THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY PRESS

"Love is Not Love": Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order
Author(s): Arthur F. Marotti
Source: *ELH*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (Summer, 1982), pp. 396-428
Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2872989
Accessed: 16/11/2009 12:42

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=jhup.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *ELH.*

http://www.jstor.org

"LOVE IS NOT LOVE": ELIZABETHAN SONNET SEQUENCES AND THE SOCIAL ORDER*

BY ARTHUR F. MAROTTI

"Every time there is signification there is the possibility of using it in order to lie."

—Umberto Eco[1]

It is a well-known fact of literary history that the posthumous publication of Sir Philip Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella* inaugurated a fashion for sonnet sequences in the last part of Queen Elizabeth's reign, an outpouring of both manuscript-circulated and printed collections that virtually flooded the literary market of the 1590's. But this extraordinary phenomenon was short-lived. With some notable exceptions—such as the delayed publication of Shakespeare's sought-after poems in 1609 and Michael Drayton's continued expansion and beneficial revision of his collection—the composition of sonnet sequences ended with the passing of the Elizabethan era. The sonnet form, of course, was still used for complimentary, dedicatory and religious purposes, but by about 1600 collections of love sonnets ceased to be written in England: it was as though a genre (or subgenre) had died. Although modern scholars reading through the hundreds of amorous sonnets of the 1590's might be predisposed to believe, as some have claimed, that the form exhausted itself,[2] it should be obvious that this explanation is bizarre, especially given the durability of other much-used literary types like the epigram and song. Other reasons need to be found to account for the life and death of the love sonnet in Renaissance England.

Before the watershed publication of *Astrophil and Stella,* sonnets were not a preferred poetic form in England and sonnet sequences were hardly a familiar aesthetic enterprise. No satisfactory answer has really been given to the question why, between the publication of Tottel's *Miscellany* (1557) and the printing of Sidney's poems in 1591 and 1592, so few sonnets were written. The form was used, in a limited way, for a variety of purposes—for commendatory and dedicatory poetry, epitaphs, epistles, didactic and religious verse, polite encomia, setpieces in dramas and romances, and songs for musical

ELH Vol. 49 Pp. 396-428
0013-8304/82/0492-396 $01.00 © 1982 by The Johns Hopkins University Press

accompaniment. Wyatt, Surrey and others had experimented, in single poems, with translations and adaptations of Continental models. George Gascoigne included a "terza sequenza" in *A Discourse of the Adventures passed by Master F.J.* and did a series of "Seven Sonets in sequence" on the subject of disillusioning courtly experience.[3] Minor versifiers like Thomas Watson and John Southern feebly imitated foreign authors.[4] But, given the dates of the Renaissance sonnet sequences of sixteenth-century Italy and France,[5] it is clear that the literary fashion of composing Petrarchan collections of songs and sonnets did not reach England until quite late. The form was not really Englished until Sidney wrote *Astrophil and Stella* in the early 1580's, proving, in his native country, DuBellay's claim that the sonnet sequence could be an effective means of demonstrating the artful versatility of the vernacular.[6] The full impact of Sidney's achievement was not really felt until the publication of the poems in 1591, and the phenomenon was not a narrowly literary one. Largely because of his prestige as a martyred culture-hero, Sidney raised the status of sonnets in the hierarchy of genres within the literary system of his time and virtually authorized poets of different social classes to undertake the composition of amorous sequences.

To understand the historical vicissitudes of a particular genre (or subgenre) it is necessary to view literature in a context broader than that of literary or intellectual history. Fredric Jameson suggests that "Genre criticism . . . involves the use of three variable terms: the individual work itself, the intertextual sequence into which it is inserted through the ideal construction of a progression of forms (and of the systems that obtain between those forms), and finally that series of concrete historical situations within which the individual works were realized, and which thus stands as something like a parallel sequence to the purely formal one."[7] In the case of English sonnet sequences, it is not sufficient to consider their formal properties or their places either in the canon of particular authors or in the literary history of sonnet collections from Dante and Petrarch through the High Renaissance. One must also deal with the social, economic, and political realities of late Elizabethan England and with those cultural codes implicit in both the life and literature of the time. Although the influential example of Sidney's work is the focus of the following discussion, it only makes sense to consider it in terms of the more general socioeconomic and sociopolitical encoding of love poetry, especially with reference to the culturally central issues of ambition and social status.

I

Sonnets were, of course, only one kind of love poetry written in Elizabethan England. They might have required more technical skill than the usual "idle toys" of courtly amateur versifiers, especially when composed in structured sequences, but they shared with other amorous verse a common cultural vocabulary. Both historical precedent and contemporary usage sanctioned such poetry as a means of expressing personal ambition, and not simply that of the artistic kind. From the time of the troubadours, courtly authors in particular used love poetry as a way of metaphorizing their rivalry with social, economic, and political competitors, converting what psychoanalysis calls "narcissistic" issues into "object-libidinal" ones, that is self-esteem and ambition into love.[8] Their verse reflects courtly striving for the rewards available in hierarchical societies that functioned according to systems of patronage and that allowed (at least limited) forms of social mobility. Love lyrics could express figuratively the realities of suit, service, and recompense with which ambitious men were insistently concerned as well as the frustrations and disappointments experienced in socially competitive environments. This was the case, according to Herbert Moller, in the courts of Southern France and Southern Germany in the late Middle Ages, where rivalry with peers for status, money and power could be fictionalized as the wooing of a woman of superior station.[9] Lauro Martines, in his fine study of Renaissance Italian city-states, suggests that, in the context of the crises of social identity in sixteenth-century Italy, "Sequences of lyric poems in the Petrarchan mode are mini-utopias"—that is imaginative heterocosms within which ambitious men could fantasize a kind of mastery they lacked in their actual experience.[10]

In Elizabethan England, a female monarch, whose unmarried state preserved her symbolic *and real* value in both domestic and international transactions, specifically encouraged the use of an amorous vocabulary by her courtiers to express ambition and its vicissitudes. When Sir Christopher Hatton was abroad for his health in 1573-74 and worried that he would be replaced in the Queen's favor by a rival like the Earl of Oxford, he wrote her in the idiom of a Petrarchan lover separated from his mistress: "Madame, I find the greatest lack that ever poor wretch sustained. No death, no hell, no fear of death shall ever win of me my consent so far to wrong myself again as to be absent from you one day. . . . to serve you is a heaven, but to lack you is more than hell's torment. . . . Passion overcometh

me. I can write no more. Love me; for I love you. . . ."[11] These are fanciful words for an astute politician who became a member of Elizabeth's Privy Council! The Queen's last great favorite, the Earl of Essex, utilized the same politically-invested language of love to address her after being exonerated from blame for the failed Azores expedition. "Since I was first so happy as to know what love meant," he wrote, "I was never one day, nor one hour, free from hope and jealousy, and as long as you do me right, they are the inseparable companions of my life. If your Maj. do in the sweetness on your heart nourish the one, and in the justness of love free me from the tyranny of the other, you shall ever make me happy and increase the worth which is thought to be in you more by this one mean than by all your other excellent perfections."[12] In the Elizabethan courtly context ambition and envy were thus translated into amorous "hope" and "jealousy," the socially more acceptable terms. Since the royal court, under the Tudors, had become the country's central political institution, extending its influence to such satellite environments as the universities and the Inns of Court, this particular encoding of love language had wide influence. This phenomenon underlies Sir John Harington's joking definition of love rivals as "those that be suters to one woman, as are competitors to one office."[13] Not surprisingly, poems and speeches at royal tilts and entertainments as well as complimentary letters and verse all expressed social, political, and economic suits in the language of love, metaphorizing the ambition Elizabethans paradoxically valued and condemned. Particularly after the establishment of the cult of the virgin Queen at the start of the third decade of Elizabeth's reign, the amorous verse of courtly and satellite courtly writers alike bore the marks of this semiosis.[14]

In composing *Astrophil and Stella* Sidney, no doubt, revealed a certain literary ambition (on the model of Petrarch's pursuit of poetic rather than imperial laurel),[15] but, like so many of those who followed his example, he crafted a sonnet sequence as a form of mediation between socioeconomic or sociopolitical desires and the constraints of the established order. He was the first Englishman to use a Petrarchan collection for this purpose. In so doing, he spoke to some of the central social concerns of an ambitious, educated elite. Originally, however, he wrote for a coterie audience aware of his own social, economic, and political circumstances, a readership, therefore, able to appreciate a subtly ironic interplay of text and context. We should not be surprised at the relative absence of autobiographical and historical details in the sequence, for, in the

socioliterary situation in which Sidney wrote and circulated his work, the readers would have been able to supply a great deal of contextual information and interpretation.

Critics dealing with the biographical material of *Astrophil and Stella* have usually focused upon the identity of Stella as Penelope Devereux, Lady Rich, and the question of the authenticity of Sidney's love for her. But neither was the real biographical-social focus in the sonnet sequence. In context, Lady Rich was a symbolic figure for Sidney: her fictionalization as Stella put her at the center of a constellation of issues larger than those involved in a private "tragi-comedy of love." When Sidney wrote the sonnets (or gathered them into a structured sequence), he was and *he was known as* a politically, economically and socially disappointed young man. He had lost the prospect of inheriting the Leicester and Warwick estates when his aging uncle had a son by his mistress-turned-wife Lettice Knollys, the widow of the first Earl of Essex. After a prodigious start in national and international politics and diplomacy, he had become marked as an ambitious and irresponsible radical Protestant. He had been denied, for at least a half-dozen years, the advancement and honors which he hoped to win through merit, service, and birth. But, especially, after the imprudent public letter opposing the Queen's marriage to the Duke of Alençon and a subsequent period of exile from court, he was obviously regarded by Elizabeth as unfit for major office. Proud of his family background (on his mother's side), the son of a government official who had profited little from his years of faithful service, Sidney was, in the early 1580's, a fiercely ambitious courtier who faced the reality of a failed political career—whose final stage culminated in his bravely foolish death. Lady Rich was for him, as was Anne Boleyn for Wyatt, a fit symbol of his unattained and unattainable social and political goals. She was, after all, the stepdaughter of the man whose property the poet had hoped to inherit—a prospect that would have enabled him to marry a more wealthy and socially prominent woman than Frances Walsingham.[16] Lady Rich was a bright star of Elizabeth's court, whose marriage to a titled man of wealth and whose (at least fictional) rejection of the poet-lover became convenient focuses for the injuries to Sidney's self-esteem.[17]

In *Astrophil and Stella* the metaphorizing of ambition as love presupposes an interpenetration of poetic text and biographical-social context, a situation we must accept if we are to understand the sonnet sequence historically. Sidney deliberately located his fictionalization of love in the very political framework in which he

hoped to succeed. But he ironically made his lover-persona repeatedly deny ambition and profess love. It is significant, for example, that Astrophil's first direct address to Stella takes place in the most historically allusive of the poems, Sonnet 30, a lyric that emphasizes the conjunction between the political and the amorous even as it repudiates it:

> Whether the Turkish new-moone minded be
> To fill his hornes this yeare on Christian coast;
> How *Poles'* right king meanes, without leave of hoast,
> To warme with ill-made fire cold *Moscovy;*
> If French can yet three parts in one agree;
> What now the Dutch in their full diets boast;
> How *Holland* hearts, now so good townes be lost,
> Trust in the shade of pleasing *Orange* tree;
> How *Ulster* likes of that same golden bit,
> Wherewith my father once made it halfe tame;
> If in the Scottish Court be weltring yet;
> These questions busie wits to me do frame;
> I, cumbred with good manners, answer do,
> But know not how, for still I thinke of you.

Many of Sidney's own political experiences and interests figure in this sonnet, including his involvement with the Dutch Protestant cause and his desire to succeed his father as Elizabeth's Lord Deputy in Ireland.[18] Sidney's comic irony highlights the truth that both this poem and others deny, that he was politically ambitious, something of which his coterie readers would have been all too aware. The earlier reference in Sonnet 21 to the "Great expectation" (8) and "great promise" (9) of his youth points to their and others' hopes for his success.

By having Astrophil renounce ambition for love, however, Sidney was free to portray the poet-lover's enemies and detractors as the ones who interpreted his behavior as politically self-serving. While those who are not particularly mean-spirited, Astrophil says in Sonnet 23, "Because the Prince my service tries, / Thinke that I think state errours to redresse" (7-8),

> . . . harder Judges judge ambition's rage,
> Scourge of itself, still climing slipprie place,
> Holds my young braine captiv'd in golden cage.
> O fooles, or over-wise, alas the race
> Of all my thoughts hath neither stop nor start,
> But only *Stella's* eyes and *Stella's* hart. (9-14)

The Sidney who tried ineptly to redress state errors by meddling in the French marriage negotiations consistently acted upon "ambi-

tion's rage," a fact that his readers would have recognized, but probably would have expressed less harshly, knowing how to interpret the disingenuous overvaluation of love in this and the other poems. Of course, by mentioning the way skeptical observers might regard the lover's behavior, Sidney referred to the normal attitude of Elizabeth's courtiers toward him. He wrote later from the Low Countries to his father-in-law: "I understand I am called very ambitious and prowd at home, but certainly if thei knew my ha[rt] thei woold not altogether so judg me."[19]

Sonnet 27 pointedly refutes such a (supposed) misinterpretation of the poet-lover's activities:

> Because I oft in darke abstracted guise,
> Seeme most alone in greatest companie,
> With dearth of words, or answers quite awrie,
> To them that would make speech of speech arise,
> They deeme, and of their doome the rumour flies,
> That poison foule of bubling pride doth lie
> So in my swelling breast that only I
> Fawne on my self, and others to despise:
> Yet pride I thinke doth not my soule possesse,
> Which lookes too oft in his unflattring glasse:
> But one worse fault, *Ambition*, I confesse,
> That makes me oft my best friends overpasse,
> Unseene, unheard, while thought to highest place
> Bends all his powers, even unto *Stella's* grace.

This poem wittily reconverts the language of ambition into the language of love. But the effect is to signal the connection between the two. The pretense that love and ambition are separate either in courtly life or in the lover's motives is a thin one. Even though Astrophil distinguishes himself from the "busie wits" who "discourse of courtly tides" (51.9), Sidney himself was certainly one of their company.

The irony in the poet's use of the fictional lover's disclaimers is an insistent one:

> I do not envie *Aristotle's* wit,
> Nor do aspire to *Caesar's* bleeding fame,
> Nor ought do care, though some above me sit,
> Nor hope, nor wishe another course to frame,
> But that which once may win thy cruell hart:
> Thou art my Wit, and thou my Vertue art.
>
> (64.9-14)

Sidney, of course, cared passionately about learning (or about his reputation for learning), about the kind of military heroism that led

to his death, and about his own relatively inferior social status—all interests denied in these lines. To take the example of the last of these, one only has to recall this author's sensitivity about his social rank. Although he had an exalted sense of his own worth by "birth" (62.8), he enjoyed in his lifetime a status no higher than that of knighthood, an honor he received only because Count Casimir requested him as a stand-in at a Garter investiture ceremony and for this he had to be raised to a higher social level.[20] In referring disparagingly to himself as "sir foole" (53.7) or in calling Stella's parrot "sir *Phip*" (83.14), Sidney alluded ironically to his title of honor. He was all too aware of the social disparity between himself and the greater nobility whose ranks he had hoped to enter, having been humiliated publicly in the famous tennis court quarrel with the arrogant Earl of Oxford and in the Queen's subsequent admonishment that he learn his place. Although Fulke Greville later romanticized the incident as an example of the way a free-born gentleman could stand up for his rights in the face of the "oppressions of the grandees,"[21] the episode was one of many reminders to Sidney that his actual social status could not bear the weight of his aspirations.

Of course all had not been frustration, disappointment, and humiliation in Sidney's courtly experience. If Osborn is right in suggesting that the first tournament poem (Sonnet 41) refers to Sidney's participation in the tilting of May 15, 1581,[22] that episode was one that could have been turned into a metaphor of amorous favor. As Louis Adrian Montrose has shown,[23] the "Triumph of the Fortress of Perfect Beauty" tournament, of which the tilting was a part, was a particularly apposite context for the association of the erotic and the political. In Sonnet 41 the conspicuously absent figure is the one who was at the center of the courtly ceremonial, the Queen herself. By putting in her place a sonnet-mistress who favors the poet-lover's actions, Sidney once again transformed the political into the amorous. At the same time, he referred to an analogous situation in which the same literary langauge was enacted at court. The chivalrous Astrophil, who performs in the fictional world of the poetry before both Stella and the commissioners sent by "that sweet enemie *Fraunce*" (41.4) to arrange a royal marriage, is Sidney the tilter in but another guise.

It is curious that the fleeting moment of triumph in the sonnet sequence, celebrated in Sonnet 69, locates the lover's victory in an arena of competition: "Envie, put out thine eyes, least thou do see / What Oceans of delight in me do flow" (3-4). Writing a number

of years earlier about a politically encoded "desire" (one of his favorite words), the Earl of Oxford had stated:

> Desyre can haue no greater payne
> Then for to see an other mann
> The thinge desyred to obtayne
> Nor greater ioye can be than this
> That to enjoye that others mysse.[24]

In the cultural vocabulary of courtiers both love and ambition required the presence of potentially envious competitors.

As has often been noted, Sidney used the term "desire" in *Astrophil and Stella* in an emphatically sexual sense. In Sonnet 72, for example, it is typically the disruptive erotic force that breaks the decorum of a polite relationship the same way that presumptuous ambition violated the rules of the courtier's relationship with the Queen. From a Jacobean perspective, Sir Francis Bacon said of Elizabeth that she was like the kind of queen one finds in romances who "allows of amorous admiration but prohibts desire."[25] As Richard McCoy has suggested in his fine discussion of the *Arcadia*, there is an historical basis for Sidney's association of seduction and sedition.[26] The sestet of the sonnet suggests that banishment was an appropriate punishment for both the sexually assertive lover and the actively ambitious courtier:

> Service and Honor, wonder with delight,
> Feare to offend, will worthie to appeare,
> Care shining in mine eyes, faith in my sprite,
> These things are left me by my only Deare;
> But thou Desire, because thou wouldst have all,
> Now banisht art, but yet alas how shall?
>
> (9-14)

In the thematics of the sonnet sequence, erotic desire for the sexual favors of a Petrarchan mistress (whose conditions for loving explicitly forbid such yielding) is the amorous analogue of the poet's political willfulness. In the wittily cynical poem on Edward IV (Sonnet 75), Sidney treats this material in yet another way. Describing this lecherous royal failure as a "worthy knight" who "durst prove / To lose his Crowne, rather then faile his Love" (13-14), Sidney ironically communicates the message that the world is well lost for love at a point in the sequence at which even love is impossible. In Sonnet 84 Sidney alludes to the fact that he is "blam'd for [Dudley] bloud" and "sham'd for sinfull deed" (11), the

latter ambiguously suggesting both erotic and political frowardness. The penultimate sonnet in the collection combines the erotic and political codes in a final unmistakable form:

> *Stella* since thou so right a Princesse art
> Of all the powers which life bestowes on me,
> That ere by them ought undertaken be,
> They first resort unto that soueraigne part;
> Sweete, for a while give respite to my hart,
> Which pants as though it still should leape to thee:
> And on my thoughts give thy Lieftenancy
> To this great cause, which needs both use and art,
> And as a Queene, who from her presence sends
> Whom she imployes, dismisse from thee my wit,
> Till it have wrought what thy owne will attends.
> On servants' shame oft Maister's blame doth sit;
> O let not fooles in me thy workes reprove,
> And scorning say, 'See what it is to love.'
>
> (Sonnet 107)

At the end of the sonnet sequence the lover is left disgraced and exiled in a state that characterizes Sidney's own political frustration and disillusionment. The central irony of *Astrophil and Stella* is that the heterocosm of love to which the poet-lover has fled from the viciously competitive world of the court is no compensation for sociopolitical defeat. Instead it is the locale for a painful repetition of the experience in another mode. In the context of this sequence, amorous courtship is not only fraught with temptations to self-delusion and dangers to self-esteem analogous to those found in the world of politics; it is also, in a sense, the very same reality expressed in different terms.

This, I believe, is exactly the way Sidney expected coterie readers like Sir Fulke Greville and Sir Edward Dyer to interpret the sonnets. After all, he had treated just this kind of material earlier in, for example, the answer poem to Dyer's "Prometheus" sonnet[27] and he probably took Greville as the model for the critic-friend of Sonnets 14, 21, and 69.[28] In a biography written at a low point of his political frustration, Greville later made Sidney into a symbol of his own victimization.[29] Both friends were able not only to appreciate the artistic skill and originality of *Astrophil and Stella* but also to perceive Sidney's ironic manipulation of its relationship to specific biographical and social contexts. The importance of such readers as a sympathetic and knowledgeable audience is suggested by the rhetorically significant place assigned to the poet-lover's friends

and peers within the sequence, a group addressed more often than the mistress herself.

Sidney stressed the coterie character of his sonnet sequence by emphasizing its metapoetic and metacommunicative features, extending in a new way the literary self-consciousness of his circle. He explicitly treated within the verse itself the proper style, content, originality, and method of interpreting love sonnets; he called attention to the fact that he was presenting, parodying, and commenting upon traditional forms such as the kiss poem, the Anacreontic lyric, the palinode, and the reverdie; he displayed an ironic awareness of engaging in the act of writing a Petrarchan sequence that is repeatedly anti-Petrarchan. He thus invited his sophisticated readers to exercise their critical faculties to such a degree that the whole work must have begun to take the shape of a metapoem, that is a literary work whose metacommunicative character made the relationship of poet and audience more important than either the ostensible amorous subject-matter or its sociopolitical coordinates.[30] The shared attitudes, the common method of interpreting social experience, the sensitivity to the ironic interplay of literature and its immediate historical context—these became the real center of the communication. Sidney thus used the environment of *Astrophil and Stella* as an imaginative and social retreat more hospitable to him than was the larger world. This was, of course, the usual situation for his literary works.

II

In the years between their composition and the poor Newman edition of 1591,[31] the *Astrophil and Stella* poems appear to have circulated in the restricted Sidney-Pembroke circle that included the poet's friends, his relatives, and their clients. Unlike other privately circulated courtly verse, which normally found its way through the vagaries of manuscript transmission into a larger social environment, often finally into printed editions or anthologies, these songs and sonnets seem to have been kept out of the literary mainstream for about eight years. Had they reached a wider manuscript audience they would have appeared, as did the verse of Dyer, Oxford, and Ralegh, and Sidney's own *Arcadia* poems and *Certain Sonnets,* in some of the commonplace-book poetical miscellanies of the period.[32]

Apart from the immediate influence on Fulke Greville, reflected in the compiling of poems in *Caelica, Astrophil and Stella* obvi-

ously stimulated Sidney's younger brother Robert to compose a similar collection. The recently rediscovered sequence he wrote in the early part of his public life, as G. F. Waller has observed, "seems to reflect something of [his] own political and personal career, caught as he was in the Low Countries carrying on his brother's political duties."[33] Henry Constable, loosely connected to the Sidney-Pembroke circle, also shaped sonnets into a collection, some poems of which appealed to Lady Rich for patronage. Well before their inclusion in *Diana* (1594)—a book published after Constable's conversion to Catholicism, flight from England, and abandonment of love poetry[34]—Sir John Harington recorded twenty-one of his friend's sonnets in his family's manuscript poetical miscellany. Separated from these entries by but one poem is the beginning of a transcription of *Astrophil and Stella* labelled "Sonnetes of Sir Phillip Sydneys [vppon] ye Lady Ritch." Two poems later, Harington copied Sir Walter Ralegh's epitaph on Sidney in which the deceased poet is called the "Cipio, Cicero and Petrarke of owr tyme."[35]

Ralegh's epitaph, like the other contemporary poetical and prose accounts of Sidney's life and death, helped to transform the departed poet-courtier into a culture-hero.[36] Clearly the initial reception and imitation of the printed *Astrophil and Stella* (1591) were shaped by the idealization of this author as both intellectual-literary paragon and political martyr. The sonnet sequence was important not only as the masterful achievement of an "English Petrarke"[37] but also as the exemplary utterance of a well-born courtier whose failures were romanticized as a magnificent triumph—especially by "alienated intellectuals"[38] who lacked advancement. Newman included, among the other appended poems in his augmented edition, Greville's lyric "Faction that euer dwells / in Courts" (*Caelica* 29), a choice (or happy accident) underscoring the sociopolitical encoding of Sidney's sonnet sequence and the transformation of its author into a cultural sign. But, inevitably, in the translation from coterie manuscript circulation to print, the precise social coordinates of the poems were lost and what remained was a generalized language perceived as the proper idiom of the disappointed and the importunate, one flexible enough to be used in circumstances other than those in which Sidney had found himself.

For his immediate contemporaries and successors, Sidney endowed the sonnet form and the sonnet sequence with a special prestige. The genre's rhetorical strategies were usually those of the

politely deferential suitor, by definition the social inferior of the putative addressee. But Sidney's use of the form in a substantial body of lyrics, especially in the context of his rhetorically forceful assertions of independence and autonomy, established the sonnet sequence in late Elizabethan England as a socially respectable enterprise.[39] Despite the fact that some desperate poetasters and socially pretentious gentlemen virtually made a travesty of the practice by mishandling the task of composing sonnet collections,[40] it is still true that Sidney's authorizing example permitted writers like Daniel, Spenser, and Shakespeare to adopt the form without endangering their social status. He 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. In one sense, sonneteering was perceived as an activity for losers: hence some of the rhetorically violent attacks on the practice by satirists like Marston, Guilpin, and Hall as well as the practice of undermining the decorum of the form by writing "Gullinge Sonnets" (Sir John Davies),[41] prurient Ovidian sonnets (Barnabe Barnes),[42] and strongly-pointed sonnet-epigrams (Shakespeare).

The inclusion of twenty-eight of his sonnets in Newman's unauthorized edition of *Astrophil and Stella* gave Samuel Daniel the opportunity to share in Sidney's fame and to bring out his own textually more accurate edition of *Delia* (1592) as a separate volume. He dedicated the work to Sidney's sister, Mary, Countess of Pembroke, as an act of complimentary imitation of his patroness' brother, hoping for the continuance of aristocratic favor. The ambitious suitorship that Sidney enacted on the national and international stage was thus translated into more restricted and more humble social circumstances. The dedicatory sonnet prefixed to the 1594, 1595, and 1598 editions of *Delia* presents the collection as an act of clientage on Daniel's part:

Wonder of these, glory of other times,
O thou whom Enuy eu'n is forst t'admyre:
Great Patroness of these my humble Rymes,
Which thou from out thy greatnes doost inspire:
Sith onely thou hast deign'd to rayse them higher,
Vouchsafe now to accept them as thine owne,
Begotten by thy hand, and my desire,
Wherein my Zeale, and thy great might is showne.
And seeing this unto the world is knowne,
O leaue not, still to grace thy worke in mee:

Let not the quickning seede be ouer-throwne,
Of that which may be borne to honour thee.
Whereof, the trauaile I may challenge mine,
But yet the glory, (Madame) must be thine.
(Sprague, pp. 170-171)[43]

While he does not actually say the Countess is his Delia, Daniel flatteringly claims that the poems were "Begotten by thy hand, and my desire": although the sonnets about the "sweet maid of Avon," as Joan Rees suggests, may have belonged to a fruitless courtship broken off because of "social inequality,"[44] they could be reused as poems of compliment to a patroness. The poems that represented originally, as Daniel said, the "Priuate passions of my youth . . . uttered to my selfe, and consecrated to silence" (Sprague, p. 9) served new purposes as a tributory offering.

Daniel's sequence is really an anthology of sonnets in the process of being converted into a unified work. In composing, revising, and expanding the collection for publication and republication, Daniel obviously was at pains to construct a plausible thematic development, a high degree of literary polish, and a consistent portrayal of the sonnet-mistress. To this end he took what were probably, in many cases, occasional poems and fit them into an artful arrangement. The project, of course, allowed him to satisfy literary ambitions as he appealed to his patroness for continuing social and economic support. But since he did not consider himself a professional writer comfortable with printing his works, but a gentlemanly amateur cultivating patronage in a dignified manner, his literary competitiveness belonged to an immediate set of social relationships and not merely to the framework of literary history. He expressed a strong, but friendly, rivalry with Edmund Spenser, another poet connected with the Sidney-Pembroke circle, envying the (small) measure of royal patronage that author won by writing *The Faerie Queene:*

Let other sing of Knights and Palladines,
In aged accents, and vntimely words:
Paint shadowes in imaginary lines,
Which well the reach of their high wits records;
But I must sing of thee and those faire eyes,
Autentique shall my verse in time to come,
When yet th'vnborne shall say, loe where she lyes,
Whose beautie made him speake that els was dombe.
These are the Arkes and Tropheis I erect,
That fortifie thy name against old age,
And these thy sacred vertues must protect,

> Against the Darke and times consuming rage.
> Though th'error of my youth they shall discouer,
> Suffice they shew I liu'd and was thy louer.
>
> (Sonnet 46)

Although Daniel protests that his is an "vnambitious Muse" (48.1) and that he did not compose "mercynary lines, with seruile pen" (6), he clearly wrote a deferential poetry of patronage for which his plaintive style was expecially suited. In such a situation other poets could have been perceived as competitors for a patroness' social and economic favors. The eternizing conceit probably better suited someone like the Countess of Pembroke than the (real or imagined) original sonnet-mistress, for Daniel used his pen to curry her favor, as he later sought that of the Countess of Bedford and Queen Anne.

A similar combination of strong literary rivalry, the eternizing conceit, and the appeal for patronage is found in Shakespeare's sonnets. In his poems to the young man, Shakespeare wrote the poetry of compliment to a social superior. Despite the unmistakable gestures of moral and intellectual superiority and the self-advertising act of literary-cultural mastery probably involved in allowing the "sugred *Sonnets*" to circulate among his "priuate friends,"[45] Shakespeare presented himself in these poems as the insecure petitioner who seeks the continuing favor of a patron in order to enjoy social (and probably financial) rewards.[46] The man who was so concerned with gentleman's status in the 1590's and who made a deliberate effort to secure his family's claim to a coat of arms,[47] the bourgeois provincial poet who was associated with the socially unrespectable professions of acting and playwrighting, entered into a patron-client relationship with undoubted socioeconomic aspirations. Though he claims in the sonnets to prefer the young man's love to "public honour and proud titles" (25.2) and tells him "Thy love is better than high birth to me" (91.9), denying elsewhere that his "dear love" is "the child of state" (124.1), he clearly expressed social ambitions in the poems.

Sonnet 29 is a most interesting poem to consider in relation to this context:

> When in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes,
> I all alone beweep my outcast state,
> And trouble deaf heav'n with my bootless cries,
> And look upon myself and curse my fate,
> Wishing me like to one more rich in hope,
> Featured like him, like him with friends possessed,
> Desiring this man's art and that man's scope,

With what I most enjoy contented least;
Yet in these thoughts myself almost despising,
Haply I think on thee, and then my state,
Like to the lark at break of day arising
From sullen earth, sings hymns at heaven's gate;
  For thy sweet love rememb'red such wealth brings
  That then I scorn to change my state with kings.

Like Donne's "The Canonization," Shakespeare's sonnet ironically asserts the sufficiency of love and its power to compensate wonderfully for social losses and defeats. But, there is also a similar kind of manic hyperbole that suggests the degree to which the speaker's self-consolation is forced and inadequate. Despite the obvious exaggeration, the painful sense of the devastating reality of "disgrace" and poor "fortune," of being in a world where "heav'n" is "deaf" to one's "cries," of envious resentment of the happier prospects of others cannot really be wished away or transcended by means of the happy remembrance of love. The epigrammatic couplet, which asserts the speaker's superiority to the vicissitudes of fortune, is an eloquent, but patently disingenuous, gesture.[48]

Shakespeare employed an encoded language in Sonnet 29 to deal with social and economic disappointment: for example, such words as "disgrace," "fortune," "hope," "scope," "arising," and "state." By using the last term to refer both to emotional condition and to social status, he suggests a connection between the two. The word "friends" (6) had a special meaning in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England in terms of the sociology of patronage. As Lawrence Stone has recently reminded us: "'my friends' . . . before the eighteenth century always meant no more than 'my advisors, associates and backers.' This category often indicated a relative, particularly a parent or an uncle by blood or marriage. But it could also include . . . a person of high status and influence with whom there was acquaintance and from whom there was hope of patronage."[49] Sir Francis Bacon shrewdly observed in his essay "Of Followers and Factions," "There is little friendship in the worlde, and least of all betweene equals; which was wont to bee magnified. That that is, is betweene superiour and inferiour, whose fortunes may comprehend the one the other."[50] In valuing his friendship with the young man of the sonnets, Shakespeare did more than simply express his affection and love; he underscored the importance of his hope of patronage.

After all, it is friendship as patronage that is at stake in the most

serious crisis of the collection, the rival poet sequence and its aftermath. Shakespeare dramatized two betrayals in the sonnets to the young man: the first is implied by the "sensual fault" (35.9) of the young man's stealing the poet's mistress; the second, and more serious one, occurs in the favoring of a rival poet. The first is rationalized with relative ease: in a collection in which erotic love and the affectionate friendship of males are kept strictly separate, as in Sonnets 20 and 144, and in which the latter relationship is portrayed as the only one of moral and spiritual value, the young man's libertinism can be excused, even when it involves the woman with whom the poet has had a liaison.[51] The second betrayal, however, strikes at the heart of a friendship in which affectionate love and beneficent patronage are inextricably mixed. In such a situation, the favoring of a rival poet can be perceived as terrible rejection, the focal point for the poet's gradual disillusionment. In his treatment of the patron's betrayal and in the related discovery of this fair youth's inability to reciprocate love, Shakespeare seems to acknowledge a failure of purpose. Recognizing that the young man is really uneducable, morally obtuse, and generally unworthy of anything more sincere than the kind of praise rendered in encomiastic formulae, the poet discovers he is engaging in self-praise finally, celebrating a love whose constancy, growth, and worth exist in himself rather than in a beloved friend who is actually abandoned to his impervious narcissism.[52] He discovers also in his resources as a poet the means both for enacting a kind of revenge and for establishing an authority and status better than the benefits of clientage. Shakespeare uses the eternizing conceit, among other purposes, for asserting a power that reverses the roles of inferior and superior; he also projects onto the recurrent figure of time-as-destroyer the hostility and resentment implicit in his disadvantageous position as a client.[53] The section of sonnets to the young man ends not with what the poet calls the "mutual render" of "me for thee" (125.12) but with the prediction of the way a destructive time will "render" (126.12) the now "lovely boy" (126.1) to death (and higher judgment).

In circulating his sonnets among his "priuate friends," Shakespeare, I believe, strongly asserted both moral and aesthetic authority, thus making up for some of the social disadvantages implicit in a poetry of patronage. He subtly exposed the young man's moral corruption, sometimes with surprising forcefulness as in such passages as the powerful couplet of Sonnet 94 ("For sweetest things

turn sourest by their deeds; / Lilies that fester smell far worse than weeds."). He also mercilessly anatomized his own weaknesses, self-delusions, and vices, powerfully juxtaposing, as in *Hamlet*, an analysis of viciousness with a pained yearning for the ideal. His self-conscious display of aesthetic power, however, was no less significant, often, as in some of the sonnets' pointed conclusions, part of their ethical force.

Shakespeare's inventive conflation of sonnet and epigram forms points to an important instance of his assertion of his artistic authority.[54] The polite rhetoric of the sonnet suited hierarchical relationships, including the poet-patron one involved in Shakespeare's collection. The plainspeaking critical idiom of the epigram belonged properly, like satire and the humanist verse epistle, to the transactions between peers. To utilize the rhetoric of the epigram in sonnets, fashioning for some of them epigrammatically-pointed conclusions, was to convert the social position of the deferential suitor into the morally, aesthetically and socially authoritative role of an artist free to address equals as well as to condescend to social *and moral* inferiors. In mixing genres and styles, then, Shakespeare compensated for social inferiority and injuries, dissociating himself, as Sidney did, from the social-rhetorical disadvantages of the sonnet and claiming, in literary competition with other writers, a kind of aesthetic mastery.[55] He seems to have acknowledged the failure of his sonnets as patronage verse—this is one of the implications of the rival poet crisis and its consequences. Although he probably wished to retain the social advantages of private manuscript circulation rather than arranging for book-publication, he self-consciously crafted a literary monument, a work that could transcend the socially limiting conditions of coterie poetry.

In 1595, Edmund Spenser presented his *Amoretti* (with the accompanying *Epithalamion*) as the polished work of England's most *literarily* ambitious author. Having already used the medium of print to advertise his status as his country's most accomplished poet and to win royal patronage, Spenser exploited the advantages offered by publication to a writer whose social status would not have been harmed (as Sidney's would have been) by the "stigma of print."[56]

Through print, Spenser exercised his artistic control in a less restricted environment than that of occasional poetry and offered his sonnet sequence as a part of a literary tradition in which aesthetic value was the main criterion of merit, competing on equal

terms with predecessors and contemporaries. He followed Sidney's example in composing a structured sequence, but he also gave it a more ingeniously articulated order—for example, a calendrical structure[57]—as he looked back past his illustrious friend and patron to the literary achievements of Petrarch and Dante. He used the publication of sonnets as yet another occasion to claim "laureateship,"[58] proclaiming artistic authority in a world that consistently frustrated his economic and political ambitions.

Unable to boast of high social status, Spenser advertised his role as the author of *The Faerie Queene*, the literary masterpiece by which he claimed to be England's great national poet and a royal client. In Sonnet 33 of the *Amoretti*, addressed to his friend Lodowick Bryskett, he wrote about his in-progress epic:

> Great wrong I doe, I can it not deny,
> to that most sacred Empresse my dear dred,
> not finishing her Queene of faery,
> that mote enlarge her liuing prayses dead:
> But lodowick, this of grace to be aread:
> doe ye not thinck th'accomplishment of it,
> sufficient worke for one mans simple head,
> all were it as the rest but rudely writ.
> How then should I without another wit,
> thinck euer to endure so taedious toyle,
> sins that this one is tost with troublous fit,
> of a proud loue, that doth my spirite spoyle,
> Ceasse then, till she vouchsafe to grawnt me rest,
> or lend you me another liuing brest.

Complaining that his love for his mistress (and wife-to-be) distracted him from his romantic-epic project in praise of Queen Elizabeth, Spenser reminded his friend (and the reader) that he was a major poet who had undertaken an intellectually and artistically challenging work that had a kind of royal authorization. Simultaneously, he complimented his beloved as an object of amorous attention attractive enough to divert him from this public role. As in the case of Sidney's first tournament poem, there is a happy connection between public and private success, between the royal patroness and the sonnet-mistress.

The relationship between the two idealizable women is made explicit in the poem about the three Elizabeths in the poet's life:

> Most happy letters fram'd by skilfull trade,
> with which that happy name was first desynd:
> the which three times thrise happy hath me made,

with guifts of body, fortune and of mind.
The first my being to me gaue by kind,
from mothers womb deriu'd by dew descent,
the second is my souereigne Queen most kind,
that honour and large richesse to me lent.
The third my loue, my liues last ornament,
by whom my spirit out of dust was raysed:
to speake her prayse and glory excellent,
of all alive most worthy to be praysed.
Ye three Elizabeths for euer liue,
that three such graces did vnto me giue.

(Sonnet 74)

As benefactresses (and as maternal figures), the three women are praised for the "guifts" they have given the poet: the first, his mother, for his very being, the second, Queen Elizabeth, for social prestige and economic support, and the third, Elizabeth Boyle, for an ennobling love. A fantasy of nurturance underlies all three relationships and, when things go wrong morally in the sequence, as they do in the famous poems about the mistress' breasts (Sonnets 76-77), the cause is metaphorized as an oral longing that has become a predatory greed.

When the poet announces the completion of the first six books of his epic in Sonnet 80, he defines his lyric sequence as secondary activity compared to his more public poem:

After so long a race as I haue run
Through Faery land, which those six books compile,
giue leaue to rest me being halfe fordonne,
and gather to my selfe new breath awhile.
Then as a steed refreshed after toyle,
out of my prison I will breake anew:
and stoutly will that second worke assoyle,
with strong endeuour and attention dew.
Till then giue leaue to me in pleasant mew,
to sport my muse and sing my loues sweet praise:
the contemplation of whose heauenly hew,
my spirit to an higher pitch will rayse.
But let her prayses yet be low and meane,
fit for the handmayd of the Faery Queene.

Again, the relationship with his monarch that Spenser enjoyed as the poet of *The Faerie Queene* takes precedence over the one that is the subject of these recreative sonnets. But in praising a "handmayd" of Elizabeth, Spenser gave his poems the moral and religious seriousness needed to protect them against the censure of amorous verse associated with the attitudes of politically powerful

men like Lord Burghley.[59] Spenser took pains to see that neither Queen nor mistress could be scandalized by the published work for which he claimed, as Sonnet 51 suggests, the status of a literary monument.

Unlike the other sonnet sequences of the 1590's, the *Amoretti* celebrates a relationship of amorous mutuality. Instead of making courtship repeat in another mode the frustrations and disappointments experienced in the public world, Spenser created a sphere of reciprocity in which love could be fulfilled. But for him, as assuredly as for Donne or Shakespeare (the dramatist), mutual loving had social implications beyond the private world of a couple. When a toughminded Bacon wrote in his 1612 essay "Of Love" that "loue is euer rewarded either with the reciproque, or with an inward and secret contempt,"[60] he was articulating a morality of reciprocity applicable both to personal amorous experience and to social, economic, and political transactions. In the context of the powerful socioeconomic realities of Elizabethan England, including those marriage arrangements that left little room in the experience of the gentry or nobility for romantic love, amorous mutuality was a compelling cultural fantasy. It created a situation of open competition and reward through merit that served as an ideal not only for love relationships but also for other kinds of social transactions. From the time of the early Tudor interlude *Fulgens and Lucres* through Shakespeare's romantic comedies, marriage for love was a metaphor for advancement by merit rather than by birth or influence. But, given the established social order, in neither love nor politics did this system obtain. Thus the literary depiction of a love-match could compensate, but only imaginatively and emotionally, for the way things were. In the *Amoretti,* mutual love implies this larger context: Spenser both separates a sphere of amorous, moral, and spiritual fulfillment from the more frustrating and disappointing larger world and, especially in the last sonnets of the collection, dramatizes that world's intrusion—in the form of an envious slander inevitable in the environment of social competition.

In his sonnet sequence, Spenser exercised two related types of authority through which he achieved the moral and literary prestige that could partly compensate for his socioeconomic disadvantages. Although his lover-persona speaks from the point-of-view of the deferentially polite suitor, he nonetheless assumes the role of moral educator—both for his beloved and for a larger audience. In the high comedy of the *Amoretti,* the speaker teasingly criticizes his

mistress' personal vanity and egotism (Sonnets 27, 45), her coquettishness (Sonnet 47), her hubristic self-assurance (Sonnet 58), and, most importantly, her fear of commitment (Sonnet 65). While accepting love as a traditional means of moral education for the lover (a function treated ironically, even cynically, in Sidney), Spenser's speaker acts as his beloved's intellectual and ethical superior, a position from which he can comically, but affectionately, condescend to her at various points in the sequence.[61] The fact that Spenser was some 15-20 years older than his second wife no doubt facilitated this strategy.

But this authority within the amorous fiction reflects the serious poetic authority Spenser valued so highly in all his work and proclaimed to a large audience through publication. As for Ben Jonson, whose arrogant publicizing of his *Works* in 1616 was a similar gesture, Spenser's deliberate printing of a series of literary compositions in various forms from the eclogue, the complaint, the hymn, the epic, to the sonnet sequence was an act of assuming the social eminence claimed earlier by writers like Petrarch and Ronsard. In identifying the "laurell leafe" (28.1) he gives his mistress as "the badg which I doe beare" (3), he self-consciously signals his role as English laureate poet. Spenser remained the frustrated politician, complaining late in his career in the *Prothalamion* about the

> . . . discontent of my long fruitlesse stay
> In Princes Court, and expectation vayne
> Of idle hopes, which still doe fly away,
> Like empty shaddowes. . . .
>
> (6-9)

But he made a virtue of necessity and competed for poetic, rather than sociopolitical preeminence.[62]

In Spenser's literary ambition, as in Jonson's, one can detect fantasy rooted not only in an academic-humanist dream of aesthetic-intellectual glory but also in the specific cultural circumstances of Renaissance England. Dismissed usually as one of the excesses of encomiastic flattery, the traditional association of high social rank and poetic ability could be reversed in the imagination of some authors. The Earl of Surrey was given the premier position in Tottel's *Miscellany,* George Puttenham commended Elizabeth as the greatest poet of the time,[63] and, later, John Donne sent "Holy Sonnets" to the young Earl of Dorset claiming they were inferior to this nobleman's own compositions.[64] *The Phoenix Nest* (1593) dignified its poetic contents by advertising that they were the "most rare and

refined workes of Noble men, woorthy Knights, gallant Gentlemen, Masters of Arts, and braue Schollers" (Rollins, p. 1), using the same kind of hierarchical ordering John Bodenham employed in his introduction to his commonplace anthology *Belvedere*.[65] And, as I am arguing, Sidney's (exaggerated) social prestige enhanced the contemporary value of his sonnet collection, elevating the form in the hierarchical literary system. But the main point of the Sidney influence was that a writer like Spenser could assume that the equation could work the other way: just as social status could bring aesthetic merit in its train, so aesthetic merit could confer a kind of social prestige. This belief is yet another version of the wish for a social system in which abilities count more than birth, and gentlemen are made not born. In the ambiguous statement to Ralegh about his purpose in *The Faerie Queene*, Spenser remarked that the poem was written to "fashion a gentleman or noble person in virtuous and gentle discipline." This suggests that one did not become a gentleman or nobleman by birth but by intellectual, moral, spiritual, and social education. In his late commendatory sonnet to the translation of Nenna's *Nennio*, he stated this outright; one can "seeke by right deserts t'attaine, / Vnto the type of true Nobility, / And not by painted shewes and titles vaine / Deriued farre from famous Auncestrie" (2-4). Noble is as noble does: an old idea, articulated, for example, in Chaucer's "Wife of Bath's Tale" and many other Medieval and Renaissance fictional and non-fictional texts, but one particularly favorable to Spenser's own situation as both a socially and an aesthetically ambitious man of low birth. In their dreams of royal support for and authorization of their literary enterprises, Spenser and Jonson passionately wanted to believe in the possibility of winning social status through artistic merit. The latter's reference to the former's supposed death in poverty,[66] however, was only one indication, among many, of the acknowledged impossibility of realizing such an aspiration, at least in their contemporary worlds.

III

With the example of Fulke Greville's *Caelica* we return to the Sidneyan starting-point, to the coterie circumstances of sociopolitically encoded love poetry. In this collection of verse, however, only 41 poems of which are actual sonnets, there is a clear signal within the text of the end of amorous sonneteering.

Unpublished in Greville's lifetime, *Caelica* is, in Geoffrey Bul-

lough's words, "not a true love-sequence, but the repository of all those of his shorter pieces which he wished to survive" (I, 34). In terms of the different social circumstances of lyric poetry ranging from private coterie circulation to deliberate publication, *Caelica* represents the work of a literary amateur jealousy guarding the poems he composed in his idle hours away from courtly business, many examples of which, as the posthumous Folio page advertises, were "Written in his Youth, and familiar Exercise with SIR PHILIP SIDNEY" (Bullough, I, 25). Many of the lyrics, especially those from the early part of the collection, were probably generated by Greville's participation in the recreations of the Sidney circle. Sonnet 3 looks like a poem written to compete with the lyric that became the eighth sonnet of Spenser's *Amoretti*. Sonnet 83 is an answer to Dyer's famous "Fancy." Several pieces specifically imitate or compete with sonnets and songs from *Astrophil and Stella* or poems from the *Arcadia*.[67] It is interesting that Greville apparently composed his famous life of Sidney as an introduction to a planned edition of his own works, thus explicitly utilizing his friend as a means of authorizing his literary efforts.

In its first unit of poems (1-76, and the misplaced 83), dated by Ronald Rebholz between 1577 and 1587,[68] *Caelica* represents a collection of verse loosely modelled on Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*. The lyrics, however, appear to be a rather heterogeneous anthology of pieces belonging to different social and literary circumstances. The signs of anthologizing are obvious. There are some lyrics implying particular social occasions, such as the lover's taking liberties with his mistress' breasts (Sonnet 25). Greville was part of the social world of the Elizabethan court, where he was nicknamed "Robin Goodfellow" and supposedly flirted with the Queen's maids of honor and ladies-in-waiting.[69] Both complementary and satiric pieces could have been written in such an environment. The poems to Myra and Caelica, as well as most of those to Cynthia, appear to have been addressed to a middle-aged courtly woman of fashion.[70] Some other lyrics may refer to the Queen herself as the object of devotion.[71] Sonnets 72 and 73, a poem and answer set, are an example of a courtly literary game played, for instance, by the Earl of Oxford and Anne Vavasour as well as by the Queen and Sir Walter Ralegh.[72] The customary signs of the political encoding of amorous verse appear in this collection. Sonnet 29 ("Faction that euer dwells / In Courts") portrays love as the resort of those sick in fortune. Sonnet 30 mixes political and erotic vo-

cabularies as it criticizes the corrupt social system. Sonnet 83, like Dyer's "Fancy," which it answers, is saturated with sociopolitically significant language. Terms like "worth," "desert," and "reward" recur constantly in the poems. But while maintaining the idealization of the Queen with which the collection opens, this bachelor poet presents some uncharacteristically harsh criticism of women for their venality, promiscuity, duplicity, and ambition.[73]

Greville was obviously uncomfortable with love poetry. Sonnets 77-81 are politically critical pieces that deal explicitly with such topics as the abuses of power and the evil of court favorites. Sonnet 81 celebrates Elizabeth (possibly after her death) and, if Rebholz is right in dating 77-81 between 1587 and 1603, this last poem, together with the first, designates a markedly Elizabethan collection of verse. Sonnet 84, like the first poem in Petrarch's *Rime,* is a renunciation lyric that serves to frame both the amorous sequence (Sonnets 1-76, 83) and the rest of the collection (Sonnets 82, 84-109). The last section of *Caelica* is essentially an anthology of philosophical and religious poems, many elements of which can be perceived in the preceding pieces, but nonetheless Jacobean lyrics in a different sociocultural idiom.

Critics usually account for the shift in subject matter in *Caelica* by pointing to this author's religious concerns, to a deepening spiritual commitment that may have taken the form of a conversion experience.[74] But this argument is hard to sustain in the face of the overwhelming evidence that he was throughout his career, in F. J. Levy's words, a "self-serving and unprincipled politician."[75] Although temperamentally inclined to philosophical and religious abstraction and seriously concerned with Protestantism, Greville probably switched from writing amorous verse to composing religious and philosophical poetry partly because, with the change from Elizabethan to Jacobean rule in 1603, the former lost most of its importance as a cultural idiom. With the death of Elizabeth and the accession of a king interested in religious and philosophical verse and prose, love poetry no longer served as a major literary means of expressing social, economic, and political ambition.[76] The fashion for amorous sonnet sequences ended (except for the anachronistic literary persistence of Michael Drayton), as writers looked to other subjects and genres to mediate between their private needs and the social order. Analogously, the popular Elizabethan form of the poetical miscellany containing love poems passed out of vogue. After *A Poetical Rhapsody* (1602) no new

anthology containing amorous verse appeared. Elizabeth Pomeroy's explanation for this change as the result of the growing popularity of song books[77] cannot account for the phenomenon any more than can the claim that sequences of love sonnets exhausted themselves explain why that form disappeared. What happened was that the social circumstances for the production and consumption of literary texts altered. Instead of a Queen who recognized the reality of ambition, manipulated it, and allowed it to be expressed in the language of love, there was a king on the English throne, a man whose earlier sonnets to his wife were perfunctory performances[78] and who misread the ambitious designs of many of his courtiers as love and affection for his person. The author of a treatise on witchcraft and of a scathingly antifeminist poem,[79] James I was inclined to regard women as creatures on whom to project the worst male vices and weaknesses. He preferred also religious and philosophical mystifications of human relationships and political realities to fictions of amorous-ambitious yearning. Complimentary affection, often baldfaced flattery, was sanctioned as socioliterary currency in patronage transactions with the crown and spectacular villainesses were popular in the drama and fictions of the period, women whose ambitions and dangerous sexuality were the grotesque projections of culturally repressed male desires. For example, Spenser's divinized royal mistress became in Jonson's *The Alchemist* a "Queen of Faery" who was a fradulent goddess of good luck impersonated by a prostitute. When the woman who was the model for Sidney's sonnet-mistress died as the Countess of Devonshire, having borne five children in an adulterous relationship and having finally married with royal blessing, she was the satiric target of a widely-circulated obscene epitaph.[80]

* * *

Clearly the analysis of the sonnet fashion in late Elizabethan England in a sociopolitical context points to challenging critical problems—of explaining the culture-specific encoding of literature, the nature of literary change, and the arrangement of a society's heirarchy of genres. As my references to other literary forms suggest, it should be obvious that the kind of historical inquiry conducted in this study, and undertaken already by a number of other scholars discussing various literary types, is not limited to an individual genre, subgenre, or mode. This is precisely what Maria Corti indicates when she states that one-to-one connections be-

tween a "single genre and ideology" should not be isolated from the larger context since "the genre . . . only assumes ideological content through its relations with the other institutions of the literary system."[81] Singly and collectively, the various genres of Elizabethan or Jacobean literature served as the symbolic language that articulated the complex character of the social system and expressed the criticisms that were part of the cultural dialectic. In examining works from any historical moment we need finally to recognize that not only are we in the process of discovering the relationships between verbal artifacts and their sociocultural context, but also we are attempting to define the institution of literature itself—not ahistorically, but in a way proper to a specific period.

Wayne State University

FOOTNOTES

* An earlier version of this essay was presented at a special session on "English Renaissance Literature and the Social Order" at the 1980 MLA convention. The research for it was completed with the help of a Wayne State University Faculty Research Award.

[1] *A Theory of Semiotics* (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1976), p. 59.

[2] F. T. Prince, for example, states: "The publication of *Astrophel and Stella* in 1591 set off a frenzy of sonneteering which soon wore itself out" ("The Sonnet from Wyatt to Shakespeare," in *Elizabethan Poetry*, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 2, ed. John Russell Brown and Bernard Harris [London: Edward Arnold, 1960], p. 21). Some twenty sonnet sequences were written and/or published in the last dozen years of the Elizabethan era.

[3] *George Gascoigne's* A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres, edited with an Introduction and Notes by C. T. Prouty, University of Missouri Studies, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1942; rpt. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1970), pp. 155-57. Cf. William O. Harris, "Early Elizabethan Sonnets in Sequence," *SP*, 68 (1971), 451-69. I have used the following texts for the poets discussed in this essay: *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. William A. Ringler (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962); Samuel Daniel, *Poems and A Defence of Ryme*, ed. Arthur Colby Sprague (1930; rpt. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1965); *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, edited with analytic commentary by Stephen Booth (New Haven and London: Yale University press, 1977); *The Works of Edmund Spenser: A Variorum Edition*, 9 vols., ed. Edwin Greenlaw *et al.* (Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1932-1957); *Poems and Dramas of Fulke Greville, First Lord Brooke*, edited with Introduction and Notes by Geoffrey Bullough, I (New York: Oxford University Press, 1945).

[4] See *Hecatompathia or Passionate Centurie of Love* (1582) and *Pandora* (1584).

[5] Serafino's, Bembo's, Ariosto's *Rime* (1502, 1530, 1534), Sceve's *Délie* (1544), Du Bellay's *Olive* (1548), and Ronsard's poems to Cassandre and Marie (1552, 1555) all represent a much earlier flourishing of the sonnet fashion on the Continent. See the dates of Petrarchan collections printed in Janet G. Scott, *Les Sonnets Élisabéthains: Les Sources et L'Apport Personnel* (Paris, Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1929), pp. 299-302.

[6] See *The Defence & Illustration of the French Language*, trans. Gladys M. Turquet (London: J. M. Dent, 1939), p. 73.

[7] "Magical Narratives: Romance as Genre," *NLH,* 7 (1975), 157. Cf. Alastair Fowler, "The Life and Death of Literary Forms," *NLH,* 2 (1970), 199-216 and Maria Corti, *An Introduction to Literary Semiotics* trans. Margherita Bogat and Allen Mandelbaum (Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1978), pp. 115-143.

[8] See, for example, the discussions of the sexualization of narcissistic material in Heinz Kohut, *The Analysis of The Self: A Systematic Approach to the Psychoanalytic Treatment of Narcissistic Personality Disorders,* The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child Monograph No. 4 (New York: International Universities Press, 1971), pp. 69-72 and *passim* and *The Restoration of the Self* (New York: International Universities Press, 1977), pp. 271-3 and *passim.*

[9] "The Social Causation of the Courtly Love Complex," *Comparative Studies of Society and History,* 1 (1958), 137-59 and "The Meaning of Courtly Love," *Journal of American Folklore,* 73 (1960), 39-52. Cf. Erich Köhler, "Observations historiques et sociologiques sur la poesie des troubadours," *Cahiers de civilisation médievale,* 7 (1964), 27-51. Frederick Goldin says of the medieval lyric poet: ". . . he vacillates between his faith that the lady is a mirror of the ideal, and his suspicion that she is merely the passive and glorified instrument of his own aspiration, reflecting what she does not truly possess" (*The Mirror of Narcissus in the Courtly Love Lyric* [Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1967], p. 51).

[10] *Power and Imagination: City-States in Renaissance Italy* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1979), p. 325.

[11] Sir Harris Nicholas, *Memoirs of the Life and Times of Sir Christopher Hatton* (London: Richard Bentley, 1847), pp. 26-27.

[12] Walter B. Devereux, *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex, 1540-1646* (London: Murray, 1853), I, 465.

[13] See Harington's note in *Ludovico Ariosto's Orlando Furioso translated into English Heroical Verse by Sir John Harington (1591),* edited with an Introduction by Robert McNulty (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), p. 21.

[14] See the discussions of the historical context in: Wallace MacCaffrey, "Place and Patronage in Elizabethan Politics," in *Elizabethan Government and Society: Essays Presented to Sir John Neale,* ed. S. T. Bindoff, J. Hurstfield, and C. H. Williams (London: Althone Press, 1961), pp. 95-126; Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy: 1558-1641* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), esp. pp. 385-504; and Anthony Esler, *The Aspiring Mind of the Elizabethan Younger Generation* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1966). Leonard Forster (*The Icy Fire: Five Studies of European Petrarchism* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969], pp. 122-47) discusses Queen Elizabeth's assumption of the role of the Petrarchan lady. Cf. Frances Yates, "Elizabethan Chivalry: The Romance of the Accession Day Tilts," *JWCI,* 20 (1957), 4-25; Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977); Marie Axton, "The Tudor Mask and Elizabethan Court Drama," in *English Drama: Forms and Development, Essays in Honour of Muriel Clara Bradbrook,* ed. Marie Axton and Raymond Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 24-47, 227-28; the discussion of Sir Henry Lee's handling of his role as Elizabeth's official "champion" in E. K. Chambers, *Sir Henry Lee: An Elizabethan Portrait* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936); and the fine recent essay by Louis A. Montrose, "Celebration and Insinuation: Sir Philip Sidney and the Motives of Elizabethan Courtship," *Renaissance Drama,* N.S. 8 (1977), 3-35. Daniel Javitch (*Poetry and Courtliness in Renaissance England* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978]) discusses courtly behavior primarily from an intellectual-historical point of view.

[15] In the *Secretum,* "Augustine" says to the poet: ". . . since you could not hope for the imperial laurel, you have sought the laurel of poetry" (translated by Marguerite Waller in *Petrarch's Poetics and Literary History* [Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1980], p. 17).

[16] This daughter of Elizabeth's (hardly prosperous) Secretary of State was valued on the aristocratic marriage market only after her husband's death, when, as the widow of the heroic Sidney, she could be passed on to the Earl of Essex along with his sword. Spenser's statement that Sidney wrote all his verse for her is less an indication of his belief than of her social ascent.

[17] For a discussion of the biographical facts see James M. Osborn, *Young Philip Sidney, 1572-1577* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1972), pp. 496-510, 536 and Ringler, pp. 435-47.

[18] See Ringler, pp. 470-71, who refers also to Lisle Cecil John, *The Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), pp. 189-93.

[19] *The Complete Works of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. Albert Feuillerat, III (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923), 167.

[20] See Osborn, pp. 508-9.

[21] *The Life of the Renowned Sr. Philip Sidney* in *The Works in Verse and Prose Complete*, ed. Alexander Grosart, IV (1870; rpt. New York: AMS, 1966), 70. Cf. Osborn, p. 504.

[22] Pp. 505-6.

[23] Pp. 23-31.

[24] "The liuelye larcke stretcht forthe her winge" (20-24), in *Bodleian Rawlinson Poetical MS* 85, transcribed in Lawrence Cummings, "John Finet's Miscellany," Diss. Washington University 1960, p. 197.

[25] "In Felicem Memoriam Elizabethae Angliae Reginae" in *The Works of Francis Bacon*, ed. James Spedding, Robert Eiiis and Douglas Heath, VI (1861; rpt. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag Gunther Holzboog, 1963), 317.

[26] *Sir Philip Sidney: Rebellion in Arcadia* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1979), p. 195.

[27] Dyer's "Prometheus, when first from heauen hie" (in Ralph M. Sargent, *At the Court of Queen Elizabeth: The Life and Lyrics of Sir Edward Dyer* [London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1935], p. 176) expresses the suffering of the man smitten by the love of an angelic mistress; Sidney's "A Satyre once did runne away for dread" (*Certain Sonnets*, 16) characteristically eschews the timidity of "coward minds" (5) to affirm the need for the bold pursuit of one's goal.

[28] This is argued by Rees, pp. 102-3. Cf. Ringler, pp. xxx-xxxii, on the Sidney-Dyer-Greville relationship.

[29] Although throughout his life of Sidney he uses his friend as an outstanding example of neglected merit, it is after the long account of the poet's death in the fourteenth chapter that Greville complains most strongly about his own ill treatment at Elizabeth's hands and the frustration of his ambitions (that remained unrealized through the first decade of the next reign).

[30] Gregory Bateson defines metacommunication as that (usually "implicit") type of communication in which "the subject of discourse is the relationship between the speakers" ("A Theory of Play and Fantasy," in *Steps to an Ecology of Mind* [New York: Ballantine Books, 1972], p. 178). He explains further that it constitutes "all exchanged cues and propositions about (a) codification and (b) the relationship between the communicators" ("Information and Codification: A Philosophical Approach," in Gregory Bateson and Jurgen Ruesch, *Communication: The Social Matrix of Psychiatry* [New York: Norton, 1951], p. 209).

[31] For a discussion of the text of the poems see Ringler, pp. 447-58, 538-46.

[32] Ringler, pp. 538-42, lists only three manuscripts in which substantial numbers of *Astrophil and Stella* poems appear—two connected fairly closely to the Sidney circle, one to Sir John Harington. L. G. Black ("Studies in Some Related Manuscript Poetic Miscellanies of the 1580s," Diss. Oxford University 1970, pp. 244-52) discusses those Sidney poems that show up in the manuscript miscellanies, noting that, while one can find many poems from the *Old Arcadia* and from *Certain Sonnets*, the only pieces from *Astrophil and Stella* to turn up are some of the songs,

which may have been composed prior to the sonnets.

[33] "The 'Sad Pilgrim': The Poetry of Sir Robert Sidney," *Dalhousie Review*, 55 (1975), 696. Cf. the same author's "'My Wants and yowr perfections': Elizabethan England's Newest Poet," *Ariel* 8 (1977), 3-14; J. B. James, "The Other Sidney," *History Today*, 15 (1965), 183-90; and Katherine Duncan-Jones, "'Rosis and Lysa': Selections from the Poems of Sir Robert Sidney," *ELR*, 9 (1979), 240-63.

[34] See the account of Constable's life and work in *The Poems of Henry Constable*, ed. Joan Grundy (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1960), pp. 15-105.

[35] *The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry*, ed. Ruth Hughey (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1960), I, 244-52, 254, 257.

[36] See Richard Lanham, "Sidney: The Ornament of his Age," *Southern Review* (Adelaide), 2 (1967), 319-40 and Alan Hager, "The Exemplary Mirage: Fabrication of Sir Philip Sidney's Biographical Image and The Sidney Reader," *ELH*, 48 (1981), 1-16.

[37] Harington, p. 183.

[38] This term is used by Mark Curtis, "The Alienated Intellectuals of Early Stuart England," *Past and Present*, no. 23 (1962), 25-41.

[39] In his dedicatory epistle to Lady Mollineux prefaced to his sonnet sequence *Licia*, Giles Fletcher, for example, wrote: "Peruse but the writings of former times, and you shall see not onely others in other countryes, as *Italie* and *France*, men of learning and great partes to have written Poems and Sonets of Love; but even amongst us, men of best nobilitie, and chiefest families, to be the greatest Schollers and most renowned in this kind" (*The English Works of Giles Fletcher, the Elder*, ed. Lloyd E. Berry [Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1964], p. 75).

[40] I have in mind such works as William Percy's *Sonnets to the Fairest Coelia* (1594), Bartholomew Griffin's *Fidessa* (1596), R[ichard] L[inche]'s *Diella* (1596), William Smith's *Chloris* (1596), R[obert] T[ofte]'s *Laura* (1597), and the anonymous *Zepheria* (1594), whose author seems to have been the target of Donne's second satire. See *Elizabethan Sonnets*, ed. with an Introduction by Sidney Lee, II (Westminster: Archibald Constable, 1904).

[41] *The Poems of Sir John Davies*, ed. Robert Krueger, with Introduction and Commentary by the Editor and Ruby Nemser (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), pp. 161-67. These poems are found along with this author's satiric epigrams in *The Farmer-Chetham Manuscript* (Chetham Society 89, ed. Alexander Grosart [Manchester: Chetham Society, 1873]). Davies' less obviously parodic sequence "Ten Sonnets, to Philomel" (Krueger, pp. 187-92), which was first published at the very end of the Elizabethan era in *A Poetical Rhapsody* (1602), concludes with the mistress' (comic) refusal of her lover because he supposedly deserves better ("Your worth requireth a more worthy place" [10.6]).

[42] See *Parthenophil and Parthenophe*, edited with an Introduction by Victor A. Doyno (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press and London and Amsterdam: Feffer & Simons, 1971).

[43] The four poems added to the second (54 sonnet) version of *Delia* (1592) bespeak the patronage context, especially the poem "To *M.P.*" (Sprague, p. 181), a sonnet-epistle complaining of the poet's "hateful want" (5) and clouded "fortune" (13).

[44] *Samuel Daniel: A Critical and Biographical Study* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1964), p. 20.

[45] Francis Meres, *Palladis Tamia* (1598) in *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, edited with an Introduction by G. Gregory Smith (London: Oxford University Press, 1904), II, 317.

[46] Although I lean towards the identification of Shakespeare's patron as William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke (partly because of the association of sonnets with the Sidney-Pembroke circle), I wish to avoid the issue of the identity of the young man of the sonnets. The best discussions of the two leading candidates for this place, The Earls of Pembroke and of Southampton, are found in William Shakespeare, *The*

Sonnets, ed. John Dover Wilson, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), pp. xlii-cviii and G. P. V. Akrigg, *Shakespeare and the Earl of Southampton* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968).

[47] See Herbert Howarth, "Shakespeare's Gentleness," in *The Tiger's Heart: Eight Essays on Shakespeare* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 1-23.

[48] It is also hardly an original one. *The Phoenix Nest* (1593), for example, contains an anonymous poem that ends with the same formulation: "I seeke your loue, and feare not others hate, / Be you with me, and I haue Caesars state" (ed. Hyder Edward Rollins [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931], p. 101). Cf. Sonnets 25 and 37 as well.

[49] *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (New York, Harper & Row, 1977), p. 97.

[50] *Essaies* (1598) in Spedding, Ellis, and Heath, VI, 528. For a discussion of *amicitia* as a term used in classical times both for patronage relationships and for political factions, see Ronald Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (1939; rpt. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 12-13, 157, 385.

[51] See esp. sonnets 35, 40, 41, 42.

[52] Especially after Sonnet 82, in which the poet describes himself as the young man's "true-telling friend" (12), he uses the conventions of compliment disingenuously. The ironies of Sonnets 97-108 are quite pronounced. Cf. Richard Wheeler, "Poetry and Fantasy in Shakespeare's Sonnets 88-96," *Literature and Psychology*, 22 (1972), 151-62 and Carol Thomas Neely, "Detachment and Engagement in Shakespeare's Sonnets: 94, 116 and 129," *PMLA*, 92 (1977), 83-95.

[53] See esp. sonnets 19, 60, 100, and 126.

[54] For provocative discussions of Shakespeare's mixing of genres, see Rosalie Colie, *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance*, ed. Barbara K. Lewalski (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1973), pp. 67-75 and *Shakespeare's Living Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), pp. 68-134.

[55] Although Colie observes that "The middle style between the high vocabulary of the love-sonnet and the low vocabulary of the epigram brackets a psychological and social reality between these two generic renderings of milieu" (*Resources*, p. 75), she does not discuss the sociological context of the conflation of genres. A good example of the use of the mixing of sonnet and epigram forms within a (fictional) social frame is the penultimate poem in Gascoigne's *A Discourse of the Adventures passed by Master F. J.* (Prouty, p. 103).

[56] See J. W. Saunders, "The Stigma of Print: A Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry," *EIC*, 1 (1951), 139-64. Although Saunders does not make fine enough distinctions among the social ranks of various authors, his essay is still the finest study of the topic.

[57] See Alexander Dunlop, "The Unity of Spenser's 'Amoretti,'" in *Silent Poetry*, ed. Alastair Fowler (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), pp. 153-69.

[58] Richard Helgerson has discussed this topic well in two important essays: "The New Poet Presents Himself: Spenser and the Idea of a Literary Career," *PMLA*, 93 (1978), 893-911 and "The Elizabethan Laureate: Self-Presentation and the Literary System," *ELH*, 46 (1979), 193-220.

[59] In the Proem to Book IV of *The Faerie Queene*, Spenser mentions this official's objection to the amorous subject matter of the first three books even as he reasserts his intention to write about love for Elizabeth, "the Queene of loue" (IV.Proem.4.9).

[60] Spedding, Ellis, and Heath, VI, 558.

[61] See esp. Sonnets 27, 58, 59, and 65.

[62] Alexander C. Judson (*The Life of Edmund Spenser* [Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1945], p. 190) states that Spenser probably had hoped for a grant of property or another source of steady revenue or an important governmental post in Ireland. Cf. Muriel Bradbrook, "No Room at the Top: Spenser's Pursuit of Fame," in Brown and Harris, pp. 91-109 and Helgerson, "New Poet," 893-911.

[63] *The Arte of English Poesy* (1589); facs. rpt. Menston, England: The Scolar Press, 1968), p. 66.

[64] See "To E. of D. with six holy Sonnets," in John Donne, *The Divine Poems,* ed. with Introduction and Commentary by Helen Gardner, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), pp. 5-6.

[65] See *Bodenham's Belvedere or The Garden of the Mvses* (1600; facs. rpt. Manchester: The Spenser Society, 1875).

[66] ". . . the Irish having Robd Spensers goods & burnt his house & a little child new born, he and his wyfe escaped, & after he died for lake of bread jn King street and refused 20 pieces sent to him by my Lord of Essex & said he was sorrie he had no time to spend them" ("Conversations with Drummond," in *Ben Jonson,* ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, I [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925], 137).

[67] Sonnets 11, 12, 13, and 14 modify the material of *Astrophil and Stella* 8, 11, 17, and 18; Sonnet 75 parodies the eighth song of the sequence; Sonnet 6 matches the Sapphic meter of a lyric from the first book of the *Arcadia* (see Bullough, I, 38-39, 236-37, 267, 233). Richard Waswo (*The Fatal Mirror: Themes and Techniques in the Poetry of Fulke Greville* [Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1972]) discusses Greville's ironic revision of Sidneyan material that was itself an ironic reformulation of Petrarchan conventions. On Greville's literary competition with both Sidney and Dyer, see Joan Rees, *Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, 1554-1628, A Critical Biography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), pp. 87-103.

[68] *The Life of Fulke Greville, First Lord Brooke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), pp. 325-40.

[69] See Bullough, I, 7-8.

[70] Rees, *Greville,* p. 97.

[71] Bullough (I, 42) notes that only Sonnet 81 is explicitly concerned with the Queen, but mentions Sonnets 17, 46, and 55 as poems possibly dealing with the author's relationship with his monarch. I am suspicious of the identification of Sonnet 46 and would add Sonnet 7 to the group for its possible reference to Elizabeth's personal motto (*Semper eadem*): "Onely like fate sweet *Myra* neuer varies, / Yet in her eyes the doome of all Change carries" (17-18).

[72] See "Verses made by the earle of Oxforde and Mrs Ann Vauesor" ("Sittinge alone vpon my thoughte in melancholy moode") in *Rawl. Poet. MS* 85 (Cummings, pp. 166-67) and the discussion of an exchange of verse between Ralegh and Elizabeth in L. G. Black, "A Lost Poem by Queen Elizabeth I," *TLS,* 23, May, 1968, p. 535.

[73] See, for example, Sonnets 33, 38 and 64.

[74] See, for example, Rebholz, pp. 216-32.

[75] "Fulke Greville: The Courtier as Philosophic Poet," *MLQ,* 33 (1972), 443. Levy criticizes the "conversion" hypothesis in his perceptive discussion of both Rees's and Rebholz's work (pp. 441-444).

[76] Donne's composition of religious sonnets was as much a sign of the times as it was the product of his holy (or unholy) melancholy.

[77] *The Elizabethan Miscellanies: Their Development and Conventions* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), p. 106.

[78] See *The Poems of James VI. of Scotland,* ed. James Craigie, II (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons, 1958), 68-73, 78.

[79] "A Satire against Woemen," in Craigie, II, 90-93.

[80] There are four versions found, for example, in *Folger MS* V.a.345, a Christ Church College (Oxford) manuscript commonplace book of poetry. The longest of these is the following:

On ye Lady Rich

Heer lyes ye Lady Penelope Rich,
Or ye Countess of Deuonshire, chuse ye which

One stone contents her, loe w^{t} death can doe
That in her life was not content wth two.

(p. 28)

For a list of manuscript and printed versions of this poem see James Lee Sanderson, "An Edition of an Early Seventeenth-Century Manuscript Collection of Poems (*Rosenbach MS.* 186)," Diss. University of Pennsylvania 1960, p. 656.

[81] Corti, p. 123.