Emulous Fellowship

and the Elizabethan Pastoral Eclogue

by

Nathan Jursza Szymanski

M.A. (English), Concordia University, 2009
B.A. (Liberal Arts), Dartmouth College, 2005

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in the
Department of English
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Fall 2017

Approval

Name: **Nathan Jursza Szymanski**
Degree: **Doctor of Philosophy**
Title: ***Emulous Fellowship and the Elizabethan Pastoral Eclogue***

Examining Committee: **Chair:** Michelle Levy
Professor

Tiffany Werth
Senior Supervisor
Associate Professor

Ronda Arab
Supervisor
Associate Professor

Vin Nardizzi
Supervisor
Associate Professor

John Craig
Internal Examiner
Professor
Department of History
Simon Fraser University

Stephen Guy-Bray
External Examiner
Professor
Department of English
University of British Columbia

Date Defended/Approved: December 05, 2017

Abstract

"Emulous Fellowship and the Elizabethan Pastoral Eclogue" re-conceptualizes literary composition according to ideas of competition unique to early modern England. Elizabethan terms of fellowship—including copemate, emulator, and competitor—might connote positive, reciprocal relationships while simultaneously suggesting opposition, antagonism, and envy. This "emulous" language structures much of the dialogue in Elizabethan English eclogues, a verse form modelled after ancient singing shepherds and popularized by Philip Sidney and Edmund Spenser. My dissertation starts with the eclogue's humble beginnings in early modern schoolrooms and finishes with its usage in elegizing Elizabeth I and in praising James I. Hence, the dissertation's arc, loosely based on the Virgilian literary career (or *rota*), progresses from youth until death, and from shepherds to princes. As both canonical and lesser-known poets present "composition as competition" modelled after the eclogue's pseudo-rustic lessons, singing contests, amorous invitations, and funeral rehearsals, they showcase unstable, competitive relationships between shepherds and between shepherd-poets. This dissertation aims to restore the eclogue, long regarded as leisurely pastoral verse associated with poetic neophytes, to its Elizabethan context: a significant literary form through which shepherd-poets, engaging their fellows as copemates, emulators, and competitors, cast poetic composition as exercises in power and hierarchy.

Keywords: Renaissance and early modern poetry and drama; pastoral eclogue; rivalry; emulation; competition; pedagogy; homoeroticism; queer; Barnabe Googe; Edmund Spenser; Sir Philip Sidney; Christopher Marlowe; William Shakespeare; Elizabeth I

Acknowledgements

Thanks to my supervisor Dr. Tiffany Werth for her tireless support and for being a dedicated mentor, teacher, confidante, and friend. Her commitment to the material that she studies, to her students, and to the profession at large continues to motivate and inspire me. Thanks to Dr. Ronda Arab for her help and friendship, including during those first disorienting years of my PhD but especially during these final couple years—she has been an engaged, careful, and clear-sighted reader of various drafts of my dissertation. And thanks to Dr. Vin Nardizzi, another wonderful reader, who has consistently made me feel as though I am a cherished student and friend, despite working at a different institution. These three professors have been the keystone and springers around which the following intellectual work has been built, and I cannot thank the three of them enough.

Dr. Carolyn Lesjak, Dr. Peter Dickinson, Dr. Jeff Derksen, and Dr. Michelle Levy have all exceeded their roles as graduate chairs (or acting graduate chairs) during my time at SFU. They consistently and seamlessly provided support when it was needed most. Thanks to Dr. Tom Grieve for being a really great teacher and for reminding me why I love poetry outside the Renaissance too. Thanks to Dr. Betty Schellenberg and Dr. Diana Solomon, two 18th-century English professors who have been supportive and influential. Thanks to Dr. Steve Collis, fellow Tsawwassenite, for his friendship and mentorship. And thanks to the SFU Renaissance team, especially Dr. James Fleming, but also Dr. Paul Budra, Dr. Gavin Paul, Dr. Torsten Kehler, and Dr. David Coley (who almost works in the Renaissance). Thanks to Maureen Curtin, Christa Gruninger, and Wendy Harris for countless hours of help.

I've been lucky to make a few friends in the department, though especially Matt Tomkinson, whose friendship over these last couple years has been both surprising and uplifting. And who could forget the three amigos: Kyle Carpenter, Dr. Nico Dicecco, and Dr. Justin O'Hearn. Also, Kandice Sharren, David Weston, Natalie Knight, Steve Hahn, Ryan Fitzpatrick, Lauren Fournier, Heath Wood, Kelsey Blair, George Temple, Lauren Perchuk, Emily Lauman, Taylor Morphett, Dr. Sarah Creel, Dr. Alison Dean, Dr. Marc Acherman, Dr. Erin Keating, Dr. Jennifer Scott, Dr. Amy De'Ath, and Dr. Chris Ewart. I am also grateful for my friends in the English department at University of British Columbia, many of whom have since moved on: Dr. Sarah Crover, Dr. Noelle Phillips, Dr. William Green, Eve Preus, and Katie Davison.

My work has benefited from the continued support of several professors at Concordia University, where I did my M.A., though especially Dr. Judith Herz, Dr. Kevin Pask, and Dr. Marcie Frank.

Thank you to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) for their support. In granting me a CGS Doctoral Scholarship and a Michael Smith Foreign Study Supplement, SSHRC has provided me with the time to think and the means to travel. Thank you to Dr. Lucy Munro and Dr. Cameron Laux for their support in London. Also, thank you to Simon Fraser University for the many private awards and for being such a wonderful place to study. I also want to respectfully acknowledge that SFU is on unceded Tsleil-Waututh, Skwxwú7mesh, and Musqueam lands.

I have several haunts where the writing gets done and in each of these places I have overstayed my welcome: the Woodn' Frog Coffee Shop, the Tsawwassen Public Library,

and my in-laws spare bedroom / office. Thank you to the staff at the Frog and at the library, and a heartfelt thanks to Lorie and Dominic, who opened up their home to me on day one. Thanks also to Jodi and Kevin for the fantastic (and free) childcare.

The support of my Ottawa family has been relentless, and I am grateful to have grown up in a family that honours learning and the arts. Thanks to my father Leo, my mother Suzana, and my brother Andy. To my two kids, Dom and Rose, two beacons of perpetual light: what I give to you will never equal what you give to me.

Finally, Beth: what can I say? Nearing an end always makes me think of beginnings—like that time in 2010 we pushed my desk through the snow from Verdun to the new apartment in Pointe-Saint-Charles. We had just started dating and I was waiting to hear back from schools, trying to save a little money. But pushing a desk that far through snow? It took strength, stamina, and some stupidity. And did I even thank you? I think about the desk getting stuck beneath the overpass, or finding cardboard to make a sled for it to slide on, or you taking a rest on top of it and laughing.

I hope you will forgive the obvious analogue between a) pushing an upturned desk through snow to some distant end point and b) writing a dissertation. The point is that I have been blessed to have you by my side then and now, and this dissertation is dedicated to you.

Table of Contents

Approval ii
Abstract iii
Acknowledgements iv
Table of Contents vii
List of Figures ix

Introduction: "Emulous Fellowship" 1
I "… and the Elizabethan Pastoral Eclogue" 22
II Why eclogue? 39
III The structure of this dissertation 48

Chapter 1 "By emulation and striuing who may do best": the Shepherds' Forum and Opening Eclogues 53
I Shepherds' forum 59
II *Aemulatio* and Sir Philip Sidney's "The Lady of May" 67
III *Imitatio* and "The First Eclogues" in Sidney's *Old Arcadia* 76
IV Sexuality and pedagogy in the opening eclogue 90

Chapter 2. "Thou shalt ycrouned be in *Colins* stede": the Singing Contest in Edmund Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calender* 103
I Virgilian and Spenserian riddles 113
II Spenser's "choise Friend" Sidney 120
III E.K., Colin, and the English eclogue tradition 132
IV Champion shepherds 143
V Coda: Spenser's other contest 147

Chapter 3. "Then Shalt thou be my competitor": the Invitation to Love and Christopher Marlowe 151
I Marlowe's invitation to love and the eclogue tradition 154
II Marlowe's passionate and sporting shepherds in *Hero and Leander* 174
III Come with me and be my competitor 183
IV Coda: Marlowe and Shakespeare's losing shepherds 190

Chapter 4: "Ile chiefe mourner be": Rehearsing Death and the Pastoral Elegy 197
I Virgil among the Elizabethans 202
II *Meliboeus* and *Astrophel* 209
III "A Mayden-Queene, and now a manly King" 225

Bibliography 236

Appendix: Three Poems 253

List of Figures

Figure 1. The woodcut that fronts "August" in Edmund Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579).....112

Figure 2. The opening image of Barnabe Googe's *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* (1563).....138

Introduction: "Emulous Fellowship"

I begin "Emulous Fellowship and the Elizabethan Pastoral Eclogue" by walking back over familiar literary terrain and briefly pausing over seven examples of men using terms of fellowship. Each example depicts the use of a term with an unfamiliar meaning for the modern reader. The aggregate of seven examples provides the foundation for the ensuing analysis while also providing a clarification of the first two words in my dissertation's title, "Emulous Fellowship." My close analysis of early modern "emulous" terminology and of the shifting concepts it represents is inspired by stalwart philological studies by Jeff Masten and Peter Stallybrass.[1] Without further delay, I turn my reader's attention to these familiar examples while quoting Claudio from *Much Ado About Nothing:* "Let every eye negotiate for itself / And trust no agent" (2.1.156-7).[2]

[1] Jeff Masten's latest book, *Queer Philologies: Sex, Language, and Affect in Shakespeare's Time* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), suggests that "[t]here can be no nuanced cultural history of early modern sex and gender without spelling out its terms" (16), and the book includes readings of "boys" in/as text, of "sweet" as a term of address, and of "fundament" as a body part. See also Peter Stallybrass, "Shakespeare, the Individual, and the Text," in *Cultural Studies* ed. Larry Grossberg, Cary Nelson, Paul A. Treichler (New York: Routledge, 1992), 593-612. Stallybrass reads the word "individual" not as an emerging modern concept, but as both a "specific signifier" (593) deployed during the seventeenth century that eventually comes to define how Shakespearean authorship is constructed. Stallybrass's focus on collaborative authorship is furthered by Jeff Masten in *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), who suggests that early modern ideals of male friendship (as depicted, for instance, in Michel de Montaigne's "On Friendship") mark collaborative writing with homoeroticism.

[2] All quotations from Shakespeare's plays are from *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997) unless otherwise noted in a footnote. This dissertation follows the formatting guidelines set forth by *The Chicago Manual of Style: 16th Edition* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2010) and uses the footnotes-bibliography citation system outlined in Chapter 14. I have taken some formatting liberties (including single-space block quotations) to improve readability.

The first example is from the first twenty lines of William Shakespeare's *Hamlet,* between the guards Bernardo and Francisco:

> Bernardo: Have you had quiet guard?
> Francisco: Not a mouse stirring.
> Barnardo: Well, good night.
> If you do meet Horatio and Marcellus,
> The **rivals** of my watch, bid them make haste (1.1.10-3).

Example two is in Christopher Marlowe's *Tamburlaine I*, when Tamburlaine solicits his first army general, Theridamas, to leave King Mycetes:

> Tamburlaine: Join with me now in this my mean estate […]
> And when my name and honour shall be spread […]
> Then shalt thou be **competitor** with me
> And sit with Tamburlaine in all his majesty (1.2.203-9).[3]

Example three is in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*, when Oliver goads Charles before the wrestling match against Orlando, Oliver's youngest brother:

> Oliver: I'll tell thee, Charles, it [Orlando] is the stubbornest young fellow of France, full of ambition, an **envious emulator** of every man's good parts, a secret and villainous contriver against me his natural brother (1.1.133-6).

Example four is in *I Henry IV* when the Archbishop of York speaks about King Henry's forces:

> York: the king hath drawn
> The special head of all the land together:
> The Prince of Wales, Lord John of Lancaster,
> The noble Westmoreland, and warlike Blunt;
> And more **corrivals** and dear men
> Of estimation and command in arms (4.4.26-31).

Example five is in a short stage direction in *Much Ado About Nothing*:

[3] Christopher Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus and Other Plays,* eds. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

> *Enter* Dogberry *and his* ***compartner*** [Verges], *with the* Watch. (3.3.1 s.d.).

Example six brings me back to *As You Like It*, and to Duke Senior's first lines in the forest when he takes a breath of fresh air and turns to his fellows:

> Duke: Now, my **co-mates** and brothers in exile,
> Hath not old custom made this life more sweet
> Than that of painted pomp? (2.1.1-3).

Example seven is by a more obscure author, Francis Sabie, who in the preface to *Pan's Pipe* (1595) writes a word that resembles "co-mates,"

> Or clownish Coridon, one while taking and giuing quaint taunts and priuy quips of and to his froliking **Copemates**: One while againe contending for superiority, in turning rurall ditties on Pans patorall pipe.[4]

The first three examples in the quotations above—rival, competitor, and emulator—contrast with our current understanding of these terms: Barnardo's request that Francisco bid his "rivals" make haste implies partnership between the guards, not opposition; Tamburlaine's proposition to Theridamas to become a "competitor" means (at its face) to become a partner working toward a common goal as opposed to becoming an adversary, the expected modern meaning; meanwhile, Oliver's branding of his brother

[4] Francis Sabie, Author's Preface, in *Pan's Pipe, Three Pastoral Eclogues, with Other Verses, by Francis Sabie (1595)*, eds. James W. Bright and Wilfred P. Mustard *Modern Philology* 7 no. 4 (Apr., 1910) 442. Admittedly, this is the most obscure example, though it succintly captures the multifariouness of the term. One finds the term "copemates" in Shakespeare's *The Rape of Lucrece* and a more sexualized "copemates" in Robert Greene's *Greenes Groates-Worth of Witte* and *Menaphon*.

as an "emulator" connotes the term's sixteenth-century proximity to "envy."[5] It would be incorrect to assume that these three terms contained any singularity of meaning now or then, but what is especially notable is the uncertainty of whether the person addressed—as competitor, rival, or emulator—is a friend or an adversary (or even a blood relation, in Orlando's case), according to the early modern understandings of these terms.

In the examples above, I have generally chosen popular playwrights, though the ambiguous usages of these terms accord with countless poets and prose writers in the period. When the shepherd Democles uses the terms "rivals" and "emulators" in Robert Greene's *Menaphon* (1589) to add context to the singing contest between the shepherds Menaphon and Melicertus, the meaning of both terms is at odds with the two opening examples from Shakespeare:

> Arcadian swains, whose wealth is content, whose labours are tempered with sweet loves, whose minds aspire not, whose thoughts brook no envy, only as rivals in affection you are friendly emulators in honest fancy.[6]

In contrast to Oliver's "envious emulators," Democles's "friendly emulators," ones who "brook no envy," positions the concept of emulation at a distance from its sinful, accompanying emotion, envy. Democles uses the term "emulator" as a synonym for "rival," and the ensuing suggestion that Menaphon and Melicertus are "rivals in

[5] The "envious emulators" example recalls recent scholarship on "envy" that takes notice of the term's distinction with "emulation." Working in the early modern period, Lynn Meskill, *Ben Jonson and Envy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) provides a reading of Jonson's plays that views the role of spectator and reader from a writer's perspective, and she highlights the extent to which Jonson describes the relationship between author and spectator/reader in envious terms. The only book-length study that addresses emulation in early modern England is Vernon Guy Dickson, *Emulation on the Shakespearean Stage* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2013), which reads emulation in the plays of Shakespeare through specific references to classical ideas of "emulation" and "imitation."

[6] Robert Greene, *Greenes Arcadia. Or Menaphon: Camillaes alarum to slumber Euphues in his melancholy cell at Silexedra* (London, 1610) D3r. The 1610 edition, despite being the most readable edition available online at Early English Books Online (EEBO), contains some indistinguishable orthography ("u" from "v," for example), and so I have modernized the entire passage.

affection" positions the two shepherds as contestants in song who sing against one another. Despite the call to "friend[ship]" and "affection," in other words, both "emulators" and "rivals" are synonymous with "adversaries."

Green uses the term "rival" contrary to how it is used in the opening of *Hamlet,* though Shakespeare uses the term in more complex ways elsewhere. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Shakespeare uses the term "rival" twice in quick succession to highlight its tricky double sense. To Lysander and Demetrius, Helena says, "You both are rivals, and love Hermia: / And now both rivals to mock Helena" (3.2.156-7). In the first part of this sentence, "rivals" denotes Lysander and Demetrius working against one another (similar to "rivals in affection" in *Menaphon*) for Hermia's love, whereas, following the colon, "rivals" denotes that the two men are working together to mock Helena (similar to "rivals of my watch" in *Hamlet*).[7] One can find additional instances, of words that connote fellowship between men being used to opposite ends, in other plays by Shakespeare.[8]

The first three letters in "competitor," "com-," share an etymological link with examples four, five, and six—corrival, compartner, and co-mate. "Corrival," "compartner," and "co-mate" almost seem familiar to the modern reader, but they do not quite mean what we presume that they do. The co- prefix is the anglicization of the Latin prefix com-, and, according to the Oxford English Dictionary (OED), "[t]he general

[7] While someone might suggest that second usage also implies that Lysander and Demetrius are competing against one another, the lines of Hermia's that immediately precede the quoted passage suggest otherwise: "Can you not hate me, as I know you do, / but you must join in souls to mock me too?" (3.2.150-2).

[8] Similarly, Shakespeare uses "corrival" to different ends in the same play, as in *1 Henry IV* (see 1.3.199-206 and 4.4.26-31). In *1 Henry IV,* the editors of *The Norton Shakespeare* gloss "corrival" at 1.3.205 as "competitor" and at 4.4.30 as "associate."

sense [of the prefix co-] is 'together', 'in company', 'in common', 'joint, -ly', 'equal, -ly', 'reciprocally', 'mutually'."[9] By adding the prefix, then, corrival, compartner, and co-mate seem to imply an affirmation of the positive bond between the two (or more) parties represented. York uses "corrival" to imply kinship and loyalty; Dogberry is a partner to Verges; and the Duke uses "co-mate" alongside "brothers" to signify the communality he feels in the forest of Arden. Part of the logic of deploying "co-" is to clarify terms that might otherwise be understood ambiguously (with mate and rival, especially) and also to intensify the intimacy of the relation.

The "co-" or "com-" that begins a word does not always signal mutuality, however. "Competitor," "compeer," and "companion" all allude to a friendly relationship but also contain a counter possibility. Although one definition of "competitor" was, as it is used in the second example from *Tamburlaine I*, "One associated with another in seeking the same common object; an associate, a partner,"[10] the term had another early modern definition closer to our modern understanding: "One who competes, or engages in a competition; one who seeks an object in rivalry with others also seeking it."[11] In other words, the "co-" or "com-" prefix by no means exclusively connoted a sense of further mutuality or reciprocity in early modern England. In *King Lear*, for example, Regan and Goneril argue over their desire for Edmund, and the verb they use, "compeers," implies the ambiguity between adversary and friend:

[9] "co-, prefix." OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/view/Entry/34948?rskey=oMmXFS&result=8&isAdvanced=false (accessed 3 August 2017). Henceforth, dictionary citations will not include URL or access date.

[10] "competitor, n." 2a. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

[11] "competitor, n." 1a. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

> Goneril: In his own grace he [Edmund] doth exalt himself,
> More than in your addition.
> Regan: In my rights,
> By me invested, he **compeers** the best.
> Goneril: That were the most, if he should husband you (5.360-3).[12]

Shakespeare uses the term as a verb here, though its primary usage in the period is in noun form, as an extension of "peer."[13] As Shakespeare uses it, "compeers" seems to connote either a) that Edmund is a peer with the best, b) that he is an adversary with the best, or c) in a buried pun that comes out when hearing the lines spoken aloud, that Edmund compares with the best. Even a term such as "companion," which I had originally understood as a term that does not imply "adversary," except in moments of irony or sarcasm, in fact connotes an oppositional relationship often enough for both the Oxford English Dictionary and major Shakespearean word studies to include alternative definitions for the term.[14]

The final and seventh example, "copemate," sounds as though it may be another instance of 'co-," though in fact it refers to someone who performs the verb "to cope." Like the verb "to die," which signals both death and orgasm, "to cope" contains several, seemingly contrary definitions: to "cope" is "to fight [and] to contest," though it also

[12] I quote the folio edition, *The Tragedy of King Lear*, though the quarto edition, *The History of King Lear*, has the same lines, except Goneril's "addition" (5.3.61) in the foilo is "advancement" (24.67) in the quarto.

[13] Thomas Lodge uses the term in this way in "In Praise of the Country Life," which presents an idealized portrayal of the agrarian lifestyle: "My sweete and tender flocks (my faithfull feeld compeers)" (l. 85). See Thomas Lodge, "In Praise of the Country Life," *Scillaes Metamorphosis (1589)* ProQuest Literature Online. References to transcribed works in this and other well-known online database entries that follow will omit the URL. For access date, please see the Bibliography.

[14] David Crystal and Ben Crystal, *Shakespeare's Words* (Toronto: Penguin Group, 2002), 86, suggests that companion is both a "rogue, rascal, fellow" and also "associate, aide, comrade." Shakespeare uses the term in its adversarial sense in *2 Henry IV*: "I scorn you, scurvy companion" (2.4.120). See also "companion." OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

implies "to come into contact, touch, or relation with," including sexual activity.[15] The first OED definition of "copemate" is, "A person with whom one copes or contends; an adversary, antagonist," and the second is "A partner or colleague in power, office, etc.; an associate, companion, comrade." There is a third sexualized meaning, which is a "paramour."[16] In the seventh example that opened this dissertation, Corydon's "frolicking copemates" implies a participant in a contest, whether friendly or otherwise, and with an erotic charge.

The point is that these terms of fellowship vacillate between meanings in ways that are not immediately familiar. As a linguistic game, I urge my reader to attempt to clearly distinguish between the following early modern terms:

Companion
Peer
Compartner
Co-mate
Compeer
Contestant
Copemate
Competitor
Emulator
Corrival
Rival

The words all seem to be located somewhere on the spectrum between our current understanding of "friend" and "adversary." Yet one cannot help but note how often these terms are used in ways that contain an opposing definition within a single usage or context.

[15] "cope, v.2." OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.
[16] "copemate | copesmate, n." OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

The first claim I argue is that the various terms of fellowship betray a writer's knowledge of the multiple and/or opposing definitions. Take, for instance, a familiar example from Shakespeare. Which term, might one guess, does Menas use to refer to Antony's fellowship with Caesar in *Antony and Cleopatra?* Recall that Antony was Caesar's erstwhile enemy who becomes a brother-in-law after marrying Octavia then an enemy after returning to Cleopatra. The answer: Antony is referred to as a "competitor" to Caesar (1.3.1-4). "Competitor" is also the term that Menas will use when describing Antony and Caesar's relationship with Pompey (2.7.73), signalling with a knowing wink at the fragility of the truce among the three men. Eventually the truce breaks down, of course, and Eros informs everyone that there will be no "rivality" (3.5.6-9), or communality, between the warring camps. Over the course of *Antony and Cleopatra*, the three characters—Menas, Antony, and Caesar—will go from one type of "rival" to another, oscillating between "competitor-as-friend" and "competitor-as-adversary."

For the modern reader, the relationship between Menas, Antony, and Caesar might be described as a competitive one, or as an instance of competition. But while there are plenty of "competitors" in early modern England, the concept of "competition" is anachronistic or is at the very least a misnomer. One problem with attempting to theorize competition, as we understand it today, is not only that its participants—or competitors—are so capaciously defined, oftentimes obfuscating whether or not people would be working together or in opposition, but in Elizabethan England the terms "competition," "competitive," and "compete," as we understand them today, do not yet exist. According to the OED, "competition" does not make its way into English printed texts until 1608, though I have found two possible instances in Elizabethan England,

both of which deploy "competition" in an opposing way to how we currently understand it.[17] In its usage in W.C.'s *The Aduentures of Ladie Egeria* and in Lodovico Castelvetro's translation of Aristotle's *Art of Poetry,* "competition" implies, in the first instance, a partnership between a Duke and the king of Egypt,[18] and, in the second, an agreement between Mr. Corneille and the narrator.[19] In Elizabethan England, in other words, "competition" does not imply opposition or contest, but instead a joining of forces or an agreement.

We can trace the confusion of early uses of the word "competition" across the Latin/English divide by looking at early dictionaries, including early fifteenth century Latin-English bilingual dictionaries and the first vernacular English dictionary in 1604. The closest Latin word, "*competītiōn-em,*" is not in the earliest Latin-English dictionaries that I consulted, though one does find an entry for "*competĕre*" in Sir Thomas Eliot's *The dictionary of syr Thomas Eliot knyght* (1538). In contrast with "competition" in the two English examples above (in W.C.'s *The Aduentures of Ladie Egeria* and

[17] "competition, n." OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press. The earliest entry is in 1608. The adjective "competitive" first appears in 1829, and "compete" ("To enter into or be put in rivalry *with*") first appears in 1620.

[18] W.C., *The Aduentures of Ladie Egeria (1585?),* ProQuest Literature Online: "And the rather Duke Bendal the cheareful starre rightly guiding the wandring ship, consulted the best opportunity for recouery of the Hetrurians dominion, of themselues able to finish something, but without the king of Ægypts might, power, & furniture to perfect, and accomplish nothing: so that with daily competition, viewed the king of Ægypts person for ayde of souldiers in this their pretence" (109). In the preceding instance, Duke Bendal requires the king of Aegypts aid, and thus a "competition" is primarily a partnership.

[19] Lodovico Castelvetro, *Aristotle's Art of Poetry. Translated from the Original Greek, according to Mr. Theodore Goulston's Edition. Together, with Mr. D'Acier's Notes Translated from the French*, ProQuest Literature Online: "As Mr. Corneille has accused Aristotle of not knowing Thyestes's Character. I accuse Horace of having put Thyestes for Atreus; but Aristotle and Horace are in the right, and Mr. Corneille and I in the wrong. For I may venture to put my self into Competition with that Great Man, where we speak only of faults which we are both Guilty of" (216). "Competition" connotes similar to the example from *The Aduentures of Ladie Egeria.* Note that the Castelvetro text contains no exact date, and the Elizabethan publication date is surmised based on Lodovico Castelvetro's life span, from 1505-71.

Castelvetro's translation of *Art of Poetry*), the Latin term, cognate with "*competition-em*," is understood as an adversarial term. Eliot translates the verb "*competere*" as follows: "Competo, til, tere, to aske, or sue for an of-fyce, or other lyke thinge agaynst an other that dothe the semblable."[20] In the revised edition published 15 years later, *Bibliotheca Eliotae* (1552), there exists a similar entry, "Competo, iui, ere, to aske or sue for an office, or other like thing, agaynst another that sueth for the same, to wishe," but there is also a new entry preceding it: "Competitor, oris, ma. ge. he that sueth for that, which an other man sueth for, a competitour. Compeitrix, icis, the feminine."[21] The first English dictionary in the period, *An Alphabeticall Table* by Robert Cawdry, mirrors this language directly: "competitor, hee that sueth for the same thing, or office, that another doth."[22] What is missing in Cawdry's English dictionary is whether or not the two people sue for the same thing, or office, by joining together or by working against one another.[23] Until the 1620s, the verb form of "competition," "compete," does not exist in a way that denotes our current understanding of the term; rather, the only instance before the turn of the seventeenth century denotes a definition similar to "competent."[24]

"Competition," in English, acquires its modern definition over the course of the seventeeth century, albeit slowly and in tentative terms. By the time that Milton

[20] Thomas Elyot, *The dictionary of syr Thomas Elyot knyght* (London, 1538), 29r.

[21] Thomas Elyot and Thomas Cooper, *Bibliotheca Eliotae = Eliotes dictionarie the second tyme enriched, and more perfectly corrected, by Thomas Cooper, schole maister of Maudlens in Oxforde* (London, 1552), R3v.

[22] Robert Cawdry, *A table alphabeticall conteyning and teaching the true writing, and vnderstanding of hard vsuall English wordes* (London, 1604), 17.

[23] The definition in Henry Cockeram, *The English dictionarie: or, An interpreter of hard English vvords* (London: Edmund Weauer, 1623), mirrors Cawdrey's definition from nearly twenty years prior: "*Competitor.* One suing for the same thing another doth" (n.p.).

[24] "Compete, v.1" OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press. The verb "compete," with the definition "To be suitable, applicable, or 'competent'," contains a single example from 1547.

publishes *Samson Agonistes* in 1671, "competition" appears in accordance with our contemporary understanding of these terms.[25] Note the care in which John Fletcher and Philip Massinger's *The Prophetesse*, written in 1622 and published in folio in 1647, distinguishes between friendly and adversarial forms of male fellowship and the terms that Charinas uses to describe each type:

> 'Tis vertue and not birth that makes us noble:
> Great actions speak great mindes, and such should govern;
> and you are grac't with both. Thus, as a Brother,
> a Fellow, and Co-partner in the Empire,
> I do embrace you: may we live so far
> from difference, or emulous Competition,
> that all the world may say Although two Bodies
> we have one Minde (2.3.118-21).[26]

This example depicts Charinas calling the self-proclaimed emperor Diocles a brother, a fellow, or co-partner, taking special care to distinguish their relationship from "emulous Competition." "Emulous competition," viewed here as a oppositional bond or a "difference," signals the affinity in the mid-seventeenth century between "emulation" and "competition." In fact, "emulation" may be the closest early modern synonym to our modern concept of competition, and the early modern term "emulator," especially, seems to capture the possibility for both friendliness and opposition.[27]

[25] Milton's *Sampson Agonistes*, published in 1671, uses competitive terms "rivals" (l. 387) and "competition" (l. 476) in accordance with how they are used today. See John Milton, *Milton's Selected Poetry and Prose* ed. Jason P. Rosenblatt (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2011).

[26] John Fletcher and Philip Massinger, *The Prophetesse*, ed. Paul Ellison, University of Exeter http://people.exeter.ac.uk/pellison/BF/prophess/frameset.htm (accessed 3 August 2017).

[27] Several recent critics, including Lynn Meskill and Vernon Guy Dickson, have read the role of "emulation" on the early modern stage. Neither critic pursues the link with competition that I do here, nor do they consider the Fletcher and Massinger passage. When I derived my source quotations from their books, I mention this in the footnote.

"Emulate," "emulator," and "emulation" derive from the Latin *aemulatio*, a word whose root spreads into several different and contrasting definitions of fellowship in Elyot's first edition of his dictionary in 1538:

> Aemulor, emulatus sum, aemulari, to en-uy without malyce, or to folowe, or studye to be lyke to an other.
> Aemulus, he that foloweth or enuieth ano-ther, onely for desyre of glorie.[28]

The term expands significantly in the later edition of the dictionary, revised by Cooper, in 1552:

> Aemulatio, onis, f.g. enuy, emulacion, imita-ciaon with desyre to excell.
> Aemulator, oris, m.g. he that doeth enuy, or imitate any person.
> Aemulatus, us, m.g. idem quod aemulatio
> Aemulor, aris, atus, sum, ari dep. with a cer-taine enuy and ambition, to endeuour, to passe or excell an other man, to folow or studie to be lyke an other.[29]

Especially noteworthy here is that, besides the proliferation of cognate terms, "Aemulor" specifically has expanded in such a way as to contradict its earlier definition to more closely connote "excell[ing] an other man." In other words, the "envy without malice" of 1538 has become "with a certain envy and ambition" in 1552. Other terms with the "aemul-" root go so far as to relate emulation to "enemy:"

> Aemulus, la, lum, that foloweth, or enuieth an other onely for desyre of glory, a louer, or fo-lower of the same thyng, or person, and some-tyme an enemy.[30]

With Cooper's additions and modifications to Eliot's original dictionary, there is a discernible movement toward more antagonistic definitions.

[28] Elyot, *The dictionary*, 11v.
[29] Elyot and Cooper, *Bibliotheca Eliotae*, 26r.
[30] Elyot and Cooper, *Bibliotheca Eliotae*, 26r.

The vacillation in these two dictionaries concerning the relationship between emulation and envy has a classical precedent. In an early theorization of the concept of emulation by Aristotle, in *On Rhetoric*, he pairs "emulation" with "envy" in chapters ten and eleven, and he defines "emulation" against its subtle distinctions with "envy":

> for if emulation is [defined as] a kind of distress at the apparent presence among others like him by nature of things honored and possible for a person to acquire, [with the distress arising] not from the fact that another has them but that the emulator does not (thus emulation is a good thing and characteristic of good people, while envy is bad and characteristic of the bad; for the former, through emulation, is making an effort to attain good things for himself, while the latter, through envy, tries to prevent his neighbor from having them)[31]

The distinction between "envy" and "emulation"—the former an effort to prevent one's neighbour from having good things and the latter an effort to attain good things for oneself—becomes considerably more complex when one recalls that the "good things" reference not only character attributes such as "bravery [and] wisdom" but also tangible social positions, such as "public office."[32] If a person is emulating against another for a public office, how distinct is the impulse to "prevent his neighbour" from "making an effort to attain…for [one]self"?

While Aristotle is the most frequently cited classical commentator on emulation, he may be commenting on an earlier passage from *Works and Days* by Hesiod. In the first lines following the proem to *Works and Days*, Hesiod announces his intention to

[31] Aristotle, *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, trans. George A. Kennedy (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007) 2.11.1. This passage is quoted in Dickson, *Emulation*, 2, and Meskill, *Ben Jonson and Envy*, 44.

[32] Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, 2.10.5-7.

proclaim truth and then suggests to Perses that one must be careful to maintain the correct type of "strife":

> So there was not just one birth of Strife after all, but upon the earth there are two Strifes. One of these a man would praise once he got to know it, but the other is blameworthy; and they have thoroughly opposed spirits. For the one fosters evil war and conflict—cruel one, no mortal loves that one, but it is by necessity that they honor the oppressive Strife, by the plans of the immortals. But the other one gloomy Night bore first; and Cronus' high throned son, who dwells in the aether, set it in the roots of the earth, and it is much better for me. It rouses even the helpless men to work. For a man who is not working but who looks at some other man, a rich one who is hastening to plow and plant and set his house in order, he envies him, one neighbor envying his neighbor who is hastening toward wealth: and this Strife is good for mortals.[33]

In the passage above, Glenn M. Most translates Hesiod's emulative term (from ancient Greek) as "strife," though one notes the similarity with early modern ideas of emulation. Positive strife, which causes the two "men" or "neighbor[s]" to compete in ways that foster concurrent (even symbiotic) growth, is similar to early modern understandings of "emulation," while the negative strife, in which one party profits at the expense of the other (as in "war" and "conflict"), resembles "envy." Hesiod, similar to Aristotle, identifies both a positive and a negative instance of his emulative concept, strife.

In the classical texts above, a precondition for two people being emulators or enviers of one another is their underlying similarity in condition and social rank. Hesiod writes, "A neighbor envying his neighbor who is hastening toward wealth," and Aristotle writes that emulation is apparent "among others like him [the emulator] by nature." The

[33] Hesiod, *Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia,* ed. and trans. Glenn W. Most (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 87-9. Note also that the passage that immediately follows this quotation reiterates its didactic purpose to Perses: "Perses, do store this up in your spirit, lest gloating Strife keep your spirit away from work, while you gawk at quarrels and listen to the assembly" (89). This passage is quoted in Meskill, *Ben Jonson and Envy*, 42.

idea that both emulation and envy are concepts experienced between near-equals is an unstated assumption about our contemporary idea of competition. Today, sports teams compete only against those at roughly the same level, playing the same sport, subject to the same rules and parameters. Similarly, in early modern literature one often finds explicit instances of emulation existing between men of similar rank, social class, or education level. Many of the opening examples presuppose such an underlying equality, and the proximity and overlap between "emulation" and "imitation" further reinforces the similarity between emulators.

In early modern England, the idea that one emulates with or against or alongside a near-equal finds equivalence in texts treating "envy." Here is Francis Bacon, the renowned politician and philosopher, speaking about such a phenomenon in "Of Envy":

> [N]eare Kinsfolks, and Fellowes in Office, and those that haue beene bred together, are more apt to *Enuy* their Equals, when they are raised. For it doth vpraid vnto them, their owne Fortunes; And pointeth at them, and commeth oftner into their remembrance, and incurreth likeswise more into the note of others: And *Enuy* redoubleth from Speech and Fame[34]

[34] Francis Bacon, *The Essayes or Covnsels, Civill and Morall, of Francis Lo. Vervlam Viscovnt St. Alban* (London, 1625) 43-4. Thanks to Ronda Arab for pointing out Francis Bacon's and Petrus Ramus's interests in envy.

Bacon positions envy as burgeoning between near-equals, particularly when one person is being "raised."[35] Envy is an emotion, for Bacon, that contains persuasive force: envy "vpraids," "points," "comes," and "incurs."

Bacon sounds a lot like Petrus Ramus, the French humanist and education reformer killed in the massacre of Paris in 1572, who suggests that envy is experienced by those "Such as our selves, I call those that are equall to us in bloud, in age, in abilities, in glory, or in means."[36] In a passage in which he suggests that the men who are most prone to envy are "competitors," Ramus demonstrates the interchangeability of some of the terms outlined in the seven opening examples of my introduction:

> Obnoxious to envy are, Men of our own time, of our own Countrey, of our own age, and Competitors of our glory And therefore, Those whom we strive with for honour. And those that covet the same things that we do."[37]

"Obnoxious" also means "Liable, subject, exposed, or open *to* a thing" during the period.[38] What is most important here is not only the underlying similarity between people who "envy" one another, but the uncertainty of whether "competitors" implies adversaries or partners or both.

[35] Envy is often deployed differently today, since its usage is often predicated on a gap in status. The man who is somehow the president of the United States while I write this dissertation, Donald Trump, uses the term in this modern way, "I've had that thing all of my life where people are bending to envy." See Jenna Johnson, "Donald Trump Likes that Proverbs Verse that Might Not Exist," *The Washington Post,* 16 September 2015. Sianne Ngai's focus on envy, in *Ugly Feelings* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004) illuminates the Trump passage: "Moralized and uglified to such an extent that it becomes shameful to the subject who experiences it, envy also becomes stripped of its potential critical agency—as an ability to recognize, and antagonistically respond to, portentially real and institutionalized forms of inequality" (129). Trump's usage presupposes that peoples' criticism of him derives from personal jealousy rather than from flagrant, "institutionalized forms of inequality."

[36] Petrus Ramus, "Of Envy," in *A compendium of the art of logick and rhetorick in the English Tongue. Containging all that Peter Ramus, Aristotle, and Others have writ thereon* (London 1651) 208. [208-210]

[37] Ramus, "Of Envy," 209.

[38] "obnoxious, adj." 1a. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

In texts that treat "emulation," there exists always a necessity of clearly distinguishing between "envy" and "emulation," particularly since envy would connote a "bestial" deadly sin, to quote Edmund Spenser.[39] Like Aristotle, Ramus pairs emulation with envy in an effort to define and distinguish them. Of emulation, Ramus says,

> Emulation is griefe arising from that our Equals possesse such goods as are had in honour, and whereof we are capable, but have them not; not because they have them, but because not we also[40]

Ramus makes the Aristotelian distinction between envy and emulation into whether one hopes to obtain something at the expense of another. To be an "emulator" thus presupposes a hope and capability that one might advance, in whichever terms such advancement may take, though not explicitly in adversarial postures. Ramus continues, "No man therefore *Emulates* another in things whereof himselfe is not capable" and that "Apt to *Emulate* are, Such as esteem themselves worthy of more then they have. And Young and Magnanimous Men."[41] Emulation implies social advancement, or better learning, in the hopes of becoming more "worthy."

While the subtle distinctions between "emulators" and "enviers" abound in early modern England, there is also ample indication that the two terms are used near-synonymously by other writers. When George Chapman translates Hesiod in 1618, he expands on the passage in which neighbour-emulates-neighbour as follows:

[39] See Edmund Spenser, *The Faerie Queene (Revised Second Edition)* ed. A.C. Hamilton (Toronto: Pearson Longman, 2007). As one of the deadly sins, envy parades in personified form in Book One of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*: riding "Vpon a rauenous wolfe," "malicious *Enuy* … chawed his owne Maw / At neibors welth" (1.4.30).

[40] Petrus Ramus, "Of Emulation," in *A compendium of the art of lofick and rhetorick in the English Tongue. Containging all that Peter Ramus, Aristotle, and Others have writ thereon* (London 1651) 210.

[41] Ramus, "Of Emulation," 211 211.

> The Neighbour, doth the Neighbour, aemulate:
> The Potter, doth the Potters profit hate;
> The Smith, the Smith, with spleene Inveterate:
> Beggar, maligns the Beggar, for good done;
> And the Musition, the Musition.[42]

It goes without saying that such a passage troubles the distinction between "envy" and "emulate" by Aristotle, Ramus, and Bacon. Rather, Chapman's conflation of "aemulate" with "hate" and other "malign[ing]" ideas speaks to the propensity to read aemulation as a type of emotion. Robert Burton, a few years later in 1621, channels Chapman's Hesiod in a passage from *The Anatomy of Melancholy* that is entitled: "Aemulation, Hatred, Faction, Desire of Revenge." Burton writes, "A Potter *emulates* a Potter; One Smith *envies* another: A beggar *emulates* a beggar; A Singing man his brother."[43] Burton clearly views the term "emulate" and "aemulation" as synonymous or indistinguishable from their envious counterparts.

The slipperiness among the various terms of fellowship—including rivals, competitors, and emulators, but also companions, copemates, and compeers—as well as the underlying similarity that these terms presuppose between their two parties, suggest that neither the terms nor the conceptions pertaining to competition in the period were at all stable. "Emulous" is an archaic word for "emulative," which I use to connote the conception of not only "emulation" but also those other similar terms in my opening

[42] George Chapman, *The Georgicks of Hesiod: Translated Elaborately out of the Greek* (London, 1618) B1r. The original passage contains a note "17" in the first line of the passage quoted above, which points the reader to marginalia: "17. … He showes Artizans aemulations for *riches*, and approues that kinde of contention" (B1r). Note the close relationship between "aemulations" and "contention." The passage (but not the marginalia) is also quoted in Meskill, *Ben Jonson and Envy*, 43.

[43] Dickson, *Emulation, 6,* notes the synonymous usage of "envy" and "aemulation" in Burton, and Meskill, *Ben Jonson and Envy,* 43, calls attention to the Burton translation of Hesiod. For the original passage, see Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* ed. Holbrook Jackson and William H. Gass (New York: New York Review Books, 2001) Part 1. Sec. 2. Memb. 3. Subs. 8.

examples. “Fellow” was a capacious term in early modern England that calls attention to a variety of power relations, including “an associate,” “an equivalent,” and “a match,” but one that also implies admitting or recognizing another person in a particular group; to “give the right hand of fellowship” in Reformation England would recall the ceremony of admitting a person to church membership.[44] The moments of convening upon which this dissertation focuses often constitute an initiation, or a joining of forces, and hence the ritualistic connotations of “fellowship” apply more broadly than in a narrow religious context. Thus, “emulous fellowship” is a way of signalling this unstable relationality, alternately oppositional and friendly, between men of similar rank, position, grade level, or vocation.

Despite many areas of overlap between “emulation” in early modern England and our current understanding of “competition,” they are not synonymous and should not be confused as such in early modern England. The first and most obvious reason is that many of the emulous terms at the beginning of this introduction contain both competition and partnership in their definitions. The duality of these early modern emulous terms is not only visible in the opening examples, but also in other terms of fellowship, including “mate,” “companion,” and, of course, “fellow.” A second reason that emulation is not a simple substitute for competition is because of how the former term structures a literary relationship in ways that the latter does not. Because of the kinship between “emulation” and “imitation,” an overlap that will be discussed in more detail below, to emulate a literary superior, a teacher, or a recently deceased writer implies both a deep literary debt

[44] “fellowship, n.” P2. OED Online. July 2017. Oxford University Press.

and a potential desire to surpass or excel one's model. In short, to "emulate" a model means to work in his/her tradition, according to some of the formal parameters that he/she helped to champion and innovate, whereas one may "compete" with a model without writing in a similar form or tradition.

The present study focuses on emulous fellowship as it appears in relation to the literary world of early modern England. I am not certain that there exists a literary form that more directly calls attention to a writer's development in early modern England—and especially Elizabethan England—than does the English pastoral eclogue. One of the reasons that the English eclogue so strongly speaks to literary endeavours is because of the form's association with the Virgilian *rota*, the influential career trajectory whereby a writer should progress from composing eclogues to an epic. More importantly, however, the eclogue foregrounds and enacts moments when shepherds convene to display their versifying skills, which provide snapshots of literary relationships and their communities. "Emulous Fellowship and the Elizabethan Pastoral Eclogue" thus takes as its focus the various moments of convention between shepherd-poets that the eclogue stages: the first is the convening of a boy and an elder shepherd for a lesson; the second is the singing contest between two contestants; the third is the invitation to love or to amorous play; and the fourth is the rehearsal of a funeral elegy. These four different scenarios of shepherdly convening happen so often in the eclogue form that they might be called "conventions" in the literary sense as well, as literary *topoi.*[45] Each convention

[45] Paul Alpers, *What is Pastoral?* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996) 79-93. I focus more on "convention" in a later section of this introduction.

depicts both an imitative impulse and an emulous one, and it is the subtle shifts in power between these two impulses that both constitute and extend "emulous fellowship."

I "… and the Elizabethan Pastoral Eclogue"

I turn now to the second half of my title "Emulous Fellowship and the Elizabethan Pastoral Eclogue." In a sense, my dissertation adds another line after Hesiod's "neighbour emulates neighbour," or after Burton's "A Potter *emulates* a Potter; One Smith *envies* another." I suggest that in early modern England "shepherd emulates shepherd" and also, to a lesser extent, "poet envies poet." More than any English era that precedes it, Elizabethan England saw a proliferation of shepherd poets, those who wrote from the perspective of shepherds, called their friends by typical shepherd's names, modelled literary communities around imaginary shepherd gatherings, signalled and channelled poetic predecessors through shepherd's dialogue, published anthologies that exclusively contained poems written in shepherd guise, and mourned for one another through the masks of shepherds. The popular, prevailing word for shepherd literature is "pastoral," which exists across prose, poetry, and drama, in manuscript, in print, and on the stage, and represents various social, economic, and political classes during the period.[46] Because of pastoral's amorphousness, literary critics often refer to pastoral less

[46] There are so many writers during Elizabeth I's reign that wrote pastoral literature, in some capacity or another and at different times during their careers, that it is a more difficult task to find writers who showed zero interest. For four compendious studies that treat a wide array of early modern English pastoral, see W. W. Greg, *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama* (1904; New York: Russell & Russell, 1959), William Empson, *Some Versions of Pastoral*, 5th printing (1935; New York: New Directions, 1974), Ronato Poggliolli, *The Oaten Flute: Essays on Pastoral Poetry and the Pastoral Ideal* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975), and Sukanta Chaudhuri, *Renaissance Pastoral and its English Developments* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989).

as a 'genre' but instead as a 'mode,' which allows for a broader understanding of the pastoral and its ubiquitous place within the period's larger literary canon.[47]

While critics often read the early modern pastoral as an indeterminate mode that encompasses many genres and that brings together a diverse range of motifs and functions, there seem to be some underlying assumptions about how shepherds relate to one another in this mode. Over the course of the last fifty years, the early modern pastoral has often been invoked as a mode through which writers explore a range of topics, from "representative" shepherd-poets or courtiers,[48] to homoerotic desire,[49] to

[47] Alpers, *What is Pastoral?* puts it most clearly: "Literary pastoral ... includes not only the whole range of formal eclogues—pastoral elegies, love complaints, singing-contets, and the like—but also pastoral romances, pastoral lyrics, pastoral comedies, and pastoral novels. If all these are pastoral, then we are certainly right to say that pastoral is not a genre. Rather, it seems to be one of the types of literature—like tragedy, comedy, novel, romance, satire, and elegy—which have generic-sounding names but which are more inclusive and general than genres proper. We seek to recognize that pastoral is one of these literary types, when we say that it is not a genre, but a mode" (46) Other critics who define pastoral along modal lines include Nancy Lindheim, *The Virgilian Pastoral Tradition* (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2005), 4, and Andrew V. Ettin, *Literature and the Pastoral* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1984), 65. See also Jahan Ramazani, *Poetry of Mourning: The Modern Elegy from Hardy to Heaney* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994) for a reading of pastoral tropes into modern poetry less concerned with shepherds.

[48] Alpers, *What is Pastoral?,* 13-21 considers how the lives of pastoral shepherd function as "representative anecdotes," appropriating the phrase from Kenneth Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969), to demonstrate how the pastoral is both typical and specific in its representations of reality. For a reading of pastoral serving as a courtly language orchestrated by Queen Elizabeth, see Louis Montrose, " 'Eliza, Queene of shepheardes,' and the Pastoral of Power," *English Literary Renaissance* 10 no. 2 (1980): 153-82, and then Montrose's "Of Gentleman and Shepherds," *ELH* 50, no. 3 (1983): 415-59. The former article looks at the "Elizabethan pastorals of power" (180), which functions to buttress the authority of the cultural elite. The latter article continues to build upon the "ideological character" (416) of Elizabethan pastoral. Both articles build off the premise that Elizabeth built her court around the language of pastoralism put forth in the final chapter of Helen Cooper, *Pastoral: Medieval into Renaissance* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1975).

[49] See Bruce Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), especially "Chapter 3: The Affectionate Shepherd"; Kenneth Borris and George Klawitter, eds. *The Affectionate Shepherd: Celebrating Richard Barnfield* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2001); Stephen Guy-Bray, *Homoerotic Space: The Poetics of Loss in Renaissance Literature. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002*; and, Rictor Norton, *The Homosexual Pastoral Tradition*, 20 June 2008, http://rictornorton.co.uk/pastor00.htm (accessed 20 October 2017). Rictor Norton's work originally appeared in the mid 1970s. A later section of this introduction will consider homoeroticism in the eclogue more closely.

environmental consciousness and advocacy.[50] The majority of these and other early modern pastoral studies have a tendency to read the pastoral as an intellectual community that privileges likeness, learning, and mutuality; according to such understandings, even pastoral critique and satire are performed under the guise of concerned shepherds removed from the vices that they seek to remedy or punish.[51] The pastoral consciousness is ethical, intellectual, or progressive, and it is the surrounding court, church, or city that might follow such an example.

This dissertation locates and studies one particular subsection of the broader pastoral landscape, the eclogue, and makes a claim for interpreting the eclogue as a literary form in its own right, within the larger pastoral mode but particularly within the historical milieu where it first emerged in Elizabethan England. Specifically, this

[50] For an early example of pastoral's progressive *ethos,* see Richard Cody, *The Landscape of the Mind* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969). Cody's focus on the interconnectedness of pastoralism and neo-Platonism (through Marsilio Ficino) acts as a predecessor to later eco-critical studies: Todd Borlik also reads pastoralism via neo-Platonism (through Ficino) and quotes Cody directly, in *Ecocriticism and Early Modern English Literature: Green Pastures* (New York: Routledge, 2011). The argument in Ken Hiltner *What Else is Pastoral?* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2011) follows in the footsteps of Robert Watson, *Back to Nature: The Green and the Real in the Late Renaissance* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006) to suggest that Renaissance writers were adherents to the tenets espoused in Plato's *Cratylus*, whereby nature is not easily representable; Renaissance artists avoided writing nature through "mimesis and representation" (5) and instead chose to "gesture" (11) to nature in ways that depict early instances of environmental awareness. For readings of the pastoral through a post-humanist perspective, see Julian Yates, "Sheep Tacks—A Multi-species Impression," in *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral: Ethics and Objects*, ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen (Washington, D.C.: Oliphaunt Books, 2012), Lowell Duckert, in "Fleece the Craziest Transport: Fleecing the Non/human *Merchant of Venice*," in *Shakespeare International Yearbook,* ed. Tiffany Werth (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2015), and most recently Julian Yates, *Of Sheep, Oranges, and Yeast* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).

[51] Many critics presuppose that the pastoral serves as a learned community that satirizes from afar. For example, Borlik, in *Ecocriticism*, suggests that the pastoral functioned as a "continuation of moral philosophy by literary means" (135) and thus Borlik approaches the pastoral "as both a vehicle for satirizing on an overly acquisitive society and a bid to link human well-being to stewardship of the natural surroundings" (140). Annabel Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valery* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988) makes the link between intellectualism and the pastoral explicit, by showing that the pastoral (and, especially, Virgil's eclogues) functions as a type mirror that allows the intellectual reader to project his or her own circumstances and interest onto the form.

dissertation shows that early modern understandings of the eclogue complicate the purported ethos of likeness and mutuality in the greater pastoral, and I show this by presenting instances of emulous fellowship. The eclogue's various conventions, including the shepherds' lesson, the singing contest, the invitation to love, and the pastoral elegy all depict literary ambition under the guise of pastoral musing. Each one of these conventions enacts a variation of emulous fellowship that serves as the subject of one of my chapters: in chapter one, I study how the first eclogues of Barnabe Googe, Sir Philip Sidney, and Edmund Spenser depict an overbearing elder that is likened to an outmoded schoolmaster who must be surpassed; in chapter two, I explore how the singing contest that Edmund Spenser stages with a number of his contemporaries invokes consequential literary rankings and hierarchies; in chapter three, I elaborate how Christopher Marlowe's "invitation to love" responds to similar invitations found in classical eclogues, blurring the boundaries between seduction, sport, and war across Marlowe's oeuvre; and finally, in chapter four, I examine how pastoral elegists throughout the period organize and control posthumous "rehearsals" of the deceased. The eclogue and its conventions provide an emulous backdrop against which to read these and other moments of shepherdly dialogue.

As both canonical and non-canonical Elizabethan poets and playwrights don shepherds' garb and deploy terminology from the eclogue, they challenge what it means to be a shepherd in the schoolroom, the published poetry collection, and the theatre. My dissertation's movement—from the eclogue's humble beginnings in the early modern "forums" (schoolrooms) to its focus on elegizing princes—roughly follows the progression of the Virgilian literary career, or *rota,* from shepherds to knights and

princes, all the while making significant interventions into critical discourses pertaining to homosociality, pastoralism, and poetic influence in early modern England. My reading restores the eclogue, long regarded as leisurely pastoral verse associated with poetic neophytes, to its Elizabethan context: it is, in my analysis, a significant literary form through which shepherd-poets, engaging their fellows as copemates, emulators, or competitors, cast poetic composition as an exercise in power and authority.

To write eclogues in early modern England was to engage in a complex dialogue about ever-shifting power. English eclogues that I study in this dissertation depict instances where poetic dominance is sought and contested; where rival poets are half-alluded to through shepherdly personae; and where shepherds are distinguished according to the language of sexual subservience and domination. Thus, between a master and a pupil, between two poets in a contest, between the inviter and invitee, between the elegizer and the deceased—the dialogic eclogue provides the potential for a shift or reversal in the power dynamics between its shepherds. My study thus adds to conversations begun by pastoral scholars who focus on the relationship between eclogue and epic. Judith Haber, for example, reads the classical eclogues of Theocritus and Virgil as self-consciously entangled with the epic and suggests that pastoral writers in both classical and early modern epochs "revise" and rewrite the contradictions and paradoxes of their predecessors.[52] Haber follows other pastoral scholars, both early modern and contemporary, who read Virgil in competition with Theocritus; indeed, as early as 1579,

[52] See Judith Haber, *Pastoral and the Poetics of Self-Contradiction: Theocritus to Marvell* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994) 36. "Revise" and its cognates appear frequently in Haber's book, especially in depictions of Virgil's relation to Theocritus.

Spenser's commentator to *The Shepheardes Calender*, E.K., suggests that Theocritus is "more ground in authoritie" than is Virgil.[53]

Less common are scholars who read the homosocial bond within the early modern English eclogue (or greater pastoral) synchronically, whereby the eclogue is understood as a form that directly responds to and critiques contemporaneous writers. Louis Montrose, in his masterful treatment of the "pastorals of power," comes closest. Montrose analyzes, over the span of a couple articles, how Elizabeth cultivated a sycophantic pastoral language that simultaneously reinforced her authority and engendered a new language of courtship. He writes,

> Whether conceived as a means of covert political communication or as a mode of ornamental self-display, Elizabethan pastoral was a literary cult associated with the courtly milieu. As such, it was a symbolic instrument by which a sociocultural elite set itself apart from and above the rest of society … Such pastorals are coded performances in which a community of speakers and auditors, writers and readers, participate in a dialectic of inclusion and exclusion, in a process of social signification.[54]

Montrose, although he does not refer to the eclogue directly, outlines how Elizabeth consolidated power through the "pastoralization" of her court, whereby the circulation of poems served as a tool for garnering power in her court. However, Montrose ultimately focuses less attention on the specific "dialectic[s] of inclusion and exclusion" than on the ensuing consequences—a "sociocultural elite" presiding over the court. In contrast, my study focuses squarely on the literary mechanisms at play in this dialectic and attempts to add nuance to the adversarial tactics used within the community of Elizabethan shepherd-poets. And while Montrose does not distinguish between different literary

[53] Edmund Spenser, *The Shorter Poems* ed. Richard McCabe (Toronto: Penguin Books Ltd., 1999) 32.
[54] Montrose, "Of Gentlemen," 448.

forms within the broader pastoral landscape, I suggest that the eclogue, specifically, is a dialogic and emulous form that merits its own focus. A central question posed by my study is, How did Elizabethan writers deploy conventions of the eclogue to signal in emulous ways toward their literary peers?

My suggestion that eclogue writers depicted and enacted shepherdly roles in the name of demonstrating poetic authority recalls Michel Foucault's work on the ubiquity and multi-directionality of power. Over the course of his work, Foucault focuses on power as a malleable, dispersive, and discursive force that signals and responds to authority in diverse ways. *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1,* in particular, investigates how various social institutions in Western Europe since the seventeenth century (including the Christian Church and the scientific community in Victorian England) channels desire into discourses that reproduce and buttress the (often conservative and capitalist) values held by these institutions. While my reading distances itself from Foucault's political focus, as well as his at-once-vague-and-precise periodization of certain sexualities and sexual tendencies, his larger claim about the "polymorphous techniques of power" provides a reminder of the extent to which power is at once currency and consequence.[55] By focusing on the subtle shifts in power in the eclogue—when a pupil responds to a schoolmaster or when a poet bemoans the loss of another—I hope to demonstrate how such (purportedly) congenial, pastoral gestures toward fellowship often import ideas of emulation and contest, and how such ideas enable shifts

[55] Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, An Introduction: Volume 1*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1990) 12. For his discussion on the omnipresence of power, see especially 92-102. For the emergence of homosexuality, as it became "a personage, a past, a case history, and a childhood, in addition to being a type of life, a life form, and a morphology" and also a "singular nature," "a kind of interior androgyny," and, finally, a "species" in the Victorian era, see 43 ff.

in power and authority. My general methodology is to consider how a supposedly friendly fellowship becomes more fraught when read against both contemporaneous understandings of competition and the eclogue tradition.

Thus, my dissertation focuses on moments where two parties recalibrate an existing power hierarchy into one that is more "emulous." Reading fellowship in this way both complements and complicates existing and foundational studies on "rivalry" in early modern England and beyond. An early and influential study in "rivalry" is René Girard's *Deceit, Desire and the Novel*, where he first outlines the "mimetic desire" found between a "subject" and rival (or "mediator"); for Girard, human desire is not autonomous but instead evolves from another's desire for an object.[56] Girard sets up a triangular model in which two parties (the subject and the "mediator") compete for a third object, a geometric formation that paradoxically closes the bond between the two parties. Girard's theorization is influential for how it posits that the "rivalrous" bond between subject and mediator is equally strong as—or stronger than—the "loving" bond between subject and object of desire. But whereas Girard views rivalry as a first step toward a closer (often male-male) bond, my study works in the opposite direction, since I begin with the premise of a friendly and oftentimes reciprocal fellowship in an idealized pastoral setting and then detail how such bonds tense up because of shiftings in power, thereby becoming hierarchical or unstable.

[56] René Girard, *Deceit, Desire and the Novel*, trans. Yvonne Freccero (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1965). While Girard does not explicitly focus on the early modern period in this book, his model provides the basis for early modern scholars who deploy some version of "mimetic desire" to understand the subject-mediator bond. Further, *Deceit, Desire and the Novel* also forms the basis for his own continuation of this argument in René Girard, *A Theatre of Envy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick and Laurie Shannon both expand Girard's conception of the (oftentimes) masculine bond between subject and mediator. Sedgwick, in *Between Men,* takes issue with Girard on two key matters: first, she faults Girard's triangular model for not adequately historicizing the triangular relationships; and second, in a related claim, she suggests that his triangular model does not adequately account for "asymmetries" caused by gender.[57] About the latter (but not the former), Sedgwick provides a reading of Shakespeare's sonnets that highlights the power discrepancy between male-male and male-female relationships, namely the speaker's relationship with the youth and the speaker's relationship with the rival mistress.[58] For Sedgwick, the male-male relationship occurs at the expense of the male-female relationship, regardless of whether the woman is the object of desire or the mediator. Sedgwick writes,

> My point is … that we are in the presence of male heterosexual desire, in the form of a desire to consolidate partnership with authoritative males in and through the bodies of females.[59]

Counterintuitively, Sedgwick here suggests that the Shakespearean speaker's desire for the young man constitutes a form of heterosexuality, since it does not challenge the existing, heteronormative patriarchy. To this end, Sedgwick repurposes Girard's model

[57] Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985) 31.

[58] It is worth noting that Sedgwick's work on Shakespeare begins with a *caveat emptor* that runs against her historicization issue with Girard. She says, in *Between Men*, that "*The* tradition of the Sonnets is the tradition of reading them plucked from history and, indeed, from factual grounding …To most readers of the sequence, this decontextualization has seemed to provide a license for interpreting the Sonnets as a relatively continous erotic narrative played out, economically, by the smallest number of characters—in this case four, the poet, a fair youth, a rival poet, and a dark lady. I am going to take this reductive interpretive tradition (which represents the way I read the Sonnets, in fact) as a license in turn for using the Sonnets to illustrate, in a simplified because synchronic and ahistorical form, what I take to be some of the patterns traced by male homosocial desire" (29 italics in original).

[59] Sedgwick, *Between Men,* 38.

of triangular desire along gendered lines, whereby "authoritative males" work to "consolidate partnership … in and through the bodies of females." Putting critical focus onto the female body recalls the anthropological work of Gayle Rubin on the "traffic of women,"[60] although Sedgwick expands on Rubin by focusing on a woman in the "rival" position (for Rubin, the woman serves mainly as an object of desire).

In her interest of recuperating the significance of gender difference in the erotic triangles and, in particular, of outlining the subjugated position of the women involved in them, Sedgwick, inadvertently or not, posits a presiding "male power" that presumes if not equality then at least mutuality amongst its members.[61] Specifically, Sedgwick suggests that even when one man must "undergo … a humiliating change in the course of a relationship with a man" the process "still feels like [it is] preserving or participating in the sum of male power."[62] As Sedgwick demonstrates with her reading of

[60] In the first chapter of *Between Men*, Sedgwick uses criticism by Gayle Rubin to destabilize arguments—such as those by Girard—that do not adquately account for the assymetricality of erotic triangles when women are in competition with men. See Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," in *Feminist Anthropology: A Reader* ed. Ellen Lewin (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2006) 87-106.

[61] A short word on these two terms, since they will be used over the course of this dissertation. By "equality" I mean "the condition of having equal dignity, rank, or privileges with others; the fact of being on an equal footing." By "mutuality" I mean "the quality of two or more people having the same feelings for each other; standing in reciprocal relation to one another." See "equality" 2a., "mutuality" 1., and "mutual" 1.b. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press. In such a formulation, a hierarchical bond, such as one between a master and pupil, is not based on "equality" but on "mutuality" when both participants benefit from the bond.

[62] Sedgwick, *Between Men,* 40. What is most important for Sedgwick is the power discrepancy between genders, not within a single gender, which she outlines in *Between Men*: "One useful way of putting the difference between the male-male bond and the male-female bond seems to be that the tensions implicit in the male-male bond are spatially conceived (you are this way, I am that way) and hence imagined as stable; while tensions of the male-female bond are temporally conceived (as you are, so shall I be) and hence obviously volatile. Thus, to be self-divided in loving the fair youth feels like being stoical, while to be self-divided in loving the dark lady feels like becoming ruined. Differently put, for a man to undergo even a humiliating change in the course of a relationship with a man still feels like preserving or participating in the sum of male power, while for a man to undergo any change in the course of a relationship with a woman feels like a radical degeneration of substance" (45).

Shakespeare's sonnets, the triangular model will essentially correct itself so that the two men form a bond at the expense of the woman, regardless of whether the woman is a rival mistress or an object of desire herself: any "assertion" of "symmetry" in a male-female rivalry is a fiction, made possible only by a "suppression" or "translation" of gender differences.[63] Whether in terms of male "partnership," "symmetry," or "male power," Sedgwick's focus on male supremacy in these triangular relationships mitigates the possibility of significant power hierarchies within the male-male bond.

Laurie Shannon, in *Sovereign Amity*, presents an alternative to Sedgwick's asymmetrical, gendered triangle by suggesting that all three points of the triangle are occupied by men. Shannon suggests that friendship in the early modern period functioned as a counterpoint to sovereignty, in which the bond between friends is "sovereign" over the bond between monarch and subject; ironically, the person who is less likely to enjoy the "sovereign" experience of friendship is the monarch, since the rules of monarchy and of early modern discourses of friendship conflict.[64] By outlining the prevalence of "homonormativity" between the subject and his "mediator" (Girard) or "rival" (Sedgwick) or "friend" (Shannon), Shannon reads the triangular model with the sovereign occupying the third place (where Girard figures the object of desire). Like Girard and Sedgwick, however, Shannon reads the male bond as preemiment and in terms that suggest mutuality and likeness between the two friends involved. Shannon's

[63] Sedgwick, *Between Men,* 47, suggests that "[t]he assertion of symmetry [is] made possible by a suppression of effectual gender differences or by a translation of them into factitiously comparable spatial and/or temporal rhetorical figures."

[64] Laurie Shannon, *Sovereign Amity: Figures of Friendship in Shakespearean Contexts* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002). For an earlier treatment of "homonormativity," see Laurie Shannon, "Nature's Bias: Renaissance Homonormativity and Elizabethan Comic Likeness" *Modern Philology* 98, no. 2 (2000): 182-210.

formulation especially presupposes a mutually beneficial male-male bond reminiscent of that found in Michel de Montaigne's "Of Friendship."[65]

My reading moves in an opposite direction from Girard, Sedgwick, and Shannon, who all read the male homosocial bond in the direction of rival-becomes-friend (or lover). I consider instances where the male-male bond shifts in the direction of friend-becomes-rival, and, further, I leave the "triangular" model behind whenever possible. Generally, my reading of fellowship moves from equality and mutuality to lopsided authority and hierarchy. In a sense, I extend Fran Dolan's work on heterosexual coupledom and companionate marriage into same-sex fellowship. Dolan has written, on various accounts, of the underlying power discrepancy of the heterosexual marriage bond in early modern England, where, despite calls toward mutuality, the bond ineluctably returns to a model with "one head." In a short book chapter on this uneven bond, Dolan pauses her argument for a brief moment to consider the supposed equality of same-sex friendship:

> Some have argued that same-sex friendship offered one model for the intimacy possible between equals, a model freed of assumptions about gender hierarchy, before a "companionate marriage" between opposite-sex spouses could yet be imagined without contradiction or terror. But in discourses of male friendship we find the same fear that equality

[65] Michel de Montaigne, *The Essays of Michel de Montaigne*, trans. M.A. Screech (London: Allen Lane, 1991) 135-44. It in this essay Montaigne places male friendship above the bounds of marriage, which he views as "a bargain" that is "contrained and forced" (137) in comparison with the words spoken of his friend: "Our souls pulled together in such unison, they regarded each other with such ardent affection, and with a like affection revealed themselves to each other to the very depths of our hearts, that not only did I know his soul as well as mine, but I should certainly have trusted myself to him more readily than to myself" (140).

> degenerates into muderous enmity that characterizes many early modern descriptions of marriage.[66]

Dolan does not substantiate this short passage with examples. It is not my interest in this study to trouble the "intimacy possible between equals" or to depict the "fear" that same-sex bonds might degenerate "into murderous enmity." My study does, however, accord with Dolan's underlying idea here, in that I focus on examples where supposed pastoral male fellowship gestures in significant ways to oppositional and adversarial possibilities.

One underlying feature of all the scholarship I've adduced so far is the potential for different formulations of gender and sexuality. My focus on emulous fellowship necessarily attends to questions related to gender and sexuality, though my focus narrows on how different formulations of fellowship redistribute power and authority. In other words, my work addresses both gender and sexuality as discursive strategies through which poets expand on fellowship and on its politics of power. An earlier draft of this project considered the possibility of emulous fellowship being a constituent of a masculine gender identity in the period, though "emulous masculinity" was troubled not only by the various female characters, writers, and princes who enter into the later portion of my project, but also because the most articulate writer (that I encountered in my research) to express the relationship between "emulation" and the literary process is a

[66] Fran Dolan, "One Head is Better than Two: The Aphoristic Afterlife of Renaissance Tragedy," *Essays in Memory of Richard Helgerson*, ed. Roze Hentschell and Kathy Lavezzo (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2012) 103.

woman: Margaret Cavendish, the Duchess of Newcastle.[67] Although my project has de-emphasized masculinity and the emulous bonds that undergird so much of masculine gender identity in the period, the project nonetheless speaks to many scholars who treat masculinity or whose projects are male-focused.[68]

My dissertation expands on ideas of early modern sexuality, particularly within the purview of homosocial and homoerotic bonds in Elizabethan pastoral. As Rictor Norton, Bruce Smith, and Stephen Guy-Bray attest, the pastoral space of the eclogue is oftentimes a homoerotic one.[69] All three critics, as well as all other critics that read pastoral characters, traditions, and spaces as homoerotic, most often focus on

[67] It is worth quoting at length a fantastic passage by Margaret Cavendish in *A True Relation of my Birth, Breeding, and Life (1656)*, in *Paper Bodies: A Margaret Cavendish Reader* ed. Sylvia Bowerbank and Sara Mendelson (Peterborough: Broadview, 2000): "I am neither spitefull, envious, nor malicious, I repine not at the gifts that Nature, or Fortune bestows upon others, yet I am a great Emulator; for though I wish none worse than they are, nor fear any should be better than they are, yet it is lawfull for me to wish my self the best, and to do my honest endeavour thereunto, for I think it no crime to wish my self the exactest of Natures works, my thred of life the longest, my Chaine of Destinie the strongest, my minde the peaceablest; my life the pleasantest, my death the easiest, and the greatest Saint in Heaven; also to do my endeavour, so far as honour and honesty doth allow of, to be the highest on Fortunes Wheele, and to hold the wheele from turning, if I can, and if it be comendable to wish anothers good, it were a sin not to wish my own, for as Envie is a vice, so Emulation is a Vertue, but Emulation is in the way of Ambition, or indeed it is a Noble Ambition, but I fear my Ambition inclines to vain glory, for I am very ambitious, yet 'tis neither for Beauty, Wit, Titles, Wealth or Power, but as they are steps to raise me to Fames Tower, which is to live by remembrance in after-ages" (61).

[68] Specifically, my study speaks about the fabric of the male-male bond. Some standard studies of masculinity include Alexandra Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), Catherine Bates, *Masculinity, Gender and Identity in the English Renaissance Lyric* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), and Ronda Arab, *Manly Mechanicals on the Early Modern English Stage* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2011). A good comprehensive overview is Karen Harvey and Alexandra Shephard, "What Have Historians Done with Masculinity? Reflections on Five Centuries of British History, circa 1500 – 1950" *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 274-80. My study also expands on understandings of early modern sports by troubling sporting terminology. The standard study of early modern sports is Gregory M. Colón Semenza, *Sport, Politics, and Literature in the English Renaissance* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003), which uses many of the terms that constitute emulous fellowship without regard to their early modern defintions (see, for example, page 116, where Semenza defines "competition").

[69] See note 49 of this introduction.

relationships that seem to privilege reciprocal, consensual affection, and even equality.[70] While these critics recognize the importance of "contest" in the homosocial landscape, in other words, their interests are often focused on homoeroticism.[71] On one hand, my work would seem to complicate homoeroticism within the pastoral landscape, since emulous fellowship narrows on power discrepancies that these critics rarely consider within the male-male bond. On the other hand, my study builds upon their work by expanding on moments that inscribe poetic dominance with a discourse of homoeroticism. For example, in Stephen Guy-Bray's *Homoerotic Space: The Poetics of Loss*, he identifies a homoerotic literary space within the pastoral that allows Latinate, educated poets to communicate homoerotic desire through a language derived from classical shepherds. Guy-Bray reads the classical attitude toward homoeroticism (in Theocritus and Virgil especially) against increasing restrictions in early modern England to show how homoerotic space, in England, was shrinking and centered around loss. At first glance, my suggestion that shepherdly relations are "emulous" might seem to counter Guy-Bray's thesis, since my work responds to readings that do not analyze emulation within

[70] The privileging of mutuality should not been seen as a shortcoming or narrow reading, since these critics are doing essential work to recuperate a literary tradition from some egregiously narrow and downright bigoted readings of pastoral homoeroticism by scholars who precede them. Poggioli, in *The Oaten Flute*, is wrong on many accounts when he writes, "Thus many writers of our time have used the pastoral dispensation to justify the claims of homosexual love. Andre Gide dared to protest the exclusion of that forbidden territory from love's realm in a book that he named after Vergil's Corydon, disregarding the fact that the original Corydon is a half-comic, half-pathetic character, doomed to a hopeless infatuation for a boy. That the dark region of that unnatural passion is still envisaged in pastoral images may be proved by the title *Arcadie* given by a group of Parisian writers to a new little review pleading and preaching the cause of sexual perversion" (15).

[71] Homoerotic pastoral criticism often explicitly recognizes the adversarial aspects of the pastoral world. Guy-Bray, in *Homoerotic space*, writes that, "In what may be a survival from the genre's roots in epic poetry, poetry is also presented as something at which men compete. In a sense, then, the song contests that are so common in Theocritus and Virgil may be seen as pastoral equivalents to the great duels that structure the *Iliad*" (25).

the homoerotic bond. However, my work is the first to recognize that the opening poem of just about every English eclogue collection published between 1563 and 1590 foregrounds or responds to, in a deliberate and specific way, a homoerotic bond between its shepherds, including opening eclogues by Barnabe Googe, Alexander Barclay, Edmund Spenser, as well as the first eclogue in the 1588 translation of Theocritus's idylls. While my ultimate focus is on the shifting power dynamics inherent to this male-male bond and its resonance with early modern schoolrooms, I nonetheless add support to Guy-Bray's argument by depicting how writers entered one of the pastoral's most prominent forms—the eclogue—with an eye to homoeroticism, in both English collections and in English translations of classical texts.

While I agree that the eclogue is primarily a homoerotic literary space, it is limiting for my purposes to too strictly associate queer sexuality with "homoeroticism" and with male-male bonds. Often it is not only male shepherds, but female ones also, who get inscribed into the eclogue in queer ways. By "queer," I will use a particularly clear definition put forth by David Orvis,

> I use the term "queer" to signify an array of social and sexual practices, arrangements, and peoples that, when put into discourse, confront or undermine the (perceived) dominant culture's views on gender and sexuality … From this vantage, "queer" carries with it deconstructive as well as generative properties, enabling, on the one hand, the dissection and interrogation of dominant ideology, and, on the other, the construction and expression of alternative configurations.[72]

[72] David L. Orvis, "Cross-Dressing, Queerness, and the Early Modern Stage," in *The Cambridge History of Gay and Lesbian Literature*, eds. E. McCallum and M. Tuhkanen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014) 199. Orvis reading follows Eve Kasofsky Sedgwick's expansion of queer terminology in *The Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).

As shepherdesses make their ways into my dissertation, they present "alternative configurations" to what one typically envisions as a heterosexual relationship. For example, Christopher Marlowe's incessant amorous invitations to shepherds and shepherdesses alike—in lyric, epyllion, and dramatic verse—signal his eclogue forebears, presenting models of sexuality that recall the power hierarchies implied in some classical relationships, as elaborated upon by David Halperin.[73] Further, various pastoral elegies for Queen Elizabeth present her relationship with the ascendent King James in both matrimonial and incestuous terms. As my dissertation incorporates representations of women in the second half, in other words, it expands on the possibilities of emulous fellowship to demonstrate how women are incorporated into the traditionally male realm of the eclogue in queer ways.

Gender and sexuality are not the primary concern of any single chapter, but most chapters necessarily include gender and sexuality within their purviews, particularly as these concepts are used discursively.[74] A few of the emulous terms in the opening examples of this dissertation might signal sexuality—such as Tamburlarine's usage of

[73] Halperin, David. *100 Years of Homosexuality.* New York: Routledge, 1990. Halperin suggests that, in Ancient Greece, "Sex, as it is constituted by the public, masculine discourse, is either act or impact (according to one's point of view): it is not knit up in a web mutuality, not something one invariably has *with* someone" (30 emphasis in original). For Halperin, the receiving agent in the sexual encounter is equated with passivitiy, and most important is that the receiver is of a lower social status.

[74] My dissertation also sexualizes studies of "emulation" by expanding on the term's possibilities. In a 2016 book chapter, Coppelia Kahn writes that "Compounded of imitation and envy, emulation makes rivals want at the same time to be like and to eliminate and replace each other … This pattern of emulation, widely diffused in English Renaissance culture as in Shakespeare is, I would say, normative rather than queer" (53). See Coppelia Kahn, "Family Quarrels: Feminist Criticism, Queer Studies, and Shakespeare in the Twenty-First Century" in *Rethinking Feminism in Early Modern Studies* eds. Ania Loomba and Melissa Sanchez (New York: Routledge, 2016). Similarly, recent book-length studies (Lynn, *Envy* and Dickson, *Emulation*) read envy and emulation in primarily normative terms. Since most of my chapters treat emulation as implicating sexualized and gendered discourse, I expand on the possibility of how emulation works in early modern England.

"competitor"—but the term "copemate," especially, signals the cross-pollination of sexuality and the eclogue. As the seventh example that opens this dissertation shows, "copemate" is a word used for Coridon's relationship with his fellow shepherds in the preface to Francis Sabie's eclogues, *Pan's Pipe*. And while copemate is a term that encapsulates the emulous fellowship that this introduction has been outlining thus far, it also very clearly signals "a paramour." The verb "to cope" is used in the period, specifically, as both a verb that means "to fight" and "to have sex with." And "copemate" could sound enough like "cupmate" that I suspect that the two terms may have been wittily and strategically confused. The term "copemate" thus encapsulates the emulous bond, one that vacillates between different definitions and that does not need a third term (an object of desire or other triangular endpoint) to exist.

II Why eclogue?

Why the eclogue? The model of emulous fellowship that I have been expanding over the course of this introduction might be applied across a variety of literary forms, and the opening gambit provides proof that such a model might be fruitfully applied beyond the timeframe of Elizabethan England as well: *Antony and Cleopatra*, with its cast of "competitors," is one of Shakespeare's later plays. A complementary project would be to track the progression of "competition" from a nearly non-existent term in Elizabethan times through to its prevalence in the later works of John Milton: not only does Milton use "competition" and "rivals" in ways that accord with our contemporary definitions of these terms, but he also presents an early English usage of a cognate of

"agon" in *Sampson Agonistes*.[75] I choose to focus on the Elizabethan eclogue, however, because the eclogue provides early usages of such terminology alongside an emergent literary community. Further, the Elizabethan eclogue's dialogic structure as well as the representation of its writers in poetic form (Spenser's Colin and Sidney's Philisides) merges poetic creation with commentary. Finally, the eclogue provides enough parameters and a small enough case study to allow for it to be read as an expanding literary tradition over the course of the Elizabethan period. The eclogue parameters were porous and actively debated, though "eclogue" retains more defining features than does "pastoral" and the two terms, when parsed, offer subtle distinctions in the period.

The dialogic structure of the eclogue is one of the features that most clearly distinguishes "eclogue" from a broader sense of "pastoral." Although the terms "eclogue" and "pastoral" were sometimes used interchangeably in early modern England, they were not synonyms: "pastoral" might stand in for "eclogue," but oftentimes it did not.[76] The eclogue is never, tellingly, used as an adjective in the period, without an additional word added, such as "eclogue-wise."[77] Rather, the eclogue was more often understood as a distinct entity within the larger pastoral landscape, with a specific characteristic: the eclogue was understood as an instance of shepherdly "talk,"

[75] See note 25 in this introduction.

[76] The distinguishing features between "pastoral" and "eclogue" are rarely noted by critics of the pastoral. Even studies that primarily look at eclogues, and that reinterpret the form in new and interesting ways, such as Katherine Little, *Transforming Work* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013) blur the distinction. Exceptions include the rarely cited James Edmund Congleton, *Theories of pastoral Poetry in England, 1684 – 1798* (University of Florida Press, 1952) 3-37, who clearly associates the eclogue with instances of shepherdly dialogue on both the continent and in England during the 16th century. Also, Helen Cooper, "The Goat and the Eclogue" *Philological Quarterly* 53.3 (Summer 1974): 363-79.

[77] Sir Philip Sidney, *The Old Arcadia* ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) 285.

often in verse, following the eclogues of Theocritus, Virgil, and their continental imitators. The dialogic focus of the eclogue, combined with how often it figures its shepherds as copemates, emulators, and other emulous terms, makes it especially suitable to analyze the ever-shifting power dynamics that underlie poetic fellowship in the period.

Many prominent early modern English literary theorists shed light on the eclogue's unique dialogic structure. As George Puttenham says about the eclogue in his classification of poetry in *The Arte of English Poesie*,

> in base and humble stile by maner of Dialogue, vttered the priuate and familiar talke of the meanest sort of men, as shepheards, heywards and such like, such was among the Greekes *Theocritus*: and *Virgill* among the Latines, their poemes were named *Eglogues* or shepheardly talke.[78]

Puttenham provides a fuller definition of the eclogue in the section entitled "Of the shepherds' or pastoral poesy called eclogue, and to what purpose it was first invented and used," in which he explains that "the pastoral poesy, which we commonly call by the name of eclogue and bucolic," is one that, while modelled after "babble and talk" and "disputation and contentious reasoning" of rustic shepherds, in fact more closely entails a "counterfeit[ing]" of "the rustical manner of loves and communications."[79] Puttenham's use of words such as "dialogue," "talke," "babble," "disputation," and "communications" paints the eclogue in decidedly dialogic terminology, and as a form concerned with the relations between its shepherds. One finds a similar definition of the eclogue in oft-cited,

[78] See George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589) in *Sidney's 'The Defence of Poesy' and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism,* ed. Gavin Alexander (Toronto: Penguin Group, 2004) 78. This quotation is from Chapter 11, entitled "Of poems and their sundry formes and how thereby the auncient Poets receaued surnames."

[79] Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie,* 88 89.

contemporaneous discussions: in *The Defence of Poesie*, Sidney makes a special note of the "contentions" inherent to Virgil's eclogues;[80] and in the introduction to *The Shepheardes Calender,* Spenser's verbose commentator, E.K., calls the "aeglogues" "extraordinary discourses of unnecessary matter."[81] E.K.'s focus on the word "aeglogue" and its various connotations responds to Abraham Fleming's *The Bucolikes of Publius Virgilius Maro* (Virgil), printed four years prior, wherein an entire section is devoted to "the interpretation of this worde Ecloge."[82] In this section, Fleming provides several contrasting definitions, including "a choosing, a deviding [sic], or a separating, and a declaring," but mainly the term eclogue "impart[s]" yet another dialogic quality: "a talking togeather."[83] "Talking together" gets repeated in several instances, and "Eclogarij," or "Colloquntores, or Interloquuteres" are "talkers together, or speakers."[84]

My interest is not to parse E.K.'s or Fleming's circuitous classical terminology, but to note the extent to which the eclogue was largely understood to connote a shepherdly version of dialogue in early modern England, one that is distinguished from other pastoral activities. In Sir Philip Sidney's *Old Arcadia,* Basilius invites Cleophila to "see the sports and hear the eclogues of his country shepherds," making a distinction

[80] See Philip Sidney, *The Defence of Poesy,* in *Sidney's 'The Defence of Poesy' and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism,* ed. Gavin Alexander (Toronto: Penguin Books, 2004) 26.

[81] Spenser, *Shorter Poems,* 32.

[82] Abraham Fleming, trans. *The Bucolikes of Publius Virgilius Maro* (London: John Charlewood, 1575) B3r.

[83] Fleming, *The Bucolikes (1575)*, B3r. For the sake of clarity, I include the date in shortened citations for Abraham Flemings two translations of Virgil (1575 and 1589).

[84] This is also repeated elsewhere in Fleming, *The Bucolikes (1575)*: "But let those same Eclogarij minglers of communication: talkers, or speakers, Let them I saye, be marked well, who, and what they be and whereof they reason" (B2v).

between listening to the dialogic poems and seeing other sports.[85] With Sidney one notes that *eclogue* often connotes some form of disputation or contention: when Basilius "had a sufficient eclogue in his own head betwixt honour … on the one side, and this new assault of Cleophila's beauty on the other side" the term eclogue so strongly connotes a dialogue (with its accompanying preposition "betwixt"), that it is used synonymously with "contention" (Basilius, shortly afterwards, is said to be "carrying his unquiet contention about him").[86] One assumes that Donne uses the term to connote dialogue for his "Eclogue: 1613. December 26," which contains no reference to pastoral otherwise, and which in some extant manuscripts is entitled an "Epithalamion" instead of an "Eclogue."[87] Perhaps the best example of how the eclogue might be distinguished from pastoral occurs in Abraham Fleming's 1589 translation of Virgil's eclogues, where Fleming writes about the content of the ten eclogues in the introduction: "you must note that seven of these eclogs are meere pastoral: in the other three the poet swarveth from this rurall plainnesse."[88] For Fleming, an eclogue may or may not be "pastoral," despite all the translated eclogues containing shepherds or other rural labourers. This dissertation

[85] See Sidney, *Old Arcadia,* 39. "Pastoral" and "eclogue" do have some overlap in *The Old Arcadia,* though "pastoral," in comparison with "eclogue," is more closely affiliated with sports: Basilius's request is that Cleophila would "see their pastorals (for so their sports were termed)," and shortly afterwards he refers to "pastoral sports" (41).

[86] Sidney, *Old Arcadia,* 41 41. Later, Sidney uses the term in this way when he speaks about Strephon and Klaius singing their competing sestinas "eclogue-wise," which connotes a dialogue, or perhaps a competition, between the two sestinas (328).

[87] See John Donne, "Eclogue: 1613. December 26," in *Complete English Poems* Ed. C.A. Patrides, Intro. Robin Hamilton (Vermont: Everyman, 1994) 134-6. Note that in several manuscripts the poem is entitled "Epithalamion at the Marriage of the Earl of Somerset."

[88] Abraham Fleming, trans*., The Bvcoliks of Pvblivs Virgilivs Maro, Prince of All Latine Poets; otherwise called his Pastoralls, or shepeherds meetings* (London: Thomas Woodcocker, 1589). The "other three" eclogues are eclogues 4, 6, and 8. While this titled page calls the eclogues "Pastoralls," they are more often referred, in the introduction, to "bucoliks" or "eclogues," and the title page calls them "shepherds meetings." Congleton, *Theories of Pastoral Poetry*, 8, notes that Drayton's 1619 title, "*Pastorals. Contayning Eclogues*," reflects the distinction between his dialogue poems and those that are not.

will follow Fleming, Sidney, and other early modern commentators by distinguishing between the pastoral more broadly, which often includes the eclogue but more often contains other sports, activities, or pastimes, and the eclogue, which was more closely understood as a poetic dialogue, one that, according to the recurring terminology, is often related to a debate or contention.

In early modern England, "bucolic" is a term close in meaning to "eclogue." Recall, in a passage quoted earlier, that George Puttenham writes "pastoral poesy, which we commonly call by the name of eclogue and bucolic."[89] While Abraham Fleming distinguishes between the "bucolike" and "eclogue" in the introduction of his 1575 translation of Virgil, he uses the two terms interchangeably in other parts of his 1575 translation and especially in his 1589 translation and paratext.[90] Following David Halperin, who distinguishes "bucolic" from "pastoral" in ancient usage, particularly in the context of Theocritus, I extend a similar disambiguation to "eclogue" and "pastoral" in Elizabethan England.[91] To borrow Halperin's phrasing, I hope to complicate the "pastoralist interpretation" of the eclogue,[92] and my dissertation marks the first effort to treat the eclogue as a form in its own right, one that might find itself within the larger

[89] Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie,* 88.

[90] In the 1575 edition, A1v, the two words appear in sequence. See, for example, "6 A generall argument vpon the *Bucolikes* 7 The tenne *Ecloges* with their seuerall contentes."

[91] See David Halperin, *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983). Halperin's thesis is that post-Virgilian interpretations of "pastoral" have obfuscated the "bucolic" roots of Theocritus, and have caused the latter poet to be read anachronistically according to pastoral convention that came after him (some of which he originated). Thus, Halperin wants not only to disentangle Theocritus from later imitations of various aspects of his poetry, but even attempts to disentangle the terminology of "bucolic" from the later "pastoral." Instead of reading Theocritus from a pastoral perspective, he attempts to read Theocritus according to his Greek bucolic context.

[92] Halperin, *Before Pastoral*, 19.

pastoral but that might also be at odds with much of what we have come to associate with pastoralism in early modern England.

Germane to the dialogic structure of the eclogue is its capacity for imitation. Simply put, the eclogue is an imitative form, and early modern English renditions of the eclogue deploy conventions, tropes, and even shepherd names from both contemporary and bygone eras to signal literary affiliation. The eclogue's literary space,[93] on the one hand imitates the literary past: as shepherds named Corydon, Thyrsis, Dorus, and Daphnis perform singing contests against one another, they reference backwards in time to both classical (Theocritus, Mopsus, Virgil) and continental (Petrarch, Mantuan, and Sanazzaro) literary namesakes. Looking forward, the eclogue names are also immediate and concrete, whereby the eclogue's setting is early modern England and its various locales, and the dialogues that it stages are between living eclogue writers familiar with one another's collections. Imitation, both synchronic and diachronic, is thus a means through which the dialogic eclogues gesture beyond the shepherdly conversations contained within individual eclogues. It is the contention of this dissertation that the imitative quality of the shepherds' songs, which respond to both classical and

[93] My study is indebted to critics who have conceptualized "space" in the pastoral landscape. For Regina Schneider, *Sidney's (Re)Writing of the* Arcadia (New York: AMS Press, 2008): "to declare the pastoral realm one of pure invention also enabled the poet to create a whole new world in his imagination, as golden as he wanted it to be without having to fear that he would be denounced as a liar. It thus became the fictional space *par excellence*" (83). Stephen Guy-Bray, in *Homoerotic Space,* draws a more careful connection between pastoral and space, whereby "space" designates "practiced place," or moments in the text through which different readers personalize it and even connect with other readers; if a famous classical text is a "public place," homoerotic readings of that text, which maneouvre new pathways through it, create a "space" (7). For his distinguishing between place/space, Guy-Bray follows Michel de Certau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* trans. S. Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

contemporary sources, often blur the distinction between models of influence based on imitation and those based on emulation.[94]

One common feature of the eclogue form is to blur the distinction between shepherdly persona and author, between fiction and reality, as evidenced in the shepherdly personae of Sidney's Philisides and Spenser's Colin.[95] The shepherd personae often signal multiple and contrasting affiliations with real life personages: the first English translator of Virgil's eclogues identifies several shepherds with the figure of Virgil, and E.K. follows suit in his introduction to *The Shepheardes Calender*.[96] The eclogue genre continually plays with the boundaries of character / personae, and, ultimately, studies of the author that mark a definitive break between character and writer, such as "The Death of the Author" by Roland Barthes, do not adequately account for the interplay between shepherd and shepherd-poet within the space of the eclogue.[97] Instead, the ambiguity between character and author, so often marked by textual "riddles," adds nuance to what I call emulous fellowship found in the eclogue and its dialogic conventions. The eclogue is a literary form that allows poets to create their own

[94] The overlap between imitation and emulation has been explored by critics across a range of languages and genres, including Thomas M. Greene, Vernor Guy Dickson, and G.W. Pigman. Thomas M. Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982; Dickson, *Emulation*; and G. W. Pigman III, "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance," *Renaissance Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (Spring 1980): 1-32. This study adds to existing studies by demonstrating how the overlap between imitation and emulation might be contextualized according to literary parameters derived from a specific form: the Elizabethan eclogue.

[95] Neither is this a distinctly early modern English phenomenon: commentaries for Virgil's eclogues by Servius and Donatus were widely circulated, and many English poets would likely have been familiar with the eclogues (and the substantial apparatuses) of Petrarch. For the interplay between fictional characters and their historical allusions, see especially the commentary in Petrarch, *Bucolicum Carmen* trans. Thomas G. Bergin (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974).

[96] See chapter two, page 114 ff., for a further discussion on the porous boundary between writer and persona in the eclogue genre. E.K. associates both Colin and Cuddie, at different instances, with Spenser.

[97] Roland Barthes, "Death of the Author," in *Image, Music, Text* (London, Fontana, 1977) 142-8.

shepherdly characters and write out relationships that invoke emulous models of fellowship.

Various schools of criticism—historical formalism, new formalism—have called for a closer engagement with the specifics of literary form, whereby a particular form is understood to have a unique set of cultural, social, and political expectations.[98] The idea that different forms undergird different authorial networks and models of communication is not new. Northrop Frye, the great taxonomic critic, put it this way: "The purpose of criticism by genres is not so much to classify as to clarify ... traditions and affinities, thereby bringing out a large number of literary relationships that would not be noticed as long as there were no context established for them."[99] While the broader catchment of the pastoral might include just about every literary writer in the Renaissance, thereby rendering its relational aspect more diffuse, the eclogue's blossoming in England entailed a small enough literary event to foster something of a community, both synchronic and diachronic, whereby poets engaged one another's works in ways not sufficiently illuminated by capital-p pastoral scholarship. Over the course of this dissertation, I hope to put Frye's dictum *in situ* and to answer these questions: what does it mean to write eclogues in early modern England, and how does this innately dialogic, imitative, and queer form inform poetic fellowship in the period?

[98] Stephen Cohen, "Between Form and Culture: New Historicism and the Promise of a Historical Formalism," in *Renaissance Literature and Its Formal Engagements*, Ed. Mark David Rasmussen (New York: Palgrave, 2002) and Stephen Cohen, ed., *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism* (Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2007).

[99] Northrop Frye, *The Anatomy of Criticism,* (New Jersey: Princeton Press, 1957) 247-48. The passage is also quoted in Halperin, *Before Pastoral*, 34.

III The structure of this dissertation

My chapters are divided around four "conventions" of the eclogue that depict variations in emulous fellowship, and I extend Paul Alpers's theorization of the term "convention" to include both a place of meeting and a literary *topoi*.[100] Thus the eclogue conventions transcend the function of a simple "trope," in my formulation, in the way that they signal a "coming together" (from the Latin *convenire*) between two or more shepherds: an example of a "trope" of the eclogue is a gift or a prize awarded at the end of a shepherd's song, while an example of a "convention" is the singing contest itself. In accordance with this spatial connotation of "convention," then, the four conventions that structure my chapters are each associated with different, overlapping spaces: the shepherds' forum of chapter one is associated with the schoolroom; the singing contest of chapter two is associated with print and manuscript literary coteries; the invitation to love of chapter three is associated with the early modern theatre; and the funeral rehearsal of chapter four is associated with public ceremony. I read emulous fellowship within the works of Barnabe Googe, Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser, Christopher Marlowe, William Shakespeare, and Thomas Watson, among others. While some of these writers did not write eclogues, *per se*, I show how their poems are deeply indebted to the dialogic eclogue and its conventions. Ultimately, the shepherds contained in the works by the writers above resemble a poetic community, since the various dialogues that structure the shepherds' verse transcend the immediate moment to gesture toward both contemporaneous poets and long gone classical influences.

[100] Alpers, *What is Pastoral?,* 79-93.

My first chapter, "'By emulation and striuing who may do best': the Shepherds' Forum and Opening Eclogues" takes as its focus the first poems in the printed eclogue collections circulating in Elizabethan England. Critics have not noticed that the first eclogues continually stage encounters between young and old shepherds that respond to early modern models of pedagogy, as espoused in texts by Thomas Elyot, Roger Ascham, and Richard Mulcaster, among others. The opening eclogues contained in *The Lady of May* and *The Old Arcadia* serve to critique the all-powerful schoolmaster. As the eclogues reframe both the pupil/pupil and the master/pupil dialogue, the linguistic instability of terms like "emulator" that get deployed—in both eclogue collections and school treatises—foregrounds the ambivalence of pedagogical bonds. My chapter closes by analysing the frequency with which the masculine relationships in these eclogues deploy sexualized homoerotic language to signal adversarial ideas of pedagogy, particularly in eclogues by Barnabe Googe, Edmund Spenser, and in Fleming's translation of Virgil's eclogues.

My second chapter "'Thou shalt ycouned be in *Colins* stede:' the Singing Contest in Edmund Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calender*," suggests that "the singing contest" is a convention through which established poets vie for pre-eminence within the larger, imagined poetic marketplace. The singing contest in "August" in *The Shepheardes Calender* provides a metaphorical frame through which this chapter reads literary contention within Spenser's eclogues and toward his contemporaries. Colin Clout's oppositional stance is analogous to the text's ambivalent attitude toward contemporaneous eclogue collections. The contests at the heart of my chapter are, first, between Spenser and Barnabe Googe and, secondly and most significantly, between

Spenser and Sidney. In the cases of both Googe's and Sidney's eclogues, Spenser situates his work against English predecessors, troubling E.K.'s pronouncement that Spenser, as the "new Poete," flies toward the classical tradition while eschewing his contemporaries.

The two remaining chapters continue to focus and expand on emulous fellowship, although they consider the eclogic conventions as they appear in forms further removed from the eclogue, including the epyllion, tragedy, and elegy. My third chapter, entitled "'Then Shalt Thou be my Competitor': the Invitation to Love and Christopher Marlowe," argues that Christopher Marlowe's lyric, "The Passionate Shepherd to his Love," enacts a trope—the invitation to love—that can be traced back to its competitive iteration in the eclogue tradition in a way that helps to elucidate the eroticized power dynamics throughout Marlowe's canon. In the place of the "lover" in the invitation, I suggest that the shepherds are more often figured as "competitors," a term used by Tamburlaine toward various lieutenants and generals he solicits with a martial version of the invite. By demonstrating the extent to which shepherds throughout Marlowe's oeuvre deploy the invitation to love with less than loving ends in mind, this chapter posits that persuasive verbal power is congruent with a shepherdly heritage and not a departure from it. Marlowe's continued association with his lyrics and with his own protagonists, such as Tamburlaine, speaks to how the eclogue entered the early modern theatre: as a convention through which playwrights could respond to one another's work. The coda of this chapter turns to Shakespeare to consider how he responds to Tamburlaine with a theatrical shepherd of his own.

My fourth chapter, "'Ile chiefe mourner be': Rehearsing Death in the Pastoral Elegy," looks at the pastoral elegy and at how it reimagines poetic authority and kingship. The pastoral elegy overlaps with the eclogue in Elizabethan England, and my first step in this chapter is to read Virgil's two eclogues that contain pastoral elegies—the fifth and the tenth—and foreground their careerist implications. Second, I turn to early modern English elegies by Thomas Watson and Edmund Spenser, and I outline their complementary attempts to a) find consolation for the deceased and b) rewrite the deceased's mythology. In both Watson's and Spenser's elegies, the speaker showcases his organizing control over a procession of mourners, which is a gesture that responds both to the careerism inherent in the classical pastoral elegy and to the burgeoning literary community in England during the 1590s. Third, the chapter looks at elegies for Queen Elizabeth and at their attempts to "chiefe mourner be," to quote the anonymous poet known as T. W. The three elegies that this section analyzes attempt to find new methods of consolation as they mythologize the deceased, and a recurring trope is to figure James I as consolation incarnate. The dissertation then finishes with a focus on Virgil's messianic fourth eclogue and on how it is invoked to praise James I.

The arc of my dissertation moves from young boys to princes, from youth to death, and from entering to exiting the eclogue form. A loose framing device for my dissertation is the Virgilian *rota*: the chapter that immediately follows this introduction presents a reading of the opening (or first) eclogues in major Elizabethan collections and their affinity with grammar school; and, my last chapter considers pastoral elegies that mourn the death of England's queen. While the poetic career is not the only concern of

the present study, the structural device of the *rota* highlights the extent to which Elizabethan poets deployed the eclogue in diverse circumstances.

Chapter 1 "By emulation and striuing who may do best": the Shepherds' Forum and Opening Eclogues

Midway through William Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost*, the schoolmaster Holofernes misquotes the opening lines of the first eclogue in the collection of Baptista Spagnuoli, better known in English as Mantuanus or Mantuan. In a vapid show of pedantry toward his pupils, Holofernes renders Mantuan's lines as, "Facile precor gelida quando pecus / omne sub umbra Ruminat" (4.2.86-7), which should be "*Fauste,* precor gelida quando pecus omne sub umbra Ruminat."[1] Shakespeare's inclusion of Mantuan's lines gestures at the possibility that some audience members might recognize them from their own grammar school educations, of which the *Adulescientia* (Mantuan's eclogues) was a studied text. The bastardization of the lines even implies that some would have been familiar enough with the original passage to recognize Holofernes's error. Most likely, however, the early modern audience would recognize Holofernes's recollection of Mantuan's lines as an allusion to the popular, near-contemporaneous skirmish between Gabriel Harvey and Thomas Nashe. Harvey quotes Mantuan first, in *Foure Letters,* to draw an analogy between Nashe's intellect and the puerility of grammar school: "The summe of summmes is, He [Nashe] lost his imagination a thousand waies, and I belieue searched every corner of Grammar-Schoole witte (for his margine is as deeplie learned,

[1] My emphasis. The song between Winter and Spring at the end of the *Love's Labour's Lost* suggests a further parallel with eclogues.

as *Fauste precor gelida*) to see if he could finde anie meanes to relieuve his estate."[2] The expression "To learn one's margin at grammar school" is not entirely clear, though it seems to refer to Nashe being juvenile, not properly learned, or perhaps overly reliant on his lowly grammar school education. As with so much of Holofernes's portrayal, Shakespeare's inclusion of the lines serves a deft jab at Harvey, though it also recalls Nashe's reply in *Foure Letters Confuted,* which singles out the same "*Fauste precor gelida*" lines from Mantuan.[3] Ultimately, Shakespeare's usage of the Mantuan quotation to signal the Harvey/Nashe feud underscores the eclogue's association with pedagogy, with literary contest, and with pedagogy *as* literary contest.

This chapter provides the first sustained critical effort to contextualize the Elizabethan eclogue within early modern pedagogy, and it does so using the terms of emulous fellowship outlined in the introduction to this dissertation. Elizabethan poets incorporate training from and speak back to their grammar school educations, and they do so during the first steps of their poetic careers—in the eclogue. As students become "emulators"—of other students, of their masters, and of a master-text—they blur the distinction between the pedagogical practices of "imitation" and "emulation." The introduction to this dissertation outlines that "emulator" is synonymous with both "imitator" and with "adversary in a contest." In this chapter, I argue that these two

[2] Gabriel Harvey, *The Works of Gabriel Harvey*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart (New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1966) 190. The "lost" appears as "tost" is the Grosart edition.

[3] Thomas Nashe's reply is from *Foure Letters Confuted,* in *The Complete Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart (London, 1583), which also singles out the Mantuan passage: "With / the first and second leafe hee plaies verie pretilie, and in ordinarie terms of extenuating, verdits *Pierce Penilesse for an Grammar Schoole wit: saies his Margine is as deepelie learnd as* Fauste praecor gelida*, that his Muse sobbeth and groneth very piteouslie, bids him not cast himself headlong into the horrible gulph of desperation*" (249). See also Willem Schrickx, *Shakespeare's early contemporaries: the background of the Harvey-Nashe polemic and Love's Labour's Lost* (Antwerpen: Nederlandsche Boekhandel, 1956).

possibilies of emulator become confused and collapsed, whereby shepherdly pupils come to regard their elder educators not only as models to be imitated but as figures to be lampooned, or as competitors against whom they might contest.

By combining focii on pedagogy and the eclogue, the present study adds to criticism pertaining to both early modern education and early modern pastoral. In regards to education, the study complicates the claim in some early modern criticism that the schoolroom was a place of harsh discipline, policed by flogging and other corporal punishment, which in turn created passive or docile students.[4] My study suggests that the dialogic qualities of both the eclogue (a form often understood, as my introduction argues, as "a talking together") and the schoolroom create a complex intermeshing of conversation, imitation, and contest. I follow Jeff Dolven's suggestion, in his book about early modern romance's response to education, that "[t]he challenge is to capture that double sense of debt and resentment that … poets, whose greatness depended so deeply on their education, felt toward their teachers."[5] Along with Dolven and critics such as Lynn Enterline, William Weaver, Rebecca Bushnell, and Peter Mack, my study adds to the complexity of reading early modern writers back against their schoolroom environments and the ambiguous legacy left by a writer's education.[6] In contrast with the

[4] See Richard Halpern, *The Poetics of Primative Accumulation* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991) 10-22. For a complication of this view, see Lynn Enterline, *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), especially 33-61, which follows the close interplay between methods of imitation and punishment in early modern school tracts.

[5] Jeff Dolven, *Scenes of Instruction in Renaissance Romance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007) 62.

[6] Dolven, *Scenes of Instruction*; Enterline, *Shakespeare's Schoolroom*; William P. Weaver, *Untutored Lines: The Making of the English Epyllion* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012); Rebecca Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996); Peter Mack, *Reading and Rhetoric in Montaigne and Shakespeare* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010).

critics mentioned above, who focus on education within the genres of romance, drama, and the epyllion, I turn to a poetic form—the eclogue—that signals the commencement of a poetic career.

This chapter also responds to early modern pastoral criticism. By focusing on moments of emulation, I complicate the idea that the pastoral serves as a community-oriented space in which poets find minimal opposition before moving onto grander forms. More importantly, my study adds a new focus to pastoral's place within a poetic career: pastoral critics often consider how a poet leaves the pastoral space, whether Virgil's speaker in the tenth eclogue turning to the epic, or Colin Clout hanging up his pipe in "December," or Milton's "uncouth swain" turning to "pastures new" in the coda to Lycidas.[7] My final chapter on the pastoral elegy will treat some of these closing eclogic moments, though the current chapter poses counterbalancing questions: how do poets enter the pastoral space of the eclogue? What concerns get foregrounded in an eclogue collection's opening moments?

I argue that, in the context of the Virgilian *rota*, whereby the eclogue is understood to be an early step in a poetic career, the opening eclogues serve as transitional spaces between classroom and poetic career in Elizabethan England. The frequency with which pedagogical concerns are highlighted in the opening eclogue (and/or the opening exodium) is alarming, all the more since these phenomena have not been recognized by critics of either early modern education or pastoral. Such a recurring

[7] There are many studies that consider the progression of the pastoral, specifically as it moves toward another genre. For a popular study that question Spenser's literary trajectory, and whether he leaves the pastoral at all, see Patrick Cheney, *Spenser's Famous Flight: A Renaissance Idea of a Literary Career* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993).

focus on pedagogy in the opening moments of eclogue collections reinforces my distinction between the "eclogue" and the "pastoral" to show how the former contained its own thematic features, thus constituting a tradition of its own. More importantly, the enactment of, and challenge to, master/pupil bonds at the heart of early modern pedagogical manuals depicts the extent to which the eclogue distances its writer from his grammar school experience while simultaneously acknowledging a deep and lasting influence. The eclogue was, after all, a form first encountered in grammar school or in a private master/pupil relationship. As this chapter unearths the link between the eclogue and grammar school, it attempts to demonstrate that central to both early modern pastoral and pedagogical environments is a homosocial (often male-male) bond, one that is continually being tested and refigured.

Before proceeding, I would like to make a quick note concerning terminology and chapter format. First, the common term for an early modern schoolroom was "forum," and over the course of this chapter I maintain this spelling, despite varied orthography in Elizabethan England, to distinguish "forum" from its literary counterpart, "form." Second, this chapter casts the shepherds' forum found in the opening eclogue (of various Elizabethan collections) as a "convention," a term which recalls Paul Alpers's formulation as both "site of convention" and "literary trope."[8] Both "form" and "convention," ultimately, contain within their broader definitions the gathering of people and the literary vessel, trope, or expectation. The crucial terms of "emulous fellowship" in this chapter are "emulation" and "emulators," which will be further clarified and

[8] Alpers, *What is Pastoral?*, 79-93.

complicated over the course of what follows, though especially in the upcoming first section.

The chapter is divided into four distinct sections. The first section will highlight the many moments of cultural overlap between the eclogue and the early modern schoolroom, with a special focus on how ideas of "emulation" serve to connect these two environments. The second section will focus on the pupils in Sidney's first published eclogues, contained in "The Lady of May," and on the power dynamics inherent to the classroom environment it presents. The third section turns to "The First Eclogues" of the *Old Arcadia* and focuses on how the eclogues are structured around emulation between students and their schoolmasters. Both "The Lady of May" and "The First Eclogues" demonstrate how there existed a clear slippage between competing with one's fellow and one's master; Sidney's texts often depict sympathetic younger poets who cast schoolmaster figures as fellows and, specifically, as adversarial contestants. Finally, the fourth section posits that sexuality is a recurring language that accompanies emulation in both early modern eclogues and schoolrooms. As this final section considers the sexualized language found throughout pedagogical forums and eclogues forms, it recalls what Stephen Guy-Bray calls a homoerotic space, but one that figures the underlying relationship in more adversarial terms. Sidney's eclogues are but a first step in this final section before I turn to other writers in the tradition, including Barnabe Googe and Edmund Spenser. Ultimately, over the course of this chapter, I show how the various English collections engage one another at the intersection of learning, homoeroticism, and competition in significantly more complex ways than any uni-directional, patriarchal, or hierarchical model of pedagogy.

I Shepherds' forum

Many early modern students first encountered poetry and the poetic vocation within some type of a pedagogical relationship—in grammar schools and in lessons with tutors—where the eclogues play a crucial role. When Michael Drayton recalls in "To my most dearely-loued friend Henry Reynolds," that he asked his tutor to "make me a Poet," he explains how his tutor "first read to [him] honest *Mantuan*, then *Virgils Eglogues.*"[9] Despite Drayton's reference to a tutor/pupil relationship, his memory of those two collections in particular would accord with the experiences of countless boys in public schools as well, since the primary two eclogue collections integrated into the grammar school curriculum were Virgil's eclogues, the *Bucolikes,* and Mantuan's eclogues, the *Adulescentia.*[10] Both collections appear among the fifty odd school books entered into the "English stock," a listing of books controlled by members of the Stationers' Company in London.[11] Of the "English Stock," Ian Green suggests that the core titles were "regular, safe money-spinners," and that the main shareholders in the stock ensured that "unauthorized copies or new versions of titles claimed by the Company … were vigorously pursued and prosecuted."[12] This protectionism speaks to the popularity and ubiquity of these eclogue collections, both of which would be used as tools for learning

[9] Michael Drayton, "To my most dearely-loued friend Henery [sic] Reynolds," in *The Minor Poems of Michael Drayton* ed. Cyril Brett (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907) ll. 29, 36-7. Parts of the passage quoted here are also quoted in Lee Piepho, *Holofernes' Mantuan: Italian Humanism in Early Modern England* (New York: Peter Land, 2001) 67.

[10] Piepho, *Holofernes' Mantuan*, 93.

[11] See Ian Green, *Humanism and Protestantism in Early Modern English Education* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), xi, 40-1. For exact numbers of textbooks being ordered, see page 37. Green procures a list from 1620 onwards, though the figures are applicable for Elizabethan England as well. Dolven, *Scenes of Instruction*, p. 7 note 11, shows that John Brinsley's pedagogical practices were relevant to Elizabethan England.

[12] Green, *Humanism and Protestantism*, 36.

and/or practising Latin. To learn Latin during the period was, of course, a rite of "initiation" that prepared young boys for any number of vocations.[13] Green notes also that Virgil's eclogues were likely taught prior to the teaching of the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, hence depicting students following Virgil's career *rota,* from lower to higher verse forms, in their school training.[14] The schoolroom may have been, in other words, a place where young poets encountered and engaged with the idea of a Virgilian poetic career in a way that mirrored the chronology of Virgil's bibliography.

One of the reasons that the eclogues seem to fit so well into the schoolroom environment, according to early modern commentary, is because of the inherent similarity between the verse dialogues of shepherds and the dialogic interactions between boys in the schoolroom. Compared with the lengthy epic, for example, the single best-selling early modern education theorist, Sir Thomas Elyot, recommends Virgil's shorter eclogues in grammar school for the reason that he views the "praty controuersies" of the eclogue as being germane to the schoolroom milieu: "For what thinge can be more familiar than his bucolikes? nor no warke so nighe approcheth to the comune daliaunce and maners of children and the praty controuersies of the simple shepeherdes therin

[13] See Walter J. Ong, "Latin Language Study as a Renaissance Puberty Rite," *Studies in Philology* 56 no. 2 (April 1959): 103-24. Ong reminds his readers that Latin learning distinguished between the sexes since it was primarily taught to boys. He suggests also that Latin learning served as a puberty rite, which he defines as "ceremonial inductions or initiations of the youth into extra-familial life which involve a sense of break with the past (a "marginal environment") together with segregation from the family and from those of the other sex, and chastisement under the direction of elders for didactic purposes" (106).

[14] Green, *Humanism and Protestantism*, 220-1, 227. Green finds evidence of Mantuan's eclogues being taught during the 1570s and Virgil's eclogues being taught roughly contemporaneously. Piepho, *Holofernes' Mantuan,* 93, also notes that the influential scholar and critic J.C. Scaliger had "mounted an attack" against Mantuan's eclogues, since Scaliger felt that they were being taught at the expense of Virgil's eclogues.

contained."[15] Part of the appeal of the eclogue, in other words, is that the "comune daliaunce and maners of children and the praty controuersies of the simple shepeherdes" resemble one another, or, to phrase this in the terms espoused by this dissertation, because the moments of emulation found in and around the eclogue resonate with the learning environments available to boys.

As a standard grammar school text, Virgil's eclogues, contained within his *Opera,* would likely be deployed in varying degrees through the grammar school process—first as a text for directly imitating verse, and then, potentially, as a model for rhetoric and as a tool for disputation.[16] Of the approximately six different grammar school forms—with lower schools for students between the ages of seven to twelve, and upper schools for students up to the age of sixteen or so[17]—it was in the third forum or thereabouts that students first turned their attention to composition and imitation modelled on Roman (and Greek) precepts.[18] I have not encountered an education tract in the period that explicitly states at what age the eclogues were first studied, though they would likely be taught more comprehensively (not as excerpted single words or short

[15] Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Book named The Governor*, ed. and intro. S. E. Lehmberg (New York: Everyman's Library, 1962), 31.

[16] Green, *Humanism and Protestanism*, 218. Green suggests that Lily and Cato were abandoned for Ovid, Virgil and Horace in the third forums and upwards, and that one of the more advanced practices was "emulating different poetic metres and rhetorical devices, turning a verse they had just read into other verses using similar words and phrases or into another language or form" (218). Green does not follow the emulate / imitate distinction that I do in this study.

[17] Dolven, *Scenes of Instuction*, 21.

[18] While students would have focused on Latin words and sentences prior to the third forum, tracts such as William Kempe's *The Education of Chlidren in Learning* suggest it was during the third forum, or thereabouts, that students begin to engage with dialogues and with poems. See Dolven, *Scenes of Instruction*, 23.

passages to be translated) midway through a student's education (the third forum) through to the end of the upper forums (the sixth forum).[19]

Grammar school rooms use various models of dialogue—including repetition, catechism, and disputations—in a variety of exercises and to various ends. Some dialogue exercises lend themselves especially well to the contests in eclogues, such as "disputations," which were short exercises through which students competed by arguing a particular theme before an adjudicating student, usher, or teacher. However, it would be incorrect to equate the eclogues too strictly with grammar school exercises that most clearly resemble the eclogue in structure, such as disputations, since preeminent educational theorists continually advocate for contest scenarios throughout the grammar school curriculum.[20] One of the more influential theorists on education in Elizabethan England, Desiderius Erasmus (Erasmus), provides but one instance where the ethos of contest transcends any specific, singular moment:

> The motives of victory and competition are deeply embedded in our children, and the fear of disgrace and desire for praise are also deeply rooted, especially in children who have outstanding intellectual abilities and energetic personalities. The teacher should exploit these motives to advance their education. If he cannot make headway with a certain pupil by using entreaties, flattery, or praise or by promising small rewards, he should organize a mock contest between him and his fellow-students. A lazy student should hear his comrades being praised; and a boy who is

[19] Prior to attending grammar school forums, whose sizes, ages, and other features varied according to locale, students would attend elementary or "petty" (after the French "petit," for small) school, where they would receive their first formal instruction in English, beginning roughly at the age of five. According to Kempe *Education*, n.p., it is at this early stage that students first attempt to master the arts of English *Prosodia* ("pronouncing of letters, syllables, and words with the mouth") and *Orthographia* ("in writing of them [letters] with the hand"). For a seventeenth-century account, see Charles Hoole "The Petty School," in *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School*, intro. Thiselton Mark (Syracuse, N.Y.: C.W. Bardeen, 1912), 26.

[20] One cannot help but notice, for example, how eclogues in early modern England are occasionally called a "disputation," as in Puttenham, *Arte of English Poesy,* 78.

> deaf to his teacher's exhortations will be stirred to action by the desire to emulate his fellows. The palm of victory should not be conferred for good and all, but hope should be held out to the loser that with concentrated effort he may make good his disgrace—this is how commanders exhort their soldiers in war.[21]

Erasmus's "mock-contests" have been largely ignored by critics, perhaps because critics are more often concerned with Erasmus's conception of the master-pupil relationship rather than pupil-pupil; Erasmus is hugely influential to the peaceful and loving terms between master and pupil espoused by English theorists, including Thomas More and Roger Ascham.[22] In the passage above, Erasmus suggests that "a boy who is deaf to his teacher's exhortations will be stirred to action by the desire to emulate his fellows," which is an instance where Erasmus (or his translator) uses the term "emulate" ambiguously, I think, since it might connote either "imitate" or "challenge," or both.

Other texts in circulation in the period, such as Quintilian's treatise *The Orator's Education*, suggest in explicit ways that "emulation" is to be preferred over "imitation," even in a pupil's relationship with literary masters. Quintilian suggests that "imitation is not sufficient on its own" and that the student must attempt to emulate the master text:

> [E]ven those who do not aim for the top have an obligation to compete and not lag behind. The man who tries to win a race may perhaps draw level, even if he does not get into the lead; but no one can draw level with

[21] Erasmus, Desiderius, *The Erasmus Reader*, ed. Erika Rummel (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 120.

[22] For more on the specifics of Erasmus's conception of peace, see Nathan Ron, "The Christian Peace of Erasmus" *The European Legacy* 19, no. 1 (2014): 27-42. Thanks to Nathan for the Erasmus lesson at the Renaissance Society of America 2017 conference in Chicago. For an example of Erasmus's influence on Thomas More's conception of the master-pupil relationship, see Gerard B. Wegemer and Stephen W. Smith, eds., *A Thomas More Source Book* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2004), 187-230, and especially 221-6.

> a man in whose footsteps he feels bound to tread. The follower is inevitably always behind.[23]

Quintilian reiterates similar impulses throughout his tenth book of *The Orator's Education*, though he is clear that his emulative model transcends the subject of oration. Of the written exercise "paraphrase," for example, Quintilian says, "I do not want paraphrase to be a mere passive reproduction, but to rival and vie with the original in expressing the same thoughts."[24] The importance that Quintilian places on contest transcends the classroom and instead depicts an adversarial methodology toward masters both alive and long dead.

The possibility that students might benefit from competing with one another, and that contest helps to structure how schoolrooms are organized, is found in multiple English treatises in the period as well.[25] In *The Governor*, Elyot begins with an exhortation against violence, as does Ascham many years later, though, in contrast with Ascham, Elyot is clear that he is not against students in "contention:"

> there is no better allective to noble wits than to induce them into a contention with their inferior companions: they [the inferior companions] sometime purposely suffering the more noble children to vanquish and, as it were, giving to them [the inferior companions] place and sovereignty, though indeed the inferior children have more learning.[26]

[23] Quintilian, *The Orator's Education: Books 9-10,* ed. and trans. Donald A. Russell (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 323, 327.

[24] Quintilian, *Orator*, 359.

[25] For Ong, in "Latin Language Study," one effect of the Latin-based education model was the competitiveness that it bred: "the status of Latin helped maintain the relatively violent puberty rite setting, a sense of existence on a threshold, within a marginal environment (associated w/ forced seclusion from the company of women and to a certain extent from one's own family), in an atmosphere of continuous excitement and of that aggressive competition or *aemulatio* which, toned down or outlawed in modern de-Latinized co-educationalism, was a key principle of most Renaissance education" (122).

[26] Elyot, *The Governor*, 17.

In this tricky passage to parse, Elyot suggests that, as an allective ("something that allures or entices")[27] for noble "wits" or "children," they may "contend" with their "inferior companions." Despite phrasing the entire passage as a means for inducing the noble children to action, Elyot suggests that the "inferior children [with] more leaning" take the victory. Not only is there a sense that "contention" mitigates the social hierarchy, but the structure of a contest—particularly when one considers the preceding passage and its promises of gifts and praises—resembles "emulation." Both emulators, in other words, are able to enter in a contest that benefits both parties: the "inferior children" take the victory, which is a good "allective" for the nobles, despite being "vanquish[ed]." Echoing Elyot, William Kempe's treatise *The Education of Children* advocates for "publike" school and schoolmasters since public schools have more students in a single forum, which allows students to learn from one another and for students to be ranked against one another, where "by emulation and striuing who may do best."[28] In accordance with the emulous terms outlined in the introduction of this dissertation, the first, and now obsolete, usage of "strive" was "to be in a state of variance or mutual hostility."[29] In both Elyot and Kempe, there is a gesture toward mixing students with disparate backgrounds and placing them against one another in contest.

The larger point is that in the "emotional community" of the schoolroom, to use Judith Owens's phrase, emulation was used as both a tool for teaching and as a way of

[27] "allective," 1a. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.
[28] See Kempe, *Education,* n.p.
[29] "strive, v." 1. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

ranking the students. John Brinsley, in *Ludus Literarius*, suggests that "… every thing in the Schoole may bee thus done, by emulation and contention for praise; there would be a carefull sorting, and matching every one with him, who is next unto him in learning."[30] Brinsley and other early modern education theorists outline the benefits of a grammar school forum meeting in a single room in which students were ordered by rank.[31] I am not suggesting, however, that Elyot's or Brinsley's "contention" between students was overly harsh or mean-spirited. Again and again, there is a close affinity with "play;" concerning disputations, for example, Charles Hoole in *New Discovery* (1660) suggests that Friday afternoon is the perfect time for disputing, since Friday afternoon is a time of leisure. Rather, it is the mix of friendly and adversarial play that speaks to the eclogue's "praty controuersies." Similar to the conversations that structure the eclogue form, the classrooms would continually utilize dialogue to structure exercises, ones related not only to copying, repetition, and imitation, but also ones that more directly forced a student to interpret and create verse, including translation, paraphrase, and composition.

As the eclogue came into vogue in Elizabethan England, one finds the "mock-contests" espoused by Erasmus enacted and stylized in the verses of the shepherds. The eclogue collections in Elizabethan England, furthermore, generally address these pedagogical concerns right from the outset, whether in the opening eclogue (or eclogues) in a particular collection or in the front matter. By focusing on these opening moments of

[30] John Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius or the Grammar Schoole* ed. E. T. Campagnac (London: Liverpool University Press, 1917), 50.

[31] Weaver, *Untutored Lines,* 25. See also Dolven, *Scenes of Instruction*, 19, and 49. Jeff Dolven reminds his readers that there were consequences to disputations in particular: "As students progress, disputations become formal, competitive occasions, where success and failure dictate classroom standing, and even the order of seating" (49).

pedagogical commentary in the eclogue, one gains greater insight into the ambiguous ideas of fellowship in the early modern poetic community. Along with critics working in other literary forms in the period, I suggest that the eclogue does not only reflect lessons learned in school but also speaks back to education in alternately critical and praising terms.[32]

II *Aemulatio* and Sir Philip Sidney's "The Lady of May"

It may seem like a bold claim to suggest that there exists an unspoken rule in Elizabethan England that opening eclogues should foreground a lesson or some other thinly veiled pedagogical moment, but it is true. The rule is oddly applicable to just about every English eclogue collection between 1563 and 1593, including the opening eclogues in collections by Alexander Barclay, Barnabe Googe, Sir Philip Sidney, and Edmund Spenser. The overt pedagogical focus of the opening eclogue appears to be an English phenomenon, since it is not apparent in either the opening eclogue of Virgil's *Bucolikes* or Mantuan's *Adulescentia*, two ubiquitous collections in Elizabethan England.[33] The English eclogue is deeply imbricated with early modern pedagogy—in the opening eclogue and beyond—and it benefits our understandings of both early

[32] Enterline, *Shakespeare's Schoolroom* repeatedly collapses the division between grammar school and drama during the period by emphasizing their shared performativity. For Enterline, the educational model centered on *imitatio* has not been adequately expanded to include the extent to which "true eloquence also relies on the power of the emotions," and thus Enterline attempts to synthesize the imitative aspects of the schoolroom with *actio*, early modern pedagogical moments of performance (4). Dolven, *Scenes of Instruction* is another book that extends the learning models espoused in the schoolroom beyond their immediate landscapes by positioning romance as a genre that both reflects and critiques earlier pedagogical practices. Dolven does not address the theatre or theatricality as directly as Enterline, though several of the "poetics of pedagogy" that he identifies within his larger taxonomy of educational practices contain a considerable performative element, including repetition, drill, composition, and disputation.

[33] Abraham Fleming first translated Virgil *Bucolikes* in 1575 and George Tubervile translated Mantuan's *Egloges* in 1572.

modern pedagogy and of the English eclogue to better understand this cross-pollination. However, we might first look to Elizabethan translations of classical and continental eclogue collections, which further reinforce the eclogue-schoolroom link.

The Elizabethan translations of classical and continental eclogues all gesture early in their collections to pedagogy. When Abraham Fleming translates Virgil's eclogues into English for the first time, he does not alter the eclogue sequence to open with its most overtly pedagogical lesson (such as in the sixth eclogue), but he does comment on a debate, in his introduction to the collection, in which his contemporaries argue for precisely that:

> [Some argue] that which beginneth, *O* Tityrus &c: to be the first, according as it is commonly placed … Othersome will haue that Eclog to be the first in order, which beginneth thus, *Our muse* Thalia *first of all vouchsafed hath to play, &c.*[34]

As the gloss in the margin confirms, *"Our muse* Thalia" begins Virgil's sixth eclogue, which is the most overtly pedagogical eclogue (and which this chapter will look at in a later section). When Theocritus was first translated into English in 1588, the idyll opening the collection was not Idyll I ("The Passion of Daphnis") as it appears in translated collections on the continent, but instead was Idyll VIII, which is a contest between two shepherd boys reminiscent of a schoolroom contest.[35]

Whether or not one accords importance to the sequencing of eclogues, the front matter of English eclogue translations further reinforces the idea that the eclogue was a pedagogical form. Fleming features a lengthy commentary on pedagogy and grammar

[34] Fleming, *The Bucolikes (1579)*, A4r.

[35] Theocritus, *Sixe idillia that is, sixe small, or petty poems, or aeglogues, chosen out of the right famous Sicilian poet Theocritus, and translated into English verse* (Oxford, 1588).

schools in the introduction to his 1575 translation of Virgil's eclogues, including harsh passages such as the following:

> It is well knowne that there be in this Englishe land many ignorant and vnskilfull instructors of youth in the Latine language, who sometime need that to their heerers which they themselues vnderstande not, and teache their scholers that which they themselves had neede to learne.[36]

Here Fleming advocates for instruction by reading a text that would be frequently taught in grammar schools, while simultaneously critiquing pedagogical authority. Such a sentiment gets echoed and highlighted, right from the outset, fourteen years later in the epistle to Fleming's 1589 translation. Fleming says that his latest translation is "plaine I confesse, and easie withall (for so I desired and stroue with my wits to answer my will) that yoong Grammar boyes, may euen without a schoolemaister teach themselues by the helpe hereof."[37]

Fleming's defiant attitude is countered by John Brinsley's 1620 translation of Virgil's eclogues, which envisions a mutually beneficial relationship between translated eclogue collection and schoolroom. The title cast the eclogues thusly,

> Virgils Eclogues, with his booke *De apibus*, concerning the government and ordering of bees, translated grammatically, and also according to the proprietie of our English tongue, so farre as grammar and the verse will well permit. Written chiefly for the good of schooles, to be used according to the directions in the preface to the painfull school maister.[38]

Brinsley explicitly states that the eclogues are "[w]ritten chiefly for the good of schools," and then Brinsley provides directions to the "painfull school maister." We might linger

[36] Fleming, *The Bucolikes (1575)*, A2v.

[37] Fleming, *The Bvcoliks (1589)*, A3v.

[38] John Brinsley, trans., *Virgils Eclogues* (London: Richard Field for Thomas Man, 1620) A1r. A second edition of the translation was released in 1633 with the same title page. See also Andrew Wallace, *Virgil's Schoolboys* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 99.

longer on the fractious relationship between the translated eclogues and the larger pedagogical apparatus, but the point is that the first three major English translations of Virgil all view their collections as textbooks for students, whether at odds with, or as a supplement to, their instructors.

Whether one views Sidney's "The Lady of May" or "The First Eclogues" (from *The Old Arcadia*) as Sidney's first foray into the eclogue form, both of his works clearly harken to the early modern schoolroom at the beginning of their respective eclogues. However, it is "The Lady" that most clearly signals the schoolroom and its schoolmaster, and so I will consider it first here. "The Lady," a short play likely performed in honour of a visit from the Queen in Wansteed Garden in 1578, depicts Sidney's sarcastic portrayal of "maister Rombus" and is a helpful reminder that a pastoral text seeking royal favour does not preclude harsh critique of other figures of authority.[39] The eclogue begins with "the woman-suitor" who expresses her problem of having two suitors who are interested in her daughter's love, one a forester and the other a shepherd. There is a sense, as many critics have noted, of the ensuing eclogue contest performed for the woman-suitor being germane to Elizabeth's situation, in which various suitors would be competing for her hand in marriage. Sidney has the woman-suitor ultimately yield her authority to the Queen, who begins the play as a spectator but is incorporated into the action, to later serve as judge. "The Lady" thus positions several different figures with authority in

[39] Sir Philip Sidney, *Lady of May*, ed. R.S. Bear, *Renascence Editions,* University of Oregon, January 1992, n.p. All subsequent citations are from this edition, of which the specific URL and access information can be found in the bibliography to this dissertation. I have not provided in-text citations because the *Renascence Editions* text does not contain page numbers.

relation to one another, as authority shifts from schoolmaster, to woman-suitor, to Queen.

The reader is introduced to the schoolmaster early on in the text, and from the outset Rombus is lampooned. As the troupe of a dozen or so shepherds and foresters enter the scene, "[a]mong them was maister Rombus a schoolemaster of a village thereby, who being fully perswaded of his owne learned wisedome, came thither, with his authoritie to part their fray; where for aunswer he receiued many vnlearned blowes." The scene resembles the commencement of a school lesson, in other words, with a gaggle of students needing to be "part[ed]" by the schoolmaster. Rombus is dealt, however, "many vnlearned blowes," which recalls Rebecca Bushnell's reminder that some teachers held a relatively low social status in early modern England. Bushnell reminds her reader that, at the time, teaching was "pooly paid work" and that Richard Mulcaster, the schoolmaster of Merchant Taylors' grammar school, allegedly quit his job over his salary.[40] Among the large cast of *The Lady,* Rombus is very briefly an authority figure before assuming the role of a comedic buffoon.

Despite his buffoonery, Rombus's mediating presence over the eclogues shows that the contest judge and the schoolmaster were viewed to occupy overlapping territory in the early modern imagination. The entire scene for the eclogues is very much set up as a schoolroom, and the description of the two fellows (by the woman-suitor) recalls the structure of the contest:

[40] Rebecca Bushnell, "Early Education," in *Elizabethan and Jacobean England*, ed. Arthur Kinney (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 495.

> I am a faire wench or else I am decieued, and therefore by the consent of all our neighbours haue bene chosen for the absolute Lady of this mery moneth, with mee haue bene (alas I am ashamed to tell it) two yong men, the one a forrester named Therion, the other Espilus a shepheard very long euen in loue forsooth, I like them both, and loue neither, Espilus is the richer, but Therion the liuelier: Therion doth me many pleasures, as stealing me venison out of these forrests, and manie other such like prettie and pretier seruices, but with all he growes to such rages, that sometimes he strikes me, sometimes he rails at me. This shepheard Espilus of a mild disposition, as his fortune hath not beene to do me great seruice, so hath he neuer done me any wrong, but feeding his sheepe, sitting under some sweet bush, sometimes they say he recordes my name in dolefull verses. Now the question I am to aske you faire Lady, is, whether the many deserts and many faults of Therion, or the very small deserts and no faults of Espilus is to be preferred.

The two peers—the shepherd Espilus and the forester Therion—are depicted in terminology that describes both similarity and difference. The contrasting portrayal of Espilus being richer and more refined and Therion being livelier but more fun calls attention, at least in a cursory way, to Elyot's "contentions" quoted earlier, in which "noble" and "inferior" children vie for a prize. While it would be incorrect to make an argument that the schoolroom constituted any type of proper public space, one does note many moments in which shepherds of different social classes are put into dialogue, even in Sidney's unabashedly aristocratic portrayal of the form.

The first eclogue in "The Lady" features "two yong men" who are figured as different in manner, wealth, and occupation, though whose similarity is foregrounded in their age and in a common interest in the woman-suitor. The eclogues enact the fundamental idea that a contest requires similarity (as outlined in my introduction): one can compete only with those who share similar, underlying features. The first idyll of Theocritus's *Sixe Idillia*, translated in 1588, opens with an eclogue that highlights the similarity underlying the contest:

> With louely Netehearde Daphnis on the hills,
> they saie,
> Shepehearde Menalcas Mett, vpon a summers
> daie.
> Both yuthfull striplings, both had yeallow heades
> of heare,
> In whistling both, and both in singing skilfull
> weare.[41]

The shepherds here are unmarked by traditional markers of social superiority, since neither are landowners nor of higher birth. While they are distinct—Menalcas is a shepherd and Daphnis is a neatherd—their similar "yuthfull" appearance and skill levels are foregrounded. Thus Sidney's passage resonates with both its predecessors in the eclogue form and with school tracts. Ultimately, Espilus and Therion call attention to the emulous fellowship characteristic of bonds among pastoral singers and among schoolboys.

The eclogue contest between Espilus and Therion presents a series of verses that exhume and engage classical eclogues. In a representative passage, Espilus boasts that "Two thousand sheep I have as white as milke, / Though not so white as is thy louely face" to which the forester Therion replies "Two thousand Deere in wildest woods I have, / Them can I take, but you I cannot hold." These two passages presuppose the audience's familiarity with Virgil's second eclogue, in which the lovesick Corydon promises "A thousand lambs" to Alexis, or with the preceding passage in Theocritus's eleventh idyll, in which Polyphemus promises "one thousand livestock" to the sea nymph Galatea. Sidney gestures to the eclogue tradition and its spirit of one-upmanship—Therion and Espilus double the number of livestock in Virgil and

[41] Theocritus, *Sixe Idillia*, H2.

Theocritus. Despite this, the exercises of Therion and Espilus, with their deliberate Virgilian undertones, are not engaged or provocative exhumations of Virgil's second eclogue, as are those later iterations by Christopher Marlowe and Richard Barnfield. Rather, they call attention to the overlapping techniques of paraphrasing and composition through which students first made verses in grammar school. In another passage in John Brinsley's *Ludus Literarius*, he expands on how closely related poetic composition is with reading, pedagogy, and translation. Specifically, Brinsley outlines the methodology through which students might "enter to make verses with delight and certainty, without bodging; and to traine up Schollers to imitate and expresse Ovid or Virgil, both their phrase and stile."[42] (To "bodge," by the way, is an archaic version of "to botch.") The exercise of making verses constitutes several steps: first, displaying good manners in Latin; second, to be "well acquainted with … poetical phrases" of Virgil and company; third, to translate into prose in a "Grammaticall order" and then to translate into verse; fourth, to ensure the students understand the "rule[s]" of "versifying"; fifth, to ensure that the students are "expert in scanning a verse"; and then sixth, to ensure the students "shall never bodge in their entrance, neither for phrase nor otherwise, but to enter with ease, certainty and delight."[43] Sidney's shepherds, with their careful pentameter and obvious calls to Virgil, signal an exercise in poetic composition fitting for a grammar schoolroom.

On one hand, "The Lady" clearly speaks to Elizabeth's contemporaneous courtships; on the other hand, Sidney distances the Espilus and Therion courtship of the

[42] Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius*, 190.
[43] Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius,* 192-3.

woman-suitor from the queen's situation by trivializing the Espilus-Therion eclogue as a schoolroom exercise. After Espilus and Therion have finished their exchange, a second eclogue debate takes place, this time amongst a larger group of shepherds and foresters about which "of their fellowes had sung better, and so whether the estate of shepheards or foresters were the more worshipfull." Again, Rombus's role is highlighted when two shepherds have a second contest about the outcome of the first contest; in this second contest, "the speakers were Dorcas an olde shepeheard, and Rixus a young forester, betweene whom the schoole-maister Rombus came in as moderator." It is not only the contest between shepherds, but the ensuing debate about who should be chosen, which group is "more worshipfull," that Sidney shows his ability to please the queen while also ironizing the entire situation surrounding her suitors and the gossip that it created.

Rombus serves a larger purpose as a ridiculous master of ceremonies, though it is Sidney's correlative motive, I think, to lampoon the master of the grammar school more generally. This occurs in several ways. Rombus's opening speech, which precedes and attempts to delimit the ensuing eclogues, is overly arch: "Yet hat not the pulchritude of my vertues protected me from the contaminating hands of these plebians, for coming, solumm[o]do to have their sanguinolent fray." Despite the near incomprehensibility of the passage, Rombus thinks that he indoctrinates his listeners: "Attend and throw your eares to mee, for I am grauitated with child, till I haue endoctrinated your plumbeous cerebrosities."[44] But what Sidney most ridicules is the prospect of, and the underlying qualification for, Rombus serving as a judge. Rombus's inaptitude is highlighted in his

[44] In a moment of Sidnean humour, Rombus yields to the Queen reluctantly: "So that since both this place and this time are my seruants, you may be sure I wold look for reuerence at your hands, if I did not see something in your face which makes me yeeld to you."

role as "moderator" for the trivial, second contest between the shepherds and foresters. Then, he stumbles in his decision. Rombus's authority is ultimately revealed to be shallow, and his Latinate language serves as a foil for the queen's eloquence and judgment. Rombus is continually flustered, or foolish, or cut short, and the women-suitor disparages him directly, midway through "The Lady:" "Away away you tedious foole, your eyes are not worthy to look to yonder princely sight."

III *Imitatio* and "The First Eclogues" in Sidney's *Old Arcadia*

If Rombus is a fool who is easily dismissed, and whose role is eventually relegated to deciding whether the entourage of shepherds or foresters better supports the main contest, the presence of pedagogical authority is significantly more complex and fraught in "The First Eclogues" of *Old Arcadia.* Whereas the shepherd contests in "The Lady" seem to be sycophantic, puerile affairs, "The First Eclogues" showcase a wide range of verse and prose forms, with shepherds such as Philisides who inhabit more substantial roles than their counterparts in "The Lady." And, unlike the Queen's presiding authority in "The Lady," "The First Eclogues" contain several authority figures, none of whom are especially fit to judge the contest. Rather, Sidney calls traditional forms of poetic authority into question. The fantasy of the opening eclogues of Sidney's *Old Arcadia* is that they provide a forum in which the elders expect deferential and imitative students (according to the tenets of *imitatio* espoused by Ascham, Erasmus, and others) but instead are put in emulous environments that resemble a schoolroom and its ranking of students. Sidney inserts schoolmasters into the type of

emulous environment espoused by schoolroom tracts as a means of speaking back to pedagogical authority.

Before turning to the first eclogues, it is important to outline the congruence of the concept of *imitatio* and the role of the schoolmaster. In early modern England, *imitatio* is a complex subject whose parameters go well beyond our current understanding of imitation: it is one of Roger Ascham's tenets of education, one that includes both a) a theory of art as mimetically referencing and imitating "the life of every degree of man" and b) a means to eloquence whereby one follows "the best authors" for the "learning of tongues." Of the latter understanding of imitation, Ascham of course advocates for his oft-cited method of "double translation," and much time is spent determining which authors are best to follow, a task that ultimately points back to the centrality of the teacher:

> Now to return to that Question, whether one, a few, many, or all, are to be followed, my answer shall be short: […] in every separate kind of learning and study, by itself, you must follow choicely a few, and chiefly some one, and that namely in our school of eloquence, either for pen or talk. […] we seek such one in our school to follow, who is able always in all matters to teach plainly, to delight pleasantly, and to carry away by force of wise talk all that shall hear or read him: and is so excellent indeed, as wit is able or wish can hope to attain unto.[45]

While Ascham does provide evidence for multiple literary masters, he advocates for a singularly close relationship between master and pupil. In particular, Ascham seems to draw from Erasmus, who assumes that the young pupil, to quote Judith Owens, "must

[45] Roger Ascham, *The Schoolmaster (1570),* ed. Lawrence V. Ryan (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967), 137.

not only *like* his tutor, but he must *become like* him."[46] The conception of a model teacher is found in another prominent school treatise of the period, Elyot's *Elementarie.* Elyot suggests that a teacher should be "such a one as the child by imitation following may grow excellent."[47] Part of what Sidney stages in "The First Eclogues" is the fracturing of such a version of *imitatio* between pupil and schoolmaster.

Within the first lines of the prefacing prose section of "The First Eclogues," Sidney calls attention to both the shepherds' education and to the importance of emulous environments. The prose section of "The First Eclogues" opens with the following:

> The manner of the Arcadian shepherds was, when they met together, to pass their time, either in such music their rural education could afford them, or in exercise of their body and trying of masteries. But, of all other things, they did especially delight in eclogues; wherein sometimes they would contend for a prize of well singing, sometimes lament the unhappy pursuit of their affections, sometimes, again, under hidden forms utter such matters as otherwise not fit for their delivery.[48]

From the outset, Sidney shows the "rural education" of the shepherds combining eclogues with "exercise of their body and trying of masteries." The grouping of sports, eclogues, and education goes beyond the purview of this study, but substantial portions of school tracts by Thomas Elyot, Richard Mulcaster, and John Brinsley advocate the importance of physical exercise for the wellbeing of scholars.[49] The eclogues, which the shepherds did "especially delight" in, foreground ideas of ranking and contest

[46] Owens, "Unpublished chapter draft." Emphasis is in original. See also Enterline, *Shakespeare's Schoolroom*, 34.

[47] Quoted in Bushnell, *Culture,* 34.

[48] Sidney, *Old Arcadia*, 50. Henceforth in this section, all *Old Arcadia* citations will be in text whenever possible.

[49] Semenza, *Sport, Politics, and Literature,* 39-59. A significant portion of his first chapter is dedicated to the expanding role of sports in English school tracts.

("sometimes they would contend for a prize of well singing") and of complex verse ("under hidden forms utter such matters as otherwise not fit for their delivery"). The eclogues are poems of consequence in other words, and one recalls Puttenham's conception of the eclogue, which specifically suggests that it serves as a "vaile" under which one might "glaunce" at greater matters: "[the shepherds of the eclogues,] vnder the vaile of homely persons, and in rude speeches to insinuate and glaunce at greater matters, and such as perchance had not bene safe to haue beene disclosed in any other sort, which may be perceiued by the Eglogues of Virgill."[50] The shepherds' capabilities to "glaunce at great matters" seems to distinguish them from their agricultural counterparts, since the shepherds in *Old Arcadia* are raised with poetry and song. As later portions of this chapter show, the "rural education" is not limited to the young or to any particular age group, but rather applies to all shepherds in the community.

The shepherds of "The First Eclogues" engage in contests not only with one another, but also with other nations too. The passage that follows the preceding block quotation calls attention to the poetic pedigree of Sidney's shepherds:

> Neither is it to be marvelled that they did so much excel other nations in that quality [eclogues] since, from their childhood, they were brought up unto it, and were not such base shepherds as we commonly make account of, but the very owners of the sheep themselves (50).

Despite the earlier calls to "rural education," then, the shepherds singing—and their eclogues specifically—are figured as a constituent of their English identity ("they did so much excel other nations") and as somehow intrinsic to their social class as the "very owners of the sheep themselves." These social distinctions call to mind not only the

[50] Puttenham, *Arte of English Poesy,* 32.

"anti-pastoral" arguments of Raymond Williams, but also the suggestion by Katherine Little that the pastoral does not only hide its labour, but depicts an emerging agrarian landowning social class.[51] The eclogue contest is no trifling affair but is rather a call to a larger English community, made by the owners of sheep and, presumably, land.

From the outset of the eclogues, Sidney is intent on showcasing the praise that he bestows on the English language elsewhere, since the very first eclogue within "The First Eclogues" depicts two- and three- syllable rhymes, which accord with Sidney's praising of English rhyme in *The Defense of Poesy.* In the very first eclogue between Lalus and Dorus, the two shepherds versify in a variety of both rhyme and metrical patterns: Lalus and Dorus sometimes "underwrit[e]" one another, modelling their verse on the previous singer's rhyme scheme, or sometimes follow one another in lengthy portions of mono-rhymed verse. The closing of their eclogue culminates in the two singers ventriloquizing the final line of the other poet's preceding stanza before attempting to complete and

[51] Little, *Transforming Work,* follows Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Co. Ltd, 1973) to consider the social conditions out of which the pastoral emerged in early modern England. But, whereas Williams, especially in the chapter "Pastoral and Counter-Pastoral," focuses on the omissions and occlusions of agrarian controversies within the pastoral, Little claims that the eclogue reveals a new emergence of a capitalistic breed of sheep keepers. Therefore, Little's shepherd undergoes both a change of class status and a fragmentation: the laborers are still present but there emerges a shepherdly class that rules over these laborers. This emergent class heralds an ideology that opposes the communalism of the laborer (91), which is further signalled by so many shepherds owning their own sheep, in contrast not only with the medieval laborers but also with the shepherds of Virgil and Theocritus. For my book review of this work, see Nathan Szymanski, "Review of Katherine C. Little, *Transforming Work: Early Modern Pastoral and Late Medieval Poetry*, University of Notre Dame University Press, 2013" *Spenser Review* 45 no 2 (Fall 2015).

outdo it.[52] Unlike a debate in which the formal innovation is given less emphasis than the logic and argument, Sidney's eclogues, from the outset, suggest a model of contest whereby versifying skills serve as a key criterion for determining the winner.

If the singers in the "The Lady" depict more elementary verse, with the highest authority in England serving as judge (the Queen), "The First Eclogues" stage a very different problem: a group of talented poets without proper adjudication. Early in the "The First Eclogues," Sidney delivers a jab at authority figures, similar to the lampooning of Rombus. Presiding over these various contests are Dametas and Duke Basilius:

> But nothing lifted it [the shepherds wits] up so high a key as the presence of their own duke who, not only by looking on but by great courtesy and liberality, animated the shepherds the more exquisitely to seek a worthy accomplishment of his good liking (50).

The Duke is hardly an impartial party, but it is Dametas who is most skewered as a schoolmaster:

> Dametas, who much disdained (since his late authority) all his old companions … stood like a director over them [the shepherds], [and] with nodding, gaping, winking or stomping, show[ed] how he did like or mislike these things he did not understand (51).

[52] The contest is staged between two shepherds of similar age and mindset: "[Lalus] began first with his pipe, and then with his voice, thus to challenge Dorus; and was by him answered in the underwritten sort" (52). Sidney distinguishes between the "singing [of] some short couplets" and "the eclogue betwixt Lalus and Dorus" through the circumstances of Lalus's challenge (57). The process of "underwriting," which during the period meant "written (out), expressed in writing, below or beneath" betrays the decidedly written aspect of the text, despite the continual calls to singing. Lalus and Dorus accordingly display the metrical and poetic virtuosity that undergirds the contest. Lalus begins in ABABAB rhyming hexameters, with each rhyme end containing two-syllable and three-syllable rhymes, while Dorus's "underwritten" response, primarily in three-syllable rhymes, attempts to overdo Lalus. See "underwrite," 1a. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

Neither the Duke nor Dametas represent proper adjudicators of the eclogues, since *Old Arcadia* undermines their authority by the end of the romance: the Duke may appear to hold some authority, though his lasciviousness and unfortunate fate ultimately reveal that the text places sympathy elsewhere, while Dametas, compared to an "ass" soon after his introduction, is ridiculed from beginning to end (30). In the passage above, Dametas's label as a "director," specifically, uses the same language as Richard Mulcaster's text *The Elementarie*, where Mulcaster's schoolmaster frequently "direct[s]" the children and their customs. Mulcaster even uses the term "director" synonymously with "schoolmaster."[53] Further, the name "Damaetas" is etymologically derived from a Greek verb meaning "to tame;" Milton would later use the name in *Lycidas* to signify a tutor at Cambridge.[54] In comparison with impressive versifying found in the opening eclogue between Lalus and Dorus, the shepherds that are in the adjudicating and directing roles are not cast as being qualified or capable.

The bulk of the first eclogues stage a larger contest between older shepherds who resemble schoolmasters and younger shepherds who resemble students, which takes the form of multiple smaller contests that continually adhere to this format. While the very first eclogue within "The First Eclogues" does not begin in this way, the contest between Lalus and Dorus is soon co-opted by elder shepherds who request the type of respect, even imitation, commonly associated with schoolmasters. When Lalus and Dorus's

[53] See especially Richard Mulcaster, *The Elementarie* (London, 1582), 165, which suggests that "a good director will first sift the certain right from the supposed wrong, and in ruling them both call custom to counsell, from whom the right came, as all men know, and by whom the wrong must be helpt, as theie that mark, maie se."

[54] Clare Carroll and Andrew Hadfield, eds. *The Longman Anthology of British Literature: Fourth Edition* (New York: Longman, 2010) 1709. Milton, in his lament for Lycidas, writes that "old Damaetas loved to hear our song" (l. 36).

eclogue finishes without a winner, but with both shepherds "receiv[ing] great commendations" from their beholders (and from one another), it soon becomes apparent that the contest is not between Lalus and Dorus so much as it is between the elders and the youth (56). Geron and Dicus "protes[t]" because their "wits should be employed about so very a toy as that they called love," which Sidney attributes to an age differential: "Geron therto the more inclined, a[t] that age, having taken from him both the thoughts and fruits of that passion, wished all the world proportioned to himself" (57). Geron, hoping that the world will be "proportioned to himself," expects not only a deferential treatment, but the phrasing even hints that Geron hopes to be imitated in the terms espoused by Ascham's, Elyot's, and Erasmus's tracts. Geron's next song is interrupted by "a young shepherd named Histor" who delivers a Lydian prose interlude, which Geron interrupts in turn to complain "that it was very undecent a young man's tongue should possess so much time, and that age should be an auditor" (64). Soon, Geron begins a singing contest anew with "another young shepherd named Philisides"—often understood to be an alter ego for Sidney—that does not end well for Geron, who "was out of countenance, finding the words he thought were so wise win so little reputation at this young man's hands" (68).[55] The larger structure of "The First Eclogues," in other words, positions youthful shepherds against a group of elders who expect deference and imitation, recalling the dynamic of a schoolroom.

Staging a contest between old and young, or dividing up into groups according to age, is not a feature of classical eclogues so much as it is a feature of the education tracts

[55] Sidney, *The Old Arcadia,* 68. The Philisides/Sidney link will be considered more in the next chapter.

of the period. Several theorists, including Richard Mulcaster and John Brinsley, speak to the question of how a schoolroom that incorporates more students is beneficial since it causes them to "emulate" one another. Richard Mulcaster, for example, cites contest as a positive consequence of putting students of like years into the same classroom:

> For sorting like yeares into one roome, … All good common weales not fained by fantsie, but being in deede such haue vsed it both for likenes of education in like yeares, and for trying out where most excellencie lodged, to bestow prefermentes vpon apparent desert, besides that it is most fit, and emulation to the better doth best beseeme like yeares. The greeke poet saith, that God draweth allway the like to the like, and therefore men may well follow the president.[56]

The justification for "sorting like years into one room" is both because the content of their lessons is similar ("likenes of education in like yeares") and because it fosters healthy emulation ("emulation to the better"). And Mulcaster's interest in "bestow[ing] preferments vpon the apparent desert" recalls the gifts and wagers of the eclogue contest. The theological justification that Mulcaster deploys at the end of the passage, that "God draweth allway the like to the like," speaks to the inherent similarity required for emulation. Mulcaster's suggestion that similarity between emulators allows them to "[f]ollow the president," a term that connotes its governmental position during early modern England, suggests a hierarchical model of ranking that is not based solely on birth or social standing, but on emulation and contest.

Brinsley expands Mulcaster's ideas to incorporate an even broader range of students into a similar classroom. For Brinsley, the less forums the better:

[56] Richard Mulcaster, *Positions concerning the training up of children,* ed. William Barker (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), 250.

> By this meanes [of having fewer forums], everyone of a fourme shall someway provoke, or incourage the rest of their fellowes. If they be but dull, the rest will thinke to go before them; but if they be more pregnant and witty, or more painefull and diligent, they shall put spirits into all the rest, and be as a spurre unto them. For there is in our nature an inbred desire to ayme at the best, and to wish to equalize them in each commendable quality.[57]

According to Brinsley's logic, larger groups will emerge within the forums, ones that will emulate one another:

> So they [the students] would be placed as adversaries, that they may contend in all things, whether of them shall doe the better, and beare the bell away. Thus the whole fourmes through the Schoole should bee divided also into two equall parts; to strive alwayes, whether side of the fourme should get the victorie: like as it is in games, at shooting, or the like. Experience sheweth how this will provoke them, to be preparing and fitting for the victory.[58]

For Brinsley, such a situation allows for a larger ranking system, one based on contest: "To the end that every thing in the Schoole may bee thus done, by emulation and contention for praise; there would be a carefull sorting, and matching every one with him, who is next unto him in learning."[59] Sidney's "first eclogues," with their various contests between two sides use the template of a grammar school forum and apply it to poetic creation.

Sidney's first eclogues, particularly in these opening passages, relay a sort of fantasy whereby the poet contends in song against older ushers, tutors, or schoolmasters. Geron specifically speaks like a teacher or master in his chosen grammatical form, the

[57] Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius,* 48.

[58] Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius,* 50. Preceding the passage cited above, Brinsley suggests that "every thing in the Schoole may bee thus done, by emulation and contention for praise" which further reinforces the link between emulation and contention. Brinsley then cites "a most true proverbe," "*Marcet sine adversario virtus*," which he translates as, "Vertue loveth the vigour and decayeth, where it hath no adversarie" (50).

[59] Brinsley, *Ludus Literarius,* 50.

imperative: “Let not,” “Begin,” “Try,” “Go,” “Cherish,” he says (67). Philisides at one point mocks the attempt on Geron’s part to, significantly, “teach,” feigning disinterest: “Hath any man heard what this old man said?” (67). Obedience would feature in all of the education tracts in the period, and every tract calls attention to some sort of corporeal punishment, whether in support of or against it.[60] In Geron’s last ditch attempt at poetic supremacy, in an eclogue inspired by his two dogs, “whereof the elder was called Mealmapus, and the younger Laelaps … one brawling with the other,”[61] Geron laments that he finds “more obedience [in dogs] than in unbridled young men.”[62] The language that Geron and his friends deploy suggest that they expect to be listened to, instead of rebutted against. The elders, in other words, feel disdain for being a part of a contest instead of assuming their proper roles as educators; the implication is that the “unbridled” and “auditor” youth should respectfully learn lessons from their experienced elders.

The elders in “The First Eclogues” become cantankerous, not only in the condemnation of the love poetry being composed and sung by the youthful shepherds, but also in the ways that the youthful poetic license and freedom begets “offspring gaily bent” and troubles traditional gender roles. Specifically, Geron’s speech includes a direct allusion to the gendered consequences of a coddled generation:

> To age thus do they draw their youthful prime,
> knowing no more than what poor trial shows,

[60] Judith Owens notes that every school tract speaks about corporeal punishment, which does not suggest that all schoolmasters practiced violent forms of obtaining obedience so much as it shows the general prevalence in schools. See Owens, “Unpublished chapter.”

[61] Sidney, *Old Arcadia, 68*

[62] Sidney, *Old Arcadia,* 68.

As fish sure trial hath of muddy slime.
This pattern good unto children goes,
For what they see their parents love or hate
Their first caught sense prefers to teacher's blows,
These cocklings cockered we bewail too late
When that we see our offspring gaily bent,
Women manwood, and men effeminate (69-70).

Geron seems to argue for the continuity of discipline at home and at school. Here are two such instances in William Kempe's *The Education of Children:* "The Father therefore must keepe his fatherly authoritie ouer his Child, and ioyntly with the Maister prescribe vnto him a good order for manners and behauiour" and "The fathers discipline, I say, here ioyned with the maisters, will be a singular helpe to the good education of the scholler, and at once redresse and cure the foresayd maladie."[63] The figurative schoolmasters of *Old Arcadia* bemoan the youthful shepherds' lack of discipline both at home and at school.[64] Particularly in the context of gender-bending Pyrocles and Musidorus, Geron's castigation of "women manwood, and men effeminate" is at odds with where the text places sympathy. But such problems arise, for Geron, from both parental and educational models that are insufficiently forceful: students who adhere to their "first caught sense" in lieu of "teacher's blows."

The fear that a lack of corporeal punishment in grammar school might lead to women becoming effeminate is found elsewhere in the period. The character of the young boy in Thomas Ingelend's play *The Disobedient Child* (1570), which Rebecca Bushnell focuses on in her book-length study on early modern education, evades

[63] Kempe, *Education*, n.p.

[64] For a counterbalancing example, see Ascham's description of his tutor relationship with Jane Grey, who benefited from Ascham's gentle teaching practices because of its stark contrast with the severity of her parents. For more on the relationship between Asham and Grey, see Alan Stewart, *Close Readers: Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 104-16.

punishment at school but is later subject to punishment at the hands of women. Bushnell outlines the play's takeaway: "the simple message is that lacking a schoolmaster's beating a man will be beaten by his wife."[65] The elder shepherds in "The First Eclogues" echo ideas about discipline and corporeal punishment that would be circulating during the period, namely that discipline at school is coextensive with discipline at home, and that a lack of discipline (particularly in corporeal form) might lead to effeminate young men.

The elders resent the youths' lack of deference, and Geron's friend Mastix likens the entire poetic landscape to discord and opposition. Mastix says, in his reply to Geron, that the adversarial poetic landscape is analogous to the dispute of school children:

> And such discord 'twixt greatest shepherds flows,
> That sport it is to see with how great art
> By justice work they their own faults disclose
> Like busy boys to win their tutor's heart,
> One saith he mocks; the other saith he plays;
> The third his lesson missed; till all do smart.
> As for the rest, how shepherds spend their days
> At blow point, hot cockles, or else at keels,
> While, 'Let us pass our time,' each shepherd says (69).

Mastix, like Geron, characterizes the poet as a consequence of his schoolroom experience, all the while making an argument of his own—that despite the repeated calls to shepherdly *otium* ("let us pass our time"), in fact most of the shepherd-poets spend their days at "blow point, hot cockles, or else at keels." Mastix, though he will soon be shunned from the landscape, laments the combative contest he finds himself in, which denies him a schoolmaster's rightful authoritative role.

[65] Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching*, 29.

Where the shepherd-schoolmasters expect deference and imitation, they receive contest and emulation: Sidney takes the pedagogical master-pupil relationship and renders it adversarial. Following the songs of these two shepherds, "all the assembly laugh[ed] at the lustiness of the old fellow [Geron], who departed muttering to himself he had seen more in his days than twenty of them" (71). The tone is not entirely congratulatory, and, as Christopher Martin notes, Geron is written with a demeanour that occasionally solicits sympathy.[66] But, while it is lamentable that the younger shepherds do not take heed of Geron's advice—"An old man hear, who would thy fancies raise" (64)—Geron's indignity is satirized. Poetry does not always, as Sidney reminds his readers in *The Defence of Poesy*, work toward the end of teaching and delighting *ipso facto.* The irony that is not fully grasped by the elders—when Geron speaks about "[t]heir [youths] first caught sense prefers to teacher's blows" or when Mastix says that one boy his "lesson missed"—is that the emulous environment in which they find themselves is modelled after the early modern classroom. While Geron, Dicus, and Mastix expect master/pupil relationships, they are instead positioned within the classroom, amongst decidedly disobedient pupils.

[66] Christopher Martin, *Constituting Old Age in Early Modern English Literature, from Queen Elizabeth to King Lear* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012). See the third chapter for a reading of the "bucolic elders" in Sidney, in which he suggests that the elder Geron "focuses an alternative version of temperate and pliant senescence" (65). Martin's is a recuperative effort, and he acknowledges that "[d]espite its promise of retreat and regeneration, pastoral's literary domain often proves a deeply unaccommodating space for its aged inhabitants" (64-5). By associating the "elder" with the pedgagogical tradition so closely implicated in the eclogue, I attempt to explain why some pastoral (specifically the opening eclogue) is so unaccommodating.

IV Sexuality and pedagogy in the opening eclogue

Sidney's opening eclogues, whether in "The Lady of May" or in "The First Eclogues" in *Old Arcadia*, suggest a fractious relationship between master and pupil. The schoolmaster is a figure who is lampooned or is the loser of a poetic contest with youthful shepherds. Sidney's eclogues thus depict a clear distancing from their schoolroom function (as, essentially, textbooks) and demonstrate the shepherd-poet transcending the influence of his former schoolroom masters. In *Old Arcadia* in particular*,* the text does not locate much sympathy on the side of the elder shepherds, who complain in schoolmasters' terms that the youthful shepherds are neither obedient nor "proportioned" to their masters. The elders continually rebuke attitudes that they view as profligate or corrupting,[67] and when one turns to later eclogues in *Old Arcadia* the pattern continues.[68] Policing sexuality certainly finds precedence in some school tracts in the period: More and Ascham, for example, both advocate for teaching morality

[67] Beyond what appears in the previous section of this chapter, in "The First Eclogues" to Sidney's *Old Arcadia,* Dicus wears "on his breast ... a painted table" that depicts Cupid as a lecherous satyr-figure, and Geron's song, which serves to complement Dicus, is about the "beastly vice" that Cupid "plants" in men (59).

[68] Dicus serves as judge for the contest between Nico and Pan—full of sexualized banter—and in a gesture hardly to be found in eclogues anywhere, Dicus ultimately proclaims both contestants to be losers. No winners and no prizes goes against the typical ethos of both eclogue and pastoral at large. As Thomas Gustav Rosenmeyer*, The Green Cabinet. Theocritus and the European Pastoral* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969) suggests, "The singing is always rewarded, no matter whether the award is formal, and at the discretion of a judge, or not" (161). This gift-giving is indicative of a type of self-sufficiency within the world of the eclogue that is akin to what Poggioli*, Oaten Flute*, calls the "pastoral economy," the rudimentary, self-sustainable marketplace (4). For both Rosenmeyer and Poggioli, the giving of humble gifts is in congruence with the ethics of the shepherds' leisurely lifestyle. For the suggestion that the poem is an early composition with characterization that aligns it with *The Lady of May*, see Sukanta Chaudhuri, ed., *Pastoral Poetry of the English Renaissance* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016) 107.

that borders on chastity.[69] However, other critics, including Richard Mulcaster, depict the relationship between schoolmaster and pupil as bordering on the erotic. The eroticism, for a critic like Mulcaster, centers on the concept of punishment, including the "marriage" between birch rod and the schoolboys' exposed behind. The first eclogues, with their continued focus on pedagogy, suggest a relationship that is not depicted in chaste terms or in overly punishing ones.[70] Rather, in the eclogues I consider, eroticism is deployed to signal contest and mastery within the playful banter among shepherds.

In 1563, Barnabe Googe published the first eclogue collection in English, in *Eclogues, Epitaphs, and Sonnets*. In Googe's "Egloga Prima" (the first eclogue), Amintas cautions a younger shepherd, Daphnis, about the perils of love and ultimately offers advice regarding what, specifically, to beware. Amintas's caution likens lovers' torments to various humoural imbalances and provides a chronicle of these torments upon the body, but following a litany of potential ailments caused by love, Amintas gives Daphnis an explicit warning:

> Daphnes nowe beware,
> for thou art yonge, and fre,

[69] Thomas More, especially, makes a link between virtue and pedagogy, though not in a pedagogical tract but in a letter pertaining to the education of his daughter, "Letter to William Gonell, the Teacher of More's Children" (circa. 22 May 1518), in Wegemer and Smith, *A Thomas More Source Book*, 199. See also Naomi J. Miller and Naomi Yavneh, *Gender and Early Modern Constructions of Childhood* (New York: Routledge, 2016).

[70] Alexander Barclay wrote eclogues at the beginning of the sixteenth century but published them in full, in English, in 1570. See Alexander Barclay, *The Eclogues of Alexander Barclay from the Original edition by John Cawood*, ed. Beatrice White (London: Oxford University Press, 1928). For Barclay, sexual impropriety is cautioned against with religious zeal in the shepherd lesson between Cornix (the elder) and Coridon (the youth). Coridon, Barclay's younger shepherd, seems to give a sly wink to Coridon's Virgilian namesake of the second eclogue: Barclay's first description of Coridon as a "lustie freak," which connotes a youthful vigour, though the implication of sexual misconduct is also present, since Barclay uses the word "lustie" elsewhere to denote sexual impropriety. Cornix demonstrates evident interest in outlining the various sexual improprieties at court. Coridon's lesson continues in the second eclogue, where Cornix's cautionary tale treats the woes of love more explicitly.

> Take heade of vewynge faces longe,
> for losse of Lybertye,
> I shall not nede (I thynke) to byd
> the, to detest the Cryme,
> Of wycked loue, that Ioue did vse,[2] [the FN here says "Iupiter."]
> In Ganimedes tyme (1. 146-53)[71]

Homoerotic love here is invoked by name as the "Cryme, / Of wycked loue ... in Ganimedes tyme." When the eclogue is read back against Sidney's Geron and Dicus, it sets some eclogue parameters in motion—a shepherd lesson with a moral tone—only to disrupt and subvert them. One way of interpreting the Ganymede passage is to view it as an instance of categorical homophobia, or as a deliberate refutation of the classical homoerotic model. But, in the context of the eclogue tradition, the seemingly homophobic passage becomes much more complex.

Sexuality is a topic in most opening eclogues in Elizabethan England, though we might also look at eclogues in two influential translations, both of which were considered to be "opening eclogues" by some translators when they were published in 1575 and 1588.[72] Virgil's sixth eclogue, which Fleming calls the "song of Silenus," is thought to allude to Virgil's own education, though whether as schoolmaster or student is uncertain.[73] The languages of pedagogy and authority overlap, as the "boies" *Chrome*

[71] See Barnabe Googe, *Eclogues, Epitaphs, and Sonnets,* ed. Judith M. Kennedy (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989). In-text parenthetical citation with line numbers are from this edition.

[72] Both of Fleming's translations (in 1575 and 1589), maintain the standard eclogue order, though Fleming suggests in 1575 that some people thought the sixth eclogue should lead the collection: "Othersome will haue that Eclog to be the first in order, which beginneth thus, / *Our muse* Thalia *first of all vouchsafed hath to play, &c.* / But ouerparsing these idle controuersies (A4r).

[73] Virgil is associated with both schoolmaster and student. According to Fleming and some classical commentators, Virgil is associated with the figure of Silenus. Fleming writes in an argument to the 1589 translation that, "The sixt Eclog conteineth a sonnet or song of Silenus, by whom is meant the poet *Virgill* himself... The only speaker in this eclog is the poet himselfe" (17). As Wallace, in *Virgil's Schoolboys*, notes, the first Venetian edition in 1558 and also Brinsley's edition in 1620 "characterized the poem as the residue of Virgil's schooldays in the garden off his Epicurean master" (99).

and *Mnasil* bind the drowsy, elder *Silen* and force him to sing. When *Silen* (or Silvanus) wakes,

> His garlands only fallen from his head did lie far off,
> And neere him hoong a migthtie kain with eare [or handle] worne,
> These boies setting on *Silen* cast upon him binding bands,
> Made of the very garlands, for old *Silen* oftentimes
> Had both these boies beguiled with [vaine] hope of [promis'd] song,
> *Aegle* she paints old *Silens* browes, and temples of his head,
> With bloudie [colour] mulberries, he being now awake,
> And laughing at the subtill iest said [to them] To what end
> Knit you these knots and bands; O boies loose me, it is ynough
> That I could haue beene seene of you [being seene but when I list:]
> Know songs of me now what you will, songs to you [I will sing]
> [But] to this Aegle shalbe [giuen] another [one] reward:
> And here withall old *Silen* doth begin himselfe to sing.[74]

Jeff Masten suggests that the early modern term "boy" was a word of "categorical fluidity" that served as a "universal object of desire,"[75] though here we view a scenario in which the boys are the acting agents. Virgil presents a playful image where sexuality gets imbricated not only with pedagogy but with mastery as well. One critic suggests that the song of Silenus "is an artful by-product of Silenus' willingness to read his own entanglement and capture as evidence that the boys have already learned a lesson."[76] Silenus says, specifically, "O boies loose me, it is ynough / That I could haue beene seene of you" (17).[77] Ultimately Virgil's sixth eclogue resists (and even subverts) not only the unilateral master-pupil hierarchy suggested by many early modern education

[74] Fleming, *Bucolikes (1575)*, 18.

[75] Jeffrey Masten, "Editing Boys: The Performance of Gender in Print," *From Performance to Print in Shakespeare's England*, eds. Peter Holland and Stephen Orgel (New York: Palgrave, 2006), 117. See also the chapter that this article evolved into, in Masten, *Queer Philologies*.

[76] Wallace, *Virgil's Schoolboys,* 105.

[77] As Wallace points out, the implication here is that the bondage is "enough" of a lesson learned, though the Latin original is "*satis est potuisse uideri*," which more closely translates to "it is enough to have shown your power" (105).

tracts, but even reverses the standard narrative of acting sexual agent. Contrary to the forceful schoolmaster depicted in education tracts in early modern England, Virgil's two boys require that the master perform for them and not the other way around.

Theocritus's eighth idyll appears as the leading idyll in the first English translation, published anonymously but dedicated to Sidney's friend Edward Dyer, in 1588.[78] The boys, Menalcas and Daphnis, sing two songs together, the first pertaining to the nature of love, sung in pentameter, and the second, on the themes of nature and renewal, sung in hexameter. At the end of the idyll, the shepherds' "skilfull" singing is distinguished the one from the other by gendering them, sexualizing them, and imposing a hierarchy:

> So then was Daphnis glad, and lept, and clapt his handes,
> And danst, as doth a fawne, when the damn he standes.
> Menalcas greevd, the thing his mind did much dismaie,
> And sad as a Bride he was, upon the marriage daie.
> Since then, among the Shepeheards, Daphnis chiefe was had,
> And took a Nimphe to wife, when he was but a lad.[79]

Daphnis, following his victory, dances "as doth a faune, when the damn he stands," which implies the image of a faune (or a young animal) "standing" aginst a "dam" (or a female of the same species). While "standing" may primarily connote its military meaning, it also casts a glance at the obvious phallic implication. The next metaphor figures Menalcas as the "bride" of Daphnis, and as a bride "upon the marriage day" more

[78] Specifically, Theocritus's first/eighth idyll, in *Sixe Idillia*, depicts Menalcas and Daphnis making wagers on one another's pipes, and then the two "lustie boies" select a goteherd for their judge: "the lustie boies / Did call him, and the goteherd came to hear their toies" (A3v). While Theocritus would not be a primary text taught at grammar schools, his idylls would certainly be in circulation: Spenser references Theocritus, for example, in the exordium to *The Shepheardes Calender* and there would be many translations of his works circulating on the continent, in a variety of languages. See page 72-3 of this dissertation for the beginning portion of the idyll.

[79] Theocritus, *Sixe Idillia*, A4v.

specifically, which further solidifies the sexual imagery. This figuration of Menalcas as a virgin bride suggests that winning the singing contest is equated, in this instance, with sexual conquest. It is Daphnis's poetic superiority that renders him into the "chiefe," and Menalcas's loss that renders him into the "bride."

On one hand, one is inclined to view the sequence between Daphnis and Menalcas as mirroring contests within the schoolroom that position the students against one another. However, the language of sexuality in Theocritus introduces a difference of kind, and not simply of degree. As Menalcas loses, he adopts not only a submissive sexual position but his gender becomes linked to, according to Greek conceptions of gender roles, the weaker sex. As David Halperin's *100 Years of Homosexuality* reminds us, sexuality in ancient Greece was often predicated on power dynamics, in which "active" and "passive" partners are clearly distinguished, hence the idyll's final figurations of Daphnis as "chiefe" and Menalcas as "wife."[80] Theocritus's contest provides a good reminder that a) contest does not preclude sexuality but can in fact heighten it, and b) sexuality served as a discourse not only between master and pupil but between pupil and pupil.

The point I want to make clear is that the first eclogues in English, even some as they appear in translation, call attention to poetic predecessors that view the master-pupil and the pupil-pupil relationships is terms that are considerably more complex than a master with a rod swinging at a boy's bare behind. I would then like to return to the "homophobic" eclogue by Barnabe Googe and read it within a more complex power

[80] See Halperin, *100 Years of Homosexuality*. See also page 38 (note 73) of the introduction.

relationship between master and pupil. In a continuation from the previous quotation, in which Amintas advises Daphnis "to detest the Cryme, / Of wycked loue, that Ioue did vse … / in Ganimedes tyme," Amintas qualifies his earlier advice in the passage that immediately follows it:

> For rather wolde I (thoo it be muche)
> that thou shuldest seake the fyre,
> Of lawfull Loue, that I haue tolde,
> than burne wyth suche desyre,
> And thus an end, I weryed am,
> my wynde is olde, and faynt (ll. 153-8)

The ambiguity of the phrasing "burne wyth suche desyre / And thus an end, I weryed am, / my wynde is old" connects "weryed" to both, or either, the preceding and / or subsequent phrases. As a concluding remark, this might mean "Do as I say. Period. I am weary and tired of talking," but it equally suggests "Do as I say, not as I have desired. It has brought me to this weary end." Or, "weryed" meant wearied (tired) but also "troubled or distressed in mind."[81] "Wicked" / sodomitical love is cautioned against not because of its moral or atheistic connotations that one reads about in later Elizabethan anti-theatrical tracts, but because, potentially, it is the love that "surmownts" all other affections. When read with an eye to the first eclogue and its overlapping foci of pedagogy and sexuality, Googe's eclogue plays with the concept of "imitating" the master; Googe seems more intent on outlining the intensity of the love that leaves one so wearied than he is on cautioning against it.

Looking backwards through Googe's first eclogue, consequently, one notes that the gender of the lover is neutral, and that the "wicked love" passage resembles a

[81] "weary, adj." OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

culmination, or apex, of how love can render the body "weary," rather than a lesson. In a quatrain appearing before the "ganymede" warning, Menalcas urges,

> And therefore, Daphnes, now beware,
> for thou art young and free;
> Take heed of viewing faces long
> for loss of liberty (ll. 145-8).

"Faces long" might contain a secondary meaning: a sexual position in which one partner faces backwards. The ensuing threat of "loss of liberty" suggests that Amintas is cautioning Daphnis against this particular "unlawful" love because of its passionate feelings, not because of any moral problem. Amintas's closing words, "Fetche in the Gote: that goes astraye, / and dryue hym to the folde," suggests that a goat has presumably leapt the hedge and must be driven back "to the folde"—an apt metaphor for the shepherds' own passions.[82] Googe's first eclogue complicates, rather than clarifies, the sexual lesson, and the eclogue tethers eroticism, imitation and emulation, and pedagogy in a more complex web than its purported cautioning against the "Cryme of … wycked love" suggests.

By the time that Edmund Spenser first publishes *The Shepheardes Calender*, in 1579, he is following a long tradition of poets featuring a master-pupil relationship prominently in their eclogues. Equally important, he is working in a tradition that foregrounds sexuality within the aforementioned pedagogical bond, whether in praising, policing, or subversive terms. Spenser leaves the grammar school behind altogether and focuses on a relationship founded at the university: Spenser depicts Colin in a bind with

[82] This is also an image that mirrors the closing passage of Theocritus's first idyll. See a reading of this passage in Guy-Bray, *Homoerotic Space*, 31. For more on the various roles of goats in medieval and early modern eclogues, see Cooper, "The Goat and the Eclogue."

Hobbinol right from the outset of the *Calender*, and Colin's evolving relationship with Hobbinol provides a narrative thread that connects the individual, varied eclogues. I argue here that Colin, Spenser's closest surrogate, is interested in maintaining a loving relationship with Hobbinol, Harvey's surrogate, though the dynamics of the pedagogical relationship must change.

According to E.K. in the oft-cited note to January, the Colin / Hobbinol relationship might be characterized as "pederastice." Despite using a term that combines sexuality, pedagogy, and hierarchy, E.K. sidesteps the question of whether the "paederastic" relationship is an explicitly sexual one: "In thys place seemeth to be some sauour of disorderly loue, which the learned call paederastice: but it is gathered beside his meaning."[83] One could read the commentary as clarifying Colin and Hobbinol's relationship from being confused with one of "execrable and horrible sinnes of forbidden and vnlawful fleshlinesse" (39), though I prefer Ann Lake Prescott's suggestion that Spenser provides a model for "how to write homoerotic poetry while claiming not to."[84] One could extend Prescott's statement backwards until at least 1563 in the English eclogue tradition, when Googe published his collection, to show how shepherd-poets caution against homoerotic love while simultaneously upraising it. In the *Calender,* Spenser views Colin's "paederastic" relationship as one that requires transcending not because of its sexual charge but because of the implied power imbalance. In other words, Colin's relationship must progress from "pederastice" to something more akin to Michel

[83] Spenser, *Calender*, 39. E.K.'s commentary is cited by page number and the poems are cited by line number.

[84] Anne Lake Prescott, "Barnfield's Spenser: 'Great Collin' and the Art of Denial," in *The Affectionate Shepherd: Celebrating Richard Barnfield,* eds. Kenneth Borris and George Klawitter (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2001), 85.

de Montaigne's concept of friendship.[85] Or, in the terms used by this dissertation: Spenser must change the imitative pedagogical relationship into an emulous one.

Harvey is identified at once as a friend, patron, fellow poet, tutor, and pederast. Within the poems contained in the text, however, Harvey seems to primarily occupy a position of authority, since Hobbinol is a presiding figure who often attempts to woo Colin with gifts or to dictate what Colin sings. With Hobbinol-Colin-Rosalind, there is an echo of a Girardian or Sedgwickian love triangle, in that there is a closening of the male bond through the (absent) figure of the woman.[86] However, Colin functions as an intermediary, too, since Hobbinol passes gifts to Colin, who in turn passes these gifts on to Rosalind:

> It is not *Hobbinol,* wherefore I plaine,
> Albee my loue he seeke with dayly suit:
> His clownish gifts and curtsies I disdaine,
> His kiddes, his cracknelles, and his early fruit.
> Ah foolish *Hobbinol,* thy gyfts bene vayne:
> *Colin* them giues to *Rosalind* againe (ll. 55-60).

In addition to this passage from "January," Hobbinol attempts to win Colin's favour by "Forcing with gyfts," which implies an aggressive gesture, in "April."[87] Ultimately Colin's relationship to Hobbinol must be surmounted: whether Colin is passing along Hobbinol's songs or his other gifts, the implication is that Colin is unable to begin his

[85] See the introduction to this dissertation, page 33 (note 65).

[86] See the introduction to this dissertation, page 29-34.

[87] The passage in "April" is as follows: "*Colin* thou kenst, the Southerne shepheardes boye: / Him Loue hath wounded with a deadly darte. / Whilome on him was all my care and ioye, / Forcing with gyfts to winne his wanton heart (l. 21-4).

own poetic flight under such circumstances.[88] It is not the pastoral mode that must be transcended; rather, Colin must alter the relationships within the eclogue that keep him from the successes he will enjoy in "Colin Cloute Comes Home Again" and in Book 6 of *The Faerie Queene.*

The clearest way to alter the power dynamic implied between master and pupil is to reverse the trajectory of imitation: in other words, instead of the pupil imitating the master, the master must imitate the pupil. In the world of the eclogue, singing another shepherd's song is a way of upraising him. Daphnis, Coridon, and Thyrsis, all prominent shepherds in the larger pastoral universe, have others sing their songs in Virgil's and Theocritus's poems: shepherds ventriloquize Daphnis in Theocritus's first idyll, and Meliboeus remembers the entire exchange between Coridon and Thyrsis, word for word, in Virgil's sixth eclogue. In the *Calender,* Colin appears in name or in recollection in more than half the eclogues, and in "April," Hobbinol imitates Colin's song in its entirety. The eclogues skew toward Colin in the latter half of the collection, as he either appears in, or is mentioned in, all the eclogues from "August" onward. Colin is the singer of the elegy for Dido in "November," which E.K. suggests "farre pass[es] … all other the Eglogues of this booke" (138). In "November," Thenot says explicitly that it is "better learne of hem [Colin], that learned bee" (l. 29), which posits the potential for

[88] There is continuity between "gift" and "song" throughout in the greater pastoral universe, where gifts are traded for songs. However, the *Calender* complicates this friendly exchange, especially in instances that implicate Colin. One such instance is in "August" when Colin "purchase[d]" the best of Willye's lambs in a singing contest. In "November," Thenot writes to Colin, that for his "rymes… Much greater gyfts for guerdon [reward] thou shalt gayne / Then Kidde or Cosset" (ll. 43-6). Thus, while the exchange between goods and song ends "November"—"Thyne be the cossette, well hast thow it gotte" (l. 206)—the more important implication is that the gift, or reward, transcends the monetary. The implication throughout the *Calender* seems to be that Colin's song merits more than gifts.

Colin emerging as the one to be imitated, as the master to be followed. The question that the text sets up is, Will Colin emerge from the eclogues, in "December," successfully enshrined in the poetic pantheon (of Virgil et al.) as E.K. promises in the introduction?[89]

In "December," Colin signals an affiliation with "January" through the eclogues' shared pedagogical themes. "December" focuses on Colin's growth as a poet and references a former teacher, that "good olde shepherde, *Wrenock* was his name" who "made me by arte more cunning in the same" (ll. 41-2). Wrenock, E.K. notes, likely serves as a shepherd surrogate for Spenser's former grammar school teacher Richard Mulcaster at Merchant Taylors' School. Andrew Wadoski reads the *Calender* as a movement from the tutelage of Wrenock toward the more "expansive" education provided by Gabriel Harvey (425), in which "December," especially, "memorializ[es] this change of teachers" (425).[90] While I agree that the *Calender* foregrounds pedagogy, I think that another reading is to understand "December" as transcending Harvey, too.

In "December," Colin no longer acts as an intermediary in a text that very clearly positions the "originator" of a song above the imitator who passes it along. Colin gives instructions for Hobbinol in the final lines of "December:" "Adieu good *Hobbinol,* that was so true, / Tell *Rosalind,* her *Colin* bids her adieu" (ll. 155-6). The implication of these lines is not that Colin has failed in his attempt to woo Rosalind. Rather, Colin is requesting that Hobbinol "bids [Rosalind] adieu," which connotes a request for imitation similar to the ventriloquized song that Hobbinol sang to Elizabeth in April. Colin, in

[89] The passage that I have in mind is the oft-cited poetic credo, in which E.K. suggests that Colin will chase after his eclogue forebears: "So flew Theocritus, as you may perceiue he was all ready full fledged…" (29). This passage will be treated in chapter two of this dissertation, on page 134.

[90] See Andrew Wadoski, "Spenser, Harvey, and the Strange Poetics of *The Shepheardes Calender*," *College Literature: A Journal of Critical Literary Studies* 44, no. 3 (2015): 425.

closing his eclogue with such an instruction, alters the asymmetrical love triangle: Colin no longer gives Rosalind the gifts of Hobbinol, but instead Colin requests that his own songs be sung, by Hobbinol, to Rosalind. Colin, in requesting that Hobbinol imitate his verse, has altered the pedagogical relationship into one where he (Colin) originates the song. In surpassing Hobbinol, Colin has turned his former imitative relationship into an emulous one.

This chapter has demonstrated how Elizabethan poets deploy the eclogue—a literary form first taught to them in grammar schools—to symbolise and critique the schoolmaster. I have considered how the schoolroom provides versions of emulous fellowship that shape and inform the eclogue and its poetic relationships. Education tracts in the period, such as Thomas Elyot's *The Govenour,* Roger Ascham's *The Schoolmaster,* Richard Mulcaster's *Positions,* among others, provide models of didacticism and emulation. However, the eclogues critique these restrictive models as much as they borrow from them. The opening eclogues of Elizabethan collections (and translations) signal a poet's emergence into a new poetic form and often contain a response to the pedagogical expectations of imitation. The response is by no means unequivocal. The opening English eclogues continually stage a scene of instruction to complicate it, or to sexualize it, or to surpass it, and it is the movement toward emulation within these opening eclogues that provides the foundation for understanding the focus of the next chapter of this dissertation: the convention of the singing contest.

Chapter 2. "Thou shalt ycrouned be in *Colins* stede": the Singing Contest in Edmund Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calender*

The various eclogic "forums" that were the focus of the preceding chapter provide a clear and direct segue into Edmund Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calender*, where Spenser deploys the convention of the singing contest, along with its accompanying formal tropes, to signal emulation.[1] Similar in spirit to the forums that constitute grammar school, Spenser's contests serve to both reflect and engender emulous fellowship with other eclogue writers. Thus, this chapter looks not to the youthful shepherds found in the opening eclogue but instead toward shepherds later on in the narrative framework of an eclogue collection. Specifically, this chapter focuses most closely on moments of contest that depict shepherd-poets in the midst of poetic development. I contend that the singing contest is not light and trivial pastoral play but instead speaks to aspirations of poetic exaltation.

Poetic aspiration and exaltation in Spenser's *Calender* is often read against the classical tradition—a continuing trend as evidenced by a 2016 book-length study—but this chapter provides a sustained reading of the *Calender* as responding directly to

[1] As much as I would like to, I cannot take credit for the adjective "eclogic," which was first coined, to my knowledge, by Peter Sacks, early in his book *The English Elegy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), when he writes, "We also need to interpret the eclogic division within or between mourning voices" (2).

native, English predecessors of the eclogue.[2] My work complements studies that read Spenser's engagement with his English contemporaries in less than congenial terms, including those that focus on Spenser's use of archaism and his appropriation of the language of manual labour.[3] My argument is that Spenser's formal innovations in the eclogue display an acute awareness of his English forebears, but that Spenser does not directly acknowledge his debts. Spenser's reticence is depicted not only through his primary persona in the eclogue, Colin Clout, but also in the larger textual production, where his verbose commentator E.K. at once solicits a literary community while gesturing in ambivalent fashion toward its members, including eclogue writers Barnabe Googe and, to a certain extent, Sir Philip Sidney. E.K. also responds to the major English translations that precede the *Calender*'s 1579 publication date, including George Turbervile's translation of Mantuan (1572) and Abraham Fleming's first translation of Virgil (1575). Thus, in contrast with arguments that focus on archaism and the language of labour in Spenser's *Calender,* which tend to read Spenser's innovations against a range of earlier English texts, I focus on how the eclogue form, specifically, provides formal parameters through which Spenser signals emulation toward contemporary shepherd-poets. In these emulous relations with his English forebears in the eclogue,

[2] There are ample studies that relate Edmund Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calender* to the classical tradition of the eclogue. Most recently, see Syrithe Pugh, *Spenser and Virgil: The pastoral poems* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2016), especially chapters 2 and 3.

[3] There are several studies that position Spenser within an English tradition, including recent studies in archaic language, such as those by Lucy Munro, *Archaic Style in English Literature, 1590 – 1674* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013) and Catherine Nicholson, *Uncommon Tongues: Eloquence and Eccentricity in the English Renaissance* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013). Both Munro and Nicholson read Spenser's use of archaism against a contingent of preceeding English writers, several of whom I treat here. Another critic who positions Spenser at the end of an English tradition, but with a focus on the language of labour, is Little, in *Transforming Work*. However, in all three cases, the studies focus more of how Spenser engages with a theme (archaism, labour) instead of directly positing instances of poetic influence.

Spenser diminishes his English influences to propel Colin Clout toward his role as the "new Poete."

The eclogue that best invokes the competitive spirit of the *Calender* in relation to contemporary eclogue collections is, not coincidentally, the one that stages the convention of the singing contest: "August." This chapter thus uses "August" as a starting point from which to unearth larger competitive tendencies that undergird the *Calender* and to position the text squarely amongst (and against) a variety of English writers and translators, despite the lofty claims made in E.K.'s introduction that position Spenser amongst ancient and continental writers. "August" is one of the eclogues that receives minimal critical attention, in no small part because it does not foreground political, religious, or cultural commentary as clearly as many of the other eclogues do. Rather, at first glance, Spenser's singing contest in "August" is light-hearted pastoral play, sandwiched between the austere religious analogues of "Julye" and "September." It is also, presumably, one of the "recreative" eclogues, to quote E.K., which "conceiue matter of loue, or commendation of special personages…," and which, in contrast with "moral" and "plaintive," are not identified by month in E.K.'s introduction (32).[4] E.K.'s lesser focus on the "recreative" foreshadows the dearth of sustained criticism that addresses the singing contests of *The Shepheardes Calender*—and the "August" eclogue specifically—in contemporary scholarship. In *Renaissance Pastoral and its English*

[4] See Spenser, *Shorter Poems*. All in-text parenthentical citations will refer to page numbers in this edition unless otherwise preceded by "l." for line.

Developments, Sukanta Chaudhuri provides a reading that is largely representative of this eclogue's reception in Renaissance pastoral criticism.[5] He writes that, in "August,"

> Spenser is presenting the untroubled, almost unthinking otium that, while never the constant state of the pastoral universe, constitutes its basic, ideal element. Somewhere in the pastoral world, at least by implication, there will always be this direct, delightful response to life: song, love, friendship, sport, enjoyed in unvexed simplicity.[6]

In one sense, Chaudhuri is not incorrect to make such a claim, and he accords with other essential scholars of the *Calender* and/or the pastoral, who treat the eclogue in passing or not at all.[7] However, the shepherds in "August" enact the ideals of emulous fellowship in

[5] In David R. Shore, *Spenser and the Poetics of Pastoral* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1985), the following eclogues are given their own individual sections for analysis, as noted in the table of contents: "January," "February," "May," "June," "July," "September," "October," "November," and "December." Two of the three missing eclogues—"March" and "August"—are notably "recreative," and their labelling as "the least serious of the eclogues" (103) presumably merits this omission.

[6] Chaudhuri, *Renaissance Pastoral*, 141.

[7] A.C. Hamilton, "The Argument of Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender*," *ELH* 23, no. 3 (Sept., 1956) 175, 180 [171-82]. Hamilton views the eclogue as the poet testing his skill against the ancients, suggesting that, "The August eclogue is a recreative interlude displaying the poet's skill through the traditional singing-contest in which the shepherds' praise of love is significantly opposed by his lament upon love" (180). For Hamilton, the recreative eclogues (March, April, August) serve as moments of respite before the poet returns to "moral" and "plaintive" modes that are crucial to Hamilton's reading of the pattern of the eclogues. See also Harry Berger Jr., "Mode and Diction in 'The Shepheardes Calender'," *Modern Philology* 67, no. 2 (Nov., 1969): 141. Alpers, *What is Pastoral?*, does not treat the eclogue at all. One critic who is the exception to this rule is Patrick Cheney, whose focus on the careerist implications of Colin's sestina in August is mentioned in Partrick Cheney, "'The Nightingale is Sovereigne of Song': the bird as a sign of the Virgilian orphic poet in 'The Shepheardes Calender,'" *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 21, no. 1 (Spring 1991): 42-6; Patrick Cheney, *Spenser's Famous Flight*, 98-107; and Patrick Cheney, "Spenser's Pastorals: 'The Shepheardes Calender' and 'Colin Clouts Come Home Again'," *The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*, ed. Andrew Hadfield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). In "Spenser's Pastorals," 93, Cheney writes, "Cuddie's rehearsal of Colin's song is the first sestina printed in English. … 'August' fully detaches Colin from the amateur model, elevating him to pre-laureate status, singing a love lyric useful to the nation" (93).

ways that resonate throughout the *Calender* and that glance at shepherds in other eclogue collections.[8]

I begin by outlining "August" and its characters, as well as the various contests that the "musike match" sets up (l. 2). Like its classical models, "August" begins with banter between two shepherd contestants, Perigot and Willye, before they decide on an "vmpire to their strife," Cuddye, to serve as judge. The first half of "August" chronicles the banter, the wager of gifts, and then the contest between Perigot and Willye, wherein Perigot tells a story about his love interest the "bouncing Bellibone" (l. 61), in the form of a roundelay, replete with images of the suffering Petrarchan lover. In the contest, Willye replies in echoing verse and, despite the contest framing, his input is not at all adversarial. Rather, Willye supplements Perigot's song in a manner reminiscent of a modern-day backup singer. When reading passages such as the one that follows, the honest reader must wonder whether the contest *qua* contest is a joke at the expense of rustic simplicity:

> Per. Hasting to raunch the arrow out,
> Wil. hey ho Perigot.
> Per. I left the head in my hart roote:
> Wil. it was a desperate shot.
> Per. There it rancleth ay more and more,
> Wil. hey ho the arrow... (ll. 97-102)

[8] The singing contest is predicated on two parties being proportionate in poetic aptitude (one cannot have a contest with a total novice) or on one of the parties striving toward such (as between a master and a pupil). The notable, underlying similarity between emulators is a recurring feature in commentary on emulation and envy, linking thinkers such as Aristotle with Sir Francis Bacon. See page 12-20 of the introduction to this dissertation. The contest positions its contestants as equals before distinguishing and ranking each contestant, according to a judge's verdict or to one singer's popularity, and in ways that complicate or that trangress traditional Elizabethan hierarchies (for example, when a master and a pupil compete, or when an emerging poet competes with one who is well established).

In a gesture marked with Spenserian humour, the judge Cuddye responds to the contest by suggesting that both win, or is it that neither win? Cuddye begins by praising Perigot: "Little lacketh Perigot of the best" (l. 126). Then, turning to Willye, Cuddye praises him in equal measure: "And Willye is not greatly overgone" (l. 127). Both compliments, however, have an ironic underbelly: the implication in the former is that Perigot does lack, and in the latter that Willye can be overgone. Using classical terms, one might suggest that Cuddye subverts the rhetorical figure of a "litotes" to highlight Willye's and Perigot's mediocrity or, in simple modern terms, that Cuddye speaks out of both sides of his mouth.[9]

When "hey ho" Willye persists in questioning "who has the victorye?" the discerning reader cannot but wonder whether the contest framework has been an elaborate ruse. Neither competitor is awarded the prize, which becomes a trade of the gifts wagered: Willye is awarded Perigot's mazer (an ornamental goblet made from maple wood and precious metal) while Perigot is awarded Willye's lamb. Cuddye's meandering chatter, following the contest, serves to further pronounce the triviality of Willye and Perigot's song, before Cuddye suggests that they "hear a doolefull verse" (l. 140) written by Colin. Cuddye's aside "(who knowes not Rosalend?)" sounds a lot like a later reference in Book 6 of the *Faerie Queene*, "Who knows not Colin Clout?", which is a question variously formulated so many times in *The Shepheardes Calendar* that it

[9] The definition for "Litotes" is as follows: "A figure of speech, in which an affirmative is expressed by the negative of the contrary; an instance of this." See "Litotes, n." OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

could work as an alternate title.[10] The contest between Perigot and Willye originally cast them as adversaries, but when the judge Cuddye so quickly forgets about their exchange and the reader learns that the "Doleful verse" by Colin is a sestina, the purview of the singing contest widens. Cuddye's recollection of Colin's entire sestina effectively resets the parameters of "August" in a way that repositions Perigot and Willye alongside one another, and the new contest becomes one that is between Perigot-and-Willye's roundelay and Colin's sestina, ventriloquized by Cuddye. Colin's upraising recalls a similar moment with Theocritus's Daphnis, who is elegized and also as active participant in contests within Theocritus's larger collection.[11] In short, Spenser shows Colin earning his poetic pre-eminence within the eclogues through contest. Lastly, in contrast with the May-game *ethos* of the roundelay's "bouncing Bellibone," Colin's sestina gestures toward decidedly literary possibilities of the eclogue, which are at a remove from the rustic song of Perigot and Willye.[12]

Colin often appears in moments of recollection over the course of the eclogues, and in "August" he appears in memories that are competitive. It is easy to miss the fact that Cuddye's recollection of Colin's sestina is the second time that Colin gets brought up as a participant of singing contests. Colin's first contest is referenced early in

[10] Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, 6.9.16: "That jolly Shepherd, which there piped, was / Poor Colin Clout (who knows not Colin Clout?) / He pip'd apace, whilst they him daunc'd about, / Pipe, jolly Shepherd, pipe thou now apace / Unto thy Love, that made thee low to lout."

[11] See Theocritus, *Idylls*, 7.

[12] An early instance of this view is made by William Lindsay Renwick, ed., *The Shepherd's Calendar* (London: Scholartis Press, 1930). Renwick writes "the simple swains sing merrily enough, but a grave, elaborate, Italiante song of *Colin's* hushes them in admiration, their simple impromptu is overshadowed" (206). See further arguments in Hamilton, "Argument," 180, and in Cheney, "Spenser's Pastorals," 93. For more on the roundelay as itself an imported form, see Bruce Pattison, "The Roundelay in the August Eclogue of The Shepheardes Calender," *The Review of English Studies* 9, no. 33 (Jan. 1933): 55.

"August," following Perigot's wager of "yonder spotted Lambe" (l. 37), the brother of which Colin victoriously "rafte" off Perigot. "Rafte" is an archaic variation of "reave," which includes the definition "to take (something) away from a person, etc., or out of a place, by force; esp. to steal."[13] Presumably, such is the usage that Spenser implies in Book 1, Canto 1 of *The Faerie Queene*, when Red Cross Knight performs this action against Errour: "From her body...He raft her hatefull heade without remorse."[14] Perigot immediately qualifies "rafte" by saying that Colin "purchast [the lamb] of me in the Playne field" (ll. 41-2). "Purchast" in this instance does not only imply a monetary transaction, since "purchase" also means "To obtain; to gain possession of."[15] The inference is that Colin is a regular participant in contests and that, without stepping foot in "August," he is nonetheless signalled, by various shepherds, as its preeminent contestant.

Prior to Cuddy's iteration of Colin's sestina, Willye makes the competitive implication absolutely clear when he says to Cuddye: "Fayth of my soule, then shalt ycrowned be / In Colin's stead" (ll. 145-6). Colin wins the crown ("O Colin, Colin, the shepherds joy," exclaims Perigot), though his victory is hardly surprising, since Colin is referenced as the dominant shepherd, once again, immediately prior to Perigot and Willye commencing to sing.[16] Similar to Meliboeus in Virgil's seventh eclogue, the

[13] "Reave, n." 3b. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

[14] Spenser, *Faerie Queene,* 1.1.24.

[15] "Purchase, n." II.4. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press. The relevant definition is as follows: "a. *trans.* To obtain in any way; to acquire; to take possession of; to gain. Now *rare.*"

[16] See lines 47-50 of "August" for more praise of Colin's preeminence among shepherds: "Wil. But for sunnebeame so sore doth vs beate, / Were not better, to shunne the scortching heate? / Per. Well agreed Willy: then sitte thee downe swayne: / Sike a song never heardest thou, but Colin sing."

presence of the adjudicating shepherd is less to serve as judge than it is to sing the victor's song and to praise him within the shepherd community.

Understanding how singing contestants were physically positioned within the classical contest helps to illuminate a significant feature of "August": Colin's sestina seems to point outward, beyond the bounds of the *Calender.* Thomas Rosenmeyer, in his book on Theocritus's idylls, highlights the dialogue between singers and their audience in the classical contest:

> Where no umpire is present, the contestants face each other, as friends or quasi-foes […] Where the umpire *is* available, the contestants face away from each other, and the umpire forms an audience. In such a situation, the songs come closest to being performances; the circle of friendship extends beyond the chance meeting of two men...[17]

The idea of the contestants not facing one another provides a helpful metaphor in "August," where Colin seems to point outward, off toward other singing "contestants" or "quasi-foes" in texts that exist beyond the scope of "August" and even beyond the scope of *The Calender*. Indeed one cannot help but notice that the shepherd contestants in the woodcut for "August" (see Figure 1) have both turned their lower torsos away from the umpire and out toward an audience beyond the frame of the image.

[17] Rosenmeyer, *The Green Cabinet*, 157.

Figure 1. The woodcut that fronts "August" in Edmund Spenser's *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579)

Rosenmeyer's suggestion that "the contestants face away from each other" resonates with David Radcliffe's introductory remarks to "August," in which Radcliffe hints at the adversarial potential at the heart of the eclogue: "The sestina in August was a standing challenge for other Elizabethan poets to emulate. Who but the creator of the Spenserian stanza could invent so many rhymes on so few words?"[18] Rephrasing Radcliffe's question concerning Colin's sestina, I propose looking backward in time as well as forward, since another way of posing this question is, Who might Spenser be emulating in writing a sestina? Toward which existing, literary shepherds might Spenser's singing shepherds be gesturing?

[18] David Hill Radcliff, "August," *English Poetry 1579 – 1830: Spenser and the Tradition*, http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?action=GET&textsid=22 (accessed 10 August 2016).

I Virgilian and Spenserian riddles

Perhaps E.K. would be helpful to point us toward who else Colin might be signalling in "August," but when the reader turns to the gloss, she finds, curiously, the longest absence of textual notes in the entire text—over 60 lines. If his defining feature is his sheer verbosity, E.K., in regards to Colin's sestina, is uncharacteristically silent.[19] Where E.K. does direct the reader, at the beginning of "August," is to the classical precedents of the singing contest. Recall that in E.K.'s headnote to the eclogue, he writes that, "[i]n this Aeglogue is set forth a delectable controuersie, made in imitation of that in Theocritus: whereto also Virgile fashioned his third and seuenth Æglogue" (107). This section will focus on Virgil's third eclogue (the penultimate section of this chapter will consider his seventh) and on one trope of the contest therein that gets taken up by early modern poets who reference Virgil's third eclogue: riddles that close the contest.[20] I will suggest here that the riddle is an integral part of not only Spenser's "August" but of the framing of his eclogues more generally, since the eclogues continually hint in ambiguous (and ambivalent) ways toward contemporary people and poets.

Right from the opening headnote of his 1575 translation of Virgil's third eclogue, Abraham Fleming foregrounds its competitive heritage. Fleming echoes E.K.'s headnote to "August" by suggesting that the third eclogue is one "for the most part taken out of Theocritus" (107), and the staging of the contest looks a lot like the Theocritan examples

[19] Berger, in "Mode and Diction," poses the question whether the inclusion of "August" "may have postdated E.K.'s commentary" (141). No further evidence is provided. Renwick, ed., *The Shepheardes Calender*, writes that, "It is noticeable that E.K. has no remarks on the sestina. It was, then, probably, an afterthought" (208).

[20] See, for example, the contest modeled after Virgil's third in Sidney's *Old Arcadia*, between Pas and Nico in the second eclogues. See also John Considine, "Two Riddles by Sir Philip Sidney and Their Solutions," *English Language Notes* 41, no. 2 (2003): 32-6.

that I considered in chapter one of this dissertation (Idyll I/VIII).[21] However, at the close of the eclogue between the "[c]hallenger" Menalcas and the "defendant" Dametas,[22] neither Menalcas nor Dametas is declared the winner:

> Menalcas, and Damoetas, shepheards, at the first accuse & reuile one another, anon, *Palamon* coming whiles they were so iarring, and being iudge betwixt them, they cōtend after the Lawe of songes sounge by course or turnes, wherein neyther of them is ouermatched, but on as good as another, and therefore made equall: *Palamon* in this case giving verdicte.[23]

This headnote is found in the 1575 translation, though in the headnotes to both the 1575 and 1589 editions, the competitive implications of the eclogue are at the fore.[24] The contest is not phrased in trivial terms; rather, the "verdicte" of the judge Palamon renders Menalcas and Damoetas as "equal" and "as good as [one] another." Further, in the passage quoted above, the manner in which Menalcas and Damoetas "[c]ōtend after the Lawe of songes" accords with the type of emulous fellowship that this dissertation has been locating within the eclogue at large: "contend" contains within its meaning both partnership and opposition, similar to words like "emulate." The primary meaning of "contend" is one that connotes individual effort or even partnership: "To strive earnestly; to make vigorous efforts; to endeavour, to struggle."[25] It is the second definition that implies rivalry "betwixt" two people—"To strive in opposition, to engage in conflict or

[21] See Fleming, *The Bvcoliks* (1589), 6. Others are fourth and fifth.

[22] Ibid.

[23] See Fleming, *The Bucolikes* (1575), 12.

[24] See Fleming, *The Bvcoliks* (1589), 6: "First therefore these two being at ods one with another, and striuing for excellencie, fall to reproachfull speeches and euill words: aferward their skill commeth in triall vpon wagers laid to and fro, both of them keeping course, number, and time."

[25] "Contend, n." 1. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

strife; to fight."[26] Demonstrating an early modern understanding of Virgil's third eclogue, Fleming labels the two contestants with shifting emulous terminology that might gesture to congeniality or toward opposition: Menalcas and Damoetas "iarr" as they "[c]ōtend after the Lawe of songes."

The general understanding of the riddle that closes the third eclogue is that it seems to imagine, or gesture toward, a select coterie of readers who may be able to understand the inside joke. Although the favoured solution to Dametas's riddle is "to one looking up at the sky from the bottom of a well," the mystery that surrounds these lines persists, and a definitive answer to both riddles is uncertain to this day.[27] The riddle itself is less important than the fact that it provides a means to gesture and hint without being explicit.[28] Further, the cryptic nature of the riddle accords it with Spenserian allegory and allusion more broadly. One recalls, for example, the debate surrounding the various characters of *Muiopotmos* or of *Mother Hubberds Tale*, whereby cryptic passages might solicit an early modern coterie readership that is aware of the broader implications of a

[26] "contend, v." 2. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press. For this second definition of "contend," the supporting preposition is as follows: "Const. *with*, *against* (an opponent), *for*, *about* (an object)." Note that the preposition used in Fleming's argument to the third eclogue is "after": "they cōtend after the Lawe of songes."

[27] See Robert Coleman, *Vergil: Eclogues* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977) and W. Clausen, *A Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).

[28] In his translation of the third eclogue in *The Bucolikes (1575)*, Fleming translates the closing lines of the contest, prior to Palamon's equalizing verdict, as follows: "D. Tell s[?] in what Lād ý heauē shewes no more but three elnes space / And thou shalt be to me therefore in wise r. Apollos place" (7). Menalcas's response is as follows: "M. Tell s[?] in what Land grow floures wherein, are writ ý names of kings, / And Phillis faire possesse take in whome great pleasure springs" (7).

particular allusion.[29] Spenser explicitly recognizes and comments upon the urge to locate contemporary people in his texts in his opening letter appended to *The Faerie Queene*, to Sir Walter Raleigh, eleven years later.[30] More generally, critics have long recognized that there is a similarity between the riddle and the allusion: Johan Huizinga suggests in *Homo Ludens* that "[a]s a form of competition proper, archaic poetry is barely distinguishable from the ancient riddle contest ... both presuppose a circle of initiates who understand the language spoken."[31] In the commentary of many classical writers, including Cicero, Aristotle, and Quintilian, the riddle is viewed as an obscure form of allegory.[32]

Understood in this way, the riddle accords not only with the particulars of the singing contest in "August" by hinting at different personages who Spenser may be emulating, but also the riddle exists in some form across the scope of *The Calender*: the naming of the shepherds and their near-pairings with historical personages serve as riddles that gesture to meanings and characters outside the text in tantalizing ways. This

[29] There is much commentary that attempts to figure out who the butterfly references. See, for example, Viola Blackburn Hulbert, "A New Interpretation of Spenser's *Muiopotmos*," *Studies in Philology* 25.2 (1928): 128-48 and Jessie M. Lyons, "Spenser's *Muiopotmos* as an Allegory," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 31 (1916): 90-113. For an instance of the continued debate over "the fox" of *Mother Hubberds Tale*, see Thomas Herron, "Outfoxed? *Mother Hubberds Tale*, Adam Loftus, and Lord Burleigh in Irish Context," *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual* 28 (2013): 221-32. Rachel E. Hile, *Spenserian Satire: A Tradition of Indirection* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017), expands on Spenser's ambiguous use of satire, which she calls "indirect satire" (3).

[30] While Spenser's letter to Raleigh purports to "giueth great light to the Reader," it nonetheless recognizes that "[t]o some I know this Methode will seeme displeasaunt, which had rather haue good discipline deliuered plainly in way of precepts […] then thus clowdily enwrapped in Allegoricall deuises" (ll. 21-3). The acknowledgment of "clowd[y]" allegory recalls other passages in the letter, such as where allegories for the queen intentionally serve to "shadow her" (ll. 34-5), or the recognition made at the opening of the letter concerning "how doubtfully all Allegories may be construed" (l. 3). The letter thus draws attention to the impossibility of firmly placing allegory and allusion as much as it "giueth great light" to its possibilities. See Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, 714-21.

[31] See Johan Huizinga, *Homo Ludens* (London: Routledge, 1949), 133.

[32] Ibid., 133.

gesture to "riddling" characters and persons is especially apparent in E.K.'s various commentaries and glosses, which use "secretive" language and "shadowy" imagery: in the gloss to "January," for example, Colin Clout is the name "[v]nder which ... this Poete secretly shadoweth himself, as sometime did Virgil vnder the name of Tityrus" (38), and Rosalind "is also a feigned name, which being wel ordered, wil bewray the very name of hys loue and mistresse, whom by that name he coloureth" (39); E.K. outlines in "March" that "in the person of Thomalin is meant some secrete freend" (52); and then in "June," Menalcas, Colin's adversary for the love of Rosalind, is "the name of a shephearde in Virgile; but here is meant a person vnknowne and secrete, agaynst whome he often bitterly inuayeth" (93). In the last examples, not only are the characters—Colin, Rosalind, Menalcas—written in veiled and cryptic terms, but the ambiguous pronoun "he" is never given a precise referent. The reader is left to wonder, is E.K. speaking about Colin? About the author?[33]

From the anonymity of its title page through to the hazy referents of its shepherds, Spenser's *Calender* imports manuscript ideas of selectivity and exclusivity to the printed medium, and one recalls Arthur Marotti's suggestion that through these coterie practices Spenser was able to legitimize the form of print.[34] What has been less

[33] There is much of this partial and titillating allusion, perhaps nowhere more pronounced than in the "November" eclogue: "In this xi. Aeglogue he bewayleth the death of some mayden of greate bloud, whom he calleth Dido. The personage is secrete, and to me altogether vnknowne, albe of him self I often requred the same" (138). Note that it is unclear whether "he" refers to Colin or to Spenser.

[34] See Arthur Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 226. Further to this project of legitimizing print was Sir Philip Sidney, particularly his various posthumous publications of *The New Arcadia*, 228. For a distinct but complementary view of Spenser's various "secret" peripheral people populating the glosses of the *Calender*, see Richard Rambuss, *Spenser's Secret Career* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). Rambuss provides a reading of the *Calender* that suggests the complexity of Spenser's allusion is both indebted to, and gesturing toward, his experiences in the secretarial career.

examined is the extent to which such "riddling" commentary is, by the time of the publication of *The Calender* in 1579, one of the eclogue genre's established tropes. In fact, E.K. hints that Spenser finds precedence amongst classical sources, presumably the eclogue writers of which he speaks in the introductory paratext, to show that there "generally hath bene a common custome of counterfeicting the names of secret Personages" (39) in the eclogue. Indeed *The Calender* presents the eclogic maneuver of gesturing toward various personnages in "riddling" fashion, including its author.[35] Recall Colin is the shepherd most closely associated with Spenser, though in October Cuddye is presented as an alternative, as E.K. reminds the reader in the gloss: "I doubte whether by Cuddie be specified the authour selfe, or some other" (133). Readers in the period may have likened E.K.'s "riddling" author to its analogue in Fleming's translations, where Fleming associates Virgil with Corydon in both eclogues II and VII, though also with Silvanus in eclogue VI,[36] following Virgil's early commentators such as Donatus (who would have been taught alongside Virgil in early modern schoolrooms). Or, Petrarch circulated supplementary writings that provided clues to the shepherd names in his eclogue collection *Bucolicum Carmen*, gesturing at the various personages who may or may not be referenced in the various eclogues.[37] The question of "who could this be?" gets posed so often in *The Shepheardes Calender* that the argument in February attempts to preclude such a method of interpreting the eclogue: "This Aeglogue is rather morall and generall, then bent to any secrete or particular purpose" (40). However, and of

[35] Hamilton, "The Argument," 173.

[36] E.K., one cannot help but notice, has Tityrus associated with *both* Virgil and Chaucer.

[37] See, *Bucolicum Carmen*. Many of the eclogues contain various allegories that are revealed in later letters by Petrarch, such as in "Eclogue I. Parthenias," where Petrarch suggests that the shepherd Silvius represents the authorial voice, on page 217.

course, such a caveat only points to the general allusiveness of the genre and serves to heighten both the ambiguity and significance of allusion throughout the text.

A significant component of emulous fellowship, as I have been expanding on it over the course of this dissertation, is ambiguity. The introduction suggests that there exists ambiguity contained in popular terms of fellowship, including "rival," "competitor," "copemate," and even "companion" and "fellow." The eclogue, however, adds to this ambiguity through the hazy boundary between character and writer. For one, ambiguity is integral for authors to maintain a certain distance from their poetry; unlike in the lyric, in the eclogue the reader is less able to directly identify one particular shepherd persona with its author, or one historical person with an allusion.[38] Rather, the eclogue vacillates between analogue or as allegory. Second, the riddle demarcates a like-minded community of writers, real or imagined, that creates a sense of exclusivity and even a selected coterie. E.K., in his role as commentator, draws the perimeter of the text's coterie with himself inside its bounds when he suggests that "...by meanes of some familliar acquaintaunce I [E.K.] was made priuie to his counsell and secret meaning in them, as also in sundry other works of his" (29). Finally, and most importantly, the riddle signals competition in a manner that contains enough ambiguity to not be blatantly disrespectful (think, again, of *Mother Hubberds Tale*, which, deprived of its "riddling" allusion would have been grounds for severe reprimanding or worse). The allusion to Virgil's third eclogue at the beginning of "August," in other words, cast the eclogue as a

[38] Rebecca Yearling, "Homoerotic Desire and Renaissance Lyric Verse," *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 53, no. 1 (Winter 2013): 53-71, outlines the extent to which different early modern forms of writing suggest (and, more importantly, were understood to suggest) closer affiliation between writer and speaker / character. More on Yearling's argument in Chapter 3 of this dissertation on page 156 ff.

singing contest that ends in a riddle, while also highlighting the riddle as a trope that solicits friends, companions, competitors, and even enemies.

II Spenser's "choise Friend" Sidney

Rephrasing Radcliffe, I suggest that one of the primary questions that "August" poses is, "Who might Spenser be emulating?" The combination of the reference to Virgil's third eclogue and of E.K.'s silence during the sestina suggests that Spenser is soliciting interpretation. Spenser's reader is given no clues concerning the derivation of the sestina and, more importantly, whether there are other sestinas that exist in English and which specifically might be written within a longer eclogue collection. The only other sestina that I have encountered, most likely available in English before 1580, is contained within the eclogue section of Sidney's *The Old Arcadia*, and it is entitled "Ye Goat-herd Gods" in modern editions and anthologies. If Sidney began the *Old Arcadia* following his return from Vienna in 1577, and if he finished his "toyfull book" by 1580-1 as he suggests to his brother Robert, or if it is "made in the year 1580" as written on the Phillips manuscript, then this completion date allows for a considerable time overlap between Spenser's collection of eclogues and Sidney's.[39] Of course, Sidney's eclogues do not entail a proper collection, per se, but they are collated as such in at least one

[39] Sidney, *Old Arcadia*, i. Note also that "made" was defined during the period as related to creating fictions: "Of a story: invented, fictitious. Of a word: invented, coined. Of an errand: invented for a pretext; made-up. *Obs.*" See "made" 1. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

extant manuscript, and the eclogues are replete with contests.[40] This section will attempt to read the two sestinas alongside one another, positioning Spenser and Sidney as emulators in the eclogue genre, before looking beyond the scope of the eclogue to supplement critics who have read Spenser's and Sidney's poetry in more oppositional terms than is typically assumed.

One point I would like to make early and expressedly is that it is not important whether or not the two texts unequivocally signal to one another; what is most important, rather, is that they gesture at one another enough that they may be read in the terms of emulous fellowship. My argument is not that Sidney and Spenser were adversaries who jarred continually and reprimanded one another in verse. Instead, I suggest that there existed an emulous impulse in their gestures to one another, one that incoporates influence and amicability as well as hints of something more oppositional. Spenser works in a form recently upraised by Sidney—the eclogue—though Spenser combines a methodology of imitation with one of emulation. When one reads Sidney's and Spenser's sestinas alongside one another, with an eye for emulation and contest, one cannot help but notice that Spenser is not engaging Sidney's *The Old Arcadia* in its entirety but is rather focusing on the eclogues as distinct poems apart from the plot. In referencing the double sestina "Ye Goat-herd Gods" sung by Strephon and Klaius, Spenser calls

[40] At the British Library, Add MS 41 498 is a hand-written transcription of the eclogues in Sir Philip Sidney's *Old Arcadia,* composed sometime in the seventeenth century. While I had previously considered the eclogues as an after-thought to the larger narrative within Sidney's epic romance, the discovery of this text (and how it collects the eclogues into a commensurate whole) helps me to make the case that the eclogues merit a more central role within the text. Though no definitive date stamp exists in the manuscript, the text was written in a secretary hand that suggests it predates the 1630s. For more on the relationship between the eclogues and the main narrative, see Robert E. Stillman, *Sidney's Poetic Justice: the Old Arcadia, its Eclogues, and Renaissance Pastoral Traditions* (London: Bucknell University Press, 1986) for an argument that reads the eclogues as relevant to the larger narrative.

attention to Sidnean shepherds who exist outside the narrative: two "errant shepherds," to use Rebecca Schneider's terminology, unconnected to the larger prose romance in the *Old Arcadia* prior to their expanded roles in later editions of the text. Schneider further remarks that "[t]he special attention that [Sidney] devoted to Strephon and Klaius has always invited speculation that their names may have been used as pseudonyms for real people."[41] By alluding to Strephon and Klaius, Spenser invites the reader to recall Sidney's sestina and its potential for "riddling" allusion as well. Hence, the allusive quality of Spenser's sestina links "August" to a larger poetic community, implicating Sidney and his circle in myriad ways.

The verbal echoes between "Ye Goat-herd Gods" and Colin's sestina suggest cross-pollination and also highlight variance. While both sestinas contain a volta at the beginning of the sixth stanza, Sidney's shepherds divulge, in their respective penultimate stanzas (stanzas 11 and 12), that the mournful tone of the eclogue is due to the rejection of the beloved: "I hate the house, since thence my love did part, / Whose waylefull want debarres myne eyes from sleepe" (ll. 11-2). In contrast, Spenser begins his sestina with Colin divulging that he laments the loss of a beloved, and the volta in the final stanza depicts the woman returning: "She home returne, whose voices wilder sounds / To cheerefull songs can change my cherelesse cryes" (l. 113). While all three (Colin, Strephon, and Klaius) appear in the guise of the Petrarchan lover, the similar images contained in Sidney's and Spenser's sestinas transcend the general mood and tone of the

[41] See Schneider, *Sidney's (Re)Writing*, 72.

Petrarchan model.[42] For example, in Sidney's sestina, Strephon's "ill changed forrests" (l. 37) and Klaius's "our spoyled forrests" (l. 71) bear a resemblence to the Spenserian imagery of Colin's "wastefull woodes." More importantly, Spenser takes the image of the nightingale / owl from Sidney's poem and gives it a positive facelift: whereas Sidney's poet is figured as "shrich-owle" and then later the "Nightingale" learns its song from the owl, Spenser says, in his final stanza, that he will "take part" with the "Nightingale" to sing of the return of the beloved.[43] Patrick Cheney has written repeatedly about the nightingale serving as a clear marker for poetic aspiration during the period, and consequently he views Spenser's "August" as the poet's bid toward achieving a type of *vatic* authority. But while Cheney reads Spenser's bid as engaging only with his classical forebears, my suggestion here is that the competitive framing of the nightingale calls attention also to Spenser's contemporary, English predecessors.

The point is that, regardless of the direction of influence, the presence of sestinas couched in eclogue contests positions the two pre-eminent poets of the era as emulators. Who will be the English Sanazarro or Petrarch? Whether the vector of influence goes from Sidney to Spenser or Spenser to Sidney, either way it complicates a popular myth, pithily summed up in a comment made in S.K. Heninger Jr.'s book-length study of the

[42] Their respective stances, particularly in how they each figure the relationship between the sestina's speaker and his beloved, are consistent with the sonnet sequences of *Amoretti* and *Astrophel and Stella* (Spenser's love with Elizabeth Boyle is ultimately requited, whereas Sidney's love with Stella is not).

[43] For William Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity* (Toronto: Clark, Irwin, and Co., 1930), this sestina is a prime example of "ambiguity": "*Mountaines, vallies, forrests; musique, evening, morning;* it is at these words only that Klaius and Strephon pause in their cries; these words circumscribe their world; these are the bones of their situation… and in tracing their lovelorn pastoral tedium through thirteen repetitions, with something of the aimless multitudinousness of the sea on a rock, we seem to extract all the meaning possible from these notions; we are at last, therefore, in possession of all that might have been implied by them ... I must glance, to show this, at the twelve other occasions on which each word is used," 35, 36-7.

two poets: "So Spenser admired Sidney without stint."[44] Heninger's claim has been troubled by recent studies that reposition Spenser and Sidney in more complex relationship than those implied by a uni-directional vector of influence. A recent article by Samuel Fallon, in a passage that follows Ralphael Falco groundbreaking work, articulates how an older Spenser exerted an "organizing control" among Sidney's posthumous literary image, and how Spenser "carefully framed" the *Astrophel* elegies.[45] Other recent work that focuses on archaism in Spenser, including work by Catherine Nicholson and Lucy Munro, suggest that a poet's use of archaic language as "both collusive and competitive."[46] These critics present a textual relationship between Sidney and Spenser that complicates patrilineal and/or genealogical models of studies of influence.[47] I situate my work here amongst such scholars, who I hope to supplement, with the suggestion that, from the outset of *The Calender*, the contest is invoked as a significant model of literary production, one that is framed in emulous terminology.

[44] See S.K. Heninger, *The Poet as Maker: Sidney and Spenser* (University Park: Penn State University Press, 1989), 11-2. To my knowledge, this is the only full-length monograph that reads the two poets alongside one another.

[45] See Samuel Fallon, "Astrophil, Philisides, and the Coterie in Print," *English Literary Renaissance* 45, no. 2 (2015) 175-204. Fallon writes, "Spenser's "Astrophel" marked a change in his stance toward Sidney, who had loomed over his literary career from its beginning, first as potential patron and then as an unexpected rival for Spenser's laureate aspirations" (194). See also Raphael Falco, "Instant Artifacts: Vernacular Elegies for Philip Sidney" *Studies in Philology* 89.1 (Winter, 1992): 1-19, and Raphael Falco, *Conceived Presences: Literary Genealogy in Renaissance England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994), especially chapter two.

[46] See Munro, *Archaic Style*, 5. See also Nicholson, *Uncommon Tongues,* 100-23. Munro's study is helpful in its broader methodology concerning Spenser, whereby she states explicitly that "the self-conscious use of archaism in English literature did not begin with Spenser" (5). Like the present study, Munro reads Spenser late within a literary tradition that includes Barnabe Googe and George Turburville, among others who did not write eclogues. Nicholson, in treating how Spenser's archaism in the *Calender* works specifically as an isolating tactic, also positions Spenser within an earlier English tradition, including Fleming's translation of Virgil's eclogues in 1575.

[47] See studies that pertain to Sidney and Spenser directly, such as Heninger, *Poet as Maker*, but also to studies of influence more generally, including Bloom's *Anxiety of Influence* and Bate's *The Burden of the Past.*

There is some evidence in the paratext of *The Calender* to support the idea that Sidney was a mentor to Spenser, while other parts suggest that *The Calender* may have lacked deference to its patron. The title, for example, appears to gesture at Philip Sidney's importance and prestige. In the dedication of *The Calender*, "Entitled to the noble and vertvous Gentleman most worthy of all titles both of learning and cheualrie M. Philip Sidney" (23), some scholars have suggested the "M." (meaning "Master") as misattributing Sidney's rank,[48] but such a reading does not give adequate attention to the honours bestowed upon Sidney on the continent ("most worthy of *all* titles," reads the epithet). It seems possible, in other words, that Spenser recognized Sidney's continental titles that many of his fellow Englishmen (including the Queen) did not.[49]

Despite such moment of deference, E.K.'s verse epistle to *The Calender* contains many moments where the praise appears to be more ambivalent. Although E.K. speaks in obsequies of "Ma. Phi. Sidney, a special favourer and maintainer of all kind of learning" (30) in the epistle, there exists equal moments which might be easily construed as lacking proper deference. For example, when E.K. attempts to "mak[e] a singular account of two so very good and so choise frends [Sidney and Harvey]" (30), he elides Sidney's social distinction (as stated in the dedication) and positions Sidney within the cohort of Spenser, E.K., and Harvey (Harvey, too, is referred to as "Master"). Or, E.K. makes a request for Sidney to "defend" and "shield" Spenser against the inevitable

[48] Andrew Hadfield's biography of Spenser, *Edmund Spenser: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) suggests the following: "In *The Shepheardes Calender,* 'To his book' appears to someone more highborn than Sidney. According to William Ringler, the phrase 'his honour' had to refer to a nobleman such as Leicester (Sidney would have been addressed as your worship)" (129-30).

[49] See Alan Stewart, *Philip Sidney: A Double Life* (Thomas Dunne Books, 2001) especially 190 ff. for an account of how Sidney's continental titles were viewed as potentially threatening within the context of Elizabeth's court.

"malice and outrage of so many enemies … [that] wilbe set on fire with the sparks of his [Spenser's, not Sidney's] kindled glory" (30). While patrons may be asked for "defense" and this dissertation will show another instance of this in Watson's *Meliboeus* in chapter four, patrons are not traditionally asked to perform so many tasks for the writer. The envy of detractors is a common trope in prefaces to poetry collections in the period, as R.B. Gill writes, though Gill focuses more often on texts more directly associated with flyting, such as the Grammarian's War in the 1520s and the uprising of satires in the 1590s.[50] Spenser's use of the "envious" trope, and specifically of his request for Sidney to provide him with defense, is suprising because of the supposedly congenial context of the eclogue and of the greater pastoral community. Spenser (or E.K.) seems to expect a maelstrom of criticism, which might be understood as E.K. expressing concerns that Spenser will be envied.

Spenser will issue a similar request for protection, almost verbatim, to Sir Walter Raleigh in the dedication to *Colin Clout's Come Home Again*, though the differences between Spenser's portrayal of his patron Raleigh in *Colin Clout* and his patron Sidney in *The Calender* merits pause. To Raleigh, Spenser writes in the introduction to *Colin Clout:* "and with your good countenance protect [this work] against the malice of euill mouthes, which are alwaies wide open to carpe at and misconstrue my simple meaning."[51] But in contrast with the *Calender*, Colin Clout frames the relationship with Raleigh in "aemuling" terms that expand on Raleigh's status as a poet:

[50] R. B. Gill, "The Renaissance Conventions of Envy," in *Medievalia et Humanistica: Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Culture 9,* ed. Paul Clogan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979): 215-30.
[51] Spenser, *Shorter Poems*, 344.

The shepheard of the Ocean by name,
And said he came far from the main-sea deepe.
He sitting me beside in that same shade,
Prouoked me to plaie some pleasant fit,
And when he heard the musicke which I made,
He found himselfe full greatly pleasd at it:
Yet aemuling my pipe, he tooke in hond
My pipe before that aemuled of many,
And plaid theron; (for well that skill he cond)
Himselfe as skilfull in that art as any.
He pip'd, I sung; and when he sung, I piped,
By chaunge of turnes, each making other mery,
Neither enuying other, nor enuied,
So piped we, vntill we both were weary.[52]

In this eclogue-inspired vision of the mainland shepherd and the shepherd of the sea competing in song, Spenser, here, is careful to position "aemuling" as a mutually beneficial action, one that is far away from the word's connotations of envy or bitter opposition ("Neither enuying other, nor enuied, / So piped we"). With Raleigh, Spenser seems to frame emulation and contest as friendly practices that acknowledge influence and posit some sort of equality. There may be all kinds of reasons why Spenser treats Raleigh and Sidney differently, but for my purposes what matters most is that he does treat them differently, particularly in how he frames Colin's relationship with the poetry of a patron.

The passage with Raleigh casts an image of two poets "aemuling," and as such it provides a contrast with Sidney's portrayal in the paratext of the *Calender.* E.K. suggests that Sidney is a "speciall favourer of all kinds of learning" who possesses the skill of "mighty Rhetorick and other rare gifts of learning," though Sidney is nowhere identified as a "poet," despite being the most important English writer of the eclogue at the time of

[52] Spenser, *Shorter Poems*, 346-7.

The Calender's publication. One cannot help but wonder whether Sidney had yet to be confused with being the writer of *The Calender*, as he would be during the late 1580s.[53] Sidney responds to the anonymous writer of *The Calender* with a backhanded compliment of his own in *The Defense of Poesy*:

> The Sheepheards Kallender, hath much Poetrie in his Hit Egloges, indeed woorthie the reading, if I be not deceiued. That same framing of his style to an olde rusticke language, I dare not allow: since neither Theocritus in Greeke, Virgill in Latine, nor Sanazara in Italian, did affect it. Besides these, I doo not remember to haue seene but fewe (to speake boldly) printed, that haue poeticall sinnewes in them.

Of his use of archaic diction, Nicholson writes that Spenser was "reproached for what seems to be a posture of willful self-estrangement" by Sidney and others.[54] Though such a combination of praise and criticism, I suggest, was indicative of their early relationship. In the context of the group *The Areopagus*, we might consider Spenser's words regarding Sidney in *Three Proper and Familiar Wittie Letters*, the "private" correspondence between Edmund Spenser (as "Immerito") and Gabriel Harvey, published, supposedly without the knowledge of its authors, in 1580, one year after the publication of *The Calender.* While the term "emulate" is not used, it is implied in Spenser's letter to Harvey. Spenser suggests that he

> would heartily wish you would either send me the Rules and Precepts of Arte, which you obserue in Quantities, or else follow mine, that M. Philip Sidney gaue me, being the very same which M. Drant devised, but enlarged with M. Sidneys own judgment and augmented with my

[53] Hadfield suggests that several people printed work that ascribed *The Shepheardes Calender* to Sir Philip Sidney. See Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser,* 119.

[54] Nicholson, *Uncommon Tongues,* 120.

> Observations, that we might both accorde and agree in one: leaste we ouerthrowe one an other, and be ouerthrown of the rest.[55]

One notes how the relationality between the various poets hinge around emulous terms: the precepts "enlarged" by Sidney, then further "augmented" by Spenser, whereby "we might both accord and agree in one, lest we overthrow one another." Who is the "one another"—Spenser and Sidney? Spenser and Harvey? What is the consequence of not simply "follow[ing]" the original precepts, but effectively topping them? The male-male bonds sit between congeniality and contention, or, if they are purportedly congenial, the phrasing suggests that behind such obsequies rests a more adversarial impulse.

The Sidney-Spenser bond retains its emulous character after Sidney's death, when Spenser plays a large role in shaping the Sidnean poetic lineage in *Astrophel* (which will be a focus of chapter four). Even as late as *The Faerie Queene*, Spenser writes to Sidney's sister, the Countess of Pembroke, in one dedicatory sonnet:

> *To the right honourable and most vertuous Lady, the Countess of Pembroke.*
> Remembraunce of that most Heroicke spirit,
> The heuens pride, the glory of our daies,
> Which now triumpheth through immortall merit
> Of his braue vertues, crownd with lasting baies,
> Of heuenlie blis and euerlasting praies;
> Who first my Muse did lift out of the flore[56]

The Faerie Queene editor A.C. Hamilton glosses the lines "Who first my Muse did lift out of the flore" as Spenser "acknowledg[ing] Sidney as the one 'Who first my Muse did lift out the flore.'"[57] The lines contain phrasing that is more ambivalent, however, since it

[55] Edmund Spenser and Gabriel Harvey, *Three Proper and wittie, familiar Letters* (London, 1580) 6-7.
[56] Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, 734.
[57] Spenser, *Faerie Queene,* 734.

is not clear who performs the lifting. In other words, a second meaning is equally apparent, which is that it was Spenser's Muse who "did lift [Sidney] out of the flore," which is supported by the very next line "To sing his sweet delights in lowlie laies." Spenser's writing about Sidney perpetually attests to an emulous impulse that is first engendered in the *Calender*.

When other writers in the era mythologize the two poets, the direction of influence moves primarily from Sidney to Spenser, though there is evidence also of a relationship more closely framed around emulation. The myth of Sidney and Spenser's congeniality is no doubt construed, in large part, from several early commentators who painted their relationship in idealizing terms, including Edward Phillips's account in *Theatrum Poetarum Anglicanorum*, which suggests that Sidney brought Spenser to Elizabeth's attention, and then urged the Queen to bestow a large sum of money for the composer of the ninth canto of the first book of *The Faerie Queen*.[58] Counterbalancing these are other accounts that link the two poets, such as in the commendatory verse in the paratext of *The Faerie Queene.*[59] In the sixth commendatory verse (CV6), written by W.L., who may be William Lisle, Sidney is compared to Ulysses and Spenser to Achilles, when the disguise of "stout *Achilles*" is recognized by Ulysses, who convinces Achilles to take up "armes" and to fight again. The passage by W.L. refers to Book 13 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, where the speaker Ulysses elaborates:

[58] See "Appendix 3" in Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser*, 419-25 for an overview with excerpt from early Spenser biographers. See also Edward Phillips, *Theatrum Poetarum Anglicanorum* (London 1675).

[59] Speaking of *The Faerie Queen,* I sidestep older critical debates pertaining to whether Calidore, the hero of Book 6, alludes to Sidney or not. See Kenneth Thorpe Rowe, "Sir Calidore: Essex or Sidney?" *Studies in Philology* 27, no. 2 (1930): 125-141.

> Foreknowing that her sonne should dye, the Lady Thetis hid
> Achilles in a maydes attyre. By which fyne slyght she did
> All men deceyve, and Ajax too. This armour in a packe
> With other womens tryflyng toyes I caryed on my backe,
> A bayte to treyne a manly hart. Appareld like a mayd
> Achilles tooke the speare and sheeld in hand, and with them playd.
> Then sayd I: O thou Goddesse sonne, why shouldst thou be afrayd
> To raze great Troy, whoose overthrowe for thee is onely stayd?
> And laying hand uppon him I did send him (as you see)
> To valeant dooings meete for such a valeant man as hee.
> And therfore all the deedes of him are my deedes. (ll. 200-10)[60]

The line that follows Ulysses-recognizes-Achilles story cited by W.L. is "And therfore all the deedes of him [Achilles] are my [Ulysses's] deeds." Understood in this context, W.L.'s poem places Ulysses and Achilles in more adversarial terms.[61] Further, the equanimity of Ulysses is often viewed in counterpoint to the zealotry of Achilles. Hence, the dedicatory sonnet presents something of a convoluted allusion by positioning Spenser as the brash youth who dies early, when in fact Spenser presides over Sidney's funeral verse in a manner reminiscent of Ulysses presiding over Achilles funeral.

Ultimately, I suggest that there exists the possibility that Spenser and Sidney viewed one another, and were viewed by others, in more emulous terms, and that one finds evidence of the possibility for poetic contest early on in Spenser's career, in the *Calender.* The general consensus will certainly remain that Spenser was indebted to Sidney, both as a source of poetic inspiration and also as a socializing force who would have helped to develop Spenser's relationship with Leceister. However, I have shown here that *The Calender* signals at fissuring moments in the supposedly solid bond that

[60] Arthur Golding, trans., *Ovid's Metamorphoses*: *The Arthur Golding Translation 1567,* Ed. John Frederick Nims (Philadelphia: Paul Dry Books, 2000), 13.200-10.

[61] Ulysses outlives Achilles and then competes with Ajax over Ulysses's armour in the following passage, translated by Golding, in *Ovid's Metamorphoses*: "I it [the armour] gave / Achilles whyle he was alive: and now that he is gone / I clayme it as myne owne agein" (13.220-2).

these two poets shared. As I hope to show in the next section of this chapter, the ambiguous gestures that *The Calender* displays toward its most prominent literary influence (and its patron) are amplified by the text's treatment of other English writers of the eclogue.

III E.K., Colin, and the English eclogue tradition

Spenser's "choice frend" Sidney was but one emulator in a text that continually brandishes a rough hook, crook, or hoof toward its English eclogue contemporaries. In E.K.'s introduction, which serves to frame Spenser's relationship to his contemporary literary moment, there is scant mention of any previous English writers of the eclogue or even of English poets. The notable exceptions are medieval English writers, including Chaucer and John Skelton, who did not write eclogue collections and were long dead by 1579.[62] When E.K. speaks of Spenser's contemporaries working in English, it is with considerable disgust, and one moniker E.K. gives English writers is "ragged rhymers":

> For what in most English writers vseth to be loose, and as it were ungyrt, in this Authour is well grounded, finely framed, and strongly trussed vp together. In regard wherof, I scorne and spue out the rakehellye route of our ragged rymers (for so themselues vse to hunt the letter) which without learning boste, without iudgement iangle, without reason rage and fome, as if some instinct of Poeticall spirite had newly rauished them aboue the meanenesse of commen capacitie (28).

This is a passage that gets reiterated not simply in other portions of the introduction to *The Calender*,[63] but later on in Spenser's work with, one cannot help but note, verbal

[62] Hamilton, "The Argument," 178, notes the extent to which Colin's adjective as the "new" poet is contrasted with the "old" terminology used for Chaucer.

[63] Here is a second instance, in Spenser, *Shorter Poems*: "So now they haue made our English tongue, a gallimaufray or hodgepodge of al other speeches" (27).

parallels. In "The Teares of the Muses," published in the 1591 volume of *Complaints*, the song by Euterpe laments how "Ignorance" with "a ragged rout / of Faunes and Satyres" has stained the dwellings where, previously, "virtue rained."[64] The metaphor is that the pastoral landscape of England has been co-opted by a certain lecherous type of poet, and Spenser, as the "Shepherd swaine," notices the corruption done by these new inhabitants. Euterpe is the muse of the pastoral, and Spenser's propensity to read the pastoral space, both in *Teares* and in the *Calender*, as one that is primarily desecrated and in need of restoration speaks to the oppositional stance that Colin adopts toward contemporary writers.

Despite the multiple and varied iterations of "ragged rhymers" passages in the introduction of *The Calender,* the passages that are most often viewed as instructive for understanding Spenser's poetic vision are those of a loftier vein. The passage in the epistle that receives the most airplay is when E.K. outlines Spenser's poetic lineage and then places a bid for Spenser's poetic canonization, if not immortality:

> So flew Theocritus, as you may perceiue he was all ready full fledged. So flew Virgile, as not yet well feeling his winges. So flew Mantuane, as being not full somd. So Petrarque. So Boccace; So Marot, Sanazarus, and also diuers other excellent both Italian and French Poetes, whose foting this Author euery where followeth, yet so as few, but they be wel sented can him out. So finally flyeth this our new Poete, as a bird, whose principals be scarce growen out, but yet as that in time shall be hable to keep wing with the best (30).

This passage is generally interpreted as an extraordinary poetic credo for a poet deciding to publish English verse. Accordingly, the passage proves instrumental in the stalwart

[64] See Spenser, *Shorter Poems,* 199. A related passage, again in "Tears of the Muses," makes the allegorical critique clear, where the "fowle footings" of the satyrs connotes both the physical hooves and also the foul "foot" (e.g., an iamb) of verse (198).

studies dealing with the trajectory of Spenser's poetic career, including Richard Helgerson's "The New Poet Presents Himself: Spenser and the Idea of a Literary Career,"[65] and the most comprehensive study of Spenser's poetic trajectory, Patrick Cheney's *Spenser's Famous Flight: A Renaissance Idea of a Literary Career.*[66] Both Helgerson's and Cheney's arguments position Spenser standing aloof from his contemporaries without really putting pressure on the formal mechanisms that signal his "aloofness."[67]

One might forget, while reading E.K.'s preface alongside these influential modern studies, that there exists a considerable English tradition to the eclogue leading up to Spenser. Besides Sidney's eclogues circulating in manuscript, the most notable omissions to E.K.'s preface are Barnabe Googe's *Eglogs* (1563), the publication of Alexander Barclay's five eclogues (1570), and the English translations of the continental and classical eclogue collections, including George Tubervile's translation of Mantuan's eclogues (1567 and 1572) and Abraham Fleming's translation of Virgil's eclogues (1575). The emulous gestures that Spenser deploys, I have suggested, underlie the

[65] Richard Helgerson, in "The New Poet Presents Himself: Spenser and the Idea of a Literary Career," *PMLA* 93, no. 5 (October 1978): 893-911, takes the moniker of the "new Poete"—both here and in the epistle's dedication—at its word. In this influential study, Helgerson suggests that Spenser "had to redefine the limits of poetry, making it once again (if in England it had ever been) a profession that might justifiably claim a man's life and not merely the idleness of excess of his youth" (894).

[66] See Cheney, *Famous Flight*. Patrick Cheney positions avian images as a recurring trope through which one can chart Spenser's poetic process and career: "Spenser relies on the avian-based representation of a 'famous flight' in order to prophesy and then fulfill a four-genre Orphic career" (27). Cheney suggests that Spenser disrupts the traditional myth of the Virgilian rota to reframe the quest for literary fame in terms that eventually lead to Christian glory.

[67] Cheney, *Famous Flight*, 25. Another critic to look at Spenser's careerism in the *The Shepheardes Calender* is Bart van Es, who writes about how the various "low" and "high" geographic locales (such as hills and dales) correspond to a larger discussion about poetic form and careers, in Bart van Es, "Spenserian Pastoral," in *A Critical Companion to Spenser Studies* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

"August" eclogue, but such gestures occur also throughout the text and accompanying paratext. In other words, "the new Poete" not only engages his literary contemporaries with direct reference and allusion but oftentimes engages them indirectly, in a manner reminiscent of Rosenmeyer's "contest," whereby the contestants look away from their opponents. The main writer with whom Spenser has a relationship marked by absence as much as presence is Philip Sidney, because of Spenser's engagements with Sidney's poetics (as in "August"), and because of the contemporaneity of the *Calender* and *Old Arcadia*. But Sidney was not the only writer circulating eclogues before Spenser. By reading Spenser's eclogue against recent English practitioners of the form, I address a topic rarely discussed in Spenser or pastoral criticism: the possibility that Spenser's eclogues respond directly to English predecessors in the eclogue.

The looming elephant in the introduction of the *Calender*, a poet not mentioned at all, is Barnabe Googe. That Spenser did not personally know Googe seems impossible. There are considerable cultural, geographic, and historical areas of overlap between the two writers: Googe was employed in the service of William Cecil, and Googe went to Ireland in 1574, possibly to gather intelligence for Cecil on the activities of Walter Devereux, first earl of Essex."[68] Googe returned from Ireland intermittently over the next dozen years, though he was in Ireland again from 1582 until 1585, which means that Googe and Spenser would have both been among the community of English settlers in Ireland together for a number of years. In modern critical editions of texts by Googe, the editors posit Googe's relevance to Spenser's *Calender* in hesitant terms: in his

[68] Barnabe Googe, *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes (1563),* intro. Frank B. Fieler (Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Racsimiles & Reprints, 1968), vii.

introduction to *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes*, Frank Fieler is careful to write that "it is generally believed" Spenser "became acquainted with" Googe;[69] and in an edition of Googe's translation of *The Zodiake of Life*, Rosemond Tuve writes that Spenser "very probably knew" Googe.[70] That Spenser went to Ireland following the publication of *The Calender* might partially account for this critical skepticism.

Even if critics posit a direct relationship between Googe and Spenser, or a vector of influence from Googe to Spenser, there is never (to my knowledge) a substantiation of how Spenser might be influenced by Googe's poetics. In his recent autiobiography of Spenser, Andrew Hadfield suggests that Googe's eclogue collection was "a direct source for the *Calender*"; that Spenser used black letter to print the text so that it might resemble earlier published eclogues, including those by Googe; that Spenser was indebted to the almanac tradition, of which Googe was a recent and important translator; and that Googe's *Foure Bookes of Husbandry* may have effected English policy in Ireland around the time when Spenser was there.[71] Hadfield does not substantiate these claims, however, nor does he present a longer passage on the specifics of their relationship, as he does with Spenser's relationship to other poets in the era. Ultimately, Hadfield's reader is left without a sense as to how, specifically, Spenser is indebted to Googe.

The first and most obvious point is that the *Calender* blends tropes of the almanac with those of the eclogue, two forms that Googe had helped to popularize in the

[69] Fieler, *Eglogs* also notes that Googe's eclogues "probably had some influence upon the *Shepheardes Calendar* [sic]" (vii). See also page viii.

[70] See the introduction in Marcellus Palingenius, *The Zodiake of Life*, trans. Barnabe Googe, ed. Rosemond Tuve (New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1976), ix.

[71] Hadfield, *Spenser*, 87, 124, 125, 229.

period. Spenser's *Calender* was indebted not simply to Googe's *Eglogs* published in 1563, but to Googe's translation of *The Zodiake of Life*, a popular text that was published in various editions, one of which was in 1575.[72] If Spenser did not know the book personally, it was certainly familiar in his circle. Of *The Zodiake*, Gabriel Harvey said that it was "most learned" and "pregnant introduction into Astronomie, & both philosophies."[73] *The Zodiake* is similar in form to the kitchen almanac *The kalender of sheepehardes*, from which, E.K. tells us, Spenser took his title. In *The Zodiake*, Googe's title page outlines the twelve-month structure of the text, "Wherein are conteined twelve severall labours, painting out most lively, the whole compasse of the world, the reformation of manners, the miseries of mankind, the pathway to virtue and vice..."[74] The preceding passage, and passages similar to it, causes Heninger Jr. to posit Spenser's indebtedness to the calendar/almanac genre: "*The Shepheardes Calender* is … a reworking of this familiar motif [the almanac], albeit a much more refined and elegant version of it."[75] Or, Adam Symthe writes about the extent to which almanacs were inscribed with handwritten notes, noting that "[a]lmanacs encouraged reader annotations," and one cannot help but view E.K.'s lengthy gloss as responding, also, to the almanac and its solicitation of commentary along the margins.[76] However, despite Spenser's familiarity with Googe's work, none of the above suggests that Spenser was

[72] According to Tuve, *Zodiack,* v, the text was put into the Stationer's registry sometime between 22 July 1562 and 22 July 1563.

[73] Tuve, *The Zociake,* v.

[74] Tuve, *The Zociake*, 1a.

[75] Heninger Jr., *Sidney and Spenser,* 319.

[76] Adam Symthe, "Almanacs, Annotators, and Life-Writing in Early Modern England," *English Literary Renaissance* 38, no. 2 (2008) 204.

actively engaged in a dialogue with Googe, or, to quote Hadfield's first claim, that Googe's eclogues were a "direct source for the Calender."

The moments of overlap between Googe and Spenser go beyond subtle reference, which makes Spenser's total silence on Googe and his work all the more surprising. For one, the image that fronts Googe's *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* is an image of Daphnis and Amyntas taken from a block of a woodcut from *The kalender of sheepehardes*, the text from which Spenser derived his title.

Figure 2. The opening image of Barnabe Googe's *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* (1563)

And it is not Spenser but Googe who first sets the English eclogue to the seasons. Within ten lines of the beginning of Googe's first eclogue, Daphnis speaks about how the sun "lies point" along the "right equinoctial line," and concurrently "the Ram doth cause to spring / each herb and flower in field" (45).[77] The Ram signifies the astrological sign of

[77] Googe, *Eclogues,* ed. Kennedy, 45. Subsequent references for "Egloga Prima" are to page numbers in this edition.

Aries and right equinoctial line signifies the vernal equinox; Googe is beginning his eclogue according to the beginning of the Roman calendar, in which the year was said to begin in March. Immediately following this, Googe likens the beginning of the year to the poetic process in an explicit way, and so he sets, years before Spenser, the English shepherd-poet's interior poetic process to the development of the seasons:

> Whereas the Ram doth cause to spring
> each herb and flower in field
> And forceth ground, that spoiled of green
> did lie, new green to yield,
> Let shepherds us yield also tales,
> as best becomes the time (45)

One is reminded here of the opening of "January," where Colin Clout extends the metaphor that Googe uses by aligning all the seasons with different moods of the poet.[78] Furthermore, as my last chapter demonstrated, the two openings eclogues—Googe's "Egloga Prima" and Spenser's "January"—both treat the theme of homoeroticism in a manner that, to quote Anne Lake Prescott, present early English examples of "how to write homoerotic poetry while claiming not to."[79]

E.K., in the front matter, highlights the omission of Googe's influence by addressing various features of Googe's collection without addressing either the collection or its author by name. First, E.K.'s verbosity on why Spenser's *Calender* begins in January instead of March must constitute a response to Googe, though I will save my reader the trouble of rehashing the circuitousness of E.K.'s argument, part of

[78] One passage from "January," in *Shorter Poems*, that clearly and succintly encapsulates this tendency by Spenser begins as follows: "Thou barrein ground, whome winters wrath hath wasted, / Art a myrrhour, to behold my plight: / Whilome thy fresh spring flowrd, and after hasted / Thy sommer prowde with Daffadillies dight" (ll. 19-22)

[79] Prescott, "Barnfield's Spenser," 85. For a longer discussion, see chapter one of this dissertation, on pages 98-9.

which can be found in a footnote below.[80] Second, E.K. is deliberate concerning how he positions Spenser as innovative, in regard to his use of a glosse, in regard to his diction, and so forth, but Spenser's practices are not unique.[81] Lucy Munro and Catherine Nicholson outline the tradition for archaism that predates Spenser's *Calender*, though here I add that the presence of a gloss for difficult words at the back of Googe's *The Zodiake* appears to be a common textual apparatus: "A large table alphabeticall, conteining such *words and matters as be necessarie* and principall in this book."[82] Finally, the existence of E.K.'s epistle, and its focus on the didactic ideals of poetry, and on promoting English verse through a sublimation of Chaucer, are themes that Googe speaks about in his own defenses of poetry (in "To Cecil" in 1561 and in "To the Reader" in 1565), and that Sidney famously did as well. My conclusion is that Spenser's text actively positiones itself among—and simultaneously above—more than one contemporary eclogue writer.

If one extends the purview of the *Calender*'s precedessors outside the bounds of Googe and Sidney and instead looks at preceeding English eclogue collections, including translations, the overlap becomes even more considerable. In Turburvile's translation of

[80] E.K.'s lengthy explanations are reacting against the English eclogue tradition. Here is an excerpted portion, in *Shorter Poems,* of E.K. musing on why "March" is not a suitable month for beginning the new year: "For it is wel known, and stoutely mainteyned with stronge reasons of the learned, that the yeare beginneth in March. for then the sonne reneweth his finished course, and the seasonable spring refresheth the earth, and the pleasaunce thereof being buried in the sadnesse of the dead winter now worne away, reliueth. … But sauing the leaue of such learned heads, we mayntaine a custome of coumpting the seasons from the moneth Ianuary, vpon a more speciall cause, then the heathen Philosophers euer coulde conceiue, that is, for the incarnation of our mighty Sauior and eternall redeemer the L. Christ, who as then renewing the state of the decayed world, and returning the compasse of expired yeres to theyr former date and first commencement, left to vs his heires a memoriall of his birth in the ende of the last yeere and beginning of the next" (33).

[81] E.K. writes, in *Shorter Poems,* 29, that "which maner of glosing and commenting, well I wote, wil seeme straunge and rare in our tongue" (ll. 170-2).

[82] Tuve, *Zodiake*, 243. Emphasis in original.

Mantuan, for example, Turburvile positions his translation against the current contemporary literary landscape:

> They vvere not in that age such siellie sottes as our Shephierdes are novve a dayes, onely hauing Reason by Experience to prate of their Pastures, and folde and vnfolde their flockes: But these fellovves, vvhome the Poet and I haue here brought in, vvere vvell able both to moue the doubtful cause, and (if neede vvere) to discide the proponed case" (Aij^{v}).

While Turburvile's translation of Mantuan is light (by eclogue standards) in its textual apparatus, Turburvile has a passage attacking contemporary English poets, and his "siellie sottes" resembles E.K.'s "ragged rhymers." In both Turburvile's and E.K.'s arguments, there is a disparaging contrast made between contemporaneous writers and those from the distant past; both Turburvile and E.K. bypass the work being performed by contemporary poets. Neither is E.K. the only commentator to make an argument for what is the appropriate style for the simple eclogues.[83] Fleming translates Virgil's eclogues twice, in different styles and rhyme schemes, according to different formal specifications and with different cultural significances.[84] Spenser enters into a topic of debate—how to write the eclogue in English—not as its originator but as a voice among many.

[83] See George Turbervile, *The Egloges of the Poet B. Mantuan Carmelitan* (London, 1567) Aiiijv: "For in deede, he that shall trāslatea shephierds tale, and use the talke and stile of an Heroical personage, expressing the siellie mans meaning with loftie thundering words: in my simple iudgement ioynes (as *Horace* sayth) a Horses necke and mans hed togither."

[84] Abraham Fleming's 1575 translation is in rhymed fourteeners, while the 1589 translation, issued with the same bookseller, in unrhymed fourteeners. For more on Fleming's two translations, and in particular their "Ramist" ramifications, see Robert Cummings, "Abraham Fleming's *Eclogues*," *Translation and Literature 19* (2010): 147-69.

We might continue at length concerning how E.K. borrows liberally from the paratexts from every existing English eclogue collection.[85] I have already mentioned, in the introduction to this dissertation, how Fleming's introduction to his 1575 has an entire section, several pages long, devoted to understanding the word "eclogue." E.K. takes issue not only with the derivation of "eclogue," but with its spelling, "For they be not termed Eclogues," he writes in "The generall argument," "but AEglogues."[86] E.K. is harsh toward others who are "mistaken" about the definition of "AEclogue":

> But for the word AEglogues I know is vnknowen to most, and also mistaken of some the best learned (as they think) I wyll say somewhat thereof, being not at all impertinent to my present purpose.[87]

For E.K. to define the term eclogue is not "impertinent" ("Not appertaining or belonging … to"[88]), though E.K. may be characteristically a bit impertinent here—especially in his parenthetical jab, "as they think," toward "the best learned" individuals. How does one not read this as a jab at Fleming? E.K.'s dialogue with various eclogue writers and translators reaffirms that the eclogue form structured a literary community in England, under but also distinct from the broader auspices of early modern pastoralism.

[85] The materiality of Spenser's text bears a close resemblance to Fleming's translation. Bart van Es, "Spensian Pastoral" suggests that the elaborate paratext works to position the *Calender* as a "classic" (81), though specifically, I think, as a classic of the eclogue. There exists many resemblances in textual materiality between the Fleming 1575 translation and Spenser's *Calender*. For example, both eclogue collections present the argument in an italic font and the text itself in black letter. According to Zachary Lesser, "Typographic Nostalgia: Play-Reading, Popularity and the Meanings of Black Letter," in *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England*, ed. Marta Straznicky (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006), black letter carried many meanings in early modern England, "including state authority, antiquity, the English language, the established church," though it was often understood as a font that combines Englishness (the "English letter") and antiquity (120). Ultimately, it is not only the contents of the eclogues, but the text's entire packaging, that signals a relationship with the preceeding tradition of the English eclogue. Spenser is certainly aware of those who precede him, but he does not directly acknowledge his debts.

[86] Spenser, *Shorter Poems*, 32.

[87] Spenser, *Shorter Poems,* 32.

[88] "impertinent" 1a. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

IV Champion shepherds

Returning to "August," then, I suggest that the gesture of competing with unstated competitors who inhabit roles both influential and adversarial is important to understanding Spenser's text within its literary milieu. Such a claim runs counter not only to criticism that reads Spenser as the first significant English eclogue writer but also against criticism that suggests or implies that singing contests are instances of inconsequential pastoral play.[89] My claim is that the contest has actual stakes in the eclogue, and in this penultimate section I hope to show how a ranking system of eclogue writers develops more generally in the period. In contrast which how one might envision a pastoral community of poets, commentators in the period cast the eclogue writers in terms that privilege contest and victory. Furthermore, commentators in the period posit that classical contests serve as definitive markers of poetic authority and prestige.

To elaborate how early moderns understood the singing contest, I return again to E.K.'s headnote in "August." This time I consider Virgil's seventh eclogue, the other eclogue (earlier we looked at Virgil's third) that E.K. suggests provides a direct influence on Spenser's contests. Virgil's seventh eclogue is the only eclogue that Sidney quotes verbatim in his *Defence of Poesy*, and it appears in a passage where Sidney elaborates on the pastoral more generally and on its capability to both valorize and deflate "them that sit highest."[90] Specifically, Sidney speaks of Darius and Alexander, commanders who earned no more "benefit" than Coridon did after beating Thyrsis in the singing contest of Virgil's seventh eclogue. Following this comparison between commanders and

[89] Chaudhuri, *Renaissance Pastoral*, 141. The passage is also quoted on page 107 of this dissertation.
[90] Sidney, "The Defense of Poesy," 26.

shepherds, Sidney quotes Virgil's Latin "*Ex illo Coridon, Coridon est tempore nobis."*[91] While Sidney quoting Virgil's seventh eclogue may appear to be an insignificant gesture, it accrues meaning when read in conjunction with other writers in the period who focus on the same lines.

The "*Ex illo Coridon, Coridon est tempore nobis"* lines are highlighted, and translated, by Fleming in his argument to Virgil's seventh eclogue in his 1575 edition of Virgil's eclogues:

> The Argument of this Ecloge is drawne out of *Theocritus* his Bucoleasts: The Poet bringeth in heere *Melibey* the shepheard, rehearsing *Coridon* and *Thirsis* theyr contention, whereat he was present, beinge thereto called by *Daphnis* the iudge of their controuersye, whiles he sought the gote which went astray from the flocke, which *Melibey* he bringeth in speaking one *Coridons* syde, whe he sayth in the end of the Eclogue, thus,
> *These songes []and, Thirsis stroue in vaine, he conquerd was,*
> *And Coridon, yea Coridon from that tyme farre did pas.*[92]

In this instance, one notes that, besides more goats and another reference to Theocritus, Fleming highlights Coridon's champion status. "*Ex illo Coridon…,"* the closing lines of Virgil's seventh, are translated by Fleming as *"*These songes []and, Thirsis stroue in vaine, he conquerd was, / And Coridon, yea Coridon from that tyme farre did pas." When one recalls that Coridon is one of the shepherds that Fleming (following classical commentators such as Donatus) associated directly with Virgil, the importance of the lines become even more apparent: it is after this contest, says Fleming, that Virgil first took steps toward poetic fame. Further, these "*Ex illo Coridon"* lines respond to

[91] Ibid. There are many critics who attempt to ready why Coridon wins, including Michael J. Putnam, *Virgil's Pastoral Art: Studies in the 'Eclogues'* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1970), who directly ascribes their opposing relationship to how the two shepherds urge/expect Galatea "to come" as a critical difference in their opposing songs (241).

[92] Fleming, *Bucolikes (1575)*, 20. Emphasis in original.

Theocritus's first English idyll translated in 1588 (Idyll VIII), which was a focus of chapter one, and which ends with Menalcas feeling "sad as a bride upon the marriage daie." Like Coridon, Daphnis is uplifted at the end of the eclogue: "Since then, among the Shepeheards, Daphnis chiefe was had."[93] Sidney, Fleming, and the anonymous translator of Theocritus all choose to foreground not only the convention of the singing contest, but its defining moments of actualization for its champion shepherd-poet—the moments when Daphnis and Coridon, two archetypal shepherds, earn their laurels following victory.

The evidence above suggests that Spenser would not view contests as a trivial and idealized form of pastoral play, but instead would recognize the poetic stakes inherent to singing contests. Accordingly, E.K. casts the only two shepherds in the text that are directly associated with its author—Cuddye and Colin—as victorious shepherds. This chapter has read the contest, and its rendition of emulous fellowship, as a primarily synchronic gesture that responds to the English eclogue tradition. However, one might also read such ideas of literary competition in more diachronic terms, whereby Spenser engages the hollowed Classical tradition of the eclogue as one to be emulated (and not only imitated). Virgil and Theocritus were oftentimes figured not simply as patron saints of the eclogue but as competitors in its form, so that many critics felt inclined to rank them, as E.K. does in his introduction: "yet Theocritus in whom is more ground of authoritie, then in Virgil" (35). Such a system of ranking provides a first clue that the

[93] Theocritus, *Sixe Idillia,* A3r.

early moderns did not view the pastoral literary enterprise as one existing apart from contest, but as one of its early constituent forms.

The competitive ranking of eclogue writers is nowhere more apparent than in *A Discourse of English Poesie* by William Webbe (1586), which ranks Virgil and Theocritus from the outset, taking a view that accords with E.K. but that counters Fleming: "The cheefest of these [writers of eclogues] is *Theocritus* in Greeke; next him, and almost the very same, is *Virgill* in Latin."[94] Tellingly, Webbe ranks Spenser among and then against Virgil and Theocritus. First, Webbe suggests that Spenser's "fine poeticall witt and most exquisite learning" is "in my iudgment inferiour to the workes neither of Theocritus in Greeke nor Virgill in Latine, whom he narrowly immitateth."[95] Later in the same passage, Webbe more directly positions Spenser in the language of contest with Theocritus and Virgil,[96] and then Webbe ranks Spenser's eclogues "in comparison" with the corresponding eclogues in Virgil:

> *Virgill* maketh a braue coloured complaint of vnstedfast freendshyppe in the person of *Corydon;* the lyke is him in his 5 *Æglogue.* Agayne, behold the pretty Pastorall contentions of *Virgill* in the third *Æglogue;* of him in the eight *Eglogue.* Finally, either in comparison with them, or respect of hys owne great learning, he may well were the Garlande, and steppe before the best of all English Poets that I haue seene or hearde.[97]

[94] William Webbe, *A Discourse of English Poesie* (London, 1586) n.p. http://www.bartleby.com/359/14.html (accessed 10 July 2017).

[95] Ibid.

[96] Ibid. Webbe writes, "Master Sp:, Author of the Sheepeheardes Calender, whose trauell in that peece of English Poetrie I thinke verely is so commendable, as none of equall iudgment can yeelde him lesse prayse for hys excellent skyll and skylfull excellency shewed foorth in the same then they would to eyther Theocritus or Virgill, whom in mine opinion, if the coursenes of our speeche (I meane the course of custome which he woulde not infringe) had beene no more let vnto him then theyr pure natiue tongues were vnto them, he would haue (if it might be) surpassed them."

[97] Ibid.

Webbe provides evidence that to engage in the singing contest might also mean to engage with ancient poets in a "contentio[us]" fashion; Virgil and Theocritus were often compared around the contest, and Spenser, through his engagement with the contest, enters into this "contention" as well. In the eclogue, the contest offers a model of literary influence, synchronic and diachronic, that sits somewhere between amicable and the adversarial, between friend and opponent.

V Coda: Spenser's other contest

One might wonder why, if Spenser is signaling competition within *The Shepheardes Calender*, he would make fewer contests over the course of twelve eclogues than his classical predecessors do. Ostensibly, Spenser's *Calender* contains only one contest eclogue, "August," while Virgil's eclogues contain at least three (III, V, and VII), and Theocritus contains many, including I, IV, V, VI, VIII in the first dozen idylls alone. While this is a relevant question, it does not adequately account for the subtle nature in which Spenser implicates the classical singing contest. For one, Spenser gestures at the contest with allusion, whereby poems allude to their Virgilian or Theocritan contest originals. For example, Spenser's "March," his third eclogue, at first glance seems to be a song that deploys the well-worn trope of the lament (similar to Mantuan's first eclogue), but closer reading shows that Spenser also gestures at Virgil's third (with its riddling contest) by quoting the eclogue directly.[98] Spenser thus cites an affiliation not only with E.K.'s paratext but with direct allusion as well.

[98] See Willye's reference in March at ll. 43-5, and then E.K.'s commentary, in *Shorter Poems*, on page 40.

More importantly, Spenser's method of condensing Virgil's contests mirrors Virgil's treatment of Theocritus's contests. Spenser's model of combining two of Virgil's contests (Eclogues III and VII) into one contest ("August"), is precisely what Virgil does with Theocritus. According to Robert Coleman, Virgil's third eclogue "is heavily indebted" to Theocritus, since the singing match "recall[s]" and alludes to Idylls IV, V, VI and VIII.[99] In particular, Virgil's choice of having Damoetas compete with Menalcas seems to suggest a closer association with Theocritus directly.[100] Thomas K. Hubbard states that, because of its condensing of Theocritus's contests, "*Eclogue 3* is the first overtly agonistic piece in the Eclogue Book, and may be seen as a dramatic embodiment of Vergil's challenge to literary tradition."[101] Ultimately, Virgil's contests, fewer in number than Theocritus, often condense and amalgamate Theocritus, which Hubbard reads as a form of mastery.[102] Therefore, when Spenser condenses Virgil's contests into a single eclogue, it might be read as Spenser deploying Virgil's own techniques (of how Virgil emulates Theocritus) against him.

Finally, shepherds at the periphery of the *Calender* often appear in contest scenarios with Colin Cloute. In June, Spenser couches contest within a larger discourse about poetry, and, like that other "Recreative" eclogue "August," "June" highlights the

[99] See Coleman, *Eclogues*, 128. Coleman notes that Virgil's third eclogue combines Theocritus's idyll IV (Virgil's ll. 1-2, 100), V (ll. 25, 62, 64, 69, and 89), VI (l. 64), and especially VIII (ll. 32-4, 50, 80, 85).

[100] Specifically, Damoetas and Menalcas, in their respective eclogues, both compete in song with Daphnis, the shepherd most often associated with Theocritus. This causes Coleman, in *Eclogues*, to suggest, "The association of the latter two names with Daphnis in Theocritus can hardly be accidental to Vergil's choice of them as participants in the present poem [Virgil's third eclogue]" (128).

[101] See Thomas K. Hubbard, "Allusive Artistry and Vergil's Revisionary Program: Eclogues 1-3," in *Vergil's Eclogues,* ed. Katharina Volk (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) 101.

[102] See Coleman, *Eclogues*, 129, for a counter viewpoint. Coleman acknowledges Virgil's "indebted[ness]" to Theocritus's Idylls IV, V, VI, and VIII but ultimately suggests the opposite of mastery: "the Eclogue as a whole is probably the least successful of the ten" (129).

importance of contest for Colin's growth as a poet. The "June" eclogue is purportedly about "the complayning of Colins ill successe in his loue" (87) according to E.K., but as soon as Colin begins singing, he provides a credo concerning his poetic process. He begins, in the first of six uninterrupted stanzas, with the humility *topos* that he "conne no skill" (l. 65) and then he explicitly states that he stays away from contests, citing the contest between Pan and Phoebus as a reason (ll. 66-8).[103] Colin continues that he "neuer lyst presume to *Parnasse* hyll" (l. 70) since, as he elaborates in the second stanza, his aspirations are lower, and he does not "striue to winne renowne or passe the rest: / With shepheard sittes not, follow flying fame" (ll. 74-5). In the third stanza of six, Colin calls attention to his poetic tutelage and his master's fame: "The God of shepheards *Tityrus* is dead," says Colin, "Who taught me homely, as I can, to make" (ll. 81-2). One can almost see Colin's mind moving toward asking who will be Tityrus's successor, while he explains that "[h]e, whilst he liued, was the soueraigne head / Of shepheards all" (ll. 83-4).[104] But the passage that Colin has been moving toward immediately follows this lamenting vein, in which Coline moves directly to its main argument:

> And thou *Menalcas*, that by trecheree
> Didst vndersong my lasse, to wexe so light,
> Shouldest well be knowne for such thy villanee (ll. 102-5).

[103] E.K., in *Shorter Poems*, says of the contest: "the tale is well knowne, how that Pan and Apollo striuing for excellencye in musicke, chose Midas for their iudge. Who being corrupted wyth partiall affection, gaue the victorye to Pan vndeserued: for which Poebus sette a payre of Asses eares vpon hys head &c." (93).

[104] In stanza four of "June," in *Shorter Poems,* Colin suggests that "And all hys [his mater's] passing skil with him is fledde, / The fame whereof doth dayly greater growe" (ll. 91-2). Then, he explains why he might benefit from some of the "drops" of greatness learned from his deceased master. Colin hopes that his "plaints" might "Flye to [his] loue, where euer that she bee, / And pierce her heart with poynt of worthy wight" (ll. 93, 97, 99-100).

Of "Menalcas," E.K. glosses "the name of a shephearde in Virgile; but here is meant a person vnknowne and secrete, agaynst whome he often bitterly inuayeth" (93). And, Colin imagines himself engaging with Menalcas though "vndersong," which E.K. glosses as "vndermyne and deceivue by false suggestion" (93). However, the only other instance of "vndersong" in the *Calender* is in August, when Willye sings "vndersongs" ("August" l. 128) to Perigot's roundelay. "Undersong" as a term is primarily used in contests, as Drayton uses it in his "Eglog IX," and that is how Colin uses it here.[105] Similar to "August," Colin gestures at a "riddling" or "secret" shepherd with whom he competes in verse, and these moments of contest are crucial for Colin's development as a poet. Spenser's *Calender* continually depicts various shepherds singing, praising, and proclaiming Colin's preeminence, in such a way that propels the text's author up and beyond the space of the eclogue.

[105] Michael Drayton, *Poems: From the Earliest and Rarest Editions Or from Unique Copies*, ed. J. Payne Collier (London: J.B. Nichols and Sons, 1856), uses the line as follows: "When now at last, as lik'd the shepheards King, / (At whose commaund they all obedient were) / Was poynted who the Roundelay shoold singe, / And who againe the vndersong should beare" (422).

Chapter 3. "Then Shalt thou be my competitor": the Invitation to Love and Christopher Marlowe

In the preceding chapter, I argued that the singing contest in *The Shepheardes Calender* served as a means for Spenser (and E.K.) to gesture in ambivalent, "riddling" ways to the shepherd-poets peopling the landscapes of the English eclogue. In this chapter, I focus on another convention of the eclogue, the invitation to love, to demonstrate how Marlowe's erotic and persuasive lyric, "The Passionate Shepherd to His Love," imports a violent heritage when it is read alongside its eclogic forebears. My use of the term "convention" recalls Paul Alpers's definition of the term as both a "location for meeting" and as a "literary *topoi*," since Marlowe's invitation structures a meeting between two participants—one participant is the inviter while the other is the invitee—as it simultaneously serves to reference earlier iterations of the invitation found in English and classical poetry.[1] The invitation to love might be implicated within the shepherd lesson of chapter one, or within a singing contest of chapter two, or finally as a function of the pastoral elegy forthcoming in chapter four, though the invitation merits its own chapter focus since the convention has a unique reception history in early modern England and, furthermore, is associated with a different (albeit overlapping) set of classical eclogues. Similar to how Spenser's singing contest signals beyond the scope of

[1] See Alpers, *What is Pastoral?,* 79-93.

the eclogue in which it appears, Marlowe's invitation accrues varied meanings as it is deployed across Marlowe's oeuvre and as it generates various responses from poets and playwrights including Walter Raleigh, John Donne, and William Shakespeare.

Marlowe's invitation to love presents a model of fellowship that sits at the intersection of eroticism, companionship, and violence. In one sense, the extent to which Marlowe's invitation to love depicts ambivalent and ambiguous sentiments toward its invitees aligns it with Spenser's deployment of the singing contest; however, Marlowe takes the image of the shepherd and infuses it with eroticism and violence in ways that are not as readily apparent in Spenser's contests in the *Calender*. Marlowe's invitation brings the dualities that underlie "emulator," "copemate," and "competitor" to further extremes, whereby the sentiments of congeniality and amicability are eroticized, and the opposing threat of violence is rendered more pronounced. (Marlowe's invitation is often toeing the line between *mort* and *le petit mort*.) While critics have read Marlowe's aggressive, persuasive rhetoric as corrupting the invitation or altering its underlying meaning, I suggest that contextualizing Marlowe's invitation against the eclogue provides a method of elucidating the power dynamics inherent to the form. To supplement critics who read Marlowe as reiterating lofty ideals of Virgil's second eclogue or the Bible's "Song of Songs," I take the cue from Marlowe's contemporaneous responders to put the "The Passionate Shepherd" back in dialogue with the portrayals of threatening eclogue invitations, such as those found in Theocritus's usage of the Polyphemus/Cyclops and Galatea myth. After establishing the invitation's turbulent (and aquatic) heritage, I read Marlowe's lyric more broadly through his oeuvre, focusing on its surrounding shepherds and the potential for, or consequences of, the retreat that the

lyric solicits. When alluding to "The Passionate Shepherd," Marlowe's eroticism is always accompanied by unequal distributions of power.

This chapter begins by outlining the convention of the invitation to love, first in "The Passionate Shepherd," then in its figuration by Marlowe's classical influences, and finally in Marlowe's contemporaneous responders in *Englands Helicon* (1600). After re-contextualizing Marlowe's poem against his two most oft-cited responders, this chapter turns to his erotic epyllion *Hero and Leander*. The invitations in *Hero and Leander* elucidate the power dynamic crucial to the retreat, but also expand on Marlowe's linkage between the invitation to love and its potential for violence. The third section of this chapter focuses on *Tamburlaine I* and *II* in order to argue that Tamburlaine is an especially canny speaker of the invitation to love, which serves both personal and military purposes in a way that blurs the distinction between "lover" and Tamburlaine's chosen term for his military invitee, "competitor." As my chapter expands its focus from Marlowe's lyric to look more broadly at his shepherds and how they signify power across his oeuvre, I consider not only what happens when the lyric receives a response, or when the invitation results in an ensuing retreat, but I also ask what happens when someone rejects the invitation. My final section looks at how Shakespeare responds to Marlowe through the figure of the shepherd in such a way that makes visible the duality—love and violence—of the Marlovian retreat. As evidenced in *Tamburlaine I* and *II,* Marlowe's retreats always seem aware of their military potential, and thus harken to a secondary meaning of "retreat," not as pleasurable vacation but as hurried escape; Henry, in Shakespeare's *Henry VI part 3,* inhabits the retreating shepherd character, and Henry fails to recognize the retreat as a tool for soliciting and deploying power.

I Marlowe's invitation to love and the eclogue tradition

One of the most iconic lyrics of Elizabethan England is Marlowe's invitation "The Passionate Shepherd to his Love," likely written sometime around 1588, though published for the first time in the 1600 publication of *Englands Helicon* along with several replies to the poem. To begin the poem, Marlowe's speaker urges his invitee to "Come live with me and be my love" by alluding to the various "pleasures" to be "prove[d]." The pastoral retreat, which takes place over a number of stanzas, is framed as both idealized locale ("we [will] sit upon the rocks / And watch the shepherds feed their flocks") and as gift ("There will I make thee beds of roses / And a thousand fragrant posies").[2] The bulk of Marlowe's listing of "pleasures" exist in a world that materializes before the speaker and his invitee, and over the course of the middle section of the poem the speaker becomes syntactically distanced from the labour required for the retreat, as the poem shifts into passive voice:

> Thy silver dishes for thy meat
> As precious as the gods do eat,
> Shall on an ivory table be
> Prepared each day for thee and me (ll. 21-4).

With a deft play on syntax, Marlowe moves from the active voice of stanza three into the passive voice of stanza six, and he renders unclear who performs the actions of the itemized list, including who prepares the meat and who provides the silver dishes.[3] The speaker is nearly absent from the action, in other words, except when he promises to

[2] See Christopher Marlowe, "The Passionate Shepherd to his Love," in *Englands Helicon: Edited from the Edition of 1600 with Additional Poems From the Edition of 1614*, ed. Hugh MacDonald (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962), 192.

[3] Raymond Williams considers the nameless pastoral workers in *The City and the Country*. My intention here is not to provide a larger social reading of the pastoral or of the eclogue, but to note the ornate, courtly, and priveleged setting of Marlowe's invitation.

make his invitee "a thousand fragrant posies," punning on "poesies." When Marlowe's speaker returns, he does so to reiterate the invitation, and the poem closes with a call for the invitee to, again, "Come with me and be by love." The final lines shift the focus away from the body and on to the "mind"—"If these delights thy mind may move, / Then live with me and be my Love"—and thus show the speaker making a final appeal not to the bodily pleasures but to, supposedly, the intellectual enticement of his offer.

Contemporary critics have not been fooled, however, by this seemingly neo-Platonic movement from body to mind in "The Passionate Shepherd"; rather, prompted by the unanimous refusal of Marlowe's invitation by his contemporaries in verse, critics often read Marlowe's invitation as threatening. Douglas Bruster, citing "[t]he vehemence of the response" to Marlowe's invitation, posits "a cultural anxiety, one which came . . . from the recognition of the power of the monological lyric."[4] Bruster frames the "power of the monological" exhibited by "The Passionate Shepherd" as a consequence of the lyric mode: "Most often a single-voiced utterance, the lyric as a mode tends to deny dialogue."[5] One is reminded of more recent work on the lyric—though not Marlowe's lyric—by Rebecca Yearling, which asserts that the early modern lyric implies a direct relationship between writer and reader in early modern England, since "there is no space for the reader within the poem unless he assumes the position of the person being

[4] Douglas Bruster, "Come to the Tent Again": "The Passionate Shepherd," Dramatic Rape and Lyric Time, *Criticism* 33.1 (Winter 1991) 58, 58.

[5] Bruster, "Come to the Tent Again," 57. Elsewhere, Bruster suggests that "[t]he dialogue which 'The Passionate Shepherd' developed in *England's Helicon*, for instance, remained extrinsic to the individual poems and ideologically self-contained" (58).

addressed."[6] By positing the lyric as monological and personal, Yearling and Bruster read it as a form that confronts the reader, instead of as a literary excise that primarily addresses a larger literary tradition.

Critics who more directly position Marlowe's poem within the tradition of the invitation poem highlight moments of antithesis between "The Passionate Shepherd" and earlier, affiliated works. Erik Gray, for example, reads the poem as deriving from the Biblical invitation depicted in the Song of Songs, whereby Marlowe's poem functions as an intermediary between the Songs and John Milton's deployment of the invitation in *Paradise Lost*.[7] Marlowe's "The Passionate Shepherd," which Gray calls "the first invitation poem in English," "reflects the precedent of the Song of Songs, while carrying increasingly troubling overtones of monologue and materialism."[8] Like Bruster, Gray identifies the "monological" power of Marlowe's poem as part of its threat, though

[6] Yearling, "Homoerotic Desire," 60. For Yearling, the personalized and direct features of the lyric form account for why it was understood as a more direct engagement with the author's own sentiments, and thus why is was more prone to censure. In addressing why certain homoerotic poems elicited a more direct response than others, Yearling suggests that, "[Lyrics] also involve directly performative speech acts: they make promises, pleas, threats, apologies, or requests, which demand a response. They imply an ongoing relationship between speaker and listener, and there is no space for the reader within the poem unless he assumes the position of the person being addressed" (60). Yearling reads the choice of the lyric mode as a crucial determinant to why and how a work that features homoeroticism garners a response; for Yearling, it was Barnfield's choice of lyric mode that partly accounted for the presumable outcry over the homoeroticism depicted in *The Affectionate Shepherd*. Barnfield later suggested that the homoeroticism of the central relationship in *The Affectionate Shepherd* was a reference to Virgil's second eclogue. See also Prescott, "Barnfield's Spenser."

[7] Erik Gray, "Come Be My Love: The Songs of Songs, *Paradise Lost*, and the Tradition of the Invitation Poem," *PMLA* 128, no. 2 (2013): 370-85. Gray shows how Milton's Eve deploys the invitation when she persuades Adam to leave paradise at the end of *Paradise Lost*. Gray reads this scene as "reassert[ing] a sense of radical mutuality ... "[i]n spite of the new, more unequal gender roles that their transgression has brought about" (384). Gray locates five iterations of the invite poem in Milton's epic, and Eve's invitation to Adam at the close of *Paradise Lost* "redeem[s]" the corrupted invitation poem (384).

[8] Ibid., 371, 377.

where Bruster reads the monological as overpowering any possibility of denial,[9] Gray positions Marlowe's monological power as a corrupting, materialist influence on the "Songs" tradition.[10] Similar to Bruster, Gray cites Marlowe's responders as integral to how one interprets Marlowe's invitation.[11] Gray's linkage between Marlowe's persuasive rhetoric and materialism provides a precedent for Milton's speakers more than half a century later: tellingly, Satan is the speaker of nearly half the invitation passages in *Paradise Lost*.

The propensity to read Marlowe's speaker as threatening, or as a precursor to Milton's Satan, rubs uncomfortably against homoerotic readings that treat "The Passionate Shepherd" as a descendent of Virgil's second eclogue and its frustrated erotic encounter between two men. Bruce Smith's foundational study *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England*, in which he identifies the "kirtle" promised to Marlowe's invitee as most likely implying a male garment, continually subsumes any threat within more playful discourse. Of the poem as a whole, Smith asks,

[9] Bruster, "Come to the Tent again," suggests that, "Because no active dialogue is permitted in the unitary discourse of the lyric, the lyric speaker possesses the ability to overwhelm contradiction (internal as well as external) by means of powerful language—language so rich and entrancing that the possibility of denial decreases with the lyric speaker's determination and poetic ability. This vocal discrepancy forms the basis of the monological power underlying the shepherd's sensuous 'invitation'" (61).

[10] Gray, in "Come Be My Love," distinguishes between the monologue of the *Songs* and Marlowe's invitation. He suggests that, "As the invitation poem evolves, the dialogue of the Song increasingly gives way to monologue, and its mutuality to something more like seduction; similarly, the Song's imaginative concentration on a *locus amoenus* and its physical features yields to an emphasis on material goods" (371). For Gray, the monological and the focus on material goods go hand in hand. Part of Gray's materialistic reading of Marlowe could be attributed to classical eclogues, which, in contrast with the "eroticized *locus amoenus"* in the *Songs*, portrays the idealized places and objects "as, essentially, bribes" (378).

[11] Gray, in "Come Be My Love," notes how the responses to "The Passionate Shepherd" by Donne, Raleigh, and Shakespeare attest to the "at once irresistable and troubling" (380) forms of persuasion deployed by Marlowe's speaker.

> What is Christopher Marlowe's "Come live with mee, and be my love" but a recital of the country pleasures with which Corydon tries to woo Alexis? Marlowe's shepherd is far more seductive than Virgil's, however—and far more witty."[12]

Note how Marlowe's litany of gifts is a "recital" of classical "country pleasures." For Smith, Marlowe's "assault" is "on his beloved's senses," and any focus on "ravishment" is contained within "an exercise in soft pastoral."[13] Smith recognizes that Marlowe engages his peers and especially his classical forebears in the eclogue, and the extent to which he views Marlowe's poem as dialogic (with pastoral predecessors) troubles the "monological" readings of Bruster and Gray. However, I am not sure that Smith gives adequate attention to the threat of "ravishment" implied by Marlowe's invitation. My reading here attempts to supplement Smith by providing an alternative to how he sees (or presupposes) mutuality inherent to the relationship between the inviter and invitee:[14] as this dissertation has argued, the eclogue was by no means the call to *otium* and light

[12] Bruce Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991) 92.

[13] Ibid., 92, 93.

[14] Smith, in *Homosexual Desire*, calls the poem "an exercise in soft pastoral" that "promises of a homoerotic idyll beyond the exigencies of time and place" (93). His reading of the poem presupposes consent: "Considering Corydon's loving description of the fruits he will bring to Alexis, it is surprising that Marlowe's shepherd attempts to seduce every other sense but taste. That, presumably, must wait until the beloved says yes" (92). For another reading that focuses on mutual play, see Judith Haber's chapter on Marlowe's poem in *Desire and Dramatic Form in Early Modern England* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009). Haber writes, "What is 'queer' about 'The Passionate Shepherd,' I would suggest, is precisely this flattening out of hiearchies, this celebration of the artificial, this (necessarily only) implied argument that desire has no natural and inevitable end. The poem, in effect, conflates two images that are frequently juxtaposed in Marlowe's dramatic and narrative works—the image of a female beloved in which conventional desire is presented as wholly rhetorical—as artificial, aestheticized, and unconsummated—and the image of an eroticized male, which similarly diverts desire from its expected end (and which, though more physical and literal in its terms, is never wholly so)" (16-7).

pastoral play that it is sometimes suggested to be.[15] I also attempt to supplement the readings by Gray, Bruster, and others, who view the lyric as threatening, but who also ignore the poem's homoerotic overtones. My view is that Marlowe unearths and deploys the shifting power dynamics that are prevalent throughout the invitations found in the classical eclogue tradition. Ultimately, my hope is to open a critical space that accommodates and adds nuance to critics who read the invite as either a) primarily threatening, or b) primarily loving. I think that Marlowe's invitation is both.

Specifically, this section will contend that Marlowe's poem is threatening not in its "monological" force or in how it corrupts its literary forebears, but in how it exhumes the invitation of the classical eclogue in ways that signal uneven power relationships. Marlowe's classical forebears help the modern reader to expand the purview of queer discourse within the poem. I suggest that such discourse is not uniquely "playful" but inhabits (and expands upon) the relationship models that I have identified thus far over the course of the dissertation. Emulous fellowship positions its eclogue speakers in ambivalent relationships with perpetually fraught power dynamics, whether between tutor and master, between adversary and friend, or between inviter and invitee. For Marlowe, the call to classical models of sexuality, in Virgil's second eclogue but also in several other eclogues/idylls by Virgil and Theocritus, is partly deployed toward affirming a power hierarchy and foregrounding its potential for force. As David Halperin and others have demonstrated, certain classical models of sexuality presuppose an

[15] In *Ecocriticism*, Borlik suggests that "[d]espite its status as a prime example of English pastoral lyric, the poem ["The Passionate Shepherd"] cannot really be considered as an ideal specimen of the genre" (146). For Borlik, Marlowe's overt interest in material gifts goes against what he views as a prevailing pastoral ethos founded on ethical (and environmental) consciousness.

active/passive partner and demarcate between higher and lower power positions.[16] My argument is that Marlowe's "The Passionate Shepherd" makes a bid for erotic power, and thus the poem solicits retreats—in the hetero- and/or homo- erotic relationships it imagines—with "one head," to quote Fran Dolan.[17]

What follows is necessarily messy: Marlowe references Virgil, who references Theocritus, though sometimes Marlowe seems to bypass Virgil to look back to Theocritus directly. As clearly as possible, I will follow four distinct, logical steps with a final goal of rereading Marlowe's "The Passionate Shepherd" and his responders. First, I will provide a recap of the two principle influences of Marlowe's "The Passionate Shepherd," as identified by critics such as Paul Alpers, and then I will outline how Marlowe enters into the spirit of one-upmanship that these two eclogues depict. Second, I will expand on the classical precedents of "The Passionate Shepherd," beyond these two eclogues, to highlight moments where Coridon/Alexis and Polyphemus/Galatea appear. In this second step, I will highlight how often invitations become contests. Third, I will put pressure on the significance of the Polyphemus/Galatea myth and how it presents a violent subtext to Marlowe's poem. Fourth, I will reassess Marlowe's invitation and his responders in light of the above.

I begin here with a reading of the poem that is viewed as Marlowe's primary influence, Virgil's second eclogue. A central text for early modern queer scholarship, the second eclogue follows the shepherd Coridon "becoming intāgled with the loue of the

[16] Halperin, *100 Years,* 30. Halperin cites Kenneth Dover's *Greek Homosexuality* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1978) as a crucial source study.

[17] See page 33-4 of my introduction.

Lad *Alexis*," according to the argument of Abraham Fleming's 1575 translation, where Coridon offers oft-cited pastoral gifts and locales, such as "kyds in daungerous dale" while providing an imperative *huc ades* linguistic framework for Marlowe to follow, translated by Fleming in the imperative of "to come":[18] "Come hether boye most beautifull, loe, Lyllies wite as wull, / The nimphes doo bring and offer these by baskets fylled full."[19] Virgil's second eclogue ultimately turns into lament, since Coridon gives up hope on Alexis, and specifically, Coridon nearly likens his infatuation with Alexis to a form of madness: "Yet loue doth burne me styll, for what meane can there be in loue / Ah, Coridon Coridon, tel me this, what madnes thee doth moue."[20] In Virgil's second eclogue, the speaker promises an idealized retreat, albeit fleetingly, before adopting the tone of a bitter lament.

The eclogue that undergirds Virgil's second eclogue is Theocritus's eleventh idyll, a monovalent lament that contains many features of Virgil's more often cited iteration, though which also has the distinguishing feature that the inviter is a cyclops (Polyphemus) and the invitee is a nymph (Galatea). The change in gender of the invitee suggests a heterosexual relationship, though significantly the power discrepancy between Polyphemus and Galatea parallels the Coridon/Alexis relationship in Virgil's second eclogue, despite the nymph existing beyond the reach of the earth-bound cyclops.[21]

[18] Fleming, *The Bucolikes (1575)*, 5. Note that this passage compares with the "kids" that Hobbinol offers to Colin in "January."

[19] Fleming, *The Bucolikes (1575)*, 5.

[20] Ibid*.,* 6.

[21] Anna Rist, trans. and intro., *The Poems of Theocritus* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1978), suggests that critics often overlook the identity of Polyphemus's mother, the sea nymph named Thoösa, who adds a Freudian dimension to the entire scene, in how "the sea origin of the mother accounts for the son's inevitable and immediate (l. 26) 'transference' to the sea nymph Galatea" (102).

According to classical scholarship, Virgil's second eclogue references Theocritus's eleventh within the first thirty lines and then several times after that.[22] Theocritus eleventh eclogue was published anonymously in *Sixe Idyllia* in 1588, presented as the second eclogue in the collection (the first eclogue, a contest, is featured in chapter 1 of this dissertation), and Theocritus's idyll paints a now familiar retreat for his invitee:

> Yet I [Polyphemus], this such a one, a thousand sheep feed on these lands.
> And pleasant milke I drinke, which from the strouting bags is prest.
> Nor want I cheese in summer, nor in Autumne of the best,
> Nor yet in winter time, my cheese-rackes euer laden are,
> And better can I pipe, than anie Cyclops maie compare.
> ... for thee, aleavne faunes vp I bring,
> All great with young, & foure beares whelps, I nourish vp for thee.
> But come thou hither first, and thou shalt haue them all of me.[23]

Yet again, one finds the idealized locale ("a thousand sheep feed on these lands"), gifts ("foure beares whelps"), and the invitation presented in the imperative tense ("But come thou hither first"). The Polyphemus myth is the original invitation to love found in the eclogue tradition.[24]

Part of what Virgil is doing by deploying the Galatean myth is depicting his mastery of Theocritus's chosen myth, and consequently Viril's narrative of sexual longing is both indebted to, and a departure from, the Theocritan original. When one compares the Virgilian and Theocritan passages, one notes Corydon's boasting overdoes Polyphemus's boasting, and the two shepherds engage in the form of a contest across

[22] Hubbard, "Allusive Artistry," 88. See also Coleman, *Eclogues*, 108.

[23] Theocritus, *Sixe Idyllia*, A4.

[24] Scholars who contextualize the "The Passionate Shepherd" alongside its classical sources commonly cite Virgil's second eclogue and its predecessor, Theocritus's eleventh idyll. For example, Paul Alpers, in *What is Pastoral?*, suggests that Marlowe's poem "is in the direct line of descent" from these two predecessors of the invitation to love (223).

time and place.[25] While Theocritus's Polyphemus boasts that his flock is "a thousand sheep," Corydon touts that he has "a thousand lambs," specifically implying that he has more sheep that are older (lambs are, of course, the young of the sheep) while also appealing to Alexis's sense of delicacy.[26] Next, while Polyphemus suggests that he is the best singer of the cyclops ("better can I pipe, than anie Cyclops maie compare"), Corydon, in the line following "a thousand lambs," explains that he sings the songs "that Amphion Dircey was woont [to sing= Upon the hyll of Aracynth butting vpon the [e] shore."[27] On one hand, there is something decidedly tongue-in-cheek about Corydon's comments, since Amphion famously sung music that could move the stones to Thebes while Corydon cannot move a boy to love him.[28] On the other hand, Virgil's response positions his shepherds singing "underwriting" against Theocritus's shepherds.[29] Similar to eclogues in early modern England, the extent to which the writer overlaps with the fictionalized shepherd is never clear.[30]

Marlowe's lavish gifts, for one, seem to function in the spirit of one-upmanship that characterized Corydon's response to Polyphemus. For Marlowe's shepherd, the thousand sheep of Theocritus, which becomes the thousand lambs of Corydon, becomes

[25] Hubbard, in "Allusive Artistry," notes that Virgil "chooses to vary and enrich his model" (94).

[26] Theocritus, *Sixe Idyllia*, A4. Fleming, *The Bvcoliks* (1589), 4. Hubbard, "Allusive Artistry," 94. Lambs historically connote meekness, gentleness, and innocence. See "lamb, n." 2b. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

[27] The odd symbols appear in the original. Fleming, *The Bvcoliks* (1589), 4.

[28] In this Greek myth, Amphion plays his lyre so that the stones follow after him and slide into place to build the walls of Thebes. See Dominique Battles, *The Medieval Tradition of Thebes: History and Narrative in the Roman de Thebes, Boccaccio, Chaucer, and Lydgate* (New York: Routledge, 2004) 156.

[29] For "undersongs," see chapter two of this dissertation, especially page 150-1.

[30] See chapter two of this dissertation (beginning on page 119) for a lengthier discussion of how Virgil, Petrarch, and Spenser solicit audience opinion concerning the relationality between fictional shepherd and writer.

the "thousand fragrant posies," a seemingly smaller gift, though perhaps in the mind of Marlowe, with the pun of "poesy," a commentary on the value of his own poetic output. And then Fleming's translation and Virgil's closing love/move rhyme gets rehashed in the close of Marlowe's poem, though Marlowe sublimates the emotion and maintains the possibility of courtship: "If these delights thy mind may move, / Then live with me and be my Love." Or does he sublimate the emotion? On one hand, the reference to "mind" might indicate transference of the lustful desire into the realm of the mind, which would certainly follow a Neoplatonic elevation of desire.[31] On the other, Kimberly Huth, citing John R. Searle, suggests that the conditional ending ("If") differs from the invitation in terms of its "illocutionary force," and she suggests that it is during this closing moment that, "[a]s compared to the invitation, the conditional presents the beloved with less of a choice, almost gesturing toward command rather than request."[32] In comparison with the Virgilian precedent, Marlowe might gesture toward an ultimatum at the poems close instead of lamenting the speaker's ineffectuality. The point is that Marlowe signals affiliation not only with Virgil but also with the emulous games that Virgil plays with Theocritus.

When one looks to eclogues beyond Virgil's second and Theocritus's eleventh, both the Polyphemus/Galatea and the Alexis/Coridon myths expand into contests.

[31] Specifically, I mean the extent to which Platonic theory argues that, on the ladder of love, desire begins in the realm of the physical and then becomes elevates into the realm of the mental and spiritual. See Sir Thomas Hoby's translation of Count Baldassare Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano,* in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature (Volume 1)* ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (W.W. Norton and Company, 2012) 704-20.

[32] Kimberly Huth, "Come Live With Me and Feed My Sheep: Invitation, Ownership, and Belonging in Early Modern Pastoral Literature," *Studies in Philology* 108.1 (Winter 2011), 56. For Huth, the conditional presents less of a choice, which she derives from John R. Searle, *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979) 3.

Corydon, as this dissertation has demonstrated (in the reading of the eclogue contest in chapter two), is a competitor (and winner!) of Virgil's seventh eclogue, that "great contention sproung" between Coridon and Thirsis as they "strive" for victory.[33] Coridon sings "to Alexis" in this contest, though Alexis becomes one of several love interests. What gets highlighted as Coridon alternately invites and praises various lovers is his persuasive force. I will quote from Fleming's translation here:[34]

> Cor. O Galath [milke white] nimph & daugh-ter vnto Nereus too
> More sweet and sauourie to me than hony of Hibla hill
> More white than swans, more faire [and fine] than ivy [berries] white,
> So soone as being fed the bulls shall home returne to stalls.
> Then come thou too, if [e] any care of Coridon possesse thee.
> …
> Cor. The iunipers stand [full of frute] the chestnuts heary rough,
> And under trees their scatred frute all sorts lie euery where,
> Now all things laugh: but if Alex-is faire should from these hills
> Depart and go, then shouldst thou see the riuers dried up.[35]

I have quoted the passage above to show that a) the first persuasion uses the common imperative of "to come," and b) Alexis is but one of several love interests about whom Coridon sings. Similar to Virgil's second eclogue, Coridon's invitation serves to solicit an invitee, but this time it is not Alexis but Galatea, a nymph born from Nereus, who is first solicited through allusions to her beauty and by likening her to a gift. The link between Galatea and Alexis does not refute, but certainly complicates, a "playful" reading of Virgil's second eclogue, such as Smith's reading in *Homosexual Desire*.

[33] Fleming, *The Bvcoliks* (1589), 21. In Virgil's seventh eclogue, Fleming uses words, such as "contention" and "strive," that speak to the emulous fellowship outlined in this dissertation, since these two terms may or may not imply opposition between contestants. Another term that gets used in the argument of eclogue 7 is "controuersye" (20).

[34] Note that the square brackets are found in Fleming's original text.

[35] Fleming, *The Bvcoliks* (1589), 21.

Further, the parallel presences of both Alexis and Galatea in Virgil's seventh eclogue—as objects to be won in contests—suggests that the development of their characters is limited.

More than once Virgil's Alexis and Galatea serve as objects against which their speaker's vie for poetic supremacy. In Virgil's third eclogue, Damoetas signals his virility through boasting of his courtship with Galatea, whom he chases through the "willowes."[36] To such a list, one might add Amyntas, who "comes unasked" to Menalcas, or Phoebus, who "always finds" Damoetas in the mood for love. So while Virgil's second eclogue is certainly a significant source of Marlowe's invite, it is by no means the only one, and the potential for rivalry inherent in those other, less-often-considered invitations is wide-ranging, particularly with the Polyphemus and Galatea myth, which is referenced in no less than three of Virgil's eclogues. By expanding the list of literary forebears, a picture emerges that more and more resembles the type of emulous fellowship this dissertation has been focusing on, since Marlowe's speaker, whoever he might be, is unclear about what myth is being referenced and in what capacity. Marlowe's invitee finds its lineage not only in homoerotic lament, but also in more forceful narratives of courtship, competition, and conquest.

One important point to remember, when reading Marlowe's and Virgil's allusions to Theocritus's invitation, is how often Theocritus's "invitations" result in chases.

[36] See Fleming, *The Bvcoliks (1589),* 8: "Da: The wanton wench Galath doth cast an apple oft at me, / And runs unto the willowes, and would first full faine be seene." One possible reading of the lines is that Galatea here invites the chase; another is that the "cast[ing]" of "apples" is not particularly playful. Either way, this chase provides the basis for Menalcas's response, which helps to establish the link between the chase and sexual consummation: "Me. But my loue sweet Amyntas coms to me of his owne will, / So that Diana is not now more knowne unto our dogs"(8).

Polyphemus is sometimes figured more directly as a predator, which helps to explain various passages (in Virgil's seventh eclogue, in Theocritus's sixth eclogue) where different competing shepherds, in response to the invitation, urge Galatea to leave. In Theocritus's version of the myth, a large part of the attraction is chasing the fleeing beloved, similar to when, in Virgil's third eclogue, Damoetas chases Galatea after she throws apples at him. In Theocritus's eleventh idyll, the speaker places the image of Galatea running away directly before the moment when he first began to love her: "...as a sheep you run, that on the plaine a Woolfe doth spie. / I then began to loue thee, Galate, when first of all / You with my mother came."[37] The peculiar line break, which seems to position the "loue" being a consequence of the chase, connects the invitation to pursuit and violence. It is Polyphemus's penchant for violence that helps us to understand why Polythemus, elsewhere in Theocritus's eclogues, is referred to as the "monstrous shepherd."[38]

In the various iterations of the Polyphemus myth, one finds various power imbalances on display. However, it is Ovid's reading, in his *Metamorphoses*, book thirteen, of the failed invite, that brings the violence to its logical conclusion. The poem, as translated by Arthur Golding in 1567, begins with the standard images, locales, and gifts, including the kids and lambs. And, of course, the invite contains the imperative to "come":

> But come thyself (and if thou wilt) the truth therof to see.
> See how thyr udders full doo make them straddle. Lesser ware
> Shet up at home in cloce warme peends, are Lambes. There also are

[37] Theocritus, *Sixe Idyllia*, A4.
[38] Theocritus, *The Idylls*, trans. Robert Wells (Markham, Ontario: Penguin Group, 1989) 87.

> In other pinfolds Kidds of selfsame yeaning tyme. Thus have
> I always mylke as whyte as snow. Wherof I sum doo save
> To drink, and of the rest is made good cheese. And furthermore
> Not only stale and common gifts and pleasures wherof store
> Is to bee had at eche mannes hand, (as Leverets, Kidds, and Does,
> A payre of pigeons, or a nest of birds new found, or Roes,)
> Shall unto thee presented bee.[39]

And then the passage continues as follows:

> I found this t'other day
> A payre of Bearewhelpes, eche so lyke the other as they lay
> Uppon a hill, that scarce yee eche discerne from other may.
> And when that I did fynd them I did take them up, and say
> Theis will I for my Lady keepe from her therwith to play.
> Now put thou up thy fayre bryght head, good Galat, I thee pray,
> Above the greenish waves: now come my Galat, come away.[40]

But the loving fervour quickly turns to rage when Polyphemus spots Galatea lying with Acis/Simethus. In his raging fury Polyphemus chases the two lovers, and then Polyphemus, referred to as the "roundeyd devill," throws "a fleece / Of Aetna Rocke."[41] The rock strikes Simethus in the head and his blood becomes the founding story of the Acis River: the blood "did issue from the lump, and more and more / Within a whyle the rednesse gan to vannish: and the hew / Resembled at the first a brooke with rayne distroubled new, / Which wexeth cleere by length of tyme."[42] Often in the *Metamorphoses,* the invitee is punished; in this instance, the violence toward the chased invitee finds its release in the killing of the rival lover. Such an entanglement of the invitation to love and/or the Polyphemus myth, in Virgil's second, third, and seventh eclogues, and in Theocritus's sixth, ninth, and eleventh eclogues, may better account for

[39] Golding, *Metamorphoses*, 13. 970-80.
[40] Ibid., 13. 980-7.
[41] Ibid., 1035, 1035-6.
[42] Ibid., 1041-4.

why Marlowe's invite received such defensive responses:[43] for boys who read eclogues beginning in grammar schools, the Marlovian invite is not only a call to erotic play but also a call to erotic discourse predicated on the uneven distribution of power. One might turn, even, to other classical precedents that showcase contests concerning who invites whom to sit where, such as Theocritus's fifth idyll.[44] Early modern readers of the eclogues no doubt had a good understanding of the various recurring power struggles that underlie the invitation to love.

When we approach Marlowe's invitation with an eye to the classical tradition, it takes on connotations of uneven power, sexual threat, and even physical force. While critics such as Bruster have made much of Marlowe's movement away from the eclogue and into the monological space of the lyric, a counter reading would be to view the lyric as one half of a dialogue, that Marlowe was even soliciting dialogue, particularly as it appears in its first edition of *Englands Helicon* in 1600, followed by responses by both John Donne and Walter Raleigh. It should also come as no surprise that both Raleigh's and Donne's responses use themes related to nymphs and water, which accords with

[43] I might focus on Theocritus's sixth eclogue, another contest centering on Polyphemus/Galatea, though I trust my reader gets the idea without belabouring the point. See Theocritus, *Idylls*, 81-2. In the contest between Damoetas and Dapnis, the eclogue casts Damoetas as the cyclops: "Let my treatment work on her [Galatea]; she will send a message / Perhaps. But the door is closed till she promises / To share my bed and live with me on this island. / My face is not half so ugly as folk make out" (82). This particular contest ends not in a victor, but in an exchange of goods. Damoetas "closed the song with a kiss for Daphnis" and "there was no winning or losing where both played best" (82).

[44] It is worth noting, however, that the invite functions in adversarial terms outside of the myth of Polyphemus. For example, in Theocritus's fifth idyll, in Theocritus, *Idylls*, 73-80, which is an especially contentious eclogue, the two competing shepherds jostle over which shepherd can get the other to move to an idealized locale (see pages 74-5). As Thomas Rosenmeyer suggests, there is power implied in being the initiator of the contest: "In the later pastoral, the honour of starting the singing contest often goes to the more distinguished of the two, or to the older, or to an injured party. He sets the theme, the number of verses, the meter" (161). The exchange between Lacon and Comatas, which immediately precedes their contest, signals that the position of "the more distinguished" is not agreed upon.

Galatea, the water nymph. The aquatic nature of the Polyphemus/Galatea myth contributed to Sanazzaro's choice to stage the myth as a "piscatory eclogue."[45] That Marlowe understood the provocative heritage of his invitation can be gleaned by how his own characters respond to the invitation in his drama (which I will feature in a later section of this chapter).

As critics ranging from Michael Everton to James Shapiro have pointed out, Marlowe's original lyric is less about leaving the court to become actual shepherds than it is an exercise in persuasion.[46] Marlowe's reference to a "kirtle" serves to not only blur the gender of the beloved but to call into question whether the invitation evokes the female addressee Galatea or the male addressee Alexis.[47] The invitation might work for either gender, in a variety of situations. An ambiguously gendered invitee further blurs whether s/he should identify Marlowe's speaker as an occasionally monstrous, one-eyed cyclops or as a doting (and aging) shepherd.

When Sir Walter Raleigh responds to Marlowe in "The Nymph's Reply to the Shepherd," Raleigh's nymph rebukes the passionate shepherd by reiterating and negating the question of "if":

[45] See Jacopo Sanazarro, *Arcadia and Piscatorial Eclogues,* trans. and intro. Ralph Nash (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1966) 164-9. Piscatory eclogues were rarely written by Elizabethan writers, but Phineas Fletcher writes *Piscatory Eclogues* between the years of 1606-15 and publishes them in 1633.

[46] See Michael Everton, "Critical Thumbprints in Arcadia: Renaissance Pastoral and the Process of Critique," *Style* 35, no. 1 (Spring 2001) 1-16. Everton frames his discussion of the poem in terms of the "pastoral" and "antipastoral," whereby, on one hand "The Nymph's Reply" is an "antipastoral" text that "is a thorough attack on 'The Passionate Shepherd'" (5), while on the other hand, "The Nymph's Reply" does not so much argue against the pastoral ideal as it attempts to refigure the meaning of shepherdly *otium* (6). See also James Shapiro, *Rival Playwrights: Marlowe, Jonson, Shakespeare* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), who highlights similar features in Raleigh's poem to show that Raleigh "recognizes" that Marlowe's invitation "is simply bait, a trap" (19).

[47] Smith, *Homosexuality*, 92, points out that the "kirtle" was a garment worn by a man in early modern England, too. See also page 157 in this chapter.

If all the world were young,
And truth in every shepherd's tongue,
These pretty pleasure might me move,
To live with thee and be thy love.

Raleigh's opening lines, that doubt "truth in every Shepherd's tongue," point to the duplicitous nature of the invitation.[48] The ensuing reference to Philomel, who "becometh dumb" in the next stanza, rhymes with the young/tongue opening and signals the invitation's violent literary heritage. In the original myths, Philomel (following her tragic assault) becomes a nightingale, and the nightingale, as the previous chapter of this dissertation suggests, also connotes poetic aspiration in the period.[49] Thus, Raleigh "alertly discover[s]" the underlying careerist implications of Marlowe's original through an oblique reference to the nightingale.[50] Further, Raleigh alludes directly to precedents in the eclogue by personating a nymph who responds negatively to an invitation; Raleigh's nymph occupies the role of a contestant in the singing contest similar to those found in Virgil's seventh and Theocritus's sixth and ninth eclogues/idylls.[51] Ultimately, Raleigh acknowledges Marlowe's persuasive force and questions the underlying motives of the proposed retreat.

[48] Walter Raleigh, "The Nimphs Reply to the Sheepheard," in *Englands Helicon: Edited From the Edition of 1600 with Additional Poems From the Edition of 1614*, ed. Hugh MacDonald (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962), 193.

[49] For a reading of the nightingale as a signal of poetic aspiration in the sestinas of both Sidney and Spenser, see page 120 ff. of this dissertation.

[50] Patrick Cheney, "Career Rivalry and the Writing of Counter-Nationhood: Ovid, Spenser, and Philomela in Marlowe's 'The Passionate Shepherd to his Love'," *ELH* 65 no. 3 (Fall 1998): 524. Cheney views Raleigh's invocation of Philomela as signalling Marlowe's poetic aspirations in decidedly Ovidean terms. Cheney places Marlowe's Ovidean career trajectory against that of Spenser's Virgilian trajectory.

[51] Raleigh's impersonation of the nymph appears to be his own invention, since, in Theocritus's sixth, ninth, and eleventh idylls, Polyphemus is impersonated (and, sometimes, apostrophized) but Galatea is not.

Donne most aptly responds to the threat implied by the poem's Galatea/Polyphemus heritage, since Donne recognizes, foregrounds, and interrogates the power dynamics inherent in Marlowe's invitation. Donne begins by reiterating Marlowe's language ("Come live with me"), but then Donne shifts the locale from the pasture to the river, and he refigures the shepherd's wooden hook into a fisherman's "silver hoo[k]" (l. 4). Like Raleigh, Donne acknowledges that he is a responder within a dialogic form, akin to responders in the contests of Virgil's seventh or Theocritus's sixth. And, like Raleigh, Donne replies to Marlowe's invitation from the water, so to speak: recall that Ovid's iteration of Polyphemus contains an amphibious aspect, when Polyphemus says "Now put thou up thy fayre bryght head, good Galat, I thee pray, / Above the greenish waves: now come my Galat, come away." In typical, twisting fashion, Donne submerges both the invitee and the inviter and then subjects the entire courtship to his metaphysical wit.

Donne's feat in "The Bait" is to continually recast the bonds of power—who is the inviter and who is the invitee become rephrased in Donne's language as who is the fisherman and who is the fish. At first, the "you" of the poem is the fisherman for whom "th'inamor'd fish" will betray themselves. But when the fisherman takes a dip himself, he will become the one "caught" by the fish. The metaphor, in typical Donnean fashion, gets entangled, as the "you" fisherman takes on the qualities of a fish (when he "swim[s] in that live bath") and eventually of bait. Donne closes the poem by suggesting that "thou thy selfe art thine own bait," and that the speaker has been caught. The blending of fisherman and fish imagery serves to blur the existing power dynamic, or perhaps to recast the terms of its reach: the opening inviter is in the position of the caught fish (or

the invitee) by the end of the poem. Such is, Donne seems to suggest, the convoluted teleology of the courtship, whereby power shifts over the course of these first encounters. One might read this complex and convoluted model of courtship back against the Polyphemus/Galatea myth, where Galatea is both the provocateur and the pursued.

The literary context of Marlowe's invitation suggests that it connotes eroticism, play, power, and violence all at once. If "The Passionate Shepherd" is understood not only to solicit love but also to recast power relations, the iterations of "the invitation to love"—and the responses they garner—become clearer in Marlowe's own literary canon.[52] The shepherd figures in Marlowe's canon are perpetually in the act of persuading, often in the language of "The Passionate Shepherd." The retreat for Marlowe is rarely a place of respite; rather, it often serves as a site in which power is sought, contested, or negotiated. Even when a text has little to do with the eclogue or with the wider pastures of the pastoral, shepherds wander in to graze at unexpected, and, I hope to show, deliberate places. Shepherds, their idealized language, and the imagined retreat all signal to a Marlovian model of fellowship, which perpetually toes the line between lover and adversary, between eroticism and violence, and between consent and force.

[52] There have been several critics who have focused specifically on the mobility of the phrase "Come with me" in Marlowe's canon. The first lengthy study of this kind is R.S. Forsythe, "The Passionate Shepherd; And English Poetry," *PMLA* 40 no. 3 (Sept. 1925): 692-742. Forsythe suggests that Marlowe's primary influence is Theocritus's eleventh idyll, of which I have provided a reading earlier in this chapter, and, curiously, Forsythe denies any influence from Virgil's second eclogue: "There seems to be no evidence that "The Passionate Shepherd" owes anything to Virgil's "Eclogue II," where the invitation is addressed to a boy" (695). Forsythe is the first, to my knowledge, to notice the echo of "The Passionate Shepherd" in *Tamburlaine*, which will be a focus of the third section of this chapter. For more on the mobility of the phrase "Come live with me and be my love," see also Bruster, " 'Come to the tent again'," and Haber, *Desire and Dramatic Form in Early Modern England* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), especially 11-49.

II Marlowe's passionate and sporting shepherds in *Hero and Leander*

In this section I hope to make two interrelated claims about *Hero and Leander*. The first is that we might deploy Marlowe's invitation to love, and the hierarchical power dynamics that it advocates, to read the shepherds of Marlowe's Ovidean epyllion. The second is that the invitation sheds light not only on the two passages in the poem that contain shepherds, but on the structure of the narrative as a whole. Shepherds, for Marlowe, are never innocuous, rustic labourers; rather, Marlowe deploys the shepherd figure at precise moments in *Hero and Leander* where the main narrative (between Hero and Leander) has been delayed to follow characters engaged in secondary dalliances. Critics have often attempted to understand the point (or, pointlessness) of these narrative digressions, and I think that reading the digressions as retreats, of the type espoused by the invitation to love, helps to explain why sexualized violence is never far at bay. The invitation, in other words, is not an aberration for Marlowe, but is a convention that he deploys repeatedly across his oeuvre to different, though interrelated, ends.

Contemporary criticism has often noted the extent to which *Hero and Leander* frames the titular relationship around a seemingly endless series of interruptions and digressions, and that the delayed pacing of the courtship narrative signals a larger engagement with different models of desire. The prevailing logic is that Marlowe's seemingly interminable courtship serves to envision forms of love and desire that eschew and simultaneously critique the status quo. Judith Haber, for example, considers the text as interested in a poetics of "pointlessness" that problematizes standard closure

narratives of heterosexuality:[53] for Haber, "[t]he disruption of end-directed narrative is paralleled by, and indeed equivalent to, the disruption of end-directed sexuality."[54] James M. Bromley continues along Haber's line of inquiry, by questioning "what 'counts' as sex in Renaissance texts" to demonstrate how Marlowe's various dalliances effectively expand the purview of how modern criticism views early modern sexual acts.[55] Like Haber, Bromley turns to the Neptune passage in particular to insist on Marlowe's interest in depicting "pleasure without possession, penetration or even consummation."[56] For Bromley and Haber, the narrative format of the epyllion with its meandering pace mirrors a distinctly non-consummation teleological sexual progress. These two critics can be fruitfully read alongside Fred Tromly, who also identifies a halting narrative and alternate discourses of pleasure, though Tromly considers such moments as engaging the myth of Tantalus. For Tromly, Marlowe's text equates narrative delay with desire, but Tromly reads desire in terms related directly to authorial power. Specifically, Tromly suggests that Marlowe takes on a "teasing" authorial role that "lures" readers only to "frustrate" them.[57] Similar to Haber, Bromley, and Tromly, I too focus on the passages of digression and delay in *Hero and Leander,* and I agree with the three critics above that Marlowe is exploring various alternatives to end-directed sexuality. Unlike these critics,

[53] Haber, *Desire and Dramatic Form*, 48. See 39-49 for her chapter on *Hero and Leander*.

[54] Ibid., 43.

[55] James M. Bromley, "'Let it Suffise': Sexual Acts and Narrative Structure in *Hero and Leander*," in *Queer Renaissance Historiography: Backward Gaze*, eds. Vin Nardizzi, Stephen Guy-Bray, and Will Stockton (London: Routledge, 2009) 67.

[56] Ibid., 79.

[57] Fred Tromly, *Playing with Desire: Christopher Marlowe and the Art of Tantalization* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 166. See especially 153-73. Tromly writes, "In *Hero and Leander* Marlowe demonstrates to his reader ... that he or she is not in control of the process of interpretation, and is in fact dependent on the author's whim for crucial information which can easily be withheld" (166).

I speak explicitly about shepherds: I feel that these narrative digressions have much to do with persuasion and power inherent to the invitation and its accompanying ideas of the pastoral retreat.

The two principle narrative digressions of the text—which entail a break from the central courtship of Hero/Leander for over 100 lines each— are Mercury's visit to the destinies and Neptune's dalliance with Leander. Both digressions are signalled by the invocation of "to come" in deliberate ways that resonate with the opening lines of "The Passionate Shepherd" and its eclogic predecessors: "Come hither" are the words that spark the first lengthy digression, when Hero invites Leander to her turret; and, Leander shouts "I come" to and across the Hellspont, which prompts the second lengthy digression.[58] At the heart of both digressions, one finds not only examples of the invitation and of the ensuing retreat, but one finds shepherd figures in the act of persuasion. This section attempts to explain how the two principal digressions in the text, following Hero's invite to "Come hither" and Leander's proclamation that "I come," deploy shepherds as figures of seduction, persuasion, or force.

The first digression, during which Cupid fires "a shaft" (l. 372) that strikes Hero and then returns to "the Palace of the Destinies" (l. 377), immediately follows Hero's invitation to Leander to her "turret" (l. 351). In other words, the first major digression is prompted by Hero inviting Leander to her tower, when she seems to realize all at once the larger implications of her declaration.

[58] Christopher Marlowe, *The Collected Poems of Christopher Marlowe*, eds. Patrick Gerard Cheney and Brian J. Striar (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

> Come thither; As she spake this, her toong tript,
> For unawares "(Come thither)" from her slipt,
> And sodainly her former colour chang'd,
> And here and there her eies through anger rang'd.
> And like a planet, mooving severall wales,
> At one selfe instant, she poore soule assaies,
> Loving, not to love at all, and everie part
> Strove to resist the motions of her hart (ll. 357-64).

While the imperative "to come" aligns the passage with the eclogue by mimicking the language of the invitation, it is the ensuing narrative digression that more directly responds to the concerns of this chapter. The digression, which provides a backstory for Cupid's "dreadful countenance" at the palace, mirrors the main narrative between Hero and Leander, as the digression is also centered around a courtship: the principle story of the digression centers on Mercury as he wooes a "country maid" (l. 388), and in this brief Mercury/maid courtship one finds a surprising number of references to shepherds.

The first use of "shepherd" in *Hero and Leander* occurs during this digression of Mercury and the country maid, and it is not as an example of shepherd simplicity; rather, in the description of the country maid, the shepherd serves to demonstrate the ubiquity of prideful, courtly behaviour:

> Her breath as fragrant as the morning rose,
> Her mind pure, and her toong untaught to glose.
> Yet prowd she was, (for loftie pride that dwels
> In tow'red courts, is oft in sheapheards cels) (ll. 385-89).

Whereas the typical scenario is that shepherds sing or declaim against the sins of the court, Marlowe suggests here that "loftie pride … dwels" in shepherd's humble abodes ("cels") too. An ensuing passage expands on fit behaviour for a shepherd:

> And silver tincture of her cheekes, that drew
> The love of everie swaine: On her, this god
> Enamoured was, and with his snakie rod,

Did charme her nimble feet, and made her stay,
The while upon a hillocke downe he lay,
And sweetly on his pipe began to play,
And with smooth speech, her fancie to assay,
Till in his twining armes he lockt her fast,
And then he woo'd with kisses, and at last,
As sheap-heards do, her on the ground hee layd,
And tumbling in the grasse, he often strayd
Beyond the bounds of shame, in being bold
To eie those parts, which no eie should behold (ll. 390-403).

Consider the placement of the phrase "As sheap-heards do" in the lines "...and at last, / As sheap-heards do, her on the ground hee layd, / And tumbling in the grasse, he often strayd / Beyond the bounds of shame." The "As sheap-heards do" arrives at a curious moment, since it immediately precedes the active moment of "lay[ing]" the country maid "on the ground." One might have expected the "As sheap-heards do" to be more suitable to sitting down on the hill and wooing the maid with pleasing pipe music, but Marlowe frames the shepherd as an active sexual participant here, and quite possibly a forceful one. The movement of the narrative digression to go "Beyond the bounds of shame" and "To eie those parts, which no eie should behold," not only further objectifies the female body of the country maid to the gaze of the god (and reader), but casts the invasive ocular gaze as a shepherdly trait. Particularly when one recalls the ending of *Hero and Leander*, with its description of Hero "all naked to his [Leander's and also the readers'] sight displayed" (l. 808), this first digressive shepherd scene serves not only as a foretelling device but also as a representative passage for how courtship functions in *Hero and Leander*.

The country maid apparently resists the advances of Mercury, and an ensuing passage suggests specifically that the country maid "was now about to crie, / And crave the helpe of sheap-heards that were nie" (ll. 413-4), but instead she decides that, like

examples of Galatea studied in the previous section of this chapter, it would be better to make a run for it:

> Whose only dower was her chastitie,
> Having striv'ne in vaine, was now about to crie,
> And crave the helpe of sheap-heards that were nie.
> Herewith he stayd his furie, and began
> To give her leave to rise: away she ran..." (ll. 412-6).

The shepherds in this passage serve as personnages who might be called for help, though the country maid does not call. In light of earlier passages, in which the shepherds are depicted as prideful and lascivious, the maid's idea to simply run away seems best. While Mercury's "furie" might connote "fierce passion," it also has other contemporaneous definitions, including "fierce impestuosity or violence" and even "fierce cruelty."[59] In *Hero and Leander*, the shepherds' retreat ultimately denies *otium*, in the sense that it is never a leisurely getaway, and, by the end of the digression, the affair between Mercury and the maid has been subsumed into the larger contest between Hermes and Mercury.[60]

The second mention of "shepherd" occurs during the text's other narrative digression, the Neptune episode. Similar to the Mercury episode above, shepherds appear at moments of sexual persuasion and force. Leander, of course, will respond to Hero's "Come hither" as he stands next to the Hellspont, ready to take Hero up on her invite:

> With that he stripped him to the ivory skin,
> And crying, "Love, I come," leapt lively in (ll. 638-40).

[59] "fury, n." 1a., 2a. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

[60] Accordingly, the closing passage of the digression references Midas choosing Pan over Apollo in the singing contest from the *Metamorphoses*. See Ovid, *Metamorphoses,* 11.85-193.

There is a faint echo of Caeser's famous proclamation *Veni, Vedi, Vici* in Leander's cry, "I come." The irony in these lines is rich, as Leander figures himself in the dominant sexual position, except that he unknowingly shouts these bold lines to Neptune, a sea god who mistakes him for Ganymede. Like the first narrative digression, this one also centers around a dalliance between a mortal and a god. And Neptune, like Mercury in the digression that precedes him, goes on to recount a shepherd's tale in an attempt to woo the beloved. And, of course, both narrative digressions follow bold proclamations of "to come": the first follows Hero's invite to "Come hither" and the second follows Leander's proclamation that "I come."

I provide a longer quotation to show the extent to which the shepherd's invitation is invoked at the precise moment where the act of persuasion goes beyond the bounds of shame and the boundaries of consent become unclear:

> He [Neptune] clapt his [Leander] plumpe cheekes, with his tresses playd,
> And smiling wantonly, his love bewrayd.
> He watcht his armes, and as they opend wide,
> At every stroke, betwixt them would he slide,
> And steale a kisse, and then run out and daunce,
> And as he turnd, cast many a lustfull glaunce,
> And throw him gawdie toies to please his eie,
> And dive into the water, and there prie
> Upon his brest, his thighs, and everie lim,
> And up againe, and close beside him swim,
> And talke of love: *Leander* made replie,
> You are deceav'd, I am no woman I.
> **Thereat smilde *Neptune*, and then told a tale,**
> **How that a sheapheard sitting in a vale,**
> **Playd with a boy so faire and so kind,**
> **As for his love, both earth and heaven pyn'd;**
> **That of the cooling river durst not drinke,**
> **Least water-nymphs should pull him from the brinke.**
> **And when hee sported in the fragrant lawnes,**
> **Gote-footed Satyrs, and up-staring Fawnes,**
> **Would steale him thence.** Ere halfe this tale was done,

> Aye me, *Leander* cryde, th'enamoured sunne,
> That now should shine on *Thetis* glassie bower,
> Descends upon my radiant *Heroes* tower.
> O that these tardie armes of mine were wings,
> And as he spake, upon the waves he springs.
> *Neptune* was angrie that hee gave no eare,
> And in his heart revenging malice bare:
> He flung at him his mace, but as it went,
> He cald it in, for love made him repent (my bold ll. 665-94).

James Bromley cites portions of this passage to illustrate the poem's tendency to showcase non-consummative instances of pleasure that resist the typical hetero-erotic structure. However, when read in conjunction with the preceding shepherdly passage, such a viewpoint condones sexual behaviour that toes the line of consent. I agree with the queer implications of the passage, particularly in the earlier part of the passage, where Neptune "steal[s]" kisses and "run[s] out and daunce[s]," though the ire of Neptune, who "in his heart revenging malic bare" is harder to reconcile with the playing *ethos* evoked by critics such as Bromley and Haber. Further, the shepherd's tale that sits at the center of the passage above figures the "boy so faire and so kind" as perpetually in the midst of sexual advances: from the shepherd, from the water-nymphs, and then from the satyrs and fauns. The boy is continually in the grammatical position of the direct object—the shepherd "playd" with him, the water-nymphs attempted to "pull him from the brinke," and the satyrs and faunes would "steale him thence"—which does not suggest that the boy possesses agency. Thus, while this digression in *Hero and Leander* serves to expand the purview of how sexual desire might work in the text, I think we might also focus on how the shepherd provides both persuasion and justification for eroticism based on force and mastery, and how the presence of the shepherd underscores the possibility that such a dalliance is not in the congenial terms that scholars such as

Bromley imagines. For Marlowe, there is a hazy boundary separating leisurely dalliance on the one hand and sexual force on the other.

In the Ovidean erotic epyllion of *Hero and Leander*, Marlowe modifies and adds to his own version of the invitation to love. Understanding the invitation's underlying myths, derived from the eclogue, helps to add context to both the invitation itself and to the shepherd figures that are conjured in these acts of sexual persuasion. In *Hero and Leander*, the narrative digressions, portraying two dalliances between gods and mortals, invoke both the language and matter of pastoral retreats. Unlike in "The Passionate Shepherd," however, both narrative digressions depict not only the invitations but also the response and ensuing pastoral retreat: two instances where lovers are set apart from the narrative in moments of horizontal "play" (l. 678) and "sport" (l. 682); two instances where there is a clear power hierarchy between a mortal and god (Mercury/maid and Neptune/Leander); and, two instances that end not with any type of cathartic or satisfactory feelings but with anger, fury, and escape. On one hand, the retreats depict alternatives to the *telos* toward consummation typical of heterosexual relations in the period, but, on the other hand, the alternatives provided in the retreats maintain the imbalanced power structure and may even accentuate it. While Marlowe certainly does appear to depict male-male bonds in more mutual terms than male-female, the specific gender formations in Marlowe's invitations (and in subsequent retreats) seem to be less important than the eroticization of uneven power relationships. The shepherd that is most effective at inviting to, and at negotiating in, the pastoral retreat is not one the gods contained in *Hero and Leander*; rather, it is the warlike, titular shepherd of Marlowe's popular martial dramas, *Tamburlaine I* and *II*.

III Come with me and be my competitor

Tamburlaine's first words in *Tamburlaine I*, spoken to his future wife Zenocrate, are yet another instance of the Marlovian imperative: "Come, lady, let not this appal your thoughts / The jewels and the treasures we have ta'en / Shall be reserved [for you]" (1.2.1). Marlowe shows from the outset that Tamburlaine, the Scythian shepherd, is a master of exploiting the invitation for his own authoritative ends. The invitation recurs in various guises in *Tamburlaine I* and *Tamburlaine II*, as Marlowe brings the audience to the "tent of War" to depict how power is solicited and won through the act of persuading people to join forces, which often borrow their language from the invitation to love.[61] Marlowe's Tamburlaine deploys the invitation with male army generals and marriage invitees alike; in the place of "lover," both invitees inhabit the ambivalent space connoted by Tamburlaine's chosen term, "competitors." Tamburlaine's invitation to love, and the pastoral retreats that he promises, are undergirded by language and allusion that signals violence and threat. Nowhere in Marlowe's canon is the invitation and ensuing retreat more clearly a means to power and authority.

From the outset of *Tamburlaine*, verbal power is foregrounded as integral to both the acquiring and maintaining of authoritarian rule. In the opening scene, the dialogue between Mycetes and his brother Cosroe foregrounds Mycetes's ineffectual power of command. Mycetes interprets Cosroe's council as transcending proper decorum, and Mycetes attempts to show that the sovereign's word is law:

> Mycetes: Brother, I see your meaning well enough,
> And through your planets I perceive you think

[61] See Marlowe, *Tamburlaine,* in *The Complete Plays*, Prologue l. 3.

> I am not wise enough to be a king. ...
> I might command you to be slain for this.
> Meander, might I not?
> Meander: Not for so small a fault, my sovereign lord.
> Mycetes: I mean it not, but yet I know I might.
> Yet live, yea, live, Mycetes wills it so. (1.1.18-27).

Mycetes is shown to be an ineffectual ruler, from the outset, through his lack of command and persuasion in language: in the passage above, Mycetes gestures at punishing Meander, but quickly backpedals when he is challenged. Mycetes's idea is to send Theridamas, with a thousand horses, to apprehend Tamburlaine, and Mycetes says, "Go, stout Theridamas. Thy words are swords, / And with thy looks thou conquerest all thy foes" (1.1.74-5). A large part of what limits Mycetes is his ineffectuality at courting love and favour, particularly from his brother, and the two continue to banter and argue (1.1. 95-105). Ultimately, neither brother is depicted as using rhetoric adequately enough to maintain their regal authority.

The ineffectualness of Mycetes's verbal power is juxtaposed with Tamburlaine's persuasive force. One of Mycetes's primary commands in the opening scene is to send people away: [to Theridamas] "Go frowning forth, but come thou smiling home" (1.1. 65); [to Menaphone] "Go, Menaphone, go into Scythia, / And foot by foot follow Theridamas" (1.1. 85-6). As people move away from Theridamas, Tamburlaine's opening lines, in the ensuing scene, cast him in the opposite verbal position: "Come, lady, let not this appal your thoughts / The jewels and the treasures we have ta'en / Shall be reserved [for you]" (1.2.1-3). Tamburlaine will, of course, soon deliver on his promise of "jewels" for Zenocrate, though his invocation of the promised gifts and rewards is more elaborate:

> Disdains Zenocrate to live with me? …
> A hundred Tartars shall attend on thee,
> Mounted on steeds swifter than Pegasus;
> Thy garments shall be made of Median silk,
> Enchased with precious jewels of mine own,
> More rich and valorous than Zenocrate's;
> With milk-white harts upon an ivory sled
> Thou shalt be drawn amidst the frozen pools
> And scale the icy mountains' lofty tops (1.2.82-100).

As Judith Haber writes, "Tamburlaine creates the world with his words and offers it to Zenocrate."[62] We hear not only the verbal echoes "live with me" and the iteration of a promise of jewels, but also other familiar traits from "The Passionate Shepherd," such as the ambiguity of the maker of the various listed items, and the various foreign and exotic articles of clothing. Before Zenocrate is given proper space to reply, Tamburlaine presents Zenocrate to Theridamas as though she has responded favourably to the invitation and has acquiesced to be in Tamburlaine's train.[63] Tamburlaine's manoeuvre here is representative of how he accrues territories and allies: someone goes from being courted and solicited to possessed and accumulated very quickly and without ceremony.

Tamburlaine's solicitation of his first army general mirrors his courtship of Zenocrate so closely that the invitation blurs the lines between eroticism and martial gain. To Theridamas, Tamburlaine says,

> Forsake thy king, and do but join with me,
> And we will triumph over all the world. …
> If thou wilt stay with me, renowned man,
> And lead thy thousand horse with my conduct,

[62] Haber, *Desire and Dramatic Form*, 17.

[63] It is not my intention to contest the authenticity of affection that Tamburlaine feels for Zenocrate, though he seems aware of his own machinations. Immediately following his invitation to Zenocrate, Tamburlaine says to Techelles: "Techelles, women must be flattered. / But this is she with whom I am in love" (1.2. 106-7).

> Besides thy share of this Egyptian prize
> Those thousand horse shall sweat with martial spoil
> Of conquered kingdoms and of cities sacked.
> Bot we will walk upon the lofty clifts,
> And Christian merchants that with Russian stems
> Plough up huge furrows in the Caspian Sea
> Shall vail to us as lords of all the lake …
> Join with me now in this my mean estate
> (I call it mean, because, being yet obscure,
> The nations far removed admire me not)
> And when my name and honour shall be spread …
> *Then shalt thou be competitor with me*
> *And sit with Tamburlaine in all his majesty* (1.2.172-209 my emphasis).

While the preceding passage does not begin with the imperative "to come," "Forsake thy king" works as a variation of it, since it implies the same action: Theridamas should leave Mycetes and join Tamburlaine. But what does it mean that Tamburlaine asks Theridamas to be a "competitor"? In early modern England, "competitor" had two contrasting definitions: 1) One who competes, or engages in a competition; one who seeks an object in rivalry with others also seeking it; a rival; 2) One associated with another in seeking the same common object; an associate, a partner. Tamburlaine inhabits the boundary between those two definitions with his "allies," high-standing nobles and kings, since Tamburlaine's relationships can quickly shift from amity to enmity. Cosroe, for example, begins the play as Tamburlaine's competitor (as partner), before becoming his competitor (as adversary), since Tamburlaine was not satisfied with the prospects of being "regent of Persia" and lieutenant general to Cosroe's armies.[64] In the invitation to Theridamas quoted above, Tamburlaine adjusts his strategy by offering Theridamas to "join" with him, promising the spoils of war that Tamburlaine will wage.

[64] Cosroe too attempts to be Tamburlaine's competitor: "[…] none shall keep the crown but Tamburaline. / Thee do I make my regent of Persia / And general lieutenant of my armies" (2.5.8-9).

Tamburlaine's use of "competitor" adds a new element to my discussion of the Marlovian retreat thus far. Earlier examples of the retreat in "The Passionate Shepherd" and *Hero and Leander* solicit love through allusion to uneven power relationships; for Tamburlaine, the invitation seeks a "partner," and yet the potential to become an "enemy" is contained within the term of fellowship "competitor." In another sense, Theridamas will never be a "partner" to Tamburlaine, and so the invitation is disingenuous. As Tamburlaine uses it, the term competitor does not imply the mutuality that it does in Shakespeare's *Richard III*, where Richard says that "In Kent the Guilfordes are in armes, / And euerie houre more competitors, Flocke to their aide" (4.4.435). For Tamburlaine, Theridamas is put in a lower social position, partly indicated by the continued reference to the "thousand horse," which are Theridamas's horses but which Tamburlaine fits with martial spoils: "Those thousand horse shall sweat with martial spoil / Of conquered kingdoms and of cities sacked" (1.2.191-2). The one thousand horses might be an indirect reference to the one thousand sheep and lambs of Theocritus and Virgil, respectively. More broadly, the "thousand horse" epitomizes the manner in which Tamburlaine promises material stuff to people—including both his wife Zenocrate and army general Theridamas—that are not in Tamburlaine's current possession. Tamburlaine's pleasures promised are merely possibilities and are often illusory, similar to the promised gifts in the eclogues studied earlier in this chapter, and yet his persuasion works.

The lack of pomp and of rejoicing at the close of this crucial Act 1, Scene 2 highlights the chimeric quality of Tamburlaine's words. Once Theridamas has pledged

his allegiance (and his armies) to Tamburlaine,[65] Tamburlaine reissues a closing invitation to Zenocrate and the nobles, but with a choice:

> A thousand thanks, worthy Theridamas.
> And now, fair madam, and my noble lords,
> *If* you will willingly remain with me
> You shall have honours as your merits be—
> Or else you shall be forced with slavery (1.2.252-6 my emphasis).

Tamburlaine gives a "thousand thanks," which is fitting for the "thousand horses" now in his possession. More importantly, the contingent "If" ("If you will willingly remain") resonates with the earlier discussion of "The Passionate Shepherd," whereby the final portion of the invitation is issued in a threatening way.[66] The decision to "remain" with Tamburlaine cannot be done "willingly," in other words, since the alternative of being "forced with slavery" precludes freewill. And although it is yet unclear whether Tamburlaine has the capacity (or manpower) to make such a claim, he assumes the role of ruler without a doubt. Zenocrate's last line, "I must be pleased perforce. Wretched Zenocrate" (1.2.259), begets the question of rejection, specifically the following: what happens when someone does not take up the pastoral invitation?

"The Passionate Shepherd" received several rebuttals in verse, and in *Hero and Leander* one finds characters who are able to either deny or flee from the pastoral retreat. But, in *Tamburlaine,* as the play makes clear again and again, the only possible rejection to Tamburlaine's invitation is death. In *Tamburlaine I*, the prisoner Zabina brains herself, screaming about leaving her current state for a new reality on the other side of the grave:

[65] Theridamas says, "Won with thy words and conquered by with thy look, / I yield myself, my men, and horse to thee, / To be partaker of thy good or ill / As long as life maintains Theridamas" (1.2.228-31).

[66] In "The Passionate Shepherd," these closing lines are, "And if these pleasures may thee move" and "If these delights thy mind may move." See the discussion of this threat on page 164 of this dissertation.

"Hell, death, Tamburlaine, hell! Make ready my coach, my chair, my jewels. I come, I come, I come!" (5.1.316-7).[67] The impossibility of rejecting the invitation is most clearly articulated not by rejecting an invitation from Tamburlaine, but by rejecting one from Theridamas, who mimics his boss's language in addressing and courting Olympia in *Tamburlaine II*:[68]

> Nay, lady, then if nothing will prevail
> I'll use some other means to make you yield.
> Such is the sudden fury of my love,
> I must and will be pleased, and you shall yield.
> Come to the tent again (4.2.50-4).

One might note, again, the fake option of choice in "if nothing will prevail." Olympia, recognizing her limited options, is eager to die after her husband's death, and she accomplishes this wish by duping Theridamas. She will trade a secret elixir for her honour, and to prove that the elixir is real she proposes to anoint the sword that Theridamas will plunge into her neck. Olympia's death foregrounds the fine line, within Tamburlaine's tent of war, between the erotic *petit mort* and literal death. In other words, by tricking Theridamas to expedite her murder, Olympia is able to decide the terms of

[67] If one pauses to look at death in the plays of Marlowe more generally, one notes that death is an entity that is addressed, that is invited, that is commanded. There is often a curious duality in how death is invoked, as alternately a salve or a lover. Edward says, several scenes prior to his execution: "Come, Death, and with thy fingers close my eyes, / Or if I live, let me forget myself" (5.1.110 – 111). When the queen of Edward II dies, she reiterates the invitation: "Then come, sweet death, and rid me of this grief." (5.6.92). Or, in *Dido Queen of Carthage*, Iarbas kills himself not in the language of suicide, but as a means of moving closer to Dido: "Dido, I come to thee: ay me, Aeneas!" (5.1.318). In final lines in this same play, Anna echoes Iarbas's words and actions: "Now, sweet Iarbas, stay, I come to thee!" (5.1.327). Even Tamburlaine must "meet death" in *Tamburlaine II*: "But see, [Death] comes again / Because I stay" (5.3.75 – 76).

[68] Theridamas uses a similar invitation to Tamburlaine: "Leave this [thought of death], my love, and listen more to me. / Thou shalt be stately queen of fair Argier, / And, clothed in costly cloth of massy gold, / Upon the marble turrets of my court / Sit like to Venus in her chair of state, / Commanding all thy princely eye desires; / And I will cast off arms and sit with thee, / Spending my life in sweet discourses of love" (4.2.37-45).

her own death, which is a feat that few characters are able to achieve in the *Tamburlaine* plays.

Tamburlaine's effectiveness in courting lovers, army generals, and subjects alike speaks to his upbringing as a shepherd. Marlowe shows that Tamburlaine is a shepherd through and through with his extraordinary ability to combine command and seduction; the *Tamburlaine* plays present the idea that the shepherd-prince's persuasive verbal power is congruent with his eclogue heritage and not a departure from it. Marlowe depicts the mobility of the invitation from the lyric, to the epyllion, to the martial drama, all the while maintaining links with its eclogue roots. Underlying his idealized rhetoric, one finds persuasive strategies that harken to the power negotiations within earlier invitations, including Marlowe's "The Passionate Shepherd" and their accompanying classical myths. Further, Tamburlaine's discourse of persuasion is further infused with the eroticism that underlies the classical invitation. Tamburlaine's invitees are "competitors," a term that vacillates between congeniality and opposition and that resonates with other forms of shepherdly address—such as copemate and emulator—highlighted by this dissertation.

IV Coda: Marlowe and Shakespeare's losing shepherds

When Shakespeare's Phoebe alludes to Marlowe as the "dead Shepherd" in *As You Like It,* there is a sense that Shakespeare is calling attention to Marlowe as a fellow poet-shepherd.[69] To many modern readers, speaking to Marlowe in shepherdly terms

[69] The lines to Marlowe are spoken by Phoebe: "Dead shepherd, now I find thy sawe of might: / 'Who ever loved that loved not at first sight?'" (3.5.82-3).

may seem odd, since in so much of Marlowe's oeuvre shepherds occupy the margins and are rarely commented upon by modern criticism. And yet, the shepherd figure and the invitation to love are undeniably linked with their author, and, as this chapter has shown, shepherds in Marlowe's oeuvre intertwine in complex and myriad ways. Often, responses to Marlowe, signalling shepherds, seem to pose more questions than they answer: when Richard Barnfield writes his own invitation to love, entitled *The Passionate Shepherd,* also modelled after Virgil's second, but litters it with references to Marlowe's oeuvre, how might this serve as a comment on Marlowe's shepherds?[70] When Thomas Dekker writes the play *Old Fortunatus*, which was commissioned by Philip Henslowe while Marlowe's plays were still being performed, might not the various moments of overlap with Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* contain a nod to the Fortunatus/Faustus dialogues that feature in the first three eclogues by Mantuan?[71] Marlowe's work is often framed as one half of a shepherdly dialogue, which is surprising, if only because he so clearly eschews other popular forms of pastoralism during the period, such as pastoral romance and pastoral drama. But the dialogic eclogue, and specifically the invitation to love, structures how Marlowe's contemporaries responded to him.

Critics have noted Shakespeare's responses to Marlovian shepherds and invitations, particularly in *As You Like It* ("dead Shepherd") and also in *Merry Wives of*

[70] See Charles Crawford, "Richard Barnfield, Marlowe, and Shakespeare," in *Collectanea* (Stratford-on-Avon: Shakespeare Head Press, 1906), 1-18.

[71] See Sidney R. Homan, "*Doctor Faustus*, Dekker's *Old Fortunatus*, and the Morality Plays," *Modern Language Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (1965): 497-505.

Windsor.[72] But Shakespeare's engagement with Marlowe's shepherds extends beyond *As You Like It* and *Merry Wives of Windsor.* This is the first study that considers how Shakespeare's titular protagonist in *3 Henry VI* responds to his counterpart in Marlowe's *Tamburlaine.* Many playwrights during the period responded to *Tamburlaine*, and Peter Bereck has found that almost a third of the thirty-eight plays performed in the five years after *Tamburlaine* show considerable influence.[73] Bereck notes instances where playwrights seem indebted to Tamburlaine's bombastic language, though my suggestion here is that Shakespeare imagines Henry VI in *3 Henry VI* as a shepherd to contrast with how Tamburlaine solicits his "retreats." One might extend Shakespeare's response to *Tamburlaine* into other parts of the *Henry VI* trilogy, in particular to the "shepherdly" heritage of Joan of Arc in *1 Henry VI*.[74] However, my interest here is to present a single instance of shepherdly dialogue between the two major playwrights of the 1590s.

[72] In *Merry Wives of Windsor*, Shakespeare ventriloquizes and lampoons Marlowe's poem at the pinnacle of the play's contest between Sir Hugh Evans and Master Doctor Caius: Evans awaits Caius for a duel, during which time he sings passages of Marlowe's song. On one hand, Evans reiterating "The Passionate Shepherd" is a type of nervous tick, and Shakespeare ironizes the song rendering it into a type of jingle or ditty. On the other hand, there seems to be a knowing wink to the solicitation found Marlowe's lyric. Shakespeare's passage fits neatly in James Shapiro's conception on "inhearsing" Marlowe, whereby Marlowe's influence on contemporary playwriting is "contained" through the invocation/incorportation of Marlovian language in ironic ways. See Shapiro, *Rival Playwrights,* 14.

[73] Peter Berek, " 'Tamburlaine's Weak Sons': imitation as Interpretation before 1593," *Renaissance Drama* n.s. 13 (1982): 58. Also quoted in Shapiro, *Rival Playwrights*, 29. Berek's article does consider Tamburlaine's shepherdly heritage and instead focuses on "Marlowe's mighty line" (79) and the extent to which this style was imitated by his contemporaries.

[74] In *Henry VI Part I,* Shakespeare mines similar ground to Marlowe's Tamburlaine with the Joan of Arc character: like Tamburlaine's shepherdly pedigree, Joan, in her first introduction in Act 1 Scene 2, is "by birth a shepherd's daughter" (1.2.72). There is much that signals affiliation between Joan and Tamburlaine besides shared elements of their upbringing: Joan too has a penchant for comparing herself to Caesar, for bombast more generally, and for speaking of herself in the third person. Both characters ostensibly have a "dark" complexion in comparison with the other characters of their respective plays. *1 Henry VI* of course stages the debate about whether or not Joan is actually of shepherdly heritage with her father, the character identified as "shepherd," in Act 5.

Whereas Tamburlaine is a master at the invitation, a type of preeminent shepherd poet who wins all contests, and who is continually "jesting" in ways that reaffirm his position of power, Henry VI's ineffectualness is framed as deriving from his inability to speak and to persuade. Henry's early moment of panic in *3 Henry VI*, which causes him to "adopt an heir" (1.1.136) is explained as "I know not what to say, my title's weak" (1.1.135). While this line is glossed as an aside in modern editions, there is a pervading sense of weakness and feebleness in Henry VI's dialogue more generally, and his queen, Margaret, links Henry VI's ineffectualness to his rhetoric, or lack thereof. "I shame to hear thee speak," she says, after he craves pardon (1.1.233), and, when Henry urges her to "Stay gentle Margaret and hear me speak" (1.1.258), she replies "Thou hast spoke too much already; get thee gone" (1.1.259). One contrast with Henry's rhetorical ineptitude is with the house of York,[75] but the more apparent contrast, I suggest, is with Tamburlaine.

Henry's moment of comparison with Tamburlaine comes in the battle between the houses of York and Lancaster in *3 Henry VI*. Henry imagines himself as a shepherd engaged in a type of pastoral retreat. I include a lengthy portion of the soliloquy:

> Would I were dead! If God's good will were so;
> For what is in this world but grief and woe?
> O God! methinks it were a happy life,
> To be no better than a homely swain;
> To sit upon a hill, as I do now,
> To carve out dials quaintly, point by point,
> Thereby to see the minutes how they run,

[75] Following Henry's hasty "adoption," the second scene of the play begins *in medias res,* in a "slight contention" between the York brothers for who will present the plan to usurp Henry's throne more quickly (1.2.1-6). The contention, whereby the brother's argue over their oration skills, contrasts starkly with Henry's obsequious tone immediately prior.

How many make the hour full complete;
How many hours bring about the day;
How many days will finish up the year;
How many years a mortal man may live.
When this is known, then to divide the times:
So many hours must I tend my flock,
So many hours must I take my rest,
So many hours must I contemplate,
So many hours must I sport myself,
So many days my ewes have been with young,
So many weeks ere the poor fools will earn,
So many years ere I shall shear the fleece,
So minutes, hours, days, months, and years
Passed over to the end they were created,
Would bring white hairs unto a quiet grave.
Ah what a life were this! How sweet, how lovely.
Gives not the hawthorn bush a sweeter shade
To shepherds looking on their silly sheep
Than do a rich embroidered canopy
To kings that fear their subjects' treachery?
O yes it doth, a thousandfold it doth.
And to conclude, the shepherd's homely curds,
His cold thin drink out of his leather bottle,
His wonted sleep under a fresh tree's shade,
All which secure and sweetly he enjoys,
Is far beyond a prince's delicates (2.5.19-51)

Over the span of this passage, Henry deploys the "retreat" to opposite ends of Tamburlaine's retreat. Henry resembles Tamburlaine's son Calyphas, who deploys the retreat incorrectly and pays the price for it.[76] Both Calyphas and Henry fail to recognize the important political jostling (of forming allies, securing contracts, etc.) that occurs in

[76] Calyphas uses the invitation for romantic ends (4.1.61) and as a way to hide from the surrounding war. Shortly thereafter he is killed.

Tamburlaine's retreat: Tamburlaine's pastoral retreat is not *otium* but *negotium*.[77] However, whereas Calyphas focuses on dalliance with a lover, Henry imagines a solitary moment of escape and withdrawal, a "retreat" in the military sense of the term.

The implied dialogue between Henry and Tamburlaine likens their exchange to an eclogue, such as those found earlier in this chapter. Neither is the shepherd a onetime metaphor for Henry, despite the passage above serving as its most clear pronunciation. In the first scene after Henry has been deposed, he encounters two gamekeepers, whose first words to Henry are, "Ay, here's a deer whose skin's a keeper's fee" (3.1.22). The gamekeepers' interest in their own personal gain signals the transfer of power to the new monarch (the "keepers" will take Henry and hope for reward), though more broadly the passage shows the king playing the part of the herded animal instead of the shepherd. While the gamekeepers call him a "deer," at the end of the play Henry refers to himself as "the harmless sheep" (5.6.8).[78] Henry's vision of the shepherd lifestyle is excessively idealized, while, as I've shown above, the successful shepherd of the eclogue is caught up in power negotiations. Because Henry does not engage in these power negotiations effectively, he can only be a sheep. The lowly gamekeepers understand this, and Henry understands this, and he goes from dreaming about being the shepherd to recognizing himself as the sheep.

[77] For a comprehensive and chronological reading of "*otium*" that demonstrates how rarely the term was used to denote escape and timelessness, see Brian Vickers, "Leisure and Idleness in the Renaissance: the Ambivalence of *Otium*," *Renaissance Studies* 4, no. 1 (1990): 1-37 and Brian Vickers, "Leisure and Idleness in the Renaissance: the Ambivalence of *Otium*," *Renaissance Studies* 4, no. 2 (1990) 107-54. For a more recent analysis of *otium*, see Yates, *Of Sheep, Oranges, and Yeast*, especially chapter two. Yates's depiction of *otium*—as an "anthropo-zoo-genetic practice" (95)—frames his argument against an essentialized understanding of the term that counters Vickers's chronicling.

[78] When left alone with Gloucester, Henry says "So flies the reckless shepherd from the wolf, / So first the harmless sheep doth yield his fleece / And next his throat unto the butcher's knife" (5.6.7-9).

The various vectors that connect Marlowe and Shakespeare do not imply the singularity of Raleigh's or Donne's responses; rather, they engage the invitation, the retreat, and the figure of the shepherd monarch in complex ways. Marlowe updates what it means to be a certain type of shepherd-poet, infusing the shepherd figure with persuasive and powerful rhetoric. As he does so, he uses conventions of the eclogue, in particular the invitation to love. By focusing closely on moments of shepherd interaction, I suggest that mighty Tamburlaine uses the language of Coridon, Polyphemus, Damoetas, and their shepherd peers, not to pass the time but instead to play with "fellow kings" (*II*.1.4.39) and build an empire.

Chapter 4: "Ile chiefe mourner be": Rehearsing Death and the Pastoral Elegy

With its focus on the processes of death, mourning, and moving on, the pastoral elegy provides an apropos focus for the closing chapter of this study. At first glance the pastoral elegy may be the eclogue convention that most baldly signals the elements of emulous fellowship that I have discussed over the course of this dissertation: the poet who elegizes announces an affiliation for, but also a distancing from and supplanting of, the deceased poet. Hence the pastoral elegy, like the shepherds' lesson, the singing contest, and the invitation to love, usually depicts a bond that is both friendly and adversarial. The survival and flourishing of the elegizing poet depends on transgressing the influence and tutelage of the deceased, and accordingly tropes of renewal and new beginnings accompany the many and variant images of death and decay. When considering the emulation inherent to early modern pastoral elegy, one may be reminded of Samuel Johnson's famous dictum, concerning mourning in the pastoral and especially in John Milton's *Lycidas*, that "where there is leisure for fiction there is little grief."[1] More recently Celeste Schenck has suggested that "[t]he pastoral funeral elegy … has been from the outset a statement of careerism," in which poets "demonstrate … mastery"

[1] Samuel Johnson, *"The Life of Milton" from The Lives of the Poets (1779)*, *Poetry Foundation*, 13 October 2009, https://www.poetryfoundation.org/resources/learning/essays/detail/69382 (accessed 18 September 2017).

over a corpus of poems with an eye to literary history.[2] Schenck's careerist focus has been complicated by critics such as Peter Sacks, who acknowledges the careerist implications of the elegy while considering it as a sincere and valid work of mourning.[3] This chapter borrows from both of these positions—elegy as both careerist and sincere work of mourning—to depict the shifting power dynamics that pervade the emulous relationships among poets, among princes, and between poets and princes.

The English pastoral elegy and many of its core tropes—including its casting of the mourner in poet's weeds, its procession of mourning speakers, and its closing passage that propels the speaker beyond the landscape—derive primarily from the idylls and eclogues of Theocritus and Virgil.[4] The close affiliation between "eclogue" and "pastoral elegy" persists into and beyond Elizabethan England. First, major Elizabethan eclogue collections all contain pastoral elegies (think of Edmund Spenser's "November" or Dicus's song in the *Old Arcadia* that begins "Since that to death is gone the shepheard hie"). Second, early modern pastoral elegies borrow eclogic names (the titular character of Milton's *Lycidas*). Third, the terms "pastoral elegy" and "eclogue" are often used interchangeably, since, as my introduction shows, a shepherdly dialogue was often understood as an "eclogue" (Thomas Watson's most famous pastoral elegy is "An

[2] Celeste Schenck, *Mourning and Panegyric* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 50 52.

[3] Peter Sacks, *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).

[4] The other poems often associated with early pastoral elegy, which are composed in the second century BCE—between Theocritus in the third century BCE Theocritus and Virgil in the first century CE—are *Lament for Adonis* by Bion and the anonymous *Lament for Bion*. While these two poems are not from proper eclogue collections, they engage with one another in dialogue that is eclogic. For a succinct chronicle of classical pastoral elegy, see Laurence Lerner, ed., *The Works of John Milton* (Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 1994), 41.

Eclogue upon the Death of Sir Francis Walsingham"). As I have done throughout this dissertation, my chapter will read the English pastoral elegies in the context of both classical and especially English eclogues, in the hopes of depicting how English poets gesture toward poetic ambitions while signalling both companionship with and opposition to their Elizabethan predecessors.

As both a convention within the eclogue and as solitary, occasional poems outside of eclogue collections, English pastoral elegies defy the seemingly private moment of mourning and instead speak to broader synchronic and diachronic associations. A word that gets taken up by many pastoral elegists in early modern England, and one that I think encapsulates the various social processes contained within the simultaneously public and private act of mourning, is "rehearsal." The word gets used in major pastoral elegies, including Thomas Watson's *Meliboeus* and Edmund Spenser's *Astrophel*, but it appears also in many other elegies during the period and beyond (including John Milton's *Lycidas*), and it connotes both a practiced action of mourning and a more private one. The word recalls Steven Mullaney's theorization of "the rehearsal of cultures," in which English court culture exhibited and staged "strange"

cultural events and artifacts, not with the intention of preserving them but with the "paradoxical" intention to erase or overwrite them.[5]

My use of "rehearsal" will draw from Mullaney's understanding of the term. However, while he views "rehearsals" as rewriting cultural histories, I view "rehearsals" as a recasting or re-envisioning of a deceased poet's place within the surviving poetic community. I will also follow the cue of early modern writers who signal the capaciousness of "rehearsal," particularly as it appears in works of mourning. Then, as now, "rehearsal" had two primary meanings: first, "[t]he action or fact of recounting or reciting something, or of repeating something previously heard, written, or spoken..." and second, "A practice performance of all or part of a play or other work, in preparation for later public performance."[6] Pastoral elegists in Renaissance England combine these two definitions and include a third one related specifically to the "hearse" in funeral elegies. Sacks reminds us that the "hearse" served as a physical location for commemoration: "The original function of a funeral hearse was … to serve as the coffin's cover or frame—a structure on which … demarcative offerings could be

[5] Steven Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988), 60 69. Mullaney, in "Chapter 3 The Rehearsal of Cultures," focuses on the restaged battle of Rouen, in which Brazilian culture is acted out, only to be demolished in a mock-battle, performed over two days: "in the two-day course of events at Rouen both representation and re-presentation, imitation and repeated performance, conspired to achieve a paradoxical end: not the affirmation of what was thus represented and repeated, but its erasure or negation" (69). The mock-battle leads to Mullaney's conception of "rehearsal": "What we glimpse in the field outside Rouen is not a version of the modern discipline of anthropology, but something preliminary to it; not the interpretation, but what I would call the *rehearsal* of cultures … A rehearsal is a period of free-play during which alternatives can be staged, unfamiliar roles tried out, the range of one's power to convince or persuade explored with some license; it is a period of performance, but one in which the customary demands of decorum are suspended, along with expectations of final or perfected form" (69).

[6] "rehearsal, n." 1a, 2a. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

affixed."[7] In the poems that I will consider in this chapter, there is a deliberate gesture to "re-hearse," or to make new poetic and commemorative offerings in the place of those that previously adorned the hearse. To "re-hearse" in the context of a pastoral elegy becomes a strategy to recast or re-envision the deceased, often according to a new mythology. From Watson's "An Eclogue upon the Death of Sir Francis Walsingham" in 1590, to Spenser's "A Pastoral Elegy upon the Death of … Sir Philip Sidney" in 1595, through to the various elegies for Elizabeth published in 1603, the mourning poet continually re-hearses the deceased. Often these spirited rehearsals are presented to the public very much after the fact: Spenser, for example, first publishes his collection of elegies for Sir Philip Sidney nearly 10 years after his death.

As it follows the Elizabethan pastoral elegy, my argument will employ various connotations of "rehearsal," focusing especially on moments of emulation, contest, and succession. The first section of the chapter will look at the translated pastoral elegies found in the eclogues of Virgil in order to highlight the emulous tendencies that get taken up later by the English elegists. The second section will provide Watson's and Spenser's responses to earlier elegies (including Virgil's), outlining how both Watson and Spenser exert an organizing control over their respective poems. The third section will read three pastoral elegies following Elizabeth's death, "The Lamentation of Melpomene" (1603), "Englandes Mourning Garment" (1603), and "An Elegie vpon the death of the high and renowned Princesse, our late Soueraigne Elizabeth" (1603). The last section will begin with a look at how the poets invoke and speak back to earlier pastoral elegies of Spenser,

[7] Sacks, *English Elegy*, 19.

Watson, and Virgil. The main question this final chapter seeks to answer is, What does it mean for a poet to rehearse/re-hearse a pastoral elegy in Elizabethan England? My focus on the surviving poet, and on his strategies for finding consolation in both praise and contest, suggest that emulation was an integral part of mourning the deceased.

Like earlier chapters, this final one will pose corollary questions that pertain to gender and sexuality: how are female shepherds ventriloquized by their male authors? How is a woman, in the masculine space of the eclogue, praised differently? And, how is the female monarch rehearsed? After the first section establishes some of the eclogic tropes that are imported into the pastoral elegy, the second section of this chapter will question what it signifies when a male poet speaks in the guise of a woman (or a female mourner). Specifically, Spenser writes the relationship between Sidney's muse, Stella, and sister, Clorinda, in emulous terms: the former finds consolation in the transcending image of a flower "both red and blew," while the latter speaks of Sidney as a flower "deface[d]" and "cropt." Then, the third section will consider how a monarch, Elizabeth I, is mourned, and how consolation for her death is sexualized: the image of James as a "manly king," potent and fertile, serves as consolation incarnate for the queen and her "mayden[ly]" qualities.

I Virgil among the Elizabethans

While the pastoral elegy becomes a literary form in its own right during the English Renaissance, the versifying of shepherds mourning other shepherds derives primarily from the idyll and the eclogue, especially those of Theocritus and Virgil. The pastoral elegy is a convention that presents the speaker in (at least) two relationships: the

speaker's relationship with the deceased and the speaker's relationship with other mourners. To demonstrate how both these relationships accord with the emulous terms of fellowship espoused in this dissertation, this section will read the speaker's relationship with the deceased in Virgil's tenth eclogue and the speaker's relationship with other mourners in Virgil's fifth eclogue. Virgil's tenth and fifth eclogues present two early examples of how the speaker negotiates life after the death of the deceased, as both a moment of mourning and as a potential opportunity.

There are various moments of emulous fellowship that get staged in Virgil's tenth eclogue, perhaps none so pre-eminently as the speaker's relationship with the deceased, Cornelius Gallus. In Virgil's tenth eclogue, entitled by Abraham Fleming, "The tenth and last Eclog of the mad loue of Cornelius Gallus," Virgil's speaker provides both a highly personalized, loving account of his deceased companion, while he also signals at the speaker's careerist intentions. Fleming quickly conflates speaker and poet in the argument—"In this eclog the poet *Virgill* himselfe is the onely speaker"[8]—and then proceeds to take liberties in his translation that align the speaker of the eclogue with its poet.[9] Other parts of Fleming's argument suggest that such a personalization of the form is what distinguishes Virgil's effort from those of his predecessor Theocritus, despite the fact that many recent scholars of Virgil, including Robert Coleman, outline the extent to

[8] Fleming, *The Bvcoliks (1589)*, 29.

[9] Fleming, *The Bvcoliks (1589)*, 31, makes the link between the speaker and the poet absolutely clear at the end of the eclogue: "O [ladies] you Pierides, it shalbe [now] enough / That [I] your poet [Virgill] haue these [foresaid sonnete] soong, / Whiles he sits still." Square brackets in original.

which Virgil's eclogue "contains scarcely any echoes of Id[yll] 1," Theocritus's most famous pastoral elegy.[10]

The allegorizing of Gallus in shepherd terminology causes a moment of hesitation for Fleming, who writes, "In this last eclog the poet aduaunceth the loue of *Gallus*, but yet so, as that he swarueth not from the persons and comparisons of shepheards."[11] The mysterious conjunction "but yet so" connotes the complications, I think, that Fleming finds with Virgil's treatment of Gallus in the form of a shepherd. Gallus was "an excellent poet" too, as Fleming reminds his readers, and Gallus had also procured political favour, being "so familiar with Caesar, and likewise so favoured of him."[12] What does it mean to cast someone as a shepherd, even a fellow shepherd, just before declaring one's intentions to move out and beyond the shepherdly landscape onto grander forms? One of the first gestures that the speaker makes in the tenth eclogue, while casting Gallus as a shepherd, is to urge him to not be ashamed:

> For Gallus being vnderneath a solitarie rocke,
> And round about him stand the sheepe[c] ne shames at them of vs,
> Nor let it shame thee poet great of cattell and of sheepe.[13]

Fleming's note "c," superscripted in the quotation following "sheepe," points to a marginal gloss that explains the passage as "The sheepe are glad of vs, we be not ashamed of sheepe, or to keepe of sheepe." This marginal gloss includes the possessive

[10] See Coleman, *Eclogues*, 295.
[11] Fleming, *The Bvcoliks (1589)*, 29.
[12] Ibid.
[13] Ibid., 30.

pronouns "vs" and "we" that implicate Virgil, the speaker, and Gallus into a community that of shepherds.[14]

The poem stages moments of affection between the shepherds alongside the larger gesture of the speaker leaving the eclogue form altogether. Virgil sets the poem in motion as though it were a funeral procession that depicts the speaker moving from a place of mourning to one of reconciliation. Over the course of the tenth eclogue, one notes the invocation of an altered pastoral landscape,[15] a procession of mourners, a ventriloquized passage,[16] and finally a poet moving beyond the immediate grieving space of the eclogue.[17] Each of these particular tropes, and the varied ways in which subsequent poems invoke each step, adds to the tradition of the pastoral elegy. Each new pastoral elegist places himself within a larger progression of poets, and one is reminded of T.S. Eliot's figuration of a literary tradition: "The existing monuments form an ideal order among themselves, which is modified by the introduction of the new (the really new) work of art among them."[18] English poets will position themselves within the Virgilian tradition while simultaneously attempting to compete with or supplant English predecessors and contemporaries.

[14] Ibid.

[15] One such instance of an altered pastoral landscape in Fleming, *The Bvcoliks*, 30: "yea euen the bayes beewaild & mon'd my Gall, / So did the shrubs and bushes lome."

[16] Fleming, translating Virgil, describes a procession of mourners who come to visit Gallus, including Adonis, Menalcas, Apollo, Lycoris, and Syluanus, and even "God Pan of *Arcadie,"* before the speaker ventriloquizes Gallus in a lengthy soliloquy, which begins, "… o you *Arcadians* [all,] / Who are alone the cunning men to sing [my wretched case] / O then how soft [and all at ease] my bones should take their rest (30). These opening lines of the soliloquy, which demarcate precisely who may sing for Gallus, constitute one more instance where the poem acknowledges its public function: early in the poem, the speaker affirms that "we sing not to the deafe" since "The woods doo answere euery thing" (29), an image that echoes the opening five lines of Virgil's first eclogue.

[17] Following Gallus's ventriloquized song about love, time, and his own impending death, the speaker in Virgil's tenth eclogue ends his song and leaves the space of mourning. See note 9 in this chapter.

[18] T.S. Eliot, "Tradition and the Individual Talent," in *Selected Essays* (New York: Harcourt, 1950) 5.

The processional movement of the pastoral elegy serves as a means for the speaker to envision himself progressing beyond the altered landscape that confronts him, and such a progression (or procession) is depicted as both physical and psychological: in Virgil's tenth, the weeping/altered landscape must be made right and concordantly the speaker must reconcile himself to his own loss. The particulars of Gallus's song, as well as the seemingly disparate voices in the eclogue, have been subject to varied interpretation—an early view, for example, was that Virgil was directly referencing and showcasing Gallus's own work in ventriloquizing him, though such a biographical view has been debunked by more recent critics.[19] Ultimately, the specifics of the Virgil/Gallus relationship are less important to later English iterations of the pastoral elegy than its broader contours; as the pastoral elegy gets taken up in the English Renaissance, the Virgilian model is crucial to developing a text of mourning that is very much aware of its public and careerist implications, while also signalling mourning and camaraderie.

Elizabethan pastoral elegies will borrow from Virgil's fifth eclogue as much as from his tenth, in no small part because the fifth eclogue positions the pastoral elegy more directly within the realm of contest. In Virgil's fifth eclogue, two countering pastoral elegies are composed over the death of Daphnis: Mopsus argues that the pastoral landscape grieves for Daphnis while Menalcas suggests that the landscape rejoices because Daphnis has become a god. One might read emulous fellowship in the speaker's ventriloquization of Gallus or in how the speaker's song seems to go above and beyond the other mourners in the poem (such as Apollo, Pan, *et al*.) in Virgil's tenth eclogue; in

[19] Gian Biagio Conte, "An Interpretation of the Tenth *Eclogue*," in *Vergil's Eclogues* ed. Katharina Volk *(Oxford Readings in Classical Studies)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 216-7.

Virgil's fifth eclogue, emulous fellowship is apparent from the outset since the pastoral elegies are sung within the convention of the singing contest. Accordingly, in his argument for the eclogue, Fleming writes that,

> Two shepheards, both freends, and the one elder, the other younger, are presented vnto vs in this eclog singing avy, or in course and turnes, wherevpon the poet taketh occasion to write an epitaph or funerall verse, which doth wholy comprise an allegorical meaning.[20]

The word "avy" in "singing avy" means to sing "[i]n rivalry or emulation" and dies out, according to the OED, around the time of the English civil wars.[21] This capacious phrase "singing avy" recalls the contests analyzed in the second chapter of this dissertation, and the shepherd "freends," one elder (Menalcas) and one younger (Mopsus), would fit well with the master/pupil relationships analyzed in the first chapter of this dissertation.

By analysing the contest in Virgil's fifth eclogue, one gains a better understanding of the methods through which poets utilize the pastoral elegy to vie for poetic supremacy. At first glance, Mopsus is sycophantic toward Menalcas's position as the elder: "O Menalc thou mine elder art, and therefore meet it is that I obey thee, whether we go into the shades."[22] However, Fleming may be off the mark when he suggests in the argument that Mopsus "giv[es] place to the first as to his elder,"[23] since the two shepherds oppose one another in at least three instances. In the first of three skirmishes, there is a jostle concerning who invites whom to the chosen location for the contest, whereby Mopsus attempts to alter the meeting location by suggesting that

[20] Fleming, trans., *The Bvcoliks (1589),* 12.
[21] "avy, n." OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.
[22] Fleming, trans., *The Bvcoliks (1589)*, 13.
[23] Ibid., 12.

perhaps the wind would make the contest better suited to a cave than the "shades" suggested by Menalcas.[24] Similar to power dynamics implied by the Marlovian "invitation to love" in chapter three, the two shepherds vie for who invites whom: Menalcas invites Mopsus to a certain location, and Mopsus's reply is to re-invite Menalcas to a new location.[25] After more banter around a potential competition between Mopsus and Amyntas, Mopsus brings up a second matter of contest.[26] Here the elder Menalcas attempts to assume the authoritative role when he requests that Mopsus "Begin thou first … to sing if thou haue any loue / Of Phyllis, or haue Alcons praise," but again Mopsus directly defies this request for a specific type of praise or love song: "Nay rather I will trie to sing the songs, which lately I / Wrote on the greene barke of a beech."[27] Whereas Menalcas assumes the authority to determine the parameters of what poetic form will be sung, Mopsus decides that the contest should be staged in a more austere mood than the songs of love and praise imply. Mopsus's ensuing pastoral elegy, sung in honour of his deceased master, earns Menalcas's praise, although Menalcas also seems to keep his praise meagre ("O Mops, thou luckie youth, / Thou shalt be now the next to *

[24] Schenck, in *Mourning,* focuses on how Mopsus matches wits on several occasions with Menalcas: "The master goatherd of Idyll I who finds the *locus* and determines which song Thyrsis will sing is irreverently parodied here by a very self-confident young herdsman who assumes the authority to make those choices himself" (42-3). My figuration supports Schenck and counters readings that focus on mutuality in the fifth eclogue, such as in Alpers, *What is Pastoral?*, 158.

[25] This reader cannot help but wonder if there is a deliberate nod in this fifth eclogue to Theocritus's fifth idyll, which depicts the younger shepherd attempting to alter his passive sexual position. See page 169 (note 44) in the previous chapter of this dissertation.

[26] Fleming, *The Bvcoliks (1589)*, 13 13. Further, Mopsus seems to undercut the comparison with Amyntas, made by Menalcas: "Me. Let *Amynt* all alone * striue with thee in [these] hils of ours, / Mo. What if the same [*Amynt*] should striue to conquer *Phebe* in singing?" (13).

[27] Fleming, trans., *The Bvcoliks (1589)*, 14. Schenck, in *Mourning,* suggests that the "greene barke" is a signal that "we are to look here for a new kind of pastoral poetry" (42).

him [the second I meane]").[28] Mopsus may be an initiate into the tradition of singing grander forms, though he has not supplanted his master ("him") quite yet. The divergent pastoral elegies that they sing further point to their "singing avy," since Mopsus and Menalcas's elegies vary in tone and in mourning strategy. The ending of this third and final contest depicts a gift exchange which signals the initiation of Mopsus into a higher poetic register, though such a progression is not without resistance or poetic jostling. Virgil's fifth eclogue makes explicit what was only implied in his tenth: mourning shepherds consider their elegies in contest with others as an initiative or self-actualizing process.

II *Meliboeus* and *Astrophel*

Published in 1590, Watson's *Meliboeus,* or as it originally appears, "An Eglogue upon the Death of Sir Francis Walsingham," uses tropes from both Virgil's fifth and tenth eclogues to signal emulous fellowship. Watson hints at the popularity of his pastoral elegy in his introduction, and he suggests that he has undertaken the task of translating *Meliboeus* from an earlier Latin version so that it can reach a wider audience: "many (rather affecting his praise, then my verse) haue requested and perswaded me to publish *Meliboeus* in English, for the more general vnderstanding thereof" (A2r).[29] While Watson's eclogue is ostensibly a bid both for patronage and for further inclusion within

[28] Note that Fleming, *The Bvcoliks (1589)*, 14, glosses the "*" in the margin as follows: "*Namely the poet Theocritus, whom Virgil imitateth in these pastorals."

[29] Thomas Watson, *An Eclogve Vpon the death of the Right Honorable Sir Francis Walsingham* (London, 1590). Henceforth, I will refer to this text in footnotes as *Meliboeus,* after its titular character and for clarity. The titling of the pastoral elegy as an "eglogve" accords with both the Virgilian reading provided above (see page 198 of this dissertation) and with the introduction of this dissertation, which suggests that "eclogue" connotes a dialogue in verse during Elizabethan England. See Congleton, *Theories*, 13-37 and page 39-45 of this dissertation.

the influential Sir Francis Walsingham circle (the deceased was a high-ranking member of Elizabeth's privy council), equally apparent is Watson's interest in positioning himself within a poetic tradition.[30] Right from the prefatory materials, Watson distances himself from certain poets and aligns himself with others. A few years prior to Watson publishing *Meliboeus,* Abraham Fraunce translated Watson's *Amyntas* to mixed reviews, and in the introductory materials of *Meliboeus* Watson clarifies that he is not keen on Fraunce's work: "And I interpret my self, lest Meliboeus in speaking English by any other mans labour, should leese my name in his chaunge, as my *Amyntas* did" (Av). Watson's first manoeuvres in the introduction to his elegy, in other words, are to signal its popularity, to court a patron, and to distance himself from poets who might "leese [his] name" to make inferior work.

Watson maps Arcadia directly onto England, and the different shepherds who appear in *Meliboeus* allude to historical counterparts: Watson explicitly writes that "I figure Englande in *Arcadia,* … Sir Francis Walsingham in *Meliboeus,* ... Master Thomas Walsingham in Tyterus, and my selfe in *Corydon*" (Av). While the eclogue sounds Virgilian notes throughout, it owes more to the contest of Virgil's fifth than it does to Virgil's tenth, and Watson gives Sir Francis Walsingham the name of the elder in Virgil's fifth. Corydon, Watson's speaker, is positioned in a friendly contest against Tityrus, Walsingham's son, and Tityrus reminds everyone that Corydon is both

[30] Dedicated to Lady Francis Syndey, the daughter of Walsingham, the elegy depicts an obsequious Watson seeking protection, though in significantly more muted style than Spenser in *The Shepheardes Calender*. In the dedication to *Meliboeus,* Watson writes, "Such as the translation is, I humblie offer it to your Ladiships protection, hoping it will be as favorablie redd and accepted, as it is affectionately written and presented" (A2R). See pages 125-30 of this dissertation for a discussion of Spenser's address to Sidney and Raleigh.

renowned and skillful: "(for eurie shepheard swaine / reports thee skilfull in a sacred verse)" (B2r). However, there are instances where a more adversarial bond is apparent between these two speakers, particularly in the frequency with which they interrupt one another's verse:

> [Corydon] O *Tityrus* thy plaint is ouerlong,
> here pause a while, at *Corydons* request:
> Of what is wanting in thy farfet song
> my moorning voice shall striue to tell the rest …
> [Tityrus] O let me interrupt thee yet once more,
> for who should more lament his losse then I,
> That oft haue tasted of his bounteous store,
> and knew his secret vertues perfectlie? …
> [Corydon] But *Tityrus* inough, leaue off a while:
> stop moorning springs, drie vp thy drearie eine,
> And blithlie intertaine my altred stile,
> inticd from griefs by some allure diuine (C1r, C1r, C2r)

Tityrus suggests at one point that he and Corydon "stand copartners," which foregrounds their shared, mutual interest in elegizing Walsingham but also hints at the actual contest in verse: one definition of "copartners" is to be equal in the context of a match.[31] The contest between Walsingham's son and Watson's speaker positions Watson's speaker as the victor.

The eclogue/elegy progresses from cursing the "envious heauens" (B2r) to finding consolation in Walsingham's apotheosis. Corydon's anger, early in the poem, is typical of the classical pastoral elegy,

> Let deadly sorrow with a sable wing,
> throughout the world go brute this tragedie:
> And let *Arcadians* altogether sing
> a woefull song agenst heauns tirannie (B2r)

[31] "copartner, n." 3. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

Watson's repeated use of the imperative "to let" recalls various definitions of the term that imply "granting permission," and one cannot help but think of James I's forthcoming translation of the book of Genesis: "And God said, Let there be light: and there was light."[32] Implied in this grand gesture is Watson's speaker calling to Arcadians "altogether" to follow his lead. When one recalls that the exodium specifies Arcadia as an allusion to England, Corydon's unifying call speaks to the English poetic community.

The "eclogue" includes multiple mourning voices and gestures to inclusivity, though it also continually foregrounds Corydon's point of view. Corydon dominates Tityrus in the latter portion of the elegy, when Corydon gives a speech that lasts for five of the final six pages (C2r-C4v). It is also Corydon who decides when the mourning ends: "But *Tityrus* inough, leaue of a while …. now at last our sorrows must be done, / and more then moorning reason must preuail" (C2r). Corydon apotheosizes Meliboeus, and in the spirit of moving beyond the process of grief, Corydon alters the elegy's prevailing refrain: "*Alas too soone by Destins fatall knife / Sweet* Meliboeus *is depriu'd of life*" into the uplifiting "*Let vs be ioifull after long annoie, / Since* Meliboeus *lius in perfect ioie*" (C2v). The saintly Walsingham will reside among the *Seraphins* and *Cherubins.* Tityrus speaks the final, short passage, praising Corydon's effort: "Thy learned persuades cōmand my sorrow cease, / and sweetnes doth allure to merriment" (C4v). The poem ends with its speakers finding consolation, and the final note of harmony resolves the moments of anger and grief found earlier in the poem.

[32] See "let, v1." 1. and especially 9. and 10. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

What is surprising and immediately noteworthy in this elegy is Corydon's short interlude, midway through the elegy, where he mourns Astrophell, whom the prefatory material identifies as (quite obviously) Sir Philip Sidney. Watson frames Sidney as "the mirrour of our time" (B2v) but primarily as a lauded warrior, the latter of which accords with many of the early attempts to elegize him following his death:

> Stout *Astrophell* incenst with sole remorse,
> resolu'd to die, or see the slaughter ceast:
> Then fenst with fire and sword, with manly force
> he made assalt vpon the furious beast.
> But of this tale teares downe the latter part:
> I must returne to *Meliboeus* fall,
> VVho mourning still for *Astrophils* depart,
> forsooke his friends, and lost himself withall. (B2v-B3r)

When Sidney died in 1586, his funeral procession encompassed much of London and cast Sidney as England's consummate courtier and war hero. As some commentators and biographers have pointed out, such a gesture was not without its overt politicization, and one Sidney biographer suggests that the relationship between Elizabeth and Sidney was less than harmonious—that perhaps Sidney's quick upward mobility was threatening to many of those close to Elizabeth.[33] And yet, when Sidney died in the Battle of Zutphen against Spanish forces—when he was shot and the gangrenous wound killed him within a month—all of England mourned. It is primarily in the spirit of a soldier that Watson frames Sidney here, and the intended connection with the main subject of Watson's elegy is both explicit and implicit: explicit in the sense that the deceased Walsingham was a "freend" of Sidney and was still in the process of mourning him, and implicit in the sense that Walsingham deserves to be mourned with the lavishness that Sidney was,

[33] See Stewart, *A Double Life,* 190 ff. See page 125 of this dissertation.

as a hero. Watson's attempt to link the two men attaches the posthumous legacy of Walsingham to the heroic Sidney, but there is also a clear implication that Watson's Corydon, by mourning Sidney too, places his own star within Sidney's poetic lineage. In other words, Watson's inclusion of a short elegy for Sidney betrays poetic aspirations and not only political ones.

Watson's invocation of Sidney pairs with another invocation late in the poem, again by Corydon, that calls upon Spenser. Corydon assumes the role of the master of ceremonies, despite Corydon's acknowledgement that Spenser is the "alderliest swaine":

> Yet lest my homespun verse obscure hir [excellency's] worth
> sweet *Spencer* let me leauve this taske to thee,
> Whose neuerstooping quill can best set forth
> such things of state, as passe my Muse, and me.
> Thou *Spencer* art the alderliesest swaine,
> or haply if that word be all to base,
> Tho are *Apollo* whose sweet hunnie vaine
> amongst the Muses hath a chiefest place (C3v-C4r)

Such homage makes clear Watson's attempt to position himself in the poetic line of Sidney and Spenser. But, when Watson begins to dictate what Spenser should say (and to whom), and when Watson seems to mourn through Spenser's voice, the elegy takes on a curious tone. I have quoted a rather long section, abridged in several instances, to illustrate:

> Therefore in fulnes of thy [Spenser's] duties loue,
> calme thou the tempest of *Dianaes* brest,
> VVhilst shee for *Melibaeus* late remoue
> afflicts hir mind with ouerlong vnrest.
> Tell hir forthwith (for well shee likes thy vaine)
> that though great *Melibaeus* be awaie:
> Yet like to him there manie still remaine,
> which will vphold hir countrie from decaie.
> First name *Damaetas*, flowre of *Arcadie*,
> whose thoughts are prudēt, & speech vertuous,

> VVhose looks haue mildnes ioind with Maiestie,
> whose hand is liberall and valorous …
> Then name old *Damon*, whom shee knows of old
> for such as *Nestor* was to *Graecians* guide:
> VVorth ten of *Aiax*, worth all *Craessus* guide: …
> Then name braue *AEgon*, that with ships defenc
> about our coast orespreds the *Ocean* plaines …
> Name *Mopsus, Daphnis, Faustus*, and the rest
> whose seurall gifts thy singing can expresse (C4r-v).

Watson's Corydon signals, according to one critic, the "distinguished courtiers Spenser was busily appending to the Faerie Queene."[34] Watson is positioning himself within Spenser's coterie and establishing himself as an influential voice, dictating to Spenser what and who should be included in the mourning process; like Virgil's speaker in the tenth eclogue, Watson dictates and enumerates the various mourners. Further, when one reads the one-hundred-line instructions to Spenser and then considers this in light of the Virgilian precedent where the speaker of the tenth eclogue ventriloquizes Gallus, there seems to be both homage and presumption. Spenser's response (or lack thereof) is to not include Watson in the dedicatory sonnets to the *Faerie Queene* (1590). Of this omission, Thomas Nashe, in *Pierce Pennilesse,* does "most highlie … accuse thee [Spenser] of forgetfulness" to allow "so speciall a Piller of Nobilitie [to] pass unsaluted."[35]

In 1595 when Spenser re-hearses Sidney in William Ponsonby's book, Colin serves as the opening elegist within a curated collection of elegies from Sidney's fellows, and there is a recasting of Sidney's life and public image, one that seems to acknowledge

[34] David Hill Radcliffe, ed., *An Eclogue Upon the Death of Sir Francis Walsingham (1590)*, http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?textsid=104 (accessed 20 February 2017).

[35] See Thomas Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse his Supplication to the Divell* (1592), on the website *English Poetry 1579-1830: Spenser and the Tradition,* ed. David Hill Radcliffe, http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?action=GET&textsid=32768 (accessed 9 November 2017).

earlier instances of praise, such as Watson's depiction of Sidney in *Meliboeus*, while distinguishing the posthumous Sidney from earlier, heroic portrayals.[36] The poems of *Astrophel* in William Ponsonby's book do not form a proper sequence, since they were written at different times and for different audiences, but Spenser presents these poems in dialogue with his own poem that fronts the collection. As Ralphael Falco argues, Spenser presents the genealogy as naturally naming himself the heir apparent.[37] The formation of a community around the *Astrophel* collection is often invoked in communal terms, as Dennis Kay's study of the poems exemplifies, though one might also view it in more emulous terms in accordance with the collection's eclogic roots.[38] Certainly, several other commentators on the Sidney/Spenser relationship, as I've outlined in my second chapter, have viewed the two master poets in less than congenial terms.[39] Right from the beginning of the opening elegy, Spenser gives diluted praise to Astrophel's heroic exploits, which contrasts with the resounding praise he gives to poetry and to its shepherd singers. In Spenser's elegy it will be shepherds who find Astrophel, who carry his hearse, and who sing him into posterity in the collection. If Sidney strayed from his

[36] While Sidney is portrayed in largely heroic terms in his early elegies (until 1590), there are some exceptions, including Drayton's fourth eclogue, which calls Sidney by the name Elphin: "Oh Elphin, Elphin, Though thou hence be gone, / In spight of death yet shalt thou live for aye, / Thy Poesie is garlanded with Baye: / And still shall blaze / Thy lasting prayse: / Whose losse poore shepherds ever shall bemone." For this text and others in Drayton's eclogue collections, see Michael Drayton, "*Eclogue Four,*" http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?action=GET&textsid=32778 (accessed 20 February 2017).

[37] See Falco, *Conceived Presences*, 40-8. Fallon echoes Falco in "Astrophil,": "But its [Spenser's collection of Sidney elegies] more powerful effect is the articulation of a living, practicing community of poets under the aegis of Sidney and the organizing control of Spenser" (201).

[38] Dennis Kay, *Melodious Tears: the English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1990) 65-6, suggests Spenser's central role in the creation of a poetic community later in the century.

[39] Some critics who read archaism in early modern English literature consider the bond between Spenser and Sidney as more contentious. See Munro, *Archaic Style*, Nicholson, *Uncommon Tongues*, and page 104 (note 3) of this dissertation.

poetic enterprise to pursue martial fame, a troupe of shepherds led by Spenser will return, or rehearse, Sidney to his proper resting place among his versifying kindred. Spenser espouses a mourning strategy that includes and foregrounds fellow poets as integral to the process of achieving poetic fame.

Despite using the courtly name "Astrophel" that is associated with Sidney's sonneteer persona, Spenser mythologizes Sidney as a shepherd, writing right from the outset that Sidney was "A gentle shepheard borne in Arcady, / Of gentlest race that ever shepheard bore" (ll. 19-20).[40] This invocation reiterates the common trope of casting the deceased as a fellow shepherd, but it also seems to at least partly go against Sidney's self portrayal, since Sidney in the latter part of his young life distanced himself from his most shepherdly persona, Philisides (as evidenced by a reduction of the Philisides poems in the *New Arcadia*).[41] While Spenser's title refers to Sidney the soldier—"A Pastorall Elegie Upon the Death of the Most Noble and Valorous Knight, Sir Philip Sidney"— the opening of Spenser's elegy spends much time going over the more humanist values of Sidney as well as his athletic prowess. Spenser praises Sidney's "wrestling nimble" (l. 91), "renning swift" (l. 91), "shooting steddie" (l. 92), and "swimming strong" (l. 92), and the bulk of these and other compliments of physicality—with the possible exception

[40] References to Spenser's elegy will be in-text and by line number. See Edmund Spenser, *The Complete Poetical Works,* ed. R.E. Neil Dodge (Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1908), Bartleby.com 2010, http://www.bartleby.com/153/108.html (accessed 20 October 2017).

[41] William A. Ringler, Jr., ed. *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962) 378-82. Ringler chronicles the changing poem sections of the different versions of the *Arcadia*, focusing especially on the standard *Old Arcadia*, the 1590 publication, and the 1593 publication. Ringler notes how Sidney has "revised his fictional self-portrait" in such a way that allowed him to tranfer three poems in the *Old Arcadia* to other characters (378). For a political reading of the significant changes found in the evolving text, see Richard McCoy, *Sir Philip Sidney: Rebellion in Arcadia* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1979). See also the introduction to Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The New Arcadia)*, ed. Victor Skretkowicz (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

of "shooting steddie"—seem to allude to a shepherdly rusticity, or "all the sports that shepheards are emong" (l. 94).

Spenser suggests that Sidney oversteps by serving Elizabeth as a soldier in the Low Countries, where Sidney played "that perilous game" (l. 109). Spenser portrays Sidney as misguided in his career choice, a fact further highlighted by Spenser's own views on the pre-eminence of a poetic career.[42] Thus, it is significant that the shepherds in the poem, and not the soldiers, are those who come to Astrophel's aid. Following Sidney's narrativized death in the poem, in an account that receives more stanzas than do his martial exploits, Spenser poses the rhetorical question: "where were ye this while, his shepherd peares, / To whom alive was nought so deare as hee?" (ll. 145-6). The question is not posed to Sidney's comrades in arms, and the implication is that Sidney's unfortunate death would have been best prevented before ever leaving for battle. Spenser suggests that Sidney's talents may have been employed at home, in England: "What need perill to be sought abroad, / Since round about us it doth make aboad?" (ll. 107-8).

In Spenser's elegy, when Sidney's gored body is physically removed from the place of war and brought back to the pastoral setting, it mirrors Sidney's return to England and his upraising by a community of writers. Indeed, the elegy's focus on a community of shepherds recuperating Sidney calls attention to the very process that Spenser is undertaking:

> They [the shepherds] stopt his wound (too late to stop it was)
> And in their armes then softly did him reare:
> Tho (as he wild) unto his loved lasse,
> His dearest love, him dolefully did beare.

[42] See Helgerson, "The New Poet Presents Himself."

> The dolefulst beare that ever man did see
> Was Astrophel, but dearest unto mee (ll. 163-8).

As Ralphael Falco, Peter Sacks, and Samuel Fallon all note in various ways, Spenser invokes himself as the organizing principle around which the mourners—"a sort of shepheards" (l. 157)—take place. For one, such a passage responds to the speaker's earlier consternations, where he asks "Ah where were ye this while his shepheard peares, / To whom aliue nought so deare as hee" (ll. 145-6)? The trope of asking rhetorical questions such as these will be echoed by Milton's *Lycidas*, though, in contrast to Milton, Spenser's community of shepherds continually reappear in the poem during crucial moments after Astrophel's death:[43]

> And euery one did make exceeding mone,
> With inward anguish and great grief opprest:
> And euery one did weep and waile, and mone,
> And meanes deviz'd to shew his sorrow best (ll. 223-6).

That the songs of grief would become something of a contest, as a "meanes deviz'd to shew his sorrow best," recalls not only the procession of mourners in Virgil's tenth eclogue, but also the contest of pastoral elegies contained in his fifth eclogue. Further, such an emulous framing accords with Spenser's earlier invocation, quoted above, that Sidney was loved by many "but dearest unto mee."

Instead of ventriloquizing Sidney as Virgil ventriloquized Gallus, Spenser speaks through two competing female mourners. The main competition of Spenser's eclogue is not between the various shepherds who have helped Sidney return home, but between Stella and Clorinda. The two female mourners are competing over how to mourn

[43] See Milton, *Lycidas*, ll. 50-1.

Sidney's death and find consolation. Stella's chosen method of consolation is to envisage that Sidney and herself will be transformed into a flower "that is both red and blew" (l. 202), one that was formerly called Starlight or Penthia, but that should henceforth be entitled Astrophel. In the Clorinda passage, which is purported to be a ventriloquization of the Countess of Pembroke, Spenser makes a link with the earlier passage and with the earlier method of mourning: "The fairest flowre in field that ever grew / Was Astrophel; and was, we all may rew" (l 263-4). After invoking the image set forth by Stella, however, Clorinda pushes the flower metaphor to its logical conclusion, as the flower, she suggests, is ultimately "deface[d]" (l. 262), "cropt" (l. 266), and "gone to ashes" (l. 273). The final, unanswerable question points toward the inadequacy of the metaphor: "VVhat is become of him whose flowre here left / Is but the shadow of his likenesse gone?" (l. 291-2). Instead, Clorinda does away with Stella's image of metamorphosis to sublimate the image of Sidney as a "new-borne babe" who is but wrapped in flowers (l. 303). Even the careful psychoanalytic reading of Peter Sacks cannot help but note that Clorinda's mourning tops Stella's mourning.[44] At the end of the Clorinda passage, Spenser presents a deliberate moment of ambiguity around who is speaking: "Thus do we weep and waile, and wear our eies, / Mourning in others, our owne miseries" (ll. 329-30). The phrasing of "mourning in others" points both to mourning other people (in death) and to using other people (through ventriloquization) to mourn.

The end of the Clorinda passage signals at a literary coterie in a way that solicits speculation; like the anonymous author of *The Shepheardes Calender* or its commentator

[44] Sacks, *English Elegy, 4*2.

E.K., Spenser's *Astrophel* hints at an exclusive, knowing coterie that surrounds the deceased poet. Clorinda's introduction by the speaker— "Which least I marre the sweetnesse of the vearse, / In sort as she it sung, I will rehearse" (ll. 233-4)—suggests that Spenser is recalling her very words. However, the secondary meaning of "rehearse" calls attention to the larger ceremony, whereby the staging of Clorinda's song becomes a larger spectacle. Here, as in the final portion of the elegy, Spenser pilots the rehearsal, and one is again reminded of the "dolefulest beare" that the shepherd-poets adorn with verse. On one hand, it might appear that Spenser is expanding the purview of the pastoral elegy to include female mourners. On the other hand, the fact that such a preeminent literary patron (Clorinda, Sidney's sister) should win the contest diminishes the subversive potential of the passage.

In the elegies that immediately follow Spenser's opening effort, Spenser retains a controlling presence. After Stella and Clorinda have presented their respective elegies, the procession continues, and Spenser serves as master of ceremonies for the next singer, Lodowick Bryskett as Thestylis:

> Which when she [Clorinda] ended had, another swaine,
> Of gentle wit and daintie sweet device,
> Whom Astrophel full deare did entertaine,
> Whilest here he liv'd, and held in passing price,
> Hight Thestylis, began his mournfull tourne,
> And made the Muses in his song to mourne (ll. 331-6).

Spenser's integrates Lodowick Bryskett's poem so that it appears to address the tropes used by Spenser, despite the fact that Bryskett wrote "The Mourning Muse of Thestylis" in 1587, years before Spenser composed his elegy. Bryskett structures his elegy around an invocation to Mars, and Sidney's heroic virtues are extolled:

> Thou hast in Britons valour tune delight of old,
> And with thy presence oft vouchsaft to attribute
> Fame and renowne to vs for glorious martial deeds.[45]

While some critics may view Bryskett's martial figuration of Sidney as complementary to Spenser's shepherdly figuration, the two poems might also be read in more emulous terms.[46] One might give more attention to the other areas of considerable overlap: like Spenser, Bryskett likens Sidney's death to the Venus and Adonis myth, ventriloquizes Stella, and presents the apotheosis of Sidney.

If Bryskett's first elegy appears in contest with Spenser's opening elegy, then Bryskett's second poem signals its deference to Spenser. Entitled "A pastorall Aeglogue vpon the death of Sir *Philip Sidney Knight, &*c.," Bryskett's contest between Lycon and Colin figures Colin as the leader, to whom Lycon will "second."[47] Eventually, Lycon decides to leave the burden to "beare" Sidney's hearse with Colin, Sidney's preeminent singer. Fred Tromly notes, further, that there are multiple allusions to Spenser's "November" eclogue (from *The Shepheardes Calender*) in Bryskett's second elegy but not in his first.[48] Bryskett's second elegy might even be understood as a rewriting of his earlier elegy in terms that more directly accord with the mythologizing tone of Spenser's

[45] Lodowick Bryskett, "The Mourning Muse of Thestylis," in *English Poetry 1579-1830: Spenser and the Tradition,* ed. David Hill Radcliffe, http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?action=GET&textsid=32810 (accessed 23 October 2017). No line numbers are provided in this edition.

[46] Kay, *Melodious Tears,* 62, views Spenser's omission of Mars as "Spenser's artful framing" which "integrates Bryskett's poem so well that it appears to develop and expand."

[47] Lodowick Bryskett, "A Pastorall Aeglogue upon the Death of Sir Phillip Sidney Knight, &c.," in *English Poetry 1579-1830: Spenser and the Tradition,* ed. David Hill Radcliffe, http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?action=GET&textsid=32811 (accessed 23 October 2017). No line numbers are provided in this edition.

[48] Frederic B. Tromly, "Lodowick Bryskett's Elegies on Sidney in Spenser's *Astrophel* Volume" *The Review of English Studies* (1986) 386-7. Tromly writes that the internal evidence in the Bryskett's two poems suggests that one was composed prior to Spenser's *Astrophel* and the other was composed later. See also Kay, *Melodious Tears*, 64.

Astrophel (Bryskett's second elegy views Sidney in more poetic and companionate terms).

The movement from his earlier martial elegy (circa. 1587) to this most recent iteration (circa. 1595) with Spenser at the helm encapsulates the ethos of Spenser's *Astrophel* collection. The first poem presents "the poet's complaint to 'dreadfull *Mars,*'" while the second poem, with its eclogic framing, more directly locates Sidney within the pastoral tradition, with Spenser as heir apparent:

> Behold my selfe with *Colin*, gentle swaine
> (Whose lerned *Muse* thou cherisht most whyleare)
> Where we thy name recording, seeke to ease
> The inward torment and tormenting paine,
> That thy departure to vs both hath bred;
> Ne can each others sorrow yet appease.[49]

Lycon, representing Bryskett here, appears alongside Colin, "[w]hose lerned *Muse* thou cherisht most whyleare," and as "recording" Sidney's name. Recording is a resonant word to use, since it implies our current definition ("to relate, narrate, or mention in a written account") but also 1) "to learn by heart … to repeat and say over as a lesson or portion of memorized text, to recite" and 2) "Of a songbird (rarely of a person): to practise or sing (a tune) in an undertone … to produce subsong."[50] Spenser will speak of birds in the opening elegy, too, and Bryskett implies that he and Colin are singing the backup accompaniment to Sidney's leading voice. Similar to Spenser's opening elegy, Bryskett positions Sidney as the originator and Spenser as his most important follower or heir apparent.

[49] Tromly, "Lodovick Bryskett's Elegies," 388.
[50] "record, v." 1.a. 2. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

This process of rewriting Sidney's posthumous reputation, or of writing an elegy in 1587 and then another half a dozen years later, has the effect of rehearsing the dead in more ways than one. Spenser's last words in his elegy, which close out the two female mourners (Stella and Clorinda) while simultaneously looking ahead to Bryskett's two elegies and beyond, makes the link between hearse and rehearse explicit: [51]

> And after him full many other moe,
> As everie one in order lov'd him best,
> Gan dight themselves t'expresse their inward woe,
> With dolefull layers unto the time addrest.
> The which I here in order will rehearse,
> As fittest flowres to deck his mournfull hearse. (ll. 337-42)

Spenser's opening elegy serves to "re-hearse" Sidney into the poetic community that he is directing. Spenser will "rehearse" the elegies "in order," but what does he mean when he says that "everie one in order lov'd him best"? One recalls earlier lines in the poem, in which Spenser says of the shepherd community: "euery one did weep and waile, and mone, / And meanes deviz'd to shew his sorrow best" (ll. 225-6). A few years prior, Watson would attempt to sing through Spenser in the elegy for Walsingham, in a bid to be included in the growing poetic narrative surrounding these two Elizabethan poets. Spenser would deploy similar tactics, organizing a group of mourners around a central figure, ventriloquizing different mourners, signalling some poets while excluding others. Spenser's poem is also dedicated to Frances Walsingham, Sir Francis Walsingham's daughter. Despite these various moments of overlap, Thomas Watson was not a part of Spenser's community in *Astrophel*. Sir Philip Sidney's death provided the occasion for

[51] Similar to Bryskett, Drayton writes an elegy for Sidney in his fourth eclogue, several years prior to Spenser, then rewrites his elegy many years later when he republishes his pastoral. See Kay, *Melodious Tears,* 74-75.

Elizabethan poets to engage one another in competing elegies. Both Spenser's and Watson's bids betray the hopes of their writers to be considered not only the organizing presence of Sidney's elegiac rehearsals but also his direct literary successor.

III "A Mayden-Queene, and now a manly King"

The three elegies for Queen Elizabeth in this final section depict how poets continued to deploy the pastoral elegy as an occasion for social and, especially, poetic advancement after the Queen's death. The elegies that this section considers, "The Lamentation of Melpomene" (1603) by T.W., "Englandes Mourning Garment" (1603) by Henry Chettle, and "An Elegie vpon the death of the high and renowned Princesse, our late Soueraigne Elizabeth" (1603) by John Lane all attempt to a) position their speakers as the leaders, and b) associate themselves with poets from the recent past, including Sidney and Spenser.[52] The most surprising similarity between the three, however, is their underlying assumption that the accession of James is consolation incarnate for Elizabeth's death. While the sycophantic upraising of James may not be surprising, the "re-hearsing" of Elizabeth recasts her image in decidedly "mayden[ly]" and even incestuous terms. In this section, I look at moments of intertextuality between the three elegies before turning to their contesting claims to praise James's accession. I finish the

[52] Henry Chettle, *England's Mourning Garment: Worne heere by plaine Shepheards, in memorie of their sacred Mistresse, Elizabeth* (London: for Thomas Millington by Walter Burre, 1603); John Lane, "An Elegie vpon the death of the high and renowned Princesse, our late Soueraigne Elizabeth" (London: for John Deane, 1603); T.W. *The Lamentation of Melpomene, for the death of Belphaebe our Late Queene. With a Ioy to England for our blessed KING* (London: by W.W. for C.K., 1603). Henceforth, all citations for these three books will appear in text. I am indebted to Kay, *Melodious Tears*, for pointing me to these elegies. The most comprehensive study of the extensive list of elegies for Elizabeth is in Catherine Loomis, *The Death of Elizabeth I: Remembering and Reconstructing the Virgin Queen* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010).

dissertation with a glance at the upraising of the poet figure alongside the monarch, propelled together into the future.

All three elegies stake claims to poetic authority through combative associations with their immediate literary communities, real and imagined. John Lane's "An Elegie" begins by casting its speaker standing amongst "euery Cuckoe [who] learnes to tune a note" (A2r), and Lane is quick to invoke his Muse:

> Mine infant *Muse* begins but now to creepe,
> Yet loe, already learnde to weepe
> To weepe for her, from whose vntimely death,
> (Vntimely borne) she borrowes all
> And early she learnes her prayses to rehearse,
> And with the fame of her immortall verse,
> A never dying life she may obtaine,
> And to her selfe a life of glory gaine (A2r-2v)

Over the course of this passage, the ambiguous "she" refers to both Elizabeth and to the Muse who is invoked to praise her. First, Lane's "infant Muse" grows mature in just three lines. Then, "her immortall verse" signals most directly the Muse's verses for Elizabeth while simultaneously invoking an image of the Muse's (and, by extension, the poet's) poetic output. By the closing lines, it is unclear who may "obtaine" the "never dying life." The logic of the argument points to Elizabeth, but, grammatically, "she" refers to the Muse of the poet. The simultaneous upraising of Elizabeth and of the speaker's "infant Muse," in other words, is hinted at from the outset.

Henry Chettle's "Englandes Mourning Garment" foregrounds its own poetic mission against a group of inadequate mourners, though instead of Lane's "[c]uckoe[s]" who surround the speaker, Chettle finds "beasts accurst, with grosest flattery nurst"

(n.p.).[53] Specifically, in a lengthy litany of the various poets who have either failed to sing for Elizabeth or failed to sing properly, Chettle singles out a few poets, addressing them in the imperative:

> Prove not ingrate to her that many a time
> Hath stoopt her Majestie, to grace your rime.
>
> And thou that scarce hast fligd thy infant Muse,
> (I use thine owne word) and commend thee best,
> In thy proclaiming James: the rest misuse
> The name of Poetry, with lines unblest;
> Holding the Muses to be masculine:
> I quote no such absurditie in thine.

I am the first critic to note that Chettle's "infant Muse" refers to John Lane's "infant Muse" in the passage quoted above. Further, in the passage by Chettle, "the rest" who "misuse[s] / The name of Poetry" by "Holding the Muses to be masculine" must refer to T.W., the poet of "The Lamentation of Melpomene" (the third elegy for Elizabeth that this section will consider).[54] Chettle's attack on the other poets' Muses is hardly surprising, since he stages a literary contest and consequently structures a community of shepherd-poets around emulous ideas of fellowship.

The attempts to "re-hearse" the Queen—to rewrite the terms in which she is mourned—through contest with other poets recalls Spenser's dominating presence in his collection of elegies for Sidney. Accordingly, one common trait among these three

[53] Note that Chettle's elegy does not contain clear or consistent pagination, and so I do not cite folio page numbers. T.W.'s and Lane's elegies, however, are cited by page number.

[54] In "The Lamentation of Melpomene," the poet casts himself as the preeminent shepherd who issues the rallying cry to "lament you shepherds" (l. 11) or to "conioyne" with the speaker in his mourning (l. 119). Melpomene specifically figures his role as one who must "awake[n]" the other mourning voices and who will sit among the Muses. In order to accord Melpomene's status as a capital-M Muse with his male gender, all the Muses are conceived to be male; the other muse mentioned by name, Terpscicore, is male and is one of the "brothers." Reconstituting the gender of the Muses appears to be an obvious bid for the speaker to serve as one of them.

elegists is their attempt to associate their poems with Spenser. Lane's "An Elegy" connects itself within the tradition that includes Spenser's Colin Clout: "Oh, come, and do her corpse with flowers embraue, / And play some solemne musicke by her graue, / Then sing her Requiem in some dolefull Verse, / Or do the songs of *Colin Clout* rehearse" (A3v). By 1603 Spenser's stamp on the pastoral elegy is irrefutable, and "rehearsing" Spenser, here, seems to imply something akin to recitation.[55] Chettle's "Englandes Mourning Garment" takes up Lane's request for others to "the songs of *Colin Clout* rehearse" by staging the entire elegy around a debate between two shepherds with Spenserian names, Colin and Thenot. Colin continually registers the apathy of the poetic community, and a recurring trope in Chettle's elegy is the exhortation to follow its lead.[56]

All three poems—T.W.'s "The Lamentation of Melpomene," Lane's "An Elegie vpon the Death," and Chettle's "Englandes Mourning Garment"—exaggerate their potential to serve as organizing forces for the community mourning Elizabeth. T.W.'s phrasing in "The Lamentation of Melpomene" encapsulates the larger arguments of all three:

[55] There is a lengthy invocation of weeping landscapes and corrupted flora and fauna, such as in the following: "Where Vines and Oliues, euermore were seene, / Vines euer Fresh, and Oliues euer greene: / With Brambles now and Briers ouer-cast" (A4v). The reference to the brier may harken to the "February" eclogue, and, later, Lane's illusion to November as another May could signal Spenser's multiple allusions to May in the "November" eclogue; for Spenser, "November" marks Queen Elizabeth's accession day (17 November 1558), which he links with May Games festivities.

[56] Chettle references, for example, "Coryn," "English Horace," "silver tongued Melicert," "Coridon," "sportive Musidore," "Quicke Antihorace" and "yong Moelibee thy frend." There are likely several contemporary obvious references, such as "English Albion" as Drayton ("Poly-Albion"), "silver tongued Melicert" as Shakespeare ("sing her Rape"). The urge for others to follow Chettle's lead is often framed in a way that does not directly place blame, rather as an abnegation of duties: "Nor doth one Poet seeke her name to raise, / That living hourely striv'd to sing her praise."

> Earthes soueraigne *Queene* is dead.
> Dead sure she is, imbalm'd, and wrapped in Lead:
> For this cause sorrow, and lament with mee;
> follow you after, Ile chiefe mourner be:
> My harts condolement shall excell you all,
> For it is made of Lyuer, more then Gall.
> Why, now you are compassionate I see,
> I weepe before, you after seconde mee,
> And now you sigh, your colours come and go. (Biiv)

"My harts condolement shall excell you all" speaks to the emulous tendencies inherent to the pastoral elegy as a convention and tradition, though T.W.'s careerism showcases sentiments that were more subtly stated in the pastoral elegies of Virgil, Watson, and Spenser. In Chettle's "Englands Mourning Garment," the two speakers attempt to act as master of ceremonies not only for the poetic community, but also for the entire funeral at large. Chettle's text finishes with a lengthy listing of the order and procession of Elizabeth's funeral, from "Pallace of Westminister called White-Hall" to "the Cathedral Church of Westminster," on the 28th of April, 1603, which positions the poem as an introduction to the larger ceremony. The list runs for several pages, with a listing of the funeral participants, such as,

> First, the Knight Marshals man, to make way.
> Next, the 240 poore women by foure and foure.
> Then, servants of Gentleman, Esquires, and Knights.
> Two Porters. Next, four Trumpetors.

Ultimately, each of these three elegists for Elizabeth attempts to signal his own importance, whether within the English poetic community, within London civic society, or both.

One feature of the contest between the three elegies is how to best praise James, and each poet depicts James as the consolation incarnate to Elizabeth's death.[57] T.W.'s "The Lamentation of Melpomene" follows the poet figure leaving his seat in Parnassus to dwell hermit-like among nature, which comprises nearly half of the elegy, and the poet is only convinced to return to Parnassus once he has been assured that there is an adequate successor:

> And know, the Fates haue seated in her place,
> Though not a Woman, yet of heauenly race,
> A goodly KING, to be earthe's Soueraigne:
> Which Iustice, Peace, and Vertue, will maintaine. (Biiii^{v})

The typography betrays T.W.'s distinction between "a Woman" and "A … KING," and the formerly corrupted pastoral landscape is made right again not through a completed cycle of mourning, but with James' accession. Henry Chettle frames the accession in seasonal imagery, including a "potent" king who propels the seasons forward:

> This ground wears all her best embrodery,
> To entertaine our Soueraignes Maiestie
> And well she may, for neuer English ground
> Bore such a Soueraigne as this Royall Lord

In this passage, Chettle's seasonal focus accords with multiple eclogues that highlight a springtime of flourishing growth.[58] The ground that "wears all her best embrodery" is cast in feminized terms and serves to "entertaine" the new king.

[57] In two of the elegies, James's ascension is reflected in the expanded titles. The first is T.W.'s "The Lamentation of Melpomene, for the death of Belphaebe our late Queene. With a Ioy to England for our blessed King" and the second is "Englands Mourning Garment … After which followeth the Shepheards Spring-Song, for entertainment of Kign Iames our most potent Soueraigne. Dedicated to all that loued the deceased Queene, and honour the liuing King."

[58] See, for example, the first eclogue of Barnabe Googe on pages 90-8 of this dissertation.

The elegy that most praises James's potency and fertility is Lane's "An Elegy." Lane figures James as "that rising Sunne, which from the North / Displayes his beames, and darts his glory foorth" (B2r) and an ensuing passage makes his virility clear:

> See how the Sunne for ioy of our good hap
> Raines showres of gold into his Lemans lap:
> See how the earth, to grace this ioyfull day,
> Attyres her selfe in all her best array,
> And paintes her coate with party colour'd floures,
> Dewd with the drops of sweet Rose-water shoures,
> that glistring gay and smelling sweete.
> All like a Queene she might her bridgerome meete" (B2r)

The imagery in this passage, where the earth "Attyres her selfe in all her best array" to accept the "showres of gold" from the Sun King, is directly likened to the meeting between "a Queene" and her "bridgerome."[59] But which queen? Whereas the "Queene" in the quotation above might imply Anne of Denmark, it is Elizabeth, the deceased "mayden-queen" (B1r), who is continually phrased in earthen imagery throughout the poem:

> Ah why should spightfull Nature hide away,
> So rich a treasure in the lowly clay.
> And burie in the bowels of the ground
> The rarest Iem the world had euer found? (B1r)

Right at the end of the elegy there are many metaphors that corroborate James's fertility and its importance for the proper succession of the throne:

[59] The imagery here of the sun raining "showres of gold" seems to connote male fertility, particularly with the earth gendered "her" and the sun "him," and the earth further referred to as a "Leman," which had a primary meaning of "A person beloved by one of the opposite sex; a lover or sweetheart; *occas.* a husband or wife" and secondly "Often used, in religious or devotional language, of Chirst, the Virgin, etc. *Obs.*" The final definition of "leman," of "one who is loved unlawfully" and "chiefly applied to the female sex" leaves it difficult to not see the image connoting mastery through fornication. "leman, n." 1a, 1b, and 2. OED Online. June 2017. Oxford University Press.

> Long may he [James] flowrish with his royall seed
> That from his loynes so fruitfully proceed (B3r)

And then,

> How happily before the change did bring
> A Mayden-Queene, and now a manly King …
> So shall his Realme, so shall his scepter flowrish,
> And that his Crowne, and this his kingdome nourish
> So honour still on vertue shall be grounded (B3v).[60]

Over the course of the elegy, Lane depicts Elizabeth less in princely, immortal terms, and more so in earthly, "Mayden[ly]" terms. Such a recasting, or re-hearsing, of Elizabeth by Lane (and also, to a lesser extent, by Chettle), circumscribes the Queen's body and denies her the gender amorphousness that she so often conjured over the course of her reign.[61]

In this final section of this final chapter, I want to finish by lingering for a moment on one consequence of figuring James as a) a shepherd, b) in the springtime, and c) ushering in the golden age. Casting James in these terms recalls not only eclogues that contain pastoral elegies (such Virgil's fifth and tenth eclogues) but a different eclogue altogether: Virgil's messianic fourth eclogue. Virgil's fourth eclogue celebrates a boy's

[60] Another elegy for Elizabeth that treats some of the themes I focus on here is Thomas Newton's "Atropoion Delion, OR, The death of Delia: With the Teares of her Funerall." Printed in London in 1603, Newton's elegy epitomizes the intention to put forth various voices, beginning with Castitas and Nymphae, but then moving on to Heroes, Mundus, Terra, Delos, Tempus, Clotho, Lachesis, Atropos, Natvra, Mors, Angeli, Fama, and then Cast it As. Toward the end of the elegy, Newton distinguishes between true and false mourners, "Many haue writ sad Elegies of woe: / But these true Mourners with her Funerall goe" (B2r).

[61] As Anne Somerset, in *Elizabeth I* (London: Anchor Publishing, 2003) puts it, "on virtually every occasion when she made a reference to what she once termed 'my sexly weakness,' she balanced this with a reminder of her supreme position within the state" (59). See also Elizabeth I, "Speech to the Troops at Tilbury," *The Norton Anthology of English Literature (6th Edition, Volume 1)* ed. M. H. Abrams (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1993) 999. For Elizabeth's allusion to herself as a shepherdly "milkmaid," see Elizabeth 1, *Collected Works*, eds. Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000, 169-70.

birth and subsequent coronation alongside a flourishing of an idealized spring landscape, both of which are indicative of a new "golden… time to come."[62] Most important for this dissertation, however, a prominent feature of Virgil's fourth eclogue is the upraising of the poet who will sing the new king's praises. Reading Fleming's translation of Virgil's fourth eclogue, one might wonder whether the speaker is more concerned with casting the new-born king or the poet that praises him into posterity:

> Behold how all things ioy at the same [golden] time to come.
> O that the last part of my life might last so long to me,
> My breath also, as might suffice to tell thine acts and deeds
> No *Orph* of *Thrace* should passe me then in [sweet melodious] songs,
> Nor *Linus* neither, though the mother of the one were by,
> And th'others father present too, *Calliope* the muse
> Is *Orpheus* mother, and of *Line Apollo* [father] faire.
> Though *Pan* should striue with me [in song] *Arcadia* being iudge,
> Euen *Pan* would say hee's ouercome, *Arcadia* being iudge.[63]

Immediately following the invocation of the "golden time" is a focus on the poet's preeminence in singing contests.[64] Virgil, despite the messianic and prophetic tone of the eclogue, outlines the integral (and emulous) role of the poet. According to Virgil, neither Orpheus nor Linus, both leaders in song and poetry, would overpass the speaker, and the onlooking Calliope and Apollo would not intervene either. The golden age does not preclude singing contests, and the battle with Pan in particular recalls the eclogue convention on which I focused in chapter two. As Virgil parallels the upraising of the

[62] Fleming, *The Bvcoliks (1589),* 12.

[63] Ibid. And, one last reminder that square brackets are found in original manuscript.

[64] The role of the poet in Virgil's fourth eclogue recalls the poet's similar role in the sixteenth idyll of Theocritus, in which the poetic speaker is upraised along with the king, Hiero. Of the idyll, the anonymous translator of *Sixe Idillia* suggests that, "[the speaker/Theocritus] reproueth the nigardise of Princes and great men, towards the learned, and namelie Poets, in whose power it is, to make men famous to al posterity" (A6r).

king and of the poet who sings for him, he also makes it clear that gods will emulate ("striue") with the poet and that the poet will win.

It should come as no surprise that Chettle and Lane both deploy imagery from Virgil's fourth eclogue that not only praises the king but that highlights the importance of the poet.[65] I want to make a last turn toward Edmund Spenser, who most explicitly calls attention to Virgil's fourth eclogue in his closing eclogue, "December:"

> A good olde shepherarde, *Wrenock* was him name,
> Made me by arte more cunning in the same.
> Fro thence I durst in derring doe compare
> With shepheards swayne, what euer fedde in field:
> And if that *Hobbinol* right iudgement bare,
> To *Pan* his owne selfe pype I neede not yield
> For if the flocking Nymphes did follow *Pan*
> The wiser Muses after *Colin* ranne" (ll. 41-8).

Colin's imagined contest with Pan resonates with the Virgilian speaker of eclogue four, with whom Pan did "striue … [in song] *Arcadia* being iudge." Colin signals his intention to leave the pastoral world of the *Calender* behind, though he does not sing for Calliope, the Muse of epic poetry—rather, the Muses chase after Colin. Over the course of the "December" passage quoted above, Colin's envisioning of his own poetic growth mirrors the progress of this dissertation: the passage begins with Colin being taught in grammar school by the shepherd "Wrenock," an allusion to his former schoolmaster Richard Mulcaster; next, the passage envisions Colin "compar[ing]" or emulating with "shepheards swayne, what euer fedde in field"; finally, the passage imagines Colin

[65] Not only does Chettle, in *Englandes Mourning,* reference the former "iron hand" of the Saxon and Danes which will be eventually supplanted by James's golden touch, but the idea that "this May excels all springs" resonates with the springtime imagery found throughout Virgil's fourth. It is worth noting the subtitle of the poem: "The Shepheards Spring-Song, in gratulation of the royall, happy, and flourishing entrance to the *Maiestie of* England, *by the most potent and* prudent Soueraigne." Finally, there are other specific references to Virgil's eclogue, such as the "birds" who "salute" the King.

defeating the "shepherds God," Pan, among a host of witnesses. Colin's self-assessment may appear wishful when the *Calender* is published in 1579, and yet it speaks to the extent to which Spenser envisioned the eclogue and its various relationships as constitutive of a poet's upraising in early modern England.

With its focus on the shifting relations between the master and pupil (chapter one), one contestant and another (chapter two), the seducer and the seduced (chapter three), and the surviving poet and the deceased (chapter four), this dissertation has depicted instances where poetic power and contest serve to recast formerly stable bonds into emulous ones. An emulous bond contains multiple valences—praising and adversarial, yes, but also imitative, sometimes erotic, occasionally envious. Shepherd-poets throughout Elizabethan England deployed these vacillating, emulous bonds in relation to a supposedly "low," youthful, and carefree literary form—the Elizabethan pastoral eclogue.

Bibliography

Alpers, Paul. *What is Pastoral?* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Arab, Ronda. *Manly Mechanicals on the Early Modern English Stage.* Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2011.

Aristotle. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Translated by George A. Kennedy. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Ascham, Roger. *The Schoolmaster* (1570). Edited by Lawrence V. Ryan. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967.

Bacon, Sir Francis. *The Essayes or Covnsels, Civill and Morall, of Francis Lo. Vervlam Viscovnt St. Alban.* London, 1625. EEBO.

Barclay, Alexander. *The Eclogues of Alexander Barclay from the Original edition by John Cawood*. Edited by Beatrice White. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.

Barthes, Roland. "Death of the Author." In *Image, Music, Text*, 142-8. London, Fontana, 1977.

Bate, W. Jackson. *The Burden of the Past and the English Poet*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Bates, Catherine. *Masculinity, Gender and Identity in the English Renaissance Lyric.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Battles, Dominique. *The Medieval Tradition of Thebes: History and Narrative in the Roman de Thebes, Boccaccio, Chaucer, and Lydgate.* New York: Routledge, 2004.

Berek, Peter. " 'Tamburlaine's Weak Sons': Imitation as Interpretation Before 1593." *Renaissance Drama* 13 (1982): 55-82.

Berger, Harry. "Mode and Diction in *The Shepheardes Calender*" *Modern Philology* 67, no. 2 (1969): 140-9.

Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Borlik, Todd A. *Ecocriticism and Early Modern English Literature*. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Borris, Kenneth, and George Klawitter, eds. *The Affectionate Shepherd: Celebrating Richard Barnfield.* Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2001.

Brinsley, John. *Ludus Literarius or the Grammar Schoole*. Edited by E. T. Campagnac. London: Liverpool University Press, 1917. PDF e-book.

Brinsley, John, trans. *Virgils Eclogues.* London, 1620. EEBO.

Bromley, James M. "'Let it Suffise': Sexual Acts and Narrative Structure in *Hero and Leander*." In *Queer Renaissance Historiography: Backward Gaze,* 67-84. Edited by Vin Nardizzi, Stephen Guy-Bray, and Will Stockton. London: Routledge, 2009.

Bruster, Douglas. " 'Come to the Tent again': 'The Passionate Shepherd,' Dramatic Rape and Lyric Time." *Criticism* 33, no. 1 (1991): 49-72.

Bryskett, Lodowick. "A Pastorall Aeglogue upon the Death of Sir Phillip Sidney Knight, &c." In *English Poetry 1579-1830: Spenser and the Tradition.* Edited by David Hill Radcliffe. http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?action=GET&textsid=32811 (accessed 23 October 2017).

-----."The Mourning Muse of Thestylis." In *English Poetry 1579-1830: Spenser and the Tradition*. Edited by David Hill Radcliffe. http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?action=GET&textsid=32810 (accessed 23 October 2017).

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. Edited by Holbrook Jackson and William H. Gass. New York: New York Review Books, 2001.

Bushnell, Rebecca. *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996.

-----. "Early Education." In *Elizabethan and Jacobean England*, 493-500. Edited by Arthur Kinney. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Carroll, Clare, and Andrew Hadfield, eds. *The Longman Anthology of British Literature: Fourth Edition.* New York: Longman, 2010.

Castelvetro, Lodovico, trans. *Aristotle's Art of Poetry. Translated from the Original Greek, according to Mr. Theodore Goulston's Edition. Together, with Mr. D'Acier's Notes Translated from the French*, ProQuest Literature Online (accessed 3 August 2017).

Castiglione, Baldassare. *Il Cortegiano.* In *The Norton Anthology of English Literature (Volume 1)*, 704-20. Edited by Stephen Greenblatt et al. W.W. Norton and Company, 2012.

Cavendish, Margaret. *A True Relation of My Birth, Breeding, and Life*. In *Paper Bodies: A Margaret Cavendish Reader,* 41-63. Edited by Sylvia Bowerbank and Sara Mendelson. Calgary: Broadview Press, 2000.

Cawdry, Robert. *A table alphabeticall conteyning and teaching the true writing, and vnderstanding of hard vsuall English wordes*. London, 1604. EEBO.

Clausen, W. *A Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Chapman, George. *The Georgicks of Hesiod: Translated Elaborately out of the Greek.* London, 1618. EEBO.

-----. *The Georgicks of Hesiod: Translated Elaborately out of the Greek.* London, 1618.

Chaudhuri, Sukanta. *Renaissance Pastoral and its English Developments*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.

Chaudhuri, Sukanta, ed. *Pastoral Poetry of the English Renaissance*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016.

Cheney, Patrick. " 'The Nightingale is Sovereigne of Song': the bird as a sign of the Virgilian orphic poet in *The Shepheardes Calender*." *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 21, no. 1 (1991): 29-57.

-----. *Spenser's Famous Flight*: *A Renaissance Idea of a Literary Career*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

-----. "Career Rivalry and the Writing of Counter-Nationhood: Ovid, Spenser, and Philomela in Marlowe's 'The Passionate Shepherd to his Love'." *ELH* 65, no. 3 (Fall 1998): 523-55.

-----. "Spenser's Pastorals: 'The Shepheardes Calender' and 'Colin Clouts Come Home Again'," *The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*, 79-101. Edited by Andrew Hadfield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Chettle, Henry. *England's Mourning Garment: Worne heere by plaine Shepheards, in memorie of their sacred Mistresse, Elizabeth*. London: 1603. EEBO.

Clausen, W. *A Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Cockeram, Henry. *The English dictionarie: or, An interpreter of hard English vvords.* London, 1623. EEBO.

Cody, Richard. *The Landscape of the Mind*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969.

Cohen, Stephen. "Between Form and Culture: New Historicism and the Promise of a Historical Formalism." In *Renaissance Literature and Its Formal Engagements*, 17-41. Edited by Mark David Rasmussen (New York: Palgrave, 2002).

Cohen, Stephen, ed. *Shakespeare and Historical Formalism*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2007.

Coleman, Robert. *Vergil: Eclogues.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Colón Semenza, Gregory M. *Sport, Politics, and Literature in the English Renaissance* Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003

Congleton, James Edmund. *Theories of Pastoral Poetry in England, 1684 – 1798*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 1952.

Considine, John. "Two Riddles by Sir Philip Sidney and Their Solutions." *English Language Notes* 41, no. 2 (2003): 32-6.

Conte, Gian Biagio. "An Interpretation of the Tenth *Eclogue.*" In *Vergil's Eclogues,* 216-44. Edited by Katharina Volk. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Cooper, Helen. "The Goat and the Eclogue." *Philological Quarterly* 53, no. 3 (1974): 363-79.

-----. *Pastoral: Medieval into Renaissance*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1977.

Crawford, Charles. "Richard Barnfield, Marlowe, and Shakespeare." In *Collectanea*, 1-18. Stratford-on-Avon: Shakespeare Head Press, 1906.

Crystal, David, and Ben Crystal. *Shakespeare's Words.* Toronto: Penguin Group, 2002.

De Certau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Translated by S. Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Dickson, Vernon Guy. *Emulation on the Shakespearean Stage*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2013.

Dolan, Fran. "One Head is Better than Two: The Aphoristic Afterlife of Renaissance Tragedy." In *Essays in Memory of Richard Helgerson,* 93-112. Edited by Roze Hentschell and Kathy Lavezzo. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2012.

Dolven, Jeff. *Scenes of Instruction in Renaissance Romance.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Donne, John. "Eclogue: 1613. December 26." In *Complete English Poems,* 134-6. Edited by C.A. Patrides and introduction by Robin Hamilton. Vermont: Everyman, 1994.

Dover, Kenneth. *Greek Homosexuality*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Drayton, Michael. "To my most dearely-loued friend Henery [sic] Reynolds." In *The Minor Poems of Michael Drayton.* Edited by Cyril Brett. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907. Online copy. http://www.luminarium.org/renlit/draytonofpoets.htm (accessed 25 June 2016).

Duckert, Lowell. "Fleece the Craziest Transport: Fleecing the Non/human *Merchant of Venice*." In *Shakespeare International Yearbook.* Edited by Tiffany Werth (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2015)

Eliot, T. S. "Tradition and the Individual Talent." In *Selected Essays,* 3-11. New York: Harcourt, 1950.

Elizabeth I. "Speech to the Troops at Tilbury." In *The Norton Anthology of English Literature (6th Edition, Volume 1),* 999. Edited by M.H. Abrams. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1993.

-----. *Collected Works*. Edited by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Elyot, Sir Thomas. *The dictionary of syr Thomas Elyot knyght*. London, 1538. EEBO.

-----. *The Book named The Governor*. Edited and introduction by S. E. Lehmberg. New York: Everyman's Library, 1962.

Elyot, Sir Thomas, and Thomas Cooper, *Bibliotheca Eliotae = Eliotes dictionarie the second tyme enriched, and more perfectly corrected, by Thomas Cooper, schole maister of Maudlens in Oxforde.* London, 1552. EEBO.

Empson, William. *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. Toronto: Clark, Irwin, and Co., 1930.

-----. *Some Versions of Pastoral*. New York: New Directions, 1974.

Enterline, Lynn. *Shakespeare's Schoolroom: Rhetoric, Discipline, Emotion.* Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Erasmus Reader*. Edited by Erika Rummel. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Ettin, Andrew V. *Literature and Pastoral*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.

Everton, Michael. “Critical Thumbprints in Arcadia: Renaissance Pastoral and the Process of Critique.” *Style* 35, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 1-16.

Falco, Raphael. “Instant Artifacts: Vernacular Elegies for Philip Sidney.” *Studies in Philology* 89, no. 1 (Winter, 1992): 1-19.

-----. *Conceived Presences: Literary Genealogy in Renaissance England*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994.

Fallon, Samuel. “Astrophil, Philisides, and the Coterie in Print,” *English Literary Renaissance* 45, no. 2 (2015) 175-204.

Fleming, Abraham, trans. *The Bucolikes of Publius Virgilius Maro*. London, 1575. EEBO.

Fleming, Abraham, trans. *The Bvcoliks of Pvblivs Virgilivs Maro, Prince of All Latine Poets; otherwise called his Pastoralls, or shepeherds meetings*. London: Thomas Woodcocker, 1589. EEBO.

Fletcher, John, and Philip Massinger. *The Prophetesse*. Edited by Paul Ellison. University of Exeter. http://people.exeter.ac.uk/pellison/BF/prophess/frameset.htm (accessed 3 August 2017).

Forsythe, R. S. “The Passionate Shepherd; and English Poetry.” *PMLA* 40, no. 3 (1925): 692-742.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, An Introduction: Volume 1*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.

Frye, Northrop. *The Anatomy of Criticism*. New Jersey: Princeton Press, 1957.

Gill, R. B. “The Renaissance Conventions of Envy.” In *Medievalia et Humanistica: Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Culture 9,* 214-30. Edited by Paul Clogan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Girard, René. *Deceit, Desire and the Novel*. Translated by Yvonne Freccero. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1965.

-----. *A Theatre of Envy.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Golding, Arthur trans. *Ovid’s Metamorphoses*: *The Arthur Golding Translation 1567,* Edited by John Frederick Nims. Philadelphia: Paul Dry Books, 2000.

Googe, Barnabe. *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes (1563).* Introduction by Frank B. Fieler. Gainesville, Florida: Scholars’ Facsimiles and Reprints, 1968.

-----. *Eclogues, Epitaphs, and Sonnets*. Edited by Judith M. Kennedy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

-----. "Egloga Prima." In *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* (1563). ProQuest Literature Online. Accessed 20 October 2017.

Gray, Erik. "Come Be My Love: The Song of Songs, 'Paradise Lost,' and the Tradition of the Invitation Poem." *PMLA* 128, no. 2 (2013): 370-85.

Green, Ian. *Humanism and Protestantism in Early Modern English Education*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009.

Greene, Robert. *Arcadia. Or Menaphon: Camillaes alarum to slumber Euphues in his melancholy cell at Silexedra*. London, 1610. EEBO.

Greene, Thomas M. *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.

Greg, W. W. *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1959.

Guy-Bray, Stephen. *Homoerotic Space: The Poetics of Loss in Renaissance Literature*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

-----. *Loving in Verse: Poetic Influence as Erotic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.

Haber, Judith. *Pastoral and the Poetics of Self-Contradiction: Theocritus to Marvell*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

-----. *Desire and Dramatic Form in Early Modern England*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Hadfield, Andrew. *Edmund Spenser: A Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Halperin, David. *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

Halperin, David. *100 Years of Homosexuality.* New York: Routledge, 1990.

Halpern, Richard. *The Poetics of Primative Accumulation*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Hamilton, A.C. "The Argument of Spenser's 'Shepheardes Calender'," *ELH* 23, no. 3 (1956) 171-82.

Harvey, Gabriel. *The Works of Gabriel Harvey*. Edited by Alexander B. Grosart. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1966.

Harvey, Karen and Alexandra Shephard. "What Have Historians Done with Masculinity? Reflections on Five Centuries of British History, circa 1500 – 1950." *Journal of British Studies* 44, no. 2 (2005): 274-80.

Helgerson, Richard. "The New Poet Presents Himself: Spenser and the Idea of a Literary Career." *PMLA* 93, no. 5 (October 1978): 893-911.

Heninger, S.K. *The Poet as Maker: Sidney and Spenser*. University Park: Penn State University Press, 1989.

Herron, Thomas. "Outfoxed? *Mother Hubberds Tale*, Adam Loftus, and Lord Burleigh in Irish Context," *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual* 28 (2013): 221-232.

Hesiod. *Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia.* Edited and translated by Glenn W. Most. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Hile, Rachel E. *Spenserian Satire: A Tradition of Indirection*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017.

Hiltner, Ken. *What Else is Pastoral?: Renaissance Literature and the Environment*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2011.

Homan, Sidney R. "*Doctor Faustus*, Dekker's *Old Fortunatus*, and the Morality Plays." *Modern Language Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (1965): 497-505.

Hoole, Charles. "The Petty School," in *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School.* Introduction by Thiselton Mark. Syracuse, N.Y.: C.W. Bardeen, 1912.

Hubbard, Thomas K. "Allusive Artistry and Vergil's Revisionary Program: Eclogues 1-3." In *Vergil's Eclogues*. Edited by Katharina Volk, 79 -109. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Huizinga, Johan. *Homo Ludens.* London: Routledge, 1949.

Hulbert, Viola Blackburn. "A New Interpretation of Spenser's *Muiopotmos*," *Studies in Philology* 25, no. 2 (1928): 128-48.

Huth, Kimberly. "Come Live With Me and Feed My Sheep: Invitation, Ownership, and Belonging in Early Modern Pastoral Literature," *Studies in Philology* 108, no. 1 (Winter 2011): 44-69.

Johnson, Jenna. "Donald Trump like that Proverbs verse that might not exist." *The Washington Post.* 16 September 2015. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2015/09/16/donald-trump-likes-that-proverbs-verse-that-might-not-exist/?utm_term=.201380b5c29d (accessed 10 July 2017).

Johnson, Samuel. "'The Life of Milton' from *The Lives of the Poets (1779)*." *Poetry Foundation.* 13 October 2009. https://www.poetryfoundation.org/resources/learning/essays/detail/69382 (accessed 18 September 2017).

Kay, Dennis. *Melodious Tears: the English Funeral Elegy from Spenser to Milton*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Kempe, William. *The Education of Children* (1588). Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership. http://name.umdl.umich.edu/A68296.0001.001 (accessed 18 September 2017).

Khan, Coppelia. "Family Quarrels: Feminist Criticism, Queer Studies, and Shakespeare in the Twenty-First Century." In *Rethinking Feminism in Early Modern Studies,* 43-58. Edited by Ania Loomba and Melissa Sanchez. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Lane, John. "An Elegie vpon the death of the high and renowned Princesse, our late Soueraigne Elizabeth." London, 1603. EEBO.

Lerner, Laurence ed. *The Works of John Milton*. Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 1994.

Lesser, Zachary. "Typographic Nostalgia: Play-reading, Popularity and the Meanings of Black Letter." In *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England,* 99-126. Edited by Marta Straznicky. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.

Lindheim, Nancy. *The Virgilian Pastoral Tradition.* Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2005.

Little, Katherine. *Transforming Work*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013.

Loomis, Catherine. *The Death of Elizabeth I: Remembering and Reconstructing the Virgin Queen.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.

Lyons, Jessie M. "Spenser's *Muiopotmos* as an Allegory," *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 31 (1916): 90-113.

Mack, Peter. *Reading and Rhetoric in Montaigne and Shakespeare.* New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010.

Marlowe, Christopher. "The Passionate Shepherd to his Love," in *Englands Helicon: Edited From the Edition of 1600 with Additional Poems from the Edition of 1614*, 192. Edited by Hugh MacDonald. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962.

-----. *The Collected Poems of Christopher Marlowe*. Edited by Patrick Gerard Cheney and Brian J. Striar. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

-----. *Doctor Faustus and Other Plays.* Edited by David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Marotti, Arthur. *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Martin, Christopher. *Constituting Old Age in Early Modern English Literature, from Queen Elizabeth to King Lear*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012.

Masten, Jeffrey. *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

-----. *Queer Philologies: Sex, Language, and Affect in Shakespeare's Time.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.

McCoy, Richard. *Sir Philip Sidney: Rebellion in Arcadia.* New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1979.

Meskill, Lynn. *Ben Jonson and Envy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Miller, Naomi J., and Naomi Yavneh. *Gender and Early Modern Constructions of Childhood*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Milton, John. *Milton's Selected Poetry and Prose.* Ed. Jason P. Rosenblatt. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2011.

Montaigne, Michel de. *The Essays of Michel de Montaigne*. Translated by M.A. Screech. London: Allen Lane, 1991.

Montrose, Louis Adrian. " 'Eliza, Queen of shepheardes,' and the Pastoral of Power." *English Literary Renaissance* 10, no. 2 (1980): 153-82.

-----. "Of Gentlemen and Shepherds: The Politics of Elizabethan Pastoral Form." *ELH* 50, no. 3 (1983): 415-59.

Mulcaster, Richard. *The Elementarie* (London, 1582). EEBO.

-----. *Positions concerning the training up of children*. Edited by William Barker. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994.

Mullaney, Steven. *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988.

Munro, Lucy. *Archaic Style in English Literature, 1590 – 1674.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Nashe, Thomas. *The Complete Works of Thomas Nashe*. Edited by Alexander B. Grosart. London, 1883.

Nashe, Thomas. *Pierce Penilesse his Supplication to the Divell* (1592). Online at *English Poetry 1579-1830: Spenser and the Tradition.* ed. David Hill Radcliffe. http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?action=GET&textsid=32768 (accessed 9 November 2017).

Newton, Thomas. "Atropoion Delion, OR, The death of Delia: With the Teares of her Funerall." London, 1603.

Ngai, Sianne. *Ugly Feelings.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Nicholson, Catherine. *Uncommon Tongues: Eloquence and Eccentricity in the English Renaissance*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

Norton, Rictor. *The Homosexual Pastoral Tradition*. 20 June 2008. http://rictornorton.co.uk/pastor00.htm (accessed 20 October 2017).

Ong, Walter J. "Latin Language Study as a Renaissance Puberty Rite." *Studies in Philology* 56, no. 2 (1959): 103-24.

Orvis, David L. "Cross-Dressing, Queerness, and the Early Modern Stage," in *The Cambridge History of Gay and Lesbian Literature*, 197-217. Edited by E. McCallum and M. Tuhkanen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses: The Arthur Golding Translation 1567*. Edited and introduction by John Nims. Philadelphia: Paul Dry Books, 2000.

Owens, Judith. "Instruction Settings: Schoolrooms." Unpublished manuscript, last modified 3 April 2017. Microsoft Word file.

Oxford English Dictionary Online. *Oxford English Dictionary*. oed.com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca (various access dates).

Palingenius, Marcellus. *The Zodiake of Life*. Trans. Barnabe Googe, ed. Rosemond Tuve. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1976.

Patterson, Annabel. *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valery*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Pattison, Bruce. "The Roundelay in the August Eclogue of *The Shepheardes Calender*." *The Review of English Studies* 9, no. 33 (Jan. 1933) 55.

Petrarch. *Bucolicum Carmen.* Translated by Thomas G. Bergin. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Phillips, Edward. *Theatrum Poetarum Anglicanorum.* London, 1675. EEBO.

Piepho, Lee. *Holofernes' Mantuan: Italian Humanism in Early Modern England*. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.

Pigman III, G. W. "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance." *Renaissance Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (Spring 1980): 1-32

Poggioli, Renato. *The Oaten Flute: Essays on Pastoral Poetry and the Pastoral Ideal*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Prescott, Anne Lake. "Barnfield's Spenser: 'Great Collin' and the Art of Denial." In *The Affectionate Shepherd: Celebrating Richard Barnfield,* 85-98. Edited by Kenneth Borris and George Klawitter. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2001.

Pugh, Syrithe. *Spenser and Virgil: The pastoral poems.* Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2016.

Putnam, Michael J. *Virgil's Pastoral Art: Studies in the 'Eclogues*.' Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1970.

Puttenham, George. *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589). In *Sidney's 'The Defence of Poesy' and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism,* 55-204. Edited by Gavin Alexander. Toronto: Penguin Group, 2004.

Quintilian, *The Orator's Education: Books 9-10,* Edited and translated by Donald A. Russell. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Radcliffe, David Hill, ed. "August." *English Poetry 1579-1830: Spenser and the Tradition.* http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?action=GET&textsid=22. (accessed 12 August 2017).

-----. *An Eclogue Upon the Death of Sir Francis Walsingham (1590)*. http://spenserians.cath.vt.edu/TextRecord.php?textsid=104 (accessed 20 February 2017).

Raleigh, Sir Walter. "The Nimphs Reply to the Sheepheard." In *Englands Helicon: Edited From the Edition of 1600 with Additional Poems From the Edition of 1614,* 193. Edited by Hugh MacDonald. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Ramazani, Jahan. *Poetry of Mourning: The Modern Elegy from Hardy to Heaney.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Rambuss, Richard. *Spenser's Secret Career.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Ramus, Petrus. "Of Emulation." In *A compendium of the art of lofick and rhetorick in the English Tongue. Containging all that Peter Ramus, Aristotle, and Others have writ thereon*, 210-2. London 1651.

-----. "Of Envy." In *A compendium of the art of lofick and rhetorick in the English Tongue. Containging all that Peter Ramus, Aristotle, and Others have writ thereon,* 208-210. London 1651.

Renwick, William Lindsay, ed. *The Shepherd's Calendar*. London: Scholartis Press, 1930.

Rist, Anna, trans. *The Poems of Theocritus.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1978.

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

Ron, Nathan. "The Christian Peace of Erasmus." *The European Legacy* 19, no. 1 (2014): 27-42.

Rosenmeyer, Thomas Gustav. *The Green Cabinet. Theocritus and the European Pastoral*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.

Rowe, Kenneth Thorpe. "Sir Calidore: Essex or Sidney?" *Studies in Philology* 27, no. 2 (1930): 125-141.

Rubin, Gayle. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." In *Feminist Anthropology: A Reader.* Edited by Ellen Lewin (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 2006) 87-106.

Sabie, Francis. *Pan's Pipe, Three Pastoral Eclogues, with Other Verses, by Francis Sabie (1595)*. Edited by James W. Bright and Wilfred P. Mustard. *Modern Philology* 7, no. 4 (1910): 433-464.

Sacks, Peter. *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

Sanazarro, Jacopo. *Arcadia and Piscatorial Eclogues.* Translated by Ralph Nash. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1966.

Schrickx, Willem. *Shakespeare's early contemporaries: the background of the Harvey-Nashe polemic and Love's Labour's Lost.* Antwerpen: Nederlandsche Boekhandel, 1956.

Schenck, Celeste. *Mourning and Panegyric*. University Park: University of Pennsylvania, 1988.

Schneider, Regina. *Sidney's (Re)Writing of* The Arcadia. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 2008.

Searle, John R. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Sedgwick, Eve Kasofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

-----. *The Epistemology of the Closet.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Shannon, Laurie. *Sovereign Amity: Figures of Friendship in Shakespearean Contexts*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002.

-----. "Nature's Bias: Renaissance Homonormativity and Elizabethan Comic Likeness." *Modern Philology* 98, no. 2 (2000): 182-210.

Shapiro, James. *Rival Playwrights: Marlowe, Jonson, Shakespeare*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.

Shepard, Alexandra. *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Shore, David R. *Spenser and the Poetics of Pastoral.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1985.

Sidney, Sir Philip. *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The New Arcadia)*. Edited by Victor Skretkowicz. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

-----. *Lady of May*. Introduction and Edited by R.S. Bear. *Renascence Editions,* University of Oregon, January 1992 (online 1996), n.p. http://www.luminarium.org/renascence-editions/may/may.html (accessed 10 July 2017).

-----. *The Defence of Poesy*. In *Sidney's 'The Defence of Poesy' and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism*, 1-54. Edited by Gavin Alexander. Toronto: Penguin Classics, 2004.

-----. *The Old Arcadia*. Edited by Katherine Duncan-Jones. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

-----. *The Norton Shakespeare*. Edited by Stephen Greenblatt. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1997.

Smith, Bruce. *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Somerset, Anne. *Elizabeth I*. London: Anchor Publishing, 2003.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Complete Poetical Works,* ed. R.E. Neil Dodge. Boston & New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1908. Bartleby.com, 2010. http://www.bartleby.com/153/108.html (accessed 20 October 2017).

-----. *The Shorter Poems.* Edited by Richard McCabe. Toronto: Penguin Books Ltd., 1999.

-----. *The Faerie Queene (Revised Second Edition)*. Edited by A.C. Hamilton. Toronto: Pearson, 2007.

Spenser, Edmund and Gabriel Harvey. *Three Proper and wittie, familiar Letters*. London, 1580. EEBO.

Stallybrass, Peter. "Shakespeare, the Individual, and the Text." In *Cultural Studies*, 593-612. Edited by Larry Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paul A. Treichler. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Stewart, Alan. *Close Readers: Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Stewart, Alan. *Philip Sidney: A Double Life.* London: Chatto & Windus, 2001.

Stillman, Robert E. *Sidney's Poetic justice: the Old Arcadia, its Eclogues, and Renaissance Pastoral Traditions.* London: Bucknell University Press, 1986.

Symthe, Adam. "Almanacs, Annotators, and Life-Writing in Early Modern England." *English Literary Renaissance* 38, no. 2 (2008) 200-44.

Szymanski, Nathan. "Review of Katherine C. Little, *Transforming Work: Early Modern Pastoral and Late Medieval Poetry*, University of Notre Dame University Press, 2013." *Spenser Review* 45, no. 2 (2015).

Theocritus. *The Idylls*. Translated by Robert Wells. Markham, Ontario: Penguin Group, 1989.

---. *Sixe idillia that is, sixe small, or petty poems, or aeglogues, chosen out of the right famous Sicilian poet Theocritus, and translated into English verse*. Oxford, 1588. EEBO.

Tromly, Fred. "Lodowick Bryskett's Elegies on Sidney in Spenser's *Astrophel* Volume." *The Review of English Studies* (1986): 384-8.

-----. *Playing with Desire: Christopher Marlowe and the Art of Tantalization*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Turbervile, George, trans. *The Eglogs of the Poet B. Mantuan Carmelitan*. London, 1567. EEBO.

T.W. *The Lamentation of Melpomene, for the death of Belphaebe our Late Queene*. London, 1603. EEBO.

van Es, Bart. "Spenserian Pastoral." In *A Critical Companion to Spenser Studies*, 79-89. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Vickers, Brian. "Leisure and Idleness in the Renaissance: the Ambivalence of *Otium*." *Renaissance Studies* 4, no. 1 (1990): 1-37.

-----. "Leisure and Idleness in the Renaissance: the Ambivalence of *Otium*," *Renaissance Studies* 4, no. 2 (1990) 107-54.

Virgil. *The Bucolikes*. Translated by Abraham Fleming. London, 1575. EEBO. (see also bibliographic entry beginning with "Fleming")

-----. *The Bvoliks.* Translated by Abraham Fleming. London, 1589. EEBO. (see also bibliographic entry beginning with "Fleming")

-----. *Virgils Eclogues*. Translated by John Brinsley. London: Richard Field for Thomas Man, 1620.

Wadoski, Andrew. "Spenser, Harvey, and the Strange Poetics of *The Shepheardes Calender*." *College Literature: A Journal of Critical Literary Studies* 44, no. 3 (2015): 420-41.

Wallace, Andrew. *Virgil's Schoolboys*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

W.C., *The Aduentures of Ladie Egeria (1585?),* ProQuest Literature Online. Accessed 10 October 2017.

Watson, Robert N. *Back to Nature: The Green and the Real in the Late Renaissance*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Weaver, William P. *Untutored Lines: The Making of the English Epyllion.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

Webbe, William. *A Discourse of English Poesie (London, 1586)* n.p. http://www.bartleby.com/359/14.html (accessed 10 October 2017).

Wegemer, Gerard B., and Stephen W. Smith, *A Thomas More Source Book*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2004.

Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City*. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Co. Ltd, 1973.

Yates, Julian. "Sheep Tacks—A Multi-species Impression." In *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral: Ethics and Objects*. Ed. Jeffrey Jerome Cohen. Washington, D.C.: Oliphaunt Books, 2012.

-----. *Of Sheep, Oranges, and Yeast: A Multispecies Impression* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017

Yearling, Rebecca. "Homoerotic Desire and Renaissance Lyric Verse." *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 53, no. 1 (Winter 2013): 53-71.

Appendix: Three Poems

The first poem is Barnabe Googe's "Egloga Prima" in its entirety, which features in the first chapter of this dissertation. The second and third poems are excerpts, the first from "August" in *The Shepheardes Calender* and the second from "The Fourth Eclogues" in *Old Arcadia.* The second and third poems both feature in the second chapter of this dissertation.

1) Barnabe Googe's "Egloga Prima," in *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* (1563).

Daphnes. Amintas.

Syth Phebus now begins to flame,
O frende Amintas deare:
And placed hath his gorgeous globe
in midste of all the Spheare
And fro y e place doth cast his Beames;
where (they that starres defyne)
Lyes poynt (doo save) that termed is,
ryght Equinoctial lyne.
Wheras the Ram doth cause to spring,
eche herbe and floure in fyelde
And forceth ground (y t spoyld of grene
Did lye,) newe grene to yelde.
Let shepherds vs yelde also tales,
as best becomes the tyme:
Suche tales as Winter stormes haue stayde
in countrey Poets Ryme.
Begyn to synge Amintas thou,
for why? thy wyt is best:
And many a saged sawe lies hyd
within thine aged brest.
Ofte haue I heard, of Shephards old,
thy fame reported true,
No Herdman liues: but knowes the praise,
to olde Amintas due:
Begyn therfore, and I gyue care,
for talke doth me delyght,
Go Boye: go dryue the Beasts to fede
whyle he his mynde resyght.

Amin.

Thy prayses Daphnes are to great,
and more for me than meete:
Nor euer I, suche saged sawes,
coulde synge in Uerses sweete.
And now, to talke of spring time tales
my heares to hoare, do growe
Suche tales as these, I tolde in, tyme,
when youthfull yeares dyd flowe.
But synce, I can not the denye,
thy Fathers loue doth bynde:
In symple Songe I wyll adresse
my selfe, to showe my mynde.
Longe hast thou Daphnes me requyred
the state of Loue to tell,
For in my youth, I knewe the force,
and passions all, full well.
Nowe Loue therfore I wyll defyne
and what it is declare,
which way poore souls it doth entrap
and howe it them doth snare.
My Boie, remoue my beasts fro hens
and dryue them farther downe,
Upon the Hylles, let them go feade,
that ioyne to yender towne,
O Cupyde kynge of fyerye Loue,
ayde thou my syngynge Uerse,
And teache me heare the cause & case,
Of Louers to reherse,
Direct my tong, in trothe to treade,
with Furye fyll my brayne,
That I may able be to tell,
the cause of Louers payne.
Opinions diuers coulde I showe,
but chiefest of them all,
I wyll declare: and for the rest,
with silence leaue I shall.
A feruent Humour, (some do iudge)
within the Head doth lye,
Whiche yssuyng forth with poysoned beames
doth ron fro eye to eye:
And taking place abrode in heads,
a whyle doth fyrmely rest:
Till Phrensie framde in Fancie fond
discends from hed, to brest.

1 And poison strong, fro eies outdrawn
doth perce the wretched harte,
And all infectes the bloud aboute,
and boyles in euery parte:
Thus: whe the beames, infected hath,
the wofull Louers blud:
Then Sences al, do strayght decaye,
opprest with Furyes flud.
Then Lybertie withdrawes herself,
and Bondage beares the swaye,
Affection blynd then leades the hart,
and Wyt, is wownde awaye.
O Daphnes then, the paines appeare,
and tormentes all of hell.
Then sekes, the selye wounded soule,
the flames for to expell.
But all to late, alas he stryues,
for Fancie beares the stroke
And he, must toyle (no helpe there is)
in slauysshe seruyle yoke.
His blud corrupted all within,
doth boyle in euery vayne,
Than sekes he howe to sewe for salue
that maye redresse his payne.
And when the face, he doth beholde
by whiche he shulde haue ayde,
And sees no helpe, the lookes he long,
and trembleth all afrayde.
And museth at the framed shape,
that hath his lyfe in handes:
Nowe fast he flies, aboute the flames,
nowe styll amased standes:
Yet Hope relieues, his hurtful Heate
and Wyll doth Payne make lyght,
And al the griefes, that then he feeles
doth Presence styll requyght.
But when the Lyght absented is,
and Beames in hart remayne,
Then flames the Fyre fresh agayne,
and newe begyns his Payne.
Then longe he lookes, his losse to se,
then sobbes, and syghes abounde,
Then mourneth he, to mys the marke
that erst to soone he founde.
Then shadefull places oute he lookes,

and all alone he lyues,
Exylynge Ioye, and myrth from him,
hymselfe to waylynge gyues,
And styll his minde theron doth muse
and styll, therof he prates,
O Daphnes here I swere to the,
no griefe to Louers state.
Yf he but ones beholde the place,
where he was wont to mete,
The pleasaunt forme y t hym enflamd,
and ioyfull Countnaunce swete.
The place (a wonderous thing I tell)
his gryefe augmenteth newe,
Yet styll he sekes the place to se,
that moste he shulde eschewe.
Yf but the name rehearsed be,
(a thynge more straunge to heare)
Then Colour comes and goes in hast
then quaketh he for feare,
The verye name, hath suche a force,
that it can dase the mynde,
And make the man amasde to stande,
what force hath Loue to bynde?
Affection none to this is lyke,
it doth surmownt them all,
Of greiffes, the greatest greif no doubt
is to be Venus thrall,
And therfore, Daphnes nowe beware,
for thou art yonge, and fre,
Take heade of vewynge faces longe,
for losse of Lybertye,
I shall not nede (I thynke) to byd
the, to detest the Cryme,
Of wycked loue, that Ioue did vse, 2
In Ganimedes tyme,
For rather wolde I (thoo it be muche)
that thou shuldest seake the fyre,
Of lawfull Loue, that I haue tolde,
than burne wyth suche desyre,
And thus an end, I weryed am,
my wynde is olde, and faynt,
Suche matters I, do leaue to suche,
as finer farre can paint,
Fetche in the Gote: that goes astraye,
and dryue hym to the folde,

163 My yeares be great I wyl be gone,
164 for spryngtyme nyghts be colde.
Daphnes
165 Great thankes to the, for this thy tale
166 Amintas here I gyue:
167 But neuer can I make amendes
168 to the whilste I do lyue.
169 Yet for thy paynes (no recompence)
170 a small rewarde haue here.
171 A whistle framed longe ago,
172 wherwith my father deare
173 His ioyfull beasts, was wont to kepe.
174 No Pype fortune so swete
175 Might shepharde euer yet posses.
176 (a thynge for the full mete.)
Finis Eglogæ primæ.[1]

2) Colin's sestina in "August" in *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579).

YE wastefull woodes beare witnesse of my woe,
Wherein my plaints did oftentimes resound:
Ye carelesse byrds are priuie to my cryes,
Which in your songs were wont to make a part:
Thou pleasaunt spring hast luld me oft a sleepe,
Whose streames my trickling teares did ofte augment.
Resort of people doth my greefs augment,
The walled townes do worke my greater woe:
The forest wide is fitter to resound
The hollow Echo of my carefull cryes,
I hate the house, since thence my loue did part,
Whose waylefull want debarres myne eyes from sleepe.
Let stremes of teares supply the place of sleepe:
Let all that sweete is, voyd: and all that may augment
My doole, drawe neare. More meete to wayle my woe,
Bene the wild woddes my sorrowes to resound,
Then bedde, or bowre, both which I fill with cryes,
When I them see so waist, and fynd no part
Of pleasure past. Here will I dwell apart
In gastful groue therefore, till my last sleepe

[1] Barnabe Googe, "Egloga Prima," in *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* (1563) ProQuest Literature Online (accessed 20 October 2017).

Doe close mine eyes: so shall I not augment
With sight of such a chaunge my recklesse woe:
Helpe me, ye banefull byrds, whose shrieking sound
Ys signe of dreery death, my deadly cryes
Most ruthfully to tune. And as my cryes
(Which of my woe cannot bewray least part)
You heare all night, when nature craueth sleepe,
Increase, so let your yrksome yells augment.
Thus all the night in plaints, the daye in woe
I vowed haue to wayst, till safe and sound
She home returne, whose voyces siluer sound
To cheerefull songs can chaunge my cherelesse cryes.
Hence with the Nightingale will I take part,
That blessed byrd, that spends her time of sleepe
In songs and plaintiue pleas, the more taugment
The memory of hys misdeede, that bred her woe:
And you that feele no woe, | when as the sound
Of these my nightly cryes | ye heare apart,
Let breake your sounder sleepe | and pitie augment.[2]

3) Strephon and Klaius's sestina in Sir Philip Sidney's "The Fourth Eclogues" in *Old Arcadia* (1580?). (The sestina is often titled "Ye Goateherd Gods" when it is anthologized.)

Strephon *Klaius*

Strephon. Ye Goatherd gods, that love the grassy mountains,
Ye nymphs which haunt the springs in pleasant valleys,
Ye satyrs joyed with free and quiet forests,
Vouchsafe your silent ears to plaining music,
Which to my woes gives still an early morning,
And draws the dolor on till weary evening.

Klaius. O Mercury, foregoer to the evening,
O heavenly huntress of the savage mountains,
O lovely star, entitled of the morning
While that my voice doth fill these woeful valleys,

[2] Edmund Spenser, "August," in *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579), *Renascence Editions,* http://www.luminarium.org/renascence-editions/august.html (accessed 20 October 2017).

Vouchsafe your silent ears to plaining music,
Which oft hath *Echo* tired in secret forests.

Strephon. I that was once free burgess of the forests,
Where shade from Sun, and sport I sought in evening,
I, that was once esteemed for pleasant music,
Am banished now among the monstrous mountains
Of huge despair, and foul affliction's valleys,
Am grown a screech-owl to myself each morning.

Klaius. I that was once delighted every morning
Hunting the wild inhabiters of forests,
I, that was once the music of these valleys
So darkened am, that all my day is evening,
Heart-broken so, that molehills seem high mountains,
And fill the vales with cries instead of music.

Strephon. Long since alas, my deadly swannish music
Hath made itself a crier of the morning
And hath with wailing strength climbed highest mountains;
Long since my thoughts more desert be than forests,
Long since I see my joys come to their evening,
And state thrown down to over-trodden valleys.

Klaius. Long since the happy dwellers of these valleys
Have prayed me leave my strange exclaiming music,
Which troubles their day's work, and joys of evening;
Long since I hate the night, more hate the morning;
Long since my thoughts chase me like beasts in forests,
And make me wish myself laid under mountains.

Strephon. Meseems I see the high and stately mountains
Transform themselves to low dejected valleys;
Meseems I hear in these ill-changed forests
The nightingales do learn of owls their music;
Meseems I feel the comfort of the morning
Turned to the mortal serene of an evening.

Klaius. Meseems I see a filthy cloudy evening
As soon as sun begins to climb the mountains;
Meseems I feel a noisome scent, the morning
When I do smell the flowers of these valleys;
Meseems I hear, when I do hear sweet music,
The dreadful cries of murdered men in forests.

Strephon. I wish to fire the trees of all these forests;
I give the sun a last farewell each evening;
I curse the fiddling finders-out of music;
With envy I do hate the lofty mountains
And with despite despise the humble valleys;
I do detest night, evening, day, and morning.

Klaius. Curse to myself my prayer is, the morning;
My fire is more than can be made with forests,
My state more base than are the basest valleys;
I wish no evenings more to see, each evening;
Shamed, I hate myself in sight of mountains
And stop mine ears, lest I grow mad with music.

Strephon. For she, whose parts maintained a perfect music,
Whose beauties shined more than the blushing morning,
Who much did pass in state the stately mountains,
In straightness passed the cedars of the forests,
Hath cast me, wretch, into eternal evening
By taking her two suns from these dark valleys.

Klaius. For she, with whom compared, the Alps are valleys,
She, whose least word brings from the spheres their music,
At whose approach the sun rose in the evening,
Who, where she went, bare in her forehead morning,
Is gone, is gone from these our spoiled forests,
Turning to deserts our best pastured mountains.

Strephon. These mountains witness shall, so shall these valleys,

Klaius. These forests eke, made wretched by our music,
Our morning hymn this is, and song at evening.[3]

[3] Sir Philip Sidney, *The Old Arcadia,* ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) 285-7.