University of Strathclyde

Department of English Studies

# *Leaves which whisper'd what they could not say:* Petrarch Reading Early Modern English and Scottish Petrarchism, c.1530-1630

Patrick Hart

A thesis presented in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2011

*This thesis is the result of the author's original research. It has been composed by the author and has not been previously submitted for examination which has led to the award of a degree.*

*The copyright of this thesis belongs to the author under the terms of the United Kingdom Copyright Acts as qualified by University of Strathclyde Regulation 3.50. Due acknowledgement must always be made of the use of any material contained in, or derived from, this thesis.*

*Signed:* *Date:*

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

'There is in Petrarch what must be called a compulsion not to finish what he begins', observes Giuseppe Mazzotta in his influential study of *The Worlds of Petrarch* (1993: 189). This at least I have in common with the central protagonist of my thesis, and I would like to thank Dr. Alison Thorne, my supervisor, from the bottom of my heart for her patience, understanding, enthusiasm and wisdom when faced with my vacillations: without her sensitive guidance, encouragement, insistence and insight this thesis would never have been completed.

The inspirational teaching of Dr. Theo van Heijnsbergen at the University of Glasgow first showed me that Scotland had a literary renaissance before Hugh MacDiarmid came along. With amazing generosity he has acted as an unofficial second supervisor on the Scottish aspects of this thesis, and his kindness, knowledge and passion have been inspirational on many levels. My fellow editors at the *Journal of the Northern Renaissance*, Dr Sebastiaan Verweij at Lincoln College, Oxford, and Dr. Elizabeth Elliott at the University of Edinburgh, generously agreed to my taking a leave of absence from my duties to finish writing up. Both have also provided helpful feedback, information, tips, coffee and moral support throughout. Dr Jane Yeoman of the University of Edinburgh helped with difficult French, while Dr. Jamie Reid Baxter of the University of Glasgow offered me the benefit of his remarkable knowledge and love of Scottish renaissance literature and culture. The English Studies department at the University of Strathclyde has provided me with a stimulating and supportive environment for postgraduate study, and I owe a debt of gratitude to all its staff. Dr. Elspeth Jajdelska in particular gave me encouragement and constructive feedback on late drafts. Without the benefit of a full faculty scholarship I could never have embarked upon this project, and I would therefore also like to thank the faculty at Strathclyde for their faith in me.

Much of the research for this thesis took place at the National Library of Scotland, and I would like to thank all the staff there. Special thanks go to Dora Petherbridge, for support and cups of tea beyond the call of duty. I would also like to thank my colleagues at Istanbul Kültür University for their support over the last year, and in particular Prof. Nebile Direkçigil for first taking a chance on me, and Prof. Ayşem Seval for helping me stay sane. Derya Cokal, I hope, knows already how important she has been to the completion of this thesis, and how grateful I am. Finally, my last thanks must go to my father for teaching me to read, in more ways than one; and to my mother, for everything.

Glasgow - Edinburgh - Istanbul
2011

# CONTENTS

**Abstract** i

**Abbreviations** iii

**Preface: Postfiguring Petrarchism ~ Petrarch Reading the Early Moderns** 1

## PART ONE

### 1. *Dentro... et for*: Petrarch, Petrarchism, the Public and the Private

1.1 Private Courtiership and Cut-Price Werthers 11
1.2 Histories of the Subject 15
1.3 Aphasiacs and Zombies: idiosyncratic readings and private idiocies 25
1.4 Singular Universals and the *benedizione della negatività* 32
1.5 Petrarchan Imbrications: *dentro…et for* 38

### 2. Epistolary Poetry and Lyric Withdrawal

2.1 The Occasion of Form 54
2.2 *'S' i' fussi stato'*: the retreat from epistolary circulation 63
2.3 Petrarch, politics and the letter 70
2.4 Poetry, letters, and the Henrician privatization of power 87
2.5 The Early Modern Letter 93
2.6 Epistolary satire and the problem of the addressee: Wyatt 97
2.7 Tottel's Miscellany and the sonnet as commodified form 108

## PART TWO

### 3. Petrarchan National Sentiment and the Union of the Crowns ~ William Drummond of Hawthornden

3.1 Honesto otio: neo-Stoic and Petrarchan withdrawals 119
3.2 The British Problem 130
3.3 Scotland, Britain, and the social circulation of sonnets 135
3.4 The Language Question 149
3.5 'This Northerne Phenix': Drummond, Nation, and the North 158

### 4. The Thinking Woman's Petrarchism ~ Lady Mary Wroth

4.1 Heads and Bodies: Reading Petrarchan Genderings 181
4.2 'Privately groan'd': from Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus 185
4.3 'wise speache': writing Lauras 193
4.4 'The constant Art': Petrarchism, Stoicism, and the thought of love 205

### 5. Where Breath Most Breathes ~ Shakespeare's Sonnets

5.1 Poetry and Plague 235
5.2 Death as annihilation and time's *lento correr* 242
5.3 *Incertior auris*: winds of oblivion 250
5.4 The greening of Laura: 'Almo sol' 255
5.5 Transcendence, Endurance, *Oblio* 262
5.6 The green and the black: Petrarchan negotiations with death 269

**Afterword** 283

**Bibliography** 285

# ABSTRACT

This thesis brings a fresh engagement with the writings and career of Francesco Petrarca (Petrarch) and with recent Italian scholarship to a reading of the Petrarchan sonnet sequence in England and Scotland. Rather than focusing on questions of influence, it borrows from Harold Bloom's notion of postfiguration to argue that certain preoccupations of the early modern sonnet sequence are anticipated by the *Canzoniere.* In particular, it examines how Petrarch's wranglings with a series of imbricated dyads—withdrawal and revelation, introspection and celebrity, public and private—are played out again in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It offers new interpretations of not only individual sonnets and sequences, but also the longer narrative of the lyric's changing relationship to both its public audience and its private reader.

The thesis is divided into two parts. Part one examines the relations between poet, individual reader, the poem and its publics that Petrarch's *Canzoniere* establishes. Chapter one explores Petrarch's insistence upon the importance of the affective response of the individual reader in the establishment of a transhistorical audience. Chapter two argues that while Petrarch's lyric practice has its origins in epistolary exchange, it enacts an always ambivalent turn away from its embeddedness in the social circumstances of its composition, both inwards into the recesses of selfhood and outwards to a wider envisioned audience. This turn has profound implications for the politics of lyric practice, which are explored in relation to how the early Tudor sonneteers negotiate with political power, social embeddedness and the epistolary.

Part two consists of three readings of individual sonnet sequences. Chapter three looks at William Drummond's Petrarchan negotiation of conflicted local and national sentiments in the wake of the Union of the Crowns of 1603. Chapter four examines the Petrarchan rupturings of the public/private dichotomy in Lady Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus*. It then investigates Pamphilia’s concern with thought’s (in)constancy. Finally, chapter five reads Shakespeare’s sonnets as performing an uncanny return to Petrarchan origins in their obsessive preoccupation with death and oblivion. It is ultimately a shared fear of oblivion, this chapter concludes, that most forcefully shapes the peculiar sense of time, the ferocious introspection, and the pursuit of fame we find in both poets’ works.

# ABBREVIATIONS

## Works by Petrarch

| | |
|---|---|
| *ASI* | *Ad Seipsum* |
| *BC* | *Bucolicum Carmen* |
| *De Ign.* | *De Ignorantia* |
| *EM* | *Epistola Metrica* |
| *Fam.* | *Familiares* |
| *RVF* | *Rerum Vulgarium Fragmenta* * |
| *Secr.* | *Secretum* |
| *Sen.* | *Seniles* |

## Works by other writers

| | |
|---|---|
| *A&S* | Sir Philip Sidney, *Astrophil and Stella* |
| *Const.* | Justus Lipsius, *De Constantia* |
| *DP* | William Drummond of Hawthornden, *Poems (1621)* |
| *SS* | *Shakespeare's Sonnets* |

* Called variously the *Canzoniere*, the *Rime*, and the *Rime sparse* in the Renaissance, for Teodolinda Barolini Petrarch's collection of vernacular lyrics is 'properly and authorially only *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*', or 'fragments of vernacular matters' (2009: 33). However, given the peculiar history of the *RVF*'s reception and influence, as well as the weight of convention, it seems perfectly proper to refer to it by its other names, even without authorial sanction. As one focus of this study is the many different lives led by Petrarch's vernacular lyrics in his own lifetime, in the Renaissance, and today, I have used all these titles, depending upon my emphasis. Petrarch was constantly preoccupied by the question of the unification and dispersal of his poetry, and the distinction between the *Canzoniere*, as a unified work, and the *Rime sparse*, referring to the dispersed 'fragments' of the Latin title, is a useful one. Where giving references in parentheses to poem and line, however, I have consistently used the abbreviation *RVF*, in recognition of the underlying truth of Barolini's observation.

***Editorial Note***

*My own editorial ellipses are in square brackets. All other ellipses are the author's own.*

# PREFACE

## POSTFIGURING PETRARCHISM ~
## PETRARCH READING THE EARLY MODERNS

This thesis was born out of the coming together of a number of concerns and intuitions. Primary among these was a sense that while it has over the last twenty years or so become modish to observe how much writing in the Petrarchan mode is in fact 'anti-Petrarchan' or 'post-Petrarchan' — subverting, transforming or negotiating a way out of Petrarchan genderings, Petrarchan temporal frameworks, or Petrarchan erotic and spiritual economies — there has, with a number of notable exceptions, been relatively little attempt to bring a considered — let alone a passionate — engagement with Petrarch's own poetry to bear on readings of his early modern followers. Turning to the *Canzoniere,* the poet I found there struck me as very different from the composite image gained from sustained reading in anglophone scholarship on Renaissance Petrarchism. The impression of a failure to engage seriously with Petrarch is heightened by the widespread neglect of recent (and not-so-recent) Italian research. The work of Petrarch scholars such as Adelia Noferi, Marco Santagata and Ugo Dotti very rarely figures in contemporary writing in English on Petrarch and Petrarchism.

First of all, then, this thesis presents the fruits of an attempt to read Petrarch, as near as possible, on his own terms, and to bring the insights gained from this engagement to fresh readings of English and Scottish sonneteering. In making Petrarch himself our guide to his late Renaissance imitators, the Virgil to our Dante, I have been influenced, albeit ambivalently, by Harold Bloom's notion of postfiguration. In *The Western Canon* Harold Bloom writes of Shakespeare, 'You cannot illuminate him with a new doctrine, be it Marxism or Freudianism or Demanian linguistic skepticism. Instead, he will illuminate the doctrine, not by prefiguration but by postfiguration as it were' (1994: 25). Bloom's proscriptions are problematic, but his account of how Shakespeare sheds light on later work is a useful one, and offers a model for a new kind of Petrarch-esque reading of anglophone Petrarchism. In addition, it shifts our attention to the manner in which we feel Shakespeare still reads *us*, today, and stands looking over our shoulder as we read his ephebes. Petrarch, too, I argue, is still our reader, and having him at our shoulder as we read his early modern imitators, Shakespeare included, gives us a new sense of how they grapple with problems and possibilities to which the Italian laureate had already responded. From this perspective, supposedly 'anti-Petrarchan' or 'post-Petrarchan' works can begin to look distinctly 'pre-Petrarch'. Yet equally, reading through the lens of a renewed study of Petrarch also pulls into focus certain poetic gambits on the part of English and Scottish sonneteers that might otherwise sink from view. Furthermore, as any good tourist would expect, we often find out as much about our guide as we do about the sites he illumines for us.

Of course, such a methodology can in itself only ever be a useful fiction, a ploy for finding new and interesting things to say about the poetry. It does, however, force upon us difficult theoretical questions regarding how we read in and out of history, a sense of our always already bifurcated perspective. The dominant dialect throughout this thesis is, to borrow from Jerome McGann, 'writing rather than theory, and the art of writing rather than the writing of culture' (2008: 129), but both theory and the writing of culture have their parts to play, and chapter one explores the implications for both of Petrarch's poetics of futurity. No writer was ever more self-conscious in his writing for the future than the poet who sought to bring pity to the eyes 'di tal che nascerà dopo mill' anni', to the reader to be born a thousand years from now (*RVF* 30.35). That 'now', of course, is one that recedes infinitely, the thousand years not only beginning from the historical moment of the *canzone*'s composition, but also starting afresh from each new moment in which these lines are read. Petrarch's poetry troubles 'Times theeuish progresse' (*SS* 77.8), and Petrarch himself struggled with the sense that his own endeavours were postfigured by the writings of Augustine, Cicero, and the other ancients he addressed directly in his letters. His appeal for a transhistorical *pietà* is founded upon the affective power of his verse, and this affective appeal is one that is simultaneously singular, addressed to each *one* of us, and deliberately universalising. It is also one that is profoundly political, signalling a withdrawal from an embeddedness in a particular social economy. Attention to this aspect of Petrarch's work in particular suggests we may need to supplement our readings of English Petrarchism with a more properly Petrarchan perspective.

The social character of English Petrarchism has been the focus of much of the most stimulating scholarship in the field over the last twenty-five years. As Arthur Marotti influentially put it, early modern English lyric poetry 'was basically a genre for gentleman-amateurs who regarded their literary "toys" as ephemeral works that were part of a social life that also included dancing, singing, gaming, and civilized conversation' (Marotti 1986: 3; cf. Saunders 1964). Influenced by Marotti, by J. W. Saunders' earlier work on manuscript circulation within a group system and the 'stigma of print', and by Eve Kosofsky Sedwick's concept of homosociality, scholars such as Wendy Wall have delineated, for example, how the 'social boundaries that relied on the coterie network' were translated through the Petrarchan mode into sexualized terms in order to ward off the 'vexed class concerns' excited by publication in print (Wall 1993: 172-3). More recently, Christopher Warley has traced how sonnet sequences in Renaissance England 'provided a form to describe social positions for which no explicit vocabulary existed' (2005: x), encoding emergent social distinctions. In a similar vein, David Schalkwyk has tracked early modern social discourses of service in Shakespeare's sonnets (2008), and discussed the Renaissance sonnet 'as a form of social action' (2002: 3).

All these studies, then, embed the Renaissance sonnet sequence in its historical contexts, and, more precisely, in the historically specific circulations of what Stephen Greenblatt termed 'social energy' (1988: 6). Petrarch's own work, as Italian scholars of Petrarch have amply demonstrated, is equally embedded in the social circumstances of its production. Yet what Italian scholars such as Ugo Dotti and Marco Santagata have also drawn attention to is the degree to which Petrarch's work performs a withdrawal from those circumstances, from its own historical situatedness. Rather than being merely a retreat, this withdrawal represents a sophisticated if sometimes partial recognition of the dangers for lyric of its appropriation by power and wholesale assimilation into the social sphere. This assimilation was taking place under the impetus of a regression into neo-feudalism prompted by the first flowerings of capitalism in Italy in the fourteenth century. Petrarch's self-conscious and always ambivalent removal of his lyrics from social circulation, his gathering of his 'scattered rhymes' into the unified form of the *Canzoniere* and his much-noted evocation of an unprecedented inwardness, are profoundly political responses to the reduction of the lyric to courtly *intrattanimento,* mere social entertainment, or a means of negotiating a social space.

Bringing to our reading of English and Scottish Petrarchism an awareness of how this central preoccupation shapes the *Canzoniere* allows us to think more astutely about Petrarchan poetry's embeddedness in the circulation of social energy, about its appeal to futurity (to *us*), and about relations more generally between what we might as a kind of shorthand call formalist and historicist approaches. In particular, it points in the direction of a renewed attention to a familiar web of imbricated dyads—withdrawal and revelation, introspection and celebrity, public and private—at the heart both of Petrarch's achievement and of English Petrarchism. In exploring the theoretical implications of  this approach, chapter one draws out these strands and ties them to the specifics of Petrarchan practice, as well as tracing how our understanding of them has inflected our readings to date.

Building on recent work on early modern epistolarity, and in particular Seth Lerer's argument that the early modern English lyric has its origins in epistolary exchange, chapter two asks what light Petrarch's poetry's relationship with the letter can shed on early modern sonneteering. Petrarch's love affair with the letter is well known, and his correspondence in verse and prose with friends, family, kings, princes and churchmen, as well as with the dead, dwarfs the *Canzoniere*. Petrarch's lyric practice, however, while originating in epistolary exchange, enacts an always ambivalent turn away from the social circumstances of its composition, both inwards into the recesses of selfhood and outwards to a wider envisioned audience. This turn, chapter two argues, has profound implications for the politics of lyric practice, which are explored in relation to how the early Tudor sonneteers, lost notably Sir Thomas Wyatt, negotiate with political power, social embeddedness and the epistolary.

Part Two of the thesis consists of three readings of individual early modern sonnet sequences published in English in the early seventeenth century. Each chapter illuminates one facet of the Petrarchan dichotomy of public and private, inwardness and display.  Chapter three focuses on William Drummond of Hawthornden's Petrarchan negotiations of often conflicted local and national sentiments. In doing so, it brings together two recent developments in early modern literary history: a renewed focus on Petrarchism's role in the cultivation of national sentiment across Europe (exemplified by William Kennedy's *The Site of Petrarchism* (2003)) on the one hand; and on the other, the geopolitical turn towards 'the British problem' -

that is, toward questions of national and regional identity in the North-East Atlantic archipelago around the time of the Union of the Crowns. In *Archipelagic English* (2008), a study exemplary of this latter movement, John Kerrigan offers a sophisticated reading of how William Drummond's work was conditioned by the relative isolation of Scotland within a culturally conflicted regal union. In doing so, however, he makes barely any mention of the Petrarchan poetry upon which Drummond's literary reputation has hitherto rested. This is surprising. As Kennedy observes, the premise that the Petrarchan sonnet provides a site for the expression and exploration of early modern national sentiment is 'not controversial', and, given Scotland's ambivalent status post-Union we might expect the sonneteering of the 'Petrarch of the North' to be the site of a particularly fascinating Petrarchan negotiation of a conflicted sense of nationhood. But Kennedy too, while discussing Petrarchism's role in the shaping of national sentiment not only in Italy, France and England, but also in Spain, Germany, Poland and the New World, barely touches upon the phenomenon of Scottish Petrarchism in the wake of the Union of the Crowns. For Drummond, this chapter argues, Petrarchism proved a seductive and malleable means of retaining a highly localised sense of place and self, while writing what he hoped might prove a new, British poetry for the newly united kingdoms which would win the international acclaim that had hitherto been denied vernacular writing in both English and Scots.

Chapter four's focus is upon Lady Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus*, the sonnet sequence appended to her prose romance *Urania,* printed in 1621. Read with some justification by Wroth's contemporaries as a *roman à cléf,* the *Urania*, as has been well documented, provoked a degree of scandal. Ostensibly penned by Pamphilia, one of the leading characters in the romance, the sonnet sequence stands in a complex dialogic relation both to the romance that precedes it and to the figure of its author, Wroth herself. The modern history of *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus*'s reception has centred upon two related questions. The first is whether the sequence is an intensely private, insular text, or one that is intended for a public audience and addresses public affairs. The second is the significance of Wroth's appropriation of the Petrarchan mode by a female voice. Public and private were fiercely if not always unambiguously gendered in the early seventeenth century as in the fourteenth, and this chapter focuses upon the implications for Wroth's female-voiced sequence of Petrarchism's disruption of the public/private dichotomy. It then goes on to look at a third dyad, equally persistently gendered, that of reason and emotion. Exploring Wroth's sequence's preoccupation with the constancy of amorous thought in the light of Petrarch's insistence that 'one thinks when the mind is mobilized by love' (Mazzotta 1993: 8), it suggests that Petrarchism provides Wroth with the ground for a working through of the relation of thought and feeling. The results reveal Wroth's Petrarchism, and Petrarchism's politics of gender, to be far more complex than Wroth's critics have sometimes allowed.

Chapter five turns to Shakespeare's sonnets. Often regarded as among the most 'anti-Petrarchan' of sequences, or at least as engaging with the Petrarchan tradition only in an unindividuated form, as a set of literary conventions, this chapter claims that on the contrary, the sonnets' obsessive meditations upon death signal an uncanny return to the deepest concerns of the *Canzoniere*. Challenging recent critical interpretations that have contrasted Petrarch's temporal framework with Shakespeare's sense of time in the sonnets, this chapter, while not denying certain differences, argues instead for the remarkable similarities between the two sequences. Where Shakespeare's 'fleeting time' has been construed as indebted to new modes of production and new technologies of time-keeping, I contend that reading Shakespeare and Petrarch in tandem reveals a pressing fear of *oblio*, oblivion, that drives both toward a bifurcated temporality within which time both races and crawls. It is also the driving force behind the ferocious introspection, coupled with the deeply troubled pursuit of fame (whether for the beloved, the poet, or the poem), that we find in both works. Taking as a starting point the two sequences' shared markings by the plague as a largely symbolic motif that, nevertheless, focuses attention on their common responses to the immediacy of death, this chapter identifies in the peculiar interpenetration of a profound inwardness with a glittering textual surface a poetics best described as baroque. This baroque or proto-baroque poetic, preoccupied by the terror of oblivion and the possibility of transcending or circumventing death, no matter how unsatisfactorily, should complicate the narrative of a Protestantised and secularised English Petrarchism, most recently delineated by Ramie Targoff (2010: 615-634). Transforming the grave into a very public place, and turning death's own weapons against it, Shakespeare's Petrarchism is read as properly *unheimlich*, a true return to origins.

*Dentro pur foco et for candida neve,*
*sol con questi pensier, con altre chiome,*
*sempre piangendo andrò per ogni riva,*
*per far forse pietà venir ne gli occhi*
*di tal che nascerà dopo mill' anni,*
*se tanto viver po ben colto lauro.* (*RVF* 30.31-36)

[Inwardly fire and outwardly white snow,
alone with these thoughts, with changed locks,
always weeping I shall go along every shore,
to make pity perhaps come into the eyes
of someone who will be born a thousand years from now —
if a well-tended laurel can live so long.]

# PART ONE

# CHAPTER ONE

## DENTRO…ET FOR:
## PETRARCH, PETRARCHISM, AND THE READING OF LYRIC

*Our nature is my greatest privacy, and this is the silly and sustaining paradox, that the most idiosyncratic and inadmissible is the most deeply shared.*
John Wilkinson, 'Cadence' (1987: 82)

### 1.1 Private Courtiership and Cut-Price Werthers

'All the Elizabethan sonneteers', argued Basil Bunting, 'were infected more or less with Petrarch's bad example' (Bunting 1999: 48). Bunting lays out Petrarch's contagious failings in typically forthright terms:

> To Petrarch love was mainly an excuse for displaying his skill as a versifier and his knowledge of classical mythology. He hardly ever pays any real attention to *Laura*: he focuses the reader's attention on his own cleverness, and that cleverness is far too often trivial, quite often a matter of puns. Petrarch's verse is from the first aimed directly at the coronation with laurel which he did indeed achieve in Rome. He had no humility. He loved neither the countess de Sade (Laura) nor God. Too many of his lines are mere perfunctory decoration. (Bunting 1999: 48 – italics and parentheses Bunting's own)

Most twenty-first century scholars of the early modern would be chary of Bunting's straight talking, and his account is easy enough to argue with.[1] Yet the accusation that Laura served Petrarch merely as a means to his own glorification is older even than the final form of the *Canzoniere* itself, and endures still, informing contemporary criticism. Some years before Petrarch had pulled his scattered rhymes together into a unified collection, his friend Giacomo Colonna had written to him doubting whether Laura existed at all. Petrarch refuted Colonna's suggestion:

> What in the world do you say? That I invented the splendid name of Laura so that it might be not only something for me to speak about but occasion to have others speak of me; that indeed there was no Laura on my mind except perhaps the poetic one for which I have aspired as is attested by my long and untiring studies? And finally you say that the truly live Laura by whose beauty I seem to be captured was completely invented, my poems fictitious and my sighs feigned. I wish indeed that you were joking about this particular subject, and that she indeed had been a fiction and not a madness. (*Fam*. 2.9)[2]

Leading Petrarch scholars remain divided on whether Laura ever existed. While for Ugo Dotti Laura is a 'donna vera, reale, «storica»', a real, historical woman (2001: 94), for Giuseppe Billanovich, 'she was certainly not a real being. She was only the personification of the project that the father of humanism and patron of the Italian lyric pursued tenaciously from his youth: his coronation as poet' (1994: 149).[3] The suspicion that Petrarch's *furor* is feigned and his private love and woe subjugated to the pursuit of literary fame has endured, inflecting and infecting readings not only of Petrarch's poetry but of the whole European Petrarchan tradition. In the Anglophone world at the end of the twentieth century, such misgivings resurfaced in influential cultural materialist, new historicist and feminist interpretations which argued that in much Petrarchan verse 'private courtship' served the ends of 'public courtiership', while Petrarch and his followers dismembered Laura's body in their pursuit of the laurel crown.

---

[1] Certainly Petrarch had no need to show off his knowledge of classical mythology in the *Canzoniere* (had Petrarch been set on flaunting his familiarity with the classics, his Latin works would have been a more appropriate and likely place for him to do so) and there is little evidence that he did: the poems within are for the most part constructed around a fairly limited series of recurring and interconnected mythic tropes, mostly deriving from Ovid's description of Apollo's pursuit of Daphne and her subsequent transformation. These were familiar enough to Petrarch's educated contemporaries for there to have been little caché in demonstrating one's familiarity with them *per se*. Where a wider range of classical myths are referenced, as in the canzone 'Nel dolce tempo de la prima etade' (*RVF* 23), which alludes to the fates of Cygnus, Battus, and Byblis, as well as the more familiar tales of Narcissus and Actaeon, the source remains Ovid. For a truly esoteric display of classical learning in a Petrarchan setting, Bunting need only have looked a little north of his own Northumberland, to Scotland, home of Alexander Craig, author of the *Amorose Songes, Sonets and Elegies* (1606).

[2] 'Quid ergo ais? finxisse me michi speciosum Lauree nomen, ut esset et de qua ego loquerer et propter quam de me multi loquerentur; re autem vera in animo meo Lauream nichil esse, nisi illam forte poeticam, ad quam aspirare me longum et indefessum stadium testator; de hac autem spirante Laurea, cuius forma captus videor, manufacta esse omnia, ficta carmina, simulate suspiria. In hoc uno vere utinam iocareris; simulation esset utinam et non furor!' The English translation given here is from Bernardo 1975: 102.

One motive for re-examining the inward/outward dynamic in Petrarch and in later poetry in the Petrarchan mode is a suspicion that the common insistence on its privileging of the public over the private habitually elides both a fundamental turn inwards and the true nature of the 'public' scope of that turn. Of course, Petrarch's exploration of interiority is widely acknowledged. Indeed, running parallel with the insistence that private courtship serves the ends of public courtiership in Petrarchan poetry, there is also a more subterranean critical strain that is suspicious of Petrarch, and the Petrarchan mode, precisely because it sees it as self-indulgently inward-looking, as problematically effete. This has its modern roots, perhaps, in the portrait of Petrarch as a 'cut-price Werther', a 'Romantic *poète maudit*' diffused by his more sentimental late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century translators (Mortimer 2000: 1071). Profoundly influential too has been Yvor Winters' distinction between the 'Native' and the 'Petrarchan' traditions. In a splendidly pugnacious essay, 'The Sixteenth-Century Lyric in England', first published in *Poetry* in 1939, the 'Grand Wizard of the Plain Style' defined the Native mode as forceful and flourishing, while rejecting the Petrarchan as the wilting, decadent import. This reading was cemented in the critical consciousness by John Williams's 1963 anthology *English Renaissance Poetry*, and its endurance was reflected in the publication of a second edition of Williams's anthology in 1990 (cf. Sanders 1991: 370). In his preface to the reprint, Williams insisted that Winters' distinction, 'though crude, remains necessary' (1990: x).[4]

---

[3] 'Se il Petrarca la chiamò Laura, sicuramente non fu creatura reale. Fu solo la personificazione del progetto che il padre dell'umanesimo e insieme patrono della lirica italiana preseguí tenacemente fino dalla giovinezza: l'incoronazione a poeta.'

As Wilbur Sanders has pointed out, however, 'the primitive simplicities of "Native him good, Petrarchan him heap bad feller" do not eventuate', if only because 'the putting forth of poetic power tends to dissolve the dichotomy' (1991: 373). Few contemporary critics now follow Williams in relying explicitly upon Winters' distinction. Unacknowledged and unrecognised influences, however, can be the most powerful and insidious, and alongside something akin to Bunting's Poundian scorn for Petrarch's supposedly self-regarding cleverness and eye to his own reputation, there often seems to lurk behind contemporary critical studies of early modern Petrarchism a warily couched distrust of the introspective, closed world of the *Canzoniere*. At worst, Petrarch can come across – even if he is never quite explicitly described in such terms – as simultaneously guilty of an excessive preoccupation with the laurel crown of poetic fame, and of a 'bad privacy' that gives rise to a morbidly inward-looking and self-referential poetic universe that is ultimately sterile.

This nexus of suspicions has often contributed to a serious misprision both of Petrarch's work and of later Renaissance poetry written in the Petrarchan mode. As the best writing on Petrarch has always recognized, the relationship between the public and the private inscribed in his lyric poetry is fundamental to his aesthetic. Petrarch's work, like his life, is marked by an unprecedented movement both inwards and out, a hitherto unseen emphasis on the sanctity of the private coupled with a unique preoccupation with the construction of a public self. As Christopher Martin notes, few challenges situated his imagination with greater consequence than 'the absurdities occasioned by oxymoronic desires for exposure and concealment, celebrity and privacy' (Martin 1994: 74). The poet who delighted in - and was largely responsible for engineering - his public coronation at Rome as poet laureate also wrote the *De vita solitaria* in praise of the private life, making solitude 'a central category' of his thought and poetry (Mazzotta 1993: 43). Imbricating Laura and *lauro*, private love and public glory, the *Canzoniere*'s most famous trope draws these two poles into a complicated dialectic that was to have even more complicated ramifications for later poets writing in the Petrarchan mode. The dichotomy between Petrarch's longing for seclusion and his hunger for acclaim was one of the driving forces behind his prodigious poetic production. For Petrarch, 'no facile separation is possible between the world one carries inside oneself and the outside world' (Mazzotta 1993: 6). The two are constantly in agitation: as Petrarch wrote elsewhere in his letter to Giacomo Colonna, 'My wishes fluctuate and my desires conflict, and in their conflict they tear me apart. Thus does the outer man struggle with the inner' (*Fam*. 2.9).

---

[4] The genderings of this distinction are particularly fascinating. Much has been written on the alignment of the masculine with the public and the feminine with the private (cf., for example, Pateman 1989, and Ceresano and Wynne-Davies (eds.), 1992). The alignment of Petrarch and Petrarchan sonneteering with a continental femininity as opposed to the masculinity of an unsentimental, straight-talking English tradition is a long-standing one, informing not only Winters' and Williams' readings but also, for example, W. J. Courthope's contrast of the 'manliness' he identifies as Wyatt's distinguishing characteristic with the 'excrutiating ingenuity' and the 'servility' of the Petrarchan pose (1974: 41; cited in D'Amico 1979: 17-18). I return to the question of Petrarchan genderings and their relationship to the public/private distinction in chapter 4.

### 1.2 Histories of the Subject

One obvious motive for looking again at the dialectic of the public and the private in Petrarch's work is that both his own lyric poetry and that of the Renaissance sonneteers directly or indirectly adopting the *Canzoniere* as a model have often been granted a privileged position in the history of what has sometimes been labelled the rise of the modern subject, while that history is commonly identified with changing relations between inward and outward identities. As Patricia Fumerton puts it, 'the history of subjectivity *is* the history of delicate shiftings between changing conceptions of private and public self' (Fumerton 1991: 110; italics added). New Historicism has long privileged a focus on Elizabethan and Jacobean England precisely because it sees it as the birthplace of the modern. If private Petrarchan courtship could serve the ends of public courtiership in the Renaissance, the notion that the Petrarchan (or 'post-Petrarchan', or 'anti-Petrarchan') sonnet was one of the key sites in a revolution in subjectivity in the Renaissance became established in the 1980s as a critical commonplace. Stephen Greenblatt made Wyatt's refashioning of Petrarch a key moment in the development of a new, early modern, outwardly-oriented fashioning of a public self. At around the same time, the pioneering historian of the private life, Philippe Ariès, described England as 'the birthplace of privacy,' noting that diaries were widely kept there from the late 1500s (1989: 5). In an argument that chimes with Ariès' position, the sonnet sequence came to be identified with the emergence of, in Anne Ferry's terms, a new kind of 'inward language' (Ferry 1983), and even, in Joel Fineman's immensely influential reading of *Shakespeare's Sonnets*, with the very invention of poetic subjectivity (Fineman 1986).[5]

If the Petrarchan mode and the various counterdiscourses it provoked are often regarded as an important locus of a new kind of interiorised subjectivity, Petrarch's own work has occupied a more contested position in what Brian Cummings has recently described as 'a war of ownership over the rise of human subjectivity' (2010: 636). As Cummings goes on to note, 'Petrarch is pre-eminently the writer who challenges simplistic appeals to period descriptors and paradigm shifts' (2010: 644). While early modernist historians of subjectivity have often 'fought for possession of Petrarch's remains' with medievalists (Cummings 2010: 644), many early modernists – perhaps precisely as a result of Petrarch's capacity to trouble notions of a paradigm shift between the two periods – have seemed anxious to downplay his importance, situating him firmly as a medieval precursor. Like many of those that followed in its wake, Ferry's study of the English Renaissance sonnet is strangely dismissive of the contribution Petrarch or the European Petrarchan mode might have made to the emergence of the new form of subjectivity she identifies, a point reviewers picked up on.[6] Since Burckhardt, of course, Petrarch has been granted a kind of special dispensation from his historical situatedness by historians of the early modern subject, a sort of honorary membership of the Renaissance, as 'the first modern man'. This status has been granted him largely in recognition of his coupling of an acute exploration of his inner self with a punctilious fashioning of an outward self for the benefit both of his own age and of posterity.[7] All too often, however, Petrarch is acknowledged as a precursor only to be all the more summarily passed over on the way to supposedly demonstrating how any given early modern sonneteer transcends the alleged limitations of the Petrarchan mode. The subjectivities fashioned by the Renaissance sonneteers have as often been celebrated for their transcendence of Petrarchism's restrictive conventions as fathomed for Petrarchan continuities. Gordon Braden's observation that the orthodox mode in which to praise any given example of poetry in the Petrarchan mode seems to be to celebrate its departure from that mode seems to hold particularly true wherever subjectivity is under scrutiny (Braden 1986b: 9)

---

[5] Jurgen Habermas, too, situated the origins of both the modern public sphere and modern conceptions of privacy in Britain. While his focus is upon the emergence of a bourgeois public sphere in the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries, Habermas originally saw the prehistory of this public sphere as lying in the development of a specifically literary public sphere with its beginnings in the seventeenth century (1989 [1962]: 51-66). Habermas's model has been at the crux of most subsequent discussions of the nature and history of the public sphere (and has inevitably proved particularly attractive to literary scholars), with a wide range of more or less radical revisions proposed by various critics. Particularly notable among these is David Zaret's argument that Habermas's overly narrow focus on economic forces and issues leads him to neglect the influence of religion, science and printing on shifts in the development of public spheres (Zaret 1992: 213). The implications of Zaret's critique of Habermas's model are wide-ranging, and will be returned to later in this study, but for now it is enough to note that he presents a compelling case for locating the composite origins of the modern public sphere firmly in the sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries, with the rise of the printing press, the Reformation, and the New Science. It should be noted, however, that while Habermas himself has significantly revised his model of the public sphere in the light of subsequent empirical research and theoretical critiques of his original position, he has also expressed 'some doubts about how far we can push back the very notion of the public sphere into the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries without somehow changing the very concept of the public sphere to such a degree that it becomes something else' (cf. Calhoun 1989: 465).

---

[6] See, for example, Ronald Levao's review in *Renaissance Quarterly*, which noted that 'the lack of sympathy for Petrarch […] is surprising' (Levao 1987: 179). Ferry acknowledges that 'Petrarch's direct influence on [Wyatt and Sidney] was probably as profound as his originality in the presentation of traditional materials', but her emphasis throughout is on how 'many of the distinguishing uses of language in sonnets by Wyatt and Sidney were actually calculated departures from Petrarchan models, rather than assimilations from them' (1983: 16). When Ferry writes that 'some of their chief preoccupations—for instance, Wyatt's with *trust*, Sidney's with *show*—were not Petrarch's, while his absorption with metamorphosis, memory, and beatific vision were alien to the moods and concerns of both English innovators in the sonnet', it is perhaps possible to hear a distant echo of Winters' distinction between a vigorous 'native' tradition and effete continental Petrarchism (1983: 16). *Pace* Ferry, Sidney's preoccupation with *show* mirrors exactly Petrarch's own preoccupation with concealment, signalled most obviously by the recurrence of variants of the verb *celare* (to conceal) throughout the *Canzoniere*, (*RVF* 2.3, 4.6, 23.154, 28.107, 35.11, 37.104, 102.14, 127.100, 151.12, 182.8, 185.13, 189.12, 195.8, 196.6, 207.18, 207.67, 217.8, 230.2, 234.4, 256.4; see too *TA* 1.50 and *TT* 24).

[7] 'Petrarch is sometimes called the father of humanism, and there is no doubt that in the amalgam of pagan and Christian, of classical scholarship and a dual consciousness of human frailty and human potential which we find everywhere in his work, he gives to that term something of its modern meaning. He has been called the first modern historian; his attempts to plant trees mark him as an early exponent of the experimental method and have

Setting the dialectic of publicized retreat and intimate revelation in Petrarch's vernacular verse alongside that found in the Elizabethan and Jacobean sonneteers, in such a way as to allow for the possibility that the former might in some sense 'postfigure' the latter (to adopt Harold Bloom's term), offers a potential challenge to the dominant, essentially teleological history of subjectivity that sees Petrarch as a more or less important first step on the road to the properly modern self. Despite innumerable localized variations based on often profoundly divergent theoretical grounds, this narrative is in its principal elements remarkably consistent and enduring. As Cummings notes, 'Burckhardt's view of *Der Mensch des Mittelalters*, and the corresponding awakening of *Personlichkeit* in the Renaissance, is one that refuses to go away' (2010: 636). Its most influential recent articulation in early modern literary studies has come from New Historicist or Cultural Materialist critics. Given New Historicism's insistence on the alterity of the past, the willingness of some of its adherents to appropriate Petrarch (while often essentially ignoring him) into a narrative whose teleological end is the modern subject has been striking.

---

earned him the label of the first modern gardener; his ascent of Mount Ventoux has been hailed, however erroneously, as the first act of modern mountaineering. [...] Above all, however, in his perception of himself, in his acute awareness of his inner motives, and in his never-ceasing efforts to construct an image of himself for posterity, we might consider him the first modern man' (Mann 1984: 113).

From its beginnings, the assumptions behind the New Historicist and Cultural Materialist history of the subject have been challenged, perhaps most articulately by David Aers' cautionary 'whisper in the ear of the early modernists' (1992). Aers' challenge, in truth more of a wake-up call than a whisper, is now almost twenty years old. It has prompted much excellent scholarship and helped to make the cruder sort of diachronic claim for the originality of Renaissance or early modern subjectivity untenable. Revisiting his argument is to some extent to return to the scene of battles already won. The master narrative he disputed, though, still retains considerable currency. For this reason if no other, Aers' essay remains a useful starting point for a study of a poetic mode often identified with the emergence of a new kind of subjectivity.

Aers criticizes the diachronic pretensions of many of the purveyors of the influential 'history of the subject' discussed above, which traces the emergence of interiority, and the subjectivity to which that belongs, quite specifically to early modern England. Aers identifies 'an amnesia systematic and institutionalised' common to both the conservative 'historical criticism' that flourished through the 1950s into the early 1970s, and the anti-humanist Cultural Materialism and New Historicism already becoming dominant at Aers' time of writing, and notes how both rely on a homogenized view of the Middle Ages (Aers 1992: 179). These are seen as witnessing 'a unitary culture free from anything remotely resembling the subjectivity invented by the products of that famous fall called the "dissociation of sensibility" which set in during the seventeenth century' (1992: 178, 181).[8] 'As in Cultural Materialism, New Historicism turns the Middle Ages into a homogenous and mythical field which is defined in terms of the scholars' needs for a figure against which

---

[8] Thus for Jonathan Dollimore, one of the Cultural Materialist critics Aers challenges, the Middle Ages were a period of 'Christian essentialism' in which 'what mattered was [...] not the individual but society, the corpus of all individuals', and the 'conception of identity' can be adequately described as 'hierarchical location' (1989: 153, 155-6; cited Aers 1992: 188-9).

"Renaissance" concerns with inwardness and the fashioning of identities can be defined as new' (Aers 1992: 192).[9]

Aers's demolition of some of the more absurd New Historicist and Cultural Materialist claims of the 'eighties and early 'nineties focuses in particular on the inward/outward dynamic, as, indeed, those claims often do themselves. Francis Barker's *The Tremulous Private Body* offers some paradigmatic examples of the wilful amnesia Aers attacks. For Barker, there was simply no 'interiorized self-recognition' in late medieval culture, and it is only when we reach the second scene of Hamlet that we even begin to glimpse what he calls 'a separation . . . between the inner reality of the subject' and an 'exterior'. It is only when Hamlet reminds his mother that he has 'that within which passeth show' that 'an interior subject begins to speak', although, for Barker, even this is historically 'premature': subjectivity is here 'emergent but only in promissory form' (Aers 1992: 186-7; cf. Barker 1984: 31-41). For Catherine Belsey, meanwhile, any sense of division between 'individual and society, private and public, family and state' is entirely and exclusively the product of a 'liberal humanist' ideology that supposedly first emerged in the early years of the seventeenth century and has been dominant in the West ever since (Belsey 1985: 199, 8; cited Aers 1992: 190). Aers follows Lee Patterson in tracing this notion of a culturally homogenous Middle Ages back to Jacob Burckhardt's well-known argument that then, unlike in the Renaissance, 'man was conscious of himself only as a member of a race, people, party, family or corporation—only through some general category', a sentence that he notes 'would fit as cosily into the books by Eagleton, Barker, Belsey, Dollimore or Greenblatt as into the anti-humanist conservative medievalism' with which his essay begins (Aers 1992: 195).[10]

---

[9] As Aers observes laconically in a parenthesis, 'at the leading edge of ever-revolutionary consumerism, what that does not represent "change" and the new could deserve our attention?' (Aers 1992: 192).

[10] Given the very foundations of Christianity, it is peculiar that the notion that individualised reflexive subjectivity somehow only emerged in the Renaissance or after could ever have had any currency. As Hegel (with Dante specifically in mind) puts it, 'in the world of Christian thought the individual is not to be regarded as a mere accident of the Godhead but

Against the notion of identity in the Middle Ages as defined purely by one's outward, social role, Aers cites approvingly Patterson's counter-argument that 'the dialectic between an inward subjectivity and an external world that alienates it from both itself and its divine source provides the fundamental economy of the medieval idea of selfhood' (Patterson 1990: 99; cited Aers 1992: 179). As he notes in an earlier, shorter version of the same article, 'this would certainly be a good way of approaching St. Augustine's *Confessions* [or] Petrarch's *Secretum*' (Aers 1991: 23). In asserting with Patterson that this dialectic runs throughout medieval life and culture, Aers identifies two key modes or areas in which it can be witnessed. Firstly, he points to the importance of private confession in shaping medieval inwardness. Referring to Chaucer's *Parson's Tale*, he notes how the teacher 'carefully emphasizes that attention to external actions, to "outward" deeds, is not remotely adequate [and] warns that self-scrutiny, confession and repentance must address the most intimate movements of thought, contrition leading to a "wonder sorweful and angwissous" response' (Aers 1992: 185; cf. *Parson's Tale* 291-315). As Aers goes on to conclude, 'the whole medieval penitential tradition involves a fundamental and perfectly explicit distinction between inner and outer, between that which is within and passes show and that which is without, the external act' (Aers 1992: 185).

Of equal importance for Aers in revising the dominant histories of early modern subjectivity, though, is Petrarch's confessional Augustinianism. Augustine is the figure to whom anyone writing a history of interiority and the subject must return, 'the always, the already, in the history of autobiography'

---

as an infinite end in himself, so that here the universal end, God's justice in pronouncing damnation or salvation, may appear at the same time as an immanent affair, the eternal interest and being of the individual himself. In this divine world, concern is purely for the individual: in the state he may indeed be sacrificed for the safety of the universal, i.e. the state, but in relation to God and in the Kingdom of God he is without qualification an end in himself' (Hegel 1998: II, 980). As David Aers observes in a footnote, however, the canonisation of the history of the subject he addresses makes dismissals such as those of Richard Levin 'less than satisfactory' (1992: 197-198, n.3). Levin suggests that such accounts are 'incredible ... it should be obvious that this ... [history] is an absurd fiction' 1989: 78). As Aers comments, however, 'It is obviously not obvious!'

(Cummings 2010: 636).[11] As Charles Taylor points out, the opposition of spirit/matter, higher/lower, eternal/temporal, immutable/changing is described by Augustine 'not just occasionally and peripherally, but centrally and essentially in terms of inner/outer' (Taylor 1989: 128-129). Augustine was the single most important influence on Petrarch's writing, and the *Confessions* the single most influential book.[12] Augustine's influence on Petrarch was lifelong, dating at least to Petrarch's first recorded book purchase, a copy of the *City of God* bought in Avignon in 1325. It intensified as Petrarch grew older: Augustine was to be more responsible than any other for Petrarch's turn away from pagan literature toward the Church Fathers in his later years (Mann 1984: 13-14). Aers offers a number of examples of Augustine's introspective turn, noting that central to the *Confessions*

> is an approach that remains basic throughout the Augustinian tradition—in the Middle Ages as in the early-modern period. Namely, that the journey to God demands a move from the outer person to the inner, while in the very activity of an introspective search for self-knowledge we may hope to encounter God. (Aers 1992: 183)[13]

---

[11] If Augustine has played a fundamental role in the formation of a certain kind of late modern subjectivity, we should remember that this Augustine is only one of many, and that from Augustine's death until at least the mid-fifteenth century readers were focused upon elements of his work very different from those corresponding to modern interests (cf. Cummings 2010: 638-644).

[12] Charles Taylor's *Sources of the Self: the making of the modern identity*, arguably the most thorough recent attempt at such a history, observes that if was Augustine 'who introduced the inwardness of radical reflexivity and bequeathed it to the Western tradition' (1989: 131). For a more recent articulation of Augustine's innovative role in shaping Western inwardness, see Phillip Cary's study, *Augustine's Invention of the Inner Self: The Legacy of a Christian Platonist* (2000). For Cary, the thing that distinguishes Augustine's contribution to the notion of inner space from previous forms of Platonist inwardness 'is precisely that Augustine's inner space is actually private': that is, not only is it 'hidden' from the outside world, but it is particular to the individual soul. For a Platonist, 'since the best things in reality are One not Many, they are things that souls can only have in common. Thus, for example, wisdom in one soul is not ultimately different from wisdom in another, for there is ultimately only one true Wisdom. This Platonic Idea or Form of Wisdom is common to all, not the private possession of the individual, and it is equally available to all who have eyes to see it. Hence it is not so obvious that the inner self must be private. On the contrary, the natural thing for a Platonist to say (once Platonism acquires a concept of inner space) is that the inner realm is public not private, since the goods in it are common possessions rather than private property' (Cary 2000: 4-5).

[13] Augustine's centrality in the history of subjectivity is well-documented—and the failure of the historians of early modern subjectivity to acknowledge the vast body of scholarship on Augustine constitutes part of Aers' criticism—but Aers offers a particularly crucial insight

As Cummings notes, 'the inward movement in Augustine is always characterized as a necessary first principle in a movement outward which is the real object', as reflexivity finds its counterpart in externalization (Cummings 2010: 645). This becomes central to the dialectic of inward and outward that we find in Petrarch, who makes it possible for the first time 'for the individual to become [...] his own book' (Stock 2001: 76).[14]

As both Aers and Patterson argue, if we turn our attention not only to Augustine and Petrarch's confessional Augustinianism, but also to courtly romances and lyrics, hagiographic writing, penitential discourses in Gower and Langland, to Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* and *Canterbury Tales*, Walter Hilton's *The Scale of Perfection*, *Piers Plowman* and any number of other medieval sources:

> There is no reason to think that languages and experiences of inwardness, of interiority, of divided selves, of splits between outer realities and inner forms of being, were unknown before the seventeenth century, before capitalism, before the "bourgeoisie", before Descartes, before the disciplinary regimes addressed in Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*. (Aers 1992: 185-186)

As an antidote to the early modernists' 'history of the subject', Aers proposed not only a greater attention to the full scope of medieval culture, but an abandonment, or at the very least a suspension, of the commitment to a linear master narrative of Dark Ages to Renaissance or of feudalism to capitalism.[15]

---

when he notes that passages of extra-overt subjectivity in the *Confessions* seem an attempt to remedy on the surface a sense of a profoundly felt underlying *lack*.

[14] There is a direct line running from Augustine's questioning in the *Confessions* of the basis of his own self-identity, prompted by his analysis of his erotic dreams after he has become a priest—'Am I not myself [*ego non sum*] at that time'—to Sidney's 'I am not I' (*A&S* 45.14) by way of Petrarch's Augustinian self-alienation (cf. *RVF* 29.36), a line that has its origins in a sense of severance from God's identification of himself to Moses ('I am that I am') and which, perhaps, forks at Shakespeare with Viola's and Iago's shared 'I am not what I am' (*Twelfe Night*, III.i.1324; *Othello* I.i.65).

[15] It is worth emphasizing that Aers is not here simply replicating the early modernists' gesture of inauguration, by relocating the origins of modern subjectivity in the middle ages rather than the Renaissance (as Brian Cummings might be taken to be implying – cf.

'What if subjectivity', he asks, 'is more bound into a microhistory that is less linear than the master narrative determining the story told by Burckhardt, Robertson, Barker, Belsey, Dollimore, Greenblatt and Eagleton and, it must be acknowledged, suggested too by Foucault?' (Aers 1992: 197).

Engaging with some of the 'early modern' texts written in Britain in the Petrarchan mode through the prism of Petrarch's own writings, in the manner set out here and in the preface, rather than focusing exclusively on questions of influence, promises a provisional methodology that might militate against reproducing the standard narrative that sees Petrarch as anticipating or founding a movement towards a poetic subjectivity that is only fully realized in, say, Shakespeare's sonnets. This should go some way towards satisfying the demand made by the authors of the Neo-Historicist manifesto that we remain alert to the 'otherness' of the past and not 'recruit past thinkers as precursive spokesmen and women of modern values' (Headlam Wells, Burgess & Wymer 2000: ix). Yet, if it promises to address some of Aers' concerns and return Petrarch's texts to their own contexts, so that he is not read solely as a precursor, the impetus behind this comes from another desire, too: the desire to address what Jacques Roubaud has described as an 'aphasia about the reading of poetry' by insisting with him that 'the poetry of the past is also a present poetry' (Roubaud 2006: 170-171).[16] In part this means recognising that those contexts are never wholly or innocently recoverable—to this extent this could be seen as a simple reassertion of one of the founding tenets of New Historicism. More fundamentally, however, it means insisting on a distinction — no matter how difficult to pin down conceptually — between reading a text in historical terms and reading it as a literary text: a distinction with which New Historicism has always been profoundly uncomfortable.

---

Cummings 2010: 638). Aers is rather arguing that the whole idea of a grand narrative of the rise of subjectivity needs to be re-examined, suspended, and perhaps abolished.

[16] As Roubaud adds in a parentheses, 'I don't think the poems of Cavalcanti, Du Bellay, etc., etc., are non-existing, outdated, unreadable poems today' (2006: 171). It should go without saying that for this reader the same holds true of Petrarch and of the majority of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Petrarchan poetry explored in this thesis.

## 1.3 Aphasiacs and Zombies: idiosyncratic readings and private idiocies

While its most pressing concern is with the purblind attitude of the would-be historians of the early modern subject toward the middle ages, and their willingness—even, indeed, their anxiety—to make sweeping diachronic claims without even the briefest of surveys of the evidence, Aers' whisper raises more general theoretical questions about the relation of literary scholarship to history, and of philology to *reading*. If it has forced specialists in early modern literature to be more circumspect in the claims to novelty they make for their subject, the more general issue has, if anything, become ever more problematic as a historicizing approach to early modern literature has become ever more dominant. In 2002, Hugh Grady recalled that in the early nineties (when Aers was whispering) there were still three broad critical paradigms: textual deconstruction; feminism; and new historicism/cultural materialism. Within just a few years, however, as Grady goes on to observe, these three paradigms had become one, as the first two modernised rapidly and climbed into bed with the third. The result, as Grady notes, has been that historicism has become 'virtually an unrivalled paradigm for professional writing', something that is 'taken for granted' (2002: 1).[17]

Today, as Douglas Bruster has recently observed, 'most scholars in the field know that, when opening a journal or monograph, they are more likely to read about trading ships and foreign encounters than stanzas' (2010: 150). As Bruster points out, this leads one to ask why certain historicizing scholars focus on literature when what is sought seems closer to the province of history (2010: 150).[18] This thesis is not the place for an assault on a broad front upon the practice and the theoretical underpinnings of historical criticism, ‘new’ or otherwise. Yet the question ‘Why literature?’ (and, more particularly, ‘Why poetry?’), if obscene, is increasingly worth insisting upon. For all its formal recognition that the past is conditioned by the present, that, as Benedetto Croce put it, all history is contemporary history, the currently dominant historicism, chastened perhaps by criticisms such as Aers’ of its earlier, more grandiose claims, ‘typically disavows this knowledge as an obstacle to experiencing historical difference and distance’ (Fernie 2005: 171). The sense it leaves behind is that ‘the present might reasonably be thought of as an intervening, distracting fog that an effective literary criticism ought rigorously to blow away’ (Grady and Hawkes 2006: 2).[19]

---

[17] Of course, other kinds of criticism have persisted despite historicism's hegemony. Grady's work contributed to the rise of the 'Presentist' school of criticism, an explicit reaction to historicism's pervasiveness. Yet presentism set itself up largely in terms that allowed it, while offering a superficial challenge to historicism, to act essentially as its supplement, another marginal special interest largely confined to Shakespeare Studies, and particularly to drama. Despite some excellent, penetrative critiques of New Historicism, its exclusion of history has in practice tended to be too shallow to challenge the hegemonic position of historicist criticism.

[18] Bruster also points to a gap he sees as having opened up between the research of many academics on the one hand, and their teaching and what the public expects and believes them to be doing on the other.

In largely confining its focus to the poem’s essentially public role in the flow of social energy in the historical milieu of its own composition and immediate circulation, the historicism of the last twenty-five years or so has too often disavowed the intimate, idiosyncratic experience of the individual, contemporary (in both senses) reader, or partitioned it off within a coyly knowing preface, rather than making it interpretation’s kernel. In so doing, it has not only alienated itself from educated non-academic readers, but also induced its own identity crisis: as Roland Greene (one of the most perceptive writers on European Petrarchism and its wake) has recently put it, ‘If literary critics insist on writing books no one cares about, does literary criticism have a future?’ (2010: 1).[20]

The tendency towards neglect of the modern reader’s intimate experience of reading is sometimes mirrored in a reluctance to engage with prosody, with that in which the poem's embodied appeal to us inheres. Historicism's relative neglect of that contraction of the platysma muscle and erection of the hair described by Darwin, of what Frank Kermode has recently explored as 'the shudder', betrays a certain squeamishness before such seemingly unseemly phenomena, or simply an undeclared understanding that such phenomena are properly a matter for the individual private reader, with little place within the public realm of scholarship, and little political consequence (Darwin 1998 [1872]: 299-305; Kermode 2010: 13-16).[21]

---

[19] As Grady and Hawkes also note, such criticism often seems to be founded upon a ‘deep-rooted belief that the “facts cannot help but save us” ’ (2006: 3).

[20] By focusing on early modern writing’s immediate public functions in its own age, criticism has arguably cloistered itself away from a wider, less scholarly readership. In this context, Petrarch’s ambiguous attitude to the monastic life pursued by his brother perhaps has much to say to us. Petrarch’s move towards interiorization is bound up with ‘an assertion of the possibility of a secularized form of the religious life in the lay work of literature’ (Cummings 2010: 646). As Cummings notes, however, we can see a parallel ambiguity within medieval monasticism itself, ‘in the simultaneous movements for a more idealized interiority in the eremitical traditions combined with a suspicion of the cloistered orders and a drive to new encounters with the laity’ (Cummings 2010: 646).

The shunning of prosody, however, has perhaps also been a consequence of what Simon Jarvis has called 'the expulsion of prosody from cognition', and its subsequent reduction to mere method (Jarvis 2003: 8).[22] One of the conditions for a meaningful prosody, Jarvis has argued, might be 'a rethinking of the place of idiosyncrasy in the experience of poetry' (Jarvis 2003: 6):

> The truth about such experience cannot be reached by trimming off what are thought of as the merely private extras. This kind of route to supposed objectivity starts with some individual shudder of experience — as when the thought that *I should have been a pair of ragged claws/ Scuttling across the floor of silent seas* flits half-noticed across the cerebral cortex of one participating in some grim festival of functions — and then deletes the contingent, the accidental, or the merely personal. It thus deletes, in the event, everything about that experience that makes it an experience: in bracketing out the festival of functions, the functions themselves,

---

[21] Kermode quotes Eliot on the importance of that first early moment of shock and surprise, 'a moment which can never be forgotten, but which is never repeated integrally; and yet which would become destitute of significance if it did not survive in a larger whole of experience; which survives inside a deeper and a calmer feeling'. The study of such phenomena seems all too often now to be implicitly regarded as fitting material only for literary scholars' colleagues in experimental psychology departments: this, at least, is the impression sometimes given not only by individual studies but by entire conferences and whole issues of journals. Kermode's piece takes T. S. Eliot as the pivot for its wheeling around the issue of the 'shudder', of art that manages 'to make one's flesh creep with sincerity' (Eliot's description of what Tennyson's *Maud* failed to do), but ranges far and wide, taking in Eliot's engagement with the Jacobean dramatists and with Dante, too.

[22] '[P]rosody *as a method* is the oblivion of prosody', as Jarvis notes earlier in the same study (2003: 3). Jarvis offers a perceptive reading of how in much modern prosody 'nothing plus nothing equals something' and 'Meaning is pumped back into the acoustic carcass, which must, but which cannot, take up its bed and walk' (Jarvis 2003: 6).

> and whatever else in the moment should be thought to pertain only to this single point in space-time, it presents a mutilated rump known as 'the effect of the metre upon the reader'. Here is the experience of 'the' 'reader' as mechanical doll, in which the range of experiences which readers historically have had, are having, and might have, must know themselves for their own silly and quite private idiocies, and so must measure their lack against this timeless, placeless zombie. (Jarvis 2003: 6-7)

Jarvis is referring here, of course, to precisely the kind of formalism that lay behind the new historicist revolt. The kind of reading he pinpoints parallels historicism's own tendency to neglect the 'private idiocies' of a particularized reader. This study's focus is in part driven by the hope that such an emphasis offers one route out of what has become a deadeningly habitual recourse to an often unreconstructed historicism that, no matter what its token gestures towards an (already stale) theoretical 'newness', has little time for the *pietà* of the individual contemporary reader. Insisting on the individual contemporary reader's experience of the text is absolutely not to say that the literary text has nothing, in its very aesthetic specificity, to tell us about history: it is simply to insist that that knowledge is embedded in form, or better, that that knowledge *is* form: that, as Jarvis has it elsewhere, 'verse is not merely a kind of thinking but also a kind of implicit and historical knowing', that 'the finest minutiae of verse practice represent an internalized mimetic response to historical changes too terrifying or exhilarating to be addressed explicitly' (Jarvis 2008: 99).[23]

Exploring the finest minutiae of Petrarch's verse practice demonstrates, first of all, the complexity with which even the very intake and release of breath is woven into the semantic weft of the *Canzoniere*'s imbrications of the public and private, inwardness and outwardness, political aspiration and amorous expiration (I am thinking here in particular of Giorgio Orelli's readings of Petrarch in *Il suono dei sospiri*: see, for example, his reading of 'Solo et pensoso' (1990: 45-50)). Petrarch's own formidable sense of history provides a counterbalance to any temptation to slip into too facile a presentism, or too naïve a focus upon reader-response, in challenging the dominant historicizing modes of reading. No writer, perhaps, has ever been as acutely and inwardly aware of the alterity of the past as Petrarch, the rediscoverer of so many classical texts and by some accounts the discoverer, too, for the modern west, of the very notion of historical anachronism.[24] Yet at the same time, Petrarch was intimately aware of the capacity of literature to bridge the chasms between past and present. At a distance of more than the thousand years he imagines his own work transcending to move a future reader to pity (*RVF* 30.35), the rediscovery of Cicero's letters to Atticus in the library of Verona Cathedral reportedly moved him to tears. Perhaps the best, the most Petrarchan way to think about this relation between the 'historical' literary text and our relationship to it as readers today is precisely in terms of (Petrarch's) *pietà*. Covering a far greater range of senses for Petrarch than its simplest English translation, *pietà* is code borrowed from the courtly love tradition for the sexual favour solicited from the beloved, and Petrarch uses it in his most nearly obvious erotic fantasizing on Laura, to whom his reader in futurity is insistently assimilated throughout the *Canzoniere* (Braden 1999a: 56). The appeal that the poet of the *Canzoniere* makes to a particularised reader in an anterior future—that is, to *us*, or rather to *you*, and to *me*—for *pietà*, for a visceral, emotive, intellectual, ethical and even fundamentally erotic response, is one that the same (new) historicising tendency that Aers criticizes has increasingly come to suppress, not only in Petrarch but in the poetry of his Renaissance ephebes, too.

---

[23] Pierre Bourdieu is another who has identified a need to 'escape from the usual dilemma of internal ("tautegorical") reading of the work (taken in isolation or within the system of works to which it belongs) and external (or "allegorical") analysis, i.e. analysis of the social conditions of production of the producers and consumers which is based on the – generally tacit – hypothesis of the spontaneous correspondence or deliberate matching of production to demand or commissions'. A full engagement with Bourdieu's response to this need lies beyond the purview of this study, but in broad terms it looks to adopt his proposed solution by examining the 'field' of English and Scottish Renaissance Petrarchism as, 'inseparably, a field of positions and a field of position-takings' (Bourdieu 1993: 34).

---

[24] For Panofsky, Petrarch 'revolutionized the interpretation of history no less radically than Copernicus, two hundred years later, was to revolutionize the interpretation of the physical universe' (1960: 10-11), while in seeing the literary and architectural achievements of pagan Rome as greater than those of his own, Christian epoch, Petrarch, according to Thomas Greene, 'took more or less alone the step an archaic society must take to reach maturity: he *recognized the possibility of a cultural alternative*' (Greene 1976: 90 – italics Greene's). In so doing, Greene argues, he laid the foundations for a critique that not only subverted the ideals of his own culture, but that put the very notion of ideals themselves into doubt.

That response, the tears Petrarch shed on reading Cicero's letters and that he may yet bring to the eyes of some reader born in the twenty-fourth century, is a profoundly intimate, idiosyncratic affair that usually has only an indirect relationship to the immediate circulation of social energy. Yet it depends in part on such circulation to reach the pitying eye and ear, and therefore has to pay its dues to social energy even as it stages a retreat from it. At the same time, it also brings into being a peculiar kind of transhistorical 'public' realm quite distinct from the much-studied 'Republic of Letters'. It is instead, as we shall see, something much more conceptually problematic, much more rigorously interiorized.

A helpful way of thinking about how the texts explored in this thesis relate to us as readers in an author's anterior future is offered by Lisa Freinkel in one of the most intriguing recent recastings of that narrative of subjectivity that culminates in *Shakespeare's Sonnets.* While the main thrust of Freinkel's argument, focusing on the history of the mutation of Christian *figura* from Augustine via Petrarch and Luther to Shakespeare, is one with which this study for the most part runs parallel rather than actively engages, her emphasis upon the importance of reading, in Hegelian terms, *für uns*, for ourselves, rather than in the narrowly historical mode that is currently so much in vogue, is relevant here.[25] For Freinkel, the specifically Christian *allegoria* by which Paul seeks to ground the authority of the gospel within the scriptures of the Jews – what Erich Auerbach calls figural interpretation or *figura* – entails 'an effort to read the text in its wholeness, delivering from it a truth that is neither partial nor historical, but universal'. That is, in other words, 'to read from a standpoint outside of history—or at least outside of the book's own historical occasions—and yet to read as if this book written *in* history were written *for us* who stand outside (Freinkel 2001: xvii). Hegel's *für uns*, as Freinkel shows in some detail, repeats 'almost to the letter' Paul's formula for an allegorical reading of Jewish scripture: 'These things touched them [i.e., the Israelites] in figure, but they were written *for our sake*, in whom the ends of the ages have come' (1 Cor. 10:11; cited Freinkel 2001: xviii – emphasis Freinkel's). We read from the end of times.

---

[25] Freinkel shifts the focus from subjectivity as such onto 'intentionality', noting that when literary critics use the former term 'they do so in order to denote the textual representation of human agency', whereas her interest is in '"will" as the intention we ascribe to texts', the 'active, readerly construction of a meaning before and beyond the text' (Freinkel 2001: xix).

There is not the space here to do full justice to Freinkel's complex yet lucid tracing of a Pauline/Hegelian mode of reading that promises to begin to span the chasm between the incompatibility of empirical and transcendental discourses, between 'the piecemeal nature of history' and 'the wholeness of truth' (or, we might suggest, between historicist and formalist readings) through a retrospective construction of readerly and writerly authority that functions allegorically (Freinkel 2001: xvii). Freinkel's mode of reading, however, providing both her subject and her method, traces a tradition within which both the texts studied here and my own reading continue, no matter how problematically, to belong.[26] The 'central emblem' of *Reading Shakespeare's Will* is a fantasy that Augustine recounts in his *Confessions*. Struggling to interpret the Book of Genesis, Augustine imagines that Moses himself, its (supposed) author, were present to reveal its meaning directly to him. Yet,

> just as soon as Augustine imagines this moment of a direct, unmediated link to the author's will, he abandons the fantasy. Moses' truth would have been particular, private, mortal, and—importantly—*Jewish*, while Augustine seeks a public, eternal, and universal truth. For Augustine, authorial intention is a fallacy because it can only reveal the limits of time and flesh. The real intention of the text is always the spiritual one, and it can only be discovered once we inure ourselves to the siren's call of the long-dead, distant author'. (Freinkel 2001: xxi-xxii)

---

[26] Freinkel reads Shakespeare's will (or Will) as 'the figural culmination of a history that has called *figura* itself into question': while requiring the resources of that very tradition to carry out such a reading, this nevertheless puts her – and her modern reader – in an ambivalent position in relation to that history (Freinkel 2001: xxii).

In arguing from and for a Hegelian reading *for ourselves*, however, Freinkel perhaps misses a trick. What Petrarch teaches us to hear in Hegel's *für uns* is the individuated *un* that is the only possible ground for that 'public, eternal, and universal truth', which always remains inseparable from the 'particular, private, mortal' conditions of its realization. As I shall argue in greater detail below, while Petrarch's own 'pre-posterous' proem, 'Voi che ascoltate' (*RVF* 1), addresses a collective audience, that audience is subtly imagined throughout as a series of particularized individuals in an anterior future.[27] We can hear this in the stanza from the sestina that serves as epigraph to this study, where Petrarch imagines how he will perhaps bring pity to the eyes 'di tal che nascerà dopo mill' anni' (*RVF* 30.35). In offering her own translation of this line – 'of *anyone* born . . . a thousand years from now' (Freinkel 2001: 49 – my italics) Freinkel elides the individuation latent in Petrarch's singular pronoun, *tal*. Petrarch is, we might argue, more properly Hegelian than Freinkel, in that his poetry recognizes implicitly (*für uns,* we should perhaps add) that true universality is actualized only in concrete determinations, 'through the concrete wealth of particular human passions and strivings' (Žižek 1999: 91).

## 1.4 Singular Universals and the *benedizione della negatività*

'Our nature is my greatest privacy, and this is the silly and sustaining paradox, that the most idiosyncratic and inadmissible is the most deeply shared' (Wilkinson 1987: 82). John Wilkinson's 'silly and sustaining paradox', which serves as an epigraph to this chapter, offers a useful supplement to Freinkel in the construction of a model of how Petrarch makes his appeal to his reader in futurity for *pietà* through a metatheses of public and private, the inward and the outward. Wilkinson's paradox draws us back to a possibility often forgotten in post-modern historicism's suspicion of all notions of universality, which it tends to regard as oppressive masquerades, as always already hopelessly particularized impositions. Recent years have seen a return of this particular repressed in philosophy: it is the explicit subject of Alain Badiou's influential rehabilitation of the insistence on universality in St. Paul's vision of Christianity (a rehabilitation which parallels and may have influenced Freinkel's own Pauline reading of *figura*), and runs as a rich vein through the *copia* of Slavoj Žižek's work.[28] As Ernesto Laclau foresaw in the mid 'nineties, 'the redefinition of the existing relation between universality and particularity' has become of central importance within both politics and philosophy over the last decade or so (Laclau 1996: vii).[29]

---

[27] For Freinkel on the 'pre-posterous', see 2001: xx.

A comparable reservation about a certain brand of postmodernism's proclamation of the  death of the universal and its subsequent celebration of pure particularism and contextualisation has been expressed within early modern literary scholarship, too. In their 'Neo-Historicist' manifesto, published at the turn of the millennium, Robin Headlam Wells, Glenn Burgess and Rowland Wymer noted that 'so powerful is the current of anti-essentialist rhetoric in literary and cultural studies that many liberal intellectuals now find it embarrassing to admit to a belief in something called human nature; to do so, would be to confess to the crassest kind of intellectual naiveté' (Headlam Wells et al. 2000: 25). The Neo-Historicists argue that there is no need for such embarrassment: 'Art is a universal human practice and the literary works of art that remain interesting to us are likely to be those which put into play problems and conflicts of value which can be called universal to the extent that we, as human beings, are still involved with versions of them' (2000: 26). This is no doubt true. It is worth observing a distinction between this notion of literature's universality, however, and the more Hegelian – or Augustinian – concept explored by Žižek and implicit behind Wilkinson's position. For both Žižek and Wilkinson, one arrives at the truly universal not through a recognition and exploration of the parallels between, say, the political or amorous struggles endured by fifteenth-century Florentines, the Yanomami of the Amazon, and ourselves; or at least, such parallels, while potentially fascinating, are not their main concern. Instead, the universal is to be found precisely in what sets each of these cultures apart from the others; not in what they share. What both Žižek and Wilkinson point to, whatever their divergences might be, is the possibility that it is only by penetrating to the most intimate, inward, idiosyncratic and socially inadmissable depths of the singular subject that one breaks out into the 'empty space' (to adopt Laclau's term again) of true universality. As Žižek puts it in *First as Tragedy, Then as Farce,* 'one is truly universal only when radically singular, in the interstices of communal identities' (2009: 105).[30]

---

[28] As Fabio Vighi and Heko Feldner observe, 'from a Zizekian angle the lower and normally neglected manifestations of the human spirit allow us an insight into nothing other than the object of all philosophical investigations from time immemorial: truth, or rather universality' (2007: 225). Terry Eagleton, meanwhile, has written of Badiou's 'audacious return to the universal, hardly *à la mode* among the Parisian intelligentsia' (2003: 248). Žižek's most notable work in this regard with respect to the Cartesian notion of the self is in *The Ticklish Subject* (1999). Much of Giorgio Agamben's work also intersects, in a more tangential fashion, with Badiou and Žižek's attempts to rehabilitate the universal.

[29] Laclau delineates two positions around which the dominant tendencies with regard to universalism and particularism have been polarized in late twentieth-century thought: 'One of them unilaterally privileges universalism and sees in a dialogical process a way of reaching a consensus transcending all particularism (Habermas); the other, dedicated to the celebration of pure particularism and contextualism, proclaims the death of the universal (as in some forms of postmodernism)' (Laclau 1996: viii). For Laclau, as for the other thinkers I am looking at here, neither of these two extremes is acceptable. Laclau's main thesis is that any mediation between the two 'can only be a hegemonic one (which involves reference to the universal as an empty space)', and that the operation any such mediation performs 'modifies the identities of both the particular and the universal' (Laclau 1996: viii).

Such a model, it is worth noting, while relating historical particularity to our reading in the present, also promises to be more rather than less sensitive to historical difference than the 'liberal' model offered by the Neo-Historicists (which, as we have already seen, makes such attention its *raison d'être*). In insisting that the universal, the location of what we have in common with others—'our shared nature'—is to be discovered not at the level of the social but through a radical turn inwards to the most particularized, 'idiosyncratic and inadmissable' reaches of subjectivity, Wilkinson and – in a more problematic way – Žižek both offer a view of selfhood that has structural affinities with that of Augustine. For Augustine, as has already been noted, the principal road to God leads not through the domain of external objects but through an epistemological turn inwards: 'in contrast to the domain of objects, which is public and common, the activity of knowing is particularized; each of us is engaged in ours' (Taylor 1989: 130).[31] This entails what Charles Taylor defines as a 'radically reflexive' stance that 'brings to the fore a kind of presence to oneself which is inseparable from one's being the agent of experience, something to which access by its very nature is asymmetrical' (Taylor 1989: 131). Yet what we find when we journey inwards to deconstruct the very foundations of the individual is not the kernel of selfhood, but God. Travelling from the 'public and common' domain of objects into the interior recesses of subjectivity – whether this is taken as a magnificent baroque social construction or some kind of innate selfhood – we come out into the universal. In the intimacy of my self-presence, I discover that God is *interior intimo meo et superior summomeo,* 'more inward than my most inward part and higher than the highest element within me' (*Conf.* III.VI.11).

---

[30] Wilkinson's wording is arguably more nuanced, more modest than Žižek's, pointing to both the frustration and the hope that this truth entails, and placing a greater emphasis upon idiosyncratic interiority *per se*, rather than that arising from one's falling outwith social groupings.

Where Augustine finds God, contemporary philosophers such as Laclau and Žižek have found Hegelian 'abstract negativity', or, 'in the more vivid language of the young Hegel, "the night of the world"' (Žižek 1999: 82). At the heart of the subject, for these thinkers, lies a 'deeply shared' fundamental emptiness, the very absence of a unique, innate subjectivity that simultaneously, paradoxically, serves to bring the individual subject into being in all its baroque particularity. As Laclau puts it, 'the universal is part of my identity as far as I am penetrated by a constitutive lack' (Laclau 1996: 28).[32] If drawing such a parallel between the structural, constitutive role of Augustine's God and Laclau's lack or Žižek's *cut* seems extravagant, we should perhaps recall Aers' insight, noted above, into how passages of extra-overt subjectivity in the *Confessions* seem an attempt to remedy on the surface precisely such a sense of a profoundly felt underlying *lack*. Even more significantly, the 'benedizione delle negatività' or thankfulness for negativity, is one of the key oxymoronic Petrarchan tropes identified by Roberto Gigliucci in the Italian Renaissance tradition, and one that can be traced across European Petrarchism too (cf. Gigliucci 2004: 141-143). In temporal terms (and, I'm tentatively suggesting, in other ways too) Petrarch is positioned more or less equidistantly between ourselves and Augustine, while in Badiou and Augustine's shared interest in St. Paul's universalism the contemporary and the Augustinian models bracketing Petrarch share a common ancestor.[33] It is perhaps significant too that chapter two of *The Ticklish Subject*, where Žižek presents the core of his argument, closes with a section entitled 'Towards a Materialist Theory of Grace'. For both Augustine and Žižek (here following Malebranche, in turn strongly influenced by Augustine), it is in this turn to the universal that lies at the innermost core of the particular subject that human freedom is – if anywhere – to be found.[34]

---

[31] In its most famous formulation as an imperative: 'Noli foras ire, in teipsum redi; in interiore homine habitat veritas' ('Do not go outward; return within yourself. In the inward man dwells truth' – (*De vera religione* XXXIX, 72; cited Taylor 1989: 129)

[32] As Laclau continues, rewording his formulation slightly, 'that is[,] as far as my differential identity has failed in its process of constitution. The universal emerges out of the particular not as some principle underlying and explaining the particular, but as an incomplete horizon suturing a dislocated particular identity' (Laclau 1996: 28).

This common structure for a draft of a model of subjectivity and of the relative positions of the universal and the particular within it offers a helpful way of thinking about the place of the inward and the outward, the private and the public, in the poetry of Petrarch and of the Renaissance inheritors of his lyric mode. It may also offer us some insights into an apparent paradox of Petrarchism; that it is simultaneously one of the most conventional of literary modes and one of the foremost loci for the expression or constitution of a radically individuated and interiorized subjectivity. For Laclau, 'the universal is the symbol of a missing fullness and the particular exists only in the contradictory movement of asserting at the same time a differential identity and cancelling it through its subsumption in the non-differential medium' (Laclau 1996: 28). This takes some untangling, but it seems to me not too far off being an accurate description of one of the fundamental dynamics of Petrarchism. Augustinian confessionalism advocated a radical turn inwards towards God. As Ugo Dotti notes, Petrarch was undoubtedly a Christian (and, we might add, the most Augustinian of Christians), but his whole literary output can be considered a 'continuous, subtle, but also ultimately subversive work of transgression' (Dotti 2001: 16).[35] If the Neoplatonising of Petrarch by Ficino and his followers spiritualised and, in a quite different sense, universalised Petrarchan love, the textual exegesis that crowded editions of his work with scholarly commentary from the 1420s on — making pages from the *Canzoniere* almost indistinguishable at first glance from Bibles and theological texts — suggests that the Petrarchan model could be seen as a rival to the tradition of Catholic Christianity, as well as belonging to it.[36] Throughout Petrarch's work, and most especially in the amorous verse, the Augustinian turn inward results – ambivalently, problematically – in the discovery of a hugely productive vacuum at the kernel of the self, out of which pours a flood of literary production, a construction of a self-reflective symbolic order that was to be (and in many ways still remains) paradigmatic for western culture.

---

[33] It is perhaps worth highlighting the full extent of the influence of Badiou's reading of St. Paul on Zizek's recuperation of the Cartesian subject: In *The Ticklish Subject* Zizek devotes to it a whole chapter ('The Politics of Truth, or, Alain Badiou as a Reader of St Paul'), while frequent allusions to it are scattered through his other works. Zizek's response is in part a disagreement, but one arising from a fundamentally shared overview. Augustine's indebtedness to Paul for his emphasis on inwardness is well-known, and addressed by virtually all writers on Augustine, but for an interesting and relevant take see Cary 2008a: Cary emphasizes how in the last of his early Pauline exegeses, *To Simplicianus*, Augustine locates the deepest roots of faith not in the act of assent, as in the Stoic theory of free choice, but in inward delight, as in the Platonist theory of love (Cary 2008a: 33-67).

[34] My attention here to the renewed interest among European philosophers in universals and singularities parallels Sarah Kay's recent work on 'oneness' and monologic discourse in late medieval French didactic poetry of the long fourteenth century (2007: 4). It is perhaps not coincidental that both Kay's work and my own have been spurred toward such issues by (very different) fourteenth century texts.

Whether it is the oblivion of radical negativity, God the divine Presence, or radical absence (or perhaps the God of apophatic theology) to which the *Canzoniere*'s reflexive, Augustinian turn inward leads Petrarch's reader in a post-Freudian, and, more ambivalently, post-Christian futurity, ultimately lies beyond this study's scope. To better grasp Petrarch's poetics of futurity, and the dynamic of public and private, revelation and concealment that we find there, it is time we looked at the poetry itself.

---

[35] '[T]utta l'opera petrarchesca pu ritenersi, nei confronti del punto di vista cristiano (e cristiano Petrarca indubitabilmente lo fu), una continua, sottile, ma alla fine anche eversiva opera di trasgressione' (Dotti 2001: 16-17).

[36] Most recently Ramie Targoff has noted this resemblance, juxtaposing the Venice 1497 *Rime* with Nicholas of Lyra's *Postilia*, and observing how lines of verse and of scripture respectively are 'similarly fenced in by elaborate glosses' (Targoff 2010: 610-613).

## 1.5 Petrarchan imbrications: *dentro…et for*

Let us look at 'Giovene donna sotto un verde lauro', not a sonnet but Petrarch's best-known sestina. Here the poet envisages the future that awaits him as a result of his beloved's refusal to turn her gaze his way:

> Giovene donna sotto un verde lauro
> vidi più biancha et più fredda che neve
> non percossa dal sol molti et molt'anni;
> e 'l suo parlare e 'l bel viso, et le chiome
> mi piacquen sì ch'i' l'ò dinanzi gli occhi,
> ed avrò sempre, ov'io sia, in poggio o 'n riva.
>
> Allor saranno i miei pensieri a riva
> che foglia verde non si trovi in lauro;
> quando avrò queto il core, asciutti gli occhi,
> vedrem ghiacciare il foco, arder la neve:
> non ò tanti capelli in queste chiome
> quanti vorrei quel giorno attender anni.
>
> Ma perché vola il tempo et fuggon gli anni,
> sì ch'a la morte in un punto s'arriva,
> o colle brune o colle bianche chiome,
> seguirò l'ombra di quel dolce lauro
> per lo più ardente sole et per la neve,
> fin che l'ultimo dì chiuda quest'occhi.
>
> Non fur già mai veduti sì begli occhi,
> o ne la nostra etade o ne' primi anni,
> che mi struggon così come 'l sol neve;
> onde procede lagrimosa riva,
> ch'Amor conduce a pie' del duro lauro
> ch'à i rami di diamante, et d'òr le chiome.

I' temo di cangiar pria volto et chiome
che con vera pietà mi mostri gli occhi
l'idolo mio scolpito in vivo lauro,
ché s' al contar non erro oggi à sett' anni
che sospirando vo di riva in riva
la notte e 'l giorno, al caldo ed a la neve.

Dentro pur foco et for candida neve,
sol con questi pensier, con altre chiome,
sempre piangendo andrò per ogni riva,
per far forse pietà venir ne gli occhi
di tal che nascerà dopo mill' anni,
se tanto viver po ben colto lauro.

L'auro e I topacii al sol sopra la neve
vincon le bionde chiome presso agli occhi
che menan gli anni miei s tosto a riva. (*RVF* 30.1-39)

A youthful lady under a green laurel
I saw, whiter and colder than snow
not touched by the sun many and many years,
and her speech and her lovely face and her locks
pleased me so that I have her before my eyes
and shall always have wherever I am, on slope or shore.

Then my thoughts will have come to shore
when green leaves are not to be found on a laurel;
when I have a quiet heart and dry eyes
we shall see the fire freeze, and burning snow;
I have not so many hairs in these locks
as I would be willing, in order to see that day, to wait years.

But because time flies and the years flee
and one arrives quickly at death
either with dark or with white locks,
I shall follow the shadow of that sweet laurel
in the most ardent sun or through the snow,
until the last day closes these eyes.

There never have been such lovely eyes,
either in our age or in the first years;
they melt me as the sun does the snow:
whence there comes forth a river of tears
that Love leads to the foot of the harsh laurel
that has branches of diamond and golden locks.

I fear I shall change my face and my locks
before she with true pity will show me her eyes,
my idol carved in living laurel;
for, if I do not err, today it is seven years
that I go sighing from shore to shore
night and day, in heat and in snow.

Inwardly pure fire and outwardly white snow,
alone with these thoughts, with changed locks,
always weeping I shall go along every shore,
to make pity come into the eyes
of someone who will be born a thousand years from now —
if a well-tended laurel can live that long.

Gold and topazes[37] in the sun above the snow
are vanquished by the golden locks next to those eyes
that lead my years so quickly to shore.

*Dentro pur foco et for candida neve*: the nexus of concerns concentrated here in the poem's sixth stanza can be taken as emblematic of Petrarch's hugely complex preoccupation with the inward and the outward. Perhaps the first thing to note about this line is that it separates out the terms of the best-known of all Petrarchan oxymora, the 'icy fire' that was to become so popular with Renaissance sonneteers.[38] This oxymoron has already made an appearance earlier in the poem, in stanza two, where it stands, in a line we will return to shortly, for the impossibility of the lover's hopes being realized: 'vedrem ghiacciare il foco, arder la neve' (l.10). In line 31, however, the two qualities of heat and cold are separated, even opposed: the fire burns within, while outwardly the poet is snowy coldness.  Yet while opposed, the poet's inner state and outward appearance are also linked by this line, in more – and more complex – ways than at first appear; ways that ultimately turn the whole dynamic  inward. The alliteration of *foco* and *for* across the connective *et* pulls the two realms into relation sonically as well as logically and associatively.[39] If dichotomous, both the inward fire and the outward snow are associated with purity: 'candida' carries connotations of innocence and chastity, while if the primary sense of 'pur' here is 'continuamente', as Rosanna Bettarini suggests (2005: I, 172), its proximity to 'puro' is inescapable.[40] The inward and the outward aspects are two faces of the one pure passion, whose purity – if problematic – has been insisted upon from the *Canzoniere*'s start. Moreover, if a separation of the inward and the outward recurs throughout Renaissance Petrarchism when the poet's ardent or inwardly conflicted condition necessitates its concealment under a public display of cool in a fundamentally social situation, here, as the following line makes clear, Petrarch is envisioning himself 'sol con questi pensier', alone with his thoughts. The snowy outward whiteness is, first of all, the colour of the poet's 'altre chiome' (l.32), his locks turned ashen by age and by the burning passion within him.[41]

---

[37] For reasons that will shortly become apparent, I have here modified Robert Durling's translation of 'i topacii' to bring out the plural, partly on the basis of his own reading of the poem in Durling 1971.

[38] For more on the Petrarchan paradox of the 'icy fire', see Forster 1969: 17; and, on the hot/cold oxymoron within the Italian Petrarchan tradition, see Gigliucci 2004: 163-174.

---

[39] It is interesting to note how many translators of this poem into English are compelled, for no obvious reason, to translate Petrarch's *et* (and) in such a way as to make more explicit the opposition or contrast between the inward and outward states: Robert Durling, James Wyatt Cook and Lisa Freinkel all have *though* for *et* (Durling 1976: 88; Roche 2005: 258; Freinkel 2001: 110), and in Musa's translation *et* becomes *but* (Musa 1996: 51), while Thomas Bergin elides it entirely: 'Within afire, without as white as snow' (Roche 2005: 245). The translators' choices throw into relief the manner in which Petrarch, by contrast, leaves the relation between the inward and outward open, indicating that at an underlying level this is as much a question of similarities and connections as it is of contrasts.

[40] 'Candida' is often used to describe Laura, too, or otherwise associated with her (her foot – *RVF* 165.1; her neck – *RVF* 185.2; her glove – *RVF* 199.9), so that the poet's outward appearance reflects Laura's presence within him. For the clearest association of 'candida' with purity (and with Laura), see *RVF* 187.5, where Petrarch celebrates his 'pura et candida colomba', his pure, white dove.

[41] As Petrarch was to write in a much later poem, when already an old man: 'or l' andrò dietro omai con altro pelo', now I will follow her, with changed hair (*RVF* 331.60).

If *dentro* and *for* are counterpoised across that open bridge of *et*, then, this inward/outward dichotomy is itself an inward concentration, within the projected figure of the future poet, of the external landscape of the present. This is the landscape described at the close of the preceding sestina, through which the poet of the present goes sighing in heat and snow, 'al caldo ed a la neve' (*RVF* 30.30). Both the poet's inward and outward imagined future selves are distillations of his present external surroundings, of the natural, but also emotional and spiritual terrain through which he has passed over the seven years of his dedication to the laurel to date. Rather than an 'authentic' inward self emerging into view through this long period of suffering and hope, that subject, in which the very contradiction between the inward and the outward state reveals its self-consistency, is fashioned by experience of an external environment.

As noted above, the oxymoron of the frozen fire and the burning ice has already made an appearance in the poem's second stanza. This opens with an envisaged realization of the poet's desire that is turned round as it becomes apparent that the 'Allor', the *then* of that future, is implicitly impossible:

> Allor saranno i miei pensieri a riva
> che foglia verde non si trovi in lauro;
> quando avrò queto il cor, asciutti gli occhi,
> vedrem ghiacciare il foco, arder la neve (*RVF* 30.7-10)
>
> Then my thoughts will have come to shore
> when green leaves are not to be found on a laurel;
> when I have a quiet heart and dry eyes
> we shall see the fire freeze, and burning snow

The final two lines of that stanza, however, turn from this impossibility to express a conditional hope, at least, that the poet's desires might come to shore in some distant future, introducing the preoccupation with ageing that runs throughout the rest of the poem:

non ò tanto capelli in queste chiome
quanti vorrei quel giorno attender anni. (*RVF* 30.11-12)

I have not so many hairs in these locks
as I would be willing, in order to see that day, to wait years.

To return to line 31, then, we find there the exemplary impossibility of the realization of the lover's hopes – which has been reiterated in the preceding stanza, stanza 5 – transmuted into the poet's very substance. Yet at the same time, this paradoxically suggests the possibility of their fulfilment. In stanza 2, the freezing fire and burning snow will be seen when the poet has a quiet heart and dry eyes—when he has been granted 'quel giorno', that day, that he longs for.[42] In stanza 6, the poet *is* burning snow, freezing fire, even if these are split between his outward aspect, and his inward pain. If in stanza 2 the poet declares his willingness, even his desire, to wait years for that day to come about, the coming together of these poles in the poet in stanza 6 points to the possibility that in this imagined, even apocalyptic future (in which the lover seems to have stepped outside the normal frame of time to become, like the Wandering Jew, one who has trodden every shore) he might enjoy some strangely transmogrified version of the *pietà* that Laura denies him. Yet that *pietà* is to be achieved through the internalization of the impossibility of its being granted in its originally desired form. It is to be won through the maintaining in balanced opposition—or perhaps in dialectical relation—of the polarities of inward and outward in an externalisation that will address a particularised individual in a near-mythological future that almost lies outside of time. And both the medium and the realm in which this metamorphosed *pietà* is to be won is, of course, poetry.

---

[42] It should be noted, though, that if the foremost implication is clearly that 'that day' would be that in which Laura would bestow upon the lover her 'pietà', the quiet heart might also be that of the poet who has transcended his carnal love for Laura either through stoic resignation or through a higher love.

There is also here an interiorization of the effect of Laura's gaze upon the poet. In an earlier stanza, Petrarch has described how her 'begli occhi', her beautiful eyes,

  mi struggon così come 'l sol neve,
onde procede lagrimosa riva
ch' Amor conduce a pie' del duro lauro
ch' à I rami di diamante et d'or le chiome. (*RVF* 30.21-24)

  melt me as the sun does the snow:
whence there comes forth a river of tears
that Love leads to the foot of the harsh laurel
that has branches of diamond and golden locks.

Thus, whereas earlier in the poem it is Laura's gaze that melts the poet into the tears that water his art, here, in the future foreseen, there is a hint that he now goes 'piangendo', crying, because, as he has interiorized the landscape through which he wanders, he is now literally melting himself from within, as the inward fire turns the outward snow to tears. He has thus interiorized, too – or at least, he envisages a future in which he will do so – the effect of Laura's eyes (so central to this sestina) upon him. A process that began in the effect of the outer (Laura's gaze) upon the inner is (or will be) transformed, through memory and imagination, into a self-perpetuating, purely interior dynamic. It is *these* more intensely solipsistic tears, produced by the poet's self-immolation rather than directly by the effect of Laura's gaze upon him, that will perhaps provoke the *pietà* of the reader born a thousand years from now, in the twenty-fourth century, perhaps on some other river-bank far from Petrarch's beloved Sorgue.

Such a reading chimes with Robert Durling's masterly exegesis of 'Giovene donna' (cf. Durling 1971), which notes that as an anniversary poem the sestina identifies itself, within the fictionalized temporal framework of the *Canzoniere*, as having been penned on Good Friday. It is thus composed on the one day above all days upon which the poet should be focusing his attention on the cross, rather than his beloved. Durling points out the closeness of the parallels: the cross is regularly referred to as a tree in both the liturgy and in exegetical writings, as well as being frequently correlated with the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.[43] We thus have two trees, the cross and the *verde lauro*, as rivals for Petrarch's attention, even if the lover, if not the poet, seems unaware of the choice before him. Both trees, too, have women below them: Durling's suggestion that Petrarch had in mind the Virgin at the foot of the Cross as an apt parallel with the figure of Laura beneath the laurel seems wholly plausible, given the ubiquity of the figure in fourteenth-century painting as well as in poems such as Iacopone da Todi's 'Stabat Mater' (Durling 1971: 18, n.30).

We shall return to the idolatrousness of Petrarch's love and its relation to the inward/outward dynamic shortly. For now, it is worth returning to Laura's eyes and their effect upon the poet and his art, by way of the topazes that appear in the poem's *tornata*. These have been the subject of some critical disagreement, from the first commentaries and annotated editions of the *Canzoniere* published in Renaissance Italy to the present day. Where many commentators have assumed Petrarch to be referring to the yellow stone, Durling argues convincingly that he has in mind the blue variety, and that rather than referring to Laura's hair, they refer to her eyes.[44] Durling then goes on to suggest that in 'Giovene donna' Petrarch is drawing on traditional exegeses of Revelation 21, most of which are traceable back to the Venerable

---

[43] Durling cites St. Jerome's commentary on Mark 15:24, as included in the *glossa ordinaria*, and notes as equally well-known such Good Friday hyms as 'Vexilla regis prodeunt' and 'Pange, lingua' (Durling 1971: 17). There was also, as Durling also observes, a well-known legend that the Cross was made from the wood of the Tree of the Knowledge of good and Evil (Durling 1971: 18, n.30; cf. Emile Mâle 1958: 186-188). 'The symmetrical relation of the two trees was generalized in the allegory of the arbour bona, the tree of virtues, whose root was humility and summit the New Adam; and the arbor male, the tree of vices, whose root was pride and summit the Old Adam' (Durling 1971: 18, n.30; cf. Katzenellenbogen 1964: 63-70 and Greenhil 1954: 323-371).

[44] Bettarini (2005: I, 173) argues that 'L'oro e i topazi sono coloristicamente congrunete', following Castelvetro and citing Isidore of Seville, but Durling's argument seems strong: the topazes are plural, Laura's eyes have been central to the poem throughout, and if, as Castelvetro argues, 'le chiome rispondono all'oro e a' topaci', the latter would seem to be uncharacteristically redundant. It is perhaps worth noting too that Laura's eyes are elsewhere identified directly with the laurel tree themselves, as the 'Occhi leggiadri dove Amor fa nido', the lovely eyes where Love makes his nest (*RVF* 71.7).

Bede's commentary on this passage. In the Book of Revelation we read that the twelve foundations of the walls of the New Jerusalem are garnished with twelve precious stones, of which the ninth is a topaz. For Bede, as for most subsequent commentaries, the topaz is firstly, a stone that provokes an unusually intense visual pleasure, and, secondly, a figure for the withdrawn *vita contemplativa* (in contrast to the beryl, the eighth stone, which is a figure for the active life). As Durling notes, the mention of the topaz in the *tornata*, together with gold, 'is the climax of the poem and the key to its significance' (Durling 1971: 12). The whole sestina has been concerned with the process whereby Laura is progressively transformed within the poet's memory through the operation of his fantasy from a living woman into a metallic idol of gold and diamonds, a process of metamorphosis that correlates with Daphne's metamorphosis into the laurel yet also, in a sense, transcends and perverts it. Where Apollo's pursuit only turns Daphne into a living tree, Petrarch envisages how his will turn Laura into a bejeweled, rigidified artifice, richer, more enduring, but also dead, inanimate.

Springing from a meditation on the past, on the 'sett' anni' of sighs that the poet has already spent on Laura, the poem's final sestina is nevertheless doubly oriented toward the future. It imagines, firstly, the poet as he will be, constant in his inward fire even as his hair turns the colour of white snow. But beyond this, it imagines that poet's appeal to one born a thousand years from the present moment of writing. It thus speaks directly to us as Petrarch's readers in futurity. What the poet might wring from this reader to come is pity or 'pietà', the same 'vera pietà' that Laura denies him (l.26). Of course, the suggestion that the reader will grant the poet the *pietà* Laura withholds is a reiteration of the hope, first expressed in 'Voi ch' ascoltate', that the poet will find among his readers 'pietà, non che perdono' (*RVF* 1.8). In late medieval love poetry, *pietà* is code for the sexual favour solicited from the beloved, and Petrarch uses it elsewhere in his most nearly obvious erotic fantasizing on Laura (cf. Braden 1999a: 56). If Petrarch also invests *pietà* with a far more complex significance, the word retains its visceral, emotive sense. The poet's immediate goal is not to inform or educate his readers to come, but to touch them.

Moreover, in the envisaged future scene, rather than time's passage diluting or obscuring the emotive impact, it intensifies it. In the sestina's fifth stanza the poet tells us that he 'sospirando vo di riva in riva', goes sighing from shore to shore. This too recalls the opening sonnet of the *Canzoniere*, where Petrarch addresses us directly as 'Voi ch' ascoltate in rime sparse il suono | di quei sospiri', those who hear the sound of those sighs with which he nourished his heart (*RVF* 1.1-2). In the sixth stanza of 'Giovene donna', however, Petrarch tells us that he shall go always weeping along every shore: 'sempre piangendo andrò per ogni riva'. The modulation from 'sospirando', sighing, to 'piangendo', weeping, is intensified by that 'sempre', *always*, and by the parallel shift from 'di riva in riva', from shore to shore, to 'ogni riva', *every* shore. The scene is universalized, both temporally and geographically: every shore, every time will hear the poet's sighs.

Yet the reader to come is indicated by the singular indefinite pronoun 'tal', the same 'tal' used elsewhere as a sometimes deliberately ambivalent deictic marker for Laura herself – ambivalent often in order to allow the possibility that it is also the reader being alluded to (see, for example *RVF* 71.45, 134.5). While universalized, then, this future reader, in whom we today cannot help but see ourselves anticipated, remains distinctly singular, even as he or she is assimilated ever more longingly if ever more hopelessly to the figure of the unobtainable mistress (a process already triggered by the suggestion that the reader will grant *pietà* where Laura has not).[45] It is to the

---

[45] The feminization of the reader is intensified if we note that in the poem preceding this one, 'tal' points to Dido:

> Da me son fatti i miei pensier diversi:
> *tal* già qual io mi stanco
> l'amata spade in se stessa contorse; (*RVF* 29.36-38: my italics)
>
> My thoughts have become alien to me:
> one driven like me once

private recesses of this individualized reader's conscience that Petrarch seeks to publicize his sighs.

The *Canzoniere*'s opening sonnet too inscribes the complex relationship developed in the rest of the sequence between public and private, between concealment and exposure, and between the different audiences Petrarch both scorned and addressed. It begins by invoking an audience with which we readily identify ourselves:

> Voi ch' ascoltate in rime sparse il suono
> di quei sospiri ond' io nudriva 'l core
> in sul mio primo giovenile errore,
> quand' era in parte altr' uom da quel ch' i' sono: (*RVF* 1.1-4)
>
> You who hear in scattered rhymes the sound of those sighs with which I nourished my heart during my first youthful error, when I was in part another man from what I am now:

On the one hand we are included within the select company of sophisticated, educated and noble readers Petrarch welcomed with various degrees of ambivalence during his lifetime: on the other, the present in which we listen and read is identified with and collapsed into the present in which Petrarch writes this poem. While Petrarch acknowledges the imperfect nature of his detachment from his former self – he is only 'in parte' another man now - the uniting of the moment of writing and the moment of reading or hearing, of author and reader, is made all the more powerful by its contrast with that partial severance within the poet from himself. Furthermore, the plural form of address makes us part of a reading community, but one whose boundaries lie beyond temporal or geographical limits:

> del vario stile in ch'io piango et ragiono
> fra le vane speranze e 'l van dolore,
> ove sia chi per prova intenda amore

---

turned the beloved sword upon herself;
Here death becomes an eroticized surrogate for sexual – or at least amorous – satisfaction.

> spero trovar pietà, non che perdono. (RVF 1.5-8)
>
> for the varied style in which I weep and speak between vain hopes and vain sorrow, where there is anyone who understands love through experience, I hope to find pity, not only pardon.

The sympathetic public the *Rime* hope for is to be found wherever there is anyone who understands love through experience. It is made up of individuals, in their individual, private experiences of reading and loving. Petrarch's 'per prova' hints that reading the poems will serve as an adequate surrogate for the direct experience of love: the *Canzoniere* as a whole, if not the opening sonnet, claims for itself the power to evoke the compassionate understanding that Petrarch seeks.[46] The *Canzoniere*'s public is one that is not only emotionally literate, but well read in the literature of the emotions. In any case, 'Voi ch' ascoltate' seems to establish itself as exactly the sort of message in a bottle envisaged by Osip Mandelstam, addressed to its finders, the distant, unknown friends defined by their sympathy rather than their proximity. Yet where Mandelstam envisages a 'secret addressee', Petrarch insists on his addressees' plurality, calling into existence a peculiar transhistorical public that extends beyond the individual reader's own personal moment of discovery (1979: 68). This is one manifestation of that 'radical futurity to which the Petrarchan laurel orients literary activity', bringing the poet into communion with its readers in posterity, but it also reflects that broader sense on Petrarch's part of the importance of a republic of letters, of the writer's reliance not only on individual readers but on a literary community. If the scattered form of Petrarch's poems correlates to the inevitably scattered nature of that community, Petrarch's unmatched generosity in this regard was focused on giving it coherence and cohesion: we remember that Petrarch wrote letters both to his classical predecessors such as Cicero, and to Posterity.

---

[46] As Christopher Martin notes, 'In a plea that reverberates through to the closing prayer in 366, the poet urges us to experience vicariously the disorientation his passion excites, to gain the *prova* that will lend our verdicts a legitimacy without which they would remain purblind and dogmatic' (1994: 80).

At the same time, however, this apparent appeal to our commonality can be read as operating in the opposite way to alienate us from the text and place us outside it. In late medieval love poetry, as Braden notes, *pietà* is code for the sexual favour solicited from the beloved, and Petrarch uses it in his most nearly obvious erotic fantasizing on Laura (1999a: 56). Recalling us to Petrarch's hope that before death he might see Laura take pity on him – 'vedess' io in lei pietà' (*RVF* 20.28) – this note takes us back to the poem's opening, reminding us that the plural form of address is also the respectful form he adopts in addressing his beloved. For a split second we as readers are aligned with Laura as the poet's addressee. This poem's position as both first (in sequence) and last (within the fiction of the *Canzoniere*'s chronology) positions us as eavesdroppers on the more private discourse that both precedes and follows it. If this increases the pleasure we feel, anticipating our role as authorized eavesdroppers, it also reminds us of the extent to which we come to the sequence as ulterior to the intimacy Petrarch hoped to share with Laura.[47]

If the echo of that private discourse troubles our sense of the inclusivity of the poem's opening, its invocation of a public to which we feel we properly belong, it also reminds us that that intimacy was never granted the poet. Instead, it was frustrated by the poet's timidity, Laura's virtuous unresponsiveness, and finally and most conclusively by her death. Thus while *pietà* recalls us to an awareness of our detachment from the private agonies of which we are about to read, it also ultimately assimilates us longingly to the figure of the dead beloved.[48] As long as Laura lives, she can 'serve as a surrogate for Petrarch's posthumous literary audience': once she is dead, that audience becomes her surrogate in turn, bestowing the laurel upon the poet where Laura refused to bestow herself (Braden 1999a: 54).[49] If in part this assimilation transubstantiates an earthly, carnal desire into a wish for a more sublime satisfaction in a selfless communal future that the poet himself will never see, it also works in the opposite direction, condensing the eternal salvation Laura increasingly comes to embody into a desire to defy death in this world through worldly glory. This double movement, which initiates a constant troubling throughout the *Canzoniere* of priorities and heirarchies of value, means that while the literary intimacy Petrarch promises us appears a surrogate for the lost hope of erotic intimacy with Laura, the latter can also seem, as it did to his friend Colonna, a means to the true goal of an ultimately even more intense penetration into the readers' sensibilities.

---

[47] As T. S. Eliot observes, 'part of our enjoyment of great poetry is the enjoyment of overhearing words which are not addressed to us' (1950: 100).

[48] Braden's vocabulary here cannot be bettered: 'We are…assimilated longingly to the mistress he could never win' (1999a: 56).

At the poem's *volta* the interpenetration of public and private is further intensified and disrupted. We are more insistently recalled out of our shared timeless present into the particularities of Petrarch's moment:

> Ma ben veggio or sì come al popol tutto
> favola fui gran tempo, onde sovente
> di me medesmo meco mi vergogno;
>
> et del mio vanegiar vergogna è 'l frutto,
> e 'l pentersi, e 'l conoscer chiaramente
> che quanto piace al mondo è breve sogno. (*RVF* 1. 9-14)

> But now I see well how for a long time I was the talk of the crowd,
> for which I am often ashamed of myself within;
> And of my raving, shame is the fruit, and repentance, and the clear
> knowledge that whatever pleases in the world is a brief dream.

Here that *or* (now) splits time, dividing us from Petrarch as earlier he divided himself from himself, and as he now divides himself from the general crowd.

---

[49] The relationship is of course more anxiety-ridden than such a neat parallelism allows for: the correspondence between Laura and the laurel is in part an attempt to overcome or elide the disparities between Petrarch's various aspirations. Rather than guaranteeing Petrarch's earthly reputation, Laura will ensure his soul's salvation, or so he hopes in *Canzoniere* 126.

Throughout the *Canzoniere*, as in his other works, Petrarch articulates a 'relentless disdain for a public audience'. (Martin 1994: 71). Yet even as the 'popol tutto', 'the whole crowd', is set up as the alternative public, implicitly ignorant and insensitive, against which Petrarch defines his community of sympathetic readers, he acknowledges his ethical indebtedness to it. At the same time, the privacy of those sighs that nourished his heart is revealed to have made him a public figure, and this in turn leads to an intensification of precisely that inwardness as it becomes reflexive. Of all emotions, *vergogna*, shame, perhaps most obviously amplifies and unites our sense of both the public and the private. Likewise *vaneggiar*, which Durling translates as 'raving', carries connotations of vanity and self-display, strongly hinting that it is not merely the crowd's fault if his private sighs have made him a public figure. As Martin remarks, 'for all the metaporphoses this poet-lover will suffer in the following lyrics, he begins with his own vital act of transformation, turning public condemnation into private sympathy, and this exclusive sympathy back into an awareness of one's broader social vantage' (1994: 80).

Just as the author implicates himself more closely with the universalized world and its indiscriminated audience even as he stages his withdrawal from it, so as readers we find ourselves absorbed into that audience too, as the sestet makes clear that this is a story we are supposedly already familiar with (as indeed we are). Having flattered and included us as part of that audience dispersed in time and space but unified by its merits, he half-exiles us to our place outside his experience as part of the *popol tutto*, only to reveal in turn the extent to which he is beholden to that group. In so doing, he complicates the aesthetic and moral oppositions between these publics even as he invokes them. In describing himself as a *favola*, Petrarch points to himself as an empty shell of reputation: the Latin *fabula* from which it derives suggests, as Martin notes, a narrative devoid of meaning, with no correspondence to reality. The word is used pejoratively more than once by Augustine to attack 'insubstantial poetic constructs' (Martin 1994: 81-2). Yet the foremost sense of *favola* here, as Martin also notes, is 'scandal'.[50] It thus 'conjures an image of one ostracized from a society whose public discourse ironically keeps him alive...The same infamy that goads him to depart a world he loved too much keeps open the chance for reintegration, by means of the sympathy he now aggressively covets' (Martin 1994: 82).

These themes – *favola*, or scandal; *oblio*, or oblivion; and the publicized, even vaunted neo-Stoic withdrawal from courtly life and aesthetics – form the bases for the readings of the engagements with Petrarch and the Petrarchan mode of Lady Mary Wroth, Shakespeare, and William Drummond of Hawthornden that make up the second part of this study. To better appreciate Petrarch's own aesthetics of publicized retreat, however, and to outline the response to this dynamic in Petrarch's earlier followers, the next chapter returns to the subject of Petrarch's staged withdrawal of the vernacular lyric from the essentially epistolary function as a courtly *intrattenimento* traced, as we have seen, by Marco Santagata and Ugo Dotti. Looking more closely at how Petrarch's *rime sparse* emerge from and relate to his unrivalled epistolary achievements offers a context for a reading of early Tudor sonneteers that in turn establishes a useful context for the readings of Wroth, Shakespeare and Drummond that follow.

---

[50] This sense was available to Petrarch, as Martin and others note, from Ovid's *Amores* and Horace's eleventh *Epode* (cf. Martin 1994: 209, n.26).

# CHAPTER TWO

# EPISTOLARY POETRY AND LYRIC WITHDRAWAL

> *Among our English Poets, Petrarch is imitated, nay surpast in some Things, in Matter and Manner: In Matter, none approach him to Sidney, who hath Songs and Sonnats in Matter intermingled: In Manner, the nearest I find to him, is W. Alexander; who, insisting in these same Steps, hath Sextains, Madrigals and Songs, Echoes and Equivoques, which he hath not; whereby, as the one thing surpast him in Matter, so the other in Manner of Writting, or Form. (Drummond 1711: 226)*

## 2.1 The Occasion of Form

Matter and manner were generally regarded in the Renaissance as distinguishable aspects of the literary work worthy of more or less equal attention. The trend in early modern literary studies in recent decades, however, has been for attention to matter to prevail over considerations of manner or literary form. As Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank have recently observed, '[f]ormal analysis and a concomitant appreciation of literary artefacts for their aesthetics are not currently much employed by most early modernists, as we favour more historicist approaches' (2010: 167). In 1979, one year before the publication of Stephen Greenblatt's *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, Heather Dubrow called for a new methodology in early modern studies, noting a tendency among her colleagues 'to separate literary history and generic analysis' (1979: 159). With the advent of new historicism, however, many literary scholars were not only 'slow to respond to Dubrow's appeal for a new kind of historical formalism' (Scott-Baumann & Burton 2010: 1), but neglected questions of manner and genre almost entirely as, in Paul Alper's words, 'the pendulum of criticism swung from form to context' (2007: 309). An increasing absorption in the circumstances of literary production, as Douglas Bruster notes, fixed critical attention on literature's engagement 'with the *matériel* of social life—with clothing, printed texts, household goods, even body parts,' (Bruster 2007: 31). This has led to a situation in which, as Bruster puts it, 'matter has clearly won the day over form in the study of [...] early modern literature' (Bruster 2007: 31). Meanwhile 'formalism,' as Richard Strier points out, has become for many a dirty word, and 'formalist' a cheap put-down (Strier 2002: 207-15; cf. Bruster 2007: 31).

While recognizing the achievements of new historicist and materialist criticism over the last thirty years, Strier, Bruster and Paul Alpers are all among those who have argued for a new attention to literary form. What Alpers and Bruster in particular have in common, though — and here I am taking them as the most articulate of a number of critics arguing along similar lines — is a desire not for a return to the more decontextualised formalisms of some varieties of New Criticism, even supposing such a return were possible, but for a reintegration of formalist readings on the one hand, and historicist and materialist readings on the other.

As Bruster remarks in the course of his quest after 'The Materiality of Shakespearean Form,' where certain recent studies understand materiality in a most literal-minded fashion, materialist criticism 'was formerly a much broader, more complex method [...] based on a capacious understanding of materiality' (2007: 33). This understanding recognised form itself as material. The founders of materialist criticism, figures such as Mikhail Bakhtin, Walter Benjamin and Georg Lukács, typically counted form as an important part of the social and material circumstances of a literary work. The finest materialist critics have continued to do so: Bruster offers the example of Fredric Jameson, whose interest in style and genre as 'important registers of a text's engagement with the world' is evident from his first book, *Sartre: The Origins of a Style*, right up to his most recent work, which including studies of early modern writers such as Sir Thomas More (Bruster 2007: 37; cf. Jameson 1970, 2003). The search that matters, then, is, as Alpers puts it, for ‘a way of incorporating contextual perspectives into formal analysis of lyric poems’ (2007: 309). As Dubrow pointed out on the eve of new historicism’s birth, ‘exploring why certain genres flourished when they did and how they shaped and were shaped by the temper of their age is one of the surest ways of tracing the complicated movements that inform literary history’ (1979: 159). It is in such a spirit that I want to offer a reading of the Petrarchan lyric, its epistolary origins, and, in particular, its recurring agon with those origins.

Occasional poetry, being the kind of poetry most obviously tied to the social and material circumstances of its production, has tended to find itself centre-stage in critical wrangles over the nature of the relationship between context and form. Alpers’ study of ‘Renaissance Lyrics and Their Situations’ provides a history of some of these controversies (2007). For New Criticism (or ‘modernist’ criticism, to use the broader term Alpers prefers) a good poem re-presented a situation in such a way that the original occasion giving rise to the poem became no more than ‘mere biography’. As T.S. Eliot famously put it,

> The only way of expressing emotion in the form of art is by finding an ‘objective correlative’: in other words, a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of that particular emotion; such that when the external facts, which must terminate in sensory experience, are given, the emotion is immediately evoked. (Eliot 1950: 124-125)

In the words of Barbara Herrnstein Smith, whom Alpers takes as a late representative of the ‘modernist’ hegemony in criticism, the reader is thus invited ‘to conceive of the kind of situation which might lead a speaker to feel thus and speak thus’ (Smith 1978: 34; cited Alpers 2007: 309). New Criticism distinguished between ‘natural’ and ‘fictive’ utterances and situations: the meanings of natural utterances depend on, and are even exhausted by, their contexts, while the fictive situation that serves in the literary work as an objective correlative must not be confounded with the ‘natural’, originary situation that first gave rise to the emotion the writer seeks to express. This originary situation, for New Criticism, is ultimately irrecoverable, and in any case more or less irrelevant to the functioning of the work itself. Instead, the characteristic effect of a poem ‘is to create its own context or, more accurately, to invite and enable the reader to create a plausible context for it’ (Smith 1978: 34; cited Alpers 2007: 309).

Smith’s principal example of a ‘natural’ utterance in textual form is the personal letter. Letters are contrasted with poems, which for Smith ‘are not natural utterances, not historically unique verbal acts or events; indeed a poem is not an event at all, and cannot ever have been said to have “occurred” in the usual sense’ (1978: 24; cited Alpers 2007: 310). This is, as Alpers comments, ‘a quite astonishing statement’, which leaves us wondering what to make of such occasional poetry as ‘The Princely Pleasures at Kenilworth Castle’ or Sidney’s ‘The Lady of May’, poetical rejoicings written to welcome Elizabeth I on her visits to various aristocratic estates (2007: 310). Perhaps, Alpers suggests, Smith would, like many other modernist critics, simply claim that such works are not real poems. Certainly, one significant achievement of recent historicizing approaches has been the recuperation of a wide range of occasional verse, much of which New Criticism tended to dismiss as trivial or as hopelessly caught in its own time. Yet if, as Kenneth Burke put it, ‘[e]very poem is, in a sense, an “occasional” poem’ (1953: 184; cited Alpers 2007: 313), as ‘highly context-sensitive social interaction’ letter writing, as Terttu Nevalainen observes, ‘has always been situated activity’ (2007: 9, 1). In its most common form the letter is a paradigmatically occasional genre, its meaning bound up in the contingencies of its material being (i.e. in who is handling and reading it, and when, and where), and in its social and historical situatedness. Typically, few forms of early modern text are as embedded in their contexts as the early modern letter. It is therefore unsurprising that the attention to matter and context of the last thirty years has given rise to excellent studies of medieval and early modern epistolary practice, on several of which the present study draws liberally. As Nevalainen comments, '[t]he variety of ways in which epistolary activity can be contextualised derives from its diverse nature as social and discursive practice' (2007: 9), and this diversity has proved a rich mine for historicist and materialist critics, who have extracted precious information on diplomatic and mercantile activities, on the lives of women, on the circulation of what Stephen Greenblatt calls social energy, and on a wide range of other fields through their studies of early modern letters. At the same time, a great deal has been learnt about the early modern letter itself in its full variety.

The relation of the epistolary to the lyric in general and to the Petrarchan sonnet in particular has also been the subject of considerable research — to much of which, again, this study is indebted. However, materialist and historicist investigations have largely focused upon questions of manuscript circulation and dissemination, and upon the role that the Petrarchan lyric could play, through its epistolary or pseudo-epistolary exchange, in cementing homosocial bonds of friendship and patronage. Where the form of the lyric has been the subject of study, attention has for the most part been devoted to demonstrating the extent to which the lyric, like the letter, is a genre profoundly embedded in its social and historical contexts by the circumstances of its production and intended reception. Once again, much of the work done in this field is both exciting in its own right and indispensible to the present study.

What has not been sufficiently studied, at least within anglophone studies of the early modern Petrarchan mode, is how, in the *Canzoniere,* form becomes for Petrarch the medium for a quite deliberate yet deeply ambivalent attempt to transmute the social contexts of its production, and, more specifically, its epistolary origins. Petrarch's works' agonic dialogue through form with their own relation to the epistolary, with their own situatedness is played out again, partially under those works' influence, in the development of the English Renaissance sonnet sequence, as it is in Renaissance poetic practice more generally. Reading that development through the lens of a better appreciation of Petrarch's own agon with the epistolary throws new light on both: that, at least, is what this chapter looks to argue. Turning back to a repeated originary moment, that at which Petrarchan form engages self-consciously with the specific material and social contexts that give birth to it, offers one way, I hope to show, of moving beyond naïve readings of the relationship between form and context, between matter (and twenty-first century materialism) on the one hand, and Petrarchan manner on the other.

There are other important reasons for attending to epistolarity and its sublimation in Petrarch's *Canzoniere* when reading English Renaissance sonnet sequences. These reasons are bound up not with the more theoretical debates over a rapprochement between historicist and formalist reading practices with which I opened, but with the point to which the best of recent research and criticism on the beginnings of Petrarchan sonneteering in England has brought us. In what follows I look to build upon one of the most intriguing and influential (but also most problematic) accounts offered in recent years of the impact on the form of the early Tudor lyric of the socio-political and cultural context from which it emerged. In *Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII: Literary culture and the arts of deceit* (1997), Seth Lerer argued that Tudor epistolary culture, and in particular the 'intercessory epistolics' of the Tudor court, had a formative influence upon English courtly lyric poetry (Lerer 1997: 12). While his focus is not on the sonnet sequence as such, the sixteenth-century authors and texts that Lerer highlights are for the most part precisely those that played formative roles in establishing Petrarchism as a poetic mode in England. For Lerer, preoccupations with privacy, publicity and intended and unintended audiences are set at the heart of the Tudor lyric thanks to the 'nascent culture of surreption and surveillance' that defined the social practices of letter-writing of the Tudor courtier, diplomat and lover (1997: 12). In an epistolary environment in which even the King's love missives were subject, in Henry VIII's own words, to a 'lake of dyscrette handelyng' (Ridley 1988: xv: cited Lerer 1997: 112), the work of Surrey, Wyatt and those other Tudor poets who first accommodated the Petrarchan mode to English came to be infused, Lerer claims, with a heightened sensitivity to the risks and the delights of revelation and concealment. Building on earlier work by critics such as Alistair Fox, for whom the central narrative of Henrician life is one of personal distress coded through the fictive imagination of surveillance, Lerer concludes that '[t]he interception of letters, the taking of statements, the encouragement of informany, the need for concealment — all are political issues that have an impact on the formation of literary subjectivity in the age of Wyatt' (Lerer 1997: 6).

Part of what makes Lerer's study attractive is the manner in which it couples close reading and an attention to form with a siting of the Tudor lyric in the conditions of its production. Lerer's book follows punctiliously Arthur Marotti's injunction that it is not sufficient to consider the formal properties of lyrics or their places either in the canon of particular authors or in literary history without also dealing with 'the social, economic, and political realities' of and with 'those cultural codes implicit in both the life and literature of the time' (1982: 396). The entangling of lyric and epistolary culture, and of questions of privacy and publicity, reticence and display that Lerer presents suggests parallels with similar concerns in Petrarch. Yet one thing that is striking about Lerer's account is that in discussing the origins of the English courtly lyric, and devoting considerable space to Wyatt and Surrey, it nowhere considers how the Petrarchan concern with epistolarity, audience, and a peculiar kind of reticent display might cross-pollinate with the more native, Chaucerian tradition that is Lerer's principal concern.

Given the ground he covers, Lerer might reasonably argue that analysis of the intersection of the continental Petrarchan tradition with what he describes as an essentially 'Pandaran' native mode lies beyond his study's purview. However, given the parallels and contrasts between Petrarch's relationship with the letter on the one hand and that of the Tudor sonneteers' on the other, reading the two together in this context is the obvious next step. This seems even more likely to prove illuminating in the light of Cathy Shrank's recent groundbreaking work on mid-Tudor poetry and poetics. Shrank has argued convincingly that in our accounts of the English sonnet tradition, rather than leaping from the 1530s and 1540s to the 1580s and 1590s, from Wyatt and Surrey to Spenser and Sidney, we need to look again at the work produced in the intervening years, and in particular at the ostensibly single-authored poetic miscellanies printed and published in the wake of Richard Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes* (1557). The claims to be working in a sonneteering vein made by these collections' titles and prefatory material have, as Shrank notes, long been dismissed on grounds of form, meter, and content: the 'sonnets' that appear in George Turberville's *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets*, in Thomas Howell's *Newe Sonets and Pretie Pamphlets*, and in Barnabe Googe's *Eglogs Epytaphes, and Sonettes* rarely have fourteen lines (some have as few as two); they eschew the pentameter in favour, most often, of the 'thumping fourteeners' denigrated by C. S. Lewis (often broken into dimeters and trimeters on the page – cf. Shrank 2008a: 32); and, while often dealing with amorous matters, tend to reject or resist erotic love, deploying the sonnet instead for 'sober reflection or even blatant didacticism' (Shrank 2008a: 35). Cathy Shrank shows, however, that instead of discounting these writers' use of the term sonnet as a misnomer, we need to take their descriptions of their own work seriously (2008: 35). By doing so, she suggests, we can 'uncover a strand of the English sonnet tradition that bears further examination', one that reveals a significant understanding of Petrarchanism (Shrank 2008: 31).

My argument here is indebted to both Lerer and Shrank, and is an attempt to contribute to the reassessment of the poetics of mid-Tudor literature recently called for by Shrank and Mike Pincombe (2010: 160-176). It suggests, however, that Lerer’s account of the grounding of early- and mid-Tudor verse in courtly epistolary practice linked to a native Pandaran tradition needs to be supplemented by an attention to Petrarch: to the possibility of Petrarchan influences, but also, and perhaps more importantly, to how a familiarity with the relationship of Petrarch’s own vernacular poetry to the letter can open up new perspectives on the origins of the English sonneteering tradition. At the same time, while agreeing with Shrank regarding the sonneteering credentials of the mid-Tudor poets and their often acute awareness of the possibilities and the pitfalls of the Petrarchan mode, it adopts Lerer’s focus on the letter to probe further at their turn away from Petrarchan introspection. In drawing, in particular, on recent Italian work on Petrarch that is rarely cited in anglophone studies of English Petrarchism, it also seeks to challenge the seemingly still prevalent notion of Petrarch as a poet of ‘intensely private and apolitical’ interests’ (Gillespie 2008: 47). By then turning to later Elizabethan sonneteers, it looks to suggest that the attempt to turn away from, negate, or otherwise transcend through form an embeddedness in epistolarity, in the social, in the immediate occasion of composition, is one that those later writers increasingly found themselves having to make, and for reasons that were in part themselves embedded in the socio-political contexts within which they were writing – circumstances perhaps not so very different from our own. To this extent, it proposes that the mid-Tudor sonneteers, Petrarchan though they were, weren’t perhaps quite Petrarchan enough. Or at least, that Petrarch found more profound – if only ambiguously successful – answers to problems to which many of the mid-Tudor poets were either indifferent, or unable to respond. It thus ultimately looks, not to challenge the wholly necessary revival of interest in mid-Tudor writing, but to ensure that in the course of that revival, we ask ourselves some difficult questions about how and why we value it.

### 2.2 *S' i' fussi stato fermo:* the retreat from epistolary circulation

Let us begin with a poem. Among the vast collection of documents relating to Petrarch collated in the Riccardian MS 1103 is to be found the following sonnet, sent to Petrarch by a correspondent whose identity is now lost to us:

> Vo' mi negate la virtù che nu[n]ca
> sep[p]e contenta star nascosta e cheta
> e ozïosa: ma' no vis[s]e lèta
> suo poses[s]ion, avaro fos[s]e chiunca;
>
> ma grande e largo spenditor quantunca
> no gli rincresce, e vuol ch' ogni uom gli pèta.
> Questa chiara ragion [...] veta
> la negativa che mi fate adunca.
>
> A ciò che 'l gusto mio del cibo prove
> sapido e dolce de la pingue oliva,
> piac[c]iavi di sdegnar la negativa,
>
> sì che 'n eterno cor[r]a fama, e viva;
> e di vostra virtù, quasi di nove
> stel[l]e, si' ornato il ciel che l'orbe move. (c.114*r*)[51]

Even with the graphemes and Venetianisms of the scribe removed, as here, this is a knotted piece of work, described by Rosanna Bettarini as 'poeticamente inetto', poetically inept (2005: I, 783). At the risk of transcending the clumsiness of the original, we might translate it, very roughly, along these lines:

> You hold back from me that virtue that was content to remain hidden and quiet and idle; but no happiness comes of its possession to whoever is miserly of it;
>
> but to its free and generous spender no regret comes, and it desires that every man should exercise it. This clear reason forbids the refusal that you hitherto have given me.

---

[51] The sonnet is given here in the version reprinted in Bettarini 2005: I, 784.

> So that my palette might experience the flavour and sweetness of the fertile olive, may it please you to throw off this refusal.
>
> So as to make your fame eternal and vivid, and your virtue, almost of nine stars, so adorn the sky which the orb moves.

The poem's grappling with the difficult initial rhyme on 'unca' leads to a distorted syntax that in turn twists the rest of the sonnet out of shape. The poem's central message, however, is quite clear: the author desires that Petrarch make public the fruits of his *virtù*, in order that he might draw from them poetic nourishment. Nor is the sonnet absolutely devoid of functioning literary devices: in making Petrarch's *virtù* itself the desiring subject in the second quatrain (l.6), the author implies that Petrarch has a moral responsibility to some power greater than himself, of which he is merely the cipher. The suggestion that 'ogni uom', every man, is required to exercise his *virtù* also glances at a wider community of poets to whom the laureate has a duty, implicitly elevating the author into Petrarch's company even as it flatteringly emphasizes his reliance upon him. This then permits the author to offer his potentially presumptuous judgment that 'Questa chiara ragion [...] veta | la negativita che mi fate' (ll.7-8). However, if the principal reason the sonnet offers Petrarch for publicising his work is his responsibility to his talent, to the author, and to a broader literary community, the closing tercet offers an alternative motivation, the poet's quest for eternal fame. It is through the admiration of such figures as the author, the sonnet implies, and through such figures' social circulation of Petrarch's texts, that Petrarch might come to be publicly crowned with those 'nove stelle', those nine stars.

Petrarch's reply, however, incorporated into the *Canzoniere*, re-enacts and intensifies the refusal to circulate of which he stands accused. Even as formally it answers the verses sent him (by, for example, redeploying that difficult rhyme on –*unca*), it turns away both from their author and from the kind of epistolary exchange he invites, inverting his argument: rather than erring by hiding himself and his works away, Petrarch declares, his mistake has been quite the reverse:

> S' i' fussi stato fermo a la spelunca
> la' dove Apollo divento' profeta,
> Fiorenza avria forse oggi il suo poeta,
> non pur Verona et Mantoa et Arunca.
>
> ma perché 'l mio terren più non s'ingiunca
> de l'humor di quel sasso, altro pianeta
> conven ch'i' segua, et del mio campo mieta
> lappole et stecchi co la falce adunca.
>
> L'oliva è secca, et è rivolta altrove
> l'acqua che di Parnaso si deriva,
> per cui in alcun tempo ella fioriva.
>
> Così sventura over colpa mi priva
> d'ogni buon fructo, se l'etterno Giove
> de la sua gratia sopra me non piove. (*RVF* 166)

> If I had stayed in the cave where Apollo became a prophet, Florence would perhaps have her poet today, not only Verona and Mantua and Arunca;
> but, since my ground produces no more reeds from the water of that rock, I must follow another planet and with my hooked sickle reap thistles and thorns from my field.
> The olive tree is dry, and the waters have turned elsewhere that flow down from Parnassus and at one time made it flourish.
> Thus misfortune or my fault deprives me of all good fruit, if eternal Jove does not rain His grace down on me.

A complex meditation arising from a profound sense of poetic failure, Petrarch's poem is, of course, playing a sophisticated game of withdrawal and display, involving itself in its correspondent's world of socio-literary circulation even as it encodes a retreat from it. What is at stake here is not simply a commitment to private retreat over public fame, but the question of the proper relationship between the two, which the poet worries has become distorted. Petrarch exhibits his own reticence even as he mourns his failure to live up to it, positioning himself by implication among the eternal poets even as he explicitly eliminates himself from their company, and in turn making the latter self-exclusion the paradoxical ground for the former claim. Indeed, for all its awareness of its audience, the sonnet's ambitions clearly rest upon a profound retreat away from public circulation into the recesses of an intricately constructed interiority. Where Petrarch's correspondent urges the importance of a poetic community in the production of poetry and the generation of poetic fame, Petrarch not only internalizes his metaphor of the poetic garden, but makes an absent Jove the only possible source of nourishment for his verse.

If the 'spelunca', or cave, is Apollo's Delphic grotto on Parnassus, the imagery also recalls the fissured cliffs that loom over Petrarch's rustic retreat in the 'secluded valley' of Vaucluse, outside Avignon. The poem thus inscribes Petrarch's regret at spending too much time away from that 'refuge' by the source of the river Sorgue, the 'acqua' that sustained so much of his poetic output.[52] In a manuscript belonging to Petrarch, on a page featuring an allusion to the river, Boccaccio sketched the 'gran sasso [...] ond' esce Sorga' (*RVF* 135.92-93), the great rock from which the river flowed. Boccaccio turns the landscape allegorical. The reeds that serve Petrarch in the *Canzoniere* as a metaphor for his poetry are here seen springing up at the rock's base, watered by 'l'umor di quel sasso', just as Petrarch describes them as no longer doing or being in the sonnet above. Petrarch himself, meanwhile, is represented by Boccaccio as the heron, the bird that, in medieval bestiaries, fears the disorder of the world, and to avoid its storms fly high above it in spirit (Rico 2008: 54-

---

[52] In the 'Draft of a Letter to Posterity', Petrarch writes of the Sorgue as 'the prince of all rivers', adding of his time at Vaucluse: 'It would be a long story if I were to tell you what I did there over so many years. To be brief: almost all of the little works that came from me were either entirely written there or started there, or at least conceived there; and they were so many that they still occupy me and weary me even now' (Nichols 2010: 135). Petrarch deploys, once again, the simile of life as a sea voyage (see *RVF* 189) in describing how, upon returning from Rome, he 'looked for some refuge as one looks for a port in the storm, and found a tiny but pleasantly secluded valley, known as Vaucluse, fifteen miles from Avignon' (Nichols 2010: 135).

57).[53] The mountain path with the chapel at its end represents the long, steep road to religious and poetic perfection that Petrarch had ascended (Calitti 2003: 9-29; Rico 2008: 85-6).

Below Boccaccio's doodle Petrarch has inscribed the words 'Transalpina solitudo mea iocundissima', my joyful transalpine solitude. The opening quatrain of Petrarch's reply to his now anonymous correspondent, rather than recognizing poetic immortality as threatened by withdrawal, makes it dependent upon that solitude, upon a retreat from the kind of social circulation that his correspondent invites. Presumably Petrarch sent this poem, or an earlier version of it, to his correspondent by way of reply. Yet whereas the first poem clearly fulfils an epistolary function, Petrarch's is free-standing, self-contained: without the evidence of the Riccardian manuscript, we would not know that Petrarch's sonnet is written as a response to another. Its inclusion in the gathering together of fragments that is the *Canzoniere* further divests it of its epistolary, social origins.

As ever in the *Canzoniere*, Petrarch leaves much ambiguous, undefined: this reticence in itself marks a kind of retreat from view, one manifestation of the acute anxiety regarding the boundaries between the properly public and the private foregrounded from the collection's beginning. At the same time, it also establishes those boundaries, situating the reader either in a position of intimacy with the poet, where we recognize the connections he invites us to make, or outside, baffled. If the stated reason that the landscape of Petrarch's poetry is scorched and shrivelled is his departure from the poetic fount, it is also implicitly thanks to the heat of the sun, thanks to his overexposure, that his groves have become a desert. If Petrarch must now follow an 'altro pianeta', another planet, it is because until now he has followed too closely the sun-god, Phoebus Apollo. Poetic aspiration, again, leads to poetic dearth. As the pursuer of Daphne and the cause of her transformation into the laurel, Apollo constantly lurks behind Petrarch's verse: he is his rival as lover, and as 'profeta', or divine poet, he is both his deity, the star he follows, and his adversary.

---

[53] As Rosalind Brown-Grant notes, 'the heron was thought to be a very religious bird, as betokened by its colours of white, denoting purity, and grey, denoting penitence' (2008: 186).

That sun, however, is also Laura. In an apostrophe to the landscape of Vaucluse and the river Sorgue four poems earlier, Petrarch has observed that in that landscape there cannot be a single stone that is not learning to burn with the same flame from which he suffers.[54] Furthermore, at the close of the sonnet that immediately precedes 'S' i' fussi stato fermo', it is from Laura's eyes, gait, look and words that 'nasce 'l gran foco di ch' io vivo et ardo', comes that great blaze on which the poet lives and burns (*RVF* 165.13). By hinting that it is his pursuit of Laura that has scorched his poetic ambitions, Petrarch, Janus-faced, glances in two directions at once, at concerns that his poetry has been damaged through being overly public, or public in the wrong ways, and also overly private. Laura, of course, shadows forth the laurel wreath, emblem of poetic fame, and this allusion thus reinforces the sense that it is precisely his excessive concern with winning public praise that may have prevented him from taking his place alongside the great Latin poets.[55] This vulgar hungering for glory is the source of a shame that preoccupies Petrarch throughout his writing. Related to that 'vergogna' that is the fruit of his 'vaneggiar' in the *Canzoniere*'s proem (*RVF* 1.12), it infects not only his poetic composition, but, as the voice of Augustinus in the *Secretum* (that most private of Petrarch's books) makes clear, his reading too: 'if you had directed your reading of so many volumes to the improvement of your life, and not to vain display and the windy plaudits of the mob – you would not have made such callow and stupid remarks' (*Sec.* 8). Yet the allusion to Laura also hints at Petrarch's doubts, frequently expressed elsewhere, concerning the amatory direction his vernacular verse has taken. As the tree of Minerva, the goddess of wisdom, the olive here, carried over by Petrarch from his correspondent's poem, stands for the serious historical or philosophical-theological public poetry, perhaps in Latin, that he might have written had the

---

[54] Non fia in voi scoglio omai che per costume
d'arder co la mia fiamma non impari. (*RVF* 162.13-14)

[55] The laurel, 'sola insegna al gemino valore', sole ensign of the twin deservings' (*RVF* 161.6), that sends the poet seeking across shores and mountains -- 'che mi fate ir cercando piagge et monti' (*RVF* 161.8). Here the audience addressed are the 'anime gentili et amorose, | s' alcuna à 'l mondo , et voi, nude ombre et polve' - the noble loving souls (if there are any in the world) and naked shades and dust (*RVF* 161.12-13).

Parnassian waters not been diverted 'altrove', to an elsewhere that we can easily associate with the laurel of private love.

The question of vernacular versus Latin verse lurks even more deeply behind this poem. The intimations of the suppressed presence of a rival poet in the figure of Apollo are intensified by Petrarch's implicit exclusion of Dante – the obvious candidate even then – from consideration for the Florentine crown he himself would win. For many, even then, Florence already had its poet. That the sun drying up Petrarch's inspiration might also be Dante is hinted at not only by Petrarch's pre-emptive exclusion of his predecessor from that title, but also by the echoes of the second quatrain, whose stony tone, with its Dantean 'lappole et stecchi' – described by Rosanna Bettarini as 'aspra' and 'petrosa' (2005: I, 781) – recalls Dante's *rime petrose*, an obvious influence on Petrarch in this period.

Ostensibly, Dante would be excluded from the company of Juvenal, Catullus and Virgil (and perhaps the author of the *Africa*) because he wrote his great works in the vernacular rather than in Latin. Coming from a writer who so persistently avoided acknowledging his very evident agon with Dante, however, it is hard not to see the ignoring of Dante's candidacy as a slight, a deliberate clearing of the way for his own claim. Yet precisely the acceptable 'public' justification for excluding Dante, his use of the vulgar tongue, also serves to reiterate the 'private' quality of Petrarch's own vernacular work. It excludes Petrarch's poem, too, together with the vernacular collection within which it appears. Petrarch, unlike Dante, produced a significant body of Latin poetry, and often seems to have rested his main hopes of poetic fame in that work. Described in the *Canzoniere* as his 'altro lavoro' (*RVF* 93.7), his other work, his Latin verse is characterized as his proper employment, associated more generally with the *studia humanitatis* and identified firmly with the public sphere. It is repeatedly privileged over the latter, which is described as a private distraction. Here Petrarch subtly glances at what was evidently a lifelong anxiety regarding the proper relationship between his vernacular and his Latin works. This poem draws attention to its own non-public status, and in a sense legitimizes its own self-declared failure as proper (even as the formal elegance and complexity with which it does so conveys a mastery that overwrites that legitimation with one altogether grander). At the same time, if Petrarch's sonnet is in itself the poetic fruition whose absence its lines lament, and thus might help win for its author the public recognition his correspondent urges him to actively pursue, it simultaneously excludes itself from consideration for canonical status. And here is the central problem. It is not simply that he has neglected his public, Latin work in favour of the composition of private vernacular, amatory verse: it is that a failure to be sufficiently private lies behind his failure to be successfully and appropriately public.

### 2.3 Petrarch, politics, and the letter

The complexities of 'S' i' fussi stato' arise, in part, from its simultaneous engagement with and withdrawal from the social, epistolary exchange of verse. A prodigious correspondent, who insisted on writing letters by dictation even when on horseback, Petrarch wrote not only to friends, relations and minor patrons, but also to kings and cardinals, some of the most powerful men of his time. Yet if Petrarch was in one sense the most epistolary of poets, much of his poetry follows 'S' i' fussi stato' in encoding a withdrawal from its own implication in epistolary, social circulation.

The *copia* of Petrarch's letters in verse and prose runs to hundreds of thousands of words and many volumes, dwarfing the *Canzoniere*. Petrarch claimed that these letters represented a mere handful of his total output, those that survived after he had 'handed over for Vulcan's correction [i.e. consigned to the fire] a thousand or more letters and poems of every kind' (*Fam*. 1.1). This may be no more than a typical bit of self-conscious myth-making, or a more complex 'rejection of the responsibility of authorship,' as John Najemy suggests (1993: 27). The sheer mass of the surviving correspondence, though, gathered together in the *Familiares* and the *Seniles*, seems, however paradoxically, to lend Petrarch's claim some credence. In any case, Petrarch's love affair with the letter played at least as significant a role in fostering the subsequent development of the humanist hermeneutic as did either his Latin or his vernacular verse, and his position as father of the republic of letters is a literary commonplace. His rediscovery in the chapter library of the cathedral of Verona in 1345 of a manuscript copy of Cicero's familiar letters to Brutus, Quintus and Atticus, has often been taken as a, or even *the*, founding moment of the Renaissance. This event, which Petrarch tells us moved him to tears, was to be almost as significant for the development of European literary culture as it was for Petrarch's own maturation. As Alan Stewart notes, Petrarch was

> inspired by Cicero to develop a new critical theory of letter-writing, and to write and collect his own prose letters, a habit that became popular with such prominent quattrocento Florentine humanists as Giovanni Boccaccio, Coluccio Salutati, Leonardo Bruni, and Poggio Bracciolini, the last two of whom edited and disseminated collections of their own letters. By the time the printing press appeared in Europe, letter-writing was a fashionable academic movement, ripe for development, and in 1495 Marsilio Ficino became the first living writer to disseminate his personal correspondence in print. (2008: 13)

It was in Poggio Bracciolini's correspondence with his fellow humanist Francesco Barbaro that the original Latin expression *respublica litteraria* first appeared.

It is not my intention to revisit in any detail the vast range of scholarship dedicated to Petrarch's role as a founder of the republic of letters, a subject that has been the focus of particular attention in recent years, not least under the impetus of Stanford University's 'Mapping the Republic of Letters' project. It is worth noting, however, Petrarch's emphasis on the letter's emotive power. As Carol Quillen notes, Cicero's correspondence offered Petrarch examples of the intensely personal letter, 'a genre rare in a society whose heavy reliance on official correspondence had refined epistolography (*ars dictaminis*) into a technically precise craft' (1998: 107). Where the *ars dictaminis* advocated adherence to a series of more or less rigid rules and types derived from classical oratory, Cicero's letters, written 'not to persuade or impress the public but in lieu of conversation with a distant, trusted friend, an alter ego', offered Petrarch a model of apparent spontaneity (Quillen 1998: 109). As excited by their style as he was offended by their supposed revelation of Cicero's 'weakness in adversity,' Petrarch read Cicero's 'quarrelsome' letters as addressed not only to their historical recipients, but also directly to himself: in posterity he discovered himself to be their true addressee. That this was so was demonstrated by their confusing, emotive impact upon him. 'On reading these letters,' he declared in a dedicatory letter addressed to another ancient, Socrates, 'I was soothed and ruffled at the same time' (*Fam*. 1.1.42). Indeed, Cicero's letters provoked in Petrarch, by his own account, a loss of self-control:

> I could not restrain myself, and, indignation prompting me, I wrote to him as to a friend of my own years and time, regardless of the ages which separated us. Indeed, I wrote with a familiarity acquired through an intimate knowledge of the works of his genius, and I pointed out to him what it was that offended me in his writings. This letter served as a precedent. Years later, on re-reading the tragedy entitled *Octavia*, the memory of the letter which I had addressed to Cicero prompted me to write to Seneca also. (*Fam.* 1.1.42)

Thereafter Petrarch went on to address letters to Homer, Marcus Varro, Virgil, Quintilian, Livy and other classical writers and thinkers, while in his *Letter to Posterity* he speaks to us directly, not as eavesdroppers, but as his letter's intended recipients, candidly addressed. In Petrarch's collections, most notably the *Familiares* and the *Seniles*, 'the letter becomes again what it had been for Cicero: a mirror of interior life and experiences as well as an intimate exchange of public and private news' (Quillen 1998: 109). Petrarch passed on his emphasis on the emotive, connective power of the letter to his Renaissance humanist followers. 'If letters lack real feelings and fail to represent the very life itself of a person, they do not deserve the name of letters', wrote Erasmus to Beatus Rhenanus, the editor of the 1521 Froben collection of his letters. As Lisa Jardine notes, '[w]hen Erasmus is undecided as to whether particular letters (Seneca's *Epistles to Lucilius*, some of Jerome's longer letters) deserve the designation "letters", it is on the grounds that they may not be sufficiently emotional to qualify. He is committed to the view that letters convey feeling with immediacy, between a writer and a reader with some kind of mutual investment in the topic treated' (Jardine 1993: 151).

What prompted this loss of self-control in Petrarch turns out to be a parallel shortcoming in the master he admires and loves. The main cause of Petrarch's lament to Cicero is the latter's failure, revealed in his letters, to adhere to his own stoic doctrine of withdrawal from public affairs in favour of contemplation:

> what boots it to instruct others, of what profit to discourse eternally on the virtues, and that too in most eloquent terms, if, at the same time, one turns a deaf ear to his own instructions? Ah, how much better had it been for a man of declining years, and especially for one devoted to studies, even as thou, to have lived his last days in the quiet of the country, meditating (as thou thyself hast said somewhere) on that everlasting life, and not on this fleeting one. How much better had it been never to have held office, never to have longed for triumphs, never to have vaunted of crushing such men as Catiline. But 'tis vain indeed to talk thus. Farewell forever, my Cicero. (*Fam*. 1.1)

'Hitherto I knew what true counsel thou gavest to others,' Petrarch observes wryly: 'now, at last, I have learned to what degree thou didst prove mentor to thyself' (*Fam*. 1.1). Petrarch's condemnation of Cicero's engagement in public life, however, rings somewhat hollow. Petrarch himself was constantly torn between the public and the private, engagement and retreat. It was perhaps because he saw so much of his own inmost tensions in Cicero's own life as revealed in his letters that they produced such an ambivalent, lasting effect upon him.

Those tensions run through Petrarch's poetry too, where they are closely bound up with the vernacular lyric's epistolary, social function in the fourteenth century. Petrarch's poetic practice took place within an atmosphere in which the lyric tended to serve a primarily epistolary, social function that reflected its complicity in and dependence upon the ongoing privatization of power and wealth. Even as the figure of the poet was elevated, and poetry's cultural capital increased, real understanding of poetry diminished, along with its power to actually shape both private lives and, perhaps most importantly, public discourse. Deprived of affective power over the will, and relegated to the status of a mere *intrattenimento*, a mere entertainment for the *roco mormador di corti*, (*RVF* 360.117), the vulgar mob of courtiers clustered about the palaces of both the curia in Avignon and the princelings of northern Italy, lyric poetry's public role had been seriously debased, both in relation to its immediate past (one cannot help but think of Dante here) and in comparison with the classical age of Cicero and Seneca. This, at least, was Petrarch's view.

As Ugo Dotti notes, Petrarch was writing at a time when:

> particularly in Italy, the opulence of the first mercantile capitalism, with its new, free ways that Boccaccio immortalized in his Decameron, was giving way to authoritarian and, in certain cases, neofeudal involutions. A restricted circle of rich families (bankers, former merchants and new landowners) was progressively abdicating its commercial and civic responsibilities in order to withdraw into a more comfortable, 'private' space. (Dotti 2001, 17)[56]

Poetry's role and status in this emerging new world order was, for Petrarch, a serious concern. The authoritarian convulsions gripping Europe, bringing with them famine, pestilence and perpetual war, seemed to render poetry impotent, even as they demanded of it some sort of meaningful engagement. Meanwhile, within the retreats of power, in the new private ambit of the emerging neo-feudal courts that Dotti describes, poetry was gaining a new currency, as it increasingly came to be seen as one of the commodities that helped render that new privacy pleasurable. Here it is worth quoting Marco Santagata's tracing of the vernacular lyric's emerging status in the fourteenth-century courts at length:

---

[56] 'particolarmente in Italia, l'opulenza del primo capitalismo mercantile, con quei suoi rinnovati e liberi costumi che Boccaccio immortalo' nel suo *Decamerone,* stava tuttavia ripiegando verso involuzioni autoritarie e, in certa guisa, neofeudali. Una ristretta cerchia di ricche famiglie (banchieri, ex mercanti e nuovi proprietari terrieri) che venivano progressivamente abdicando ai loro impegni commerciali e civili per ritirarsi in un piu' comodo "privato".'

> If we exclude the Venetian parenthesis, Petrarch lived and wrote within the world of the Padanian courts. And in fact, it was precisely that world of the courts that had decreed the extraordinary success that poetry in the vernacular enjoyed in this century. The courtly ambiences being fashioned, precursors of the more impressive courtly circles of the fifteenth century, chose vernacular poetry, aove all the lyric, as their principal instrument of literary communication. Those courtiers and those courts were the distant but not illegitimate heirs of the feudal 'families' and of the courtly institutions of the preceding centuries. If we reflect on the fact that lyric poetry was born within the western feudal system, and that since that moment it had never lost the imprint conferred upon it by its noble birth, we can see the courtly flowering of the fourteenth century as a return to the source, after the 'bourgeois' digression in the Tuscany of the thirteenth-century. But little enough survived of the old 'courtly' tradition in the modern reprisal of the genre: the direct intervention of power and the more immediate but no less urgent exigencies of social life had deeply marked it, making of it a form overwhelmingly epistolary, of entertainment. (Santagata 1992: 269-70)[57]

By the mid-fourteenth century, then, the lyric had been reduced to no more than a lightweight *intrattenimento* amongst courtly circles, a primarily epistolary form of communication that served to oil the social wheels.

Petrarch's great contribution to the development of Renaissance Humanism, his remarkable conception of an extended literary audience reaching beyond geographical and temporal boundaries and united into a transcendent public by its shared participation in a profoundly inward, concentrated, private experience of reading and response was in large part a response to this sense of lyric's debasement at the hands and tongues of a more immediate, vulgar, courtly public. To restore the lyric to the properly public function Petrarch saw it as having enjoyed in the classical world entailed a complex negotiation of his own work's relation to its various audiences, both actual and potential. Circulating as *rime disperse*, fragmented and often corrupted, his vernacular lyrics had done much to win him the literary fame he craved. However, much of that fame derived from their appropriation into that courtly world of *intrattenimenti*. Throughout Petrarch's writing we thus find encoded an always profoundly ambivalent withdrawal from public overexposure into an intensely private, hitherto unmatched exploration of the recesses of the individual psyche. This is supplemented by a retreat into the refuge of the coterie of his literary, educated friends — including not only the living but also those long dead and yet to come — in order ultimately to reclaim for lyric poetry a new kind of public audience and importance.

---

[57] Se escludiamo la parentesi veneziana, Petrarca vive e scrive dentro l'universo delle corti padane. Ebbene, è proprio il mondo delle corti ad avere decretato lo straordinario successo che la poesia volgare conosce in questo secolo. Gli ambienti cortigiani in formazione, antesignani dei più imponenti circoli di corte quattrocenteschi, eleggono la poesia volgare, sopratutto lirica, a loro principale strumento di communicazione letteraria. Quei cortigiani e quelle corti sono i lontanissimi, ma non illegitimi eredi delle "famiglie" feudali e delle instituzioni cortesi dei secoli precedenti. Se riflettiamo sul fatto che la poesia lirica era nata nell'ambito della feudalità occitanica e che da allora non aveva perso l'impronta conferitale dalla nascita nobiliare, la fioritura cortigiana trecentesca ci apparirà anche come un ritorno nell'alveo originario, dopo la divigazione "borghese" nella Toscana del Duecento. Ma dell'antica tradizione "cortese" ben poco sopravviveva nella moderna ripresa del genere: l'intervento diretto del potere e le esigenze più mediate, ma non meno imperative, della vita sociale lo avevano segnato profondamente, *facendone un genere eminentamente epistolare e di intrattenimento* (italics added).

Ultimately, Petrarch's project had as its logical end the subtraction of the lyric from the original circumstances of its material production, its removal from the immediate social economy of epistolary versifying, into the potentially transhistorical realm of a humanistic community of letters. His work seeks, to appropriate Habermas's description of the grounds for the rise of a literary public sphere in seventeenth-century England, 'a private autonomy denying its economic origins' (1992: 46). That Petrarch's transcendental project was dependent upon the very economic foundations it denied did not undermine its radicality. Indeed, as Ugo Dotti's *Petrarca Civile* makes abundantly clear, Petrarch always remained acutely aware of the conditions that made that autonomy possible, and of both how they threatened to impinge on that autonomy and how their removal could undermine it (Dotti 2001). Ever wary of the threat of *oblio*, oblivion, and haunted by the possibility that his work would simply disappear from view, Petrarch was careful to maintain the favour of those who could guarantee his work visibility: indeed, his pragmatism in cultivating the tyrannical Visconti was to distress his friend Boccaccio. Petrarch thus played a remarkable balancing game. Unlike Dante or Boccaccio, he consorted with the most powerful figures of his age, with the cardinals of the Curia, and even with kings, princes, emperors and popes. Yet, while wielding his own celebrity in political causes that often conflicted with the expectations of those in power,[58] his pronouncements on poetry and his poetic praxis itself often perform a paradoxical withdrawal from visibility.

The necessity of detaching his work from some of poetry's established associations, while not alienating the circles that supported him, emerges from the history of the *Canzoniere*'s circulation. Santagata has shown how even in the very act of scribal publication Petrarch could perform a radical withdrawal from the public sphere. While many of Petrarch's individual vernacular lyrics circulated widely, we know of only two copies of the *Canzoniere* being given as presentation manuscripts by Petrarch. In a letter written to accompany the gift of one of these manuscripts to Pandolfo Malatesta, Petrarch declares that now he is old, he wishes his earlier poems were unknown, even to himself. 'But what can I do?' he bewails,

> By now they've been abroad among the people and they're read with more enthusiasm than the things I've written more recently and with a more mature soul. And how then can I refuse to you, a man of much importance, who has solicited me with many requests, those writings that to my vexation the common herd [il volgo] possesses and mars at its pleasure. (*Sen*. XIII.ii)

At the very moment at which Petrarch presents his gathered fragments, he affirms his wish to deny them to the public. As Santagata notes, the idea of the *book* is born from the desire to reappropriate the *fragments* fallen into the hands of a public unable to gather from them the unitary experience they should yield. 'For a vernacular versifier, to deny oneself to the public was an act of extraordinary novelty', one that shook the very foundations upon which the lyric genre had rested up to that moment (1992: 283). By voicing a desire to keep his vernacular work safe from the mob, he ascribes to it a value sufficient to ensure its public worth. Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, Santagata argues, should be seen as a reaction to the perceived falling-off of lyric poetry, a reassertion of its importance:

---

[58] Dotti discusses a number of such occasions at length (2001: 22-25).

> The *Canzoniere*, the book form, is the clearest expression of his refusal to accede to the demands of the public, to contaminate the poetic act with the rites of mundanity and with the conventions of social communication. But Petrarch lived in those environments and knew well that those circles, however much he had succeeded in acquiring humanistic readers too for his vernacular texts, were the natural audience for his poems. (1992: 270)

When Petrarch sent his poems abroad, he addressed them to protectors, to public men, to versifiers: to the social groups, that is, that by tradition such work was addressed to. Although the poetry makes no concessions to fashion or to current practice, Petrarch takes care to offer no provocative gestures outside the lines of his verse. Even if his poetry requires the sort of *caldi ingegni* that only a cultivated humanist could aspire to, however, Petrarch is careful to keep the *cavalier* onside. Intriguingly, however, Petrarch did not actually send these lines to Malatesta. They appear only in the version of the letter reworked at a later date by Petrarch for inclusion in his *Seniles*. They thus form part of a message to a future readership encoding an idealized withdrawal into the realm of the private that almost certainly never took place. In reality, as Santagata argues, Petrarch was extremely wary of lamenting publicly the success his poems enjoyed in the courtly circles within which Malatesta moved.

If he could mock from outside, Petrarch was well aware that both a certain aspect of his own temperament and the exigencies of his time made both he and his work potentially susceptible to the corruptions of power, to appropriation into the world of courtly *intrattenimenti* from which he fled so assiduously. Petrarch’s coronation as poet laureate was the most spectacular manifestation of poetry’s new celebrity, and Petrarch endeavored in his writings to distinguish between the welcome acclaim of the educated and the unwelcome praise of the ignorant ‘vulgar herd’. This led Petrarch throughout his career to express what one critic has described as a ‘relentless disdain for a public audience’ (Martin 1994: 71). In his *Epistola metrica*, turning a blind eye to the origins of his fame, he asks whether his verses ‘must win | the vulgar herd’s approval?’ The answer is a resounding no:

> Nay, I’d rather
> forego the name of bard and tear the wreath
> of laurel from my brow and head, uncrowned,
> languish long years, inglorious and unknown. (2.10)

In ‘La gola e ’l sonno’ (*RVF* 7), he speaks scornfully of ‘la turba al vil guadagno intesa’, the mob bent on low gain. As Christopher Martin notes, while ‘such outspoken animosity enjoyed both classical and contemporary precedents...Petrarch plies his studied snobbery with a consistency and intensity that transcend convention’ (Martin 1994: 72). Yet the anecdote of Cola di Rienzo’s possible redemption suggests that it was the likes of the officials of the Curia and the courtly administrators and poetasters that were Petrarch’s true target, rather than the common mass of the population. In another story ‘worthy of tears and laughter’, Petrarch describes how he was called to Avignon to serve the Curia (*Fam*. XIII. 5.1). There, while they had a certain esteem for Petrarch’s eloquence, they had ‘even more for my capacity for confidentiality and trustworthiness...Thus, I seemed suitable for guarding the pontiff’s secrets for which purpose I had been summoned’. In the view of the Curia’s officials, however, one obstacle stands in Petrarch’s way: his style is deemed ‘too lofty for the humility required of the Holy See’. ‘The pontiff and the College of Cardinals...expected one thing of me, that I should, in their own words, humble my talents and subdue my style’. Given the task of writing something to demonstrate ‘how near I could fly to the earth,’ Petrarch deliberately sets out to soar as high on the wings of his talent as he can. The result is predictable: ‘What I had written was considered insufficiently intelligible for the most part, although it was really very clear; by some, it was viewed as Greek or some barbarian tongue. Imagine the kind of men in charge of the highest matters!’ (*Fam.* XIII.5.15).

Petrarch goes on to elucidate the kind of audience and the kind of writing he aspires to:

> It gives me pleasure to be noticed by few men; and the fewer they are, the more I take pride in myself. I do not wish dignity or wealth to be of any assistance to my reader; I wish that a pontiff or a king or anyone else pay equal attention to me. ... It is not a crown but intelligence aided by study that makes writings intelligible; otherwise, it would be preferable to be a monarch. (XIII. 5.15)

For Petrarch, indeed, to be a monarch is not so great a fate as to be a poet. In the long canzone 'Quel antiquo mio dolce empio signore' (*Canz*. 360), we find a further clue as to the nature of the vulgar herd that Petrarch so despised. There Amor remonstrates that

> Sì l'avea sotto l'ali mie condutto
> ch' a donne et cavalier piacea il suo dire;
> et sì alto salire
> il feci che tra' caldi ingegni ferve
> 'il suo nome, et de' suoi detti conserve
> si fanno con diletto in alcun loco;
> ch' or saria forse un roco
> mormorador di corti, un uom del vulgo! (110-117)

> I had so carried him (the poet) under my wings that his speech pleased ladies and knights; and I made him rise so high that among brilliant wits
> his name shines, and in some places collections are made of his poems; who now would perhaps be a hoarse murmurer of the courts, one of the mob!

Here Petrarch enumerates three distinct audiences: the 'donne et cavalier' of the aristocracy; the 'caldi ingegni' of his fellow proto-humanist authors and scholars; and the 'vulgo' to which he would otherwise belong, and which elsewhere he refers to as possessing and marring his works. This 'vulgo', we learn, is made up of the 'hoarse murmurers of the courts', that class of lowly courtiers and social climbers who utilized poetry as a means to a social or political end, and with whom Petrarch had so much, and so little, in common.

It is from the public acclaim of these *mormador di corti*, then, that poetry must be protected. One way Petrarch seeks to protect it is by demanding a new sort of attention from his reader, one that demands solitude, eliminating the possibility of distracted, social reading:

> I wish my reader, whoever he may be, to consider me alone, and not his daughter's marriage, not a night with his lady friend, not the wiles of his enemy, not his security or his home, not his land or his money. Even as he reads me, I want him to be with me; if he is pressed by affairs, let him defer his reading. When he decides to read what I write, he must lay aside the burden of his affairs and the anxieties of his home life in order to direct his attention to what is before his eyes. If these conditions do not please him, let him stay away from my useless writings. I refuse to have him simultaneously carry on his business and study; I refuse to allow him to learn without labour what I wrote with labour. (*Fam*. XIII.5.23)

Petrarch's insistence on the exclusively private character of his *rime*, though, was as disingenuous as his dismissal of them as mere diversions. Unlike his *Secretum,* Petrarch circulated his *Canzoniere* and looked to it as one of the columns upon which his fame might rest.

What was true of poetry in the Padanian courts was also true of its status within the Papal curia. Indeed, Petrarch's disgust for poetry's position there was overwhelming. We get something of a sense of Petrarch's feelings about contemporary attitudes towards poetry from his correspondence with his friend Francesco Nelli, prior of the church of the Holy Apostles in Florence. Petrarch tells 'Simonides' (the nickname he gives Nelli in his letters) an anecdote regarding Cola di Rienzo's arrival in Avignon, in order to show his friend how 'poetry has begun nowadays to be dishonoured, not to say profaned and prostituted ('poesis divinum munus et paucorum hominum, iam vulgari, ne profanari dicam ac prostitui, cepit'. *Fam.* 13.6.1). Di Rienzo had been brought before the Curia to face charges of sedition, or, in Petrarch's own words, of having 'wished the republic to be free' (ibid). While condemning di Rienzo for a lack of ruthlessness in pursuing his goals, Petrarch's letter reiterates his support for the ideal of a free republic. He focuses, however, with an irony both delighted and appalled, on the one hope of rescue remaining for the leader of the failed coup. 'There is a widespread report,' he tells his correspondent, 'that he is an outstanding poet and that therefore it is terrible to punish a man dedicated to such sacred studies' (ibid). 'What more can I say?' Petrarch demands: 'I certainly rejoice and am delighted more than I can express that the Muses are still held in such esteem, and what is more astonishing, by those very men who are ignorant of them. Could they have expected anything more under Caesar Augustus, when they enjoyed the highest esteem and when poets from every land gathered in Rome to view the face of that distinguished ruler, friend of poets and master of kings?' (ibid). Di Rienzo, Petrarch goes on to observe,

> is a very eloquent man, most persuasive, with a bent for oratory, even a pleasant and charming writer capable of delightful and colourful thoughts, though they are not many. I believe he has read all the poets who are commonly known. Still he is no more a poet than he is a weaver because he is wearing a mantle woven by others' hands. Writing one poem is insufficient to merit the name of poet [...] Cola, however, never composed even one poem as far as I know; nor did he ever apply his mind to it, without which nothing, however easy, can be done well. If – were it only true! – Nicola escapes beneath the shield of poetry from such great perils, from what could Virgil not have escaped? But Virgil would perish for another reason at the hands of such judges since he was considered a necromancer and not a poet. I shall say something that will make you laugh even more. I myself, the greatest enemy of divination and magic, am oftentimes called necromancer by those excellent judges because of my admiration for Virgil. How low our studies have sunk! O hateful and laughable nonsense! (ibid)

The superficial inflation of poetry's stock is the concomitant of a complete lack of serious engagement with it. Equally, the greater its detachment from the public lives of men and political controversy, the easier it becomes to celebrate it publicly as a sacred art.

Petrarch concludes the letter by lamenting the case of a dear friend of his there in the Babylonian atmosphere of Avignon. This man, 'one in a million, a leader among leaders, most distinguished among the greatest men, an acclaimed honour of the Sacred College, a man of rare prudence in whose counsel may easily be seen the ability to rule the entire world, and furthermore extremely well-read with a rare intelligence' nevertheless would ask Petrarch of every man 'who had learned to address a few words to the public' whether he was not a poet (*Fam*. 13.6.30-33). This man, who Petrarch encourages us to take as representative of his class, 'did not know the first and even the most general principles of an art in which we know the masters of the world at one time exercised their lofty talents with passion and constancy despite their involvement in public affairs' (13.6.33).

Petrarch was rather more ambivalent in his attitudes towards the poetry circulating at the courts of northern Italy to which he moved after leaving Avignon behind. After the failure of Cola di Rienzo's attempt to inaugurate a new Roman republic, Petrarch had to revise his hopes for political and cultural renewal. These came to focus, perhaps largely out of necessity, on the princely courts. Petrarch looked both forward and back to escape from the depressing reality of the present as he saw it. Vernacular lyric verse had never lost the imprint of its noble birth, and in the right light the fourteenth-century courtly flowering of poetry could appear a return to origins after the 'bourgeois' Tuscan detours of the thirteenth century (Santagata 1992: 270-271). While little enough remained of the older courtly tradition, however, Petrarch never abandoned hope that the Muses might be returned to their former status by the old, literate nobility, typified by his admirer, Robert of Anjou, the King of Naples.[59] On the other hand, Petrarch, looking forward, was for Dotti the first to sense in the figure of the Prince and his court – a court still consisting of humanists, and not yet of courtiers – the first nucleus of a possible secular and unified State that might develop on the model of the Roman 'res publica'.[60] Where di Rienzo had failed, Petrarch hoped that the new nobility might succed.

---

[59] It is notable that in his 'Draft of a Letter to Posterity' Petrarch identifies Robert as 'no less renowned as a scholar than as a prince, the only monarch in our time who was also a friend to learning and virtue' (Nichols 2010: 136).

Petrarch thus chose to pass his later days in the orbit of the small courts presided over by the likes of the Scaligeri and the Carraresi, the Gonzaga, the Estensi and the Pio, always with the Visconti as the primary point of reference. The recipients of the only two extant presentation manuscripts of the *Canzoniere*, Malatesta at Parma and Azzo da Correggio at Rimini, were both men of arms, *signori* of small city-states, and they represent the new feudality Dotti and Santagata describe, rulers over their own small fiefdoms linked at the same time in a semi-feudal relationship to courts of far greater importance and power (in their case, again, the Milan of the Viscontis). These despotic regimes of northern Italy were pioneering a "systematic alienation from local custom and familiar modes of social relationship' (Wallace 1997: 380).[61] And it was these small courts, as Santagata notes, that decreed the popular success that the vernacular lyric enjoyed in the fourteenth century.

Yet as Petrarch's letters and poems make abundantly clear, the reality was often far from the humanist ideal. Although poets – most notably Petrarch himself – became celebrated figures and writing verse became fashionable, serious literary endeavour and appreciation declined exponentially, alongside poetry's public role. This, at least, was Petrarch's view. In part, he was weighing his own age against the classical world of Cicero and Horace; in part, he was judging the new brokers and administrators of power against the literary standards set by the courts from which European lyric poetry had emerged in the preceding centuries. If he could mock from outside, however, Petrarch was well aware that both a certain aspect of his own temperament and the exigencies of his time made both he and his work susceptible to the corruptions of power, and appropriation into the world of courtly *intrattenimenti* from which he fled so assiduously.[62] Perhaps as the result of a guilty conscience, Petrarch repeatedly insists in his writings on his maintenance of his independence, and even of a certain distance between himself and all but a very few patrons distinguished by their learning as much as their nobility.

---

[60] 'Petrarca fu il primo a scorgere nel Principe e nella sua corte — corte allora di umanisti e non ancora di cortigiani—il primo nucleare di un possible Stato laico e unitario che sapesse svilupparsi secondo il modello della "res publica" romana' (Dotti 2001: 25).

[61] It has been argued, most notably by David Wallace (1997), that Petrarch's whole project was founded upon Milanese absolutist rule, and that his fame rests upon an elision of slavery and tyranny through an escape from history. Wallace's study of 'Chaucerian polity' takes as its starting point a supposed dichotomy between Florentine associational polity, exemplified by Boccaccio, and the tyrannous dictatorship of the Visconti, exemplified by Petrarch and underwriting humanism. Petrarch's relationships with the Visconti and their underlings are problematic, to put it mildly, but Wallace's diametric opposition between Boccaccio and Petrarch is even more so: if 'careful research into Italian politics, particularly the despotic Viscontis' lies behind his study, as one reviewer suggested , it might have benefited from more careful reading of Petrarch's own deeply ambivalent negotiation of his position. Nevertheless, Wallace's book is a useful reminder of the environment within which Petrarch chose to end his career, and, if his answers seem too simplistic, the questions he raises regarding the origins of the Petrarchan lyric and humanism are ones that still demand investigation, and which this present thesis, while addressing, ultimately also fails to answer.

In the 'Draft of a Letter to Posterity', Petrarch writes that while 'very mindful of benefits received', and fortunate in his 'familiarity with princes and kings and in friendship with nobles, which was such as to provoke envy', he was nevertheless careful to avoid any threat to his autonomy: 'Many of them, of whom I was very fond, I kept at a distance: so deeply rooted in me was the love of liberty that I took care to avoid any who had a name for being hostile to it' (Nichols 2010: 131). One of the reasons Petrarch's *rime* were *sparse*, dispersed, was that so many of them had been sent abroad as part of an epistolary exchange by their author, for whom they served as a kind of social currency. In the early years of his literary career, when his reputation was still growing, Petrarch wrote many poems serving an immediately social epistolary function. An interesting example of an occasional poem that presumably originally served such a role is 'A pie' de' colli' (*RVF* 8), a sonnet that seems to have been written to accompany a gift of game. Here the animals depict their own end, and close by describing their sole consolation: that he who was responsible for their death remains in the power of another, 'legato con maggior catena', bound with a greater chain (*RVF* 8.14).

---

[62] After Petrarch's death early Italian commentators such as Antonio da Tempo and Francesco Filelfo, mostly also writing from under the wing of the Visconti, sought to appropriate Petrarch's public status by recasting the *Canzoniere* as a public performance of the painful negation of private love, in favour of the cultivation of the moral probity appropriate to a servant of the state. The *Canzoniere* thus became 'a call to sacrifice one's personal interests to a transcendent polity' (Kennedy 2003: 65).

As Petrarch's conception of his vocation matured, however, the turn away from the deployment of poetry to such ends becomes increasingly pronounced. Already, perhaps, the pattern is evident in that early poem, with its turn back to the poet, away from definite description toward an atmospheric refusal to specify (*altrui* [*RVF* 8.13], 'another' or 'elsewhere'). Yet while poems addressed to particular individuals are scattered throughout the rest of the *Canzoniere*, as the work progresses they become increasingly rare, and increasingly turn away from their social, epistolary origins, sublimating their original addressee to an abstracted audience identifiable with the woods and breezes of Vaucluse, the apprehension of the mind in its own self-expression, or posterity. Petrarch's progressive exclusion of poems that retained the traces of their social, epistolary origins becomes especially clear if we turn to the so-called *Rime disperse*, the vernacular poems Petrarch left out of the final signature version of the *Canzoniere*. Many of these are to be found among Petrarch's autograph working papers, the *codice degli abbozzi* (MS Vat. Lat. 3196). Among the *disperse* we find a high number of epistolary poems: eighteen of the twenty-one poems in the Paolino edition are written to or for others.[63] There are sonnet exchanges, or *tenzoni*, with contemporaries such as Ricciardo da Bagno, Antonio Beccari da Ferrrara, Sennuccio del Bene and Pietro Dietisalvi, and sonnets written in reply to his patron Cardinal Giovanni Colonna. As Justin Steinberg notes, even a preliminary study of the *disperse* discloses a Petrarch 'surprisingly involved in the exchanges, performances, and contingent and ephemeral functions of poetry that typify the northern courts of fourteenth-century Italy' (2009: 90). The *disperse* are primarily social and communicative, addressed to specific intended readers, and are inextricably occasional, tied to specific places, dates and circumstances.

Petrarch's re-orderings of the contents of the *Canzoniere* have been the subject of much research, and figures such as E. H. Wilkins and, more recently, Marco Santagata, have shown how these revisions focused increasingly upon shaping the *Rime sparse* into what Walter Ong calls a 'closed field', a text that is self-referential and suppresses the traces of its origins in multiple and unrelated social exchanges.[64] To some degree, this might reflect Petrarch's growing age, the passing of many of the friends with whom he had corresponded and perhaps an intensifying withdrawal from wordly matters. It is significant that perhaps the last of the sonnets of the *Canzoniere* addressed to a specific addressee, both in terms of its position in the collection and its date of composition, is 'Mai non vedranno le mie luci asciutte' (*RVF* 322). This poem is a reply, using the same rhyme scheme, to a sonnet by Giacomo Colonna, in which the Bishop of Lombez speaks of his delight at hearing tell in the Roman Forum of how

---

[63] Robert Durling reproduces fourteen of these 'Poems Excluded from the *Rime sparse*' at the close of his English translation of the *Canzoniere*. Of these, seven are replies to sonnets from correspondents, and at least one other appears to be addressed to another 'signor gentile' ('L'oro e le perle' - Durling 1976: 595).

> del novo et degno fiorentin poeta
> sopra le tempie verdeggiava illoro (*RVF* 322.12-13)
>
> on the temples of the new and worthy Florentine poet
> there grew green a laurel wreath

Colonna died only a few months after Petrarch's coronation, and his poem opens with a barely hypothetical image of the parts of his own body 'destrutte | et ritornate in athomi et faville (ll.1-2), destroyed and reduced to atoms. In his working papers, Petrarch dated his response December 5, 1366, some twenty-five years after Colonna's death, and entitled it 'Responsio mea. Sero valde', or ‘My reply. Late indeed’ (Durling 1975: 500). By the time Petrarch was writing, in the last decade of his own long life, the only kind of direct address he saw fit to introduce to the *Canzoniere* was one to an addressee no longer alive to hear or read him.

---

[64] Because a significant part of my argument involves this determination on Petrarch's part to unify the disparate texts that make up the *Rime sparse* into a single work, a *Canzoniere,* I have throughout tended to prefer the latter title to the former. The contrast between the two names for Petrarch's collection of vernacular lyrics is, however, a useful reminder that that tension between dispersal and unification is never fully resolved, and I have occasionally deployed the former title in the text as just such a reminder, where it seemed appropriate to do so. I have, of course, also retained it in quotations from critics who prefer it.

## 2.4 Poetry, letters, and the Henrician privatisation of power

As we have seen, Petrarch's poetic practice took place within an atmosphere in which the lyric tended to serve a primarily epistolary, social function that reflected its complicity in and dependence upon the ongoing privatization of power and wealth. Even as the figure of the poet was elevated, and poetry's cultural capital  increased, real understanding of poetry diminished, along with its power to actually shape both private lives and, perhaps most importantly, public discourse.  Deprived of affective power over the will, and relegated to the status of a mere *intrattenimento* for the *roco mormador di corti*, (*RVF* 360.117), the vulgar mob of courtiers clustered about the palaces of both the curia in Avignon and the  princelings of northern Italy, lyric poetry's public role had been seriously debased, both in relation to its immediate past (one cannot help but think of Dante here) and in comparison with the classical age of Cicero and Seneca. This, at least, was Petrarch's view.

Yet Petrarch's attitude towards these new circumstances in which poetry found itself was profoundly conflicted. On the one hand, the new 'privatised' ambience of the courts was, at least superficially, sympathetic to poets: indeed, it was more or less the only foster home available to lyric poetry, especially that written in the vernacular. Petrarch could still hope that the older, educated aristocracy, typified by Robert of Anjou, might preside over a poetic rebirth; or, alternatively, that the new courts could be transformed into centres for the new humanist learning more conducive to a serious engagement with poetry, and to poetry's serious, properly public role (in the Kantian sense) in the inward and outward life of man. Yet for his own poetry to perform such a public function, Petrarch, as I have attempted to show, had to stage a complex retreat from the kind of private, social entanglements that originally nurtured not only his own work, but also the growth of its audience and, subsequently, of the fame that would underwrite its transcendence of its occasional, socially situated genesis. This ambivalent retreat runs as a vein throughout Petrarch's work, but, as I hope again to have shown, it is particularly apparent when we focus on the epistolary origins of Petrarch's vernacular lyrics.

If we turn our attention to Tudor England, we find that there, too, the Petrarchan sonnet has its beginnings in courtly epistolary and pseudo-epistolary exchanges that embed the poems in particularized social contexts. As many critics have noted, 'Tudor writing was a social activity' (Pincombe and Shrank 2010: 165), and the reading and writing of lyric verse took place within the 'socially dialogic' context of manuscript miscellanies and poetry anthologies (Marotti 1995: 159). Yet there too writers in the new Petrarchan mode found themselves attracted to it by its capacity to express and publicize certain kinds of withdrawal; and also ultimately having to negotiate a way beyond that social embeddedness, and out of those epistolary origins.

As Gordon Braden notes, Petrarchism sought out the courts of western Europe 'as if they were its natural home', despite the significant vein of anti-curial sentiment running through Petrarch's most widely read writings (Braden 2004: 241). And in fact, recent work on Petrarchism's English beginnings suggests that it may have been in part precisely Petrarchism's aesthetic of withdrawal and its profoundly ambivalent attitude toward courtly life that first made it attractive to English poets, and in particular to Sir Thomas Wyatt, the first of the English Petrarchans.[65] Wyatt's two dozen English translations of poems from Petrarch's *Canzoniere* circulated in manuscript at the court of Henry VIII (and, as we shall see, probably beyond) along with a similar number of versions of more recent French and Italian poems clearly written under Petrarch's influence. These verses, many of which we know were set to music, may well have been performed at the court, possibly by the king's Brescian musician, Zuan Piero, and perhaps even by Wyatt himself, who characterizes himself in his sonnets not as a poet but as a singer-lutanist.[66] Yet if Wyatt's poems evidently served a social function as courtly *intrattenimenti*, it is equally apparent that they express a deep ambivalence not only toward the court and courtly life, but toward their own status as entertainment. Wyatt's poems are indeed courtly 'in the original sense of that term - lyrics showing the abrasions of life at court, or frequent close encounters within a small circuit' (Braden 2004: 243). Petrarchism's ellipses, the potentially suffocating claustrophobia of its closed system, its suppression of the specifics of the occasion of composition, and of the identity of its addressee, its ambiguous deictics, all mimetically echoed or otherwise answered to the 'nascent culture of surreption and surveillance' (Lerer 1997: 12) at a court where, as Stephen Greenblatt put it, conversation with the king in person 'must have been like small talk with Stalin' (Greenblatt 1980: 136-7; ). Partly under the influence of Greenblatt's reading of the later Henrician court as a site of growing tyranny, critics such as Seth Lerer, Greg Walker, James Simpson and Mary Thomas Crane have in various ways all read the lyric poetry of Wyatt and his early Tudor followers as, at least in part, a response to the growing concentration of power in the king's ever more autocratic grasp. In an interpretative framework that has the attraction of situating Wyatt's long-recognised poetics of 'inwardness' in a specific, historicized cultural and political milieu, Henry's privatisation of power is seen as resulting in a concomitant turn inward on the part of the courtier-poet and his language.[67]

---

[65] For George Puttenham, looking back from the late 1580s, the Petrarchan origins of a fundamental shift in English poetry were clear. In 'the latter end' of Henry VIII's reign, he argued in *The Arte of English Poesie*, there sprang up 'a new company of courtly makers, of whom Sir Thomas Wyatt th'elder and Henry, Earl of Surrey were the two chieftains, who, having travailed into Italy and there tasted the sweet and stately measures and style of the Italian Poesy as novices […] greatly polished our rude and homely manner of vulgar Poesy. […] I repute them […] for the two chief lanterns of light to all others who have since employed their pens upon English Poesy, their conceits were lofty, their styles stately, their conveyance cleanly, their terms proper, their metre sweet and well proportioned, in all imitating very naturally and studiously their master Francis Petrarch' (Puttenham 1968 [1589]: 48-9). Surrey in fact never seems to have visited Italy, and Wyatt to have done so only once.

---

[66] Wyatt may well have performed his poems at court, either reading them aloud or singing them to the accompaniment of a lute. C. S. Lewis (1954: 230) argued that he did, and is supported by Raymond Southall (1964: 9-11), while John Stevens (1961: 112-113) and Elizabeth Heale (1998:82) also consider this possibility. More recently Jon Robinson has offered an unconvincing reading of the 'initial performances' of Wyatt's lyrics, which he equates with a 'first reading' which 'was more than likely made by the poet himself to the king and court' (2008: 2; cf. 105-140).

[67] Wyatt's introduction into the English lyric of a new kind of inwardness ultimately indebted to the *Canzoniere*, 'the source of an extraordinary rhetoric of introspection', has long been a critical commonplace (Mortimer 2005: 12). Raymond Southall offered an early yet still influential statement of this position (1964: 98ff), which has been re-articulated, with

Thus James Simpson has emphasized how the 'peculiarly repressive discursive conditions of the Henrician court' pushed Wyatt towards adoption of Petrarchan forms and the Petrarchan sense of a conflicted self (2004: 152); while for Greg Walker what made Wyatt and Surrey special was that they chose to address their readers 'not as an audience of royal subjects, but as a readership of Englishmen, victims of the same despotic regime, and potential agents of its redemption' (2005: 432). For Walker, Wyatt was looking more or less consciously to conjure into being a new literary territory for writers and readers, one that thanks to its independence from the court might exercise a reforming influence upon it. The parallels with Petrarch should, I hope, be obvious, although Walker never really draws them.

Mary Crane, meanwhile, puts it slightly differently. For her, the amorous lyrics circulating in manuscript at the Henrician court give 'expression to a privatized individual feeling self', 'rediscovered […] as a means of countering the centralized and increasingly impersonal power of the Tudor monarchy' (1993*:* 150). Crane's wording highlights a fact that complicates the neat critical framework largely shared by Greenblatt, Simpson and Walker. England's slide under Henry towards an authoritarian dictatorship entailed *both* the privatisation of power in the hands of an increasingly totalitarian king ever more governed by his private passions and moods, *and* the rapid growth of a depersonalised administrative state apparatus. Although this will not be the main thrust of my argument here, it will perhaps be helpful in the reading of Wyatt that followes to see the dynamic of a knotted, ironic, self-protective interiority on the one hand and an intervention in public or pseudo-public discourse *precisely through the reticent display of that interiority* on the other as the mirror-image of that simultaneous privatization and centralisation of power ongoing in the latter half of Henry's reign.

---

variations, in most major studies of Wyatt since, including, of course, Stephen Greenblatt's *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (1980). Anne Ferry's account of Wyatt's 'inward language', published in 1983, has also been influential, although Ferry, as reviewers pointed out, mysteriously elides Petrarch and Petrarchism's influence.

Seth Lerer, meanwhile (whose work on the epistolary origins of Tudor lyric poetry has already been alluded to earlier in this chapter) has explored just how closely Wyatt's conception of his verse is bound up with epistolarity and with the fears and desires associated with the secrecy and interception of letters. Treating Wyatt's *Declaration* and *Defence*, taken together, as 'a manifesto of editorial principles', Lerer notes how '[t]hey come to equate poem and letter as forms of discourse equally subject to the slippage of the pen or the intrusions of the interceptor' (1997: 184). Lerer then goes on to make one of the central claims of his study:

> The status of manuscript poems in the age of Wyatt *is* the letter — not just in coterie circles of exchange that defined gentlemanly class against the stigma of public and commercial print, but rather as documents that have all the intimacy of the epistle; documents, in short, that work like letters and that, in their transcription and compilation, operate as intercepted letters in the coteries of courtly culture. (1997: 184)

Lerer identifies this as a Chaucerian, 'Pandaran' aesthetic, and makes a persuasive case for the 'native' Chaucerian influence on Wyatt's verse. Yet Lerer's account, as I have already argued, singularly fails to take account of why Wyatt should have adopted the continental, Petrarchan form for so much of his most potent work. Of course, a desire on Wyatt's part to fashion a public image as a poet at the cutting edge of literary fashion can be evoked, and no doubt played a significant role in his adoption of Italianate verse forms. Yet the parallels with Petrarch's own lyric practice are striking enough and appear to run deep enough to make their further investigation worthwhile. In particular, while the conceit of the 'Pandaran' intercepted letter certainly helps to account for something of the dialectic of reticence and revelation at work in Wyatt's most intriguing sonnets, it cannot adequately explain, I think, the withdrawal from that epistolary context itself that I would argue we find there. This is a withdrawal that perhaps only becomes fully apparent when we compare Wyatt's poems as they circulated in manuscript with their presentation in Richard Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes* (1557), some fifteen years after Wyatt's death, and we shall therefore defer discussion of Wyatt's sonnets until we can situate them in that context.[68] Before that, we shall look at what is probably Wyatt's most famous explicitly epistolary poem, the verse satire 'To Myne Owne John Poyntz', to see how Petrarchan overtones fuse with yet also trouble a more neo-Stoic withdrawal from courtly circles. Before doing so, however, it will be useful to briefly survey the significance of the letter in early modern European literary and political culture.

## 2.5 The Early Modern Letter

The literature produced over the last thirty years on the early modern epistle is vast. A few years ago, James Daybell's surveys of recent studies in sixteenth-century and seventeenth-century letters extend over two articles and more than sixty-five pages (2005: 331-62; 2006: 135-70). Letter-writing's centrality to commercial, political and cultural life , the letter's role in social functions, in constituting and maintaining homosocial relations, its deployment by women and significance for our understanding of women's history, its rhetorics, and its relation to the development of the vernaculars of Europe have all been the subject of numerous articles, books, debates and controversies. Since Daybell's surveys of the field, appreciation of the letter's role in almost every aspect of early modern life, and especially in literary works, has, if anything, grown.[69]

---

[68] Tottel's miscellany, as it has come to be better known, was to serve as 'almost the sole school of poetry for English writers' until the publication of Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar* in 1579, popularising the Petrarchan mode in England. We shall return later too to Cathy Shrank's argument that rather than there are 'hitherto unrecognized continuities' between the "courtly makers" of the Henry VIII and the later Elizabethan sonneteers' (2007: 31). I should note here that I will not be suggesting in what follows that Wyatt consciously copied this withdrawal from courtly, epistolary origins from Petrarch. At a deeper, structural level, though, it seems probable that Wyatt's engagement with Petrarch and his Italian and French imitators helped shape, quite literally, his deployment of a Pindaran-Petrarchan anti-epistolary aesthetic.

[69] The importance of letters in literary works of the early modern period seems to have come under particular scrutiny in the last four or five years, as witnessed by Alan Stewart's *Shakespeare's Letters* (2009), as well as his work with Heather Wolfe on *Letterwriting in Renaissance England* (2005).

These studies have inevitably all had to struggle with (and have often been generated by) the Renaissance letter's ambivalent, vigilantly crafted imbrications of the intimate and the revelatory, its fluctuating, ambiguous status in relation to the public and the private. Early modern letters often 'combined the official and professional with the personal in a way that in the premodern world seemed entirely natural' (Grafton 2009: 21), but which to us can be surprising, and often quite moving. The modern assumption that letters 'circulate between private individuals by means of an anonymous and impersonal postal service', while underpinning most theoretical approaches to letter-writing over the last thirty years, such as Derrida's *The Post Card* (1987), is, as Alan Stewart notes, 'an assumption that will not bear scrutiny' in the early modern context (2008: 9). Letters were delivered by various means, often involving the employment of servants or messengers. Household secretaries or amanuenses frequently wrote letters on behalf of their signatories, and particularly in aristocratic households were often entrusted with the entire process, from composition of the contents to the arrangements for their delivery. The receipt of letters, like their composition, was often 'by no means a private affair': in the world of Shakespeare, 'letters are usually delivered in public, and often read silently in public, or aloud in gatherings of various sizes' (Stewart 2008: 10). As Stewart concludes, 'these habits necessarily challenge our causal linking of letter-writing and individual privacy' (2008: 10). At the same time, epistolary exchange at its most private enabled writers 'to create communities—both of people and of information—that crossed political, linguistic, and religious borders', establishing a 'capillary system along which information could travel from papal Rome to Calvinist strongholds in the north, and vice versa' (Grafton 2009: 23, 22). Letters could bind writers together in imagined communities whose bonds might be made all the stronger by the risk their authors and recipients ran: if the vulnerability of letters to interception and their value as potentially damning evidence often provoked understandably heightened levels of paranoia and suspicion, they also must have foregrounded trust as a virtue.

The importance both of Petrarch's own epistolary practice and of his recuperation of classical epistolary models for the development of the most important of these imagined communities, the republic of letters, has already been mentioned, and has been most recently and perhaps most articulately restated by Anthony Grafton in his *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West* (2009). Yet while Petrarch contributed very visibly to the shaping of the precursor to Habermas's 'public realm', he also played a part in intensifying the private aspect of the early modern letter. While the influence of the medieval *ars dictaminis* persisted, Petrarch passed on to the Renaissance humanists the lesson he learnt from Cicero; that true letters, rather than coldly following a prescriptive formula, should create an affective, intimate bond between correspondents. Thus in his *Libellus de conscribendis epistolis,* Erasmus, arguably the foremost Renaissance theoretician of the letter, likens it to the private, even secretive whisper:

> For this ought to be the character of the letter: as if you were whispering in a corner with a dear friend, not shouting in the theatre, or otherwise somewhat unrestrainedly. For we commit many things to letters, which it would be shameful to express openly in public. (1521: fol. 1r)

Erasmus's simile, however, also points to a darker, more sinister side to Renaissance epistolary practice. Constantly subject to interception and potentially shameful publication, letters on amatory, religious or political matters could be and were repeatedly produced as evidence of the immoral, heretical or traitorous behaviour of their authors and/or their intended recipients. By Tudor times, if not before, 'the illicit reading, if not interception, of both personal and official correspondence had [...] become the primary means of diplomatic leveraging in the English and the European courts' (Lerer 1997: 111). Perhaps the most notorious example of private epistolary poetry in something approximating the Petrarchan mode being (allegedly) intercepted and produced as evidence is the case of the 'Casket Sonnets' produced at the trial of Mary, Queen of Scots. That these sonnets may well have been faked in order to ensure Mary's condemnation and blacken her reputation only highlights just how potent such 'evidence' was considered to be. Moreover, if private letter-writing was a potentially dangerous activity, abstaining from letter-writing could be equally perilous. Muriel St. Claire Byrne records the 'anxieties and distress' felt by members of the Lyle family throughout the 1530s concerning the preservation and destruction of potentially seditious letters: 'the destruction of private letters could become yet another account in an indictment for treason. To burn letters of receipt…might be dangerous. To have no letters to produce could be as fatal as to have indiscreet letters. Their absence could be interpreted as evidence that one had something to conceal' (Lerer, 1997: 29, n.117).

In such a context, it is intriguing to note that Erasmus excised the above passage from the text of the *Libellus de conscribendis epistolis* that he allowed to be published in 1522, if indeed it was his at all. It appears only in the pirated edition that appeared the preceding year. We should be wary of reading such bibliographical information too confidently, but perhaps the exclusion of this insistence on the letter's intrinsically secretive nature hints at what troubled territory this was for the sixteenth century.

Against this historical backdrop, writers of all kinds of texts, including poetry and personal letters, resorted to theatricalized dialogues to shield themselves from accusations of suspicion, caught in the pull between public and private – between the licitly observed and the illicitly performed. Lerer hypothesizes that 'the spectacle of the King's theatricalized body may have provoked a new sense of the private in the court: an understanding that shouts must be discussed in whispers'. In this environment, 'not just letter writing but letter reading takes on a newly clandestine quality – one that makes the act of reading something of a voyeuristic act, a peeping into corners where the eye should not be led' (Lerer 1997: 13). It will be my argument here that epistolary exchange functions in the Renaissance as a – perhaps even the – fundamental figure for the communion between poet and reader. It is consciously deployed as such, but the letter is also so fundamental an aspect of medieval and early modern textual culture that epistolarity inevitably functions at a subconscious level as a structuring framework for thought. The multifarious pleasures and risks of the author-reader relationship, and, in particular, of publication, whether through print or manuscript, are all focused in and through the letter, which holds together associations with erotic delight, the dangers of transmission, and anxieties over in- or mis-comprehension, and over inappropriate and unintended readers. Moreover, the letter usually – although not always – is, at least implicitly, dialogic: it invites a response, an exchange, a relationship of reciprocity. In this there is often something implicitly provisional, an orientation towards the future and that which is yet to be written: the text that will emerge out of a response to the co-respondent's articulation of his or her own engagement with an earlier epistle. The analogy cannot be pushed too far, but, as I hope what follows will suggest, there is surely something in the sonnet sequence that formally parallels or echoes one side of an exchange of letters. In addition, as the preceding reading of Petrarch's own complex relationship with the epistolary has shown, seeing the Petrarchan sonnet, at least, through the lens of its agon with the letter, enables us to read it not only in a historical context but also as a text addressed, like one of Petrarch's best-known epistles, to posterity: that is, to ourselves.

A good part of the fascination for us of the epistolary practices of the Renaissance lies in their various modes of inhabiting this shadowy liminal zone in which the private often risks exposure, while a kind of virtual public space is shaped through intimate, frequently secretive exchange. The complex intertwinings of epistolary and poetic practices in Early Modern culture have been recognized in important studies of, for example, the convention of the prefatory dedicatory epistle, and renewed attention to explicitly epistolary verse. The relation of the epistolary to the lyric, however, has been somewhat less explored: where it is considered, it is largely in terms of the means of circulation, the ways in which lyric poems were disseminated in manuscript form, often enclosed within intimate letters; or in terms of the similar role the exchange of both letters and poems could play in cementing homosocial bonds of friendship.

## 2.6 Epistolary satire and the problem of the addressee

Now let us return to Wyatt. The best-known and most explicit of Wyatt's expressions of anti-courtly sentiment is to be found in his verse epistle, or epistolary satire, 'Myne owne John Poyntz'. Addressed to a friend at court by a poet in rural retreat, this letter participates in and openly acknowledges a long tradition of stoic anti-curial writing, a tradition that Petrarch, as we have seen, had done much to revive. Indeed, 'Myne owne John Poyntz' can be read as an intertwining of a medieval, Boethian Stoicism and a more classical, Renaissance neo-Stoicism indebted in part to Petrarch. Elsewhere in Wyatt's work these strands are more obviously separated. In 'If thou wilt mighty be', Wyatt had adapted material from the third book of Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy* into 'a textbook lesson' on the importance of a monarch subduing all his own vices and passions in order to legitimately judge and rule those of others (Walker 2005: 296). In the short lyric 'Stond who so list', meanwhile, Wyatt delineated the orthodox classical neo-Stoic view of the advantages of rustic retreat over the vicissitudes and perils of courtly life, translating a passage from Seneca's *Thyestes* that would later also appeal to Andrew Marvell. 'Myne owne John Poyntz' is a transcreation of the tenth satire of Luigi Alamanni, an Italian contemporary. Like Petrarch, Alamanni was living in exile from Florence, and, like Petrarch, had taken up residence in Provence. His satire opens with a promise to explain to Tommaso Sertini, its addressee, 'perch'amo e colo | Più di tutti altri il lito Provenzale' (Alamanni 1786: 67 - ll.2-3), and, perhaps unsurprisingly given the similarities between its author's life and Petrarch's, it is rich with verbal and sonic echoes of the *Canzoniere*.

Carefully clarifying that it is not out of disrespect for those who, ‘per sangue, e per ricchezze’ (as a result of blood, or of riches) have power over him that he flees the press of courts (l.9) , Alamanni declares:

Ma ben è ver ch’ assai gli estimo meno
Che ‘l vulgo, e quei ch’ a ciò ch’ appar di fuore
Guardan, senza veder che chiugga il seno. (ll.10-12)

which Wyatt translates thus:

It is not because I scorn or mock
The power of them to whom Fortune hath lent
Charge over us, of right to strike the stroke;
But true it is that I have always meant
Less to esteem them than the common sort,
Of outward things that judge in their intent
Without regard what doth inward resort. (7-13)

Behind Alamanni’s original lines here we can hear the opening sonnet of Petrarch’s *Canzoniere*, with its turn at the sestet to consider how the poet has become exposed to public ridicule and shame as a result of his love, and of its exposure through the circulation of his own poems. The echoes are both sonic and structural (‘Ma ben è ver ‘/’Ma ben veggio or’ ’) and thematic, with the reference by Alamanni to the ‘vulgo’ (a significant word for Petrarch, as we have seen) here recalling the ‘popol tutto’ of Petrarch’s proem. Consciously put in place by Alamanni or not, these echoes function on one level to further individuate his position: where Petrarch is confessing to having made a blazon of his heart, albeit, perhaps, inadvertently, and to having thus become an object of public mockery, Alamanni marks himself out as one who, rather than looking only at outward appearances, at ‘ciò ch’ appar di fuore’, pays attention to ‘che chiugga il seno’, what the breast encloses.[70] But on another level, the invocation of Petrarch also lends a legitimacy, a Petrarchan authority to Alamanni's neo-Stoic withdrawal, recalling Petrarch's own anti-curial stance and study of the secrets of the heart. One of the difficult lessons that Petrarch's opening sonnet presents the poet as having learned at great pains — that of the risks of self-exposure, particularly in a courtly environment — is one that Alamanni presents himself as having also learned.

---

[70] Curiously Rebholz, without citing the original, gives the Italian sense as ‘without seeing what the depth shows’, which loses (as Wyatt does) something of the concrete quality of Alamanni’s image (Rebholz 1978: 440).

Furthermore, the Petrarchan echo also intimates that in advocating a Stoic withdrawal, Alamanni will not fall prey to an un-Christian suppression of passion.[71] The Renaissance revived anti-Stoicism along with Stoicism, as Richard Strier notes, and 'the two strands exist in opposition and complex interaction throughout the period' (Strier 2004: 23), just as they do in Petrarch's own works. It was no doubt inevitable that two discourses as powerful as Stoicism and Petrarchism should mingle in the Renaissance, but by tinting one's neo-Stoicism with Petrarchan hues one could indicate one's possession of a sensibility, and a sensitivity, that would make one's Stoic withdrawal all the more admirable, all the greater an achievement. Rather than the Stoic sage of the *Tusculan Disputations,* who greets the news of his child's death with the words 'I was already aware that I had begotten a mortal', rather than the ideal man Coluccio Salutati mockingly described as 'not a man but a tree trunk, a useless piece of wood, a hard rock', we have the melancholy Petrarchan-Stoic who, in Alamanni's words, 'Viva temprando il mio infinito duolo', who lives tempering his infinite sorrow (King 1945: III.xxiv; Vlastos 1971: 16 - both cited Strier 2004: 25; Alamanni 1786: 67 - l.6).

---

[71] As Richard Strier argues, the notion that the control of "passion" by "reason" is the 'fundamental ethical-psychological ideal' of the whole "Western Tradition" distorts intellectual history not only by equating a great variety of classical philosophy with a severe understanding of a Socratic or Stoic position, but by eliding the 'praise of passion' (Strier 2004: 23). This emanates on the one side from the Aristotelian tradition, and on the other from the Judaeo-Christian tradition: for the Aristotelians, because the "mean" is conceptual and situational rather than arithmetic or fixed, 'the "right amount" of emotion for a circumstance need not be a moderate amount'; while the Judaeo-Christian tradition, 'insofar as it is biblical, is a tradition that allows for strong, even uncontrolled emotion', the Psalms, the behaviour of Jesus and of his disciples, and the passions of St. Paul's letters all being important cases in point (Strier 2004: 23).

As a mode of self-representation, this feeling Stoicism was to come to underwrite many of those mid-Tudor poetic subjects that Elizabeth Heale presents as having to show themselves both as passionate and rational; as familiar with courtly graces - most obviously demonstrated by a facility in the writing of courtly love lyrics - and yet as ethically stable and reformed characters. (In doing so, of course - inasmuch as it betrays itself as a rhetorical ploy of self-fashioning - it might be thought to risk undoing its already publicized withdrawal. Yet that withdrawal is almost always half-game, a move in which it is at least as important to indicate one's understanding of the kind of public persona one is expected to fashion, as it is to be identical with that persona.) Perhaps equally significantly, however, lacing one's Stoicism with a healthy dose of Petrarchism allowed the poet, both at the practical and the theoretical level, to affect the reader's will, answering to the Renaissance's privileging of rhetoric. As Strier notes, Petrarch declared his own preference for Cicero over Aristotle to be founded upon the fact that upon reading Aristotle 'I know a little bit more than I knew before, but mind and will remain the same as they were, and I myself remain the same' (*De Ign.,* 266). He then goes on to make 'a key distinction, one that Plato, for instance, would not make' (Strier 2004: 24) - and, we might add, a distinctly anti-Stoic one: 'It is one thing to know, another to love; one thing to understand, another to will. He [Aristotle] teaches what virtue is, I do not deny that; but his lesson lacks the words that sting and set afire and urge toward love of virtue and hatred of vice, or has only the smallest amount of such power' (*De Ign.*, 268; cited Strier 2004: 24).

It is at the close that Wyatt's transcreation diverges most obviously from its Italian source. Alamanni's poem accumulates negative definitions of its Stoic self, as one who would not know how to call the cruel man severe, for example, or how to trick men and God with promises ('Non saprei l'uom crudel chiamar severo' [...] 'non saprei ingannar gli uomini, e Dio | Con giuramenti'). Each negative, as in Wyatt's version, implicitly attributes to the poet a corresponding positive virtue. Approximately halfway through Alamanni's epistle, these negatives shift to focus on questions of place, prompted by thoughts of the poet's new locale: 'Oggi in Provenza volentier dimoro' — Today in Provence I happily dwell. The negative virtues of the poet's Petrarchan retreat in Provence remain the poem's principal theme to its close, the emphasis on 'Provenza' reinforced 13 lines from the poem's end. As the poet withdraws ever further, our sense of a real addressee behind this 'letter' fades, and the poem seems to close with an avowal of the 'pace vera' that the poet has discovered. In a retreat inwards into a supposedly authentic self closely bound up with not merely country retreat but with a specifically Petrarchan locus, society, the addressee, and thus the social character of the poem appear to be left behind.

Looked at more closely, however, the epistle's ending leaves open the possibility of an alternative, divergent reading. Here is the final sentence of the poem:

> Non le gran Corti omai, non l'alte Soglie
> Mi vedran gir co i lor seguaci a schiera,
> Né di me avran troppo onorate spoglie
> Avarizia, e livor, ma pace vera.
>
> No longer will the grand courts, nor the high entrances
> See me going round with their crowds of hangers-on,
> Nor will greed and spite have too honoured spoils of me
> But true peace.

Who will be the recipient of this 'pace vera'? Given all that has gone before, we naturally associate it with the serenity of the poet's new environment, Provence, which the poet has absorbed and internalised. Yet in fact it is the poet himself who at the poem's close becomes the active bearer of this true tranquility, and the recipients, rather than the poet, are the half-personified vices of the court, 'Avarizia, e livor' with the 'alti Soglie', or high thresholds, evoking the contrasting *stoa* of the Stoics). All this is easy enough to reconcile with our expectations, of course: the conceit that the poet, freed from courtly concerns, offers no honourable spoils to courtly greed , but only the peace he has found in his Stoic retreat, is on one level a simple one. By recasting the poet at his letter's close as active agent rather than passive beneficiary, however, Alamanni signals that the peace of his retreat will - or at least may - be bestowed upon the court, exercising a transformative influence upon its vices. How? The answer is clear - through the poem, through Alamanni's letter to Tommaso Sertini. The epistle's apparently progressive withdrawal from, or forgetting of, its specific addressee thus comes to make sense: the truly intended recipient of its public, anti-courtly message is, of course, the court. The negatory nature of that message, however, necessitates the conceit of a private letter, of a refusal to engage in a hopelessly corrupted courtly discursive field.

The peace with which the poem closes, then, carries an ambivalent charge. On the one hand, inasmuch as that peace is itself the ultimate negation of all the positive ills of court, a final cleansing of the spirit, it is the culmination of the build up of negations over the whole course of the epistle, of the correspondent's self-definition in terms of what he *doesn't* say or know. This negation, which is of course first and foremost a negation of the social values of the court, informs the syntactic structure of the whole poem, down to its very last sentence. On the other hand, however, the poem's very last word, *vera*, making *pace* an unmistakably positive virtue, marks the moment at which the accumulation of the negative energy of retreat is released as a positive charge. Withdrawal, the negation of social energy and of epistolarity, claims for itself a public, political potency, a potency that inheres, however, only in its paradoxical refusal to participate in a (hopelessly debased and socialised) public discourse.

When we turn to Wyatt, we find that he follows Alamanni in his build-up of negatives, but these reach a crescendo midway through his poem: 'I cannot, I; no, no, it will not be!' (l.76). As Walker points out, this 'remarkable irruption of personal emotion' has the effect of 'stopping the narrative in its tracks' (2005: 307). It is followed by a deictic ambiguity worthy of Petrarch:

> This is the cause that I could never yet
> Hang on their slevis that weigh, as though mayst see,
> A chip of chance more than a pound of wit. (ll.77-79)

That 'This' has an ambiguous referent. Ostensibly rolling up into one ball all the matter that has gone before, it points more locally, Walker argues, to the absent presence in the poem of Henry VIII, signalled by the 'collation of lechery and tyranny' in the immediately preceding lines, another of Wyatt's additions to his source (Walker 2005: 307).[72] After this climax, Wyatt, returning to Alamanni's text, enumerates the places he is not now to be found. Where Alamanni shifts his focus in the second part of his epistle to Provence, however, it is only in the closing four lines of 'To Myne owne John Poyntz' that Wyatt reveals the locus of his new retreat:

> But here I am in Kent and Christendom
> Among the Muses where I read and rhyme,
> Where if thou list, my Poyntz, for to come,
> Thou shalt be judge how I do spend my time. (ll.100-103)

'In Kent and Christendom': is Wyatt in one place, or two? Wyatt's parataxis allows for multiple readings. It invites us to see it as establishing an equivalence which sets Wyatt's refuge against the irreligious, corrupted, dishonest world beyond. *Kent* is Christendom, as opposed to the unholy press of courts who 'crouch' and 'kneel [...] To worship them like God on earth alone | That are like wolves' (25-27) (or as opposed to Spain, where 'one must him incline, |Rather than to be, outwardly to seem' (91-92); or to Rome, 'where Christ is given in prey | for money, poison and treason' (97-98)). The play on the old proverb, 'in Kent *or* Christendom', heightens the sense of a reversal of the natural order of things, and of virtue shrunken to this small corner of Protestant England.[73] Yet given the popular use of 'Christendom' in an *inclusive* manner, to refer to the whole of the western world, we can also read Wyatt's lines here as asserting the persistence of a connection to the socio-political universe, even in (enforced) withdrawal. Kent is part of Christendom too, and if Wyatt is not there in the courtly press, his poem, like Alamanni's, engages with courtly discourse through its negation of it.

---

[72] 'Say he is rude that cannot lie and feign, | The lecher a lover, and tyranny | To be the right of a prince's reign' (74-76).

This brings us to what is perhaps Wyatt's most significant deviation from his Italian source. Where Alamanni omits any address to Sertini from the close of his poem, whose immediate epistolary pretext is backgrounded as the poem progresses, the close of Wyatt's poem returns to address Poyntz directly, inviting him to be the 'judge' of the poet's retreat, and of his art. Moreover, where Alamanni closes with a hint that his withdrawal presents a model with the potential to reform the 'gran Corti', and thus in a sense turns back toward them, Wyatt invites his friend to join him, and thus, by 'subtracting' him from court, in a sense attempts to redouble the negative charge built up over the course of the poem. By reiterating the ostensibly private, epistolary character of the satire, the close of 'To Myne Owne John Poyntz' succeeds in redoubling the rejection of courtly hypocrisy and the atmosphere of intimate retreat found in Alamanni's poem. On the other hand, it also redoubles that sense in the Italian original that this withdrawal has some sort of potential to reform the court. In Alamanni's 'Satira decima' this is never more than a hint, and perhaps this is true of Wyatt's satire too; but by turning back to address

---

[73] As Rebholz notes, the proverb, listed in Tilley, derived from the fact that Kent, unlike most of England, remained unconverted to Christianity in the reign of King Ethelbert and was therefore not considered a part of Christendom. [...] Wyatt's placing of Kent in Christendom is therefore partly a joke, in that it reverses the proverb, and partly a way of affirming that life in the countryside of Kent can be more genuinely Christian than life at court' (Rebholz 1978: 445). Wyatt's poem also implicitly evokes Kent's long history of resistance, dating back to Kent's designation as a semi-autonomous County Palatine in 1067, largely as a result of its resistance to Norman rule, and including its prominent role in subsequent rebellions, such as the Peasants' Revolt of 1381 and Jack Cade's rebellion of 1450. Wyatt's son, Thomas Wyatt the younger, was of course to play a leading role in the 1554 Kentish uprising against Mary I's betrothal to Philip of Spain.

Poyntz, a courtier himself, and inviting him both to join Wyatt in removing to the country and to judge how the poet now spends his time, it makes Kent simultaneously both the site of an ongoing dialogue with the court, and a model for an alternative site for the construction of a value system and a literary and political community. It is a carefully controlled balancing act, and in it we see a paradigmatic example of how Wyatt addresses an audience not of royal subjects, but of Englishmen united by a resistance to tyrannizing power (cf. Walker 2005: 432).

Furthermore, where Alamanni's poem is an ending, Wyatt's is a beginning. If there is that hint that Alamanni's 'pace vera' has reforming potential, the dominant tenor of his poem is nevertheless that that peace marks an end to his struggles both with the evils of courtly life and with his own 'infinito duolo' (6), his own infinite sorrow. Wyatt's poem, however, looks to the future: 'Where if thou list, my Poyntz, *for to come*, | Thou shalt be judge how I do spend my time' (102-103: my emphasis). In turning back to its addressee, Wyatt's epistle seems to promise the construction of some unspecified alternative, some perhaps as yet undetermined project. If we can say anything about it, it is that it will be grounded in literary reading and writing: 'I read and rhyme' (101). It seems, too, to be both the project of the single self, albeit bifurcated as reader and rhymer, and to require another, as either 'judge' or audience. Anne Ferry has noted how, in his borrowings from the continent, 'Wyatt does not explicitly identify his speaker as a poet, or present him in the act of writing verses [...]. Nor elsewhere in Wyatt's sonnets, either translated or original, is the speaker identified as a poet-lover' (Ferry 1983: 92-93). As Gordon Braden observes, 'for a Petrarchist, this is a momentous absence' (Braden 2004: 248). Here, though, Wyatt does appear to identify himself as, if not a poet-lover, at least a reader-writer. More specifically, *rhyme* bridges the gap between a performative self-consciousness that is expressly that of a poet, of the sort that Braden suggests we almost never find in Wyatt, and his identification with the role of the lutanist, one Wyatt may or may not have actually performed.  Applicable to either role, it perhaps shows Wyatt moving beyond the kind of audience and conception of his art that Braden suggests he had in mind when writing his sonnets. Braden notes that whether Wyatt actually performed in the roles of singer and lutanist or not, his appropriation of this 'still foreign Italian manner', whether fictional or not, 'very possibly mediated his […] first encounter with Petrarch's texts' (Braden 2004: 250). However, as Braden goes on to point out, this 'would have placed them in a significantly un-Petrarchan or at least pre-Petrarchan situation: one like that of the troubadours, their eyes not on a distant audience to be reached by writing but on a present audience waiting to be entertained in the here and now' (ibid).

The role of singer, Braden suspects, 'attracted Wyatt in great part because of the way it implied that kind of context (ibid). If this is true of the sonnets, however, 'To Mine Owne John Poyntz' marks a serious shift in Wyatt's conception of both audience and art. On one level, this can be explained simply enough, through reference to Wyatt's changed circumstances: as Greg Walker notes:

> Deprived of regular access to the courtly circles that had provided both the subject matter and the audience for his amatory lyrics, the poet almost of necessity had to adapt his mode of writing if he was to maintain a relationship with a community of courtly readers. Short poems that adopted the fiction at least of oral performance had to give way to more obviously textual forms, since they would have to be despatched to geographically distant readers if they were to be read. Hence the epistolary poem was an attractive and obvious choice. (Walker 2005: 296)

By presenting himself within the complex, future-oriented dynamic of engagement and retreat explored above as a reader and a rhymer among the muses, however, Wyatt insinuates that he intends his present work to have a more serious, public end, and does so precisely through the (factitiously) more private medium of the epistle, rather than the publicly performed sonnet, *canzone* or *sonata*. Adapting a private form ostensibly intended to a single addressee was the best way of guaranteeing a public readership. And indeed, it seems that Wyatt's epistle may have reached a wider audience than any of his other work, or indeed any other early Tudor poem circulating in mansucript. As David Carlson notes, in the manuscript corpus of Henrician courtier writing, 'Mine owne John Poyntz' is the single most frequently recopied item, with six now or formerly complete copies extant (Carlson 2010: 151). Yet if on one level 'Mine Owne John Poyntz' represents a successful new solution to new circumstances, on another it indicates an enforced return to epistolary origins that Wyatt in his courtly lyrics had turned away from. To understand that turn, we will need to look at Wyatt's sonnets again, and it will be useful to do so through the prism of their publication in print by Richard Tottel.

## 2.7 *Tottel's Miscellany* and the sonnet as commodified form

When in 1557 Richard Tottel printed and published his *Songes and Sonettes* — containing ninety-seven poems attributed to Sir Thomas Wyatt and forty attributed to the Earl of Surrey, along with works by other named poets as well as ninety-four poems attributed to 'Uncertain auctors' — he made the new Petrarchan poetic mode available to a wider readership beyond the aristocratic, courtly circles in which these works had hitherto circulated. Perhaps the most obvious and influential example of how public printers could 'construct the court as subject of the intruding eye', Tottel's volume, as Lerer notes, offers its readership the opportunity to buy into the experience of the courtly compilation, granting an insight into aristocratic manuscript assembly and providing in turn a model for the reader's own compositions and personal anthologies (1997: 31-32). This new audience was drawn largely from those on the margins of the court, for whom, as Wendy Wall observes, it could function as a kind of conduct book (XXXX: 97). It also included in its number, no doubt, the ladies' men-in-waiting and the tutors in noble households who would perpetuate the sonneteering fashion in the early years of Elizabeth's reign. 'Central to the process of transmission', *Tottel's Miscellany*, as it has come to be better known, was to serve as 'almost the sole school of poetry for English writers' until the publication of Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar* in 1579: from Tottel these poets 'learnt not only the seriousness of which the new lyric poetry was capable, but also many new means of expression' (Walker 2005: 424; Baldi 1961: 5 - cited Walker 2005: 537, n.18).

For Christopher Warley, *Songes and Sonettes,* put together to make a profit on the open market, established the English sonnet at its origin as a 'commodified form' (Warley 2005: 54). It did this in part through a canny understanding of the interplay of public and private that would appeal to its target audience. As Elizabeth Heale puts it,

> Tottel's project was to make public the private poems of courtly and gentlemanly amateurs previously circulating in manuscripts owned by, in Tottel's ironic phrase, 'the ungentle horders up of such treasure'. [...] As we hold Tottel's small quarto in our hands, our sense is not of private matters drawn forth on to the public stage, but of privileged access into a cultivated private world. The volume gives us the illusion that it has merely extended the process of manuscript copying to reach a wider network of coterie readers, some of whom seem to have treated it as they would a manuscript miscellany, answering, adapting and freely imitating individual items. (Heale 2003: 14)

Wyatt had fused love and politics, using Petrarchism's capacity to evoke an unparalleled inwardness partly in order to find a space from which to articulate a critique of Henrician tyranny[74]. The titles Tottel invented for Wyatt's poems give the impression that they are all written by one single lover, who inevitably comes to be aligned with the author, as Tottel sets out to emphasize the miscellany's marketable revelation of scandalous biographical details[75]. At the level of the poet's individual style – most infamously, his troublesome metrics – Tottel does much to normalize idiosyncrasies. Semantic improprieties are eliminated in favour of a more elevated register. Tottel 'omitted Wyatt's most negative poems, damped the irony in the poems he did select, and rewrote them so that Wyatt's rebellious unchivalric courtier emerged sounding like a selfless, devoted romance hero' (Skura 2008: 41). He thus performs a double metamorphosis on Wyatt's lyrics. On the one hand, he largely strips Wyatt's poems of their political overtones, reducing them to occasional, purely private epistolary evidence of the poet's intimate amorous tribulations. For example, in printing Wyatt's 'The pillar pearisht is whearto I lent', a free imitation of Petrarch's 'Rotta è l'alta colonna e 'l verde lauro' (*RVF* 269), Tottel attaches to it the title 'The Lover laments the death of his love'. Most critics are in agreement, however, that the poem is a politically loaded lament for the execution of Wyatt's friend and patron, Thomas Cromwell, Earl of Essex, in July 1540. On the other hand, the titles Tottel attaches to Wyatt's poems, and the changes he makes to the text, serve to morph ambiguous, multivalent, difficult, irregular lyrics such as 'The pillar pearisht' into smooth verses fit for easy public consumption. Or, as Heale puts it, '[p]aradoxically the effect of Tottel's] titles is both to represent the poems as the spontaneous and intimate expression of individuals participating in an exemplary amorous narrative in a privileged social world, and at the same time to erase all sense of idiosyncrasy and possible irony' (Heale 2003: 15). As readers, we are encouraged to focus on the personal and amorous, rather than any political overtones. Wyatt, who had so carefully fashioned an aesthetic that might hope to find pity with those who, through their own experience, could understand his poetics of retreat, was, in the *Songes and Sonettes* of Tottel, made the *favola* of the crowd.

---

[74] As Walker notes, 'The Italian forms so useful as vehicles for the new amorous courtly verse were doubly effective for voicing the growing sense of political unease that the events of the 1530s provoked. Both their vernacular inwardness and their ostensibly playful indirection gave them their particular potency in courtly discourse. [...Petrarch [...] was, of course, himself adept at both political and amatory verse, and his innovations in each mode provided models for [Wyatt's] own work' (2005: 425).

---

[75] For more on how Tottel's editing of Wyatt's texts created an autobiographical aspect largely absent in the originals, see Heale 1998: 193-5. Heale also makes the plausible suggestion that part of the success of the *Songes and Sonettes* might have been due to the fact that, 'while offering models of taste to its upwardly mobile customers, it made courtly culture more palatable to a growing Protestant suspicion of insincerity and verbal manipulation by constructing little narratives in which the poems play an apparently self-expressive role' (1998: 192).

Much of the pleasure Tottel's miscellany promises lies in its revelation of texts supposedly intended for private circulation within an aristocratic coterie. At the same time, however, that reader's pleasure comes in no small part from the vicarious sense the poems themselves give him or her of being included within the intimate private circle, addressed by such titles as 'To his familiar frend' (148). While the 'exterior' motive and position of the reader might be that of the eavesdropper or the interceptor, once the reader engages with the lyrical fabric of the poems, that position has at least the potential to shift to an 'interior' mode, in which we position ourselves – or are positioned in the act of reading – as the poems' true addressees. The initial violence by which these verses are ripped from their coterie context and exposed to the public gaze is inverted by their powers of seduction, by the very intimacy that prompted their publication: the initial displacement of the poems is followed and substituted by the displacement of the reader into their private realm. Wyatt's poems in their manuscript contexts arguably function in precisely the opposite fashion: shocked by their idiosyncratic revelations of an intimate interiority, we are then thrown outward, as it were, by the discovery that that interiority conceals and reveals a political kernel (which, of course, is in turn a potentially even more profound and authentic revelation of self).

Tottel's revisions, then, ultimately obscure the complexities of the self they seek to expose to view. While retaining the paraphrasable content of Wyatt's lyrics, Tottel alters or removes many of the elements that root Wyatt's verse in the inward movement of the speaker's (and hence the reader's) mind. Meredith Skura has demonstrated how this occurs through a close comparison of Tottel's version of 'They fle from me' with the poem as it appears in the Devonshire and Egerton manuscripts. In the manuscript versions, Wyatt's lover's language is turned inward: 'for him it is the external, public reality that is vague, while inner memory is in perfect focus' (Skura 2008: 43). Tottel's reworking, however, seems to reveal an anxiety to anchor Wyatt's 'subjunctivity' (2008: 43) down to hard, chronological facts. The interpolations of 'Once' at the beginning of the poem's third line, and of 'now' in the sixteenth, chop Wyatt's continuous 'somtime' into discrete moments. Tottel's version

> transforms Wyatt's passive, puzzled lover into a crisply objective reporter, less ironically out of tune with the events he narrates. Tottel begins by adding a title that makes makes his lover active and assertive even before the poem begins: 'the lover sheweth how he is forsaken of such as he hath enjoyed.' Already Tottel's lover is different from Wyatt's. As we have seen, Wyatt's lover 'sheweth' very little; at most he suggesteth. (Skura 2008: 46-47)

As Skura adds in a footnote, 'while Tottel's title announces that the lover definitely "enjoyed" such as hath forsaken him, Wyatt's speaker never explicitly admits that he had "enjoyed" anything' (2008: 249, n67).

Perhaps most significantly of all, Wyatt's speaker closes not (as Skura sugggests) on a question at all, but with a couplet that expresses both a longing and an anger in its ambiguously conditionalized hope for a resolution to the continuing internal struggle to come to terms with the beloved's behaviour and merit (and, perhaps, his own):

> But since that I so kindly am served
> I would fain know what she hath deserved (ll. 20-21)

Tottel's version of these lines removes the ambiguity both of sentiment and thought: he rewrites Wyatt's interior monologue as 'one side of a locker-room exchange between two men', turning the introspective speaker into a 'regular guy' (Skura 2008: 47):

> But, sins that I unkindly so am served:
> How like you this, what hath she now deserved? (ll.20-21)

As Skura observes, 'when Tottel's lover asks his buddy "how like you this?" not only does he know the answer to the question, but he crassly repeats the exact words that "she" had used in her erotic teasing', a moment that in the manuscript version stands out limpidly as 'once in special' (l.9) (Skura 2008: 47).

Examples of such revisions to Wyatt's lyrics in the *Songes and Sonettes* could be multiplied almost infinitely. Whatever their localized disagreements, critics such as Anne Ferry, Arthur Marotti, Wendy Wall, Elizabeth Heale, Greg Walker and Meredith Skura have all offered incisive readings of how Tottel transforms Wyatt's knotted, sprung rhythms, and his articulation of an interiority extremely ambivalent toward the court as a centre of privatized power, into a public model of depoliticized courtierliness.[76] Rather than retrace any further ground that has already been so thoroughly and skilfully covered, then, in concluding our brief look at Tottel's miscellany it might prove more worthwhile to glance at another way we might read his publication in print of Wyatt's poems.

It has long been supposed that the Petrarchan lyrics of Wyatt and of Surrey were circulated in early Tudor England  only among a tightly restricted, courtly coterie.  Recently, however, Steven May has offered convincing evidence that the 'coterie' verse of courtly origin circulating in manuscript that was published by Tottel was probably far more widely available than has been hitherto supposed.[77] Examining the printing history of both Wyatt and Surrey's verse, May argues persuasively that this 'indicates that manuscript collections of their work circulated widely enough that five different printers had obtained and published some of their canon before 1557', the date of *Songes and Sonettes* (2010: 421). In addition, he points to evidence that 'most of the manuscripts available to bourgeois publishers such as [William] Owen and Tottel have long since disappeared', warning that 'their absence should not be misinterpreted as evidence that only a few such texts circulated four and a half centuries ago or that they circulated only among the socially elite' (2010: 422). In many cases, such as Surrey's translation of Book Two of the *Aeneid*, also published by Tottel in 1557, 'the loss rate is 100 per cent' (2010: 422). A balance needs to be struck, May argues, between the idea that 'elite manuscript verse was detained by private owners, and the equally valid conclusion that even the Miscellany's most aristocratic lyrics were available in manuscript to an audience far too numerous and unconnected to fit the received understanding of a coterie' (2010: 422).

---

[76] On Tottel's titles, see Ferry 1983: 18-19, and Marotti 1995: 218-20.

[77] May examines the printing history of both Wyatt and Surrey's verse, which 'indicates that manuscript collections of their work circulated widely enough that five different printers had obtained and published some of their canon before 1557', the date of Tottel's Miscellany (May 2010: 421).  In addition, he points to evidence that 'most of the manuscripts available to bourgeois publishers such as [William] Owen and Tottel have long since disappeared', warning that 'their absence should not be misinterpreted as evidence  that only a few such texts circulated four and a half centuries ago or that they circulated only among the socially elite' (May 2010: 422).

As we have seen, for Greg Walker, Wyatt and Surrey's 'original readers were no secretive coterie', but 'a cross section of the aristocrats, gentlemen, and civil servants at the heart of the court': what the poets had done 'was to address them, not as an audience of royal subjects, but as a readership of Englishmen, victims of the same despotic regime, and potential agents of its redemption' (2005: 432). May's argument that their poems were most likely circulating even beyond this more extended audience — at least by the time Tottel was publishing, and probably before — suggests that, if Walker is right, then Wyatt was, consciously or unconsciously, appealing to a wider audience, and answering to a more widely felt need, than has previously been supposed. May goes on to puzzle as to why Tottel chose to print and publish these works, given that they seem to have been far more readily available in manuscript form to likely interested parties than has hitherto been assumed (2010: 422). One answer Walker's work might suggest is that in doing so, Tottel was more or less consciously recognising and furthering the shaping of an incipient literary sphere outwith the court, if still related to it. Such an end pulls against the *Songes and Sonettes*' role as a collection of models of courtly literary practice that aspiring courtiers might follow, but that such a tension might exist seems entirely in keeping with the miscellany's status as addressed to an audience of those on the fringes of the court, and likely to be torn themselves between courtly aspirations and a rejection of courtly mores, either on ethical or political grounds — or out of mere sour grapes. It is notable that the justification Tottel offers for the printing of *Songes and Sonettes* is couched firmly in terms of the public — and, in particular, the national — good: as he declares in the epistle 'to the Reader' that opens the collection, he is publishing 'to the honor of the Englishe tong, and for profit of the studious of Englishe eloquence, those workes which the vngentle horders vp of such treasure haue heretofore enuied thee' (2). Critics have generally been somewhat skeptical of the first part of this declaration, while taking the reference to the hoarding up of 'treasures' as evidence of restricted, coterie circulation. May's research suggests that literary history needs to stop taking the latter at face value, but the flip side of this may be that the former claim should be treated more seriously. If Greg Walker is right, and Wyatt was indeed attempting to write a 'readership of Englishmen' into being, Tottel may have been picking up on this. At the very least, he certainly facilitated the forging of a self-consciously English, national vernacular poetry in the Petrarchan mode, and, whatever the transformations he wrought on Wyatt's verses, they remain models of a new, Petrarchan inwardness. In bringing Wyatt's poems into the realm of print, Tottel may well have had a broader demographic in mind as the locus of Englishness, and was almost certainly influenced by earlier writers who found in Wyatt a foundation for a canon of vernacular English poetry. In his epitaph 'Wyatt resteth here', Henry Howard, the Earl of Surrey, describes how within the forge of Wyatt's brain 'some work of fame / Was dayly wrought to turne to Britains gaine', going on to account him 'a worthy guide to bring / Our English youth by travail unto fame' (ll.7-8, 19-20). John Leland follows Surrey in celebrating 'our Wyatt' as the *ornamentum patriae*, 'the Ornament of his Country'. For Cathy Shrank, who cites both these works in her study of *Writing the Nation in Reformation England* (2004), these readings represent a distortion of Wyatt's work, revealing much more about their authors' programmes and desires than about their subject, Wyatt. The image of Wyatt as the forger of a new national literature,

> enduring though it is, is far from the impression made by Wyatt's poetry, which is, on examination, the work of private spaces and defensive self-reflexivity from which the notion of 'Britain' is notably absent. The figure of Wyatt as the cultivated, courtly, national poet — writing sonnets, *strambotti*, and epistolary satires, genres in which Italians such as Dante, Petrarch, and Alamanni had won international acclaim — nevertheless fulfills a need on the part of Leland and Surrey to provide a suitable example with which to counter England's long-standing reputation as a country bereft of literary accomplishment' (Shrank 2004: 75)

As we have seen, however, while demarcating a retreat from the effects of Henrician despotism on political and amorous life and discourse, those paradigmatically Petrarchan private spaces and defensive self-reflexivities were also oriented outward toward the fashioning of an alternative discursive space, one that it was hoped — in more optimistic moments, at least — might have a redemptive influence on the court. That Wyatt was probably not doing this programmatically, and perhaps not even particularly consciously, does not diminish the possibility that this was nevertheless what he was doing. Shrank's study was published a year before Walker's, and therefore does not engage with his reading of Wyatt's poems. If Walker is right in supposing Wyatt's work of private spaces to be fashioning 'a readership of Englishmen', however, then Leland and Surrey's readings of Wyatt may be articulating something they genuinely sensed, rather than merely appropriating him to their own ends.[78] If this is so, then one answer to May's question as to why Tottel printed texts that were by that time 'out of step with the climate at court', in the form of an anthology 'for which English printing had as yet established no market', may be that he — and/or the source or sources of his texts — really saw themselves as participating in the formation of a embryonic Petrarchan literary sphere that, while oriented toward the court, would be relatively independent of it. Tottel compiled his miscellany in the wake of turbulent years in English history, and published it only a year before another change of monarch and state religion. In such circumstances such a project must have seemed particularly, even instinctively attractive. If in revising and printing the poems of Wyatt and his fellow Henricians Tottel tended to reverse their Petrarchan dynamic of public and private, reticence and revelation, passing on a perversion of Wyatt's Petrarchism to a new generation of writers, he nevertheless did pass on Wyatt's poems to a wider audience — even if the differences between the audience for Wyatt's poetry in print and in manuscript does not seem to have been as great as has previously been supposed.

---

[78] Shrank compares Leland's elegy on Wyatt to his lines on Chaucer to show how he : 'Lauded in virtually identical terms (even repeating the phrase "merito [...] florentia Dantem"), the authorial characteristics of Wyatt and Chaucer are subordinate to their role as cultural champions of "our England" (Shrank 2004: 74-5).

# PART TWO

# CHAPTER THREE

# PETRARCHAN NATIONAL SENTIMENT AND THE UNION OF THE CROWNS ~

## WILLIAM DRUMMOND OF HAWTHORNDEN

### 3.1 *Honesto otio*: neo-Stoic and Petrarchan withdrawals

Upon completion of the extensive works on his residence at Hawthornden in 1638, the Petrarch of the North had inscribed above his new porch the Stoic epigram *ut honesto otio quierescet*, 'that he might rest in honourable ease'.[79] In a study that sets Drummond's career within a neo-Stoic context that is simultaneously both cosmopolitan European and distinctively Scottish, David Allan takes this epigram as emblematic of Drummond's broader self-fashioning: 'In other words, happy in his garden and his carefully-crafted isolation, the leading vernacular writer of early seventeenth-century Scotland knew that he epitomized the philosophical withdrawal from public cares recently promoted by Justus Lipsius' (2000: 93-4).[80] Allan is not alone in identifying Drummond's

---

[79] The inscription as a whole reads *Divino munere Gulielmus Drummondus ab Hawthornden, Joannis, Euitis Aurati, Filius, ut honesto otio quiesceret, sibi et successoribus instauravit, 1638*, 'By divine favour, William Drummond of Hawthornden, son of Sir John Drummond, Knight, that he might rest in honourable ease, founded this house for himself and his successors' (Masson 1969: 289; the inscription is also cited in Allan 2000: 93).

[80] Scottish neo-Stoicism has been the subject of several recent studies building on the impressive foundations laid down by David Allan's *Philosophy and Politics in Later Stuart Scotland: Neo-Stoicism, Culture and Ideology in an Age of Crisis, 1540-1690* (2000): of particular note are Michael Bath's study of Alexander Seton's house and its Stoic-inspired decoration in his *Renaissance Decorative Painting in Scotland* (2003), and Jamie Reid Baxter's unearthing of

*otium* with Stoic influences: in his recent *Scotland's Books*, Robert Crawford writes of a 'Stoical Drummond' (2007: 183), while Theo van Heijnsbergen and Nicola Royan have written of Drummond's 'neo-Stoic detachment' (2002: xxiv), and over thirty years ago Robert MacDonald pointed to the 'Stoical...resignation of *A Cypresse Grove*' (Drummond 1976: xxiii).[81]

The Drummond that emerges from this focus on neo-Stoic influences is 'a beguiling, multi-faceted figure, torn excruciatingly between the public obligations intrinsic to his social rank and the private pleasures of philosophical retreat for which his psychology, wealth and cultural interests seems to have provided considerable encouragement' (Allan 2000: 90). The focus upon Drummond's neo-Stoicism in reading his rustic retreat and its re-enactment in his writing is attractive not least because it reveals the public, even political import of the 'retiring life removed from the political and religious activities of Scotland' that Drummond is generally characterized as living (Atkinson 2007: 181). It thereby goes some way towards answering the criticisms MacDonald made over twenty-five years ago of the Romantic notion of Drummond as a 'philosopher hermit, the romantic scholar poet locked in his study from the affairs of this world' (1971: 12).[82]

While acknowledging Drummond's impulse towards personal isolation from the public realm, as inscribed above his *stoa*, Allan follows Drummond's Augustan editors, Sage and Ruddiman, in arguing that Drummond did not withdraw to 'Ease and Indolence, with a Design only to please himself, but withdrew out of the Crowd, with Desires of Inlightening and Instructing the Minds of those that remained in it' (Drummond 1711: iii; cited Allan 2000: 93). For his *otio* to be *honesto*, Drummond recognized that it had to address public affairs, even as it turned its back upon the new London court. Like many of his Scottish acquaintances who had followed James south upon the Union of the

---

'Mr. Andrew Boyd (1567-1636): A Neo-Stoic Bishop of Argyll and His Writings', in *Sixteenth-Century Scotland: Essays in Honour of Michael Lynch* (2008).

[81] In fact, Drummond's Stoic philosophizing was explored over half a century ago by French Rowe Fogle (1952: 60, 66, 91).

[82] These interpretations of Drummond's life and literary career were put forward in the nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries respectively by his biographer, David Masson, and the author of what is, remarkably, still the only book-length monograph on Drummond in English, French Rowe Fogle.

Crowns, Drummond borrowed from the vocabulary of the Stoics to focus provocatively on the injustices of public life, ‘a theme well-worn in the tradition of Seneca and Tacitus but now lent peculiar topical animus by the controversial distribution of patronage which had marked James VI’s later British reign’ (Allan 2000: 95). Through a reading of his correspondence and his later speeches and prose texts, Allan demonstrates how from the sanctuary of Hawthornden Drummond offered his distracted countrymen both in Scotland and at the London court the benefit of his Stoic diagnoses and advice. Allen cites a letter from Drummond to his kinsman, Sir Maurice Drummond, as re-articulating Seneca’s view that at the imperial court ‘there is nothing too sacred for sacrilege’:[83]

> You have spent now many Years at Court, and yet that Clock which hath struck Ten to others, is still pointing at One or Two to you. Have you not yet taken a Distaste and Satiety of that old Mistress of yours the Court? Her long delay in preferring you, tells you are too honest. Methinks you should have a Desire to recreate your self at last in your native Country with the Remembrances of passed Contentments at Court, as your Kinsmen here have a Longing after so long a time to see you, and unanimously now salute you (Drummond 1711: 145-6, cited Allan 2000: 95)[84]

If for the most part Drummond counselled Stoic forbearance and constancy to the king, his analyses could, at times, ‘take on a distinctly seditious air’ (Allan 2000: 96). In this context, Drummond’s construction of a rural retreat as ‘the narrative correlate of an isolated self’ (Halsted 1996: 21: cited Allan 2000: 92) demarcated an alienation from Whitehall and the perceived anglicisation of government and royal life that was ultimately to have grave ramifications for relations between the Stuart court and its traditional backers.

---

[83] As Allan notes, these words from Seneca’s *De beneficiis* ‘are actually quoted by Drummond’s great contemporary Sir Thomas Craig of Riccarton, who deployed a harsh Stoical realism in his own analysis of modern politics’ (Allan 2000: 126, n.35).

[84] Appropriating the neo-Stoic posture of defensive moral withdrawal in response to the malice and corruption of the court carried some obvious advantages: it allowed writers such as Drummond to articulate their reservations and even their condemnation while couching it in implicitly universalizing terms that minimized any sense of an attack on the person of the monarch. Echoing sixteenth-century European commentators such as Lipsius and Montaigne, and classical figures such as Seneca and Tacitus, suggested that courts were always and everywhere thus. The flip side of this manoeuvre, of course, was that the political sting of any critique was drawn even as it was delivered.

Our interpretation of Drummond's rustic retreat is of particular importance because it served as a model and an ideal both for his contemporaries and for subsequent generations. It therefore potentially has repercussions for our understanding of the whole cultural landscape of seventeenth-century Scotland. As Allan observes elsewhere, the moral ideal of retirement for which Drummond had become such a striking advertisement proved increasingly attractive to Scotland's educated elite during the troubled reigns of James VI and Charles I:

> Drummond was [...] symbolic of many in seventeenth-century Scotland, popularising and validating a choice taken by other, less famous figures. Neatly detaching oneself from a public realm scarred by internecine conflict, retirement of the kind made manifest at Hawthornden also silently voiced the high-minded criticism of contemporary public ethics which fashionable neo-Stoicism had to some extent legitimized. For, while alive to the perennial charge that retreat was merely an abdication of wider responsibilities, the revival of Roman Stoicism had encouraged above all an articulate disgust at the repellant viciousness of court and city, providing at the same time a moral vocabulary and a series of stock arguments perfectly attuned to the perspectives of marginalised or disenchanted members of the elite—men hovering about the fringes, incurably anxious about Scotland's political affairs, spellbound by the train of events, yet unwilling or unable to expose themselves to the risks involved in more active participation (Allan 1999a: 259)

Amongst those following Drummond's example in adopting the retired life, along with James Boyd of Trochrig (a fellow graduate from Bourges, a centre for the dissemination of neo-Stoic ideas) and Sir Thomas Stewart of Coltness, Allan notes the case of Sir George Mackenzie. Mackenzie, author of an *Essay upon Solitude*, acknowledged in verse the importance of Drummond as a model:

> *Sir George Mackenzie, His Majesty's Advocate, being in Hawthornden's Closet, wrote down this Elogy of him.*

Here liv'd that Poet whose Immortal Name,
Was Crown'd by Lawrels, and adorn'd by Fame;
Whom every Man next to himself did love;
Who durst be Loyal, and what's more, reprove
The Vices of that base rebellious Age;
His was a Poet's, their's a Tyrant's Rage.
Each Man him then his Neighbour wish'd to be,
And we now grieve that we did not him see.
They did his Wit, we do his Works admire,
And each young Spark does kindle at his Fire:
Or, which is more, he Poems can beget
On my old Muse, tho' now much past the Date.
(Drummond 1711: xix)

Mackenzie's poem glances quite cleverly at Drummond's position as a critical, moderate Royalist: the enjambement across the end of line four and the beginning of line five, by leaving hanging momentarily the object of the verb 'reprove', reminds us that Drummond was capable of admonishing what were to become both sides in the current wars, including those to whom he was 'Loyal'. This sense is reinforced by the subsequent balancing of the 'Vices of that base rebellious Age' against the 'Tyrant's Rage', which, if it semantically seems still to refer to the rebels, lexically seems to point towards the King. Like Drummond, Mackenzie could see both sides, opposing Lauderdale's administration yet serving as King's Advocate and earning the soubriquet 'Bluidy Mackenzie' for his prosecution of the covenanting conventicles (Allan 1999a: 252-55). Yet that the poem is prompted by a visit to Drummond's closet, the most private room at Hawthornden, and immediately evokes (in hackneyed enough terms, it is true) the laurel crown, the motif of Petrarchan fame, should serve to remind us of how closely the neo-Stoic retreat was bound up with Petrarchan versifying for Drummond.

Indeed, Drummond's retreat can be seen just as easily in Petrarchan as in Stoic terms. Hawthornden was his Vaucluse; the river Esk, his Sorgue. Francisco Rico's description of Petrarch's love of solitude applies equally well to Drummond:

> Petrarch's taste for solitude, for nature and for frugality was genuine and profound: but no less intense was his desire to distinguish himself by virtue of this taste; and, transforming Vaucluse into a myth, to transform himself into a legend. (2008: 57)[85]

Jennifer Petrie has gone so far as to suggest that Petrarch could be attributed with 'the virtual invention of a literary type that was to have considerable significance in western European culture: the solitary artist or thinker, the solitary lay hermit'. Petrarch, she maintains, can be seen as standing 'at the head of a long line which includes Montaigne in his tower, Marvell in his garden, Rousseau, Wordsworth, down to the Romantic and post-Romantic images of the solitary poet' (2007: 29). While Petrie is right to emphasize the impact that Petrarch's philosophy and aesthetics of rural retreat was to have on early modern Europe, she overstates Petrarch's originality: Petrarch himself was profoundly influenced by Stoic thought, and by the Stoic idea of the proper relation between retirement and public engagement in particular. He played a vital role in the rediscovery and the transmission of the classical texts that would reveal to later centuries the tenets and tone of classical Stoicism. Yet Petrarch's own life and work represent not only a significant re-imagining of the Stoic notion of *otium*, but a profound challenge to that notion. Throughout his prose works and his letters Petrarch set out a cultural ideal that found its most powerful encoding in the *Rime sparse*. This ideal fused solitude and a love of nature with a poetic sensibility, the love of books and a reflective existence, and a critical, even hostile stance towards one's own age, all elements central to Drummond's own retreat.[86]

---

[85] 'Il gusto di Petrarca per la solitudine, per la natura e per la frugalita era genuino e profondo, ma non era minore il suo desiderio di distinguersi in virtù di questo gusto; e trasformando Valchiusa in mito trasformava se stesso in leggenda.'

[86] Examples of Drummond's condemnation of his own age are easy to come across, but see, for example, letter V in Eloisa Paganelli's 'Lettere e note ineditedi William Drummond of Hawthornden': 'It may be estimed folyshnesse in this tyme to embrace anay other actiones than those of the tyme, which are the studdy of auarice or defence from the vultures of this country from whom no estate is so free or meane that their serues do not reach vnto it. Innocence now serues onllye to be an occasion of losse and ouerthrow; and as in tymes {of plague it is hard to thinke of any escape or saftye except with the danger of once being sicke, no more is there anay escape} from iniurye except other by a couragious suffring them or a

Drummond's reputation, of course, largely rested then as now upon his achievements as a poet writing in the Petrarchan vein. When we turn to the poetry upon which his reputation rests and in which Drummond most memorably depicted himself as the melancholic recluse, in particular the *Poems* of 1616 and the *Flowres of Sion* of 1623, we find that neo-Stoicism offers an inadequate and potentially misleading model to describe the publicized retreat inscribed there. The 'rusling Spring' and 'flowrie Bankes' found therein might be read as offering a space where, in the words of Lipsius, those courtiers and administrators exposed to the corrupting 'worldly businesses' of the court could 'be refreshed again, where the food of quietnes, & gentle blowing of the pure and whol some aire, will even breath a new life into thee' (Stradling 1595: 135). There are, moreover, clear echoes of the Stoic doctrine of the care of the self, the recommended retreat to an isolated rural environment that enables contemplation and peace of mind: when Drummond writes of being 'Best companied when most I am alone' (*DP*1.4.11), we can hear behind this line Lipsius's approving allusion to Cicero's personal statement to his son in the third book of *On Duties*: 'I am never lesse solitarie (said one) then when I am alone: nor never less idle, then when I am at leasure' (Stradling 1595: 135). Yet where Lipsius's paradox suggests a sense of stability and repose, reinforced in John Stradling's 1594 translation by its symmetrical balancing across that colon against the second paradox, Drummond's occurs in a context which gives it a quite different import:

> Faire is my Yoke, though grieuous bee my Paines,
> Sweet are my Wounds, although they deeply smart,
> My Bit is Gold, though shortned bee the Raines,
> My Bondage braue, though I may not depart:
> Although I burne, the Fire which doth impart
> Those Flames, so sweet reuiuing Force containes,
> That (like *Arabias* Bird) my wasted Heart
> Made quicke by Death, more liuely still remaines.
> I joye, though oft my waking Eyes spend Teares,

---

violent doing them. I leave the after ages (if they be not like this) to […] my fortune and the leaders of this violent course to the supreme iudge' (Paganelli 1968: 308).

I neuer want Delight, euen when I grone,
Best companied when most I am alone,
A Heauen of Hopes I haue midst Hells of Feares:
Thus euery Way Contentment strange I finde,
But most in Her rare Beautie, my rare Minde. (*DP*1.*s*4)

This is paradigmatic Petrarchism, as the catalogue of antithetical conceits makes plain, and those paradoxes signal not the Stoic repose of the mind, but its agitation. The poem has its origins in Petrarch's 'Amor si sprona' (*RVF* 178). Set in its Petrarchan context, we are more likely to see that the line that might be traced to Lipsius also finds a potential father in Sidney's 'Seem most alone in greatest company' (*A&S* 27.2). If this points in part to the degree to which Petrarchan and Stoic notions of retreat fused into the common cultural vocabulary of the age, it also reminds us that this solitude is associated with the emotional turbulence of a 'swelling breast', rather than the calm care of the self. As the concluding insistence upon the 'Contentment strange' to be found in these smarts makes clear, this Petrarchan turmoil signals a radical disruption of the Stoic faith in reason and its exercise in rustic solitude as the proper path to happiness.

Allan eschews any close reading of Drummond's poems or any serious engagement with the question of how his neo-Stoicism influences his aesthetics. Like his contemporaries working on Stoic influences south of the border, he gives no consideration to the role Petrarchism, a seemingly very different discourse, might have played in shaping the early modern engagement with classical Stoicism. The one glancing reference to Petrarch in Allan's book does occur in the section on Drummond, but suggests that he sees Petrarchism, if he sees it at all, as an alternative and contrasting attitudinal posture rather than a philosophical node that both supports and troubles Drummond's Stoicism. While noting that the first song in Drummond's *Poems* 1616 'probably hints at Drummond's debt to Sidney's *Arcadia*, and also, perhaps, at his early attachment to Petrarch', Allan argues that it is its 'explicit association of moral innocence with a situation of florid isolation' – a floridity he curiously identifies as peculiarly Stoic – that is 'of greater interest' (2000: 91).

In translating the inscription over Drummond's *stoa*, however, it is worth remembering that for the Roman Stoics *honesto* carried aesthetic as well as ascetic connotations.[87] Precisely because the aesthetics of the Stoics was 'circumscribed by the general assumptions of their system[,] by their ethics and ontology', we might expect the adoption of the latter to have had ramifications for Drummond's poetic practice (Tatarkiewicz 2005: 1, 186). Stoic literature had a profound impact on early seventeenth-century prose styles, as evinced by Drummond's own *A Cypresse Grove*. At a conceptual level, however, Stoic moralism was characterized by the subordination of aesthetic values to moral values ultimately grounded in reason. Where beauty was considered at all, it tended to be rigorously identified with moral goodness. Yet, as Sarah Dunnigan has recently highlighted, Drummond as a poet is peculiarly preoccupied with both the mimetic creation of 'rare Beautie' and the interrogation of its meaning (2007). If this might in part be precisely because beauty and his Petrarchan preoccupation with it potentially threatened his Stoic principles and had to be neutered, the primacy he often seems to attach to it often threatens, as we shall see, to uproot those very principles themselves. As David Murray noted in the commendatory sonnet that appears at the end of Drummond's 'Urania' verses, while 'To write our Thoughts in Verse doth merite Praise', Drummond gilded his 'delicious Layes', which, 'Bright, rich, delightfull, [...] deserue much more' (ll.9-11).

In failing to attend to Drummond's Petrarchism, the neo-Stoic account risks seriously misrepresenting Drummond's *vita solitaria* and its relation to, and reflection in, his writing. In doing so, it potentially belittles Drummond's ambitions, privileging negative critique and the immediately political at the expense of the more wide-reaching, constructive cultural project. It also downplays the intensity and complexity of Drummond's exploration of the recesses of subjectivity, while failing to recognize the extent to which, for Drummond, these two extremes of public and private were, thanks to the

---

[87] It denoted, as Cicero explains, 'that which is precious and praiseworthy independently of its usefulness or the rewards and fruits it would bring' (cited Tatarkiewicz 2005, I: 191). It is worth noting that, as such, it offers an alternative ethics to that contained in Machiavelli's use of *virtu* along more opportunist and expedient lines.

Petrarchan inheritance, thoroughly imbricated. Petrarchism, I want to begin to argue here, offered Drummond a subtly yet profoundly different ideal of the relationship between public ambition and solitary retreat, between textual reticence and display, to those he might have found in Seneca or Justus Lipsius. Closely and problematically intertwined as it is with his Stoicism, Drummond's Petrarchism has to be attended to alongside it if we are not to come away with a distorted sense of Drummond's engagements with something approximating to a nascent literary public sphere. Rather than having his attention always fixed on the court, even (or even especially) when he is most soundly condemning its moral vices or most ostentatiously turning his back on it, the Drummond that emerges turns out both to harbour more vaunting public ambitions for his work than a narrow focus on his Stoicism allows for, and to attempt to realize these through a more inward, reticent aesthetic than anything imagined by the Stoic philosophers.

Such a reinterpretation might take many aspects of Drummond's Petrarchism as a point of departure, and any properly adequate study would have to take account of all of them. Only by fully reading Drummond's stoic withdrawal in terms of its indebtedness to, and agon with, the Petrarchan inheritance might we hope to delineate with any accuracy some of the contradictions and tensions implicit within it, and to explore how these shape his aesthetic practice. Petrarch plays a central if profoundly ambivalent role in the history of attempts to assimilate Stoic thought to Christian orthodoxy, a struggle we find ongoing in Drummond's works. This struggle might be one starting point for illuminating how Drummond dissents in much of his poetry from his (neo-)Stoic influences. A well-established reading sees Petrarch as struggling to negotiate between a Stoicism derived largely from the works of Seneca and Cicero, and a broadly Augustinian moral theology. This interpretation has been articulated most impressively by Francisco Rico (1974) and Hans Baron (1985), and more recently enlarged upon by Alexander Lee (2008). In similar terms, Klaus Heitmann (1957) perceived a tension between a Stoicism grounded upon human reason and a fideistic Augustinianism, a model that re-emerges in William Bouwsma's treatment of Petrarch in his examination of the 'two faces' of Renaissance humanism, Stoicism and Augustinianism (1975). Charles Trinkaus too, although somewhat more hesitantly, identifies 'contradictions' in Petrarch's thought arising out of broadly the same tensions between classical philosophy and Christian theology (1979: 2).

In the context of William Bouwsma's contention that a better understanding of the relationship between the two closely intertwined yet mutually contradictory ideological strains of Stoicism and Augustinianism is fundamental to a better understanding of the Renaissance itself, we can see Petrarch and Drummond as standing at opposite ends of a single, if singularly complex, narrative.[88] Bouwsma argues that the tensions and fissures between Stoicism and Augustinianism, 'more frequently latent than overt for even the most acutely self-conscious. . . . and never fully resolved' run to the very core of Renaissance humanist culture (1975: 3, 4). Interpreting humanism as a single movement 'in much the sense that a battlefield is a definable piece of ground', he regards the struggle between Stoic impulses and Augustinian tendencies as 'subtler, more confused, and more difficult', but also more fundamental, than the consciously articulated disputes between the humanist Neo-Platonists and the Aristotelian schoolmen (1975: 3).[89] It is ultimately in this context that Drummond's Petrarchan struggle to negotiate his own sense of the proper kind of retreat ought to be situated: Petrarch's engagement with Augustine brought into poetic discourse a more deeply interiorized sense of the profundities of the private self than the Stoic tradition had been able to offer him, together with an awareness of the unknowability of man's motives and his contradictory desires. This was accompanied by a radical undoing of the notion that the subject might, through the Stoical care of the self, achieve an internal harmony, even as these Augustinian revelations intensified the longing for just such a peace within.[90]

---

[88] If Petrarch is the father of the Renaissance, Drummond fits perfectly into the context established by another of Bouwsma's works, *The Waning of the Renaissance* (2000).

[89] For Bouwsma, 'Stoicism and Augustinianism represented, far better than Plato and Aristotle, genuine alternatives for the Renaissance humanist to ponder' (1975: 6)

[90] A proper exploration of how Drummond's Petrarchism is imbricated with his Stoicism would, I think, suggest that that Stoicism could be of a far darker, more pessimistic tone than Allan allows for, far closer to the Senecan attraction toward death and even suicide explored by Gordon Braden than to the optimistic, civic-minded neo-Stoicism delineated in an English context by Andrew Shifflett.

This chapter, however, focuses on another aspect of the Petrarchan inheritance, its association with national sentiment, in order to argue that Drummond's Petrarchan retreat had more far-reaching cultural and even political ambitions than a reading in purely neo-Stoic terms can adequately account for. The shaping role of the Union of the Crowns of 1603 on Drummond's literary career has been noted by several critics of late, most notably by John Kerrigan, while the role of Petrarchism in the generation and exploration of early modern national sentiment, long recognized, has recently come under increasing scrutiny, especially from William Kennedy. As yet, however, no serious attempt has been made to bring these two strains of recent critical thinking together. The encounter, as well as teaching us something about Drummond, promises to tell us something about those two strains, too.

### 3.2 The British problem

Born partly out of his experience of exile, Petrarch's lyric poetry articulates an identification with his native Italy, and a consciousness of belonging to an Italian community, that transcends the regional loyalties and internal geopolitical divisions of the fourteenth century. His most famous expression of national sentiment, the canzone 'Italia mia' (*RVF* 128), was probably composed during the siege of Parma by forces from Mantua and Milan in 1344-45. It laments the internecine warfare that has ravaged the 'bel corpo' of his beloved, holy country, God's 'diletto almo paese' (*RVF* 128.3, 9). Throughout the poem suggestive parallels between Italy and the persons of both the poet and his beloved are made, inviting us to draw parallels between the personal and the political in ways that modify our understanding of both. In itself, the apostrophe with which the poem opens echoes those addressed elsewhere to Laura, whose fragmented 'bel corpo' with its 'belle contrade', its lovely parts, is also celebrated and lamented. At the same time, the civil strife within the nation is presented as akin to that provoked within the poet by Laura and by his own passions: it is ' 'l desir cieco, encontra 'l suo ben fermo | [...] ch' al corpo sano à procurato scabbia' (36-38), blind desire, strong against our own good, that has contrived to make this healthy body sick. It is 'voglie divise', divided wills, that are destroying 'la più bella parte', the most beautiful part of the world (55-56). Yet even as Petrarch appeals to Italian national sentiment—and in so doing was to play a vital role in its shaping—his canzone also glances obliquely at the possibility that that sentiment lacks a real object, in a manner paralleling his fears and hints that his Laura, even if a woman with that name existed, is essentially a fiction : 'non far idolo un nome | vano, senza soggetto', do not make an idol of an empty name, he warns his fellow Italians (76-77).

Over a century after his death, Petrarch's *Canzoniere* and his *Trionfi* were canonized by a series of commentators and practitioners—most notable among whom was Pietro Bembo—as paradigmatic examples of Italian literary style and patriotic sentiment. Thanks in part to its classical features and its avoidance of regionalisms, Petrarch's language, while rooted in Tuscan, also came to be accepted as a supra-regional standard for writing in the vernacular. Petrarchan imitators throughout the Italian peninsula coupled this supra-regional style and language with the expression of proto-nationalistic sentiments. Partly as a result of these qualities, the Petrarchan mode spread to Europe's other principal vernaculars, where it served as the site for the forging of national sentiment and national literatures. Provoked in part by Petrarch's apparent denigrations of France in his calls for the Papacy to return from Avignon to Rome, French writers of the sixteenth century paradoxically found in Petrarchan imitation a mode through which they might realize a desire for a national French culture, and ultimately claimed for themselves the commemorator of an idealized Vaucluse and 'sa dame avignonnoise'.[91] In Protestant Elizabethan England, the Petrarchan trajectory by which earthly love for Laura was transformed at the *Canzoniere*'s close into spiritual love for Mary was inverted, transforming Catholic sentiment into national feeling: Elizabeth as head of state became the object of a Petrarchan worship 'not dissimilar in quality from that which for centuries had warmed English hearts that looked to the virgin Queen of Heaven for all grace' (Wilson 1939: 215).[92] More widely, Philip Sidney's self-fashioning as 'a Continental courtier bearing a totemic Italianate Petrarchism' gave birth to a Protestantized Petrarchan writing that both nurtured and explored an emerging English national character (Kennedy 2003: 7; cf. 163-262).

---

[91] Jean Lemaire, whose words these are, was from Hainault, in Burgundy. As Kennedy notes, he draws an explicit parallel between Petrarch, who is born in Florence but falls in love with a woman from Avignon, and himself, 'né de Haynnau', but enamoured of a French woman from Lyon (2003: 105-6). Lemaire cites Filelfo's commentary: 'There is no one who does not understand that love of one's father land is extremely potent; and especially Petrarch, since he was a rebel and an exile' (39v). Lemaire 'borrows this characterization when he shifts his own allegiance from Burgundy to France and invents for himself a patriotic French connection" (Kennedy 2003: 106). The example of Lemaire is worth bearing in mind when we come to look at Scoto-British deployments of the Petrarchan mode in the wake of the Union of the Crowns.

As William Kennedy observes, the premise that the Petrarchan sonnet provides a site for the expression and exploration of early modern national sentiment is 'not controversial' (2003: 1). In *The Site of Petrarchism* (2003), Kennedy himself has traced this story in some detail, paying particular attention to how Petrarchism acquired 'a protonationalist density' through the critical commentaries appended to the many different printed editions of the *Rime sparse* that circulated in Renaissance Europe.[93] Kennedy documents how these commentaries became the site for contesting notions of nationhood and national identity, and had a considerable impact upon the way poets approached Petrarchan forms, in Italy, Spain, France, England, Germany, Poland, and finally the New World.

Scotland, however, is excluded from Kennedy's study. Petrarchan sonneteering came later to Scotland than to most of the rest of western Europe. In his *Reulis and Cautelis* the young King James VI was to make the adoption of French rather than Italian literary models a defining characteristic of Scottish verse, over and against its English counterpart.[94] It is only with the Union of the Crowns in 1603 that unmistakably Petrarchan amorous sonnet sequences by Scottish writers begin to appear, just as the Sidneian craze for sonneteering was dying out in England. Literary history has traditionally identified this shift towards Petrarchan versifying with the dramatic alteration in notions of national identity enforced upon Scottish writers by the Union, as James moved south and urged English literary criteria upon both kingdoms of his new Great Britain. Scottish sonneteers such as William Alexander, David Murray, William Drummond and Alexander Craig have traditionally been seen as belatedly adopting the Petrarchan mode in accordance with this reorientation toward London. Their shift in literary style has also been seen as accompanied by a parallel linguistic shift, as they abandoned the Scots of Montgomerie, John Stewart of Baldynneis, and their own earliest work in favour of a wholesale—even craven—embrace of the courtly English of the south.

---

[92] Leonard Forster's acount of 'the political petrarchism of the Virgin Queen' remains the best summary on this subject: see Forster 1969: 122-47.

[93] The notion of Petrarch's poetry and the Petrarchan commentaries as a 'site' for the emergence of particular national styles throughout Europe, and for articulating ideological concerns and emergent national identities, is especially important for Kennedy, and he deploys the term both in the 'familiar sense of a place or position set aside for some purpose' and in the 'architectural sense of a framework or foundation for further building' (2003: 1-2).

[94] Given the way Italian (and especially Petrarchan) influences had already fed into the establishment of a French sense of a national literary culture by this point, the distinction between then two, particularly with regard to sonneteering in the Petrarchan mode, was by no means clear cut.

Of late this narrative has come under pressure, at least within the field of Scottish literary studies. However, while a degree of attention has been paid to the manner in which these authors in their wider writings grappled with a conflicted sense of national, regional and local loyalties in the wake of the Union, little focus has been placed upon how they deployed the Petrarchan mode in order to engage with these deeply felt contradictions and tensions. In 1998 Willy Maley noted an increasing interest among historians in 'the British problem', but lamented the absence of a significant concomitant development in literary criticism (159).[95] The intervening decade has seen a proliferation of studies on literature's entanglement in questions of national and regional identity in early modern Britain and Ireland.[96] These culminate, perhaps, in John Kerrigan's formidable tome *Archipelagic English* (2008), which explores from a number of perspectives the sundry ways in which the various parts of the

---

[95] As evidence of the growing interest in 'the British problem', Maley pointed to a number of recent studies: Brendan Bradshaw and John Morrill (eds), *The British Problem* (London, 1996); Jane E. Dawson, 'Two kingdoms or three?: Ireland in Anglo-Scottish relations in the middle of the sixteenth century', in Roy Mason (ed.), *Scotland and England, 1286-1815* (Edinburgh, 1987), 113-38; Steven G. Ellis and Sarah Barber (eds.), *Conquest and Union: fashioning a British state, 1485-1725* (London, 1995); Conrad Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637-1642* (Oxford, 1991), 'The British Background to the Irish Rebellion of 1641', *Historical Research*, 61:145 (1988), 166-82; 'The British Problem and the English Civil War', *History*, 72:236 (1987), 385-415; David Stevenson, *Scottish Covenanters and Irish Confederates: Scottish and Irish relations in the mid-seventeenth century* (Belfast, 1981).

[96] Maley's own article on 'The British problem in three tracts on Ireland by Spenser, Bacon and Milton', together with a number of other papers in the same collection of essays, *British consciousness and identity: The making of Britain, 1533-1707*, edited by Brendan Bradshaw and Peter Roberts (Cambridge University Press, 1998), played an important role in initiating this new attention within literary studies to the British problem.

North-East Atlantic archipelago (Kerrigan's preferred collective noun-phrase[97]) were culturally and politically both linked and divided.

Kerrigan's work is invaluable, but it fails to bring together two fruitful movements in recent criticism: the focus on Petrarchism's part in the cultivation of early modern national sentiment, and the geopolitical turn in literary studies towards the turbulent relations between the constituent states of Kerrigan's Atlantic archipelago. Kerrigan produces a sophisticated reading of how Drummond's work was conditioned by the relative isolation of Scotland within a 'culturally conflicted regal union,' but makes barely any mention of the Petrarchan poetry upon which Drummond's reputation rests, beyond noting that it has been 'misconstrued as a hangover from Elizabethan Petrarchism' (2008: 145). In attempting to make that connection between Petrarchism, national sentiment, and the conflicted state of Scottish culture post-Union, this chapter seeks to add still further weight to Kerrigan's already persuasive contention that, 'once his British contexts are understood, Drummond emerges as a more complex and pressured figure than has been realized, and a grossly undervalued writer' (2008: 145).[98] At the same time, it also attempts to show that the Petrarchan mode—often aligned, sometimes problematically, with other literary genres and styles—offered Scottish writers a more fluid means of negotiating tensions and contradictions between local, regional and national identities than perhaps even Kennedy's admirably subtle study allows for.

---

[97] Kerrigan addresses the history of 'the British problem', and some of the problems with its use of the word 'British', along with alternative terminologies, in his Introduction (2008: 21-27). Kerrigan's principal opposition to use of the term 'British' is that it 'tends to imply if not the existence then the inevitability of a state that was only just, unevenly, forming, in the seventeenth century, and it suggests that there was more cultural Britishness around the islands than can be found' (2008: 23). Moreover, while the literature of the period 'includes officially sponsored accounts of imaginary, often antique Britishness (as in court masques), and testifies to the existence of vital interfaces which encourage hybridization [...] the record is also riven [...] with inter-ethnic strife. Overall there are few signs of a newly synthesized identity; and it is questionable how complete that synthesis would ever become' (2008: 23-4).

[98] Drummond's neglect is striking. There exists no comprehensive modern scholarly edition of his poetry, let alone his collected works, and no monograph in English has been dedicated to him since French Rowe Fogle's critical biography, which appeared in 1952. It is perhaps significant that the most modern book-length study of Petrarch, Eloisa Paganelli's *La poesia di Drummond of Hawthornden* (Bari: Adriatica, 1972), is in Italian. Similarly, for editions of Drummond;s work readers are forced to fall back upon the impressive but dated two-volume Scottish Text Society version of Drummond's *Poetical Works*, edited by L. E. Kastner (1913), and the 1711 Edinburgh edition of Drummond's *Works* edited by Sage and Ruddiman.

### 3.3 Scotland, Britain, and the social circulation of sonnets

In late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth century Britain, nationalism was rarely invoked in political discourse as a legitimating principle. Both before the Union, and especially after, the dynasticism of the government on the one hand and the universalism of its presbyterian opponents on the other precluded the construction of debates between them in terms of nationalism (Goodare 2004: 65-66). Those thinkers on both sides who welcomed the prospect of a unified Britain saw this as 'fully compatible with Scottish patriotism,' while 'the essentialism and separatism characteristic of modern nationalism were absent' (Goodare 2004: 65). For many subjects, loyalty to the monarchy and its imperial ambitions demanded that the project of Union be embraced, and the continental model of the composite monarchy provided a template that disparaged any nationalism that threatened that loyalty. Moreover, once it was clear that James would ascend to the English throne, the Union was in practical terms 'manifestly in Scotland's best interests' (McGinnis and Williamson 2002: 47). If Scots wanted to influence the king's policies they would have to go to London, and it was preferable to travel there through one's own country and develop a common British perspective, than be subjected to a monarchy dominated by English interests and outlooks.

A brief glance at the work of Andrew Melville, Calvinist principal of St. Mary's College at St. Andrews, serves as a useful corrective to modern notions that the Scots must necessarily have viewed any union with England with nationalistic resentment. Writing prior to the Union of 1603, Melville repeatedly looked forward with enthusiasm to the prospect of a Britain united under a Stewart monarch leading a protestant crusade against the papal Antichrist. This, for Melville, was the destiny of the Scots, which would find its prophetic fulfilment, in what Melville clearly envisioned apocalyptically as the latter days of the world, in the protestant British empire of Henry IX. Melville's prophetic Calvinist anticipation of union even led him to argue that the Stone of Scone, long-time symbol of Scottish national identity, should remain in London. Almost ten years before the Union of the Crowns, Melville could prophesy in his celebration of the birth of Prince Henry:

> Those who ere now were divided by the Tweed,
> By the shores of the Solway Firth and by the Cheviot Hills,
> The rule of Scoto-Britannic sovereignty now joins together,
> United in law and within a Scoto-Britannic commonwealth,
> And a prince born of a Scoto-Britannic king
> Calls them into a single body of Scoto-Britannic people.
> To what great heights will Scoto-Britannic glory now rise
> With no limits set by space and time?
> ('Principis Scoti-Britannorum natalia', ll.25-36; McGinnis & Williamson (eds.), 1995)

Melville's hope for a 'Scoto-Britannic commonwealth', both indebted to, and a reworking of, John Foxe's imperial vision for England, was shared by many of his Scottish contemporaries (cf. Williamson 1979). If Scottish Presbyterianism was to be one key site for the nurturing of a distinctively Scottish cultural identity, for Melville and his followers it also become the ground for a British imperialist vision. For Melville, as for many Scots, 'Scottish patriotism generated British consciousness' (McGinnis & Williamson (eds.) 1995: 284).

Melville's near-apocalyptic, crusading Calvinism is a long way from Drummond's conservative Episcopalianism, but a bridge between the two can be found in the figure of David Hume of Godscroft. Hume fused Melville's Calvinist opposition to episcopacy with a Renaissance civic humanism profoundly indebted to the Stoics. In his *De unione insulae Britannicae,* first published in London in 1605 (but probably begun significantly earlier), Hume envisaged a Union whose citizens would acquire an altogether new, civic-minded British identity in the new state of Britannia, to become 'the most glorious kingdom in the world' (McGinnis & Williamson (eds.) 2002: 163). The nature of the pseudo-republican, aristocratic Calvinist oligarchy that Hume envisaged, together with his pamphlet war with the bishops, meant that the longer second part or 'Tractatus Secondus' of his *De Unione* circulated only in manuscript, prefaced with a commendatory letter from Melville himself, describing it as 'a difficult and dangerous work but both useful and necessary for these times (McGinnis & Williamson (eds.) 2002: 136-7).

Poetry plays a central role in Hume's conception of the Union. On the one hand it served to promote it: his tract, as McGinnis and Williamson note, was part of a project he simultaneously promoted through his highly complex Latin poem *Daphn-Amaryllis*, also published in 1605 (2002: 48). On the other, Hume anticipated a Union that would lead to a great cultural flowering, particularly in the field of literary endeavour. No longer engaged in bitter internecine strife, Britons would go 'over to the delightful camps of the Muses' and the humanistic arts. This in turn would answer to a specifically Scottish national concern, showing that in former times Scots had been warriors rather than 'men of letters' out of necessity: 'we want to refute that old charge of ignorance and to show that it was never a failing of the Scottish people, but rather of the times—and henceforth not to yield to anyone a superior rank in the civilized virtues than they did in former times with respect to their bravery' (2002: 89-91).

Drummond certainly knew Hume, and possessed both his *Daphn-Amaryllis* and his *De Unione* (MacDonald 1971: catalogue no. 306 and 516). Hume's daughter Anna was to become a formidable translator of Petrarch, and the evidence suggests that the two families were linked by the kind of Petrarchan social exchange that shall be examined a little later in this chapter. We can easily imagine that Drummond would have been receptive to Hume's vision of a Scottish poetic blossoming under the guise of a British literature set forth in the first part of the *De Unione*. The opening of the 'Tractatus Secondus' lays out the grounds for Union in terms that might have appealed even more to the Petrarch of the North. The one bond, the one principle, 'the touchstone of union', Hume declares, is love, and Hume goes on the draw an explicit parallel with marriage (McGinnis & Williamson (eds.) 2002: 143). There is no evidence that Drummond ever saw the 'Tractatus Secondus' of the latter, but it seems at least feasible that he might have done so, and probable that he might have heard of its contents.

In this light, it is tempting to read Drummond's Petrarchan sonneteering on the pains of love as an oblique reflection of the difficulties of that union. By the time Drummond was writing, the initial enthusiasm for union on the part of many Scots had begun to wane in the face of the reality, and particularly in response to the King's new religious policies. As James failed to return to visit his northern kingdom, Hume's claim that the Scots' king 'did not withdraw from them to their detriment just because the English have yielded to him' began to look increasingly shaky (McGinnis & Williamson (eds.) 2002: 147). In a widely disseminated correspondence with the King's new Scottish bishops, Hume himself attacked the new order as English 'tyrrany', and in 1608 undertook a critique of William Camden's *Britannia* (1586), defending traditional claims regarding Scotland's antiquity as set forth in Buchanan's *Rerum Scoticarum historia* (1582). In his correspondence with the bishops he could appeal to them 'as a Scottishman to you as a Scottishman, and I trust not without some regarde unto your native countrie' (McGinnis and Williamson (eds.) 2002: 49).

The presence of the court in Scotland had been of vital importance to the development of a sense of Scottish literary identity in the late sixteenth century. While the notion of a coterie of poets forming a 'Castalian band' tightly tied to the presence of the King has been questioned of late (cf. Bawcutt 2001), recent scholarship has increasingly illuminated the extent to which Scottish lyric poetry under James enjoyed a self-aware flowering (cf. Dunnigan 2000). However, the exodus to London following the Union of the Crowns of the court, and with it a significant portion of the Scottish nobility, removed a significant source of patronage and an important focus for literary activity. As Alexander Craig lamented in the months following the King's departure:

> What art thou Scotland then? no Monarchie allace,
> A oligarchie desolate, with straying and onkow face,
> A maymed bodie now, but shaip some monstrous thing,
> A reconfused chaos now, a countrey, but a King.
> ('Scotlands Teares', ll.30-34; Craig 1604: unpaginated)

Craig's complaint was in good part rhetorical flattery, but its concerns were prescient. So were the fears that the court would not be returning any time soon, expressed in a poem in the same volume addressed to the queen. Again, the notion that 'the shock of losing the court [...] deprived Scotland of the confidence that would have allowed it to maintain a healthy provincial culture' (Cummings 1987: 6) has been made to look increasingly problematic by the excavations of scholars over the last twenty years, which have begun to turn up evidence of a more vigorous literary environment in seventeenth-century Scotland than has long been supposed. Nevertheless, the departure of the court did undoubtedly result in a fragmentation of Scottish cultural life. Specifically, it led to a steadily widening division emerging between 'those noblemen who were left in Scotland where they faced the prospect of being relegated to the status of a provincial aristocracy, and those who went with the king to become courtiers in London' (Brown 1993: 543). Precisely because there remained in Scotland 'a very powerful public culture which fed the national consciousness' (Brown 1990: 184, n.9), the 'seductive royalist ideology of the court' gradually led to a gap opening up between 'the courtiers' sense of national identity, essentially a British imperial viewpoint, and that of the "provincial" nobility which was untouched by the court and harked back to a concept of Scotland which predated the regal union' (Brown 1993: 576). For Keith Brown, who has explored this process in some detail, this growing chasm was ultimately to contribute to the aristocratically-led national revolt that brought down the imperial British monarchy a few decades later (1993: 576).

Brown takes a particular interest in Scots who tried to bridge this gap by following James south to London but maintaining significant economic and social ties with their homeland. These included retaining fundamentally Scottish cultural assumptions, using the revenues from their activities in England or abroad to buy or build property in Scotland, and continuing to pay regular visits north of the border, even as they might marry English wives and take up prestigious positions at Whitehall. More or less consciously, figures such as Robert Ker and William Alexander sought to negotiate both at the personal and the national level, both emotionally and pragmatically, a sense of identity that would enable them to simultaneously maintain and balance local, Scottish, and British loyalties. At the same time, they found themselves constituted by precisely these differing and often contradictory impulses.

Unlike the Scoto-British sonneteers who published their work in the immediate afterglow of the Union of the Crowns, Drummond's Petrarchan verse did not appear in print until 1614, and then only in what it has been argued is a 'pre-publication' print run properly seen as preparatory to the *Poems* of 1616. Drummond was thus writing his poems as the first of these concerns, and the opening of the gap described by Keith Brown, were beginning to become evident. A glance at Drummond's reading in this period is suggestive. In the years immediately following his first reading in Italian of Petrarch's *Rime*, and immediately preceding the first publication of his *Poems* in 1614, Drummond 'worked his way in Italian through most of [...] Bembo' (MacDonald 1971: 139). Around the same time, Drummond also read Drayton's *Poly-Olbion* (cf. MacDonald 1971: 138), which is described in its opening pages as a 'chorographicall description of...Great Britain', (Drayton 1931-41: ii). The book itself, however, begins in Devon and Cornwall and makes its way through England to end, thirty songs later, at a northernmost point of Westmorland and Cumberland. Drayton planned another volume, in which the history and geography of Scotland too would be traced, and his desire for materials for this work may well have prompted him to first make contact with Drummond. In the 'Heads of a Conversation' Drummond writes of Drayton's effort that it 'is one of the smoothest Poems I have seen in English, Poetical and well prosecuted; there are some Pieces in him [Drayton], I dare compare with the best Transmarine Poems' (Drummond 1711: 266). The reference to mainland Europe is an indicator of the context within which Drummond is always embedding any consideration of national representativeness: no poet writing in either the English or Scottish vernacular had yet established the reputation on the Continent that would be the only proper grounds on which to base any claim to represent the nation's genius. National and international fame were inextricably linked, the one the potential guarantor of the other. In a rider to his comments on Drayton, Drummond admits that 'I find in him, which is in most part of my Compatriots, too great an Admiration of their Country; on the History of which, whilst they muse, as wondering, they forget sometimes to be good Poets' (Drummond 1711: 227). (The shift from first person to third person in

Drummond's possessive pronouns here is perhaps revealing of Drummond's ambivalent sense of his own nationality and his relation to English writers: they are '*my* Compatriots' but admire too much '*their* Country', and it is not entirely clear whether Drummond writes in the first instance as a Briton (as seems more probable), thus identifying himself with his English neighbours, or as a Scot, thereby distinguishing himself and his countrymen on national grounds only to identify a parochialism shared with the English.) Against a background of reading in Petrarch, Bembo and the Pléiade, it is easy to suppose that Drummond might well have more or less consciously conceived of his own *Poems* as a work that in its indebtedness to (and translation of) the 'Transmarine' poetry of mainland Europe, and its union of Scottish and English poetic strains, could provide a representation of 'Great Britain' much less inclined to fall into parochial admiration for its country of origin at the expense of its art. Following the Petrarchan model, Drummond would 'fulfill' James I's newly united kingdom(s) as James VI had declared Fowler to have done for Scotland.

What I want to argue here, as a prelude to a broader case regarding Petrarchism's role in Drummond's negotiation of problematic national sentiments, is that the Petrarchan mode, with its peculiar dynamic of retreat and dissemination, served Drummond and his friends, consciously or unconsciously, as an alternative and important means of bridging the gap that Brown identifies. In exploring Petrarchism's role in the development and expression of national feeling, William Kennedy emphasizes how in the early modern literary world, 'limited, sometimes transitory allegiances among people operated at personal, highly contingent levels, with the inflecting power of gender, class, and status modulating their affiliations' (2003: 8). From these personal relationships 'flow the currents and cross-currents of social, political, economic, and legal institutions and ideas that would later define nation-states in Western Europe' (8). In spite of its highly formalized rhetorical structures, he goes on, lyric poetry 'offers especially good insight into these personal, private, and idiosyncratic contours of early national sentiment' (8). Petrarchan lyric offers particularly specific insights because of its 'elite providence, linking it to social groups among the aristocracy and professional urban classes with well-defined investments in the ideology of patria, race and nation' (8). National sentiment grew out of personal loyalties.

In the wake of the Union of the Crowns, just such a web of private, idiosyncratic, sometimes highly contingent allegiances placed the Petrarchan lyric and its circulation at the centre of a negotiation of problematic questions of nationhood and identity by Scottish authors. Drummond's probable connection to the Humes has already been alluded to. Relationships between the 'Scoto-British' writers, as several of them identified themselves, have been the subject of some research, but there remains more to be said about how Petrarchism served both as a social glue binding them together and a means of exploring and shaping notions of the nation(s) they now inhabited. The interest in Petrarchan versifying on the part of Scottish writers post-Union has often been regarded as the result of belatedness, attributed to negative factors such as James VI's aversion to the use of the sonnet for treating of amorous matters, or the predominance of French over Italian influences in Scotland throughout most of the sixteenth century. Yet it should also be seen in part as a positive if largely intuitive response to newly problematic questions of nationhood and status, springing from a deep-seated sense of how apposite a medium Petrarchism was for addressing these questions.

As Kerrigan notes, the careers of the Scottish courtly poets who moved to London in the wake of the Union for the most part fit the pattern Brown describes of those seeking to maintain connections with both England and Scotland. Robert Ker of Ancram, for instance, became a member of the English privy council, but his correspondence demonstrates a continued concern with Scottish affairs, while William Alexander continued to publish books in Edinburgh, built a new house in Stirling, and became chief of the MacAlexander clan, at the same time as being made an earl by Charles I, and acquiring land in Ulster and the Governorship of Nova Scotia (Kerrigan 2008: 149). Others, such as Alexander Craig, published their work with London printing houses (Craig, for example, published his *Poetical Essayes* with William White in Holborn) while declaring themselves on their title-pages (as did Craig, Alexander, and David Murray) to be 'Scoto-Britanes'.

Drummond, however, remained in Petrarchan retreat in the Lothians: Hawthornden became his Vaucluse; the River Esk, his Sorgue. Yet through poetic and epistolary activity, Drummond not only maintained but helped to generate an essentially Petrarchan literary sphere of the kind described by Kennedy, within which a revised sense of what it meant to be Scottish, as well as British and European, was negotiated.

As Robert Crawford notes, 'commendatory verses in which poets wished one another good luck with their new books indicate that there persisted among the Scottish poets at the southern court a sense of fellowship which extended to other writers still in Scotland' (2007: 165). At least as important as evidence of this sense of fellowship, however, are the letters and poems exchanged in private correspondences. The very conception of the literary friendship founded on the exchange of letters and verses was in itself, of course, ultimately indebted to Petrarch. When viewed in the round, these literary correspondences often appear to add up to the construction of a semi- or quasi-public literary sphere. Often Drummond and his contemporaries would enclose a letter or message for one literary acquaintance in a letter to another, relying upon, and thereby also facilitating and perpetuating, a broader web of literary connections. The evidence of Drummond's 1614 pre-publication of the *Poems*, while difficult to interpret with any certainty, also suggests that within this loose network printed publication was on a continuum with private manuscript circulation.

Evidence for such a network from one on its margins can be found in William Lithgow's poem on his departure from Scotland:

> Amongst these long Goodnightes, farewell yee Poets deare,
> Graue Menstrie true Castalian fire, quicke Drummond in his spheare.
> Braue Murray ah is dead, Aiton supplies his place,
> And Alens high Pernassian veine, rare Poems doth embrace.
> (Lithgow 1618: H4$^{r}$; cited Kerrigan 2001: 164)

As John Kerrigan observes, no distinction is drawn here between Scottish poets from north and south of the border, and if Lithgow wrote partly in the hope of winning patronage from his fellow Scots, this makes 'the cultural map he expected these poets to favour' all the more significant (2001: 164-5). There is not space here to map all the literary exchanges between Scottish writers in the wake of the Union of the Crowns, but that figures such as Drummond, Alexander, Ker and Hume were bound together by a web of literary cross-connections emerges from a number of recent studies. Allan, for example, draws attention to a number of literary cross-border friendships between the Scottish neo-Stoics: Alexander Seton, for instance, enjoyed a close friendship with Drummond's friend Robert Ker. This friendship, he notes, 'operated at a high level of literary sophistication' (Allan 1997: 68). Yet while Allan finds their correspondence 'full of gentle Stoical pathos for a secluded but once-active life nearing its close', the letter he cites as an example of this pathos also makes easy use of a metaphor rich with Petrarchan associations:

> I will nocht be subject to greate discontentement, and be this starne, I intend to hald out the reste off my voyage or nauigatioun. I hope shortlie to discouer my port. Think nocht for this, Sir Robert, that I think me onye neirar to death, farder nor that I knaw thair is fa monye ziers off my mortalitie past. (Kerr 1875: 22-23; cited Allan 1997: 68)

The metaphor of the bark was hardly limited to the Petrarchan tradition, but the combining of Stoic resilience with language evocative of the body of literature deriving from Petrarch's *RVF* 189 points to how closely these two threads were interwoven in early seventeenth-century Scotland.

If the overarching effect of this web of correspondences was to create a 'Scoto-British' literary sphere, however, that sphere (perhaps better conceived of as a network or a hive of interconnecting tunnels) drew much of its strength and vitality from its exclusion of a wider outside world. Drummond's desire to maintain this sense of an elite literary community while also upholding its exclusive, private nature is evident in the extant draft of a letter he wrote to William Alexander to accompany some of his verses:

> this piece of my grauer Muses which I diuulge <not> not (by reason of the great contempte and scorn which this kind of studies is subiect to in this part of the world) but priuatlye impart to such whose vertues and true worth deserveth onlye to be celebrate in verses to the posteritie, <dead>[...] after the momentary course of this life, and only read worthy poets, alone of which small number in this clime as a diamond amidst so many Rocks your L. shines' (Paganelli 1968: 316).

In the *Poems*, meanwhile, we find Petrarch's scorn of the 'vulgo' (*RVF* 114.9; see too *RVF* 7.9-11 and 99.9-11) reiterated repeatedly: 'Let me Renown'd liue from the vulgare Throng' (*DP* 1.s12.11) Drummond asks at one point, and later, as we have already seen, he celebrates that 'sweet solitarie Place, | Where from the vulgare I estranged liue' (*DP* 1.s43.1-2). Yet that sphere also both encoded, and was held together by, a retreat from an alternative pseudo-public sphere in which conceptions of nationhood might be expected to be explored and invested, that of the court. We have seen how this retreat was informed by neo-Stoicism, yet it also recalls Petrarch's alienation from 'Babylon', the papal court at Avignon. Drummond, having remained in rural retreat at Hawthornden, held a privileged status among his literary peers, almost all of whom had headed south to London in James's wake.

Petrarch's own reworking of the Senecan attack on the Imperial court in his criticisms of the Papal court at Avignon undoubtedly lies near the origins of the adoption of a Stoic critique of the courtier that runs throughout humanism as a counter-current to the celebration of courtly life that takes its cue from Castiglione. Yet Petrarch also supplemented and complicated the Stoic critique. Something of the Petrarchan colouring Drummond gives to the Stoic retreat from the court emerges from his correspondence with Sir Robert Kerr, later the first Earl of Ancram. In his letters Drummond repeatedly cautions the Gentleman of the King's Bed-Chamber that courts 'be changing Moons', and reiterates the metaphor he used in the letter to Sir Maurice cited by Allan, warning Kerr against 'the Embracements of your Mistress the Court' (Drummond 1711: 143). This metaphor of the court as mistress itself perhaps glances back towards the Petrarchan imaginary that surrounded Elizabeth in the previous generation. In another letter, Drummond celebrates the stability of Kerr's self over against the 'Vapours of Court': 'How ever Fortune turn her Wheel I find you still your self, and so ballasted with your own Worth, that you may out-dare any Storm'. (Drummond 1711: 141-2).

These warnings and encouragements represent one half of a partially formalized literary exchange, the always already anticipated counterpart to Ker's praises of Drummond's solitary life. As with all such codified social exchanges, its formulaic nature serves at least as much to guarantee as to trouble its sincerity. The variations rung on the theme not only allow but actively enable the expression of individuality, as well as serving to reinforce the sense of the writer's genuineness, and there is an affecting intimacy to the exchange between the two men.

Of particular interest is a sonnet that Ker sent to Hawthornden on the very subject of Drummond's solitary existence. Ker's letter is dated 16 December 1624, a year after Drummond's *Flowres of Sion* had first appeared in print in Edinburgh, and his poem, entitled 'A Sonnet in praise of a Solitary Life', was presumably written as a sort of response or echo to Drummond's own 'The Praise of a Solitarie Life', sonnet 22 of *Flowres*. The letter is addressed from 'Cambridge, where the Court was the Week past, about the Making of the French Match'. The reference to the court draws attention to its status as a private emanation from a public context, even as the reference to the wedding negotiations reminds us of the public role the exchange of Petrarchan verse often played in state marriages, themselves a peculiarly ritualized imbrication of the private and the public. James himself had, of course, addressed a number of love sonnets to Anne of Denmark.

Ker, who in his accompanying letter worries at his own enslavement to the court, presents his poem as the product of a withdrawal into the closet. A note Ker appends to his sonnet tells Drummond (and us) that 'The Date of this starved Rhime, and the Place, was the very Bed-Chamber, where I could not sleep'. Is this literary convention, melancholy insomnia being a characteristic, even necessary attribute of the properly Petrarchan poet? Or is it a straightforward description of the circumstances of the poem's production? Ker's note, like his sonnet, suggests how at times in the social economics of Petrarchism performance and intimacy could become so tightly intermeshed as to be indistinguishable.

In his sonnet, Ker's letter tells Drummond, 'I have sent you an Approbation of your own Life, whose Character howsoever I have mist, I have let you see how I love it, and would fain praise it, and indeed would fainer practise it'. Interestingly, in the light of Drummond's own retreat, these thoughts immediately run into a meditation on mortality. Meditating on his own enthrallment to the corrupting life of the court, he broods, 'It may be, the All-Wise God keeps us from that kind of Life we would chuse in this World, lest we should be the unwillinger to part with it when he calls us from it'. Kerr goes on to hope he will have time before his death to set his house in order, 'that the wicked World have not Occasion altogether to say of me, there *was a foolish Courtier'*.

Kerr's modest poem is an orthodox enough neo-Stoic rejection of the court and the 'fierce Ambition' (l.8) and 'savoury Lyes' (l.12) that are found there. However, when it speaks of the solitary life's freedom from 'the Annoy, | Which from sore Wrongs done to one's Self doth rise' (ll.3-4), we hear the voice of a moral agent worrying at his own responsibility for his 'State', a word the poem puns upon in order to establish both the relationship and the contrast between the public realm and the interiority of the private individual. Chiming with the sentiments expressed in the letter, this authentic (or authentic-sounding) note of personal engagement saves the poem from the emaciated status its author accords it. Perhaps most intriguing, though (other than a peculiarly baroque figure Ker deploys at the start of the second quatrain and appends a note to explain), is his description of the 'Sweet Solitary Life' in the opening line as one of 'lovely dumb Joy'. Solitude's muteness serves to contrast with what Drummond in his poem describes as 'the clamorous World' and 'smooth whisperings neere a Princes Throne' (*FS* 22.2,7). If joy can be conventionally dumb, however, Ker's foregrounding of the silence of solitude contrasts with Drummond's celebration of the polyphony of his own retreat, enriched by the sweetness of the 'Birds harmonious Moane,' the 'hoarse Sobbings of the widow'd Dove' and 'Zephires wholesome Breath' (ll.5,6,9). Apart from the disparity in literary merit, the major contrast between the two lies in their treatment of the natural world. Nature is almost totally excluded from Ker's sonnet. Drummond's, on the other hand, is rich with natural imagery, and is as much a celebration of nature as it is of the solitary life. Indeed, the opening quatrain makes clear that he who passes his days in 'some shadie Grove', 'though solitarie, is not alone': rather he converses with 'Eternall Love,' articulated through the 'true Delightes' of his natural surroundings.

Drummond's poem, then, rather than presenting the solitary life of retreat in essentially negative terms, emphasizing the absence of the corrupting influence of court, establishes the positive values of solitude. In communicating these values, however, Drummond was of course contributing to the overcoming of solitude and the accompanying sense of political and cultural impotency. The publication of solitude, firstly through the private networks that linked the Scoto-British writers together, helped establish a 'national' space that could serve as an alternative to both the London court and the Presbyterian, and often ferociously Calvinistic, sense of Scottish cultural identity that Arthur Williamson's study of Scottish national consciousness in the age of James VI focuses upon. We have seen how Drummond rejected the court as a locus of either Scottish or British identity, notwithstanding his (occasionally critical) loyalty to the monarch: as Robert Cummings notes, to the eirenical and episcopalian Drummond, who identified Presbyterianism with factionalism and advantage-seeking, this offered an even less attractive alternative. Jenny Wormald, writing almost thirty years ago, wrote of the survival of a literary culture in Scotland beyond the court in houses and castles like those of William Mure of Rowallan, or of Drummond himself, but suggested that any such survival was 'diffused and uncertain' (1981: 193). In the rich network of epistolary exchanges, however, supplemented and broadcast through printed editions, the Scoto-British Petrarchans do appear to have found a means of turning privacy and a sense, even, of alienation, into the locus of a kind of national feeling that nevertheless always remained receptive to influences from outside.

Before moving on to look more closely at Drummond's poetry, it is worth making a parenthetical examination of the question of Drummond's language. As has already been noted, one of the ways in which Petrarchism served early modern writers' attempts to fashion a sense of national sentiment was through its serving as a privileged model of a national literature that could overcome political boundaries and civil strife. Renaissance commentaries upon the *Rime sparse* exhibit the history of Petrarchism as one of 'negotiation between the imputed universalism of a Petrarchan style shared across Europe and the particularism of its local and regional adaptations', and writers such as Bembo Boscán, Du Bellay, Sidney and Opitz 'encouraged a regeneration of vernacular styles based on Petrarchan models' (Kennedy 2003: 16). For Drummond, writing in the wake of the Union and caught between the Scots that came naturally to him and the southern English of the court in which his literary models such as Sidney and Daniel wrote, Petrarchism both threatened and promised to be the site of the working out of a linguistic struggle.

## 3.4 The Language Question

A year after the publication of Drummond's *Poems* (1616), interpreters at the port of London were declared no longer necessary: the English and Scots tongues were now considered 'not so far different bot ane understandeth ane uther' (cf. Wormald 1981: 193). This illuminates both the linguistic gap between English and Scots at the time Drummond was writing, and the manner in which this gap was narrowing. Some years ago, Robert MacDonald suggested that 'We must read Drummond as he wished to be read, as an English poet' (1971: 22), and the established narrative has tended to see courtly Scottish poets post-Union, Drummond included, as rapidly and even opportunistically anglicizing their verse. Focusing on Drummond's use of southern English and of Scots, however, literary linguist John Corbett interprets his verse as a distinctively British project:

> The intertextual, multicultural collage that is Drummond's poetry, and his choice of an English idiom with only occasional Scottish colouring, can be seen as his attempt to both distil the vernacular European tradition and position himself as one of the first generation of *British* writers [...] his ambition was clearly to be recognised not as a Scottish or English writer and translator but as a fusion of the two'. (1999: 84)

While it promises to lend further weight to his argument, Corbett never explicitly evokes the Petrarchan mode's deployment as a linguistic model for the creation and exploration of national sentiment. Yet since at least Bembo's *Le Prose della volgar lingua* (1525), Petrarch's *Canzoniere* had been regarded as a model for the development of national literatures across Europe (and beyond) on not only stylistic but also linguistic grounds.[99]

This model, however, was by no means an unproblematic one, and to see Drummond simply as a British writer rather than an English one is to risk moving from one simplification to another. Rather, Drummond's language, like his Petrarchan texts more generally, is best seen as the troubled site of contrasting, often contradictory impulses and ambitions. In the years immediately following his first reading in Italian of Petrarch's *Rime*, and immediately preceding the first publication of his *Poems* in 1614, Drummond 'worked his way in Italian through most of [...] Bembo' (MacDonald 1971: 139), including, of course, *Le Prose della volgar lingua*. Within Italy, Bembo's *Prose* 'put Italian on the same footing as Latin and gave Italian rhetoric its rules. Henceforth Latin classics were abandoned for Italian classics and it became axiomatic that poetry must follow Petrarch and prose Boccaccio' (Kidwell 2004: 230). In the *Prose*, Bembo proposed the language of Petrarch specifically as an alternative to the adoption of the language of the court as a national tongue. Both Dante, in *De vulgari eloquentia*, and Calmeta, in his lost tome on language, had argued for a courtly Italian. In the *Prose*, however, Giuliano de' Medici points out that language varies from court to court, and that the Roman court Calmeta praised, full of foreigners introducing words from their own languages, was the worst of all. We are clearly supposed to agree, and we can imagine that Drummond, given his neo-Stoic feelings regarding the corruptions of the court, would have found Bembo's presentation of the Petrarchan style as an alternative, potentially oppositional language extremely attractive. It is impossible to prove, but it seems at least feasible that Drummond might have conceived the 'British' project embedded in the linguistic texture of his text as part of the establishment of an alternative (but not disconnected) site for cultural formation from that of the English court, especially in the light of how Scoto-British Petrarchan literary networks seem to have operated to form some kind of alternative pseudo-public sphere.

---

[99] The scholarship on Petrarch and Bembo is, of course, extensive. William Kennedy's study offers much of the relevant context, while Antonio Daniele's essay on 'Il Petrarca del Bembo' (2005: 195-218) offers some interesting points of departure for a consideration of Bembo's importance in linguistically founded notions of national sentiment.

In exploring the workings of the Petrarchan model, William Kennedy makes a useful distinction between a mother tongue and a father tongue.[100] A mother tongue is 'a common language within broad bounds of local difference' the sharing of which might constitute a metaphor for collective origins, 'a figure of natural inclusion and national coexistence that accepts all who embrace it regardless of social rank or geographical locale' (Kennedy 2003: 17). Those who speak it, wherever they come to reside, feel a shared attachment to their motherland, the land of their birth. The father tongue, on the other hand, is linked to the idea of a patria, or fatherland, implying 'a more restrictive form of coexistence' that 'embraces only those who formally submit to its laws and orders, as expressed in a particular variant of its language' (2003: 17). Rather than simply belonging to it, 'people aggressively will a fatherland into being by activating its values [...] and defending its sovereignty in a precise lexicon' (2003: 17). The father tongue is 'the acquired discourse of law, education, commerce, and specialized professions, couched in a language such as Latin in the West, Arabic in Islamic countries, and Mandarin in the East (2003: 17).

---

[100] Kennedy draws for his distinction on Ghassan Hage's distinction between a motherland and a fatherland: see Hage 1996.

For Kennedy, Petrarchism serves as an apt medium for national literary discourse because it accommodates the mother tongue of the modern vernaculars to the father tongue of the ancient classics:

> The *Rime sparse* deploys an artificial self-consciously constructed amalgam of literary Tuscan, Sicilian, Provencal, and classical Latin, all of them elite forms embedded in textual conventions of antiquity and the later Middle Ages. Fashioned in this composite, such patriotic poems as Petrarch's canzoni 53 and 128 express some of the earliest national sentiment in European letters. But, as a vehicle for predominantly amatory poetry, Petrarch's style favours topics that express personal feelings and interpersonal relationships. It offers a transitional space for freedom, play, and creation which permits access to sometimes discordant and discrepant dreams, exurient desires, and tractable realities. (2003: 18)

As Scotland underwent the sudden transition from independent state to a lesser, sometimes even peripheral partner in a new Britain, such a 'transitional space' was to prove extremely valuable.

As the persisting European father tongue, Latin, rather than Scots, was often seen as the proper language in which to display patriotic pride in Scottish culture, having the possibility of reaching a far wider audience abroad. This remained the case well into the seventeenth century, as is attested to by the use of Latin in so many of the panegyrics welcoming James back to Scotland in 1617 (cf. Kerrigan 2008: 152). The relation between the various vernacular dialects and languages in Scotland was already complex prior to the Union of the Crowns. Scottish culture had long been characterized by linguistic eclecticism (Kerrigan 2001: 164). Early modern Scots recognised a tripartite division between *Scoti* (the modern lowlands and borders) *Scoti Boreali* (the territories of Aberdeenshire and Moray) and *Scoti Montani* (the Gaelic-speaking territories, much more extensive then than now) (Stevenson and Davidson 2009: 73). Lowland Scots had emerged out of the dialects of Northern England to become a distinct language with a distinct literature of its own only in the fifteenth century (Schwend 1989: 29). Dame Scotia in *The Complaynt of Scotland* (c.1549) acknowledges the historical unity of language between Scots and Northern English, even though she goes on to list all the differences between Englishmen and Scotsmen: 'there is nocht tua nations vndir the firmament that ar mair contrar and different fra vthirs nor is inglis men and scottis men, quhoubeit that thai be vitht in ane ile, and nychtbours, and of ane langage' (cited Schwend 1989: 29). The courtly Scottish poets at the beginning of the seventeenth century knew too that their speech 'was close to that spoken in northern England, and they regarded themselves as speaking in the same "Inglis" as their fellow-Britons' (Kerrigan 2008: 151). As J. D. McClure notes, 'as it suited the individual, the speech [of the Anglo-Saxon dialect used in non-Gaelic Scotland] could be described as the same language as English, one dialect of the language of which Metropolitan English was another dialect, or a distinct tongue' (1995: 56).[101]

In his *Reulis and Cautelis*, however, the young James VI, while acknowledging their familial ties, had distinguished Scots from English as a medium for a national poetry, and thus established it as a potential 'father tongue' in its own right, a process courtly Scottish poets of the late sixteenth century such as Stewart of Baldynneis and Alexander Montgomerie furthered. This linguistic project, pursued through literary means, coincided with the most ambitious expansion of Scotland's borders since the reign of James III. For most of those poets associated with James's court in Scotland, any gap between the mother tongue and the newly privileged vernacular would have been minimal. Upon the Union of the Crowns, however, James's emphasis shifted. In a Proclamation to the Privy Council, the King cited 'ydentie of language' as one of the elements portending union between England and Scotland. As McClure notes, 'the language had not changed, but the political situation had; and with it James's attitude' (1995: 55, n.5). In his *Brief Discourse of the Happy Union betwixt the Two Kingdoms of Scotland and England*, which he presented to the King in 1604, Francis Bacon set out an ideal view of the marriage of tongues designed to appeal to his new monarch:

---

[101] Something of this flexibility is perhaps suggested by the persistence of the two interchangeable terms for what Douglas called 'our awin language', 'Inglis' and 'Scottis'.

> It is true that the nations are *unuis labii*, and have not the first curse of disunion, which was confusion of tongues, whereby one understood not another. But yet the dialect is differing, and it remaineth a mark of distinction. But for that, *tempori permittendum,* it is to be left to time. For considering that both languages do concur in the principal office and duty of a language, which is to make a man's self understood, for the rest, it is rather to be accounted (as was said) a diversity of dialect than of language: and as I said in my first writing, it is like to bring forth the enriching of one language, by compounding and taking in the proper and significant words of either tongue, rather than a continuance of two languages. (1740: IV, 220; cited McClure 1995: 55-6)

In practice, however, this marriage of the tongues was hardly to be an equal partnership, as the last sentence of Bacon's text quoted above already hints: the 'one language' of the 'British imperial' state and its literature was to be southern English, even if James's court would continue to sound distinctly Scottish.

The Scoto-British poets were thus confronted with a suddenly yawning chasm between the language of their *natio,* Scotland, and that of the new fatherland, Britain, the latter of which was still in the process of formation. For the politically ambitious, this was troubling, if also potentially exciting. That the King himself was having to negotiate the chasm in question must have made the social tribulations of doing so less taxing, and perhaps have given the Scottish courtier-poets hope that they could play a role in the 'aggressive willing' of a new 'British' father tongue into being, at least at the level of poetic discourse. In practice, these two forces pulled many writers in opposing directions. Sir William Alexander feared that his tragedy *Darius*, being 'mixt of the English and Scottish Dialects', might therefore 'perhaps be un-pleasant and irksome to some readers of both nations', but went on to hope that 'both countrie-men will take in good part the mixture of their dialects, the rather for that the bountiful providence of god doth invite them both to a straiter union and conjunction as well in language, as in other respects' (1921: I, cxcvi). The second part here expresses the hope that elements of the Scottish dialect might find their way into a new British vernacular father tongue. As Kerrigan notes, however, Alexander's 'unpatriotic assertion that southern English is superior in elegance and perfection makes Alexander's further reduction of Scots in the 1604 (London) and later editions of *Darius*, as well as in other plays and poems, seem less a compromise than a dilution' (2001: 163). In practice, for courtly Scottish writers south of the border, the myth of a project of linguistic union offered a useful veil for any shortcomings in their attempts to appeal to an English audience by writing in an English 'almost indistinguishable from that of the literati of the English court' (Corbett 1999: 77).

The literary linguistic anxieties of the Scoto-British poets can easily be exaggerated. Partly because of the aforementioned recognition of the shared parentage of northern English and Lowland Scots, Scottish writers could regard themselves as shifting dialects rather than languages. Poets such as Alexander, Kerr and Drummond were fluent in a range of languages,[102] and 'Sudron' English 'could be added to this repertoire, as the lingua franca of the King's new British state, without it seeming a betrayal' (Kerrigan 2001: 164).[103] Again, Latin's persisting status as the true father tongue made the decision to write in Scots or English far less fraught that we are inclined to suppose it today.

Drummond's manuscripts reveal that he composed his early work at least in Scots, using the familiar <quh-> and <y> forms and Scots words such as 'speir' ('ask'), and inflexions such as <-it> in words like 'kepit' (Corbett 1999: 77). In the printed poems, however, while traces of Scots remain, the question forms and much of the vocabulary are anglicized. This led Macdonald to suppose that 'in his published work Drummond attempted to erase Scotticisms, but [that] occasionally examples survived his vigilance' (1976: 196-7 – cited Corbett 1999: 77). Michael Spiller too notes that Drummond evidently sent sheets from his 'pre-publication' printing of *Poems* in 1614 to Sir William Alexander, who tried 'to bring Drummond's Scots grammar and stress into line with English usage' (2007: 199). In a letter from London dated 12 April 1615 Alexander notes that of the few faults he has detected in the pieces Drummond sent him, some are 'of the Printer, some of the Accent, and others in the Congruity according to the phrase here' (Drummond 1711: 150; cited Spiller 2007: 198-99). Yet significant Scotticisms remain in the 1616 printing of the *Poems*. Alexander's letter alludes to the 'Haste' (Drummond 1711: 150) in which he has had to peruse what was sent him, so it may be the case that Drummond simply didn't manage to have all his work 'corrected' by friends before going (again) to press. For Corbett, however, Drummond is 'probably aware' of the Scotticisms he left in the printed versions of his poems (1999: 82). Indeed, it seems unlikely that a poet with as refined an ear as Drummond's, and as familiar with contemporary English literature, a poet who clearly revised his works almost as punctiliously as his visitor Jonson in preparing them for print, would fail to realize that the 'Flowrs' in his poesie sometimes offered masculine rhymes on /u/, while elsewhere proffering feminine rhymes on a schwa, or would be unable or unwilling to find suitable 'southron' alternatives. Although Drummond's general preference is for English, he 'moves between English and Scots as each serves his immediate purpose' (Corbett 1999: 82).

---

[102] These languages in any particular case might include 'Latin for educational purposes, French at court, Gaelic in some regions [and] Scots for dealing with lowland tenants and for many official documents' (Kerrigan 2004: 163), as well as a number of other European tongues.

[103] As McClure notes, 'the Anglo-Saxon dialects formed a continuum, in which the most conspicuous break occurred not at the Tweed but at the Humber' (1995: 50).

Examples of Drummond's integration of Scots into the language system of the *Poems* can be found not only at the lexical level, but also in his occasional use of Scots grammatical structures, or to make a rhyme.[104] A poem such as 'Floras Flowre' (cf. Kastner 1913: I, 124), printed amongst the 'Madrigals, and Epigrammes' in the *Poems* of 1616, depends entirely upon its readers supplying its missing last word:

> *VEnus* doth loue the Rose,
> *Apollo* those deare Flowrs,
> Which were his Paramours,
> The Queene of sable Skies,
> The Subtile *Lunaries*,
> But *Flore* likes none of those,

---

[104] See, for example, madrigal iii of *Poems*, where Drummond rhymes on the Scottish monophthong /u/ in Flowrs' and 'Paramours' (Corbett 1999: 82).

> For faire to Her no Flowre seemes saue the *Lillie*:
> And why? because one Letter turnes it *P*.

The presence of that Scots rhyme on ‘Flowrs’ and ‘Paramours’ points us in the right direction, towards the Scots and Northern English dialect word for the penis, ‘Pillie’. This is a slight enough piece, which suggests Drummond could grow sufficiently tired of florid pastoral mythologizing to need to debase it occasionally with bawdy. As the burlesque interweaving of Scots with macaronic Latin in the *Polemo-Middinia* also suggests, Drummond has a tendency to associate Scots with a low register (as Corbett notes, he uses it here to realize the ‘mock’ element in ‘mock-heroic’). This is potentially problematic for any supposed ‘British’ poetics, looking somewhat analagous to Alexander’s downplaying of the elegance of Scots in *Darius*. Alternatively, it could be taken as Drummond’s self-aware, humorous deprecation of his native tongue, or a sign of a sense of anxiety and even inferiority in respect to the new language of power.

In order to be a British poet, then, Drummond seems to have accepted that he would have to ‘project a public voice closer to southern English than was idiomatic’ for him (Kerrigan 2001: 162). As Corbett notes, however, Scotticisms survive in his work in sufficient numbers for us to suppose that they did not simply escape eradication. Corbett argues that Drummond ‘did not generally use the Scots linguistic system available to him as a signal of his national affiliation’ (1999: 82), yet, if he seems to have had anxieties regarding its use, neither did he eradicate it from the *Poems*. Yet if his anglicization was far from being merely the result of ‘cultural cringe’ (Kerrigan 2001: 163), that cringe was real, and founded on an increasingly acute sense of ‘the relative isolation of Scotland within a culturally conflicted regal union’ (2001: 155). Drummond’s correspondence offers an intriguing insight into the tensions between English and Scots, and Drummond’s sense of the dangers of being seen to be offending English sensibilities. In a letter addressed to Northumberland, Drummond defends ‘my countrie and my selfe’ from the slander done him by ‘certaine infamous verses latelie by your l.[lordship’s] menes dispersed abrod’(cf.

Paganelli 1968: 318-320). Drummond takes great care that it should not be possible for his letter to be interpreted as in any way anti-English, 'protesting what so euer hier is said is no way entendet to the Nobilitie and gentrie of engliand in general, for the which I dare trewlie say that my countrie men and my selfe sall be euer as reddy to sacrifice our blood all [as?] for our owne mother Scotland' (Paganelli 1968: 320).

### 3.5 'This Northerne Phenix': Drummond, Nation, and the North

The very name of the beloved of his *Poems*, 'Auristella', sets Drummond's sequence up as a fusion of what he saw as the best of English and Scottish practice within the European Petrarchan tradition. In one of his commonplace books, Drummond notes that 'the Italiens vpon the names of ther mistrisses hath a sorte of diuision particulare in my iugement to them selues as may be seene in the 5 sonnet of Petrarche' (NLS MS 2060: 241$^{r}$). This is followed by a transcription of the first seven lines of 'Quando io movo i sospiri a chiamar voi' (*RVF* 5), the sonnet in which Petrarch plays on the syllables of a Latinized version of Laura's name:

> Quando io movo i sospiri a chiamar voi
> e 'l nome che nel cor mi scrisse Amore,
> LAU-dando s'incomincia udir di fore
> il suon de' primi dolci accenti suoi;
>
> vostro stato RE-al che 'ncontro poi
> raddoppia a l'alta impresa il mio valore;
> ma "TA-ci," grida il fin, "ché farle onore (*RVF* 5.1-7)

Drummond was thus clearly alert to the possibilities of Petrarchan syllabic play upon the beloved's name. In christening his beloved 'Auristella', a name with no other mythical or literary precedents, Drummond could hardly be pointing more explicitly to his intention to fuse the matter of his preferred English poet with the manner of his Scottish friend in order to create a new, distinctly British strain of Petrarchism. In 'Heads of a Conversation' Drummond declared that

> Among our *English* Poets, Petrarch is imitated, nay surpast in some Things, in Matter and Manner: In Matter, none approach him to *Sidney*, who hath Songs and Sonnats in Matter intermingled: In Manner, the nearest I find to him, is *W. Alexander*; who, insisting in these same Steps, hath Sextains, Madrigals and Songs, Echoes and Equivoques, which he hath not; whereby, as the one thing surpast him in Matter, so the other in Manner of Writting, or Form (Drummond 1711: 226).

The eponymous beloved of William Alexander's sequence is Aurora, while Sidney's Astrophel is of course enamoured of Stella. As Kennedy notes, Philip Sidney (and indeed the whole Sidney clan) played a central role in establishing Petrarchism as an important discourse for articulating and shaping 'an emerging English national character' (2003: 7). For Alexander, meanwhile, 'Petrarch and Sidney are the twin peaks of achievement' (Fleming 1997: 153), yet in christening his beloved 'Aurora', he has been seen as signalling his agonic desire to eclipse Sidney's Stella, as the stars are eclipsed by the dawn (Roche 1989: 277). The *Aurora* has also been seen as of interest above all for the manner in which it attempts 'to amalgamate the dominant trends in both Scotland and England' (Fleming 1997: 153). Given Drummond's friendship with Alexander and the high regard in which he held his work, it seems likely that the *Aurora* prompted Drummond to consider how English and Scots traditions might be melded together through the European Petrarchan tradition.

In his most optimistic, ambitious moments, Drummond may have hoped not only to ease the growing pains of the new union by bestowing upon it a potentially unifying literary language in the same way that Petrarch, thanks in part to Bembo, had done for Italy: as a writer perhaps unrivalled in seventeenth-century Britain in his knowledge of contemporary Continental poetic practice, he may also have hoped, as a British writer with the weight of the two kingdoms behind him, to win the Petrarchan laurels on the continent that had hitherto eluded vernacular lyricists writing in both English and Scots. Private ambition tangled with public aspiration. Yet ultimately Drummond was in many respects a political realist, and his work reveals the strain as much as the hope of holding together the two parts of the union against the forces that threatened to pull them apart.

The idealized, solitary rural existence that Drummond both described and performed in his poems was the result of a fusion of partially fictionalized life and art that marks him out as a more 'fundamentalist' Petrarchan than almost any of his contemporaries. Sidney had made sophisticated, often playful use of a fluctuating, ambiguous relationship between the Petrarchan poet and his persona, and done much to establish the sonnet sequence as an instrument of urbane self-fashioning. Drummond was familiar with the Elizabethan and early Jacobean Sidneians as well as with *Astrophel and Stella*, and saw himself as continuing the line. Closer to home his uncle William Fowler's *Tarantula of Love* had, with its own idiosyncrasies, established the Petrarchan mode in Scotland, looking back to Petrarch himself first and foremost for a new literary model for Scottish poetry. Yet perhaps precisely because of the geographical and temporal distance he must inevitably have felt from his English predecessors (far more important influences for Drummond than they were for Fowler), Drummond seems to have embraced more completely if not more profoundly than any of his British precursors the Petrarchan weaving of the poet's life into the weft of his work. Where Sidney seems to have dramatized a possible affair with Penelope Rich, however, Drummond made the character of his own stylized persona, and, above all, his reclusive mode of life, the primary subjects of his Petrarchan performance. As Karl Miller suggests in his memoir, *Rebecca's Vest*, it is more than possible to think that 'the occasions of [Drummond's] life and the occasions of his verse belong to the one work of the imagination, to the closet of a man whose sonnets say that he must both "write and love"' (1994: 92-3).

The picture of the melancholy recluse that Drummond's poetry presents and that Drummond himself may perhaps quite literally have had painted is, however, hard to square with the luxurious, Baroque surface of his amorous verse. His poetry is loaded with 'sparking Topaces' and 'sparkling Saphires', (*DP* 1.s1.203; *DP* 1.s2.1), with 'Pearle, Iuorie, Corrall, Diamond' (*DP* 1.s6.13). Morna Fleming compares his poetry to 'intricately woven tapestry' (1997: 233). (In the context of Drummond's permanent residence at Hawthornden, the simile is serendipitously Petrarchan, recalling Petrarch's determination that if he were ever to enjoy a *stabilis sedes*, a steady abode, he would weave through his writing a *nobiliorem et certe uniformem telam*, 'a more noble and certainly a unified tapestry' (*Fam*. 13:250).) Karl Miller notes how Drummond's sonnets are 'given to performing [...] calling to mind a ceremony of melancholy music, paces and pauses,' thanks to their cadences 'fit to accompany some stately dance' and their exotic word-order 'leaning into Latin' (1994: 95). As Robert MacDonald puts it,

> His poetry was designed to catch the eye: it is marked by its decorative quality; it is colourful, fanciful, exotic. Drummond liked the unusual word and the obscure epithet; he collected them and displayed them like rare flowers. He enjoyed ornament for its own sake, and his work is full of the most elaborate toys (1976: xvii).

One might take issue with Sarah Dunnigan's claim that Drummond's love poems 'rarely seem to rework or critique' what Joel Fineman calls the 'foregrounded rhetoricity of Petrarchist manner': yet that sparkling patina is undoubtedly always very much present, even if one could argue that it is sometimes troubled by darker, more introverted currents of thought (Dunnigan 2007: 133). Properly belonging to the following generation, Drummond is nevertheless a fully paid-up member of that 'cult of rhetorical magnificence' that Dunnigan rightly identifies with late sixteenth-century Scottish verse. As is the case with his immediate predecessors, his verbal extravagance is 'held in formal tension with the constraining exactitude of the sonnet scheme' (Dunnigan 2005: 109). Indeed, Drummond outdoes his antecedents in refinement: his *Poems* combine *manierismo* and *Marinismo*, while assimilating seamlessly into an international model the distinctively Scottish late medieval sound patternings still protuberant in the works of poets like Stewart of Baldynneis and Alexander Scott. The philological focus on Drummond's literary borrowings has perhaps blinded us somewhat to the unity of the surface lustre to his work, the extent to which he binds the disparate sources for his 'matter' in a virtuoso display of unified, consistent 'manner'. This manner may be a composite, but it is one that it is perfectly mixed, so that its constituent parts are no longer easily identifiable. Where the preceding generation's 'love of literary bricolage' (evident in, for example, the fusion of formal devices borrowed from the late medieval *grands rhetoriqeuers* with the verbal mannerisms of Petrarchism) led to the creation of 'bizarrely beautiful word-sculptures, intent on revealing the "lustre of a poem",' in Drummond, notwithstanding his love of the exotic and the obscure, that bizarreness is almost wholly absent (Dunnigan 2005: 109). To post-Romantic, post-Modernist eyes this stylistic unity can seem close to mere blandness, no more than an enslavement to formal conventions. Alongside his intertextuality, it has no doubt contributed to the illusion of a lack of originality that has led to Drummond's relative neglect. Yet arguably, before Drummond no poet had consistently achieved a style that fused continental, English and more distinctively native forms and stylistic traits into an integrated vernacular mode that was both unquestionably European and undeniably British, while insisting on its local, Scottish environs.

Drummond's concern with Scottish nationhood after the Union is evident in his *History of Scotland from the Year 1423 until the Year 1542*, which was printed posthumously in 1655. The very writing of such a text is potentially poised between the elegiac and the assertive: it implicitly both mourns a Scotland whose identity Drummond perhaps felt to be under threat, and reasserts its distinctive origins and character. As Nicola Royan and Dauvit Broun observe, Drummond, like any other historiographer, reveals the preoccupations of his own age in his description of another. Royan and Broun cite a speech by the French ambassador at the court of James I, in favour of a French marriage alliance (and against an alliance with the English), as best summarizing these concerns:

> But it may be, after mutual marriages have one day joined your two Kingdomes in one, they [the English] will seek no preheminency over your State, nor make Thrall your Kingdome, but be knit up with you in a perfect union: Do not small brooks lose their Names when they commix their Streams with mighty Rivers, and are not Rivers ingolfed when they mingle their waters with the Seas? Ye enjoy now

> a kind of mixed Government (my Lords) not living under absolute sovereignty; your king proceedeth with you more by Prayers and requests than by Precepts and Commandements, and is rather your Head than Soveraign, as ruling a Nation not conquered; But when ye shall be joined in a Body with that Kingdom which is absolutely Royal and purely Monarchical, having long suffered the Laws of the Conqueror, ye shall find a change and a terrible transformation (cited Royan with Broun 2007: 181).

The French ambassador's speech captures Drummond's own ambivalences towards the amalgamation of the crowns. On the one hand, there is the dream of a true marriage, but even within that vision there is contained the loss of identity: as Royan and Broun note, 'the hope of "perfect Union" is instantly denied by the practice of rivers' (2007: 181).

Drummond's language here echoes the terms in which Bacon described the Union of the Crowns. For Bacon, two conditions would bring about a 'Perfect mixture' of the two states. The first of these was 'Time'; the second, the scientific principle 'that the greater draw the less': 'So we see when two lights do meet, the greater doth darken and drown the less. And when a smaller river runs into a greater, it leeseth both the name and the stream' (1868: X.3.98). Scottish identity, then, was to be wholly subsumed into English culture. Bacon's use of river imagery here (which in his use of the verb 'drowns' also seeps into his light metaphor) belies his earlier suggestion that the two nations should, in their new British guise, be considered 'in the proportion that they bear to the whole', Scotland making up one third of the new nation and its culture, to England's two-thirds' (X.3.228; cited Maley 1998: 175-6).

Drummond's deployment of the metaphor of smaller streams running into greater perhaps adds an extra significance to his Petrarchan use of the names of local brooks and rivers in his *Poems*. There not only the Ore but also the Esk that ran beneath his window and the Forth whose great estuary ran into the sea nearby become the primary place-marks that establish the location of Drummond's retreat, even as their classicizing incorporates them into the Petrarchan schema (and thus into the European tradition), immortalizing them against their imminent absorption into the seas of union.

Since Tudor times, river poetry as a minor genre in England had provided a model within which poets such as John Leland and William Vallans 'could endorse particular versions of national identity' (McRae 2008: 507). Spenser, of course, had subsequently done more than any other poet to establish the River Thames as a vital symbol and locus of national identity and sentiment. As several recent studies have shown, poetic discourse on rivers retained its potency as a means of exploring and shaping political debate over spatial identities and myths well into the seventeenth-century. Drayton's *Poly-Olbion*, Drummond's qualified admiration of which has already been noted, is perhaps the most famous example of an early seventeenth-century poetic essay in chorography. There 'rivers are given voices, and bear much of the poem's burden of historical and topographical description' of England (McRae 2008: 507). The multiple, competing voices of Drayton's rivers reveal tensions between national and local identities (McEachern 1996: 138-91) in a manner that finds an echo in Drummond's use of river names in his *Poems*. In Drummond, however, a Petrarchan intertwining of national and regional sentiment on the one hand and private, amorous retreat on the other leads to a more complex awareness of both.

In Scottish writing, too, rivers are naturally associated with national identities. For Melville, the Stone of Scone stood 'on the noble banks of the beautiful Thames', from where it 'demands | a Scoto-Britannic king, and a kingdom owed to the seed of the Scots' (McGinnis & Williamson (eds.) 1995: 284), while it is the river Tweed that divides the peoples who are to be united under first James and then Henry. In the wake of the Union, Sir Robert Ayton addressed a sonnet to the Tweed 'which sometyme did devyde, | But now conjoynes, two Diadems in one' (Ayton 1963: 167: ll.1-2). Ayton's sonnet, however, reveals a more troubled, complex sense of identity than Melville's 'Natalia'. 'Emblematic of the simultaneous potency of the Union and of a stubborn nationalist iconography', it is, as Carruthers and Dunnigan note, subtly dialogic: it contains 'both celebration and a poignant note of regret in the transference of sovereign power' as it crosses the water from north to south (1999: 85). The poet's ambivalent attitude toward the Union is evident in the implicit contradiction by which the river becomes the 'Trinchman', or toastmaster, an ostensibly celebratory role, for the nation's 'mone', or lament (l.4). Lines 5 – 8 might well allude to the departure of the Scottish court and its writers, Ayton included, for London:

> And since non's left but thy report alone
> To show the world our Captaines last farewell
> That courtesye I know when wee are gon
> Perhapps your Lord the Sea will it reveale.

The sonnet then envisions the sea's 'high tydes' sending 'these flowing tydeings' upstream to 'that Religious place whose stately walls | Does keepe the heart which all our hearts inthralls' (ll.13-14). This, presumably, is Melrose Abbey, where the heart of the Bruce is interred. The syntactic ambiguity regarding who is speaking to who might be a result of failed poetic technique, but it seems to be in tune with the poem's broader ambivalences, the sense of an empty message going back and forth at the risk of being lost in the process. The King's farewell and the poet and the nation's 'mone' run into each other, so that both are borne upstream, but the content of both is left to be inferred. This leaves an absence at the core of the poem that makes the imagined future return to the literal heart of Scotland with which it closes all the more poignant and wistful. The image of the sea's high tide swelling to the point where the tidal current can bear the 'murmuring sounds' of these contentless messages all the way inland to Melrose is potentially disturbing in its reversal of the natural order. As such, it hints at the potency of both the desire for a two-way exchange between nation and sovereign that was never to come about, and the potentially disruptive persistence of a national loyalty made all the more potent by its projection into a future 'when wee are gon'. Moreover, the poem begins with the head (moving from the 'Diadems' the river conjoins to the evocation of its estuary) contemplating union, only to end in the heart. Where the King traces a journey from North to South, Ayton here dwells literally in the stream of union, journeying from East to West, a journey which geographically traces the line simultaneously of division and union between the two nations, but which spiritually (and in due course, geographically, too) leads back to the centre of Scottish identity.

Ayton’s poetic deployment of the River Tweed is clearly not intended to suggest a political critique of James’s Union of the Crowns: rather, it becomes a way of tracing the disjunctions between rational approval of public policy and the private urgings of the heart of both the individual and the nation. The overt rhetoric of such celebratory laments was flattering to James, and they were undoubtedly written with more than an eye to royal patronage: yet even so, they pointed implicitly to the potential pitfalls of Union.

Rivers are almost the only geographical markers Drummond deploys in the *Poems*. Several of the commendatory verses included in the various editions of his works identify him closely with the local streams, a pattern established from the opening lines of an anonymous commendatory sonnet in pastoral vein appended by way of introduction to the *Poems*, 1614. There Drummond is described as the ‘Swanne which so sweetly sings, | By Aska’s Bancks, and pitifully plaines’ (ll.1-2: Kastner 1913: I, ci). In 1617, upon what was to be James’s one and only return to Scotland following the Union of the Crowns, Drummond delivered *Forth Feasting*, his panegyric to the King. To celebrate the reunion of king and country, Drummond ventriloquizes the River Forth. In a catalogue that makes Scotland’s rivers the locus of her identity, the Forth appeals to its nymphs to ‘rise from your moyst Repaire’ and ‘pray | Our Floods and Lakes, come keepe this Holie-day’ (45-47):

> What e’re beneath *Albanias* Hills doe runne,
> Which see the rising or the setting Sunne,
> Which drinke sterne *Grampius* Mists, or *Ochells* Snows:
> Stone-rowling *Taye*, *Tine* Tortoyse-like that flows,
> The perlie *Don*, the *Deas*, the fertile *Spay*,
> Wild *Neverne* which doth see our longest Day,
> Nesse smoaking-Sulphure, *Leave* with Mountaines crown’d,
> Strange *Loumond* for his floating Isles renown’d:
> The Irish *Rian*, *Ken*, the silver *Aire*,
> The snakie *Dun*, the *Ore* with rushie Haire,
> The Chrystall-streaming *Nid*, lowd-bellowing *Clyd*,

> *Tweed* which no more our Kingdomes shall devide:
> Rancke-swelling *Annan*, *Lid* with curled Streames,
> The *Eskes*, the *Solway* where they loose their Names,
> To ev'rie one proclame our Joyes, and Feasts,
> Our Triumphes; bid all come, and bee our Guests:
> And as they meet in *Neptunes* azure Hall,
> Bid Them bid *Sea-Gods* keepe this Festivall. (49-66)

A little further on, James's status as king of England, Ireland and Scotland is also described in terms of the allegiances of representative rivers:

> Thy Deedes not only claime these Diademes,
> To which *Thames*, *Liffy*, *Taye*, subject their Streames (249-50)

The poem closes, however, with a lament for the King's inevitable departure:

> Ah, why should *Isis* only see Thee shine?
> Is not thy forth, as well as *Isis* Thine?
> Thou *Isis* vaunt shee hath more Wealth in store,
> Let it suffice Thy forth doth love Thee more:
> Though Shee for Beautie may compare with *Seine*,
> for Swannes and *Sea-Nymphes* with imperiall *Rhene*,
> Yet in the Title may bee claim'd in Thee,
> Nor Shee, nor all the World, can match with mee. (383-90)

For Robert Cummings, the poem signals Drummond's resignation of serious political intentions, making an impossible demand – that the king remain in Scotland – and simultaneously acknowledging its impossibility. This resignation, Cummings argues, 'makes the poem, in a quasi-technical sense, profoundly unethical: it makes no appeal that can be acted on, and becomes instead an exhibition of passion' (1987: 3). Yet if there is no appeal that the monarch, the poem's ostensible audience, might act upon, in pointing to Isis' superior wealth as the primary cause of the king's inevitable return south, *Forth Feasting* does reveal a clear-eyed awareness of the realities of power and dynastic reign that threatens to undo its own apparently overblown panegyric. Moreover, the loving catalogue of Scotland's rivers and waterways, and the melodious mimesis of the Forth's voice, together with the superficially purely rhetorical insistence on the value of love over wealth and beauty, all hint that the poem is also speaking to another audience committed, perhaps, to establishing the relation between Scottishness, Britishness and local loyalties at an affective rather than purely political level. Cummings suggests that Drummond would have shared Puttenham's notion of poetry as identified with pleasure rather than persuasion – with inducing feeling rather than, in Jonson's words, guiding us 'by the hand to action' (1987: 3). This is questionable – Drummond's poetry, it might be argued, is more Scottish than it appears, and partakes in a significant strand within Scottish writing that sees literature as playing a deeply moral role, instructing the reader in a parallel reading of verse and life, alerting him to the temptations of superficial interpretation. Yet even if we accept Cummings' argument, *Forth Feasting*, while obviously serving as praise of a dynastic imperial ruler, and, through its main conceit of identifying peoples with rivers obscuring the realities upon which imperial wealth rests (as occurs most clearly in the reference to the River Liffey), also not only evokes but generates a pleasure in locality that suggests an alternative basis for political commitments.

Drummond's most extended Petrarchan river poetry occurs in sonnets 14-16 of the first part of the 1616 edition, which form a kind of sequence in miniature. The first, as Kastner (1913: I, 182) observes, takes its cue from *RVF* 148:

> Non Tesin, Po, Varo, Arno, Adige et Tebro,
> Eufrate Tigre, Nilo, Ermo, Indo et Gange,
> Tana, Istro, Alfeo, Garona, e 'l mar che frange,
> Rodano Ibero, Ren, Sena, Albia, Era, Ebro—
>
> non edra, abete, pin, faggio o genebro—
> poria 'l foco allentar che 'l cor tristo ange
> quant' un bel rio ch' ad ogni or meco piange
> co l'arboscel che 'n rime orno et celebro.
>
> Questo un soccorso trovo fra gli assalti

d’Amore, ove conven ch’armato viva
la vita che trapassa a sì gran salti.

Così cresca il bel lauro in fresca riva,
et chi ’l piantò pensier leggiadri et alti
ne la dolce ombra al suon de l’acque scriva!

> [Not Tesino, Po, Varo, Arno, Adige, or Tiber, Euphrates, Tigris, Nile, Hermus, Indus or Ganges, Don, Danube, Alpheus, Garonne, the sea-breaker Timavus, Rhone, Ebro, Rhine, Seine, Elbe, Loire or Hebrus—
>
> not ivy, fir, pine, beech, or juniper—could lessen that fire that wearies my sad heart as much as a lovely stream that from time to time weeps along with me, and the slender tree that in my rhymes I beautify and celebrate.
>
> I find this a help amid the assaults of Love, where I must live out in armour my life that goes by with such great leaps.
>
> Then let this lovely laurel grow on the fresh bank; and he who planted it, let him—in its sweet shade, to the sound of the waters—write high and happy thoughts!]

The six rivers enumerated in the poem’s opening line are all Italian, establishing a national context that echoes that of the famous ‘Italia mia’ (*RVF* 128), which appears twenty poems earlier, and which also opens with an evocation of ‘ ’l Tevero et l’Arno, | e ’l Po’ (5). That *canzone* also established a series of parallels between the ‘bel corpo’ (3) of the nation and that of the beloved, the poet, and the reader. Here, though, the catalogue of Italian rivers, itself a negation rather than an affirmation, opens out to include rivers in Africa, Asia, Asia Minor, and the rest of Europe. Having gestured towards a national consciousness only to move beyond it to an implied universality, Petrarch insists upon the superior curative value of the local stream that ‘ad ogni or meco piange’, that weeps along with him from time to time. The ‘bel rio’ by which Petrarch plants his laurel tree, unlike the famous rivers listed in the opening quatrain, goes unnamed, even though it has consistently been identified (as Petrarch no doubt intended) with the Sorgue in Vaucluse. In the final tercet the poem contains the poet's sorrow in the wish that he should write high and happy thoughts under the laurel's shade: 'piantò' in line 13, meaning 'planted', becomes with a shift of stress 'pianto', the past participle or substantive of the verb 'piangere' (to cry), whose appearance at the end of line 7 prepares us to hear this latent sense at the poem's close.

This move inwards into the emotionally-conflicted privacy of the 'dolce ombra' on the banks of the Sorgue, however, inevitably carries with it echoes of broader concerns. In describing his refuge as a help amid the 'assalti | d'Amore', the assaults of Love, 'ove conven ch'armato viva', where it is wise to live in armour/armed, Petrarch again evokes the 'crudel guerra' (11), the cruel war under which Italy suffers in 'Italia mia', and his call on the petty lords of Italy there to prenderà l'arme' (94), to take up arms for the sake of peace. The 'bel lauro' that Petrarch hopes will grow by the Sorgue is of course in great part that of his own poetic fame, which in turn was to become such a focus for the Italian national sentiment the poem's first line evokes. What Petrarch's sonnet seems to suggest is that to keep itself alive real national feeling has to be constantly and paradoxically denying and transcending itself by moving both outwards beyond its geographical borders and inwards into the disruptive realms of the conflicted 'cor tristo', the sad heart.

In his study of Petrarchism's role in the formation of early modern national sentiment in France, William Kennedy cites as an exemplary case the translation of *RVF* 148 by Vasquin Philieul, the canon of Notre Dame des Dons in Avignon (2003: 112-13). In the headnote to the poem, Kennedy notes, Philieul iterates 'the preeminence of Avignon and Vaucluse in Petrarch's literary experience' (2003: 113), claiming Petrarch for the French. Philieul's translation of the *RVF* celebrates French excellence and military might, 'and a key component in this excellence is Petrarch's poetry, now fully French in Philieul's punning association of "Francesco" with François (Francis/French): "aussy Petrarque aura nouueau renom | Quand il sera François dessoubz ton nom" ' (cited Kennedy 2003: 113). Petrarch's sonnet was thus already associated with expressions of national sentiment by the time Drummond was exploring how 'the French have also set Petrarch before them as a paragon' (1711, 226). There is no evidence that Drummond knew Philieul's translation: he owned and appears to have used Philippe de Maldeghem's later translation into French of the *RVF* (MacDonald 1971: 213 –catalogue no. 1133). It is quite feasible that Drummond may have come across Philieul's version of *RVF* 148; what is far more probable and significant is that his poetic consciousness was more generally alert to the complex interweaving of local and national affiliations throughout the Petrarchan tradition. Philieul's translation, as Kennedy (3004: 113) notes, prepared the ground for Du Bellay's more influential appropriation for French cultural history of the *RVF*, an appropriation with which Drummond was certainly familiar. Drummond's copy of de Maldeghem's translation of the *Canzoniere* into French is prefaced by a short commendatory poem, in Latin, by Maximilian de Vriendt, that establishes the translation's import for French national sentiment and literary aspiration:

> Orbis honos Itali, & diuini gloria vatis
> Seu Deus illie fuit, fiue Petrarcha fuit.
> Quisquis at ille fuit, magnus fuit, & mihi nomen
> Victurum Latio semper in orbe dedit.
> Nec minor ille Alpes vltra Rhodanumque sequestrena
> Qui me Liligeri Flander in Arua f[?s?]oli
> Transtulit, & tanto cumulatem fœnore audaxit,
> Itala vt addubitem, Galla vel esse velim.
> Itala vel Phoebi vel amantis ab ore Petrarchę
> Galle ero, Leyschoti non minor arte mei.
> Gallia sed quantum Ausonia est extensior omni,
> Tantum ego plus Galli lætor honore soni. (f10$^{r)}$

The presence of a poem here from de Vriendt, who also contributed a 20-line Latin epigram and a longer commendatory Latin verse to the 1597 edition of Justus Lipsius's *De cruce*, indicates something of how closely interwoven Petrarchan and Stoic discourses were in the literary environment Drummond worked in. The possibility of Petrarchan sonneteering and translating in itself serving as a suitable pastime with which to fill a neo-Stoic retreat from strife in the outside world is suggested by another commendatory sonnet to de Meneghem's volume, which records that

Philippe (dont le nom par tout soit estendu
Et viuent a iamais les labeurs difficiles)
Qui pour passer l'ennuy de nos guerres ciuiles
En vulgaire François Petrarque auez rendu. (5-8)

[Philippe (whose name is known by all
and whose life is one of most arduous labour)
In seeking to lessen the pain of our Civil Wars
Here renders Petrarch into the vernacular French.]

Drummond at Hawthornden was 'literally surrounded, throughout the disturbing events of the religious conflicts and open warfare which carried Scotland's public life in the first half of the seventeenth century, by the protective cordon of his own trees and grottoes and gardens' (Allan 1997: 65-6), which, along with his own private moat, the Esk, he duly metamorphosed into Petrarchan material.

*RVF* 148's importance in the French context might help to account for James VI's echoing of it in his own river sonnet:

Not orientall Indus cristall streames:
Nor fruitfull Nilus, that no bankes can thole;
Nor golden Tagus; where bright Titans beames,
Ar headlongst hurled, to vew the Antartike Pole;
Nor Ladon (wch sweet Sidney dothe extole)
While it, th' Arcadian Beauties did embrace:
All these cannot, thee, nameless thee, controle;
But, with good right, must rander and give place:
For, whilst sweete she, voutsafest to show her face,
And, with her presence, honours thee ilke daye;

> Thou slyding, seemest, to have a slower pace,
> Against thy will, as if thou went away;
> And, loathe to leave, the sight of suche a one
> Thou still imparts, thy plaints, to every stone.

Intriguingly, James's addressee, this river spoken to by a king, remains anonymous: indeed, James insists on its 'nameless' state. It is tempting to read the poem as a kind of riddle, and straining for a solution one might hear in 'loath to leave' the plaint of the waters of Leith. This river flowing through Edinburgh is associated homonymically with Lethe, the river of forgetfulness, and this might in turn suggest a possible explanation for the river's namelessness. This is not particularly convincing, but in any case, what 'nameless' suggests above all here is the river's lack of fame: unlike the Nile and the Tagus, this Scottish stream bears no historical or literary prestige. Precisely in conceding the Scottish river's anonymity, however, James also insists on its parity with, even its superiority over, those rivers of international renown: 'All these cannot, thee, nameless thee, controle; | But, with good right, must rander and give place'. That we are engaged in an agonic literary struggle here is clear enough from the reference to Sidney's 'Ladon'.

Ostensibly, it is, of course, the excellence of the (likewise nameless) beloved that bestows this status upon the river. Yet the river, with its 'plaints', also stands as a figure for the poet, making the poem an auto-celebration: the fame of poet and river go hand in hand. At the same time, the identification of poet and river also opens up a reflexive space within which a potentially discursive selfhood comes into being: the 'thou' that is addressed is also implicitly a figure for the absent 'I' that is doing the addressing. This thou and I are further identified in the closing four lines, as the verse, like the river, slides and slows its pace, reluctant to leave the reader. If the reader is thus cast as the beloved, he is also implicitly cast as one of the stones that hears the river's complaint. This not only echoes the traditional stony-heartedness of the Petrarchan beloved, but challenges the feminized reader-beloved's capacity to respond to the orphic power of his king's verse. As addressee of the poem, however, the reader is also identified with the river. It is thus in the poem's subject that reader and poet are fused, and this reminds us of the role the reader must play in the realization of the poet's striving after fame. These fundamentally Petrarchan metamorphoses of reader and writer work to bestow upon the poem a temporal and geographical scope that transcends the moment (or pretended moment) of composition. That 'still' in the final line points to both the river's and the poem's contradictory, Heraclitean quality: unchanging yet ever-moving, the river and the poem we read now both are and are not the same as those seen and composed by James in the late sixteenth century.

James's sonnet, then, grounds its own striving after the laurel crown on geographical and literary obscurity. The refusal to name both river and beloved is of course a perfectly Petrarchan trait found in *RVF* 148 itself. As we shall see, Drummond's micro-sequence of river sonnets looks indebted to both *RVF* 148 and James's sonnet, although there is no evidence that Drummond saw James's poem, and the resemblances may well be familial rather than indicative of direct influence. Drummond's micro-sequence is anticipated by the first and longest of the *Poems*' songs, which is oriented about the River Ore. The song's opening, while referring to the seasons, nevertheless serves to remind us of the northern setting:

> It was the time when to our Northerne Pole
> The brightest Lampe of Heauen beginnes to rolle (l-2)

Echoing Sidney's *Arcadia*, the song describes the poet, prior to the experience that awaits him, as the model of the withdrawn, solitary Stoic:

> I, in simple Course, free from all Cares,
> Farre from the muddie Worlds captiuing Snares,
> By *Oras* flowrie Bancks alone did wander (9-11)

The river, meanwhile, is described as

A Floud more worthie Fame and lasting Praise
Than that which Phaeton's Fall so high did raise (13-14)

The comparison with the Eridanus, or Po, and its association with the falling Phaeton, will be reprised in sonnet 14's description of 'the Floud into whose Streames | He fell who burnt the World with borrow'd Beames' (ll.2-3).

Part of the delight of Drummond's celebration of the Ore lies in the way he classicizes it almost, but not quite, out of all recognition or relation to the real river running through Lothian. The river valley becomes a 'little Arden', that 'might Elysium bee' (l.30), populated with classical gods (ll.31-2), 'Nymphes' (l.33), Satyres' (l.35), and pastoral shepherds and their 'Phillis' (l.39). Significantly, the trees that Drummond describes as growing along the river banks associate the scene with both Petrarchan fame, and death: they are 'The Lawrell' (l.23), 'The Palme' (l.24), and 'The Poplar' (l.25), who 'spreds her Branches to the Skie, | And hides from sight that azure Canopie' (ll.25-6).

In sonnet 14, the first of his three poems, Drummond outdoes Petrarch, at least in the number of rivers he manages to cram into his fourteen lines:

Not *Arne*, nor *Mincius*, nor stately *Tyber*,
*Sebethus*, nor the Floud into whose Streames
He fell who burnt the World with borrow'd Beames,
Gold-rolling *Tagus*, *Munda*, famous *Iber*,
*Sorgue*, *Rosne*, *Loire*, *Garron*, nor prowd-banked *Seine*,
*Peneus*, *Phasis*, *Xanthus*, humble *Ladon*,
Nor *Shee* whose Nymphes excelle her who lov'd *Adon*
Faire *Tamesis*, not *Ister* large, nor *Rheine*,
*Euphrates*, *Tigris*, *Indus*, *Hermus*, *Gange*,
Pearlie *Hydaspes*, Serpent-like *Meander*,
The Golfe bereft sweet *Hero* her *Leander*,
*Nile* that farre farre his hidden Head doth range,
 Have ever had so rare a Cause of Praise,
 As *Ora*, where this *Northerne Phenix* stayes.

A glance at this display promises tedium, but Drummond achieves a sense of excess, a Baroque piling up of detail, not only through his enumeration of river names, but through rhythmic tricks such as the frequent intrusion of hendecasyllabic lines (4, 6, 7, 9, 11 – also echoing the meter of Drummond's Italian original) into the basic decsyllabic structure. Drummond incorporates both Petrarch's Sorgue and Sidney's Ladon (cited, as we have seen, by James) into his display of *copia*, the cataloguing of waterways suggesting the weight of classical and vernacular European literary tradition against which Drummond is pitching his little stream: or perhaps, given the image of the phoenix, it would be more accurate to say that the river Ore is here presented as the site of a new renaissance of that tradition, Drummond thus claiming the full weight of its backing.

Drummond's celebration of his 'Northerne Phenix' here makes of the north the equivalent, for both Britain and the world, of the retreat into privacy at the level of the self that is enshrined in Petrarchism. The archetypally Petrarchan rhetorical boast of his beloved's superlative status becomes the vehicle by which the poet elevates his own locale amongst the ranks of those places celebrated for their literary, mythological and historical associations. Yet at the same time, in making northernness the mark of distinction explicitly of his beloved, and implicitly of his environs and his verse ('Northerne Phenix' might as easily be read as referring to Drummond himself as to Auristella), Drummond intimates that the perceived seclusion of the north, an indication of its exclusion from cultural developments, is actually a source of value, guaranteeing the inwardness upon which Petrarchan fame depends. Elsewhere, Drummond plays down the merits of the north with formulaic modesty: writing of the possibility of his own publisher in Edinburgh, Andrew Hart, bringing out the second part of the *Poly-Olbion*, he assures Drayton that he would be 'overjoy'd to see our North once honoured with your Works, as before it was with *Sidney's*; tho' it be barren of Excellency in it self, it can both love and admire the Excellency of others' (Newdigate 1941: 181). This is of course typical of the conventional self-deprecation we find running throughout Drummond's correspondence. Yet emphasizing the cultural poverty of the north also fits with Drummond's schema: to be the properly Petrarchan locus of fame, the banks of the Ore also have to be obscure, not only because this throws the poet's achievement into relief, but because it both symbolizes and facilitates the poet's introspection.

The sonnet that follows develops this theme of reclusive inwardness, and, in as much as it is more convoluted and sophisticated, it places greater demands on its reader's inward resources. Verbal and thematic echoes might almost convince us that it takes the close of James's river sonnet as its point of departure:

> To heare my Plaints faire River Christalline
> Thou in a silent Slumber seemes to stay (1-2)

The pathetic fallacy is complicated by the possibility that we hear 'Plaints' as genitive, a sense endorsed by both the sibilant alliteration of the following line and the flowing musicality of the sequence as a whole. The poet's solitary commune with the Ore is thereby deftly opened out to its public audience through a reflexive move that makes of itself its own subject, thus simultaneously intensifying the work's aura of introspection. As in James's sonnet, where the reader is cast as an unresponsive 'stone', and thereby challenged to read attentively (a challenge he answers, of course, by recognizing in the first place the potential identification the poem is making), an intellectual, ironic countercurrent is detectable here, by which the reader as the poem's addressee is also identified with the river, tarrying in 'silent Slumber' to hear the poet's plaint, and challenged to awake.

As the poet's lament fuses with the stream it addresses, the analogy is revealed between the poet's solitary experience and our own commune with the murmuring eddy of words we hear in silence as the ambiguities of 'still' in the final line of his sonnet); and indeed we can come back to Drummond's lines, revisiting the words that just slipped past. As the poet's words mingle with the burbling waters they mimetically stand for, we too as potential addressees of the second line become identified with the river, standing in for it as the poet's proxy auditor: reader, poem, poet and natural world are dissolved into a unity. Sounding silently, the poem as it purls by 'seemes to stay', halting time, and recalling James's deployment of the word 'still', and his blurring of identities between author, reader and river.

This identification runs over into the following lines so that we ourselves as listeners animate the 'Delicious Flowrs' and 'Forrests' the poem goes on to number. The compassion of the natural world for the poet's suffering is, again, inseparable from his audience's willingness to acclaim his 'Woes display'. Just as the river is 'Christalline', nature not only at its most formally complex but also at its most laden with culturally superimposed value, so the 'Mirtle, Palme' and, most significantly of all, the 'Bay', participating in the symbolic economy of Petrarchism, denote the laureate's recognition by his peers and the fame which has us reading him now. The poem itself has become the landscape, so that if we are receptive to its affective force that distinction only serves to immerse us more completely in it. More precisely, the bay's presence here evokes the collective accretion of meaning about a (mythic) originary experience of oneness with nature, whose mimetic reliving in verse has both preserved and transubstantiated that experience, which exists both within time (looking towards Petrarch as a father figure) and outside it (in our individual intimations of a fundamental sympathy between ourselves and our natural habitat). On both levels that experience evokes melancholy, being always in part lost: Petrarch's experience is always already a culturally mediated one, and going back beyond him yields no pure correspondence between language and world, while our individual epiphanies are fleeting, and corrupted in the reflexive act of trying to capture and preserve them.

Things are thus set up nicely for the octet's climax:

> The Winds with Sighes have solemniz'd my Mones
> Mong Leaves, which whisper'd what they could not say. (7-8)

Here nature, in the form of the wind blowing through the trees, adds a dignity to the poet's inarticulacy: its voice seems to him to express better than he can the suffering he feels as a result of the 'lack of sense' he attributes to his beloved. Yet the Petrarchan ground to the poem also makes this voice a silent echo of the word from the beloved that never comes: the Petrarchan 'Bay' has prepared us to hear 'l'aura' in the wind, the breath of the beloved, and the wind's whisper thus becomes a figure for her otherwise mute voice. But it is also identified with or as the voice of the poet, whose 'sospiri' are of course set down on the 'leaves' before us. The trope drawn from nature thus becomes the locus where the poet's own inability to name desire in such a way as to penetrate his insensible beloved is overcome by the articulate – articulate because it is whispered, because it is not public speech – voice of the wind in the trees, the unspoken speech of both poet and beloved.

Ambiguous Petrarchan deictics open up a multiplicity of possible senses. Is it the winds which whisper what they themselves cannot say outright in words? Is it the winds that whisper what the leaves of a book cannot articulate, the book the speaker is reading under a tree by a river bank or in a private library at Hawthornden, or in bed in 2011? Or are those leaves the gathered laurels of the Petrarchan lyric tradition within which Drummond is writing? Or are they the leaves of Drummond's book itself, the leaves before us as readers, which whisper what Drummond himself, already absent and now long dead, cannot say? The poem fuses together all these senses. The last points to how the sound of the poems, their organization at the level of form (metrical, syntactic, rhythmic, phonic) whisper a language that accompanies but can also go beyond or even against their explicitly articulated message.

It is ultimately in our capacity to hear and respond to this language, an intensely private experience which is envisioned in terms of the reader's engagement with the page, but one which also generates writing, and subsequently engagement with other private individuals, that Drummond embeds his troubled sense of national sentiment. It is, too, one that springs out of his own individual experience of his rural retreat, of the particularities of nature that surround him. Yet, in its linguistic compromises, and its publication to an audience beyond the limited Scoto-British networks within which Drummond operated, it also looks outward in concentric circles, from Hawthornden to Scotland, the North, Britain and Europe. Indeed, Drummond's insistence on 'the North' as the location with which he identifies parallels the perpetual Petrarchan retreat ever further into the depths of the psyche: as Peter Davidson notes, North ‘is always a shifting idea, always relative, always going away from us’, a perpetually retreating notion, yet at the same time can become the locus of a meaningful identity. It was ultimately, perhaps, in the idea of the North that Drummond found a suitably unstable sense of identity for the unstable times he lived in, one that allowed him to be British and yet continue to insist upon the uniqueness of his Scottish situation. By turns he could let it apply to his position as a Scot in relation to London, as a (Scoto-)Briton in relation to Europe, or as a poet in retreat at Hawthornden. In doing so through the medium of the Petrarchan mode, Drummond showed that the ‘gente ritrosa’, the ‘slow northerners’ of ‘Italia mia’ (*RVF* 128.78), could indeed compete with the southerners not only of London but of France and Italy too.

# CHAPTER FOUR

# THE THINKING WOMAN'S PETRARCHISM ~ LADY MARY WROTH

## 4.1 Heads and Bodies: Reading Petrarchan genderings

The year 2004 saw a range of publications, conferences and exhibitions marking the 700th anniversary of Petrarch's birth. One of the more unusual celebrations planned was the production of a definitive portrait, which was to be achieved, with the aid of digital imaging, through a reconstruction of the poet's facial features from his skull. In November 2003 forensic scientists duly exhumed Petrarch's remains from the church of Santa Maria Assunta in Arquà, near Padua. In the course of their genetic and morphological analyses, however, they made a curious discovery. The reassembled skeleton dated to the fourteenth century and, as the scientists noted, 'bore evidence of injuries compatible with those mentioned by Petrarca during his lifetime' (Caramelli et al. 2007: 4), such as the kick he received from the horse of an old abbot while travelling to Rome in 1350 (*Fam*. XI.i; cf. Bishop 1963: 284). Molecular gender determination, however, revealed — to everyone's surprise — that the skull in the tomb was almost certainly female (Caramelli et al. 2007: 1-5; cf. Hooper 2004).

For what should this strange case serve as metaphor? One obvious temptation might be to adopt it as a figure for the decapitation of a fundamentally and problematically masculinist mode by feminist criticism, a project crowned by the recuperation of long-forgotten female sonneteers — most notably, in English, Lady Mary Wroth, niece to Sir Philip Sidney and the subject of this chapter. The last quarter of the twentieth century saw both Petrarch and the European, male-authored Petrarchan tradition taken to task for their gender politics. Critics influenced by a range of feminist critical theory argued that Petrarchism silenced the female voice and rent, fetishized and commodified the female body. 'The longevity of Petrarchism,' one critic argued, 'was based on the remarkable extent to which it incorporated the major fantasies of patriarchal gender assignments and sexual pathologies' (Waller 1993: 146). At the same time, Wroth, newly rediscovered after centuries of neglect, was celebrated for what was frequently seen as her *anti*-Petrarchan sequence, *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus*. Appropriating and transforming masculinist Petrarchan discourse in order to write against it, Wroth was read, in a feminist-inflected version of the flawed narrative explored in chapter one, as the inventor of a nascent female poetic subjectivity (cf. Post 1999: 215; Fienberg 1991: 175-90).[105] Wroth, many critics seem to argue, puts a female head on the Petrarchan *corpus*.

An alternative reading, however, might take the mystery over Petrarch's skull to figure the inversions and complications of gender roles and identities that Petrarch's poetry itself performs upon poet, love object and reader. That the *Canzoniere* encodes a far more complex and potentially subversive pattern of genderings than a certain kind of crude feminist criticism sometimes allows for should be evident on even the most cursory of readings. And in fact, from its first recovery in the early 1980s (Josephine Roberts' edition, the first to appear since its original publication in 1621, came out in 1983) the more sophisticated studies of *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* have recognized how the Petrarchan mode, while undoubtedly problematic, was in many ways inherently enabling for Wroth, as for other female poets in France and Italy. Building on such studies, this chapter examines in further detail the possibilities and the pitfalls Wroth encountered in her Petrarchan adventure. In so doing, it looks to better understand the complexities of the kind of 'negotiation' she had to engage in with her Petrarchan inheritance, an inheritance that was in part familial (cf. Waller 1993).

---

[105] In another version of this narrative, put forward most persuasively by Jeff Masten, Wroth fails to articulate a distinctively female poetic subjectivity in *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* precisely because of the inherently masculinist poetic mode she had adopted (cf. Masten 1991).

In largely endorsing this second metaphorical reading of the strange case of Petrarch's remains over the first, this chapter addresses one critical controversy over Wroth's work in particular. This is the question of whether *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* is, for better or worse, an intensely private work, whose achievement—or failing—is its articulation of a withdrawal into interiority in the face of 'women's limited textual agency and constraint in the public sphere' (Smith 2000: 408; cf. Masten 1991); or instead a determinedly public work, encoding a 'public self-identification' with certain political and religious factions (Bassnett 2011: 111). Does Wroth 'expel almost completely the realm of the visible and public world' from her sequence, as Wendy Wall argues (1993: 338)? Or does she position her sequence in 'a wide political and religious frame' so that it 'actively seeks political, religious and textual purchase on a range of public and private levels', as Rosalind Smith claims (2000: 431)? And can these two apparently conflicting interpretations in any way be reconciled?

There is merit in both readings, and the real question is of course how to read the imbrication of public and private that we find in Wroth's text—as many critics, including several of those quoted above, have already recognised. The two issues of Wroth's (anti-)Petrarchism on the one hand, and the relation between her public ambitions and her 'convincing [...] poetic mapping of her interior world' on the other (Fienberg 2002: 121), have perhaps proved the most contentious aspects of *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* to date. The best approach to each, I suggest here, may prove to be through the other. A long cultural history identifies the categories of public and private with those of male and female: as Leonore Davidoff notes, the public/private divide has played a dual role as 'both an explanation of women's subordinate position and an ideology that constructed that position' (1998: 165). Indeed, the gendered history of the distinction between public and private is apparent in the words' very etymology. The former derives from *publicus*, derived from *pubes*, which 'specifies "the people" as "adult men" or "the male population",' while *privatus* 'takes in those who are deprived of such status' (McKeon 2005: 9). *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* has repeatedly been read in terms of a withdrawal from the public display of male-authored Petrarchism into a private, anti-Petrarchan realm of female subjectivity. Within that framework, the alignment of Petrarchism with the public tallies with readings that see it as a masculinist genre inhospitable to female voices. Yet as we have already seen in earlier chapters, the *Canzoniere* initiates a troubling of the notion of the public and the private as distinct realms that reverberates well into the seventeenth century and beyond, and is far more complex than such a schematic approach allows for. Petrarch bequeaths to the European lyric mode a peculiar and complex relation between an intensified interiority and an expanded public reach, and the Petrarchan mode has the potential not only to disrupt the orthodox hierarchy of public and private but to place the two categories in a wholly new dialectical relation. Yet to date (to the best of my knowledge) no critic has systematically examined the implications of Petrarch's distinctive imbrication of inwardness and authority, retreat and emblazoning, for how we read the gender politics of Petrarchism. If Carol Pateman is right that the dichotomy between the public and the private is 'ultimately what the feminist movement is all about' (1989: 118), then it is here, in its disruption of that dichotomy, that we may find the Petrarchan mode to have been most inviting for a female poet such as Wroth, and most liberating.

Before revealing the most likely explanation for the female head upon Petrarch's shoulders in the tomb at Arquà, this chapter concludes by proposing a third figural reading of its presence there. To the familiar, conventional equation of the male with the public and the female with the private, we can add a third pair of terms, reason (public, male) and emotion (private, female). The distinction between these two terms, too, is one that Petrarch, with his deep insistence that 'one thinks when the mind is mobilized by love', repeatedly and seriously disrupts (Mazzotta 1993: 8). Indeed, Petrarch's complications of the relation between each of these conventional polarities are ultimately closely implicated, the one in the other. By focusing on Pamphilia's preoccupation with amorous thought, this chapter argues that we can see Wroth re-articulating, with some important differences, a central Petrarchan concern. In its surprising constellation of public and private, reason and emotion, the Petrarchan mode, it concludes, enables Wroth to articulate important ways of thinking about thinking. These, in turn, do indeed set a new kind of head on the body not only of the Petrarchan corpus, but also, perhaps, of the Petrarchan reader.

### 4.2 'Privately groan'd': from Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus

*Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* survives in two seventeenth-century texts, one a manuscript in Wroth's formal italic hand with authorial corrections (Folger MS V.a.104), the other a printed version that appears at the end of Wroth's prose romance, *The Countess of Montgomerys Urania,* published in 1621. The exact relationship of the autograph manuscript to the printed text is contested, as is the question of whether the poems in each constitute one sequence or several. Roy Booth has argued that it is only the first fifty-five poems printed at the end of the *Urania* that, properly speaking, make up *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus.* Wroth's zeal to imitate her uncle, he claims, led her to publish a prose fiction broken off in mid-sentence, and do everything to put out a volume which looked as much as possible like the Countess of Pembroke's 1598 collected works of Philip Sidney, which had just had its fifth printing. For Booth, in Wroth's 1621 publication the first 55 poems are her equivalent to 'Astrophel and Stella', the rest her 'Certaine Sonnets' (Booth 1994: xxxix).

These latter poems include a *corona,* or 'crowne of Sonetts dedicated to Love', and a shorter sonnet sequence of complaints by another character in the *Urania*, Lindamira. The analogy with Wroth's aunt's edition of Sidney's works is persuasive, even if often passed over by critics. It is worth noting, however, that the manuscript of Wroth's poems closes with the 'signature' of 'Pamphilia', and that in making the protagonists of her sonnet sequence central characters from her romance, Wroth was arguably breaking with her uncle's model.

It is also disputed whether the printed text is simply 'tacked on' to the end of the *Urania* (Millman & Wright 2005: 35) or stands in a meaningful relation to it. The volume's page numbering begins afresh with the poems, but Pamphilia and Amphilanthus are two characters central to the romance, and certain key character traits of both appear to be carried over into the verse. The romance was read *à clef*, with the mythically-named characters corresponding to well-known figures at court, and Pamphilia and Amphilanthus have frequently if problematically been identified as figuring Wroth herself and her lover and cousin William Herbert.[106] In the romance, Pamphilia confesses her love for Amphilanthus through an eloquently mute gesture, by handing over to him a collection of her private writings. It is only after Amphilanthus has read Pamphilia's poems that they embark on an amorous relationship. While it is never explicitly stated, this scene raises the possibility that the poems printed at the volume's end equate to this bundle of handwritten texts. Within the plot of the *Urania*, it is therefore probable that *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* is, as Emmanuel Bock suggests, 'a wholly private document' (1998: 63).

This raises issues of interpretation. Some of the poems within the sequence have frequently been read as suggesting that an amorous relationship between poet and beloved has already been ongoing at the supposed date of composition, and that hints at the beloved's betrayal glance at real infidelities (either by the fictional Amphilanthus or the real-life Herbert). I would suggest, however, that all the poems *might* be read as having been 'Privately groan'd' *before* the scene in Pamphilia's closet (P4.6).[107] Such a reading not only fits the fiction the romance establishes for their authorship, but pushes us away from the temptation to read the sonnets as (merely) a thinly-veiled autobiographical recasting of Wroth's relationship with her cousin. More importantly, it intensifies the impression of an agonizing passion endured in secrecy within 'a world of interiority' (Feinberg 1991: 18). Every thought, every emotion is lived out not in the reality of an already existing relationship, but within the inmost recesses of the mind, where it is magnified and inflamed, where every kind look of the beloved seems a promise, and every glance elsewhere a betrayal. It is in this capacity for inward amplification of minimal outside input that Petrarchism reveals the inner landscape to be as wide and rich as the outside world. The attribution of intent—whether 'disdaine' or 'cruelty' (cf. P6)—to the oblivious beloved is of course as common in the Petrarchan mode as it is in life itself.[108]

---

[106] Mary Ellen Lamb offers a useful summary of the plot of the *Urania* as it relates to Pamphilia and Amphilanthus in the appendix to her study of *Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle* (1990: 231-235). Throughout I refer to Josephine Roberts' edition of Wroth's *Poems* (1983), and use her referencing system.

Reading *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* in such terms also makes it a darker, much more deeply ironic text: the betrayals, the enticements, and the false promises that Pamphilia perceives in Amphilanthus's behaviour turn out in the later stages of the romance to prefigure his later conduct perfectly. This suggests, of course, that those amplifications that take place in the echo-chamber of Pamphilia's mind, rather than blowing things up out of all proportion (or perhaps precisely because of their blowing things up out of all proportion) are uncannily perceptive, and thus extraordinarily valuable.

---

[107] Ultimately, the fictional 'occasion' of the poems' composition remains indeterminable. The romance itself specifies that Pamphilia continues to write verses to Amphilanthus after he has proved false to her, falling in love with one Musalina.

[108] It is in such terms, I think, that we are to read the sequence's Petrarchan preoccupation with the lover's gaze. Look at a line often taken as suggesting a pre-existing relationship: 'Eyes, having wunn, rejecting proves a sting' (P5.9). It is perfectly possible to read this as Pamphilia's response to her impression—perhaps justified, perhaps not—that Amphilanthus no longer favours her with his sun-like, life-bestowing gaze. And indeed, the following line, 'Killing the bud beefor the tree doth spring' seems to support such a reading (P5.10).

Moreover, because we read these poems *after* we have read the romance—at least if we read the whole 1621 volume in the order it is printed—that irony becomes retrospective, pre-posterous even: we look back on Pamphilia's inward innocence and appreciate its wisdom in a manner that Pamphilia herself, at the time of composition, cannot.

The place held for the sequence within the romance also rings an interesting change on an important Petrarchan parallel. Pamphilia's amorous gift to Amphilanthus of her hitherto secret poems is analogous to Wroth's publication of her writing to a wider audience. We shall return later to the question of exactly who that audience might have been supposed to be. The parallel invites us to read Wroth's gift to us amorously too, and tesselates with the trope whereby the Petrarchan reader is identified with the beloved and invited to display 'pietà', or pity, rather than remaining as 'pietra', unfeeling stone: to be one of those who 'per prova intenda amore', understanding love from experience (*RVF* 1). How far we can take the analogy, and what kind of relationship it implies between poet and reader, is an intriguing question, given the problematic course of Pamphilia's relationship with the roaming Amphilanthus: at least, if nothing else, it suggests a clear-eyed view of promiscuous reading habits.

Another way of thinking about how the framing of the sequence within the romance functions is as a kind of knowing baroque performative revelation of a process evident in the weft of the Elizabethan sonnet. Ilona Bell describes this process best, explaining it in terms of a significant parallel between the practices of early modern English courtship and the Elizabethan love lyric. The former 'generally began as a private conversation between lovers' before, if successful, leading to 'a public acknowledgment of an earlier private relationship'; likewise the latter 'also generally began as a private communication [...] before moving 'beyond the original dialogue with a private lyric audience to a wider reading public' (Bell 1997: 86). This might be through 'wider, uncontrolled manuscript circulation or printed book, whether pirated, authorized, or posthumous' (Bell 1997: 86). 'A poetics of courtship', Bell concludes, 'produced an erotics of secrecy when the private conversations of manuscript poetry and clandestine courtship steeled themselves against publicity and exposure' (1997: 86). By embedding her sonnet sequence within the fiction of the romance so that the two parallel transitions from private to public are elevated to a formal structuring principle and become themselves the publicized object of the readers' gaze, Wroth brings the Elizabethan Petrarchan sonnet to a new level of self-awareness regarding its own dynamic of secrecy and revelation. This dynamic in itself becomes the spectacle.

What Tottel claimed to have done for real, making public in print poems previously kept private in manuscript by their 'ungentle hoarders', Wroth does in fiction. Together the romance and this last English Petrarchan sequence of the early modern age thus playfully (yet seriously) return the sonnet sequence to its mid-Tudor epistolary origins in the social revelation of the scandalously private, inmost affairs of public figures. The conceit of Pamphilia's poems, though, is that they are composed as the very opposite of epistolary poems, or as anti-epistolary, as letters composed in the knowledge that they cannot be delivered. They address the beloved with what *cannot* or should not be actually communicated, whether out of social pressures or inward fears or a combination of both. They thus serve an ostensibly cathartic rather than communicative end, if with little evidence of any actual catharsis. It is only in their subsequent delivery, their wrenching out of the purely self-reflexive realm of the secret into epistolarity, that they become efficacious. But their epistolary power (both over Amphilanthus and over us) derives from their origins in a negation of epistolarity.

This ambivalence is evident in the very title of Wroth's sequence. The titles of other English sonnet sequences tend to join the lover and beloved with a straightforward *and*, or are simply named after their beloved, like

Thomas Lodge's *Phillis* (1593) or Henry Constable's *Diana* (1592).[109] '*Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus'*, however, emphasizes the epistolary, communicative, occasional character of the poems. It also makes Pamphilia potentially both author and subject, both correspondent and that which is to be 'delivered'. Moreover, that 'to', as well as highlighting the epistolary nature of the poems, also evokes Amphilanthus's evident magnetism. The comma in the title of the printed 1621 edition, however, which is dropped by modern critics and editors, signals a block, a hesitancy, that finds a correlative in the poems in Pamphilia's fears of self-revelation and reactions to Amphilanthus's perceived inconstancies.[110] Provisionally holding 'Pamphilia' back from 'Amphilanthus', it captures in miniature the partial barrier erected through a withdrawal into the self by Wroth's persona against her problematic attraction *to* her putatively faithless beloved. For this reason, I would argue, it is worth retaining—as I have done throughout this chapter.

Of course, Pamphilia's 'delivery' of epistolary poems is further complicated by the fact that it is contained (in both senses of the word) within a fiction which simultaneously veils and exposes its revelation of inwardness. On the one hand, as a fiction, it shields Wroth from exposure, and from any accusations of impropriety: it is Pamphilia's most inward self that is revealed, not Wroth's. However, inasmuch as it mimics her uncle's portrayal of his relationship with Penelope Rich, while being attached to a *roman à clef*, this fiction becomes the veil that makes the true revelation possible. It invites us to read the sequence not only as an emblazoning of the inward selfhood of Wroth herself, but as also revealing to us precisely the conditions that make that veiling necessary. These, of course, are conditions which in turn form a central constitutive part of that womanly subjectivity many critics have argued that we encounter in *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus*. It is in part the veil itself and its imposed necessity that is being revealed. This, at least, is the seductive possibility that Wroth evokes through her use of personae from the *Urania* in her sequence. In the event, we are caught in an undecideable tug-of-war between the titillating invitation to a biographical reading, and its irreducibly fictitious framing.

---

[109] These simple titles are often supplemented by long subtitles, such as, in the case of the latter sequence, 'The praises of his Mistres, In certaine sweete Sonnets'.

[110] The one exception to this rule is Risa and Micah Bear's online version of *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* for Renascence Editions (1991), which follows the Mariott and Grismand printing of 1621.

The exchange of letters (that is, of the sonnet sequence itself) is the climax of an episode that dramatizes Amphilanthus' ever deeper penetration into Pamphilia's privacy, as he is admitted from the outer chambers of her palace to her very closet. It is there that Pamphilia hands over her poems to Amphilanthus, and he learns his love is reciprocated. As Georgianna Ziegler points out, a 'long patriarchal tradition in which the chaste female is metaphorically an enclosed garden, vessel, or chamber' sets up an 'association of woman with *room*' (1990: 77). Early modern women were 'specifically encouraged to identify their closets and bedchambers as chaste spaces' (Roberts 2001: 37). As Richard Braithwaite's *The English Gentlewoman* put it, only ten years after the publication of Wroth's *Urania*, 'we may be in *security* so long as we are sequestred from *society*' (1631: 43; cited Roberts 2001: 37). Yet if gentlewomen were confined within their closets, precisely the privacy of those spaces made them dangerous. As Braithwaite warns, 'PRIVACY is the seat of *Contemplation*, though sometimes made the recluse of *Temptation*' (1631: 44). Therefore women, unlike men, are exhorted to ensure identity between their private selves and their public selves: 'Doe not say, the walls encompasse mee, darkenesse o're-shadowes mee, the Curtaine of night secures me: These be the words of an *Adulteresse*: Therefore do nothing *privately*, which you would not doe *publickly*' (1631: 49; cited Roberts 2001: 38).

The manner in which the *speculum naturae* of the Petrarchan mode is transmuted in Pamphilia's sonnets is just one aspect of Wroth's work that, although not intrinsically gendered, it is hard *not* to read in gendered terms. For Petrarch it is the outer landscape that reflects his thoughts and emotions and supplies the tropes for his inner landscape, the woods, hills, cliffs, and stones of Vaucluse and the Sorgue. As Giuseppe Mazzotta puts it, '[t]he conjunction of the journey within and the journey without suggests that the mind is also a space marked with continuities, discontinuities, proximities, and juxtapositions that are not clearly mapped' (1993: 50). This outward psychic landscape is transformed in Pamphilia's sonnets into a series of interiors.[111] Her psychic landscape seems to be the house. Thanks in part to the *Urania* and in part to their almost obsessively nocturnal settings and preoccupations, the overwhelming impression is of a world of interiors, of chambers and closets. Where Petrarch seeks solitude and solace (and finds inspiration) in the countryside by day, Pamphilia appears to find it in a largely nocturnal withdrawal ever further indoors. It is this, as much as the tightly delimited range of themes and emotions Pamphilia explores or her often tortured syntax, that gives the sequence its frequently-noted claustrophobic atmosphere.

Pamphilia's sequence, then, interweaves interiority and exposure, revelation and concealment, in a complex fashion that is indebted to and makes use of expectations excited by its Petrarchan genre. In certain ways it intensifies Petrarchan figures of retreat, which become more concentratedly inward: after the dark interiors of *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus,* Petrarch's mournful breezes, woods and streams seem positively airy. Pamphilia's mind, like the rooms in which she spends her time (in the poems at least), comes across as a dark, obscure place. Whether this powerfully publicizes the problematics of female subjectivity and Pamphilia/Wroth's struggles to overcome them, or reveals the failure or impossibility of realising a fully-formed female subject in the seventeenth century, has been a moot point in criticism. Before turning to look in greater detail at the role Pamphilia ascribes to thought, therefore, it will be useful to look at the arguments regarding Petrarchism's genderings.

---

[111] Examples of the pathetic fallacy in *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* are notable largely thanks to their absence elsewhere in the sequence. One such is to be found in P22, where 'the very trees with hanging heads condole | Sweet sommers parting' (ll.5-6). That Wroth herself thought it particular is perhaps suggested by the fact that in one copy of the 1621 *Urania* she herself wrote in a title, 'For absence' opposite this poem (Roberts 1983: 222). This poem too, however, opens with a typically Wrothian invocation: 'Come darkest night, becoming sorrow best' (l.1).

### 4.3 'wise speache': writing Lauras

In Italy, and to a lesser degree in France, women writing in the Petrarchan mode, such as Gaspara Stampa, Vittoria Colonna and Louise Labé, have long been more or less canonical figures, and the largely Anglophone notion of a monolithically masculinist Petrarch has consequently had less purchase there. In England, however, as far as we know, no sonnet sequence treating of profane love was authored by a female writer prior to Wroth's (I suggest one possible reason for this below.) This occurred some thirty years after the unauthorized publication of her uncle's Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* sparked the English sonneteering craze of the 1580s and 90s, and nearly a century after the first wave of female continental Petrarchists of the 1530s and 40s. Wroth's sequence can thus be seen as doubly belated—even if, as I shall again suggest below, it is also peculiarly timely. Perhaps as a result of this apparent belatedness, the supposition that Petrarchism was an inherently male poetic idiom resistant to female utterance, and that female writers adopting the Petrarchan mode were necessarily writing against the grain of a tradition that always threatens to silence them, still seems to have considerable currency amongst critics within the English-speaking world. Despite a steadily growing number of studies offering an alternative view of Petrarchism's genderings, 'current readings of poetry by women within the Petrarchan tradition', as Virginia Cox has recently noted, still 'tend to start from the assumption that women were writing as "outsiders"' (2005: 585). Given the family background of Mary Wroth (née Sidney), one might expect such assumptions to be rarer among commentators upon *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus*, yet Cox's observation holds good for a surprising number of studies of Wroth too. It is therefore perhaps worth briefly surveying the wider question of Petrarchism's gender politics before focusing specifically on how they emerge in Wroth's imbrication of the public and the private, reason and emotion.

Renaissance readers recognized how Petrarchan sonneteering disrupted established gender boundaries. Wroth's uncle, in his *Defence of Poesie*, acknowledged that early modern English readers were expected to read love poems as 'if I were a mistress' (Sidney 1964: 48). As we saw in chapter one, the association of English Petrarchist lyric poetry with the feminine endures into twentieth-century criticism, where it has often been used as the basis for a devaluation of Petrarchan verse. As Diana Henderson notes, '"Effeminate" Petrarchism has sometimes been opposed to the moral rectitude of "plain stylists"', while '"Strong lines," masculine force, austerity, stoicism, and anti-Petrarchist Satire are often perceived to be more mature realistic, and serious' (1995: 15). In his essay 'Aspects of the Short Poem in the English Renaissance' Yvor Winters finds that work by authors such as Spenser, endowed with a 'Petrarchan polish,' 'lacks weight,' 'intellectual substance,' and 'moral grandeur' (Winters 1967; cf. Henderson 1995: 15). His vocabulary here, as Henderson observes, unwittingly echoes in some intriguing ways common masculinist discourses on the nature of women (1995: 15).

Given the way it destabilizes gender boundaries, we might expect the model established by Petrarch to prove more attractive than most to women poets seeking a voice in an early modern Europe whose dominant discourses generally police those boundaries ferociously.[112] Petrarch's gender-bending was, of course, a development of earlier poets' deliberate confoundings of the discourses of social distinction and sexual love. In the poetry of courtly love the role of the male lover explicitly parallels the role of the vassal; he addresses his lady as *midons* or *Mo cortes*, etymologically denoting not 'my lady' but 'my lord'.[113] Having taken this inversion of socially existent gender relations as the ground for his poetics, however, Petrarch sublimates it and then proceeds to disrupt it in a manner more precocious and thorough-going than anything attempted by the troubadors. As a result of a continuous series of metamorphoses, the binary distinctions between not only male and female but subject and object and self and other become unstable. Petrarch is transformed into Daphne or Semele, while Laura becomes Jove, an engendering bull, or the sun; her capacity to provoke acts, thoughts and words out of love make her the creator of the fictive poet, of 'Petrarch'.[114] These inversions and confusions of gender appear momentarily, to melt away on the instant and be replaced with new ambiguities and metamorphoses. As Mary Moore argues, this disturbance of gender categories was to open up interesting possibilities for Petrarch's female followers (Moore 2000: 42ff).

---

[112] Josephine Roberts offers an insight into some of the policing tactics employed by king and church in Jacobean England in her introduction to Lady Mary Wroth's prose romance *Urania* (Roberts 1995: pp.xv-xvi).

[113] Both C. S. Lewis and, more recently, Sarah Kay offer examples and extended discussions of such uses (Lewis 1951: 18; Kay 1996: 216). As Kay notes, the poet's lady 'has the power to

In the 1980s and 90s, however, largely under the impetus of developments in feminist criticism, a reading of Petrarchism emerged that turned a blind eye to its disruptive potential. Even as writings in the Petrarchan mode by early modern women were recovered from apparent oblivion, the Petrarchan aesthetic came to be identified with male discourses of containment and oppression. Petrarchism, we were told, is a discourse 'everywhere coded as male', a poetics that not only dismembers and commodifies the female body but silences the female voice (Wall 1993: 330). According to this account, as Louis Montrose puts it, the Petrarchan lover 'masters his mistress by inscribing her within his text, where she is repeatedly put together and taken apart' (1986: 325). Or, as Nancy Vickers writes of Petrarch's 'emblematic' silencing of Diana in 'Nel dolce tempo', Petrarchism 'suppresses a voice, and...casts generations of would-be Lauras in a role predicated upon the muteness of its player' (1981: 278-9). Vickers's study in particular has been extremely influential in metamorphosing Petrarchism in the critical eye into a misogynistic, 'masculinist' mode inhospitable to women's

---

reward the lover's love-service by granting him a reward or payment, and to the extent that she is empowered within a feudal framework, she functions socially as a man and is addressed using a masculine form of address' (Kay 1996: 216).

[114] Mary Moore offers an extended reading of these shifting tropes in *RVF* 9 (2000: 42-43).

writing. Yet the feminist project of recuperation has revealed that not only would-be Lauras but real ones did find a voice through Petrarchism, as the achievements of Laura Terracina and Laura Ammannati attest. Even more impressively, the works of Gaspara Stampa, Louise Labé and Vittoria Colonna indicate that female poets could find in the Petrarchan mode a 'paradigm of problematic subjectivity that resonated with their own experience and a language – a set of images, tropes, topics, and signs – through which they could voice the ways that constructs of femininity impeded their subjectivity' (Moore 2000: 12). At least six *Rime* by women writers were published during their own lifetimes in Italy between 1538 and 1575, while numerous women poets appear in the Giolito anthologies—described as 'a de facto canon of contemporary Italian lyric'—that appeared from 1545 on. In 1559 the main editor of the latter, Lodovico Domenichi, produced an anthology made up almost exclusively of women poets writing in the Petrarchan manner (Braden 1996: 118).

The notion that Petrarch's poetry entails Laura's silencing seems to run quite contrary to the interpretation favoured by Petrarch's Renaissance readership. One popular legend made Laura herself a poet, a member of a *Cour d'amour* of women perpetuating the art of the troubadours. Another, as Gordon Braden notes, attributed Petrarch's poetic vocation to the example of another female poet, said to be the addressee of *Canzoniere* 7.[115] In 1552 *I sonetti, le canzoni et i trionfi di M. Laura* was published in Venice, containing 366 moralizing replies, ostensibly by Laura herself, to the 366 poems of the *Canzoniere*.[116] The Italian Renaissance amplified Petrarch's allusions to Laura's sharp mind and articulate speech. A year before the printing of Wroth's sonnets, Agostino della Chiesa was including an entry on "Laura Sada" in his compendious *Teatro delle donne letterate* (1620), noting that Petrarch's beloved was 'very well read in Literature' and 'fluently and very skillfully composed in Provencal' (1620: 205). As Cox, who cites della Chiesa's entry, claims, 'while less obviously promising [than models for the 'vocal woman' such as Ovid's Heroides], the reticent and exemplary Laura may have proved equally productive as a template for female poets in fashioning their poetic personae' (2005: 592).

---

[115] The women named as Petrarch's contemporaries seem to have been real and may have written sonnets, although those published in their names are for the most part 'obvious cinquecento forgeries' (1996: 136, n.14). The circulation of these forgeries might in itself be taken as evidence of an interest in female 'Petrarckizing', although more substantial evidence for such an interest exists.

[116] On the basis of its frontispiece the work has often been attributed to Stefano Colonna. Thomas Roche (who accepts the attribution) describes *I sonetti* as 'the earliest feminist response to the intolerable burden put on the sonnet lady by the poet-lover; it should be noted that it was written by a male' (1989: 94).

In her aunt's translation of Petrarch's *Trionfo della morte*, Wroth would have found a paradigmatic example of the articulate Laura of the Renaissance. Mary Sidney's *The Triumphe of death* opens with a description of Laura's 'wise speache, which did with honor linked goe'. As Margaret Hannay notes, 'this emphasis continues throughout the poem: 'Unlike the stereotypical silent mistress in English Petrarchan sonnets, whose only presence is absence, the Laura of the "Triumph" is praised for her eloquence and her wisdom as much as for her chastity' (1990: 109). If Laura, then, was a more articulate, forceful, even virile figure for the Renaissance than she seems to have become for us – and both Braden and Cox's studies, in particular, offers further convincing evidence that she was – the broader culture of Petrarchism seems to have provided, as Braden phrases it with admirable circumspection, 'a venue in which female aspiration is detectably more welcome than elsewhere, and, insofar as informed guesswork is possible, probably did more to encourage than to inhibit female literary activity' (1996: 118).[117] Pietro Bembo, the sixteenth-century figure most responsible of all for the European phenomenon of Petrarchism, was supportive of both Vittoria Colonna and (albeit less so) Veronica Gambara, and in *Gli Asolani* held out to women choosing a serious literary career over the usual responsibilities society assigned them the promise of Petrarchan fame: 'If women do not occupy all their free time with those duties which are said to be proper to them, but devote their whole leisure to literary studies and these pursuits [discourses about love], it makes little difference what some men say about it, for sooner or later the world will praise the women for it' (cited Braden 1996: 118).[118] Recent studies by Elsa Filosa and Stephen Kolsky have pointed to the role that Petrarch played, together with Boccaccio, in instigating humanistic discourse on the 'nobility of women', while Margaret King has argued of Italian fifteenth- and sixteenth-century humanists such as Isotta Nogarola (1418-1466), Cassandra Fedele (1465-1558), Laura Cereta (1469-1499) and Olympia Morata (1526-1555) that their debt to Petrarch, while 'not obvious', is probably significant (King 2005: 538).[119] In particular, she suggests that 'the kind of subjectivism [sic] that Petrarch uniquely displays in his humanist products infuses the work of the women humanists—and may have been, as I suspect it was, what attracted them to humanist careers' (King 2005: 539). Indeed, one of the elements of the

---

[117] The man most responsible of all (other than Petrarch himself) for the sixteenth-century phenomenon of Petrarchism, Pietro Bembo, candidly holds out to women choosing a literary career the promise of Petrarchan fame:

> If women do not occupy all their free time with those duties which are said to be proper to them, but devote their whole leisure to literary studies and these pursuits [discourses about love], it makes little difference what some men say about it, for sooner or later the world will praise the women for it. (Braden 1996, p.118)

---

[118] Bembo's relatively progressive stance is evident throughout his text, and it is worth quoting from this passage at greater length: 'Quantunque io stimo che saranno molti che mi biasimeranno in ciò, che io alla parte di queste investigationi le donne chiami, alle quali più s'acconvenga ne gli uffici delle donne dimorarsi, che andare di queste cose cercando. De' quali tuttavia non mi cale. Perciò che se essi non niegano che alle donne l'animo altresì come a gli huomini sia dato, non so io perché più ad esse che a noi si disdica il cercare che cosa egli è, che si debba per lui fuggire, che seguitare; et sono queste tra le meno aperte questioni, et quelle per aventura d'intorno alle quai, come a perni, tutte le scienze si volgono, segni et berzagli d'ogni nostra opera et pensamento. Che se esse tuttavolta non togliendo a quegli uffici, che diranno que' tali essere di donna, le loro convenevoli dimore, ne gli studi delle lettre et in queste cognitioni de gli loro otii ogni altra parte consumeranno, quello che alquanti huomini di ciò ragionino non è da curare; ma il mondo nondimeno in loda quelle studiose chiare donne ne ragionerà quando che sia' (Bembo 1966: 181-2). (Though I believe many will blame me for asking women to take part in these inquiries, since it is more suitable for them to be occupied with womanish affairs than to rummage in such matters, I shall not accept the criticism. For unless it is denied that women as well as men have minds, I do not know why they any more than we should be refused the right to seek knowledge of what one ought to flee or pursue; and these are among the most obscure questions, around which as on their axles all the sciences revolve, questions which are the targets of all our diligence and thought. If women do not occupy all their free time with those duties which are said to be proper to them, but devote their whole leisure to literary studies and these pursuits, it makes little difference what some men say about it, for sooner or later the world will praise the women for it. (Gottfried 1954: 148))

[119] In addition, as King also notes, 'all these Italian women humanists made use of Boccaccio's pioneering work *De claris mulieribus* (*On Famous Women*), drawing from his encyclopedia of great (and notorious) exemplars of female greatness their own litanies of exemplary forebears (2005: 538).

Petrarchan mode which might have proved enabling for those women mostly denied any kind of meaningful involvement in public affairs is Petrarch's conviction that 'all events, beliefs, and values have to be refracted through the prism of one's own subjectivity', and his subsequent 'steady concentration on the innermost landscape of the mind' (Mazzotta 1993: 2). Here was a subject that those forced to focus on their inward resources rather than a public career knew as much or more about than their male rivals. The courtly Petrarchism diffused through Castiglione's *Il Corteggiano* set a female patron, Elizabetta Gonzaga of Urbino, at its centre, in a fashion that anticipated and influenced the poetry and rhetoric of the court of Elizabeth I, and in particular Elizabeth's appropriation of the Petrarchan imaginary (cf. Forster 1969: 125-147). Again, this broader aspect of Petrarchan culture's receptivity to the feminine not only as inspiration but also as producer would have been immediately apparent to Wroth through the figure of her aunt and namesake. In celebrating the Countess of Pembroke's patronage in his *Pilgrimage to Paradise*, Nicholas Breton explicitly compares her to Elizabetta Gonzaga, the patron of *Il Corteggiano*: 'Who hath redde of the Duchesse of Vrbina, may saie, the Italians wrote well: but who knowes the Countess of Penbrooke, hath cause to write better'.

As we shall see, rather than writing in isolated abandonment against a hostile tradition, Wroth herself appears to have benefited not only from the intensely literary atmosphere of the immediate household in which she was raised, but also from a wider, broadly Petrarchan community of writers. Wroth's own work has quite properly been described as 'festooned with and impelled by Petrarchan conventions' (Dubrow 1995: 141). It has even been characterized as 'fine Petrarchan wallpaper' (Hanson 1997: 177). Yet rather than being enabling, her Petrarchism has often been seen as limiting her achievement. 'Her attachment to the old-fashioned Petrarchan rhetoric (which her uncle had poked fun at thirty years before) is so strong,' one critic has claimed, 'that it is very difficult to locate any distinctive female voice' (Spiller

2001: 75).[120] More often, critics who see themselves as writing from a broadly feminist persepctive have read her sonnet sequence as a revisionist project that is fundamentally anti-Petrarchan: Wroth, we are told, 'writes in Petrarchan discourse to write against it', endeavouring to perform an 'appropriation and transformation' of the genre[121] (Masten 1991: 72; Miller 1996: 157). Similarly, the editor of a modernized edition of Wroth's poems describes her as 'having to work with, or rather, against' the 'powerful and long-established literary and cultural forces' of Petrarchism (Pritchard 1996: 12). Engaged in an agonistic struggle with the father-figures of the male-authored tradition, from Petrarch himself through to her uncle and even her sonneteering father, Wroth's female voice is either interpreted as contained and ultimately undone by that tradition, or, more often, celebrated as producing a counter-discourse that articulates a distinctive female position. Thus Naomi Miller, the author of the only monograph to date on Wroth, claims that by writing a Petrarchan sequence, Wroth is able 'to uncover the mechanisms by which Petrarchan discourse exploits the woman' (1996: 157).

Such readings are in part a result of a wider tendency Gordon Braden has observed amongst modern critics to appreciate any specimen of Renaissance Petrarchism by celebrating its attempt to break out of that category (1996: 115). Sometimes, however, the lack of any intention to engage seriously with Petrarch or with the male-authored Petrarchan tradition is painfully apparent. Vickers's claim regarding the implications of Petrarch's writing for would-be Lauras (cited above) is essentially an aside, and it makes a leap from the particular context of a notoriously complex poem to a generalized assertion regarding the literary history of the next three hundred years. Nevertheless, a surprising number of critics are happy to cite Vickers's relatively brief article as an authority that allows them to take Petrarchism's unreconstructed masculinism as a given, without any reference to his actual works. For example, we find Vickers cited in support of an extremely questionable reading of Petrarch in Patricia Parker's *Literary Fat Ladies*: '[i]n Petrarch himself, as Vickers suggests, the poet reverses the dangers of subjection and dismemberment by scattering the body of his mistress across his own *rime sparse*' (1987: 62). More recently, and with specific reference to Wroth, Lynette McGrath claims that '[i]n Mary Wroth's sonnet sequence…the female speaker invokes the images of female dismemberment, whose sado-erotic role in the male sonnet Nancy Vickers has described, precisely in order to erase them' (2002: 61). This claim, like many other such, is not backed up with any sort of detailed attention even to Wroth's texts, much less Petrarch's or those of any other male sonneteer: McGrath merely references three of Wroth's poems without so much as gesturing towards any sort of reading. Any such reading would, I hope to suggest, complicate her claims considerably.

---

[120] Spiller hereby seems implicitly to undo his suggestion, made on the same page and quoted above, that 'Petrarchan rhetoric and imagery are, as the Italian women poets of the sixteenth century demonstrated, equally applicable to the passions and distresses of both sexes addressed to a beloved of either sex'.

[121] This hendiadys is used several times by Naomi Miller to describe what she regards as Wroth's anti-Petrarchan writing. Wroth's editor R. E. Pritchard describes her as 'having to work with, or rather, against' the 'powerful and long-established literary and cultural forces' of Petrarchism. (1996: 12)

It is not hard to show that Petrarch's own poetry weaves a more complex web of genderings than most of the critics citing Vickers allow. In addition to illuminating the ambiguities discussed above, critics taking a closer interest in what Petrarch actually wrote have pointed to how he distances himself from the speaking voice of the *Canzoniere* through irony and retrospection, and how his poetic persona is itself subject to the fragmentations it inflicts upon Laura. These fragmentations have been recognized in turn as being due as much to the poet's preoccupation with the workings of memory and oblivion, with what Petrarch characterizes (in one of the sonnets he eventually excluded from the *Canzoniere)* as 'la mia sparsa virtù', 'my scattered powers', as to the male gaze.[122] The notion of the male gaze developed by feminist film theorists such as Mary Ann Doane (1991) and Laura Mulvey (1989) has been widely applied to Renaissance literature, and to the Petrarchan blazon of the female body in particular. Its appropriation for literary criticism is problematic, however, for at least two reasons. On the one hand translating it wholesale from the cinematic context for which it was originally formulated risks eliding potentially important differences both in media and in historical context. As with the retrospective application of any theory to a poetic text, there is always a risk of squeezing the poetry into a straitjacket that constrains and limits textual idiosyncrasies. More fundamentally, however, the use made of Lacan by film theorists such Mulvey (who is cited as an authority by several writers on Wroth) has itself been criticized as grounded on a disabling misinterpretation of Lacan's own notion of the gaze. In particular, Joan Copjec has accused such theorists of confounding Lacan's concept with Foucault's 'panoptic gaze' in an untenable fashion (Copjec 1994c: 15-38).[123]

---

[122] 'Quando talor, da giusta ira commosso,' (l.10; Durling 1976: 587).

Similarly, the silence of the usual Petrarchan lady has been both over- and under-interpreted by many feminist critics. As Braden notes, it is 'partly just a formal *donnée* (the beloved in almost any type of love poetry, after all, seldom gets a chance to say much), partly a synonym for No' (1996: 133). It certain circumstances it could even be a case of what Braden calls 'male ventriloquism,' as Marguerite de Navarre recognized in her Heptameron[124] (1996: 133). As Giuseppe Mazzotta notes, 'the validity of [Petrarch's] own viewpoint, which is to say the validity of the cultural paradigm he seeks to impose, depends on his rhetorical power to persuade, master, or silence' (Mazzotta 1993: 45). Yet it is precisely Petrarch's failure to persuade or master Laura that motivates the *Canzoniere*. This strongly suggests that the absence of her voice from the sequence, other than in the poet's dream or memory, is, as Braden suggests, a synonym for no, a mark of her refusal and resistance, rather than of her successful silencing. Elsewhere in Petrarch's writings it is by 'admitting to intellectual disagreements within the history of philosophy (or, as in the *Invective contra medicum*, between himself and the physician) that Petrarch 'acknowledges the existence of a possible viewpoint that transcends one's own and breaks the circle of solipsism' (Mazzotta 1993: 45). The most powerful alternative viewpoint in all of Petrarch's work, and that which most forcefully breaks the circle of solipsism, is of course Laura's. As Mary Moore points out, 'the powers that the lady's extromissive gaze exercises in love sonnet sequences involve engendering, penetration, activity, direction, and force commonly attributed to men' (2000: 43). Indeed, one of the paradoxes of the Petrarchan beloved's effect is that even the very thought of her viewpoint — her gaze, if you will — becomes at one and the same moment that which constitutes the poet as a subject and without which he feels himself to be as nothing, yet also that which disintegrates him, breaking down the solipsistic barriers of self, so that he seeks out in solitude the authenticity of inwardness in which to reconstitute his sense of himself as subject.

---

[123] In *Lacan and Postfeminism* Elizabeth Wright gives a brief summary of this debate (2000: 42-53).

[124] 'Because of ignorance and some sort of stupid timidity there are men who miss many good opportunity in love. Then they attribute their failures to their lady's virtue, even though they never get anywhere near testing it' (119: cited Braden 1996: 132).

It should by now be evident that a certain kind of cyclopic feminist reading of Petrarch, Petrarchism, and Wroth's supposed anti-Petrarchism is untenable. As Mary Moore demonstrates in her reading of Wroth in *Desiring Voices*, Petrarchism's 'ambiguity, its complication of subjectivity, its spiritually sanctioned themes of self-knowledge, its blurring of authorial identity created through the role of fictive poet, and its sometimes slippery gender roles opened a gap in prohibitions against early modern women's writing, self-development, and subjectivity' (2000: 11). Yet we should also be wary of going too far in the opposite direction. While in many ways Petrarchism does provide 'the perfect literary medium' for Wroth's struggle with the difficulties of female authorship and self-construction (Moore 2000: 131), a form in which she can explore a distinctive interiority while engaging in public religious and political discourse, aspects of the Petrarchan mode remained problematic for female writers. Petrarch's adulation of Laura did undoubtedly have unfortunate ramifications for Renaissance women. As Linda Woodbridge notes, Petrarchism's deification of the beloved,

> by making Woman more than human, reinforced the antifeminist contention that she was other than human. Petrarchan etherealization and desensualization of women led (in literature, at least) to intense disillusionment with any woman displaying normal sensuality. And the unrelenting hyperboles provoked a backlash which contributed to the antifeminism of formal satires and plays of the late 1590s and early 1600s. *The Courtier* suggests another problem: Petrarchanism was open to abuse by cynical male deceivers. (Woodbridge 1984: 58)

Precisely the inversion of the traditional gender hierarchy that led Petrarchism to be seen as effeminizing could present all manner of difficulties for a female poet, who might find herself caught between either appropriating or undoing that inversion. The first invited her to expose the masochistic sub-text of male Petrarchism and assume the role of either frigid dominatrix or saint. Arguably neither left much room for the expression of the sort of complex subjectivity that might make Petrarchism an attractive discourse in the first place, and in any case both were perilous, practically impossible roles for a woman to assume in early modern society. On the other hand, redoubling her subjection might be an equally unattractive prospect, potentially entailing the acceptance of a purely passive role and an inherent complicity in the trafficking of women as chattels. The notion that Petrarchan rhetoric and imagery are 'equally applicable to the passions and distresses of both sexes addressed to a beloved of either sex' is true only in a strictly limited sense (Spiller 2001: 75-6).[125]

---

[125] Janet Smarr identifies three central problems for women seeking to express female desire through the Petrarchan mode: firstly, 'what for a female poet could serve as a permissible object of devotion?'; secondly, 'how should the descriptions of Laura […] be adapted for a male subject? […] How was a lovable male to be described?; and thirdly, if chastity was inapplicable, 'what praiseworthy virtue could one attribute to a male that would make him similarly unattainable?' (2001: 1-2). She then identifies various responses. One way round these problems, adopted by Laura Terracina and Ermellina Aringhieri, was for female writers to write as men, ventriloquizing the male voice. This, however, as Smarr notes, 'simply obliterates the notion of writing as a woman' (2001: 2).

### 4.4 'The constant Art': Petrarchism, Stoicism and the thought of love

Thought is the principal problem of *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus*. A crude measure of its centrality can be taken by a simple word count. The word 'thoughts' recurs no fewer than 31 times; 'thought' 16 times; 'think' or 'thinke' 14; and 'thinking' 6. Actually reading the poems only reinforces the impression that the attempt to exercise reason, and the agonies this attempt brings, are their fundamental preoccupation. It is thought, as much or more than love, that agitates and discomforts Pamphilia. Perpetually restless, 'swifter then those most swiftnes need require', her thoughts are often not subject to her will, but alien, malignant torturers, on the move even when Pamphilia herself is sleeping (P1.4). They are constant only in their ceaseless 'changing' (P9.6), 'sad' (P.13.9) yet bringing with them dangerous hopes (P21.5-6). They are tied to 'despaire' (P.14.14), yet also give 'comfort' (P21.9). They are the measure of love ('by thoughts wee love doe measure' - P21.18), yet Pamphilia calls on Love to exile them; or at least those that 'touch inconstancie, | Or those which waste nott in the constant art' (P3.7-8).

As these latter lines suggest, Pamphilia's passion for thought is intricately bound up with what Risa Bear describes as 'the central and almost only theme' of the sequence, constancy (Bear 1992: unpaginated). As Elizabeth Hanson observes, the sequence's 'avowed purpose' is to prove Pamphilia's constancy, 'to demonstrate that however long she may write and suffer she will never, ever change' (Hanson 1997: 169). To properly understand Wroth's gendered concern with both constancy and thought in *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus*, it is necessary to appreciate the relation between them, a relation critics have largely neglected. In order to do this, we must first look at the different, conflicting models of constancy with which Wroth was engaging, and the place of reason and gender within these. Only then, when we have a provisional model of how Wroth's engagement might work, will we turn to her Petrarchism, and to a proper engagement of our own with her poems, to complicate and qualify our initial readings.

Constancy was practically the only virtue which women might hope or be expected to attain in medieval and Renaissance society: while men might win honour through excellence in combat, horsemanship, service to their lord or even authorship, women could only, Griselda-like, remain silently, enduringly constant. Critics picked up early on the preoccupation with constancy in Wroth's writing, as they could hardly fail to do. Many see Wroth as performing a proto-feminist redefinition or reclamation of constancy. Elaine Beilin's essay, '"The Onely Perfect Vertue"' (1981), identified constancy's singular role in both early modern society and Wroth's work. Beilin argued that by shifting the focus of the Petrarchan sequence from the beloved to her own constancy, Wroth creates within *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* a female world distinct from that of the *Urania*. In the corona at the end of the sequence, she concludes, Pamphilia presents her constancy as being ultimately to God, rather than to man. Focusing instead on the *Urania*, Maureen Quilligan argued that Pamphilia's constancy is an act of 'wilful self-definition' which gives her a 'stable position from which she can complain (poetically) of her lover's *in*constancy' (1990: 323). Also writing on the *Urania*, Josephine Roberts suggested that Pamphilia there is 'free to redefine constancy, from its narrow meaning in seventeenth-century conduct books as fidelity to one's spouse, to fidelity to one's own freely chosen love' (1995: lix). For Jeff Masten, meanwhile, constancy in *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* becomes a virtue 'constructed as interior to the self, self-authorised and unchanging' in itself (1991: 77)

As Christina Luckyj argues, however, these critics' notions of constancy as 'rigid self-discipline' make it difficult to reject claims by Tina Krontiris and Gary Waller that the result seems at best masochistic, the internalization of an externally imposed value leading to a reclamation that is at best highly ambivalent (Luckyj 2002: 161, n.17; cf. Krontiris 1992: 132ff, and Waller 1993: 206ff). Luckyj argues instead that Pamphilia's constancy 'is not static but dynamic, not self-repressive but highly libidinous, though self-contained'

(2002: 161, n.17). Luckyj's claims for a 'highly libidinous' constancy in *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus*, however, seems overblown, and run counter to our first impressions of Wroth's sequence. More plausible is Bear's suggestion that while stressing Pamphilia's 'traditional femininity' throughout, Wroth introduces a fundamental innovation by transforming Pamphilia's constancy into a universal model, rather than a purely feminine one. As Bear notes, 'Amphilanthus's lack of this virtue is his one failing, and it is viewed as an actual failing and not something to be passed off as simply lacking because he is male' (1992: unpaginated). She goes on:

> Pamphilia is constant, Amphilanthus is not, and this discrepancy drives the plot. Neither will find happiness until Amphilanthus attains honor, without which he will be unworthy of Pamphilia. And he will not find his honor until he finds constancy. Wroth's conception of female virtue then is that it is normative for both genders. A new possibility arises: human virtue. (ibid)

The claim that in universalising Pamphilia's constancy Wroth presents a 'new possibility' needs, of course, to be qualified: if constancy was consistently identified as particularly necessary in the feminine of the species, it was, formally at least, also applicable to men, and was increasingly so applied after the Reformation. Furthermore, over previous centuries various writers, from Christine de Pizan to Boccaccio to Castiglione, had to differing degrees insisted on the importance of male constancy, and the hypocrisy of demanding constancy from only one sex.

Most importantly, however, constancy was already being rehabilitated as a virtue vital to *masculine* integrity by one of the most powerful philosophical and socio-political discourses of the late sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries: neo-Stoicism. Critics have frequently noted the probable influence of neo-Stoic thought on Wroth's preoccupation with constancy, but have rarely followed this up in any detail, or paid any attention to neo-Stoicism's regendering of this hitherto feminine virtue. Constancy 'was *the* Stoic virtue, the unshakeable condition of mind which led to tranquility' (Forster 1977: 205-6). It was celebrated by the pre-eminent neo-Stoic, the Flemish scholar Justus Lipsius (1547-1606), in the hugely influential 1584 best-seller, *De Constantia Libri Duo* (*Of Constancy, in two books*), modelled on Seneca's *De Constantia Sapientis*. Fusing pagan and Christian ethical codes, Lipsius's book made him 'the widely respected prophet of high Stoicism, the preferred moral code for scholars in an age of absolutism and religious war' (Grafton 2009: 16). This  was by far the most widely-read and influential neo-Stoic text of the early modern period, going through numerous editions and being translated into English four times between 1595 and 1670 (Sellars 2006: 5).

Significantly for Wroth's poetic practice, stoicism—both in its classical form and in that of its early modern revival—identified constancy with reason, with the proper exercise of thought to contain the passions. All evils, Lipsius argued, are at bottom a result of one's own mistaken opinions. In one of the central oppositions of Lipsian thought, opinion (*opinio*) is unsure of itself, and thus leads to inconstancy, while reason (*ratio*) is secure and therefore forms the ground for constancy. As John Sellars notes in his introduction to Sir John Stradling's translation of Lipsius, *Two Bookes of Constancie* (1595): 'Cultivating reason is thus the way by which one can reach the goal of constancy, defined as freedom from "the servile yoke of fortune and affections"' (*immunis a jugo Adfectuum et Fortunae* — Sellars 2006: 6; *Const*. 1:6). Elsewhere, Lipsius defines constancy as 'a right and immovable strength of the mind, neither lifted up nor pressed down with external or casual accidents'. By 'strength', he goes on, reiterating the distinction, 'I understand a steadfastness not from Opinion, but from judgement and sound Reason' (*Const*. 1:4). Shining the 'bright beam of reason' into the 'obscurity of the brain', Lipsius argued, would eradicate 'opinion' and 'moderate the affections', enabling the neo-Stoic to 'attain that one haven of a peacable and quiet mind' (*Const*. 1:2; 'To the Reader').

The coupling of *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus*'s two central preoccupations, constancy and thought, is so marked as to suggest a deliberate engagement with neo-Stoic philosophy. As we shall see, there were strong connections between the Sidney family and Justus Lipsius, and the loose circle of oppositional, Spenserian writers of the early seventeenth century with whom Smith and Bassnett convincingly align Wroth were profoundly engaged with neo-Stoic thought. Given both the external evidence of Wroth's likely immersion in neo-Stoic ideas, and the internal evidence of the neo-Stoic vocabulary of *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus*, its concern not only with constancy and reason but with hope and fear too (Lipsius's two bugbears), it is surely right to suppose that Wroth was on some level attempting to work out her own position regarding the Stoic doctrine of constancy as it pertained to women.

In the early seventeenth century, of course, reason was as gendered an attribute as constancy: unlike constancy, however, it was resolutely gendered male. Moreover, the exercise of reason was identified as intricately bound up with self-mastery: as Yvonne Bruce observes, the calm or indifference of the Stoic 'is a function of his self-sovereignty, hardly a desirable trait in a sixteenth-century woman' (2009). This gendering of Stoicism was deep-rooted. The Roman Stoics effectively discounted women, Seneca in his *De Constantia* declaring that 'there is as great a difference between the Stoics and the other schools of philosophy as there is between males and females, since while each set contributes equally to human society, the one class is born to obey, the other to command' (Seneca 1958: 1.49; cited Bruce 2009: n.23). Women, partly because a powerful patriarchal discourse identified them as by nature inconstant and duplicitous, were expected to be constant not to and within themselves, but through obedience to men, usually their husbands. Moreover, as Bruce notes,

> Because women's constancy was judged first by men and only second by God, judgment was plagued by the same weaknesses

> associated with constancy: firstly, the appearance of constancy might not convey true constancy, thus women--being naturally duplicitous—were under greater pressure than men to conform to conventional standards of Christian Stoic behavior (modesty, silence, equanimity), or to both "be and seem," as Elizabeth Cary's motto had it. Secondly, judgment depended upon the ability of men to apprehend the difference between true and feigned constancy. These weaknesses led to [...] paradoxical expectations for women's constancy (2009).

If we read Wroth's universalisation of constancy in *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* alongside her persistent, even obsessive worrying at thought itself, its struggle with neo-Stoic discourse becomes clear, and that universalization subsequently emerges as less original but more thorough-going and radical in its implications than in Bear's account. By depicting Pamphilia on the one hand as the archetypal constant woman of mainstream patriarchal medieval and Renaissance thought, but on the other as above all a thinker, and a thinker about thought itself, Wroth intertwines the two discourses in such a manner as to evoke a subjectivity that interrogates both.

The subversive possibilities of describing Pamphilia's constancy in the language of the newly dominant, rationalist masculine doctrine of neo-Stoicism should be apparent enough. Arguably, however, Wroth's sequence might be read as presenting a perfectly patriarchal image of the female, internalising the most reactionary aspects of both the traditional and the neo-Stoic notions of woman as incapable of exercising reason effectively and thereofore needing to find constancy in adherence to a rational man. After all, many of the sonnets emblazon the mind of Pamphilia as a woman unable to bring her own thoughts under control and to achieve a Stoic detachment or emotional balance. As Letizia Panizza observes regarding the relationship of Stoic psychopathology to ethics, 'emotional balance and imbalance are synonymous with virtue and vice' (2008: 122), and in this kind of Stoic light, Pamphilia potentially becomes a figure of shame, a paradigmatic example of the womanly failure to rein in either thought or feeling.

Such a reading would, though, be fundamentally flawed. To appreciate why it will be necessary to look at how Wroth embeds her agon with neo-Stoicism within the Petrarchan mode. Before focusing on Petrarch's own agon with the Stoics, and Petrarchism's ambivalence toward the Stoic privileging of reason and relegation of the affective, it will be useful to look at another aspect of Wroth's neo-Stoic inheritance. There is a further level at which Wroth's fusion of traditional, late medieval rhetoric on the necessity of women's constancy with relatively new, fashionable neo-Stoic discourses works to turn neo-Stoicism's own logic and rhetoric against it, and to undermine its own misogynistic tendencies and exclusion of the feminine. In reclaiming for men a virtue previously regarded as much more necessary in women, neo-Stoicism (and Lipsius in particular) pushed women out of the picture entirely. As Michael Sperberg-McQueen notes, the idea of a pre-lapsarian Edenic 'Garden-state', in which man might 'wander solitary', 'without a Mate' (to quote Marvell's 'The Garden') 'only took a serious turn in the philosophy of neo-stoicism' propounded by Lipsius, the second half of whose *De Constantia* is set 'in just such a garden without women' (1995: 389). As Sperberg-McQueen goes on to observe, the absence of any female presence in this Eden 'proves to be but the surface symptom of an attitude to women, in the work and in the neo-stoicism popularized by Lipsius, that is profoundly troubling to the feminist reader both because of its mysogyny and because of its subtle pervasiveness' (1995: 389).

Now, from the very opening of the *De Constantia* Lipsius insisted on the necessity of a turn inwards as an antidote to *mala publica*, in particular the public evils of tyranny and civil strife. Such events, Lipsius argued, were part of God's plan, and thus to feel sorrow or anger at them was both fruitless and mistaken. What appear public woes are at bottom for each of us only 'inward maladies of the mind', and sorrow but an 'inward wound' caused by the 'dart of affections' (*Const*. 1:2). In drawing upon Lipsius's breaking down of the boundaries between the public and the private, and his identification of constancy, a previously feminized virtue, as a fundamental *masculine* quality, Wroth uncovers a no doubt unintended and always only *potentially* proto-feminist kernel to his thought that Sperberg-McQueen and Marvell alike do not pick up on.

Lipsius's insistence on the inter-relatedness of the public and private, however, if potentially subversive of established gender binaries, is itself marked by a patriarchal privileging of the public. To elucidate how this is so, we can borrow a rudimentary methodology from Fredric Jameson's own 'oversimplified and vulgarized model' for escaping from the crude binaries of form and content, borrowed in turn from Louis Hjelmslev's linguistics. Jameson, following Hjelmslev, proposes a fourfold perspective, so that the purer versions of the two binaries (the 'form of the form' and the 'content of the content', or, in our case, the 'private of the private' and the 'public of the public') are supplemented by two new perspectives, which consider the 'content of the form' and the 'form of the content' respectively — or, in our case, 'the private of the public', and the 'public of the private' (Jameson 2007: xiv). Under the 'private of the public' then, we might consider the effects of 'public' events on the 'private' realms of the nuclear family or the individual's state of mind. It is here that Lipsius's attention in *De Constantia* is fixed, on this public aspect of the private: on the inner suffering caused by outward woes, most notably civil strife and religious wars, rather than on what we might call the 'private' aspects of the inward self, on the agonies of unrequited love or a beloved's inconstancies.

It is this realm of the 'public of the private' that is missing from Lipsius's account, a realm in which we would place the consequences in the 'public' sphere of events generally considered as 'private' (an obvious example might be a sexual scandal involving a government minister); or, perhaps more subtly, public discourse on affairs generally associated with the private realm, such as political debate on sexual ethics, or the exercise of what Foucault terms biopower. In circulating and printing a female-voiced, amorous

Petrarchan sonnet sequence which deploys the vocabulary of neo-Stoicism, Wroth emphasizes the 'public of the private', reasserting the missing facet in Lipsius's imbrication of the two terms, revealing how it still privileges the former.

In a moment we shall look in detail at how thought and constancy, and the constancy of thought, come together in Wroth's poems. Firstly, however, we should briefly return to the question of Wroth's likely links to neo-Stoic discourse, if only because it may have been these links that helped establish a context for Wroth's gendered reworking in a Petrarchan sonnet sequence of the Lipsian imbrication of public and private. There is some evidence that Spenserian poets such as Fulke Greville with ties to the Sidneys went some way in assimilating older ideas of female constancy to the neo-Stoic ideal, diluting Lipsius's 'attempt to exclude women from the neo-stoic garden' (Sperberg-McQueen 1995: 401). It may have been that it was this conducive environment that gave Wroth the platform for her complex and far more radical challenge to neo-Stoic genderings through Petrarchism in *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus*.

The 1595 translation of *De Constantia* into English was dedicated by its author, Sir John Stradling, to Sir Edward Stradling, a close relative of Wroth's mother (Hannay 2010: 190; cf. Zurcher 2007: 4-5). Yet the Sidney's associations with neo-Stoicism, and Lipsius in particular, ran far deeper than this. Sir Philip Sidney was intimately involved in the importation of neo-Stoic ideas to England. He may have met Lipsius himself during his visit to Louvain in 1577, or at least heard his lectures on Tacitus. He certainly wrote to his younger brother Robert, Mary's father, recommending Tacitus as superior among the ancients. Robert appears to have taken up Philip's recommendation. He not only purchased Lipsius's 1585 edition of Tacitus, but covered its margins 'with annotations on the parallelisms between Tacitus's Rome and the England of his day' (McCrea 1997: 32). Both brothers also entered into correspondence with Lipsius, and a 'keen friendship' developed between the Flemish scholar and Philip (McCrea 1997: 32). Indeed, from one perspective neo-Stoicism can be seen as a manifestation of 'Sidneyism', rather than the other way round: 'If in his own writings, Sidney harked to prevailing English courtly and Italianate models, Lipsius, in devising neoStoicism, identified the model of virtue represented by Sidney, appropriated it, and applied it in both *De Constantia* and the *Politica*' (McCrea 1997: 32).

The loose network of Spenserians that clustered around the Sidneys was likewise notable for its interest in a politically enabling form of Stoicism. McCrea goes too far when she claims that the concern with constancy in England 'was wholly tied up with the political situation confronting the English in the closing years of Elizabeth's reign, a situation which persisted after the coming of the Stuarts' (1997: xxviii). This concern, as we have seen, continued to have a great deal to do with domestic sexual politics, too. However, if one strain of neo-Stoicism encouraged self-examination and a withdrawal from public affairs, another seemed to encourage active engagement in the life of the commonwealth.[126] These strains were brought together in England, where neo-Stoicism became less a summons to political engagement than a lament for lost virtue, which was then harnessed in turn to express a politically motivated dissatisfaction with the corruptions of the Jacobean court (Salmon 1989: 199-225). Stoicism thereby became particularly attractive to that group with whom Smith and Bassnett align Wroth, made up of oppositional, sometimes militant Spenserians sympathetic to Calvinism and dismayed by the king's perceived pro-Catholic policies and autocratic tendencies.[127] We thus find in the work of Fulke Greville, for example, 'the disclosure of the language of constancy within the predominant Calvinism with which he is associated' (McCrea 1997: xxx). Calvin's own relationship with Stoic thought was complex, but Calvinist theology, in its insistence on the unmediated character of every individual's relationship to God, may have helped open up Stoic ideas of self-sufficient constancy to women, too.

---

[126] The question of neo-Stoicism's implications for political engagement has generated a considerable body of scholarly literature, and remains contested. For Anthony Grafton, humanism was transformed, thanks to Lipsius, 'from a device for criticizing the world as it is by comparing it to an ideal past into a device for leaving the world unchanged while learning from the past how to cope with its defects' (390). Adriana McCrea, however, argues that Grafton underestimates Lipsius' goal of relating language to political action, which started with the realization that society resembled less Plato's commonwealth that the 'dregs of the state of Romulus' (1997: 24). McCrea is certainly right when she notes that one of the attributes of the Lipsian synthesis of humanism, classical Stoicism and Christianity was 'flexibility (1997: xxvii). Neo-Stoicism's revival of interest in in the Roman Stoics' emphasis on civic duty and a high level of individual responsibility for public actions was certainly attractive to Spenserian critics of the corruption and excess of the Jacobean court. Likewise, however, neo-Stoicism's political alignment is and was disputed. If it could be critical of decadent authority, for Forster, 'Lipsius' Stoicism provided a philosophy well suited to the age of absolutism: submission to the will of God and therefore also to that of God's representative on earth, the divinely-appointed sovereign' (1977: 216). Ultimately, neo-Stoicism was not so much 'a political philosophy', as McCrea claims (1997: 16), or even 'a language' (1997: 15), as it was (or at least came to be) a contested discursive territory.

At least, it may have done so for male writers. Noting the lack of models of 'credible virtuous behaviour available to women who desired to be ethically autonomous (the ideal of Stoic constancy) and spiritually obligated to no one but God (an assumption of Calvinist theology)', Yvonne Bruce has explored how a number of writers in the Pembroke circle found one such model in the figure of Octavia (2009). Octavia's constancy makes for an interesting juxtaposition with that of Pamphilia. Contrasting strikingly with Cleopatra,

> Octavia better exemplified the qualities of the ideal Tudor Englishwoman--she valued her marriage, she was devout, she was chauvinistic; she was, in short, an ideal character upon which to work out the conflicts facing the Pembroke poets as they addressed issues of patronage, succession, and religious and civil war and, possibly, as they strove to take English letters in a Sidneian direction. (2009)

In his Senecan 'Letter to an Honourable Lady', Fulke Greville encourages his unnamed addressee to avoid the anti-stoical passions of fear and hope that recur throughout Pamphilia's sequence. Using Octavia as an exemplar, Greville's poem 'phrases obedience less as wifely submission to her husband's tyranny than as self-mastery through the avoidance of the "mists of opinion" and the moderation of her desires (again, a Christian softening of the Stoic goal) to achieve a "naturall Harmony"' (Greville 1990: 273; cited Bruce 2009). Octavia's virtue (but also the cause of her losing Anthony to Cleopatra) was that she remained 'ever the same', and 'contented her sweete mind with the triumphs of Patience' (Greville 1990: 286). Patience was another central neo-Stoic virtue, described by Lipsius as constancy's 'true mother', and 'a voluntary sufferance without grudging of all things whatsoever can happen to or in a man' (Bk 1, Ch 4; Sellars 2006: 37).

---

[127] King James's own outspoken criticism of "Stoick insensible stupiditie" in general, and 'that proud, inconstant LIPSIVS' in particular may in itself have made an allegiance to Lipsian neo-Stoicism an attractive means of discreetly signalling one's opposition to the King's political philosophy (Craigie 1944-50: 1.156, 117).

Greville's emphasis on self-mastery, as Bruce notes, 'seems to gesture toward a fully Stoic constancy for the honourable lady' (2009). Bruce traces a similar engagement with neo-Stoic attitudes and ideas regarding female constancy in Samuel Brandon's closet drama, *The Virtuous Octavia* (1598), and in Samuel Daniel's verse 'Letter from Octavia to Marcus Antonius' (1599). Daniel has Octavia reproach Anthony not only for his own inconstancy but also for the inconstancy to which she herself, as a woman, is doomed (stanzas 15 & 16). In the same work, however, Octavia also eloquently articulates the difficulty for her sex of escaping from 'the prison of custom and reputation that is excoriated in Lipsius's T*wo Bookes of Constancie*' (2009):

> I know not how, but wrongfully I know
> Hath undiscerning custome plac'd our kind
> Under desert, and set us farre below
> The reputation to our sexe assign'd:
> Charging our wrong reputed weaknesse, how
> We are unconstant, fickle, false, unkinde:
> And though our life with thousand proofes shewes no.
> Yet since strength saies it, weaknesse must be so.
> (Daniel 1885 [1599]: stanza 15; cited Bruce 2009)

Evidently writers such as Daniel and Greville were offering, albeit ambivalently, a portrait of a Stoic woman capable of asserting her own capacity for constancy and self-mastery through reason. In doing so, they ameliorate the most misogynistic aspects of Lipsius's thought, including his elision of the constant woman, and open up new horizons that Wroth goes on to explore more fully.

Wroth, then, was thinking and writing in the context of an ongoing literary discussion regarding Lipsian neo-Stoicism, male and female constancy, and the relation between thought and the emotions. Against this ground Wroth's choice of the Petrarchan mode stands out in relief. Whatever the other motivations for this choice founded on political and familial loyalties, the Petrarchan mode proves peculiarly apt for grappling with this nexus of concerns.

If the Renaissance had revived Stoicism, however, it had also, as Richard Strier notes, revived anti-Stoicism (2004: 23). Writing before Wroth's critical rehabilitation, Leonard Forster observed that '[i]t is remarkable how often, throughout the late Renaissance and Baroque, Stoicism appears in close conjunction with Petrarchism' (1977: 219). Given that these were two of the most prominent literary discourses of the time, their frequent conjunction in itself is perhaps not all that surprising. One obvious further reason for their recurrent proximity, however, lies in the fact that Petrarch provides the pre-eminent model within Renaissance humanism of the Christian tradition's agon with Stoic philosophy.[128]

Petrarch's own engagements with Stoic philosophy were complex and profound, as scholars have long recognized. A well-established reading sees Petrarch as struggling to negotiate between a Stoicism derived largely from the works of Seneca and Cicero, and a broadly Augustinian moral theology. This interpretation has been articulated most impressively by Francisco Rico (1974) and Hans Baron (1963; 1968; 1985), and more recently enlarged upon by Alexander Lee (2008). In similar terms, Klaus Heitmann (1957) perceived a tension between a Stoicism grounded upon human reason, and a fideistic Augustinianism, a model that re-emerges in more hesitant form in Charles Trinkaus's reading of Petrarch, which identifies 'contradictions' arising out of broadly the same tensions between classical philosophy and Christian theology (1979: 2).

---

[128] While Boethius's *De consolatione philosophiae* had as great an influence in bringing Stoicism within the purview of Christian culture, that text itself 'seems to go out of its way to avoid any whiff of Christian history or doctrine' (Machan 2011, para. 1 of 6). The question of how Boethian Stoicism inflects Petrarch's encounter with classical Stoicism (or indeed Petrarchism's, or Lipsius's), while intriguing, is too problematic and, I would suggest, too peripheral to be addressed here: the essays collected in Glei, Kaminski and Lebsanft's *Boethius Christianus?* (2010) offer some sense of why this might be so, as does Tim Machan's review (2011).

William Bouwsma's treatment of Petrarch in his examination of the 'two faces' of Renaissance humanism is perhaps the most useful (1975). For Bouwsma, the tensions and fissures between Stoicism and Augustinianism, 'more frequently latent than overt for even the most acutely self-conscious. . . . and never fully resolved' run to the very core of Renaissance humanist culture: 'Stoicism and Augustinianism represented, far better than Plato and Aristotle, genuine alternatives for the Renaissance humanist to ponder' (1975: 3-6). It was Petrarch, Bouwsma suggests, who established this central dichotomy, and who arguably came closest to consciously addressing it.

Petrarch's engagement with Augustine brought into poetic discourse a more deeply interiorized sense of the profundities of the private self than the Stoic tradition had been able to offer him, together with an awareness of the unknowability of man's motives and his contradictory desires. This was accompanied by a radical undoing of the notion that the subject might, through the Stoical care of the self, achieve an internal harmony through a form of logical self-sufficiency, even as these Augustinian revelations intensified the longing for just such a peace within. The Stoics aligned reason with the will, and looked to this alliance to overcome the suffering caused by hope and fear. For example, Thomas James's *The Moral Philosophy of the Stoicks* (the 1598 translation of Guillaume Du Vair's *La Philosophic Morale des Stoiques,* the next most influential neo-Stoic text after Lipsius's *De Constantia*) follows Seneca in insisting upon the identity of the will, virtue, reason and happiness: 'the good & happines of man consisteth in the right use of reason, and what is that but vertue, which is nothing els but a constant disposition of will' (James 1951 [1598]: 55; cited Bruce 2009). Petrarch, on the other hand, finds reason and the will to be almost hopelessly divided: 'veggio 'l meglio et al peggior m'appiglio', he sees the better but lays hold of the worse (*RVF* 264.136).[129] It is reason's ongoing powerlessness over the will that in large part prompts thought to turn in on itself and go into overdrive, producing an outpouring of language and a plethora of metonymic connections that take the place of this fundamental missing relation. Laura's absence, of course, is among the most striking and dominant tropes for this inability to unite will and reason.

Petrarch's reading of Augustine also helped legitimize the intrinsic importance Petrarch seems to have attached to the emotions and, in particular, to the affective power of writing. Petrarch's career coincides with the rise in affective piety, and more research is needed into how this too may have influenced his thought and his poetic practice.[130] Where the Stoics seek to eliminate the affective as a source of suffering, Petrarch finds in it one of the few hopes for a reintegration of the self. Only through the affective power of rhetoric, the emotional effect of language, can the will perhaps be reconciled with reason. Indeed, Petrarch celebrated Cicero, more commonly a source of Stoic thought, for the affective power of his rhetoric, which 'stamps and drives deep into the heart the sharpest and most ardent stings of speech', and even chooses Cicero over Aristotle on these grounds: where Aristotle insightfully classifies the virtues and vices, 'when I learn all this, I know a little bit more than I knew before, but mind and will remain the same as they were, and I myself remain the same'. It is, Petrarch concludes, 'one thing to know, and another to love; one thing to understand, another to will' (cf. Strier 2004: 24).

---

[129] For example, Thomas James's *The Moral Philosophy of the Stoicks* (the 1598 translation of Guillaume Du Vair's *La Philosophic Morale des Stoiques,* the next most influential neo-Stoic text after Lipsius's *De Constantia*) follows Seneca in insisting upon the identity of the will, virtue, reason and happiness: 'the good & happines of man consisteth in the right use of reason, and what is that but vertue, which is nothing els but a constant disposition of will' (James 1951 [1598]: 55; cited Bruce 2009: xx).

[130] Marjorie O'Rourke Boyle notes that 'the intensely affective piety' of the Franciscans promoted an 'emotional spontaneous [...] poetry that he [Petrarch] could approve' (Boyle 1991: 127), without exploring this connection further. It may prove impossible to establish concrete links, but it nevertheless seems sensible to keep the rise of affective piety in mind as a significant context when considering Petrarch's emphasis on the affective.

By writing in the Petrarchan mode, Wroth foregrounds the Christian, Petrarchan critique of Stoicism, and particularly of neo-Stoicism's alignment of reason with masculine constancy at the expense of the affective. If, in Petrarch's own work, problematically Christianized Stoic impulses toward detachment remain potent right to the *Canzoniere*'s very close, a more Augustinian emphasis on emotion and empathy exerts an equally powerful pull, and it is the latter that Renaissance Petrarchism for the most part emphasizes. Given Wroth's largely Calvinist political and religious allegiances, it is unsurprising that *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* focuses particularly forcefully upon Petrarchism's implicit dispute with Stoic principles. As Bouwsma and Strier both note, with the Reformation the challenge to Stoicism becomes far less ambivalent (Bouwsma 1990: 225-246; Strier 2004: 29). Luther and Calvin both rejected what Calvin described as the 'iron philosophy' of the new Stoics, 'who count it depraved not only to groan and weep but to be sad and care-ridden' (cf. Strier 2004: 32). By reinterpreting the Pauline distinction between 'flesh' and 'spirit', rejecting the Platonic alignment of the former with the body and the latter with the soul or reason, Luther undid one of the dichotomies at the heart of both Stoic thought and established gender attributes. According to Paul, Luther argued, flesh "means everything that is born of the flesh, i.e. the entire self, body and soul, including our reason'. Fleshliness thus comes to be, as Strier notes, 'the condition of egotism or self-regard—the condition of being, as Luther wonderfully put it in Latin, "*incurvatus in se*" ("curved in upon oneself")' (2004: 29).

How, then, do all these influences come together in Wroth's Petrarchism? When we turn to Wroth's sequence, we find indeed that thought is very much located within the flesh, rather than isolated as a Stoic path out of emotional suffering. Petrarchism has long been recognized for its peculiar inwardness, and in *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* we find a female subjectivity in which reason itself is turned in on itself, in which thought is *incurvatus in se*.

From the opening of the sequence, we see how ‘thought’ tortures Pamphilia. Yet we also see that where Petrarch emphasizes the (admittedly partial) disjunction between himself as he was in the time of his first youthful error, his ‘primo giovenile errore, | quand’ era in parte altr’ uom da quel ch’ i’ sono” (*RVF* 1.3-4), Pamphilia insists on her identity with her past self. Describing how Venus inserts a flaming heart into her breast and Cupid shoots it, she laments: ‘I waking hop'd as dreames it would depart, | Yet since, O me, a Lover I haue beene’ (P1.13-14). This is followed by an archetypally Petrarchan meditation on the power of the eyes, ‘Which wounding, euen in hurts are deem'd delights’ (P2.12). However, one of the effects of having a female-voiced amatory sequence in the Petrarchan mode is that when the speaker assigns typically Petrarchan attributes to her beloved, we are inclined to wonder if she might not be speaking of herself, being more used to hearing such language being addressed or applied to a woman. We see this in ‘Deare eyes how well indeed’ (P2), which demands thought of us as readers: Petrarchan convention dictates that this poem is addressed to the beloved, but it also dictates that the eyes described in such terms belong to a female Laura-figure. Is the poet, Narcissus-like, gazing enamoured at her own reflection here, contemplating the power of her own ‘pleasing lookes’, ‘so pleasant in their force’ (P2.6, 13)?

> Deare eyes how well indeed, you doe adorne
> That blessed Sphere, which gazing soules hold deare?
> The loved place of sought for triumphs, neere
> The Court of Glory, where Loues force was borne.
> How may they terme you *Aprills* sweetest morne?
> When pleasing lookes, from those bright lights appeare
> A Sunne-shine day, from clowdes, and mists still cleare:
> Kinde nursing fires for wishes yet vnborne.
> Two Starres of Heauen sent downe to grace the Earth,
> Plac'd in that Throne which gives all ioyes their birthe,
> Shining, and burning; pleasing yet their Charmes:
> Which wounding, euen in hurts are deem'd delights;
> So pleasant is their force, so great their mights,

As happy they can tryumph in their harmes.

We probably conclude that she is not, that it is indeed the beloved Amphilanthus's eyes that are being emblazoned here: and this is all but confirmed in the opening lines of the following sonnet, which exhort Love to 'Shine in those eyes which conquer'd haue my heart' (P3.3). The initial ambiguity, however, establishes both a pattern of undecidability and an inward self-reflexivity that endures throughout the sequence.

It is in the following sonnet that thought and constancy first come to the fore:

Yet is there hope, then Love but play thy part,
Remember well thy selfe, and think on me;
Shine in those eyes which conquer'd haue my heart,
And see if mine, be slacke to answer thee.
Lodge in that breast, and pitty moouing see,
For flames which in mine burne in truest smart,
Exciling thoughts, that touch Inconstancy,
Or those which waste not in the constant Art,
Watch but my sleepe, if I take any rest,
For thought of you, my spirit so distrest,
As, pale and famish'd, I for mercy cry.
Will you your seruant leave: thinke but on this,
Who weares Love's Crowne, must not doe so amisse
But seeke their good, who on thy force do lye. (P3)

Here it is Love that is urged to think, and Pamphilia presents herself as the would-be object of Love's thought. By addressing Love directly here, and petitioning her to take her side by shining in Amphilanthus's eyes and lodging in his breast, she implicitly reduces the latter to a hollow mannequin. If the second sonnet seemed momentarily to figure a tribadic, potentially narcissistic exchange of gazes, this third poem, in properly Petrarchan fashion, more definitely bypasses any direct encounter with the beloved in favour of an exchange with Love himself.

At the heart of the poem (on more levels than one) Pamphilia goes on to describe how in her breast flames

> burne in truest smart,
> Exciling thoughts, that touch Inconstancy,
> Or those which waste not in the constant Art. (P3.6-8)

Here thought seems at first glance to be presented as a threat to constancy, to be suppressed by true emotion, rather than, as in the Stoic mould, as leading to emotion's suppression. Of course, the 'Inconstancy' that Pamphilia's thoughts might touch upon is, at the very least, as likely to be Amphilanthus's as her own, as the romance and the rest of the sequence make apparent. Likewise, it does not do to go hunting too voraciously or solemnly for traces of neo-Stoic sentiment or its refutation here. This is, after all, a Petrarchan sequence, and, whatever the effects of its gender reversals, it operates within those parameters: it is decidedly *not* a philosophical tract. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note the ambiguous deictics (a mark of the true Petrarchan) of line 8, where 'those', on reflection, seems to refer to potential suitors, but might also refer to 'thoughts'. Such a reading, if strained, does open up intriguing possibilities, suggesting that the proper pursuit of thought is to waste away in the pursuit of constancy, a sense which does seem much closer to the Stoic drive toward *apathia*. Perhaps more significantly, if we take 'those' to indicate would-be inconstant suitors, we are placed in a position, having read the romance, from where we cannot miss the dramatic irony: Amphilanthus, as we already know— but Pamphilia, presumably, at this early point in her sequence, does not (this sonnet surely belonging within the fiction of the *Urania* to the package of sonnets that she presents to Amphilanthus in her closet)—is foremost among all Pamphilia's suitors in his inconstancy.

Clearly Pamphilia, ‘pale and famish’d’ (l.11), is one of those who wastes in ‘the constant Art’. Her constancy, however, is definitively not of the self-contained kind advocated, for men, by Lipsius, and realised through reason: rather, as the sequence develops, the extent to which Pamphilia’s constancy is directed beyond the self, toward the beloved male, Amphilanthus, becomes ever more apparent. However, whether this inscribes Pamphilia’s positioning of herself as the properly submissive female lover, cognisant of her incapacity for self-sovereignty, seems doubtful. What becomes increasingly evident is that she cannot stay the movement of her womanly thought, which turns out to be intimately tied to feeling, rather than divorced from it into dry rationality. Even here in the sestet of this sonnet, while the syntax, not helped by the punctuation either in the manuscript or the 1621 printing, is unclear, the ‘thought of you’, of Love, reasserts itself, the source of suffering, leaving a ‘spirit so distrest’ (P3.10). Significantly, Love here is the godhead that fuses the other and the self, figuring both Pamphilia’s beloved and her inwardly felt sentiment. And the thought of Love calls forth another demand for thought from the other: ‘thinke but on this’ (P3.12). This thought in turn, politically loaded, is one that urges he ‘Who weares Love's Crowne’ to ‘not doe so amisse | But seeke their good, who on thy force do lye’ (P3.13-14). Here we see the ‘public of the private’ that the Petrarchan mode so effectively foregrounds. Arguments that ‘love is not love’ in such sonnets tends to miss the point: it is a certain model of amorous relationship that becomes the ground for a political analogy. The call for limited monarchy takes its power from its founding on an ethics of intimacy.

As the sequence develops, thought gains increasingly negative connotations. Pamphilia avows that she is ‘free from changing thought’ (P9.6), insisting at the close of the same poem that she ‘triumph may’ through the failure of ‘Vnkindnes, nor this wrong’ to allay her love (P9.13-14). Her thoughts are ‘sad’ (P13.9); they tie her to ‘Despaire’ (P14.12). If they reject more ‘deluding’ by the dreams of sleep, it is only because they have been so thoroughly deluded already (P18.4). Thoroughly emotive, thought seems the real source of Pamhilia's woes, as much as Amphilanthus's indifference. His inconstancy to her is mirrored in her own inconstancy to herself, her thoughts blown hither and thither by her emotions and divided from reason or will.

The third song of the sequence (P21), however, marks a turning point in Pamphilia's relationship with her own thoughts. It is the poem in all the collections that struggles most directly with the roots and purpose of thinking:

> Stay my thoughts do not aspire,
> To vaine hopes of high desire;
> See you not all meanes bereft,
> To inioye no ioye is left,
> Yet still me thinkes my thoughts doe say,
> Some hopes do liue amid dismay.
>
> Hope then once more, hope for ioy,
> Bury feare which ioyes destroy,
> Thought hath yet some comfort giuen,
> Which despaire hath from vs driuen:
> Therefore deerely my thoughts cherish,
> Neuer let such thinking perish.
>
> 'Tis an idle thing to plaine,
> Odder farre to dye for paine;
> Thinke and see how thoughts doe rise,
> Winning where there noe hope lies;
> Which alone is louers treasure,
> For by thoughts we loue doe measure.
>
> Then kinde thought my fant'sie guide,
> Let me neuer haplesse slide;
> Still maintaine thy force in me,
> Let me thinking still be free;
> Nor leaue thy might vntill my death,
> But let me thinking yeeld vp breath.

The poem opens with what looks like an orthodox enough Stoic imperative on the part of Pamphilia that her thoughts ‘ not aspire | To vaine hopes’, that they not align themselves with ‘high desire’ (ll.1-2) but find a constant repose. Indeed, reason shows that hopes are indeed vain: ‘See you not all meanes bereft, | To inioye no ioye is left’ (ll.3-4). Any capacity for enjoyment has been exhausted, we suppose, by exposure to disappointment and the apparent hopelessness of Pamphilia’s situation, and thus reason dictates that thought should cease to trouble itself: the only hope can be for peace, for rest in a state of Stoic *apathia*. The speaker therefore seeks to still thought, to ‘stay’ it.

This Stoic resolution, however, does not last long. Thought itself, observing itself, notes hope’s persistence: ‘Yet still me thinkes my thoughts doe say, | Some hopes do liue amid dismay’ (ll.5-6). That ‘me thinkes’ is strictly speaking redundant to the sense of the line, but its self-reflexive presence triggers a potentially infinite regression of selves thinking about themselves thinking, observing themselves observing and interpreting the persistence within the thinking subject of emotions they can see no rational grounds for (in this case, hope). On the one hand, this articulates a paradigmatically Petrarchan alienation from the self, recalling the Petrarchan schism between reason and the will. The thinking subject, cut off from itself, observes how the passions persist irrespective of its own orders founded on rational thought. Yet it is also thought that brings news of hope to that thinking subject, that *speaks* hope and makes it, as it were, available to thought. In its reflexivity, that ‘me thinkes’ also suggests an identity between the self that gives the poem’s opening order to its ‘thoughts’ to ‘stay’, and the process of thinking itself: this in a poem where the actual location of the subject, the ‘I’ that recurs again and again throughout the rest of the sequence (surely with a greater frequency than in other Tudor or Jacobean sequences) is left unclear, or even absent. Indeed, the self here seems to be more tangibly present as addressee than as speaker.

That ‘still’, too, if it most obviously indicates the persistence of hope, or, more specifically, of thought’s identification of hope’s endurance beyond reason, might also be read as pointing to what happens when the opening imperative is obeyed. Become ‘still’, as requested, and ceasing to aspire, thought turns inward (as indicated by the reflexive ‘me thinkes’) and sees hope alive.

Thought, then, leads not toward the attainment of Stoic *apathia*, but back to meditation upon its own discovery of something beyond itself. Upon its discovery of hope’s unreasonable persistence, of course, any good neo-Stoic thought ought to turn its attention anew to this vicious emotion’s suppression. Yet thought has already discovered the ineffectiveness of its own stilling (or indeed that, in just such stilling, thought gives birth to hope) and, in the second stanza, thought is celebrated as the bearer of hope, ‘comfort’ against ‘despaire’. In the new imperative, ‘thoughts’ become the object, not the subject: ‘Therefore deerely my thoughts cherish’ (l.11). Who, then, or what, is the addressee of *this* imperative? Is it those same thoughts of the poem’s opening, that now must cherish themselves, in another reflexive turn? Is it the absent I, the thinking seat of the will? Or is there a glance here toward the always absent presence of Amphilanthus as the simultaneously intended and negated (and ultimately realised) addressee of the collection as a whole? All of these possibilities inhere, and, at a stretch, we might even take ‘thoughts’ here as, again, subject of the verb rather than its object: while such a reading would be tenuous, the intensely reflexive character of the poem invites us to at least register its spectral presence as a possibility. Certainly the kind of thinking whose preservation Pamphilia urges in the following line (‘Neuer let such thinking perish’) is a thinking that is profoundly emotive, infused with hope, rather than opposed to it.

The poem reaches its climax in the third stanza:

> Thinke and see how thoughts doe rise,
> Winning where there noe hope lies;

> Which alone is louers treasure,
> For by thoughts we loue doe measure. (15-18)

Here thought is celebrated as indispensible: without it, hope is powerless, unobtainable. Thought is presented as prior to hope, the condition for its discovery, and, likewise, the realisation that 'by thoughts we loue doe measure' refuses the traditional and the neo-Stoic disjunction between reason and love, making the former the test of the latter. The poem's final stanza confirms and further celebrates 'kinde thought''s own affective status:

> Then kinde thought my fant'sie guide,
> Let me neuer haplesse slide;
> Still maintaine thy force in me,
> Let me thinking still be free;
> Nor leaue thy might vntill my death,
> But let me thinking yeeld vp breath. (19-24)

The yielding up of breath here is a figuring of the poet's mortality. However, it is also a self-addressed summons by the hitherto silent female poet, whose words have until now remained on the page, unvoiced, unseen and unsuspected by the eyes of the other, to give those words 'breath', to make them live. (The rhyme, binding life and death together, activates a central Petrarchan trope that will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.) Freedom lies in thinking, for it is thinking that brings reflexivity and allows the subject to be its own object. Yet precisely this curving in on itself, rather than granting it self-sufficiency, reveals to it the absence at its own core of which hope is the irreducible mark. True constancy can only be to that lack, to the truth of the need for the other. The Stoic constancy of sovereign reason is revealed to be no more than a hollow pastiche of this Christian love that acknowledges the need for grace from without: where *apathia* is the death of hope, Petrarchan hope subsists where logic would have it die. As Giuseppe

Mazzotta observes, for Petrarch 'one thinks when the mind is mobilized by love' (1993: 8), and thought is indistinguishable from the recognition of the lesion at the heart of subjectivity that makes it possible. As Luther had it—and here we remember Petrarch's celebrated status in the Reformation as a proto-Protestant—reason too is of the flesh, and thus implicated in desire, rather than a means of transcending it.

However, from the conviction of this song, the sequence plunges back into its meditations upon the agonies of the constant lover. Thought can offer the consolation of pleasurable deceits, as in sonnet 21 (P24), where the poet's 'faith' ensures that kindly sleep

> gladly thee presents into my thought,
> And still true Louer-like thy face doth keepe (P24.10-11)

Yet thought remains inextricably tied to love, and highly prized. 'When every one to pleasing pastime hies' (P26) is one of Wroth's best known and most anthologized poems:

> When euery one to pleasing pastime hies
> Some hunt, some hauke, some play, while some delight
> In sweet discourse, and musicke shewes ioys might:
> Yet I my thoughts doe farr aboue these prize.
> The ioy which I take is, that free from eyes
> I sit and wonder at this day-like night,
> So to dispose themselues as voyd of right,
> And leaue true pleasure for poore vanities.
> When others hunt, my thoughts I haue in chase;
> If hauke, my minde at wished end doth flye:
> Discourse, I with my spirit talke and cry;
> While others musicke choose as greatest grace.
> O God say I, can thes fond pleasures moue,
> Or musicke bee but in sweet thoughts of Loue?

As is widely recognized, Wroth’s poem rewrites the Petrarchan metaphor of the hunt, most famously deployed in English in Wyatt’s ‘whosoever list to chase, I know where is an hind’. Wyatt’s refusal to hunt is famously prompted by Caesar’s ownership of the ‘hind’ that he invites his listener to pursue. Wroth, however, refuses both the actual and the amorous hunt for a prey she prizes far higher: her own thoughts. Other critics have explored with perspicuity the gendered retreat from the social gaze here. Yet what the poem reveals is that the withdrawal from social exchange into interiority, rather than protecting the integrity or oneness of the self, rather than producing self-mastery, actually illuminates a split in the subject. Moreover, this split has in itself a valuable affective force. In line 9, the ‘I’ is emptied out: it is not the source of the ‘thoughts’ that fly from it. Or better: the ‘I’ here stands for pure desire or volition, while thought is externalised. In line 10, however, it is the mind—which presumably *is* the locus of thought—that is in pursuit. Again, as the apparently casual, almost throwaway rhetorical question that closes the sonnet suggests, this is on some levels a whimsical piece that resists philosophical theorising, but that very resistance, the emphasis on the chase of language, is itself an indication of how thought is tied within Wroth’s Petrarchism, as in the Petrarchan mode more generally, to the affective, and thus to language, rather than to a cold reason that strives toward detachment. Wroth’s explicit and gendered preoccupation with thought, however, marks her out from most of her English predecessors.

Constancy, however, is not to be found by Pamphilia in her worldly, inconstant beloved, and she is increasingly forced to delineate the relationship between constancy, thought and love more clearly. In the fifth song (P35) she rails at Amphilanthus:

> Haue I thee slack'd, or left vndone
> One louing rite, and so haue wonne,
> Thy rage, or bitter changing?
> That now noe minutes I shall see,

Wherein I may least happy be,
Thy fauours so estranging.

Blame thy selfe, and not my folly,
Time gaue time but to be holy,
True Loue, such ends best loueth:
Unworthy Loue doth seeke for ends,
A worthy Loue but worth pretends;
Nor other thoughts it proueth. (P35.7-18)

The argument that 'worthy Loue' attends to itself, rather than to 'ends', to what it hopes to gain, privileges its irrationality. This fits with the sense that that irrational kernel of emotion is itself the proper object of thought, and irreducible by it. Yet the suggestion that worthy love 'proueth' no 'other thoughts' represents a return to thought's suppression, a moment of bad faith on the part of Pamphilia and, arguably, of Wroth, given the paranomasia of her name in 'worth'.[131] Clearly, if love sometimes blinds Pamphilia to Amphilanthus's shortcomings, allied with thought it all too often exposes them. And the overall effect of the sequence, if not of these lines, is that Pamphilia's loving thought does indeed engage reflexively with the thought of Amphilanthus's inconstancy. At the end of the sequence as Roy Booth publishes it, we are left in a state of unresolved conflict. Pamphilia seems trapped between the thought of her own constant love and that of her lover's inconstancy. Her constancy is to itself, to her own recognition of love's endurance, which, if admirable in its acknowledgement of passion's irreducibility, nevertheless seems unhealthily self-absorbed, threatening to deny or obscure the real beloved as much as any Petrarchan sequence. It is truly *incurvatus in se*.

Yet after the signed poem that for Booth signals the end of the sequence proper, there is, as Bear and others have noted, a *volta* in the sequence, which ‘turns [still further] inward, with many poems meditative and contemplative in character, or self-exhortatory’ (Bear 1992: unpaginated). Following Elaine Beilin, Bear aligns this with an episode in the *Urania* in which Pamphilia attempts to rescue Amphilanthus from a cave where he has been imprisoned by a fiendish spell. She fails: the cave’s entrance refuses to admit true lovers, allowing only ‘false ones’ to enter. Pamphilia withdraws, and returns to court where she lives ‘more like a religious’ than a courtly lady (Beilin 1987: 229). For Bear, it is in the corona of sonnets that Pamphilia finds her way out of the ‘strange Labyrinth’ of thought that threatens to overwhelm her. There, Pamphilia concludes that

---

[131] As May Paulissen notes, 'worth' was in the early seventeenth century the common pronunciation of 'Wroth' (1982: 2).

> HE that shuns Loue, doth loue himselfe the lesse,
> And cursed he whose spirit, not admires
> The worth of Loue, where endlesse blessednes
> Raignes, & commands, maintain'd by heau'nly fires.
> Made of Vertue, ioyn'd by Truth, blowne by Desires,
> Strengthned by Worth, renew'd by carefulnesse,
> Flaming in neuer changing thoughts: (1-7)

Bear argues that the generic pronoun with which this poem begins universalizes the argument, and thereby ‘achieves a spiritualization of love that, unlike the spiritualization of love by Petrarch and so many of his masculine followers, does not depend upon dressing up the beloved as God’ (1992: unpaginated). Instead, she argues, ‘the beloved is pointed the way to become like Pamphilia herself, who in her constancy has found a way to union with the divine’ (ibid). Bear points to the ‘costly clarity’ Pamphilia attains in so doing, the realisation that she must give up her pursuit of her beloved; but far more costly here is the stilling of thought that she had so insistently refused earlier in the sequence, a stilling that ‘Flaming’ does little to mask. The final sonnet, Pamphilia’s ‘farewell to love’, is simultaneously a final address to Amphilanthus, an address that the closing signature in the manuscript reinforces:

My Muse now happy lay thy selfe to rest,
Sleepe in the quiet of a faithfull loue,
Write you no more, but let these Phant'sies mooue
Some other hearts, wake not to new vnrest.
But if you Study be those thoughts adrest
To truth, which shall eternall goodnes prooue;
Enioying of true ioy the most, and best
The endles gaine which neuer will remoue.
Leaue the discourse of *Venus*, and her sonne
To young beginners, and their braines inspire
With storyes of great Loue, and from that fire,
Get heat to write the fortunes they haue wonne.
And thus leaue off; what's past shewes you can loue,
Now let your Constancy your Honor proue.

Pamphilia

'Only his conversion to the "womanly" virtue of constancy will make Amphilanthus the man of honor Pamphilia knows he can be', argues Bear, concluding that, 'assuming *his* thoughts are addressed to truth', Wroth's argument 'that a single standard of virtue precedes gender proves to be an argument from strength' (ibid). Ultimately, however, Pamphilia's desire to arrest thought in order to protect constancy, rather than to persist in her constancy *to* the thought of love, with all the pain and suffering and uncertainty that brings, reveals, perhaps, the deleterious impact of the Stoic strain of thought that she so powerfully challenges in the second song of the first part of her sequence and elsewhere.

A few years after the publication in print of *The Countesse of Montgomery's Urania*, with *Pamphilia, to Amphilanthus* appended, a drunken friar, Tommaso Martinelli, broke into the tomb in S. Maria Assunta with four accomplices and stole away some bones, apparently for resale. Martinelli and his associates were later apprehended, tried and exiled (Caramelli 2007: 1). It seems probable that the drunken friars substituted a disinterred female skull for Petrarch's cranium in the hope that their theft would thereby go unnoticed. From an English perspective, their timing in posthumously crowning Petrarch's skeleton with the head of a woman could not have been more apposite. Wroth's sequence, in its challenge to prevailing notions of female constancy and to the masculinist neo-Stoic alignment of constancy with the exercise of reason detached from the emotions, aiming toward *apathia*, was in many ways paradigmatically Petrarchan. If the conclusion of her sequence presents a picture of Pamphilia as retreating from Petrarchan thought, elsewhere it offers a thorough-going Petrarchan argument for the universalization of constancy to the thought of love, one that is founded on the affective thought of poetry.

# CHAPTER FIVE

# WHERE BREATH MOST BREATHES ~ SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS

*There is nothing so neare Immortality, as to die daily; for not to feele death, is Immortality; and onely hee shall never feele death, that is exercised in the continuall Meditation thereof; Continuall Mortification is Immortality.*

(John Donne, Sermon preached at S. Pauls, the Sunday after the Conversion of St. Paul, 27 Jan. 1627)

*i' cheggio a Morte incontra Morte aita*
[I ask Death for help against Death]
(*RVF* 327.7)

## 5.1 Poetry and Plague

Were it not for the bubonic plague we would have neither Petrarch's *Canzoniere* nor Shakespeare's sonnets in their extant form. Petrarch first conceived of unifying his *rime sparse*, his dispersed rhymes, into a single work in the immediate wake of the Great Mortality, or Black Death, of 1347-1348. In his letters and in his Latin verse he bewailed the ravages the disease inflicted upon his loved ones, and turned inwards to interrogate himself as to the meaning of these horrors, and his readiness to confront his own mortality. In a Latin verse epistle addressed to himself, the 'Ad Seipsum', he presents himself as a man struggling to come to terms not only with the immense loss so suddenly and unjustly inflicted upon him, but also with an intense, visceral fear for his own life:

> Funerals meet my terrified eyes, wherever I turn them,
> Horror piles upon horror, the churches crowded with coffins
> Echo to loud lamentations, while countless bodies unburied,
> Noble and peasant alike, lie in the open unhonoured.
> Life's final hour oppresses my soul... (*ASI*, 7-11)

In the *Canzoniere*, however, that self-reflexive turn sublimates both plague and fear into the structure, imagery and linguistic texture of the work as a whole. Never mentioned explicitly, it nevertheless informs the entire collection. The autograph manuscript held in the Vatican Library (Vat. Lat. 3195) is divided into two parts by seven blank pages. These pages silently witness the Black Death's return to Europe after an absence of six hundred years, a return that resulted in the demise of Laura and of many of Petrarch's closest friends. The two parts of the *Canzoniere* either side of those seven blank pages have become known as *in vita* and *in morte*, yet while the poems *in morte* explicitly lament Laura's death, the poems *in vita* too repeatedly foreshadow her end.

Over two hundred and fifty years later, plague was to be 'a defining context for all Shakespeare's writing, but above all for his non-dramatic writing' (Duncan-Jones 2001: 54). If Duncan-Jones's thesis regarding the composition and the publication of the sonnets is correct, then the plague's maleficent touch can be traced in the very printing of the 1609 Quarto, in the ostensible misspellings, apparently erroneous repetitions, and the various other textual peculiarities that have kept modern editors so busy. 'A booke called SHAKESPEARES sonnettes' was entered in the Stationers' Register on 20 May 1609, a few days before the end of the Easter Law Term allowed the professional classes, gentry and courtiers to flee the City, where deaths from the plague had been approaching a hundred a week (Duncan-Jones 1997: 11).

Shakespeare too was no doubt anxious to get out of London, and it is probable that, as Duncan-Jones suggests, his haste lies behind the apparent absence of authorial proof-correction.[132] It may account too, as Duncan-Jones suggests, for Thorpe's being the signatory of the dedication, rather than Shakespeare.

If the plague played a part in leaving us a printed text that is notoriously problematic, without it we might not have that text at all. The London theatres were closed whenever plague fatalities in the city rose above thirty a week, and from 1606 to December 1610, 'the public playhouses were not likely to have been open for more than a total of nine months' (Barroll 1999: 177). In such circumstances those who made their living from them had to 'diversify or starve' (Duncan-Jones 2001: 54). The rewards of patronage and, increasingly, of publication, made the writing of lyric poetry an attractive alternative to which dramatists might devote the time they found on their hands. Whether Shakespeare originally penned his sonnets for publication, in order to win patronage, or as keys to unlock his heart, it seems likely that some at least might never have been written without the sustained pauses in theatrical activity caused by the theatres' closure. Of the four probable phases of composition suggested by external evidence that the Arden editor identifies, two coincide with severe outbreaks of plague, 1603-4 and August 1608-May 1609.[133] It seems probable that the financial pressures the plague exerted helped to convince Shakespeare to publish poems whose economic efficacy as a means to patronage, perhaps always dubious, had waned or been used up. Whatever the case, the evidence suggests that while a handful of the poems in the 1609 quarto would have made their way down to us – often in a significantly different form – thanks to their appearance in anthologies such as *The Passionate Pilgrim* or in commonplace books or 'tables' like those mentioned in sonnets 77 and 122, we would not have the majority of them (or any of them in their 1609 form) were it not for the plagues of the early seventeenth century.

---

[132] The plague, as Duncan-Jones notes, "may also account for the uniquely bad state" of Jonson's *The Case is Alterd,* which was also published in the summer of 1609 (1997: 12, n.4). That a text by an author so rigorously attentive to the appearance of his publications as Jonson could have appeared in such a condition would tend to support the argument that the plague, as much as any laxity on Shakespeare's part, may explain the quarto's anomalies.

[133] 'Severe plague outbreak and consequent loss of income from the theatre make this a plausible time for Shakespeare to have turned once more to non-dramatic poetry,' Duncan-Jones says of the first period, while 'an even more severe and prolonged plague outbreak again deprived Shakespeare of income from the theatre' in the second, during which she suggests he may have finished work on the manuscript before selling it to Thorpe and leaving London (1997: 13).

*Shakespeare's Sonnets* and the *Canzoniere,* then, stand at either end of the European lyric tradition we have come to know as Petrarchism, a tradition whose endurance across Europe more or less coincides with that of the worst years of the bubonic plague. Both are marked by the disease, and both, peculiarly within that tradition, meditate obsessively, even ferociously, upon human mortality. Both, moreover, have militated with extraordinary efficacy against the symbolic deaths of the subjects they enunciate. Both, too, ground that enunciation of subjectivity upon an articulation of the oblivion at its heart, upon precisely the negation of the subject in the encounter with death. Equally ambivalently, both sequences have bequeathed immortality upon their principal objects—although whether Petrarch's Laura ever existed in the flesh (not to mention her true identity) remains hotly disputed, and Shakespeare's young man and dark lady both remain notoriously nameless.

Of all Renaissance sonnet sequences none comes so close to the ur-sequence's preoccupation with death as does Shakespeare's. Yet while *Shakespeare's Sonnets* has been variously described as 'intensely Petrarchan' (Dubrow 1995: 121), 'one of the most Petrarchan sequences of the age' (Braden 1999b: 171), and of all English sequences the 'most nearly comparable' with Petrarch's (Spiller 2001: 46), this striking, elementary resemblance, while often noted, has gone relatively unexplored. This might be due in part to the difficulty of establishing a literary genealogy that would link death's presence in the sonnets to Petrarch's meditation on the death of Laura. In the lyric tradition that emerges from the imitation of the *Canzoniere*, Petrarch's focus on death goes underground: it becomes latent, if it is present at all. Few sonneteers in the following 250 years write poems on or to a deceased love, or deal with themes of death and mortality in anything remotely approaching Petrarch's explicit fashion. Where these themes are present, they are usually associated first and foremost with the *carpe diem* trope (or the more explicitly erotic *carpe florem*) as a call to pleasure, a technique of seduction, tropes whose absence from both Petrarch's and Shakespeare's sequences Gordon Braden has made a key point of resemblance between the two (1999b).

These parallels prompt the question of whether Shakespeare was directly influenced by, and perhaps even responding to, Petrarch's *Canzoniere*. Scholarly opinion regarding the likelihood of Shakespeare's having had some first-hand knowledge of Petrarch has changed little in the last hundred years. In 1904 H.R.D. Anders wrote in *Shakespeare's Books* that

> though we discover many Petrarcan [sic] conceits in Shakespeare's sonnets, we can scarcely claim for the latter a direct acquaintance with the Italian poet, who had been imitated *ad nauseam* by a whole army of English sonnetists. In one place [*Romeo and Juliet* II.iv.40] our poet openly avows his knowledge concerning Petrarca's sonnets, but it does not follow from the passage, that he had read them'. (1904: 72)[134]

Anders' position is seconded by contemporary students of Shakespeare's Petrarchism. William Kennedy believes 'it is highly unlikely that Shakespeare ever read Petrarch directly', while for Braden, 'we cannot be sure Shakespeare did not read Petrarch, but he might as well not have' (Kennedy 1994: 75; Braden 1999b: 164). In his own *Shakespeare's Books*, published at the beginning of the twenty-first century, Stuart Gillespie, while suggesting that 'Petrarch's poetry would have been known to Shakespeare in some form, and may have had some direct effect on the *Sonnets*,' agrees that 'influence is hard to demonstrate' (2001: 411).

---

[134] Anders follows Sidney Lee, whose observation on the subject he quotes approvingly: 'Such resemblances as are visible between Shakespeare's sonnets and those of Petrarch or Desportes seem due to his study of the English sonneteers' (Lee 1898: 109, cited Anders 1904: 102).

The lack of any convincing evidence that Shakespeare ever read the *Canzoniere*, however, has not held critics back from exploring, often with great ingenuity and insight, the relations, parallels and contrasts between his poetry and Petrarch's.[135] Critics invariably see Shakespeare's encounter with Petrarchism as mediated almost entirely through his reading of the Elizabethan sonneteers.[136] The work of that guild, as Braden notes, is 'promiscuously dependent on a range of Italian and French practice whereby specifically Petrarchan topics and conventions were systematized, altered and supplemented in the course of the sixteenth century to create an international poetic idiom corresponding to no particular writer's own *parole*' (1999b: 164). The existence of Shakespeare's sonnets is inconceivable without the precedent laid down in the 1580s and 1590s, yet attempts to trace allusions in Shakespeare's sonnets have rarely led with any convincing degree of specificity to Petrarchan lyrics by other English practitioners. The one serious suggestion of a direct borrowing from Petrarch, that the opening of sonnet 110 deliberately echoes the opening poem of the *Canzoniere*, is, as Braden admits, impressive, but without other examples there is no reason to take the parallel as anything other than 'uncanny coincidence' (cf. Rollins 1944: 1.276; Braden 1999b: 164).

---

[135] It is important to distinguish one aspect of what might be considered Shakespeare's Petrarchism from the matter in hand. Offering an intelligent synthesis of recent scholarship on 'Shakespeare's Reading of Modern European Literature,' Stuart Gillespie argues that the past model which saw Shakespeare as most affected by other writers' work in matters of plot and storyline is flawed. The influence of what he calls 'texts of ideas,' he argues, is far more profound (2001: 112). These texts of ideas include works such as Palingenius's *Zodiacus Vitae* (1530s) and the Flemish writer Alexandre Sylvain's *The Orator* (translated by 'L.P.' in 1596), which lie behind Jacques's 'All the world's a stage' speech and the notion of the pound of flesh in *The Merchant of Venice* respectively. Exploring such texts' influence on Shakespeare's writing, Gillespie suggests, can show how European literature offered 'a range of works which, though not possessing imaginative or dramatic appeal, could stimulate on other levels, structural or conceptual' (112). 'Far more important' among these texts of ideas though, Gillespie claims, 'is the mainstream European humanist tradition of such writers as Petrarch, Erasmus and Montaigne, a tradition whose influence is felt over the length and breadth of Shakespeare's work' (113). The importance of that tradition, however, and of the individual works within it, is far from universally recognized, or so Gillespie argues. One reason he suggests for this is 'the difficulty of proving direct influence…In the case of Petrarch and Erasmus, the extremely wide diffusion of their work often makes it impossible to trace a direct connection, and it is often likely that one or several intermediary texts lie between their work and the dramatist's' (113).

[136] This reading dates back at least as far as Sidney Lee's contention that 'such resemblances as are visible between Shakespeare's sonnets and those of Petrarch…seem due to his study of the English sonneteers' (1898: 109).

Instead, what Shakespeare appears to have taken from his reading of individual sonnets was, as Braden argues, an encounter with a general and even anonymous idiom, whose presence we register in conceits and in themes that might be equally well illustrated by reference to a number of different poets. In most cases, Shakespeare was perhaps ignorant of, or at least unconcerned with, their particular pedigree. Given this ignorance, and given the improbability of his having picked up on what would have to be a profoundly sublimated concern with mortality in the unindividuated *langue* of Petrarchism as he encountered it, we have to treat the turn to death in what is arguably the last of the great European sonnet sequences as uncanny, a properly *unheimlich* return to origins.

As far as Shakespeare's first-hand knowledge of Petrarch goes, however, the absence of proof should not blind us to the possibilities. Naseeb Shaheen has presented persuasive evidence that Shakespeare had a respectable grasp of Italian (1994: 161-9). The availability in early modern London of not only the *Canzoniere* but also the *Trionfi* makes it hard to believe that Shakespeare never read any Petrarch, either in the original or in translation. Similarly, Shakespeare's engagement with, for example, Daniel's *Delia*, was almost certainly more individuated than Braden sometimes implies: Braden himself has pointed to the need for more work on the literary and historical sources behind the sonnets. As this chapter shows, Shakespeare's exploration in the sonnets of the possibilities of transcending death through poetry not only exists within and reworks a broadly Petrarchan tradition, but on several occasions does so through some images peculiar to and characteristic of the *Canzoniere*. Whether this is down to coincidence, direct influence, an uncanny return to origins or transmission through intermediary writers is perhaps less interesting than the comparison it invites us to make of their respective responses to the spectre of death as annihilation.

## 5.2 Death as annihilation and time’s *lento correr*

‘Despite its ferocious displays of Christian conviction’, Robert Watson argues in *The Rest is Silence*, ‘Jacobean culture struggled with the suspicion that death was a complete and permanent annihilation of the self, not merely some latency of the body awaiting Last Judgement’ (1994: 3). The extent to which early modern attitudes might transcend the era’s hegemonic belief structures is much contested, particularly when it comes to questions touching upon religion or its outright rejection. The modern debate goes back at least as far as Lucien Febvre's study of Rabelais, *Le probleme de l'incroyance au XVIe siecle* (1982 [1942]) and Paul Oskar Kristeller's ‘The Myth of Renaissance Atheism and the French Tradition of Free-Thought’ (1968), and as with most topics, where the focus is Shakespeare, the debate can become peculiarly heated. As Eric Mallin argues in *Godless Shakespeare*, however, there are clearly serious problems with the assumption that Renaissance unbelief could only ever arise ‘within the conceptual borders of religion itself — as a heresy, a perversion, or some other already summoned, negated and reviled possibility’ (2007: 2-3).[137] Not least among these is that it excludes out of hand the possibility that religion ‘constructs itself against the backdrop of atheism’, rather than the other way around (Mallin 2007: 3).[138] While the question of Shakespeare’s own beliefs remains moot, however, what is widely—if not universally—acknowledged is that some sort of significant shift in attitudes towards death began with the Renaissance and reached a peculiar pitch in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries.

This shift has been variously characterised as a ‘crisis of death’ (Neill 1997: 15) or a ‘mortality crisis’ (Watson 1994: 2) by the scholars who have traced its impact in the English Jacobean theatre and in English baroque or metaphysical poetry. Its precise character, like its causes and its consequences, is disputed. However, a growing fear of death as leading to mere annihilation or silence, coupled with a waning sense of the immanence of an afterlife, is central to most definitions. Philippe Ariès, whose diachronic studies of western attitudes to death have been particularly influential, identifies a heightened anxiety about death in Renaissance Europe with a magnified sense of personal identity generated by new social configurations (1974: 138).[139] While Ariès's essentially Burckhardtian emphasis on individualism as the primary motor behind changing attitudes to death in the Renaissance has been challenged, its broad outline has retained its currency.[140] Robert Watson follows the thrust of Ariès's argument and makes use of many of his insights, paying especial attention to the part played by the Reformation. Largely as a result of the great sixteenth-century schism in the church, he argues, assurance about personal salvation in England was declining even as attachment to both the 'internal subjectivities' and the 'external properties' of the individual was increasing. Born in part of the realization that the fear of death was being manipulated by the Church for financial gain, the Reformation, by shifting the locus of redemption from group ritual to personal conscience, heightened the 'psychological burdens of mortality':

---

[137] Mallin’s study is perhaps the most controversial recent contribution to this discussion, and among the most self-consciously iconoclastic, as one reviewer noted (Lander 2010: 121).

[138] Francis Bacon’s observation that ‘a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism’, no matter how derogatively intended, certainly seems to suggest that atheism was not a difficult idea for early moderns with a little learning to conceive of, while his authorship of an essay ‘On Atheism’ in itself suggests the topic had a certain currency (Bacon 1995: 46).

> Both the inscrutable determinism and the systematic iconoclasm of Calvinist theology created a blank wall between the living and the dead, encouraging the ominous inference that all might be blankness or darkness beyond it. Since (pace Max Weber and R. H. Tawney) worldly conduct was no longer a reliable guide to otherworldly destiny, the illusion of continuity was lost; the

---

[139] Ariès sets this argument out in greater detail in the second part of his *Hour of our Death* (1981). Arnold Stein (1986) offers a useful summary of Ariès' position, as well as some of the challenges to that position.

[140] Ralph Houlbrooke summarizes some of the difficulties in assessing the causes of changing attitudes to death, and points out some of the shortcomings of Ariès's style, concluding that 'The relationships between the changes he sought to document are often highly obscure, and the choice of "individualism" as the main motor of change seems an arbitrary one' (1989: 6). As Michael Neill observes, 'it is possible to argue that individualist constructions of the self were themselves partly produced by the changing experience of death...In a circular and mutually reinforcing fashion, new ways of responding to mortality probably helped to produce new forms of subjectivity, even as new subjectivities must have transformed the experience of dying' (1997: 30, n.63).

> resulting uncertainties were aggravated by the erasure of other aids for visualising the hereafter. (1994: 5)

The resulting demands on the promise of afterlife, Watson concludes, 'became so great that the Christian denial of death threatened to become visible as a mere ideology, a manipulative illusion rather than an absolute truth' (1994: 2).

The recurring ravages wrought by the plague must have exacerbated the pressures that the Reformation and new forms of individualism placed on both the Protestant and the Catholic denials of mortality. For Michael Neill, its impact was greater than that of the Reformation or of the other changing social patterns discussed by Ariès: 'No other single phenomenon had a more decisive effect than the plague in shaping the early modern crisis of death.... By exposing populations to the trauma of mass death on an unprecedented scale, the plague repeatedly activated the fantasy of universal destruction' (1997: 15). Ultimately, as Ralph Houlbrooke observes, establishing with any certainty the causes of changing attitudes to death is fraught with difficulties, yet if we agree that the Great Mortality played a significant role in driving Petrarch toward a new kind of inwardness and self-reflexivity, then we might perhaps come close to finding a common point of origin for both Ariès' and Neill's accounts of the later mortality crisis in Petrarch's response to the events of 1347-48. When we remember Petrarch's appropriation as a proto-Protestant, then Watson and Houlbrooke's emphases on the Reformation's role in the 'mortality crisis' might also be made to accommodate a Petrarchan element.

One of the principal manners in which the shared preoccupation with oblivion seems to haunt both the *Canzoniere* and *Shakespeare's Sonnets* is in their similarly bifurcated temporalities. In the *Blackwell Companion to the Sonnets*, Dympna Callaghan contrasts their concepts of time, juxtaposing 'the sheer *speed*, the agitated urgency' she takes to be the hallmark of Shakespeare's sonnets against the 'protracted' temporal framework of Petrarch's *Canzoniere* (2007: 104). In contrast to the drawn-out rhythm of the 'eternal cycle' embodied in the latter, Callaghan argues, Shakespeare's 'accelerated sonnet temporality…speeds up the natural rhythms of lifetimes and seasons'. Whereas the *Canzoniere*'s sense of time belongs to 'the order of temporal progressions registered by books of hours,' in the sonnets 'remarkably contemporary business' such as 'debt, dearth, and distillation…imposes itself on the ostensible timelessness that is the leisurely inactivity of lyric' (2007: 104-6). 'The remnant of the language and lyricism of medieval, and even Anglo-Saxon, temporality' is revealed to 'bespeak a temporality that is no longer the reality of Shakespeare's England, where 'reckoning time' [*SS* 115.5] asserts its demands even on the most privileged members' (2007: 109-10). The achievement of the *Canzoniere* for Callaghan lies in how Petrarch explores the interiority of the suffering lover, 'and, crucially, the *time* he takes to do this' (2007: 106). In particular, Callaghan suggests, Laura's demise from plague in 1348 leads Petrarch to seek to transcend worldly time altogether, focusing instead on a realm the other side of death, beyond both time and space.[141] The *Canzoniere* 'is shaped *not* by the urgency of desire…but by waiting'; its lingering, long-drawn-out temporal structures reflect its poet's 'almost monastic meditative discipline' (2007: 105). In Shakespeare's sonnets on the other hand, 'time hacks away with a demented speed and fury that registers the shaping pressures of the conditions in which Shakespeare's poems were composed' (2007: 115). 'In the sonnets' stress on the way time diminishes or ruins beauty and finally extinguishes existence altogether', Callaghan concludes, 'we are a world away from Petrarch, whose encounter with Laura and Cupid metamorphoses him into the evergreen laurel' (2007: 116).

Callaghan's main focus is on Shakespeare rather than the *Canzoniere*, and her essay does highlight some important aspects of the sonnets' temporal framework. Her Petrarch, however, is a straw man, put in place merely to set up a crude contrast where a complicated comparison is required. As Teodolinda Barolini points out, the *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta* is 'obsessed with time' as 'the medium that fragments us, makes us multiple and metamorphic, ribs us of ontological stillness and wholeness' (2009: 33). As Callaghan's focus is on Shakespeare her over-simplication of Petrarch might not matter, were it not that her desire to throw into relief Shakespeare's preoccupation with 'speeding time' leads her into a serious misprision of Shakespeare's sonnets themselves. Just as time often flies in the *Canzoniere*, the sonnets, as Lars Engle had already observed, are also 'concerned with what the Annalistes have taught us to call the *longue durée*, with the ways human patterns change slowly over generations and with the ways love or poetry can survive the bodies and emotions that gave them birth' (1993: 31). Time in both the *Canzoniere* and Shakespeare's sonnets 'travels in divers paces' (*As You Like It*, 3.2.307-8). Frequently, time in both sequences somehow crawls, runs and freezes all at once, producing temporal frameworks far more sophisticated than anything Callaghan allows for.

---

[141] Callaghan's reading of Petrarch in this regard appears to be based wholly on Brian Stock's *After Augustine: the Meditative Reader and the Text* (2001), the only secondary material on the Italian poet that she cites, other than Mark Musa's 1996 translation of the *Canzoniere*.

In fact, Callaghan devotes little consideration to Petrarch's texts, and elides the thought-provoking paradoxes in the few fragments she does cite, such as the 'lento corer', or slow run, of 'Sì traviato è 'l folle mi' desio' (*RVF* 6.4). Callaghan takes that phrase to describe 'the urgency of desire', and reads it as revealing how lacking in urgency that desire really is in Petrarch's work (2007: 105). In context, however, it actually describes something much more complex:

> Sì traviato è 'l folle mi' desio
> a seguitar costei che 'n fuga è volta
> et de' lacci d'Amor leggiera et sciolta
> vola dinanzi al lento correr mio,
>
> che quanto richiamando più l'envio
> per la secura strada men m'ascolta,
> né mi vale spronarlo o dargli volta

ch'  Amor per sua natura il fa restio;

et poi che 'l fren per forza a sé raccoglie,
i' mi rimango in signoria di lui,
che mal mio grado a morte mi trasporta;

sol per venir al lauro onde si coglie
acerbo frutto, che le piaghe altrui
gustando affligge più che non conforta.          (*RVF* 6)

> So far astray is my mad desire, in pursuing her who has turned in flight and, light and free of the snares of Love, flies ahead of my slow running,
> that when, calling him back, I most send him by the safe path, then he least obeys me, nor does it help to spur him or turn him, for Love makes him restive by nature;
> and when he takes the bit forcefully to himself, I remain in his power, as against my will he carries me off to death;
> only to come to the laurel, whence one gathers bitter fruit that, being tasted, aflicts one's wounds more than it comforts them.

Here the poet is separated from his desire, which flies off ahead of him, with Laura. It is the poet, rather than his desire, that runs slowly after both. As so often in the *Canzoniere*, the signifier shifts and slides between a tightly limited set of signifieds, creating a perpetual, dizzying movement of thought. The poem's tortuous syntax confounds the lady flying off ahead with the poet's own straying desire, so that we read 'vola dinanzi', flies before, which clearly appertains to Laura, as describing that desire, too. This, rather than 'lento correr', is the proper description of the poet's desire in this poem.

The identification of the poet's desire as a separate entity starts as a ploy which paradoxically enables that part of him to keep up with Laura, but the price of this identification with the beloved is that his desire establishes its own autonomy, breaking free of the will. In the poem's second quatrain the consequence of this divorce becomes more explicit, as the poet's desire is characterized as an uncontrollable animal. Initially, it remains in a subservient if disobedient role, as a badly-behaved hound or steed, but then in the first tercet it takes control, ‘ ’l fren per forza a sé raccoglie’, by force taking the reins itself. The image is an undoing of the attempt at self-persuasion that Petrarch had undertaken in the ‘Ad Seipsum’, where he asserted that as long as his body was alive, ‘you have in your own keeping the rein of your thoughts’. Furthermore, the image of will’s reins seized by the desire they are supposed to control also echoes the ‘lacci d’Amor’ (*RVF* 6.6), the ties of love so easily shaken off by the beloved, contrasting the poet’s enslavement and division from himself with Laura’s freedom and apparent self-identity.

The flying sequence of bestial metamorphoses that the poet’s desire passes through eventually transforms the poet too. Their roles are reversed, and the poet is transformed into a servile animal himself as rider becomes ridden, steed transforms itself into not only master but lord:

> i’ mi rimango in signoria di lui,
> che mal mio grado a morte mi trasporta (*RVF* 6.10-11)
>
> I am left there in harness of his lordship
> as he against my will rides me to death

This galloping race towards death is a quite literal ‘hacking away with demented speed and fury’, as terrifying, I think, as anything Callaghan identifies in Shakespeare’s sonnets. As in Shakespeare’s sonnets, however, the terror derives here in large part from the schism within the self, the self-alienation that has one watching in horror as one is dragged off to death by one’s own self, one’s own desire. And most significantly in Petrarch’s poem, it is that observing dispassionate self, the supposedly rational part, the ego, that is transformed into the bestial, ridden hack, now divided from both his desire, who masters him (now reduced to an it) and his will.

Of course, Petrarch’s poem doesn’t end there: the final tercet turns again, and rather than bearing him to death, leaves the poet at the laurel,

onde si coglie
acerbo frutto, che le piaghe altrui
gustando affligge più che non conforta. (6.12-14)

whence one gathers
bitter fruit that, being tasted, afflicts
one's wounds more than it comforts them.

The complexities of these lines are apparent in the difficulties they pose translators. Where Musa (1996) translates 'le piaghe altrui' as 'someone else's wounds', Durling (1976) has 'one's wounds', and Jones (2000) has 'the wounds of every lover'. It is worth noting, however, that the bitter fruits of this death are those of the laurel, figuring both Laura in sublimated form and the poet's worldly prize. Within the economy of the *Canzoniere* the lady too has undergone her own transformation, but the eternity this offers the poet is acrid and deathly.

This whirlwind concentration of poetic metamorphoses, in which desire in its headlong rush mistakes the path and leads to the 'acerbo frutto', the bitter fruit of death, should be enough to suggest that Petrarch's temporal concerns are both more complex and more pressing than Callaghan implies. This impression is confirmed by a more profound engagement with Petrarch's texts, or, indeed, with the wealth of secondary literature dealing with changing conceptions of time in the Renaissance. As Fausto Montanari notes, in 'the minute circumstances surrounding all of his poetic activity we observe that subjective attachment…to the very hours and ever-fleeting minutes which have been made infinitely precious by the irrecoverable flight of time' (1958: 12-13).

'Sì traviato è 'l folle mi' desio' is an early poem, composed well before the plague's outbreak. It serves to illustrate how a sense of the temporal disjunction induced by desire, through which one seems to be living at several different speeds at once, as in a nightmare, was already fundamental to Petrarch. This disjunction, moreover, this temporal split within the self, already pointed to death. With the appearance of the plague, however, the grappling with mortality already present in ‘Sì traviato è ’l folle’ is intensified, as time both speeds up and slows down. To get a better understanding of how Petrarch’s work responds to the experience of the Great Mortality, we should turn to the work authored in its immediate wake.

### 5.3 *Incertior auris*: winds of oblivion

In ‘Laurea occidens,’ the tenth eclogue of the *Bucolicum Carmen*, Petrarch appears in the figure of the poet-gardener Silvano. In a transparent enough allegorizing of the Black Death, he bewails to Socrates (Petrarch’s familiar name for his friend Ludwig van Kempen) that his smallholding has been devastated by pestilential winds. Felling trees far and wide, they have uprooted too Silvanus’ pride and joy, the laurel. In the form in which Petrarch first wrote it, the ‘Laurea occidens’ was a relatively simple elegy for Laura, in which Socrates takes on the role played by Theophilus in the ninth and by Fulgida in the eleventh eclogue, attempting to bring Petrarch-Silvano to a state of Christian resignation. In the spring or summer of 1364, however, he embarked on major additions, taking up the identification of the laurel with the art of poetry. In the revised text, Silvano recounts his voyage around the world in search of horticultural advice as to how he should tend the laurel. Over some three hundred lines Petrarch presents the fruits of his philological research. While some reference is made to Hebrew and Christian literature, the emphasis is very much upon the Greek and Latin writers. As Nicholas Mann observes, ‘The tenth eclogue is almost the Triumph of Scholarship’ (1984: 97). When Petrarch laments the death of his beloved tree he transmutes what was at root ‘a genuine experience—a lady falling victim to the Black Death in 1348—into a literary image located in the densest foliage of his conceptual tree: an elegy for the passing of all the poets of antiquity’ (Mann 1984: 96-7).

As poetry, this experiment with the bucolic tradition is not entirely successful, at least to modern ears, and is described by Bergin as ‘the furthest removed from our taste today' (1968: xii). As Martellotti notes, this is in part because Petrarch 'loves both to show off and to hide his erudition at one and the same time, in a prestige-based game of enigmatic allusions in tune with the allegorizing tendency of his pastoral, but not with our tastes' (1968: 8).[142] Of all Petrarch's texts it is the densest and most obscure in its allusiveness (no mean feat): Petrarch almost certainly produced a key to the eclogue's riddling allusions similar to those that survive for some of his other eclogues (cf. Martelloti 1968: 12-13).

Inserting this peculiarly literary meditation, ambivalently situated between elegy and triumph, into a lament for Laura's death enabled Petrarch to explore the interdependencies of loss and survival in such a way that Laura's death might underwrite the survival of poetry while, conversely, literature could immortalize his dead love. These two strands together might, then, win eternity for their poet. The possibility that this might be so, though, is always present only fragmentarily, blown on the wind and impossible to pin down. It can exist, it seems, only in the moment the one metamorphoses into the other. In the gardener-poet's encounter with Menander, Petrarch's preoccupations with Laura's recent death, with his own mortality and with the survival and destruction of literature and literary reputations come together:

> There was another shepherd, dearer still to the fostering Sisters,
> Though less admired in the woodlands; always in art the victor,
> Always the loser in verdict until it became his custom
> to mock his victorious rival. Seldom, 't is true, are verses
> Fairly adjudged, and fame is untrue as the winds are inconstant.
> (*BC*, 120-24)

Here the poem seems most elegiac, most pessimistic about poetry's capacity to survive the winds of time (which, as we have seen, are also the winds of plague). Yet Laura is present in dispersed and metamorphosed form in that 'auris', the Latin form of 'l'aura', the breeze that figures her in the *Canzoniere*. Her presence here, where poetry's doom is most explicitly set down, weaves into the line a sense of continuity that sweetly draws the venom from the declarative content, even as its airy insubstantiality signals a recognition of, and renewed mourning for, Laura's death. The recollection of loss paradoxically transforms blank incertitude and muted outrage into a hint at endurance.

---

[142] 'Dal punto di vista poetico l'esperimento non è molto felice, anche perchè il Petrarca si compiace di ostentare e nascondere a un tempo la sua erudizione in un gioco prestigioso di allusioni enigmatiche, consono alla tendenza allegorizzante della sua bucolica, ma lontano dal nostro gusto'.

Even as it is an elegy for the ancient poets, mourning their loss, the whole eclogue is also a ferocious attempt at recovery on Petrarch's part, an edifice constructed to withstand the vagabond winds of *oblio*, oblivion. It includes both obscure Greek poets that he could not have read in the original and a large number of minor Latin poets that he could almost certainly have known only through fragmentary citations by other writers. It represents the pulling together of painstaking philological research into what is lost into a coherent whole. This very passage enacts the eclogue's rhetoric in miniature, undoing, for example, the neglect Menander suffered, and reinstating him as one always 'victor' in art. Similarly, Petrarch perceives that the best way to ensure that a building isn't blown down by a gale is to leave lots of holes for the wind to pass through. This logic helps us understand why what starts out as an allegorized elegy on Laura's death from the plague turns into a long catalogue of more or less obscure, mostly classical, poets.

In 'I' vo pensando,' the wind of oblivion is heard in the very breath that praises and seeks to guarantee the poet's fame:

> Ma se 'l latino e 'l greco
> parlan di me dopo la morte, e' un vento;
> ond'io, perche' pavento
> adunar sempre quell ch'un'ora sgombre,
> vorre' 'l ver abbracciar, lassando ombre. (*RVF* 264.68-72)

> If Latin or Greek tongues

> praise me when I am dead, it is all wind;
> and since I fear to be
> always hoarding what in a moment scatters,
> I would embrace the truth, and leave the lies.

Instead of being lost in the past, the Latin and Greek tongues have become those that will follow his own passing. The death has become his own. Most significantly, the wind, rather than being that of oblivion which hides within its inconstancies the figure of constancy itself, has become that of its supposed opposite, fame (recalling the bitter l/aur/o of death at the close 'Sì traviato è 'l folle mi' desio'). The identity of simile, though, points of course to the underlying parallel. Here fame itself, which the *Laurea Occidens* sought to preserve for almost forgotten poets, and thereby to earn for its author too, is revealed as valueless. Yet like the wind of oblivion, this wind unpicks its own undoing, echoing as it does the eleventh book of Dante's *Purgatorio*.[143] There Oderisi tells Dante:

> Non è il mondan romore altro ch'un fiato
> di vento, ch'or vien quinci e or vien quindi,
> e muta nome perché muta lato.
> (ll.100-102)
>
> The clamour of the world is nothing but a breath
> of wind that comes now from here and now from
> there, and changes names because it changes directions.

Even as it reinforces the overt assertion that praise is worthless, the allusion subverts it by achieving this reinforcement through the fame of Petrarch's most famous predecessor. What it does is even more eloquent than what it says. It reveals a value to fame that goes beyond the posthumous survival of the individual. This value derives from the added richness of reference that literature can attain when words point not only to things, but also to other words and texts. Such a value in turn suggests how literary fame really might give an individual writer a meaningful kind of immortality. In the intertextual relationships that Petrarch builds, one text can make another come alive anew. In the tercet preceding that to which Petrarch alludes, Oderisi, having warned Dante of how fleeting fame can be, goes on to tell him:

---

[143] While the motif of the wind recurs frequently in Petrarch's Latin writings (cf. *Fam* 1.2.24-9; 9.1.2; 10.6.1; 11.8.27; 2214.7; and above all *Sec.* 3.14.5, where fame is defined as 'flatus…atque aura volubilis') I follow the editors of most recent Italian editions in supposing that there is an identifiable reference to Dante here.

> Così ha tolto l'uno a l'altro Guido
> la gloria de la lingua, e forse è nato
> chi l'uno e l'altro caccerà del nido.
>
> Just so, one Guido has taken from the other the
> glory of our language, and perhaps he is born who
> will drive both of them from the nest.

Whether the two Guidos are Guittone d'Arezzo and Guido Guinizelli, or Guinizelli and Cavalcanti, the suggestion that it is Dante himself who will drive them from the nest, as indeed he did, is clear enough. Durling argues that we should remember that this is said penitentially (2003: 185). The words, though, are put into Oderisi's mouth, giving them authority, and it is precisely the unpenitential self-assurance in the midst of one of Dante's longest meditations on the futility of earthly glories that strikes us. Not only does Petrarch's echoing of Dante in itself subtly undermine his apparent refutation of posthumous literary glory; it evokes a moment in Dante's text where a similar undermining occurs.

Coming 'now from here and now from there,' Dante's winds of worthless fame bring us back to the pestilential winds in *Laurea Occidens*, which come too from two directions. Whether these resemblances are due to chance or spontaneously similar thought processes, as Petrarch later assured Boccaccio any similarities in his work to that of Dante must be, seems doubtful.[144] There is perhaps rather a conscious, or more probably an unconscious echoing here:

> Pestifer hinc eurus, hinc humidis irruit auster;
> Ac, stratis late arboribus, mea gaudia laurum
> Extirpant franguntque truces, terreque cavernis
> Brachia ramorum, frondesque tulere comantes.
> (381-4)
>
> Pestilent Eurus on the one hand swept in, and rain-swollen Auster
> Struck from the other. And felling trees far and wide they uprooted
> My joy and delight, my laurel. They buried its savagely shattered
> Boughs and its fair-crested leaves forever under earth's surface.

The plague was often thought to be wind-borne, and these particular winds, as Bergin suggests, may well have been chosen as representing the directions from which the plague came to Avignon to strike Laura down, Eurus blowing from the south-east and Auster from the south (1974: 247).

### 5.4 The greening of Laura: 'Almo sol'

Let us turn from these winds to one of the sonnets in the *Canzoniere* in which we see emerging in very different ways Petrarch's preoccupation with mortality and its survival, and his identification of Laura with the *lauro* and with poetry's capacity to guarantee the immortality of both beloved and poet. 'Almo sol' (*RVF* 188), was composed in 1366, five years after the second serious outbreak of plague to hit Petrarch's life, but was placed by him amongst those poems of the *Rime sparse* widely designated *in vita* (cf. Bettarini 2005). For precisely that reason, its restrained foreshadowing of death and its peculiar temporal frameworks are all the more revealing of a movement central to Petrarch's poetic:

---

[144] 'One thing I want to make clear: if anything in my Italian writings resembles or even exactly reproduces something written by him [Dante] or by anyone else, it is not due to theft or deliberate imitation, two pitfalls I have sedulously avoided, especially in my vernacular works. Any possible resemblances have been caused by chance, or, as Cicero opined, by similarity of mind, which led us unwittingly on the same course.' (*Fam*. XXI.15. trans. Bishop 1966: 177) Petrarch's denial that Dante's work exercised any influence on his own has been much discussed. As most commentators agree, the range of resemblances to Dante tends to undermine Petrarch's disavowals. It is worth noting, too, that 'anyone else' that Petrarch slips in, making his denial generic rather than specific. The manoeuvre is characteristic of Petrarch's reluctance to address his agon with Dante directly. Inasmuch as it renders the negation general, however, it gives us the author's authority to find exactly the same kind of resemblances to Dante in Petrarch's vernacular works as we do to all his other predecessors.

> Almo sol, quella fronde ch'io sola amo
> tu prima amasti, or sola al bel sogggiorno
> verdegggia et senza parpoi che l'adorno
> suo male et nostro vide in prima Adamo.
>
> Stiamo a mirarla, i' ti pur prego et chiamo,
> o sole; et tu pur fuggi et fai dintorno
> ombrare i poggi et te ne porti il giorno,
> et fuggendo mi tòi quell ch' i' più bramo.
>
> L'ombra che cade da quell'umil colle
> ove favilla il mio soave foco,
> ove 'l gran lauro fu picciola vverga,
>
> crescendo mentr'io parlo, agli occhi tolle
> la dolce vista del beato loco
> ove 'l mio cor con la sua donna alberga.
>
> Life-giving sun, you first loved that branch which is all I love;
> now, unique in her sweet dwelling, she flourishes, without an
> equal since Adam first saw his and our lovely bane.
> Let us stay to gaze at her, I beg and call on you, O sun, and you
> still run away and shadow the hillsides all around and carry off
> the day, and fleeing you take from me what I most desire.
> The shadow that falls from that low hill where my gentle fire is
> sparkling, where the great laurel was a little sapling,
> growing as I speak, takes from my eyes the sweet night of the
> blessed place where my heart dwells with his lady.

In this poem Laura's metamorphosis into the laurel, 'quella fronde' that the poet alone loves and that Apollo the sun-god loved, is almost entire, but her immortalization, reiterating that of Daphne, is coloured with wistfulness and a sense of the gaping lacunae that such a manoeuvre leaves. In the first line we find an anagrammatic chiasmus that enseams mutability into the poem's structure, as 'Almo sol' is transformed into 'sola amo' over the laurel, reminding us that that too can be rearranged to signify both Laura and poetic fame. The second line continues these mirrorings in miniature: 'tu pri*ma* *am*asti, or so*la* *al* bel soggiorno'. Already in these two lines twin oppositions have been set up: *io* is opposed to *tu*, *prima* to *or*, while an identification is also established with the repetitition of *sola*, which applies here firstly to the *io* and then to Laura/*lauro*. Having addressed the sun directly, and suggested an identification between them, Petrarch thus nevertheless manages to imply that he, rather than Apollo, may be Laura's true love. At the same time, however, this will be subtly undone by one of the double senses of time that the contrast between *prima* and *or* sets up. Inasmuch as the poem is spoken to the sun as it sets, taking from Petrarch (the view of) 'quell ch' i' più bramo', what he most desires, there is the sense that the sun in the natural course of things will return on the morrow's morning. The privilege that *or* and that double use of *sola* grants Petrarch's love thereby becomes very fleeting indeed, especially in the context of the intimations of mortality introduced later in the poem. If the poet is the laurel's lover now, the sun will be once again, and will continue to be so long after the poet's death. It is this sense that gives a special, doubly tragic poignancy to the poet's appeal to the sun at the beginning of the second quatrain. To ask the sun to stop is to ask mortal time itself to stop, that is, to ask for immortality - or death. We are reminded that in the *Trionfo del Tempo* time is represented by the sun. Yet that *prima* in line two also alludes to a mythical past in which Apollo pursued Daphne and then held sacred the *lauro* into which she was transformed, a past disjunctive from the fleeting time that Petrarch would halt with his poetry.

Lines 3 and 4 introduce a further temporal dimension. The laurel is 'senza par', without equal, 'che l'adorno / suo male et nostro vide *in prima* Adamo', since Adam first saw his and our lovely bane. Durling's translation is difficult to better, but it misses the suspension of 'in prima', which falls at the last moment possible. Echoing yet subtly complicating the 'prima' of line 2, the modern reader is perhaps tempted to take it as another reference to mythical time, but in a fourteenth-century context it should be read, I think, in historical terms, as an allusion to man's origins. This introduction of a temporal framework that covers the whole of mankind and his history is part of a wider broadening of the poem's reach in this distich. From *io* and *tu* the poem has conjugated its way by the end of the first quatrain to *suo* and *nostro*, an 'our' which, of course, excludes the sun god, but includes the reader.

Identifying the beauty of the laurel with Eve's beauty is an epideictic manoeuvre that simultaneously assigns a corrupting power to the former, evoking that fear that Petrarch expressed so forcefully in the *Secretum* that both his love for Laura and his desire for fame went against the injunctions of God. If the emphasis is on the laurel's loveliness (and loved-ness) a darker undercurrent is hereby established. The sun, refusing to obey the poet's prayers, carries off with him the day, which almost seems to take the place of the nymph he once failed to ravish.[145] Indeed, in doing so, he takes with him that which the poet most desires. What the poet desires, of course, is not the day itself, but the vision of Laura and her dwelling place that it grants him. Throughout the poem there is an emphasis on sight: 'vide' (l.4), 'mirarla' (l.5), 'la dolce vista' (l.13). Even as the poem laments the falling shadow that steals that vision from the poet's eyes, though, it relocates that 'sweet sight' quite literally *in* shadow: the anagrammatic chiasmus that the poem's first line alerted us to returns in the second quatrain, where '*ombra*re' (to shadow) at the beginning of line 7, modulates into 'bramo', desire, longing, or lust, at the end of line 8. This glimpse being given us, it is then, in its turn, transformed immediately across the line break back into 'L'*ombra*', at the beginning of line 9. 'Bramo' contains too within its longing the *ramo*, or branch, near synonym for the ‘fronde’ (l.1) of the laurel. The object of the phrase, ‘quel ch’ i’ più bramo’, that which is desired, remains semantically undetermined, shadowed from view.

---

[145] The way the 'Stiamo' that opens the second quatrain is echoed at the end of the line by 'chiamo' hints at the hope, expanded on in line 12, that the voice will be the one thing that can in some way stop time's march.

This shadow, as Adelia Noferi observes, slowly extends itself, until it occupies the whole semantic field of the poem (2001: 131). The shift from the simple present of ‘fuggi’ (l.6) to the gerund ‘fuggendo’ (l.8) conveys an impression not only of time passing, but of it doing so faster than the poet can get to grips with it. The first tercet complicates the play of light and shadow in the poem. The ‘umil’ colle’, that humble hill whose shadow lengthens across the poet’s vision, is also a source of light; ‘ove favilla il mio soave foco’, where my gentle fire is sparkling. Or at least, it seems to be – in the gathering gloom the exact positioning of things becomes difficult to determine. The ‘ove’, the ‘where that opens lines 10 and 11, seems to belong to the hill, but might also belong to ‘l’ombra’, its shadow. The hill, of course, is in its own shadow here. Again, the ‘ove’ of the final line of the poem need not be the same ‘ove’ as that of the first tercet, although both the sense and the repetition at the lines’ openings imply that it is. In any case, the long shadow cast by Apollo’s setting rays – which are identified with his sight, in accordance with the mediaeval physics of vision – falls across the poet’s own light, the laurel, and the ‘beato loco / ove ’l mio cor con la sua donna alberga.’, the blessed place where the poet’s heart dwells with its lady.

The slow advance of the sestet’s subject, the hill’s shadow, is conveyed too by means of its syntactic suspension from its verb, ‘tolle’, three relative clauses and a gerund intervening between the two. That gerund, ‘crescendo’, while its opening syllable suggests faint premonitions of other words associated with darkness and death (‘crepuscolo’, ‘crepare’), picks up on ‘fuggendo’, the gerund of line 8, speeding up the action to ensure it finally reaches that main verb as the shadow finally obliterates ‘la dolce vista’. The fourfold sense of time the poem’s opening established – the immediate present, the historical past, the mythic past and the impossible, eternal, frozen present – is further complicated by line 10. The hill's shadow falls 'ove 'l gran lauro fu picciola verga'. The great laurel, which we implicitly assume that we are viewing, is thus half-removed from sight. Here the laurel was a little sapling. Yet we know that trees such as the laurel don't usually show a great propensity for roaming – so why the emphasis on the whereabouts, the 'ove'? The assertion of a continuity with the past here actually serves to trouble our sense both of location and time. It provokes the question, 'If not here, then where?' Of course, we know that the allusion is to the place where Laura grew up, but this emphasis on her similarity, grounded in nature, with the growth of the individual plant, rather than with it in its ever-green aspect, serves to highlight her mortality rather than to transcend it.

The poem closes as the shadow cast by the sun turns into night, obscuring Laura's 'soggiorno', or dwelling place, where the laurel flourishes, from the poet's view. The process of losing Laura, however, has brought the poet's heart home to lodge, *unheimlich*, 'ove 'l mio cor con la sua donna alberga.' With the culminating third and final 'ove', the separation of the poet from his love – his loss of the sight of her at the end of the day, prefiguring the greater loss to come – is transcended. The trope of the poet's heart leaving his body to dwell with his lady is common enough in courtly love poetry in Provençal and in Italian. Petrarch's originality lies in how in re-enacting, through poetry, a moment of loss, he transforms it, self-consciously, into a reclamation. 'Crescendo mentr' io parlo', he says of the stealing shadow, growing as I speak.[146] The suggested link functions not only as another device to evoke that sense of time moving too fast, but to point to how the words bring in the darkness that make that transport of the poet's heart possible. At the same time, it hints that that transport is possible only in and through words, while also emphasizing the distance that remains between the 'io' that is speaking, and the 'cor' that is beating, linked and held apart as they are by the poet's blinding.  Only in the darkness of such a schism in the self, it implies, can such a paradoxically blinded vision of unity in love be achieved.[147]

---

[146] This is the final result of a series of revisions Petrarch made to the text, earlier drafts including 'crescendo a poco a poco', later amended to 'cresce mentre ch'io parlo'. The rehabilitation of the gerund in the final version is described by Contini as 'non gia' come passivo vvestigio, bensi' come perentorio sigillo della contemporaneita' (Bettarini I:869).

The poem's final verb is held off until the very last word of the poem, and when it comes it rings out in the present tense, achieving that suspension of time's advance that the poet begged of the sun at the beginning of the second quatrain.  By this point the poem itself has taught us to look out for echoes of words within words, and standing at the flank of 'donna', it is difficult to miss the 'albero' which became her dwelling place when her mythical predecessor was transformed by her father Peneius as the sun god pursued her.  That final word gives us the definitive answer to those ambiguous 'ove' – the where is the 'bel soggiorno' that is a tree that is a verb.

That lodging of the heart in the spoken womanly treeing of poetry is what keeps it eternally renewed, as the rhyme back to 'verga', sapling or young branch, indicates. This reading, possible only in the light of the poem's final line, effectively overwrites the thought of mortality earlier provoked by the reference to the younger plant, and recalls us to the sense of growth therein, reminding us that this is also the growth of poetry. We are taken back to what it is that that 'fronde' does in the poem's opening quatrain: 'verdeggia', which Durling translates as 'flourishes', but which might be translated, if we follow Petrarch in blurring the line between noun and verb, thing and act, as 'greens'. That 'gg' picks up on 'soggiorno' (l.3), mirroring it across the line ending.

The greening of Laura, the guaranteeing of her endurance through the poetic fame she embodies in her transformed state, is here, as I hope to have demonstrated, performed *through* her enshadowing by the encroaching shadow. If we turn now to Shakespeare's sonnets, we can see how there too death is enlisted to fight against itself, as the poetry greens its lover and itself anew.

---

[147] The underlying irony here is that Laura's identity, so fragmented linguistically (*l'aura, lauro, lau-dare*), is here complete.  Her dwelling place *is* her self.

## 5.5 Transcendence, Endurance, *Oblio*

Just what sort of survival in the face of death do the sonnets claim? Critical opinion is divided. At one extreme, John Bernard argues that ‘the triumph of the sonnets to the friend…is their refusal to concede that time and betrayal can defeat the poet’s vision of enduring love. Rather, they remain faithful to a truth perceived as invulnerable to decay’ (1979: 77). Bernard argues that Shakespeare presents the triumph over time in transcendent terms, conceiving poetry as accessing properties that lie beyond any earthly temporal framework, giving it an absolute value that time cannot touch. ‘Shakespeare’s desire to isolate love’s “worth” from the physical and moral laws of nature impels him,’ Bernard claims, ‘to emphasize a “constancy” in both beloved and poet that is increasingly metaphysical. It is this constancy on which he will erect his edifice of poetic faith’ (1979: 81).

In *Shakespearean Pragmatism*, on the other hand, Lars Engle takes issue with Bernard’s position, arguing that Shakespeare does not in fact idealize the power of poetry over circumstance, but ‘treats value that defies time and death as contingent’ (1993: 31). The moments of apparent transcendence that seem to allow for an escape from the economic model of profit and loss governing the sequence, are, for Engle, only ‘momentary…bursts of relief’, whose ‘mood of expansive assurance never lasts long’ (1993: 32). That the sonnets make endurance claims ‘when they seem, and are often taken, to make transcendence claims’ is, Engle believes, ‘part of a general Shakespearean relocation of the human urge for certainty, knowledge, and permanence within the boundaries of human community over time’ (1993: 35). As his title anticipates, Engle casts this relocation in terms of Wittgensteinian pragmatics, arguing for the value of a relative continuity grounded upon a historical sense of human community. Such continuity ‘is no absolute assurance of the permanence of anything, but it offers a kind of deeply stable contingency, like a rocky channel conducting more fluid aspects of our experience’ (1993: 36). Picking up on Wittgenstein’s interest in house design and construction, he suggests that we need to rethink the architectural metaphor of 'grounding': 'Shakespeare's poetry,' he concludes, 'like Frank Lloyd Wright's Imperial Hotel in Tokyo, does not anchor itself on an essential bedrock from which it can be shaken by metaphysical earthquakes but instead floats deep in a thickly liquid deposit of human behaviours and desires' (1993: 37).[148]

Both Engles and Bernard identify important aspects of the sonnets. What readings such as theirs play down, however, are the violent swings across the sequence as a whole, not only between the two poles they individually identify, of transcendence and of a historically contained pragmatism, but also open-eyed despair in the face of oblivion. Engle's reading is the more sophisticated, and, I think, comes closer to the essence of the sonnets' confrontation with death, but what Engle's account never quite comes to terms with is the power of that 'fear in excess of the announced argument' that Greene identifies. While recognising that we are often 'dealing with a relation in which the stabilising contingencies seem frail and the destabilising ones strong', Engle sticks to his pragmatist guns and sees the poet of the sonnets as doing the same (1993: 52). He acknowledges his focus on the 'more affirmative sonnets', but sees the darker sonnets, 'engrossed as they are with the problem of transience, instability, and uncertainty of value' as conforming to his overall model (1993: 45). It is, however, as much in the need or longing expressed in what Engle calls the more affirmative sonnets as in the radical fears of the darker ones that the coherence of the pragmatist position which Engle presents Shakespeare as adhering to threatens to break apart. In the darker sonnets, the lack of an absolute value in the contingent survivals Engle discusses always threatens to make those survivals simply worthless. Similarly, in the affirmative sonnets, a reaching towards or a nostalgia for a transcendence modelled on the Christian ideal but consigned to the sublunary world undermines the pragmatist compromises other sonnets sometimes seem content to settle for.

---

[148] 'As the subsoil was liquid mud and the area itself subject to earthquakes Wright resolved to float the whole building on rafts of concrete linked by joints which would permit differential movement...The success of these measures was dramatically demonstrated during the severe earthquake of 1923' (Futagawa & Pawley 1970: 119: cited Engle 1993: 233, n.27).

Taken as a whole, *Shakespeare's sonnets* is thus a much more volatile, baroque work than Engle allows for. The volatility lies as much in the increasingly sudden swings from hope to despair, from a transcendental to a pragmatic perspective, from the poem to the beloved and back again as a locus of endurance (or transcendence), as in any of the sonnets taken singly. The hopelessness of a quest for transcendental value or survival here on earth through either love or poetry leads to a hunt for foundations that are more provisional, of the sort Engle describes. But the destabilising contingencies Engle sees as contained actually provoke a longing for a transcendental, absolute escape, which lacerates the pragmatist position founded on cultural endurance with nostalgia, dislocation and loss. This leads in turn to a renewed quest for transcendent value. Ultimately, what survives might be much closer to the sort of historically rooted pragmatism outlined by Engle than to the faith in the transcendent power of poetry described by Bernard, but it is a pragmatism that is never happy with itself, of a far less optimistic tone than Engle implies. It is a pragmatism that bespeaks 'not only the impermanence but the solitude of history'. The phrase is one Thomas Greene uses, in another study, of Petrarch (1982: 9). Both writers share in their poetry a refusal, or a failure, to find an Archimedean point on which to stand in the face of *oblio*, the oblivion that Petrarch so feared.

Ultimately, however, it is in that very constancy of movement enforced upon them, in that pattern of claim and retraction and counter-claim, and in the transformations that accompany this pattern, that the sonnets find the aesthetic that offers them the paradoxical permanence they aspire to. It is an aesthetic, however, founded precisely on its own impossibility, or rather on its refusal to fully accept the sort of 'deeply stable contingency' Engle finds, but which the sonnets never settle for. The sonnets maintain their ferocious energy, and their power to endure, by ploughing their own worst fears of death back into their bravest claims, enforcing upon themselves an ever new turn, an ever new metamorphosis.

The sonnets open, of course, with the injunction to breed. In the wake of the Reformation's dismissal of the Catholic promise of a heavenly afterlife to those who preserved their virginity, procreation came to be seen in the sixteenth century as a substitute for sacramentalism and transubstantiation: it offered 'a tangible and communal form of immortality tied to the cycle of human life, a consuming of the body in the hope of rendering life eternal' (Watson 1994: 6-7). In his *Religio Medici* Sir Thomas Browne observed how 'some upon the courage of a fruitfull issue, wherein, as in the truest Chronicle, they seem to outlive themselves, can with greater patience away with death' (1977: 111). John Donne described marriage as 'a second and suppletory eternity, in the continuation and propagation of Children' (1956: 99), while in lines that seem to echo Shakespeare's preoccupation with breath (of which more shortly), one Jo. Castillian, in a eulogy on the death of a childless man, noted that

> Thy soule might still have liv'd, in others breath,
> Whose single life is now a numerous death.
> (*Honour and Vertue* 1640: sig. Q2v; cited Watson 1994: 328, n.19)

Yet while procreation offered a biological surrogate for immortality, it was incapable of preserving the individual consciousness. Browne goes on to dismiss 'this conceit and counterfeit subsisting in our progenies', describing it as 'a meere fallacy, unworthy the desires of a man' (1977: 111). As Watson notes, while the Reformation 'encouraged people to find some version of immortality in their legitimate progeny', it was 'nevertheless obliged to acknowledge that this was not really immortality at all' (1994: 110).

The limitations of the Protestant valorisation of marriage and its ambivalent promise of immortalization by proxy govern the poetic economy of Shakespeare's procreation sonnets. Through a series of manipulations of language that pun across economic and sexual/biological semantic fields, all coming under the 'umbrella-pun' of husbandry, the opening poems suggest that through marriage and reproduction the friend can 'still live sweet' (*SS* 5.14). Yet as Thomas Greene notes, the husbandry of the sonnets fails, as the poetry comes to undermine the rhetoric, and 'procreation progressively comes to appear as a desperate defence, a final manoeuvre against a principle which is ultimately irresistible', that of death as annihilation (1985: 232). Indeed, the poetry undermines procreation's promise practically from the start. In sonnet 2, the poet urges 'beauties use' upon the young man (*SS* 2.9). To have a child, he concludes in the closing couplet, 'were to be new made when thou art ould, | And see thy blood warme when thou feel'st it could' (*SS* 2.13-14). If the spelling leaves open the possibility that we can hear the final word as either 'could' or 'called', both of which offer possible positive readings, the long dipthong, the primary sense of 'cold' (agreed on by all modern editions), and the rhyme with 'old' all point toward the death of the individual.

This cold returns in sonnet 13, where the earlier partial elisions of the individual's fate fall away in the chill of the 'barren rage of death's eternal cold' (*SS* 13.12). The phrase's potency exerts, as Thomas Greene notes, a 'disproportionate force' over the suggestion that through good 'husbandry' the continuance of the young man's house can be guaranteed (1985: 232). Already, in the closing couplet of sonnet 12, the poet has admitted that 'nothing gainst Times sieth can make defence | Saue breed to brave him, when he takes thee hence' (*SS* 12.13-14). Even as it makes it an existential duty, that final line too seems an admission of the ultimate futility of such defiance: 'brave', picking up on line 2, brings us back to how we 'see the brave day sunck in hidious night' at the poem's opening (*SS* 12.2), and thus becomes a reiteration of death's power, rather than a genuine challenge to it.

As the young man's synecdochic status as a representative of all worldly beauty becomes ever more evident, the poems begin to introduce the sequence's main alternative immortalizing power, art, and specifically the poet's own verse. The modulation from poems urging the young man to fulfill his moral duty towards beauty, into poems considering how his own uniqueness might be preserved, culminates in the poet's magnificent claim in sonnet 18 to immortalize the beloved in his 'eternal lines' (*SS* 18.12).[149] Art, and lyric poetry in particular, offered the Renaissance a model that promised to preserve the individuality of character and appearance in a manner that biological procreation could not. Classical culture both presented powerful articulations of such claims for art, and, in its survival, gave proof of its efficacy. Horace claimed to 'have finished a monument more lasting than bronze and loftier than the Pyramids' royal pile' (1914: 279). 'I shall not altogether die, but a mighty part of me shall escape the death-goddess', he went on: 'On and on shall I grow, ever fresh with the glory of after time' (1914: 279). The trope was hugely influential in the Renaissance, spawning a host of poems in the *exegi monumentum* vein. Petrarch had been the first to seriously revive the Horatian notion of poetic fame as a guarantee of some sort of transcendence of death, yet partly perhaps under the pressure of a sense of how uncomfortably the trope's undiluted egotism sits with Christian dogma, it becomes his means of ensuring not only his own immortality but also that of his beloved Laura.

The great ambivalence over whether it is the individuality of the subject or of the artist that is being preserved is self-consciously addressed by Petrarch in the *Secretum* and the *Familiares*, but never resolved, and is present too, in modified form, in Shakespeare's sonnets. The poet of the sonnets, however, expresses none of Petrarch's hopes that his poetry will immortalize his own name. While his poetry sometimes claims for itself immortal qualities, it is its power to immortalize the beloved rather than the poet's own name that it draws attention to. Thus we are told in Shakespeare's most famous poem in the *exegi monumentum* mode that the young man will 'Gainst death, and all obliuious emnity…pace forth' in 'this powrefull rime' (*SS* 55.9-10, 2). Yet here too there exists a tension: all trace of the young man's identity has been lost to posterity, and the sonnets seem to write the poet's name into their fabric rather than immortalize that of his beloved, unless we suppose that he is written into the sequence cryptically as a Will or a Hugh.

---

[149] This movement, of course, is complimentary to the young man, implying that his intrinsic value, rather than that of what he simply stores, is coming to be valued. It also suggests the shifting involvement of the writer. It is surely thanks to this modulation that readers have so often read into the sequence a narrative of a poet who, having been commissioned to write poems exhorting a young heir to marry, slowly becomes enamoured of his subject.

This tension has a violent effect on the sonnets. If the poetry comes to take the place of the young man as the locus of an immortalizing power, and the young man comes to be dependent upon it (and thus on the poet) for any hope of transcending death, a sense of inner depletion, deprivation and worthlessness soon infects the poetry in its turn. The young man then becomes the guarantor of both the poetry's and the poet's worth, and is looked to to fill or to clothe them both, to 'put[s] apparrell on my tottered loving' (*SS* 26.11). As Greene notes, sometimes the language evokes patronage, sometimes it suggests a literal filling up through sex. Thus in sonnet 38 the poet's 'slight Muse' is filled out by the beloved, 'that poor'st into my verse, | Thine owne sweet argument' (*SS* 38.13, 2-3). The poet takes on the labour of giving birth while the friend rightly takes the credit: 'The paine be mine, but thine shal be the praise' (*SS* 38.13-14). 'All value', as Greene concludes, 'seems to reside with the friend' (1985: 233).

Elsewhere in the sequence, though, this economic system is reversed. Both the friend's own shortcomings and betrayals and that 'cosmic mutability' evoked in the procreation sonnets menace his worth. In the face of these threats 'the poetry, elsewhere naked, becomes…an artefact that successfully resists time and death, assures eternal life to the one it celebrates [and] acts as a perpetuating force against 'mortall rage'' (Greene 1985: 234; cf. *SS* 64). The young man's worth is still present as the basis of the gift of life that the poetry promises to bestow upon him, but it is inert: the poetry now 'preserves, engrafts, refurbishes; it seems informed with a masculine force the friend lacks', reversing the gendering that saw him inseminating the poet's verse (Greene 1985: 234).

However, this locus of permanence too is unstable. Its affirmation emerges most often in the couplets, which often lack the energy of the negative vision in the preceding 12 lines, failing to reverse their rhetorical momentum. The attempt at restoration in the couplets of sonnets such as 63 and 65, Greene claims, 'can be read as a desperate bourgeois manoeuvre, struggling to shore up the cosmic economy against the mutability which instigates true verbal power'. More generally, the poetry arguably fails to celebrate or to refurbish the worth of the young man, which remains 'abstract, faceless, blurred, even when it is not tainted' (Greene 1985: 234).

These two sources of value in the sequence, then, the friend and the word, are each the basis for a 'rudimentary economic system' and each 'vulnerable to skepticism'. Moreover, the existence of each 'tends to destabilize the other by casting doubt on the kind of value it attempts to establish', even as they are required to underwrite each other (Greene 1985: 234). The tension in Petrarch becomes in Shakespeare's sonnets a desperate, contradictory paradox, producing fiercely conflicting representations of the poetry's power, its gender and its durability.

## 5.6 The green and the black: Petrarchan negotiations with death

The extent to which Shakespeare's sonnets adopt a Petrarchan conception of time is exemplified by sonnet 63. We can see here again that paradoxical sense of 'never resting' time as simultaneously swift footed and sluggardly typical of Petrarch's writings in the immediate wake of the plague. The poet anticipates a time when the young man shall be as worn down by age as he himself now is:

> Against my loue shall be as I am now
> With times iniurious hand chrusht and ore-worne,
> When houres haue dreind his blood and fild his brow
> With lines and wrincles, when his youthfull morne

Hath trauaild on to Ages steepie night,
And all those beauties whereof now he's King
Are vanishing, or vanisht out of sight,
Stealing away the treasure of his Spring.
For such a time do I now fortifie
Against confounding Ages cruell knife,
That he shall neuer cut from memory
My sweet loues beauty, though my louers life.
  His beautie shall in these blacke lines be seene,
  And they shall liue, and he in them still greene.

A concern with time, time's passing, and the relationship between different times runs throughout the poem: 'now' (l.1); 'time' (l.2); 'hours' (l.3); 'when' (l.4) 'age' (l.5); 'now' (l.6); 'time', 'now' (l.9); 'age' (l.10); 'never', 'memory' (l.11). The first line sets up a paradigmatically Petrarchan temporal structure, setting up a relationship between two times that the poem will then complicate as much as it elucidates. The state the poem is describing in the octave exists both in the 'now' of the poet's current condition, or at least his rhetorical description of it, and in the 'then' of a future in which the young man too will be lined and wrinkled. The poem thus collapses these two times together, even as it seeks to guard against or somehow postpone the latter. At the same time, there is a movement in the first twelve lines that seems to be attempting to render the inevitable merely hypothetical, as though the poet's defence against the inevitability of the young man's beauty withering were to pretend that it might not happen. The ambiguity of 'shall' plays a key role here: should we read it as indicating a necessary condition, or as setting up a hypothetical, relative temporal clause denoting a future contingency? When with the beginning of the sextet we finally reach the main clause, we again find a time expression that seems conditional, rather than inevitable: 'For *such* a time' does the writer fortify himself, as though this were only one of many possible times that might unfold. This of course conveys the poet's impossible hope that such a time might *not* come. Turning on a potential ambiguity in 'confounding', there is perhaps even a further hidden hope here that 'age's cruell knife' will, in the face of such hypothesizing of the inevitable, be 'confounded' or confused itself (the word's etymology springs from *confondere*, mix up or confuse, and, as the OED notes, 'confounded' formerly served as past participle to the verb 'confuse').[150] Converting the ineluctable march of time and approaching death into a hypothetical thus becomes the doomed manoeuvre which foreshadows the partial surrender of lines 11-12 and the radically different solution proposed by the couplet.

The vocabulary, the rhythm and the sound of the poem, though, thoroughly undermine the always already forlorn hope lurking in the syntax, conveying both time's inexorable progress and its terrible inevitability, and that sense of its fleetingness we have as the present moment slips into the past. This sense of time as slow-paced and infinitely drawn-out and yet absolutely irresistible is encapsulated in l.2, where the former is suggested by the way the dipthongs and long yawning vowel sounds draw out the iambic beat, while the reversed foot on 'chrusht' conveys a sense of premature, violent closure.[151] Stephen Booth argues that 'iniurious' is 'trisyllabic, by syncopation', supporting his reading by pointing out that 'Shakespeare regularly pronounced suffixes like *-ious* as one syllable, "yus" '. This, allowing for the reversed fourth foot, enables us to read the line as an iambic pentameter, yet because of those dipthongs and long vowels, and the crushing of that potentially bisyllabic ending into a monosyllable, we struggle to pull it off as such, and as a result, as Booth comments, 'the line sounds appropriately crushed, metrically' (2000: 244). Because that stamping reversed foot does not come down at the end of the line, however, there remains open the possibility of some survival beyond it, yet the wavering dipthong and prolonged moan of 'ore-worne' perhaps suggest creeping entropy rather than any hope of green life. Indeed, the long, drawn-out vowels on which all the lines of the first quatrain close evoke time's

---

[150] Booth gives only 'destroying' as a possible sense of 'confounding', while Duncan-Jones passes over the word without comment.

[151] Even the slightly unusual form of the word found in *Q*, with that 'h' like a foot coming down, and the 't' replacing the more common 'ed' or 'd', seems to add a visual emphasis to its force.

*longue durée*, while the building-up of the dependent clause over the course of the octave, and its elaboration with two time clauses ('when houres haue dreind his blood' (l.3); 'when his youthfull morne / Hath trauaild on' (ll.4-5)) creates a sense of entropy whilst also mirroring the poet's attempt to postpone the inevitable. At the same time, however, the avoidance of end-stops throughout the octave noted by Vendler 'mimics the unstoppable advance of time' (1997: 296), while the quick modulation or self-correction in line 7, from 'vanishing' to 'vanished', suggests again the speed with which time's hand can move.[152] Time in this sonnet both crawls and rushes, the difference deriving from the standpoint from which we look at it.

It is in the sextet, and ultimately in its couplet, that the poem builds its fortifications against the horrific vision of time's ruin set forth in the octet. In accepting that 'Ages cruell knife' will take his 'louers life', a recognition whose painfulness the rhyme acknowledges, the poet simultaneously claims his own absolute: 'he shall *never* cut from memory' his 'loues beauty'. Yet here one of the great Petrarchan ironies emerges. If we can read 'love' in l.12 as referring to the beloved, the way 'my sweet love's beauty' is counterpoised across the comma (a comma, it is perhaps worth noting, present in *Q*) in the middle of the line against 'my louers life' opens up the possibility that not only is the poet powerless to preserve his lover's life, but what he will be preserving is the beauty of his own emotion, his own love, rather than the beauty of the young man, which, notoriously, is almost never described. Just as by interweaving so closely the name of his love with the poetic fame signified by the *lauro* Petrarch opened himself up to the charge that Laura was simply a poetic invention, or, more seriously, that his writing was effectively an egotistical betrayal of his love for the sake of glory and immortality (a concern that runs throughout the *RVF*), so the poet here gives us a glimpse of that possibility before slamming the door shut on it in the following line. In this light, we may read a slight emphasis, suggesting (mock?) guilt or irony, into the first word of the couplet, against the natural rhythm of the metre; it is '*His* beauty' that will be immortalized, the poet says, *not* my art's.

---

[152] The effect of this self-correction is noted by Kerrigan.

It is in the final couplet that the poem makes its problematic claim to immortalize:

> His beautie shall in these blacke lines be seene,
> And they shall liue, and he in them still greene.

The black lines of printer's ink on the page, which will redeem the 'lines and wrinkles' of age, are surely, in the context established by line 12 and by the funereal anticipation of death in the octet, lines of mourning. It is almost irresistible to read them too as extending the military metaphor initiated by 'fortify' (l.9) although the OED dates the first use of 'lines' to refer to trenches, ramparts or other field-works to 1665. Just as he urges the young man into a 'war with Time', Shakespeare repeatedly uses images of military defences throughout the sonnets. Most often these are trenches, as in the 'paralels' of sonnet 60. Yet these lines are almost always something else too, and 'line' has a polyvalence in the sonnets to match Petrarch's puns on the laurel. Lines in the sonnets are military defences, the bloodlines of ancestry, and of course lines of verse, all buttresses against death, but they are also the marks of death's encroachment on the living, the lines Time carves on beauty's brow with his 'antique pen'. The defence against death, and death itself, inhere in the same word.

Written *before* the young man's death, these black lines reverse that ghost of a rhetorical strategy behind the first eight lines: rather than trying to turn the inevitable into a hypothesis and so dissolve it, they effectively treat it as having *already* happened. On one level this represents the enactment of the familiarly brilliant rhetorical resolution (with a painfully hollow ring) that we find in so many of the couplets. By mourning his love's death before it occurs, the poet-speaker renders his actual death doubly irrelevant, firstly by anticipating it, and secondly by making the young man outlive it. In retrospect, all the gestures towards always already failed manoeuvres to overcome death's inevitability that we saw in the octave turn out not only to have been moving all the time towards this final conquest of death, but to be themselves that conquest, being the 'blacke lines' in which he lives.

Time's linear structure is thus turned in on itself and stretched. Having located the time of writing firmly in the 'now' (l.1, l.9), the 'now' of 'these blacke lines' is displaced into the future. Our reading of the poem, our first reading of the poem, as we look back on it from and in the light of the couplet's conclusion, becomes a foreshadowing or prefiguring of the future reading the couplet proposes is to come. The immediate effect of this is to make the poem's beginning seem a long way away, and to dissolve the poem's present into a chimerical past and future. The 'greening' of the young man through death and lines of mourning in sonnet 63 rewrites anew Petrarch's Ovidian greening of Laura, employing death's aid against death itself. Yet it also ironizes that process in a manner far removed from anything in the *Canzoniere*. It does this through a more knowing awareness not only of the always already doomed nature of that rhetorical manoeuvre, but also of the shortcomings of the object of this immortalization, the young man. The 'greene' which the poem's final word bestows on him, picking up on 'Spring' in line 8, makes him a fresh young shoot, locating his youthful beauty in the natural cycle just as the identification of Laura with the *lauro* did; but it also points to his emotional callowness, the inconsiderateness, inexperience and insensitivity for which so many of the preceding sonnets upbraid him, with varying degrees of transparency and directness.

This emphasis on the young man's greenness carries us back and forward to sonnet 104. There, as we saw, the poet describes how three years have passed 'Since first I saw you fresh which yet are greene'. The purely positive value we initially might give that 'greene', as in sonnets 12 and 33 where it is associated relatively simply with summery beauty and freshness, is undermined when we recognise that it is also a synonym of the 'unbred' in the couplet. Part of the effect of this is to realize that the couplet can be read in a wholly different manner. The sonnet opens as an apostrophe addressed to the young man. Our first instinct, especially as readers coming to the text four hundred years after it was first published, is to assume a shift in addressee: yet the potentially synonymic relationship between 'greene' and 'unbred' pulls us back to the possibility that there is no such shift, that the young man addressed in line 1 as 'faire friend' is now being addressed as 'age unbred', a description which fits perfectly in the context both of this particular sonnet and the sequence as a whole. That the young man's behaviour has been unmannerly at times is strongly implied by sonnets such as 42 and 94, while the epithet of 'age' in a poem meditating on how the beloved *has* aged, despite appearances, seems apposite, especially as when yoked together with 'unbred' it can also refer simultaneously precisely to his youth.

The sonnet's final line then becomes the negative correlative of the hope for a sort of eternity that transcends time expressed in a poem of constancy such as 123. 'Ere you were borne was beauties summer dead': your demise was already written into your birth and flowering, your death was conceived with your birth. Time is collapsed in on itself, and the poem's ending thus becomes doubly pessimistic. Yet it is both against and from this pessimism that the poetry works. It is the constant redoubling of death in the sonnets that seems to be the guarantor of their endurance. Only by undoing their own immortalizing claims can they protect them.

The black lines of mourning that will make the beloved evergreen reappear in sonnet 81, where, however, they are given a new twist:

> Or I shall live your Epitaph to make,
> Or you survive when I in earth am rotten,
> From hence your memory death cannot take,
> Although in me each part will be forgotten.
> Your name from hence immortall life shall have,
> Though I (once gone) to all the world must dye,
> The earth can yeeld me but a common grave,

When you entombed in mens eyes shall lye,
Your monument shall be my gentle verse,
Which eyes not yet created shall ore-read,
And toungs to be, your beeing shall rehearse,
When all the breathers of this world are dead,
You still shall live (such vertue hath my Pen)
Where breath most breaths, even in the mouths of men.

Much of the wit here turns on the temporal games being played. The sonnet itself, and the sequence as a whole, is revealed in the sestet to be precisely that ‘Epitaph’ that the poet in the first line envisages himself writing in the future. By bringing into the present this future moment which stands paradigmatically for his own literal survival, the poet makes that survival something that has already happened, but also something that happens anew each time we read the poem. This is of course exactly what the poem tells us will happen to the memory of the beloved. Moreover, as we ‘ore-read’ it, we recognize ourselves as the ‘toungs to be’ of the future. This gives the poem a nostalgic edge, as we realize that both the poet and his beloved are indeed dead, along with all the ‘breathers’ of that world. Yet at the same time, it draws us back into the poem’s own present, from where we too look forward ourselves to another future time in which Shakespeare’s poem will still breathe in men’s mouths. The epitaph bestows life, just as death is undone by its closeness to breath.

Creating a template by which apparent oppositions are reversed, revealed to be complementary, and fused together in a third term, only to emerge anew as more problematically antagonistic than ever, the either/or construction of the poem’s opening establishes from the start an ambivalent relationship between the death and survival of the poet and the beloved. What we might call the rhetorical excess of the opposition set up by the first two lines almost suggests a dependency, as though the survival of the one might be reliant on the death of the other.[153] At the same time, while the survival of the poet is opposed to that of the beloved, it is subordinated to his role in memorialising the young man by writing his 'Epitaph'. Either way, it will be the young man who will live on, a sense that is reinforced by these lines' logical relation to line 3, as Booth notes (2000: 275). Yet as the poem unwinds it becomes evident that it is in the hypothesis of the first line, which anticipates the beloved's premature death, that the real assurance of the beloved's endurance lies: the poet's verse, as we have already read, will keep alive the young man's memory far beyond his death, even if this should fall long after the poet's demise. Even as the poet's importance is diminished, it is heightened.

The 'ostentatiously alternative' mode that Booth identifies in the first two lines continues throughout the octet, which so pathetically contrasts the glorious 'immortall life' promised the beloved with the anonymity that awaits the poet that we suspect a degree of irony. A series of oppositions reinforce this suspicion. Death would 'take' from the young man (l.3), while 'The earth' (l.7), death's metonymic representative, will 'yield' to the poet. Even while the lines in question emphasize that the youth will transcend death while the poet sinks into oblivion, the verb associated with each implies that it is the poet who is here in tune with death, able to direct it perhaps because he is of it, while it is the youth who is potentially threatened.[154] There is something grandiose, too, in the poet's claim that he '(once gone) to all the world must dye': it leaves a self-mockingly bombastic aftertaste whose irony flavours the following two lines' emphasis on the social distinctions between poet and beloved. There 'intombed' evokes the grand 'monument' upon which an aristocrat can expect his epitaph to be engraved, as opposed to the 'common grave' that awaits the poet, although the effect is muted by modern editors' decisions to change the original punctuation at the end of line 6, replacing the quarto's comma with a full stop (Booth, Kerrigan) or a semi-colon (Vendler, Duncan-Jones).

---

[153] Booth describes this as an 'ostentatiously alternative mode' (2000: 275). This sense of interdependency is intensified in retrospect, as here 'I' and 'you' are 'linked in reciprocal regard in each line', as Vendler notes, whereas the remaining six lines of the octet establish an alteration between 'I' and 'you' extending over two lines at a time. Lover and beloved are thus pulled a little apart in order in to be reunited again at the sestet's 'turn' in line 9, where 'your' and 'my' are brought together again in a single line.

[154] Of course, part of the role of these words in their context is to heighten the sense of irony: death *cannot* take away the young man's memory, while earth yields no more than a 'common grave', giving way to the poet only to secure his oblivion. Nevertheless, the associations of these words linger beyond their immediate import.

It is worth noting, too, the peculiar physical evocativeness of these lines. In line 7, the long vowels and dipthongs, the modulation from the harder /ð/ of 'The' to the softer /θ/ of 'earth', culminating in the yawning vowel and the finality of the /v/ at the end of the line, all suggest the yielding of the earth as a body sinks into it, an effect that contrasts with the hard, marble-like plosives of 'intombed' in the following line. This peculiar mimetic quality is especially significant because it bestows added emotional force upon the recognition that the octet closes with an image of mutual destruction, with both the poet and the beloved sealed in their respective burial places. From the opening, with its insistence on the survival of one or the other pointing in both cases to the beloved's endurance, we arrive, after a series of assertions of the immortality of the young man's name and memory, at the image of both poet and beloved interred. If the beloved's entombment 'in mens eyes' ensures him some kind of posterity, it nevertheless emphasizes his death rather than his continued life, as does 'lie': the poet does not say in line 8, as he might, something like 'when you flowering in men's eyes shall live'.

The first line of the sestet, in which first and second person are reunited again in a single line, makes the neo-Horatian claim which is the poem's crux: 'Your monument shall be my gentle verse'. This immediately causes us to realign our readings of certain ambiguities in the octet, most significantly the repeated 'hence' of lines 3 and 5. In line 3 'hence' seems spatial, equivalent to 'here', and we probably don't think too hard initially about where that 'here' is, taking it perhaps to refer simply to this 'world', this 'earth'. In this capacity it plays a role as an intermediate step between the purely physical sense of 'earth' as soil or ground in line 2, and the bifurcated sense it assumes in line 7, where, if as we saw before that original reading powerfully persists, ‘earth’ also assumes a more social meaning, one that line 6 sets up and line 8, with its reference to ‘mens eyes’, confirms. In the light of line 9, however, the ghostly reading that makes ‘hence’ refer to the poem itself solidifies. The ‘hence’ of line 5, which we are probably inclined on a first reading to take in a temporal sense, meaning ‘from henceforth’, ‘from now on’, modulates back into line with its predecessor in line 3, becoming too a spatial reference to the sonnet we are reading. The octet, then, which initially appears to privilege the young man as a source of power and enduring value, is rewritten by the sestet in such a fashion that the ambivalences already present come to the fore, the poet retrospectively becoming the guarantor of the beloved’s immortality claimed therein.

This metamorphosis in the power balance of the sonnet is signalled by its description of itself as ‘gentle’ verse. Redeploying the discourse of social distinction, it contrasts with the ‘common’ grave that awaits the poet. The suggestion could be that the poem’s noble subject renders the low-born poet’s verse similarly dignified, as Duncan-Jones proposes, but the manner in which it picks up on the sub-text of the octet implies otherwise. The sestet’s turn invites a more sinister retrospective reading, too, of line 8. If the beloved lies ‘intombed in mens eyes’ inasmuch as his actual funeral monument will be a grand affair much gazed upon, the sestet insinuates that it is in the black lines of print of the sonnets that he is entombed. If the poet has the power to give the beloved life, or at least some sort of afterlife, the sonnet warns, it has the power to bury him too.[155] Embedded in a series of sonnets dealing with the poet’s jealousy and the beloved’s possible infidelity, this admonition seems apposite.

With its reiteration of ‘eyes’ in association with reading, line 10 reinforces this interpretation, drawing the process of reading itself, as it does so, into this death-dealing circle. 'Ore-read' carries similarly dark overtones: not only is it (arguably) rhymed with 'dead', but in a poem and a sequence so fixated upon entombment, 'o'er-read', as modern editors almost universally have it, carries a residual sense of interment, as though with each reading another patina might obscure the gilding of the beloved's image preserved there.[156] This sense is muted, but it fits with and is thus amplified by the redefining of the poem from its printed form to its oral recitation at the sestet's close.

---

[155] This many readers feel the sonnets do: while they have contributed to Shakespeare’s immortal reputation, the identity of the beloved has, despite the wild (and Wildean) efforts of biographers and critics, remained obscure.

The pun on 'rehearse' in the following line augments the poem's covert threat. As Hammond notes, it 'combines the prospect of immortality – the young man's existence being repeated verbally through future time – with the threat that in bringing this about the poet is in reality perpetually burying him – to 'hearse' over and over again (104). While 'hearse' signified a bier or coffin to Elizabethan ears, it could also have the more specific sense of a temple-shaped structure of wood used in royal and noble funerals. This structure would be decorated with banners, lighted candles and heraldic devices, and it was customary for friends of the deceased to pin short poems or epitaphs on it.[157] This picks up on 'intombed' and 'monument', reinforcing the social distinction between poet and beloved established in the octet. It also hints, perhaps, at the possibility that out of the 'over-reading' of this sonnet and sequence, new poems will be appended to the young man's tomb. Even in the space of this pun, then, we have the sense that precisely by burying the beloved the poet brings him new life.

The line suggests too, of course, that there will be something defective about the future reiteration through poetry of the beloved's being. 'Rehearse' suggests that while future tongues will repeatedly declare the beloved's being, making him live on, this performance will not be the real thing. While the theatrical meaning of ‘rehearse’ familiar to us today was a fairly new one in the late-sixteenth century, Shakespeare was, unsurprisingly, familiar with it, and used it unequivocally in this sense in his plays.[158] In this capacity the word picks up on an underlying concern with public visibility. The poem’s closing emphasis on orality entails a double bifurcation. Firstly, there is the contrast between breath as the very sign of life and thus the greatest possible guarantee of immortality, and breath as mere air, ‘the closest thing to nothing’, the commonest act of man, not even distinguishing him from the beasts; secondly, there is the disjunction between ‘breath’ as an intensely private quality filled with eroticism, and the Horatian or Ovidian ‘breath Fame blowes’ that Aeneas speaks of in *Troilus and Cressida* (I.iii.244). The ‘immortall life’ promised the beloved’s name depends, of course, on its currency persisting in the public sphere, just as the poetry’s power to immortalize is contingent upon its readers. Similarly, the importance of dying ‘to all the world’, or of being entombed ‘in mens eyes’ has already been underscored. The poem closes on the word ‘men’, reiterating the importance of the public sphere to any hope of survival for either the poet or his beloved. Yet the stress on the body, and in particular the mouth, the liminal ‘O’ that marks the point of transition from interior to exterior, makes that interface between public and private the locus of poetry’s immortalizing claim even as it recognizes its ethereal quality. And here the poem’s eroticism becomes inseparable from the peculiarly private experience of reading published poems. The young man will survive in Shakespeare’s poetry because it will breathe forth his fame in the sensual privacy of men’s mouths. His poetry will be performed, but in the closed theatre of the great ‘O’ the reader’s ‘mouth’ shapes as he pronounces the word.[159]

---

[156] As Booth notes, 'the rhyme, imperfect in modern dialects, may or may not have been so in Shakespeare's. The evidence suggests that individual Elizabethans varied the vowel sounds in read and dead arbitrarily and at will' (2000: 278).

[157] For the first sense of 'hearse', see *Julius Caesar* III.ii.163: 'Stand from the hearse, stand from the body'. The OED gives a number of contemporaneous sources for the second sense.

It is through ‘l’aura’, the broken breath that refreshes and renews even as it contains within it the scar of the beloved’s ruin, that Shakespeare here, like Petrarch, explores death and its transcendence through verse. Like Petrarch, confronted by the *incertior auris* of oblivion he turns its blast back upon itself, until death itself seems to be the guarantor of eternal life. Led towards this baroque aesthetic of *oblio* by Ovid as Petrarch was, it is nevertheless here, perhaps, rather than in the sparse gestures towards an orthodox Christian afterlife and the Last Judgement, that the sonnets' Christian inheritance can be felt.

---

[158] See, for example, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* – III.i.75, III.ii.11.

[159] Perhaps there is a glance here too at the secrecy imposed upon an explicitly, sometimes ostentatiously homoerotic sequence, regarding its subject.

# AFTERWORD

This thesis set out to see whether re-engaging with Petrarch could shed new light on Petrarchan sonneteering in English in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In particular, rather than studying Petrarch solely as an influence, it has looked to take Petrarch as our reader or guide to those who came after him. This approach sprang from a growing awareness that Petrarch still, today, reads *us*, as much as we read him. We are, in Harold Bloom's terms, postfigured by the *Canzoniere*, by their preoccupation with mortality and the fear of oblivion, by their engagement with the troublesome relation between national and local identities, and by their unpicking and restitching of our established understandings of the public and the private, of inwardness and outwardness, of celebrity and retreat, and of male and female subject positions. Petrarch, as we saw in part one, while engaging with a contemporary, historically specific audience, carries out that engagement in part through a withdrawal from it, in order to speak to an audience in futurity, a thousand years from the now of the moment of composition. His lyrics are written *for our sake*, for those at the end of history (a place perpetually in retreat), and they thus always invite us to read them as looking *back* at us, rather than forwards in time toward us, prefiguring us. Like all poems, but more self-reflexively than most, they live in the 'now' in which they are given breath by new readings.

Moreover, the appeal they make to us is lodged in the breath itself, in the fleshly shudder of emotive thought their affective impact provokes. This means that the way they move us, in futurity, is always profoundly idiosyncratic, always deeply personal. This idiosyncratic response points the way toward the proper kind of relation between history and poetry. It leads away from the crude presentism, at best an interesting thought experiment, that would expunge historical context, and away too from the cruder kind of historicism that would trap the artwork in its own historical context, refusing it the enduring life it derives *not* from new readings by modern critics, but from its own reading *of us* today. It is the registering of historical distance coupled to its transcendence that moves us, the frisson created by the simultaneous awareness of a gap and its bridging. This is the real historical sense that Petrarch epitomizes, that awareness of the past both as concurrently hopelessly lost and horrifyingly, gloriously alive within us.

Perhaps the most satisfactory outcome from this thesis is a sense of where new research might lead. It is over three decades since William Bouwsma suggested that we read Renaissance humanism in terms of an internal struggle between Stoic and Augustinian influences and modes of thinking and feeling. Returning to Petrarch to read anew the English and Scottish Petrarchans, the prevalence of Stoic or neo-Stoic concerns has been one of the most immediately striking discoveries. They are there in Thomas Wyatt's epistolary satires and their advocacy of a withdrawal from court, in Lady Mary Wroth's concern with constancy and the functioning of reason, and in William Drummond of Hawthornden's country retreat. Yet in the Petrarchan poetry of all of these poets, there is a (frequently ambivalent) revolt against Lipsian philosophy and theology, a revolt that is generally founded (albeit again ambivalently) on the celebration of passion and a determination to accept indeterminacy. The strength of this revolt in the sonnets of Shakespeare makes them out as distinctive in yet another fashion from the other sequences being penned around the turn of the century. A great deal of work has been conducted of late on neo-Stoic influences and thought in the early modern period, but more research is needed on how Lipsian neo-Stoicism and Petrarchism, two of the most potent discourses of the age, interacted. Often one has the sense that Petrarchan norms in themselves militated against Stoic impulses, perhaps—although this is impossible to determine—even against authorial intentions. A next step might be to look for traces of Petrarchan modes of thinking in more obviously Stoic or Stoic-influenced texts of the period.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Manuscripts

NLS MS 2060 – National Library of Scotland

## Printed Matter

Aers, David. 1991. ‘A Whisper in the Ear of Early Modernists; or, Reflections on Literary Critics Writing the ‘History of the Subject’, in *Culture and History, 1350-1600. Essays on English Communities, Identities and Writing* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf)

______. 1992. ‘Reflections on Current Histories of the Subject’, *Literature and History* (second series) 2:2, 20-34

Alamanni, Luigi. 1786. ‘Satire’, in *Satire di Antonio Vinciguerra, Lodovico Ariosto, Ercole Bentivoglio, Luigi Alamanni, Lodovico Dolce* (London)

Alexander, William, Earl of Stirling 1921/1929. *Poetical Works*, ed. by L. E. Kastner and H. B. Charlton, 2 vols (Manchester: Scottish Text Society)

Alexander, Gavin. 1996. *Five Responses to Sir Philip Sidney 1586–1628*. Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Cambridge

Allan, David. 1997. ‘ “A Commendation of the Private Countrey Life”: Philosophy and the Garden in Seventeenth-Century Scotland’, *Garden History* 25.1, 59-80

______. 1999a. “In the Bosome of a Shaddowie Grove”: Sir George Mackenzie and the Consolations of Retirement”, *History of European Ideas* 25, 251-73

______. 1999b. ‘Reconciliation and Retirement in the Restoration Scottish Church: the Neo-Stoicism of Robert Leighton’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 50, 251-78

______. 2000. *Philosophy and Politics in Later Stuart Scotland. Neo-Stoicism, Culture and Ideology in an Age of Crisis, 1540-1690* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press)

Alpers, Paul J. 2007. ‘Renaissance Lyrics and their Situations’, *New Literary History* 38.2: 309-331

Anders, H. R. D. 1904. *Shakespeare’s Books: A Dissertation on Shakespeare’s Reading and the Immediate Sources of his Works* (Berlin: Reimer)

Ariès, Philippe. 1974. *Western attitudes toward death from the Middle Ages to the present* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press)

______. 1981. *The Hour of Our Death*, trans. by Helen Weaver (London: Allen Lane)

______. and Georges Duby (eds.). 1981-1989. *A History of Private Life*, 5 vols (Cambridge, Mass., and London: The Belknap Press)

Atkinson, David W. 1985. ‘Tradition and Innovation in Drummond of Hawthornden’s *A Cypresse Grove*’, in *Scottish Language and Literature, Medieval and Renaissance*, ed. by Dietrich Strauss and Horst W. Drescher (Frankfurt: Verlag Peter Lang), 447- 467

______. 1986. ‘The Religious Voices of Drummond of Hawthornden.’ *Studies in Scottish Literature* 21, 197-20

______. 1991. 'William Drummond as a Baroque Poet', *Studies in Scottish Literature* 26, 394-40

______. 2007. 'Flowres of Sion: The Spiritual and Meditative Journey of William Drummond', in *Language Cleir Illumynate: Scottish Poetry from Barbour to Drummond, 1375-1630*, ed. by Nicola Royan (Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi)

Auerbach, Erich. 1958. *Literatursprache und Publikum in der lateinischen Spätantike und im Mittelalter* (Berne: Francke Verlag)

______. 1965 [1958]. *Literary Language and its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages*, trans. by Ralph Manheim (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul)

Ayton, Robert, Sir. 1963. *The English and Latin Poems*, ed. by Charles B. Gullans (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society/W. Blackwood)

Backscheider, Paula R. 1996. 'Introduction' in *The Intersections of the Public and Private Spheres in Early Modern England* ed. by Paula R. Backscheider and Timothy Dykstal (London/Portland, Oregon: Frank Cass)

Bacon, Francis. 1868-92. *Works*, ed. by James Spedding, Robert Leslie Ellis, and Douglas Denon Heath, 14 vols. (London: Longman)

______. 1995. *Selected Writings*, ed. by H. Dick (New York: Random House)

Barash, Carol. 1996. *English Women's Poetry, 1641-1714: Politics, Community, and Linguistic Authority* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Barker, Francis. 1984. *The Tremulous Private Body: Essays on Subjection* (London and New York: Methuen)

Barolini, Teodolinda. 2009. 'The Self in the Labyrinth of Time', in *Petrarch: A Critical Guide to the Complete Works*, ed. by Victoria Kirkham and Armando Maggi (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press), 33-62

Baron, Hans. 1985. *Petrarch's Secretum: Its Making and Its Meaning* (Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America)

Baroncini, Daniela. 1999. *Ungaretti Barocco* (Torino: Einaudi)

Barroll, J. Leeds. 1999. *Politics, Plague, and Shakespeare's Theatre* (Ithaca and London)

Barthes, Roland. 2002 [1977]. *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments*, trans. by Richard Howard (London: Vintage)

Bassnett, Madeline. 2011. 'The Politics of Election in Lady Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*.' *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 51.1 (Winter): 111-134

Bate, Jonathan. 1993. *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford: Clarendon)

Bath, Michael. 2003. *Renaissance Decorative Painting in Scotland* (Edinburgh: National Museums of Scotland)

Bawcutt, Priscilla. 2001. 'James VI's Castalian Band: A Modern Myth', *The Scottish Historical Review* 80, 251-9

Baxter, Jamie Reid. 2008. 'Liminary Verse: The Paratextual Poetry of Renaissance Scotland,' *Journal of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society* 3

Bear, Risa and Micah Bear. 1992. Online edition of Lady Mary Wroth's 'Pamphilia to Amphilanthus', Renascence Editions/Luminarium. Accessed 17 July 2011 <http://www.luminarium.org/renascence-editions/mary.html>

Beilin, Elaine V. 1987. *Redeeming Eve: Women Writers of the English Renaissance* (Princeton University Press)

Bell, Ilona. 1997. 'Women in the Lyric Dialogue of Courtship: Whitney's *Admonitio$^{n}$ to al yong Gentilwomen* and Donne's "The Legacie" ', in Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (eds*.), Representing Women in Renaissance England* (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press), 76-92

______. 1992. 'Milton's Dialogue with Petrarch', *Milton Studies* 28, 91-120

Belsey, Catherine. 1985. *The Subject of Tragedy : identity and difference in Renaissance drama* (London and New York: Methuen)

Bembo, Pietro. 1966. *Prose della volgar lingua. Gli Asolani. Rime,* ed. by Carlo Dionisotti (Torino: UTET)

Bergin, Thomas G. 1970. 'Ungaretti Traduttore', *Books Abroad* 44:4 (Autumn), 571-576

______. 1974. *Petrarch's Bucolicum Carmen* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press)

Bernard, John D. 1979. ' "To Constancie Confin'de": The Poetics of Shakespeare's Sonnets', *PMLA* 94:1, 77-90

Bernardo, Aldo S. 1950. 'The Importance of the Non-Love Poems of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*', *Italica* 27, 302-12

______ (ed. & trans.). 1975. *Rerum familiarum libri I-VIII (Petrarca),* (Albany, New York: University of New York Press)

Bettarini, Rosanna (ed.). 2005. *Francesco Petrarca: Canzoniere - Rerum Vulgarium Fragmenta*. 2 vols. (Torino: Einaudi)

Billanovich, Giuseppe. 1994. 'Laura fantasma del *Canzoniere*', *Studi Petrarcheschi* 11, 149-158

Bishop, Louise M. 1998. 'Review of *Chaucerian Polity: Absolutist Lineages and Associational Forms in England and Italy*, by David Wallace', in *The Medieval Review*.<https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2022/4548/98.05.02.html.txt;jsessionid=20242CFCF2E9A1414854C48EF1140923?sequence=2> [Accessed 12.08.2011]

Bishop, Morris. 1963. *Petrarch and His World* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press)

______. 1966. *Letters from Petrarch* (Indiana: Indiana University Press)

Blevins, Jacob. 2004. *Catullan Consciousness and the Early Modern Lyric in England* (Aldershot, UK and Burlington, VT: Ashgate)

Bloom, Harold. 1994. *The Western Canon. The Books and School of the Ages* (New York: Harcourt Brace)

______. 1999. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human* (New York: Riverhead)

Bock, Emmanuel. 1998. 'Lady Mary Wroth and the Situation of Women in Elizabethan and Jacobean England'. *English Studies* 8 (Luxembourg : Centre Universitaire de Luxembourg), 41-112

Bolam, Robyn. 2002. 'The Heart of the Labyrinth: Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus'*, in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. by Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell), 257-266

Bondanella, Julia Conaway. 1978. *Petrarch's visions and their Renaissance Analogues* (Madrid: Ediciones José Porrúa Turanzas)

Booth, Roy J. 1994. 'Reviser's Note', *Elizabethan Sonnets*, ed. by Maurice Evans and rev. by Roy J. Booth (London: Everyman), xxxviii-xl

Booth, Stephen (ed.). 2000. *Shakespeare's Sonnets* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press)

Borri, Giancarlo. 1997. 'Petrarca e Ungaretti', in *Petrarca e la Cultura Europea,* ed. by Luisa Rotondi Secchi Tarugi (Milan: Nuovi Orizzonti), 311-326

Bosco, Umberto. 1961. *Francesco Petrarca* (Bari: Laterza)

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature* (Cambridge: Polity Press)

Bouwsma, William J. 1975. ‘The Two Faces of Humanism: Stoicism and Augustinianism in Renaissance Thought’, in *Itinerarium Italicum*, ed. by Heiko O. Oberman and Thomas A. Brady (Leiden: Brill), 3-60

______. 1990. ‘Renaissance and Reformation: An Essay on their Affinities and Connections’, in *A Usable Past* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press), 225-246

______. 2000. *The Waning of the Renaissance, 1550-1640* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press)

Boyle, Marjorie O’Rourke. 1991. *Petrarch’s Genius: Pentimento and Prophecy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press)

Braden, Gordon. 1986a. ‘Love and Fame: The Petrarchan Career’, in *Pragmatism’s Freud: The Moral Disposition of Psychoanalysis*, ed. Joseph H. Smith and William Kerrigan (Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press)

______. 1986b. ‘Beyond Frustration: Petrarchan Laurels in the Seventeenth Century’, *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 26, 5-23

______. 1990. ‘Unspeakable Love: Petrarch to Herbert’, in *Soliciting Interpretation: Literary Theory and Seventeenth-Century Poetry,* ed. by Elizabeth D. Harvey and Katharine Eisaman Maus (Chicago: Chicago University Press)

______. 1996. ‘Gaspara Stampa and the Gender of Petrarchism’, *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 38.2: 115-3

______. 1999a. *Petrarchan Love and the Continental Renaissance* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press)

______. 1999b. ‘Shakespeare’s Petrarchism’, in *Shakespeare’s Sonnets: Critical Essays*, ed. by James Schiffer (New York and London: Garland), 163-183

______. 2000. ‘Ovid, Petrarch, and Shakespeare’s Sonnets’, in *Shakespeare’s Ovid: The Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems,* ed. by A. B. Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 96-112

______. 2004. ‘Wyatt and Petrarch: Italian Fashion at the Court of Henry VIII’, *Annali d’Italianistica* 22, 237-26

Braithwaite, Richard. 1631. *The English Gentlewoman* (London)

Brennan, Michael G. 2002. ‘Creating female authorship in the early seventeenth century: Ben Jonson and Lady Mary Wroth’ in *Women’s Writing and the Circulation of Ideas: Manuscript Publication in England, 1550-1800*, ed. by George L. Justice and Nathan Tinker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Brown, Keith M. 1990. ‘Courtiers and Cavaliers: Service, Anglicization and Loyalty among the Royalist Nobility’, in *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context*, ed. by John Morrill (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

______. 1993. ‘The Scottish Aristocracy, Anglicization and the Court, 1603-38’, *Historical Journal* 36.3, 543-576

Brown, Richard Danson. 1999. *‘The New Poet’: Novelty and Tradition in Spenser’s Complaints*, Liverpool English Texts and Studies (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press)

Brown-Grant, Rosalind. 2008. *French Romance of the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Bruce, Yvonne. 2009. “‘That which Marreth All’: Constancy and Gender in *The Virtuous Octavia,” Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 22

Bruster, Douglas. 2010. ‘The New Globalism’s Bubble’. *Journal of the Northern Renaissance* 2.1 (Spring 2010): 149-162

______. 2007. ‘The Materiality of Shakespearean Form,’ in *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism*, ed. by Stephen A. Cohen (Abingdon, Oxon: Ashgate), 31-45

Bunting, Basil. 1999. *On Poetry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press)

Burckhardt, Jacob. 1990. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, trans. by S. G. C. Middlemore (London: Penguin)

Burke, Kenneth. 1953. *Counter-Statement*, rev. ed. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press)

Burke, Peter. 1969. *The Renaissance Sense of the Past* (London: Edward Arnold)

______. 1997. ‘Representation of the Self from Petrarch to Descartes’, in *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*, ed. by Roy Porter (London: Routledge)

Burrow, Colin. 2002. ‘Re-embodying Ovid: Renaissance Afterlives’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, ed. by Philip Hardie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 301-319

Burt, R. A. 1991. *Contending Kingdoms: Historical, Psychological and Feminist Approaches to the Literature of 16th Century England and France* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press)

Bush, Douglas. 1945. *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Calder, Charles. 1991. ‘Artificiosa Eloquentia: Grammatical and Rhetorical Schemes in the Poetry of William Drummond’. *Studies in Scottish Literature* 26, 380-393

Calderwood, James. 1987. *Shakespeare and the Denial of Death*. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press)

Calhoun, Craig. 1992. *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, England: MIT Press)

Calitti, Floriana. 2003. ‘Valchiusa «locus locorum»’, in *Spazi, geografie, testi*, ed. by Siriana Sgavicchia (Rome: Bulzoni)

Callaghan, Dympna. 2007. ‘Confounded by Winter: Speeding Time in Shakespeare’s Sonnets’, in *A Companion to Shakespeare’s Sonnets*, ed. by Michael Schoenfeldt (Oxford: Blackwell), 104-118

Camden, Willam. 1970 [1615]. *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth Late Queen of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Caramelli, David, et al. 2007. ‘Genetic analysis of the skeletal remains attributed to Francesco Petrarca’, *Forensic Science International*. Accessed online 27 August 2011<http://web.unife.it/progetti/genetica/Guido/pdf/Caramelli%20ForSciInt.pdf>

Carey, Peter. 1992. *The Intellectuals and the Masses* (London: Faber and Faber)

Carlson, David R. 2010. ‘The Henrician Courtier Writing in Manuscript and Print: Wyatt, Surrey, Bryan, and Others’, in *A Companion to Tudor Literature*, ed. Kent Cartwright (Oxford: Blackwell), 151-177

Carruthers, Gerard and Sarah Dunnigan. 1999. ‘“A reconfused chaos”: Scottish poetry and nation from the medieval period to the eighteenth century’, *Edinburgh Review* 100, 81-94

Cary, Phillip. 2000. *Augustine’s Invention of the Inner Self: The Legacy of a Christian Platonist* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press)

______. 2008a. *Inner Grace: Augustine in the traditions of Plato and Paul* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press)

______. 2008b. *Outward Signs: The Powerlessness of External Things in Augustine's Thought* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Castiglione, Baldassar. 1937. *Opere*, ed. by Giuseppe Prezzolini (Milan and Rome: Rizzoli)

Cerasano, S.P. and Marion Wynne-Davies (eds.) 1992. *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance* (Detroit: Wayne State UP)

Chadwick, Henry. 1985. 'The Ascetic Ideal in the History of the Church', in *Studies in Church History, Vol. 22: Monks, Hermits and the Ascetic Tradition*, ed. by W. J. Sheils (Oxford: Blackwell), 1-24

Chatman, Seymour. 1971. 'On Defining Form,' *New Literary History*, 2.2: 217-228

Chaucer, Geoffrey. 1957. *Works*, ed. F. N. Robinson, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Chaudhuri, Sukanta. 1997. Review of Heather Dubrow, *Echoes of Desire*, in *Review of English Studies,* 48.192 (November), 519-21

Cherchi, Paolo. 2008. *Verso la chiusura: Saggio sul Canzoniere di Petrarca* (Bologna: Mulino)

Clarke, Elizabeth and Jonathan Gibson. 2005. 'Introduction', in *Early modern women's manuscript poetry*, ed. by Jill Seal Millman and Gillian Wright (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press)

Clayton, Tom. 2009. 'Meter and Meaning in Shakespeare' in *Talking Renaissance Texts: Essays on the Humanist Tradition in Honor of Stanley Stewart*, edited by Jeffrey Kahan and M. Thomas Hester, Special Double Edition of *The Ben Jonson Journal*, 16.1-2, (May), 266-280

Cohen, Stephen. 2002. 'Between Form and Culture: New Historicism and the Promise of a Historical Formalism,' in *Renaissance Literature and Its Formal Engagements*, ed. by Mark David Rasmussen (New York: Palgrave), 17-41

Contini, Gianfranco. 1979. *Varianti e altra linguistica: Una raccolta di saggi, 1938-1968* (Torino: Einaudi)

Coogan, Robert. 1983. *Babylon on the Rhone: A Translation of Letters by Dante, Petrarch, and Catherine of Siena on the Avignon Papacy*. (Potomac, Md: Studia Humanitas)

Cook, James Wyatt. 1995. *Petrarch's Songbook – Rerum Vulgarium Fragmenta: A Verse Translation* (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies)

Cooper, Helen. 2010. 'Poetic Fame', in *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*, ed. by Brian Cummings and James Simpson (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Copjec, Joan. 1994a. 'Introduction' to *Supposing the Subject,* ed. by Joan Copjec (London/New York: Verso)

______. 1994b. 'Sex and the Euphanasia of Reason', in *Supposing the Subject*, ed. by Joan Copjec (London/New York: Verso)

______. 1994c. *Read my Desire: Lacan against the Historicists* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press)

Corbett, John. 1999. *Written in the Language of the Scottish Nation: A History of Literary Translation into Scots* (Clevedon: Topics in Translation / Multilingual Matters)

Cox, John D., and David Scott Kastan. 1997. *A New History of Early English Drama* (New York: Colmbia University Press)

Cox, Virginia. 2005. 'Sixteenth-Century Women Petrarchists and the Legacy of Laura'. *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 35.3 (Fall), 583-606

Craig, Alexander. 1604. *Poeticall Essayes* (London)
______. 1606. *Amorose Songes, Sonets and Elegies* (London)
Craigie, James (ed.). 1944-50. *The Basilicon Doran of King James VI*, Scottish Text Society, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: William Blackwood)
Crawford, Robert. 2007. *Scotland's Books: The Penguin History of Scottish Literature* (London: Penguin)
Cretavin, Giuliana (ed. and trans.). 1995. *Francesco Petrarca: In difesa dell'Italia (Contra Eum qui maledixit Italie),* (Venice: Marsilio)
Cummings, Brian. 2010. 'Autobiography and the History of Reading', in *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*, ed. by Brian Cummings and James Simpson (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 635-657
Currie, Mark. 2007. *About Time: Narrative, Fiction and the Philosophy of Time* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)
Cusk, Sarah. 1996. *Scattered Readers, Scattered Rhymes: Authorship, Publication and the Renaissance Lyric Sequence*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Columbia University.
D'Amico, Jack. 1979. *Petrarch in England. An Anthology of Parallel Texts from Wyatt to Milton* (Ravenna: Longo Editore)
Daniel, Samuel. 1885. *Complete Works in Verse and Prose*, ed. A. B. Grosart, 4 vols. (printed for private circulation)
Daniele, Antonio. 2005. *La memoria innamorata: Indagini e letture Petrarchesche* (Roma & Padova: Antenore)
Dante Alighieri. 2003. *Purgatorio*, ed. & trans. by Robert M. Durling (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
Darwin, Charles. 1998 [1872]. *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*, ed. by Paul Ekman (London: HarperCollins)
Dasenbrock, Reed Way. 1991. *Imitating the Italians: Wyatt, Spenser, Synge, Pound, Joyce* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkiins University Press)
______. 1988. 'Wyatt's Transformation of Petrarch', *Comparative Literature* 40, 122-33
Davidoff, Leonore. 1998. 'Regarding Some `Old Husbands' Tales': Public and Private in Feminist History', in *Feminism, the Public and the Private*, ed. by Joan B. Landes (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
Daybell, James. 2005. 'Recent Studies in Sixteenth-Century Letters', *English Literary Renaissance* 35, 331-62
______. 2006. 'Recent Studies in Seventeenth-Century Letters', *English Literary Renaisssance* 36, 135-7
de Navarre, Marguerite. 1984. *The Heptameron*, trans. by P. A. Chilton (Harmondsworth: Penguin)
Derrida, Jacques. 1987. *The Post Card: from Socrates to Freud and Beyond*, trans. by Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)
De Venuto, Domenico. 1990. *Il 'Bucolicum Carmen' di F. Petrarca: edizione diplomatica dell'autografo VAT. LAT.3358.* (Pisa: ETS)
Dews, Peter. 1996. *The Limits of Disenchantment* (London: Verso)
Distiller, Natasha. 2008. *Desire and Gender in the Sonnet Tradition* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)
Doane, Mary Ann. 1991. *Femmes Fatales: Feminism, Film Theory, Psychoanalysis* (New York: Routledge)
Dollimore, Jonathan. 1999. *Death, Desire and Loss in Western Culture* (London: Penguin)

______. 1989 [1984]. *Radical Tragedy*, 2nd ed. (Hassocks: Harvester)

Dotti, Ugo. 2001. *Petrarca Civile* (Roma: Donzelli)

Dowling, William C. 1991. *The Epistolary Moment: The Poetics of the Eighteenth-Century Verse Epistle* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press)

Draper, William H. (trans). 1911. *Petrarch's Secret, or The Soul's Conflict with Passion: Three Dialogues Between Himself and S. Augustine* (London: Chatto & Windus)

Drayton, Michael. 1931-41. *Works*, ed. by J. William Hebel, 5 vols. (Oxford)

Drummond, William, of Hawthornden. 1976. *Poems and Prose*, ed. by Robert H. MacDonald (Scottish Academic Press: Edinburgh and London)

______. 1913. *Poetical Works*, ed. by L. E. Kastner, 2 vols (Manchester: Manchester University Press)

______. 1711. *Works*, ed. by John Sage and Thomas Ruddiman (Edinburgh: James Watson): repr. in the Anglistica & Americana series (Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim/New York, 1970)

Dubrow, Heather. 1979. 'The Country House Poem: A Study in Generic Development,' *Genre* 12, 153-79

______. 1995. *Echoes of Desire: English Petrarchism and its Counterdiscourses* (Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press)

______. 1996. '"Incertainties now crown themselves assur'd": The Politics of Plotting Shakespeare's Sonnets'. *Shakespeare Quarterly* 47.3 (Fall), 291-305

Duncan-Jones, Katherine. 2001. *Ungentle Shakespeare: Scenes from his Life*. (London: Arden)

______ (ed.). 1997. *Shakespeare's Sonnets* (London: Arden)

______. 1996. Review of *Policy in Love: Lyric and Public in Ovid, Petrarch and Shakespeare*, by Christopher Martin, in *Essays in Criticism*, 46:2 (April): 153-158

Dunnigan, Sarah M. 2000. ' "O venus soverane": Erotic Politics and Poetic Practice at the Courts of Mary Queen of Scots and James VI', in *Terranglian Territories: Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on the Literature of Region and Nation*, ed. by Susanne Hagemann (Frankfurt: Peter Lang)

______. 2002. *Eros and Poetry at the Courts of Mary Queen of Scots and James VI* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)

______. 2005a. 'A New Critical Cartography: pre and post-Union Scottish Renaissance', in *Alba Literaria: A History of Scottish Literature*, ed. by Marco Fazzini (Venice: Amos Edizioni)

______. 2005b. 'Marian and Jacobean Literature', *Literature Compass* 2: 1-14

______. 2007. 'Drummond and the Meaning of Beauty', in '"*Joyous Sweit Imaginatioun":*
*Essays on Scottish Literature in Honour of R.D.S. Jack*, ed. by Sarah Carpenter and Sarah M. Dunnigan (Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi Press)

Durling, Robert M. 1971. 'Petrarch's "Giovene donna sotto un verde lauro" '. *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. 86:1, 1-20.

______. (ed. and trans.). 1976. *Petrarch's Lyric Poems: the Rime sparse and Other Lyrics* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press)

Dykstal, Timothy. 1996. 'Introduction' in *The Intersections of the Public and Private Spheres in Early Modern England* ed. by Paula R. Backscheider and Timothy Dykstal (London/Portland, Oregon: Frank Cass)

Eagleton, Terry. 2003. *Figures of Dissent* (London: Verso)

Eliot, T. S.. 1950. *Selected Essays* (New York: Harcourt Brace)

______. 1957. *On Poetry and Poets*. (London: Faber and Faber)

Engel, William E. 2002. *Death and Drama in Renaissance England: Shades of Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

______. 1995. *Mapping Mortality: The Persistence of Memory and Melancholy in Early Modern England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press)

Engle, Lars. 1993. *Shakespearean Pragmatism: Market of his Time* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press)

Erasmus. 1521. *Libellus de conscribendis epistolis* (Cambridge, Siberch)

Evans, Maurice (ed.). 2003. *Elizabethan Sonnets*, rev. & ed. by Roy J. Booth (London: Phoenix)

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

Febvre, Lucien. 1982 [1942]. *The problem of unbelief in the sixteenth century: the religion of Rabelais* (*Le probleme de l'incroyance au XVIe siècle*), trans. by Beatrice Gottlieb (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press)

Fenzi, Enrico. 2003. *Saggi Petrarcheschi* (Fiesole, Firenze: Cadmo)

Feo. Michele. 1979. 'Fili Petrarcheschi', *Rinascimento* 19, 3-89

Fernie, Ewan. 2005. 'Shakespeare and the Prospect of Presentism', *Shakespeare Survey* 58

Ferry, Anne. 1983. *The "Inward" Language: sonnets of Wyatt, Sidney, Shakespeare, Donne* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Fienberg, Nona. 1999. 'Mary Wroth and the Invention of Female Poetic Subjectivity' in *Reading Mary Wroth: Representing Alternatives in Early Modern English*, ed. by Naomi Miller and Gary Waller (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press), 175-90

______. 2002. 'Mary Wroth's Poetics of the Self', *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 42.1 (Winter), 121-136

______. 1991. 'Mary Wroth and the Invention of Female Poetic Subjectivity', in *Reading Mary Wroth: Representing Alternatives in Early Modern England*, ed. by Naomi J. Miller and Gary Waller (Knoxville: University of Tennessee)

*Financial Times*, 2009. 'Investors cling to gold as prices surge', 7th October. Accessed online, 24 October 2010 <ttp://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/51671c84-b372-11de-ae8d-00144feab49a,dwp_uuid=413b4c2e-b9f8-11dc-abcb 0000779 fd2ac.htmlnclick_check=1>

Fineman, Joel. 1986. *Shakespeare's Perjured Eye: the invention of poetic subjectivity in the sonnets* (Berkeley: University of California Press)

Finucci, Valeria. 2005. 'In the Footsteps of Petrarch', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 35.3, 457-466

Fleming, Morna Robertson. 1997. *The Impact of the Union of the Crowns on Scottish Lyric Poetry 1584-1619*, unpublished PhD thesis (University of Glasgow)

Fogle, French Rowe. 1952. *A Critical Study of William Drummond of Hawthornden* (New York: King's Crown Press)

Forster, Leonard. 1969. *The Icy Fire: Five Studies in European Petrarchism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, ed. & trans. by Donald Bouchard (Ithaca: Cornell University Press)

Fowler, Alastair. 1996. *Time's Purpled Masquers: Stars and the Afterlife in Renaissance English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Fraser, N. 1995. 'Politics, Culture and the Public Sphere: Toward a Postmodern Conception'. *Social Postmodernism: Beyond Identity Politics* ed. by L. Nicholson and S. Seidman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Freccero, John. 1989. 'The Fig Tree and the Laurel', in *Petrarch: Modern Critical Views*, ed. by Harold Bloom (New York: Chelsea House), 43-56: first published in *Diacritics* 5 (1975): 34-40

Freinkel, Lisa. 2001. *Reading Shakespeare's Will: the theology of figure from Augustine to the sonnets* (New York: Columbia University Press)

Freud, Sigmund. 1990. 'The Theme of the Three Caskets', in *Art and Literature: Jensen's Gradiva, Leonardo Da Vinci and other works*, ed. by Albert Dickson. Vol. 14 in *The Penguin Freud Library,* ed. by James Strachey (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

Fumerton, Patricia. 1991. *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press)

Futagawa, Yukio and Martin Pawley. 1970. *Frank Lloyd Wright: Public Buildings* (New York: Simon & Schuster)

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1989. *Truth and Method*, rev. edn, trans. by W. Glen-Doepel, trans. rev. by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (London: Sheed & Ward)

Gadoffre, Gilbert. 1974. 'Structures des mythes de Du Bellay.' *Bibliothèque d'humanisme et renaissance* 36, 273-289

Gascoigne, George. 2000 [1573]. *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, ed. by G. W. Pigman III (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

______. 1907-1910. *Complete Works*, ed. by John W. Cunliffe, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Gigliucci, Roberto. 2004. *Contraposti: Petrarchismo e ossimoro d'amore nel Rinascimento* (Rome: Bulzoni)

Gillespie, Michael Allen. 2008. *The Theological Origins of Modernity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Gillespie, Stuart. 2001. *Shakespeare's Books: A Dictionary of Shakespeare Sources* (London: Athlone Press)

Glei, Reinhold F., Nicola Kaminski, and Franz Lebsanft (eds.). 2010. *Boethius Christianus? Transformationen der 'Consolatio Philosophiae' in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit* (Berlin: De Gruyter)

Golding, Arthur (trans). 2002 [1567]. *Ovid's Metamorphoses* ed. by Madeleine Forey (London: Penguin)

Goodare, Julian. 2004. *The Government of Scotland, 1560-1625* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Googe, Barnabe. 1989 [1563]. *Eclogues, Epitaphs, and Sonnets*, ed. by Judith M. Kennedy (Toronto: Toronto University Press)

Gottfried, Rudolf B. (trans.). 1954. *Pietro Bembo's Gli Asolani* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press)

Gouwens, Kenneth. 1998. *Remembering the Renaissance: Humanist Narratives of the Sack of Rome*. (Leiden: Brill)

Grady, Hugh. 2002. *Shakespeare, Machiavelli, and Montaigne, Power & Subjectivity from Richard II to Hamlet* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

______. 1996. *Shakespeare's Universal Wolf: Studies in Early Modern Reification* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

______, and Terence Hawkes (eds.) 2006. *Presentist Shakespeares* (London: Routledge)

Grafton, Anthony. 2009. *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West* (Cambridge, Mass. / London: Harvard University Press)

Graham, Kenneth J. E. 1990. Review of William J. Bouwsma's *John Calvin: A sixteenth-century Portrait*, in *Renaissance Studies* 4.1, 83-86

Gray, Douglas. 2001. 'Finding Identity in the Middle Ages', in *Sixteenth-Century Identities*, ed. by A. J. Piesse (Manchester and New York)

Greenblatt, Stephen. 2005 [1980]. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: from More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

______. 1988. *Shakespearean Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England* (Oxford: Clarendon)

Greene, Roland. 1991. Post-Petrarchism: Origins and Innovations of the Western Lyric Sequence (Oxford and New Jersey: Princeton University Press)

______. 2010. 'Misplaced Horizons in Literary Studies', *Arcade*, 12 March. Accessed 27 July 2010. <http://arcade.stanford.edu/misplaced-horizons-literary-studies>

Greene, Thomas M. 1968. 'The Flexibility of the Self in Renaissance Literature', in *The Disciplines of Criticism: Essays in Literary Theory, Interpretation, and History*, ed. by Peter Demetz, Thomas Greene, and Lowry Nelson, Jr. (New Haven and London: Yale University Press)

______. 1976. 'Petrarch and the Humanist Hermeneutic', in *Italian Literature: Roots and Branches, Essays in Honor of Thomas Goddard Bergin*. ed. by Giose Rimanelli and Kenneth John Atchity (New Haven: Yale University Press)

______. 1982. *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press)

______. 1985. 'Pitiful thrivers: failed husbandry in the Sonnets', in *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, ed. by Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman (London: Methuen), 230-244

______. 1986. *The Vulnerable Text: Essays on Renaissance Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press)

Greville, Fulke. 1990 [1633]. *Certain Learned and Elegant Workes* (Delmar, NY: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints)

Griffin, Robert. 1969. *Coronation of the Poet: Joachim Du Bellay's Debt to the Trivium* (Berkeley, University of California Press)

Griffin. M.T. 1976. *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Guss, Donald L. 1966. *John Donne, Petrarchist. Italianate Conceits and Love Theory in the Songs and Sonnets* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press)

Guthmüller, Bodo. 1997. *Mito, Poesia, Arte: Saggi sulla tradizione Ovidiana nel rinascimento* (Rome: Bulzoni)

Habermas, Jurgen. 1992. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. by Thomas Burger (Cambridge: Polity Press)

______. 1992. 'Further Reflections on the Public Sphere', trans. by Thomas Burger, in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. by Craig. J. Calhoun (Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology), 421-461

Hackett, Helen. 1996. 'Courtly Writing by Women', in *Women and Literature in Britain 1500-1700*, ed. by Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Hadfield, Andrew. 2008. Review of John Kerrigan's *Archipelagic English: Literature, History and Politics 1603-1707*', in *Review of English Studies* 59, 783-4

Hammond, Gerald. 1980. *The Reader and Shakespeare's Young Man Sonnets* (Basingstoke: Macmillan)

Hand, Seán. 1990. 'Missing you: intertextuality, transference and the language of love', in *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*, ed. by Michael Worton and Judith Still (Manchester: Manchester University Press)

Hannay, Margaret Patterson. 1987. 'Mary Sidney: Lady Wroth', in *Women Writers of the Renaissance and Reformation*, ed. by Katharina M. Wilson (Athens: University of Georgia Press)

______. 1990. *Philip's Phoenix: Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

______. 1991. '"Your Vertuous and Learned Aunt": The Countess of Pembroke as a Mentor to Mary Wroth', in *Reading Mary Wroth: Representing Alternatives in Early Modern England*, ed. by Naomi J. Miller and Gary Waller (Knoxville : University of Tennessee Press), 15-34

Hanson, Elizabeth. 1997. 'Boredom and Whoredom; Reading Renaissance Women's Sonnet Sequences' *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 10, 165-91

Hardie, Philip. 2002. *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Harington, John. 1930. 'The Praise of Private Life', in *The Letters and Epigrams of Sir John Harington*, ed. by Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press), 323-378

Harrier, Richard. 1975. *The Canon of Sir Thomas Wyatt's Poetry* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press)

Harvey, Barbara F. 1991. 'Introduction: the "crisis" of the early fourteenth century', in *Before the Black Death: Studies in the 'crisis'of the early fourteenth century*, ed, by Bruce M. S. Campbell (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press)

Hawkes, Terence. 2002. *Shakespeare in the present* (London: Routledge)

Headlam Wells, Robin, Glenn Burgess & Rowland Wymer. 2000. 'Introduction', in *Neo-Historicism: Studies in Renaissance Literature, History and Politics*, ed. by Robin Headlam Wells, Glenn Burgess and Rowland Wymer. Studies in Renaissance Literature 5 (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer)

Heale, Elizabeth. 2003. *Autobiography and Authorship in Renaissance Verse* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan)

______. 2000. 'Songs, Sonnets and Autobiography: Self-Representation in Sixteenth-Century Verse Miscellanies', in *Betraying Our Selves: Forms of Self-Representation in Early Modern English Texts*. Ed. Henk Dragsta, Sheila Ottway and Helen Wilcox (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)

______. 1998. *Wyatt, Surrey, and Early Tudor Poetry* (Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman)

Henderson, Diana E. 1995. *Passion Made Public: Elizabethan Lyric, Gender, and Performance* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press)

Hegel, G. W. F. 1998. *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*, 2 vols. Ed. and trans. by T. M. Knox (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

______. 1977. *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. by A. V. Miller (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Heidegger, Martin. 1996. [1927]. *Being and Time: A Translation of Sein und Zeit,* trans. by Joan Stambaugh (New York: State University of New York Press)

Heitmann, Klaus. 1957. *Fortuna und Virtue: Eine Studie zu Petrarcas Lebensweisheit* (Cologne & Graz)

Henriksen, John. 2001. 'Poem as Song: The Role of the Lyric Audience'. *Alif: Journal of Contemporary Poetics* 21, 77-100

Hieatt, A. Kent. 1983. 'The Genesis of Shakespeare's Sonnets: Spenser's "Ruines of Rome: By Bellay"'. *PMLA* 98.5, 800-814

______. 1984. 'Forum: "Shakespeare's Sonnets": reply to Gary Schmidgall'. *PMLA* 99. 2, 244-245

Hill, John Spencer. 1997. *Infinity, Faith, and Time: Christian Humanism and Renaissance Literature* (Montreal & Kingston/London: McGill-Queen's University Press)

Hobbs, Mary. 1990. *The Stoughton Manuscript: A Manuscript Miscellany of Poems by Henry King and his Circle, circa 1636* (Aldershot: Scolar Press)

Hoffmeister, Gerhart. 1990. 'The Petrarchan Mode in European Romanticism', in *European Romanticism: literary cross-currents, modes, and models,* ed. by Gerhart Hoffmeister (Detroit: Wayne State University Press)

Holmes, Olivia. 2000. *Assembling the Lyric Self: Authorship from Troubadour Song to Italian Poetry Book*. Medieval Cultures, vol. 21 (London and Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press)

Hooper, John. 2004. 'Petrarch – the poet who lost his head', *The Guardian*, Tuesday 6 April. Accessed online, Sunday 28 August 2011. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2004/apr/06/research.italy>

Horace. 1914. *The Odes and Epodes,* ed. & trans. by C. E. Bennett, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann)

Horrox, Rosemary. 1994. *The Black Death*. Manchester Medieval Sources (Manchester: Manchester University Press)

Houlbrooke, Ralph (ed.). 1989. *Death, Ritual and Bereavement* (London: Routledge)

Howard, Deborah. 2000. 'Languages and Architecture in Scotland, 1500-1660', in *Architecture and Language: Constructing Identity in European Architecture, c.1000-c.1660,* ed. by Georgia Clarke and Paul Crossley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Hull, Elizabeth M. 1996. 'All My Deed But Copying Is: The Erotics of Identity in *Astrophil and Stella'*. *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 38, 175-190

Hunt, Edwin S. 1994. *The Medieval Super-Companies: A Study of the Peruzzi Company of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Hunter, G. K. 1997. 'A Roman Thought: Renaissance Attitudes to History Exemplified in Shakespeare and Jonson', in An English Miscellany: Presented to W. S. Mackie, ed. by B. S. Lee (Capetown and New York: Oxford University Press), 93-115

Jack, R. D. S. 1976. "Petrarch in English and Scottish Renaissance Literature." *Modern Language Review* 71

______. 1968-69. 'Drummond of Hawthornden: The Major Scottish Sources', *Studies in Scottish Literature* 6

______. 1968a. *The Scottish Sonnet and Renaissance Poetry,* unpublished PhD thesis (Edinburgh University)

______. 1968b. 'Imitation in the Scottish Sonnet', *Comparative Literature* 20

______. 2007. ‘Petrarch and the Scottish Renaissance Sonnet’, in *Petrarch in Britain: Interpretors, Imitators and Translators over 700 Years*, ed. by Martin McLaughlin and Letizia Panizza, with Peter Hainsworth (Oxford: British Academy/Oxford University Press)

Jacks, Philip. 1993. *The Antiquarian and the Myth of Antiquity: The Origins of Rome in Renaissance Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

James, Thomas (trans.). 1951 [1598]. *The Moral Philosophic of the Stoicks*, ed. by Rudolf Kirk. (a translation of Guillaume du Vair’s *La Philosophic Morale des Stoiques* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press)

James VI and I. 2003. *Selected Writings*, ed. by Neil Rhodes, Jennifer Richards and Joseph Marshall (Aldershot: Ashgate)

Jameson, Fredric. 1961. *Sartre: The Origins of a Style* (New Haven: Yale University Press)

_____. 2007. *The Modernist Papers* (London: Verso)

Jardine, Lisa. 1993. *Erasmus, Man of Letters: the Construction of Charisma in Print* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press)

Jarvis, Simon. 2003. ‘Prosody as Cognition’, *Critical Quarterly* 40.4, 3-15

______. 2008. ‘Thinking in Verse’, in *The Cambridge Companion to British Romantic Poetry*, ed. by James Chandler and Maureen N. McLane (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Jeffreys, Mark. 1995. 'Ideologies of Lyric: A Problem of Genre in Contemporary Anglophone Poetics', *PMLA* 110.2, 196-205

Jones, Frederic J. (trans.). 2000. *Petrarch’s Canzoniere*, 2 vols. (Market Harborough: Troubador)

Jones, Ann Rosalind, and Peter Stallybrass, 1984. ‘The Politics of *Astrophil and Stella’*. *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 24, 53-68

Jones, Ann Rosalind. 1991. ‘Designing Women: The Self as Spectacle in Mary Wroth and Veronica Franco’ in *Reading Mary Wroth: Representing Alternatives in Early Modern England*, ed. by Naomi J. Miller and Gary Waller (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press), 135-153

Kahan, Jeffrey. 2009. ‘“Shakespear wanted Arte”: Questioning the Historical Value of *Ben Jonson’s Conversations with Drummond*’, in *Talking Renaissance Texts: Essays on the Humanist Tradition in Honor of Stanley Stewart*, ed. by Jeffrey Kahan and M. Thomas Hester, Special Double Edition of *The Ben Jonson Journal* 16.1-2, 132-147

Kant, Immanuel. 1995 [1784]. ‘What is Enlightenment?’, in *The Portable Enlightenment Reader*, ed. by Isaac Kramnick (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

Kastner, L. E. (ed.) 1913. *The Poetical Works of William Drummond of Hawthornden, With ‘A Cypresse Grove’*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: William Blackwood)

Kay, Sarah. 1996. ‘The Contradictions of Courtly Love and the Origins of Courtly Poetry: The Evidence of the Lauzengiers’, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 26.2, 209-253

______. 2007. *The Place of Thought: the Complexity of One in Late Medieval French Didactic Poetry* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press)

Kelly, Joan. 1984. *Women, History & Theory: the Essays of Joan Kelly* (London: Chicago University Press)

Kennedy, William J. 1974. ‘Petrarchism in Short Narrative Poetry Of the Renaissance’, *Comparative Literature* 26:4, 318-333

______. 1994. *Authorizing Petrarch* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press)

______. 2003. *The Site of Petrarchism: Early Modern National Sentiment in Italy, France, and England* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press)

______. 2006. 'Petrarca come "Homo Economicus": Il Petrarchismo in Ronsard e Shakespeare', in *Il Petrarchismo: Un modello di poesia per l'Europa*, vol. 1, ed. by Loredana Chines (Roma: Bulzoni)

Kermode, Frank. 2010. 'Eliot and the Shudder', *London Review of Books* 32.9, 13 May: 13-16

Kerrigan, John and Gordon Braden. 1986. 'Milton's Coy Eve: *Paradise Lost* and Renaissance Love Poetry', *ELH* 53

Kerrigan, John (ed.). 1986. *The Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint*, by William Shakespeare (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

______. 2001. 'William Drummond and the British Question', in *On Shakespeare and Early Modern Literature: Essays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

______. 2008. *Archipelagic English: Literature, History and Politics 1603-1707* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Kidwell, Carol. 2004. *Pietro Bembo: Lover, Linguist, Cardinal* (Montreal and Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press)

King, Margaret L. 2005. *Humanism, Venice, and Women: Essays on the Italian Renaissance* (Variorum Collected Studies Series; Hampshire UK: Ashgate)

Knowles, Ronald. 2002. *Shakespeare's Argument with History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave)

Knox, John. 1890.*Works*, ed. David Laing. 6 vols (Edinburgh)

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. 1968. 'The Myth of Renaissance Atheism and the French Tradition of Free-Thought', *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 6.3 (July), 233-243

Krontiris, Tina. 1992. *Oppositional Voices: Women as Writers and Translators in the English Renaissance* (London: Routledge)

Laam, Kevin. 2008. ' "Lyke Chaucers Boye": Poetry and Penitence in Gascoigne's *Grief of Joye*'. *Early Modern Literary Studies* 14.1 <URL: http://purl.oclc.org/emls/14-1/article7.htm>. Accessed 12 March 2011

Laclau, Ernesto. 1996. *Emancipation(s)* (London: Verso)

Lamb, Mary Ellen. 1990. *Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press)

Lander, Jesse M. 2010. Review of Eric S. Mallin, *Godless Shakespeare* (with three other titles), *Shakespeare Quarterly* 61.1: 120-124

Lanham, Richard. 1966. 'Narrative Structure in Gascoigne's *F.J.*', *Studies in Short Fiction* 4, 42-50

Lee, Alexander. 2008. Dissertation title/ switch for book?

Lee, Sidney. 1898. *Life of William Shakespeare* (London)

Leishman, J. B. 1961. *Themes and Variations in Shakespeare's Sonnets* (London: Hutchinson)

Lerer, Seth. 1997. *Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII: Literary culture and the arts of deceit.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Levao, Ronald. 1987. Review of *Shakespeare's Perjured Eye: the invention of poetic subjectivity in the sonnets* by Joel Fineman, in *Renaissance Quarterly* 40.4 (Winter), 814-819

Levenson, Jill L. 2002. Review of Heather Dubrow's *Echoes of Desire*, in *Shakespeare Quarterly* 53:1 (Spring) 126-127

Levin, Richard. 1989. 'Bashing the bourgeois subject'. *Textual Practice* 3: 76-86

Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. 1993. *Writing Women in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press)

Lewis, C. S. 1951. *The Allegory of Love* (Oxford: Oxford Universtiy Press)

Lindley, David. 1985. *Lyric* (London: Methuen)

Lithgow, William. 1633. *Scotland's Welcome to her Native Sonn, and soveraigne Lord, King Charles*. (London)

______. 1618. *The Pilgrimes Most Humble Farewell to his Natiue Countrey of Scotland* (Edinburgh)

Luckyj, Christina. 2002. *"A moving rhetoricke": Gender and Silence in Early Modern England (*Manchester: Manchester University Press)

Lyall, Roderick J. 2006. 'London or the World? The Paradox of Culture in (post-) Jacobean Scotland', in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences*, ed. by Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer and Jason Lawrence (Basingstoke: Macmillan)

Lyne, Raphael. 2002. 'Love and Exile after Ovid', in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, ed. by Philip Hardie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 288-300.

MacArthur, Janet. ' "A Sydney, though un-named": Lady Mary Wroth and Her Poetical Progenitors', *English Studies in Canada*, 15 (1989), 12-20.

MacDonald, A. A. 1998. 'Early Modern Scottish Literature and the Parameters of Culture', in *The Rose and the Thistle*, ed. by Sally Mapstone and Juliette Wood (East Linton: Tuckwell Press)

MacDonald, Robert Hugh. 1969a. *The Manuscripts of Drummond of Hawthornden*, unpublished PhD thesis, 2 vols (Edinburgh University)

______. 1969b. 'Amendments to L.E. Kastner's Edition of Drummond's Poems'. *Studies in Scottish Literature* 7 (1-2): 102-22

______. 1971. *The Library of Drummond of Hawthornden* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

______. 1976. *William Drummond of Hawthornden: Poems and Prose* (Edinburgh and London: Scottish Academic Press for the Association for Scottish Literary Studies)

Machan, Tim William. 2011. Review of *Boethius Christianus? Transformationen der 'Consolatio Philosophiae' in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, ed. by Reinhold F. Glei, Nicola Kaminski, and Franz Lebsanft, in *Journal of the Northern Renaissance*, August 2011, <http://www.northernrenaissance.org/reviews/Reinhold-F-Glei-Nicola-Kaminski-Franz-Lebsanft-eds-emBoethius-Christianus-Transformationen-der-Consolatio-Philosophiae-in-Mittelalter-und-Frher-Neuzeitem-De-Gruyter-2010brReviewed-by-Tim-William-Machan/36> [accessed 28 September 2011]

Magnusson, Lynne. 1998. ' "Power to Hurt": Language and Service in Sidney Household Letters and Shakespeare's Sonnets', *English Literary History* 65.4: 799-824

______. 1999. *Shakespeare and Social Dialogue: Dramatic Language and Elizabethan Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Maley, Willy. 1998. 'The British Problem in Three Tracts on Ireland by Spenser, Bacon and Milton,' in *British Consciousness and Identity: the Making of Britain, 1533-1707,* ed. by Brendan Bradshaw and Peter Roberts (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Mallin, Eric S. 2007. *Godless Shakespeare* (London: Continuum)

Mandelstam, Osip. 1979. *The Complete Critical Prose and Letters*, ed. by Jane Gary Harris and trans. by Jane Gary Harris and Constance Link. (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis)

Mann, Nicholas. 1984. *Petrarch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Mann, Nicholas. 1975. *Petrarch Manuscripts in the British Isles* (Padova: Antenore)

Marotti, Arthur F. 1982. '*Love* is *Not Love*: Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order', *English Literary History* 49: 396-428

______. 1986. *John Donne, Coterie Poet* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press)

______. 1995. *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press)

Marquis, Paul A.. 2007. *Richard Tottel's Songes and Sonnettes: The Elizabethan Version* (Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies / Renaissance English Text Society)

Martellotti, Guido (ed. and trans.). 1968. *Francesco Petrarca - Laurea Occidens: Bucolicum Carmen X.* (Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura)

Martin, Christopher. 1994. *Policy in Love: Lyric and Public in Ovid, Petrarch and Shakespeare* (Duquesne University Press)

Martin, Randall (ed.). 1997. *Women Writers in Renaissance England* (London: Longman)

Marx, Karl. 1973 [1939] *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy (Rough Draft)*, trans. by Martin Nicolaus. The Pelican Marx Library (London: Allen Lane / New Left Review)

Martinez, Ronald L. 2009. '*The Book without a Name*: Petrarch's Open Secret (*Liber sine nomine*)', in *Petrarch: A Critical Guide to the Complete Works*, ed. by Victoria Kirkham and Armando Maggi (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press)

Masson, David. 1969. *Drummond of Hawthornden: The Story of His Life and Writings*, repr. of 1873 ed. (New York: Haskell House)

Masten, Jeff. 1991. ' "Shall I Turne Blabb?": Circulation, Gender, and Subjectivity in Mary Wroth's Sonnets', in *Reading Mary Wroth: Representing Alternatives in Early Modern England*, ed. by Naomi J. Miller and Gary Waller (Knoxville : University of Tennessee Press)

Mazzotta, Giuseppe. 1978. 'The *Canzoniere* and the Language of the Self', *Studies in Philology* 75: 271-296

______. 1993. *The Worlds of Petrarch* (Durham and London: Duke University Press)

McClune, Katherine. 2007. 'The Scottish Sonnet, James VI, and John Stewart of Baldynneis', in *Language Cleir Illumynate: Scottish Poetry from Barbour to Drummond, 1375-1630*, ed. by Nicola Royan (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi)

McClune, Norman Egbert (ed.). 1930. *The Letters and Epigrams of Sir John Harington, together with The Prayse of Private Life* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press)

McClure, Norman (ed.). 1939. *The Letters of John Chamberlain* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society)

McClure, J. Derrick. 1995. *Scots and its Literature* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins)

______. 2001. 'Drummond of Hawthornden and Poetic Translation', in *The European Sun: Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Medieval and Renaissance Scotttish Language and Literature*, ed. by Graham Caie and others (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press)

McCrea, Adriana. 1997. *Constant Minds: Political Virtue and the Lipsian Paradigm in England, 1584-1650* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press)

McDiarmid, M. P. 1949. 'The Spanish Plunder of William Drummond of Hawthornden', *Modern Language Review* 44, 17-25

McEachern, Claire. 1996. *The Poetics of English Nationhood, 1590-1612* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

McGann, Jerome. 2008. 'Laura Riding and the History of Twentieth-Century Poetry', in *Authority Matters: Rethinking the Theory and Practice of Authorship*, ed. by Stephen Donovan, Danuta Fjellestad and Rolf Lundén (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi)

McGavin, John. 2007. *Theatricality and Narrative in Medieval and Early Modern Scotland* (Aldershot: Ashgate)

McGinnis,, Paul J., and Arthur H. Williamson. 2002. *The British Union: a critical edition and translation of David Hume of Godscroft's De Unione Insulae Britannicae* (Aldershot: Ashgate)

______. 1995. *George Buchanan's Political Poetry* (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society/Lothian Print)

McGrath, Lynette. 2002. *Subjectivity and Women's Poetry in Early Modern England: 'Why on the ridge should she desire to go?'* (Aldershot: Aldgate)

McKenzie, Kenneth (ed.). 1912. *Concordanza delle rime di Francesco* Petrarca (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

McKeon, Michael. 2005. *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press)

McLaughlin, Martin L. 1995. *Literary Imitation in the Italian Renaissance: The Theory and Practice of Literary Imitation in Italy from Dante to Bembo* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

McNamara, Jo Ann Kay. 1996. *Sisters in Arms: Catholic Nuns through Two Millennia* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

McRae, Andrew. 2008. 'Fluvial Nation: Rivers, Mobility and Poetry in Early Modern England', *English Literary Renaissance* 38:3, 506-534

McWilliam, Colin. 1980. *The Buildings of Scotland: Lothian, except Edinburgh*. Editor-in-Chief Nikolaus Pevsner. (London: Penguin)

Miller, Karl. 1994. *Rebecca's Vest: A Memoir* (London: Penguin)

Miller, Naomi-J. 1990. 'Rewriting Lyric Fictions: The Role of the Lady in Lady Mary Wroth's "Pamphilia to Amphilanthus"', in *The Renaissance Englishwoman in Print: Counterbalancing the Canon*, ed. by Anne M. Haselkorn and Betty S. Travitsky (Amherst : University of Massachusetts Press)

______. 1996. *Changing the Subject: Mary Wroth and Figurations of Gender in Early Modern England* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky)

______. 2002. 'Mary Wroth, The Countess of Montgomery's Urania', in *A Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing,* ed. by Anita Pacheco (Oxford: Blackwell)

Miller, Paul Allen. 1991. 'Sidney, Petrarch, and Ovid, or Imitation as Subversion'. *English Literary History* 58: 499-522

Millman, Jill Seal and Wright, Gillian (eds.). 2005. *Early modern women's manuscript poetry*. (Manchester: Manchester University Press)

Mommsen, Theodor E. 1957. *Petrarch's Testament* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press)

Montanari, Fausto. 1958. *Studi sul Canzoniere del Petrarca* (Roma: Studium)

Montrose, Louis. 1986. 'The Elizabethan Subject and the Spenserian Text,' in *Literary Theory/Renaissance Texts*, ed. Patricia Parker and David Quint (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press)

Moore, Mary B. 2000. *Desiring Voices: Women Sonneteers and Petrarchism* (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press)

Morford, Mark. 1991. *Stoics and Neostoics: Rubens and the Circle of Lipsius* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)

Morgan, Edwin. 1990. *Crossing the Border: Essays in Scottish Literature* (Manchester: Carcanet)

Mortimer, Anthony. 2000. 'Petrarch', in *The Encyclopedia of Literary Translation into English*, vol. II, ed. by Olive Classe (London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn), 1069 – 1071

Mulvey, Laura. 1989. *Visual and Other Pleasures* (London: Macmillan)

Musa, Mark (trans.). 1996. *Petrarch: 'The Canzoniere' or 'Rerum vulgarium fragmenta'* (Indiana: Indiana University Press)

Mussio, Thomas E. 1997. 'The Augustinian Conflict in the Lyrics of Michelangelo: Michelangelo Reading Petrarch', *Italica* 74.3: 339-359

Najemy, John. 1993. *Between Friends: Discourses of Power and Desire in the Machiavelli-Vettori Letters of 1513-1515* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press)

Neill, Michael. 1997. *Issues of Death: Mortality and Identity in English Renaissance Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Nevalainen, Terttu. 2007. 'Introduction' to *Letter Writing*, ed. by Terttu Nevalainen and Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen (Amsterdam: John Benjamins): 2-11

Newdigate, Bernard. 1941. *Michael Drayton and His Circle* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)

Newman, Karen. 1990. 'Directing Trafic: Subjects, Objects, and the Politics of Exchange, *Differences* 2.2: 41-54

Nichols, J. G. (ed. and trans.). 2010. *My Secret Book, by Francesco Petrarca* (London: Hesperus)

Noferi, Adelia. 2001. *Frammenti per i fragmenta di Petrarca* (Roma: Bulzoni)

Norbrook, David. 2002. *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, rev. ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

______. 1999. *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Ong, Walter J. 1977. *Interfaces of the Word* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press)

Orelli, Giorgio. 1990. *Il suono dei sospiri: sul Petrarca volgare* (Torino: Einaudi)

Orlin, Lena Cowen. 1994. *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press)

______. 2007. *Locating Privacy in Tudor London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Pacheco, Anita (ed.). 2002. *A Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Paganelli, Eloisa. 1968. 'Lettere e note inedite di William Drummond of Hawthornden'. *English Miscellany* 19, 295-333

______. 1972. *La poesia di Drummond of Hawthornden* (Bari: Adriatica)

Panizza, Letizia A. 2008. 'Stoic Psychotherapy in the Middle Ages and Renaissance: Petrarch's *De Remediis*', in *The Erotics of Consolation: Desire and Distance in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. by Catherine Léglu and Stephen J. Milner (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)

Panofsky, Erwin. 1960. *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art (*Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell)

Parker, Patricia. 1987. *Literary Fat Ladies: rhetoric, gender, property* (London/N.Y.: Methuen)

Pateman, Carol. 1989. *The Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism and Political Theory* (Cambridge: Polity Press)

Pater, Walter. 1959. *The Renaissance: Studies in Art and Poetry*, ed. by Louis Kronenberger (New York)

Patterson, Lee. 1990. 'On the Margin: Postmodernism, ironic history, and medieval studies', *Speculum* 65, 87-108

Paulissen, May N. 1982. *The Love Sonnets of Lady Mary Wroth: A Critical Introduction* (Salzburg: Inst.fur Anglistik & Amerikanistik, Univ. Salzburg)

Payne, Paula Harms. 1999. 'Finding a Poetic Voice of Her Own: Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania* and *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*,' in *Pilgrimage for Love: Essays in Early Modern Literature in Honor of Josephine A. Roberts*, ed. bySigrid King (Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies)

Pequigney, Joseph. 1999. 'Sonnets 71-74: Texts and Contexts' in *Shakespeare's Sonnets: Critical Essays*, ed. by James Schiffer (New York and London), 285-304

Perry, Curtis. 1998. 'Inwardness as Sedition in Heywood and Marlowe', in *The Future of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Problems, Trends, and Opportunities for Research*, ed. by Roger Dahood. Arizona Studies in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, 2 (Turnhout: Brepols)

Petrarca, Francesco. 1975. *Opere*. Firenze: Sansoni,

______. 1974. *Bucolicum Carmen*, trans. by Thomas G. Bergin (London: Yale University Press)

______. 1995. *In difesa dell'Italia (Contra Eum qui maledixit Italie),* ed. and trans. by Giuliana Cretavin (Venice: Marsilio)

______. 1948. *On His Own Ignorance, and That of Many Others*, trans. Hans Nachod, in *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man*, ed. Ernst Cassirer, Paul Oskar Kristeller, and John Herman Randall, Jr. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

______. 1999. *De Ignorantia (Du sui ipsius et multorum ignorantia*), ed. and trans. (into Italian) Enrico Fenzi (Milan)

Petrie, Jennifer. 2007. 'Petrarch *solitarius'*, in *Petrarch in Britain: Interpretors, Imitators and Translators over 700 Years*, ed. by Martin McLaughlin and Letizia Panizza, with Peter Hainsworth. Proceedings of the British Academy 146 (Oxford: British Academy/Oxford University Press)

Piccini, Daniele. 2004. *Un Amico del Petrarca: Sennuco del Bene e le sue rime* (Roma – Padova: Antenore)

Pincombe, Mike, and Cathy Shrank. 2010. 'Doing Away With the Drab Age: Research Opportunities in Mid-Tudor Literature (1530-1580). *Literature Compass* 7:3 (March), 160-176

Porter, Roy and Mikuláš Teich (eds.). 1992. *The Renaissance in National Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Post, Jonathan F. 1999. *English Lyric Poetry: The Early Seventeenth Century* (London: Routledge)

Poulet, Georges. 1972. 'Criticism and the Experience of Interiority', in *The Structuralist Controversy: The Language of Criticism and the Sciences of Man*, ed. by

Richard A. Macksey and Eugenio Donato (Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins University Press), 56-72

Praz, Mario. 1958. *The Flaming Heart* (New York)

Pritchard. R. E. 1996. 'Introduction' to *Lady Mary Wroth: Poems: A Modernized Edition* (Keele: Keele University Press)

Pugh, Syrithe. 2007. 'Sidney, Spenser, and Political Petrarchism' in *Petrarch in Britain: Interpretors, Imitators and Translators over 700 Years*, ed. by Martin McLaughlin and Letizia Panizza, with Peter Hainsworth. Proceedings of the British Academy 146 (Oxford: British Academy/Oxford University Press)

Puttenham, George. 1968 [1589]. *The Arte of English Poesie* (Michigan: Scolar Press)

Quillen, Carol E. 1992. 'A Tradition Invented: Petrarch, Augustine, and the Language of Humanism', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 53.2: 179-207

______. 1998. *Rereading the Renaissance: Petrarch, Augustine, and the Language of Humanism* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press)

Quilligan, Maureen. 1990. 'The Constant Subject: Instability and Female Authority in Wroth's *Urania* Poems', in *Soliciting Interpretation: Literary Theory and Seventeenth-Century English Poetry*, ed. by Elizabeth Harvey and Katharine Eisaman Maus (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Rae, Thomas. I. 1975. 'Historical Writing of William Drummond', *Scottish Historical Review* 54:1

______. 1974. 'The Political Attitudes of Drummond of Hawthornden', in *The Scottish Tradition: Essays Presented to R. G. Cant*, ed. by G.W.S. Barrow (Edinburgh), 132-146

Rebholz, R. A. (ed.). 1978. *Sir Thomas Wyatt: The Complete Poems* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

Reid, David. 1987. 'Royalty and Self-Absorption in Drummond's Poetry', *Studies in Scottish Literature* 22, 115-131

Revel, Jacques. 1989. 'The Uses of Civility', in *A History of Private Life. Volume 3: Passions of the Renaissance*, ed. by Roger Chartier, trans. by Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press), 167-205

Rico, Francisco. 1974. *Vida u obra del Petrarca: lectura del Secretum* (Padua: Antenore)

______. 2008. *Gabbiani* (Milan: Adelphi)

Ridley, Jasper (ed.). 1988. *The Love Letters of Henry VIII* (London: Cassell)

Roberts, Josephine A. 1983. *The Poems of Lady Mary Wroth* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press)

______ (ed.). 1995. *The First Part of the Countess of Montgomery's Urania*. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 140/ Renaissance English Text Society, 17 (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies)

______ (ed.). 1999. *The Second Part of the Countess of Montgomery's Urania,* completed by Suzanne Gossett and Janel Mueller. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 211/ Renaissance English Text Society, 24 (Tempe, Arizona: Renaissance English Text Society in conjunction with Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies)

Roberts, Sasha. 2001. 'Shakespeare "creepes into the women's closets about bedtime": women reading in a room of their own', in *Renaissance Configurations: Voices, Bodies, Spaces, 1580-1690,* ed. by Gordon McMullen (London: Palgrave Macmillan)

Robson, Mark. 2003. 'Defending Poetry, or, is there an early modern aesthetic?' in New Aestheticism, ed. by John J. Joughin and Simon Malpas (Manchester: Manchester University Press), 119-130

Roche, Thomas P. 1989. *Petrarch and the English Sonnet Sequences* (New York: AMS Press)

______. 2005. *Petrarch in English* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

Rollins, H. (ed.). 1944. *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company)

Roubaud, Jacques. 2006. *Poetry Etcetera: Cleaning House* (Los Angeles: Green Integer)

Royan, Nicola, with Dauvit Broun. 2007. 'Versions of Scottish Nationhood, c.850-1707', in *The Edinburgh History of Scottish Literature, Volume One: From Columba to the Union (until 1707)*, ed. by Thomas Owen Clancy and Murray Pittock; gen. ed. Ian Brown (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

Salmon, J. H. M. 1989. 'Stoicism and Roman Example: Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 50, 199-225

Salutati, Collucci. 1978. 'Letter to Pellegrino Zambecari', trans. Ronald G. Witt in *The Earthly Republic: Italian Humanists on Government and Society*, ed. Benjamin G. Kohl and Ronald G. Witt (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press)

Salzman, Paul. 1978. 'Contemporary References in Mary Wroth's Urania'. *Review of English Studies* (New Series), 29.114 (May), 178-181

Sanders, Wilbur. 1991. 'Wilting Petrarchists and Sturdy Natives', *Cambridge Quarterly* 20: 370-75

Sandy, Amelia Zurcher. 2002. 'Pastoral, Temperance, and the Unitary Self in Wroth's *Urania' Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 42:1 (Winter), 103-120

Santagata, Marco. 1992. *I frammenti dell'anima: Storia e racconto nel Canzoniere di Petrarca* (Bologna: Mulino)

______. 1989 (1979). *Dal sonetto al Canzoniere: ricerche sulla preistoria e la constituzione di un genere* (Padua: Liviana)

Saunders, J. W. 1951. 'The Stigma of Print: A Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry', *Essays in Criticism* 1:2 (April): 139–6

______. 1964. *The Profession of English Letters* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul)

Schalkwyk, David. 2008. *Shakespeare, Love and Service* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

______. 2000. *Speech and Performance in Shakespeare's Sonnets and Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Schmidgall, Gary. 1984. 'Forum: "Shakespeare's Sonnets"', *PMLA* 99:2 (March), 244-245

Schmidt, Jeremy. 2007. *Melancholy and the Care of the Soul: Religion, Moral Philosophy and Madness in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate)

Schneider, Gary. 2002. 'The Public, the Private, and the Shaming of the Shrew'. *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 42:2 (Spring), 235-258

Schwend, J. 1989. 'Nationalism in Scottish Medieval and Renaissance Literature' in *Nationalism in Literature/Literarischer Nationalismus: Literature, Language and National Identity*, ed. by H. W. Drescher and H. Volkel (Frankfurt), 29-42

Scott-Bauman, Elizabeth, and Ben Burton. 2010. 'Encoding Form', *Appositions*. Accessed 12 February 2011 <http://appositions.blogspot.com/2010/02/e-scott-baumann-b-burton-encoding-form.html>

Seelig, Sharon Cadman. 2002. 'The Poets of the Renaissance: or, The Illusions of My Youth', in *Fault Lines and Controversies in the Study of Seventeenth-Century*

*English Literature*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbio, MO: University of Missouri Press), 156-169

Sellars, John (ed.). 2006. *Justus Lipsius: On Constancy – the De Constantia translated by Sir John Stradling* (1595) (Exeter: Bristol Phoenix Press)

Seneca. 1958. *Moral Essays*, trans. by John W. Basore, Loeb Classical Library, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press)

Severance, Sibyl Lutz. 1981. '"Some Other Figure": The Vision of Change in Flowres of Sion, 1623' *Spenser Studies* 2, 217-228

Shaheen, Naseeb. 1994. 'Shakespeare's knowledge of Italian'. *Shakespeare Studies* 47, 161-169

Shifflett, Andrew Eric. 1998. *Stoicism, politics, and literature in the age of Milton: war and peace reconciled* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Shire, Helena Mennie. 1969. *Song, Dance and Poetry of the Court of Scotland under King James VI.* (Cambridge)

Shrank, Cathy. 2008a. ' "Matters of love as of discourse": The English Sonnet, 1560-1580', *Studies in Philology* 105:1, 30-49

______. 2008b. '"But I, that knew what harbred in that hed": Thomas Wyatt and his Posthumous "Interpreters"', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 154, 375-402

______. 2004. '"These fewe scribbled rules": Representing Scribal Intimacy in Early Modern Print', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67.2: 295-314

Sidney, Sir Philip. 1964 [1595]. *A Defence of Poesy*, ed. by Dorothy M. Macardie (London: Macmillan)

Simpson, Evelyn M. 1948. *A Study of the Prose Works of John Donne* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Simpson, James. 2004. *Reform and Cultural Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Skura, Meredith Anne. 2008. *Tudor Autobiography: Listening for Inwardness* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Smalley, Beryl. 1960. *English Friars and Antiquity in the Early Fourteenth Century (*Oxford: Blackwell)

Smarr, Janet Levarie. 2001. 'Substituting for Laura: Objects of Desire for Renaissance Women Poets,' *Comparative Literature Studies* 38:1, 1-30

Smith, Barbara Herrnstein. 1978. *On the Margins of Discourse* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

Smith, Rosalind. 2000. 'Lady Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*: The Politics of Withdrawal'. *English Literary Renaissance* 30: 408-431

Sperberg-McQueen, M.R. 1995. 'Gardening Without Eve: The Role of the Feminine in Justus Lipsius's *De Constantia* and in Neo-Stoic Thought', *German Quarterly* 68.4, 389-407

Spiller, Michael R. G. 1998. 'The Scottish Court and the Scottish Sonnet at the Union of the Crowns', in *The Rose and the Thistle*, ed. by Sally Mapstone and Juliette Wood (East Linton: Tuckwell Press)

______. 2001. *Early Modern Sonneteers: From Wyatt to Milton* (Tavistock: Northcote House)

______. 2007. '"Quintessencing in the Finest Substance": the Sonnets of William Drummond', in *Language Cleir Illumynate: Scottish Poetry from Barbour to Drummond, 1375-1630*, ed. by Nicola Royan (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi)

Stein, Arnold. 1986. *The House of Death: Messages from the English Renaissance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press)

Steinberg, Justin. 2009. 'Petrarch's Damned Poetry and the Poetics of Exclusion: *Rime disperse*', in *Petrarch: A Critical Guide to the Complete Works*, ed. by Victoria Kirkham and Armando Maggi (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press)

Stephens, Dorothy. 1998. *The Limits of Eroticism in Post-Petrarchan narrative: Conditional Pleasure from Spenser to Marvell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Stevenson, David. 1982. ' "The Letter on Sovereign Power" and the Influence of Bodin's Political Thought on Scotland', *Scottish History Review* 61

Stevenson, Jane and Peter Davidson. 2009. 'Ficino in Aberdeen: The Continuing Problem of the Scottish Renaissance', *Journal of the Northern Renaissance* 1:1

Stewart, Alan. 2008. *Shakespeare's Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Stewart, Alan and Heather Wolfe. 2005. *Letterwriting in Renaissance England* (Washington, DC: Folger Shakespeare Library)

Stock, Brian. 2001. *After Augustine: The Meditative Reader and the Text* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press)

______. 1996. *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge, and the Ethics of Interpretation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press)

______. 1995. 'Reading, Writing, and the Self: Petrarch and his Forerunners' *New Literary History* 26:4, 717-730.

Stortoni, Laura Anna and Lillie, Mary Prentice (eds.). 1997. *Women Poets of the Italian Renaissance: Courtly Ladies and Courtesans* (New York: Italica Press)

Strier, Richard. 2002. 'How Formalism Became a Dirty Word, and Why We Can't Do Without It', in *Renaissance Literature and Its Formal Engagements*, ed. by Mark David Rasmussen (New York: Palgrave), 207-215

______. 2004. 'Against the Rule of Reason: Praise of Passion from Petrarch to Luther to Shakespeare to Herbert', in *Reading the Early Modern Passions: essays in the cultural history of emotion*, ed. by Gail Kern Paster, Katherine Rowe, and Mary Floyd-Wilson (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press), 23-42

Summit, Jennifer. 2000. 'Topography as Historiography: Petrarch, Chaucer, and the Making of Medieval Rome', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 30, 211-246

Sylvester, Joshua. 1613. *Lachrimae Lachrimarum* (London: H. Lownes)

Targoff, Ramie. 2010. 'Passion', in *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*, ed. by Brian Cummings and James Simpson (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 615-634

Tatarkiewicz, Władysław. 2005. *History of Aesthetics*, ed. by C. Barrett, 3 vols. (London: Continuum)

Taylor, Charles. 1989. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Thompson, David. 1971. *Petrarch: A Humanist Among Princes. An Anthology of Petrarch's Letters and Selections from His Other Works* (London: Harper & Row)

Thomson, Patricia (ed.) 1974. *Thomas Wyatt: The Critical Heritage* (London and New York: Routledge)

Tichy, Matthias. 2007. 'The anticipation of the true concept of the universal in art and experience', in *Theodor W. Adorno: Critical Evaluations in Cultural Theory*, ed. by Simon Jarvis, 4 vols (London and New York: Routledge), I.221-225

Trinkaus, Charles. 1979. *The Poet as Philosopher: Petrarch and the Formation of Renaissance Consciousness* (New Haven: Yale University Press)

Van den Bossche, Bart. 2005. ' "Quegli amori che son dolci senza amaritudine": The Petrarchist Bembo in *The Book of the Courtier*', in *Petrarch and His Readers in the Renaissance*, ed. by Karl A. Enenkel and Jan Papy. Vol. 6 of *Intersections: Yearbook for Early Modern Studies* (Leiden and Boston: Brill)

Van Heijnsbergen, Theo & Nicola Royan (eds.). 2002. *Literature, Letters and the Canonical in Early Modern Scotland* (East Lothian: Tuckwell Press)

Vendler, Helen. 1997. *The Art of Shakespeare's Sonnets* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press)

Verweij, Sebastiaan. 2007. 'The Manuscripts of William Fowler: A Revaluation of *The Tarantula of Love*, *A Sonnet Sequence*, and *Of Death*', *Scottish Studies Review* 8:2, 9-23

Vincent, Andrew. *Nationalism and Particularity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Vickers, Brian. 1990. 'Leisure and Idleness in the Renaissance: the ambivalence of otium', *Renaissance Studies*, 4.1, 1-37

Vickers, Nancy J. 1981. 'Diana Described; Scattered Woman and Scattered Rhyme,' *Critical Inquiry* 8

______. 1988. 'Vital Signs: Petrarch and Popular Culture', *Romanic Review* 79.1: 184-194

Vighi, Fabio, and Heiko Feldner. 2007. *Žižek: beyond Foucault* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)

Walker, Greg. 2005. *Writing Under Tyranny: English Literature and the Henrician Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

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

Wallace, David. 1997. *Chaucerian Polity: Absolutist Lineages and Associational Forms in England and Italy*. (Stanford: Stanford University Press)

Waller, G. F. 1976. *The Strong Necessity of Time: The Philosophy of Time in Shakespeare and Elizabethan Literature* (The Hague: Mouton)

Waller, Gary. 1993. *The Sidney Family Romance: Mary Wroth, William Herbert, and the Early Modern Construction of Gender* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press)

Wallerstein, Ruth C. 1933. 'The Style of Drummond of Hawthornden in its Relation to his Translations', *P.M.L.A.* 48

Warley, Christopher. 2005. *Sonnet Sequences and Social Distinction in Renaissance England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

______. 2010a. 'readability the sequel', *Arcade*, 7 March: accessed 28 July 2010. <http://arcade.stanford.edu/readability-sequel>

______. 2010 b. 'Uncanonizing Lady Mary Wroth?', *Arcade*, 2nd October: accessed 04 September 2011. <http://arcade.stanford.edu/rip-lady-mary-wroth>

Warner, Michael. 2002. 'Publics and Counterpublics', *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 88.4: 410-454

Watson, George G. 1967. *The English Petrarchans: A Critical Bibliography of the Canzoniere* (London: Warburg Institute)

Watson, Robert N. 1994. *The Rest is Silence: Death as Annihilation in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley; London: University of California Press)

Wearden, Graeme. 2009. 'Gold prices hit fresh high', *The Guardian*, 13th October, accessed online 14.07.2010 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2009/oct/13/gold-price-record>

Weiss, R. 1964. *The Spread of Italian Humanism* (London: Hutchinson)

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

Weiss, Wolfgang. 1986. 'The Theme and Structure of Drummond of Hawthornden's Sonnet Sequence', in *Scottish Language and Literature, Medieval and Renaissance*, ed. by Dietrich Strauss and Horst W. Drescher (Frankfurt)

Wenzel, Siegfried. 1961. 'Petrarch's Accidia'. *Studies in the Renaissance* 8, 36-48

Wilkins, Ernest. Hatch. 1955. *Studies in the Life and Works of Petrarch* (Cambridge, Mass.: Medieval Academy of America)

Wilkins, Ernest. Hatch. 1950. 'A General Survey of Renaissance Petrarchism'. *Comparative Literature* 2.4: 327-342

Wilkinson, John. 1987. 'Cadence'. *Reality Studios* 9, 81-86

Williams, John. 1990 [1963], *English Renaissance Poetry* (University of Arkansas Press)

Williamson, A. H. 1979. *Scottish national consciousness in the reign of James VI* (Edinburgh)

Wilson, E. C. 1939. *England's Eliza* (Harvard University Press)

Wilson, F.P. 1963. *The Plague in Shakespeare's London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Winters, Yvor. 1939. 'The Sixteenth-Century Lyric in England'. *Poetry* 54.1

______. 1967. 'Aspects of the Short Poem in the English Renaissance', in *Forms of Discovery: Critical and Historical Essays on the Forms of the Short Poem in English* (Chicago: Swallow Press), 1-120

Witt, Ronald G. 2000. *In the Footsteps of the Ancients: The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni* (Leiden: Brill)

Wittig, Kurt. 1958. *The Scottish Tradition in Literature* (Edinburgh: Mercat Press)

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1969. *On Certainty*, ed. by G. E. M. Anscombe and G. H. von Wright, trans. Denis Paul and G. E. M. Anscombe (Oxford: Blackwell)

Woodbridge, Linda. 1984. *Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womankind, 1540–1620* (Brighton: Harvester)

Wormald, Jenny. 1981. *Court, kirk, and community: Scotland, 1470-1625* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

Wright, Elizabeth. 2000. *Lacan and Postfeminism* (Duxford: Icon Books)

Wroth, Mary, Lady. 1621. *The Countesse of Mountgomeries Urania* (London)

Wyatt, Sir Thomas. 1969. *The Complete Poems*. ed. by R.A. Rebholz (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press)

Wynne-Davies, Marion. 1992. 'The Queen's Masque: Renaissance Women and the Seventeenth-Century Court Masque', in *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance*, ed. by S.P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies (Detroit: Wayne State UP), 79-10

Zacour, Norman P. 1973. *Petrarch's Book Without a Name: A Translation of the Liber Sine Nomine* (Toronto: The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies)

Zaret, David. 1992. 'Religion, Science, and Printing in the Public Spheres in Seventeenth-Century England', in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. by Craig Calhoun (London and Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press), 212-235

Ziegler, Georgianna. 1990. *My Lady's Chamber: female space, female chastity in Shakespeare* (London: Methuen)

Žižek, Slavoj. 1999. *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology* (London: Verso)

______. 2009. *First as Tragedy, Then as Farce* (London: Verso)

Zuccato, Edoardo. 2005. *The Revival of Petrarch in Eighteenth-Century England* (Milan: Arcipelago Edizioni)