems help to illustrate and support Shagan's position that, for most early modern subjects, “ideas were not always solid objects stacked like bricks in coherent ideologies, but were rather rapidly shifting modalities that

could have different meanings in different contexts” (7). The *Miscellany*’s poems provocatively treat dangerous topics such as loyalty and treason by transposing ancient stories with clear meanings into a political context in which their meanings are no longer so clear. In this way, they illustrate how concepts central to social and political order have become hard to define and so are potentially destabilizing.

In the second section, I examine how religious beliefs are also unmoored by the Reformation experience and how the erotic poems in the *Miscellany*, particularly the anonymously authored ones, reveal that lyric poetry served several different functions for poets whose hearts, souls, and consciences the state attempted to coerce into conformity. These poems suggest that most people did not experience religion as abstract doctrine but rather as a set of practices and beliefs that structured their relationships with each other. As love poetry was primarily concerned with constructing and expressing relationships between people, it was a useful medium through which to process in a more concrete way changes that were rooted in abstract theology. For some poets, such as the authors of 272, “The lover declareth his paines to excede far the paines of hell,” and 278, “The lover describeth his whole state unto his love, and promising her his faithfull good will, assureth himself of hers again,” the conventions of Petrarchan verse allowed them to renegotiate, in a more personal and less controversial way, the meanings of two concepts hotly contested in Reformation debates: the nature of true faith and the meaning of

sacrifice. These poems indicate that the iconoclasm of the Reformation not only restructured people's attitudes towards heaven and hell but also the ways in which they loved each other and expressed that love.

The Reformation did not just fundamentally alter relationships between individuals; as we have seen from Nicholas Grimald's elegies, it also changed the language and rituals that bound communities together. For the author of 277, "The lover sheweth that he was stricken of love on good Friday," the same set of Petrarchan conventions used in nos. 272 and 278 allow this poet to voice a detachment from spiritual life and an estrangement from his community that may have been by-products of the English Reformation experience. In poem 277, at least, and possibly in other poems as well, this emptiness is filled by a devotion to the worldly beloved that is analogous to the experience of authentic spiritual connection with the divine. Where the changes in public ritual cause the speaker of no. 277 to experience a profound alienation, however, the new language of reformation energizes the speaker of no. 184, "The repentant sinner in durance and adversitie," and transforms a personal experience into a model of conversion for his community of believers. Through the ways in which these poems collapse the distinctions between spiritual and erotic desires, we can perhaps understand more clearly how the language of spirituality enabled people to articulate deeply earthly needs to belong to a community and formulate an identity through their sense of belonging.

All of these multiple experiences gain new implications in print. Tottel and his readers are able to experience the whole in a way that the individual poets cannot; through the act of publication, the poems' private positions are made into public heterodoxies and put into dialogue with each other, however willingly or unwittingly their poets may have participated in this process. Moreover, Tottel's agency forms a new community of poets and readers, one in which Surrey, Wyatt, Grimald, and the anonymous poets comprise their own religious "settlement." In the final section of this chapter and in the conclusion of this study, I explore the religious "settlement" that Tottel's *Miscellany* offers and the cultural reconstruction that it performs for its readers. In a condition of discord and disunity, one in which all formerly stable meanings have lost their semiotic reliability, the book creates a space for poets and readers to re-negotiate new and personally significant meanings. In response to iconoclasm and community breakdown, it offers readers new icons of cultural coherence, the courtier poets Wyatt and Surrey, whose explosive religious connotations are defused through their primary function as models of poetic achievement. The book also offers its readers a new cultural identity, incorporating them as members of a community dedicated to cultivating "English eloquence." The net effect is one of synthesis ; like a good law manual, the *Miscellany* mediates the extremities of Protestant and Catholic belief and offers a poetics

that resembles the theology and doctrine of the Church of England: a bit Catholic, a bit Protestant, and wholly English in content and style.

**Wyatt's Rebellion and the Poetry of Discontent:
Songs and Sonnets nos. 284, 279, 153, and 270**

The longstanding view of the *Miscellany* as a volume divorced from its historical circumstances seems to have derived largely from modern interpretations of its editor's practices. Hyder Rollins, discussing the timing and editing of the *Miscellany*, claims that the book "throughout reveals an editor who worked nervously with his eye on political conditions and possible censorship" (2.65). He notes that the editor removed a reference to Thomas Wyatt the younger from no. 205, "A praise of Audley" (65) as well as what Rollins deems the "rabid attack on Roman Catholicism" that was originally in William Gray's no. 255, "An epitaphe written by w.G. to be set upon his own grave" (97).⁴¹ Given the danger of the times, these editorial emendations do suggest that the editor was playing it relatively safe. The self-censoring, together with the volume's apparent preponderance of love lyrics, does give the book at least the surface appearance of

⁴¹ MS Sloane 1207 prints Gray's poem with sixteen extra stanzas, including two particularly sensitive ones: "Nor fferynge ones the porgynge plase / Devysed by the pope, / Bwtt in the marsy & the grase / Of chryst that is my hoppe. // As ffor the pardons and his mass / Wyche wher his cheffe chase, / Let chryston men nott on them pass, / the be butt the popes draff." (Rollins 2.307)

offering its readers pleasant ditties and escapism from the troubles around them, but the image of the book as escapist downplays the extent to which the *Miscellany*'s poems comment on their troubled times.

By 1557 those troubles included both political unrest and religious dissent. Mary's reign would be remembered in history for the burning of the Protestant martyrs, but the violence began before the burnings, with the rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyatt the younger and his cohorts. Historians do not agree whether the primary underlying cause of the Wyatt rebellion was religion or patriotism, but most agree that its catalyst was Mary's decision at the end of 1553 to marry Philip of Spain. Mary had certainly had enough warning that the marriage would not be received well by her subjects, who disliked foreigners; Bishop Gardiner, her trusted advisor and the architect of her religious policy, suggested the English candidate Edward Courtenay, the Earl of Devon in Philip's place (Loades, *Mary Tudor* 200). Gardiner feared that a Spanish alliance would jeopardize rather than assist their plan to restore Catholicism to England; Wyatt and his followers distrusted the influence of a Spanish king (Brigden, *New Worlds, Lost Worlds* 201). Mary, deeply in love already and never able to separate the personal from the political as her sister Elizabeth could, went ahead with the match that was supposed to consolidate her place among the European powers and bring her personal happiness.

Instead, the marriage alienated her from the gentry that had willingly risen up on her side to depose Lady Jane Grey; in 1554, Wyatt the younger and his Kentish neighbors rose against Mary and were gruesomely put to death for their revolt. The hostilities only escalated. By 1555, death had removed Gardiner's restraining influence and Philip, Mary's beloved Spanish husband, had gone to Flanders (Loades, *Mary Tudor* 324). He left behind a queen whose hopes for a child and Anglo-Spanish dynasty had been cruelly dashed. According to Harbison (335), this final frustration — the loss of both the chance for personal happiness and dynastic possibilities — pushed the pious but formerly tolerant queen to extremes of cruelty. The burnings intensified, and high-profile Protestants such as Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley went to the stake. Whether Mary had previously been tolerant or simply restrained by Gardiner's more politic vision of religious settlement, Loades argues that her execution of Cranmer, "the man whom she held to be primarily responsible for her mother's rejection," was more a deeply personal act of vengeance than an expression of a clear and consistent religious policy (*Mary Tudor* 326).

Here, in the tragic narrative of Mary Tudor's search for love and acceptance by her people and her husband, we might find evidence that the thorny knot of the will to power, deep spiritual devotion, and erotic hunger and frustration inevitably produces personal and political disasters. Certainly Mary has been portrayed by even the most sympathetic biographers as a hysterical woman whose religious persecution was driven

by a desire for “personal revenge” (Loades, *Mary Tudor* 324). The version of events that the *Miscellany* points towards, however, is much less black and white. England’s political and religious situation was extraordinarily complicated and the outcome of any course of action uncertain. Mary’s behavior certainly lacked any kind of political acumen, but she felt she was doing what was best for her country and her convictions — as Thomas Wyatt the younger and others like him did. Contemporary accounts of the Wyatt rebellion, when read together with poems in the *Miscellany* that cautiously treat the topic of armed revolt, reveal that the combined catalysts of religion, patriotism, and perceived threat of foreign invasion in the mid-1550s made the boundaries between loyalty and treason unclear and many allegiances fragile.

London was not quite “Ilium on flame, the matrons crying out, / And all the streets in streams of blood about” (no. 279, 228.6-7), but it apparently seemed that way to anxious Londoners, faced first with the invasion of Wyatt and his soldiers, and then with the fires burning continuously at Smithfield. The anonymous London citizen who recorded the details of the Wyatt rebellion in *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of two years of Queen Mary* reports that, in the days leading up to Wyatt’s siege of the city, the Lord Mayor and aldermen of London, along with most of the city’s householders, waited in armor for the rebel army. To observers, the streets were “very full of harnessed men in every part” (40). As Wyatt and his men drew closer, the mayor ordered all shopkeepers

to close their shops and windows, a directive that no doubt included Richard Tottel and his household. Chaos ensued:

Then should ye have seen taking in wares of the stalls in most hasty manner; there was running up and down in every place to weapons and harness; aged men were astonished, many women wept for fear; children and maids ran into their houses, shutting the doors for fear; much noise and tumult was everywhere; so terrible and fearful at the first was Wyatt and his armies coming to the most part of the citizens, who were seldom or never wont before to hear or have any such invasion to their city.

(Chronicle 43)

Even as the city waited and prepared to defend their queen, some citizens wondered whether it would be better to hand her over to Wyatt (Prescott 305). London was a troubled city in a divided kingdom, whose citizens could no longer agree on the meanings of concepts such as loyalty and truth. When word came that Wyatt had breached the city, the mayor and aldermen “were much amazed, and stood as men half out of their lives, and many hollow hearts rejoiced in London at the time” (*Chronicle 51*). A distrust of “hollow hearts” and their deceptive exteriors permeates the *Miscellany*’s poems as well, pointing to a pervasive anxiety about trust and social stability.

Order was nevertheless maintained; Wyatt was captured, and life for the ordinary Londoner went on much as it always had. The deep divisions remained, however, and a textually functional ambiguity about them manifests itself in the *Miscellany*'s poems. As Annabel Patterson has argued, the system of censorship under which editors such as Tottel worked created a set of conventions that made it possible for poets and publishers to simultaneously cooperate with and protest official decrees. Patterson identifies ambiguity, "a creative and necessary instrument, a social and cultural force of considerable consequence," as the primary tool with which writers and publishers resisted the hegemony of the moment while still managing to obey the authorities (11). In the case of the *Miscellany*, the miscellaneous format and anonymity of many of its authors created an authorial ambiguity that made it more difficult for the censors to assign responsibility for controversial ideas to any one person. Legally Tottel would have been responsible for any controversial content, but as Rollins tries to demonstrate, the editor and publisher was careful to make the changes necessary to appease the authorities. The editor's attempt to completely divorce the volume from its troubled political context, however, may not have been entirely successful.

To a certain extent, the poems Tottel published may have served as escapism if readers were able to lose themselves in the world of courtly lovers and cruel mistresses. Lyric poetry, however, had developed in the court as a medium for covert communication

and protest, and the use of allegedly fictional situations provided a safe space in which poets could comment on the political and social climate. Furthermore, the classical convention of treating philosophical and moral topics offered poets another opening to explore potentially controversial subject matter. Ultimately it would have been difficult for observant readers to escape if they noticed a scattering of verses in the first edition and second editions that deal with controversial topics.

Ironically enough, the anonymous poems that were added to the second edition make the book more topical and controversial, not less. Only the most oblivious or selective of readers could fail to notice, in the words of poem 284, that “much [was] amiss” in their world. Aside from the general humanistic tendency to mediate on the obstacles the world presents to keep people from being happy, some of the *Miscellany*’s poets display a decidedly glum outlook on current affairs. The author of 284 writes “Complain we may: much is amisse: / Hope is nye gone to have redress: / These days being ill, nothing sure is” (no. 284, 232.20-222). Its sense of immediacy and personal despair resonates with a Wyatt poem written after the execution of Anne Boleyn, which survives only in the Blage manuscript and states starkly, “These bloody days have broken my heart” (Muir 155). In addition to the poems that convey a mood of general despair, a number of the *Miscellany*’s poems treat suggestive topics in a more pointed way. The potentially dangerous and treasonable nature of these poems, and of others like them in

the volume, offers an opportunity to exercise Patterson's method of interpreting ambiguity. That the poems dealt with dangerous subject matter seems undeniable; what message the poets, and perhaps by extension the publisher, were trying to send is less clear.

The message of Nicholas Grimald's short poem 153, for example, seems clear — laws keep order — but the subversive nature of the subject matter resists linguistic control and makes the poem's implications ambiguous. The poem offers commentary on the subject of rebellion and handles its delicate subject matter by seeming to take the side of the crown; as Grimald's poems in my previous chapter show, the poet was a master of functional flattery, a useful skill for a courtly outsider attempting to gain favors and rewards from the powerful. Poem 153, however, teeters on the edge of danger by raising a complicated issue that the poet's language may be unable to control:

When princes laws, with reverend right, do keep the commons under
As meek as lambs, thei do their charge & scatter not asunder.
But if they raise their heades aloft, and law her brydle slake:
Then, like a tyger fell, they fare, and lust for law they take.
Where water dothe prevail, and fire, no mercy they expresse:
But yet the rage of that rude rout is much more merciless.

(no. 153, 106.3-8)

This poem clearly responds to a rebellion of some kind, but whether it was written after the 1549 uprising against Edward VI and Protector Somerset, or after Wyatt the younger's 1554 rebellion, as Merrill suggests (391) is not clear.⁴² Nor is it entirely clear what position the poem takes on the issues it treats. Although Grimald himself may not have intended to protest royal authority, the floating pronouns ("they") and images in the poem (fire and water), like the unruly commons, allow the poem to be read in an entirely different way.

At first glance, the poet appears to come down on the side of the crown and royal authority; "princes laws" may be merciless at times, the poem implies, but only because they must prevent the wanton destruction that the "rage of that rude rout" is capable of inflicting on the commonwealth. The very idea that princes laws can be merciless, however, is disturbing, and it appears to disturb Grimald as well, who, in order to justify the severity of royal justice, needs to posit that the commons are capable of committing violence. Moreover, by calling the crown's attempts to keep order "merciless," Grimald allows the possibility of critique, an opening that some of Tottel's readers might well have seized. The images of water and fire may have been comforting symbols of order for readers in 1549, but for the readers in 1557 "fire" was just as likely to remind them of

⁴² The 1549 insurgency, led by the popular leader Robert Kett (MacCulloch, *Boy King* 45), might be more properly attributed to the "commons" than the 1554 rebellion, led by members of the East Anglian gentry.

the scores of Protestants burning in Smithfield as of Wyatt's effort to take London. Fire, as Londoners learned repeatedly, could be an instrument of control, but it was also an element that was itself difficult to control, and the poet here likewise cannot limit the meanings that the image carries. The image resists being confined to signifying a tool of justice; instead, both fire and water can stand for order or cruelty, "prevailing" as symbols of forces that escape both physical and metaphorical control.

The poem's meaning becomes even more ambiguous if we consider how the pronoun "they" beginning in line two loses a clear referent. The more obvious answer is that "they" refers throughout to the commons. If we read "they do their charge" as meaning the laws, however, and "scatter not asunder" as a transitive phrase, then the "they" that takes "lust for law" becomes the laws themselves and the poem throughout raises the question of the extent to which royal law represents justice and when it mistakes "lust for law."

Regardless of who or what "they" are, however, the subject of the kingdom's laws was not as simple as the poem's neat formulation would have it. Tottel's lawyer readers would have known full well how far from simple England's laws actually were. Wilfrid R. Prest calls sixteenth-century English common law, which along with canon and civil law formed the basis of the English legal system, "a formless, confused jumble of undigested particulars, successfully resisting all efforts at simplification or systematic

statement” (142). Moreover, the distance between ideal and practice, even for the most carefully formulated law, could be vast. As Susan Brigden posits, “laws were believed to be consonant with divine justice” (*New Worlds, Lost Worlds* 164), but the “corruption and weakness of juries, the partiality of shrriffs and justices of the peace, and even the demands made by kings who were sworn by their coronation oath to uphold the law” could undermine its usefulness as an “instrument of justice” (162). Laws might keep the kingdom from falling into civil chaos, but they were not always the manifestations of “reverend right” that the poem regards them as. Sometimes, as the trials of Anne Boleyn and the revenge killings of Mary suggest, the agent mistaking “lust” for “law” could be the monarch.

The anonymous poem 270, “He ruleth not though he raigne over realms that is subject to his own lust,” which originally appeared in the same edition as Grimald’s poem, offers a clearer answer to the question of when justice becomes tyranny, perhaps because the veil of anonymity protects the poet from retribution. This poem boldly advises a ruler, “If thou wilt mighty be, flee from the rage / Of cruel will, and see thou keep free / From the foul yoke of sensual bondage” (no 270, 212.14-16). It was fortunate for Tottel that the advice was offered anonymously, for the Tudors did not appreciate being told what to do, even in veiled terms. Henry did not let the small matter of the Church of Rome dictate his marital terms, nor did his daughter Mary let the

opposition of her people stand in the way of her marriage to the Spanish Prince Philip or her determination to rejoin England with Rome. In the late 1550s, as the crown burned record numbers of religious dissidents for heresy, in the name of a religion that claimed mercy as the heart of its faith, the meaning of justice and right became even cloudier.

Even if we do not read Grimald's poem or the anonymous no. 270 as protesting the crown or even questioning the nature of its "reverend right," the two poems' fixation on lust nevertheless draw attention to the slippery line between might for right and might to satisfy personal desires. Poem 284 also expresses anxiety about how easily the former can become the latter: "Power, without care, sleepeth at ease: / Will, without law, runneth where he list: / Might without mercy cannot please" (no. 284, 232.35-37). It ends as a prayer does, with an appeal to God to set the wrongs right, to "save us as chickens under the hen. / Our crookedness thou canst make right, / Glory to thee for aye. Amen" (234.5-7). Those who have power are subject to God's might as much as those without power, and unlike the earthly rulers, this poem maintains, God can show mercy.

Poem 279, "Of the troubled common wealth restored to quiet by the mighty power of god" (see Appendix B for full text), also places its faith in God's ability to restore peace in a troubled kingdom — and, like poem 284, remains skeptical about the ability of an earthly authority to maintain tranquility. Rollins surmises that this poem, which recounts the fall of Troy, is a veiled response to the Wyatt rebellion (2:322), and

the poet does draw a parallel between the fall of Troy and some disturbance of peace in his own age:

Like to our time, wherein hath broken out,
The hidden harm that we suspected least.
Wombed within our walls and realm about,
As Greeks in Troy were in the Greekish beast.
Whose tempest great of harms and of arms,
We thought not on, till it did noise our harms.

(no. 279, 228.20-25)

The poem offers commentary on either Wyatt's rebellion or the coup that had previously attempted to set the Protestant Lady Jane Grey on the throne, but its claim about who is to blame for the violence is ambiguous. On the one hand, the comparison between Londoners and the Trojans implies that the threat is foreign; Greeks hidden "in the Greekish beast" suggests that the poem may be critiquing the Spanish marriage. The image of the Greeks "wombed within our walls" might also express anxiety about the dynastic implications of such an alliance; as David Loades argues, "the image of England as the bride of Spain, absorbed by the imperial ambitions of that country, was one which no Englishman could contemplate with equanimity" ("Literature and National Identity")

210). If Mary's womb produced a half-Spanish child, that heir, the English feared, would certainly annex England to the Hapsburg empire.

On the other hand, the "tempest great of harms and of arms" suggest that the rebels, who raised an armed disturbance from within, are responsible for the damage done to the state. The next stanza reinforces this implication:

Then felt we well the piller of our welth,
How sore it shoke, then saw we even at hand,
Ruin how she rusht to confound our helth,
Our realme and us with force of mighty band.
And then we heard how treason loud did rore:
Mine is the rule, and raigne I will therefore.

(228.26-31)

The poem's comparison of the English to the Trojans, attacked by a foreign force that infiltrates and destroys, and its simultaneous insistence that what befalls the realm is "treason," a native-born betrayal, makes it harder to determine where the poet locates the sixteenth-century political threat. The "piller" also suggests the gentry, the bedrock of Mary's support in the countryside, but they are certainly not foreign invaders smuggled into the city under the guise of friendship.

What does come through more clearly is the poem's critique of how those in power handled the threat. The criticism is made more forthrightly where the poet places responsibility for the fall of Troy partly at the feet of the sovereign and his advisors:

But such was fate, or such was simple trust
That king and all should thus to ruin run,
For if our stories certain be and just:
There were that saw such mischief should be done
And warning gave which compted were in sort,
As sad divines in matter but for sport.

(228.8-13)

The poet here places his faith in ancient "stories" being "certain" and "just," and this story tells him that the rulers of Troy had sufficient warning that something bad was going to happen. They chose to regard these warnings as "sad divines in matter but for sport," and their downfall was a predictable outcome. Likewise, so have the rulers whom the poet attempts to instruct through this example not only ignored the teachings of the ancient stories, but they have also, as Priam did, ignored warnings that they received. Whether the poem's story circuitously blames the Spanish or the Kentish rebels for the violence, it also lays some of the responsibility at the feet of the queen who ignored her

councilors' advice that some of her policies, particularly her foreign marriage, were unwise.

The Biblical references that the poet includes further obscure its political meaning. The title and final stanza of this poem, "The troubled commonwealth restored to quiet by the mighty power of god," express a confidence that while imprudence and treason have disrupted the realm, proper piety has brought it back to peace and stability. The poem ends with the exhortation to "Praise therefore now his mighty name in this, / And make accompt that this our ease doth stand: / As Israell free, from wicked Pharaos hand" (229.17-19). This is a confidence, however, that the other poems in the volume do not always share. In the Bible, the good and the wicked are easily distinguished; in the context of Marian England, where each side appropriated sacred language for its own purposes, the metaphor becomes unclear. Religion, both individual beliefs and state-dictated doctrines, was precisely part of the problem; it is not easy to determine from even this poem which party was Israel and which the pharaoh. After the Henrician break with Rome, the evangelical reforms under Edward, and Mary's program to restore England to Rome, each side had its martyrs and its discontents, and many people were surely simply confused. Religion was no longer a glue that bound English society together. The Reformation, while perhaps not the orderly progression of change only momentarily interrupted by Mary's counter-reformation, as pre-revisionist historiography

interpreted it, nevertheless had introduced radical ideas into England that had altered the way people thought of themselves both in relation to the divine and to each other.⁴³

Part of Mary's troubles stemmed from her inability to grasp how completely the world she had loved as a child had changed. At another time, she might have made a success of her rule, might have overcome her childhood traumas and united her divided subjects through sheer force of will. She was certainly as much like her father as Elizabeth was in wanting to impose her will on her people; that was a Tudor quality, not Mary's alone. She was also like many of her people in making her faith the center of her life. Mary's piety, however, was more than traditional; it was rigidly *Roman Catholic*, and more Spanish than English in its orientation. In her insistence that England reunite with Rome, and in her desire for a Spanish husband to help her steer England's course, Mary seems to have missed a central transformation that had taken place in England since her youth.

⁴³ In the introduction to *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society Under the Tudors*, Christopher Haigh takes issue with the tradition that posited one continuous and inevitable Reformation in sixteenth-century England. He calls such an interpretation "a highly selective approach to the past: it exaggerates conflict, accelerates change, and gives a one-sided story of protest and victory" (15). He argues instead that "England had discontinuous Reformations and parallel Reformations...which few wanted, and which no one knew had come to stay" (14). In *Popular Politics and the English Reformation*, however, Ethan Shagan, argues that "studying these fissures in traditional religion reveals a profound process of change; the ways people understood and legitimated even the most traditional beliefs altered dramatically" (6-7).

That transformation was a change from a Roman Catholic religious sensibility, tied to papal authority and church structure, to a sense of salvation and spiritual community that was founded on traditional practices but autonomous from Roman authority. As David Loades argues, at Mary's accession "what people had wanted was a legitimate Tudor and a return to the traditional forms of religion. But they did not want the pope, and they did not want a foreign king" (*Mary Tudor* 340). Eamon Duffy echoes Loades's assessment and argues that traditional religion, "the shared and inherited religious beliefs and practices of the people" handed down through the late medieval period, was on the eve of the Henrician Reformation alive and thriving (3). Many who lived through the iconoclasm of the 1530s and 1540s missed the traditional rituals that had shaped their lives and given them color and texture; some even preferred the old theologies. Duffy goes so far as to argue that the Marian campaign to restore all of the old trappings and "ritual structures, both material and conceptual," was "in fact displaying unmistakable signs of success, until the death of Queen Mary wrecked the whole enterprise" (5). Had Mary lived, Duffy believes, England could have successfully returned to Roman Catholicism.

The evidence also suggests, however, that some of those structures could not merely be put back as they were, without modification. Too much had been destroyed for the world simply to return to the way things had been before the first wave of

reformations. Robert Tittler argues in his study of the Reformation's impact on the civic and community life of England's towns, "if traditional religious belief itself seems often to have remained more resilient than one used until very recently to think, the circumstances under which such beliefs had evolved and been sustained for a very long time had been changed for ever" (43). The altars could be replaced, but broken community ties could not always be repaired by royal decree. Social and political stability were desirable, but spiritual homogeneity was not, at least in the minds of some of Mary's subjects. Perhaps it was not even possible, not now that a wide spectrum of religious thought had been introduced. What was needed most was a compromise of some kind, and compromise seemed to be a quality that Mary did not understand.

The *Miscellany*'s English poetics suggests that at least some individuals were able to find a blend between the old and the new and to modify extremities of religious thought. In the next section, I explore the ways in which the *Miscellany*'s anonymous poets use the more neutral medium of Petrarchan verse to mediate between self and society, and particularly religious community and authority. I hope to demonstrate that just as categorizing the English in 1557 as either Catholic or Protestant is misleading, too is identifying the *Miscellany* as either a Catholic or Protestant book not only misleading but inaccurate. What emerges instead in this book is a synthesis of the two

influences, and a more complex tapestry of religious thought than either label can completely describe.

“In martyrs tunes:” nos. 272, 277, 278, and 184

As ancient stories such as the fall of Troy provided convenient cover under which poets could remark upon political unrest, so too did the conventions of courtly love poetry provide ample opportunity for them to consciously or unconsciously respond to the religious troubles dividing their society. Images of burning hearts and bodies suffuse the pages of the first two editions of the book, activating the metaphorical comparison of erotic with religious suffering. In a cluster of poems added to the second edition, nos. 272, 277, and 278, this conflation particularly resonates, for in these poems we see individual poets using Petrarchan conventions to reimagine the purpose of pain and suffering in ways that were influenced by Reformation thought. These poems are not always purely Protestant in the mode of Protestant poetics that Barbara Lewalski has described, displaying the more radical thought of Calvin or Zwingli; nor is their theology, if we can call it that, uncomplicatedly Catholic either, as Stephen Hamrick argues.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ In *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*, Lewalski identifies in seventeenth-century Protestant poets such as Donne, Herbert, Vaughan, Traherne, and Taylor what she calls a “specifically biblical poetics,” one that draws its

Instead, their discourse is informed equally by an attachment to the devotional practices of the medieval church and by the renegotiation of traditional symbols and practices taking place around them. In creating their own versions of martyrdom, erotic and spiritual at the same time, these poets take part in that re-negotiation, shaping a new vision of the self in relation to heavenly and earthly communities.

In particular, the ways in which the speakers of these poems process the suffering that is common to both spiritual and romantic martyrdom points to the pressure that religious change placed on personal and community ties. The speaker of poem 277, “The lover showeth that he was stricken by love on Good Friday,” almost explicitly encounters romantic love as a substitute for spiritual experience, but he finds it every bit as miserable as the religious penitence he is supposed to be performing. The lover of poem 272, according to Tottel’s title, even more dramatically declares that “his paines,” which result from unrequited love, “excede far the paines of hell.” Together these poems reveal the variety of ways in which poets considered suffering in love to be like or unlike suffering

forms from scripture and adheres to the “Protestant-Pauline paradigm of salvation” (24). While Lewalski does not extend this model back to sixteenth-century poetry, she nevertheless maintains that “the major seventeenth-century religious lyrists owe more to contemporary, English, and Protestant influences than to Counter-Reformation, continental, and medieval Catholic resources” (ix), a position that downplays the survival of these latter influences through the sixteenth century. Stephen Hamrick, by contrast, argues that the Petrarchan tradition in the hands of Protestant poets such as Cheke, Sidney and Milton amounts to a “Catholic poetic discourse” in which the worship of the beloved, kneeling, and the image of the flame evoke specifically Catholic practices (337).

for one's faith or the process of strengthening that faith; the meaning each poet assigns to his experiences points towards how he incorporated or resisted new ideologies of sacrifice.

The speakers of nos. 272 and 278 both compare their experiences with their absent mistresses to suffering a spiritual torment, but they arrive at very different conclusions at the end of their respective poems. While no. 272 suggests that its author clings to traditional, more "Catholic" methods of coping with frustration and uncertainty, the much lengthier no. 278 takes its speaker through a kind of conversion experience, one in which he turns to more Protestant concepts of grace and hope for comfort and transforms his suffering into a transcendent performance of salvation by faith.

No. 272, "The lover declareth his paines to excede far the paines of hell" (see Appendix B for full text) does, as its title suggests, claim that the torments of the lover are far more painful than those of the soul in hell. Its argument is much more complex and nuanced, however, than the title conveys; the poem in fact takes issue with the late medieval idea of hell as a place where disembodied souls are punished for earthly transgressions in a distinctly embodied and physically painful series of torments. As Eamon Duffy has argued, the concern with what happened to souls in the afterlife "loomed large...in lay awareness, and provided the rationale underlying the immense elaboration of the late medieval cult of intercession for the dead" (338). The physical

punishments for sinners that medieval sermons, tracts, and prayer books vividly evoked resonate with the vision described in poem 272:

The souls that lacked grace,
Which lye in bitter pain:
Are not in such a place,
As foolish folk do fain.
Tormented all with fire,
And boiled in lead again,
With serpents full of ire,
Strong oft with deadly pain.

(no. 272, 217.5-12)

This image of hell as a place of boiling lead and fire also echoes the medieval “harrowing of hell” tradition, in which Christ descended into the inferno to suffer the pains of damnation before breaking free and ascending to heaven with the souls he has liberated. As Tessa Watts demonstrates, this image of hell as a place of great physical torment remained popular well into the seventeenth-century, captured in broadside ballads and woodcuts such as “The Broad and Narrow Way to Heaven and Hell, or St. Bernard’s Vision” (1640) and “The deadmans song” (1624) (111).

These popular songs and images suggest that traditional strains of thought remained ingrained in the cultural psyche even after Protestantism had changed England's official theology. The interconnectedness of body and soul and the emphasis on Christ's physical suffering were hallmarks of Catholic thought, as Bishop Bonner's 1555 version of the more abstract than colorful *Homilies* reminds worshipers in its chapter on the "Redemption of Man." Bonner describes Christ as "the second person in trinity, [sent] to be the savior of the world, and to restore man again to perfect cleanness, both in body and soul, and that by the way of very justice, in making a full amends and paying a sufficient ransom for sin" (13.v). The "cleanness" of body and soul could also be gained through prayer and good works. Likewise, the late medieval cult of the dead taught that good works performed during one's lifetime and the prayers of the living made for the dead could hurry a soul through Purgatory and to heaven (Duffy 349). Duffy argues that this "overwhelming preoccupation with death" indeed "was the single most influential factor in shaping both the organization of the Church and the physical layout and appearance of the buildings in which men and women worshiped" (301).

In contrast, Reformation theology taught that salvation was secured by grace alone, not by any actions that could be performed in the physical world. Archbishop Cranmer's 1551 edition of the *Homilies* accordingly takes a more metaphorical approach to the question of how Christ's suffering and sacrifice enabled the redemption of

mankind. Cranmer argues that those who sin after baptism “are likewise washed by this sacrifice from their sins, in such sort that there remaineth not any spot of sin that shall be imputed to their damnation” (D2r). He goes on to emphasize that Saint Paul refers to this kind of justification “when he saith no man is justified by the works of the law, but freely by faith in Jesus Christ” (D3r). Cranmer does not place the emphasis on the physical body, or the works that body performs, the way Bonner does; Cranmer’s theology instead understands that, while Christ’s sacrifice entailed physical suffering, its benefits for mankind are spiritual, not physical.

The shift in emphasis from a salvation that could be assured by actions performed in the physical world to one that depends on grace alone fundamentally changed concepts of the afterlife. This is not to say that Protestants did not believe in hell; on the contrary, Watt’s ballads suggest they did. However widespread the image of hellfire was, however, Calvinist doctrine did not believe that it signified literally physical suffering. In the *Institutes* Calvin poses the question, “If to enjoy the presence of God is the summit of felicity, is it not misery to be destitute of it?” (76). In Calvinist thought, heaven itself was the “summit of felicity,” and hell was the last state of absolute misery. As one of Calvin’s modern editors, John T. McNeill, states, “Calvin’s hell is the unspeakable anguish, not of literal fire, but of eternal alienation from God” (xxiii). It is a conceptualization of heaven and hell that the speaker of the *Miscellany*’s poem 272 shares.

Poem 272 rejects the traditional version of hell it opens with, and thus also calls into question the accompanying theology that explained the relationship between body and soul:

The souls that lacked grace,
Which lye in bitter pain:
Are not in such a place,
As foolish folk do fain.

By rejecting the idea of hell as a place of physical torment, the poet also rejects the more Catholic conception of the role that bodily suffering plays in the afterlife. It is only “foolish folk” who think of hell as such a place of physical torment, the poem claims. The speaker does believe in a hell, just not a hell of physical suffering: “No, no, it is not so / Their sorrow is not such: And yet they have of woe, / I daresay twice as much” (217.117-20). Instead, this poem redefines hell as a place of psychological torment, a kind of pain that causes “twice as much” suffering as a hell of boiling oil and stinging serpents.

This agony is twice as distressing because it is not sensory but emotional. The lover knows what damned souls endure because he, “Through absence cruelty” is made “for to prove / Hell pain before I die” (217.25-28). Likewise, the pain of unrequited love

comes from being denied the presence of the beloved's love, but the suffering is not bodily:

There is no tong can tell
My thousand part of care
Ther may no fire in hell,
With my desire compare.
No boyling leade can pas
My scalding sighes in hete:

(218.2-7)

This speaker's torment not only surpasses physical pain, it defies description: "no tong can tell" what he endures, and "no fire in hell" compares to the heat of his desire. The conventional Petrarchan imagery here serves to describe, while failing to describe, the lover's state. Perhaps such pain is intolerable because, as it is not physically grounded, there is no physical remedy for it.

As well as being disembodied, like Calvin's vision of hell, the lover's understanding of damnation is being deprived of the beloved's presence. According to the speaker, the damned souls suffer "because they lack / The sight of the godhead, / And be from that kept back / Where with are angels fed" (217.11.21-24). The absence of God's love, rather than the presence of physical torture, is what makes hell miserable.

Damnation no longer results from weighing the deceased's sins against his or her good works. Instead, the unfortunate souls wound up there because they "lacked grace," a Protestant usage that denotes the belief that one could be saved by faith in Christ alone (217.5). Likewise, the lover is left in a state of despair for which there seems to be no remedy but faith and hope.

Faith and hope, however, seem to be qualities with which the speaker needs some assistance, and not in a way Calvin would approve of. The second half of the poem backs away from the Calvinist idea that salvation comes through grace alone. Instead, the lover falls back on a very Catholic means of coping with his agony, invoking the aid of a patron saint:

O Cupid Venus son,
As thou hast showed thy might.
And hast this conquest won,
Now end the same aright.
And as I am thy slave,
Contented with all this:
So help me soon to have
My perfect earthly bliss.

(218.15-22)

If the lover is like the damned souls, deprived of the beloved's presence, then the beloved herself would seem to function as the analogue of divine love. The lover, however, does not appeal directly to the beloved; instead, he turns to Cupid as an intercessory and pleads for reward for the service (however unwilling) he has performed for "Venus son."

Perhaps the mention of Venus may position Cupid as an intermediary in the way that Christ is an intermediary, but far from being a Christ-like figure, the god of love appears in the Petrarchan tradition as a capricious and unpredictable force. Here he makes "conquests" and takes "slaves," although the lover does seem hopeful that Cupid will show mercy and deliver him from his trials. Moreover, the lover seems to view his suffering as a work he has performed, an act of penance for which he ought to receive the prize of his love. He claims that he is "contented with all this," but his lament and plea for deliverance suggest otherwise.

Cupid makes an odd patron saint, but this appeal, in wording and intention, amounts to an intercessory prayer, one that clings to traditional paradigms of devotion and salvation. Protestants and Catholics alike did believe in prayer as a powerful way to get God to assist the petitioner in an earthly matter (Thomas 113). Reformers, however, worked "to eliminate any prayers which seemed to imply that supernatural power lay anywhere other than with God," efforts that led to the dismantling of many saints' shrines that had been popular destinations for medieval pilgrims (Thomas 62). A committed

reformer also might have objected to the poem's hopeful belief that suffering in love was a penance that could (or perhaps even should) guarantee the petitioner supernatural aid. No good work, no ritual or penance, the reformers argued, could assure one either earthly or heavenly bliss; the power to save lay with God alone and could not be affected by human pleas.

Ultimately the poem hovers between new and old ways of believing, incorporating elements of both. While the lover retreats from the theology of salvation by grace alone, and leans towards the comforts of intercessory prayer, the poem nevertheless introduces elements of new and radical thought. The argument that hell is a frame of mind rather than of body and is therefore more agonizing anticipates Milton's characterization of Satan's hell in *Paradise Lost*. Cast out from heaven, in pain because he has been cut off from God's presence, Satan attempts to rationalize his new position by claiming that "The mind is its own place, and in itself / Can make a Heav'n of Hell, a Hell of Heav'n" (Book 2, ll.254-255). He finds instead that the psychological nature of hell makes it more difficult, rather than less difficult, to escape. When his efforts to "reign in Hell" fail to "render Hell / more tolerable" (2.465-466), Satan has to concede that his new situation is intolerable: "Me miserable! which way shall I fly / Infinite wrath, and infinite despair? / Which way I fly is hell; myself am Hell" (4.73-75). Poem 272 comes to much the same conclusion. What makes psychological suffering so much

more difficult to endure is that it resides in the mind of the sufferer, and thus is inescapable.

In poem 278, however, the speaker takes the theology of suffering to a new and more radical conclusion. Unlike the speaker of 272, the lover in 278, “The lover describeth his whole state unto his love, and promising her his faithful good will, assureth himself of hers again,” sees his pain as having a higher meaning and purpose. He progresses from being grounded in the suffering of the body to transcending the physical and finding a spiritual connection through his torment. Indeed, the pain he feels partially validates and affirms his experience as genuine love. He does not begin from this position, however; instead, he comes to a new understanding of the nature of suffering through a process that is analogous to a conversion experience.

Poem 278 is one of the *Miscellany*'s lengthier poems (coincidentally, 278 lines), taking the lover from mourning his absent love to celebrating that absence as a means to strengthening their mutual devotion. It begins by situating itself in springtime, the time for lovers, as many of the *Miscellany*'s love poems do. The opening couplet, “The Sunne when he hath spread his rays / And shewde his face ten thousand ways” (no.278, 220.22-23), draws on the same conventional form as we see in Surrey's no. 1, which begins, “The sun hath twice brought forth his tender green, / And clad the earth in lively lustiness” (no.1, 3.6-7). These two poems begin by employing very similar conventions,

but ultimately they construct the relationship between lover and beloved in distinctive ways,

Both poems begin by presenting a lover grieving the absence of a beloved. Whereas Surrey's speaker goes on to launch a vengeful attack on a mistress who does not requite his love, the speaker of the anonymous 278 assures himself of his mistress's true love through experiencing her very absence, although he is at the beginning more petulant than philosophical about his situation. He questions how anyone is meant to be happy when deprived of the thing that makes his life meaningful:

How can I joy how should I do?
May sick men laugh that rore for paine?
Joy they in song that do complaine?
Are martirs in their tormentes glad?
Do pleasures please them that are mad?
Then how may I in comfort be,
That lacke the thing that comforts me.

(no. 278, 222.5-10)

These questions are presented rhetorically, as the final lines here indicate. The speaker expects an answer of "no" – sick men cannot laugh, those who complain do not sing for

joy, and martyrs are not glad in the midst of their suffering, just as he himself does not find any comfort in being separated from the sight of his beloved.

The casual comparison of his state to that of a martyr's, however, leads the speaker into a lengthy exploration of what it means to suffer, and almost immediately he begins to revise his earlier position. Only three lines later, he explicates the martyr's experience and considers why a martyr might indeed be "glad" in the midst of great torment:

The blind man oft that lackes his sight,
Complaines not most the lacke of light.
But those that knewe their perfectnes,
And then do misse ther blisfulnes,
In martir's tunes they syng and waile,
The want of that which them doth faile.

(222.13-16)

While to "wayle" connotes suffering, to "syng" suggests that some kind of joy can be found in the act of suffering. Martyrs sing, this speaker proposes, because they are visionaries; they have known true perfection, however momentarily. Moreover, this "perfectnes" is "theirs," meaning that it is both a part of them and belongs to them; in witnessing God's perfection, they briefly understood how that perfection was present in

their own selves and could be possessed by them. By experiencing martyrdom, they seek to become one with that “blissfulness” again. They therefore lament the present lack of bliss, but there is in their sorrow after all an element of joy, or at least of hope that they will achieve it again.

The speaker knows the value of suffering, he goes on to discover, because he himself is able to find similar meaning in his own experience of romantic loss. He, like a religious martyr, has glimpsed perfection in the person of the mistress and has been deprived of that perfection. Indeed, the metaphor of martyrdom recurs throughout the poem, describing a process of sacrifice and compensation. The comparison of the lover’s “sigh” with the martyr’s, moreover, emphasizes common qualities between the two experiences. Like erotic love, a spiritual experience can be deeply sensory, and like spiritual love, the erotic can have a transcendent effect:

For well I find it easeth me,
And certes much it pleaseth you
As would to God it could so do.
For then I know you would soone finde,
By sent and savour of the winde.
That even a martir’s sigh it is,
Whose joy you are and all his blis.

His comfort and his pleasure eke,
And even the same that he doth seke.

(223.6-15)

The sigh seems to make the lover feel better *because* it is received by the beloved – it functions as a tangible sign of his suffering and an attempt to seek proof that she requites his love. The satisfaction that he can feel in this situation depends on his beloved receiving the sigh, or at least on his being able to imagine her receiving the sigh. Not only is she his source both of pleasure and of pain, his “joy” and “all his bliss,” her absence from him is itself both pleasurable and painful, and it is that dual nature that partly gives his experience meaning and makes it authentic.

The process through which the speaker convinces himself that his love is requited is key to fashioning his suffering as meaningful. The sigh, which the beloved witnesses, is the conduit through which the lover connects with the object of his devotion, but her requiting is not a given. Instead, the absence is figured as a kind of trial, a test to determine whether this love is indeed authentic. Doubt enters the picture midway through the poem as an external voice, a “dolefull foe” (223.32) who tries to sway the lover from his devotion by reminding him of the “old pamphlets” and “books” that tell of lovers who were betrayed by the mistresses in whose affection they felt so secure (224.4,5). Absence, doubt argues, often “brings full low that lay full oft” (224.26). The

lover argues in return that absence cannot remove his love for her: “And what I feel to be in me, / The same good will I think hath she” (225.4-5). In this line, “will” could serve as both a noun and an auxiliary verb, her favorable disposition toward him and his determination to believe the best of the situation.

Most significant, however, is the tool that the lover uses to strengthen his faith in his mistress’s love: hope. At the point when the lover’s faith might be wavering, there appears “A stedfast friend, a counselor / And named is Hope my comforter” (225.11-12). Hope reassures the lover of his beloved’s worth, reminding him “That she is one the worthiest, / The truest and the faithfullest” (225.16-17). The Reformation’s new emphasis on salvation by faith alone led to an increased emphasis on hope, a quality many reformed theologians saw as central to the working of true faith. Calvin in the *Institutes* emphasizes hope as the central ingredient of an active and lively faith:

Thus, faith believes that God is true; hope expects that in due season he will manifest his truth. Faith believes that he is our Father; hope expects that he will always act the part of a Father towards us. Faith believes that eternal life has been given to us; hope expects that it will one day be revealed. Faith is the foundation on which hope rests; hope nourishes and sustains faith. For as no man can expect any thing from God without previously believing his promises, so, on the other hand, the

weakness of our faith, which might grow weary and fall away, must be supported and cherished by patient hope and expectation. For this reason Paul justly says, "We are saved by hope," (Rom. 8: 24.) For while hope silently waits for the Lord, it restrains faith from hastening on with too much precipitation, confirms it when it might waver in regard to the promises of God or begin to doubt of their truth, refreshes it when it might be fatigued, extends its view to the final goal, so as not to allow it to give up in the middle of the course, or at the very outset. In short, by constantly renovating and reviving, it is ever and anon furnishing more vigor for perseverance. (3.2.22)

In the absence of tangible signs of God's presence, no longer believing in the power of intercessory prayer or ritual observation to assure salvation, reformers like Calvin instead sought comfort in scriptural promise and the church fathers' exegeses of how that promise played out in human experience. Wavering hope need not be interpreted as a sign of weak faith. Instead, provided that faith prevailed, the believer could actually come to a stronger expression of faith through struggle; the dynamic tension between faith and hope constantly assured the believer that his or her faith was authentic and salvation assured.

It is this emotional journey from absence to doubt to renewed faith that lends poem 278 its particularly Protestant feel, as this journey (and its public performance) figured prominently in accounts of Protestant martyrdom under Mary. The poem's construction of martyrdom, which emphasizes the martyr's doubt and the performance of faith, resonates with Foxe's accounts of the Protestant martyrs as John Knott interprets them. Knott reads Foxe's understanding of suffering as diverging from that of the medieval mystics, who "welcome abuses of the body as if seeking to imitate the passion of Christ" (723). Instead, Knott argues, these Protestant martyrs as described by Foxe "do not embrace pain as a means of joining themselves with the body of the suffering Christ. Rather, they see suffering and pain as a trial of faith sent by God and as something to be endured and overcome through faith with the help of grace" (725-726).

Grace plays a similar role in poem 278, as a divinely sent aid that enables the lover to transcend his suffering. After the debate between Doubt and Hope concludes, the speaker relates that

When hope hath thus his reason said,
Lord how I fele me well apaid.
A new blood then orespredes my bones,
That al in joy I stand at ones.
My handes I throw to heven above,

And humbly thank the god of love.
That of his grace I should bestow,
My love so well as I it owe.

(no. 278, 226.24-31)

With the appearance of hope, the speaker has come through his trial invigorated and strengthened in his love, and he believes that he owes this strength to the grace he has been given. The “god of love” in Petrarchan terms usually refers to Cupid, but the association of “grace” with the divinity gives the phrase more Christian overtones. Like the speaker of 272, the speaker sees the attainment of his beloved as a kind of reward, but unlike the other speaker, he has found meaning in the suffering he has endured, as that very suffering proves the strength of his faith and love and the value of grace.

Publicly proving such faith also constituted an important part of the experience of martyrdom. By performing this process for the community, the Protestant martyrs shifted the focus from individual to communal salvation; as Knott reads the accounts, “Foxe underscored the importance of their acts of witnessing to this community and stressed that their words would survive” (728). Likewise, when the speaker of no. 278 narrates his experience for the reader, it becomes both a personal narrative and written testament to the power of faith and the rewards of love. Not only does he perform his devotion for his beloved, he offers an antidote to the “old pamphlets” and books Doubt cites in

arguing that love is always doomed and challenges the written tradition. In a volume filled with dissatisfied lovers and unrequited love, the contented situation of the lover in poem 278 stands out.

By reading poem 272's more "Catholic" construction of love and suffering against poem 278's more "Protestant" version, I do not intend to hold up these contrasting views as evidence that Catholicism and Protestantism are at war within the pages of the *Miscellany*, or even to claim that these particular poems represent clearly thought out and coherent ideologies. Instead, I suggest that we read these poems not as statements of rigid or even classifiable positions that jar, but as lyrics that demonstrate the extent to which poetic tradition and personal belief interacted to form more elastic ideological responses to religious change than the violent extremes might seem to allow. Catholic and Protestant authorities could prescribe changes to public worship and creed, but they could not control how those changes would be followed, ignored, or altered to fit an individual's own system of belief. Nor could they prevent the proliferation of more radical religious ideas inspired by the climate of questioning and debate and facilitated by poetic experimentation and circulation.

Indeed, the very form of a printed miscellany, which brings together multiple poems and perspectives, allows for the formation of heterodoxy. In the next section, I focus on two anonymous poems, 184 and 277, that illustrate the ways in which the

circulation of lyric poetry, particularly in the print context of the *Miscellany*, provided a forum for the articulation of radical religious identities – in this case, two antithetical but equally nonconformist positions, one of which does seem to voice a coherent system of religious belief. These poems suggest that English lyric poetry, particularly the varieties presented in the *Miscellany*, synthesized native and Italian traditions and the influences of the Protestant Reformation in ways that helped develop both the secular and confessional modes to flourish.

Acts of Conformity and Rebellion: Poems 227 and 184

However the author of no. 278 might regard his situation as analogous to the religious martyr's, he is nevertheless more concerned with making that comparison explain and validate his erotic suffering than vice versa. This privileging of the secular over the spiritual offended some Elizabethans, who published volumes of religious verse in an attempt to counteract the effects of frivolous books such as the *Miscellany*; Thomas Brice's 1567-68 moralizing anthology even borrowed Tottel's title, *Songs and Sonnets*, in its "direct approach to neutralizing the evil" (Pomeroy 5). Poem 278, however, for its valuing of earthly, romantic love, still treats the experience of martyrdom thoughtfully and indicates that the language and concepts of spirituality informed people's experiences

outside of church and prayer. For this poet, there was nothing untoward in the simultaneous contemplation of embodied and divine passions, nor does the poem set the two modes of being in opposition to and in contradiction with each other. On the contrary, by comparing the two, the speaker arrives at a greater understanding of how these passions complement and enable each other.

While John King identifies “gospelling poetry” and “the Petrarchan love songs of the courtiers” as the two dominant poetic modes in the Reformation court of Edward VI (211), the poems I have just discussed indicate that the two influences sometimes intersected in the same poem. Although none of the poems previously mentioned properly could be termed religious verse, nonetheless religious concerns inform the way the poet structures the relationship between the lover and the beloved. In yet another pair of poems, no. 184 and no. 277, however, the conflict between public devotion and private conscience raises the specters of heterodoxy and disbelief and transforms the purpose of the courtly lyric in two distinct ways, indicating a split in the way the form functioned. No. 277 rejects religious experience and uses the Petrarchan love lyric as an escape from religious controversy, while no. 184 conversely rejects the Petrarchan tradition in favor of a more confessional mode of lyrical expression. Both of these reactions, I believe, can be traced to the instability of the Reformation and its impact on individuals’ systems of belief.

Beginning with Henry VIII's 1534 Act of Supremacy, the Tudor monarchs embarked on a new and ambitious project: to legislate their subjects' consciences and to enforce conformity to an erratic and unstable succession of religious laws. In England following Henry's break with Rome, the people were forced to take part in a bewilderingly rapid series of liturgical and doctrinal changes, many of which were later reversed. The royal vision of reform was never especially clear or consistent; as Susan Brigden argues of Henry's position, "the royal intention might have been to hold a 'mean [middle], indifferent, true and virtuous way' between two alternative visions of salvation, but his people were left confused, and he himself was inconstant, manipulable, and unable to control the pace of events" (Brigden *New Worlds, Lost Worlds* 122). Many parishes officially accepted the new standard but quietly continued to practice in their chosen way, or they complied for a while but eventually returned to their former customs. The people of Canterbury, for example, were forced in 1538 to abandon their "great procession and pageant," only to resume the practice four years later when the political winds changed (Haigh 159). Altars went up and came down at what must have seemed a bewilderingly rapid pace, and local practice did not always match public decree.

Enforcing public conformity is one thing, but making sure that all subjects truly believed in the orthodoxy of the moment is another. Full-hearted and true conversion remained difficult when even those leaders at the forefront of reformation or counter-

reformation could not always agree on what the official line should be. Referring to a disagreement over the use of priestly vestments, the Protestant Bishop Nicholas Ridley wrote in 1555 to his co-religionist, Bishop John Hooper, of “the time past in certain byematters and circumstances of religion, [when] your wisdom and my simplicity (I grant) have a little jarred, each of us following his own sense and judgment” (Ridley 355). Ridley and Hooper at least had the luxury of conviction to enable them to work out the details and come to a public policy they could both live with – or die for, as it so happened. For the bulk of the English subjects, who had no say in official church policy as Ridley and Hooper did, and many of whom likely did not have the understanding of theology and scripture that the clerics did, the debates over vestments and candles, rood screens and holy day processions must have had entirely different repercussions.

Faced with confusing pronouncements and a lack of consistency on the part of their leaders, all that mattered for most people was obeying the laws – but how could they obey laws that kept changing and still maintain a strong faith? What was the net effect of all of the efforts at reform on the spiritual lives of the people? For the average churchgoer, the struggles of the Reformation may have forced a re-evaluation of the relationship between private faith and public devotion, and of the shared meanings for the community. Occasionally they provoked questions about the nature of belief itself, and

in some they seem to have led to a kind of spiritual exhaustion, such as is hinted at in the *Miscellany*'s no. 277.

Poem 277 is a translation of Petrarch's poem 3 of the *Rime sparse* (see Appendix B for full texts), but the alterations the English poet made to the Italian original may stem from more than just the difficulties and nuances of translation. Indeed, the English poet translated Petrarch's sonnet into an entirely different cultural context, a world in which the rituals of the Roman Catholic church had been removed from the English observation of one of the major Christian holy days, Good Friday. In both poems the subjects are struck violently by love in church on Good Friday, but there the similarities between the two poems end. When we read no. 277 against the changes made to English devotional life by what Duffy terms the "stripping of the altars," we can see how these changes affected the individual's experience of the liturgical year.

The author of 277 attempted to write a sonnet, as the 14-line form suggests, but as the subtleties of the iambic pentameter and the Italianate sonnet's rhyme scheme escape him, his poem is limited in its attempt to mimic Petrarch's technique. More than just the technical aspects of Petrarch's *rime* change in the translation, however. Poem 277 alters the attitude of the speaker towards the religious holiday he is supposed to be observing, and in doing so, suggests that the upheavals of the English reformations profoundly altered not only the relationship of the individual to his own spiritual experience, but also

the relationship between the individual and his community – with often painful and disorienting results.

Both poems make clear that the lover's experience takes place on Good Friday, one of the major days in the church's liturgical calendar. Petrarch's references to "il giorno ch'al sol si scoloraro," "the day when the sun's rays turned pale with grief" (Durling 38) and the English poet's location of his experience on "the day on which the sunne deprived of his light, / To rew Christs death amid his course gave place unto the night" (220.4-5) situate the poems on the Friday before Easter, the day when observant Christians mourned the crucifixion of Christ.⁴⁵ In case his readers missed the date, Tottel provides a title that reinforces the poem's religious setting: "The lover sheweth that he was stricken by love on good Friday." Good Friday, as I will discuss in more detail presently, was the culmination of the Lenten season; it was an occasion for the worshiper not only to reflect and repent, but also to share some of Christ's suffering and thus to appreciate his sacrifice more deeply.

Where Petrarch's speaker seems profoundly affected by the holy day, the speaker of Tottel's 277 presents a striking indifference to or detachment from the emotional

⁴⁵ The image of the sun dimming originates with the account of the crucifixion in the Gospel of Luke: "It was now about noon, and darkness came over the whole land until three in the afternoon, when the sun's light failed" (Luke 23: 44-45). Matthew and Mark also record the noontime darkness but do not mention the sun (*New Oxford Annotated Bible*).

suffering going on around him. This detachment reveals itself in the speaker's description of how he comes to fall victim to love's arrows. Petrarch's speaker at least gestures towards the piety the worshiper is meant to show the holy day: he claims that he is disarmed against love because "Tempo non mi pareo da far riparo / contr' a' colpi d amor," "It did not seem to me a time for being on guard against love's blows." The speaker is not thinking about love because his mind is on higher, more spiritual matters; it is not a time for love, but rather, a time for penitence and suffering, "nel commune dolor s'incominciaro," "while general grieving gripped those solemn days." He is therefore an easy target for the mischievous god of love, because he is not expecting an attack from that direction.

The speaker of Tottel's 277, however, does not seem to be occupied with spiritual concerns. He relates that, on this darkest of days, "I amid mine ease did fall to such distemperate fits, / That for the face that hath my hart I was bereft my wits" (6-7). The most emotionally trying day of the liturgical year seems an odd time to be in a state of "ease," without care or concern of any kind. Tottel's more devout readers, whatever direction they leaned, might expect him to already be in a state of distress, or at least to be occupied with reflecting on the meaning of Christ's suffering and death. Instead, he is "dwelling in most quiet state," (10) which could indicate a reflective mood, except that he is "voide of care" (12). As someone who "fared as one that feared none ill" he is

certainly not reflecting on the inevitability of his own death and the fragile nature of his own mortality (9).

The speaker only becomes agitated when love strikes him; moreover, the process by which he falls in love with his mistress (“the face that hath mine hart”) could be interpreted by the devout reader as a punishment for his lack of appropriate piety. At the very least, it appears that this absence of piety opens the way for Love’s attack, suggesting that the erotic pain the lover soon feels substitutes for the seasonally required spiritual suffering. The speaker relates that “love that vewed me voide of care, approacht to take his pray,” the play on prey/pray reinforcing the idea that the god of love exacts from his victim the investment that the speaker does not willingly give the Christian God. He goes on to describe how “love ... stept by stelth from eye to hart, so open lay the way,” implying that the speaker’s gaze was not occupied with contemplating divine matters.

That Cupid finds an easy way in through the speaker’s eyes, which are unoccupied with any kind of visual contemplation, suggests that we can situate poem 277 squarely in the middle of the doctrinal debate over the destruction of images, a debate that was particularly relevant to the observance of Good Friday. A 1547 letter from Bishop Stephen Gardiner to his evangelical opponent, Bishop Ridley, protests the banning of the ritual of “creeping to the cross.” The evangelicals had argued that the

practice promoted the false adoration of idols and abused the crucifix as a graven image. Gardiner, while agreeing with Ridley that both the scriptures and the Church fathers forbid idolatry, nevertheless defends the traditional Good Friday practice:

And yet there is forbidden *cultus divinus*, and agreeth with our before said doctrine, by which we may creep before the cross on Good Friday; wherein we have the image of the crucifix in honor, and use it in a worshipful place, and so earnestly look on it, and conceive that it signifieth, as we kneel and creep before it, while it lies there, and while that remembrance is in exercise. (*Letters of Stephen Gardiner* 257)

Gardiner acknowledges that in “specialties there have been abuses,” but, he maintains. “generally images have been taken for images, with an office to signify an holy remembrance of Christ and his saints” (257). As with any prescription, a gap exists between theory and practice; people do not always use the image in the way that they are meant to. Nevertheless, he argues, the reasoning behind the practice is sound, and they should not discard it simply because some people misuse it.

He goes on to defend the ritual of “creeping to the cross” by describing the way that the image of the crucifix aids the worshiper in understanding and appreciating Christ’s sacrifice. He explains that images work on the eyes the way the reformers claim the words of the gospel work on the ears: “so doth the object of the image, by the sight,

work like effect in man, within and without; wherein is verily worshiped that we understand, and yet reverence and worship also showed to that whereby we attain that understanding” (257-258). The image is not an object of worship unto itself but instead is to us in the place of an instrument, so as it hath no worship of itself, but remaineth in his nature, of stone or timber, silver, copper, or gold. But when it is in office, and worketh a godly remembrance on us, by representation of the thing signified unto us, then we use it worshipfully and honorably. (258)

Gardiner, with the same lawyerly precision Cranmer shows in explicating the communion ritual, here separates out the object itself from its use, and ordinary use from mystical. By understanding what the object represents, the observer comes to understand the deeper meaning of Christ’s sacrifice. Where the evangelicals would have believers experience the passion through the words of the gospel, conservatives such as Gardiner believed that the visual connection with the crucifix provides an equally (if not more) authentic route to divine revelation. Indeed, in 1548, Gardiner was called to task by the Council for continuing to practice the traditional Holy Week ceremonies, including the ceremony in which the host is buried in a sepulcher until Easter Sunday (Duffy 461).

At stake in this debate and those on other points of Reformation contention is the very nature of authentic spiritual experience: how best can the clergy direct their flocks

towards the contemplation of higher matters? In what ways, the clerics ask, do Christians actively and authentically engage with the divine? In a world in which icons have been banned, the speaker of poem 277 seems to have difficulty connecting with the spirit of Good Friday. Without the crucifix to contemplate, his eyes lay open to worldly distraction, or at least to another sort of spiritual occupation: contemplation of his mistress. Gardiner might argue that the replacement of saints' images and the observation of the crucifix would prevent such straying; in his view, ceremonies such as creeping to the cross give worshipers like the distracted lover a focal point and assistance in putting themselves in the proper mindset for the season.

The English poet may not intentionally downplay the liturgical setting, but in a culture where the traditional practices had (at least temporarily) been banned, he may unconsciously reveal the space that was left by their absence and the beliefs and practices that filled the void. Whatever the cause of the lover's lack of piety, his fall into unrequited love simulates the grief he sees around him, emphasizing not only the intensely spiritual nature of his devotion to the beloved but also the sense of detachment from his community this experience causes. Durling's translation of Petrarch's poem reads "onde i mei guai / nel commune dolor s'incominciaro" as "and so my misfortunes began in the midst of the universal woe," creating a link between the lover's suffering and that of the people around him. The English poet, in contrast, relates that "that day

gan my secret sighs, when all folk wept in sight,” highlighting the contrast between publicly acceptable spiritual suffering and the “secret” erotic pain he suffers. Religious penitents may weep in public, but his care, the result of a pain rooted in erotic injury, is something that he must keep secret. Ironically, love’s attack produces tears also, “salt that did declare, / By token of their bitter taste that they were forged of care,” but the suffering does not lead the lover to a feeling of transcendence. Instead, he ends the poem by reiterating the point that he was a “wight unwise, unweaponed, and unaware” and hence susceptible to love’s attack (220.17). He explains his suffering but does not seek to make sense of it or transcend it.

The speaker’s sense of alienation from his community is subtle, but the effect is noticeable. His pain is of the wrong variety and therefore must be kept secret; erotic love is an exercise in deception, from love’s stealthy attack to the lover’s inability to communicate with his beloved. It also takes the place of spiritual penance. Instead of mourning Christ’s sacrifice, the lover elevates his mistress to the status of a divine object. She, “defenst with virtues rare,” is protected against love, but he suffers all of the pain in her place (220.17). This kind of idolization of the beloved prompted criticism from opponents of Petrarchan verse, even those such as Sidney who were influenced by it, that the form was idolatrous (Hamrick 341).

Nevertheless, the unwitting lover seems to find in his unrequited love the same sort of emotional satisfaction (or dissatisfaction, as the case may be) as the worshipers around him find in their religious penance, suggesting that the two kinds of experiences fulfill similar needs. Perhaps already distanced from his community, the lover finds an acceptable substitute connection with the figure of the beloved, however remote she may be, or perhaps falling in love with her gives him the authentic emotional experience he did not feel before. The popularity of the Petrarchan form in English suggests that the pain of unrequited devotion offers its own reward, a sense of satisfaction and purpose that outwardly – and even inwardly, too, perhaps – resembles the qualities of religious devotion. By the end of the poem, Good Friday has ceased to matter, and the lover's entire world consists of his own misery, the "face that hath [his] heart," and the visual bond between the two. There is no room for religious contemplation, even if he had been so inclined.

Poem 277 may represent an attempt, conscious or not, to escape the religious conformity demanded of someone living in Tudor society, or it may illustrate the spiritual exhaustion produced by continual change in the structure of people's spiritual lives. Most likely this poem, as the others I have discussed do, gives voice to the conflicting positions people held (or held onto) as the culture around them changed. Christopher Haigh succinctly captures how disorienting some subjects must have found the shift when

he describes the Reformation for those people as “a real spiritual reorientation: from a Catholic mental universe of supportive saints and saving sacraments to a Protestant one of justifying faith nurtured by sermons and Bible readings” (3). Some people, perhaps the speaker of poem 277, must have been lost in the transformation from a physically grounded, sensory religious experience to a more cerebral and abstract one.

Yet another possibility the poem allows is that in the Petrarchan form the poet found the vocabulary and structure to express a deep and common sense of longing and alienation that could be satisfied through earthly means, whether or not more spiritual routes were available. Undoubtedly there were always individuals who chose a different path of spiritual understanding, or none at all, but who continued to publicly conform to legal and social requirements for living. The Reformation did not produce the problem of disbelief, but it certainly shook the foundations of the traditional religious institution enough to allow more questions to creep in. What if none of the debates over ritual and doctrine mattered? What if the same sort of meaning and satisfaction could be derived from an entirely different sort of devotion?

If lack of belief was a covert but real problem for the dominant culture, then equally was overzealous belief a problem. Where poem 277 offers erotic love and its poetic expression as escape from God, the anonymous 184 turns to prayer as an escape from the troubles of the world. It does so in a way that raises the question of how such an

openly Protestant poem, with its clear rejection of traditional means of salvation, escaped the notice of the Marian censors. Emphasizing the written word as the key to understanding the divine, and subjecting the individual spiritual life to poetic scrutiny, poem 184 comes the closest of all the *Miscellany*'s poems to modeling the Protestant poetics, with its obligation to publicly confess and evangelize, that Barbara Lewalski identifies as central to the work of early seventeenth-century poets such as Herbert and Donne (13). It also serves as an example of how this mode of poetic expression, threatening to the Catholic authorities of 1557 and only a bit less so to the moderate Elizabethan settlement, found a ready conduit in the print medium.

Lewalski locates in the later Protestant poetics a “call for...the painstaking analysis of the formal religious life” (13), the poet using scriptural language that “mediate[s] in some vital way between general spiritual concepts and personal experience” as the main tool of this analysis (73). Poem 184 illustrates an earlier version of this poetics and narrates a conversion experience that makes use of the same language and vocabulary that Queen Katherine Parr used in her *Lamentation of a Sinner*, the first Protestant devotional work by a woman to be printed (1547). The opening lines of the poem (see Appendix B for full text) demonstrate an evangelical conceptualization of the workings of faith and salvation:

Unto the living Lord for pardon do I pray,

From whom I grant even from the shell, I have run still astray.
And other lives there none (my death shall well declare)
On whom I ought to grate for grace, as faulty folks do fare.
But thee o Lord alone, I have offended so,
That this small scourge is much to scant for mine offence I know.

(no. 184, 136.28-33)

The poem addresses God directly, without recourse to an intermediary. No longer is the individual believer dependent upon a priest's intercession; instead, he can speak directly to God or seek comfort and guidance from the scriptures. Indeed, it is the "faulty folkes" who look to another human being rather than directly to God to assure their salvation — or, as the poet puts it, "to grate for grace," his use of the verb "grate" revealing his contempt for such practices. Grace, in the theology of the Protestants, could not be requested or earned. It was freely given and existed solely between God and the individual believer. Whatever this speaker has done to himself or to others, he acknowledges that it is God alone who is responsible for his salvation, and therefore God alone whom he has offended in his prior life.

The description of this prior life casts the poem as a conversion narrative, one that stresses, as poem 278 does, that Protestants regarded the painful quality of religious experience as that which marked it as authentic. In the former life,

I ran without return, the way the world liked best
And what I ought most to regard, that I respected least
The throng wherein I thrust, hath thrown me in such case
That Lord my soul is beset without thy greater grace

(no.184.136.34-37)

The reference to caring for worldly things more than spiritual resonates with other conversion narratives of the period, as well as with the *Miscellany's* golden mean poems. Katherine Parr likewise describes the sin of her former ways as an error of both feeling and judgment: "When I consider, in the bethinking of myne evill, wretched former life, myne obstynate, stony, and untractable herte, to have so much exceeded in evilnes, yet it hath not only neglected, yea condemned, & despised goddes holy precepts and commaundments" (A1r). Disobedience, and therefore its opposite, obedience born of true faith, is located in the heart.

Conversion to true and "living" faith, therefore, must also take place in the heart. In language that anticipates Donne's erotically and physically charged devotional poetry, the author of no. 184 provides an explanation of how he intends to make up for the years of false belief:

No day no night no place no hour no moment I shall fail
My soul shall never cease with an assured faith

To knock, to crave, to call to cry to thee for help which sayeth

Knock and it shall be heard, but ask and given it is

(no.184.137.9-12)

Knocking, craving, and crying convey an intensity of emotional and physical experience that is mirrored in some of the *Miscellany's* Petrarchan verses; like the Petrarchan lover in 278, the worshiper in 184 knows his experience is real because he feels the mingling of pain and pleasure that is answered by the "assurance" that his supplication is heard and answered. Spiritual fulfillment here, and in Katherine Parr's account, seems akin to masochism:

Yea with how fervent a spirit ought I to call, cry, & pray to the lord,
to make his great charity to burn, and flame in my heart... Yet never had
this unspeakable and most high charity, and abundant love of god, printed
& fixed in my hart duly, till it pleased god of his mere grace, mercy, &

pity

to open mine eyes, making me to see and behold with the eye of lively
faith, Christ crucified to be mine only savior and redeemer" (B5r-v).

Such experience is different from masochism, however, because it is answered and alleviated by the sense that the believer is not alone, nor is his or her suffering submitted to another's pleasure. Instead, it is subsumed within the larger framework of Christ's

sacrifice and the redemption thereby secured for, in Thomas Cranmer's words, "the company of all faithful people" (*First Prayer Book of Edward VI* 227). Salvation is at once an individual and a communal experience, one person's drama played out within the larger narrative of mankind's fall and redemption.

This Protestant need to transform personal example into public model motivates her not only to write the tract but also to publish it, whereby it will gain a wider audience. Parr states explicitly at the beginning of her tract that the need to confess does not stem from church but from God's commandment itself. The duty to evangelize provides the impetus for public, not private, confession. Parr says that she is inspired to write and publish "partly by the love I owe to all Christians, whom I am content to edify, even with the example of mine own shame, forced and constrained with my hart and words to confess and declare to the world, how ingrate, negligent, unkind, and stubborne, I have been to god my Creatour" (A1v.). For such a public statement to come from a former queen must have been powerful indeed.

Where Parr's intention may be to evangelize, however, the poet of no. 184 seems to have a more private purpose, the lyrical form seeming to emphasize the highly personal nature of his experience. He addresses God directly and offers the poem as a "small scourge," a private moment of penance that he insists is "much too scant" to atone for his sins (136.33). Nevertheless, he employs the same vocabulary of scripture and

theology of grace as Katherine Parr does, language that is perhaps subtle enough in its use of scripture that it would escape conservative notice but that employs a vocabulary and constructs a certain view of salvation that would make it noticeable to someone who shared the same views. The speaker pleads, “Refuse not to receive that thou so dear hast bought, / For but by thee alone I know all safety in vain is sought” (137.27-28), a request that would have been safe for Katherine Parr to make in Edwardian 1547 but one that virtually guaranteed imprisonment and death in 1557. The assertion that it was “by thee alone” a Christian received salvation stood as shorthand for the rejection of everything that Mary’s Roman Catholic counter-Reformation stood for: salvation by good works, the sacrament of priestly confession, and the belief that by receiving the Eucharist, a worshiper did not simply remember Christ’s death but took part in it through the miracle of transubstantiation.

Queen Katherine Parr’s timing was more auspicious for the circulation of radical Protestant ideas. In 1547, when Parr published *Lamentation of a Sinner*, Henry VIII had just died and Edward had come to the throne. Diarmaid MacCulloch argues that the accession of the Protestant prince, the “King Josiah” who would “purify the realm,” enabled the new regime “to set out to destroy one Church and build another” (*Boy King* 57). The extent to which the reforms of the Edwardian period were predetermined is debated by historians, but the climate in which the *Lamentation* appeared was certainly

one that was more favorable to evangelical writings. The Calvinist “priesthood of all believers” seemed to be within sight of the evangelicals driving the pace of reform.

In 1557, however, the “priesthood of all believers” was subject to persecution, and those who did not want to become a martyrs had to be careful about the sort of language they used. Poem 184 is both anonymous and undated, so it is more difficult to derive clues about its purpose from its context. Brigden has proposed that Surrey was the author of 184, in which case the poem may have been the product of his religious experimentation of the late 1530s and 1540s (“Henry Howard” 515). At the time of his death, Brigden argues, Surrey had turned his back on the reformed faith favored by his sister and his former associates, a factor she sees as having figured prominently in their turn against him (536). If he did write 184, he would have had to have done so before 1547, during a period when Henry’s rejection of the Roman church, with its doctrine of purgatory, and equally strong rejection of the doctrine of justification by faith alone left the English church caught in a new kind of purgatory (MacCulloch, *Boy King* 58). Read against this context, poem 184 provides a refreshingly clear statement of personal and ideological certainty that contrasts with the muddled theological politics surrounding it.

I can find no textual support, however, for the assertion that Surrey wrote poem 184; as Rollins argues, the poem is a “mosaic of Biblical expression,” one that could have been compiled by anyone with a knowledge of scripture (Rollins 2.267). A manuscript

copy of the poem survives in a Harington manuscript (BL MSS Add. 28635) (Rollins 2.266), suggesting that it may have been produced by someone in the Harington coterie. However, the original date when the poem was written matters less here than does the context in which it first appeared in publication, in the *Miscellany* and during the summer of 1557. It would have been dangerous enough for such a poem to have circulated in manuscript in the mid-1540s, either prior to Henry's death or while its author was imprisoned in the Tower – Katherine Parr's own near brush with imprisonment at the hands of Bishop Gardiner reminds us that theological experimentation was, if anything, more dangerous the closer one got to the center of power (James 264).

For such a poem to appear in print in 1557, though, a climate even more dangerous for Protestant writings, would seem a virtual death sentence for its author. Its appearance in a printed book ensured that its private confession would be made public and that its evangelizing message would reach readers outside of small coterie circles, even if the poet did not wish it to be so. Through the act of publication, poem 184 becomes the one truly subversive poem in the collection, one that rejects not only the world (“And let the world then work such wayes, as to the world seems mete,” 137.34) but also the doctrine that its public world in 1557 lived by. Even if it was not written as a public statement of Protestant faith as Katherine Parr's tract was, it becomes so in the pages of the *Miscellany*, a book intended for consumption among the wider reading

circles of the merchants, lawyers, and citizens of London. If those readers were Protestants or sympathetic to Protestant beliefs, they could find a comforting message in poem 184's model of confessional devotion: that they were not alone, and that such beliefs could survive even in the face of oppression.

Tottel's book, however, also softens the poem's edges enough that it can slip by unnoticed by the authorities or be acceptable to readers who did not share the poem's theological outlook. Attributed to an anonymous author and sandwiched in between a more general philosophical lament "Of the wretchedness in this world" (183) and an innocuous, pseudo-Petrarchan lyric, "The lover here telleth of his diverse joys and adversities in love and lastly of his lady's death" (185), the "repentant sinner in durance and adversity" might be a sinner of any stripe, not necessarily one that would cause trouble and die publicly for his unorthodox faith. Unless one reads carefully, the poet's voice is simply one of many, voicing a generally acceptable sentiment of shame and regret, its theology of salvation by faith alone blending in with poem 277's rejection of any kind of religious doctrine, which in turn blends in with the other poems' more moderate poetics. Even hyper-vigilant editors and the system of censorship they worked under could miss one subversive statement, or look the other way.

Still, it might seem strange to modern readers that such diametrically opposed expressions of belief as those expressed by 277 and 184, not to mention the multiplicity

of positions posed in the other poems I have examined, could exist within the same textual framework. I propose that this tension and coexistence, however, was a quality particular to English spiritual thought, born of the Reformation experience, and it found its ideal medium for expression in the poetic miscellany. Viewed from the perspective of *Tottel's Miscellany*, the English Reformation appears as what Ethan Shagan argues it was, a patchwork of political movements that was pulled from one side by evangelizing, reformist impulses modeled after the German reformations, and from the other side by a dedication to traditional theologies and forms of worship reinstated in the mid-1550s through England's dynastic connection to Spain. Individuals fell any number of places within that tapestry, and some even fell outside of it entirely.

Nevertheless, the political reformations made very real impacts on the daily lives of people and communities; in addition to changes to worship and parish structure, as Shagan argues, subjects "daily confronted issues of resistance and collaboration" (12). Those individuals and groups had to find ways to live under the new official system, whatever it happened to be at the moment. In the poems I have discussed, we can see examples of ways individuals coped with and reconceptualized religious thought. More importantly, though, we can see how these changes in doctrine impacted the courtly, poetic discourse of love. While most of the poems do not openly or intentionally deal with controversial doctrines, in some we see the Protestant notion of salvation by grace

either accepted (as in no. 278, “The lover describeth his whole state unto his love, and promising her his faithful good will assureth himself of hers again”) or rejected (as in no. 272, “The lover declareth his paines to excede far the paines of hell”) as a meaningful way to conceptualize the rewards or frustrations of earthly love. These poems are distant from both Petrarch’s Roman Catholic model and Spenser’s ideal of Protestant marriage as articulated in the *Amoretti* and *Epithalamion*, but they demonstrate as clearly as those examples do how deeply the languages of spiritual devotion and erotic desire informed each other in the culture, as well as how emotionally and socially destabilizing changes in the officially sanctioned language could be.

If the individual lyrics can help us map personal responses to the Reformation, the question of what cultural work these poems do together, as a lyrical body, is complicated by their textual transmission from manuscript to print. To Stephen Hamrick’s argument that they reveal an editor’s “strategic placement” of Catholic poetics as a subversive statement (344), I answer that identifying Tottel’s religious beliefs through the *Miscellany*’s poems is a vexed and perhaps impossible task. Instead, we must first return to the question of whether the *Miscellany* is more precisely a miscellany, “a largely haphazard or practical assembly of material,” an anthology, a volume for sophisticated readers “guided by a critical intelligence” that selected and modified the texts for wider

consumption (Lerer 1255), or whether it contains elements of both. How we characterize the volume has bearing on how we identify the cultural work that it does.

I hope that the earlier chapters of this study have persuasively established the *Miscellany* as containing *both* miscellaneous and anthologistic qualities; I believe that without question the book carries traces of the critical intelligence that selected and organized its material, and that that editor attempts to construct a cultural ethos through the texts and apparatus. By Tottel's own admission, he selected texts that represented to him the best fruits of poetic accomplishment in the English language; not accidentally, these texts were largely aristocratic and courtly, or they at least developed a patina of courtliness by association. The cultural ethos the book actively constructs is therefore one of social authority and courtly, literary sophistication; as an anthology, it offers its readers a new identity as a member of a literary elite.

At the same time, however, as I hope this chapter has demonstrated, the book's identity as a miscellany complicates the ethos it attempts to establish, and the positions that Tottel's preface intentionally takes are accompanied by social, political, and religious implications that the editor probably did not intend. A culture in the midst of great change speaks through each poet and each poem, frustrating the printer's attempt to control textual meaning or the modern reader's attempts to place the book firmly within a rigid ideological framework. This may have been precisely the quality that appealed to

early modern readers, though, as the volume is able to give voice to a wide range of experiences and positions that were officially silenced, or at least discouraged, alongside those that were representative of or encouraged by the dominant groups.

Furthermore, the patchwork nature of the book's definition of literature reflects the contours of other institutions that shaped the early modern reader's experience. The institution that acquired a character most analogous to that of the English literary tradition Tottel begins to establish – one of mediation, synthesis, and identity through incorporating difference – was the Elizabethan church. The religious settlement eventually achieved under Elizabeth was formed through a peculiar combination of personalities, circumstance, and recent history. When Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558, a year after the *Miscellany*'s first edition appeared, Marian exiles who had been abroad returned full of excitement and the zeal of reform inspired by their contact with the purer Calvinism of the Genevan churches (Usher 18). They encountered resistance, however, from a relentlessly pragmatic queen who sought to maintain some ecclesiastical links with the previous regime and who was, at any rate, wary of fanaticism in any form. Elizabeth's accession did not mark the triumph of the Reformation, nor were the evangelicals able simply to resume the work that had been interrupted by Edward's death. The settlement achieved over the long years of Elizabeth's reign continued to incorporate the ideas and projects of the Calvinist clerics, but, however "unreservedly Protestant" it

was doctrinally, liturgically and ritually it was a *via media* (Usher 4), an institution that has continued, throughout its entire life, to mediate between the stark simplicities of Protestant theology and the rich, colorful traditions of Catholic liturgy.

Even earlier than the Elizabethan settlement, Cranmer's 1552 Prayer Book displays a similar sense of collaboration between the old and the new, if somewhat self-consciously and defensively. In the conclusion of the communion service, Cranmer provides a note to explain his decision to keep the custom of kneeling at the altar:

And yet because brotherly charity willeth, that so much as conveniently may be, offenses should be taken away, therefore we willing to do the same. Whereas it is ordered in the book of common prayer, in the administration of the Lords supper, that the communicants kneeling should receive the holy communion: which thing being well meant, for a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ, given unto the worthy receiver, and to avoid the profanation and disorder, which about the holy communion might else ensue. Lest the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare that it is not meant thereby, that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread or wine there received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural body and blood.

(*Second Prayer Book* 392-393)

Cranmer's decision seems to be based partly in a desire to please as many members of the congregation as possible and to make the changes to the liturgy more palatable. Out of "brotherly charity," according to him, he keeps the action, but he reinscribes its meaning, establishing a conciliation between old practices and new liturgical meanings.

The impulse to mediate and negotiate, then, seems to have been in the air for decades before Tottel's book appeared. Perhaps Tottel was further influenced by his contact with the Inns of Court, where English lawyers practiced their peculiar blend of common law and canon law. Richard Helgerson points out that Renaissance legal theorists' emphasis on the uniqueness of the English legal system was ideologically motivated, but he also maintains that the system's reputation was grounded in very real differences between English and continental systems (71). Many of those English lawyers were also the officials who during Elizabeth's early reign administered "as best they could such portions of the ancient canon law as remained valid in the wake of the Henrician break with Rome nearly thirty years earlier" (Usher 4).

The mediation between old traditions and new ideas, and sometimes between competing traditions, thus distinguishes the English legal system, church, and nascent literary tradition at the time of the *Miscellany*'s publication, and it plays out in the book as well. On the one hand, the *Miscellany*'s poems reveal that erotic discourse could be

used to explore, in a less controversial way than pamphlets and tracts did, the psychological and emotional needs that suffering and martyrdom fulfilled for the individual, as well as the ways in which religion and love operated along similar lines of desire. On the other hand, as a lyrical body they also show how, on a societal level, English culture was re-negotiating the meaning of familiar symbols and ideas and learning how to reconcile or at least live with a variety of interpretations. In post-Reformation England, the nature of faith and the meaning of sacrifice were hotly contested; where before people had one orthodoxy to join them, now numerous heterodoxies entered their experience, dividing and dissenting.

This is not to say that before the Reformation everyone believed exactly the same thing, but rather, that England's break with Rome created a space for these heterodoxies to voice themselves. As Edward, Mary, and eventually Elizabeth discovered, a country divided by doctrinal and theological disagreement was not easily fashioned into a united, smoothly functioning national body of worshipers. Even as the state in its various guises as reformist or traditionalist attempted to coerce its subjects into obedience, some individuals voiced their dissent, however obliquely. No. 279, "Of the troubled commonwealth restored to quiet by the mighty power of god," seems to attempt to check such earthly powers; Tottel's title conveys the impression that the troubles are past and that peace has been achieved, but the body of the poem voices a different perspective. In

the mouth of God, “he on hie that secretly beholds / The state of thinges” (no. 279, 228.38-39), it places this warning:

As who should say, and are ye minded so?
And thus to those, and whom you know I love.
Am I such one as none of you do know?
Or know ye not that I sit here above,
And in my handes do hold your welth and wo,
To raise you now, and now to overthrow?
...
And in their handes I will your fall shallbe,
Whose fall in yours you sought so sore to see.

(229.2-7, 12-13)

The poem goes on to urge its readers to “Praise therefore now his mighty name in this, / And make accompt that this our ease doth stand” (229.17-18), but its earlier admonition still echoes: “Am I such one as *none* of you do know?” Its depiction of God is strikingly vengeful, and it does not at all inspire confidence that the “commonwealth” has been “restored to quiet.” If it is quiet, then it is simply the calm before the next storm.

Tottel’s title for this poem reveals the editor’s hand at work, attempting to smooth out the differences, but the rough edges remain. From the angle of this “site of friction,”

as Ethan Shagan would call it (7), the collection appears scattered and its identity fragmented. From another angle, however, the little book of lyric poetry offers a more unifying vision for its readers. In the conclusion of this project, I explore how the figures of Wyatt and Surrey helped forge a new cultural identity for the book's readers, one predicated upon the ties shared by a community of readers, all dedicated to pursuing and elevating the new, common goal of "English eloquence." These two poets, while undeniably figures of courtly accomplishment and sophistication with social significance, were also nevertheless figures of religious significance as well. In fashioning Wyatt, in particular, as a seminal figure for the elevation of English lyric poetry, Tottel's book also creates Wyatt as the national inscriber of a religious and lyrical conversion, a settlement by private reconciliation of public conflicts.

Conclusion

“The Ark of Rhymes:” *Tottel’s Miscellany* and the Course of “English Eloquence”

Much has been written on Wyatt’s Petrarchan verse and its influence on the English Renaissance poetic tradition. It is a critical commonplace to say as Michael Holahan does, that by “introducing Petrarch to England, Wyatt is assured a place in English literary history” (46). An understanding of how Wyatt’s legacy as a Petrarchan lyricist integrated with his legacy as a religious poet has thus far, however, largely seemed to escape critics.⁴⁶ Alexandra Halasz is one critic who has recently examined Surrey’s praise of Wyatt’s Penitential Psalms (no. 29 in the *Miscellany*), and she argues that Surrey’s poem, which “offers a consoling fantasy of poetic accomplishment,...tacitly positions Wyatt’s poem squarely in the central debate of Henry’s reign,” that of the

⁴⁶ Jan Lawson Hinely calls the slight attention to Wyatt’s psalms “reflective of a larger critical tendency to divide Wyatt’s works into disparate factions, native or Italianate, humanist or love poet.” Hinely, however, argues that the psalms “represent his efforts to recast [the concerns of his previous poetry] into spiritual rather than secular terms” (148). A handful of other critics have also regarded Wyatt’s devotional verse as an integral part of his poetic persona. Patricia Thomson includes Leland’s elegies on Wyatt in *Wyatt: the Critical Heritage* (1974), which surveys critical reactions to Wyatt from Leland in the sixteenth century through C.S. Lewis in the 1950s. The most widely known critical treatment of Wyatt’s religious verse is Stephen Greenblatt’s *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, in which Greenblatt argues that the “dramatic setting” of Wyatt’s penitential psalms “embeds the poems firmly in a world of royal power [Wyatt] inhabited” (121). Greenblatt further posits that the poems “offer us an almost formulaic reduction of the historical, psychological, and literary forces that we have encountered: *power over sexuality produces inwardness*” (125).

relationship between the sacred and the courtly (Halasz 194). In this conclusion to my project, I wish to consider this idea of a “consoling fantasy of poetic accomplishment” and how it helps to situate the *Miscellany* as a mediating force not in the debates about the relationship between the sacred and the courtly, but in the social and religious debates central to the 1550s that I have discussed in the course of this study.

The printer’s claims for the prestige of what he calls “English eloquence,” together with the poems he selects for publication, I suggest, constitute such a “fantasy,” one that envisions a shared cultural enterprise that can pull together a society fractured by religious, social, and political division. The inclusion of Surrey’s praise of Wyatt’s psalms together with Wyatt’s courtly verses in the *Miscellany*, help to position the figure of Wyatt and the volume itself in the mid-sixteenth century conflicts over religious faith and social cohesion. Wyatt’s psalms do not appear in the *Miscellany*, but Surrey’s praise of them makes the devotional poems crucial to the construction of Wyatt’s poetic identity in print, thus aligning the courtly poets with a more Protestant position. However, because Wyatt’s poetic persona represents a more moderate position than Surrey’s, both spiritually and socially, he can be seen as the figurehead for the cultural work of reconciliation that the *Miscellany* is capable of performing, the mediation among conflicting factors that threaten to tear individuals, and societies, apart.

The title that Tottel gave to Surrey's poem 29, "Praise of certain psalms of David, translated by sir T.w. the elder," refers to poems that are not included in the *Miscellany* but that played a crucial part in forming Wyatt's poetic reputation in print. Wyatt's verse rendition of the Penitential Psalms, adapted from Aretino and other sources, was first published in 1549 and proved to be immensely popular (Thomson, *Wyatt: the Critical Heritage* 3). Indeed, as Sessions reminds us, the Psalms were Wyatt's most well known verse in his own time (Sessions 247). Tottel's readers therefore would have known Wyatt not only as a courtly maker, but also as a sacred poet, one of the first printed voices of evangelical verse. This role was imagined for him by the elegies of both John Leland and the Earl of Surrey, whose "praise" of Wyatt's psalms Tottel included with the two other elegies I discussed in chapter three. Wyatt's poetic identity is thus not religiously neutral; like his political identity, formed by his own controversial connections and posthumously by his son's 1554 rebellion, it was charged with echoes of heterodoxy and dissent. Tottel may have attempted to defuse any connections between his book and the Wyatt rebellion by advertising Surrey as the primary author of the volume. It was Surrey's verses, though, that helped to carry Wyatt's reputation as a sacred poet into the *Miscellany* and argued for the potential cultural power of such poetic ability.

At the heart of Surrey's poem on Wyatt's psalms lies the question not only of what constitutes true faith, but also of what place sacred poetry holds in Tudor society. As Halasz has noted, the "consoling fantasy" of Surrey's poem focuses on "a world in which the greatest princes accord poetry a sacred place," but, I would add, it is also a world in which ordinary Christians recognize the value of Wyatt's verse (193). In the short poem, Surrey sets up a comparison between Wyatt and Homer, a lyrical poet and an epic:

The great Macedon, that out of Persie chased
Darius, of whose huge power all Asie rong,
In the rich ark dan Homer's rimes he placed,
Who fayned gests of heathen princes song.
What holy grave? what worthy sepulture
To Wiattes Psalms should Christians then purchase?
Where he doth paint the lively faith, and pure,
The steadfast hope, the swete returne to grace
Of just David, by perfite penitence.
Where rulers may se in a mirrour clere
The bitter fruit of false concupiscence:
How Jewry bought Urias death full dere.

In princes hartes gods scourge imprinted depe,
Ought them awake, out of their sinfull slepe.

(no. 29, 27.7-21)

Halasz argues that Surrey's question of what "worthy sepulcher" Christians should provide for Wyatt's *Penitential Psalms* "suspend[s] Wyatt's poem between the political and the religious, between princely and Christian determinations of value, as if their congruence would not be assured" (194). It also, I suggest, suspends Wyatt's verse between the lyric and the epic, tacitly inquiring whether lyric can do the work of epic, recording the works of a people and shaping for them a shared identity based on history and tradition.

For such work to take place, however, those Christians must accept the components of that common identity. I would add to Halasz's reading that not only does Surrey's fantasy demand a context in which kings and princes and all Christians agree on the value of sacred poetry, but it also demands one in which they also agree on the true nature of devotional experience. If the reader answers Surrey's question in a constructive way, finding an elevated place for sacred poetry, then the fantasy can be a healing one for a time of religious dissent, in that it imagines one concerted response to Wyatt's religious poems. As such it must have carried even more force by the time it was published by

Tottel, in the midst of the crown's energized campaign to stamp out heresy through burnings.

However, Surrey's claim that Wyatt "doth paint the liuely faith, and pure," is a charged one, and never more so than at the time of the *Miscellany's* publication. Wyatt's adaptation of the Penitential Psalms lent a decidedly evangelical cast to the ancient verses, for centuries a central part of medieval Christian practice; among his primary sources were Coverdale's 1535 English Bible, Tyndale's treatises and commentaries on the scriptures, and Zwingli's Latin translation of the psalms (Rebholz 453). As we have seen in poem 184 and in Queen Katherine Parr's devotional work, reformed Christians argued that theirs was the "liuely" or living faith, compared to what they regarded as the idolatrous and spiritually false faith of Roman Catholicism, and yet the more conservative and Catholic subjects showed an equal concern for truth. Bishop Gardiner for example, writing to Edward VI on the subject of the English Bible, expresses the Catholic wonder that "the people have born to have God's trewth among them so contaminate, sometyme, a man might say, with the malice of the translatur" (313). In Surrey's Christian community, all believers are simply "Christians," living in a world in which religious division disappears and all Christians come to accept the reformed standard of thought. Heresy does not exist, simply because all have chosen to join the "priesthood of all believers;" the fantasy then relies on the poet being able to efface the

conflicts that produced the poem, in much the same way that the *Miscellany*, the volume in which Surrey's poem appears in 1557 successfully conceals the social and economic labor that produced it.

The fantasy that Surrey's poem imagines, then, relies heavily on its belief that poetry can accomplish serious cultural work. Surrey imagines that Wyatt's psalms will serve to keep princes and kings in line with the moral standard, or, in Sessions's words, that "poets as prophets can help to protect the moral life of the community: rulers, beware" (248). When they are "In princes hartes gods scourge imprinted depe," then the poems "Ought [to] them awake out of their sinful slepe" (no. 29, 27.20-21). This confidence in the inscribing power of poetry not only to reveal truth but also to permanently fix it "depe" in rulers' hearts perhaps springs as much from Surrey's aristocratic and poetic sense of entitlement as from piety, but it echoes the reformers' confidence in the power of the Scriptures to reveal God's will in the world and inspire believers, especially rulers, to act according to that will. In this new age of iconoclasm, the word, the power of print to make real and to disseminate it, and the abilities of those who can speak and write it, take on the heavy responsibility not only of individual salvation but the salvation of the entire community.

As Halasz notes, however, the poem's question is never really answered (194), and perhaps the lack of an answer serves to undercut the force of the situation it

imagines. The conflict is not definitively resolved in the world outside of the poem, either; rulers do not heed the words of prophetic poets, and Christians do not cohere as a community sharing a single definition of faith and salvation. The inclusion of Surrey's sonnet in the *Miscellany*, however, places it in a new textual matrix, one that provides a fresh opportunity for poets to create (or help create) a community that shares a core set of beliefs and a common vision. Where Halasz turns to Wyatt's David to understand the significance and political power of the *Penitential Psalms*, I propose that the figure of Wyatt, as constructed in print by the *Miscellany* and the tributes of Surrey and Leland, holds the key to understanding the cultural work that his lyrics in the *Miscellany* perform, and that the volume itself does. Through their ability to balance the conflicting elements in Wyatt's life without neutralizing the conflict, Wyatt's lyrics offer the readers of 1557 a new model of reconciliation and a new figure of cultural coherence, one that mediates Surrey's aristocratic values and the socially destabilizing effects of the Reformation.

This process of reconciliation is not glimpsed in Wyatt's clearly political or erotic verse but, surprisingly, in one of his shorter poems included in the *Miscellany*, a poem that is at once political and erotic, spiritual and worldly. Poem 121 in the *Miscellany*, which Tottel titles "Of his returne from Spain," models Wyatt's ability to integrate the various roles of his life through the lyric expression of an apparently authentic self, the quality most admired by modern critics. Just as importantly, it also suggests the potential

of lyric verse to integrate the political functions of the epic with the personal and spiritual functions of lyric, a quality that, I suggest, we privilege today in part because of the *Miscellany* and its success in effacing its own act of mediation.

As Mary Thomas Crane argues in *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England*, Wyatt appeals to modern critics because he is suspended between “two conflicting and incompatible systems,” the humanist and the courtly, and because his poems “express both the allure and the dangers of [the] subjective self” so valued by our modern poetic canon (153). Furthermore, Crane claims that a critic such as J.W. Saunders, who views the fact that Wyatt did not publish in his lifetime as evidence of the “stigma of print,” “takes [the aristocratic] ideas [of lyric] for general truth because he himself is still constituted by a version of that class system” (145). I would add to Crane’s argument the suggestion that Wyatt, as a member of the minor gentry operating in the inner circles of courtly power, was also suspended between other frameworks of belief — between courtly models of aristocratic power and prestige and a newer model of status based on skill and achievement, and between pre-Reformation models of submission and more English Protestant modes of experiencing spiritual devotion.

The tensions between these competing systems of belief make Wyatt’s poetry appealing for modern readers, and they can be seen in many of his poems, short lyrics as well as sonnets and the longer poems. Tottel included ninety Wyatt poems in the

Miscellany, and it may oversimplify Wyatt's contribution to the volume to end this study with attention to one poem that has not received much critical attention. In this poem, however, I believe that Wyatt achieves a balance and harmony that reflects the fantasy of unity the *Miscellany*'s printer hopes the book will accomplish.

Wyatt probably originally wrote poem 121, "Of his returne from Spaine" (better known by its first line, "Tagus farewell that westward with thy streams") in 1539, when Henry finally granted him permission to return to England after a long diplomatic sojourn in Spain (Rebholz 377). In this poem, an almost dreamy quality replaces the biting humor and sharpness of his earlier lyrics and satires, and the process of suffering and self-searching seems to have resulted, at least temporarily, in a balance that enables Wyatt to integrate all of the parts of his identity – lover, courtier, and religious penitent:

Tagus farewell that westward with thy stremes
Turnes up the graines of gold already tried,
For I with spurre and saile go seke the temmes,
Gainward the sunne that sheweth her welthy pride,
And to the towne that Brutus sought by dreames,
Like bended mone that leanes her lusty side.
My king, my countrey, I seke for whom I live,
O mighty Jove the windes for this me geve.

(no.121.81.27-34)

This poem, read in the context of the *Miscellany* and the Penitential Psalms, does not support Jan Lawson Hinely's claim that Wyatt had to "cast off carnal love, worldly ambition, and the unstable self to attain the long-sought quiet of mind" (Hinely 149). Instead, both the Psalms and no. 121 suggest that Wyatt achieves stability through integrating the various elements of his life and persona. The courtier speaks in poem 121, but so do the lover of 104, who has finally been granted permission to return to his beloved, and the penitent of the Psalms, who has wrestled with the demands of submission.

This poem still holds the tension between seeking peace and accepting the instability of courtly service that marks his earlier poems, but the speaker of 121 does not seem to be the bitterly cynical Wyatt of 52, "The louer sheweth how he is forsaken of such as he sometime enjoyed," more widely known as "They flee from me." Instead, this speaker, who appears near the end of Wyatt's selections in the *Miscellany*, has found a kind of stillness in motion, a balance between his diplomatic life abroad and the rustic life that he craves in England. He still seeks to understand the meaning of his life, as the final couplet indicates, but the question also contains the answer: "My king, my countrey, I seke for whom I liue" (81.33-34). The ambiguous structure of the line suggests that perhaps there is a choice to be made, "I seek for whom I live, my king *or* my country,"

but the line can just as easily be read as offering king and country as a matched pair.

Elsewhere in his poetry Wyatt wrestles with the dilemma of whether service to a monarch as capricious as Henry VIII is compatible with service to his country, as it should be but so rarely seems to be, according to the satires. Here, though, the two poles collapse into an acceptance of the tension and complexity inherent in the life he has chosen.

There is yet another unspoken possibility of the person “for whom I liue” in the person of his mistress, Elizabeth Darrell, surely one of the main reasons Wyatt was so eager to return to England. She is not named or even referred to in the poem, but as devoted as Wyatt is to his king, that devotion seems unlikely to motivate such deep feeling at the prospect of returning to England. The sensual image of London winding around the Thames “like bended mone that leanes her lusty side” lends an erotic quality to a poem ostensibly about political service, and the line “I seke for whom I liue” echoes poem 104, in which the absent lover longs to return to his lady, “Where she doth lyue, by whom I liue” (no. 104, 74.2). The speaker in 121 still struggles to balance his devotion to king, country, and lady, but the compression of meaning in the final lines suggests that he has found a way to achieve that balance, however precarious it might be. The final line, “O mighty Ioue, the windes for this me geue,” is not a desperate plea for strength, but rather, a quiet and even hopeful prayer for a speedy journey home – a home that is

geographically located in London but metaphorically constructed as the body of a woman.

The dreamy quality of the poem's structure and imagery also suggests an acceptance of conflict and complexity. The difference between the attitude of the speaker in 52 and that of 121 plays out not only through his more balanced psychology, but also through the poem's structural balance. Like the river Tagus's "graines of gold already tried," the speaker's self has been tested, refined, and shaped by years in the currents of the Tudor court, and now he can make his peace with the life he has chosen and the satisfaction that each part offers him. Where before courtly servant and private self were compartmentalized, always struggling with each other, now the integrated self can see the whole. Like the lover of poem 278, who sees his suffering at being separated from his lady as being a spiritual and emotional test, Wyatt can now regard his courtly service as a trial, one that leaves him stronger and purer. The string of images he employs to compare England to Spain reinforces this sense of progress towards balance and resolution. Wyatt associates Spain with "the sun that sheweth her welthy pride," and London with the moon "that leanes her lusty side," two complementary images that round the poem into a balanced whole.

However, acceptance of complexity does not necessarily mean the end of conflict, but merely provides a way to live peacefully with the conflict, a way out of the hostility

and self-loathing. The kind of stability Wyatt's persona achieves is not one that neutralizes conflicting forces, but rather one that is able to keep them in balance.

Jonathan Kamholtz, examining Wyatt's quest for stability in the earlier courtly lyrics, argues that

the interplay between love and politics in Wyatt's poetry demonstrates some limits to the poet's power to define his world. It is part of Wyatt's continuing struggle to try to see things in a stable way in a world where no one will let him do so. (365)

Whereas Wyatt's earlier poems do seem to make evident this type of struggle, in poem 121 he seems to have stopped struggling, or at least to have accepted the struggle as an inevitable part of his life. Indeed, he has learned that stability is an illusion, but paradoxically this lesson has also led to a deeper understanding of the world that itself lends a kind of stability. Wyatt's speaker will never cease to struggle with the world and measure its values against his own, as the three satires that round out Wyatt's contribution to the *Miscellany* and Surrey's epitaph indicate. In 121, however, we see a different Wyatt, more at peace with life and possessing a maturity for which he worked painfully and publicly in his body of poems. For Wyatt, ceasing to strive with Katherine Parr's "bit" means learning to live with his internal conflicts and moving towards

embracing the complexity of his life, and many of the individual poems are small steps in this larger process.

I do not mean to argue that this narrative of resistance and acceptance is intended by the *Miscellany*, but rather that it is made available to Tottel's readers through the group of poems the book assembles. Moreover, Tottel as the editor constructs through his editorial selections, framing material, and paratext a certain picture of Wyatt as "depewitted" courtier whose verse serves to model "weightinesse" for the reader ("The Printer to the Reader" 2.8,9). Where manuscript miscellanies such as the Devonshire and Arundel Harington Manuscripts only circulated some of Wyatt's verses, Tottel in the *Miscellany* assembles a large number of them and presents them as a group, identified by Wyatt's name and sold as an authentic record of Wyatt's courtly experience. Indeed, the changes that Tottel made to Wyatt's verses, including making regular some of Wyatt's rougher meters and altering specific lines of certain poems, help to construct this poetic identity. The Egerton Manuscript, Wyatt's personal manuscript of some of his poems, prints the final two lines of the poem I have just discussed as: "My king, my country, *alone* for whom I live / *Of mighty love* the wings for this me give" (Rebholz 98). In changing "alone" to "I seke," Tottel emphasizes the relentlessly searching quality of Wyatt's poetic voice and its almost painful introspection.

This lyrical subjectivity of Wyatt's poetry has long made him a favorite of modern critics, who value the tension and internal debate that can be found in what they see as his more sophisticated verses. I have purposely not discussed Wyatt at any great length earlier in this study in part because he is the poet most familiar to modern readers; in the years since the *Miscellany* first appeared, from Puttenham through Rollins and beyond critics have wanted to put either Surrey or Wyatt in the place of prominence. Surrey was the poet favored by the Elizabethan courtier poets, who valued his "smoother lines and more pleasing accentuation," and even Rollins in the twentieth century argues that "it is undoubtedly a good thing" that Wyatt's verses "were subjected to an editorial process that modernized even though it debased them" (2.77). More recent Wyatt editors such as R.A. Rebholz and Kenneth Muir, however, have been more fascinated by Wyatt's uneven meters and have attempted to preserve and even theorize the trickiness of the originals.⁴⁷

Both the earlier critical favoring of Surrey and the more recent preference for Wyatt, I suggest, are positions for which the *Miscellany* lays the groundwork. No less than the earlier emphasis on Surrey's aristocratic merit stems from the *Miscellany's* construction of Surrey's nobility, our modern evaluation of Wyatt's poetry, the emphasis

⁴⁷ See Rebholz's "A Note on Wyatt's Meters" in his edition of the *Complete Poems* (44-55).

that we place on the role of subjectivity, derives from the poetic reputation Surrey, Tottel, and others created for Wyatt in print. The Protestant insistence on authenticity of religious experience has an analogue in the critical value placed on poetic subjectivity as the expression of an interior self whose self-awareness of suffering affirms the authenticity of experience. Tottel's book may not have openly or intentionally championed the Protestant paradigm of perception and relation, but in holding the "depewitted" Wyatt's verse up as a poetic example, it nevertheless promotes imitation and absorption of the self-reflective and philosophical quality of Wyatt's poetry.

Wyatt and Surrey, however, are not the only poets represented in the *Miscellany*. We can see more clearly, by examining Wyatt's verses within the context of the *Miscellany*, how this particular poetic identity is constructed by its cultural matrix, and how different it looks compared to other identities in that context. This is currently the favored critical position on Wyatt, but such a perspective, I suggest, can only be sharpened by first setting the more prominent poets aside and considering the other material in its own right. The other poems, those by Grimald and the "uncertain poets," fill out our understanding of how other subjects negotiated issues of social and religious identity in the period. As a whole, the *Miscellany* offers a range of poets that spreads out across the middle and upper ranks of society and articulates a sometimes baffling array of poetic positions. These poets are by no means a representative sampling of the entire

Tudor population, but they are those offered by Tottel as the best and most “praiseworthy” examples of their kind.

Furthermore, within Wyatt’s contributions to the *Miscellany* we can see one poet negotiating his individual identity in relation to his culture. The book shows him managing change along a trajectory from conflict to acceptance to reconciliation; in calling Wyatt “depewitted” and in holding him up as a moral example, Tottel seems to recognize in Wyatt’s choices echoes of the choices all subjects are having to make. It is important to note that although Wyatt’s example is a spiritual one, and even a Protestant one, it is not a stridently or radically Protestant one. On the contrary, Wyatt is the perfect icon for the new age because he helps to perform an important reconstruction. His personal religious settlement achieves a balance between submission and self-possession, finding a way to manage the conflict between self and authority by acknowledging the power of political authority and the role that it plays in constructing one’s identity. Although he had already been fashioned in print as a prophetic poet of the Protestant persuasion, his reputation as a courtier and diplomat serve in the *Miscellany* to balance out the most controversial aspects of his public identity. Moreover, as someone born into the minor gentry, Wyatt maneuvers his social world in a way that Surrey, an aristocrat, does not. In that sense, he is closer to Grimald and the anonymous courtly poets and thus more accessible to Tottel’s readers. Tottel offers both Wyatt and Surrey as cultural

models, poets who can integrate the spiritual, erotic, and social into a new paradigm for English cultural identity, one that is attractive to readers and acceptable to the Roman Catholic authorities of 1557.

In order to fully understand what that identity was, however, and how it was absorbed by the *Miscellany*'s readers, it is necessary to step forward into Elizabeth's reign, which began the year after Tottel's book first appeared. To be sure, the summer of 1557 and the publication of the *Miscellany*'s first and second editions mark important moments in the formation of that new cultural identity. Tottel offered readers divided by religious and political conflict a new focal point around which to unite: the cultivation of a national literary tradition, one that incorporated the native ballad tradition as well as the Italianate experiments of Wyatt and Surrey and the anonymous courtly poets. His insistence that what his book offers is a particularly "English eloquence," though, aligns it (whether inadvertently or not) with the main project in the early years of Elizabeth's reign, the formation of a national church and the even larger development of a national identity.

The various endeavors of reconstruction going on in the society — religious, political, and cultural — all depended for their success on being able to conceal the very divisions that lay at their heart. As Richard Helgerson argues in his foundational work on the formation of English national identity, *Forms of Nationhood*,

The rhetoric of nationhood is a rhetoric of uniformity and wholeness.

The unified self of the Englishman or Frenchman, the Italian or German, is founded on the political and cultural unity of the nation to which each belongs. The denial of nationhood is experienced as a denial of integrated selfhood. Yet at the historic root of national self-articulation we find intractable doubleness and self-alienation. (22)

The model of “integrated selfhood” that Wyatt’s poetic corpus as constructed by the *Miscellany* — and indeed, by extension, the whole of the *Miscellany* — offers is attractive precisely because it does not deny the trials and suffering that shaped it.

Indeed, as Helgerson goes on to note,

sixteenth-century national self-articulation began with a sense of national barbarism, with a recognition of the self as the despised other, and then moved to repair that damaged self-image with the aid of forms taken from a past that was now understood as both different from the present and internally divided. (22)

The image of “English eloquence” that the *Miscellany* offers is not one that denies the social and religious conflicts that constitute it. Instead, it incorporates them in a textual space that makes room for heterodoxy and dissent, even as it tries to contain those forces and bend them to its own cultural program. The cultural identity the book offers its

readers is in many ways dependent on the tension between the differences that inevitably arise out of so many poetic voices and the similarities that it encourages readers to consider between themselves and the texts. The *Miscellany* was so popular, I suggest, precisely because it could offer so many possibilities for expression to its readers under the blanket of its social and literary project.

It is beyond the scope of this study to delve into the nationalist implications of the *Miscellany*'s model of "English eloquence," although a consideration of nationalism could only help to enrich and complicate the argument I have set forth about this book's role in English literary history. Instead, I wish to return in closing to the question of Tottel's "gentle" readers and their reactions to the book of courtly poetry that was published in June 1557. As Stephen N. Zwicker has suggested, "to reconstruct, rather than to simply reimagine, the history of literature from the point of view of its consumption might seem a very difficult task" (175). Reading is a notoriously elusive practice, and Tottel's readers are particularly elusive; one of the most striking features of the single surviving copy of the *Miscellany* is its frustrating lack of marginalia. The owner of that copy did not record his or her reactions to the text, and the copies of later editions I examined are similarly silent.

The traces of production and consumption I have managed to reconstruct, however, lead us firmly back to those readers and a question that vexes cultural critics.

To what extent do consumers of culture have a say in the culture that is constructed?

Tottel's book, according to the evidence I have put forth, was one of the first — if not the first — self-conscious products of a newly sophisticated trade, and as such it tells us as much as (if not more) about institutional forces that produced it than about its readers' responses to it. The one response we can locate, however, is the book's enormous popularity across two decades of the early modern period. If buying power can express personal identity, then Tottel's readers vociferously expressed the usefulness the book had for their private and social lives. From this perspective, they themselves institutionalized the book's poems, discarding those poets they found less helpful and canonizing those they appreciated the most. Readers who were also poets — Sidney, Spenser, Shakespeare — adapted the *Miscellany*'s poetic models and applied them to their own efforts, adding to and shaping the literary canon each in his own turn.

Ultimately, however, I am unable to answer the question of how much of a role Tottel's readers played in creating their literary culture. The answer partly depends on how one chooses to view the book: as an anthology, in which aesthetic choices are made for the reader, or as a miscellany, in which the reader exercises his or her own values and makes literary judgments that matter to the larger culture. It also depends on our own anxieties about our role as heirs to the literary culture Tottel's book was created by and

created, a culture which may be made as much by social and economic forces as by the taste and values of the individual. Indeed,

It resteth nowe (gentle reader) that thou thinke it euill doon, to publish,
to the honor of the English tong, and for profit of the studious of Englishe
eloquence, those works which the ungentle horders up of such treasure
have heretofore envied thee.

(“The Printer to the Reader,” 2.11-16)

Tottel’s question is perhaps productively directed to us, for whom “honor” and “profit” exist in such tension. We should be careful not to unconsciously project our own values backward onto Tottel’s readers, whom we are not, but we should also understand the extent to which we have been shaped by their culture and the ways in which we as social creatures — ambitious, eager for profit, eloquence, and authentic truth alike and all of the contradictions that entails — are more like them than we care to admit.

Appendix A: Chapter Three Poems

no. 139, “To L.I.S.”

Charis the fourth, Pieris the tenth, the second Cypris Jane,
One to assemblies thre adjoynd: whom Phebus fere, Diane
Among the Nymphs Oreades, might wel vouchsafe to place: 100.5
But you as great a goddesse serve, the quenes most noble grace:
Allhayle, and while, like Terpsichor, much melody you make:
Which if the field, as doth the court, enjoyed, the trees wold shake:
While latine you, and french frequent: while English tales you tel:
Italian whiles, and Spanish you do hear, and know full well: 100.10
Amid such peares, and solemn sightes, in case convenient tyme
You can (good Lady) spare, to read a rurall poets ryme:
Take here his simples sawes, in briefe: wherein no need to move
Your Ladyship, but thus lo speakes thabundance of his love.
The worthy feates that now so much set forth your noble name, 100.15
So have in ure, they still encreast, may more encrease your fame.
For though divine your doings be, yet thewes wt yeres may grow:
And if you stay, streight now adays fresh wits will overgo.

Wherefore the glory got maintayne, maintayne the honour great.

So shal the world my doom approve, and set you in that seat, 100.20

Where Graces, Muses, and Joves imp, the joyful Venus, raigne:

So shall the bachelor blessed bee, can such a Nymph obtaine.

no. 143, "An other to I.M.S."

So happy bee the course of your long life:

So roon the yere intoo his circle ryfe:

That nothing hynder your welmeanyng minde:

Sharp wit may you, remembrans redy fynde,

Perfect intelligence, all help at hand: 102.15

Styll stand your thought in frutefull studies stand.

Hed framed thus may thother parts well frame,

Divine demeanour wyn a noble name:

By payzed doom with leasure, and good heed:

By upright dole, and much avayling deed: 102.20

By hert unthirled, by undiscoomfite chere,

And brest discharged quite of coward fere:

By sober mood, and orders coomly rate:

In weal, and wo, by holdyng one estate.

And to that beauties grace, kynde hath you lent, 102.25

Of bodies helth a perfite plight bee blent.

Dame fortunes gifts may so stand you in sted,

That well, and wealfully your lyfe be led.

And hee, who gives these graces not in vayn,

Direct your deeds, his honor to maintain. 102.30

no. 200, "The pore estate is to be holden for best"

Experience now doth shew what God us taught before,

Desired pompe is vaine, and seldome doth it last: 157.5

Who climbs to raigne with kinges, may rue his fate full sore.

Alas the wofull ende that comes with care full fast,

Reject him dothe renowne his pompe full lowe is cast.

Deceived is the birde by swetenesse of the call

Expell that pleasant taste, wherein is bitter gall. 157.10

Such as with oten cakes in pore estate abides,

Of care have they no cure, the crab with mirth they rost,

More ease fele they then those, that from their height downe slides
Excesse doth brede their wo, they sail in scillas cost,
Remainyng in the stormes till shyp and all be lost. 157.15
Serve God therefore thou pore, for lo, thou lives in rest,
Eschue the golden hall, thy thatched house is best.

no. 156, "An epitaph of sir James wilford knight."

The worthy Wilfords body, which alyve,
Made both the Scot, and Frenchman sore adrad: 108.5
A body, shapte of stomacke stout to strive
With forein foes: a corps, that coorage had
So full of force, the like nowhere was ryfe:

With hert, as free, as ere had gentle knight:

Now here in grave (thus chaungeth ay, this lyfe) 108.10

Rests, with unrest to many a wofull wight.

Of largesse great, of manhod, of forecast

Can ech good English souldiour bear record.

Speak Laundersey, tell Muttrell marvails past:

Crye Musselborough: prayse Haddington thy lord, 108.15

From thee that held both Scots, and frekes of Fraunce:

Farewel, may England say, hard is my chaunce.

no. 157, “An other, of the same knightes death.”

For Wilford wept first men, then ayr also, 108.20

For Wilford felt the wayters wayfull wo.

The men so wept: that bookes, abrode which bee,

Of moornyng meeters full a man may see.

So wayld the ayr: that, clowds consumde, remayned

No dropes, but drouth the parched erth sustayned. 108.25

So greeted floods: that, wher ther rode before

A ship, a car may go safe on the shore.

Left were no mo, but heaven, and erth, to make,
Throughout the world, this greef his rigor take.
But sins the heaven this Wilfords goste doth keep, 108.30
And earth, his corps: saye mee, why shold they weep?

no. 158, “An epitaph of the ladye Margaret Lee. 1555.”

Man, by a woman lern, this life what we may call:
Blod, frendship, beauty, youth, attire, welth, worship, helth & al
Take not for thine: nor yet thy self as thine beknow.
For having these, with full great prayse, this lady did but show 109.5
Her self unto the world: and in prime yeres (bee ware)
Sleeps doolfull sister, who is wont for no respect to spare,
Alas, withdreew her hence: or rather softly led:
For with good will I dare well saye, her waye to him shee sped:
Who claymed, that he bought: and took that erst hee gave: 109.10
More meet than any worldly wight, such heavenly gems to have.
Now wold shee not return, in earth a queen to dwell.
As shee hath doon to you, good frend, bid Lady Lee farewell.

no. 160, "Upon the deceas of w. Ch."

Now, blythe Thaley, thy feastfull layes lay by:

And to resound these doolfull tunes apply.

Cause of great greef the tyrant death imports: 109.25

Whose ugsoom idoll to my brayns resorts.

A gracefull ymp, a flowr of youth, away

Hath she bereft (alas) before his daye.

Chambers, this lyfe to leave, and thy dear mates,

So soon doo thee constrayn envyous fates? 109.30

Oh, with that wit, those maners, that good hert,

Woorthy to live olde Nestors yeres thou wert.

You wanted outward yies: and yet aryght

In stories, Poets, oratours had sight.

Whatso you herd, by lively voyce, exprest, 109.35

Was soon reposde within that mindefull brest.

To mee more pleasant Plautus never was,

Than those conceits, that from your mouth did passe.

Our studiemates great hope did hold alway,
You wold be our schooles ornament, one day.
Your parents then, that thus have you forgone,
Your brethren eke must make theyr heavy mone: 110.5
Your lovyng feres cannot theyr teares restrayn:
But I, before them all, have cause to playn:
Who in pure love was so conjoynd with thee,
An other Grimald didst thou seem to bee.
Ha lord, how oft wisht you, with all your hart, 110.10
That us no chaunce a sonder might depart?
Happy were I, if this your prayer tooke place:
Ay mee, that it doth cruell death deface.
Ah lord, how oft your sweet woords I repeat,
And in my mynde your wonted lyfe retreat? 110.15
O Chambers, O thy Grimalds mate moste dere:
Why hath fell fate tane thee, and left him here?
But whereto these complaintes in vaine make wee?
Such woords in wyndes to waste, what mooveth mee?
Thou holdest the haven of helth, with blissful Jove: 110.20

Through many waves, and seas, yet must I rove.

Not woorthy I, so soon with thee to go:

Mee styll my fates reteyn, bewrapt in wo.

Live, our companion once, now live for aye:

Heavens joys enjoy, whyle wee dye day by day. 110.25

You. that of faith so sure signes here exprest,

Do triumph now, no dout, among the blest:

Have changed sea for porte, darknesse for light,

An inn for home, exile for countrey right,

Travail for rest, straunge way for citie glad, 110.30

Battail for peas, free raigne for bondage bad.

These wretched erthly stounds who can compare

To heavenly seats, and those delites most rare?

We frayl, you firm: we with great trouble tost,

You bathe in blisse, that never shall bee lost. 110.35

Wherefore, Thaley, reneew thy feastfull layes:

Her doolfull tune my chered Muse now stayes.

no. 30, "Of the death of the same sir. T.w."

Dyvers thy death doe diversly bemone.
 Some, that in presence of thy livelyhed
 Lurked, whose brestes envy with hate had swolne, 27.25
 Yeld Ceasars teares upon Pompeius hed.
 Some, that watched with the murdrers knife,
 With egre thirst to drink thy giltlesse blood,
 Whose practise brake by happy ende of lyfe,
 Wepe envious teares to heare thy fame so good. 27.30
 But I, that knew what harbred in that hed:
 What vertues rare were temperd in that brest:
 Honour the place, that such a jewell bred,
 And kisse the ground, whereas thy corse doth rest,
 With vapord eyes: from whence such streames awayl, 27.35
 As Pyramus dyd on Thisbes brest bewail.

no. 31, "Of the same."

W. resteth here, that quick could never rest:
 Whose heavenly giftes encreased by disdayn,
 And vertue sank the deper in his brest. 28.5
 Such profit he by envy could obtain.

A hed, where wisdom misteries did frame:
Whose hammers bet styll in that lively brayn,
As on a stithe: where that some work of fame
Was dayly wrought, to turne to Britaines gayn. 28.10

A visage, stern, and myld: where both did grow,
Vice to contemne, in vertue to rejoyce:
Amid great stormes, whom grace assured so,
To lyve upright, and smile at fortunes choyce.

A hand, that taught, what might be sayd in ryme: 28.15
That reft Chaucer the glory of his wit:
A mark, the which (unparfited, for time)
Some may approche, but never none shall hit.

A tounge, that served in forein realmes his king:
Whose courteous talke to vertue did enflame. 28.20
Eche noble hart: a worthy guide to bring
Our English youth, by travail, unto fame.

An eye, whose judgement none affect could blinde,
Frendes to allure, and foes to reconcile:
Whose persing loke did represent a mynde 28.25

With vertue fraught, reposed, voyd of gyle.

A hart, where drede was never so imprest,
To hyde the thought, that might the trouth avance:
In neyther fortune loft, not yet represt,
To swell in wealth, or yeld unto mischance.

28.30

A valiant corps, where force and beawty met:
Happy, alas, to happy, but for foes:
Lived, and ran the race, that nature set:
Of manhodes, shape where she the molde did lose.

But to the heavens that simple soul is fled:
Which left with such, as covet Christ to know,
Witnesse of faith, that never shall be ded:
Sent for our helth, but not received so.

28.35

Thus, for our gilt, this jewel have we lost:
The earth his bones, the heavens possesse his gost.

28.40

Appendix B: Chapter Four Poems

**no. 279, “Of the troubled commonwealth restored to quiet by the mighty power of
god”**

The secret flame that made all Troy so hot,

Long did it lurke within the wooden horse.

The machine huge Troyans suspected not, 227.25

The guiles of Grekes, nor of their hidden force:

Till in their beds their armed foes them met,

And slew them there, and Troy on fire set.

Then rose the rore of treason round about,

And children could of treason call and cry. 227.30

Wives wroung their hands, ye hole fired town through out,

When yet they saw their husbands slain them by.

And to the Gods and to the skies they shrighr,

Vengeance to take for treason of that night.

Then was the name of Sinon spred and blowne, 227.35

And whereunto his filed tale did tend.

The secret startes and metings then were knowne,

Of Troyan traitours tending to this end.

And every man could say as in that case:

Treason in Anthenor and Eneas. 227.40

But all to long such wisdom was in store,

To late came out the name of traytour than,

When that their king the aultar lay before

Slain there alas, that worthy noble man. 228.5

Ilium on flame, the matrons crying out,

And all the stretes in streames of blood about.

But such was fate, or such was simple trust,

That king and all should thus to ruine roon,

For if our stories certain be and just: 228.10

There were that saw such mischief should be doon

And warning gave which compted were in sort,

As sad devines in matter but of sport.

Such was the time and so in state it stoode,

Troy trembled not so careles were the men. 228.15

They brake the wals, the toke this hors for good,

They demed Grekes gone, they thought al surety then.

When treason start & set the town on fire,

And stroied Trojans & gave Grekes their desire.

Like to our time, wherein hath broken out, 228.20

The hidden harme that we suspected least.

Wombed within our walles and realme about,

As Grekes in Troy were in the Grekish beast.

Whose tempest great of harmes and of armes,

We thought not on, till it did noyse our harmes. 228.25

Then felt we well the piller of our welth,

How sore it shoke, then saw we even at hand,

Ruin how she rusht to confound our helth,

Our realme and us with force of mighty band.

And then we heard how treason loud did rore: 228.30

Mine is the rule, and raigne I will therefore.

Of treason marke the nature and the kinde,

A face it bears of all humilitie.

Truth is the cloke, and frendship of the minde,

And depe it goes, and worketh secretly, 228.35

Like to a mine that creepes so nye the wall,

Till out breakes sulphure, and oreturneth all.

But he on hye that secretly beholdes
The state of thinges: and in times hath in his hand,
And pluckes in plages, and them again unfolds. 228.40

And hath apointed realmes to fall and stand:
He in the midst of all this sturre and rout,
Gan bend his browes, and move him selfe about.

As who should say, and are ye minded so?
And thus to those, and whom you know I love.
Am I such one as none of you do know?
Or know ye not that I sit here above, 229.5

And in my handes do hold your welth and wo,
To raise you now, and now to overthrow?

Then thinke that I, as I have set you all,
In places where your honours lay and fame:
So now my selfe shall give you eche your fall, 229.10

Where ech of you shall have your worthy shame.
And in their handes I will your fall shallbe,
Whose fall in yours you sought so sore to see.

Whose wisdome hye as he the same foresaw,

So is it wrought, such lo his justice is. 229.15

He is the Lord of man and of his law,

Praise therefore now his mighty name in this,

And make accompt that this our ease doth stand:

As Israell free, from wicked Pharaos hand.

no. 272, "The lover declareth his paines to excede far the paines of hell."

The soules that lacked grace, 217.5

Which lye in bitter paine:

Are not in such a place,

As foolish folke do faine.

 Tormented all with fire,

And boile in leade againe, 217.10

With serpents full of ire,

Stong oft with deadly paine.

 Then cast in frosen pittes:

To freze there certaine howers:

And for their painfull fittes, 217.15

Apointed tormentours.

No no it is not so,
Their sorow is not such:
And yet they have of wo,
I dare say twice as much. 217.20

Which comes because they lack
The sight of the godhed,
And be from that kept back
Where with are aungels fed
This thing know I by love 217.25

Through absence crueltie,
Which makes me for to prove
Hell pain before I dye.

There is no tong can tell
My thousand part of care
Ther may no fire in hell,
With my desire compare. 218.5

No boyling leade can pas
My scalding sighes in hete:
Nor snake that ever was,

With stinging can so frete

A true and tender hert, 218.10

As my thoughtes dayly doe,

So that I know but smart,

And that which longes thereto.

O Cupid Venus son,

As thou hast shown thy might. 218.15

And hast this conquest woon,

Now end the same aright.

And as I am thy slave,

Contented all in this:

So helpe me soone to have 218.20

My perfect earthly blisse.

Petrarch, *rime* 3

Era il giorno ch' al sol si scoloraro
per la pietà del suo fattore i rai
quando i' fui preso, et non me ne guardai,
ché i be' vostr' occhi, Donna, mi legaro. 39.4

Tempo non mi pareo da far riparo
contr' a' colpi d'Amor; però m'andai
secur, senza sospetto, onde i miei guai

nel commune dolor s'incominciario. 39.8

Trovommi Amor del tutto disarmato,
et aperta la via per gli occhi al core
che di lagrime son fatti uscio et varco. 39.11

Però al mio parer non li fu onore
ferir me de saetta in quello stato,
a voi armata non mostrar pur l'arco. 39.14

Petrarch, *rime* 3 (Durling translation)

It was the day when the sun's rays turned pale with grief for his
Maker when I was taken, and I did not defend myself against it,
for your lovely eyes, Lady, bound me.

It did not seem to me a time for being on guard against Love's
blows; therefore I went confident and without fear, and so my
misfortunes began in the midst of universal woe.

Love found me altogether disarmed, and the way open through
my eyes to my heart, my eyes which are now the portal and
passageway of tears.

Therefore, as it seems to me, it got him no honor to strike me
with an arrow in that state, and not even to show his bow to

you, who were armed.

no. 277, “The lover sheweth that he was stricken by love on good Friday”

It was the day on which the sunne deprived of his light,
To rewe Christs death amid his course gave place unto the night 220.5
When I amid mine ease did fall to such distemperate fits,
That for the face that hath my hart I was bereft my wits.
I had the bayte, the hooke and all, and wist not loves pretence,
But farde as one that fearde none yll, not forst for no defence.
Thus dwelling in most quiet state, I fell into this plight, 220.10
And that day gan my secret sighes, when all folke wept in sight.
For love that vewed me voide of care, approcht to take his pray,
And stept by stelth from eye to hart, so open lay the way.
And straight at eyes brake out in teares, so salt that did declare,
By token of their bitter taste that they were forgde of care. 220.15
Now vaunt thee love which fleest a maid defenst with vertues rare,
And wounded hast a wight unwise, unweaponed and unaware.

no. 184, “The repentant sinner in durance and adversitie.”

Unto the living Lord for pardon do I pray,
 From whom I graunt even from the shell, I have run styl astray.
 And other lives there none (my death shall well declare) 136.30
 On whom I ought to grate for grace, as faulty folkes do fare.
 But thee O Lorde alone, I have offended so,
 That this small scourge is much to scant for mine offence I know
 I ranne without returne, the way the world liekt best
 And what I ought most to regard, that I respected lest 136.35
 The throng wherein I thrust, hath throwen me in such case
 That Lorde my soule is sore beset without thy greater grace
 My giltes are growen so great, my power doth so appayre
 That with great force they argue oft, and mercy much dispayre.
 But then with fayth I flee to thy prepared store 137.5
 Where there lieth help for every hurt, and salve for every sore.
 My loste time to lament, my vaine waies to bewaile,
 No day no night no place no houre no moment I shal faile
 My soule shall never cease with an assured faith
 To knock, to crave, to call to cry to thee for helpe which sayth 137.10
 Knocke and it shalbe heard, but ask and geven it is

And all that like to kepe this course, of mercy shall not misse
 For when I call to minde how the one wandryng shepe,
 Did bring more joye with his returne, then all the flocke did kepe.
 It yeldes full hope and trust my strayed and wandryng ghost 137.15
 Shalbe received and held more dere then those were never lost.
 O Lord my hope beholde, and for my helpe make haste
 To pardon the forpassed race that carelesse I have past.
 And but the day draw neare that death must pay the det,
 For lone of life which thou hast lent and time of payment set. 137.20
 From this sharpe shower me shilde which threatened is at hand,
 Wherby thou shalt great power declare & I the storme withstand.
 Not my will lord but thyne, fulfild be in ech case,
 To whose gret wyl & mighty power al powers shal once geve place
 My fayth my hope my trust, my God and eke my guide 137.25
 Stretch forth thy hand to save the soule, what so the body bide.
 Refuse not to receive that thou so dere hast bought,
 For but by thee alone I know all safety in vaine is sought.
 I know and knowledge eke albeit very late,
 That thou it is I ought to love and dreade in ech estate. 137.30

And with repentant hart do laude thee Lord on hye,
Thou hast so gently set me straight, that erst walkt so awry.
Now graunt me grace my God to stand thine strong in sprite,
And let the world then work such wayes, as to the world semes mete

Works Cited

- Alsop, J.D. "Nicholas Grimald's 'To L.I.S.' and Lady Jane Seymour." Notes and Queries (Apr. 1980): 113.
- . "Wilford, Sir James (b. in or before 1517, d. 1550)." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. 2004. Oxford University Press. 29 May 2005
<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29406>>.
- Anderson, Randall. "The Rhetoric of Paratext in Early Printed Books." Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Ed. John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie, with the assistance of Maureen Bell. Vol. 4 (1557-1695). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 636-44.
- Arber, Edward, ed. A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554- 1640 A.D. 5 vols. London: Priv. print., 1875-94.
- Baker, J.H. "English Law Books and Legal Publishing." Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Ed. John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie, with the assistance of Maureen Bell. Vol. 4 (1557 - 1695). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 474-503.
- Benedict, Barbara M. Making the Modern Reader: Cultural Mediation in Early Modern Literary Anthologies. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

- Bennett, H.S. English Books and Readers 1475 - 1557. 1952. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Berdan, John Milton. Early Tudor Poetry, 1485 - 1547. New York: Macmillan, 1920.
- Berger, Harry. The Absence of Grace: Sprezzatura and Suspicion in Two Renaissance Courtesy Books. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Bergeron, David M. "Printers' and Publishers' Addresses in English Dramatic Texts, 1558 - 1642." EIRC 27.2 (Winter 2001): 131-160.
- Blagden, Cyprian. The Stationers' Company: A History, 1403 - 1959. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Blayney, Peter W.M. The Stationers' Company Before the Charter, 1403 - 1557. London: The Worshipful Company of Stationers & Newspapermakers, 2003.
- Bloomfield, Morton W. "The Elegy and the Elegiac Mode: Praise and Alienation." Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation. Ed. Barbara Kiefer Lewalski. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986. 145-57.
- Boffey, Julia, and A.S.G. Edwards. "Literary Texts." Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Ed. Lotte Helinga and J.B. Trapp. Vol. 3 (1400 - 1557). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 555-75.
- Bonner, Edmund. Homelies sette forth by the righte reuerende father in God, Edmund Byshop of London, not onely promised in his booke, intituled, A necessary doctrine, but also nowe of late adioyned, and added thereunto, to be reade within his diocesse of London, of all persons, vycars, and curates, vnto theyr

- parishioners, vpon sondayes, & holy dayes. London: John Cawood, 1555. STC 3285.6 Early English Books Online. Chadwyck - Healey. 30 May 2005 <<http://http://eebo.chadwyck.com.content.lib.utexas.edu:2048/search>>.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. Distinction: A Social Critique of the History of Taste. 1979. Trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Brennan, Michael G. "Grimald, Nicholas (b. 1519/20, d. in or before 1562)." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. 2004. Oxford University Press. 29 May 2005 <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11629>>.
- Brigden, Susan. "Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey and the Conjured League." Historical Journal 37 (1994): 507-537.
- . New Worlds, Lost Worlds: the Rule of the Tudors, 1485-1603. Vol. 5. Penguin History of Britain. New York: Penguin Books, 2000.
- Bruster, Douglas. "The Structural Transformation of Print in Late Elizabethan England." Print, Manuscript, and Performance: The Changing Relations of the Media in Early Modern England. Ed. Arthur Marotti and Michael D. Bristol. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2000. 49-89.
- Byrom, H.J. "Richard Tottel: His Life and Work." Library 4th ser. 8 (1927): 195-232. Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Edward VI., 1547 - 1553, Preserved in the State Papers Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office. Ser. 16. Ed. William B. Turnbull. London: Longman, Green, Longman, & Roberts, 1861.

- Calvin, John. On the Christian Faith: Selections from the Institutes, Commentaries, and Tracts. Ed. John T. McNeill. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1957.
- Casady, Edwin. Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. New York: Modern Language Association, 1938.
- Chartier, Roger. The Order of Books: Readers, Authors and Libraries in Europe Between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries. Trans. Lydia G. Cochrane. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary. Ed. John Gouge Nichols. London: J.B. Nichols and Son for the Camden Society, 1850.
- A colleccion of all the statutes (from the begynning of Magna Carta vnto the yere of our Lorde, 1557) which were before that yere imprinted And furst a pistle, necessary to be redde by them that shall vse this booke. London: Richard Tottel, 1557. STC 9306. Early English Books Online. 2003. Chadwyck - Healey. 29 May 2005 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com.content.lib.utexas.edu:2048/search>>.
- Crane, Mary Thomas. Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth Century England. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Cranmer, Thomas. Certain sermones, or homelies, appointed by the kynges Maiestie, to bee declared and read, by all persones, vicars, or curates, euery Sondaie in their churches, where thei haue cure. London: Richard Grafton, 1551. STC 13647. Early English Books Online. Chadwyck - Healey. 30 May 2005 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com.content.lib.utexas.edu:2048/search>>.

- Cressy, David. Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Cropper, Elizabeth. "The Place of Beauty in the High Renaissance and Its Displacement in the History of Art." Place and Displacement in the Renaissance. Binghamton: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1995. 159-205.
- Davies, Norman. "The Breakup of the United Kingdom." British Studies. Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, The University of Texas at Austin. 22 April 2005.
- The Diary of Henry Machyn. Ed. John Gouge Nichols. London: Printed for the Camden Society by J.B. Nichols and Son, 1848.
- Dowling, Maria. Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII. London: Croom Helm, 1986.
- Dubrow, Heather, and Richard Strier. Introduction. The Historical Renaissance: New Essays on Tudor and Stuart Literature and Culture. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988. 114.
- Duffy, Eamon. The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400 - c.1580. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- DuPlessis, Robert S. "Capital Formations." The Culture of Capital: Property, Cities, and Knowledge in Early Modern England. Ed. Henry S. Turner. New York : Routledge, 2002. 27-50.
- Durling, Robert M., ed. and trans. Petrarch's Lyric Poems: The Rime sparse and Other Lyrics. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976.

- Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. The Printing Press As An Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Elton, G.R. Reform & Reformation: England, 1509-1558. 1977. The New History of England. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI, 1549-52. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1957.
- Ford, Margaret Lane. "Private Ownership of Printed Books." Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Ed. Lotte Hellinga and J.B. Trapp. Vol. 3 (1400 - 1557). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 205-28.
- Foucault, Michel. "What Is An Author?" Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews. 1969. Ed. Donald F. Bouchard. Trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977. 113-38.
- Fox, Alistair. Politics and Literature in the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1989.
- Foxe, John. Acts and Monuments. Ed. Rev. Josiah Pratt. Vol. 7. London: George Seeley, 1870.
- Fraser, Russell A., ed. The Court of Venus. Durham: Duke University Press, 1955.
- Giles, David. Illusions of Immortality : A Psychology of Fame and Celebrity. Houndsmills: Macmillan, 2000.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. Renaissance SelfFashioning: From More to Shakespeare. Chicago:

- University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Greene, Roland. "The Colonial Wyatt: Contexts and Opening." Rethinking the Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts. Ed. Peter C. Herman. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994. 240-66.
- Greenfield, Matthew. "The Cultural Functions of the Renaissance Elegy." ELR 28.1 (Winter 1998): 75-94.
- Greening, Anna. "A 16th-Century Stationer and His Business Connections: The Tottel Family Documents (1448 - 1719) at Stationers' Hall." The Book Trade & Its Customers 1450 - 1900: Historical Essays for Robin Myers. Ed. Arnold Hunt, Giles Mandelbrote, and Alison Shell. Winchester: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1997. 1-8.
- . "Tottell , Richard (b. in or before 1528, d. 1593)." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. 2004. Oxford University Press. 29 May 2005
<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27573>>.
- Greg, W.W. A Companion to Arber: Being A Calendar of Documents in Edward Arber's "Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554 - 1640" With Text and Calendar of Supplementary Documents. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- . Some Aspects and Problems of London Publishing Between 1550 and 1650. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Griffiths, R.H., and Robert Adger Law. "'A Boke of Balleettes' and 'The Courte of

- Venus'." University of Texas Studies in English 10 (1930): 5-12.
- Haigh, Christopher. English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society Under the Tudors. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Halasz, Alexandra. "Wyatt's David." Texas Studies in Language and Literature 30.3 (1988). Rpt. in Rethinking the Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts. Ed. Peter C. Herman. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994. 193-218.
- Hamrick, Stephen. "Tottel's Miscellany and the English Reformation." Criticism: A Quarterly For Literature and the Arts 44.4 (Fall 2002): 329-61.
- Harbison, E. Harris. Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940.
- Hardison, O.B. Prosody and Purpose in the English Renaissance. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989.
- Heal, Felicity, and Clive Holmes. The Gentry in England and Wales 1500 - 1700. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Helgerson, Richard. Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Hellinga, Lotte. "Printing." The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Ed. Lotte Helinga and J.B. Trapp. Vol. 3 (1400 - 1557). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 65-108.
- Hellinga, Lotte and J.B. Trapp. Introduction. The Cambridge History of the Book in

- Britain. Ed. Lotte Helinga and J.B. Trapp. Vol. 3 (1400 - 1557). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 1-30.
- Hinely, Jan Lawson. "'Freedom through Bondage': Wyatt's Appropriation of the Penitential Psalms of David." The Work of Dissimilitude: Essays from the Sixth Citadel Conference on Medieval and Renaissance Literature. Ed. David G. Allen and Robert A. White. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992. 148-65.
- Hirsch, Rudolph. Printing, Selling and Reading 1450 - 1550. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967.
- Holahan, Michael. "Wyatt, the Heart's Forest, and the Ancient Savings." English Literary Renaissance 23.1 (Winter 1993): 46-80.
- Howell, Martha C. "The Language of Property in Early Modern Europe." The Culture of Capital: Property, Cities, and Knowledge in Early Modern England. Ed. Henry S. Turner. New York : Routledge, 2002. 17-26.
- Hughey, Ruth, ed. The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry. 2 vols. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1960.
- Huttar, Charles A. "Wyatt and the Several Editions of the Court of Venus." Studies in Bibliography 19 (1966): 182-96. Electronic Text Center, University of Virginia Library. 1 Apr. 2003 <<http://etext.virginia.edu>>.
- The Institution of a Gentleman. 1555. Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, Ltd., n.d.
- James, Susan E. Kateryn Parr: The Making of a Queen. Ashgate: Aldershot, 1999.
- Jentoft, Clyde W. "Surrey's Four 'Orations' and the Influence of Rhetoric on Dramatic

- Effect.” Papers on Language and Literature: A Journal for Scholars and Critics of Language and Literature 9 (1973): 250-62.
- Johns, Adrian. The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Jordan, W.K., ed. The Chronicle and Political Papers of King Edward VI. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966.
- Kamholtz, Jonathan Z. “Thomas Wyatt’s Poetry: The Politics of Love.” Criticism: A Quarterly for Literature and the Arts 20 (1978): 349-65.
- Kay, Dennis. Melodious Tears: The English Funeral Elegy From Spenser to Milton. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Keiser, George R. “Practical Books for the Gentleman.” Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Ed. Lotte Hellinga and J.B. Trapp. Vol. 3 (1400 - 1557). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 470-94.
- Kennedy, Judith M. Introduction. Eclogues, Epitaphs, and Sonnets. By Barnabe Googe. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989. 3-34.
- Kennedy, William J. Authorizing Petrarch. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- King, John N. English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Knott, John R. “John Foxe and the Joy of Suffering.” Sixteenth Century Journal: Journal of Early Modern Studies 27.3 (Fall 1996): 72-134.
- Latimer, Hugh. Selected Sermons of Hugh Latimer. Ed. Allan G. Chester. Folger

- Documents of Tudor and Stuart Civilization. Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1968.
- Lerer, Seth. Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII: Literary Culture and the Art of Deceit. Cambridge Studies in Renaissance Literature and Culture 18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- . "Medieval English Literature and the Idea of the Anthology." PMLA 118.5 (Oct. 2003): 1251-67.
- The Letters of Stephen Gardiner. Ed. James Arthur Muller. New York: Macmillan, 1933.
- Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth Century Religious Lyric. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Lewis, C.S. English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama. Vol. 3. Oxford History of English Literature. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954.
- Littleton, Thomas. Lyttylton tenures nevvly revised, and truly corrected vvith a table, after the alphabete to finde out briefly the cases desired in the same, thereto added verve necessary to the readers. London: Richard Tottel, 1554. STC 15737. Early English Books Online. Chadwyck-Healey. 30 May 2005 <<http://eebo.chadwyck.com/content/lib.utexas.edu:2048/search>>.
- Loades, David, ed. Chronicles of the Tudor Queens. Stroud: Sutton, 2002.
- . "Literature and National Identity." The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature. Ed. David Lowenstein and Janel Mueller. The New Cambridge History of English Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge University

- Press, 2002. 22956.
- . Mary Tudor: A Life. 1989. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992.
- Lucas, Scott. "The Consolation of Tragedy: A Mirror for Magistrates and the Fall of the 'Good Duke' of Somerset." Studies in Philology 100.1 (Winter 2003): 44-70.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. The Boy King : Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation. London: Allen Lane, 1999.
- . Thomas Cranmer: A Life. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Marotti, Arthur. "'Love Is Not Love': Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order." ELH 49.2 (Summer 1982): 396-428.
- . Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- May, Steven. "Tudor Aristocrats and the 'Stigma of Print'." Renaissance Papers (1980): 11-18.
- McKenzie, D.F. Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts. London: British Library, 1986.
- . "Printing and Publishing 1557 - 1700: Constraints on the London Book Trade." Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Ed. John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie, with the assistance of Maureen Bell. Vol. 4 (1557 - 1695). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 553-67.
- Merrill, L.R. The Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925.
- Metzger, Bruce M., and Roland E. Murphy, eds. The New Oxford Annotated Bible.

1991. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Muir, Kenneth. Collected Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1969.
- Neville-Sington, Pamela. "Press, Politics, and Religion." The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Ed. Lotte Hellinga and J.B. Trapp. Vol. 3 (1400 - 1547). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 576-607.
- North, Marcy L. The Anonymous Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor - Stuart England. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- The Norton Anthology of English Literature: The Major Authors. Ed. M.H. Abrams. 7th ed. New York: W.W. Norton and Co, 2000.
- Orlin, Lena Cowen. "Fictions of the Early Modern English Probate Inventory." The Culture of Capital: Property, Cities, and Knowledge in Early Modern England. Ed. Henry S. Turner. New York : Routledge, 2002. 5184.
- Parr, Katherine. The lamentacion of a synner, made by ye most vertuous Ladie, Quene Caterin, bewayling the ignoraunce of her blind life: set furth and put in print at the instaunt desire of the righte gracious ladie Caterin duchesse of Suffolke, [and] the earnest requeste of the right honourable Lord, William Parre, Marquesse of North Hampton. London: Edward Whitchurch, 1547. STC 4827. Early English Books Online. Chadwyck-Healey. 30 May 2005
 <[http://eebo.chadwyck.com.content.lib.utexas.edu:2048/search](http://eebo.chadwyck.com/content/lib.utexas.edu:2048/search)>.
- Patterson, Annabel. Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and

- Reading in Early Modern England. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.
- Paul, Alpers. "Lycidas and Modern Criticism." ELH 49.2 (Summer 1982): 468-96.
JSTOR. 29 June 2004 <<http://www.jstor.org.content.lib.utexas.edu:2048/search>>.
- Pigman, G.W., III. Grief and English Renaissance Elegy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Pitcher, John. "Literature, the Playhouse and the Public." Cambridge History of the Book in Britain. Ed. John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie, with the assistance of Maureen Bell. Vol. 4 (1557 - 1695). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 351-75.
- Plomer, Henry R. Abstracts From the Wills of English Printers and Stationers, From 1492 to 1630. London: Printed for the Bibliographical Society by Blades, East & Blades, 1903.
- Pollard, Graham. "The English Market for Printed Books: The Sanders Lectures 1959." Publishing History 4 (1978): 7-48.
- Pomeroy, Elizabeth. The Elizabethan Miscellanies: Their Development and Conventions. Berkeley: California University Press, 1973.
- Prescott, H.F.M. Mary Tudor: The Spanish Tudor. 1940. London: Phoenix, 1952.
- Prest, Wilfrid R. The Inns of Court Under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts. London: Longman, 1972.
- Remley, Paul G. "Mary Shelton and Her Tudor Literary Milieu." Rethinking the

- Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts. Ed. Peter C Herman. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994. 40-77.
- Ridley, Nicholas. The Works of Nicholas Ridley. Ed. Rev. Henry Christmas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1861.
- Rollins, Hyder E., comp. An Analytical Index to the Ballad-Entries (1557 - 1709) in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London. Hatboro: Tradition Press, 1967.
- Rollins, Hyder Edward. Tottel's Miscellany (1557 - 1587). 1929. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Sacks, Peter M. The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- Saunders, J.W. "The Stigma of Print: a Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry." Essays in Criticism 1.2 (1951): 131-64.
- Sessions, W.A. Henry Howard, the Poet Earl of Surrey: A Life. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- . "Surrey's Wyatt: Autumn 1542 and the New Poet." Rethinking the Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts. Ed. Peter C Herman. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994. 168-92.
- Seymour, William. Ordeal by Ambition: An English Family in the Shadow of the Tudors. London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1972.
- Shagan, Ethan. Popular Politics and the English Reformation. Cambridge: Cambridge

- University Press, 2003.
- Smith, Sir Thomas. De Republica Anglorum. Ed. Mary Dewar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Songes and sonettes, written by the right honorable Lorde Henry Haward late Earle of Surrey, and other. London: Richard Tottel, June 5 1557. STC (2nd. ed) 13860. Bodl. Arch. G.f.12.
- Songes and sonettes, written by the right honorable Lorde Henry Haward late Earle of Surrey, and other. London: Richard Tottel, July 31 1557. STC (2nd. ed) 13862. PFORZ 506.
- Stone, Lawrence. Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558 - 1641. Abr. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Thomas, Keith. Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century England. 1971. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Thomson, Patricia. Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.
- . Wyatt: The Critical Heritage. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.
- Tittler, Robert. The Reformation and the Towns in England: Politics and Political Culture, c.1540 - 1640. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Tromly, Frederick B. "Surrey's Fidelity to Wyatt in 'Wyatt Resteth Here'." Studies in Philology 78.4 (Fall 1980): 376-87.

- Turner, Henry S. "The Culture of Capital." Introduction. The Culture of Capital: Property, Cities, and Knowledge in Early Modern England. Ed. Henry S. Turner. New York: Routledge, 2002. 1-16.
- Usher, Brett. William Cecil and the Episcopacy, 1559 - 1577. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.
- Vickers, Nancy. "Diana Described: Scattered Women and Scattered Rhyme." Critical Inquiry 8.2 (Winter 1981): 265-79.
- Wall, Wendy. The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Watt, Tessa. Cheap Print and Popular Piety 1550 - 1650. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Whigham, Frank. Ambition and Privilege: the Social Tropes of Elizabethan Courtesy Theory. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Wilson, Thomas. The Art of Rhetoric (1560). Ed. Peter E. Medine. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994.
- Wrightson, Keith. Earthly Necessities : Economic Lives in Early Modern Britain. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- . English Society, 1580 - 1680. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1982.
- Wurzbach, Natascha. The Rise of the English Street Ballad, 1550 - 1650. 1981. Trans. Gayna Walls. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Wyatt, Sir Thomas. The Complete Poems. 1978. Ed. R.A. Rebholz. London: Penguin Books, 1988.

Zwicker, Steven N. "Habits of Reading and Early Modern Literary Culture." The Cambridge History of Early Modern Literature. Ed. David Lowenstein and Janel Mueller. *The New Cambridge History of English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 170-200.

VITA

Carol Dawn Blosser was born in Washington, D.C. on January 15, 1975, the daughter of Donna Isaac Blosser and Ernest Fred Blosser. After completing her work at W.T. Woodson High School, Fairfax, Virginia, in 1993, she entered the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia. She received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from the College of William and Mary in 1997. In the fall of 1998, she entered the University of Texas at Austin, where she earned her Master's Degree in English in the spring of 2001.

Permanent Address: 1117 Hollow Creek Drive, Apt 201, Austin TX 78741

This dissertation was typed by the author.