BIBLIOFICTIONS: OVIDIAN HEROINES AND THE TUDOR BOOK

by

Lindsay Ann Reid

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Department of English

University of Toronto

© Copyright by Lindsay Ann Reid (2009)

ABSTRACT

"Bibliofictions: Ovidian Heroines and the Tudor Book"

Lindsay Ann Reid

Doctor of Philosophy, 2009

Graduate Department of English, University of Toronto

This dissertation explores how the mythological heroines from Ovid's *Heroides* and *Metamorphoses* were catalogued, conflated, reconceived, and recontextualized in vernacular literature; in so doing, it joins considerations of voice, authority, and gender with reflections on Tudor technologies of textual reproduction and ideas about the book. In the late medieval and Renaissance eras, Ovid's poetry stimulated the imaginations of authors ranging from Geoffrey Chaucer and John Gower to Isabella Whitney, William Shakespeare, and Michael Drayton. Ovid's characteristic bookishness—his interest in textual revision and his thematization of the physicality and malleability of art in its physical environments—was not lost upon these postclassical interpreters who engaged with his polysemous cast of female characters. His numerous English protégés replicated and expanded Ovid's metatextual concerns by reading and rewriting his metamorphic poetry in light of the metaphors through which they understood both established networks of scribal dissemination and emergent modes of printed book production.

My study of Greco-Roman tradition and English "bibliofictions" (or fictive representations of books, their life cycles, and the communication circuits in which they operate) melds literary analysis with the theoretical concerns of book history by focusing on intersections and interactions between physical, metaphorical, and imaginary books. I posit the Tudor book as a site of complex cultural and literary negotiations between real *and inscribed*, historical *and fictional* readers, editors, commentators, and authors, and, as my discussion

unfolds, I combine bibliographical, historical, and literary perspectives as a means to understanding both the reception of Ovidian poetry in English literature and Ovid's place in the history of books. This dissertation thus contributes to a growing body of book history criticism while also modeling a bibliographically enriched approach to the study of late medieval and Renaissance intertextuality.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank those who made this dissertation possible. First and foremost, I would like to offer my gratitude to my doctoral supervisor, Elizabeth D. Harvey. I have benefitted enormously from her guidance and encouragement at all stages of my PhD. I am also grateful to Alexandra Gillespie and David Galbraith, the members of my committee, for their expertise and feedback as I researched and prepared my dissertation.

I am grateful to a number of institutions for their generous funding. I owe particular thanks to the Ontario Graduate Scholarship Program and to Mr. Glenn Carter, the donor who funded my fellowship in 2007-2008. In addition, the financial assistance I have received from the University of Toronto in the form of numerous Open Fellowships has been greatly appreciated.

Finally, I offer my regards to all my friends and family members who supported me during the completion of my doctoral project. Special thanks to Kris Meen, Heather Ladd, and Janet Reid for the time that they invested in helping me to proofread.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

STC	Pollard, A.W. and Redgrave, G.R. *A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, 1475-1640*. 2nd ed. 3 vols. Rev. W.A. Jackson, F.S. Ferguson, and Katharine F. Pantzer. Bibliographical Society, 1986-91.
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/subscribed/>.

A NOTE ON TEXTS

Motivated by desires to reflect material historicity, I have avoided modernizing orthography and retained original spellings in my transcriptions of early materials. I have not "corrected" i/j or u/v; modernized archaic characters (e.g. Þ or ȝ); expanded abbreviations (e.g. yᵗ); or changed virgules (/) to commas. I have, however, regularized all instances of long s (ſ) in both early printed materials and modern reprints of medieval and Renaissance texts. I have also taken the liberty of capitalizing the titles of fifteenth and sixteenth-century materials.

Because I have opted to retain virgules, I have used vertical bars (|) rather than front slashes (/) to indicate line breaks when citing poetry.

Thenne it is a gret thynge to hym that secheth to know thentendement of Ovyde and he ought tendyne & sette hys hye corage to contynuel estudye & to take payne & dilygence to rumyne and chewe hys cudde and enquyre that the sayde poete hath devysed and dysputed of natures or of maners and of gestes.

–William Caxton, *Ovyde Hys Booke of Methamorphose* (c. 1480)

INTRODUCTION:
OVIDIAN BIBLIOFICTIONS AND TUDOR BOOKS

In Book 2 of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, a mock-didactic collection of elegies, the self-proclaimed "*praeceptor Amoris*" [teacher of Love] retells the Homeric story of Ulysses and Calypso in Ogygia.[1] Playfully instructing his male readers in the arts of seduction and romantic conquest, Ovid recommends that these men, like Ulysses, employ rhetoric to charm their mistresses. Conveniently glossing over the fact that Ulysses is more often remembered as the unwilling prisoner than as the active wooer of the persistent Nereid, Ovid posits the Ithacan as an example of a suitor who, though he was not "*formosus*" [comely], was "*facundus*" [eloquent] and achieved amatory success through verbal prowess (2.123).[2] Ovid relates that "*iterumque iterumque*" [again and again] Calypso implored Ulysses to tell her the story of the Trojan War (2.127). In response, "*Ille referre aliter saepe solebat idem*" [often would he tell the same story in other words] (2.128):

> *Ille levi virga (virgam nam forte tenebat)*
> *Quod rogat, in spisso litore pingit opus.*
> *'Haec' inquit 'Troia est' (muros in litore fecit):*
> *'Hic tibi sit Simois; haec mea castra puta.*
> *Campus erat' (campumque facit), 'quem caede Dolonis*
> *Sparsimus, Haemonios dum vigil optat equos.*
> *Illic Sithonii fuerant tentoria Rhesi:*
> *Hac ego sum captis nocte revectus equis.'*
> *Pluraque pingebat, subitus cum Pergama fluctus*
> *Abstulit et Rhesi cum duce castra suo.*
>
> (2.129-40)

---

[1] I cite the text of *The Art of Love* from *The Art of Love and Other Poems*, Loeb Classical Library 232, 2nd ed., trans. J.H. Mozley, rev. G.P Goold (1979; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 1.17. Subsequent parenthetical book and line numbers for the *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris* refer to this edition, and English translations have been adopted or closely adapted from this same source unless otherwise noted.

[2] As Steven J. Green points out, the dynamics of this episode are "immediately problematized by the fact that Ulysses actually wants to leave: The reader has to work hard for a lesson here: if we are being taught the merits of good speaking, are we meant to follow the example of Ulysses (who entrances his girl with his speaking) or Calypso (who manages to detain her lover with her own rhetorical powers)?": "Lessons in Love: Fifty Years of Scholarship on Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*," in *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's* Ars Amatoria *and* Remedia Amoris, eds. Roy Gibson, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 17-18.

> He with a light staff (for by chance he carried a staff) draws in the deep sand the story of which she asks. 'Here,' says he 'is Troy' (he made walls upon the beach), 'and here, suppose, is Simois; imagine this to be my camp. There was a plain' (and he draws a plain) 'which we sprinkled with Dolon's blood, while he watched and yearned for the Haemonian steeds. There were the tents of Sithonian Rhesus; on that night I rode back on the captured horses.' More was he portraying when a sudden wave washed Pergamus away, and the camp of Rhesus with its chief.

As Edmund Spenser—writing "One day I wrote her name upon the strand, | But came the waves and washéd it away"—would recognize nearly sixteen hundred years later, this Ovidian image of the aggressive tide with its ability to "pray" on Ulysses' ciphers is potent.[3] Like *Amoretti* 75, Ovid's digression in *Ars Amatoria* 2 reflects the ephemeral nature of written record, and Ulysses' pseudo-Homeric story in the sand raises doubts about the stability of script and the physical manifestations of poetic substance. The written word is both fragile and subject to mutation. Despite poetry's tantalizing promises to "eternize" its subject matter, poetic substance will invariably "dy in dust" if it is not reiterated in successive forms, inscribed *iterumque iterumque*, or, as Spenser would phrase it, written "with a second hand."[4]

Even as it thematizes the material fragility of text and the inherent instability of written artifacts, this Ovidian interlude in *Ars Amatoria* 2 also points to the paradoxical and immaterial durability of particular *fictions*. Despite literature's dependence upon tenuous material chains of transmission for survival through time, both the poetic substance of the literary text and the idea of the text itself transcend any one inscription. Literature, then, exists simultaneously in the physical world and in the supraliminal realm of imagination. In narratological terms, we can discern the separation of the enduring "story" of the Trojan War from the vagaries of "narrative discourse" and the particularities of its physical transmission.[5] When Ulysses

---

[3] I cite the text of the *Amoretti* from *Edmund Spenser's Poetry*, 3rd ed., eds. Hugh Maclean and Anne Lake Prescott (1968; New York: Norton, 1993), 75.1-2, 4. Raphael Lyne also points to connections between *Ars Amatoria* 2 and *Amoretti* 75 in *Ovid's Changing Worlds: English Metamorphoses, 1567-1632* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 94-95.

[4] *Amoretti,* 75.11, 10, 3.

[5] H. Porter Abbott defines "narrative discourse" as "the story as narrated," explaining: "the distinction between 'story' and 'story as narrated' can be taken to imply that stories exist independently of narrative presentation—in other words, the same story can be narrated in more than one way": *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 193.

presents and re-presents a single story in new discursive and scribal formulations, his text is not static. Rather, it is kept in constant motion by the very act of transmission. Familiar mythopoetic substance takes on variant and ever-changing forms—both metaphorically and materially—as it is repeatedly rephrased, reworked, and rewritten on the Ogygian beach.

In her analysis of Ulysses' sand-narratives, Alison Sharrock observes that Ovid's portrayal of "Ulysses' rhetorical skills could almost be a programmatic statement of his own."[6] After all, the Augustan poet was himself a great reviser of preexisting stories and a prolific literary commentator, a "critic of traditional mythology," as Joseph B. Solodow has called him, and an author whose "references to other writers, and to his work in relation to theirs, are more numerous than those of any other Roman poet."[7] Typically demythologizing Greco-Roman mythology and retelling earlier versions of well-known stories from marginalized—and often female—viewpoints, Ovid's strikingly inter- and intra-textual works are literary experiments in revision and focalization.[8]

Recent scholarship on the Augustan writer's poetry (particularly his *Metamorphoses* and *Heroides*) has demonstrated that Ovid's allusive and self-reflexive *oeuvre* reflects the author's preoccupation with the status of text and the nature of literature. The narrative structure of the *Metamorphoses* relies on an extensive cast of inscribed narrators, censors, and audiences, and the facets of bibliogenesis, textual transmission, literary reception, and the interpretation of poetry are repeatedly thematized and explored in the vast network of analogues and repetitions which comprise the genre-defying, epic-length poem; as Alessandro Barchiesi observes, "the act of storytelling is basic to the whole plot."[9] Similarly, the *Heroides,* a collection of letters putatively penned by the characters of epic and dramatic tradition, raises issues of hermeneutics and

---

[6] Alison Sharrock, *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's* Ars Amatoria *2* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 2.
[7] Joseph B. Solodow, *The World of Ovid's "Metamorphoses"* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 136; Richard Tarrant, "Ovid and Ancient Literary History," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, ed. Philip Hardie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 13.
[8] L.P. Wilkinson observes that "where a well-known poet had treated the same story, [Ovid] tended to accept the main outline and vary the details, passing over what had been elaborated before, and *vice versa*": *Ovid Recalled* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), 455.
[9] "Narrative Technique and Narratology in the *Metamorphoses*," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 181.

queries the unsettled dynamics of communication and exchange both through its foregrounding of epistemological questions (what is material and what is immaterial, what is physically present and what is disembodied) and through its very use of the epistolary form—a form that invites readerly interpretation and written reply.

In addition to serving as a metaphor for the Roman poet's own self-consciously intertextual processes of literary creation, the Ulysses and Calypso digression in the *Ars Amatoria* also provides an apt model for thinking about the postclassical reception and reformulation of Ovid's metatextual *corpus*. In late medieval and Renaissance England, the Roman poet not only provided fodder for exercises in Latin versification and fundamental rhetorical models within school curricula, but he also served as a literary source and venerable authority, the premier font of Greco-Roman mythological narratives. Ovid's poetry would stimulate the vernacular imaginations of authors from Chaucer and Gower to Shakespeare and Drayton, and, like so many Ulysses, each successive English reviser of the Augustan poet's works would retell the same stories in other words.

Ovid's characteristic bookishness—his interest in revision and voice, his overt thematization of the materiality, fragility, and malleability of art in its physical environments—was not lost upon these later English audiences and interpreters. Richard Tarrant astutely observes that "Ovid's 'dialogic' engagement with earlier poetry (including his own) helps to define the type of imitation Ovid's work has inspired."[10] Thus, the hermeneutic history of Ovid and Ovidianism in English literature is a history that joins and critically engages the material formulations and identities of text as artifact with the less corporeal facets of literary transmission. To examine Ovid's literary reception in the Tudor era means to investigate the material manifestations and permutations of his poems in conjunction with the metaphorics of literary transmission that accompanied and informed these texts. Ovid's numerous Tudor protégés, like the Roman poet himself, exhibit an interest in the variety of tensions between

[10] Tarrant, in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 31.

story, narrative discourse, and material embodiment. Sixteenth-century authors and readers replicated and expanded Ovidian metatextuality by reading and rewriting his poetry in light of the metaphors through which they understood both established networks of scribal production and newer, rapidly developing modes of printed production. Indeed, we might say that the intertextual, narratological, and bibliographical concerns of Ovid's poetry were only amplified and foregrounded as his images, characters, and sentiments become subject to a myriad of new contexts, media, and uses.

In this dissertation, I examine the historical and the fictionalized reception of Ovid's *carmina* in the literature and books of Tudor England through the study of a particular set of Ovidian narratives, namely, those concerning his protean heroines from the *Heroides* and *Metamorphoses*.[11] In so doing, I examine the collusions of Ovid's *corpus* and *litterae* with the inscribed *corpora* and *litterae* of his equally polysemous—and so often recontextualized—cast of female mythological characters. As my discussion unfolds, I combine bibliographical, historical, and literary perspectives as a means to understanding both the reception of Ovidian poetry in Tudor literature and Ovid's place in the history of books.

TUDOR BOOKS IN TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY THOUGHT

Like Ovid and his Tudor interpreters, I understand texts—and also books—not only as real objects in real spaces and social contexts, but also as notional entities that exist in *imaginary* spaces and *imaginary* social contexts. Engaging with the pervasive but as yet inadequately theorized notion of "materiality" that has so often informed recent literary scholarship, my work on Ovidian and pseudo-Ovidian texts probes the potent metaphors and cultural mythologies that surrounded the production and dissemination of poetry in sixteenth-century England. My discussion of Ovid's Tudor reception expands current theoretical discussions of textual materiality into this realm of imagination by considering the material

[11] To a lesser degree, my work also touches upon heroines who make their major Ovidian appearances in the *Fasti* and *Ars Amatoria* (i.e. Lucretia and Pasiphae).

identities of books and the historical conditions of the book trade as represented within literature and thus contributes to a growing body of book history criticism while also proposing a bibliographically enriched approach to the study of Ovidian intertextuality.

Since the publication of *L'Apparation du Livre* in the mid-twentieth century, scholarship has exhibited an ever-increasing amount of interest in *le rapport livre-societe.* In his seminal 1982 "What is the History of Books?" Robert Darnton proposed a model for considering the "life cycle" of a book in which he drew attention to a number of under investigated, yet crucial, roles filled by various human participants in the book trade. This textual "communications circuit" included not only authors and readers of books, but also "the publisher (if the bookseller does not assume that role), the printer, the shipper, the bookseller," and other human agents.[12] Echoing similar concerns, in his 1986 *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, D.F. McKenzie advocated an understanding of "bibliography as the study of the sociology of texts," radically redefining the discipline of bibliography as one "that studies texts as recorded forms, and the processes of their transmission, including their production and reception."[13]

It would be an understatement to say that there has been a plethora of scholarly work on the textual communications circuit and the sociology of texts in the decades since Darnton and McKenzie first wrote on these subjects. The idea that textual meaning is determined by a convergence of diverse elements in the life cycles of books has been reiterated countless times, and, in recent years, literary scholarship has begun to incorporate traditional bibliographical concerns on a wide scale. This work has increasingly revealed the complex relations between authors, printers, publishers, editors, booksellers, and readers that help to shape the literary

---

[12] I here cite from Darnton's article as reprinted in *The Book History Reader*, eds. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 11. Darnton elaborates on the nature of this "communications circuit": "It transmits messages, transforming them en route, as they pass from thought to writing to printed characters and back to thought again. Book history concerns each phase of this process and the process as a whole, in all its variations over space and time and in all its relations with other systems, economic, social, political, and cultural, in the surrounding environment": 11.

[13] *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (London: British Library, 1986), 4.

meanings of texts.[14] Linked to this burgeoning scholarly interest in the interworkings of the book trade and its various players is an increased awareness of the physical qualities of texts. Most studies that have come to be gathered under the interdisciplinary and expansive rubric of "book history"—including "New Textualism," "New Philology," and "New Materialism"—have celebrated materiality, especially as it relates to early print culture. Indeed, the editors of the 2002 *Book History Reader* claim that, "although [book history's] ancestors can be traced through prior disciplines such as bibliography and social history," the discipline "achieves its relative distinction from both its emphasis upon print culture and the role of the book as *material object* within that culture."[15]

Such studies of the material book are often posited as the necessary corrective to defunct, idealized critical and theoretical notions of both text and author. In their groundbreaking and highly influential "The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text," Margreta De Grazia and Peter Stallybrass, for example, argue that the idealized authorial "genius is, after all, an impoverished, ghostly thing compared to the complex social practices that shaped, and still shape, the absorbent surface of the Shakespearean text."[16] De Grazia and Stallybrass made a case for looking "*at*" rather than simply seeing "*through*" the surface of the sixteenth century's collaboratively produced books.[17] Drawing attention to "material practices that, even when noted, are ignored in favor of a transcendent 'text' imagined as the product of the author's mind," Stallybrass and de Grazia argued that the material text contains also the "residual

---

[14] Margreta de Grazia and Peter Stallybrass persuasively argue that "we need…to rethink Shakespeare"—and, by extension, early modern books—"in relation to our new knowledge of collaborative writing, collaborative printing, and the historical contingencies of textual production": "The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 44.3 (1993): 279. Adrian Johns asserts that a text's "character depended upon a vast array of representations, practices, and skills, which extended from the printing house, through the bookshop and marketplace, to the coffeehouse, study, salon and home—and thence back to the printing house again": *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 58-59. And David Scott Kastan suggests that a text is "produced by multiple impulses and operations, only some of which originate with the author or are even accessible to his (or, belatedly, her) control"; the form, and—ultimately—interpretations of books are shaped by the "agency" of a number of mediating operators working in bookshops and printing houses, and, therefore, that textual meaning "should be sought precisely in the webs of engagement that permit a text to be written, printed, circulated, and read": *Shakespeare After Theory* (London: Routledge, 1999), 39.

[15] David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, "Introduction," in *The Book History Reader*, 1. Italics my own.

[16] "The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text," 283.

[17] "The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text," 257.

traces" of multiple human agents and bodies that had helped to shape its meaning.[18] De Grazia and Stallybrass' article represents the ways in which looking *at* and *through* books continue to be treated as binary and mutually exclusive approaches; in fact, their own approach seems biased towards the *at* at the expense of the *through*. As the authors remark in their concluding section, "if there is any single obstacle between" the authors and the project they describe, "it is the sense that the value of Shakespeare lies elsewhere, in the inner regions of the text rather than in the practices recorded on its surfaces."[19] This precise tension between the surface and the 'inner regions' of the text—and related questions about where true meaning lies—has plagued much of the bibliographically-oriented work on Tudor literature.

In *Shakespeare and the Book*, David Scott Kastan distinguishes between what he refers to as "platonic" and "pragmatic" approaches to text.[20] I would agree with Roger Chartier's recent assessment that this "contrast between 'platonism' and 'pragmatism' is probably a false debate or the result of a badly framed question."[21] Although I applaud the commitment of the so-called pragmatists to validating textual variants and looking *at* physical texts in new and successful ways, I would argue that the widespread vilification of literary platonism is reactionary, designed to combat the "mounting resentment toward the editorial tradition."[22] Scholars' related attempts to distance themselves from New Bibliography has resulted in the fetishization of the material book and the corresponding devaluation of texts' platonic lives. In this sense, new work in the field of book history may share in and perpetuate the same "deep resistance to abstraction" that McKenzie sensed and criticized in the scholarship of his

---

[18] "The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text," 282, 281.
[19] "The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text," 280.
[20] Kastan elaborates: "Indeed the choice between thinking of the text as essentially independent of its medium and seeing the text as the product of it defines two major positions in the current debate": *Shakespeare and the Book* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 117.
[21] *Inscription and Erasure: Literature and Written Culture from the Eleventh to the Eighteenth Century*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), x.
[22] "The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text," 255.

predecessors.[23] What avowed pragmatists have not always recognized is that there are ways of thinking about texts platonically that are *not* congruent with the much-maligned, author-centered editorial practices of the New Bibliographers (who characteristically attempted, as Leah S. Marcus glosses it, "to purge the text of the impurities it had gathered over time and restore its original...splendor").[24]

Recent scholarship's repeated insistence on viewing books as material objects and its questions about textual agency, cultural history, and "plural texts" are invaluable.[25] However, I would also argue that *over*-materializing books can downplay the complexities of the book as an object of imagination, for equally central to the concept of the book is its ability to negotiate between the material *and* the metaphoric, to populate both platonic and pragmatic spaces. While books should be considered with sensitivity to their particularities, or the material forms and contexts in which they have historically appeared, they should also be approached with an awareness that those material forms and contexts are themselves necessarily in a state of continual flux. Though singular material embodiments can and do tell us much about a text, as both Ovid and his Tudor audiences were well aware, books, as imaginative and metaphorical entities, do not *only* subsist in singular, successive, concrete copies. In this sense, my work contests claims such as Kastan's that "literature exists…only and always in its materializations," which are "the conditions of its meaning rather than merely the containers of it."[26] The book is irreducible neither to the material circumstances of its production nor to the physical realities of its material embodiment, for books can also exist in multiple and materially indeterminate

---

[23] "'What's Past Is Prologue': The Bibliographical Society and History of the Book," in *Making Meaning: "Printers of the Mind" and Other Essays,* eds. Peter D. McDonald and Michael F. Suarez (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002), 265.
[24] *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton* (London: Routledge, 1996), 32.
[25] I borrow the phrase "plural texts" from Sonia Massai, who explains: "Differential readings in early modern printed texts stem from a variety of material instabilities. Even texts that were printed only once or survive in a single edition are inherently plural because proof corrections were carried out while the work was in progress. As a result, copies of the same edition preserve randomly variant sequences of corrected and uncorrected forms….Differential readings are even more significant in early modern printed texts which survive in multiple editions": "Working with the Texts: Differential Readings," *A Concise Companion to Shakespeare and the Text*, ed. Andrew Murphy (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 185.
[26] *Shakespeare and the Book*, 4.

forms. The crux of this problem, I would suggest, lies in the famous and often-rephrased query, "If *Mona Lisa* is at the Louvre, where is *Hamlet*?" In emphasizing the physical qualities of books and their identities as media, we risk oversimplifying the dynamics of textual reception and neglect to think in sustained ways about the *immaterial* lives and *metaphysical* reception of story and text. Put in another way, when we focus too closely on the architectural particularities of Ulysses' successive sandcastles, we do so at the expense of examining the nature and tenacity of the Trojan story as told, retold, scripted, and reinscribed by Ulysses and other authors.

In my study of Ovid's Tudor reception, I depart from earlier work on Tudor bibliography and materiality by exploring new territory adjacent to it. My study falls into the interstices between bibliography and what I have termed *bibliofictions*: fictive, literary representations of books, their life cycles, and the communication circuits in which they operate. Examining pseudo-material manifestations of books in imaginary spaces and considering the alternate histories that literature tells us about the production, dissemination, and consumption of books, methodologically, this dissertation aims to synthesize pragmatic and platonic approaches to the book. Like Ovid and his postclassical imitators, I see the surface and the essential content of books as non-disjunctive oppositions, and I complicate the characteristic polarization of pragmatism and platonism by simultaneously taking account of contingency of texts and their metaphysical existence. The frequently remarked historical nexus of social and commercial relationships that shaped sixteenth-century books in a material sense is also frequently the subject of fiction, and, focusing on the points of tension where bibliographical documents and fictional pseudo-documents converge, I blur what Stallybrass and de Grazia would distinguish as looking *at* and looking *through* books.[27]

[27] My primary focus on printed materials throughout this dissertation should not be taken to imply a devaluation of manuscript culture. I am interested in the interpenetration of media in the Tudor era, and, indeed, my interest in the book is not media specific. For a relevant treatment that posits the book's identity as independent of the technologies of its production, see Alexandra Gillespie, "Books," in *Middle English*, ed. Paul Strohm (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 86-103.

OVIDIAN BIBLIOFICTIONS

Ovid's poetry is rife with bibliofictions. An author who was deeply concerned with issues of communication, he frequently fictionalizes and meditates on the processes of literary composition, inscription, transmission, and poetic legacy. We might think, for instance, of the congenial confabulations of the *Metamorphoses'* Minyads, Mercury's sleep-inducing lullaby, the competition staged between the Pierides and Muses; or Venus' seductive *carmen* (itself recounted as part of Orpheus' song). Moreover, the *Metamorphoses* features numerous texts within its text: Arachne famously provides a succinct redaction of Ovidian "*caelestia crimina*" [celestial crimes] in her tapestry; the tongueless Philomela "*stamina barbarica suspendit callida tela* | *purpureasque notas filis intertextuit albis,* | *indicium sceleris*" [hangs a Thracian web on her loom, and skillfully weaving purple signs on a white background, she thus tells the story of her wrongs]; the story of "*Byblis…correpta cupidine fratris*" [Byblis, smitten with a passion for her brother] is largely a discussion of the composition process and the materials of writing; and Io, having first been denied the power of human speech, discovers that she can trace the signs of her own identity in the dust with her newly-acquired hooves, using "*littera*" [letters] "*pro verbis*" [instead of words].[28]

In addition to such programmatic, embedded "scenes of writing," Ovid's poetry also contains numerous representations of the textual communication circuit.[29] His *carmina* are typified by their tendency to fictionalize the circumstances of their own composition. The

---

[28] I cite the text of the *Metamorphoses* from *Metamorphoses, Books IX-XV*, Loeb Classical Library 43, 2nd ed., trans. Frank Justus Miller, rev. G.P Goold (1984; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), 6.131, 6.576-78, 9.455, 1.649. I have used this edition in conjunction with Ovid, *Metamorphoses, Books I-VIII*, Loeb Classical Library 42, 3rd ed., trans. Frank Justus Miller, rev. G.P Goold (1977; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004). Subsequent parenthetical book and line numbers for the *Metamorphoses* refer to these editions, and English translations have been adopted or closely adapted from these same sources unless otherwise noted.

[29] I borrow this term from Lynn Enterline, who defines it as follows: "By 'scene of writing' I am referring to two, related, matters: the poem's systematic self-reference, its complex engagement with its own figural language and with the fact of having been a written rather than a spoken epic; and its equally complex engagement with the materiality of reading and writing practices in the Roman world. Symbolically and historically resonant, this scene of writing…left indelible traces…also on many of the later European works derived from his epic. The Ovidian narrator habitually emphasizes the poetic, rhetorical, and corporeal resonance to the various 'forms' (*formae*) and 'figures' (*figurae*) about which the poem speaks, deriving many of the *Metamorphoses'* erotic and violent scenes out of the entanglement of poetic and bodily 'form'": *The Rhetoric of the Body from Ovid to Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 6-7.

pseudo-autobiographical *Amores*—a work prefaced with the waggish claim that it has been abridged so as not to bore its readers—takes its own creation, reception, and bibliographical embodiment as an explicit theme. The elegiac collection begins with an account of Love's proselytizing intervention in the poet's life:

> *Arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam*
> *edere, materia conveniente modis*
> *par erat inferior versus—risisse Cupido*
> *dicitur atque unum surripuisse pedem.*[30]
>
> Arms, and the violent deeds of war [i.e. the substance of epic], I was making ready to sound forth—in weighty numbers, with matter suited to the measure. The second verse was equal to the first—but Cupid, they say, with a laugh stole away one foot [of meter].

Love subsequently proscribes Ovid's subject and provides him with formal, metrical restrictions, and the narrative cohesion of the *Amores* is created largely through the series of related artistic aetiologies that it contains.[31]

Ovid's bibliofictions often intersect with the poet's interest in predicting the future reception of his texts and, by extension, his postmortem readership and reputation. In *Ars Amatoria* 3, the poet tellingly ponders:

> *Forsitan…*
> *Nec mea Lethaeis scripta dabuntur aquis:*
> *Atque aliquis dicet 'nostri lege culta magistri*
> *Carmina, quis partes instruit ille duas:*
> *Deve tribus libris, titulus quos signat Amorum,*
> *Elige, quod docili molliter ore legas:*
> *Vel tibi composita cantetur Epistola voce:*
> *Ignotum hoc aliis ille novavit opus.'*

---

[30] I cite the text of the *Amores* from *Heroides, Amores*, Loeb Classical Library 41, 2nd ed., trans. Grant Showerman, rev. G.P Goold (1977; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 1.1.1-4. Subsequent parenthetical book and line numbers for the *Amores* and *Heroides* refer to this edition, and English translations have been adopted or closely adapted from these same sources unless otherwise noted.

[31] Book 2 opens with a continuation of this same narrative of poetic creation: "*Hoc quoque conposui Paelignis natus aquosis, | ille ego nequitiae Naso poeta meae. | hoc quoque iussit Amor*" [this, too, is the work of my pen—mine, Naso's, born among the humid Paelingi, the well-known singer of my own worthless ways. This, too have I wrought at the bidding of Love] (2.1.1-3). Book 3 of the *Amores* continues the fiction, opening with the inscribed poet's confrontation with "*odoratos Elegia nexa capillos, | et…pes illi longior alter*" [Elegy with a coil of odorous locks, and…one foot longer than its mate] (3.1.7-8) and "*violenta Tragoedia*" [raging Tragedy] (3.1.11), both of whom accost and try to recruit him to write in their genres, and concluding with a tongue-and-cheek farewell to Love: "*Quaere novum vatem, tenerorum mater Amorum!*" [Seek a new bard, mother of tender Loves!] (3.15.1). Much like the *Amores*, Ovid's *Remedia Amoris*, too, begins with Love's visit to the inscribed poet: "*Legeret huius Amor titulum nomenque libelli: | 'Bella mihi, video, bella parantur' ait.*" [Love read the name and title of this book: 'Wars,' said he, 'wars are in store for me, I perceive.']: (1-2).

(3.340-46)

> Perhaps…my writing will [not] be given to Lethe's waters; and someone will say, 'Read the elegant poems [of the *Ars Amatoria*] of our master, wherein he instructs the rival parties [of men and women]; or from the three books [of the *Amores*] marked by the title of 'Loves' choose out what you may softly read with docile voice; or let some Letter [of the *Heroides*] be read by you with practiced utterance; [Ovid] first invented the art [of epistolary fiction], unknown to others.'

Alongside hopeful musings on their author's real life literary reception, Ovid's texts also habitually speculate on their reception in what we might think of as the more fanciful literary realm of intertextuality. I would point, for example, to the comic moment in the *Remedia Amoris* where the poet envisions the reactions that purely imaginary narratees—mythological readers—might have to his poetry:

> *Vixisset Phyllis, si me foret usa magistro,*
> *Et per quod novies, saepius isset iter;*
> *Nec moriens Dido summa vidisset ab arce*
> *Dardanias vento vela dedisse rates;*
> *Nec dolor armasset contra sua viscera matrem,*
> *Quae socii damno sanguinis ulta virum est.*
> *Arte mea Tereus, quamvis Philomela placeret,*
> *Per facinus fieri non meruisset avis.*
> *Da mihi Pasiphaen, iam tauri ponet amorem:*
> *Da Phaedram, Phaedrae turpis abibit amor.*
> *Crede Parim nobis, Helenen Menelaus habebit,*
> *Nec manibus Danais Pergama victa cadent.*
> *Impia si nostros legisset Scylla libellos,*
> *Haesisset capiti purpura, Nise, tuo.*
>
> (55-68)

> Phyllis would have lived, had she used my counsels, and taken more often the path she took nine times; nor would dying Dido have seen from her citadel's height the Dardan vessels spread their sails to the wind; nor would anger have armed against her own offspring the mother [Medea] who took vengeance on her husband with the loss of kindred blood. By my art Tereus, though Philomel never found favour, had not deserved by crime to become a bird. Give me Pasiphae: soon she will love the bull no more; give me Phaedra: Phaedra's shameful love will disappear. Entrust Paris to me: Menelaus will keep Helen, nor will vanquished Pergamum fall by Danaan hands. Had impious Scylla read my verse, the purple had stayed on thy head, O Nisus.

Ovid's works consistently reveal a conception of poetry, including his own, both as materially determinate (made manifest and transferred in individual performances and copies) and as materially indeterminate (existing apart from physically circumscribed modes of dissemination in imaginative, metaphorical, and intertextual planes). This dichotomy is perhaps

nowhere more evident than in the *Tristia,* where the exiled poet reflects upon, vociferously defends, and even amends his earlier poetry, envisioning alternative narratives of literary reception for both his current and former works. It is in the *Tristia* that Ovid confesses an earlier attempt to burn the books of the *Metamorphoses*: "*quae quoniam non sunt penitus sublata, sed extant— pluribus exemplis scripta fuisse reor—* | *nunc precor ut vivant*" [These verses were not utterly destroyed; they still exist—several copies were made, I think—and now I pray that they might live].[32] In this anecdote—programmatic as it may be, and undoubtedly inspired by Vergil's rumoured desire to have the *Aeneid* burned—Ovid reveals what we might think of as a pragmatic understanding of his books and the processes of their dissemination; books physically exist as—and are transmitted in—perishable copies.

Nonetheless, Ovid elsewhere demonstrates a more platonic understanding of the book, as exemplified in his famed address to his text in *Tristia* 1.1:

> *nec te purpureo velent vaccinia fuco—*
> ……..
> *nec titulus minio, nec cedro charta notetur*
> *candida nec nigra cornua fronte geras.*
> ……..
> *nec fragili geminae poliantur pumice frontes,*
> *hirsutus passis ut videre comis.*
> *neve liturarum pudeat ; qui viderit illas,*
> *de lacrimis factas sentiet esse meis.*
>
> (1.1.5-14)
>
> You shall have no cover dyed with the juice of purple berries. Your title shall not be tinged with vermilion nor your paper with oil and cedar; and you shall wear no white bosses upon your dark edges. Let no brittle pumice polish your two edges; I would have you appear with locks all rough and disordered. Be not ashamed of blots; he who sees them will feel that they were caused by my tears.

Clearly, the book in *Tristia* 1.1 is a text which resides in the supraliminal world of the literary imagination. Perhaps, however, this address could be more accurately called a platonic understanding of book couched in the language of pragmatism. While this is, in some sense, a

---

[32] I cite the text of the *Tristia* from *Tristia, Ex Ponto*, Loeb Classical Library 151, 2nd ed., trans. Arthur Leslie Wheeler, rev. G.P Goold (1988; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996) 1.7. 23-25. Subsequent parenthetical book and line numbers for the *Tristia* refer to this edition, and English translations have been adopted or closely adapted from this same source.

book inscribed on *charta*, and the material aspects that the imagined book lacks are enumerated in detail, Ovid's interest in the metaliterary and also the metaphorical possibilities of this imagined book is simultaneously developed as this book subsequently sets off to perambulate the streets of Rome in an extended and elaborate metaphor for textual circulation; Ovid subsequently admonishes the *Tristia* not to associate itself with the copies of the lascivious *Ars Amatoria* already in circulation, and he entrusts the rather shabby volume with a personal message to deliver to the *Metamorphoses*. For a similar example, we might also think of the moment when Ovid drafts an entirely novel preface to the *Metamorphoses* within the body of his new poem:

> *orba parente suo quicumque volumina tangis,*
> *his saltem vestra detur in urbe locus.*
> *quoque magis faveas, haec non sunt edita ab ipso,*
> *sed quasi de domini funere rapta sui.*
>
> (1.7.35-38)
>
> All you who touch these rolls bereft of their father, to them at least let a place be granted in your city! And your indulgence will be all the greater because these were not published by their master, but were rescued from what might be called his funeral.

As *volumina* that can presumably be touched, the *Metamorphoses* has a pseudo-tangible presence, even as it is envisioned in the realm of imaginitive projection. Thus, alongside Ovid's programmatic boasts about poetry's transcendent capacity to bestow immortal fame upon its author, we find that metaphors and images of concrete—and concretely imagined—literary materiality play an equally integral role in his understanding of the book and its life cycles, both real and inscribed.

READING JANE SCROPE READING OVID

As a means of illustrating some of the ways in which Ovidian bibliofictions inform and are reformulated in Ovidian-inspired Tudor texts, I turn to the poetry of John Skelton. A poet who "was born and had his education in a world of written books, and lived his creative life in one increasingly dominated by the printed book," Skelton was in his teens when William

Caxton set up shop and the art of printing made its English debut.[33] Subsequently, the trajectory of his literary career would be shaped and defined by this new technology.[34] Given the conservative nature of the literature printed by England's early presses, Skelton's printed literary output during his own lifetime was remarkable. He was the first living English poet to see a collection of his poetry printed, and, during his own lifetime, he would see his works printed more frequently than those of any other early Tudor vernacular poet. An author whose career developed alongside the nascent English print trade, Skelton is an important figure in the history of books, and Skelton's poetry, both in its bibliography (or historical, physical manifestations) and in its bibliofictions (or the ways in which it internally thematizes and fictionalizes the writing and publishing processes) is invaluable for the insights it provides into literary conditions of the early Tudor era.

Composed by Skelton in approximately 1504, *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* incorporates, cites, and transforms Ovidian intertexts in bibliographically self-conscious ways.[35] The dramatic

---

[33] F.W. Brownlow, ed., "Introduction 1," in *The Book of the Laurel*, by John Skelton (Newark, University of Delaware Press, 1990), 36-37.

[34] Seth Lerer has argued that "Skelton…represents himself as a poet of the scripted page rather than the printed book, a poet of oratorical performance rather than disseminated documents of booksellers": *Chaucer and His Readers: Imagining the Author in Late-Medieval England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 179. I am not sure, however, that Skelton should be so easily painted as a poet of "manuscript culture." Greg Walker, for example, points to a number of salient examples of Skelton's deep embeddedness in the oral, the manuscript, *and* the print cultures of his day, and he highlights the blurred boundaries between these types of publication: *John Skelton and the Politics of the 1520s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 121-22. Indeed, the earliest known reference to the poet was by none other by Caxton himself, who, in the c. 1590 prologue to his *Eneydos*, defers to Skelton's expertise in terms flattering to the newly-crowned laureate:

> But I praye mayster Iohn Skelton late created poete laureate in the vnyuersitie of oxenforde to ouersee and correcte this sayd booke. And taddresse and expowne and englysshe euery dyffyculte that is therin / For he hath late translated…diuerse…werkes oute of latyn in to englysshe not in rude and ol de language. but in polysshed and ornate termes craftely. as he that hath redde vyrgyle / ouyde. tullye. and all the other noble poetes and oratours / to me vnknowen….I suppose he hath dronken of Elycons well.

I here cite from Anthony S. G. Edwards' transcription: *Skelton: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), 43. Caxton, like many of the men who would subsequently take up his trade in the early sixteenth century, played the multiple roles of printer, publisher, bookseller, editor, translator, and literary critic, and his vested interest in the promotion and legitimization of vernacular poetry makes his comment on Skelton's place within literary tradition particularly interesting. If Caxton was indeed familiar with Skelton's poetry, the printer had accessed it in MS.

[35] An early version of the poem was likely in circulation by 1505 and must have been completely written before December of 1509; however, it is difficult to date *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* with much precision, as little is known about the exact circumstances of its composition or its early pattern of dissemination. There are no extant early MSS of the poem, and, although the earliest printed edition of *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* is undated, it is assumed to have been printed c. 1545. Unlike some of his contemporaries, such as Stephen Hawes or Alexander Barclay, who worked closely with particular printers, Skelton did not form a relationship

pretense of *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* is that Jane Scrope, the historical resident of a Benedictine convent near Norwich, is mourning the recent death of a pet. Skelton's fourteen-hundred line 'boke' can be roughly divided into three main sections: the first eight hundred and forty-four lines comprise a dramatic monologue—a silent, internal lamentation, purportedly in Jane's voice—for her bird; the second serves as a four hundred and twenty-two line encomium on Jane's beauty, written in the voice of Skelton's poetic *persona*; and the final hundred and sixteen lines, added at a later date (presumably sometime after 1509) function as a protest against the contemporary criticism which the first two sections of the poem had attracted in its early years of manuscript circulation.

Skelton's *Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* "is, quite simply," as Susan Schibanoff claimed in her influential examination of the poem, "about reading and about readers."[36] While attending an ostensibly unrelated service at a priory church, the young girl laments "Philip Sparowe, │ That was late slayn at Carowe │ Among the Nones Blake."[37] The tragedy of her deceased pet dominates Jane's thoughts as she listens to a nun recite the Vespers of the Dead, and, as her attention shifts back and forth between private meditation on her personal loss and the liturgical service, the words of the service quite literally become interlaced with Jane's own "pyteyus tale" of "Phyllyppes doleful deth" (342, 352). [38] Searching for apt precedents—secular

---

with one particular printer during his lifetime. On these poet-printer relationships, see A. S. G. Edwards, "Poet and Printer in Sixteenth-Century England: Stephen Hawes and Wynkyn de Worde," *Gutenberg Jahrbuch* (1980): 82-88; and David Carlson, "Alexander Barclay and Richard Pynson: A Tudor Printer and His Writer," *Anglia* 113 (1995): 283-302. However, several earlier sixteenth-century printers did produce editions of individual works by Skelton, and some of these were bound together as nonce volumes.

[36] "Taking Jane's Cue: *Phyllyp Sparowe* as a Primer for Women Readers," *PMLA* 101.5 (1986): 832. My own reading of this poem is indebted to Schibanoff's feminist reading and also to Celia R. Daileader's "When a Sparrow Falls: Women Readers, Male Critics, and John Skelton's *Phyllyp Sparowe*," *Philological Quarterly* 75.4 (1996): 391-409.

[37] I cite the text of *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* from *John Skelton: The Complete English Poems*, ed. John Scattergood (New York: Penguin, 1983), 7-9. Subsequent parenthetical line numbers for all of Skelton's works refer to this edition, and English translations have been adopted from this same source.

[38] F.W. Brownlow has demonstrated that "Jane's meditation on Phillip's death" corresponds precisely with the Vespers, "which consists of six psalms and their antiphons, the canticle Magnificat, and concluding versicles and prayers": "*The Book of Phyllyp Sparowe* and the Liturgy," *English Literary Renaissance* 9 (1979): 8. Brownlow further explains: "Jane, in the priory church, following the service in her primer, transforms it into something quite different": 9. Schibanoff adds: "Although we can trace the progress of the entire liturgical service…we actually read-or hear-only incipits, first lines and phrases from its psalms, antiphons, and other materials….By including only these key or cue lines, Skelton may well be reproducing exactly the text of the primer that he, Jane, and many earlier readers knew": 833.

as well as liturgical textual models with which to illume and characterize her own misery—she liberally cites the authority of "famous poetes" (88). Jane thus draws upon numerous (and largely inappropriate) Greco-Roman *fabulae*, including narratives derived from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, *Amores*, and *Heroides*:

> Whan I remembre agayn
> How mi Philyp was slayn,
> Never halfe the payne
> Was betwene you twayne,
> Pyramus and Thesbe,
> As than befell to me
>
> (17-22)

> Like Andromach, Hectors wyfe,
> Was wery of her lyfe,
> Whan she had lost her joye,
> Noble Hector of Troye;
> In lyke maner also
> Encreaseth my dedly wo,
> For my sparowe is go.
>
> (108-14)

> Of Medeas arte,
> I wolde I had a parte
> Of her crafty magyke!
> My sparowe than shuld be quycke
> With a charme or twayne,
> And playe with me agayne.
>
> (202-07)

At the end of Jane's mythologically allusive lament, we are treated to nearly two hundred lines of her so-called bibliography, "a virtual encyclopedia of literature," as Seth Lerer has called it, a list of "practically every writer who has ever written."[39] Jane's bibliography confirms that, in addition to the works of the Chaucer-Gower-Lydgate authorial triad, the fictive reader and literary critic has a taste for the *fin amours*; she namedrops an array of Carolingian, Arthurian, and Trojan romances alongside the continental poetry of "Frauncys Petrarke" (758) and works composed by various "poetes of auncyente" (767), including Vergil, Plutarch, and Sappho, as well as Ovid.[40] The Tudor schoolgirl's bibliography also serves as a

---

[39] *Chaucer and His Readers*, 196.

[40] Jane's reading list indicates that she is well-versed in English vernacular literature. Although she had difficulty understanding Lydgate since "he wryteth to haute" (812), she has also read Gower—whose

further explication of the machinations of Jane's imagination in the first section of the poem, elucidating the precise channels by which ordinary places, such as "the playne of Salysbery" and "Tyllbery fery" (321, 320), have come to co-exist in the girl's mind with the more exotic locales of Arcadia, Arden, and Rome, and it explains how the landscape of her overactive imagination has become so densely populated by "dragones" and "mantycors" (292, 294).

Like much of Ovid's poetry, *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* is infused with fictive accounts of the textual communications circuit. Skelton's descriptions of Jane's textual consumption elucidate the ways that books are understood and experienced platonically. We might think, for a moment, about the nature of the Ovidian (and, indeed, the non-Ovidian) narratives floating around in Jane's mind. These are narratives that, largely through their familiarity and the variety of their oral and inscribed retellings, have come loose from the physical books which reproduce but cannot fully contain them. Jane herself confesses that she has "enrold | A thousand new and old | …historious tales" in her memory, enough "To fyll bougets… | With bokes [she has] red" (749-53). I would draw particular attention to Skelton's use of the word *enrol*, which shares the literal meaning of physically wrapping or rolling up and also the figurative meaning of writing upon a roll or parchment and recording in a register. A consideration of the literally and metaphorically 'enrold' tales that find both quasi-physical containment and expression in Jane's fictionalized imagination complicates modern critical assumptions, such as Kastan's, that "only as texts are realized materially are they accessible" and "only then can they delight and mean."[41] Jane's repertoire reveals that real books also exist in imaginary spaces; books have transcendent, as well as material, identities—identities that cannot always be localized or historicized in the physical world.

"mater" Jane highly praises, although she does note that his "Englysh is olde | And of no value told" (786, 784-5). However, "Chaucer, that famus clerke" (800) is clearly Jane's favourite English poet. Her Chaucerian gamut includes "Palamon and Arcet," "Duke Theseus, and Partelet," and "the Wyfe of Bath" (615-17); the young girl brags that she can "Recounte, reporte, and tell | Of the *Tales of Caunterbury*" and also of "…the love so hote | That made Troylus to dote | Upon fayre Cressyde" (613-14, 677-79).

[41] *Shakespeare and the Book*, 4.

Like Ovid before him, Skelton interweaves bibliofictions in the form of speculation about his own future reception and projected readership. In the final English lines of the poem (as it existed in its original, two-part manifestation), Skelton addresses his audience at large, inviting criticism and encouraging, however facetiously, future emendations of his written work:

> And where my pen hath offendyd,
> I pray you it may be amendyd
> By discrete consyderacyon
> Of your wyse reformacyon;
> I have not offended, I trust,
> If it be sadly dyscust.
>
> (1245-50)

This invitation to critique was taken literally by at least one real-life reader. Alexander Barclay's 1509 *The Shyp of Folys of the Worlde* concluded with a programmatic "Brefe addicion" that asked readers to "Holde [him] excusyd":

> for why my wyll is gode
> Men to induce unto vertue and goodnes.
> I wryte no Jest ne tale of Robyn hode,
> Nor sawe no sparcles ne sede of vyciousnes;
> Wyse men love vertue, wylde people wantones.
> It longeth nat to my science nor cunnynge
> For Phylyp the Sparowe the Dirige to synge.[42]

Barclay compares Skelton's allegedly wanton poetry, including his Ovidian 'Phylyp the Sparowe'—the first two parts of which were then in circulation—with his own work of 'vertue and goodnes.' Skelton, though unnamed, is dismissively posited as one of those 'wylde people' who 'love wantoness' and 'vyciousnes.' Barclay's comments may reflect a personal animosity between the two authors, but they are more interesting for the literary reaction which they subsequently provoked from Skelton. Apparently in response to Barclay's "Brefe addicion," Skelton composed his own rebuttal, similarly entitled "An addicyon," to the first two sections

---

[42] *The Ship of Fools Translated by Alexander Barclay*, ed. T.H. Jamieson, 2 vols. (1874; New York: AMS, 1966), 2.331.

of *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe*.[43] This third, hundred and fourteen line section of the poem is broadly addressed to the "janglynge jayes" who "have disdayned | And of this worke complayned" (1271, 1374-5), real-life detractors such as Barclay who "deprave | Phillip Sparowes grave" (1274-75).[44]

Skelton's later work, *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell,* can be understood as a second *apologia* for *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe*. This sixteen hundred line piece, first printed in 1523 (STC 22610), is—at least topically—indebted to Chaucer's *House of Fame*. Much like Chaucer's earlier dream vision, *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell* depicts the visit of 'Skelton Poeta,' or an inscribed version of its author, to the Court of Fame.[45] *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell* is more than an argument for Skelton's own place in literary tradition or a defense of his currently circulating poetry, however. It is also a bibliofictional dramatization of book production and literary circulation.

There are two salient points to be made about Skelton's inscribed portrayal of the textual communications circuit. Firstly, Skelton is interested in fictionalizing the publication and dissemination of contemporary *vernacular* literature. His words in the English envoy to the work—where he apostrophizes his poem in the tradition of Ovid's *Tristia* (and, subsequently,

---

[43] For a succinct overview of the alleged animosity between Skelton and Barclay, see David R. Carlson, "Skelton and Barclay, Medieval and Modern," *Early Modern Literary Studies* 1.1 (1995): 2.1-17.

[44] There are hints in this final section of *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* that Jane Scrope, too, may have been unhappy with the sections of the poem already in circulation. In lines 1282-89 of his "addicyon," Skelton writes:

> Alas, that goodly mayd,
> Why shuld she be afrayde?
> Why shulde she take shame
> That her goodly name,
> Honorably reported,
> Sholde be set and sorted,
> To be matriculate
> With ladyes of estate?

In lines 1371-73, Skelton again alludes to Jane's discontent when he suggests, this time in Latin: "*Inferias. Philippe, tuas Scroupe pulchra Joanna | Instanter petiit: cur nostri carminis illam | Nunc pudet? Est sero; minor est infamia vero*" [Phyllyp, the beautiful Jane Scrope urgently asked for your obsequies. Why now is she ashamed of our song? It is too late; shame is less than truth].

[45] Scholarship on the composition of *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell* has yet to come to a consensus on the date of the poem's composition; however, it is likely that Skelton began work on the poem in the 1490s and continued to make major additions to the text up until the time of its publication in 1523. Julia Boffey has discussed Skelton's authorial control over the publication of *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell*: "'Withdrawe your hande': the Lyrics of 'The Garland of Laurel' from Manuscript to Print," *Trivium* 31 (1999): 81-83.

of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*)—make manifest this interest in the status and functions of post-Ovidian, post-Chaucerian, vernacular poetry:

> Go litille quayre,
> Demene yow fayre,
> Take no dispayre,
> Thowthe I yow wrate
> After this rate
> In Englyshe letter.
>
> So moche the better
> Welcum shalle ye
> To sum men be:
> For Latin warkis
> Be goode for clarkis[46]

Secondly, English poetry such as Skelton's 'litill quaire' is conceived and described in quasi-material terms throughout *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell*. "*Quod scripsi, scripsi*" [what I have written, I have written] (1450) Skelton Poeta asserts, and it is this material evidence of what he has written—both inside and outside the fiction of *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell*—that determines his status as a poet. An inscribed debate between the classical goddess Pallas and the Queen of Fame (to evaluate Skelton's candidacy for inclusion in the Court of Fame) revolves as much around the physical circumstances of circulation and dissemination of texts as it does around his capabilities as an author who "hathe tastid of thensugrd pocioune | Of Elyconys wel" (73-74). Authorial fame is defined by empirical, material "evydence" (1129), that is, a substantial *oeuvre* that "remaynneythe of recorde" (89).

Skelton's understanding of the book as both platonic and pragmatic is nowhere more apparent than the scene in which Occupation, "Famys regestary" (522), who has kept a record of Skelton's bibliography in her "boke of remembraunce" (1143), provides a catalogue of his literary output.[47] Within the dream vision of *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell*, Skelton's works

---

[46] On the heritage of the Ovidian "Go Little Book" conceit, see John S. P. Tatlock, "The Epilog of Chaucer's 'Troilus,'" *Modern Philology* 18.12 (1921): 625-659.

[47] Occupation's list is exhaustive, even enumerating *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell* and a set of occasional lyrics which the inscribed Skelton Poeta earlier composed within the narrative. As F.W. Brownlow notes, Occupation's "register is the actual poem that we are reading, and the lines describing its physical makeup also describe the ideal, never-realized form of the book in our own hands": "Introduction 2," *The Book of the Laurel*, 81.

are physically collected together, compiled and held in Occupation's possession. This 'boke of remembraunce' is at once both metaphorical and textual in nature. It is the repository of memory and poetic fame so often referenced—like the equally metaphorical Book of Nature, Book of Life, Book of Heaven, or Book of the Heart—in medieval literature.[48] However, as Occupation's rehearsal of his bibliography indicates, it is also a physical book that can be read, a volume of collected works from which Skelton's previous poetry can be cited and recited.

I am particularly interested in the way in which Skelton situates his own poetry within the sumptuous covers of a textual and metaphorical 'boke of remembraunce,' for Skelton's interest in this book as an inscripted, physical object is apparent in his lengthy description of its magnificent appearance:

> The margent was illumynid alle withe golden raillis
> And byse: enpycturid with gressoppis and waspis,
> With butterfliyis and fresshe pokok taylis,
> Enflorid with flowris and slymy snaylis,
> Envyvid picturis wele towchid and quikly:
> It wold have made a man hole that had be ryght sikkly,
>
> To beholde how it was garnnysshid and bownde,
> Encoverde over with gold of tissew fyne:
> The claspis and bullyons were worthe a thowsand pownde:
> With balassis and charbunclis the borders did shyne:
> Withe aurum musicum every other lyne
> Was wryttyn
>
> (1150-62)

Bibliofictions and bibliography—imaginary and historical ink—coincide on the pages of this elaborately imagined object. Occupation's written record contains previously published texts by Skelton and by Poeta Skelton. In one sense, then, the contents of Occupation's book are identical to the poetic content of books currently circulating amongst English readers; the fictional book contains real texts. Yet Occupation's ornate book, the 'claspis and bullyons' of which would cost 'a thowsand pownde' were they realized in the physical world, is patently marked as existing only in the world of imagination.

---

[48] On the book of memory, see Mary J. Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990). On the book of the heart, see Eric Jager, *The Book of the Heart* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

Occupation's endorsement of Skelton's poetry, enacted as she cites from this metaphysical 'boke,' is also double-sided. Within the fiction of *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell*, she defends Poeta Skelton's poetry against an imaginary literary critic (Fame), but this same defense has an historical function and simultaneously operates as a published defense directed towards Skelton's real life detractors, such as Barclay. Tellingly, Occupation's lengthiest digression is reserved for the controversial *Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe*:

> Of Phyllype Sparow the lamentabille fate,
> The dolefulle detiny and the carefulle chaunce,
> Devysid by Skelton after the funeralle rate:
> Yit sum there be there with that take grevaunce,
> And grudge there at with frownnyng countenaunce:
> Bot what of that? Hard it is to plese alle men:
> Who list amende it, let hym set to his pen.
> (1248-1254)[49]

It is thus that *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell* engages with publics both inside and outside of its fiction, and Occupation's 'boke,' embedded within Skelton's *Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell*, illustrates both the separation and the possible reconvergence of platonic and pragmatic books. Skelton's Ovidian *Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe,* and indeed all of his work, has a platonic life in literary imagination—an alternate, fictional history of reception, consumption and dissemination—that has the ability to come loose from the material even as it overlaps and coincides with it.

BIBLIOFICTIONS AND GENDERED *CORPORA*

Over the last two decades there has been a surge of scholarly interest in English Ovidianism. It has become customary to speak of the Ovidian heritage of Elizabethan literature in general terms, and Valerie Traub has remarked upon the scope of this "new

[49] Following this, the text of Skelton's late 'addicyon' to *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* is then reproduced in its entirety, serving double duty by being incorporated wholesale into Occupation's defense of Skelton's Ovidian poem.

Ovidianism" which now permeates sixteenth-century studies.[50] Such scholarship has often understood both classical and postclassical 'Ovidianism' in light of two main characteristics: rhetorical expressions of subjectivity and the trope of bodily transformation. Moreover, it has not gone unnoticed that both of these characteristics are gendered. Leonard Barkan sums up Ovid's most enduring legacy when he characterizes the literary milieu of Ovidianism as "a world where female emotions, themselves associated with change, are given special prominence."[51] Kathryn McKinley similarly elaborates:

> Ovid, more than any other classical poet, explores in depth a range of female characters' dilemmas….What Ovid did, within the limitations of poetic and narrative fiction, was to construct a feminine subject with a substantially increased capacity for reflection and self-interrogation—in ways never before charted in the history of western literary narrative.[52]

This frequently observed and rhetorically complex engagement with the psychological interiority characteristic of Ovid's writings—particularly his ventrilocution of self-revelatory

---

[50] "Afterword," *Ovid and the Renaissance Body,* ed. Goran V. Stauivukovic (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 261. Modern classical scholarship began its engagement with Ovid's poetry with Hermann Fränkel's *Ovid: A Poet between Two Worlds* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1945) and Wilkinson's *Ovid Recalled.* Interest in the Roman poet has only gained momentum since, and it has culminated in what Stephen Hinds refers to as a recent "recanonization of Ovid" which "has raised his status to something not far short of institutional equality with Virgil for the first time since the eighteenth century": *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 106. Much of the recent scholarship on Tudor Ovidianism has been author-based. Scholars such as Jonathan Bate and Heather James have charted the relationships between Ovid's works and those of William Shakespeare: *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) and *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Syrithe Pugh has examined the Roman poet's influence upon Edmund Spenser: *Spenser and Ovid* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005). And Partick Cheney has investigated the connections between Christopher Marlowe and Ovid: *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997). I have already mentioned the scholarship of Lyne's *Ovid's Changing Worlds* and Enterline's *Rhetoric of the Body from Ovid to Shakespeare*; other notable studies on Ovid and Ovidianism in the sixteenth-century include: William Keach, *Elizabethan Erotic Narratives: Irony and Pathos in the Ovidian Poetry of Shakespeare, Marlowe and Their Contemporaries* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1977); Clark Hulse, *Metamorphic Verse: The Elizabethan Minor Epic* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981); Lee T. Pearcy, *The Mediated Muse: English Translations of Ovid, 1560-1700* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1984); Leonard Barkan, *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis and the Pursuit of Paganism* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1986); Deborah S. Greenhut, *Feminine Rhetorical Culture: Tudor Adaptations of Ovid's* Heroides (New York: Peter Lang, 1988); M.L. Stapleton, *Harmful Eloquence: Ovid's* Amores *from Antiquity to Shakespeare* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996); Philip Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds, eds. *Ovidian Transformations: Essays in the "Metamorphoses" and its Reception* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); A. B. Taylor, ed., *Shakespeare's Ovid: The Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Liz Oakley-Brown, *Ovid and the Cultural Politics of Translation in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006); and Alison Keith and Stephen Rupp, eds. *Metamorphosis: The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2007).

[51] Barkan, 14.

[52] *Reading the Ovidian Heroine: Metamorphoses Commentaries 1100-1618* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), xix.

female characters—typically operates in close conjunction with bibliographical and metatextual concerns.

As they destabilize dominant versions of well-known stories, the *Heroides'* literary revisions play upon what has been written elsewhere, approaching familiar *materia* from new (and often unlikely) perspectives.[53] Ovid's letter-writing heroines, in the words of R. Alden Smith, "serve as affective filters, both in terms of processing the 'influences' they have experienced in their previous loci and in terms of presenting the material in this new context in an emotional and fantasizing manner."[54] It is thus that Ovid's Laodamia, for instance, glibly demythologizes the Trojan saga by asking her husband "*quid petitur tanto nisi turpis adultera bello?"* [What is your quest in so great a war but a shameful wanton?] (13.133). Ovid's interest in exploring his pretexts eliptically—often in terms of their amatory plots and female subjects—is attested throughout his *oeuvre*. We might recall, for instance, of the moment in the *Tristia* where the exiled narrator muses:

> *Ilias ipsa quid est aliud nisi adultera, de qua*
> *inter amatorem pugna virumque fuit?*
> *quod prius est illic flamma Briseidos, utque*
> *fecerit iratos rapta puella duces?*
> *aut quid Odyssea est nisi femina propter amorem,*
> *dum vir abest, multis una petita procis?*
>
> (2.371-76)
>
> The very *Iliad*—what is it but an adulteress about whom her lover and her husband fought? What occurs in it before the flaming passion for Briseis and the feud between the chiefs due to the seizure of the girl? What is the *Odyssey* except the story of one woman wooed in her husband's absence for love's sake by many suitors?

In simultaneously challenging and affirming the authority of prior texts and poetic models through these complex hermeneutic strategies, Ovid's works constantly remind us that texts are, by nature, inherently referential and rewritable. What is more, he genders intertextuality itself in his persistent use of *female* subjectivity to engage with cultural and literary hegemonies and establishments.

---

[53] On Ovid's relationship to the epic tradition, see Solodow, *The World of Ovid's "Metamorphoses"*; Alessandro Barchiesi, *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); and Philip Hardie, *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
[54] "Fantasy, Myth, and Love Letters: Text and Tale in Ovid's *Heroides*," *Arethusa* 27 (1994): 247.

Intertextual documents of complaint and critique, The *Heroides'* revisionary letters are also profoundly intergeneric. Evoking the same pseudo-autobiographical stance and discursive modes of poetic discourse that Ovid would employ in his own *Amores*, the complaints of the *Heroides* adroitly invert and complicate the gendered dynamics of elegy—a genre in which women, conventionally represented as narrated objects of desire, are often delibrately conflated with the literary products in which they are represented and used as vehicles for male poetic ambitions.[55] Ovid plays upon our elegiac expectations of women as aesthetic objects and textualized incarnations in the *Heroides*, where he blurs the roles of narrator and narrated, of writer and written subject.[56] Noting that "Ovid presents [the heroines'] laments in the form of letters," Megan O. Drinkwater has recently pointed to the "significance of the letter as a form of elegiac communication."[57] Through contiguity, the gendered subjectivity, revisionist stances, and intergeneric critiques presented in the *Heroides* are inseparable from the bibliofictional concerns of the self-consciously epistolary collection.[58] When Ovid revises his source texts, he calls attention to the very process of rewriting, thereby linking his fictional portrayals of female subjectivity to his own literary strategies and methodologies. The emotional interiors and perspectives of formerly marginalized female characters are represented in a deeply intertextual, new, and marginal genre that is itself preoccupied, as Joseph Farrell notes, with explicitly representing "the business of reading and writing, or editing and translating—in

---

[55] As Trevor Fear succinctly summarizes this dynamic, "the sexualized female who functions as a metonym for the poet's verbal product is also the desired female object of the narrator in the text": "The Poet as Pimp: Elegiac Seduction in the Time of Augustus," *Arethusa* 33.2 (2000): 232. The work of Maria Wyke has shown that the identity of the female beloved or *puella* in Roman elegy is closely related to acts of reading and writing: "Written Women: Propertius' *Scripta Puella*," *Journal of Roman Studies* 77 (1987): 47–61; "Mistress and Metaphor in Augustan Elegy," *Helios* 16 (1989): 25–47; and "Taking the Woman's Part: Engendering Roman Love Elegy," *Ramus* 23.1-2 (1994): 110-28. On this issue, see also A.M. Keith, "*Corpus Eroticum*: Elegiac Poetics and Elegiac *Puellae* in Ovid's *Amores*," *The Classical World* 88 (1994): 27-40.

[56] The representation of gender in the elegies of Ovid and his contemporaries is further complicated by the male poet's typically feminized modes of self-portryal. On the *servitium amoris*, see Kathleen McCarthy, "Servitium amoris: Amor servitii," in *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations*," eds. Sandra R. Joshel and Sheila Murnaghan (London: Routledge, 1998), 174-92.

[57] "Which Letter? Text and Subtext in Ovid's *Heroides*," *American Journal of Philology* 128 (2007): 368, 369.

[58] For the connections between literary transvestism, gender identity, and power, see Elizabeth D. Harvey, *Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and English Renaissance Texts* (London: Routledge, 1992).

short, of interpreting in all its forms."[59] Focusing on hermeneutic processes and on the paradoxical ambiguity of the poet in these processes, Ovid thereby draws attention to issues of the epistles' material forms and fictive aetiologies.

The second frequently remarked feature of Ovidianism is its self-conscious, imitative poetics of change. In Ovid's longest and most widely read poem, replication, repetition, and variation work on both literal and structural levels. "Often the business of metamorphosis," as Barkan remarks, "is to make flesh of metaphors."[60] I would argue that, for Ovid, the trope of metamorphosis is a metonym for his own synthetic poetry and a compelling metaphor for the dynamics of intertextual appropriation and literary transmission.[61] Ovid's opening characterization of the *Metamorphoses* as a treatment of "*nova...corpora"* (1.1-2) is telling, for the word *corpus* connotes both bodies and books.[62] Ovid does not simply write about bodies; his poem "not only consists of a mixture of narratives and mimesis, but also suggests the mimesis of a narrative."[63] Ovid turns *corpora* into poetic and artistic *materia*. Reflecting upon the connections between writing, reading, and the bibliogony of literary *corpora*, the *Metamorphoses* thereby exploits the possibilities of the transformative body as represented in literature simultaneously with its explorations of the transformative book in its metaphorical and physical embodiments. The seemingly innumerable experiences of corporeal transformation catalogued within Ovid's text—a densely allusive "jigsaw puzzle" which integrates, synthesizes,

---

[59] "Reading and Writing the *Heroides,*" *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 98 (1998): 309.
[60] *The Gods Made Flesh*, 23.
[61] Ovid's Tudor readers were likewise attuned to this association between metamorphosis and textual creation. As Barkan has argued, the concept of metamorphosis itself became a potent symbol of intertextuality (particularly of intertextual engagement with the ancients) for later readers and authors: "For post-classical civilization…metamorphosis is an essential metonym for the classical civilization that gave it birth. Through the repeated reinterpretation and reimagination of metamorphic myths, the cluster of beliefs associated with them comes to define the heritage of antiquity, whether that is viewed through a positive or a negative glass": 18.
[62] Hardie makes the relevant observation: "The terminology of metamorphosis itself draws attention to the tight implication of the linguistic in Ovid's narratives of transformation....In Latin the lexicon of physical metamorphosis largely overlaps with the lexicon of linguistic change": *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*, 228. In *The World of Ovid's "Metamorphoses,"* Solodow demonstrates that the semantic field that Ovid draws upon in describing the products of metamorphoses (e.g. the word *imago*) overlaps with the vocabulary of artistic creation: 203-06.
[63] Barchiesi, "Narrative Technique and Narratology in the *Metamorphoses*," in The *Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 181.

echoes, revises, and challenges a variety of pre-existing literary traditions (dramatic, elegiac, epic, Greek, and Roman)—also serve as metaphors for the corporeal genesis of the book.[64]

The metamorphoses contained within the metamorphic text of *Metamorphoses* are largely, though not exclusively, gendered. Frequently the victims of sexual violence and the unwilling participants in scenes of the amorous hunt, the women of the *Metamorphoses* undergo a plethora of material transformations into trees, flowers, birds, livestock, reptiles, rocks, springs, and even constellations; as Philip Hardie remarks, it is this "seemingly unending chain of stories of pursuit and rape" that "is perhaps many readers' most abiding memory of the poem."[65] Just as the allusive Ovidian text is itself metamorphic, the transformative female body (much like the elegiac female body) is also conceptualized through its textuality in Ovid's poetry, and I point to the Apollo and Daphne episode in Book 1 of the *Metamorphoses* as a paradigm and a means of elucidating Ovidian bibliofictional concerns. Daphne is Ovid's as well as Apollo's *primus amor* (1.452), and, in the story of her pursuit and transformation, we find the *Metamorphoses'* first representations both of erotic love and inscribed composition.[66] In this sense, Daphne's transformation into the laurel serves as the *beau idéal* for understanding the links between gender, metamorphosis, and the book in Ovid's "*mutatae, ter quinque volumina, formae*" [thrice five rolls about changing forms] (*Tr.* 1.1.117).

Readers of the *Metamorphoses* have often observed that Apollo's pursuit of Daphne, inspired by the nymph's insistent chastity, is verbally eroticized by the god of poetry. Daphne is more than an eroticized female body, however, for she also has a metaliterary function. As much as Daphne is the object of Apollo's passion, she is also his explicit subject. Though the fleeing nymph resists Apollo's "*verba*" [words] (1.503), the god nonetheless dissects her anatomy in a manner that anticipates the widespread blazon tradition of the Renaissance.

---

[64] Ovid's work is characterized as a "jigsaw puzzle" by Wilkinson, 147.
[65] *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*, 67.
[66] Daphne's metamorphosis has been identified as "the *degré zéro*...the myth of *the genesis of the symbol*, and of a very important symbol: that of poetry": Lavinia Lorch, "Human Time and the Magic of the Carmen: Metamorphosis as an Element of Rhetoric in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 15.4 (1982): 266.

Translating the woman into *verba,* Apollo identifies the female body as a symbol of rhetorical as well as amorous pursuit and representation:

> *spectat inornatos collo pendere capillos*
> *et 'quid, si comantur?' ait. videt igne micantes*
> *sideribus similes oculos, videt oscula, quae non*
> *est vidisse satis; laudat digitosque manusque*
> *bracchiaque et nudos media plus parte lacertos;*
> *si qua latent, meliora putat.*
>
> (1.497-502)

> He looks at her hair hanging down her neck in disarray, and says: 'What if it were arrayed?' He gazes at her eyes gleaming stars, he gazes upon her lips, which but to gaze on does not satisfy. He marvels at her fingers, hands, and wrists, and her arms, bare to the shoulder; and what is hid he deems still lovelier.

Much like Corinna, the elegiac *puella* of Ovid's *Amores*, Daphne is metaphorically cogent. The reaction that her subsequent transformation into the laurel provokes from her immortal wooer is notable:

> *at quoniam coniunx mea non potes esse,*
> *arbor eris certe…mea! Semper habebunt*
> *te coma, te citharae, te nostrae, laure, pharetrae;*
> *tu ducibus Latiis aderis, cum laeta Triumphum*
> *vox canet et visent longas Capitolia pompas;*
> *postibus Augustis eadem fidissima custos*
> *ante fores stabis mediamque tuebere quercum,*
> *utque meum intonsis caput est iuvenale capillis,*
> *tu quoque perpetuos semper gere frondis honores!*
>
> (1.557-65)

> Since thou canst not be my bride, thou shalt at least be my tree. My hair, my lyre, my quiver shall always be entwined with thee, O laurel. With thee Roman generals wreathe their heads, when shouts of joy shall acclaim their triumph, and long processions climb the Capitol. Thou at Augustus' portals shalt stand a trusty guardian, and keep watch over the civic crown of oak which hangs between. And as my head is ever young and my locks unshorn, so do thou keep the beauty of thy leaves perpetual.

In an act of what we might call "womanufacture," the god of poetry continues to interpret Daphne, establishing a new meaning for her transformed body.[67] Demonstrating his discursive dominance over the nymph, Apollo refashions Daphne's identity vis-à-vis language; he forecloses her symbolic association with himself, determines her new definition as *laurea,* and then authoritatively reads the tree's ambiguous nods as signs of silent assent.

---

[67] I borrow this term from Sharrock, "Womanufacture," *Journal of Roman Studies* 81 (1991): 36–49.

The dynamics between reading, writing, and loving are figured in the doubling of the body and the text of Daphne. What we might think of as the essential quality of Daphne endures even after her metamorphosis into the laurel. Apollo "*sentit adhuc trepidare novo sub cortice pectus*" [felt the heart still fluttering beneath the bark] (1.554) of Daphne's new form; even her name is merely translated from the Greek *δάφνη* to its Latin equivalent. Nonetheless, Apollo is left not with the desired presence of his beloved *puella* but, instead, with a *tenuis liber* (1.549). As Hardie has noted, this *tenuis liber* simultaneously represents "thin bark" and a "slender book."[68] Playing on a Roman tradition which held that, historically, "*in palmarum foliis primo scriptitatum, dein quarundam arborum libris*" [first of all people used to write on palm-leaves and then on the bark of certain trees], Ovid presents the transformed Daphne as a new, or perhaps a freshly prepared, writing surface.[69] In this sense, the Daphne and Apollo episode is as an aetiology of the origin of books. In transforming from nymph to laurel, Daphne physically enters into the realm of the semiotic, morphing into the passive source, symbol, and *materia* of literary production. Apollo's *primus amor* is, therefore, also the world's *primus liber,* and Apollo proceeds to act both as reader (deciphering the *liber*) and as intertextual poet (appropriating the *liber* for his own use). Playfully aware of its own aetiological fictions, the *Metamorphoses* thus employs the metamorphic *corpus* of Daphne as a gendered metonym for *the* book and also for *this* book, with her physical transformation serving as a metaphor for the formation of "*carmina mutatas hominum dicentia formas*" [verses that tell of the changed forms of men] (*Tr.* 1.7.13).

---

[68] Hardie writes: "the laurel in the landscape is a memorial of the erotic narrative that is the *aition* of laurel, a 'book' to be read...The limit to the reader's knowledge of Daphne will be the recognition that Daphne/laurel is a proleptic memorial for the achievement of the poet himself, her evergreeen leaves an icon of the perpetual freshness and life of the text": *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*, 50.

[69] Pliny, *Natural History, Libri XXI-XVI* Loeb Classical Library, trans. H. Rackham (1945; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), 13.69. In this same section, Pliny further elaborates on his history of writing materials: "*postea publica monumenta plumbeis voluminibus, mox et private linteis confici coepta aut ceris*" [afterwards folding sheets of lead began to be employed for official muniments, and then also sheets of linen or tablets of wax for private documents]. This tradition is based upon the etymological supposition that *liber* originally meant the bark or rind of a tree, and, because this bark was used as primitive writing material, the word *liber* came to stand also for the book.

SKELTON'S *SCRIPTAE PUELLAE*

As much as postclassical Ovidian intertextuality is explicitly literary and bibliographical, it is also insistent about the ways in which its bibliofictions and metapoetic concerns are gendered. Tensions and affiliations between authorial voices and acts of inscription, between texts and intertexts, and between bookish *materia* and poetic *ingenium* are frequently linked to female narrators, female bodies, and female subjects.[70] To cite what is perhaps the most obvious example, one of Petrarch's *Leitmotive* is the reinterpretation of Ovid's Daphne as the *fons et origo* of poetry. In what has been described as "the ramifying pun that spreads throughout the *Canzoniere,*" Laura, as the poetic subject and "object of the poet's all-consuming desire," is "indistinguishable from *lauro*, the laurel."[71] Gendered bibliofictions similarly characterize the Tudor discourses produced by imitations and adaptations of Ovid's poetry. To turn again to *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell*, the bibliofictions surrounding the reception and dissemination of Skelton's own poetry are deeply entwined with portrayals of of female metamorphosis. Saliently, in a text which reworks post-Petrarchan conceptions of poetic fame, these bibliofictions are also informed by their intertextual allusions to Ovid's Apollo and Daphne episode.[72]

Opposing the first page of text in the 1523 printed edition of *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell* is a woodcut bearing the superscription 'Skelton Poeta.' The youth pictured below, surrounded by a panoply of flowers, clasps a nosegay in his left hand, upon which his gaze is intently focused; his right hand, meanwhile, brandishes a laurel branch.[73] Below, the figure is glossed with the following lines:

> *Eterno mansura die dum sidera fulgent,*
> *Equora dumque tument, hec laurea nostra virebit:*

---

[70] In the *Amores*, for example, three separate elegies (1.3., 2.17, 3.12) link the impetus for Ovid's own poetry to his mistress.
[71] Gordon Braden, "Beyond Frustration: Petrarchan Laurels in the Seventeenth Century," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 26.1 (1986): 8.
[72] Lerer has remarked that "if Petrarch was the eponymous poet laureate for the fourteenth century, Skelton becomes the eponymous laureate for the early sixteenth": *Chaucer and His Readers*, 179. For a discussion of the poet laureates in late medieval and early Tudor England, see *Chaucer and His Readers*, 23–56.
[73] Edward Hodnett, *English Woodcuts, 1480-1535* (1935; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), no. 2058.

> *Hic nostrum celebre et nomen referetur ad astra,*
> *Undique Skeltonis memorabitur alter Adonis.*
>
> While the stars shine remaining in everlasting day, and while the seas swell, this our laurel shall be green: our famous name shall be echoed to the skies, and everywhere Skelton shall be remembered as another Adonis.

Maura Tarnoff has recently observed how *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell*—a work that, in its very title, deliberately begins to confuse the distinctions between the wreath of poetic fame and the text itself—"begins with a pun, a revamping of the *Canzoniere*'s equation of Laura with *lauro*."[74] The perennially green *laurea* of this epigraph operates both in reference to the poem itself and to the poet laureate's denotative garland. This semantic blurring is continued throughout the poem, and Skelton's plays on "*hec laurea nostra"* rely upon and rework the gendered bibliofictions found in Ovid's earlier rendition of the Apollo and Daphne episode.

Skelton's intertextual Ovidian bibliofictions are made more explicit when Apollo himself appears within the dream vision. A prince among poets, Apollo is "formest of alle that kam thedder" (287) in the pageant-like catalogue of poets who receive Skelton Poeta welcomingly in their midst.[75] The Greco-Roman god of poetry, sporting a laurel "cronelle on his hede" (288), is shown in the process of literary composition: he stridently "Lament[s] Daphnis" who was "Transformyd…in to the laurelle grene" (290, 294). Echoing the sentiment of the Ovidian Apollo's impassioned "*Me miserum!*" [Ah me!] (1.508), Skelton's Apollo closely paraphrases passages from Book 1 of the *Metamorphoses*.[76] Significantly, however,

---

[74] "Sewing Authorship in John Skelton's *Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell,*" *ELH* 75.2 (2008): 417.

[75] Ovid makes an important cameo appearance in this parade of poets, many of whom appear holding copies of their most popular books. This procession includes the famed writers of classical antiquity, including Vergil, Homer, Hesiod, Juvenal, Cicero, Livy, Plutarch, Terence, Plautus, and Seneca; it also gestures towards both the early medieval tradition, with nods to Macrobius and Boethius, and more contemporary continental humanists, including Boccaccio, Petrarch, Poggio Braccolini, and Robert Gaguin. It is, however, the renowned "Englyshe poetis thre" (391), Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate, the proponents of the native vernacular tradition, with whom Skelton most closely identifies himself and his own poetry.

[76] Much of Apollo's complaint is addressed to "Dyana the goddess immortalle" (303). This seems to be inspired by Ovid's suggestion that Daphne "*fugit...nomen amantis | silvarum latebris captivarumque ferarum | exuviis gaudens innuptaeque aemula Phoebes*" [fled from the very name of love, rejoicing in the deep fastnesses of the woods, and in the spoils of beasts which she had snared, vying with the virgin Phoebe [i.e. Diana]] (*Met.* 1.474-6). Perhaps the most profound similarity between the laments of Skelton's Apollo and Ovid's Apollo, however, occurs in lines 309-15 of *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell*, which bear a very close resemblance to *Met.* 1.521-524:

> Why have the goddys shewid me this cruelte,

Skelton's Apollo also reinterprets his *tenuis liber*. He provides Daphne with a new, post-Petrarchan meaning when he declares: "Yit in remembraunce of Daphnis transformacioun | Alle famows poetis ensewynge after me | Shall were a garlande of the laurelle tre" (320-22). *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell* thus posits Ovidian mythological *materia* as the poetic substance taken up and reworked by the 'formest' of poets. Moreover, in redefining Daphne's meaning, Skelton's Apollo also metemorphosizes our understanding of 'famows poetis' and their vocation; such poets are, by definition, Ovidian disciples who share in the physical act of wearing the laurel garland as a symbol of poetic fame and who actively participate in the intertextual 'remembraunce' of Daphne in their own writings.

The redefinition of Daphne's corporeal text in *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell* extends far beyond this three line gloss by Apollo. Rather, questions of the metamorphic body and its relationship to the book underlie Poeta Skelton's set of inset lyrics presented to a group of "ladis and Jantilwomen" (809): the Countess of Surrey, Elizabeth Howard, Muriel Howard, Lady Anne Dacre of the South, Margery Wentworth, Margaret Tylney, Jane Blenerhasset, Isabel Pennel, Margaret Hussey, Gertrude Statham, and Isabel Knyght. Allegedly composed in response to Fame's objection that Skelton has not produced enough poetry in praise of ladies, these inscribed literary accolades addressed to the Countess and her coterie exhibit both Daphne's 'remembraunce' and a refiguring of her 'transformacioun.' Brownlow detects that "Skelton's conception of poetry as a transforming agency...owes more to his trained Latinist's reading of the *Metamorphoses* than to anything in the native tradition of poetry," and Skelton conspicuously marks himself as a metamorphic poet *à la* Ovid.[77] Written by Skelton Poeta with

---

> Sithe I contryvid fyrst prynciplis medicynabil?
> I helpe alle other of ther infirmite,
> Bot now to helpe my selfe I am not habille:
> That profytithe alle other is no thynge profytabille
> Unto me: Alas that herbe nor gresse
> The fervent axys of love kan not represse!

[77] "Introduction 2," in *The Book of the Laurel*, 86. Skelton also aligns his own poetic project with that of Orpheus, one of the *Metamorphoses'* most memorable *alteri* Ovids in "ADMONET SKELTONIS OMNES ARBORES DARE LOCUM VIRIDI LAURO JUXTA GENUS SUM." In this short Latin piece, which follows the series of envoys at the end of *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell*, Skelton's poetic *persona* emulates Orpheus in

"dredefulle tremlyng fyst" (828), this inset lyric sequence represents a series of "specifically written documents," and the description of the poems' composition is tellingly bracketed "by a description of the poet taking up and putting down his pen."[78]

Each of these occasional lyrics is not only addressed to but also titled with the name of a lady in the Countesses' coterie. Creating an equivocal relationship between these inscripted poems and the ladies.With the written documents replicating readable *scriptae puellae*, each of Poeta Skelton's laudatory poems thereby translates and encapsulates a particular dedicatee in textual form. Moreover, recalling well-known mythological transformations of mythological characters, Skelton Poeta enacts the figurative 'transformacioun' of these *scriptae puellae* into a floral bouquet—an image that is reminiscent of the woodcut titled 'Poeta Skelton' at the outset of the work.[79] The "florisshinge" (802, 869, 876) women in his lyrics are metamorphosed into a colourful spectrum of "enbuddid blossome[s]" (969, 883), including: "the daisy flour" (986), "mageran jantel" (906, 914, 922), "flagrant camamel" (978) "sovereyne rosemary" (980), "goodely columbyne" (913), "jeloffer wele set" (983), "praty prymerose" (912), "vyolet" (984), "rosis rede of hu" (883, 890), and "lyllis whight" (891). [80]

A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell replicates Ovid's interests in text as gendered *corpus* and gendered *corpus* as text, the writeable body and the written body. The ambiguity of the Ovidian *tenuis liber* as both book and greenery is mirrored in Skelton's work. Within the fictional world of *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell*, Skelton Poeta pens and transforms the Countess and her ladies to provide tangible, inscripted proof that he is worthy of laureation. In so doing, like Apollo before him, Skelton Poeta lays claim to Daphne and redefines her for his own

---

Met. 10.86 ff. by calling upon a catalogue of trees before issuing his final command: "*Arboris omne genus viridi concedite lauro!*" [every kind of tree, yield to the green laurel!] (1609).

78 Tarnoff, 426.

79 "As Tarnoff has remarked, "this sequence inscribes the poem's female coterie as a string of verses, a poetic daisy chain in which embroidered flowers and their artificers are transformed into verbal conceits": 427.

80 Skelton's reference to his versification as an attempt to "stellify" the ladies (964) is reminiscent of the transformations of women (such as Callisto) into constellations in the *Metamorphoses*. Mythological resonances also contribute to Skelton's textualization of the women, for Skelton borrows heavily upon Ovidian intertexts within this lyrical series. He compares the various women to characters including Cydippe, Penelope, Deianira, Canace, Phaedra, Laodamia, Hipsypile, Pasiphae, and Helen. Such use of Ovidian heroines as rhetorical *exempla* is the subject of the next chapter.

purposes. In a complex formulation, the arboreal chapelet with which Skelton Poeta is crowned at the end of the text is an *augmented* laurel wreath; his intertextual garland is worked with gems, silk, and gold, and—most importantly—embroidered blossoms fashioned by the Countess and her throng of ladies. Following the lead of Ovid's Apollo, then, Skelton Poeta integrates the metonymic "flowris freshe to sight" (1105) of his poetry into his symbolic chapelet. This "florisshinge of flowris" (802) on the laurel garland is at once gendered and patently literary. These posies embody the identities of the ladies who fashioned them and also signify the poesies composed in their honour by Skelton Poeta for his admittance to the court of Fame. Skelton's "lawrelle rychely wrowght" (1099) thus functions as an aetiological artifact and symbol not only of his own poetry, but also of his intertextual debt to Ovidian literature.

Though less explicitly entwined with elegiac conventions, the Ovidian bibliofictions in Skelton's *Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* are likewise gendered. The work's engagement with the life cycles of books extends beyond the platonic implications of Jane's reading list and the *mise en abîme* of the text within the text. For, as much as it is a poem about reading, *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* is also a poem that thematizes and fictionalizes the mechanics and processes of writing. With her monologue drawing to a close, Jane asserts there is "one thynge…behynde, | That now commeth to mynde" that she wishes to do in honour of her late pet (603-04):

> An epytaphe I wold have
> For Phyllyppes grave.
> But for I am a mayde,
> Tymerous, halfe afrayde,
> That never yet asayde
> Of Elyconys well,
> Where the muses dwell:
> Though I can rede and spell.
>
> (605-12)

> I am but a yong mayd,
> And cannot in effect
> My style as yet direct
> With Englysh wordes elect;
>
> (770-74)

> But, for my sparowes sake,
> Yet as a woman may,
> My wyt I shall assay

> An epytaphe to wryght
> In Latyne playne and lyght
>
> (819-23)

Jane's protestations of authorial inadequacy are quickly realized. A professional poet who *has* partaken 'Of Elyconys well' is, coincidentally, on hand to relieve her. When we move into the second section of *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe*, we find the abrupt intrusion of Skelton's authorial *persona*, who declares:

> *Per me laurigerum*
> *Britanum Skeltonida vatem*
> *Hec cecinisse licet*
> *Ficta sub imagine texta.*
> *Cuius eris volucris,*
> *Prestanti corpore virgo:*
> *Candida Nais erat,*
> *Formosior ista Joanna est:*
> *Docta Corinna fuit,*
> *Sed magis ista sapit.*
>
> (834-843)
>
> Through me, Skelton the laureate poet of Britain, these compositions could be sung under a feigned likeness. She whose bird you were is a maiden of surpassing physical beauty: the naiad was fair, but Jane is more beautiful; Corinna [the *puella* of Ovid's *Amores*] was learned, but Jane knows more.

Suddenly and unexpectedly unveiling the machinery of his prior ventrilocution, Skelton effortlessly dismantles the carefully constructed illusions, or *ficta imagine*, of Jane's agency and subjectivity.[81] Following this theatrical entrance of Skelton's *persona,* the poem is vested with a new authorial *ego,* and "that most goodly mayd ⎪ That *Placebo* hath sayd, ⎪ And for her sparow prayd" transitions from the first-person *narrator* to the third-person *narrated* (852-54). Skelton's deliberate memorialization places Jane squarely in the past, as artifact—instantly metamorphosing the schoolgirl from fictional speaker to *scripta puella* and overt subject matter of *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe.*

Skelton's artistic motive correspondingly shifts after the poem's Latin epithet. Taking up "pen and ynk" (989), the *persona* of Britain's self-proclaimed laureate poet declares that he

[81] Skelton's wording here is reminiscent of Ovid's references to his "*falso*" Corinna (*Am.* 3.12.43).

"Now wyll…enterpryse" Jane's "beautye to commende" (856, 859), and he proceeds to do so effusively:

> Ryght so she doth excede
> All other of whom we rede,
> Whose fame by me shall sprede
> Into Perce and Mede,
> From Brytons Albion
> To the Towre of Babilon.
>
> (883-88)

Skelton's wording simultaneously makes Jane bookish and marks her as his own book. As he ostensibly exalts the young girl, by the very comparisons that he makes, she becomes associated with and absorbed into an extant tradition. This is a literary milieu that is already well-populated by 'All other' characters 'of whom we rede'; we, as audience, are called upon to corroborate Skelton's implicit claim that Jane's character and book *already* belong to a textual tradition. Skelton thereby invests her with a canonicity that establishes Jane as both a conspicuously fictional and citable character. The text of Jane will be 'sprede,' but only *per Skeltonida vatem*. In this sense, the girl's fame and her words are paradoxically indistinguishable from the *poeta's* own.[82]

Critics have long noticed the connection between Jane's sparrow and Lesbia's *passer* in Catullus' second elegy. The more obvious and immediate classical precedent for Skelton's poem, however, is Ovid's *Amores* 2.6, a mock-heroic elegy on the death of Corinna's pet parrot.[83] The defining characteristic of Ovid's lifeless "*avium gloria*" [glory of birds] is its former

---

[82] Skelton reiterates this same idea at the conclusion of the poem's second section (1261-67):

> She is worthy to be enrolde
> With letters of golde.
> *Car elle vaut.*
> *Per me laurigerum Britonum Skeltonida vatem*
> *Laudibus eximiis merito hec redimita puella est:*
> *Formosam cecini, qua non formiosior ulla est;*
> *Formosam potius quam commendaret Homerus.*
>
> Because she is worthy. Through me, Skelton, the laureate poet of Britain, this girl is deservedly crowned with choice praises. I have sung of the beautiful girl than whom there is no one more beautiful; a beautiful girl preferable to any Homer might commend.

[83] The close textual affinity between *Amores* 2.6 and *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* is specifically cited by Skelton in his abovementioned allusion, '*Docta Corinna fuit,* | *Sed magis ista sapit.*' It is possible that Skelton intends this as an allusion not only to the *scripta puella* of Ovid's *Amores*, but also to the ancient poet Corinna whom

garrulity and "*sermonis amore*," or love of speech (20, 29). During his lifetime, the parrot formerly enjoyed "*vox mutandis ingeniosa sonis*" [voice adept in mimicry of sounds] and served as a "*loquax humanae vocis imago*" [loquacious image of the human voice] (18, 37). Partway through the poem, Ovid proclaims of Corinna's former parrot that "*non fuit in terris vocum simulantior ales*" [on earth there was no bird who could better imitate speech] (23), but, in the very next line, the poet immediately qualifies this overblown commendation with a deflating and belittling jab disguised as further praise: "*reddebas blaeso tam bene verba sono*" [you rendered words so well in your throaty tone] (24).[84] Nevertheless, the parrot continues to echo human speech, even from beyond the grave, for Ovid's elegy ends with a *carmen* in the voice of the late "*imitatrix ales*" [wingèd mimic] (1):

> *Ossa tegit tumulus—tumulus pro corpore magnus—*
> *quo lapis exiguus par sibi carmen habet:*
>
> *COLLIGOR EX IPSO DOMINAE PLACUISSE SEPULCRO.*
> *ORA FUERE MIHI PLUS AVE DOCTA LOQUI.*
> (59-62)
>
> His bones are covered by a mound—mound such as fits his body's size—on which a scant stone bears a legend that just fits the space:—'YOU MAY JUDGE FROM MY VERY MONUMENT MY MISTRESS LOVED ME WELL. I HAD A MOUTH WAS SKILLED IN SPEECH BEYOND A BIRD.'

Skelton plays on Ovid's account of the parrot in his own poem, reassigning the loquacious parrot's portrayal instead onto the visibly ventriloquized *docta puella,* or learned girl, who nonetheless 'cannot in effect ⎪ [her] style as yet direct ⎪ With Englysh wordes elect.'[85] In *Amores* 2.6, "the parrot…says *vale*," as A.C. Spearing observes, much "as Jane does in her epitaph for Phyllyp." Moreover, "the epitaph with which Ovid's poem concludes this piece

---

Plutarch mentions as having bested Pindar in a poetry competition. Jennifer Summit touches upon the postclassical reputation of the second Corinna in *Lost Property: The Woman Writer and English Literary History, 1380-1589* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 23-59.

[84] John Gilmore observes of these lines: "The adjective *blaesus* suggests some sort of speech defect. It is very clever and amusing of the bird to be able to speak Latin, but you don't expect him to do so with the eloquence of an Ovid": "Parrots, Poets and Philosophers: Language and Empire in the Eighteenth Century," *EnterText* 2 (2003): 87.

[85] The image of the *docta puella* is something of a convention in Roman elegy. See, for example, Propertius, *Elegies*, Loeb Classical Library 18, trans. G.P Goold (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), 2.13.9-16. On the figure of the *docta puella*, see Sharon L. James, *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

defines not Corinna but the parrot as possessing *ora…docta,* a learned mouth." "The implication" of this transfer, as Spearing notes, "is that the 'Jane'…is herself a parrot, in the sense that she speaks words taught her by Skelton." [86] Skelton's subtle play on the widespread contemporary taste for antifeminist satire is evident in Jane's representation as a mere Ovidian parrot—and a *blaesus* one, at that. The dilettantish Tudor schoolgirl *almost* sounds like a poet, but her understanding of poetry is markedly superficial. After all, *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* also plays on the widespread tendency of Tudor readers to mirror and, figuratively speaking, to collate the texts of their own lives with the lives of literary exemplars. The success of Skelton's poem depends on our recognition of Jane's sciolism as she parrots Ovidian poetry and incongruously reads her own 'tragic' situation into the canon of literature with which she is familiar. Skelton's Jane thus misconstrues her Ovidian sources and mimics the process of poetic composition without full comprehension or true inspiration. She is an amusing and clever child-imitator, able to recite bits and pieces from the bibliography in her imagination, but Skelton' poem ultimately enervates her, reducing Jane to a *loquax* pet, a misreader of Ovidian text and an amusing Ovidian text to be read.

DEFINING TUDOR OVIDIANISM

My use of Skelton's works to elucidate my notion of Tudor bibliofictions throughout this introduction has been deliberate, for Skelton is typically understood as a poet whose works form a conceptual point of connect between the aesthetics and literary conventions of 'Late Medieval' and 'Renaissance' literature. Invoked alternately as an epilogue to one tradition or a prologue to the next, the purportedly Janus-headed Skelton has most often been interpreted in terms of his dualism.[87] His poetry is heralded as the missing link, so to speak, between the 'Age

[86] *The Medieval Poet as Voyeur: Looking and Listening in Medieval Love-Narratives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 270.
[87] The Janus metaphor has been taken up time and time again to describe Skelton's historical circumstances by his modern biographers and critics, including: Arthur F. Kinney, *John Skelton, Priest as Poet: Seasons of Discovery* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987); Stanley E. Fish, *John Skelton's Poetry* (New

of Chaucer' and the 'Age of Shakespeare.' My resolution to begin my own discussion of Tudor Ovidianism with examples drawn from the work of "a Mr. Facing Both Ways" is therefore apt, for this is a dissertation that likewise faces both ways.[88]

While there is a sizeable body of work on Ovid and Chaucer as well as on Ovid in the 1590s, particularly in relation to late Elizabethan mythological *epyllia*, there has been little written on Ovid's literary reception in the earlier decades of the sixteenth century. A strong conceptual division exists between the Ovidian literature of the 1590s and pre-1590s Ovidian literature, which is customarily treated as contextual material valued primarily for the light that it can shed upon late Elizabethan translations and adaptations.[89] This neglect of Henrician, Edwardian, and Marian Ovidianism reflects a more general neglect of Pre-Elizabethan Tudor literature. C.S. Lewis' damning assessment of the "bludgeon-work" of the Tudor era prior to Elizabeth has had an unfortunately profound and lasting impact.[90] Lewis' teleological framework and regrettably pejorative characterizations of "Drab Age" literature—as well as the stark contrast that he draws between earlier decades and the "last quarter of the century" when "the unpredictable happens" and "with startling sureness we ascend"—has helped to draw a sharp distinction between the earlier sixteenth century and the Renaissance "Golden Age" of Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser, and William Shakespeare.[91]

Haven: Yale University Press, 1965); Ian A. Gordon, *John Skelton, Poet Laureate* (1943; New York: Octagon, 1970); and William Nelson, *John Skelton, Laureate* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939).

[88] Skelton is so described by Gordon, 45.

[89] As David Loewenstein and Janel Mueller note, the mid-sixteenth century has "standardly been regarded as a prologue rather than a notable period of literary culture in its own right": "Introduction," *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature*, eds. David Loewenstein and Janel Mueller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 5.

[90] *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama* (1954; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 1.

[91] Lewis, 1. Lewis divided the sixteenth century into three periods: the Late Medieval, the Drab Age, and the Golden Age. He claimed that Late Medieval authors "seem to have forgotten the lessons which had been mastered in the Middle Ages and learned little in their stead": 1. This early period gave way to the equally dismal literature of what Lewis termed the Drab Age, a period that "begins before the Late Medieval has ended, towards the end of Henry VIII's reign, and lasts into the late seventies": 64. English literature, in Lewis' estimation, is redeemed only by the late Elizabethans: "Fantasy, conceit, paradox, color, incantation return….Sidney, Spenser, Shakespeare…display what is almost a new culture: that culture which was to last through most of the seventeenth century and enrich the very meanings of the words *England* and *Aristocracy*. Nothing in the earlier history of our period would have enabled the sharpest observer to foresee this transformation": 1.

The anatomizing instinct that has often lead scholars to distinguish between the "Renaissance," with its alleged modernity, and the "Medieval," with its alleged alterity, is evident in much of the scholarship on Tudor Ovidianism. Prior studies of late-Elizabethan Ovidianism have often been guilty of treating the 1590s as a period that fostered readings of Ovid that are at once both thoroughly classical and thoroughly modern. Assumptions that "Golden Age" authors and audiences suddenly obtained unmediated access to the Latin classics—and, as a result, resurrected an authentically classical or pagan aesthetic—abound.[92] Jonathan Bate's version of Shakespeare, for example, is an author who typically "bypasses the [medieval] moralizing tradition and returns to Ovid himself," and, according to Richard F. Hardin, due to an earlier penchant for allegory and sober didacticism, "the 'real' Ovid of pagan sympathies remain[ed] unsung if not unwanted" before the turn of the seventeenth century.[93] Lyne has recently helped to propagate the similar idea that the later part of the century saw a "juncture in the literary history of English," a transition from the "tired medieval moralizing tradition" of the "*Ovide moralisé* and its variants, to a humanist return to the classical text itself."[94]

---

[92] The standard account, which forms the historical backdrop for most studies of Ovid's English reception, is concisely articulated by Jonathan Bate. In *Shakespeare and Ovid,* Bate summarizes that, at the close of the sixteenth century (25):

> ways of reading Ovid underwent a radical transformation, as a newly unapologetic delight in the poetic and erotic qualities of the *Metamorphoses* came to compete with the predominant medieval practice of moralizing and even Christianizing them….There was…a millennium long tradition of reading Ovid's poems as if they were allegorical and as if their sentiments were morally elevated rather than erotically charged. The tradition was formalized and codified by French writers…, [and the] anonymous *Ovide Moralisé*…was the most influential work of this sort…It was thus kind of reading which went into decline, though not desuetude, in the sixteenth century.

Most studies of Elizabethan Ovidianism rely heavily upon this assumption of a 'radical transformation' in Ovidian interpretation, suggesting that, in the final decade of the century, interpretations of Ovid's texts emerged which capitalized in unprecedented ways upon the comedic spirit and salacious appeal of Ovid, dimensions of his poetry that had allegedly been repressed or censored in so-called medieval, allegorical and exegetical traditions. Hence, we find statements such as Dympna Callaghan's assertion that Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis,* is "*totally unlike its predecessors* because it is devoid of any moral purpose," instead representing a "new, more aesthetic and pagan conception of Ovid": "The Book of Changes in a Time of Change: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in Post-Reformation England and *Venus and Adonis*," *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works. Vol. IV: The Poems, Problem Comedies and Late Plays*, eds. Richard Dutton and Jean Howard (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 28. Italics my own.

[93] *Shakespeare and Ovid*, 176; "Ovid in Seventeenth-Century England," *Comparative Literature* 24.1 (1972): 46-47.

[94] *Ovid's Changing Worlds,* 28, 29. Similar distinctions are often made by literary scholars. For just one example, Georgia Brown likewise delineates a "general change in reading habits that took hold in the late sixteenth century" and identifies "two readings of Ovid [that] competed for prominence, one allegorical, the other

Although Skelton's poetry predates the historical point at which most studies of Ovid's Tudor reception begin by at least half a century, the unabashed (Ovidian?) delight that *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* and *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell* take in their own irreverence and explicit revisionism certainly does not coincide with generalized characterizations of pre-Shakespearian Tudor Ovidianism as allegorical, moral, Christianizing, and implicitly jejune. The fictionalized networks of textual reception and gendered Ovidian bibliofictions in *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe* and *A Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell* are anything but vapid. Rather, Skelton's poems clearly demonstrate some of the ways in which, to echo R.W. Maslen, "readings and imitations of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* before Shakespeare were very much more sophisticated… than scholars have often been willing to concede."[95]

My work on Ovidian heroines in Tudor England breaks with convention in delving further back into the literature of the early Tudor era than has been customary. Emphasizing continuities rather than breaks in hermeneutic practice, I ultimately paint a more complicated and dynamic portrait of both Shakespearean and pre-Shakespearean literary Ovidianism. Focusing on interpretative continuities and showing how the treatment of Ovidian characters in medieval vernacular works remained influential throughout the Tudor era, I blur the (somewhat arbitrary and anachronistic) distinctions often made between the increasingly permeable boundaries that demarcate literature of the Middle Ages from literature of the

---

historical": *Redefining Elizabethan Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 42. Though this neat schematization that Lyne and others make between medieval allegorizing and humanist classicizing is one that is often repeated, either explicitly or implicitly, in studies of Ovid's Tudor reception, it is deeply problematic, for the so-called medieval moral impulse is often properly identified as itself being a *humanist* mode of reading associated with the so-called new learning of sixteenth-century England. The confusion wrought by these distinctions is evident in Colin Burrow's assessment: "it is hard to draw hard distinctions between 'Medieval' and 'Renaissance' responses to Ovid, since many of what are traditionally thought of as 'Medieval' features of his reception (such as allegorical commentaries) persist well into the seventeenth century, and many of what are often thought to be 'Renaissance' responses to his work (such as the use of Ovidian narratorial *personae*) can be found in Chaucer and Gower": "Re-embodying Ovid: Renaissance afterlives," 302.

[95] As R.W. Maslen has recently pointed out in "Myths Exploited: the Metamorphoses of Ovid in Elizabethan England," scholars have rarely looked further back in time than the 1590s in their discussions of Tudor Ovidianism: *Shakespeare's Ovid*, 28. Despite his own admirable aim "to show that readings and imitations of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* before Shakespeare were very much more sophisticated…than scholars have often been willing to concede," Malsen, too, in his ensuing overview of pre-1590s Ovidian reception, looks back only to the early years of Elizabeth's reign; his discussion ventures back no further in history than the 1560s, a decade which has come to be treated—somewhat arbitrarily—as the starting point of Tudor literary engagement with Ovid's poetry.

Renaissance. My work thus situates itself amongst a growing body of scholarship that crosses the traditional boundary between medieval and Renaissance studies.

I have focused on Skelton's poetry throughout this introduction for another reason: his use of Ovidian intertexts provides a helpful model with which to define some of the major characteristics of Tudor Ovidianism. In its most basic manifestation, we might say sixteenth-century Ovidianism is distinguished by explicit intertextuality or active and conscious engagement with one or more of Ovid's works. However, Ovidian vernacular texts are always polyglot texts, and the Tudor Ovid only loosely resembles the historical Ovid that we would locate in Roman antiquity. Ovid's English reception was mediated through a myriad of Latin and vernacular sources and discourses, and understandings of his poetic *materia* were informed by glosses, commentaries, reference materials, and subsequent literary adaptations.[96]

Although modern scholarship has tended to treat Ovid's poems as discrete bodies of work, regarding the reception of individual mythological narratives as individual phenomena, such distinctions are largely artificial. Tudor representations of Ovidian heroines—and, indeed, postclassical Ovidianisms in general—do not derive from a direct classical source with a singular, traceable itinerary. My above discussions of Skelton's poems demonstrate many of the ways in which mythological narratives from discrete Ovidian texts frequently became intertwined in their postclassical reception. Jane Scrope, for example, appears to treat Ovid's *oeuvre* as an organic unit, making no discernible distinction between source texts when she cites her 'Ovid.' Jane's bibliography demonstrates that sixteenth-century Ovidian heroines' stories are filtered and focused through a myriad of textual lenses, viewed through the satirical and often misogynistic interpretations of Ovid's elegies, understood in relation to newer and postclassical genres such as the medieval romance, and read alongside synergistic vernacular sources, including works by Chaucer, Gower, Lydgate, and Petrarch.[97]

---

[96] See my Appendix on the publication history of Ovid's Latin works in Tudor England.
[97] We might think, for example, of the Ovidian textual interplay in Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*, in which the Elizabethan author famously signals his debt not only to *Metamorphoses* 10, his primary source for the

The co-existence and juxtaposition of 'Ovidian' and 'Chaucerian' narratives in Jane Scrope's imagination points to the tenuous divide which separates 'Chaucerianism' (or 'post-Chaucerianism') and 'Ovidianism' during the Tudor period. While 'Chaucerian' contamination has contributed to our modern sense that little 'Ovidian' literature was produced during the early Tudor period, Skelton's poetry perfectly illustrates the ways in which these two literary categories were indistinct and conceptually intertwined in readers' imaginations. When Jane refers to the tale of 'Pyramus and Thesbe' or references 'Medeas arte,' for example, is she thinking of these characters' literary manifestations in Ovid or later, derivitive renditions of these characters' tales in sources such as Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women*—or perhaps both?

James Simpson has identified a deep-rooted and parallel tendency to emphasize the 'Petrarchan' over the 'Ovidian' nature of late fifteenth and early sixteenth-century poetry.[98] The relationship between Ovid and Petrarch is vexed for much the same reason that the relationship between Ovid and Chaucer is: Petrarch, like Chaucer, relied heavily upon Ovid in his own works, and, thus, all Petrarchism is Ovidianism at one further remove.[99]Although many sixteenth-century authors' relationships to Petrarch were indirect, nonetheless, their lyric strategies are still popularly understood as Petrarchism. In modern scholarship, English literary 'Ovidianism'—unlike 'Petrarchism,' which does not necessarily imply direct textual contact with Petrarch—is typically understood as a direct engagement with or imitation of Ovid's

---

narrative, but also to the broader aesthetic and stylistic influences of Ovid's erotic works; the epyllion, after all, opens with a Latin epigraph from the *Amores* and thus promises its readers a multi-generic reworking, both in material and sentiment, of the mythological and sensual poetry of the Latin *auctor* Ovid.

[98] "Breaking the Vacuum: Ricardian and Henrician Ovidianism," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 29.2 (1999), 325. We often talk about sixteenth-century English lyricism in terms of its adherence to Petrarchan conventions and metaphorical conceits. Nonetheless, for a salient example of a discourse which we have come to think of in solely Petrarchan terms (but which might, too, be considered Ovidian), I would point to the sonnet sequences of the late sixteenth century. While we have come to think of English sonneteers almost exclusively in terms of their Petrarchan lineage, this was less true of early modern audiences. Rather, the genre was often given an Ovidian genealogy.

[99] English poets' relationship with Petrarch was generally indirect as well, mediated through contemporary continental poets such as Tasso, Ronsard, and Du Bellay. Anthony Mortimer notes: "Time and time again we find the rudderless ship, the war between the eye and the heart, the attraction of the moth to the flame, the icy fire and the burning cold. Almost any sonnet sequence, chosen at random, will provide an extensive list of the Petrarchan conventions. And yet direct translation from the *Canzoniere* is surprisingly infrequent": "Introduction," in *Petrarch's Canzoniere in the English Renaissan*œ, rev. ed., ed. Anthony Mortimer (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005), 18.

poetry. But, given the widespread acquaintance with Ovid and the conditions of his reception throughout this period, I would argue that this term, like the moniker 'Petrarchan,' should also be used to describe the indirect evocation of the recognizable narrative substance and/or sentiments of Ovid's poetry. In other words, 'Ovidianism' should not *only* be used to signal direct engagement with Ovid's Latin *oeuvre*. Rather, this category should be expansive enough to include texts composed at second- or third-generation removes from the classical source—texts that may *also* be 'Petrarchan,' 'Chaucerian,' or even, in the latter part of the century, 'Shakespearean.'[100]

I began this introduction with a discussion of Ulysses' narratives on Ogygian shore, and, by way of conclusion, I would turn again to this image of writing in the sand. "Ravish'd and wrong'd," in Act 4 of Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus*, Lavinia is encouraged by her uncle Marcus to "print [her] sorrows plain" in a "sandy plot."[101] Guiding a staff with her tragically muted mouth, the girl—whose "signs and tokens" were henceforth incomprehensible to the men around her (2.4.5), despite their authoritative efforts to "wrest an alphabet" from her "lively body" and read Lavinia as a corporeal "map of woe" (3.2.44, 3.1.105, 3.2.12)—belatedly informs her relatives of the "heinous, bloody deed" committed by Tamora's sons (4.1.80). Provocatively scratching "*Stuprum*—Chiron—Demetrius" with her staff (4.1.78), Lavinia literally confirms a tragic truth that the men around her have henceforth only suspected: "rape...was root of [her] annoy" (4.1.49). Her sandy 'print' reveals what the audience already knows: Lavinia's tragedy follows an established "pattern, precedent, and lively warrant" (5.3.44), for the written text that the violated girl constructs as she attempts to "bewray [her] meaning" is conspicuously modeled upon "the tragic tale of Philomel" (2.4.3, 4.1.47). "Play[ing] the scribe," Lavinia "quotes the leaves" of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (2.4.4, 4.1.50), a

---

[100] Just as the somewhat arbitrary distinctions between 'Ovidian,' 'Chaucerian,' and 'Petrarchan' have hindered investigations of early Tudor Ovidianism in a general sense, so have the equally subjective labels 'Homeric' and 'Vergilian' limited discussions of mythological heroines who are also 'Ovidian.'

[101] I cite the text of *Titus Andronicus* from *The Riverside Shakespeare,* ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974), 4.1.52, 75, 69. Subsequent parenthetical act, scene, and line numbers for all works of Shakespeare refer to this edition.

book that physically appeared on stage earlier in the same scene—in what Bate has referred to as "perhaps the most self-consciously literary moment in all Shakespeare."[102]

Lavinia's revelatory document is significant, not only for the content of its message, but also for the mechanics of its inscription. "Written upon...earth," Lavinia's autobiographical "display" bears an intertextual relationship with Ulysses' series of compositions on the beach (4.1.84, 73). Like Ovid, Shakespeare uses writing in the sand to comment on the physical manifestations of poetic substance. Lavinia's message and its mode of transmission remind us that *Titus Andronicus* is itself a metaphorical narrative in the sand, a dramatization of "stories chanced in the times of old," and a self-conscious retelling of Ovidian *materia* in novel discursive and physical guises (3.2.83). Moreover, the juxtaposition between the *Metamorphoses*, "the leaves" of which Lavinia "so busily...turns" (4.1.45), and the girl's own derivative text, with its words reported to the audience rather than actually *seen* onstage, reminds us that the identity of the book, along with the literary *materia* contained therein, transcends its inscription in any single copy. "What she hath writ" (4.1.77) is both a metonym for the intertextual book and an Ovidian text so ephemeral that Titus—who will devise a revenge plot "Pattern'd by that poet" (4.1.57)—is tempted to reinscribe its words on "a leaf of brass" (4.1.102). This imagery underscores not only the slippage between platonic and pragmatic books, but also the mutability of narratives as they are conceived and inscribed *iterumque iterumque*. Like the greedy tide of Spenser's *Amoretti* 75, an "angry northern wind," as Titus suggests, could easily alter or even annihilate Lavinia's Ovidian text, "blow[ing] these sands like Sibyl's leaves abroad" (4.1.104, 105).

Ovid's revisionist *corpus*, redolent with literary "demonstration[s] that all stories can be retold—and that therein lies their vitality," is a fruitful locus for thinking about literary reception and the sixteenth-century book.[103] 'Like Sibyl's leaves' blown 'abroad,' Ovidian literature circulated widely, and in numerous permutations, during the Tudor period. The

---

[102] Bate, 103.
[103] Tarrant, in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 32.

sixteenth century's fascination with the Roman poet meant that his intertextual and metatextual works were widely used as rhetorical models and sources of *fabulae,* and the later discourses which his poetry engendered and inspired would replicate Ovid's interest in representing bookish *corpora* within the literary text.

In the following chapters, I examine the bibliofictions that Tudor audiences so often noted in Ovid's poetry and emulated in their own. "If All the Yearth Wer Parchment Scribable" looks at Ovid's mythological heroines in the English *querelle des femmes*; arguing that Ovid's heroines—disembodied from their classical plotlines and redeployed as pithy *exempla*—were protean and permeable, I examine how these Ovidian characters and textual extracts are exscinded, reconceived, and rhetorically manipulated to form new Tudor treatises and books on the so-called woman question. Exploring the links, both metaphorical and material, between *fama*, publication, gossip, and the creation of literature, "Hir Name*,* Allas! Is Publisshed So Wyde" considers the ways in which the pseudo-Ovidian heroine Cressida spoke and was spoken about in sixteenth-century books. "'Both False and Also True" takes as its subject the verisimilitude of the *Heroides'* epistles as inscribed letters as well as intertextual documents in their postclassical literary reception. And, finally, "Our Sainted Legendarie" considers the Elizabethan era's hybrid Anglo-Ovidian heroines, such as Jane Shore, Rosomond Clifford, and Matilda Fitzwater. Building upon earlier chapters' observations about exemplarity, ventrilocution, and authority, this final chapter focuses on fictionalized networks of intertextual literary contact and narratives of poetic creation in the Ovidian-inspired female complaints of *A Mirror for Magistrates* and its generic descendants.

In identifying where Ovid's heroines appear and examining the various ways in which they are catalogued, conflated, and characterized, I focus on the fictions and metaphors—both historical and contemporary—which surround the production and transmission of Tudor literature. My purpose is not source study, nor is it to review all of Ovid and to chart the full trajectory of his textual afterlives. Rather, I mean to engage with the transmutations and literary

significance of his classical narratives in a postclassical context. What I offer in "Bibliofictions: Ovidian Heroines and the Tudor Book" is less a systematic survey of Ovidian literary reception over the course of the period than a sampling of postclassical Ovidian repetition and its variations, a sampling that elucidates the provocative intersections between physical, bibliographical and metaphysical, metaphorical books and their life cycles as represented in literature.

'IF ALL THE YEARTH WER PARCHMENT SCRIBABLE': OVIDIAN HEROINES IN THE *QUERELLE DES FEMMES*

In c. 1473, William Caxton ended the *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye* (STC 15375), the first book printed in English, with the comment: "I have practysed and lerned at my grete charge and dispense to ordeyne this said book in prynte after the maner and forme as ye may here see; and is not wreton with penne and ynke as other bokes ben to th'ende that every man may have them attones."[1] While I do not mean to exaggerate the impact of technological change on Tudor literature—or to overenthusiastically suggest, along with Francis Bacon, that printing presses "*faciem et statum in orbe terrarum mutaverunt*" [changed the face and condition of things all over the globe]—it is true, as Caxton's *explicit* indicates, that the first books printed from moveable type were not made 'as other bokes ben.'[2] The printing press offered an alternative method of textual reproduction that was both more efficient and less expensive than professional copying 'with penne and ynke.' Facilitating the production of multiple copies 'to th'ende that every man may have them attones,' print thus presented a viable means of supplying a preexisting demand for books, and it enabled the production of these books on an unprecedented scale. By multiplying books "not consecutively but simultaneously," print also, as Alexandra Walsham and Julia Crick write, "spread texts in a different way from manuscript."[3] Although book ownership remained socially and economically exclusive, it is indisputable that books gained an increasing physical presence in English culture after the advent of print.[4]

---

[1] I cite from *Caxton's Own Prose*, ed. N.F. Blake (London: Andre Deutsch, 1973), 100.
[2] *Novum Organum,* ed. Thomas Fowler (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1878), 330. English translation adopted from *The New Organon*, trans. Michael Silverthorne, eds. Lisa Jardine and Michael Silverthorne (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 100.
[3] "Introduction: Script, Print, and History," in *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700,* eds. Alexandra Walsham and Julia Crick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 20.
[4] Alexandra Halasz explains: "print permanently altered the discursive field not by bringing books to the marketplace (medieval scriptoria did that) but by enabling the marketplace to develop as a means of producing, disseminating, and mediating discourse independent of the sites and practices associated with and sanctioned by university, Church, and Crown": *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 4. On MSS of the literate laity during the late

Despite these differences that metal type brought to the English booktrade, it is important to appreciate that—as evinced, for example, by typefaces that recalled existing scripts or woodcuts that evoked the established techniques of manuscript illustration— early printed books, were, quite literally and profoundly, *shaped* by the established practices and organizational structures of the manuscript book.[5] Although the printing press mechanized production, it did not fundamentally alter the conventions or the established iconic resonances of the codex. It is telling that Caxton's own comment on the novelty of *Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye* takes the form of a formulaic scribal *explicit* and is prefaced with the remark: "my penne is worn, myn hande wery and not stedfast, myn eyen dimmed with overmoche lokyng on the whit paper."[6] Both the physical forms and the very idea of the book—as a metaphor or symbol that transcends the materials and means of its production—cut across these divides between script and print, medieval and Renaissance with surprising ease.[7]

---

medieval era, see Barbara A. Shailor, *The Medieval Book* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), 88–98. Of the early Tudor era, Lotte Hellinga tells us:

> After the scholars, including the lay scholars, as well as the clergy and the religious houses, English professional men were the greatest purchasers of books. They were the lawyers and doctors, dons and schoolmasters educated at university. Together with the merchant classes they represented at that time in England the layer of society that was rising on the social scale more than any other. The professionals, and also the merchant class, were more affected by the advent of printing than any other sector of society....From that point on books became part of their daily life, and they began to count books among their usual possessions.

I here cite from "Importation of Books Printed on the Continent into England and Scotland Before c. 1520," in *Printing and the Written Word: The Social History of Books, circa 1450-1520*, ed. Sandra Hindman (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 219-20.

[5] The scholarship of Arthur F. Marotti, Harold Love, H.R. Woudhuysen, and Margaret J.M. Ezell, among others, has brought increasing levels of attention to the widespread and persistent transmission of MSS in what had previously been considered, rather monolithically, a post-Caxtonian 'age of print' in England: Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995); Harold Love, *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); Margaret J. M. Ezell, *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).

[6] *Caxton's Own Prose*, 100. This image also relates back to Caxton's prologue, where he tells of his initial inspiration to translate the work: "as this booke was newe and late maad and drawen into Frenshe…I thought in myself hit shold be good a besynes to translate hyt… and thus concluded in myself to begynne this sayd w[e]rke. And forewith toke penne and ynke and begun boldly to renne forth as blynde Bayard": 97-98.

[7] Though I share Wendy Wall's sense that it is misleading to present differences between print and MS in terms of oppositions, I would distinguish my position on the retention of established bookmaking conventions in the Tudor era from her conception of "literary pseudomorphs," or printed codices that self-consciously incorporated features of MSS: *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 228-278. I do not think that the *willful* resistance to change implied in this concept is helpful in considering the earliest book printed in England, for it is

As suggested by John Lydgate's evocative comparisons of "clerkis in writyng, | Thyng that was maad of auctors hem beforn" to "potteres, which to that crafte entende, | Breke and renewe their vesselis to a-mende," the late medieval collection and interpretation of textual fragments, like bookmaking itself, was simultaneously a metaphorical and a material practice.[8] It involved both the reproduction and the reorganization of words; "olde thynges" could—and even *should*—be "chaunge[d] and turne[d] bi good discrecioun" into new "Shappis" and "formys" (1. 28, 10-11). Mary Carruthers has suggested that "a written text was presumed to need emendation and correction," and literary transmission was thus physically dependent on writers and readers who were expected to "correcte and eke to rubbe and scrape" their books.[9] Through *compilatio* and *ordinatio*, literate individuals could participate in the ongoing processes of textual revision, the thematic reframing of materials, and the production of new narrative formulations.[10]

When the narrator of Chaucer's *Book of the Duchess,* for example, encounters the Ovidian tale of Ceyx and Alcyone, it is amongst stories "Of quenes lives, and of kinges, | And many other thinges smale" in a single "bok" (58-59, 57). The poetic *persona* in *The Book of the Duchess* describes the story of Ceyx and Alcyone as a 'bok' embedded in a larger 'bok,' for his Ovidian *materia* is framed both conceptually and physically by an assorted collection of other "written fables | That clerkes had in olde tyme, | And other poetes, put in rime" (53-54). As Chaucer's narrator reworks the Ovidian story into his own memorializing paean for Blanche of Lancaster, his poetic *persona* relates how Ovidian *materia* can be held and imaginatively reshaped

---

ultimately based on the supposition that printed books *should*, by nature, have different features than their MS counterparts—a premise that I suspect most Tudor audiences would have found bewildering.

[8] I cite from *Lydgate's Fall of Princes*, ed. Henry Bergen, 4 vols. (Washington, DC: The Carnegie Institution, 1923), 1.21-22, 13-14. Subsequent parenthetical book and line numbers for *The Fall of Princes* refer to this edition.

[9] *The Book of Memory*, 196. My second description of textual emendation ("correcte and eke to rubbe and scrape") appears in "Chaucer's Wordes Unto Adam, His Owne Scriveyn," in *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. Larry D. Benson, 3rd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987), 6. Subsequent parenthetical book and line numbers for all of Chaucer's works refer to this edition unless otherwise specified.

[10] On *compilatio* and *ordinatio*, see M. B. Parkes, "The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book," in *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to R.W. Hunt,* eds. J.J.G. Alexander and M.T. Gibson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 115-141. On medieval conceptions of authorship more generally, see A.J.Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages* (London: Scolar Press, 1984).

"in minde" as well as in manuscript (55). Ultimately, *The Book of the Duchess* presents us with a tale of metamorphic textual transmission. Over the course of the poem, "the book that [he] hadde red | Of Alcione and Seys the kyng" (1326-27) is transformed from its initial embodiment into a new book that will, "in processe of tyme" be physically recorded "in ryme" (1331, 1332); as the poem's closing line informs us, "now hit ys doon" (1334).

Though print was a recognizably new medium, the physical, conceptual, aesthetic, and authorial plasticity of the early printed book continued to closely mirror the malleability of the manuscript book. However teleological our modern accounts of media technologies may tend to be, the same textual "aesthetic of permeability" that Deborah Horowitz discerns "entwined through the text" of Chaucer's *Book of the Duchess* similarly informs and characterizes early printed engagement with Ovid as well.[11] Like the late medieval Ovid, the Tudor Ovid was polyglot and polygeneric. Readers and writers could encounter Ovid in vernacular miscellanies and anthologies or learned *compilatio*, and, revealing a relationship to Ovidian 'boks' that is not unlike that described by Chaucer's narrator in *The Book of the Duchess*, the "consumers and producers" of early printed materials similarly "'looked on' pages printed and collated in a shop and saw something that might be shaped and reshaped into all sorts of different books."[12]

Tudor readers of manuscript and printed books alike were thus primed to recognize the same associations between physical metamorphosis and literary creation—that is, between mutable bodies and mutable books—that Ovid so frequently thematized in his poetry.[13] Arthur

---

[11] Suggesting that "entwined through the text of the *Book of the Duchess*, are interlacing strands of literary sources and spiraling seams of time," Horowitz argues of "the work's courtly and mythological influences" that "these overlapping sources, as well as the narrative's temporal desultoriness, create a ceaseless permeability that spans centuries and penetrates space": "An Aesthetic of Permeability: Three Transcapes of the *Book of the Duchess*," *The Chaucer Review* 39.3 (2005): 269, 260.

[12] Alexandra Gillespie, "Poets, Printers, and Early English *Sammelbände*," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 67.2 (2004): 209.

[13] Throughout this dissertation, my positions on the standardization and fixity of print rest on Adrian Johns' widely accepted thesis. Reacting against depictions of print culture as fixed and inevitable, Johns convincingly argues that "what we often regard as essential elements and necessary concomitants of print are in fact rather more contingent than is generally acknowledged": *The Nature of the Book*, 2. My characterization of Tudor print is also particularly indebted to David McKitterick's commentary on "the innate instability of printed texts" and his suggestions that "texts...are always mobile—at the time of writing, the time of production, the time of publication, and over the course of time...in the hands of different readers": *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 97.

Golding, for instance, in the dedicatory epistle to his 1567 translation of the *Metamorphoses*, echoes Ovid's own imagery of *nova corpora* in his assertion:

> For whatsoever hath bene writ of auncient tyme in greeke
> By sundry men dispersedly, and in the latin eeke,
> Of this same dark Philosophie of turned shapes, the same
> Hath Ovid into one whole masse in this booke brought in frame.[14]

Moreover, later in this same epistle, Golding goes on to characterize his own translation of this 'one whole masse' as a dissectible *corpus* from which individual textual fragments can be "as a member rent | Or parted from the resdew of the body."[15]

Touching upon what Margareta de Grazia has identified as "the sexual and mechanical interconnections so prevalent in the period's semantics," this chapter outlines the Tudor reception and rhetorical uses of Ovid's mythological heroines as fragmentary *exempla* in the books of the *querelle des femmes*.[16] In so doing, I trace the ways that both these *exempla* and the books in which they are contained are transformed into novel shapes and framed by new, aetiological narratives and alternative histories of their own metamorphic creation. Examining the impact of the numerous paratextual bibliofictions that surrounded the texts of the *querelle des femmes*, I contend that the conceptual and physical plasticity of the material book itself was metaphorically mimicked in Tudor literature as Ovidian heroines were collected, glossed, and represented in a series of new and ever-changing textual permutations.

INTERPRETING A 'BOOK OF WIKKED WYVES'

The squabble between Geoffrey Chaucer's Wife of Bath and her fifth husband, the "joly clerk Jankyn," is one of the best-known marital disputes in all of literature (628). Narrated by Alisoun—a self-proclaimed "expert" on "tribulacioun in mariage" (173-74)—the story of their discord comes at the climax of the Wife of Bath's Prologue when she describes how she

---

[14] "The Epistle," in *Ovid's Metamorphoses: The Arthur Golding Translation*, rev. ed., trans. Arthur Golding, ed. John Frederick Nims, intro. Jonathan Bate (1965; Philadelphia: Paul Dry Books, 2000), 5-8.
[15] "The Epistle," 586-87.
[16] "Imprints: Shakespeare, Gutenberg, and Descartes," *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England*, ed. Douglas A. Brooks (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 39.

"rente…a leef" from her young husband's book (635, 667). Her ensuing account of domestic violence and wedded strife is, at its heart, also an account of hermeneutic discrepancies, for it simultaneously encapsulates social, rhetorical, and textual conflict.[17] The Wife of Bath complains about her juvenile husband's antagonistic interpretations of *auctoritas* in his efforts to maintain physical and intellectual mastery in their relationship. Although Alisoun "sette noght an hawe | Of his proverbes" (659-60), in his misdirected bid for household supremacy, Jankyn "often-tymes wolde preche, | And [her] of olde Romayn geestes teche" (641-2):

> He hadde a book that gladly, nyght and day,
> For his desport he wolde rede alway.
> He cleped it 'Valerie and Theofraste,'
> At whiche book he lough alwey ful faste.
> And eek ther was som tyme a clerk at Rome,
> A cardinal that highte Seint Jerome,
> That made a book agayn Jovinian,
> In whiche book eek ther was Tertulan,
> Crisippus, Trotula, and Helowys,
> That was abbesse nat fer fro Parys,
> And eek the Parables of Salomon,
> Ovides Art, and bookes many on,
> And alle thise were bounden in o volume,
> And every nyght and day was his custume
> Whan he hadde leyser and vacacioun
> From oother worldly occupacioun
> To reden on this book of wikked wyves.
> (669-85)

The relationship of the Wife of Bath's Prologue—and indeed Chaucer's entire so-called Marriage Group—to clerical antifeminist attitudes, the conventions of courtly love literature, and the near-contemporary *querelle de la rose* of Christine de Pisan have often been remarked.[18] Without reiterating these well-known connections, I mean to highlight a particular aspect of Alisoun's debate with Jankyn: namely, the way that Jankyn selectively cites and interprets

---

[17] Marilynn Desmond has similarly argued that "[t]he struggle between Jankyn and Alisoun locates the physical violence of the *Prologue* within the traditions of rhetorical violence associated with disputation": *Ovid's Art and the Wife of Bath: The Ethics of Erotic Violence* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006) 135. See 136-141 for her discussion of the dispute over Jankyn's book.

[18] The concept of the 'Marriage Group' is a contentious one; for its origin, see George Lyman Kittredge, "Chaucer's Discussion of Marriage," *Modern Philology* 9 (1911-1912): 435-67.

female *exempla in malo* drawn from the 'legendes and lyves' of the literary, historical, and biblical heroines found in his objectionable 'book of wikked wyves.'[19]

The book was conceived by Chaucer and his contemporaries as both a physical object and conceptual framework within which textual material, including *exempla*, could be arranged and rearranged. In the opening lines of his *Confessio Amantis*, for example, John Gower is explicit about the way that his own work, as both a text and as a book, creates its identity through mining existing narratives, revising and reframing the 'ensamples' gleaned from them:

> Of hem that writen ous tofore
> The bokes duelle, and we therefore
> Ben tawht of that was write tho:
> Forthi good is that we also
> In oure tyme among ous heire
> Do wryte of newe som matiere,
> Enssampled of these olde wyse.
> So that it myhte in such a wyse,
> Whan we ben dede and elleswhere,
> Beleve to the worldes eere
> In tyme comende after this.[20]

In his own book, Gower aims not merely to reiterate the 'matiere' of historical *auctores*—a move that would allegedly "dulleth…a mannes wit" (14).[21] Rather, Gower "go[es] the middel weie," acting as both reader and poet who will 'wryte of newe som matiere' in his own *Confessio Amantis* (17).[22] Integrating preexisting *exempla,* he thereby reworks well-known narratives into

---

[19] As Alcuin Blamires notes, medieval texts "frequently allude to examples in shorthand way, implying that the supporting evidence for this or that woman's exemplary status is too obvious to need spelling out": *The Case for Women in Medieval Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 172. On Chaucer's use of medieval antifeminism, also see Lee Patterson, "'For the Wyves love of Bathe': Feminine Rhetoric and Poetic Resolution in the *Roman de la Rose* and the *Canterbury Tales*," *Speculum* 58 (1983): 656-695. R. Howard Bloch has argued that misogyny is closely related to traditions of courtly love: "The two medieval discourses on women are not contraries but intermingling zones of a common conception of gender. Antifeminism and the idealization of the feminine are mirror images of each other": *Medieval Misogyny and the Invention of Western Romantic Love* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 160.

[20] I cite the text of the *Confessio Amantis* from *The Complete Works of John Gower*, ed. G.C. MacAulay, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901), 1.1-11. Subsequent parenthetical book and line numbers for the *Confessio Amantis* refer to this edition.

[21] As Minnis' *Medieval Theory of Authorship* clarifies, the term *auctor*—distinct in meaning, for example, from *compilator*—means much more than the modern concept of 'author' and is, in fact, closer in sense to 'authority.'

[22] Cynthia J. Brown has noted that this common late medieval trope of the writer-as-reader is visually confirmed in the "many author portraits of ancient as well as contemporary writers" in the period. Such portraits typically "presented the writer at a desk bedecked with lecterns and surrounded with reference materials": *Poets, Patrons and Printers: Crisis of Authority in Late Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 100.

"a bok… | Somwhat of lust, somewhat of lore" (19)—a work that, as Caxton would later remark, is "comprysed" of "dyvers hystoryes and fables towchyng every matere."[23] Gower's comments show how the book in the late fourteenth-century was flexibly conceived and structured. Books were understood as portable containers in which any number of textual permutations and combinations might conceivably appear, and works of compilation generated their particular identities largely from the unique collection of texts that they contained. Anthologies, *florilegia*, and miscellanies could be characterized by their engagement with particular themes or unifying designs. The literature of 'hem that written ous tofore' could be reappropriated and reframed to serve a variety of purposes, and, as the work of Carolyn Dinshaw has demonstrated, such hermeneutic practices also intersected—as in the case of Jankyn's book—with misogynistic impulses: both traditions treat women, like books, as objects whose meanings can be formulated and interpreted.

Although Alisoun strongly objects both to her husband's methodology and the conclusions that the acerbic scholar draws as he cites and reinterprets literary *exempla* from his infamous book, Jankyn, who "som tyme was a clerk of Oxenford" (527), takes his hermeneutic authority for granted.[24] Alisoun therefore suffers what Robert W. Hanning would call "textual harassment" as well as physical abuse:

> throughout her matrimonial career Alisoun has in fact been fighting books more than people—books symbolized by Jankyn's omnibus volume and comprising a strong antifeminist, antimatrimonial current that flowed through medieval culture, fed by several tributaries: an ecclesiastical, celibate tradition based on biblical texts, pagan philosophers, and their patristic interpretations; a legacy of exempla from classical history and mythology; a tradition of scheming, lustful women in literature from Ovid through the *Roman de la Rose* and beyond; and a pool of popular, proverbial lore about the wiles of wives and the 'wo that is in mariage.'[25]

---

[23] Caxton makes this comment in his 1483 prologue to Gower's work: *Caxton's Own Prose*, 69-70.
[24] On Jankyn's book, see Robert A. Pratt, "Jankyn's Book of Wikked Wyves: Medieval Antimatrimonial Propaganda in the Universities," *Annuale Medievale* 3 (1962): 5-27; Robert A. Pratt, "Saint Jerome in Jankyn's Book of Wikked Wyves," *Criticism* 4 (1963): 316-322; Ralph Hanna III, "Jankyn's Book," *Pacific Coast Philology*, 21.1-2 (1986): 30-36; and Ralph Hanna III and Traugott Lawler, eds. *Jankyn's Book of Wikked Wyves: The Primary Texts* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1997).
[25] "'I Shal Finde It in a Maner Glose': Versions of Textual Harassment in Medieval Literature," in *Medieval Texts & Contemporary Readers,* eds. Laurie Finke and Martin B. Shichtman (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), 46-47.

Asking "Who peyntede the leoun, tel me, who?" (692), Chaucer's victim of textual harassment accuses Jankyn, and clerks more generally, of selectively retelling a myriad of loosely connected mythological, literary, and biblical narratives in an effort to prove the inferiority and iniquity of her sex.[26] To this effect, Alisoun exclaims:

> By God, if wommen hadde writen stories,
> As clerkes han withinne hire oratories,
> They wolde han writen of men moore wikkednesse
> Than all the mark of Adam may redresse.
> (693-696)

In response, throughout her aptly termed "long preamble of a tale" (831), Alisoun converts her own autobiographical details into a narrative, a narrative that it is *her* prerogative to construe and decipher. In so doing, she transmutes her five husbands into iconic types and textual phenomena. It is abundantly clear just 'who peyntede the leoun' in Alisoun's account of her marriages; in fact, at two separate points in her Prologue she emphatically depicts a former husband as looking or behaving like a "wood leon" (429, 794). Alisoun is well aware that women, like men, can "devyne and glosen, up and down" (26), and she, too, participates in this process of glossing.[27] Moreover, following in the tradition of works that listed execrable or commendable women, such as Plutarch's *Mulierum virtutes*, St. Jerome's *Adversus Joviniarium*, Boccaccio's *De claris mulieribus*, or Chaucer's own *Legend of Good Women*, Alisoun pointedly enumerates and classifies her erstwhile mates.[28] They are converted into entries in her own immaterial catalogue or book of assorted spouses: "I shal seye sooth; tho housbondes that I hadde, | As thre of hem were goode, and two were badde" (195-6). And it is salient that,

---

[26] Mary Carruthers has written a seminal and often-quoted essay based on this passage: "The Wife of Bath and the Painting of Lions," *PMLA* 94 (1979): 209.

[27] In "'I Shal Finde It in a Maner Glose': Versions of Textual Harassment in Medieval Literature," Hanning explains (29, 31-32):

> In classical Latin, *glossa* (from the Greek word for tongue and, by extension, language) originally denoted a foreign or obsolete word that needed explanation....In the Christian Middle Ages, however, glossa took on new and important dimensions of meaning with respect to inherited texts that, because of their canonical status within the culture, could not be allowed to become foreign or obsolete....By Chaucer's day...glossing had come to mean shady, tricky, self-aggrandizing discourse in general.

[28] Catalogues of women, a genre with origins in classical antiquity, enumerate heroines (sometimes classical, sometimes Christian, sometimes literary, sometimes mythological or biblical women). On the history and nature of such catalogues, see Glenda McLeod, *Virtue and Venom: Catalogs of Women from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991).

throughout her Prologue, Alisoun surveys this catalogue of her textualized husbands for pertinent *exempla in malo* in much the same manner that Jankyn allegedly canvassed his 'book of wikked wyves.'

Although, in contrast to Jankyn's more direct textual access, Alisoun's own acquaintance with classical and biblical sources is patently marked as hand-me-down information, she establishes her own hermeneutic 'auctoritee' on the basis of her experience, suggesting that she, too, is a sort of clerk, an apt pupil "[o]f fyve husbondes scoleiyng" (44f). Alisoun may reject her most recent husband's particular interpretations of exemplary women such as Eve, Delilah, Clytemnestra, and Pasiphae outright and dismiss his monotonous efforts to instruct her by means of pithy *exempla*, but it is clear that she *has* learned much under his tutelage. The legacy, though not the intended didactic lessons, of Jankyn's numerous 'ensamples' is tangible throughout the Wife of Bath's Prologue.

Like Jankyn, Alisoun is a skilled "protean rhetorician," to borrow a phrase from Michael A. Calabrese, expertly versed in the very same technique of selectively interpreting *exempla* that she criticizes in her partner.[29] This becomes evident when Alisoun digresses:

> Metellius, the foule cherl, the swyn,
> That with a staf birafte his wyf hir lyf,
> For she drank wyn, thogh I hadde been his wyf,
> He sholde nat han daunted me from drynke!
> (460-4)

The story to which she refers in the above passage is from *Factorum dictorumque memorabilium liber* by Valerius Maximus, likely the very same 'valerie' found in Jankyn's notorious book.[30] One can almost imagine Jankyn at the hearth reading the story of Metellius' 'wikked' wife—a woman who was fined her dowry for drinking wine—to his own ostensibly disobedient spouse. It was, most likely, as a negative example of female behaviour that Alisoun became acquainted with this particular anecdote. But instead of replicating what must have been Jankyn's intended moral, Alisoun co-opts his technique, artfully interpreting her husband's

---

[29] *Chaucer's Ovidian Arts of Love* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1994), 82.
[30] The Metellius *exemplum* is discussed in *Ovid's Art and the Wife of Bath,* 131-132.

Latin source to different ends. In her expurgated version of Valerius Maximus' text, it is the controlling husband, Metellius, who becomes the 'the foule cherl' and 'the swyn.'

Alisoun's methodological debts to Jankyn's teaching are also evident elsewhere in the Wife of Bath's Prologue as well. We discover similar textual machinations in her apparently offhand comment: "Tho redde he me, if that I shal nat lyen, | Of Hercules and of his Dianyre, | That caused hym to sette hymself afyre" (725-7). Alisoun reassigns agency in this well-known story so that Hercules becomes responsible for setting 'hymself afyre' and Deianira is implicitly exonerated. Again, one surmises that Alisoun has heard the narrative outline of this story from Jankyn but willfully mislearned her husband's intended moral. Thus, Alisoun promotes her own particular reading of *exempla* whilst simultaneously precluding opposing interpretations with her citations of authority.

Alisoun's narration reveals that she has a secondhand knowledge, presumably mediated through her scholar-husband, of at least a few anecdotes from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and *Heroides*. The spouses' debate is more deeply connected to Ovid and the Roman author's medieval reception than these passing references would suggest, however. In fact, Alisoun has been called "the most deeply embroiled of all Chaucer's characters not only in Ovid's texts themselves but in their medieval manifestations and implications."[31] While Ovid's mythological poetry was commonly mined for pertinent *exempla*, his amatory writings were correspondingly read for their allegedly antifeminist sentiment.[32] It is thus that, along with the texts by notorious misogynists like St. Jerome and Theophrastus, 'bounden' together in Jankyn's volume, we find a copy of 'Ovides Art': a work damned by Christine de Pisan as a "*livre d'Art de grant decevance*" [book on the art of great deception], better known to modern audiences as the *Ars Amatoria,*

[31] Calabrese, 81.
[32] In *Reading the Ovidian Heroine,* McKinley notes that there is a tradition of associating Ovid with misogynistic sentiments, and she posits that this tradition is closely linked to unironic readings of Ovid's erotic portrayals of women in the *Ars Amatoria*: xx-xxii.

and certainly the source for Jankyn's Pasiphae *exemplum*.[33] The medieval reception, glossing, and reappropriation of the Roman *auctor's* playfully ironic and satirical texts—particularly his erotodidactic poetry—made "Ovid misunderstood" into a vital part of the antifeminist canon.[34]

Alcuin Blamires has joked that medieval writers debating the nature of womankind "threw *exempla* around like confetti," and this image is literalized in The Wife of Bath's Prologue.[35] Ultimately, Alisoun's verbal retaliation against her husband's 'textual harassment' takes the form of physical rebellion, and, in an ill-fated and deeply transgressive gambit to gain control of Jankyn's "cursed book" (789), Alisoun rends a leaf from the offensive text. This image of the two spouses grappling for physical control of a single book is compelling. Alisoun and Jankyn's fight represents the figurative violence done to texts as they are systematically

---

[33] I cite the text of *Epistre au dieu d'amours* from *Oeuvres poétiques de Christine de Pisan*, ed. Maurice Roy, vol. 2 (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1886), 377. English translation adopted from *The Selected Writings of Christine de Pizan*, trans. Kevin Brownlee, ed. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinki (New York: Norton, 1997).

[34] C.S. Lewis thus referred to the medieval reception of the *Ars Amatoria*: *The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936), 7. Marilynn Desmond has called the Wife of Bath's Prologue "an appropriation of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, mediated through the *Roman de la Rose*": *Ovid's Art and the Wife of Bath,* 118. However, it is also a representation of the *Ars Amatoria* mediated through the writings of Boccaccio and Andreas Capellanus as well as countless other commentators and intermediaries.

[35] *The Case for Women in Medieval Culture*, 66. Similarly, Bloch has noted what he calls the "deflective nature" of antifeminism and argued that "the discourse of misogyny is always to some extent avowedly derivative; it is a citational mode": 47. Katherine Usher Henderson and Barbara F. McManus elucidate:

> Besides the classics, the Bible provided an important source for both attackers and defenders of women….The Old and New Testaments contain many generalizations about women as well as a rich vein of examples of both wicked and virtuous women. Attackers could look especially to the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes for denunciations of harlots and quarrelsome wives and to Saint Paul for disparagements of marriage and justifications of the subservience of women. Defenders could cite the Song of Songs and the proverb of the virtuous wife (Proverbs 31: 10-31) as well as scattered praises of women throughout the Bible.

I here cite from *Half Humankind: Contexts and Texts of the Controversy about Women in England, 1540-1640* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985), 7. On antifeminism and the woman question in late medieval and early modern literature, also see: Alcuin Blamires, Karen Pratt, and C. W. Marx, eds. *Woman Defamed and Woman Defended: An Anthology of Medieval Texts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992); Francis Lee Utley, *The Crooked Rib: An Analytical Index to the Argument about Women in English and Scots Literature to the End of the Year 1568* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1944); Ruth Kelso, *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956); Linda Woodbridge, *Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womankind, 1540-1620* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984); Katharina M. Wilson and Elizabeth M. Makowski, *Wykked Wyves and the Woes of Marriage: Misogamous Literature from Juvenal to Chaucer* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990); Pamela Benson, *The Invention of the Renaissance Woman: The Challenge of Female Independence in the Literature and Thought of Italy and England* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992); Joan Kelly, "Early Feminist Theory and the 'Querelle des Femmes', 1400-1789," *Signs* 8 (1982): 4-28; Gisela Bock and Margarete Zimmermann, "The European *Querelle des femmes*," *Dispulatio* 5 (2002): 127-156; and Constance Jordan, *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990).

dissected and glossed by readers, and the juxtaposition of the two characters' contradictory analyses of the same *materia* calls attention to the fictions that both literally and metaphorically form around and comprise books.[36] There is a sense in which both of Chaucer's *exempla*-citing characters could claim "NASO MAGISTER ERAT," and the feisty couple's mutual confabulations reveal the interpretative flux that surrounds the written word.[37] The aleatory nature of 'auctoritee,' and the hermeneutic volatility of *exempla* are only reinforced by the image of Jankyn's Ovidian book being torn into fragments, an image in which social and textual instabilities alike are actualized.

OVIDIAN *EXEMPLA* IN THE TUDOR *QUERELLE DES FEMMES*

Sixteenth-century English authors and readers were the heirs to a long tradition, both native and continental, of antifeminist and, to a lesser extent, profeminist propaganda, and the Chaucerian couple's selective readings of *exempla* outlined above are broadly representative of a larger tradition of defenses and defamations of women. The so-called *querelle des femmes* of the Tudor era—concerned with the character and temperament of women, the nature of romantic love, and the dynanics of marriage—developed, in part, out of medieval literary conventions.[38]

---

[36] This point is only emphasized by a comparison to lines 270-281 in *The Legend of Good Women*, where the God of Love admonishes Chaucer for his ostensibly antifeminist stance in *Troilus and Criseyde*, asking: "Was there no good matere in thy mynde | Ne in alle thy bokes ne coudest thow nat fynde | Som story of wemen that were goode and trewe?" The God of Love goes on to suggest that Chaucer could and should have found positive examples of "sundry wemen" amongst his "sixty bokes olde and newe | …ful of storyes grete, | That bothe Romayns and ek Grekes trete," and he proceeds to mention several of the authors found in Jankyn's book as potential sources of female *exempla*: "What seith Valerye, Titus, or Claudyan? | What seith Jerome agayns Jovynyan?"

[37] This phrase identically closes both Book 2 (directed at men) and Book 3 (directed at women) of the *Ars Amatoria.* In the General Prologue to Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, it is also suggested that Alisoun is familiar with the contents of Ovid's *Remedia Amoris*: "Of remedies of love she knew per chaunce, | For she koude of that art the olde daunce" (475-6).

[38] According to Zimmermann, the first known use of this term to describe the debate over women appears tro be Martin Le Franc's 1440 reference to the "querelle des dames" in *Le Champion des Dames*: "The *Querelle des Femmes* as a Cultural Studies Paradigm," in *Time, Space, and Women's Lives in Early Modern Europe*, eds. Anne Jacobson Schutte, Thomas Kuehn, and Silvana Seidel Menchi (Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2001), 21. In "The European *Querelle des femmes*," Bock and Zimmermann discuss the etymology and historical semantics of the term *querelle* (129-30):

> Its Latin etymon is *querel(l)a* and signifies an expression of pain as well as displeasure: a charge in the sense of grievance or complaint. In Old French, *querelle* dates back to the 12th century and encompasses the semantic fields of 'contradiction' and (legal) 'complaint, charge,' later also 'dispute,' 'matter of concern,' 'case,' and 'cause.' The lexeme's use in the sense of 'grievance, complaint'

The traditions, texts, and arguments of the late medieval era, such as the fourteenth-century French debate on *Le Roman de la Rose* and Jean de Meun's unfavourable depictions of women, provided important scaffolding for the Tudor dispute on the broader, but related, *querelle des femmes.*[39] Like Alisoun and Jankyn before them, authors and readers in the sixteenth century "did not passively receive but actively reinterpreted their texts."[40] Thus, established medieval techniques of citing literary *exempla* to prove and disprove maxims about women, as dramatized by Chaucer in The Wife of Bath's Prologue, coupled nicely with the humanist pedagogical and rhetorical ideologies of the Tudor era.

In the early years of the sixteenth century, the *querelle des femmes* established a modest presence in English print, largely through the efforts of Wynkyn de Worde. When de Worde, Caxton's former foreman, began his solo printing career in the 1490s, he inherited (along with Caxton's device, woodcuts, and type) an expanding literary marketplace from his predecessor.[41] As a rule, de Worde's early repertoire was largely limited to reprints of Caxton's works, including the *Golden Legend* (STC 24875) and *Festial* (STC 17960). Perhaps searching for new texts with which to expand his saleable inventory, surviving evidence suggests that in the first decade of the sixteenth century de Worde began to print a variety of short vernacular tracts related to the *querelle des femmes*.

---

becomes rare even during the Old French period. From 1535 onwards...the meaning of querelle as dispute, squabble, or controversy begins to dominate.

[39] Originating with Christine de Pisan, this epistolary *querelle* focused on de Meun's depictions of women and marriage and took issue with de Meun's allegedly questionable morality. Christine's initial reaction, in turn, excited further debates that drew in Jean de Montreuil, Pierre and Gontier Col, and Jean Gerson. For a modern English translation of the documents related to the *querelle de la Rose*, see Joseph L. Baird and John R. Kane, eds. and trans., *La Querelle de la Rose*: *Letters and Documents* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978). Along with the *querelle des femmes*, there were a number of other literary *querelles* in the late medieval and early modern eras including the *querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*, and the *querelle des amies*. The *querelle des Anciens et des Modernes* was staged around varying interpretations of progress and modernity and disagreements about the value of ancient texts. And the *querelle des amies,* which was deeply associated with Baldassare Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier,* brought together questions of social class with debate about the sexes. As a topic for debate, the *querelle des femmes* was also closely related to the *questioni d'amore,* which typically ranged from "theories of love, mythology, ancient history, [and] comparative government" to "questions [that] were obviously descendents of those discussed in the medieval courts of love": Fiora A. Bassanese, *Gaspara Stampa* (Boston: Twayne, 1982), 12.

[40] I borrow this description of Tudor reading habits from Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton's seminal article: "'Studied for Action': How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy," *Past and Present* 129 (1990): 30.

[41] On de Worde's career, see N. F. Blake, "Wynkyn de Worde: a review of his life and work," in *Études de linguistique et de la littérature en l'honneur d'André Crépin*, eds. Danielle Buschinger and Wolfgang Spiewok (Greifswald: Reineke-Verlag, 1993), 21–40.

Like the *Golden Legend* and *Festial,* the *querelle des femmes* was, in some senses, literary material that de Worde had also inherited from Caxton. For a pertinent example of Caxton's earlier engagement with the subject, I turn to the 1477 *Book Named the Dictes or Sayengis of the Philosophhres* (STC 6826), a collection "translated out of Frenshe into Englyssh" by Anthony Woodville (73).[42] In both the prologue and epilogue to this edition, Caxton describes how he was invited by Woodville himself "to correcte" the translation if he "sholde fynde faute" with it.[43] Duly checking "howe it accordeth wyth th'origynal, beyng in Frensh" and "fynd[ing] that [his] saide lord hath left out certayn and dyverce conclusions towchyng women," Caxton relates how he decided to rectify what might be otherwise perceived by his reading public as a "a grete defaulte in" Caxton's own "devoir in…overseeyng" the book.[44] Caxton, who claims he is "not certain wheder" this omission "was in [Woodville's] copy or not," playfully raises the possibility that Woodville's exclusion of the full range of Socrates' misogyny was unintentional: "peraventure that the wynde hath blowe over the leef at the tyme of translacion."[45] He seems to think it far more likely, however, that Woodville's exclusion of these passages was deliberate, prompted by "som fayr lady" who "hath desired hym to leve it out" or by "somme noble lady, for whos love he wold not sette yt in hys book" or, perhaps, by the "love and good wylle that he hath vnto *alle* ladyes."[46] Caxton, nevertheless, takes it upon himself to translate and append Socrates' full range of antifeminist wisdom "in th'ende aparte" from Woodville's work with the justification: "I can not thinke that so trewe a man and so noble a phylosophre as Socrates was shold wryte otherwyse than trouthe. For if he had made fawte in wryting of women, he ought not ne shold not be belevyd in hys other dyctes and sayinges."[47]

---

[42] For a relevant discussion of Caxton's engagement with the woman question, see V. M. O'Mara, "'Perauenture the wynde had blowe ouer the leef': Caxton, *The Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers*, and the Woman Question," *Poetica* 49 (1998): 27-47.
[43] *Caxton's Own Prose*, 73.
[44] *Caxton's Own Prose*, 77, 76.
[45] *Caxton's Own Prose*, 74.
[46] *Caxton's Own Prose*, 74. Emphasis my own.
[47] *Caxton's Own Prose*, 75, 74.

Though Caxton may have brought the concerns and the controversial tone of the *querelle des femmes* to English print before de Worde, de Worde's innovation seems to have been in changing the *format* of the printed debate into what would essentially become a drawn-out pamphlet controversy.[48] As Lauryn S. Mayer explains, the "financial success," of de Worde, England's chief printer of secular literature during Henry VIII's reign, "depended largely upon a manuscript tradition of reader compilation: the majority of his texts were small pieces, easily assimilable into individual miscellanies."[49] It seems safe to assume that most profound effect of the mass production enabled by print technology was initially seen in the production of cheap, short texts, the "infinite fardles of printed pamphlets, wherewith...all shoppes [were] stuffed, and euery study furnished" by the end of the century. [50] In producing such pamphlets or treatises, readily assembled into larger collections, or *Sammelbände*, de Worde was specifically catering to an "anthologistic impulse" that had been directly inherited from scribal book production.[51] Seth Lerer describes:

> Basic to medieval literary circulation was the miscellany or anthology. Such collections may have been put together on commission or on speculation. They may have been made up of individual booklets or fascicles, brought together by a patron, a buyer, or a much later reader or collector. They may have been shaped around the works of a single author or a theme, around the personal tastes of the reader-buyer, or around a specific set of historical or topical associations. Whatever the various reasons for their making, these anthologies are, more often than not, the material venues for the dissemination of medieval English vernacular poetry.[52]

---

[48] As both Halasz (*The Marketplace of Print,* 1-4) and Woodbridge (*Women and the English Renaissance,* 7) have observed, the word 'pamphlet' is haphazardly used in modern scholarship to describe a variety of texts. My use of this term does not contain the derogatory sense sometimes associated with Tudor and Stuart pamphleteering; rather, throughout this chapter, I use the term 'pamphlet' interchangeably with 'tract' or 'treatise' simply to describe easily assimable, short, printed texts.

[49] *Worlds Made Flesh: Reading Medieval Manuscript Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 124.

[50] This description derives from William Webbe's 1586 *Discourse of English Poetrie*, ed. Edward Arber (London, 1870), 17.

[51] This term "anthologistic impulse" is used by Seth Lerer in "Medieval English Literature and the Idea of the Anthology," *PMLA* 118.5 (2003): 1253. Gillespie explains that Tudor *Sammelbände* "have two important analogues: material produced on the Continent before and after Caxton's arrival in England, and late medieval vernacular manuscript booklets and volumes compiled or derived from these 'independent units' in a codex": "Poets, Printers, and Early English *Sammelbände*," 200.

[52] "Medieval English Literature and the Idea of the Anthology," 1253.

"Well into the first decades of print," as Lerer further elaborates, similar strategies continued to characterize and control "much of the dissemination, marketing, and critical reception of vernacular English writing."[53]

Although their frequent appearances in the *querelle des femmes* of the early sixteenth century has been almost entirely overlooked in discussions of Ovid's sixteenth-century English reception, Ovidian heroines were habitually named, and their stories redacted, reinterpreted, and rehearsed, in early Tudor debates about women. In sixteenth-century *querelle*-literature, as in The Wife of Bath's Prologue, the heroines' stories are typically presented as persuasive *exempla*. I would point to two of the *querelle*-pamphlets printed in the latter part of de Worde's career, *The Spectacle of Louers* and *A Contrauersye Bytwene a Louer and a Iaye*—texts that were anthologized together in at least one contemporary book now known as the Farmer Sammelband—to illustrate how the fictive circumstances and complexities of the heroines' Ovidian narratives are characteristically reduced to pithy epithets in such literature, while the characters themselves are redeployed to new ends.[54]

The Spectacle of Louers, which, as its subtitle indicates, contains 'many goodly arguments of good women and bad,' takes the form of a *disputatio*. The c. 1533 piece purportedly records a "greate alteracyon" between Consulator, or William Walter's authorial *persona,* and Amator, a grieving lover.[55] While Amator languishes in hope and fear, Consulator offers the lovesick youth some "wordes of conforte" that include lengthy defamations of both love and the female sex (A4^{r}). In so doing, the antifeminist Consulator, citing biblical *exempla* such as Jezebel, Delilah, and Bathsheba alongside a myriad of *exempla* gleaned from classical literature, employs the same interpretative methodology exemplified by Chaucer's Jankyn. Many of Consulator's *exempla* are Ovidian in origin, including references to the *Metamorphoses'* Procne who "her sone / rosted full truely," the *Heroides'* Medea who "slewe her chylde / lyke a cruell

---

[53] "Medieval English Literature and the Idea of the Anthology," 1253-4.
[54] On the Farmer Sammelband, see Gillespie, "Poets, Printers, and Early English *Sammelbände*."
[55] *The Spectacle of Louers* (STC 25008; London, 1533), A1^{v}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.

mother," and the *Ars Amatoria's* notorious Pasiphae who "with a Bull...medled" (C1^{v}). In response, Amator, like Alisoun in the Wife of Bath's Prologue, demonstrates how a battery of biblical and classical *exempla*, can alternatively be used to support a profeminist standpoint. Countering Consulator's host of negative *exempla* with a similarly selective reading of "hystoryes," including those of Thisbe, Penelope, Lucretia, and Dido, he thus "make[s] rehersayle" of "as many good women," claiming their "merytes...are asmoche to be praysed | As the vyces of the other / sholde be dyscommended" (C2^{r}).

The premise of Thomas Feylde's c. 1532 *Contrauersye Bytwene a Louer and a Iaye* is strikingly similar, though framed within a dream narrative. Feylde's napping authorial *persona* overhears a conversation between the swooning Amator—"a louer | without recouer" mourning for his inconstant "loue unkynde" who cruelly "chaunged her mynde"—and a "Ianglynge Iaye" named Graculus.[56] The "treatyse" itself, which Feylde posits as a faithful, "worde by worde" transcription of the Amator and Graculus' debate on the "woman question," reads like a character index of Ovid's collected works (C4^{r}).[57] In order to illustrate that "loue is dangerous | false and contagyous" (B2^{v}), Graculus notes the shifting fortunes of "louers trewe" such as Penelope, Niobe, Hypsipile, Thisbe, Helen, Scylla, Phyllis, Deianira, Medea, and Lucretia (B3^{r}–B3^{v}). Amator, in turn—confessing that he has perused "of late | Many poete laureate | That dyuers bookes dyd make" (B4^{v}-C1^{r})—responds to Graculus' *dissausio* and pertinent directory of Ovidian *exempla in malo* by compiling his own register of suffering lovers. He lists Phaedra, Procne, Pasiphae, Canace, Dido, Leda, Canace, Callisto, Cydippe, Clytamenestra, Byblis, and Alatanta amongst others who were "neuer more dolorous" than he (B4^{r}-B4^{v}). The antifeminist stance of Graculus becomes more pronounced

---

[56] *Contrauersye Bytwene a Louer and a Iaye* (STC 10839; London, 1532), A2^{r}–A2^{v}, B1^{r}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.

[57] This is hardly surprising, considering that the preface to Feylde's work lists Ovid first amongst the "laureate poetes in olde antyquyte," a group which also features the English poets Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate. Of the Roman poet, Feylde notes "Ouyde of loue made matters wonderfull | Good to be knowen for eschewynge more euyll": A.i^{v}. I borrow the term "woman question" from Jill Mann, "Chaucer and the 'Woman Question,'" in *This Noble Craft: Proceedings of the 10th Research Symposium of the Dutch and Belgian University Teachers of Old and Middle English and Historical Linguistics*, ed. Erik Kooper (Amsterdam: Rodolphi, 1991).

as the debate continues; he moves from an initial complaint about transience and mutability in general to take the position that women simply "are worthy no prayse" (C2[r]). Explicitly advocating what we might think of as a Jankynian hermeneutics, Graculus thus suggests that the pining Amator "Serche" further in "scrypture and polycy | Crownacle and phylosophy" to find convincing evidence of the "fraudes of femynyte" (C2[v]).

Daniel Wakelin observes in his discussion of Latin-English parallel texts that sixteenth-century readers "did not so much read...books as dissect them, anatomizing their grammar and transplanting their rhetorical parts to new writing of [their] own."[58] Ovid's texts were habitually dissected in precisely these ways. The use of Ovidian *exempla* in de Worde's *querelle*-tracts such as *The Spectacle of Louers* and *A Contrauersye Bytwene a Louer and a Iaye* suggests how, for early Tudor readers, books were understood as protean, while their textual substance was conducive to figurative and physical anatomization. Ovid's mythological heroines, then, functioned for Tudor audiences primarily as discrete textual fragments and manipulate *names*. Moreover, as de Worde's pamphlets also demonstrate, Tudor *querelle*-tracts presuppose their audience's familiarity with a wide range of Ovidian and pseudo-Ovidian texts and snippets; as Timothy Hampton notes, even the briefest citations of excerpted heroines' names thus evoke a range of narrative connections already "stored in the name," succinctly encapsulating the well-known classical "narrative of a heroic life" in an efficient tag.[59]

As the Wife of Bath's Prologue demonstrates, similar techniques of quoting "minimum narrative units," or the allusive use of literary *exempla,* to prove and disprove maxims about the nature of women had a precedent in late medieval culture.[60] Such established practices, however, dovetailed and harmonized with the increasingly pervasive humanist reading strategies of the Tudor era, which recommended the active accumulation of copious *exempla*

---

[58] "Possibilities for Reading: Classical Translations in Parallel Texts ca. 1520-1558," *Studies in Philology* 105.4 (2008): 465.
[59] *Writing from History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 24.
[60] I borrow this term "minimum narrative units" from Karl-Heinz Steirle: "Story as Exemplum—Exemplum as Story: On the Pragmatics and Poetics of Narrative Texts," in *New Perspectives in German Literary Criticism*, eds. Richard E. Amacher and Victor Lange (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), 400.

for *sapientia* and *prudentia* as well as *eloquentia*. The treatment of Ovid's heroines in *The Spectacle of Louers* and *A Contrauersye Bytwene a Louer and a Iaye* demonstrates the humanist collector's ability to reshape extant narrative into a subjectively determined collection of *exempla*. In this sense, the use of Ovidian heroines in the tracts of the *querelle des femmes* is also consistent with trends observed by Mary Thomas Crane, whose scholarship documents the widespread practice of gathering and framing textual fragments. "English humanists," Crane suggests, "often seemed to think of ancient literature as a space containing textual fragments," and they typically "imagined their interaction with that literature as the collection and redeployment of those fragments."[61] There was a heightened awareness amongst Tudor audiences that printed books, like manuscript books, could be edited, elaborated, copied, considered in tandem, reshaped to specific audiences, anthologized, bound together, and then taken apart again, and the sixteenth-century conception of literary texts "as fields or containers from which fragments of matter could be gathered" meant that "early in the century, intertextuality often seemed to involve not the deep incorporation and imaginative re-creation of classical works, but the recycling of significant fragments of texts."[62]

THE *QUERELLE'S* PARATEXTUAL BIBLIOFICTIONS

Recent work on paratext has called attention to the rhetorical approaches that stationers used to appeal to and direct the interpretations of book buyers. Randall Anderson, for example, emphasizes that these "subliminal—or, if you like, transliminal—features of the book significantly encode in bibliographical artifacts the essential issues of patronage, dissemination, demographics, and stylization of audience status."[63] Michael Baird Sanger has

---

[61] *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 4. Crane elaborates: "In theory at least, all texts formed a common storehouse of matter, validated by existing cultural codes, from which all educated people could gather and through which all educated subjects were framed": 6.

[62] Crane, 52.

[63] Randall Anderson, "The Rhetoric of Paratext in Early Printed Books," in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume IV: 1557-1695*, eds. John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 643. In a similar vein, suggesting that prefaces offer specific evidence about practices of

argued that "one of the most valuable ways to understand front matter during the early modern period is to recognize that these pages constituted an early, coherent, and very versatile system of advertising."[64] As the sixteenth century progressed, printed treatises and pamphlets on the woman question appeared regularly, and paratextual bibliofictions played a fundamental role in the creation, consumption, and marketing of the Tudor *querelle des femmes*.[65]

A salient example of such bibliofictional framing is found in *The Seuen Sorowes that Women Haue When Theyr Husbandes Be Deade*. Apparently an original work by Robert Copland, this antifeminist piece published in c. 1565 by William Copland. In the work's prologue, a metatextual dialogue is staged between Copland's own *persona* and a literary customer referred to as Quidam who tells Copland that he knows of "a prety geest in ryme" (i.e. *The Seuen Sorowes*) that he ought to print.[66] The prologue's fictive account of the present book's creation seeks to explain why Copland has "muse[d] suche tryfles for to wryte | Or wanton toyes," explaining that the work at hand has been produced to satisfy "the appetyte | Of wandryng braynes, that seke for thynges new" (A1^{v}). The piece is thereby, and rather disdainfully, framed as a 'tryfle' hastily executed to feed the public's taste for profeminist and antifeminist tracts:

> So that the tongue must euer wagge & clatter
> And waste their wyndes, to medle of eche matter
> Thus ben we prynters called on so fast
> That maruayle it is, how that our wittes can last.
> (A1^{v})

---

publishing, writing, and reading, Roger Chartier argues that paratextual materials reveal valuable information about authors' and publishers' strategies in securing proper responses to their books: "Texts, Printing, Readings," in *The New Cultural History*, ed. Lynn Hunt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 156–57.

64 "The Birth of Advertising," in *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England,* 197. In "Books for Sale: Advertising and Patronage in Late Elizabethan England," Paul J. Voss argues that, as patronage declined, Elizabethan authors and stationers relied upon prefaces and other front matter as sites of advertisement: *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29 (1998): 733–56.

65 In suggesting that such pamphlets "appeared regularly" I deliberately refrain from overemphasizing the physical presence or overestimating the numbers of such pamphlets in Tudor England. I am hesitant, for example, to accept without qualification assessments such as Hilda L. Smith's that the woman question was "a debate that seemed to produce endless broadsides and tracts along with longer works": "Humanist Education and the Renaissance Concept of Woman," in *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700*, ed. Helen Wilcox (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 12.

66 *The Seuen Sorowes that Women Haue When Theyr Husbandes Be Deade* (STC 5734; London, 1565), A2^{r}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.

Though Copland's authorial *persona* regards what he refers to as the "fond apetyte / To geste on women, or against them to wryte" with apparent distaste and expresses a fear that he "should gyt | Displeasure of women if that [he] prynt it," he is ultimately swayed by Quidam's economically-based persuasions that there is popular demand for the genre (A2^{v}). "If it were prynted," he promises "it wyl be wel soulde" (A2^{v}).

Perhaps the best illustration of the debate's bibliofictional dimensions in the mid-century, however, is the paratextual controversy that surrounded the anonymous publication of Edward Gosynhyll's c. 1541 *Lytle Boke Named the Schole House of Women*. *The Schole House of Women* creates a fictive aetiological scaffolding for itself by professing to have been written in response to "a booke | …all in prayse, of the femynye" that was "contryued" by a "foole of late" and was circulating under the title "Pehan."[67] Gosynhyll's apparent rejoinder, based on the premise that "in the woman | Is lytle thynge, of prayse worthye | Lettred or vnlerned, whether they be," is a rambling and protracted meditation on the unsavoury character of women (D3^{v}). *The Schole House of Women* presents its readers with a "dyuers" array of biblical, mythological, and historical examples, and, insisting that there are "other thousandes, many mo" whose stories he could also have told to demonstrate the nature of the female sex (C4^{r}), Gosynhyll's *dissausio* exhibits the contemporary tendency to cite Ovidian heroines as pertinent *exempla in malo*, including standard antifeminist references to Byblis, Myrrha, Pasiphae, and Helen, amongst others.[68]

The aforementioned 'Pehan,' or *The Prayse of All Women Called Mulierum Pean*, which *The Schole House of Women* purports to have been written in response to, was not actually printed until 1542, a year after *The Schole House of Women*. And, in an even more interesting twist, this riposte appears to have been penned by the very same Gosynhyll who authored *The Schole*

---

[67] *Lytle Boke Named the Schole House of Women* (STC 12104.5; London, 1541), A1^{v}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.

[68] In so doing, he instructs his audience to "rede, the boke Bockas," likely a reference to *De claris mulieribus*: D3^{r}. Moreover, the address to his book in the *explicit* instructs the volume to "bere in mynde" the works of "Hierome, Iuuenall, and olde Thobie | Cathon, and Ouyd" and "The wordes that Salamon, and Dauid speake | In Iudicium, and in Genesye": D4^{v}.

House of Women. Just as *The Schole House of Women* referred to *Mulierum Pean* and suggested that its existence was responsible for the text's own genesis, in *Mulierum Pean,* we find a similar reference to *The Schole House of Women* embedded within the work's aetiological bibliofictions. In a clear reprisal of Chaucer's Prologue to *Legend of Good Women,* the authorial *persona* in *Mulierum Pean* is awoken by a "sodeyne assemble" of women who complain of their treatment in "a boke... | Whiche by reporte, by the was fyrst framed | The scole of women none auctour named."[69] Noting that "In prynte it is passed, lewdely compyled," the wronged ladies thus beg Gosynhyll's *persona* to both rectify their "infamye" and clear his "owne good name" by "send[ing] forth some other" book in their defense (A2^{r}).

In a manner that is strikingly reminiscent of the Wife of Bath, Venus herself "boldely" emerges from the group to complain of the selective reading habits and interpretative techniques employed by misogynist authors (A2^{r}). She queries:

> Howe be it, ye men fast pore and prye
> All that ye may vs women agayne
> Nothynge lefte out, ye may come by
> Of holy wrytte, nor thot poetes do fayne
> All is alledged as thynge certayne
> And what that makes nat, for your purpose
> Shall be interpretate, with a lewde glose.
>
> Exemples many, faynt and feble
> Mo than ye may well iustyfye
> And saye it is a thynge impossyble
> Any one good woman founde to be
> Whiche euyll sayenge to ratyfye
> A sence of Salomon ye aledge, which sayth
> *Mulierem fortem quis inueniet.*
>
> (A3^{r})

Following the command of Venus to "sharpen [his] pen, and wryte" (A2^{r}), Gosynhyll thus obligingly records her words as a means of countering the sentiments found in publications that "pore women customably | Without cause iust...rayle and iest" (A2^{v}). Like Alisoun—or Walter's Amator, for that matter—Venus in *Mulierum Pean* borrows from her antifeminist

---

[69] *The Prayse of All Women Called Mulierum Pean* (STC 12102; London, 1542), A2^{r}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.

opponents' methodology to discredit their arguments. Noting, for example, that "Hystoryes many I coulde forth lay | That maketh wel with the feminye," she provides Gosynhyll's poetic *persona* with numerous *exempla in bono* from scripture, *historia*, and *fabula*, remarking that they are "grounded on good auctoryte" (A4^{v}). *Mulierum Pean* thus incorporates stock examples of Ovidian heroines—replete with marginal notes referring readers, respectively, to the *Heroides* and *Fasti* for further details—to confirm the dignity and virtue of the female sex:

> Penelope
> To put of weddynge tyll Ulyxes came home
> Untwyned at nyght that in the daye she woue.
> (E2^{r})
>
> Luctes…
> A myrrour to all other of goostly fame
> Whiche wylfully with a small knyfe
> Slewe her selfe in auoydynge shame
> And therby saued her olde good name
> What tyme Tarquyne newe made kynge
> Had her forlayne, she nat wyllynge.
> (E2^{v})

The antagonistic interplay between Gosynhyll's *Schole House of Women* and *Mulierum Pean* suggests that the author was determined to exploit the literary possibilities of the palinode. The fictive aetiologies and ostensibly hostile cross-referencing between his two texts creates a bibliofictional controversy in which Gosynhyll alternatively presents and systematically dismantles his own arguments in an attempt, perhaps, to garner commercial interest in both texts and in himself as their author. In this sense, the two ideologically opposing works form a unified pair: hostile defamation and superficially gallant antidote. At the end of *Mulierum Pean* when he addresses his book, Gosynhyll's impetus for staging the debate becomes clearer. He instructs that when questions of authorship arise the book should advertise that "Edwarde Gosynhyll toke the labour" (E4^{r}).

Gosynhyll's inflammatory *Schole House of Women* incited a number of printed responses besides his own, including Robert Burdet's *A Dyalogue Defensyue for Women, Agaynst Malycyous Detractoures* and a piece authored by the grandson of Thomas More, *A Lytle and Bryefe Treatyse,*

Called the Defence of Women...Made agaynst the Schole Howse of Women. Saliently, each of these printed response is rooted in this same bibliofictional context of reader-as-writer that we see in both *Mulierum Pean* and *The Schole House of Women* itself, and the prefatory materials in both replies shape and fictionalize each successive book's place amongst other books, past, present, and future. Both Burdet's and More's printed responses are couched in a new fictive aetiology that specifically grounds them in the material as well as the theoretical aspects of the *querelle des femmes*.

Before launching into a bird-debate between a Pye and a Fawcon, Burdet's *Dyalogue Defensyue for Women* begins with Burdet's narrative *persona* in his "studye," passing the time as "euery man" should: soberly and "frutefully."[70] Though not mentioned specifically by title, Gosynhyll's antifeminist tract seems to make a cameo appearance when Burdet's narrator recalls how he:

> red an oracyon
> Moste pleasauntly set forth, with flowers rethorycall
> Descrybynge the monstruous vyce of detraction
> The dowghter of eunye, the furye infernall
> whose pestylent poyson, as cankar doth crepe
> Amonge all people, in Cytie, Tower, and Towne
> Bryngynge Innocentes, in to paynes depe
> And from theyr good names, it doth them cast downe
> (A3^{r})

Similarly, in Edward More's *Lytle and Bryefe Treatyse Called the Defence of Women,* More's authorial *persona*—who identifies himself as "a bachyler...but of twenty yeares of age or lytle more"—begins his own contribution to the Tudor *querelle des femmes* with a dedicatory letter describing the genesis of his own work in relation to Gosynhyll's "rayling iestes of the pore femynye" with its "false & forged tytle."[71] "As [he] hade a lytle vacant tyme from studye," the narrator relates, he began searching for a "lytle work... correspondent and agreable both vnto [his] small

[70] *A Dyalogue Defensyue for Women, Agaynst Malycyous Detractoures* (STC 24601; London, 1542), A3^{r}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.
[71] *A Lytle and Bryefe Treatyse Called the Defence of Women...Made agaynst the Schole Howse of Women* (STC 18067; London, 1560), A2^{r}, A3^{r}, A1^{v}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.

leysure and tyme" with which he "might occupy [him]self" (A1^{v}). Evoking images of the book as a material object capable of being held and viewed, More's *persona* describes:

> at last a booke inteteled the Schole howse of women cam vnto my handes, wherin I had wel hoped to haue redde some notable gestes and actes of women...but when I had well pervsed and ouer redde the same, I found the cleane contrary. For much againste my expectation I myght vewe and see theryn diuers & sundry reprochfull thyngis spoken agaynste women... not only...vndeserued on theyr partes, but also moost beastiall lyke on hys behalfe which wrote the same....I then for the...affection which I bare to women was desyrous to wryte in theyr defence
> (A1^{v}-A2^{r})

Like Ovid himself, his Tudor interpreters "delight[ed] in reshuffling the data and producing constantly new accounts," and they shared many of the fundamental aesthetic premises upon which the Roman poet's *ars* was based: his explicit taste for revisionism, his dichotomous conception of poetry as both materially determinate and materially indeterminate, and his fascination with the transformative *corpus* in its metaphorical and physical embodiments.[72] The elaborate role-playing of authors as readers within these paratexts functions as an important bibliofictional strategy. Assuming a collaborative relationship between author and readers, and anticipating the reader-as-author, the *querelle des femes'* "paratextual inductions" provided "matter that leads the reader into the text, ...seduc[ing] and *transform*[*ing*] that reader into a new role, one which is especially suited to...engaging with the particular text that follows."[73] Such bibliofictional accounts of production, social reception, and textual revision render the *querelle des femmes'* authors, its stationers, and even its audiences characters in a narrative of literary production and dissemination; in these fictionalized versions of the Tudor communications circuit, participation in the *querelle des femmes* is posited as a sociable activity. By thus highlighting the fluid and self-propagating nature of the *querelle des femmes*, these paratextual frames also provide potent counterexamples to the widespread maxim that *printed* books are, by nature, fixed in opposition to as malleable *manuscript* books.

---

[72] Tarrant describes Ovid's engagement with prior literature thus in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 13.
[73] Sanger, in *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England,* 198.

EXEMPLA AND HUMANIST RHETORIC

In addition to illustrating the ways in which the *querelle* was propagated in early print, the *Schole House* controversy also demonstrates something of the character of sixteenth-century debate. Gosynhyll's apparent ideological inconsistencies in *The Schole House of Women* and *Mulierum Pean* are typical of mid-century *querelle* literature and, indeed, of Tudor engagement with what, in the first English book devoted entirely to the subject, Leonard Cox calls "the right pleasaunt and persuadible art of Rhetorique" more generally.[74] Rhetorical study, foundational to sixteenth-century *curricula*, was valued by the Tudors for what William J. Bouwsma has referred to as its characteristic "plasticity, its ability to flow into and through every area of experience, to disregard and cross inherited boundaries as though they had no real existence and to create new but always malleable structures of its own."[75] And I would argue that it is precisely the ideological flexibility and circularity of the debate that attracted the Tudor *rhetor* to the woman question.

Linda Woodbridge suggests that the antifeminist literature of the Tudor era operated in some sense as an elaborate intellectual game.[76] The playful veneer of the *querelle des femmes* is frequently highlighted in its textual byproducts, and often its profeminist and antifeminist arguments are saliently marked as games in their bibliofictional frames. Copland's prologue refers to the printed tracts of the *querelle* as 'tryfles,' and Walter's prologue, asserting that it is "Better...to wryte and some thynge for to saye | Than in slouthe & ydelnesse to spende the tyme awaye," clarifies that his contribution is a "thynge" made "for...recreacyon" (A1^{v}). Likewise, in his address to the book at the end of *The Schole House of Women*, Gosynhyll claims to have had no "yll intent"; the work was composed, or so he suggests, only "that the masculyne, myght hereby | Haue somwhat to ieste, with the feminy" (D4^{v}). Participation in this game often seems to have been less a matter of conviction than a self-conscious and

---

[74] *The Art or Crafte of Rhetoryke* (STC 5947; London, 1524), A2^{v}.
[75] "Anxiety and the Formation of Early Modern Culture," in *After the Reformation: Essays in Honor of J.H. Hexter*, ed. Barbara C. Malament (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980), 234.
[76] Woodbridge, 44.

recognizable display of *eloquentia*. It is telling, for example, the Burdet refers to Gosynhyll's allegedly offensive work as having been 'pleasauntly set forth, with flowers rethorycall.'

In Thomas Wilson's mid-century *Arte of Rhetorique*, he suggests that there are "two sortes" of questions: those that are "definite, and comprehended within some ende" and those that are "infinite...and without ende." Elaborating that infinite questions "generally are propounded, withoute the comprehension of tyme, place, and person, or any suche like," Wilson provides the following examples of this type of question: "Whiche is better, a courtiers life, or a scholers life" and "whether it be best to marie or to liue single."[77] Thus, it is partly within the humanist rhetorical sphere of Wilson's 'infinite' question and that I would locate the tracts of the *querelle des femmes*. "He that myndeth to perswade, muste neades be well stored with examples," and, in the rhetorical manuals of the age, *exempla* drawn from *fabula* and *historia* are presented as useful literary devices, not simply for their capacity to "delite the rude & ignoraunt," to borrow Wilson's phrasing, but also because "they helpe muche for perswasion" (Cc1^{v}, Dd1^{r}). In Tudor *querelle* literature, Ovid's heroines—the very *exampla* so often "enriched by Copy"—become, quite literally, rhetorical figures (Cc3^{v}).

Naturally, some Ovidian heroines are consistently cited by English interpreters as 'good' (such as Lucretia) and some as 'bad' (such as Byblis). However, I would echo Kathryn McKinley's observation that "I have not found the 'praise or blame' (Mary/Eve) hermeneutic to be adequate to represent the *full diversity* of readings [Ovidian heroines] represent."[78] Rather, the literature of the Tudor *querelle des femmes* is inherently discursive and dialogical, and its authors frequently exploited the possibilities of enigmatic, polysemic heroines whose traditional narrative contexts could be interpreted with a degree of ambiguity. They delighted in what Blamires has called "the bewildering capacity of some *exempla* to score for both

[77] Wilson's work was frequently reprinted in the sixteenth century. I here cite from *The Arte of Rhetorique* (STC 25799; London, 1553), A1^{r}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.
[78] McKinley, xxii. Italics my own.

sides."[79] For instance, in Burdet's *Dyalogue Defensyue for Women*—a work that pointedly urges its audience to "Rede and recorde, howe the Fawcon doth replye | Defendynge the femalles, with Aucthours one and other | Euermore aledged, and noted in the mergent" of the book (A2^{v})—Pye and Fawcon each use the example of Helen's agency to different ends. In response to the Pye's accusation that "fayre Helene" caused the fall of Troy, the Fawcon retorts:

> Dyd nat Alyxaunder [i.e. Paris], his lust to fulfyll
> Sone to kynge Pryame, by strength steale away
> Fayre Helene from the Grekes, agaynst her owne wyll
> whan she her handes wronge, howe ca[n]nest thou say nay
> If wepynge teares, yf sygtes sore and sad
> If lamentacyon, myght then haue preuayled
> Fayre Helene had escaped, Parys moste mad
> From Grecye in to Troye, with her whan he feased
> And thoughe battyll bloddye, with murder moste myserable
> Betwene these two nacyons, enshewed to theyr payne
> The adulterat it caused, by dede detestable
> whiche coulde not from lust, his body restrayne
> (C1^{r})

The *exemplum's* potential for hermeneutic variety, that is, the ways in which "some material can serve not only diverse but contrary uses" to persuade readers of different or multiple truths, was often observed.[80] As Joel B. Altman's research has demonstrated, such *argumentum in utramque partem*—which results in open-ended questions and deliberate inconclusiveness rather than didactic resolutions—was central to Tudor rhetorical training, and the widespread influence of this grammar school practice is evident in a wide generic range of Tudor texts, including orations, sermons, and dramatic forms.[81] Recognizing that the exemplarity of an *exemplum* is unstable and that readers will respond differently to the same materials, Erasmus, for example, illustrates this principle in *De duplici copia verborum ac rerum commentarii duo,* showing how Socrates' death can either "be turned to [his] praise or blame," depending on whether a *rhetor* chooses to highlight the philosopher's commendable and

---

[79] Blamires, 66.
[80] This point is made by Erasmus in *De duplici copia verborum ac rerum commentarii duo*. I have here used the translation of Betty I. Knott in *Collected Works of Erasmus: Literary and Educational Writings 2*, ed. Craig R. Thompson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978), 639.
[81] *The Tudor Play of Mind: Rhetorical Inquiry and the Development of Elizabethan Drama* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978).

"courageous contempt for death" or "his useless pursuit of philosophy and disregard of accepted standards."[82] This pervasive awareness of the *rhetor's* paradoxical ability to argue *in utramque partem* also underlies the rhetorically-inspired treatises of the Tudor *querelle des femmes*.

As strikingly *un*-Ovidian as the ostensibly moralistic tracts of the Tudor *querelle des femmes* may seem to the modern interpreter, the authors of such literature appropriated more than just mythology when they mined Ovid's works for examples.[83] Ovid functioned not merely as a seemingly inexhaustible a source of literary *exempla*, but also as an ideological precedent.[84] After all, the poet's work evidences a sustained interest in demonstrating how one might "turn the value" of an *exemplum* or a sentiment "into the antivalue."[85] Like Ovid, who himself treated "literary history is a species of rhetoric, a way of showing how a thing can be made to look depending on the perspective adopted or the effect desired," the sixteenth century's *rhetors* were keenly aware of the mutability of signs.[86] Pertinently, Tudor audiences also shared in the Roman author's belief that rhetorical and ideological reversals could be supported and substantiated by the same textual material: "*Naso legendus erat tum, cum didicistis amare:* | *Idem nunc vobis Naso legendus erit*" [You should have read Naso then when you learnt to love: you should read the same Naso now] (*Rem. am*. 71-72).

An apt example of a Tudor mind clearly trained and "accustomed to examine the many sides of a given theme, to entertain opposing ideals" is Charles Pyrrye. In a realization of the Ovidian maxim that "*una manus vobis vulnus opemque feret*" [one hand alike will wound and succour] (*Rem. am.* 44), Pyrrye's c. 1569 *The Praise and Dispraise of Women* interweaves both

---

[82] *De duplici copia verborum ac rerum commentarii duo*, 639.
[83] Manuscript culture is so described by Arthur F. Marotti and Michael D. Bristol, "Introduction," *Print, Manuscript, and Performance: The Changing Relations of Media in Early Modern England*, eds. Arthur F. Marotti and Michael D. Bristol (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2000), 5.
[84] I would, however, note here that Ovid himself might have objected to the use of copious *exempla* to defame womankind; in the *Ars Amatoria*, he specifically protests against the habit of associating the shortcomings of one individual with all women: "*Parcite paucarum diffundere crimen in omnes;* | *Spectetur meritis quaeque puella suis*" [Forbear the spread over all the reproach of a few; let each woman be judged on her own merits] (3.9-10).
[85] Wilson and Makowski, 33.
[86] Tarrant in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 13.

antifeminist and profeminist argumentation into a single text.[87] Beginning with a defamation of women, Pyrrye appeals to authoritative "examples playne and manifest"—including Helen, Scylla, and Byblis, along with marginal citations of relevant Ovidian passages—to justify his sentiments.[88] He suggests:

> By reading histories thou shalt finde
> what cruell bloudy factes:
> Committed were by woman kinde,
> delighting in such actes.
>
> Reade Ouid, Virgil, vnderstande
> in them it doth appeare
> (A7^{v}- A8^{r})

Correspondingly, in his following defense of women, Pyrrye advises his readers to "vewe" these same "olde auncient bookes" to find counterexamples of "vertuous, constant and true" women (D6^{r}). Moreover, *The Praise and Dispraise of Women* situates both of its ideological positions and textual halves within a bibliofictional milieu that is not unlike the fictive stories of genesis with which Gosynhyll earlier surrounded *The Schole House of Women* and *Mulierum Pean*. To this effect, Pyrrye's defense, curiously enough, is posited as a response to a specific "shamles booke" (B5^{v})—presumably his own "disprayse of femenie" that "did spitefullie disgrace, | the gentle woman kinde" (B5^{r}). Arguing *in utramque partem* and containing its own palinode, *The Praise and Dispraise of Women* therefore subsumes its demonstrations of rhetorical dexterity and its intertextual machinations into a single and self-referential literary unit.

OVIDIAN *EXEMPLA* IN *THE TAMING OF THE SHREW*

Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, interested, as it is, in representing the character and temperament of "unconstant womankind," the nature of romantic love, and the dynamics of marriage, in deeply ensconced in what Wilson would call the 'infinite' questions of the Tudor *querelle des femmes*. In fact, its titular subject would be recycled as a topic of rhetorical debate at

---

[87] Altman, 6.
[88] *The Praise and Dispraise of Women* (STC 20523; London, 1569), A7^{v}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.

Oxford in 1609, when degree candidates argued for and against a man's right to tame a shrew.[89] Shakespeare's play, generically self-identified as "a kind of history" (Induction 2.141), itself functions both as an Ovidian "jest" (Induction 1.45) and an elaborate rhetorical piece. Set in "fair Padua, nursery of arts" (1.1.2) and mounted for the benefit of the inebriated Sly, the play "explore[s] the pursuit of love," as Charlotte Scott remarks, "through the semiotic of the book, its institution (the school), and its ideology (humanism)."[90] The *Taming of the Shrew* is thus invested in exploring the persuasive power of the Tudor *rhetor* and in dramatizing the labile nature of Ovid's books and protean *exempla* in the *querelle des femmes*.

Jeanne Addison Roberts has observed that *The Taming of the Shrew* "virtually advertises its Ovidian connections," and it is true that Shakespeare's allusions to the *Metamorphoses* begin almost immediately.[91] The "wanton pictures" (Induction 1.47) with which Sly is tantalized in the Induction—"Adonis painted by a running brook, | And Cytherea all in sedges hid," "Io as she was a maid," "Or Daphne roaming through a thorny wood" (Induction 2.50-51, 54, 57)—serve as an overt signal of the intertextual fabric of the play about to be staged. What Vanda Zajko has described as these initial "images of disguise, hunting, and pursuit [that] set up clear thematic links with the rest of the play," work, as Jonathan Bate proposes, "almost as a program for Shakespeare's subsequent Ovidianism."[92]

In Act 1, we find intertextual gestures to Ovid's *Heroides* when Lucentio laments his newfound love for Bianca Minola. Confessing to Tranio "I burn, I pine, I perish," Lucentio turns to literary precedent as he likens himself to the quelerous and suicidal "Queen of

---

[89] The use of this topic at Oxford is noted in Arthur F. Kinney, *Humanist Poetics: Thought, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986), 15.
[90] *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Book* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 57.
[91] "Horses and Hermaphrodites: Metamorphoses in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 34.2 (1983): 159.
[92] "Petruchio is 'Kated': *The Taming of the Shrew* and Ovid," *Shakespeare and the Classics,* eds. Charles Martindale and A. B. Taylor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 39; and *Shakespeare and Ovid*, 119. Suggesting that "in this play Shakespeare utilises the *Metamorphoses* to explore the dynamic potential of relationship," Zajko draws further attention to "a potent connection between Shakespeare's treatment of Daphne and his subsequent depiction of Kate": 41. On Ovidianism in the play, see also: Karen Newman, "Renaissance Family Politics in Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*," *English Literary Renaissance* 16 (1986): 86-100; Patricia B. Phillippy, "'Loytering in love': Ovid's *Heroides*, Hospitality, and Humanist Education in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Criticism* 40.1 (1998): 27-53; and Scott, 57-101.

Carthage" as portrayed both in Vegil's *Aeneid* 4 and Ovid's *Heroides* 7 (1.1.155, 154). By implication, Lucentio's analogy aligns Bianca with Aeneas, and, in what has been called "one of the play's many comic inversions of gender and genre," Lucentio's literary reference "sets off a series of specific allusions to the *Heroides* within the subplot which explicitly link Bianca's story to the [Ovidian] text."[93] As "a language of the book emerges in the dynamic between the lover and the beloved which seeks to both fetishize and contain the body of the woman," explicit references to the Ovidian *corpus* continue to control the exchanges between Lucentio and the object of his desires in the play's third act.[94] A man who is "cunning | in Greek, Latin, and other languages" (2.1.80-81), Lucentio advertises that he has been reading Ovid's "Art to Love" (4.2.8), and, as a *praeceptor* both grammatical and amatory, Lucentio includes such "books of love" on his course syllabus (1.2.146).

Proving himself to be "master of [his] art" (4.2.9), Lucentio uses Ovidian *materia* as a tool with which to both define and covertly seduce Bianca, and his apt pupil quickly learns new amatory and hermeneutic 'arts' under his tutelage. Manipulating Ovidian text and imbuing it with new meanings, the flirtatious pair 'conster' *Heroides* 1 to new ends, "'read[ing]' each other," as Scott characterizes it, "partly through the material book that is held between them, and partly through the figurative potential that such practices of reading assume."[95] The schoolroom scenes are thus tinged with irony as Lucentio and Bianca initiate an illicit and potentially dangerous love affair by reappropriating and redeploying words found in Penelope's epistle:

> *illi uicta suis Troia fata canunt:*
> .....
> *narrantis coniunx pendet ab ore uiri.*
> *atque aliquis posita monstrat fera proelia mensa*
> *pingit et exiguo Pergama tota mero:*
> *'hac ibat Simois, haec est Sigeia tellus,*
> *hic steterat Priami regia celsa senis;*

---

93 Phillippy, 40.
94 Scott, 57.
95 Scott, 69.

> *illic Aeacides, illic tendebat Vlixes,*
> *hic lacer admissos terruit Hector equos.'*
>
> (28-36)

> The husband sings of the fates of Troy that have yielded to his own. The wife hangs on the tale that falls from her husband's lips. And someone about the board shows thereon the fierce combat, and with the scant tracing of wine pictures forth all Pergamum: 'Here flowed the Simois; this is the Sigean land; here stood the lofty palace of Priam the ancient. Yonder tented the son of Aeacus; yonder, Ulysses; here, in wild course went the frightened steeds with Hector's mutilated corpse.'

The two lovers thus invoke a familar Ovidian description of storytelling—literally inserting themselves and the development of their own love story into the narrative of the Trojan War—while also reinterpreting the letter of an Ovidian *exemplum* best remembered by posterity for her chastity, prudence, and unfailing constancy:

> BIANCA Conster them.
>
> LUCENTIO '*Hic ibat*,' as I told you before—'*Simois*,'
> I am Lucentio, '*hic est*,' son unto Vincentio of Pisa,
> '[*Sigeia*] *tellus*,' disguis'd thus to get your love,
> '*Hic steterat*,' and that Lucentio that comes a-wooing,
> '*Priami*,' is my man Tranio, '*regia*,' bearing
> my port, '*celsa senis*,' that we might beguile the old
> pantaloon
> .....
>
> BIANCA Now let me see if I can conster it:
> '*Hic ibat Simois*,' I know you not, '*hic est* [*Sigeia*]
> *tellus*,' I trust you not, '*Hic steterat Priami*,' take
> heed he hear us not, '*regia*,' presume not, '*celsa*
> *senis*,' despair not.
>
> (3.1.28-37, 40-45)

This intertextual schoolroom drama reveals that identity and expression in *The Taming of the Shrew* are closely bound up with literary precedents, particularly Ovidian precedents. Intertext fulfils a dramatic function by serving as a source upon which characters draw to represent aspects of their own identities. Intertext is also the means by which the characters, and particularly the male characters, in *The Taming of the Shrew* construct and establish the identities of the women around them. Resultantly, the characters in the play function as bookishly interpretative spaces that are filled and coloured through allusion.

The complex set of relationships forged between Bianca's character and Ovidian literary precedent demonstrate that the nature of this intertextual construction of identity in *The Taming of the Shrew* is both gendered and closely aligned to the use of textual precedent. The equivocation of book and female body, or between what Ann Thompson and John O. Thompson call the "sexual and literary rights of reproduction," is made explicit in Biondello's suggestion that Lucentio, metaphorically acting as stationer, "'Take…assurance of [Bianca], | '*cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum*'" (4.4.92-93).[96] The bookish Bianca—whose name itself suggestively connotes a writable, *white* or *blank* page—is appropriately read and written by the men around her.[97] The girl's ambiguous "silence" is duly and authoritatively glossed as "mild behavior and sobriety" (1.1.70, 71), and "look[ing] so longly on the maid" (1.1.165), Lucentio literally reads Bianca's body, announcing: "Sacred and sweet was all I saw in her" (1.1.176).

The first two scenes of *The Taming of the Shrew* establish a potent juxtaposition between "good Bianca" (1.1.76), "Sweet Bianca" (1.1.139), "beautiful Bianca" (1.2.120), "fair Bianca" (1.2.166, 175) and her elder sister, "The one as famous for a scolding tongue | As is the other for beauteous modesty" (1.2.252-53). In sharp contrast to Bianca, Katharina is "shrowd and froward" (1.2.90). Like her sister, however, it is evident that Katharina—who is variously and unflatteringly labeled "stark mad" (1.1.69), a "fiend of hell" (1.1.88), and an "an irksome brawling scold" (1.2.187)—is constructed through references to literary text, and, like Bianca, Katharina is explicitly compared to a *titled* book when Grumio exclaims: "Katharine the curst! | A title for a maid of all titles the worst" (1.2.129-30). The identities of both Minola sisters, then, are both externally determined and textually established. The men in the play, to borrow a phrase from Lucentio, "moralize them" (4.4.81) by "expound[ing] the meaning...of [their] signs and tokens" (4.4.79-80).

---

[96] "Meaning, 'Seeing,' Printing," *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England*, 72. Margreta de Grazia glosses this same passage: "In other words, Lucentio should impress Bianca with his inseminating imprint before she loses to another man's mark the whiteness or virginity proclaimed by her immaculate page-like name": "Imprints: Shakespeare, Gutenberg, and Descartes," *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England*, 38.
[97] Thompson and Thompson note that the metaphor of Bianca-as-book is further developed at 4.4.104, where Bianca is suggestively referred to as Lucentio's "appendix": "Meaning, 'Seeing,' Printing," 72.

It is to the polysemy of both Bianca and Katharina—textually readable and rhetorically constructed characters—that I wish to draw particular attention, for Shakespeare's play exhibits the ability of the Tudor *rhetor* to argue *in utramque partem*, endlessly manipulating female *exempla*. As Wayne A. Rebhorn has noted, *The Taming of the Shrew* "can be interpreted as a repetition or re-presentation of the Renaissance discourse of rhetoric," and the men who exhibit hermeneutic supremacy over the female characters in Shakespeare's play are accomplished *rhetors*.[98] Lucentio, a man "well read in poetry │And other books" (1.2.169-70), employs "rhetoric in [his] common talk" (1.1.35). Petruchio's manipulative rhetorical skill or "goodly speech" is often remarked upon (2.1.262); Grumio suggests that his master has the ability to "throw a figure [i.e. rhetorical *figura*] in [Katharina's] face, and so disfigure her with it, that she shall have no more eyes to see withal than a cat" (1.2.113-15).[99] Renaming his ornery bride, as a *rhetor*, Petruchio uses language and textual precedent to metamorphose Katharina "from a wild Kate to a Kate │Conformable as other household Kates" (2.1.277-78). Petruchio thereby, as Holly A. Crocker perceives, "deconstructs categories of femininity, insisting that the female subjects who occupy the positions of shrewish and virtuous woman are interchangeable."[100]

Both of the Minola girls—the 'good' and the 'bad' sister—are read and characterized in light of preexisting textual *exempla in bono* and *exempla in malo*. By turns, Bianca is interpreted as Europa, "the daughter of Agenor" whose "sweet beauty… made great Jove to humble him to her hand" and "Fair Leda's daughter" Helen (1.1.168-69, 1.2.242). And Petruchio, who has come to Padua "to wive and thrive" (1.2.56), gestures explicitly towards the conventions of literary exemplarity in the *querelle des femmes* by proclaiming his intention to woo the as-yet-unseen Katharina in familiar terms. He is resolved to have her even should she prove to be "as

---

[98] "Petruchio's 'Rope Tricks': *The Taming of the Shrew* and the Renaissance Discourse of Rhetoric," *Modern Philology* 92. 3 (1995): 295.
[99] Rebhorn notes: "Petruchio is...the rhetor as the Renaissance conceived him. From the Italian quattrocento through the seventeenth century, writers on the art celebrated the rhetor as a figure of power whose skill with words enabled him to control, shape, and transform the beliefs and behavior of those around him": 299.
[100] Holly A. Crocker, "Affective Resistance: Performing Passivity and Playing A-Part in *The Taming of the Shrew*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54.2 (2003): 146.

foul as was Florentius' love, | As old as Sibyl, and as curst and shrowd | As Socrates' Xantippe" (1.2.69-71).[101] Perhaps the most salient gesture towards the *exempla* of the *querelle des femmes*, however, occurs in Act 2, when Petruchio professes of his ornery bride: "For patience she will prove a second Grissel, | And Roman Lucrece for her chastity" (2.1.295-96). Petruchio's "comparison of Kate to Lucrece and Grissel" is, as Roberts perceives, highly appropriate, for "he proceeds to treat her like each of these women in turn."[102]

In Shakespeare's England, the story of Griselda was known from a variety of sources, having been filtered through Boccaccio, Petrarch, and Chaucer, and her character was frequently cited, typically as an *exemplum* of wifely patience in Tudor literature. The connections made between Katharina and Griselda have been discussed by both Carolyn E. Brown and Margaret Rose Jaster. It is, however, the lesser-explored link between Katharina and Ovid's Lucretia that I want to explore.[103] Lucretia—whose story was known to sixteenth-century audiences from Ovid's *Fasti* and Livy's *Ab urbe condita* as well as myriad of postclassical adaptations, such as Jeun de Meun's section of *Le Roman de la Rose*, Bocaccio's *De mulieribus claris*, Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women*, Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, and Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*—was frequently invoked as a paragon of feminine virtue. Recalled in Tudor works including *The Spectacle of Louers, A Contrauersye Bytwene a Louer and a Iaye, A Lytle and Bryefe Treatyse Called the Defence of Women,* and *The Praise and Dispraise of Women,* Lucretia served "in the eyen of folkys ferre and neer" as the consummate "exaumple off wifli trouthe," to borrow Lydgate's phrasing (2.1072, 974).

---

[101] In addition to Caxton's alignment of the ancient philosopher with antifeminism in *The Dictes or Sayengis of the Philosophres,* Socrates and his shrewish wife Xanthippe are frequently invoked in the literature of the English *querelle des femmes*. For example, *Tales and Quicke Answers Very Mery and Pleasant to Rede* (STC 23665; London, 1532) includes the following story "Of Socrates and his scoldinge wyfe" (E2^{v}):

> the wyse man Socrates had a coursed scoldinge wyfe, called Xantippe, the whiche on a day after she hadde all to chydde him powred a pysse potte on his heed. He takynge all paciently sayde: Dyd nat I tell you, that whan I herde Xantippe thonder so fast, that it wold rayne anone after. [W]herby ye maye se, that the wyser a man is, the more pacience he taketh.

[102] Roberts, 59.

[103] See "Katherine of *The Taming of the Shrew*: 'A Second Grissel,'" *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 37.3 (1995): 285-313 and "Controlling Clothes, Manipulating Mates: Petruchio's Griselda," *Shakespeare Studies* 29 (2001): 93-108.

In the final act of *The Taming of the Shrew*, Shakespeare plays upon this potent and often-utilized Ovidian *exemplum* when he dramatizes Katharina's metamorphosis from notorious shrew to virtuous woman at the hands of her husband and personal *rhetor*. Anxious to showcase his wife's "new-built virtue and obedience" (5.2.118), the *rhetor* initiates an intertextual game involving Lucentio, Hortensio, and himself:

> Let's each one send unto his wife,
> And he whose wife is most obedient,
> To come at first when he doth send for her,
> Shall win the wager which we will propose.
> (5.2.66-69)

The rules of this impromptu dinner wager are familiar, for Petruchio, assuming the role of "Collatine the publisher | Of that rich jewel he should keep unknown," invites the men in attendance at the Paduan wedding feast to reinact a well-known classical banquet.[104] As in Ovid's *Fasti*, "*quisquis suam laudat: studiis certamina crescunt,* | *et fervet multo linguaque corque mero*" [each praised his wife: in their eagerness dispute ran high, and every tongue and heart grew hot with the deep draughts of wine].[105] Indeed, the prefatory prose argument in Shakespeare's own (roughly contemporaneous) non-dramatic treatment of the story, *The Rape of Lucrece*, could serve as a plot summary for the closing scene of *The Taming of the Shrew*:

> the principal men of the army [met] one evening...[and,] in their discourses after supper every one commended the virtues of his own wife; among whom Collatinus extolled…his wife Lucretia. In that pleasant humor they all posted to Rome, and, intending by their secret and sudden arrival to make trial of that which every one had before avouched, only Collatinus finds his wife (though it were late in the night) spinning amongest her maids; the other ladies were all found dancing and revelling, or in several disports; whereupon the noblemen yielded Collatinus the victory, and his wife the fame.

Petruchio's game enables us to see the mechanics of Ovidian exemplarity in action, and, in Katharina's discussion of "what duty [women] owe their lords and husbands" (5.2.131), we find further evidence to link her character to the paradigmatic Ovidian "*forma*" [figure] of

---

[104] This description of Collatine is taken from Shakespeare's *Rape of Lucrece*, 33-34.
[105] I cite from *Fasti,* Loeb Classical Library 253, 2nd ed., trans. James George Frazer, rev. G.P Goold (1931; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), 2.731-32. Subsequent parenthetical book and line numbers for the *Fasti* refer to this edition, and English translations have been adopted or closely adapted from this same source.

Lucretia (*Fast.* 2.763). In her famous final speech, Katharina conspicuously shares in the imagery elsewhere used by Shakespeare's own version of Lucrece, who ineffectually begs her malefic rapist:

> Reward not hospitality
> With such black payment as thou hast pretended;
> Mud not the fountain that gave drink to thee,
> Mar not the thing that cannot be amended.
> (575-578)

Echoing (or perhaps presaging) the imagery invoked by this other Shakespearean Lucrece—who poignantly wonders why "toads infect fair founts with venom mud" and compares her violated body to a "poisoned fountain" (850, 1707)—the ostensibly reformed Katharina proclaims:

> A woman mov'd is like a fountain troubled,
> Muddy, ill-seeming, thick, bereft of beauty,
> And while it is so, none so dry or thirsty
> Will deign to sip, or touch one drop of it.
> (5.2.142-145)

Although it would appear that Katharina, who, in acting as Lucretia, "is chang'd, as she had never been" (5.2.115), there are hints that her final metamorphosis into an obedient wife *à la* Lucretia is tinged with irony. Lucentio's uncertain reaction as he dubiously declares her reversal to be "a wonder" (5.2.189) serves, as Crocker argues, to undermine the audience's acceptance of her alleged transformation by playing on our "lingering suspicion that Katharine's virtue and Petruchio's power are illusory."[106]

In self-consciously playing upon the inherent tension between the emblematic status of *exempla* and their narrative and rhetorical flexibility, Shakespeare's play brings the representational strategies and the methodologies of the Tudor *querelle des femmes* to the stage. *The Taming of the Shrew* dramatizes the varying manners in which *exempla* can be interpreted and the persuasive ability of the *rhetor* to argue *in utramque partem.* Katharina's manipulatable identity and evident polysemy ultimately render her, like the various literary *exempla* that she enacts,

---

[106] Crocker, 156.

both rhetorically useful and semantically ambiguous. Shakespeare's Katharina, a witty participant in intersexual repartée, is therefore "gamesome" (2.1.245) in more ways than one, for she is a labile and intertextual rhetorical figure in the dialogical game of the *querelle des femmes* who is just as bookishly writable and semantically exploitable as her aptly named sister.

STOW'S OVIDIAN CHAUCER

I began this chapter with an examination of Chaucer's Wife of Bath, and it is to Chaucer (though the Chaucer of the sixteenth century rather than the fourteenth) that I wish to return by way of conclusion.[107] As conducive as the woman question is to *argumentum in utramque partem* and as indebted as its tracts may have been to humanist rhetorical practices, the Tudor *querelle des femmes* was also descended from and deeply rooted in late medieval traditions that held "Of all creatures women be best: | Cuius contrarium verum est."[108] For that reason, I would like to draw attention to the 1561 *Workes of Geffrey Chaucer* (STC 5075) and the relationship of this edition to the *querelle des femmes*.[109]

John Stow, the Tudor bibliophile who served as editor for the edition "is generally remembered as a historian, antiquary, and collector and annotator of medieval manuscripts rather than for his endeavours as a literary man."[110] Nonetheless, Stow was not merely a

---

[107] On the Tudor reception of Chaucer, see: Theresa M. Krier, ed. *Refiguring Chaucer in the Renaissance* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998); Joseph A. Dane, *Who Is Buried in Chaucer's Tomb?: Studies in the Reception of Chaucer's Book* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1998); Gillespie, *Print Culture and the Medieval Author: Chaucer, Lydgate, and Their Books 1473–1557* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Kathleen Forni, *The Chaucerian Apocrypha: A Counterfeit Canon* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001); and Lerer, *Chaucer and His Readers*.

[108] This refrain is from a lyric entitled "What Women are Not," as reproduced in *Medieval English Lyrics: A Critical Anthology*, 2nd ed., ed. R.T. Davies (1963; Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1991), 221. Tellingly, these well-known lines are also referenced in *The Schole House of Women*, where Gosynhyll notes: "They say of all creatures, women are the best | Cuius contrarium, verum est": D3v.

[109] This edition survives in two issues (STC 5075 and 5076), both printed by John Kingston for John Wight. STC 5075, which I have consulted, has an elaborated and dated title page and includes additional woodcuts.

[110] Martha W. Driver, "Stow's Books Bequeathed: Some Notes on William Browne (1591-c.1643) and Peter Le Neve (1661-1729)," in *John Stow (1525-1605) and the Making of the English Past,* eds. Alexandra Gillespie and Ian Gadd (London: British Library, 2004), 135. It is telling that Barrett L. Beer's monograph on Stow only mentions his edition of Chaucer once in passing: *Tudor England Observed: The World of John Stow* (Phoenix Mill: Sutton Publishing, 1998), 16. On Stow's antiquarianism, see also Oliver Harris, "Stow and the Contemporary Antiquarian Network" in *John Stow (1525-1605) and the Making of the English Past*. The distinction between historians and antiquarians during the era is discussed in Daniel Woolf, "Erudition and the Idea of History in Renaissance England," *Renaissance Quarterly* 40.1 (1987): 11-48.

collector of historical artifacts, books, and manuscripts; he was also an avid copyist and a fastidious compiler. Stow's *Workes of Geffrey Chaucer* relied in part upon the edition of Chaucer's works edited by William Thynne several decades earlier. However, participating in what Derek Pearsall has referred to as the sixteenth-century "tradition of reprint-with-augmentation," Stow added over twenty poems to the materials found in Thynne's previous edition.[111] Although most of these texts are considered apocryphal by modern scholars, the majority of Stow's additions to Chaucer's canon originally appeared under the caption "Here foloweth certaine woorkes of Geffray Chauser, whiche hath not here tofore been printed, and are gathered and added to this booke by Iohn Stowe."[112]

Walter W. Skeat once suggested that the ballads added by Stow were "simply pitchforked into the volume," and Alice S. Miskimin has called the Chaucerian apocrypha "derivative, dull, and redundant."[113] However, there is a growing trend in scholarship that is less dismissive of the pseudo-Chaucerian texts that were 'gathered and added' by Stow, as the work's subtitle indicates. For example, Robert R. Edwards has proposed:

> Stow's specific influence can be detected beginning with his additions to what Thynne had printed, rather than his interventions in Thynne's text of the poem. In other words, 'Stow's Chaucer' is what Stow adds to Chaucer and what those additions mean in the logic of a composite edition.[114]

Though Edwards' primary interest is investigating the edition's relationship with "the reconfigurations of poetic meaning and political imagination in early-modern culture," his methodology is useful.[115] There is a sense in which every sixteenth-century edition of Chaucer's

---

[111] Pearsall elaborates: "The booksellers' reprints in the sixteenth century of William Thynne's edition...are set up, line by line, from their predecessor, diverging from it only insofar as the text undergoes the usual mechanical degeneration at the hands of the compositor. The only claim to novelty is in the augmentation of the canon": "Thomas Speght (ca. 1550-?)," in *Editing Chaucer: The Great Tradition*, ed. Paul G. Ruggiers (Norman, OK: Pilgrim Books, 1984), 71. Stow's edition is also discussed by Anne Hudson, "John Stow (1525? – 1605)," in *Editing Chaucer*, 53-70; and Bradford Y. Fletcher, "Printer's Copy for Stow's *Chaucer*," *Studies in Bibliography* 31 (1978): 184-201.

[112] *Workes of Geffrey Chaucer* (STC 5075; London, 1561), fol. cccxl[r]. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.

[113] *The Chaucer Canon: With a Discussion of the Works Associated with the Name of Geoffrey Chaucer* (1900; New York, Haskell House, 1965), 120 and *The Renaissance Chaucer* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), 230-1.

[114] Robert R. Edwards, "Translating Thebes: Lydgate's *Siege of Thebes* and Stow's Chaucer," *ELH* 70.2 (2003): 319-20.

[115] Edwards, "Translating Thebes," 319.

works is both like an anthology and a miscellany, for these works contain the traces of the editorial hands and minds that collected, selected, pruned, and structured their 'Chaucerian' materials. Thus, like Edwards, I am also interested in what Stow's particular editorial choices can tell us about the identity of his edition and the version of Chaucer's canon that he presented to Tudor readers. To this effect, I would point to the sustained engagement of the edition with the sixteenth-century *querelle des femmes*.

In the *Workes of Geffrey Chaucer*, we find a collected group of poems that, though they may individually take different stances, relate to one another through their shared interest in exploring the relative virtue of womankind. Amongst Stow's additions, we find such pieces as "The .ix. Ladies worthie," a ballad that, though significantly shorter, shares clear ideological and structural parallels with *The Legend of Good Women,* "A balade against unconstant women," "a balade whiche Chaucer made in ye praise or rather dispraise of women for ther doublenes," "A balade, warnyng men to beware of deceiptfull women," "How all thing in this worlde is variable save women onely," "A pleasaunt balade of women," and "A balade declaring that wemens chastitie doeth moche excel all treasure worldly." Stow's volume also contains the same sort of bibliofictional scaffolding and referentiality evident in the works of Gosynhyll or Pyrrye. For instance, one poem that he adopts from Thynne entitled "A praise of women" (fol. ccclxxiii^{v}) is primarily an aggressive attack upon detractors, and the piece disdainfully refers to the "tales vntrue" that antifeminist authors "so busilie painte and endite." Such references to the concerns to the ongoing *querelle des femmes* are also present in the prologue to one of Stow's newer additions to the Chaucerian canon, "The crafte of louers" (fol. ccxli^{r}). Conscious of the "peinted eloquence" and rhetorical contortions that typified *querelle* literature, the author asserts: "Thus louers with ther moral documents | And eloquent langage they can examplifye | The craft of loue what it doth signifie."

Stow's edition is also notable for the way that it allies Ovid with both the *querelle des femmes* and with the canon of "Complenntis, baladis, rou*n*delis, virelaies" associated with

Chaucer.[116] By the Tudor era, the iconic 'Ovidian' heroines represented in the English vernacular had also become, broadly speaking, 'Chaucerian' heroines. This conflation between "Venus clerk Ovide" and his poetic heir Chaucer, who "so longe trewely…faire Venus also," is one that originated with Chaucer himself (HF 1487, 615-8). We might recall the moment in *The Canterbury Tales* where the Man of Law asserts that Chaucer "hath toold of loveris up and doun | Mo than Ovide made of mencioun | in his Episteles, that been ful olde" (53-55), going on to list Chaucer's accomplishments as a love poet:

> In youthe he made of Ceys and Alcione,
> And sitthen hath he spoken of everichone,
> Thise noble wyves and thise loveris eke.
> Whoso that wole his large volume seke,
> Cleped the Seintes Legende of Cupide,
> Ther may he seen the large woundes wyde
> Of Lucresse, and of Babilan Tesbee;
> The swerd of Dido for the false Enee;
> The tree of Phillis for hire Demophon;
> The pleinte of Dianire and of Hermyon,
> Of Adriane, and of Isiphilee—
> The bareyne yle stondynge in the see—
> The dreynte Leandre for his Erro;
> The teeris of Eleyne, and eke the wo
> Of Brixseyde, and of the, Ladomya;
> The crueltee of the, queene Medea,
> Thy litel children hangynge by the hals,
> For thy Jason, that was of love so fals!
> O Ypermenestra, Penelopee, Alceste,
> Youre wifhod he comendeth with the beste![117]
> (57-76)

The Man of Law's apparent fusion and confusion of the two poets foreshadows a later, sixteenth-century English tendency to synthesize the works of Chaucer with the poetry of the self-proclaimed Roman *praeceptor amoris*. It was an association that would continue well into the next century as well, as attested by Charles Cotton's *Chaucer's Ghoast, or, a Piece of Antiquity,* which, as its subtitle suggests, contains a selection of "pleasant Fables of *Ovid*."[118]

---

[116] I borrow this line from Lydgate's descriptions of Chaucer's *oeuvre* in *The Fall of Princes*, 1.352-43.
[117] With the single exception of Alcestis, each character who appears in the Man of Law's list of *Chaucer's* poetic triumphs is also one of *Ovid's* characters.
[118] *Chaucer's Ghoast, or, a Piece of Antiquity* (London, 1672).

In Stow's *Workes of Geffrey Chaucer*, the sentiments and tone of Ovid's erotic works and the heroines-as-*exempla* culled from his mythological poetry collide and are interlaced in nominally Chaucerian formulations. Stow's Chaucer is imbued with what we might call a tangibly Ovidian sentiment, a sentiment ultimately derived from the Roman poet's erotodidactic work. Such ideological fusions are clearly evident for example, in "The crafte of louers," the title of which plays upon the *Ars Amatoria* (fol. ccxli^{r}). In this heated dialogue between a male lover and his female beloved, Ovid is twice named as an authority. After suggesting that "The rectour Tulius so gay of eloquence | And Ouide…the craft of loue expres," the male lover goes on to paraphrase, and seemingly reinterpret the stance of, the *Remedia Amoris*: "Ouide in his writinge | Saith that desire of worldly concupiscence | As for a time is swete in his worchinge | And in his ende he causeth greate offe[n]ce." A second *querelle*-related piece, which had earlier appeared in Thynne, also explicitly draws upon Ovid's amatory poetry: *The Remedie of Loue* (cccxxi^{v}). The authorial *persona* of the poem takes the stance that the "greuous malady…called loue" is a "thing moste noyous | Unto youthe" and appositely advises his (young male) readers to "Loue not to hote, least thou repent." In addition to the obvious allusion to the *Remedia Amoris* in the piece's anglicized title, the author also seems to draw inspiration from the tongue-in-cheek instructions of Ovid's self-described "*iuvenalia carmina*" [songs of youth] (*Tr.* 2.339) when he describes three jealous lovers at a dinner party who each aim "in secrete wise some signifiaunce | Of loue to haue." Perhaps more Ovidian even than these specific intertextual allusions, however, is the tone and position of the poem's authorial *persona*: a *praeceptor amoris*. The piece is presented as a palinode; the antifeminist poet is self-described as a former lover. Much as Ovid takes a final position of resistance against Cupid's will and offers an antidote to anguish in the *Remedia Amoris*, the older and wiser authorial persona of *The Remedie of Loue* likewise renounces his former master, Love:

> My penne to direct, my brain to illumine
> No lenger alas maie I sewe your doctrine
> The freshe lustie meters, that I wont to make
> Have been here afore, I vtterlie forsake

That Stow's Chaucerian apocrypha enjoy a synergistic relationship with the books of the Tudor debate over women is indisputable. In so aligning Chaucer's authorial identity with the sentiments expressed in the tracts of the *querelle des femmes*, Stow is drawing upon Chaucer's sixteenth-century identity as a love poet.[119] By the 1560s, Chaucer's poetry was so closely associated with the terms and issues of the woman question and the "old fond paradoxes" of the *querelle*-game as to be inseparable from them.[120] Thus, Stow's additions simultaneously reaffirm Chaucer's identity as a source for and also, in some sense, an active *participant* in the Tudor debate.

In redefining Chaucer in relation to the practices and concerns of the sixteenth-century *querelle des femmes*, Stow's edition also captures something of the *querelle's* textual mutability. Perhaps the most provocative image of the conceptual and material fluidity that surrounded the *querelle des femmes* appears in an often-quoted stanza from *The Remedie of Loue*:

> If all the yearth wer parchment scribable
> Spedie for the hande, and all maner wood
> Her hewed and proporcioned to pennes able
> All water Ynke, in damme or in flood
> Euery man being a parfite Scribe and good
> The cursednesse yet and desceipt of women
> Coud not be shewed by the meane of penne.[121]

---

[119] Gillespie has made a similar argument about the additions in Pynson's 1526 edition of Chaucer: "The accretion of apocryphal and genuine texts here renders Chaucer a consummate love poet, and it does so in terms of a famous French debate about love and poetry, *la querelle des femmes*": *Print Culture and the Medieval Author,* 128. See also Julia Boffey and John J. Thompson, "Anthologies and Miscellanies: Production and Choice of Texts," in *Book Production and Publishing in Britain, 1375-1475,* eds. Jeremy Griffiths and Derek Pearsall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 279-315. Chaucer's poems survive in collections from the fifteenth century, and it is typical to find anthologized MS collections which have Chaucer's minor poems alongside amorous poems; the second half of fifteenth century saw what Boffey and Thompson have called "a growing taste for such anthologies": 280.

[120] I adopt this phrase from Shakespeare's *Othello,* 2.1.138.

[121] In "A balade, warnyng men to beware of deceiptfull women" (fol. cccxliiij^{v}), found amongst Stow's 'new' additions to the Chaucerian canon, we find another variation on this same stanza:

> In soth to saie, though all the yerth so wāne
> Wer parchement smoth, white and scribabell
> And the great sea, that called is the Occiane
> Were tourned into ynke blacker then Sabell
> Euery sticke a pen, eche man a scrivener abel
> Not coud thei write, womans trecherie.

This metapoetic invocation of the 'scribable' world presents us with an apt characterization of the *querelle des femme's* dynamics.[122] The topographical image of an 'yearth' where glutinous black seas spill over onto vast parchment lands, creating meaning in the spaces where ink and blank surface converge, suggests something of the uncontainable nature both of the rhetorically infinite woman question and of textual transmission itself. And the author reminds us that it is an issue that will never be fully resolved 'by the meane of penne.' Despite the alleged impossibility of ever expressing the full 'cursednesse yet and desceipt of women,' *The Remedie of Loue's* portrait of literary production underscores the ways that engagement with the mobile metaphors and rhetorical figures of the *querelle des femmes* could operate as a social, collective, and shared activity. It is a debate in which 'eche man' might theoretically participate, for implicit to this image is the further suggestion that any scribacious individual armed with a 'penne' can operate as a 'parfite Scribe,' copying its *materia* but also moulding its sentiments and its familiar *exempla in malo* and *exempla in bono* into unprecedented bookish formulations. More than this, however, *The Remedie of Loue's* printed image of scribal inscription serves a salient reminder of the coeval and correlative nature of so-called print and manuscript cultures in Tudor books. Evoking the recursivity of book production and transmission, the poem locates itself—the printed page where it now appears, the 'scribable' leaves that it originated upon, and the 'yearth' of 'parchment' that it imaginatively posits—simultaneously in the past, as part of a historical chain of reception, in the 'present' of Stow's edition, and in the future, with its anticipations of further metamorphic and inscriptive possibilities.

I wish to conclude this chapter with the observation that, like "medieval literature," Tudor literature "cannot be understood...except as part of transmissive processes...which form part of other and greater histories."[123] The very conditions under which medieval, and likewise Tudor, books were produced and consumed meant that readers readily understood the ways

---

[122] On this image, see Irving Linn, "If All the Sky were Parchment," *PMLA* 53 (1938): 951-970.
[123] I here borrow from David Wallace's characterization of medieval literature in his preface to *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), xxi.

that—both as concepts and as objects—books move through history and succeeding imaginations, metamorphosing both their forms and their identities in the process. Indeed, as Caxton's *Dictes or Sayengis of the Philosophres* indicates, if his readers "be not wel plesyd" with its antifeminist addendum, they are invited respond by reshaping the book; they might "wyth a penne race it out or ellys," following the Wife of Bath's example, physically "rente the leef out of the booke" (76).

'HIR NAME, ALLAS! IS PUBLISSHED SO WYDE': *FAMA*, GOSSIP, AND THE PUBLICATION OF CRESSIDA

In the concluding lines of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde,* the narrator, even as he reiteratively protests his inability to 'falsen' his source texts and exonerate Criseyde, ironically gestures towards an incipient *apologia*: "Gladlier I wol write, yif yow leste, | Penolopeës trouthe and good Alceste" (5.1777-78). Luckily, Chaucer's narrative *persona* is provided with just such an opportunity. He is accosted in the Prologue to the *Legend of Good Women* by the God of Love and Alceste herself, neither of whom seems particularly impressed by his prior choices of poetic material. The God of Love, who seeks recompense for Chaucer's poetic treason, accuses the poet of defaming *all* women through his allegedly unfavourable portrayal of Criseyde: "of Cresside thou hast said as thee list, | That maketh men to women less to trust, | That be as true as e'er was any steel."[1] Chaucer's narrative *persona* is prompted to rectify his dubious literary crime—yet again, by means of his pen.[2] Lydgate's *Fall of Princes* would later sardonically summarize the genesis of Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women*:

> This poete [Chaucer] wrot, at request off the queen,
> A legende of parfait hoolynesse,
> Off Goode Women to fynde out nynteen
> That ded excelle in bounte and fairnesse;
> But for his labour and his bisynesse
> Was importable his wittis to encombre
> In al this world to fynde so gret a noumbre.
> (1.330-36)

In establishing the intertextual fiction that the ensuing tales "Of goode wymmen, maydenes and wyves, | That weren trewe in lovyng al hire lyves" (F 484-85, G 474-75) fulfill a retributive function, Chaucer's Prologue constitutes a literary antidote—however intentionally

---

[1] I cite here from the F-text (332-35). The G-text reads: "Hast thow nat mad in Englysh ek the bok | How that Crisseyde Troylus forsok, | In shewynge how that wemen han don mis?" (264-66).

[2] Many scholars try to read Chaucer here either as a misogynist or as a proto-feminist. Representative is Elaine Tuttel Hansen, who expresses the desire to "pin down the elusive author and determine whether he was or was not a friend of women": *Chaucer and the Fictions of Gender* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 1. However, Florence Percival has rightly pointed to the limitations of such reductionist approaches, suggesting that they "take at face value [the *Legend of Good Women*'s] stated subject of defending women, while ignoring the effect on the poem's meaning of the frequently flippant stance the narrator adopts": *Chaucer's Legendary Good Women* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 6.

and ironically maladroit it may be—to the poet's prior literary depiction of the less-than-'trewe' Criseyde who "forsook" Troilus "er she deyde" (1.56). Though ambiguous and unsatisfactory, this palinode serves as a narrative ligature between *Troilus and Criseyde* and the *Legend of Good Women,* linking both texts to one another and also to the broader woman question that would develop into the sixteenth century's *querelle des femmes*.[3] Hence, from the earliest history of their reception, *Troilus and Criseyde* and the *Legend of Good Women* have been indissolubly conjoined. The pseudo-classical Trojan heroine of the former work was permanently linked with Chaucer's catalogue of Ovidian heroines in the latter work, and, by extension, she also became allied with the anterior epic heroines of the *Heroides* and *Metamorphoses*. Indeed, we might say that Chaucer's Criseyde becomes an honourary Ovidian heroine by virtue of juxtaposition.

Even beyond her palinodic link to Ovid's mythological women, Chaucer's Criseyde has much to recommend her as a pseudo-Ovidian heroine. In the vein of so many of Ovid's female characters, she is subjected to relentless amatory pursuit by predatory males, and she is the victim of a love affair gone wrong.[4] Like the heroines of the *Heroides*, circumstances and her separation from a paramour prompt Criseyde to become a letter writer. Also like the majority of the women represented in Ovid's epistolary collection, she is embroiled in the epic cycles of the Trojan War, for the Chaucerian narrative in which she appears takes classical antiquity's most pervasive literary storyworld as its own point of departure. Moreover, a detailed genealogical reconstruction reveals that Troilus' mistress has an Ovidian literary pedigree: she is

---

[3] John Fyler, discussing the function of *Legend of Good Women,* suggests that the palinode is an ambiguous form, that it "adds another voice to an unresolved dispute": *Chaucer and Ovid* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979), 98. Peter L. Allen sees the palinode as ironic and claims that "the poet did not sincerely desire to repent–that his 'sin' is a sin only in the eyes of the God of Love, and not in his own": "Reading Chaucer's Good Women," *Chaucer Review* 21 (1987): 425.

[4] The relationship between Criseyde and Chaucer's 'good wymmen' is further compounded by the numerous echoes of Ovidian erotodidactic discourse found throughout *Troilus and Criseyde*. It is well-known and frequently remarked in scholarship that the psyches of *Troilus and Criseyde's* characters are deeply indebted to Ovid's poetry. Troilus, under the tutelage of Pandarus, looks to the *Heroides* and *Ars Amatoria*, while Criseyde's dialogue and behavioural strategies bear the marks of the *Remedia Amoris*, *Amores*, and *Ars Amatoria*.

an unlikely postclassical amalgam of the ancient literary heroines Chryseis and Briseis (the latter character best known as the inscribed author of *Heroides* 3).[5]

It hardly comes as a surprise that in post-Chaucerian English literature it was not uncommon for authors to portray Criseyde (or Cressida) as though she were another one of Ovid's mythological characters.[6] We might recall that Skelton's Jane Scrope turned to and reinterpreted Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* in company with a plethora of Ovidian stories in her lament at the death of her sparrow. Cressida is likewise set alongside and collated with Ovid's mythological heroines throughout the Tudor period. It is thus that, in Peter Beverly of Staple Inn's *Historie of Ariodanto and Ieneura*, we find a reference to Cressida embedded in a description of Ovidian storytelling:

> He would discourse of histories, and tell of forein newes.
> As first the siege of worthy Troy, what knightes therin weare slayn:
> And how that Helen was the cause, that Grecians felt such paine.
> Then how, the chast Penelope, did leade a widowes lyfe:
> Til hir Ulix, and Anthenor, did ende the tenne yeares strife.
> Next how Eneas, falsly delt, with Dido, Carthage Queene,
> And how for falsing of her faith, False Creseide fell uncleane.[7]

Similarly, in the final act of Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*, Lorenzo and Jessica draw upon a catalogue of famous lovers in a patently misguided attempt to read their own liaison as part of

---

[5] Briseis' depiction in the *Remedia Amoris* reverses her portrait of fidelity in the *Heroides*; Ovid suggests that Briseis, during her captivity, must have made herself sexually available to Agamemnon. Moreover, in the *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid complicates the characterization of the heroine further by telling us how Briseis enjoyed the touch of Achilles' battle-bloodied hands. These inconsistent and influential Ovidian depictions of Criseyde's classical literary antecedent uncannily mirror the multiplicity of significations which would surround Criseyde's equally enigmatic character in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. The development of Criseyde's character can be traced, albeit in a circuitous manner, to Homeric as well as Ovidian classical precedents. On the ancient origins of Criseyde, see: E. Talbot Donaldson, "Briseis, Briseida, Criseyde, Cresseid, Cressid: Progress of a Heroine," in *Chaucerian Problems and Perspectives: Essays Presented to Paul E. Beichner, C.S.C.,* eds. Edward Vasta and Zacharias P. Thundy (Chapel Hill: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979), 3-12; and Sally Mapstone, "The Origins of Criseyde," in *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts in Late Medieval Britain, Essays for Felicity Riddy*, eds. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al. (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2000), 131-47. On the medieval Cressida, see Gretchen Mieszkowski, "The Reputation of Criseyde 1150-1500," *Transactions Published by the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 43 (1971): 71-153.

[6] Cressida's name appears in countless orthographical variations in late medieval and Renaissance texts. For the sake of consistency, I have opted to use *Criseyde* only in conjunction with Chaucer's character. In all other cases, I have adopted the more familiar Shakespearian *Cressida* when referring to this character.

[7] I quote the text of *Ariodanto and Ieneura* from *The sources of* Much Ado About Nothing: *A Critical Study, Together with the Text of Peter Beverley's* Ariodanto and Ieneura, ed. Charles T. Prouty (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), 96-97.

an established literary tradition, a tradition of courtly romance in which Cressida appears alongside the Ovidian heroines Thisbe, Dido, and Medea:

LORENZO: In such a night as this,
……
Troilus methinks mounted the Troyan walls,
And sigh'd his soul toward the Grecian tents,
Where Cressid lay that night.
JESSICA: In such a night
Did Thisbe fearfully o'ertrip the dew,
And saw the lion's shadow ere himself,
And ran dismayed away.
LORENZO: In such a night
Stood Dido with a willow in her hand
Upon the wild sea-banks, and waft her love
To come again to Carthage.
JESSICA: In such a night
Medea gathered the enchanted herbs
That did renew old Aeson.
LORENZO: In such a night
Did Jessica steal from the wealthy Jew,
And with an unthrift love did run from Venice,
As far as Belmont.
(5.1.1-17)

Indeed, Cressida and Ovid's heroines are so inextricably bound up in the Tudor imagination that, in George Pettie's *Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure*, Ovidian characters actually cite Cressida within their own stories. Procris, piquantly rejecting the suit of her disguised husband Cephalus, declares:

> you are conversant with no Cressid, you have no Helen in hande! we women will now learn to beware of such guileful guests! No, if you were as cunning as Joue, that you could convert yourself into the likeness of mine own husband, as Joue came to Alcmena in the likeness of her husband Amphitrion, I doubt how I should receive you, till the prefixed time of my husband's comming were come.[8]

This chapter examines the phenomenon by which Cressida and her story were subsumed into a much older pantheon of Greco-Roman figures and canon of complementary tales. Positing Cressida as a postclassical Ovidian heroine, I trace some of the significant developments of Cressida's strikingly bookish character from her first English portrayal in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* to her late Elizabethan appearance in Shakespeare's *Troilus and*

[8] I quote from *A Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure Containing Many Pretie Histories by him Set Forth in Comely Colours and Most Delightfully Discoursed*, vol. 2, ed. I. Gollancz (London: Chatto and Windus, 1908), 71-72.

Cressida. In so doing, I focus also on the metaphorics of textual transmission that accompanied and informed Cressida's various literary appearances. Investigating how this pseudo-Ovidian heroine's reception was informed by Ovidian ideas about the process whereby new literature is created through dialogues with the textual fragments of the past, this chapter explores the reticulate associations, both metaphorical and material, between *fama*, publication, gossip, and bibliogenesis.

FAMA, GOSSIP, AND PUBLICATION IN CHAUCER

Chaucer's engagement with the storyworlds of classical epic and vernacular romance in *Troilus and Criseyde* is marked by a profound and self-consciousness relationship with the books of prior literary tradition. Accordingly, his Criseyde is a character who possesses a reflexive sense of her own bookishness, a sense that is underscored by her awareness of her own metaphorical and material place in literary history. To this effect, in Book 5, the Chaucerian heroine experiences a profound moment of metatextual awareness. Much like Shakespeare's Lucrece, who, two centuries later, famously feared that the details of her rape and "story of sweet chastity's decay" would be repeated by the "nurse to still her child" and the "orator to deck his oratory" (808, 813, 815), Criseyde dreads that her own name and defame will be broadcast and amplified by subsequent raconteurs. Hence, in our last direct vision of Chaucer's heroine, she poignantly laments her "slydyng of corage" (5.825):

> She seyde 'Allas, for now is clene ago
> My name of trouthe in love, for everemo!
> For I have falsed oon the gentileste
> That evere was, and oon the worthieste!
>
> Allas, of me, unto the worldes ende,
> Shal neyther ben ywriten nor ysonge
> No good word, for thise bokes wol me shende.
> Thorughout the world my belle shal be ronge!'
> (5.1054-61)

As Criseyde imagines her own textual future, she will become a negative *exemplum*. Chaucer's heroine foresees that the complexities of her psychology and experiences will be encapsulated

in a single resonant 'name' that will be 'ysonge' and 'ywriten' in 'bokes.' Perilously poised between prophesy and fulfillment, Criseyde's demonstration of intertextual anxiety, like Lucrece's, is intriguingly complicated by the fact that it is an act of both prediction and postdiction, embedded within multiple 'nows.' The reader is both privy to the heroine's superficial 'now,' her moment of paranoia and textual angst within the chronology of her tragedy, and also to the larger 'now' of later reception, a 'now' in which the trajectory of her pusillanimous demise is already known to narrator and audience alike.

In addition to her imaginary treatment by Lollius, Criseyde already had a fairly substantial literary history prior to her appearance in *Troilus and Criseyde*. Under the name Briseida, the Briseis/Chryseis composite made her literary debut at the Anglo-Norman court of Henry II and Eleanor of Aquitaine.[9] Following her original treatment in Benoît de Sainte-Maure's *Roman de Troie*, Cressida reappeared in an anonymous thirteenth-century French prose redaction, in Guido de Columnis' Latin *Historia Destructionis Troiae*, and in Giovanni Boccaccio's Italian *Il Filostrato*, before emerging in the English vernacular as Chaucer's Criseyde. And already by Chaucer's time, the character of Criseyde had long been plagued by metatextual unease. The vertiginous meta-awareness demonstrated by Chaucer's Criseyde functions both as a ghostly echo and paradoxical fulfillment of her last speech in Benoît's poem, where she had voiced a similar foresight:

> De mei n'iert ja fait bon escrit
> Ne chantee bone chançon.
> Tel aventure ne tel don
> Ne vousisse ja jor aveir.
> Mauvais sen oi e fol espeir,
> Quant jo trichai a mon ami,
> Qui onc vers mei nel deservi
> …….
> Dès ore avront pro que retraire
> De mei cil qui ne m'aiment guaire;

[9] Roberto Antonelli argues: "the character of Briseis [i.e. Criseyde] would not be conceivable outside of the great and complex culture of knighthood and love of the Anglo-Norman court": "The Birth of Criseyde-An Exemplary Triangle: 'Classical' Troilus and the Question of Love at the Anglo-Norman Court," in *The European Tragedy of the Troilus*, ed. Piero Boitani (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 34. Antonelli further suggests that, though Briseis' immoral behaviour bothered contemporary readers, Benoît's narrative, despite its antifeminist strands, did not definitively condemn Briseis out of consideration for Queen Eleanor: 37-38.

> Lor paroles de me tendront
> Les dames que a Troie sont.
> Honte I ai fait as dameiseles
> Trop lait e as riches puceles:
> Ma tricherie e mis mesfaiz
> Lor sera mais toz jorz retraiz.[10]
>
> Nothing good will ever be written or sung of me. I never at any time wished such a thing to happen. I behaved wrongly and stupidly, I think, when I betrayed my lover, who never deserved that of me….From now on, I shall be giving those with little love for me a great deal to gossip about. The ladies of Troy will make me the subject of their talk. I have brought the most odious disgrace upon women and noble ladies, and my treachery and misdeeds will always be laid to their charge.

A mere twenty-four lines after the Chaucerian Criseyde's similar epiphany, the vatic overtones of Criseyde's earlier speech are revealed as *vaticinia ex eventu*. Chaucer's increasingly intrusive authorial *persona* interjects to inform us that the defamation of Criseyde is a *fait accompli*:

> Ne me list this sely womman chyde
> Ferther than the story wol devyse
> Hir name, allas! is publisshed so wyde,
> That for hir gilt it oughte y-now suffyse.
> (5.1093-6)

The narrator—that self-described "sorwful instrument" (1.10) who adopts a marked ambivalence and implements a solicitous delicacy, if not genuine sympathy, when discussing his notorious heroine—pointedly abstains from contributing to Criseyde's calumny any 'Ferther than the story wol devyse.' Nonetheless, his careful wording suggests that he stands in opposition to a multitude of censurers who, unlike himself, do not hesitate to 'chyde' the craven heroine, an implication confirmed by his later assertion: "Ye may her gilt in other bokes se" (5.1776). Criseyde's fear that 'thorughout the world' her 'belle shal be ronge' has come to fruition, for Criseyde has fallen prey to a pre-existing and inflexible textual history: as Shakespeare's Hamlet would say, "the story is extant, and written in very choice Italian" (3.2.262-63)—as well as Latin and French. Thus, in a space of less than thirty lines, she is transformed from lamenting woman to familiar literary figure, and the equation of Criseyde

---

[10] *Roman de Troie*, ed. Leopold Constans (Paris: Société des Anciens Textes Français, 1904-1906), 20237-49. English translation from N. R. Havely, *Chaucer's Boccaccio: Sources of* Troilus *and the* Knight's *and* Franklin's Tales (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1980), 180.

with falsity moves from anxious prolepsis to a matter of written record and a 'publisshed' commonplace of proverbial proportions.

The narrator of *Troilus and Criseyde* conspicuously locates himself in a system of reception. He draws attention to the metaliterary and malleable nature of his own work about Criseyde in his characterization of his 'boke' as "matere" (1.53), a substance that can be physically worked. Accordingly, he marks his own depiction of the Trojan heroine as part of an ongoing and cyclical literary "proces" (3.470), a tradition devoted to the continuous reformulation and republication of Criseyde as textual artifact. His repeated reminders of "stories elleswhere" (5.1044)—and his suggestion, placed in the mouth of Cassandre, that such stories *either* reveal knowledge of the past "or ellis olde bookes lye" (5.1481)—characterize his own version of Criseyde's plastic text as a fictional construct built from a myriad of earlier such fictional constructs.

In *Troilus and Criseyde*, Chaucer replicates Ovid's pervasive fascination with representing bookish female *corpora* . Indeed, the Chaucerian Criseyde's rapid semantic 'slydyng' and her co-existence in multiple 'nows' are symptoms of her profound textuality.[11] Not only is her story marked as the product of an ongoing tradition of poetic reception, but, within Chaucer's own work, Criseyde's character is imbued with a textual-corporeal presence. The heroine's verbal composition is evident from the narrator's initial description of her, in which Criseyde's textualized body is represented in terms of the written alphabet: "In widewes habit blak, but natheless | Right as oure firste lettre is now an A, | In beaute first so stod she" (1.170-72).[12]

---

[11] In thinking about Criseyde-as-text, I follow a number of precedents, including: Carolyn Dinshaw, *Chaucer's Sexual Poetics* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989); C. David Benson, "The Opaque Text of Chaucer's Criseyde" and Rosemarie P. McGerr, "Meaning and Ending in a 'Paynted Proces': Resistance to Closure in *Troilus and Criseyde*," in *Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde: 'Subgit to alle Poesye,'* eds. R.A. Shoaf and Catherine S. Cox (Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Text Studies, 1992), 17-28 and 179-98; Catherine S. Cox, *Gender and Language in Chaucer* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1997); and Victoria Warren, "Misreading the 'Text' of Criseyde: Context and Identity in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*," *Chaucer Review* 36 (2001): 1-15. More recently, Alexandra Gillespie has linked the Criseyde-as-book analogy specifically to the material transmission of her text in both manuscript and print: *Print Culture and the Medieval Author*, 106-9.

[12] As Jennifer Summit observes in *Lost Property*, "Criseyde's black clothes," too, "are...linked to the visual, inky aspect of written language" throughout the text: 55. Although Criseyde is certainly the most explicitly textual and the most textually self-conscious of the story's characters, she is not alone in envisioning the contours of her literary reception. In Book 1, Troilus compares himself to a literary subject, saying: "I shal

Troilus and Criseyde replicates Ovid's characteristic interest in and self-conscious literary involvement with the material circumstances and metaphorics of poetic creation and dissemination by exploiting imagery which aligns Criseyde with the circulation and material qualities of books. Her character is invoked as a metonym for the literary containers in which her tale is and will be held, transmitted, and reproduced, and there is an elusive, yet tangible, connection between the fictional body of the character Criseyde and the physical body of Chaucer's 'litel book.' Both function as interpretative spaces, and both are "subgit…to alle poesye" (5.1790). Thus, as a character, Criseyde is, to borrow Catherine S. Cox's phrasing, "the feminine-body-as-text, a blank page to be inscribed."[13]

One of the most remarkable aspects of Criseyde's moment of textual self-consciousness is the synergy between her vision of future reception and the ways in which literary transmission is elsewhere characterized by Chaucer in the *House of Fame.* For, the *House of Fame* is, as described by one of its Elizabethan editors, a poem that "shew[s] how the deedes of all men and women, bee they good or badde, are carried by report to posteritie."[14] In this text, Chaucer dramatizes the process by which every single utterance that "cometh from any tonge, | Be hyt rouned, red, or songe, | Or spoke in suerte or in drede" inevitably converges in one powerfully intertextual space (2.721-23). Ruth Evans has described Chaucer's vision as "something like a vast telephone exchange or switchboard, uncannily able to tap into every conversation," and it is to the oral dimension of this polyphonic conversation that I wish to

---

byjaped ben a thousand time | More than that fool of whos folie men ryme" (531-2). By Book 5, the forlorn Trojan suggests of his own experience: "Men myght a book make of it, lik a storie" (583-5). Similarly, early in Book 3**,** Pandarus seems to anticipate the fate that lies in store for his name, lamenting that if it were known that he had become "swich a meene | As maken wommen unto men to comen," then "all the world upon it wolde crie" (254-552, 77).

[13] Cox, 43.

[14] I adopt this description from Thomas Speght's prefatory "Arguments to euery Tale and Booke" in *The Workes of our Antient and Lerned English Poet, Geffrey Chaucer* (STC 5077; London, 1598).

draw attention, for, ultimately derived from the Latin verb *feri*, "fame is itself essentially an oral concept: *fama* means talk." [15]

Chaucer's conception of *Fama*, as evinced both in his *House of Fame* and also *Troilus and Criseyde*, is itself modeled largely upon two Roman precedents: Vergil's *Fama* of *Aeneid* 4 and Ovid's incessant *Fama* who "*ipsa, quid in caelo rerum pelagoque geratur | et tellere, videt totumque inquirit in orbem*" [herself beholds all that is done in heaven, on sea and land, and searches throughout the world for news] (*Met.* 12.62-63). In both Vergil' and Ovid's earlier conceptions, *Fama* is indiscriminate about the veracity of the words she collects and circulates. Almost paradoxically, in amassing and disseminating bits of speech, she is both "*nuntia veri*" [the herald of truth] and *"ficti pravique tenax*" [one who clings to the false and the wrong] (*Aen.* 4.188), and it is in the Roman *Fama's* persistent blurring of fact and fiction that we can also locate the genesis of poetry.

The *Metamorphoses'* metapoetic House of *Fama*, the literary forerunner to Chaucer's similar architectural space, "*fremit vocesque refert iteratque quod audit*" [resounds with confused noises, repeats all words and doubles what it hears] (12.47). Ovid, putting his usual aetiological spin on things, emphasizes the idea that such social murmurings and incessant whisperings constitute narrative in its most basic form:

> *mixtaque cum veris passim commenta vagantur*
> *milia rumorum confusaque verba volutant;*
> *e quibus hi vacuas inplent sermonibus aures,*
> *hi narrata ferunt alio, mensuraque ficti*
> *crescit, et auditis aliquid novus adicit auctor.*
>
> (12.54-58)

> Everywhere wander thousands of rumours, falsehoods mingled with the truth, and confused reports flit about. Some of these fill their idle ears with talk, and others go and tell everywhere what they have heard; while the story grows in size, and each new teller makes contribution to what he has heard.

[15] "Chaucer in Cyberspace: Medieval Technologies of Memory and *The House of Fame*," *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 23 (2001): 57; D.R. Woolf, "Hearing Renaissance England," in *Hearing History: A Reader*, ed. Mark M. Smith (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004), 121.

In Ovid's conception, as a rumour is transmitted, it is reframed by each successive act of interpretation to which it is subject. Flitting rumours thereby provide interminable fodder for disparate and discordant narratives. Notably, the distortions and amplifications inherent to the rumour mill (wherein information is constantly contradicted and supplanted) mirror the metamorphic tendencies of intertextual poetic appropriations and literary adaptations. In Ovid's description of verbal repetition and reproduction, then, rumour—and, by extension, the constitutionally mutable substance of literature itself—is ingeminated, hybridized, and embellished by each *novus auctor* who encounters it.

From Ovid, Chaucer inherits this notion of literature as rooted in linguistic and semantic metamorphosis, and, in *The House of Fame,* Chaucer, like Ovid, presents his readers with a panoramic view of intertextual processes. Nickolas Haydock, who suggestively characterizes Chaucer's poem as "a comedy about the cluttered space of readerly intellection, a carnival celebration of the imagination ruminating on memories of books," writes:

> Chaucer's poem dramatizes what happens to books when they enter a mind already cluttered with other books: some of them memorized verbatim, some barely and imperfectly recollected, some hopelessly muddled, and others...present only by reputation. When a book enters the messy, cramped space of a brain full of other books it is accommodated to what is already there, just as these books have to give up space—or share it—with the new arrival.[16]

Chaucer's own cage-like House of Rumour is conspicuously adapted from the Ovidian House of *Fama.* Measuring in at "sixty myle of lengthe," this gyrating, polychromatic structure "mad of twigges" is a space of transmission (3.1979, 1936). Populated by an assortment of pilgrims, shipmen, couriers, pardoners, and messengers, it is a place in which "every wight" participates in the dissemination of "newe tydynge[s]" (3.2043, 2045):

> Whan oon had herd a thing, ywis,
> He com forth ryght to another wight,
> And gan him tellen anon-ryght
> The same that to him was told,
> Or hyt a forlong way was old,
> But gan somwhat for to eche
> To this tydynge in this speche

[16] "False and Sooth Compounded in Caxton's Ending of Chaucer's *House of Fame*," *Atenea* 26.2 (2006): 117.

More than hit ever was.
And nat so sone departed nas
Tho fro him, that he ne mette
With the thridde; and or he lette
Any stounde, he told him als;
Were the tydynge soth or fals,
Yit wolde he telle hyt natheles,
And evermo with more encres
Than yt was erst

(3.2060-2075)

Reflecting upon the material identities of rumours as they are expatiated upon and transmitted through successive minds and books, the poem can be read as an aetiology of literature and a fanciful exposition on the *modus operandi* of textual dissemination. Chaucer's *House of Fame* illustrates the channels whereby the disembodied fragments of 'soth or fals' speech and information that are transferred and amplified in the House of Rumour are transformed into written records in Fame's castle—*pro tempore* literary records that are themselves, in turn, transformative and subject to erasure. Chaucer thus evinces an Ovidian interest in representing bibliofictional processes by showing the metaphorical and physical metamorphoses of poetic substance into new verbal constructions and embodiments.

To return focus to Chaucer's bookish heroine Criseyde, she is afraid of what people will say about her—and rightly so. Thelma S. Fenster and Daniel Lord Smail observe that, since "personal reputation and the talk about it were probably the most conspicuous sorts of *fama*, medieval *fama* can be conceived of as a general impression that is inseparable from its embodiment in talk." [17] Like Ovid before her, Criseyde recognizes that "*Res est blanda canor*" [a persuasive thing is song] (*Ars* 3.315). Whisperings about her will become the stuff of more literature. The interpretation and development of her *fama* that necessarily accompanies poetic transmission will imbue her with exemplary status as she is reproduced in 'bokes,' and, in these reports, falsehood and truth will comingle as her representational resonances are successively

[17] "Introduction," in *Fama: The Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe,* eds. Thelma S. Fenster and Daniel Lord Smail (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 3. Fenster and Smail elaborate: "*Fama*.... acquired an impressively wide semantic range. It is 'rumor' and 'idle talk,' 'the things people say.' It is 'reputation' and 'memory' or 'memories,' 'the things people know.' It is 'fame,' or perhaps 'glory,' as well as their opposites, 'infamy' and 'defamation.'": 1-2.

established and developed by each *novus auctor* who encounters her tale. Criseyde's particular insecurities about the status of her honour and reputation reveal that Criseyde is also painfully aware that the future rumours about her—or the bookish *gossip* about her character, as we might perhaps more accurately label it—will be specifically linked to assessments of her 'trouthe in love.' As her concerns about her besmirched 'name' imply, Criseyde is all too aware that gossipers 'evermo' will scrutinize, evaluate, and, above all, publicize her private sexual conduct. Such rumours, after all, are perennially popular sources of fresh literary 'matere.'

These affinities between rumour, perspective, the formation of poetic substance, and scintillating gossip about amatory or erotic (mis)behaviour are posited in Chaucer's classical sources. *Fama* in *Aeneid* 4 "wreaks havoc on the stable narrative frame of the epic," as Heather James so aptly phrases it, and her presence "raise[s] questions about the vested interests that help shape events into *facta*, or usable fictions."[18] It is telling that the metapoetic *Fama's* major appearance comes as soon as Aeneas and Dido consummate their tantalizingly ambiguous affair—a union "curtain'd with a counsel-keeping cave" that Dido "*coniugium vocat*" [calls marriage] (4.172) while Aeneas staunchly insists "*nec coniugis umquam* │*praetendi taedas aut haec in foedera veni*" [I never held out a bridegroom's torch or entered such a compact] (4.338-39).[19] Rumours, both false and true, of the pair's conjugal relationship spread through Carthage "*extemplo*" [at once] (4.173), and Vergil illuminates the process by which the frequent reiteration of gossip about the couple's alleged sexual impropriety is transformed into common assumption:

> *haec tum multiplici populos sermone replebat*
> *gaudens, et pariter facta atque infecta canebat:*
> *venisse Aenean, Troiano sanguine cretum,*
> *cui se pulchra viro dignetur iungere Dido;*
> *nunc hiemem inter se luxu, quam longa, fovere*

[18] James, *Shakespeare's Troy*, 24-25.
[19] I borrow this description of Dido and Aeneas' "counsel-keeping cave" from Shakespeare's Tamora (*Titus Andronicus*, 2.3.24).

> *regnorum immemores turpique cupidine captos.*
> *haec passim dea foeda virum diffundit in ora.*
> (4.189-95)
>
> Now exulting in manifold gossip, *Fama* filled the nations and sang alike of fact and falsehood, how Aeneas is come, one born of Trojan blood, to whom in marriage fair Dido deigns to join herself; now they while away the winter, all its length, in wanton ease together, heedless of their realms and enthralled by shameless passion. These tales the foul goddess spreads here and there upon the lips of men.

As Vergil's above lines (and also modern tabloids) would suggest, the sex lives of others are always popular fodder for gossipers. And, indeed, if we believe Ovid's assertions in the *Tristia* , it was this particular section of Vergil's work that proved most appealing to its ancient readers:

> *et tamen ille tuae felix Aeneidos auctor*
> *contulit in Tyrios arma virumque toros,*
> *nec legitur pars ulla magis de corpore toto,*
> *quam non legitimo foedere iunctus amor.*
> (2.533-36)
>
> And yet the blessed author of thy *Aeneid* brought his 'arms and the man' to a Tyrian couch, and no part of the whole work is more read than that union of illicit love.

Ovid's own amatory works are, of course, famously predicated on sexual gossip, and, in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the spread of rumour—and the impetus for literary composition—is likewise associated with ambiguous hearsay. In Book 9, *Fama*, "*quae veris addere falsa*" [who loves to mingle false and true], informs Deianira that her allegedly unfaithful husband Hercules has become entangled with Iole (9.138). Although Ovid's authorial voice neither confirms nor denies this report of Hercules' new passion and sexual misconduct, nonetheless "*credit amans, venerisque novae perterrita fama* | *indulsit primo lacrimis*" [the loving wife believes the tale, and, completely overcome by the report of this new love, she indulges her tears at first] (9.141-42). Ovid's treatment of this same story in the *Heroides* shows the inscribed poet Deianira in the act of transforming such verbal rumours into written literature. Her putative letter contains, transmits, and presumably embellishes upon, circulating gossip about Hercules' alleged infidelity, and Deianira's images are underscored by a sense of comic exaggeration that marks them as the products of unsubstantiated hearsay: "*Inter Ioniacas calathum tenuisse puellas* | *diceris et dominae pertimuisse minas*" [They say that you have held the wool-basket among the girls of Ionia,

and have been frightened at your mistress' threats] (9.73-74). Though she admits "*Haec tamen audieram*" [these things, however, I have only heard] (9.119), Deianira constructs a narrative and a literary document, both for herself and for us, from verbal report.

The above Vergilian and Ovidian examples help to elucidate the links between *Fama* and sexual behaviour that underlie Criseyde's fears about gossip and the publication of her 'name' in 'bokes.' "Represented as the source for the raw material of poetry, a method for creating narrative momentum, and a means to transform old sources into new tales," gossip in Chaucer's *House of Fame* is also, as Susan E. Phillips perceives, "the means by which the poet renegotiates his relationship to traditional literary authority."[20] What Chaucer's dream narrative also makes clear, however, is that the *House of Fame* is concerned with representing specific types of gossip—juicy "love-tydynges" (3.2143)—and the process of their transformation, metaphorical and physical, into the poetic 'matere' of piquant amatory narratives. To this effect, before reaching the House of Rumour, Chaucer's narrator is specifically promised that he will hear:

> of Loves folk moo tydynges,
> Both sothe sawes and lesinges;
> And moo loves newe begonne,
> And longe yserved loves wonne,
> .....
> And more jolytee and fare,
> While that they fynde love of stel,
> As thinketh hem, and over-al wel;
> Mo discordes, moo jelousies,
> Mo murmures, and moo novelries,
> And moo dissymulacions,
> And feyned reparacions;
> And moo berdys in two houres
> Withoute rasour or sisoures
> Ymad, then greynes be of sondes;
> And eke moo holdynge in hondes,
> And also moo renovelaunces
> Of olde forleten aqueyntaunces;
> Mo love-dayes and acordes

[20] *Transforming Talk: The Problem with Gossip in Late Medieval England* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007), 81, 71. "Gossip's distortion," Phillips elaborates, "like its capacity for proliferation, becomes linked to the creative process of the poem as Chaucer's authorial strategies—augmenting, conflating, concealing, and multiplying his old sources to make them new—are everywhere made analogous to the idle talk he describes": 80.

> Then on instrumentes be cordes;
> And eke of loves moo eschaunges
> Then ever cornes were in graunges
>
> (2.675-78, 682-98)

Later in the poem, just before the narrative breaks off, Chaucer's narrator is drawn to "a gret noyse" emanating from "a corner of the halle" in the House of Rumour where "men of love-tydynges tolde" (3.2141, 2142, 2143). With "every wight" rushing "As faste as that they hadden myght" (3.2145, 2146), the unfinished poem ends in a pig pile; this physical melee is instigated by the mere promise of titillating and potentially racy love-gossip, precisely the type of enticing gossip that Chaucer's Criseyde anticipates will surround her own character through the circulation and later literary reception of her tale.

CRISEYDE AS 'PUBLISSHED' BY DE WORDE

In Middle English, the verb 'publisshen' has a variety of meanings (to announce, proclaim, divulge, become known, publicize, propagate, or spread abroad), and, as Felicity Riddy notes, "it has the senses both of speaking and of being spoken about."[21] In examining the ways that Criseyde spoke and was spoken about in post-Chaucerian English literature, I want to expand upon the implications of both Criseyde's prophetic moment of metatextual disquietude and the Chaucerian narrator's subsequent affirmation that 'Hir name, allas! is publisshed so wyde.' Both take on new—and overtly Ovidian—sets of meanings when speech by and about Criseyde is reproduced in a history of real, rather than merely hypothesized, subsequent reception. Criseyde's textual 'matere' underwent numerous metamorphoses as her explicitly bookish character was freshly reworked and 'publisshed' (in both the Middle English and modern senses of the word) in Tudor England. At the hands of early printers, writers, and readers, Chaucer's heroine was a subject of intertextual poetic gossip. Her Chaucerian concern that 'thise bokes wol me shende' is therefore validated in later interpretations of, and elaborations upon, Chaucer's text in its early printed formulations.

---

[21] "'Publication' Before Print," in *The Uses of Script and Print*, 41.

In considering the gossip that surrounded Criseyde in early print, I want to introduce a second, older sense of the word: that of the Middle English *godsib*.[22] It has often been observed that the prologues and epilogues in Caxton's editions include numerous stories of how the enterprising merchant came to print a given text. These bibliofictional framing devices often recount Caxton's interactions—real or fictive—with members of the English and Burgundian nobility; this feature of Caxton's editions has led Yu-Chiao Wang to remark that "Caxton promotes his books, just as modern publishers might, by way of a celebrity endorsement."[23] In his epilogue to *Cordial*, for instance, he suggests that Anthony Woodville provided him with a copy of the text so that it might "be enprinted and so multiplied to goo abrood emonge the peple," and he alleges that the text for a translation of Christine de Pisan "was delyvered to [him]…by the most Crysten kynge and redoubted prynce" Henry VII.[24] In addition to the nobility referenced in such 'celebrity endorsements,' however, Caxton's bibliofictional prologues and epilogues are also peopled by *gossibs*, his close friends and personal confidantes. The aetiological fictions in a number of Caxton's editions involve anonymous gentlemen or citizens of London. His translation of *Boethius*, for instance, contains the declaration: "atte requeste of a singuler frende and gossib of myne, I, William Caxton, have done my debuior and payne t'emprynte it fourme as is hereafore made, in hopyng that it shal prouffite moche

---

[22] Derived from the Old English *godsibb*, "gossip" was originally used to describe a person with whom one had contracted a spiritual affinity by acting as a sponsor or baptismal relative. The word evolved in Middle English, so that *godsib* or *gossib* also came also to designate a close friend. Though in Early Modern English, this word became increasingly associated with female confidantes, Caxton's own use of the word is gender-neutral.

[23] "Caxton's Romances and Their Early Tudor Readers," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67.2 (2004): 173. Jennifer Summit makes the related point: "Endorsing the printed book's status as a symbol of cultural privilege, the figure of the aristocratic patron paradoxically served Caxton's aim to broaden the appeal of printed books beyond the exclusive enclaves of the aristocratic library": "William Caxton, Margaret Beaufort, and the Romance of Female Patronage," in *Women, the Book, and the Worldly: Selected Proceedings of the St. Hilda's Conference, 1993*, eds. Lesley Smith and Jane M.H. Taylor (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1995), 155. The scholarship of N.F. Blake has frequently cast doubt on the historical veracity of the aetiological bibliofictions recounted in Caxton's paratextual materials. He cautions against "accepting anything that Caxton wrote in these prologues and epilogues as genuine," explaining: "He needed names to recommend his books but this does not imply that the patrons had formally given permission for their names to be used or even that they knew their names were being used in this way": *William Caxton and English Literary Culture*, 13.

[24] *Caxton's Own Prose*, 70, 81. It is unclear if Caxton received substantial financial support from the noble patrons whom he addresses in his prologues and epilogues, that is, whether or not "Caxton was…printing to order, with his dedicatee assuming the role of financial guarantor for his printing": A.S.G. Edwards and Carol M. Meale, "The Marketing of Printed Books in Late Medieval England," *The Library* 6th ser. 15 (1993): 97.

peple."[25] Similarly, *The Book of Good Manners* was provided for him by "a mercer of London named Wylliam Praat" whom Caxton describes as "an honest man" and his own "specyal frende."[26] Caxton therefore locates the genesis of his books and his editorial decisions in a context of literary gossip with his *gossibs*—or personal discussions with his intimates about books and their contents.

Before the advent of print, the production of books in England appears to have been largely, though not exclusively, a bespoke trade.[27] One consequence of print media and its capacity to reproduce books in multiple copies is, of course, that a bookseller is faced with standing stock on a new scale. The nascent market for printed books in England was, by necessity, largely speculative, and this increasingly "producer-initiated form of book-production" had to be commercially oriented.[28] As his c. 1477 advertisement, inviting prospective buyers to "com to Westmonester into the Almonesrye at the Reed Pale" would suggest, Caxton was well aware that he was producing books "good chepe" for a generalized public.[29] Thus, his inscribed cast of *gossibs,* in providing advice, recommendations, and feedback about which texts he ought to print, replicate real concerns about the literary marketplace as they engage with the entrepreneurial Caxton in a type of bookish gossip, speculating about literary tastes and consumer demands.

The metaphorical resonances between Chaucer's bibliofictional depictions of literary creation and manufacture in the *House of Fame* and the conditions under which early printed books were produced have not gone unremarked in modern scholarship. Gillespie suggests that, though Chaucer borrows "from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and from the magical worlds of medieval romance," nonetheless, his depictions in the *House of Fame* "look forward as well as

---

[25] *Caxton's Own Prose*, 59.
[26] *Caxton's Own Prose*, 60.
[27] For a brief overview of this issue, see Derek Pearsall, "Introduction," in *Book Production and Publishing in Britain*, 2-7.
[28] Pearsall, in *Book Production and Publishing in Britain*, 3.
[29] *Caxton's Own Prose*, 55.

backwards," uncannily anticipating "the grind of the printer's shop."[30] Haydock takes this metaphor even further, persuasively arguing that:

> The real House of Fame in England now resides at the sign of the Red Pale, and its proprietor Caxton, decides what works and authors will be granted the immortality of the printed page. The 'textual environment' of the House of Fame has become Caxton's shop in Westminster and this environment helped to determine how the publisher and his audience would read and reproduce the poem. Indeed the print shop and what Caxton does to texts there appears to mirror many of the distinctive features of Fame's House. Books move to the print shop, just as all speech moves to the House of Fame....Like Fame too, [Caxton] adds a little on to the end of what he receives before he passes it along to others.[31]

Haydock's observations about the Red Pale are applicable to the early Tudor print shop more generally, for the print shop is itself a sociable and discursive space where variegated bits of writing converge and compete for dominance in a seemingly endless exchange of ideas. Free floating texts representing a range of voices arrive there (some invited, others unsolicited), and such texts are evaluated, culled, edited, augmented, recontextualized, and literally duplicated in the print shop.

The traces of literary gossip in its multiple senses—as poetic impetus, as lascivious intertextual rumour, and as literary talk about saleable books—are felt in the first significant print transmogrification of Chaucer's Criseyde, the 1517 edition of *Troilus and Criseyde* (STC 5095) produced in de Worde's personal House of Fame at the Sign of the Sun. Like Caxton before him, de Worde, too, was faced with a speculative literary market, and he aimed "to maximize his readership at all social levels, both through his selection of texts and the format and design of the books in which he chose to present them."[32] De Worde thus proffers his 1517 edition of Chaucer's text as a constituent piece in what he had already discovered to be marketable literary conflict: the Tudor *querelle des femmes* discussed in the previous chapter. Surrounded by with paratextual gossip, both verbal and visual in nature, the 1517 version of Criseyde's text readily and profitably lends itself to comparison with other defamations and

---

[30] *Print Culture and the Medieval Author*, 62.
[31] Haydock, 125.
[32] Carol M. Meale, "Caxton, de Worde, and the Publication of Romance," *The Library* 6th ser. 14 (1992): 298.

defenses of women of the early Tudor period—many of which were also printed by de Worde.

Nearly three decades ago, C. David Benson and David Rollman drew attention to the "three anonymous stanzas, which are presented as if written by Chaucer" that appear at the poem's conclusion.[33] These spurious stanzas and a colophon, or de Worde's own editorial amplification of the extant text, follow the final, genuine Chaucerian lines of *Troilus and Criseyde*:

> The auctour.
>
> And here an ende / of Troylus heuynesse
> As touchýge Cresyde / to hý ryght vnkýde
> Falsly forsworń / deflourýg his worthynes
> For his treue loue / she hath hý made blýde
> Of feminine gendre / y^{e} womā most vnkýde
> Dyomede on her whele /she hathe set on hye
> The faythe of a woman / by her now maye you se
>
> Was not Arystotle / for all his clergye
> Vyrgyll the cunnynge / deceyued also
> By women inestymable / for to here or se
> Sampson the stronge / with many a .M. mo
> Brought in to ruyne / by woman mannes fo
> There is no woman / I thynke heuen vnder
> That can be trewe / and that is wondre
>
> O parfyte Troylus / good god be thy guyde
> The moste treuest louer / that euer lady hadde
> Now arte thou forsake / of Cresyde at this tyde
> Neuer to retourne / who shall make the gladde
> He that for vs dyed/ and soules frome hell ladde
> And borne of the vyrgyne / to heuen thy soule brynge
> And all that ben present / at theyr latre endynge.
> A M E N .
>
> Thus endeth the treatyse / of Troylus the heuy
> By Geffraye Chaucer /compyled and done
> He prayenge the reders / this mater not deny
> Newly correcked / in the cyte of London
> In flete strete / at the sygne of the sonne
> Inprynted by me / Wynkyn de worde
> The .M.CCCCC. and. xvii.yere of our lorde.[34]

De Worde's appendage to Chaucer's text literalizes a rhetorical invitation found in Book 3 of *Troilus and Criseyde*, when the narrator says of his own text (which, he indicates, is an

[33] "Wynkyn de Worde and the Ending of Chaucer's 'Troilus and Criseyde,'" *Modern Philology* 78.3 (1981): 275. For more recent discussions of these stanzas in de Worde's edition, see *Worlds Made Flesh*, 139-49 and *Print Culture and the Medieval Author*, 106-17.

[34] I cite the text of de Worde's additions from Benson and Rollman's transcription, 275-6.

augmented version of a work by his apocryphal antecedent Lollius): "For myne wordes, heere and every part, | I speke hem alle under correccioun" (3.1331-2). In turn, he encourages his own audience "To encresse or maken dymynucioun | Of [*Troilus and Criseyde's*] langage" (3.1335-6). The work's imagined readership is thereby fictionally emboldened to ameliorate or further interpret the text at its own 'discrecioun.' Despite this Chaucerian invitation, de Worde's interpolated stanzas, referred to by one scholar as "the most audacious editorial revision to date," were unprecedented in *Troilus and Criseyde's* printed reception.[35] Benson and Rollman remark:

> Although the three stanzas and the colophon itself are a deliberate attempt to imitate Chaucer's rime royal verse, their vocabulary, meter, and rhyme suggest that the lines were probably composed at the time of the 1517 edition. Yet there can be no doubt that [de Worde] wants his readers to consider the first three stanzas as having been written by Chaucer himself, however absurd such an attribution may seem to us. He prints the title 'The auctour' above the lines and does not change the mode of address from direct to indirect until the colophon.[36]

In its overly simplistic reduction of Chaucer's nuanced narrative—to the 'deflouryg' of 'parfyte' Troilus by 'vnkyde' Criseyde—the delusive message of these stanzas reverses one of the equally specious stated morals at the end of Chaucer's own work, where a primarily *female* imagined audience, envisioned as potential victims, is advised to beware of deceptive *male* rhetoric:

> N'y sey nat this al oonly for thise men,
> But moost for wommen that bitraised be
> Thorugh false folk; God yeve hem sorwe, amen!
> That with hire grete wit and subtilte
> Bytraise yow! And this commeveth me
> To speke, and in effect yow alle I preye,
> Beth war of men, and herkneth what I seye!
> (5.1779-85)

---

[35] Mayer, 143. *Troilus and Criseyde* had only been printed once prior to this, by Caxton in 1483 (STC 5094), and Caxton's edition contained no such additional interpretative apparatus. Rather, it had simply ended with Chaucer's own words, succeeded by a brief, two line colophon. Benson and Rollman note: "Whoever may have been the author of the lines that appear at the end of Wynkyn's edition, ...the first stanza does suggest some knowledge of Chaucer's poem and familiarity with Caxton's first edition. The opening two lines…are an expansion of the words with which Caxton ends his edition": 277.

[36] Benson and Rollman, 276.

It is thus that the appended stanzas in de Worde's edition effectively position *Troilus and Criseyde* as a response. It is a response to the denunciation of 'false' men and implicit appeal to virtuous women in the above passage, a response to the Chaucerian narrator's invitation to amend his text, a response to the negative accusations which Criseyde anticipates in her own speeches, and, most importantly, a response to medieval and contemporary treatments of the woman question.[37] De Worde's stanzas therefore resituate Chaucer's extant text in relation to the Tudor discourse of the *querelle des femmes* which, as Benson and Rollman dryly remark, "seems to have been particularly congenial" to de Worde.[38]

At the end of de Worde's 1517 edition, Criseyde is construed as an *exemplum* of women's characteristic infidelity. However, though her story allegedly confirms that 'no woman… | can be trewe,' this assessment cannot simply be taken at face value. We cannot forget that it is England's foremost contemporary printer of *querelle* literature who qualifies and recontextualizes Chaucer's narrative with these added stanzas; it is an edition that was published in the same era and in the same print shop that produced titles such as *The Spectacle of Louers* and *A Contrauersye Bytwene a Louer and a Iaye*. De Worde's added references to the unfortunate love lives of Vergil, Aristotle, and Sampson (all frequently cited *exempla* in the *querelle des femmes*) make it clear that the disastrous affair of Troilus and Criseyde, too, can be read and mined for profeminist and antifeminist evidence and expressions of sentiment.[39] The final stanzas of the 1517 *Troilus and Criseyde* are the product of complex negotiations between a tradition of antithetical profeminist and antifeminist debate, the contents of and reception anticipated by Chaucer's text, and the commercial instincts of an early English printer. Their primary function, then, is as a marketing ploy on the part of de Worde, a subtle advertisement

---

[37] The closing stanzas of de Worde's edition may well have been influenced by a number of post-Chaucerian interpretations of Criseyde, most notably Lydgate's explicit integration of Criseyde into the discourse of medieval misogyny found both in his *Fall of Princes* and *Troy Book*.

[38] Benson and Rollman, 277.

[39] Gillespie likewise reads the interpolated stanzas as a signaling involvement in "an elaborate and 'amerous' textual game," and she suggests that it was in the printer's "interest to invite the book buyer to think productively and creatively about texts" because such debate encourages readers "to situate (buy and bind) the poems along with the sorts of texts…where they would instantiate a debate": *Print Culture and the Medieval Author*, 114.

for his other, thematically related tracts. De Worde's spurious additions to Chaucer's narrative affirm and publicize a connection between the textual agglomeration known as Criseyde and the discourse and vocabulary of the *querelle des femmes*.

In Book 5 of *Troilus and Criseyde*, with the announcement "gilteless, I woot wel, I yow leve | But al shal passe; and thus I take my leve" (1084-5), Chaucer's Criseyde bodily disappears from the narrative in what John McKinnell has termed "her *real* exit."[40] This is not, however, Criseyde's final Chaucerian appearance, for she returns in epistolary form once more. And it is there, amidst her closing protestations to Troilus that "nevere yet ne koude [she] well endite," that she remarks: "Th'entente is al, and nat the lettres space" (5.1628, 1630). Criseyde points to the discrepancy between words and what they represent, between her own text and intentions, and it is precisely this gap between 'entente' and 'lettres space' which de Worde's edition exploits.[41] Criseyde is the product and the victim of prior literary reception, subject to a predetermined and inescapable storyline, but, while her *fatum* and the 'lettres' of tradition may be unwavering in their plot, it is her *fama*, or Cressida's 'entente' which is offered up for debate, not only in de Worde's verbal emendations at the end of the text, but also in his visual additions.

Though it was common in the period for the same woodcuts to appear in multiple productions of different works, generic illustrations in early printed books should not be taken as arbitrary ornamentation. Rather, when reused and positioned in new ways, these "moveable woodcuts," as they are called by Laurence Grove, come to illustrate novel ideas.[42] Whether or

---

[40] "Letters as a Type of the Formal Level in *Troilus and Criseyde,*" in *Chaucer Studies III: Essays on* Troilus and Criseyde, ed. Mary Salu (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1979), 89.

[41] On this issue, Jennifer Summit remarks: "When the full text of a *litera Criseydis* is finally presented, it is an exercise in textual opacity….Criseyde's 'entente' is illegible, leaving only the 'lettres space' that resists interpretation. That material letter, as Criseyde frets, holds the power to betray its writer through its potential for misinterpretation or misdirection once it leaves her hands": *Lost Property*, 53. For discussions of the Chaucerian Criseyde's 'entente', see Elizabeth Archibald, "Declarations of 'Entente' in *Troilus and Criseyde*," *The Chaucer Review* 25.3 (1991): 190-213 and Jennifer Campbell, "Figuring Criseyde's 'Entente': Authority, Narrative, and Chaucer's Use of History," *The Chaucer Review* 27.4 (1993): 342-58.

[42] *Text/Image Mosaics in French Culture: Emblems and Comic Strips* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 58-75. Grove writes (65):

not a woodblock was originally comissioned for a particular work, purpose-made pictures could and did serve just as well in other contexts beyond their original use. The woodcuts of Tudor books thus serve as manipulable and dynamic interpretative tools as much as depictions of particular literary moments. The frontispiece to the 1517 *Troilus and Criseyde*—an illustration of a man and woman (here labeled 'Troylus' and 'Cresyde') that was frequently recycled by de Worde—attests to the fact that moveable woodcuts were also fillable *lacunae*; empty scrolls and banners were explicitly designed to be completed with new printed captions (or simply left blank) when employed to represent different characters and plots.[43] As N.F. Blake and a number of subsequent scholars have demonstrated, the woodcuts included in de Worde's editions were specifically and thoughtfully selected and placed by the printer himself. Carol M. Meale, for example, suggests that de Worde's combinations of text and image "are revealing about the ways in which the needs, or preferences, of the reader could be satisfied by the printer—perhaps even before they were fully articulated."[44] Bearing in mind this active, interpretative role which de Worde played in the presentation and interplay of illustration and typography in his editions, I here draw attention to the woodcuts that appear at the beginning of Book 5, under the heading: "This my laste boke of Troylus consequently foloweth, and sheweth how that Cresyde fell to the loue of Dyomede, and he vnto her loue, & how she

---

> Much has been made of the novelty and advantages that came with the invention of moveable type: multiple copies of the same work could be produced, even if early printing was still a fairly slow process....The notion that a series of letters could be moved around to produce hundreds, maybe even thousands of identical copies must have had enormous novelty value. It is conceivable that the same novelty value also applied to images, which similarly could be moved around whilst producing multiple identical copies....The attraction of 'moveable woodcuts' has not been explored.

[43] This image is Hodnett, 1009. My approach to the generic woodcuts in de Worde's edition is similar to those of both Alexandra Gillespie and Seth Lerer. Gillespie's analysis points to "the link between this book and a broader range of products from [de Worde's] and contemporary presses": *Print Culture and the Medieval Author*, 110. In Courtly *Letters in the Age of Henry VIII*, Lerer provocatively examines de Worde's use of Hodnett, 1009, and, like Gillespie, Lerer also considers the meaning conveyed by the woodcut's implicit associations with other works issued from de Worde's press. Lerer—noting that the identical woodcut is also found in two editions of Hawes' *Patime of Pleasure* as well as his *Conforte of Louers*, the anonymous *Undo Youre Dore*; and the anonymous *1111 Leues of a Truelove*—suggests that the woodcut's presence on the title pages of various works "would have helped to associate them in thematic, cultural, and literary ways" and "would have provided early Tudor readers with keys not just to their contents but their contexts": 85.

[44] "Caxton, de Worde, and the Publication of Romance," 294. On de Worde's illustrations, also see A. S. G. Edwards, "Poet and Printer in the Sixteenth Century: Stephen Hawes and Wynkyn de Worde," *Gutenberg Jahrbuch* (1980): 82-88; A.S.G. Edwards, "From Manuscript to Print: Wynkyn de Worde and the Printing of Contemporary Poetry," *Gutenberg Jahrbuch* (1991): 133-48; and Julie A. Smith, "Woodcut Presentation Scenes in Books Printed by Caxton, de Worde, and Pynson," *Gutenberg Jahrbuch* (1986): 322-43.

forsoke Troylus after her departynge out of Troye, cōtrary to her promyse."[45] In so doing, I suggest that these visual representations are congruent with the printer's interpretation of the Chaucerian text and that they compliment Criseyde's own Ovidian sense of how *fama,* publication, and literary proliferation operate.

In *Worlds Made Flesh,* Lauryn S. Mayer has recently discussed Book 5's woodcuts. The top image on the page depicts two mounted men deep in conversation, while a second woodcut shows three figures, one man and two women, also on horseback. I take the first image, as Mayer does, to represent Troilus and Pandarus. However, I would further qualify this identification by suggesting that this is an image serves as a shorthand mnemonic for the exchange of gossip, particularly speculative gossip about Criseyde's behaviour and 'entente.' What could these two men, conspicuously poised at the head of Book 5, be discussing but Criseyde herself? In this sense, the image has an instructive function, providing the text's audience with a visual portrait of how readers and writers might themselves engage with Chaucer's narrative. This woodcut also extends the claims of Criseyde's impending *vaticinia ex eventu*; it provides graphic proof of the process by which literature coalesces out of rumour, and it illustrates the interplay of conversation, interpretation, and poetic creation expounded upon elsewhere in Chaucer's *oeuvre.*

The lower image found on the same page can be read as an encapsulation of the substance of Troilus and Pandarus' whispered conversation. In this second woodcut, one woman, riding closer to the male figure, stares him directly in the face; a second woman, slightly further removed, is depicted peering at the man sidelong, as though out of the corner of her eye, with her riding whip raised in an almost threatening motion. Mayer glosses the image: "Diomede converses with two smiling and coquettish women, one of whom is clearly Criseyde."[46] I instead suggest that, if we take the mounted man to be Diomedes, can we not also take *both* of the female figures to be Criseyde? These two contrary women represent,

[45] The first image is Hodnett, 1090, and the second is Hodnett, 1089.
[46] Mayer, 144.

visually, the abundance of possible textual Criseydes found within Chaucer's original work, de Worde's printed edition, and all anticipated future manifestations of her character and story. On the interpretative level, the picture—like the act of speculative gossip—pits one particular Criseyde against another, and de Worde's editorial presentation of these two antithetical Criseydes insinuates that the link between text and analysis is not rigid. This ambiguity again links Criseyde to the Tudor fascination with *exempla in bono* and *exempla in malo*—and the multiplicity and diversity of possible interpretations for a single character—which typify the *querelle des femmes*. Functioning as both sign and text, as a way of speaking and the subject of speech, the 'publisshed' Criseyde of de Worde's edition is an ideal polysemous *exemplum*; either or both interpretations of her character and *fama* can be 'true.' The diverse prospects that these moveable woodcuts suggest for Criseyde's character therefore mirror the hermeneutic possibilities of the reusable woodcut as medium. Just as a hand-me-down visual representation offers up all sorts of *au courant* meanings and gossipy possibilities when it enters into new textual and intertextual dialogues, the postclassical Ovidian heroine, too, when her character is repositioned by de Worde in relation to the texts of the Tudor *querelle des femmes* is semantically metamorphosed.

Mayer has argued that, in the 1517 *Troilus and Criseyde*, de Worde "invented an auctorial 'Chaucer,' whose voice was designed to drown out that of the troublesome narrator" and that he encases "the narrative labyrinth" of the final book "with an authorial voice instructing the reader on the proper interpretation," thereby reducing "the complex web of narratives to an attack on Criseyde."[47] Stephanie Trigg and Greg Walker both agree that the additions provide the preceding story with "emphatic ideological closure" and "an effective moral coda."[48] In contrast, I posit that these editorial emendations in de Worde's edition are far less reductive and definitive than such interpretations would allow for. Rather, de Worde's ostensibly

---

[47] Mayer, 143.
[48] *Congenial Souls: Reading Chaucer from Medieval to Postmodern* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), 119 and *Writing Under Tyranny: English Literature and the Henrician Reformation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 81.

authoritative and moralized conclusion is deliberately provocative, and his publication of Chaucer's heroine aims to incite further intertextual gossip—and, hence, more literary reworkings of Criseyde's 'matere'—rather than to quell hermeneutic controversy.

In "The Opaque Text of Chaucer's Criseyde," C. David Benson writes of Criseyde that she "does not represent a unified or even complex authorial statement of meaning, but instead challenges each reader to make her new," and he characterizes Chaucer's enigmatic heroine as "an open text who is capable of generating multiple fictions."[49] De Worde would, I think, not disagree with Benson's characterization of Criseyde as an 'open text.' Given the deliberate rhetorical positioning and game-like nature of the *querelle des femmes*, his barbed additions to the Chaucerian poem offer an intentionally provocative invitation to debate, rather than providing a definitive interpretation of the heroine. De Worde's 'publication' of Criseyde engages in and stimulates gossip that results in a literary proliferation of possible interpretations, a proliferation of future imagined and textual Criseydes.[50]

LA CONUSAUNCE DAMOURS

Self-consciously not restricted to representation within a single narrative or book, Chaucer's Criseyde cannot be contained within the narrative boundaries and physical covers of *Troilus and Criseyde.* Just as Chaucer's heroine predicted, through revisionary engagements with her tale, post-Chaucerian authors have frequently brought her character into new narrative contents. Like gossip, the pseudo-Ovidian Cressida is readily taken out of context in Tudor literature, and, also like gossip, her significations are amplified and distorted through acts of transmission. The variety of vernacular retellings and reinterpretations of her story mark Cressida an unanchored character, not confined or delimited by the particularities of any one version of her tale. As a manipulable sign and as a metamorphic text, Cressida thus transcends the variety of books that house her in much the same way that Ovid's heroines transcend the

---

[49] Benson, in *Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde: 'Subgit to alle Poesye,'* 27.
[50] "'Publication' Before Print," in *The Uses of Script and Print,* 43.

particularities of their singular classical and postclassical formulations. Like Ovid's heroines, Cressida wandered through intertexts and traversed genres, and her identity was subject to ever-new interpretations and manifestations as she trekked through the literary landscapes of Tudor books and the imaginative realms of Tudor minds.

I here turn to Cressida's representation in one such post-Chaucerian vernacular retelling of Cressida's story, the c. 1528 *Lyttell Treatyse Cleped La Conusaunce Damours*. I use this text and its engagement with Cressida as a way of thinking about Cressida as a nebulous and unmoored *exemplum* and also as a way of further detailing how the deep-rooted connections and juxtapositions between her character and the classical heroines of Ovidian tradition manifested themselves in Tudor literature. The narrator of *La Conusaunce Damours* begins with a description of his "great inclination | Per chaunce some where/to fynde recreation" on an idyllic summer day.[51] "Sodaynly" inspired "to go | Se. A faire pusell and two or thre mo | Of her companions" with whom he is acquainted (A2^{v}), he proceeds to seek them out.

Upon reaching his destination, the narrator engages in "goodly parler" with one of the damsels (A3^{r}). They are soon joined by a second female companion, and all three begin to "talke and deuyse" (A3^{r}). The characters' conversation quickly turns to amorous themes as the three congenially debate "what loue shulde be" (A3^{r}). The first damsel suggests that "Loue is the very true manocorde | That euery wyght shulde harpe vpon | Louyng well eche other by very concorde" (A3^{v}). She argues that love should involve "no crafte/nor male engyn" and posits that true love is to be found only in "frendshyp" (A3^{v}, A4^{r}). Her definition, however, is quickly dismissed by the narrative's second female speaker, who apprehends something fundamentally lacking in her companion's denial of romantic love: "I trowe none hence to the lande of Inde | Can be founde. Whiche hath nat tasted | Other loue/than ye haue nowe rehersed" (A4^{r}).

---

[51] *Lyttell Treatyse Cleped La Conusaunce Damours* (STC 5631; London, 1528), A2^{r}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.

In response to her friend's allegedly flawed love-as-friendship hypothesis, this second damsel exclaims "Harde you neuer tell/of yonge Pyramus | And his swete loue/called fayre Thysby"—as though the very mention of the doomed Ovidian lovers immediately negates the former proposition (A4^{r}). She then proceeds, for the next two hundred lines, to relate the story of Pyramus and Thisbe in a version heavily indebted to Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women*. The damsel is so moved by her own recitation of the tragic Ovidian romance, a narrative of "true loue" and "two hertes/closed in one truly" (B4^{r}), that, upon its conclusion, "teares/downe on her chekes rolde" (B3^{v}). The damsel continues her argument in favour of the existence of romantic love by invoking another persuasive tale: the story "Of the trojan knyght/called Troylus | And of Creseide/the goodly damosell" (C1^{r}).[52] She assumes that her two companions "bothe haue harde tell" of Troilus and Cressida and "the mater, of the sayd story," seeing as "Theyr great loue is wrytten all at longe | And howe he dyed onely for her sake" in "Our ornate Chaucer/other bokes amonge" (C1^{r}). The damsel's copious narrative moves from a précis of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* to speak "Of Cannace/somwhat... | And of her brother/cleped Machareus" (C1^{v}). Though, as the inscribed storyteller informs her companions, "Aeolous/her father ryght cruell | Made her dye a deth full pitous," before her final demise Canace "wrote/a pistoll dolorous" (C1^{v}). With the disclaimer that "These were [Canace's] wordes to my remembraunce," the damsel reproduces an abbreviated version of *Heroides* 11:

> Cannace doughter/of Aeolous the kynge
> Greteth Machare/her owne brother dere
> In owne hande/a naked swerde holdynge
> With the other writyng/as doth appere
> In this epistoll that she sendeth here
> Howe by naught els saue deth she can fynde
> To content her fathers cruell mynde.
>
> O my father most innaturall
> This swerde to me his daughter hath he sende
> With whiche swerde/shortly anone I shall

[52] Lerer suggests that "in its constellating of the story of Pyramus and Thisbe with the tale of Troilus and Criseyde, it may have had an influence on later, and much more canonical, poetic treatments of both amorous and literary identity": *Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII*, 25.

Of my lyfe and sorowe make an ende
To other pite/he wyll nat condiscende
Wherfore his fierce mynde to content
To slee my selfe I must nedes assent.
(C1ᵛ)

At this point in the debate, the male narrator interrupts the second damsel's storytelling, insisting that he "wolde suffre her no more | Of this wofull mater/forther for to tell" since her tales of "lamentable louers/greueth [his] hart sore" (C1ᵛ). Nevertheless, he informs us that she had not yet exhausted her repertoire of Ovidian love stories:

She wolde haue tolde/of many other mo
The great loue, and fatall destenye
Howe Phillis desolate/ofte alone wolde go
By hylles and dales/mornyng tenderly
For Demophon/and howe she dyd dye
But styll I prayed her to kepe silence
And leaue of her tragicall sentence.
(C2ʳ)

The narrator—contrasting his own experience in love with the somber reason of the first damsel and the textual precedents evoked by the second—invokes a further myriad of Ovidian allusions in an extended autobiographical monologue: Hippomenes and Atalanta; Diana and Actaeon; Hypsipile and Jason; Myrrha and her father; Scylla; Theseus, Ariadne, and Phaedra; Hypermnestra; Paris and Helen; Acontius and Cydippe; Medea; Deianira and Hercules; Achilles and Briseis; Penelope and Ulysses; Leander and Hero; Phyllis and Demophoon; Sappho and Phaon; Canace and Machirus; and Dido and Aeneas. Amidst his exhaustive citations of the *Metamorphoses*, *Heroides*, and *Legend of Good Women* (citations that he uniformly uses to investigate and characterize his own lovesick plight), the narrator also includes a salient reference that is non-Ovidian in origin:

Troylous, of whom men so moche tell
That he so great a louer was
Vnto hym/the case ryght happy fell
For in his armes ofte he dyd enbrace
His swete loue/and stode so in her grace
That nothyng to hym wolde she denye
.....
Many a nyght with his loue he lay
And in his armes/swetely can her holde
Of nothynge to hym sayd she nay

That he of her/aske or desyre wolde
His great ioy forsoth can nat be tolde
He had souerayne blysse

(D3^{v})

The narrator's intertextual allusions, like the second damsel's, thus posit thematic and generic connections between Cressida and earlier Greco-Roman characters. As in the examples with which this chapter commenced, *La Conusaunce Damours* demonstrates the conceptual grafting of a postclassical heroine Trojan into a classical, Ovidian canon.

There are several additional points to be made about *La Conusaunce Damours.* As modern scholars have remarked, the text provides insight into the sixteenth-century reception and interpretation of Chaucer's works.[53] In its narrative framing, *La Conusaunce Damours* also exhibits the ideological influence, both direct and indirect, of Ovid's love poetry and the postclassical traditions that grew out of his amatory *corpus*. In *La Conusaunce Damours'* descriptions of courtly storytelling, we see a literary portrayal of *exempla*-laden debate as a rhetorical game or pastime, a dynamic that is familiar from my discussion in the previous chapter. With its focus on issues directly linked to the woman question, *La Conusaunce Damours* also reveals its—and Cressida's—implicit links to the Tudor *querelle des femmes,* a connection destined to become so pervasive in English thought that John Dryden, writing in 1679, would assert: "The original story was written by one Lollius, a Lombard, in Latin verse, and translated by Chaucer into English; intended, I suppose, a satire on the inconstancy of women."[54]

Perhaps the most important points to be made about this poem, however, relate to the dialogic structure of *La Conusaunce Damours.* Martine Braekman has remarked the text's use of 'dialogue-in-monologue' technique," whereby "in love-scenes and love-crises, the conflict in the narrator's mind becomes articulated in a dispute between two separate voices, each more

---

[53] To my knowledge, the only existing literary analyses of *La Conusaunce Damours* are Lerer's brief discussion in *Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII* and Martine Braekman's short piece "Prolegomena to an edition of the poem *La Conusaunce Damours*, printed around 1528," *Studia Neophilologica* 68 (1996): 25-28. Both of these analyses focus upon the text's relationship with Chaucer.

[54] "Preface," in *Troilus and Cressida: Or, Truth Found Too Late*, *Dryden's Works*, ed. Walter Scott, rev. George Saintsbury, vol. 6 (Edinburgh, 1881-93), 255.

or less clearly personifying different aspects of the problem."[55] These polyphonic reverberations *within* the narrator's monologue, the chorus of differing voices that are seemingly represented throughout the poem, serve as reminders that publication is the product of social interactions and oral as well as written exchanges of ideas—a point that is made explicit in the prologue, where the narrator outlines the genesis of the poem: "most parte thereof / tolde was to me | As here after/ye may rede and se" (A1ᵛ). The narrator's use of 'dialogue-in-monologue' throughout *La Conusaunce Damours* and the poem's resultant internal inconsistencies of opinion and literary interpretation also underscore the exemplary polysemy of the various Ovidian narratives and *exempla* that it contains. By extension, we might say that, though her individual narrative appearances may be readable, Cressida cannot be definitively read in *La Conusaunce Damours*; rather, like the classical, Ovidian characters with which she is juxtaposed, she remains a ranging, metamorphic sign, whose meaning is ultimately unfixed.

La Conusaunce Damours takes as its subject the processes whereby literature is created as much as the seemingly central topic of *amour*. Hermeneutically mirroring Cressida's own intertextual fluidity, the inscribed interpreters of Cressida's character within *La Conusaunce Damours* also range through and between the texts of the past as they cite Ovidian *exempla* to suit their own purposes and create novel narratives. The characters' technique is succinctly summarized in the prologue, which opens with an idyllic springtime description of maidens "gether[ing] floures" (A1ᵛ). "So done clerkes / of great grauite," the prologue goes on the explain | Those maters / wheron they lyst to wryte" (A1ᵛ). The floral imagery of the exordium (much like the floral imagery in Skelton's *Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell* discussed in my introduction) is therefore used reflexively both to allegorize the intertextual processes through which *La Conusaunce Damours* was shaped and to elucidate the processes of literary formation that it internally fictionalizes. The readerly writer collects and arranges textual and rhetorical fragments into metaphorical bouquets—and here we might remember that, since antiquity,

[55] Prolegomena to an edition of the poem *La Conusaunce Damours*, printed around 1528," 27.

flowers have been used to suggest ornamental language and rhetorical figures, an image that is retained in the words *florilegia* and *anthology*—to create a metaphorical, textual bouquet.[56] It is thus that *La Conusaunce Damours,* like de Worde's edition of *Troilus and Criseyde*, shows how books provide an interactive space for discussion, debate, and the imaginative formation of new literature—even as they seemingly monumentalize particular snippets of literary gossip and rumour.

TROILUS' CONSTANCY AND CRESSIDA AS INCONSTANT *EXEMPLUM*

In Act 4 of *As You Like It*, in a response to Orlando's threat that he will perish if she will not have him, Rosalind sardonically remarks that the "poor world is almost six thousand years old, and in all this time there was not any man died in his own person, *videlicet*, in a love-cause." She goes on to elaborate:

> Troilus had his
> brains dash'd out with a Grecian club, yet he did
> what he could to die before, and he is one of the
> patterns of love. Leander, he would have liv'd
> many a fair year though Hero had turn'd nun, if it
> had not been for a hot midsummer night; for, good
> youth, he went but forth to wash him in the Hellespont,
> and, being taken with the cramp, was drown'd; and
> the foolish chroniclers of that age found it was—
> Hero of Sestos. But these are all lies: men have died
> from time to time, and worms have eaten them,
> but not for love.
>
> (4.1.97-108)

It is telling, as Barry Windeatt observes, that "when Rosalind makes light of the convention of dying for love, *Troilus is her first example.*"[57] According to Shakespeare's heroine, 'foolish chroniclers' are responsible for perpetuating the fiction that anyone dies of a broken heart; nonetheless, she invokes Troilus alongside the Ovidian Leander as a recognizable if fictive paragon of love, or, as Benedick would put it in *Much Ado About Nothing*, one of those

---

[56] Lerer has a brief discussion of this trope in *Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII*, 198.
[57] "Introduction," in *Troilus and Criseyde*, by Geoffrey Chaucer, ed. Barry Windeatt (London: Penguin, 2003), li-lii, n. 28. Emphasis my own.

"quondam carpetmongers, whose names yet run smoothly in the even road of blank verse" (5.2.32-4).[58]

The earlier literary tradition upon which both Rosalind's and Benedick's jaded references to Troilus rely is exemplified in Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey's "Complaint of a diyng louer refused vpon his ladies iniust mistaking of his writyng."[59] A narrative poem of eighty-two lines, the piece describes a shepherd's chance encounter with a lover who had suffered at the hands of a cruel mistress. Before collapsing into death, the rejected lover instructs the shepherd—and, implicitly, textual posterity—to memorize and internalize his woeful tale and to "print it in [his] hart" (39). The shepherd-narrator, moved to pity by the poor lover's demise, attempts to "finde some worthy place, for such a corse to rest" (76). Settling on a nearby gravesite, which he deems apt, he fittingly chooses to entomb the body of this faithful, ill-fated man alongside "Chreseids loue, king Priams sōne, y^{e} worthy Troilus" (78). Troilus, then, has already been immortalized as a fixed and eternal symbol of fidelity within the literary world of the poem; Surrey confirms and propagates this emblematic reading of the Trojan prince.[60] This potent visual image, the fantastical burying of a "giltlesse" contemporary lover at the tomb of Troilus, is deeply symbolic (40), for the literal and figurative memorialization of Troilus' character is evident in the very comparison which Surrey draws. It serves as a graphic description of the way in which Tudor interpreters had little trouble stabilizing the figure of the Trojan prince into a fixed icon of male fidelity.

---

[58] As in Rosalind's speech, the larger context of Benedick's comment also links the figures of Troilus and Leander.

[59] I cite the text of "Complaint of a diyng louer refused vpon his ladies iniust mistaking of his writyng" from *Tottel's Miscellany (1557-1587)*, rev. ed., ed. Hyder E. Rollins, 2 vols (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 71-2. Subsequent citations of materials from *Tottel's Miscellany* refer to this edition. This poem is discussed as a late example of the medieval love aunter by Martine Braekman, "A Chaucerian 'Courtly Love Aunter' by Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey," *Neophilologus* 79.4 (1995): 675-87.

[60] Troilus' established reputation as the ideal, and unfairly wronged, lover evinced in "Complaint of a diyng louer refused vpon his ladies iniust mistaking of his writyng" is only one facet of his Tudor *persona*, however. Equally pervasive was the association between the starry-eyed Trojan prince and the Renaissance *vates*, or divinely inspired poet. Troilus' Chaucerian (and indeed Boccaccian) identity as a character-author was not lost on sixteenth-century audiences who recalled not only his missives of love and complaint, but also his 'original' poetical compositions. After all, Troilus had theatrically played the wan and lovesick devotee, and this self-styled romantic hero had effectively transformed his sufferings and desires into a wellspring of poetical inspiration. It is hardly surprising, then, to discover that Troilus was frequently invoked by male writers as the ideal lover-poet: he combined unerring faithfulness with interminable eloquence.

As Hyder E. Rollins once noted, "in the popular literature of the early Tudor period" Cressida, like Troilus, "became a staple comparison."[61] However, despite the fact that allusions to her inconstancy in love were common, they were not ubiquitous. Cressida does not, in other words, simply become a symbol of infidelity in reaction to her lover's iconic fidelity. Though often associated with the traits of falsity and fickleness, Cressida's sixteenth-century identity was malleable. Like Ovid's permeable heroines, she was used both as an *exemplum in malo* and as an *exemplum in bono*, co-opted and employed to symbolize a wide, and sometimes paradoxical, range of meanings throughout the period.[62] By turns, she is read as a louche proponent of immorality or an unwitting victim of desire. In *The Straunge and Wonderfull Aduentures of Don Simonides*, Barnabe Rich suggests:

> A friuolous pleasure is Loue, a bitter sweete, a poysoned humour, a contumelious comforte, a deuilishe intent...: if Adam fell thank Eue, if Troy destroyed curse Menelaus Harlot, if Troylus died woe to Cressida: the daie would soner faile me, then examples should not fit me, but I imagine to a wise man that this is sufficient.[63]

On the other hand, in the near contemporary *A Poore Knight his Pallace of Priuate Pleasures*, we find:

> But what could Thisbe then resist, when Pyram came in sight,
> Or when as worthy Troylus came, how could Dame Cressid fight.
> Phedra shee was content to yeelde, Desire did force her so,
> And from Dianas faithfull freend, to Cupids campe to go.[64]

Moreover, citations of Cressida were by no means uniformly negative or tragic. George Gascoigne, suggesting "I list not brut hir bale, let others spread it forth," unironically

---

[61] "The Troilus-Cressida Story from Chaucer to Shakespeare," *PMLA* 32 (1917): 389.
[62] Though Rollins' "The Troilus-Cressida Story from Chaucer to Shakespeare" long ago pointed out the multiplicity of meanings attached to Criseyde in Renaissance century literature, her semantic instability is still often misunderstood and misperceived. Elizabeth Heale, for example, assumes Criseyde to be a "universally vilified example of inconstant femininity in male poetry of the early to mid-sixteenth century": "'Desiring Women Writing': Female Voices and Courtly 'Balets' in Some Early Tudor Manuscript Albums," in *Early Modern Women's Manuscript Writing*, eds. Victoria E. Burke and Jonathan Gibson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 19.
[63] *The Straunge and Wonderfull Aduentures of Don Simonides* (STC 21002; London, 1581), R1^{v}.
[64] *A Poore Knight his Pallace of Priuate Pleasures* (STC 4283; London, 1579), D3^{v}.

references the "favoure" and "grace" of "*Pandars* niece."[65] Evoking Cressida in a favourable comparison with his own mistress, he writes:

> I seeme to penne hir praise, that doth surpasse my skill,
> I strive to rowe against the tide, I hoppe against the hill.
> Then let these fewe suffise, shee *Helene* staines for hewe,
> *Dydo* for grace, *Cressyde* for cheere, and is as *Thisbye* true[66]

And the anonymous author of "A comparison of his loue wyth the faithfull and painful loue of Troylus to Creside" wishes that his own beloved would sexually "graunt [him] grace and so to do | As Creside then did Troylus to."[67] In this view, Cressida becomes the model or ideal mistress.

As the above examples would suggest, Cressida is in fact a flexible sign. Though she exceeds definition, Cressida and her shape-shifting narrative allusively drift through and feature in a wide range of sixteenth-century texts, and the printed miscellanies of the Elizabethan era provide a fruitful body of literature within which to examine the facets and dynamism of this polysemous heroine's publication. In 1557, at the age of twenty-seven, England's leading law printer aberrantly issued one of the first and arguably the most influential of the sixteenth century's printed poetical anthologies.[68] Comprised of miscellaneous courtly lyric poetry that had previously circulated in manuscript, Richard Tottel's so-called *Miscellany* has often been heralded as the book which signaled the beginning of the English Renaissance, a "canon-making anthology of mid-century English verse" and "*the* handbook for Elizabethan poets."[69]

---

[65] "Gascoignes praise of his mistres," in *The Posies*, ed. John W. Cunliffe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907), 7, 15, 16.
[66] "Gascoigne's praise of his mistres," 37-40.
[67] "A comparison of his loue wyth the faithfull and painful loue of Troylus to Creside," in *Tottel's Miscellany (1557-1587)*, 71-72.
[68] One prior lyrical anthology, *The Courte of Venus* (STC 24650), was likely published in the 1530s, which survives only in small fragments. On Elizabethan miscellanies, see Elizabeth W. Pomeroy, *The Elizabethan Miscellanies: Their Development and Conventions* (University of California Press, 1973).
[69] Roland Greene, "The Colonial Wyatt: Contexts and Opening," in *Rethinking the Henrician Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts*, ed. Peter C. Herman (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994) 250; Wall, 24. For discussions which touch on pre-print compilations of Middle English lyric poetry, see Julia Boffey, "Middle English Lyrics and Manuscripts," in *A Companion to The Middle English Lyric*, ed. Thomas G. Duncan (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2005), 1-18; Julia Boffey and John J. Thompson, "Anthologies and Miscellanies: Production and Choice of Texts," in *Book Production and Publishing in Britain, 1375-1475,* eds. Jeremy Griffiths and Derek Pearsall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989) 279-315; and the essays collected in *The*

In the wake of *Tottel's Miscellany*, a number of printed anthologies and collections of verse appeared in the 1560s and 1570s, and I would point to three such volumes to examine the diverse ways in which Cressida, who was frequently invoked as an *exemplum* in such anthologies, was 'ysonge' and 'ywriten': *The Parydyse of Daynty Deuices, A Handefull of Pleasant Delites*, and *A Gorgious Gallery of Gallant Inuentions*.[70] As Sasha Roberts notes, "volumes of poetry do more than collect isolated poems; they are interpretative objects with particular resonances, narratives, selections, arrangements and idiosyncrasies," and these lyric collections reveal the ever-increasing accumulation of meanings, the intertextual gossip, which surrounded Cressida's sixteenth-century character.[71]

The first Tudor miscellany in which I examine Cressida's representation is *The Paradyse of Daynty Deuises*, the most enduringly popular and frequently reprinted of the Elizabethan poetical anthologies. *The Parydyse of Daynty Deuices,* which went through at least ten editions between 1576 and 1606 (STC 7516-7524), had been, or so its publisher Henry Disle claimed, originally compiled by Richard Edwards.[72] Twelve of the poems had been earlier published as ballads, however, and Disle's dedication explains how the volume's "ditties both pithie and pleasaunt" are "aptly made to be sette to any song of 5. partes, or song to instrument." It was thus meant to contain "daynty deuises," or vernacular poetry, which could easily be sung.

Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on The Medieval Miscellany, eds. Stephen G. Nichols and Siegfried Wenzel (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996).

[70] I cite the texts of these miscellanies from the following modern editions: *The Paradise of Dainty Devices (1576-1606)*, ed. Hyder Edward Rollins (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927); *A Handful of Pleasant Delights (1584)*, ed. Hyder E. Rollins (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924); *A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions (1578)*, ed. Hyder E. Rollins (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926). Subsequent parenthetical citations refer to these editions.

[71] *Reading Shakespeare's Poems in Early Modern England* (New York: Palgrave, 2003), 6.

[72] As Randall Anderson elucidates, there were two possible editorial processes involved in the production of printed miscellanies: "One is substantially influenced by economic pressures of the print trade: editorship by interception and selection of fugitive manuscript material and its publication in a printed miscellany. The other and more elusive manuscript practice is necessarily antecedent to the publisher or printer: it is an individual's choice, from such circulating manuscript verse, of items to be copied into a commonplace book or manuscript miscellany": "'The Merit of a Manuscript Poem': The Case for Bodleian MS Rawlinson Poet. 85," in *Print, Manuscript, and Performance*, 128. A poet and playwright, Edwards had attended Oxford before, in 1553, becoming a gentleman of the Chapel Royal and, in 1561, being appointed Master of the Children of the Chapel, a position he held until his death. If Edwards truly was the compiler, none of the songs could date from after 1566, when he died.

The contents of *The Paradyse of Daynty Deuises* underwent several revisions. The first printing included ninety-nine poems, but, following numerous additions and subtractions, there were one hundred and twenty-five by the fourth edition.[73] Of interest here is the 1580 edition, which introduced two relevant, anonymously-written pieces. The first is entitled "A Complaint" and signed 'Troylus'; a companion piece immediately follows and is attributed to 'Cressida.' Nearly all of the love poetry contained in *The Paradyse of Daynty Deuises,* once described by Winifred Maynard as a "collection of preponderantly moralizing verse," functions didactically, as a complaint or admonition.[74] In this sense, Troilus' lament is typical. It begins:

> If *Cressed* in her gadding moode,
> Had not gone to the greekish hoste:
> Where she by Diomede was woode,
> And wonne from him that loude her most.
> She had not fallen to such mischeefe,
> Nor turned *Troylus* to such greefe
> (1-6)

Troilus suggests that "Catterwaling *Cresed* coy" could have saved "her good name" and "not known the Lazars call" if only "she in *Troy* had tarryed" with him (11, 19, 18).[75] Troilus, who believes that a desire for "noveltie" and "the tast of Straungers chere" led his former mistress to "a gadding go" (26-28), concludes his complaint with words of warning, thereby turning Cressida into a negative *exemplum* of female behaviour:

> I pleasure not to blaze her blame,
> Nor chiding cannot mend her mis:
> But all good women by her shame,
> May learne what Catterwaling is.
> For wandring women, most men say,

---

[73] After the fourth edition, no further changes were made to the work's contents. Readership for *The Paradyse of Daynty Deuises* seems to have been wide, both geographically and socially. In 1583, Thomas Chard, a London bookseller, sent "25 Paradice of Devises" to Cambridge: Robert Jahn, "Letters and Booklists of Thomas Chard (or Chare) of London, 1583-4," *The Library* 4th ser. 4 (1923): 232.

[74] "*The Paradyse of Daynty Deuises* Revisited," *The Review of English Studies* n.s. 24 (1973): 295.

[75] This leprosy is a detail that the author, no doubt, adapted from Robert Henryson's fifteeneth-century continuation to *Troilus and Criseyde.* Although Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* had concluded with Troilus' dramatic death, Henryson effectively evades the narrative impossibility of reviving a deceased character by imbuing his own postscript to the well-known tale with a large dose of distinctly Chaucerian metatextuality. In his addendum, Cresseid is abandoned by a fickle Diomedes and is duly punished for her disloyalty. Horribly "deformait" with an "uglye lipper face," the former beauty find herself living at the "spittaill hous": *Testament of Cressid* in *The Poems of Robert Henryson,* ed. Robert L. Kindrick (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1997) 349, 372, 391. Henryson's work spread widely in England after Thynne's editorial inclusion of the text in his 1532 *Workes of Geffray Chaucer* (STC 5068). Many readers of the era mistakenly believed Henryson's *Testament of Cressid* to be Chaucer's own continuation.

Cannot be good and goe astray.

It is not womens exercise,
To straye or gadde in fielde or towne:
Men count them neyther good nor wyse,
They blot and blemish their renowne.
They hurt their fame, they please their foe,
And greeves their friend to see then so.
(31-42)

Cressida's subsequent reply is a specific defense to his indictment, which turns the interpretation of their story and her role within it into a *querelle*-like rhetorical game of defense and offense, of blame and explanation. Drawing on Troilus' own vocabulary, her first line indignantly declares: "No gadding moode, but forced strife, | Compelled me retyre from *Troy*" (1-2). She combatively suggests that, though Troilus may "charge" her with accusations, she had no power against the "hie decree" which exiled her (26-27). She shifts the responsibility for her demise instead onto Troilus himself. Borrowing from the Ovidian Briseis' words to "*lenta*" [soft] Achilles (*Her*. 3.22), Cressida suggests that, though he should have "garded well his right" (22), Troilus did not adequately protect her:

The blome of blame had not bine spread,
The seede of shame had not bine sowne:
If Knightly prowes his minde had lead,
By rightfull force to keepe his owne.
(13-16)

Although Cressida concedes "I well allowe your finall clause, | To gadde and runne doth blot the name," she admonishes the dispassionate Troilus to "lay the fault unto the cause" (37-39). He is, in her opinion, misattributing her motivations and vesting her character with an agency that she did not, as a helpless pawn, actually possess. She suggests his behaviour toward her has been uniformly un-chivalric, not only when he failed to protect her from the Greeks, but also in his subsequent defamations of her character: "I see your curtesie small, your store, | The blaze my plague to make it more" (23-24). Moreover, Cressida accuses Troilus of relishing in her downfall, of taking pleasure in redrafting her calumny and erroneously amending the details

of her story: "If nought you ioy to blaze my blame, | You woulde not hunt for termes of spight" (31-32).

The second Elizabethan miscellany to which I turn was a production of Richard Jones, probable printer of Disle's *Parydyse of Daynty Deuices*. *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites* was printed at least three times during the period (STC 21104.5-21105.5). While both the first and second editions were printed by William Howe for Richard Jones, a later edition was printed for Jones by John Danter. Kirk Melnikoff has argued that *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites* was "meant for the bustling heterogeneous marketplace of St. Paul's Churchyard."[76] Accordingly, Jones' prefatory address instructs potential customers to "Peruse" the volume "wel ere [they] passe by." Moreover, as Elizabeth Heale comments, Jones' paratextual material "advertises its poems as intended for mixed gender courting."[77] Its subtitle proclaims the contents to be: 'Newly deuised to the newest tunes that are now in vse, to be sung: euerie sonet orderly pointed to his proper tune. With new additions of certain songs, to verie late deuised notes, not commonly knowen, nor vsed heretofore.' And its confident prefatory assertions that "Here may you haue such pretie thinges | as women much desire" as well as "fine Histories" and the "sundrie sorts" of "Songs as you require." Like Disle, Jones anticipates clientele who "in Musicke do delight" and, thus, informs buyers: "here may you wish and haue. | Such pleasaut songs to ech new tune."[78]

A lively dialogue between the sexes is contained within *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites*. Several of the ballads, which, significantly, were themselves advertised as 'songs' or pieces to be

---

[76] "Jones's Pen and Marlowe's Socks: Richard Jones, Print Culture, and the Beginnings of English Dramatic Literature," *Studies in Philology* 102.2 (2005): 196.
[77] "Misogyny and the Complete Gentleman in Early Elizabethan Printed Miscellanies," *The Yearbook of English Studies* 33.1 (2003): 244.
[78] Despite Jones' boasts of literary novelty and the title page's description of the volume's contents as "newly devised" poetry, the lyrics found within *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites*—as well as the tunes which are found coupled with nearly every poem—were already well-known. As Rollins' editorial notes indicate, most, if not all, of the thirty-two poems, primarily on themes of love, had been printed as broadside ballads sometime before 1566, and at least two had been printed by Jones himself. Rollins' notes also explain that the probable first edition of this work, no longer extant, was entitled *Very Pleasaunte Sonettes and storyes in meter* and registered in 1566-7 (Arber, 1.313). The running header of the alternatively titled 1584 edition, 'Sonets and Histories, to Sundrie New Tunes,' identifies it with this earlier 1566 entry.

re-voiced by Jones' customers, incorporate parts for both male and female *personae* and opinions. Furthermore, in numerous pieces we find a deliberate invocation of the themes of the *querelle des femmes*. In "The lamentation of a woman being wrongfully defamed," for instance, the female narrator addresses her complaint to "Ladies falsly deemd, | of anie fault or crime," whom she encourages to join in her "dolefull tune" (1-2, 4). Condemning the actions of "spiteful men" (5), she insists that "A thousand good women, | haue guiltlesse been accusde" and cites as examples "the godly *Susāna*" and "The good Dutchesse of *Sauoy*," who were damned by "false dissembling men" (15-16, 19, 22). The authorial voice in "The complaint of a woman Louer" agrees that "Al men are false, there is no choice" (16). And another warning against masculine wiles asserts "there are such kind of men" who "prate and make the matter nice, | And leaue [women] in fooles paradice" ("The Louer compareth some subtile Suters to the Hunter," 31, 22-23).

In direct opposition to the sentiments expressed in *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites'* aforementioned pieces, however, we find pieces such as "A proper new Song." The author of this ballad is self-identified as a student at Cambridge and a victim of "Beauties luring looks | Whose baite hath brought me to my baine, | and caught me from my Books" (77-79). He tells his audience:

> Example let me be,
> to you and other more:
> Whose heauie hart, hath felt the smart,
> subdued by *Cupids* lore.
> ……..
> And when as thou (good Reader) shalt
> peruse this scrole of mine:
> Let this a warning be to thee,
> and saie a friend of thine,
> Did write thee this of loue,
> and of a zealous mind:
> Because that he sufficiently,
> hath tried the female kind.
> (30-33, 60-67)

Similarly, the author of "A warning for Wooers, that they be not ouer hastie, nor deceiued with womens beautie," which functions as a caution against female deception, draws on his own

experience to dissuade his audience, addressed as "Ye louing wormes," from the charms of women and the dangers of love, "the thing that yeelds but labour lost" (1, 8). Admonishing his male audience that "The *Syrens* times oft time beguiles, | So doth the teares of Crocodiles" (25-6), the narrator ironically passes defamation off as profeminist praise in his final lines; he fears—like Criseyde mourning 'thise bokes wol me shende'—that he will otherwise be 'shent' by subsequent interpreters:

> I saie not so,
> That euerie woman causeth wo:
> That were too broad,
> Who loueth not venom must shun the tode.
> Who vseth still the truth to tel,
> May blamed be though he saie wel:
> Say Crowe is white, and snowe is blacke,
> Lay not the fault on womans backe,
> Thousands were good,
> But few scapte drowning in *Noes* flood:
> Most are wel bent,
> I must say so, least I be shent.
> (85-96)

Not surprisingly, amongst this atmosphere of *querelle*-inspired sentiment in *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites*, we find Ovidian inspired pieces such as "A new Sonet of Pyramus and Thisbe," which relates the "dolefull newes, | Which on these Louers did befall" (6-7). This distinctly eroticized version of Ovid's tale—in which the lovers want to meet "by *Minus* well" to "their loue vnclothe" and to "louingly imbrace, | in loues delight" (28, 24, 29-30)—ends with an invitation to "You Ladies all" to "peruse and see, | the faithfulnesse," of "These louers twaine, who with such paine, | did die so well content" (77-78, 83-84). Another Ovidian adaptation, "The Historie of Diana and Acteon," begins by describing how "poore Acteon changed was | to a hugie Hart" (49-50). A leaf is lacking in the middle of the song, and the extant text resumes in the middle of a different ballad; this one takes as its subject a deeply Gowerian-inspired, cross-dressing Narcissus (sans Echo) whom Venus punishes with drowning. And there is a fascinating combination of Chaucerian and Ovidian references embedded in "A proper new Ditye Intituled: Fie vpō Loue and al his lawes," in which we find

explicit references to Pyramus and Palamon, as well as a more subtle allusion to Ariadne, used to express the rejected poet-lover's sorrow.[79]

What I wish to draw particular attention to, however, is an extended allusion to the story of Troilus and Cressida which appears in the midst of *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites'* collection of Ovidian and *querelle*-inspired *exempla.* The author of "The Louer cōplaineth the losse of his Ladie To Cicilia Pauin" relates an almost perfect expression of the contradictory gossip surrounding sixteenth-century interpretations of Troilus and Cressida's story. The poet expresses a physical desire to consummate his own relationship with his beloved, as Troilus did with Cressida; thus, he initially frames his reference to the story as a positive pattern of love, wishing that "*Venus* would grant vnto [him], | such happinesse: | As she did vnto *Troylus*" (27-29). Yet, he goes on to refer to Cressida's notorious inconstancy and alludes to her reputation "worse, | Than all the women certainly: | That euer liued naturally" (31-33). His description of her "slight falsed faith" is inherently paradoxical, an attempted fusion of what "the storie[s] saith" (34), and it demonstrates his inability to fully synthesize the multiple Cressidas with whom he is presented by literary tradition. He is at once sympathetic to the heroine's "great and sore distresse" but chooses to rhyme this with the definitive statement that she was punished with leprosy "Because she did transgresse" (35, 38).

Comprised of previously printed broadside ballads, almost entirely amorous in nature, *A Gorgious Gallery of Gallant Inuentions* was another poetical anthology produced, like *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites*, by Howe and Jones. It was printed only once, in 1578 (STC 20402). The edition's subtitle with its reference to 'diuers dayntie deuises' deliberately alludes to and aligns the work with the earlier *Parydyse of Daynty Deuises*, from which it borrows three poems.[80] This miscellany, which also adopted content from *Tottel's Miscellany* and *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites*,

[79] In "A warning for Wooers, that they be not ouer hastie, nor deceiued with womens beautie," there is a passage which lists Troilus' name amongst what essentially amounts to a catalogue of Ovidian lovers.
[80] The title of this volume changed three times before it was printed, as its entry in the Stationers' Register indicates (Arber, 2.313). Each transitional title similarly alluded to prior Elizabethan miscellanies.

was, as its original title page suggests, 'ioyned together and builded vp: By T.P.,' or Thomas Procter, who authored some of the poems.

Both in the structure and content of *A Gorgious Gallery of Gallant Inuentions* we find familiar, deliberate evocations of the *querelle des femmes*. One of the first poems included in the volume, "To a Gentilwoman that sayd: All men be false, they thinke not what they say," begins with the provocative accusation: "Some women fayne that *Paris* was, | The falsest louer that could bee" (1-2). Proceeding to reinterpret Paris as a "Louer iust," the poem suggests "If any fault bee found at all, | To womens lot it needes must fall" (31, 37-8) In so doing, the text effectively initiates a well-known dialogue between the sexes; it restarts an ongoing rhetorical debate about the nature of men, women, and love that will run through much of the collection. In "Beauty is a pleasant pathe to distruction" we are cautioned to beware feminine artifice and the "gloze of louing lookes" which "Seduce mens mindes" (14, 15), and in "The Louer greeuously complayneth agaynst the vniust dealing of his Lady beloued" we are counseled against women's "crafty wiles, and subtill smiles: | That so in loue can fayne" (43-4). On the other hand, "The Louer perswadeth his beloued, to beware the deceites and allurements of strange suters" and "The Lady beloued exclaymeth of the great vntruth of her louer" warn, respectively, of the "false suite" (9) of men and their ability, as a sex, "To finde so many crafty wayes, | To fraude a poore woman" (27-8).

As in *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites*, the polyphony of male and female voices and subject positions voiced in *A Gorgious Gallery of Gallant Inuentions* is frequently adorned with a variety of Ovidian mythological allusions.[81] In "A short Epistle written in the behalfe of N.B. to M.H.," the author, promising to "*Vlisses* bee," hopes that his mistress will, in return, be to him "*Penelope*, | In minde, and loyall hart" (1-3). The poet of "A Louer approuing his Lady

[81] There are far too many Ovidian references in the volume to cite in full, but this paragraph gives some idea as to their diversity and prevalence. The poetry of *A Gorgious Gallery of Gallant Inuentions,* like its generic predecessors, was rife with classical allusions. To this effect, in Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller*, we find the comment: "To tell you of the rare pleasures of [the Roman's] gardens, their baths, their vineyards, their galleries, were to write a second part of *The Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Devices*": in *An Anthology of Elizabethan Prose Fiction*, ed. Paul Salzman (1987; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 270.

vnkinde Is forsed vnwilling to vtter his minde" claims that he is "periurde as *Iason*" at the hands of a "faythlesse" lady (15). In "The Louer wisheth himselfe an Harte in the Foreste, (as Acteon was) for his Ladyes sake," the poet expresses a desire to be "A hart of pleasant hew" like "*Acteon*, whom *Diana* did disguise" so that he might "walke the woods vnknown, wheras [his] lady lies" (1-3). The author of " In the prayse of the rare beauty, and manifolde vertues of Mistres D." diversely recalls "*Helens* heauenly face, whose grace the *Greekes* bought deare," "*Vlisses* wyfe, whose chastnesse brued her fame," and "Prowde Tarquin with his force, which Lucresse did defile" (11, 43, 45). In addition to "The History of Pyramus and Thisbie truely translated," the lengthiest Ovidian piece of *A Gorgious Gallery of Gallant Inuentions*, the collection also contains "The reward of Whoredome by the fall of Helen." This lament by "Helena shee, for whose vilde filthy fact | The stately Towers of Troy, the hauty Grecians sacte" serves as a cautionary tale (5-6); having emerged "From Limbo Lake," the heroine's ghost confesses that "beauty made [her] blinde" and, now-repentant, bemoans that if she had "modest liud, [her] prayse had bin the more" (1, 20, 10, 34).

Ovid himself is explicitly referenced in two of *A Gorgious Gallery of Gallant Inuentions'* collected pieces. In "The Louer forsaken, writeth to his Lady a desperate Farwell," the poet suggests that, along with "*Tullyes* cunning tongue," he would "curse and ban" "*Ouids* louing tale," and he suggests that his prior readings of both authors "haue brewed [his] bale" (85-86). More provocative, however, are the references to "*Ouid*…whose greefe by Muses grew" found in "In the prayse of the rare beauty, and manifolde vertues of Mistres D." (62). For it is there that "*Ouid* yet of Poets Prince, whose wits all others past" is compared both to "*Chawcer*… | Who sucked dry Pernassus spring," and "*Surrey*" who "scalde, the height of *Ioue* his Throne" (8, 1, 3). In citing these three authors together, this poem alludes not only to the common association and conflation of Ovid's and Chaucer's mythological heroines, but also points in interesting ways to the composition and generic identity of poetry contained within the

volume.[82] These three names can be read as a sort of bibliography, not only for the ballads collected in *A Gorgious Gallery of Gallant Inuentions,* but also for the convergence of poetical traditions which these pieces represent; the volume is clearly indebted both to the English *querelle des femmes,* with its frequent adoption of Chaucerian and Ovidian *exempla,* and to an emerging literature of Surrey-esque, subjective lyricism that had been popularized in the wake of *Tottel's Miscellany.*[83]

It comes as no surprise that references to Troilus and Cressida that abound throughout *A Gorgious Gallery of Gallant Inuentions* are frequently cited alongside examples culled from Ovidian texts. The author of "An other louing Letter," who compares himself to Pyramus, correspondingly wishes his lover to have "a *Thisbies* hart" rather than "A *Cressids* cruell stony harte" (27, 18). The exasperated sounding lover-poet in "The Louer to his beloued, by the name of fayre, and false"—having informed his mistress "As *Troylus* truth shall bee my sheeld, to kepe my pen from blame, | So *Cressids* crafte shall kepe the feeld, for to resound thy shame" (7-8)—condemns his beloved: "*Vlisses* wife shall mate the sore, whose wishly troth doth shine, | Well Fayre and False, I can no more, thou art of *Helens* lyne" (9-10). Furthermore, the author of "The Louer exhorteth his Lady to bee constant" references Thisbe as a positive

---

[82] The constellation of these particular poets in "In the prayse of the rare beauty, and manifolde vertues of Mistres D." is similar to George Puttenham's famous 1589 synopsis of the development of English vernacular literature:

> And those of the first age were Chaucer and Gower, both of them, as I suppose, knights. After whom followed John Lydgate, the monk of Bury, and that nameless, who wrote the satire called *Piers Plowman*; next him followed Harding the chronicler; then, in King Henry the Eighth's time, Skelton , (I wot not for what great worthiness) surnamed the Poet Laureate. In the latter end of the same king's reign sprang up a new company of courtly makers, of whom Sir Thomas Wyatt the elder and Henry, Earl of Surrey were the two chieftains, who having travelled into Italy, and there tasted the sweet and stately measures and style of the Italian poesy, as novices newly crept out of the schools of Dante, Ariosto, and Petrarch, they greatly polished our rude and homely manner of vulgar poesy from that it had been before, and for that cause may justly be said the first reformers of our English metre and style

I cite the text of Puttenham's *Arte of English Poesie* from *English Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. Brian Vickers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 210.

[83] In this era, the English secular love lyric was strongly associated with Surrey since this is a genre which, despite a fairly long tradition, was often marginalized in the Middle Ages and only seems to have gained status at the court of Henry VIII. John Scattergood notes: "Before Sir Thomas Wyatt no English poet acquired a substantial reputation for writing secular poetry. There was no substantial tradition of high-style art lyric in early medieval England as there has been in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Provence….When Chaucer mentions his lyric poems, moreover, it is always at the end of lists of his works": "The Love Lyric before Chaucer," in *A Companion to The Middle English Lyric*, 44.

illustration of the way in which "The constant are praysed" (13) and duly contrasts her virtuous reputation with the infamy of both Phaedra and Cressida. In "NARSETVS a wofull youth, in his exile writeth to Rosana his beloued mistresse, to assure her of his faithfull constancie, requiring the like of her," embedded amongst references to the stories of Leda and Danae, Alcmena, Helen, and Penelope, we again find the story of Troilus and Cressida cited alongside Ovidian tales:

> If Pyramus were sad, when hee found Thisby slayne,
> If Cresseds craft and falsing fayth: did Troylus turne to payne,
> Eneas traytor false: oh treason that hee did,
> With bloody woundes and murdering sword, Queene Didos lyfe hath rid
> If these haue won by death and end of pyning payne,
> And I aliue with torments great in dying deathes remaine.
> (27-32)

A perusal of the various ways and contexts in which Criseyde is cited in *A Gorgious Gallery of Gallant Inuentions* confirms not only the deep associations which literature had forged between her character and Ovid's various heroines, but it also demonstrates the ways in which both Criseyde and the Chaucerian-Ovidian mythological characters were conventionally linked to and rendered inseparable from the textual traditions of the English *querelle des femmes*. The true Troilus and false Cressida binary appears in pieces such as "The Louer beeing blinded with the faythlesse loue of his Lady is contented to remit her fault vpon promis of amendment," which references "*Cressid* that forgot, | True *Troylus*" (14-5). And, following precedents including "Gascoigne's Praise of his Mistress," Cressida's negative associations are apparently overlooked and her beauty highlighted instead in the short piece entitled "The Louer in the prayse of his beloued and comparison of her beauty":

> Not shee for whom prowde Troy did fall and burne,
> The *Greekes* eke slaine, that bluddy race did runne:
> Nor shee for spight that did *Acteon* turne,
> Into an Hart her beauty coye did shunne:
> Nor shee whose blud vpon *Achilles* Tombe,
> Whose face would tame a Tygars harte:
> Nor shee that wan by wise of Paris dome.
> Th' apple of Golde for Beauty to her parte:
> Nor shee whose eyes did pearce true *Troylus* brest,
> And made him yeeld, that knew in loue no law,
> Might bee compared to the fayrest and the best,

> Whom Nature made to keepe the rest in awe:
> For Beauties sake, sent downe from *Ioue* aboue,
> Thrise happy is hee, that can attayne her loue.

Despite the volume's frequent invocation of Cressida's story, we do not find a unified interpretation of Chaucer's infinitely textual heroine in *A Gorgious Gallery of Gallant Inuentions*. Notwithstanding her long publication history, Cressida's text rejects reduction to reified structures of signification. Rather, as in *The Paradyse of Daynty Deuises* and *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites,* we *literally* hear contending interpretative voices within the ballads of *A Gorgious Gallery of Gallant Inuentions*.

Christopher Marsh reminds us: "In early modern England, ballads flew around in crowded space, jostling for the attention of people whose attitudes to any given theme were varied. Ballads, in such a social setting, were designed to incite debate, banter and contest."[84] Thus, the collected and contradictory references to Cressida's character in Elizabethan ballads and printed miscellanies represent the aura of 'debate, banter, and contest' and the sixteenth-century proliferation of meanings which surrounded Cressida as she was gossiped about, co-opted as an honorary Ovidian *exemplum,* and used as a subject for 'alle poesye.' And, in this polyphony of voices shaping and reshaping Cressida's *fama*, we see something of Andrew Feldhar's assertion that Ovidian "metamorphosis continually compels readers to refigure their relationship to the text, their understanding of the narratives it contains, and ultimately how it functions as a literary representation."[85]

SHAKESPEARE'S CRESSIDA

Written in the closing years of Elizabeth I's reign, Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* is heir to, and in many ways a product of, Cressida's long interpretative tradition. Shakespeare's dramatic engagement with the storyworld and textual traditions of the classical epic resulted in

---

[84] "The Sound of Print in Early Modern England: The Broadside Ballad as Song," in *The Uses of Script and Print*, 175.
[85] Feldhar, in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 165.

a work that deliberately calls attention to its own status as literary rejoinder, and his Cressida is a character who has already been both 'ysonge' and 'ywriten' in countless forms. As Thersites wryly remarks, "any man may sing her, if he can take | her cliff; she's noted" (5.2.10-11), and, in a famous description of the Trojan heroine, Ulysses summarily dismisses her as a verbal construction: "There's language in her eye, her cheek, her lip, | Nay, her foot speaks; her wanton spirits look out | At every joint and motive of her body"(4.5.55-61). These comments of Thersites and Ulysses contribute to our sense that Shakespeare's Cressida is pure linguistic embodiment. She is what would and could be sung to a tune or inscribed on the page. Both literally and figuratively rhetorical, she is—like her epistle that Troilus rends into unintelligible snippets—"Words, words, mere words" (5.3.108).

Although Shakespeare's Cressida is, like so many of her literary predecessors, an explicitly textual construct, I would make the distinction that she is not a coherent text. Rather, she is full of interpretative possibilities. Despite Diomedes' suggestion that Cressida will "to her own worth…be priz'd" (4.4.133-4), there is little consensus amongst either the Greeks or Trojans about what that 'worth' is. She is read, valued, and defined in various ways by the men around her. While Nestor's Cressida is "a woman of quick sense" (4.5.53), for example, Ulysses' Cressida is one of the "daughters of the game" (4.5.63). Such divergences result in Cressida's semantic perplexity and surround her character in a deluge of signification. Whereas C. David Benson has called *Chaucer's* Criseyde "an endlessly protean figure who must be created anew with each reading," I suggest that *Shakespeare's* Cressida is an interpretative amalgam, the result of compounding *all* prior readings of her 'protean' text.[86] Shakespeare's Cressida is *all* former Cressidas, a curious admixture of textual precedents: coy and naïve, licentious and victimized, guilty and innocent. Everything is, as Shakespeare's heroine herself says, simultaneously "true and not true" (1.2.97).

"A kind of bizarre textual psychosis," as Carol Cook writes, "seems to voice itself

[86] "The Opaque Text of Chaucer's Criseyde," 18.

through her; she is a creature of intertextuality… endowed with self-consciousness."[87] Overburdened by the weight of context and tradition, Cressida recognizes the paradoxical nature of her own composition. She is aware of her status as a character comprised of innumerable textual fragments, and she notes the ultimate irreconcilability of all that 'language in her eye, her cheek, her lip' into a singular self when she tells Troilus: "I have a kind of self resides with you; | But an unkind self, that itself will leave | To be another's fool" (3.3.148-50). This multiplicity of Cressidas within Shakespeare's play is nowhere more apparent than in the conversation between Ulysses, Troilus, and Thersites in the final act:

ULYSSES: Cressid was here but now.
TROILUS: Let it not be believ'd for womanhood!
Think we had mothers, do not give advantage
To stubborn critics, apt without a theme,
For depravation, to square the general sex
By Cressid's rule. Rather think this not Cressid.
ULYSSES: What hath she done, Prince, that can [soil] our mothers?
TROILUS: Nothing at all, unless that this were she.
THERSITES: Will 'a swagger himself out on 's own eyes?
TROILUS: This she? no, this is Diomed's Cressida.
If beauty have a soul, this is not she;
If souls guide vows, if vows be sanctimonies,
If sanctimony be the gods' delight,
If there be rule in unity itself,
This is not she. O madness of discourse,
That cause sets up with and against itself!
Bi-fold authority, where reason can revolt
Without perdition, and loss assume all reason
Without revolt. This is, and is not, Cressid!
Within my soul there doth conduce a fight
Of this strange nature, that a thing inseparate
Divides more wider than the sky and earth,
And yet the spacious breadth of this division
Admits no orifex for a point as subtle
As Ariachne's broken woof to enter.
Instance, O instance, strong as Pluto's gates,
Cressid is mine, tied with the bonds of heaven;

[87] "Unbodied Figures of Desire," in *Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre*, ed. Sue-Ellen Case (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 193. My argument is indebted to a number of feminist readings of Shakespeare's play, including Cook's, which have tended to question readings of Cressida's guilt and point instead to Troilus' agency in Cressida's demise, including: Gayle Greene, "Shakespeare's Cressida: 'A Kind of Self'" in *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*, eds. Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz et al. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980), 133-49; Stephen J. Lynch, "Shakespeare's Cressida: 'A Woman of Quick Sense'," *Philological Quarterly* 63 (1984): 357-68; Mihoko Suzuki, *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), 210-57; Linda Charnes, "'So Unsecret to Ourselves': Notorious Identity and the Material Subject in *Troilus and Cressida*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40 (1989): 413-40; and Claire M. Tylee, "The Text of Cressida and Every Ticklish Reader: *Troilus and Cressida* and the Greek Camp Scene," *Shakespeare Survey* 41 (1989): 63-76.

> Instance, O instance, strong as heaven itself,
> The bonds of heaven are slipp'd, dissolv'd, and loos'd,
> And with another knot, [five]-finger-tied,
> The fractions of her faith, orts of her love,
> The fragments, scraps, the bits and greasy relics
> Of her o'er-eaten faith, are given to Diomed.
> (5.2.128-160)

In the Shakespearian Troilus' above words, we find more than a mere reiteration of the Chaucerian Troilus' hesitancy to "unloven" Criseyde (5.1698). Rather, in his logistically impossible bifurcation of Cressida's character into both his own and 'Diomed's Cressida,' I am reminded of the visual suggestion of two Criseydes competing for semantic dominance in de Worde's 1517 woodcut. Although her character might be captive to a tradition which unfailingly makes her leave Troilus for Diomedes, *Troilus and Cressida* demonstrates the way in which the heroine's identity and agency can be interpreted in multiple ways.

Troilus' verbal doubling of a Cressida who 'is, and is not, Cressid' evokes a long-established and essentially binary system of categorizing literary heroines as *exempla in bono* and *exempla in malo*. Shakespeare's Cressida is conceived of as a literary 'theme,' identified as the potential subject of 'disputation.' She is revealed as an uneasy rhetorical fusion, formed from the 'fragments, scraps, the bits and greasy relics' of a textual tradition in which her 'o'er-eaten faith' had long been a matter of debate. 'Bi-fold authority' had co-opted her, along with countless other Ovidian heroines, into an endless cycle of profeminist and antifeminist *argumentum* 'that cause sets up with and against itself.' Superficially, Cressida is not Shakespeare's most 'Ovidian' heroine, yet, it is to Ovidian interpretative traditions that *Troilus and Cressida* points as it dramatizes the act of reading her character.[88] This conversation—framed, as it is, by the discourse of misogyny—implicitly places Cressida amongst a myriad of other Ovidian heroines who had been frequently subjected to 'Bi-fold' rhetorical analyses, and

[88] It is true, however, that throughout the first three acts the "daughter of the game" delivered a series of relevant and seemingly inconsistent adages, lessons which might well have been culled from a reading of Ovid's erotodidactic verse: "Women are angels, wooing; | Things won are done, joy's soul lies in the doing" (1.2.286-87); "Men prize the thing ungain'd more than it is" (1.2.289); "If I confess much, you will play the tyrant" (3.2.119); and "Perchance…I show more craft than love" (3.2.153).

it encourages us to identify Cressida as a stock character of the English *querelle des femmes.* Thus, Ulysses' question 'What hath she done, prince, that can soil our mothers?' is of supreme relevance, and Troilus' answer guides and locates our interpretation of Cressida's text. For it is clearly to the antifeminist tradition that Troilus alludes when he mourns that, if Cressida is indeed guilty, she will be taken up time and again as a negative *exemplum* by those 'stubborn critics' who reductively aim 'to square the general sex | By Cressid's rule.'[89]

Cressida's position as the visual object of interpretation and the subject of *querelle*-related textual analysis is nowhere more evident than in the coincidence of verbal and visual storytelling in Act 5, scene 2, where Thersites apprehends Ulysses and Troilus as they, in turn, observe Cressida and Diomedes. The male gossips are, for a moment, transformed into those same 'stubborn' and sixteenth-century 'critics, apt, without a theme,' whom Troilus earlier referenced. Although they are largely out of earshot, with each man subject to his own imperfect view and limited perspective, all of these voyeurs and commentators authoritatively spin the conversation as Cressida's betrayal of her former lover and vest themselves with the authority to "make a recordation" of it (5.2.114). In their gossip about Cressida, we find an actualization of *Fama's* ability "to create visual illusion" and "to induce belief in fictions."[90]

Shakespeare's thematization of sight and perspective carries over into the play's crucial narrative absences. Perhaps most saliently, we, as audience, are deliberately denied our expected privilege of omniscience when Troilus receives his one and only letter from Cressida. This explanatory missive is a dramatic *lacuna*, never fully 'publisshed' for our final assessment

---

[89] This discussion in Act 5 is, of course, not the first gesture towards the *querelle des femmes* in *Troilus and Cressida.* Rather, earlier dialogue had been permeated by many of the *querelle's* concerns and clichés, and the nature of both sexes is frequently brought into question throughout the play. The dialogue in *Troilus and Cressida* continually presents us with stereotypes of what the Trojan heroine might call rhetorically "minc'd" men and women (1.2.256), and we are, at various points, presented with both profeminist and antifeminist hearsay. Whereas Cressida claims "They say all lovers swear more performance than they are able, …vowing more than the perfection of ten, and discharging less than the tenth part of one" (3.2.84-87), we hear an almost exact reversal of this sentiment in Troilus' misogynistic assumption that *if* it were possible for a woman "To keep her constancy in plight and youth" (3.2.161), Troilus would "presume" Cressida constant (3.2.159). The underlying implication is, of course, that since female fidelity does not exist, Cressida, like all women, will prove incapable of fidelity.

[90] Hardie, *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*, 6.

and judgment. Rather, Shakespeare's Trojan prince, having already written his own misogynistic version of Cressida at the Grecian camp, tears her document to shreds onstage and refuses to divulge its contents. These undisclosed texts of Cressida and her epistle are pregnant with conflicting rhetorical and hermeneutic possibilities. The heroine's final letter to Troilus functions, much as she does, as a blank page next to which "all whites are ink" (1.1.56). The effect of Cressida's blank letter is in this way akin to the moment in Laurence Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* when the narrator presents his readers with an empty page and invites them to draw their own individual portraits of the Widow Wadman, suited to their idiosyncratic desires:

> To conceive this right,—call for pen and ink—here's paper ready to your hand. —Sit down, Sir, paint her to your own mind—as like your mistress as you can—as unlike your wife as your conscience will let you—'tis all one to me—please but your own fancy in it.[91]

As with the blank page in Sterne's text, the implicit invitation to construct the absent text of Cressida's blank letter within Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* also highlights the performative and participatory nature of literary interpretation.

As we watch both Troilus' reading of Cressida's actions and his destruction of her text, we, too, as audience, are implicated in a separate act of hypothesizing Cressida's true 'entente.' Following a whole line of sixteenth-century interpreters, ranging from printers to editors to narrative poets to lyricists and ballad-writers, Shakespeare's play invites us to invoke "the attest of eyes and ears" (5.2.120) to construct our own version of the meaning of Cressida from the fictions which surround her. Picking and choosing from Cressida's broad semantic field, we piece together diverse scraps of gossip and textual tradition, producing our own, individualized Cressidas from the Shakespearean *lacunae*. We thus become collaborators in a larger textual tradition—readers and authors who contribute to her 'recordation' and select from the plethora of words that comprise her *fama*.

---

[91] *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*, ed. Ian Watt (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), 356.

'BOTH FALSE AND ALSO TRUE':
EPISTOLARY ELEGY AND FICTIONALIZED MATERIALITY

In Book 1 of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, as Criseyde's uncle is affably encouraging Troilus to divulge the identity of his beloved, Pandarus asks the Trojan prince if he has read the letter which "an herdesse | Which that icleped was Oënone | Wrot in a compleynte of hir hevynesse" to his elder brother Paris (653-55). Pandarus' seemingly offhand query turns into an elaborate, metaliterary joke, as Troilus replies "Nay, nevere yet, ywys" (657) and Pandarus proceeds to paraphrase the document's supposed contents for his lovesick companion:

> 'Phebus, that first fond art of medicyne,'
> Quod she, 'and couthe in every wightes care
> Remedye and reed, by herbes he knew fyne,
> Yet to hymself his konnyng was ful bare,
> For love hadde hym so bounden in a snare,
> Al for the doughter of the kyng Amete,
> That al his craft ne koude his sorwes bete.'
> (659-65)

The letter to which the two characters refer is, of course, Ovid's *Heroides* 5, in which Oenone, abandoned by Paris, laments her inability—despite knowledge of herbal lore—to cure her own heartbreak medicinally: "*me miseram, quod amor non est medicabilis herbis! | deficior prudens artis ab arte mea"* [Alas, wretched me, that love may not be healed by herbs! Skilled in an art, I am left helpless by the very art I know] (149-50).[1] The Chaucerian interlude operates, as Jamie C. Fumo perceives, as an "amusing example of a classical allusion presented as late-breaking news in an environment contemporaneous with the text's setting."[2] This intertextual reference to Oenone's letter simultaneously functions as a clever citation of source material and as a means of establishing and characterizing the literary-historical backdrop of Chaucer's own Trojan love story.

---

[1] These lines also recall a similar description of Apollo's infatuation with Daphne found in Book 1 of the *Metamorphoses*: "*ei mihi, quod nullis amor est sanabilis herbis | nec prosunt domino, quae prosunt omnibus, artes!*" [Alas, that love is curable by no herbs, and the arts which heal all others cannot heal their lord!] (523-24).This parallel is remarked by John V. Fleming, *Classical Imitation and Interpretation in Chaucer's* Troilus (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990), 123-24.

[2] "'Little *Troilus*': *Heroides* 5 and Its Ovidian Contexts in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*," *Studies in Philology* 100.3 (2003): 286.

What not all readers have noticed is the implied *physicality* of Oenone's mail within *Troilus and Criseyde*. And it is the fictive materiality of the Ovid's epistles as they were intertextually transmitted through literature, along with the *modus operandi* of their authenticity as discourse, that I take as the subject of this chapter. Chaucer treats Oenone's disconsolate letter not as a constituent piece of Ovid's *Heroides* but as a singular document and an actualized presence. The Chaucerian characters, inhabiting a storyworld that is already a familiar fictional locale, are aware of the woebegone heroine's Ovidian correspondence and have personal access to its contents. It is as if the missive has actually been sent by the lovelorn nymph, and—by means of a transhistorical, transnational postal service—her dispatch is circulating amongst the Trojans of English vernacular literature.

The letters of Ovid's *Heroides* are vested with a paradoxical substantiality elsewhere in Chaucer's *oeuvre*. Ovid's epistolary narratives are treated as interceptable mail in the *Legend of Good Women*, where Chaucer, employing *occupatio* and digression in turns, miniaturizes Ovidian complaint. The narrator's poetic task is explicitly framed as an exercise in brevity, for the God of Love insists in his commission of the work: "I wot wel that thou maist nat al yt ryme, | That swiche lovers diden in hire tyme; | It were to long to reden and to here" (F 570-72). As he strives to concisely redact their biographies and render the Greco-Roman heroines collectable, he also renders their mythological mail collectable, introducing appropriately miniaturized Ovidian epistles at crucial, emotionally charged points in their respective narratives. In addition to a passing citation of *Heroides* 10 in Ariadne's story, the *Legend of Good Women's* Phyllis, Medea, Dido, and Hypsipyle are all depicted in the act of composing and sending their Ovidian letters, that is, *Heroides* 2, 6, 7, and 12. In each instance, the narrated writing act intersects with the physicality of the Ovidian letters; Chaucer's text provides us with a contextualizing description of each document's composition as well as a brief synopsis of the Ovidian epistle's content.[3]

[3] At approximately fifty lines, Phyllis' letter, praised by Chaucer for its use of rhetoric, is significantly longer than the others.

Such treatment of Ovid's *Heroides* as source texts with palpable narrative presences is not limited to Chaucer. Indeed, in Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, the putative authors of the *Heroides* are analogously deemed to be the sources of tangible, historical documents, and the complaints of a number of mythological heroines are likewise posited as written, circulating texts. *Heroides* 1, 2, 7, and 11 are redacted and worked into Gower's narratives about Penelope, Phyllis, Dido, and Canace, and Gower digressively adapts *Heroides* 13, the epistle of the "lusti wif" of "The worthi king Protheselai" (4.1906, 1901), in the midst of a story about Ulysses. And it is to Laodamia's epistle in *Confessio Amantis* that I turn for a representative example of the cameo appearances that the *Heroides* often make in Middle English literature.

After Laodamia of the *Confessio Amantis* resolves to write "A lettre, for to make [Protesilaus] duelle | Fro Troie" (4.1909-10), the audience is given a brief glimpse of the letter and its contents. We learn that the document contains:

> Hou sche hath axed of the wyse,
> Touchende of him in such a wise,
> That thei have don hire understonde,
> Towardes othre hou so it stonde,
> The destiné it hath so schape
> That he schal noght the deth ascape
> In cas that he arryve at Troie.
> Forthi as to hir worldes joie
> With al hire herte sche him preide,
> And many another cause alleide,
> That he with hire at home abide.
>
> (4.1911-21)

Laodamia's embedded epistle is patently meant to represent the corresponding document in the *Heroides*, in which the same heroine, encouraging her husband to return safely to her, begs "*si tibi cura mei, sit tibi cura tui*!" [if thou carest ought for me, then care thou for thyself!] (166). Translating the sentiment of "*bella gerant alii; Protesialus amet!*" [Let others go to the wars; let Protesilaus love!] (84), Gower's Laodamia, in her desire that her spouse 'with hire at home abide,' replicates her Ovidian counterpart's resounding plea: "*vestras quisque redite domos!*" [Return ye all to your abodes!] (130). Furthermore, the heroine's evocation of 'destiné' and her ominous warning that Protesilaus 'schal noght the deth ascape | In cas that he arryve at Troie'

directly parallels the Latin warning that "*Sors quoque nescio quem fato designat iniquo,* | *qui primus Danaum Troada tangat humum*" [There is a prophesy, too, that marks someone for an unjust doom—the first of the Danaäns to touch the soil of Troy] (93-94). From these resemblances, we sense that Gower's Laodamia is not merely, *like* Ovid's Laodamia, a letter-writing character. Rather, as his description of the letter and its contents confirms, Gower's Laodamia is in the process of writing and sending *Heroides* 13.

EPISTOLARITY AND MATERIAL FICTIONS

In the *Ars Amatoria*, Ovid claims to have invented the elegiacally infused heroical epistle: "*Ignotum hoc aliis ille novavit opus*" [he first invented this art, unknown to others] (3.346). These amatory fictions explore themes of subjectivity, anguish, and loss, and, casting literary heroines as tragic authors, they convert the ardent speech of characters into putative epistolary exchange. Sara H. Lindheim summarizes:

> A physical separation from the beloved plagues each heroine in the *Heroides*, driving her to take up pen and paper. She has been abandoned, left behind alone on a deserted island or at home while her beloved has gone off to war, or has undertaken labors, perhaps a heroic quest, or has, quite simply, grown tired of her. An enemy has stolen her away from her beloved who has refused, or has been unable, to achieve her speedy return. Her lover spurns her for someone or something (chastity, a homecoming) else. The absence of the man she loves, the absence that is the prerequisite for any letter, propels her composition.[4]

This new Ovidian genre, with its experiments in perspective, impersonation, linguistic performance, and gender transposition, was dependent upon genres of epic, mythography, and tragedy—genres that it sought to defamiliarize, however. The success of this novel artistic venture required, for dramatic effect, the audience's recognition of key literary moments from prior literature. When Penelope's epistle to her husband discloses that, for each stranger who visits, "*quamque tibi reddat, si te modo viderit usquam,* | *traditur huic digitis charta notata meis*" [into his hand is given the sheet writ by these fingers of mine, to render up should he but see you anywhere] (1.61-62), our knowledge of the *Odyssey's* timeline results in a privileged awareness

[4] *Mail and Female: Epistolary Narrative and Desire in Ovid's* Heroides (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003), 30.

that the next apparent stranger to arrive in Ithaca will be Ulysses himself.[5] And when Medea closes her letter with the ominous admission "*nescio quid certe mens mea maius agit*" [something portentous, surely, is working in my soul] (12.212), we realize that she is "just about to embark upon the actions that constitute the tragic plot of *Medea*," referring "not only to...the Euripidean tragedy upon whose plot she is soon to embark, but also to Ovid's own, lost *Medea* tragedy."[6] Ovid thus creates a dynamic in the *Heroides* whereby each epistle is positioned in relation to a particular moment in literary history.

Howard Jacobson has written of Ovid's *Heroides* that there is a sense in which its constituent letters are "static"—that their epistolary form "crystallizes a whole complex series of dramatic events into one critical moment."[7] This situation is largely reversed in the works of medieval English interpreters, where Ovid's letters have become so much a part of the accepted literary landscape that they are inserted, at their recognizable moments of composition, into larger narratives. Fictionalized and historicized, the *Heroides'* individual epistles are integrated into the fabric of Greco-Romanic mythology as specific documents written at determinate points within a broader mythological landscape and timeline. Resultantly, Middle English adapters of Ovid's *Heroides* often provide the letters with bibliofictional narrative scaffolding that relates the circumstances of the letters' composition.

These manifestations of Ovidian heroines' epistles in vernacular narratives are a mere elaboration upon something already present in the collected letters of Ovid's *Heroides*, where each epistle's function as material signifier is established through continual emphasis on the missive's *writtenness* and status as part of a functional correspondence between two

---

[5] For a discussion of how intertexts are ironically prefigured in the letters of the *Heroides* (with particular reference to Penelope's letter), see Duncan F. Kennedy, "The Epistolary Mode and the First of Ovid's *Heroides*," *Classical Quarterly* 34 (1984): 413-22. Similar issues of the epistles' ironic anticipation of outcomes established in prior literature are also treated in Sergio Casali, "Tragic Irony in Ovid, *Heroides* 9 and 11," *Classical Quarterly* 45 (1995): 505-11 and Smith, "Fantasy, Myth, and Love Letters."

[6] P.J. Heslin, *The Transvestite Achilles: Gender and Genre in Statius'* Achilleid (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 296.

[7] *Ovid's* Heroides (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), 338.

individuals.[8] Lydgate, for instance, incorporates a Gowerian-inspired version of the tale of "Canace the faire" (1.6833) in his *Fall of Princes* that sandwiches a one hundred and forty line rendition of her Ovidian document between nearly one hundred lines of contextualizing narrative. The epistle proper is most immediately introduced with descriptions of a distraught Canace preparing to compose her letter:

> she caste for to write
> A litil lettre to hir brother deere,
> A dedli compleynt compleyne & endite
> With pale face and a mortal cheere,
> The salt[e] teris from her eyen cleere,
> With pitous sobbyng, fet from hir hertis brynke,
> Distillyng doun to tempre with hir ynke.
> (1.6875-81)

Similarly, when the letters of Ovidian *epistolers* are inserted into Middle English narratives, often we are privy to accounts of fictive reception by their *lectors*, or mythological addressees.[9] To return to Gower's treatment of Laodamia's missive in *Confessio Amantis*, we learn that, upon receiving *Heroides* 13:

> [Protesilaus] hath cast hir lettre aside,
> As he which tho no maner hiede
> Tok of hire wommannysshe drede;
> And forth he goth, as noght ne were,
> To Troie, and was the ferste there

---

[8] While the discursive nature of the letters is seen most acutely in the Ovidian collection's final pairs of so-called double letters, the fiction that the missives are part of an ongoing epistolary exchange is frequently emphasized in the single letters as well. To this effect, we might consider *Heroides* 6.1-9, where a reproachful Hypsipyle opens her letter by reprimanding Jason for neglecting to write:

> *Litora Thessaliae reduci tetigisse carina*
> *diceris auratae vellere dives ovis.*
> *gratulor incolumi, quantum sinis; hoc tamen ipsum*
> *debueram scripto certior esse tuo.*
> *nam ne pacta tibi praeter mea regna redires,*
> *cum cuperes, ventos non habuisse potes;*
> *quamlibet adverso signatur epistula vento.*
> *Hypsipyle missa digna salute fui.*
> *Cur mihi fama prior quam littera nuntia venit?*
>
> You are said to have touched the shores of Thessaly with safe-returning keel, rich in the fleece of the golden ram. I speak you well for your safety—so far as you give me chance; yet of this very thing I should have been informed by message of your own. For the winds might have failed you, even though you longed to see me, and kept you from returning by way of the realms I pledged you; but a letter is written, howe'er adverse the wind. Hypsipyle deserved the sending of a greeting. Why was it rumour brought me tidings of you rather than lines from your hand?

[9] I adopt the terms *epistoler* and *lector* from William C. Dowling, who uses them to distinguish the nominal author and recipient in epistolary fiction: *The Epistolary Moment: The Poetics of the Eighteenth-Century Verse Epistle* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).

(4.1922-26)

Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate invest Ovidian epistles with an aura of assumed materiality and historicity as well as an exterior layer of narrative context. Though they masquerade as the documents contained in the *Heroides*, the very function of the heroines' epistles is modified in such embedded Middle English reproductions; the heroines of the Latin *Heroides* are responsible for providing more contextualizing information within the bodies of their own letters than are their Middle English counterparts. One might consider, for instance, the vast number of lines in *Heroides* 9 that Deianira devotes to recounting her husband's Labours (details that would have been known to Hercules, the addressee of and fictional recipient of her letter).[10] The late medieval character-authors are divested of this function as contextual narrators, no longer responsible for *telling* about the events that led up to their unfortunate circumstances. There is an important reversal at work: rather than the letters serving as a framework within which the "temporal panorama of a whole myth" is obliquely related, they are neatly inserted into that 'temporal panorama' as physical documents.[11]

In reinterpreting the *Heroides* within bibliofictional frames, authors of Middle English narratives use fictions of materiality, as Ovid does, to "thematize the question of authenticity."[12] These postclassical authors borrow upon the complex latticework of associations that had been so carefully constructed in Ovid's epistles, associations that linked first-person female ventrilocution and the rhetorical construction of persuasive characters with the authenticating, yet eidetic, materiality of quasi-physical documents. When Lydgate describes the composition of Canace's letter, his narrative frame builds upon "*Aeolidos fratri scribentis imago*" [the picture of Aeolus' daughter writing to her brother] (11.5), or the epistolary self-portrait found within the *Heroides*, when the heroine broodingly apprises Macareus:

> *Siqua tamen caecis errabunt scripta lituris*
> *oblitus a dominae caede libellus erit.*

[10] The fiction that Deianira intends to send her finished missive to Hercules is, of course, further complicated by the fact that she hears rumours of the *lector's* death even as she composes the epistle.
[11] Jacobson, 338.
[12] Farrell, 323.

dextra tenet calamum, strictum tenet altera ferrum,
et iacet in gremio charta soluta meo.
(11.1-4)

> If aught of what I write is yet blotted deep and escapes your eye, 'twill be because the little roll has been stained by its mistress' blood. My right hand holds the pen, a drawn blade the other holds, and the paper lies unrolled in my lap.

The 'salte teris' of Lydgate's Canace, which evocatively 'tempre with hir ynke,' are similarly reminiscent of the many weeping narrators of the *Heroides,* who, as Penelope reminds us, write on *charta.* We might think of Briseis' references to the stains her tears have made on the imaginary paper:

Quam legis, a rapta Briseide littera venit,
vix bene barbarica Graeca notata manu.
quascumque adspicies, lacrimae fecere lituras;
sed tamen et lacrimae pondera vocis habent
(3.1-4)

> From stolen Briseis is the writing you read, scarce charactered in Greek by her barbarian hand. Whatever blots you shall see, her tears have made; but tears, too, have none the less the weight of words.

Briseis, like Canace, not only suggests that her text will be tangibly blotched, but she further endorses the narrative fantasy of her written letter by alluding to her own Latin-as-a-second-language status, a linguistic limitation that she assumes a perusal of her physical epistle would disclose to its *lector*.

Closely related to the scribal fictions that characterize the *Heroides* is the suggested corporeality of Ovid's maudlin heroines. Hypermnestra, who opens her letter with the information that she is "*gravibusque coercita vinclis*" [bound with heavy chains] (14.3), must physically cease writing when the weight of those oppressive restraints tires her arm. Representative of the "oscillation of credulity and disillusionment, of presence and absence" identified as an "Ovidian hallmark" by Hardie, the narrative fantasy of the heroines' palpable and ephemeral epistles becomes inextricably bound up with the larger narrative fantasy that "'the marks on the tablet or papyrus are indexes of the physical motions of the writer's body"

and that the *epistolers* possess a personal materiality and mortality.[13] Put another way, through frequent references to the mechanics of writing, Ovid's poems foster the illusion that they are physical epistles created by the physical bodies of literary characters.

Since the classical era, the interplay between physical absence and bodily presence has been understood as a fundamental feature of epistolary discourse. To this effect, in *Ad Familiares*, Cicero suggests: "*cuius causa inventa res ipsa est, ut certiores faceremus absentis, si quid esset quod eos scire aut nostra aut ipsorum interesset*" [the purpose in fact for which letter-writing was invented, is to inform the absent of what it is desirable for them to know, whether in our interest or their own].[14] As Ovid's amatory poetry makes clear, the relationship between fictive bodies and written words is closely related to this capacity of dispatched text 'to inform the absent.' While the letter comes into existence through absence, or a separation of a letter's sender and recipient that necessitates written communication, epistolary exchange also has the capacity to mitigate this absence by creating an illusion of presence for both author and addressee as each imagines the presence of his counterpart. Thus, in the *Remedia Amoris* Ovid recommends that a former mistress' letters be burned as a way of purging her presence from one's life:

> *Scripta cave relegas blandae servata puellae:*
> *Constantes animos scripta relecta movent.*
> *Omnia pone feros (pones invitus) in ignes,*
> *Et dic 'ardoris sit rogus iste mei.'*
> *Thestias absentem succendit stipite natum:*
> *Tu timide flammae perfida verba dabis?*
> *Si potes, et ceras remove: quid imagine muta*
> *Carperis? hoc periit Laodamia modo.*
>
> (717-24)

> Beware of reading again the treasured letters of an alluring mistress; letters read over again move even constant minds. Consign them all, though unwillingly, to the fierce flames, and say, 'Let that be my passion's funeral pyre.' Thestias burnt in the brand her absent son: will you be cowardly in burning treacherous words? If you can, get rid of her pictures also: why does a mute image affect you? In this way Laodamia perished.

---

[13] Hardie, *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*, 22, 108-9

[14] *Epistulae Ad Familiares*, vol. 1, ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 2.4.1. English translation adopted from *Letters to Friends*, vol. 1, trans. D.R. Shackleton Bailey (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).

Hardie remarks that, in this passage, the epistles of a mistress "have a magical power to conjure up her person, and must be destroyed as ruthlessly as Althaea burned the talismanic log coeval with the life of her son Meleager."[15] The absent spoken voice reemerges in a new scribal form in epistolary discourse, where writing shares in image's capacity to recapture the appearance and character of its sender.[16]

Associations between textual composition, credible fictions, and physical embodiment are developed throughout Ovid's *oeuvre*. An intentional blurring of elegiac *puella* and poetic *materia* is dramatized, for example, in the poet-lover's demand to his mistress: "*te mihi materiem felicem in carmina praebe*" [give me yourself as happy matter for my songs] (*Am.* 1.3.19).[17] I would point to *Amores* 3.12 as a salient example of the way in which a rhetorically constructed character—the fictitious, yet viable, *scripta puella*—takes on a life of her own through textual circulation. In this poem, Ovid playfully queries: "*Fallimur, an nostris innotuit illa libellis? | sic erit—ingenio prostitit illa meo*" [Am I mistaken, or is it my books of verse have made her known? So it will prove—'tis my genius has made her common] (7-8). "The situation that the narrator describes here," as Fear notes, "appears as the negative consequence of his professed ability to confer *fama* on the elegiac *puella* through his literary discourse."[18] Admitting "*vendibilis culpa facta puella mea est*" [through my fault she I love has become a thing of sale] (10), the poet-cum-*leno* elaborates: "*ianua per nostras est adaperta manus*" [by my hand has her door been opened] (11-12).

---

[15] Hardie, *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion,* 14.

[16] In the *Tristia,* Ovid takes this idea that texts embody and reflect the forms of their authors so far as to suggest that, compared even to a visual likeness, "*carmina maior imago | sunt*" [verses are a more striking portrait] (1.6.11-12) of their maker. A similar assumption of letters' capacity to conjure bodily presence underlies the epistolary exchanges of *Troilus and Criseyde's* Book 5, where, after Criseyde's departure, we hear of her pining lover (470-75):

> The lettres ek that she of olde tyme
> Hadde hym ysent, he wolde allone rede
> An hondred sithe atwixen noon and prime,
> Refiguryng hire shap, hire wommanhede,
> Withinne his herte

[17] As Keith has argued, two poems later, in *Amores* 1.5, "employing the diction of Latin literary criticism to characterize Corinna's *corpus*, Ovid implicitly conflates the physique of his elegiac girl friend and the poetics espoused in his elegiac collection.": "*Corpus Eroticum*," 31.

[18] Fear, 231.

Imagination, as Ovid recognizes, is powerful in its capacity to evoke palpable fictions. As he outlines in the *Remedia Amoris,* if the proper precautions are not taken to limit its capacities, "*dominaeque relictae* | *Ante oculos facies stabit, ut ipsa, tuos*" [the shape of your deserted mistress will stand, as if herself, before your eyes] (583-84). In *Amores* 3.12, the Ovidian narrator, having acted as Corinna's pimp, discovers that he has brought a rhetorical phenomenon to life in the imaginations of readers. What is more, he has advertised her putative *facies* and charms through his own writing. It is thus that *Amores* 3.12 "literalizes the trope that figures the publication of poetry about an elegiac mistress as the mistress' sexual circulation," as Ovid "invites interpretation in metaliterary terms, as a meditation on the circulation of 'Corinna' among the Roman reading public."[19] Ovid unmasks the artifice that lies behind his self-referential textuality by showing how books seemingly give body to abstract forms and illusory voices.

The letters of the *Heroides* share in but complicate the body/voice/text dynamics set out in Ovid's elegies, and they similarly reflect the poet's interest in the ontological status of viable characters. Whereas, in *Amores* 3.12, Ovid engages with the fiction that, through the power of his *own* art, the "elegiac *puella*...has stepped out of the pages….to become a real person, really 'there,' the common property of all and sundry, to be 'had, possessed' in the flesh," in the *Heroides*, Ovid extends this fiction by suggesting that *scriptae puellae* become orporeal through their *own* writing. "*Scripta puella scriptor*" in the words of Ellen O'Gorman.[20] Characterized by a narrative strategy that Elizabeth D. Harvey calls "transvestite ventriloquism," the *Heroides'* are ghostwritten, as Ovid, deferring his own poetic authority through ventrilocution, makes authorial agency oblique.[21] Inscribed references to the

---

[19] Alison Keith, "Sexuality and Gender," in *A Companion to Ovid*, ed. Peter Knox (Oxford: Blackwell, 2009), 365. Ovid plays a number of related games with the identity of Corinna, even teasing: "*novi aliquam, quae se circumferat esse Corinnam.* | *ut fiat, quid non illa dedisse velit?*" [I know one who bruits it about she is Corinna. To have it so, what would she not have given?] (*Am.* 2.17.29-30).

[20] "Love and the Family: Augustus and the Ovidian Legacy," *Arethusa* 30.1 (1997): 115. The parallels between the *Heroides' epistolers* and the male authorial *personae* of love elegy have been widely remarked. See, for example Peter J. Davis,"Rewriting Euripedes: Ovid, *Heroides* 4," *Scholia* 4 (1995): 41-55.

[21] On 'transvestite ventriloquism,' see Harvey, 1-14.

mechanics of the epistles' composition speak to the fictive scribal acts and putative authorial bodies of the mythological heroines alone. The *epistolers'* rhetoric of authentic presence is underscored by the patently autobiographical forms and confessional modes in which they write.[22] Correspondingly, the letters' audiences are encouraged to view the 'real' world and storyworld as a continuum wherein the boundaries between material fact and material fiction are blurred and permeable. The characters' physical and intellectual substance is allegedly transferred to and subsumed by the page in a way that deliberately conflates the *epistolers* with the documents they pen. Their dispatches—presented as texts produced in a perfect synchronicity of each character's mind, tongue, and hand—are rhetorically authenticated through the traces left upon them by the bleeding, crying, and writing bodies of the heroines. In turn, these smudged and stained letters serve to authenticate the fiction of the heroines' corporeality and authorial agency. The body of each heroine's circulating letter is thus posited as a simulacrum for both the voice it purportedly carries and the human form that is credited with its inscription.

Naturally, there are logical and logistical limits to the bibliofictions of scribal materiality and bodily presence upon which the epistles of the *Heroides* are predicated. When, for example, the *epistolers* refer to the droplets of blood or attest to the copious tear-stains that adorn their pages, this technique of authentication is absurdly self-undermining, for such droplets and stains are *always* absent from the physical copies of the *Heroides* that we read. Moreover, the psychological realism and sense of immediacy rhetorically cultivated in the letters stands in sharp contrast to the conspicuously artificial, versified presentation of the heroines' individuated voices—individuated voices that are uniformly rendered in elegiac couplets. And, of course, the fact that we have access to these letters (whether or not we chose to believe the fiction that they had their genesis in a personal correspondence that has, by some happy accident, fallen into the public domain) means that we can never read them as completely

[22] Hardie, *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion,* 6.

private communicative acts. While their emotive content may mimic personal discourse, the epistles' status as critical responses to well-known literary events compromises our sense of their intended confidentiality. The credibility of the epistles as dialogue between characters is therefore undercut by our awareness that the missives are also in dialogue with other texts, a textual dialogue that functions both at the intratextual level of *oeuvre* and the intertextual level of canon.

Laurel Fulkerson's assessment is apt when she comments: "The mechanics of composition and transmission are clearly not meant to be closely examined: as is often pointed out, Ariadne would have had trouble finding a mailbox on the apparently deserted island of Naxos."[23] Nonetheless, it is also true that, as Lindheim notes, "the striking premise that each poem represents a letter composed by the heroine asks us, according to the conventions of the epistolary genre, to read the Ovidian collection, at least on one level, as the written products of women."[24] Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate—with their narrative assertions that the letters of the *Heroides* were composed, dispatched, and (presumably) intercepted by posterity—perpetuate the illusion that Ovid's poems are 'at least on one level…written products of women.' Engaging with the *Heroides'* paradoxical claims of palpability, intimacy, and presence, these later authors seek within their own fictional storyworlds to play upon, rather than remove from scrutiny, the abovementioned tricky 'mechanics of composition and transmission.'

'NON OTHER AUCTOUR ALEGGE I'

The verisimilitude of the *Heroides* as letters in Middle English adaptations is closely related to questions of authorship and authority. In medieval thought, as Christopher Collins describes it: "An unbroken chain of scribal copiers reached back to an originary moment when the text was either dictated by the author or directly inscribed by him with that literate talking

---

[23] *The Ovidian Heroine as Author: Reading, Writing, and Community in the* Heroides (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 9.
[24] Lindheim, 3. On the generic identity of the *Heroides* as letters, see also Efrossini Spentzou, *Readers and Writers in Ovid's* Heroides*: Transgressions of Genre and Gender* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 123-60.

stick, that uninterruptible scepter of writers, the pen. In this sense one literally 'read Herodotus' or 'read Ovid.'"[25] When taking up the *Heroides*, medieval audiences not only 'read Ovid,' however; they also 'read Oenone,' 'read Canace,' or 'read Laodamia.' As a testament to the efficacy of Ovid's complex corporeal fictions, medieval commentaries on the *Heroides* often distinguish between the views expressed by the nominal female writers of the epistles and those sentiments attributed to Ovid.[26] The overall effect of this symbiotic authorial doubling is not unlike the images of gender transposition and epistolary palimpsest described by Ovid in the *Ars Amatoria*, where the *praeceptor amoris* advises his female readers:

> *Nec nisi deletis tutum rescribere ceris,*
> *ne teneat geminas una tabella manus.*
> *femina dicatur scribenti semper amator:*
> *Illa sit in vestris, qui fuit ille, notis.*
>
> (3.495-98)
>
> Nor is it safe to write an answer unless the wax is quite smoothed over, lest one tablet hold two hands. Let your lover always be called a woman by the writer: in your messages let what is really 'he' be 'she.'

In essence, for Chaucer, Gower, Lydgate, and their contemporaries, the Latin letters of the *Heroides* contained at least 'two hands': *ille* and *illa.*

In the *Heroides*, as in all "literary" letters, "interpretation is complicated…by the dual structure of exchange, whereby a real writer addresses a real reader in the guise of a nominal writer…addressing a nominal reader."[27] The opaque divisions between Ovid as author—perhaps even as compiler—and the classical heroines as writers of the epistles are incorporated into later literary renditions of Ovid's *Heroides.* For example, in Chaucer's "Legend of Hypsipile

---

[25] *Authority Figures: Metaphors of Mastery from the* Iliad *to the Apocalypse* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1996), 149-50. On a related note, Summit observes: "if tradition idealizes textual transmission as a continuous line of influence across time, letters recall the palpably fragile forms in which texts travel, as marks of ink on paper or parchment": *Lost Property*, 52.

[26] Medieval commentators habitually prefixed and prefaced works with short introductory notes, known as *accessus ad auctores,* which often took the form of brief biographies of the author, moralized interpretations, or plot summaries. For a general overview of this tradition see Edwin A. Quain, "The Medieval *accessus ad auctores*," *Traditio* 3 (1945): 215-64. For transcriptions of relevant texts, see Fausto Ghisalberti, "Mediaeval Biographies of Ovid," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 9 (1946): 10-59 and Alison G. Elliott "Accessus ad Auctores: Twelfth-Century Introductions to Ovid," *Allegorica* 5.1 (1980): 6-48. Ralph J. Hexter has shown how the commentary tradition and the *accessus ad auctores* provided interpretative frameworks for Ovid's *Heroides* and supplied medieval readers with the mythological context of the epistles: *Ovid and Medieval Schooling: Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's* Ars Amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, *and* Epistulae Heroidum (München: Arbeo-Gesellschaft, 1986), 137-204.

[27] Karina Williamson, "Voice, Gender, and the Augustan Verse Epistle," in *Presenting Gender: Changing Sex in Early-Modern Culture*, ed. Chris Mounsey (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2001), 80.

and Medea," he introduces the content of Medea's letter by seemingly attributing authorship to the infamous enchantress herself: "therfore in hire letter thus [Medea] seyde" (1670). However, this is immediately complicated by the assertion that he has not transcribed it in full, for "Wel can *Ovyde* hire letter in vers endyte, | Which were as now to long for me to wryte" (1678-9).[28] Chaucer credits Ovid with versifying 'hire' letter, thereby associating the genesis and identity of a single epistle with three separate writers: the historical 'Ovyde,' the mythological character-author Medea, and the 'me' of his own poetic *persona*.

Perhaps the clearest late medieval example of the *Heroides'* fictionalized materiality and resultant prism-like attributions of authority is found in Book 1 of Chaucer's *House of Fame*, which I will investigate in some depth. This work begins with a brief and general discussion of dreams and dreaming and quickly narrows its focus with a detailed description of one particular dream. Chaucer's narrative *persona* recounts: "as I slepte, me mette I was | Withyn a temple ymad of glas" (119-20). Upon entering this sanctuary, which he promptly recognizes as Venus', Chaucer's narrator gravitates towards what he considers to be its principal treasure, "a table of bras" (142), upon which he finds inscribed the opening lines of the *Aeneid*:

> I wol now synge, yif I kan,
> The armes, and also the man
> That first cam, thurgh his destinee,
> Fugityf of Troy contree,
> In Itayle, with ful moche pyne
> Unto the strondes of Lavyne.
>
> (143-8)

The remainder of Book 1 is occupied by what initially purports to be a paraphrase of Vergil's epic; this Trojan narrative demonstrates Chaucer's sense of literature as physically and metaphorically permeable. To borrow the words of Marilynn Desmond, as "a reader, a translator, a critic and a producer of texts," Chaucer "intrusively comments upon the

[28] Emphasis my own. Chaucer frequently insists that the entire epistles would be too long to include. For example, of Dido's letter he says "But who wol al this letter have in mynde, | Rede Ovyde, and in hym he shal it fynde" (1366-67), and he asks "What shulde [he] more telle" of Ariadne's "compleynynge" since "In hire Epistel Naso telleth al" (2218-20).

relationship between the text he produces and the one he imitates."[29] Although he clearly begins by recounting Vergilian words—the immediately recognizable "*Arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris* | *Italiam fato profugus Laviniaque venit* | *litora*" (1.1-3)—his ensuing account takes on a decidedly pictorial quality, demonstrating how text, when read, dissolves into imaginative image—image that can, in turn, be verbally transformed into new text. Words are not inviolate but relative and manipulable; they can be filtered through the reader's imagination and creatively shaped to novel ends, and Chaucer's narrator repeatedly emphasizes his role as the *scribal* interpreter of an increasingly *visual* Vergilian narrative that he "saugh" (127, 132, 151, 162, 174, 193, 198, 209, 212, 219, 221, 253).[30]

Although Chaucer's narrator insists twice that he will tell the story "shortly" (239, 242), he devotes more attention to describing Dido and her lovelorn plight than any other incident amongst the graven images of the *Aeneid*. Like Chaucer's Criseyde, as discussed in the previous chapter, Chaucer's Dido is imbued with a literary-corporeal presence, and she is similarly represented as a metatextually self-conscious character. A victim of "wikke Fame" (350), Dido is aware that she is gossiped about, or as she puts it "juged" by "peple prively" (357, 360), and she bemoans that her "actes" are "red and songe | Over al thys lond, on every tonge" (348-49).

Dido's lamenting body in the *House of Fame*, emerging, as it does, from the text and images that Chaucer's narrator 'saugh' in Venus' temple, gestures towards the fictions of scribal

---

[29] *Reading Dido: Gender, Textuality, and the Medieval* Aeneid (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 62.

[30] Chaucer's main inspiration in Book 1 of the *House of Fame* is Vergil's description of Aeneas at the temple doors in Carthage (1.446-97), a scene that Chaucer also adapted in the *Legend of Good Women* (1023-26):

> And whan this Eneas and Achates
> Hadden in this temple ben overal,
> Thanne founde they, depeynted on a wal,
> How Troye and al the lond destroyed was.

In the *House of Fame*, both the circumstances and content of the Vergilian ekphrasis are even more drastically altered than they are in the above quotation. What was Juno's temple in the *Aeneid* becomes Venus' temple in Chaucer's conception. Moreover, whereas Aeneas discovers only a description of the Trojan War on the doors at Carthage, Chaucer finds events that cover the entire time span of the *Aeneid* pictured in Venus' temple. This presentation of Dido as a significant pictorial component of the ekphrasis literalizes a connection at which Vergil only hints by making the body and text of Dido the artistic focal points of the glass temple. In the relevant *ekphrasis* in Vergil's *Aeneid* 1, Dido herself seems to become a work of art which Aeneas beholds just after seeing the magnificent doors; he is similarly moved by the beauty of the temple and queen.

materiality and bodily presence characteristic of the *Heroides*. Demonstrating an Ovidian awareness that written words can bear metonymic, corporeal connections with the poetic *materia* that they signify, Chaucer's text provides us with a distinct sense of Dido's bodily as well as textual corporeality. Indeed, just before her reported, first-person complaint commences, the heroine begins "to wringe hir hondes two" (299). The Ovidian conflation of female and literary *corpora* evinced so clearly in the *Heroides* was conducive to late medieval conceptions of the book that, in the words of Douglas Bruster, "tended to collapse the...distance between bodies and texts."[31] Michael Camille reminds us that such metaphorical associations were only solidified by the material circumstances of literary production and consumption:

> Books were...produced *from* bodies, first of all in the parchment pages, which were the stretched and treated skins of animals. Inks and colors were often produced with human spittle and urine, according to contemporary recipes. Moreover, the manuscript is the product of the hands and body of human labor that have registered every pressure and point of contact upon the flesh itself.
>
> The medieval book was activated constantly…by the speaking, sucking mouth, the gesturing, probing hand, and the opening, closing body. Reading a text was a charged somatic experience in which every turn of the page was sensational, from the feel of the flesh and hair side of the parchment on one's fingertips to the lubricious labial mouthing of the written words with one's tongue.[32]

In conjunction with Chaucer's Dido, it is worth further noting that in medieval literature—as in Ovid's own thought—this confusion of bodies and books was "highly gendered, the flesh, and thus the page itself, being associated with the female."[33]

Even as Dido's textualized, hand-wringing body establishes a fictive physical presence in the *House of Fame*, her virtuoso linguistic performance correspondingly begins to dominate the narrative. After Dido's first person speech commences, it becomes increasingly clear that, though Chaucer started by quoting Vergilian text, he is not presenting a mere redaction of the

---

[31] "The Structural Transformation of Print," in *Print, Manuscript, Performance*, 50.
[32] "Sensations of the Page: Imaging Technologies and Medieval Illuminated Manuscripts," in *The Iconic Page in Manuscript, Print, and Digital Culture*, eds. George Bornstein and Theresa Tinkle (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998), 42, 38.
[33] Camille, 41.

Aeneid.[34] What we find in the *House of Fame*, then, is a depiction of the events of the *Aeneid* and its events that is conspicuously coloured by the narrator's own mediating viewpoint as masked by Dido's homodigetic narration. Thus, Dido is a woman who gives her lover "Hyr lyf, hir love, hir lust" (258), while Aeneas is "to hir a traytour" who "betrayed hir" and "lefte hir ful unkyndely" (267, 294-5). Whereas the Vergilian Dido and her city are the personal and political impediments to the realization of Rome's inexorable destiny, Chaucer collapses the imbroglios of Vergil's narrative into a simpler recipe: insincere lover leaves woman, and abandoned heroine laments how she has been wronged. While Aeneas is emblematic of the "fals," "privy," and "double" lover, Dido's only apparent faults are that she trusted his dissembling appearance and "loved al to sone a gest" (285, 288). The epic heroism of Vergil's *pius* Aeneas is thereby undercut in the *House of Fame*, which focuses instead upon the figure of the wronged woman and her elegiac complaint.

Cries of *me miseram!* sound like a sorrowful refrain throughout the *Heroides,* where the majority of Ovid's letter-writing heroines—as exemplified by Dido with her query "*quod crimen dicis praeter amasse meum?*" [What can you charge me with but love?] (7.164)—render themselves faultless.[35] It is often remarked that Chaucer's depictions of the *infelix* Dido in the *House of Fame* take on something of an Ovidian air—"a consequence of the fact," as observed by Desmond, "that Ovid's *Heroides* 7 insinuates itself so intricately into the Virgilian pre-text that it complicates the attempt to assign responsibility for any one medieval representation of Dido to either classical poet."[36] The ekphrasis in the *House of Fame* points to its double source by showing how Dido's Ovidian voice has permeated her Vergilian narrative in its later reception. Chaucer's vacillation between Vergilian narrative framework and Ovidian characterization is

---

[34] To this effect, we might consider Chaucer's self-conscious choice of words when he translates '*arma virumque cano*' as 'I wol now synge, yif I kan | The armes, and also the man.' Chaucer's addition of the word *now* emphasizes his temporal position as Vergil's successor, a writer tentatively offering—and here note his use of 'yif'—a novel vernacular reinterpretation of revered and authoritative Latin lines.
[35] In additions to Oenone's aforementioned '*me miseram*' (5.149), Helen and Dido also exclaim "*me miseram!*" (17.182, 7.98); from Briseis we hear "*o miseram*" (3.61) and "*respice sollicitam Briseida, fortis Achille,* | *nec miseram lenta ferreus ure mora!*" [have regard for anxious Briseis, brave Achilles, and do not hard-heartedly torment a wretched maid with long drawn out delay!] (3.137); and Hero routinely punctuates her letter with periodic outbursts of "*me miseram!*" (19.65, 121, 187).
[36] Desmond, *Reading Dido*, 46.

made explicit at the end of her lament, where he simultaneously refers his readers back to both sources:

> And al the maner how she deyde,
> And alle the wordes that she seyde,
> Whoso to knowe hit hath purpos,
> Rede Virgile in Eneydos
> Or the Epistle of Ovyde,
> What that she wrot or that she dyde[37]
>
> (375-80)

What has been less often observed, however, is that Chaucer also posits a third source text for his own text at the moment where his narrative shifts its focalization to Dido:

> In suche wordes gan to pleyne
> Dydo of hir grete peyne,
> As me mette redely—
> Non other auctour alegge I.
>
> (311-314)

Like Jennifer Summit, I find it "significant that Chaucer, like Ovid, makes Dido a writer."[38] In particular, I am intrigued by the implications of the above assertion that Chaucer will 'alegge' no other authority for the 'wordes' of Dido's complaint, for there is a deliberate ambiguity built into these lines. On the one hand, Chaucer's wording suggests that he is citing no author but the Carthaginian *epistoler*—an entity whose voice transcends the particularities of individual texts, echoes throughout the literature of the past, and has an authority unto herself. Taken in this sense, we see a further development of the paradoxical claim of agency teased out at the end of her Ovidian letter. Just before impaling herself on Aeneas' sword, Dido, even going so far as to dictate the lines of her own epitaph, claims authorship of *Heroides* 7:

> *adspicias utinam, quae sit scribentis imago!*

---

[37] This general movement from Vergil to Ovid in the description of Venus' temple is characteristic of Chaucer. In "The Legend of Dido," we find a very similar pattern in miniature (924-9):

> Glorye and honour, Virgil Mantoan,
> Be to thy name! and I shal, as I can,
> Folwe thy lanterne, as thow gost byforn,
> How Eneas to Dido was forsworn.
> In thyn Eneyde and Naso wol I take
> The tenor, and the grete effectes make.

Again, Chaucer starts with Vergil, proclaiming his intention to follow the Mantuan poet's 'lantern' as best he can. However, he cites Ovid as a second source and admits to being reliant on the 'tenor' of *Heroides* 7 as well as *Aeneid* 4 in his own depiction.

[38] Summit, *Lost Property*, 24.

> *scribimus, et gremio Troicus ensis adest,*
> *perque genas lacrimae strictum labuntur in ensem,*
> *qui iam pro lacrimis sanguine tinctus erit.*
> .....
> *nec consumpta rogis inscribar Elissa Sychaei*
> *hoc tantum in tumuli marmore carmen erit:*
> *PRAEBUIT AENEAS ET CAUSAM MORTIS ET ENSEM;*
> *IPSA SUA DIDO CONCIDIT USA MANU.*
>
> (7.183-86, 193-96)
>
> Could you but see now the face of her who writes these words! I write, and the Trojan's blade is ready in my lap. Over my cheeks the tears roll, and fall upon drawn steel—which soon shall be stained with blood instead of tears....Nor when I have been consumed upon the pyre, shall my inscription read: ELISSA, WIFE OF SYCHAEUS; let this brief epitaph be read on the marble of my tomb: FROM AENEAS CAME THE CAUSE OF HER DEATH, AND FROM HIM THE BLADE; FROM THE HAND OF DIDO HERSELF CAME THE STROKE BY WHICH SHE FELL.

On the other hand, Chaucer's assertion 'Non other auctour alegge I' also represents a neat elision of Dido's voice with Vergil's, Ovid's, and even his own. In this palimpsest, we see something of Summit's observation that "Chaucer's representations of women writers bring to the foreground...problems of literary canon formation and vernacular writing."[39] Thelma S. Fenster and Daniel Lord Smail note that, "although *fama* as reputation appears to 'belong' to the person being spoken about, it is often presented as if it 'belongs' to the voices who make it—and in a very real way, of course, it does."[40] The authorship of Dido's lament thus belongs not only to the *illa* in whose voice it is presented, but also to several *illi*, or the poets who have fashioned and refashioned her text.

DIDO AS 'AUCTOUR' IN CAXTON AND PYNSON

The vernacular reception of Ovid's *Heroides* in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries shows signs of continuity with the earlier depictions of the heroines' epistles in the works of Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate. Many authors continued to treat the mythological dispatches as physical documents; the letters were often presented at their moments of composition and delivery within a broader narrative frame; the corporeality of the *epistolers* was frequently

[39] Summit, *Lost Property*, 26.
[40] Fenster and Smail, "Introduction," in *Fama*, 6.

elaborated; and blurry divisions of authorial attribution between Ovid and his inscribed cast of authors maintained currency. To elucidate how the concerns of Ovid's Middle English adapters manifested themselves in later literature, I turn to two renditions of *Heroides* 7, one embedded in the c. 1480 *Ovyde Hys Booke of Methamorphose* and one found in the 1526 edition of Chaucer's *Boke of Fame*. Though only one of these translations was definitively printed in the period, each was linked to an early English printer: William Caxton and Richard Pynson.

In the late seventeenth century, a professionally transcribed and illuminated English translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* was acquired by Samuel Pepys, who later bequeathed the manuscript to Magdalene College, Cambridge. The colophon of this fifteenth-century manuscript, which contains only *Metamorphoses* 10-15, tantalizingly reads: "Thus endeth Ouyde hys booke of Methamorphose, translated & fynysshed by me Willim Caxton at Westmestre the xxii day of Apryll. the yere of our lord m^{l}.iiii^{c}.iiii^{xx}. and the xx yere of the regne of kynge Edward the fourth."[41] In 1965, the first half of this same manuscript was miraculously unearthed, and, in 1968, the two parts were reunited. That Caxton translated *Ovyde Hys Booke of Methamorphose* has never been a matter of debate. However, as there is no extant printed edition of *Ovyde Hys Booke of Methamorphose* and no definitive proof that it ever was printed, *why* Caxton was motivated to translate this version of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* from an intermediary French source has been the subject of much speculation.[42]

---

[41] I cite from *Six Bookes of Metamorphoseos in whyche ben conteyned the Fables of Ovyde*, trans. William Caxton, ed. George Hibbert (London: Roxburghe Club, 1814). All further citations of Caxton's translation refer to this same source, which lacks pagination and line numbers.

[42] Caxton's translation bears a close relationship to a printed edition of the *Metamorphoses* which appeared in Bruges in 1484. This sumptuous edition, printed by Colard Mansion, was itself derived from earlier French moralized versions of the *Metamorphoses*. For a concise summary of Caxton and Mansion's relationship, see George D. Painter, *William Caxton: A Quincentenary Biography of England's First Printer* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1976), 72-81. The sole manuscript copy of the translation shows no evidence of having been used in Caxton's printing house. It is possible that Caxton did indeed prepare the manuscript as a presentation copy with the intention to print. That the edition was printed but has not survived is not entirely impossible; this may be suggested by the preface to his 1484 *Legenda Aurea*, in which Caxton claims that he has (*Caxton's Own Prose*, 89):

> parfourmed and accomplished dyvers werkys and hystoryes translated out of Frensshe into Englisshe at the requeste of certeyn lordes, ladyes and gentylman, as th'*Ystorye of the Recyel of Troye*, the *Book of the Chesse*, the *Hystorye ofJason*, the *Hystorye of the Myrrour of the World*, the xv bookes of *Metamorphoseos* in whiche been conteyned the fables of Ovyde, and the *Hystorye of Godefrey of Boloyn in the Conqueste of Jherusalem*, with other dyvers werkys and bookes

Of primary interest in this mysterious manuscript of *Ovyde Hys Booke of Methamorphose* is a section subtitled "How Eneas and his felawshipp arryued in Cartage, wher the quene Dydo receyued them right honourably, and after slewe herself for the loue of Eneas." Appearing in the midst of *Metamorphoses* 14, Caxton's ensuing account of Dido and Aeneas' love affair bears little resemblance to the pithy, seven line summary of *Aeneid* 4 found in Ovid's original text:

> *Hunc ubi Troianae remis avidamque Charybdin*
> *Evicere rates, cum iam prope litus adessent*
> *Ausonium, Libycas vento referuntur ad oras.*
> *excipit Aenean illic animoque domoque*
> *non bene discidium Phrygii latura mariti*
> *Sidonis; inque pyra sacri sub imagine facta*
> *Incubuit ferro deceptaque decipit omnes.*
>
> (14.75-81)
>
> When the Trojan vessels had successfully passed this monster [Scylla] and greedy Charybdis too, and when they had almost reached the Ausonian shore, the wind bore them to the Libyan coast. There the Sidonian queen [Dido] received Aeneas hospitably in heart and home, doomed ill to endure her Phrygian lord's departure. On a pyre, built under pretense of sacred rites, she fell upon his sword; and so, herself disappointed, she disappointed all.

Rather, what we find in Caxton's vernacular rendition of Ovid is a lengthy interpolation—complete with the reported speech of "Dydo, whyche ouermoche loued Eneas"—that bears more affinities with prior Middle English versions of the *Heroides* than it does with Ovid's Latin *Metamorphoses*.

Just as in Chaucer's, Gower's, and Lydgate's adaptations of Ovid's epistles, we find complaint embedded in a contextualizing narrative frame in Caxton's translation. "Dydo, quene of Carthage," as Caxton relates, "was joyouse in her herte whan she sawe them, and receyued them wel; and so moche loued Eneas, that wel she supposed to haue maryed hym, ffor she habandonned to hym her body...and al that she hade." Although "Eneas myghte haue had the rych crowne & moche londe...yf he hade dayned to haue her in maryage, & wold haue dwellid there," nevertheless, "he departed, wyth alle hys peple and araye...for to entre in to mortal peryllis of the londe & of the see." Upon Aeneas' departure, we learn: "Ther was neuer

---

All five works which Caxton mentions alongside 'the xv bookes of Metamorpheseos' were printed. Moreover, in this preface "Caxton lists his translations in what is apparently not their order of translating but of printing": Painter, 101.

spoken of woman more sorouful than she was," and "Dydo... moch complayned." At this point in the narrative, Caxton recounts, at length, the "wordes" of the Carthaginian queen's first-person "complaynyng and wayllyng" (which I will return to momentarily). Following this rendition of Dido's lament, Caxton's translation returns to the heterodiegetic narrator's frame by means of concluding the episode:

> Anne, her suster, was moch sorowful of the dystresse of Dydo...and gladly wolde haue reconforted her yf she hade myghte. But comfort auaylled her not; for Anne coude neuer kepe her so nygh but that she slew herself...and sterte into the fyre, and leyde her doun; wher anon she was brente. Thys hade Dydo for her loue. Grete sorowe demened Anne her suster....They of Cartage made grete sorowe & moch bewayled theyr quene, whiche was so moch sage, wyse & valyant, tofore that she was afowled w^{t} loue.

In *Ovyde Hys Booke of Methamorphose*, lamenting her desertion by the "false & untrew traytre" Aeneas, Dido delivers a lengthy complaint that—while it does not resemble anything in *Metamorphoses* 14—belies a curious admixture of classical origins. Certain details of her speech bear distinct resemblances to Dido's speeches in the *Aeneid*. For example, in Dido's assertion that she is "dyshonoured...poure & mocked," we perhaps hear an echo of the Vergilian "*extinctus pudor et... | fama prior*" [I have lost my honour and former fame] (4.322-23). Other details of her complaint, such as her disdainful remark "I can not belyue that euer [Aeneas] was sone of Venus, ffor he resembleth her nothyng," might have been derived either from Vergilian or Ovidian pretexts.[43] What I am most interested in, however, are four clear references to details that can be ultimately, if perhaps indirectly, traced back to *Heroides* 7.167-68, 83-84, 175-80, and 133-34:

1) yf he louyd me not so moche as to take me to hys wyf...I recche not whether I be lady or seruante
   si pudet uxoris, non nupta, sed hospita dicar
   If you shame to have me as your wife, let me not be called bride, but hostess

2) I am certayne that hys wyfe is dede by hys defaulte
   si quaeras, ubi sunt formosi mater Iuli— | occidit a duro sola relicta viro

[43] In the *Aeneid*, Dido spitefully tells Aeneas "*nec tibi diva parens*" [no goddess was your mother] (4.365). Ovid's Dido more subtly suggests that, as Aeneas has turned out to be unfaithful, his alleged parentage must be false: "*diva parens seniorque pater, pia sarcina nati, | spem mihi mansuri rite dedere viri*" [That his mother was divine and his aged father the burden of a loyal son gave hope he would remain my faithful husband] (7.107-08).

> Do you ask where the mother of pretty Iulus is?—she perished, left behind by her unfeeling lord
>
> 3) I pray to God that he may com agayne and remayne with me evermore. and, yf he wyl not, yet lete hym abyde but vii days, tyl that hys shyppe be repayred, and that the wyndes be stylle and the tormente passed
> *laniataque classis | postulat exiguas semirefecta moras; | ... tempora parva peto— | dum freta mitescunt et amor, dum tempore et usu | fortiter edisco trista posse pati*
> Your shattered fleet, but half refitted, calls for a short delay:...I ask for a little time—while the sea and my love grow calm, while through time and wont I learn the strength to endure my sorrows bravely
>
> 4) I shal not dye allone; ffor I am grete with chylde, which he hath engendered on me
> *Forsitan et gravidam Dido, scelerate, relinquas | parsque tui lateat corpore clausa meo*
> Perhaps, too, it is Dido soon to be mother, O evil-doer, whom you abandon now, and a part of you lies hidden in myself

John Kerrigan observes the characteristic "reversible relations between voice and script" in female complaint poetry as spoken laments draw from textual composition (and vice versa).[44] We see just such a reversal—no doubt the product of an uneasy relationship between vocal dramatization and textual documentation—at work in Caxton's literary cross-pollination of Ovidian texts. Dido's interpolated, spoken lament amounts to a recognizable oral version of *Heroides* 7, inserted and voiced at the appropriate narrative moment in *Metamorphoses* 14.

My second example, which illustrates more fully the material and bodily fictions that so often accompanied adaptations of the *Heroides*, was printed approximately fifty years after Caxton completed his translation. In 1526, Pynson printed a volume of eight Chaucerian and pseudo-Chaucerian poems entitled *Boke of Fame Made by Geffray Chaucer: With Dyuers Other of His Workes*. The edition included a short piece entitled "The Letter of Dydo to Eneas." This verse epistle of over two hundred lines, sandwiched between the prologue and envoy of an anonymous translator, is palpably a version of Dido's letter from Ovid's *Heroides*, complete with the recognizable conclusion:

> On the marble shall stande this scripture
> As an Epitaphe / vpon my sepulture
> Here lyeth Dido / to whom Enee vntrewe

[44] *Motives of Woe: Shakespeare and the 'Female Complaint'* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 4.

Gaue cause of deth / & y^{t} swerd y^{t} her slewe[45]

Like Caxton's version of *Heroides* 7, this adaptation similarly derived from a French intermediary source; as Julia Boffey has shown, the text of this letter was adapted from Octavien Saint-Gelais' fifteenth-century translation of the *Heroides*.[46] It is one of only three poems included in the volume that does not survive in an earlier printed edition. Moreover, unlike the majority of sixteenth-century Chaucerian apocrypha, it was not included in later editions of Chaucer's works, such as those edited by Thynne or Stow, and it has never been reprinted.

Much like the redacted Ovidian epistles of Chaucer, Gower, or Lydgate, this rendition of *Heroides* 7 is embedded in a narrative framework. The translator's prologue ends with a stanza of plot summary that, as Desmond observes, "illustrates the paradoxical situation evident in both the textual autonomy of *Heroides* 7 and its intertextual dependence on the [*Aeneid*] as context":[47]

> Frō Troy distroyed / full passed yeres seuyn
> Thus Eneas / arryued at Carthage
> And at the last / by influence of heuyn
> Mette with his folkes / tossed in y^{t} sees rage
> Uenus and Iuno /entended maryage
> Bitwene him & Dido / but this vntrue man
> Brake y^{t} pmyse / wherefore thus she began
>
> (F3^{v})

The prologue's Vergilian *précis* thus provides relevant background information; it alerts readers to the precise moment in the epic narrative that Dido 'began' the letter that Pynson's edition reproduces.

In her study of literary anthologies, Barbara M. Benedict suggests that, "while commodifying literature into usable and reusable elements," the printed anthology "allows both the traditional, intensive study of a few texts, and the new, comparative survey of many

---

[45] "The Letter of Dydo to Eneas," in *Boke of Fame Made by Geffray Chaucer: With Dyuers Other of His Workes* (STC 5088; London, 1526), F5^{r}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures for "The Letter of Dydo to Eneas" refer to this edition.
[46] "Richard Pynson's 'Book of Fame' and 'The Letter of Dido,'" *Viator* 19 (1988): 339-53. This edition is also discussed by A.S.G. Edwards, "Pynson's and Thynne's Editions of Chaucer's *House of Fame*," *Studies in Bibliography* 42 (1989): 185-86.
[47] Desmond, *Reading Dido*, 48.

that a burgeoning literary market would increasingly promote."[48] Pynson's printed Chaucerian anthology, allows for—and indeed encourages—just such a 'comparative survey,' for, in including "The Letter of Dydo to Eneas," the 1526 *Boke of Fame* fills in one of the blanks left by Chaucer's chronic use of *occupatio*. Boffey has commented that if this version of *Heroides* 7 "was translated especially for the volume, or whether it existed already in some form less closely or obviously tied to its Chaucerian inspiration, Pynson must have perceived a potential connection between it and the Chaucerian works he wished to print."[49] "The main body of the poem," as she further notes, "responds in a most precise way to Chaucer's injunctions to his readers" in the *House of Fame*, where he refers his audience to 'Rede Virgile in Eneydos | Or the Epistle of Ovyde' for more information about Dido.[50]

By effectually supplementing Chaucer's texts *about* Dido with a copy of 'her' letter, the *Boke of Fame* presents its readers with the opportunity to explore Ovid's *Heroides* 7 and its confluences. Indeed, a number of details within the "The Letter of Dydo to Eneas" confirm the document's connections with Chaucer's *House of Fame* and seem intended to prompt cross-referencing. As in Chaucer's work, *Fama* in "The Letter of Dydo to Eneas" has taken liberties with the reputation of the Carthaginian queen, who laments: "Wolde to god that fame & yll renowne | On my synne / were vtterly layde downe" (F5r). Positioning himself as "clerke" (or would-be clerk) to "lady Fame" (F3^{v}), the anonymous translator—in a likely reference to the Chaucerian trumpets of "Sklaundre" and "Clere Laud" (3.1580, 1575)—calls upon her to "Blowe up [her] trūpe of sclaūder & of shame" and correspondingly spoil Aeneas' reputation (F3^{v}).

In addition to encouraging the volume's audience to read Dido's letter as a document that corresponds to Chaucerian intertexts, the translator's prologue also encourages its audience to think about the letter as part of an Ovidian *oeuvre*. Like Ovid, the translator self-

---

[48] Barbara M. Benedict, *Making the Modern Reader: Cultural Mediation in Early Modern Literary Anthologies* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 35.
[49] Boffey, "Richard Pynson's 'Book of Fame,'" 342.
[50] Boffey, "Richard Pynson's 'Book of Fame,'" 342-43.

identifies as a poet-lover ("I haue loued very long | And haue no ioye"), and the prefatory interpretation of Dido and Aeneas' affair in his prologue—where he refers to his "rufull songe | Of poore Dydo / forsaken by great wronge | by false Ene" (F3^{v})—relies upon a counter-epic questioning of Aeneas' *fatum* that is similarly Ovidian in origin (though perhaps also filtered through Chaucer's two treatments of Dido's story).[51] In discussing his own inspiration for the piece, the translator locates Dido's letter as part of the Ovidian corpus by enumerating other Ovidian heroines (from the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* as well as the *Heroides*) as he considers potential 'muses':

> Shall I go to the well of Helycon
> To the muses /for to pray them of ayde
> Nay nay alas
> …….
> shulde I seke socour
> Of Niobe / of Myrra /or of Byblis
> Of Medea or Lucrece /the romayne flour
> None of thē all / may graūt me helpe in this
> (F3^{v})

Dismissing these other Ovidian heroines as potential muses, the translator then constructs a classically allusive joke by first rejecting the "helpe" of Venus—because "that goddes of loue" is too "parciall" to her son—before finally settling on "cruell Celeno" the harpy to aid him in his defamation of Aeneas (F3^{v}).[52]

In the visual presentation of the "The Letter of Dydo to Eneas," we sense the *Heroides'* characteristic tension between absence and presence being worked onto the page itself—

---

[51] It is hardly surprising that an epistle which thus advertises its Chaucerian and Ovidian connections also engages the Tudor *querelle des femmes* discussed in previous chapters. The central thematic interest of the piece is rhetorical duplicity; this includes a particular concern with masculine forms of verbal deception. The prologue denounces "dissēblaunce," proclaiming "playnnesse is the waye of parfyte trust" (F3^{v}). Filled with "furye" for the Trojan hero, the translator's preface condemns the behaviour of Aeneas, who "hast brought all true louers ī trouble | By [his] vntrouthe" (F3^{v}). These concerns with verbal duplicity are carried over into the letter, where the hero's manipulative use of "langage" and the effect that the "swete words of [his] pitous voice" had upon Dido are points of emphasis (F4^{v}, F5^{r}). Though Aeneas may have "semed kynde" initially, 'semed' is the operative word, for the hero has a hidden "defaut": he lacks that great Chaucerian virtue "pyte" (F5^{r}). In the envoy, the translator posits the story of Dido as an *exemplum* that teaches "good ladyes | whiche be of tender age" that "men be full of crafte" (F5^{r}).

[52] The Vergilian subtext to this joke relies upon Book 3 of the *Aeneid,* where Aeneas and his entourage encounter the Harpies; the foul bird-women repeatedly steal the feast which the Trojans attempt to set for themselves. During this encounter, Celaeno, the "*infelix vates*" [ill-boding-seer] (3.246) curses Aeneas and presents him with a seemingly terrifying prophesy.

perhaps most conspicuously in the form of the letter's accompanying woodcut.[53] Spatially positioned between and dividing the translator's prologue from the verse epistle, this woodcut features an unmistakable portrait of the mournful Carthaginian queen, with a sword dramatically poised in hand, standing next to a burning pyre. Before the letter even begins, the reader is thus prompted to visualize Dido, to imaginatively conjure the text's nominal author, and to participate in the twinned fictions of her agency and corporeality. Visually, the woodcut presents us with what the text of the epistle describes as: "The colde ymage / of [Aeneas'] disceyued wife | Heuy / thoughtfull / w^{t} heres pulde fro her hed | Spotted w^{t} blode / woūded / nat fully ded" (F4^{v}). It is as if Dido's subsequent textual command is preemptively actualized:

> I pray you / come regarde the ymage
> Of her that wrote to you this langage
> Alas I write / and to encrease my sorowe
> There stādeth y^{t} swerde / y^{t} shall kyll me to
> W^{t} my teres / this swerd is spotted (morowe
> Which in my brest / in hast shalbe blotted
> And all shalbe in stede of teres on y^{t} swerd
> Spotted with blode[])[54]
>
> (F5^{r})

It is striking that it is a *picture* of the tragic *epistoler* that prefaces the complaint rendered in 'her' words, for "woodcuts provide bodily habitations for first-person voices."[55] This resultant integration of the visual, aural, and textual in "The Letter of Dydo to Eneas" recalls the interplay between word, voice, and image in Book 1 of *The House of Fame*. "In woodcut illustrations," as Bruce R. Smith observes, as "in handwriting, and in print, early modern readers would…heave heard traces of sound where twenty-first-century students are likely to see only marks imprinted on paper."[56] The heroine's supposed voice and her physical presence

---

[53] This image is Hodnett, 1494.
[54] As these references to the *epistoler's* 'teres' and 'blode' would indicate, a corresponding emphasis upon the bodily existence of the woman 'that wrote to you this langage,' is felt throughout the epistle. Indeed, the textual corroborations of Dido's physical presence are developed to the extent that the *epistoler's* fictive corporeality transcends even her own mortality. "Whan I am deed / and brent to asshes colde," she warns Aeneas, "Than shall ye serch / & w^{t} yo^{r} hādʒ vnfolde | The pouder of my bones" (F5^{r}).
[55] Bruce R. Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 178.
[56] "Listening to the Wild Blue Yonder: The Challenges of Acoustic Ecology," in *Hearing Cultures: Essays on Sound, Listening, and Modernity*, ed. Veit Erlmann (New York: Berg, 2004), 32.

are thus deliberately invoked in "The Letter of Dydo to Eneas" as the image of Dido's body is literally impressed upon the same document in which we find her letter.

ANNA AS PROXY 'AUCTOUR'

Playful twists on the fictionalized materiality of Ovid's *Heroides* are evident in *The Wandring Prince of Troy*. This anonymous broadside ballad, first entered in the Stationers' Register in 1564-65, recounts how "*Eneas* wandring Prince of *Troy*" arrived at "mighty Carthage walls."[57] The opening lines of this piece, a ballad that Herschel C. Baker dubbed the "most popular of all the ballad redactions of classical material," follow the well-known Vergilian storyline.[58] "*Dido* Quéene, with sumptuous feast | Did entertaine this wandring Guest," and, "with words demure," Aeneas recounts "his unhappy ten yeares wars." Like her Vergilian prototype, the Carthaginian queen in *The Wandring Prince of Troy* suffers from love-induced insomnia; however, the subsequent description of the relationship between Aeneas and Dido departs markedly from the *Aeneid's* paradigm. The ambiguities of the couple's union are diminished, as the Carthaginian pines over Aeneas for a single, sleepless night. The very next morning, "tidings came to her anon, | That all the Troyan shipps were gone," and the "silly woman" resolves upon suicide.[59] Subsequently, her dying words become integrated into the ballad's lyrics:

> O wretched *Dido* Quéene (quoth she)
> I sée thy end approaching neere,
> For he is gone away from thée,
> Whom thou didst loue and held so deare:
> Is he then gone, and passed by,
> O heart prepare thy self to dye.
>
> Though reason would thou shouldst forbeare
> And stay thy hand from bloody stroak;

[57] Arber, 1.270. *The Wandring Prince of Troy* was frequently printed and exists in numerous variations. I here cite from STC 24293.5. As a persuasive testament to the ballad's success, it was popular enough to warrant a spin-off by 1568-69, when "a ballett intituled *the [v]vanderynge prynce moralyzed*" was entered (Arber, 1.176).
[58] "Classical Material in Broadside Ballads, 1550-1625," *PMLA* 54.4. (1939): 983.
[59] The reference to Dido as 'silly' in this ballad suggests that its author may have been thinking of her representation in Chaucerian sources; the adjective "sely" is used four times in conjunction with Dido in the *Legend of Good Women* (1157, 1237, 1254, 1336).

Yet fancy sayes thou shouldst not feare
  Whom fettereth thee in *Cupids* yoake:
Come death (quoth she) resolue my smart
And with these words she pierc'd her heart.

While the Dido of *The Wandring Prince of Troy* does not write *Heroides* 7 as an integral part of her narrative, neither is Ovid's epistle entirely forgotten. Instead, it is the queen's confidante—the grieving *Anna*—who, on the basis of their consanguinity, engages in epistolary exchange.[60] Operating as a proxy 'auctor,' in high dudgeon, she produces the "lines, full fraught with gall" of *Heroides* 7 on behalf of the deceased Carthaginian queen:

Then was *Eneas* in an Ile
  in Grecia, where he liv'd long space,
Whereas her Sister [Anna] in short while
  writ to him to his vile disgrace,
In phrase of Letters to her minde,
She told him plaine he was unkinde.

False hearted wretch (quoth shee) thou art,
  and traiterously thou hast betraid,
Unto thy lure a gentle heart,
  which unto thee such welcome made;
My sister deare, and Carthage ioy,
Whose folly bred her dire annoy.

Yet on her death-bed when she lay,
  she pray'd for thy prosperity,
Beséeching heauen, that euery day
  might bréed thy great felicity:
Thus by thy meanes I lost a friend,
Heauen send thee such vntimely end.[61]

It is impossible to underestimate the prevalence of broadside ballads in Tudor culture, and, in order to grasp the implications of the embedded version of *Heroides* 7 in *The Wandring Prince of Troy*, it is worth reflecting on the dissemination and consumption of broadside ballads in this era. Although the ballad—a poetic form with a Chaucerian pedigree that had attracted a number of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century poets, including Lydgate—predated print in England, the press facilitated the material spread of the genre. Their lyrics often accompanied

[60] In general, Anna seems to take on a greater role in the literature of the sixteenth century. In Christopher Marlowe's *Dido Queen of Carthage*, for example, there is an extensive subplot about Anna and Iarbas.
[61] Representations of epistles in ballad form were not uncommon in the era. "Set down in writing but pointed towards performance," Smith notes, "the ballad often becomes a 'bill' or 'letter'": *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England*, 178.

by woodcuts and indications of the familiar tunes to which they should be sung, broadside ballads were omnipresent in Tudor England.[62] To this effect, in 1586, William Webbe remarked there was "neither…anie tune or stroke which may be sung or plaide on instruments, which hath not some poetical ditties framed according to the numbers thereof."[63]

The subjects of Tudor ballads were wide and varied; lyric merchandise was calculated to attract "man or woman, of all sizes," as is the case of the songs sold by "pedlar at the door" in Shakespeare's *Winter's Tale* (4.4.191-92, 181-82). In an early seventeenth-century masque by Thomas Middleton and Thomas Rowley, a scholar gifted with a knack for "dog-eloquence," musing that he "could make Ballads for a need," is informed:

> thou shalt neuer want subiect to write of: One hangs himselfe to day, another drownes himselfe to morrow, a Serieant stabd next day, heere a Petti-fogger ath' Pillory, a Bawd in the Carts nose, and a Pander in the taile: *Hic Mulier, Hæc Vir*, Fashions, Fictions, Fellonies, Fooleries, a hundred hauens has the Ballad-monger to traffique at, and new ones still daily discouered.[64]

Although the news-ballads of the era have accrued the greatest notoriety, both in their own and later times, the classically themed broadsheet ballad was a substantial sub-genre unto itself. In addition to *The Wandring Prince of Troy*, several other Ovidian-inspired broadside ballads circulated in print during the later half of the sixteenth century. In 1568-69, John Allde registered "a ballett *the grevious complaint of* LUCRECE" and Richard Jones registered "a ballett intituled PYGMALYN"; in 1569-70, John Charlewood entered "a ballett intituled *the unfortunate end* of IPHIS *sonne unto* TEUCER *kynge of Troye*," Robert Heckforth registered "a ballett intitled *the*

---

[62] As broadsides were meant to be consumed, many broadsides have not survived. Noting that, in the later half of the sixteenth century, approximately 3,000 ballads were recorded, Tessa Watt speculates: "If we take 200 copies as the smallest run for which a printer would set up type, this would give an absolute minimum of 600,000 ballads circulating….If the runs were closer to 1,000 or 1,250, normal runs for a book in this period, the total number would reach between 3 and 4 million": *Cheap Print and Popular Piety 1550–1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 11.

[63] *A Discourse of English Poetrie*, 61. Despite, or perhaps because of, the genre's overwhelming popularity, ballads and their makers frequently came under attack by the *literati*. In the dedication to *Thee First Foure Bookes of Virgil his Aeneis* (STC 24806; Leiden, 1582), for example, Richard Stanyhurst writes (A4^{v}):

> Good God what a frye of such *wooden rythmours* dooth swarme in stacioners shops, who neauer enstructed in any grammar schoole, not atayning too thee paringes of thee Latin or Greeke tōgue, yeet lyke blynd bayards rush on...so they bee commended of thee ignorāt for learned. Thee reddyest way...too flap theese droanes from thee sweete senting hiues of *Poëtrye*, is for thee learned too applye theym selues wholye...too thee true making of verses in such wise as thee *Greekes* and *Latins*...haue doone; and too leaue too theese doltish coystrels theyre rude rythming and balducktoom ballads

[64] *A Courtly Masque: the Deuice Called the World Tost at Tennis* (STC 17909; London, 1620), B4^{v}.

mesyrable state of kynge MEDAS," and James Roberts entered two more Ovidian-sounding pieces: "*the Death of LUCRYSSIA*" and "a ballett intituled *no man could get ATALANTA by Runnyng*."[65]

The most common method of disseminating and selling ballads was undoubtedly by the employment of ballad-singers, men who could, like the peddler in *The Winter's Tale*, sing "tunes faster then you'll tell money," uttering them "as [they] had eaten ballads" (4.4.184-85). "Sold at markets or fairs, hawked in the streets of towns by peddlers," as Joy Wiltenburg describes, "these productions reached a far wider audience than more sedate volumes of sustained discourse."[66] Broadside ballads also had a physical presence that extended beyond their function as reading or singing material. Watt notes that "the most common form of printed decoration in humble households, according to contemporary accounts, was in fact the broadside ballad," and, as Marsh comments, these physically versatile printed sheets fulfilled a number of functions: "at the more basic end of the spectrum," ballads "were used variously as material for lining tins, fuel for the fire, and toilet paper."[67]

To return focus to *The Wandring Prince of Troy*, I want to emphasize how the broadside (as opposed to codex) presentation of Dido's story enhances the fictive materiality of the Ovidian epistle that it contains. Embedded within *The Wandring Prince of Troy*, material copies of *Heroides* 7 would have been everywhere: plastered on doors, adorning exterior and interior walls, and ornamenting posts. Typically rendered in black letter, ballads usually appeared on single or double sided sheets of folio paper, an ephemeral format that is reminiscent of personal correspondence. There are also provocative resemblances between the *diffusion* of these printed folio sheets and the transmission of letters. Broadside ballads, like the personal epistles that they physically resemble in format, are a mode of communication. They are

---

65 Arber, 1.379, 1.383, 1.403, 1.401, 1.416.
66 *Disorderly Women and Female Power in the Street Literature of Early Modern England and Germany* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1992), 29.
67 "Piety in the Pedlar's Pack: Continuity and Change, 1578-1630," in *The World of Rural Dissenters*, ed. Margaret Spufford (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 252; Marsh, "The Sound of Print," in in *The Uses of Script and Print,* 171.

designed to be passed from one person to another. In its printed broadside format, then, the text of *Heroides* 7 is posited as an intrinsically copiable and transmissible physical document.

It is not only in printed form that the Ovidian epistle of *The Wandring Prince of Troy* evokes fictions of materiality, however. Uniquely situated "on the boundaries between the oral and the written, and between commercial transaction and free circulation," ballads show us the variety of forms that voice can take.[68] And it is the medium of voice as well as the medium of the printed page that allows Dido's complaint and related epistolary correspondence to travel and circulate. First-person lyrics foster the illusion that a singer speaks in the authentic voice of a character. Thus, Dido's words—along with the speeches of Aeneas and Anna also contained within *The Wandring Prince of Troy*—become infinitely transferable as singers vocalize 'her' lyrics. Bruce R. Smith notes that, when singers of a printed ballad become "first the narrator, then this character, then that character, then perhaps a third," this opens up "possibilities for dramatic impersonation."[69] Everyone who sings the song speaks *as* Dido. By participating in the articulation of her complaint, we verbally inhabit, even if just momentarily, the character's subject position and provide the character with a corporeal body.[70]

The osmotic relationship between the letters, voices, and bodies of Anna and Dido—with those of one character seemingly flowing into the other and back again—mirrors the singer's own capacity to collaboratively produce Dido's lament and epistle. The switch of authorial agency from the *epistoler* Dido to the *epistoler* Anna in *The Wandring Prince of Troy* plays upon the implications of Anna's final speech in the *Aeneid*, when, labouring over the expiring body of Dido, she commands: "*date vulnera lymphis* | *abluam et, extremus si quis super halitus*

---

[68] Sandra Clark, "The Broadside Ballad and the Woman's Voice," in *Debating Gender in Early Modern England, 1500-1700*, eds. Cristina Malcolmson and Mihoko Suzuki (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 104.
[69] *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England*, 200.
[70] I share in Smith's conviction that it is important to "consider ballads in relationship to the bodies of the people who sang them and heard them": "Female Impersonation in Early Modern Ballads," in *Women Players in England, 1500-1660: Beyond the All-Male Stage*, eds. Pamela Allen Brown and Peter Parolin (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 287. My discussions of voice and body in ballad performance are deeply influenced not only by this paper, but also by Smith's scholarship in *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England*; "Listening to the Wild Blue Yonder," in *Hearing Cultures*; and "Shakespeare's Residuals: The Circulation of Ballads in Cultural Memory," in *Shakespeare and Elizabethan Popular Culture*, eds. Stuart Gillespie and Neil Rhodes (London: Cengage Learning, 2006), 193-217.

errat, | *ore legam*" [Bring me water to bathe her wounds and catch with my lips whatever last breath may linger] (4.683-85). In Anna's desire to catch Dido's parting breath, or *animus*, she is enacting what R.B. Onians has identified as an ancient "custom, whereby a relative caught with his mouth the last breath of the dying—*postremum spiritum ore excipere.*"[71] "Thoughts, words, were 'breath,'" as the work of Onians demonstrates, and—as the *animus* "was precious, the stuff and agent of mind, which might otherwise perish"—this means that "the 'last kiss' is virtually inspiration."[72] Like Vergil's Anna, Anna of *The Wandring Prince of Troy* is clearly marked as the inheritor of Dido's *animus*. The contents and tenor of Anna's *Heroides* 7 seem to have been literally *inspired* by her sister's dying breath. Whenever the ballad is performed, Dido's voice is further reimbodied through acoustic transfers that mimic this inscribed transliteration of Dido's *animus* to Anna. Subsequent singers provide proxy bodies to articulate Dido's voice just as the inscribed Anna provides the proxy hands to pen *Heroides* 7.

Following the composition of Anna's letter, *The Wandring Prince of Troy* relates the delivery of this epistle to its *lector* (and Aeneas' cowardly reaction after "he these lines…perused") in much the same way that Chaucer, Gower, Lydgate, or Caxton incorporate such bibliofictions of textual consumption. In this scene of reception, upon reading words penned by *Anna*, Aeneas finds himself physically confronted by "Quéene *Didoes* Ghost both grim and pale." In the *Aeneid*, Dido had warned "*cum frigida mors anima seduxerit artus,* | *omnibus umbra locis adero*" [when chill death has severed soul and body, everywhere my shade shall haunt you] (4.385-86), and this threat is realized in *The Wandring Prince of Troy*, where the very act of reading *Heroides* 7, regardless of its internal authorial ascription, evokes the Carthaginian queen's implacable, vengeful, and "grisly Ghost." In this meaningful conflation of the author and subject of *Heroides* 7, we find a familiar Ovidian dynamic wherein the acceptance of an epistle's materiality as mail invokes the corporeality of a character. This incarnation of Dido's

---

[71] *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 171-72.
[72] Onians, 172.

lugubrious image through Aeneas' reading of his mythological mail highlights the Ovidian letter's capacity as simulacrum to embody its female subject. And the fact that this embodiment is linked to a ghostly presence in the ballad is apt, for while the figure of a ghost is integrally related to the human form, a ghost simultaneously *is* and *is not* a body. This paradox of the ghost's corporeality mirrors the dynamic that I have been describing in my discussions of palpable fictions throughout this chapter: the paradox of fictive speaking and writing female presences—these bodies and not bodies, authors and not authors—that haunt the epistolary texts of the *ghost*written *Heroides*, both in Ovid's original conception and in the letters' later vernacular reception.

THE COPY OF A LETTER

As if delivered through an efficient intertextual postal service, the epistles of the *Heroides* materialize at expected (and unexpected) points throughout Tudor literature. Stephen Bateman's *A Christall Glasse of Christian Reformation* contains a rendition of Dido's story—which, heavily indebted to Gower's *Confessio Amantis,* treats the tale as an *exemplum* on "the mischiefe and vnhappines that ensueth sloth"—that relates how Aeneas unwisely ignored *Heroides* 7:

> When *Eneas* came from the siege of *Troy*, hee ariued in *Carthage*, there for a tyme to solace hym selfe: and…*Dido*, espying y^{e} comely personage of *Eneas*, was therwith inflamed. And when they had…sociated them a certaine space, the sayd *Eneas* departed into *Italy*, and there was long tyme absent from the presence of *Dido*, who waxed displeasant…saying, that the cause of hys absence without spedie returne, would be cause of her death. *Eneas* not regarding the letter that *Dido* sent, but being loth to iourney, remayned still in *Italy*.[73]

Peter Colse's *Penelopes Complaint: or, A Mirrour for Wanton Minions*, though its title page would indicate that its contents are 'Taken out of Homers Odissea' not only contains a rendition of *Heroides* 1 that recognizably opens with "Peruse those lines I send to thee, | (Sweete) let me see thee here arriue, | Tis booteles for to write to me," but it also includes an affectionate epistolary reply from Ulysses, who "note[s] the care that [Penelope] hast tooke" in her letter.[74] And when,

---

[73] *A Christall Glasse of Christian Reformation* (STC 1581; London, 1569), G1^{v}.
[74] *Penelopes Complaint: Or, A Mirrour for Wanton Minions* (STC 5582 London, 1596), E4^{r}, F3^{v}.

in 1567, George Turberville made "the Romaine" Ovid and his cast of female character-authors "speak with English jaws," his verse translation of the *Heroides* revealed a debt to the longstanding practice of encasing the *Heroides'* dispatches in narrative frames, prefacing each epistle with a contextualizing argument.[75]

For my final example of Ovid's legacy of material fictions, I turn to a more subtle instaniation of the *Heroides*, however, a text that was likely published in the same year as Turberville's translation.[76] A thirty-two page printed volume that combines epistolary discourse and ballad form, *The Copy of a Letter* is comprised of four letters in verse—as the subtitle informs us "Lately written in meeter, by a yonge Gentilwoman: to her unconstant Louer. With an Admonitio[n] to al yong Gentilwomen, and to all other Mayds in general to beware of mennes flattery. By Is.VV. Newely ioyned to a Loueletter sent by a Bacheler, (a most faithfull Louer) to an unconstant and faithless Mayden." Within the text, the 'yonge Gentilwoman' Is.W. is credited with the authorship of two epistles ("To Her Unconstant Lover" and "The admonition by the Auctor, to all yong Gentilwomen: And to al other Maids being Love"). The second pair ("A Loveletter, Sent from a faithful Lover to an Unconstant Mayden" and "Against the wilfull Inconstancie of his deare Foe E.T. Whiche example may justly be sufficient warnying for all Yongmen to beware the fained Fidelytie of the unconstant Maydens") are attributed to male *epistolers* known by the initials W.G. and R.W.[77]

Thematically, all four of the collection's epistles are linked to the concerns of the Tudor *querelle des femmes*.[78] The collection begins with a young woman's plaintive admonishment of her inconstant lover; she has heard that he is about to marry another. The second epistle of

---

[75] *The Heroycall Epistles of the Learned Poet Publius Ouidius Naso, in English Verse* (STC 18940; London, 1567), X2^{v}. See my Appendix for more information on how the *Heroides* were presented in Latin editions of the era.
[76] *The Copy of a Letter* and *The Heroycall Epistles* were both entered in the Stationers' Register in 1566-67, and their entries are nearly contemporaneous. *The Copy of a Letter* was licensed to Jones a mere eleven entries after Henry Denham's *Heroides* 1 (Arber, 1.328), and it appears directly after Denham's second, related entry for *Heroides* 4 (Arber, 1.329).
[77] No mention is made of R.W.'s letter on the title page.
[78] Although he uses different terminology, this connection with the *querelle des femmes* has also been perceived by Paul A. Marquis, "Oppositional Ideologies of Gender in Isabella Whitney's 'Copy of a Letter,'" *The Modern Language Review* 90.2 (1995): 314-324.

the collection, "The Admonition," is framed as a warning to young women "Whose hartes as yet w^{t} raginge loue | most paynfully do boyle."[79] Kim Walker remarks that the female narrative *persona* here acts as "a friendly advisor who speaks not as a superior but as an equal who happens to have experience of male deception and can therefore offer good counsel to other young women like herself."[80] Laying bare the wiles of and seductive techniques employed by duplicitous men, the world-weary *epistoler* tells an imagined audience of vulnerable gentlewomen: "To you I speake: for you be they, | that good aduice do lacke" (A5^{v}). W.G. and R.W.'s contributions serve to round out the volume's *querelle*, challenging and contesting the sentiments of Is.W.'s first two letters. W.G.'s position counters and reverses the dynamic of the first letter. Its author, a forsaken male lover, uses "playnts and pensiue mone" to describe his own "tormēts strong" at the hands of an inconstant maiden (B3^{v}). Moreover, the second epistle's admonitions are confuted by R.W. in the collection's final letter. Addressed—in direct opposition to Is.W.'s second letter, which targets 'all yong Gentilwomen' and 'al other Maids being in Loue'—to unattached young *men*, R.W.'s epistle warns instead against the company and deceits of inconstant women.

Given Ovid's deep associations with the Tudor *querelle des femmes*, it comes as no surprise that *The Copy of a Letter* relies heavily upon the *Heroides* as an intertext and generic model. My primary interest here lies in the first two epistles of the collection, which are not only the most classically allusive, but are also written from a female perspective. In these letters, the articulation of the *epistoler's* present, private dilemma is coloured by the use of textual precedents extant in the public domain. Like the letters of Ovid's heroines, Is.W.'s epistle is putatively penned at "a critical turning point in a love affair, a moment when the writer has 'yet now' heard rumors" about the unfaithfulness of a former sweetheart.[81] Drawing upon a pre-existing and conspicuously Ovidian literary milieu, the narrator of "To Her Unconstant Lover"

---

[79] *The Copy of a Letter* (STC 25439; London, 1567), A5^{v}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.
[80] *Women Writers of the English Renaissance* (New York: Twayne, 1996), 155.
[81] Walker, 154.

overtly aligns her position with the mixture of literary potency and amatory failure demonstrated by the *Heroides'* authors. Having instructed her former lover to "Example take by many a one | whose falshood now is playne" (A2^{v}), Is.W. proceeds to list Ovidian examples of men who "for their vnfaithfulnes, | did get perpetuall fame":

> As by ENEAS first of all,
> who dyd poore DIDO leaue,
> Causing the Quene by his vntrueth
> with Sword her hart to cleaue,
>
> Also I finde that THESEVS did,
> his faithfull loue forsake:
> Stealyng away within the night,
> before she dyd awake.
>
> IASON that came of noble race,
> two Ladies did begile:
> I muse how he durst shew his face,
> to them that knew his wile.
>
> (A2^{v}-A3^{r})

The *epistoler's* use of standard Ovidian *exempla* continues as she—much in the style of Ovid's Oenone—bitterly wishes him well and says of his future wife:

> I rather wish her HELENS face,
> then one of HELENS trade:
> With chastnes of PENELOPE
> the which did neuer fade.
>
> A LVCRES for her constancy,
> and Thisbie for her trueth
>
> (A4^{v})

In evaluating the use of Ovidian intertexts in "To Her Unconstant Lover," I would like to revisit briefly Pandarus' citation of Oenone's letter, the passage with which this chapter began. Pandarus' brief redaction of *Heroides* 5's content is, strictly speaking, inaccurate. As Fumo comments, he "has in fact suppressed the real relevance of Oenone's letter to Troilus's life: it narrates a story of a fateful courtship, love betrayed, incurable suffering on the part of the betrayed, and (proleptically) the very fall of Troy as a result of this betrayal."[82] In effect, Pandarus has grasped, interpreted, and augmented what was only the tiniest of references in

[82] "Little *Troilus*," 286-87.

Heroides 5 ('*me miseram, quod amor non est medicabilis herbis!*'), making this line the focal point and theme in his own curtailed rendition of the famed letter. Pandarus' discussion of the epistle does not merely end with the deficient paraphrase of its contents. Rather, he manipulates and further interprets its significance, aligning *his own position,* rather than Troilus' plight, with that of Oenone:

> Right so fare I, unhappily for me;
> I love oon best, and that me smerteth sore;
> And yet, paraunter, can I rede thee,
> And not my-self; repreve me no more.
> (1.666-69)

Since, according to Pandarus (who, as we will recall, is in the process of persuading Troilus to reveal the name of his love interest), Oenone's letter describes a healer who is unable to help herself but is successful in healing others, it logically follows that Pandarus, who cannot alleviate his own grief, might similarly be able to assuage the pain of another (i.e. Troilus). "His reading of the letter," as Lerer writes, is thus "pressed into the service…of articulating his own status as a lover."[83] The way that Oenone's epistle is read in *Troilus and Criseyde* is, in this sense, akin to the way in which the *Heroides'* letters are read to new ends in "To Her Unconstant Lover," where the *epistoler* similarly borrows upon the *Heroides* to articulate her 'own status as a lover.'

A reading of "To Her Unconstant Lover" alongside the *Heroides* affirms that Is.W. uses the classical epistles as models and prototypes for her own text; she repeats their internal repetitions, alludes to their commonalities, and borrows upon their rhetoric to elucidate and inform her own lament.[84] In *The Ovidian Heroine as Author,* Fulkerson examines the intratextual community of writers that is fostered within the *Heroides* as a collection. Since "they share in the knowledge of their entwined filiation," Fulkerson suggests that, Ovid's "abandoned women

---

[83] Lerer, *Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII*, 7.
[84] In the *Heroides*, the commonalities in the women's situations and expressions of grief are striking. For much of the twentieth century, the *Heroides'* linguistic, rhetorical, and narrative repetition was seen as a weakness. Very little serious scholarship was done on Ovid's *Heroides* prior to Howard Jacobson's seminal study of the work. Following Jacobson, there have been several significant monographs on the subject, including: Florence Verducci, *Ovid's Toyshop of the Heart*: Epistulae Heroidum (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985); Spentzou, Lindheim; and Fulkerson.

may usefully be compared to the masculine elegiac community, composing their texts together and with reference to the poetic issues of that community."[85] Just as, intratextually, "the Ovidian heroines—*puellae doctae*—are excessively literary and so self-consciously fashion themselves as alluding authors influenced by what they read," I would argue that the authorial *persona* in "To Her Unconstant Lover" is another such 'excessively literary' *puella docta* who, constructing her own literary *persona* out of fragments of an existing literature, turns to the poetic issues of the *Heroides* in crafting her own epistle.[86] Sensing their situational affinities, she adopts Ovidian language, arguments, and *exempla*. With her verbal and rhetorical reminiscences of the Ovidian heroines' letters, Is.W. purposefully patterns her discourse after, and consequently aligns herself with, Ovid's fictive community of inscribed writers.

An examination of Is.W.'s uses of Ovidian intertexts in her second letter, however, also exposes vital discrepancies between her own subject position and those of Ovid's heroines. Their various reactions to their abandonment reveals that the authors of the *Heroides* are reduced to states of hopeless resignation or even a desire for death. Amongst them, Phyllis admits "*saepe venenorum sitis est mihi; saepe cruenta* | *traiectam gladio morte perire iuvat*" [Oft do I long for poison; oft with the sword would I gladly pierce my heart and pour forth my blood in death] (2.139-40); Penelope weakly bemoans "*nec mihi sunt vires inimicos pellere tectis*" [nor have I strength to repel the enemy from our halls] (1.109); Ariadne confesses "*occurrunt animo pereundi mille figurae,* | *morsque minus poenae quam mora mortis habet*" [there rush into my thought a thousand forms of perishing, and death holds less of dole for me than the delay of death] (10.81-82); and Deianira periodically punctuates her epistle with dramatic cries of "*inpia quid dubitas Deianira mori*?" [O wicked Deianira, why hesitate to die?] (9.146, 152, 158, 164). While the epistles of Ovid's *Heroides* suggest that Ovid's literary community of mythological heroines responds to abandonment destructively, in "The Admonition," Is.W. acknowledges and reacts to her own abandonment (as laid out in "To Her Unconstant Lover") by adopting a new role. To this

[85] Fulkerson, 4, 2.
[86] Fulkerson, 2.

effect, Jean F. Howard perceives: "the female speaker…is careful to present herself as more than an injured party. She is also a moral tutor, who draws from the examples of antiquity…as well as from her own experience, in order to instruct other women."[87]

In "The Admonition," Ovid's words of the *Remedia Amoris* could become the *epistoler's* own: "*Ad mea…praecepta venite*" [Come, hearken to my precepts] (41). Discourse prevails over narrative in this letter, as the *epistoler's* personal narrative of loss is subordinated to the moral lessons imparted by her didactic voice. Is.W. demonstrates the wiles of men by citing the "falshood" of heroes including Paris and Demophoon (A7^{r}). Is.W. then briefly recounts a single positive *exemplum*: she describes how "Hero did trie Leanders truth, | before that she did trust," claiming that the vigilant Ovidian heroine "found him vnto her | both constant, true, and iust" (A7^{v}). She warns her (female) readers, however, that "like Leander there be fewe" and cautions: "therfore in time take heede: | And alwayes trie before ye trust, | so shall you better speede" (A7^{v}). To further prove her points that men should not be trusted "at the fyrst sight" since only "triall shal declare" a potential lover's "trueth," the *epistoler* invokes the story of Scylla and Nisus:

> If SCILLA had not trust to much
> before that she dyd trye:
> She could not haue ben clene forsake
> when she for help did crye.
>
> (A6^{v})

Walker notes that, by "citing examples of classical heroines who placed too much trust in men, [Is.W.] claims that good counsel would have prevented their tragic fates."[88] I would further this observation by pointing to the Ovidian resonances of this position. The tenor of Is.W.'s argument is explicitly modeled on a passage from the *Remedia Amoris*, where Ovid's *praeceptor amoris* boasts:

> *Vixisset Phyllis, si me foret usa magistro,*
> *Et per quod novies, saepius isset iter;*
> *Nec moriens Dido summa vidisset ab arce*

[87] "Textualizing an Urban Life: The Case of Isabella Whitney," in *Early Modern Autobiography: Theories, Genres, Practices*, eds. Ronald Bedford, Lloyd Davis, and Philippa Kelly (University of Michigan Press, 2006), 221.
[88] Walker, 156.

Dardanias vento vela dedisse rates;
Nec dolor armasset contra sua viscera matrem,
Quae socii damno sanguinis ulta virum est.
Arte mea Tereus, quamvis Philomela placeret,
Per facinus fieri non meruisset avis.
Da mihi Pasiphaën, iam tauri ponet amorem:
Da Phaedram, Phaedrae turpis abibit amor.
Crede Parim nobis, Helenen Menelaus habebit,
Nec manibus Danais Pergama victa cadent.
(55-66)

> Phyllis would have lived, had she used my counsels, and taken more often the path she took nine times; nor would dying Dido have seen from her citadel's height the Dardan vessels spread their sails to the wind; nor would anger have armed against her own offspring the mother [Medea] who took vengeance on her husband with the loss of kindred blood. By my art Tereus, though Philomel found favour, had not deserved by crime to become a bird. Give me Pasiphae: soon will she love the bull no more; give me Phaedra: Phaedra's shameful love will disappear. Entrust Paris to me: Menelaus will keep Helen, nor will vanquished Pergamum fall by Danaan hands.

Armed with her own artillery of mythological *exempla*, Is.W. neatly and deliberately usurps the role of the Ovidian *praeceptor amoris*. Whereas Ovid's *praeceptor* brags "*Impia si nostros legisset Scylla libellos,* | *Haesisset capiti purpura, Nise, tuo*" [Had impious Scylla read my verse, the purple had stayed on thy head, O Nisus] (67-68), this female *epistoler* pointedly remarks of this same heroine "yf she had had *good* aduice | Nisus had liued long" (A6^{v}).[89] The implication of these provocative parallels is, of course, that the 'good aduice' being dispensed in "The Admonition" constitutes a *Remedia Amoris* that is quite distinct in moral tenor from Ovid's erotodidactic *libellus*. To this end, Is.W., drawing upon a line of reasoning familiar from the *querelle des femmes*, begs women to "Beware of fayre and painted talke" and the "flattering tonges" of self-serving lovers:

Some vse the teares of Crocodiles,
contrary to their hart:
And yf they cannot alwayes weepe,
they wet their Cheekes by Art.

Ouid, within his Arte of loue,
doth teach them this same knacke
To wet their had a touch their eies:
so oft as teares they lacke.
(A6^{r})

[89] Emphasis my own.

While the image of crocodile tears evoked here is a Tudor commonplace, the *epistoler* in "The Admonition"—simultaneously fashioning her identity as an Ovidian and anti-Ovidian voice—takes this image one step further. Is.W. explicitly associates Ovid's erotodidactic poetry with verbal deception, characterizing Ovidian discourse as false rhetoric that begets false tears.[90]

Through her own classically-allusive digressions and self-applications, the female *persona* of *The Copy of a Letter's* first two epistles becomes a fictional colleague of the *Heroides'* heroines, a self-inscribed member of an extant literary community. She is akin to Oenone, who catches a glimpse of her fellow authoress Helen's face, reacts to this contact, and incorporates her experience into *Heroides* 5; we catch glimpses of innumerable Ovidian heroines' faces in "To Her Unconstant Lover" and "The Admonition," where the *epistoler* draws upon copious mythological *exempla*, revising these Ovidian intertexts, reinventing them, reinterpreting their meanings, and applying them to both her own situation and the circumstances of others. Is.W.'s advice (based both upon alleged personal experience and the comparable literary experiences of Ovid's heroines) is therefore dispensed by a single figure who acts as an author, an interpreter, and a participatory character. In this new variation on *scripta puella scriptor,* Is.W. is *scripta puella* who simultaneously fulfils the didactic function of *praeceptor amoris*.

'FAINED TALES'

The use of the female lyric *persona* in *The Copy of a Letter* would not have seemed unfamiliar to the mid-Tudor reader. Authorial assumptions of female voices, and particularly Ovidian female voices, were commonplace; we might think, for example, of Thomas Wyatt's "Dydo am I, the fownder first of Cartage." What distinguishes *The Copy of a Letter's* first two epistles from other such ventrilocutions, however, is that these female-voiced, Ovidian verse

[90] We need only to look to *Tottel's Miscellany* to find a similar example. "An answere to a song before imprinted beginnyng. To walke on doutfull grounde" contains the following counsel (15-18):

> Oft craft can cause the man to make a semyng show
> Of hart with dolour all distreined, where griefe did neuer grow.
> As cursed Crocodile most cruelly can toll,
> With truthlesse teares, vnto his death, the silly pitiyng soule.

epistles were *actually* written by a woman. Is.W. is, of course, the authorial *persona* of Isabella Whitney. Often hailed as England's "first declared professional woman poet," as a woman whose work appeared in print, Whitney was a Tudor author *sui generis*.[91]

In examining the verisimilitude of Whitney's verse epistles as letters, I would point to their autobiographical effect, for the sex of the epistles' implied author adds an air of realism to these female voiced missives. The fiction that Is.W. and Whitney are one is thus collusive and coincident with fact insofar as gender is concerned. As written utterances, letters are always, if only fictionally, autobiographical. "All writing, we know, is subject to semantic slippage," Karina Williamson observes, yet epistles "seem to come closest to an ideal of direct, sincere, transparent communication by writing."[92] The alluring possibility that the author of epistolary fiction transparently speaks in the same voice as her *epistoler* contributes to our impression of the text's emotive sincerity. In *The Copy of a Letter,* a sense of legitimacy is attached to the *epistoler's* gendered voice such that Is.W.'s texts appear to be the genuine—'direct, sincere, transparent'—personal reflections of a jilted and jaded Whitney. I have discussed at length the presupposition of a physical body, of a writing woman, upon which the fictionalized materiality of Ovidian and Ovidian-inspired epistolary discourse depends. In the case of *The Copy of a Letter*, such fictions are extended and perfected by the fact that a real woman, an identifiable contemporary woman, has penned the documents. The resultant autobiographical immediacy cultivated in the collection is so effective that modern readers continue to confuse and conflate Whitney's inscribed *epistoler* with the historical author of the first two pieces.[93]

---

[91] Whitney was thus hailed by Betty Travitsky, "The 'Wyll and Testament' of Isabella Whitney," *English Literary Renaissance* 10 (1980): 117-118. Whitney's unique position—as essentially a self-styled, contemporary Ovidian heroine—is only emphasized further in her 1573 volume of poetry, *A Sweet Nosgay, Or Pleasant Posye: Contayning a Hundred and Ten Phylosophicall Flowers* (STC 25440). The volume includes a poem entitled "A Careful Complaint By the Unfortunate Author," in which she explicitly compares herself with Dido. There has also been some speculation that Whitney may have authored a pair of letters from Dido to Aeneas and Aeneas to Dido that were anonymously included in F.L.'s *Ouidius Naso His Remedie of Love* (STC 18974). Raphael Lyne's "A Case for Isabella Whitney," Cambridge University CERES project, online at <www.english.cam.ac.uk/ceres/aeneas/attrib.htm>, last retrieved 7 April 2009.

[92] Williamson, 80.

[93] Little is known of Whitney's life. The generally accepted 'facts' about her are minimal, and they are also highly speculative: she was born in Cheshire in the mid-sixteenth century and raised in Smithfield, London; she was connected to the minor gentry; she worked as a servant in London, as did two of her sisters; she may

Working both as narratives and as putatively pragmatic documents, the epistles of the *Heroides* frequently foreground—and implicitly question—the fiction of their status as unmediated missives. In *The Copy of a Letter,* Whitney fosters this same illusion of materiality in her own, seemingly autobiographical, texts. Paradoxically intimate and intertextual, her letters follow a long-established tradition of accentuating their ostensible *writtenness* as an assurance of their emotive authenticity. Borrowing upon a familiar Ovidian technique, in "To Her Unconstant Lover," Is.W. imagines how the text will be received, valued, and read by its nominal addressee:

> And when you shall this letter haue
> let it be kept in store?
> For she that sent y^{e} same, hath sworn
> as yet to send no more.
>
> (A5^{v})

Despite such attempts to frame her letters as documents, Whitney, like Ovid, subtly undermines the carefully constructed veracity of her own letters in a variety of ways, including her use of verse form. Whitney also plays upon the hermeneutic tensions inherent to the genre of the Ovidian epistle by breaking the illusion that "To Her Unconstant Lover" is written only for the eyes of its *lector.* In the closing lines of "To Her Unconstant Lover," she concedes a more generalized public readership—the commercial consumers of her poetry—with the remark:

> And now farewel, for why at large
> my mind is here exprest?
> The which you may perceiue, if that
> you do peruse the rest?
>
> (A5^{v})

---

have suffered from poor health. All of these 'facts' derive from seemingly autobiographical references in her texts. On Whitney's career and works, see: Robert J. Fehrenbach, "Isabella Whitney (fl. 1565-75) and the Popular Miscellanies of Richard Jones," *Cahiers Elisabethains: Late Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 19 (1981): 85-87; R. J. Fehrenbach, "Isabella Whitney, Sir Hugh Plat, Geoffrey Whitney, and Sister Eldershae," *English Language Notes* 21 (1983): 7-11; Richard Panofsky, "Love Poetry of Isabella Whitney, a Woman Author of the English Renaissance," *New Mexico Highlands University Journal* 6.1 (1983): 1-8; Laurie Ellinghausen, "Literary Property and the Single Woman in Isabella Whitney's *A Sweet Nosgay,*" *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 45.1 (2005): 1-22;. Ilona Bell, "Women in the Lyric Dialogue of Courtship: Whitney's 'Admonition to al yong Gentilwomen' and Donne's 'The Legacie,'" in *Representing Women in Renaissance England*, eds. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1997), 76-92; Ilona Bell, *Elizabethan Women and the Poetry of Courtship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998);Wall, *The Imprint of Gender*; Walker, *Women Writers*; Marquis; and Howard.

Whitney's final affirmation that she has 'exprest' her mind 'at large' seems carefully calculated to raise the question of where "To Her Unconstant Lover" lies in the Ovidian continuum of material facts and material fictions. These lines encourage us to read backwards, searching for signs of doubleness, perhaps even duplicity, in her purportedly private outpourings. Alison Sharrock remarks that questions of "truth and falsehood, fiction and reality, secrets and publicity, sincerity and pose" are raised throughout Ovid's amatory poetry, "for they are central to the project of subjectivity."[94] This observation holds equally true for Whitney's Ovidian epistles. Raising the possibility that her verses are public property, circulating 'at large,' Whitney provides us with the opportunity to reconsider her subjectivity; she invites her readers to entertain the idea that she is an epistolary actor who has merely played a version of herself before a public audience. Perhaps Whitney, herself a student of Ovid's poetry, has—like the deceitful men she will go on to condemn in "The Admonition"—learned to 'wet [her] Cheekes by Art' and to rhetorically simulate passion, producing a viable fiction that is nothing more than 'teares of Crocodiles.'

Roger Pooley has written that "preliminary matters" in early modern books "show writers of fiction, and their publishers and friends, engaged in constructing, imagining and positioning their readership," and it is to *The Copy of a Letter's* 'preliminary matter' and paratextual scaffolding that I would turn to further examine how Whitney's letters are paradoxically framed for audience consumption as both material documents and credible fictions.[95] Like the miscellanies *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites* and *A Gorgious Gallery of Gallant Inuentions* discussed in the previous chapter, *The Copy of a Letter* was produced by Richard Jones, a printer remarkable, as Sonia Massai comments, for his "recurrent use of paratextual materials,

---

[94] "Ovid and the Discourses of Love: The Amatory Works," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, 153.
[95] "'I confesse it to be a mere toy': How to Read the Preliminary Matter to Renaissance Fiction," in *Critical Approaches to English Prose Fiction 1520-1640*, ed. Donald Beecher (Ottawa: Dovehouse, 1998), 110.

which introduce the reader not only to the subject matter, but also to the process whereby the copy was written, procured, brought to press and turned into print."[96]

The collection's aura of fictive verisimilitude is suggested by its title page, which contextualizes *The Copy of a Letter's* poetic contents from a third-person perspective, a technique for framing lyric utterances that Jones borrows from *Tottel's Miscellany*. This bibliofictional title page identifies the cast of inscribed *epistolers* and *lectors* who will participate in its internal *querelle des femmes*: 'a yonge Gentilwoman,' 'her unconstant Louer,' 'a Bacheler (a most faithfull Louer),' and 'an unconstant and faithless Mayden.' It also establishes the aetiological fiction that its highly stylized, printed epistles have their origins in contemporary exchange and represent a group of documents 'lately written' by private hands. The use of the word 'copy' on the volume's title page evokes images of scribal inscription for personal transmission.[97]

Like Ovid's amatory works, *The Copy of a Letter* self-consciously "put[s] private life on display—or rather, show[s] us how private life is always already on display, a fiction played out for real, a reality fantasized."[98] Margaret Aston remarks that in "this period…the handwritten letter amounted to personal converse on the page. Almost by definition, such paper-talk normally belonged to a private world of mutual exchange that was far removed from the public property of the printing shop."[99] Yet it is precisely the 'private world of mutual exchange' and the 'paper-talk' of "intercessory epistolics" that Jones' printed title page offers for sale.[100] Having publicly purchased access to putatively private discourse, *The Copy of a Letter's* audience

---

[96] *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 75. Kirk Melnikoff observes the "virtually unrivalled amount of prefatory material—sixteen extant dedications and addresses in all" that Jones produced: "Richard Jones (fl. 1564-1613): Elizabethan Printer, Bookseller and Publisher," *Analytical and Enumerative Bibliography* 12.3 (2001): 158. Melnikoff elaborates that, of contemporary printers, "only John Wolfe is comparable, having written approximately twenty prefaces. Wolfe, however, "published twice as many texts as Jones": 171 n. 31.

[97] Bell points to some of the title's other implications: "The very title declares: first, the Elizabethans were using love poems to transact clandestine courtships; second, Elizabethan women were taking an active and critical role in negotiating their own courtships, using their critical powers to judge and criticize the veiled rhetoric of courtship; and third, women were claiming the power of speech and writing to protect themselves and each other from the deception and betrayal posed by clandestine courtship and enigmatic rhetoric": "Women in the Lyric Dialogue of Courtship," in *Representing Women,* 83.

[98] Sharrock, "Ovid and the Discourses of Love," 150.

[99] "Epilogue," in *The Uses of Script and Print*, 283.

[100] I borrow this term "intercessory epistolics" from Lerer, *Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII*, 12.

is thus forced into a position of voyeurism—a position escapable only through the acknowledgement of the letters' fictionality and the rejection of that same epistolary verisimilitude upon which the collection insists.[101]

Cognizant of epistolary fiction's capacity to conjure up illusions of materiality, Jones, in *The Copy of a Letter's* paratextual materials, plays on the authenticity of the collection's documents and the bodily presence of its female *epistoler*:

> What lack you Maister mine?
> some trifle that is trew?
> Why? then this same wil serue your turne
> the which is also new.
>
> Or yf you minde to reade,
> some fables that be fained:
> Buy this same Booke, and ye shall finde,
> such in the same contained.
>
> Perchaunce my wordes be thought,
> vncredible to you:
> Because I say this Treatise is,
> both false and also true.
>
> The matter of it selfe,
> is true as many know:
> And in the same, some fained tales,
> the Audor doth bestow.
>
> (A1^{v})

Ilona Bell notes how these verses imply that the narrative of Is.W.'s rejection, as related in "To Her Unconstant Lover," is based on real events in Whitney's life and "that 'many'…readers 'know' as much."[102] The fact that Whitney *is* a woman writing *as* woman lies behind this conceit—a conceit both exploited and derided by the edition's printer—that the collection's female Ovidian *persona* and real-life poet are one and the same.

Jones' prefatory reference to 'fained tales' hints, as Bell further elaborates, both at "the poetic license which enables Whitney to tell a good story" and also at her use of "mythological tales"—the intertextual allusions that she uses to construct herself as Ovidian *scripta puella*

---

[101] "Prefaces that construct and display a sphere coded as private," as Wall has written, "cast the reader into the role of voyeur, one who partakes of forbidden discourse and is complicitious in stealing a glance at clandestine words": *The Imprint of Gender*, 176.
[102] Bell, *Elizabethan Women and the Poetry of Courtship,* 116.

scriptor and *praeceptor amoris*.[103] To Bell's observations I would add that the verb *to feign*, from the Latin *fingere* (from which the word *fiction* is also derived), intersects with a broad semantic field. Not only suggestive of inventing or composing narrative, *feign* also extends its range to include "adulterate," "counterfeit," "dissemble," and "evade." Jones' characterization of *The Copy of a Letter* as 'fables that be fained' thus advertises what we might call the fictive aspects of epistolary fiction-making, acknowledging the paradox of material presences and ghostly forms enclosed 'in this same Booke.' In his bibliofictional frame, Jones, like Whitney, thus confirms the Ovidian maxim that fictive documents composed in and transmitted through imaginary spaces are always 'both false and also true.'

[103] Bell, *Elizabethan Women and the Poetry of Courtship*, 116.

'OUR SAINTED LEGENDARIE':
THE ANGLO-OVIDIAN HEROINES

Ovid ends Book 1 of the *Amores*, his earliest work, with a memorable reflection on poetic fate. Ruminating on the resilience of literary fame and optimistically foretelling his own immortality, Ovid suggests that poets' post-mortem existences are conferred by the literary reception of their works. The self-reflexive meditation of *Amores* 1.15 equates Ovid's physical *corpus* and poetic *corpus* by suggesting that the poet lives through textual diffusion:

> *Ergo, cum silices, cum dens patientis aratri*
> *depereant aevo, carmina morte carent.*
> *cedant carminibus reges regumque triumphi,*
> *cedat et auriferi ripa benigna Tagi!*
> *vilia miretur vulgus; mihi flavus Apollo*
> *pocula Castalia plena ministret aqua,*
> *sustineamque coma metuentem frigora myrtum,*
> *atque a sollicito multus amante legar!*
> *pascitur in vivis Livor; post fata quiescit,*
> *cum suus ex merito quemque tuetur honos.*
> *ergo etiam cum me supremus adederit ignis,*
> *vivam, parsque mei multa superstes erit.*
>
> (31-42)

> What though devouring time wear down the flint, and blunt the share of the enduring plough, yet poetry shall never die. Let kings, then, and all their train of conquests, yield to poetry, to poetry let the happy shores of the golden Tagus give place. Let the vulgar herd set their hearts on dross if they will. For myself, let Apollo bestow on me cups overflowing with the waters of Castaly; let the myrtle that dreads the cold adorn my brow and let my verses ever be scanned by the eager lover. While we [poets] live we serve as food for Envy; when we are dead we rest within the aureole of the glory we have earned. So, when the funeral fires have consumed me, I shall live on, and the better part of me will have triumphed over death.

Implied in Ovid's juxtaposition of weathered flint and dulled ploughs with the freshness of 'verses ever…scanned by the eager lover' is the idea that poetry is not subject to decay as are physical objects and bodies. Literature's durability is linked to its immaterial facets; a poem has the ability to exist apart from its individual, and individually perishable, material manifestations. Put another way, for Ovid, poetry possesses a distinctive quality independent of its inscripted existence, and it is literature's very mutability that allows it to transcend death. Ovid's own survival is ensured by a projected future wherein his *corpus* will be transmitted and transformed

in consecutive ephemeral expressions, "a textual survival, animated by a surrogate vitality through the transient breath of successive generations of readers."[1]

Though Ovid would elsewhere claim that he was well suited to his own Augustan environment—"*ego me nunc denique natum* | *Gratulor: haec aetas moribus apta meis*" [I congratulate myself that I was not born till now; this age fits my nature well] (*Ars Am.* 3.121-22)—history has confirmed the predictions of *Amores* 1.15. Ovid is clearly a poet whose texts have appealed to the natures of numerous successive ages, and the self-promoting prophesy of *Amores* 1.15 found a peculiar sort of fulfillment as these resonant Ovidian lines were received, reinterpreted, and recontextualized in the Tudor era. Octavianus Mirandula's popular sixteenth-century anthology of Latin *sententiae*, for example, included amongst its prefatory materials a version of *Amores* 1.15.1-36, where he adopts the piece as a preliminary statement on poetry and retitles it "*DE LAVDE CARMINVM, & quod fama Poëtarum sit perennis: ex Ouidij Eleg. lib. 1*" [In praise of poetry and the fame of poets that lasts forever: from Book 1 of Ovid's *Amores*].[2] William Shakespeare's 1593 *Venus and Adonis* borrows Latin lines from *Amores* 1.15 for its famous opening epigraph: '*Vilia miretur populus, mihi flavus Apollo* | *Pocula Castalia plena ministret aqua.*' The incorrigible annotator Gabriel Harvey also transcribed these same Latin lines into his now-

---

[1] I borrow this phrase from *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*, 94. In its original context, Hardie is discussing the final lines of *Metamorphoses* 15, where we find a strikingly similar passage:

> *Iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iovis ira nec ignis*
> *nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere vetustas.*
> *cum volet, illa dies, quae nil nisi corporis huius*
> *ius habet, incerti spatium mihi finiat aevi:*
> *parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis*
> *astra ferar, nomenque erit indelebile nostrum,*
> *quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris,*
> *ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama,*
> *siquid habent veri vatum praesagia, vivam.*
>
> And now my work is done, which neither the wrath of Jove, nor fire, nor sword, nor the gnawing tooth of time shall ever be able to undo. When it will, let that day come which has no power save over this mortal frame, and end the span of my uncertain years. Still in my better part I shall be borne immortal far beyond the lofty stars and I shall have an undying name. Wherever Rome's power extends over the conquered world, I shall have mention on men's lips, and, if the prophecies of bards have any truth, through all the ages shall I live in fame.

[2] *Illvstrivm Poetarvm Flores* (STC 17954; London, 1598), A5^{r}.

famous copy of Speght's Chaucer.[3] Ovid's boast of poetic immortality found realization and revitalization in translated forms, as well. "When Flint and Iron weare away, | Verse is immortall, and shall nere decay," Christopher Marlowe asserts in the version that he penned for *All Ovids Elegies*, and this durability is felt in Ben Jonson's 1601 *Poetaster*.[4] This dramatic portrayal of Ovid's life and his Augustan literary milieu commences with what has been described as "a poet's meditation on the theme of personal and literary survival": namely, a recitation of *Amores* 1.15.[5] This dramatized scene of artistic contemplation and poetic creation features Ovid in the act of composing the final two lines of the elegy: "*Then, when this body falls in funeral fire,*" Jonson's Ovid familiarly utters, "*My name shall live, and my best part aspire.*"[6]

The Ovidian literature of Tudor England did not merely effect the reinscription of the Roman *vates'* words or the translation of particular texts from his *corpus* into vernacular versions (as in the above examples), however. Rather, sixteenth-century literature also demonstrates the triumph of the poet over his corporeal death in its transmigration of a palpably Ovidian aesthetic into new and distinctly English formulations. Such Tudor translations of Ovidian *ethos* were, as the Augustan poet might have predicted, not always tied to specific, perishable textual manifestations—or even to particular Ovidian works. Ovidian flux is characterized by a paradoxical stability; the physical mutations of shapes into new bodies that the poet treats on a grand scale in the *Metamorphoses* are always marked by the transformee's retention of enduring and defining immaterial characteristics.

This chapter takes as its subject Ovidian poems transformed into new English bodies. Examining Elizabethan complaint poetry drawn from the matrix of English chronicle history, I show how novel contours and non-classical narratives mask familiar Ovidian figures and

---

[3] For Harvey's citation of these lines, see *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia*, ed. G. C. Moore Smith (Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Head Press, 1913), 232.
[4] I cite the text of *All Ovids Elegies* from *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*, vol. 1, ed. Roma Gill (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 1.15.31-32.
[5] Jonson's *Poetaster* is thus characterized by Ian Donaldson, *Jonson's Magic Houses: Essays in Interpretation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 206.
[6] *Poetaster*, ed. Tom Cain (Manchester: Manchester University, 1995), 1.1.1-2. Later in this same scene, Jonson's Ovid goes on to deliver a Marlovian-inspired version of *Amores* 1.15 in its entirety.

essences. In the *Metamorphoses*, after Io's outward appearance has been altered, the visually unrecognizable heifer exposes the unchanged state of her inner being by composing a text to be read by her father. Golding translates: "she printed in the sande, | Two letters with hir foote, whereby was given to understande | The sorrowfull chaunging of hir shape."[7] In Elizabethan literature, the essential Ovidian cores of superficially English female complainants (ranging from Jane Shore to Rosamond Clifford to Elstred to Matilda Fitzwater) are similarly disclosed through inscribed acts of writing and reading. In the literature that I examine, intertextual networks of literary associations are figured in fictions of documentary materiality and authorial corporeality. This chapter thus traces a bibliographical and bibliofictional chain of real and imagined, Ovidian and Ovidian-inspired, books in a genetic line of evolution that begins with *A Mirror for Magistrates* and culminates in Michael Drayton's *England's Heroicall Epistles*. In so doing, I show that these books—putatively read and ghostwritten by a cast of characters who demonstrate a markedly Ovidian obsession with their own metapoetics—represent the collusion of real and fictive lines of ink.

A Mirror for Magistrates' Historical Composition

In the summer of 1553, the death of the Tudor dynasty's third ruler, the teenaged monarch Edward VI, seemed imminent. The printer and bookseller Edward Whitchurch responded by closing up shop at the Sign of the Sun in Fleet Street (the one-time business of de Worde). Anticipating the religious upheaval that would accompany the ascension of Edward's Catholic sister Mary, the evangelical Whitchurch—who had henceforth specialized in Protestant biblical and liturgical publications—likely fled to Germany. Subsequently, a new proprietor, John Wayland, took over Whitchurch's former establishment. When he acquired Whitchurch's defunct business, Wayland was not actively working in London's print industry,

[7] *Ovid's Metamorphoses: The Arthur Golding Translation*, 1.804-06.

although he did have relevant, if somewhat limited, professional experience in the trade.[8] It is uncertain why Wayland decided to restart his former printing career in the summer of 1553, but, by October of that year, he had finagled a highly desirable royal patent from England's newly crowned Queen Mary; this was a patent that established him as the nation's exclusive printer of primers and all books of private devotion.

Although Wayland's patent promised to be enormously lucrative, the Marian Catholic primer was not destined to be ready for printing until June of 1555.[9] In the meantime, presumably in need of a project to sustain his new business, Wayland began printing other texts, amongst them John Lydgate's colossal *Fall of Princes* (STC 3178). Wayland's notice on the verso to the c. 1554 title page explains:

> While I attended the quenes highnes pleasre in setting forth an uniforme Primer to be used of her Subjectes, for the Printynge whereof it pleased her highnes (which I besech god long to preserve) to geve me a Priuilege under her letters Patentes, I thought it good to employ and occupy my Print & servaunts for that purpose provided, about sum necessary & profitable worke. And because that sundry gentlemen very wel lerned, commended much the workes of Lydgate, chefely the fall of Prynces, which he drew out of Bochas, whereof none were to be got, after that I knew the Counsayles pleasure & advice therein, I determined to print it.[10]

A greatly expanded and elaborated verse adaptation of Laurent de Premierfait's French prose translation of Boccaccio's Latin prose *De casibus virorum illustrium*, Lydgate's *Fall of Princes* recounts hundreds of stories of the rise and fall of exemplary figures who have descended from fame and glory into obscurity and tragedy. For Wayland, just returning to the trade, Lydgate's 'necessary & profitable worke' of historical biography, the lengthiest and arguably the

---

[8] Although he had accepted the ordinances of the Scriveners' Company in 1540 and seems to have worked primarily as a scrivener between that date and 1553, in the late 1530s, Wayland had worked as a printer, and he seems to have continued a career as a bookseller even after this date. On the trajectory of Wayland's career, see Henry J. Byrom, "John Wayland—Printer, Scrivener and Litigant," *The Library,* 4th ser. 11 (1931): 312-49 and Elizabeth Evenden, "Wayland, John (c.1508–1571x3)," in the *ODNB*. On Whitchurch, see Alec Ryrie, "Whitchurch, Edward (*d.* 1562)," in the *ODNB*.

[9] John Day and William Seres held the patent for printing primers under Edward VI. When Day and Seres were imprisoned by Mary's new regime, their existing patent was not simply reassigned to Wayland, however. The primer of Day and Seres had been a *Protestant* primer, and Wayland's patent was intended to cover printing rights for a new (and as yet unprepared) *Catholic* primer. On these primers, see Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 537-43 and Edwyn Birchenough, "The Prymer in English," *The Library,* 4th ser. 18 (1937): 177-94.

[10] "The Prynter to the Reader," qtd. in Lily B. Campbell, ed., *The Mirror for Magistrates* (1938; New York: Barnes & Noble, 1960), 5. All subsequent parenthetical references to the text of *A Mirror for Magistrates* refer to Campbell's edition by page number.

most ambitious work of the previous century's most admired poet, probably seemed like a conservative editorial choice, likely to make a profit and keep his newly acquired shop afloat. [11] After all, as Lydgate argues in that same work:

> Frut of writyng set in cronicles olde,
> Most delectable of freshnesse in tastyng,
> And most goodli & glorious to beholde,
> In cold and heete lengest abidyng,
> Chaung of cesouns may doon it non hyndryng;
> And where-so be that men dyne or faste,
> The mor men taste, the lenger it wil laste.
> (4.4-7)

In addition to printing a fresh edition of a vernacular classic, Wayland's shop also began the concurrent production of an original literary work, planned as a companion text and appendage to *The Fall of Princes*. "A continuation of the Argument, concernynge the chefe Prynces of thys Iland," this new addition, *A Memorial of Suche Princes* (STC 1246), was meant to resume the narrative thread of Lydgate's earlier text.[12] "Penned by the best clearkes in such kinde of matters that be thys day lyuing, not vnworthy to be matched with maister Lydgate," the collection was compiled and edited principally by William Baldwin, a printer, author, and compositor whom Wayland had inherited along with Whitchurch's printing house. Before production on this sixteenth-century 'continuation' of *The Fall of Princes* had been completed, however, *A Memorial of Suche Princes* attracted the notice—and the censure—of Mary's government. The Lord Chancellor halted the project, and, at his insistence, the pages of *A Memorial of Suche Princes* were physically cut away from the printed pages of *The Fall of Princes* to which they were cognate.[13] A new title page was printed for the salvageable half of the

---

[11] Though *The Fall of Princes* had enjoyed great interim popularity with English audiences, it seems to have been printed only twice prior to Wayland's edition. On the status and reputation of Lydgate's poem, see A.S.G. Edwards, "The Influence of Lydgate's *Fall of Princes* c. 1440-1559: A Survey," *Mediaeval Studies* 39 (1977): 424-39 and Gillespie, *Print Culture and the Medieval Author*, 144-228. The earlier printed editions of the work date from 1494 and 1527, and both were produced by Richard Pynson (STC 3175 and STC 3176). Another edition of *The Fall of Princes* (STC 3177) was published by Richard Tottel around the same time that Wayland's edition appeared.

[12] I cite this descriptions of *A Memorial of Suche Princes* from "The Prynter to the Reader" in Wayland's *Fall of Princes*, qtd. in Campbell, 6.

[13] The reasons for the suppression of the edition remain unknown. Scholars tend to agree that the edition was suppressed because some of its content was deemed objectionable, but they have yet to come to a general consensus about the precise nature of this objectionable content. For discussions of the complex

composite printed book, a title page that omitted all references to *The Fall of Prince's* (now detached and destroyed) companion text. This act of censorship was so comprehensive that it resulted in the near-annihilation of the c. 1554 *Memorial of Suche Princes* and its material traces.

The inflammatory 'continuation' to *The Fall of Princes* was not destined to see printed circulation in *Marian* England. However, Queen Mary's reign would prove to be shorter even than her younger brother's had been. Following the Catholic monarch's death in 1558, Elizabeth, the fifth and final Tudor monarch, took the throne, and England's official religious allegiances changed once again. It hardly seems coincidental that sometime between 10 July 1558 and 10 July 1559—during the year that witnessed the new Protestant queen's ascension—London stationer Thomas Marshe successfully licensed a new edition of the vigorously suppressed *Memorial of Suche Princes,* retitling the formerly banned work *A Mirror for Magistrates.*[14] The resultant *Elizabethan* text of 1559 (STC 1247) contained nineteen tragedies.

Although it took its inspiration from Lydgate*,* whose collection of stories spanned from the time of Eden to 1356, *A Mirror for Magistrates'* collected biographies were markedly more limited in historical scope, spanning only the English period between Richard II and Edward IV. Unlike its literary prototype, *A Mirror for Magistrates* was the work of multiple authors, apparent members of a literary coterie that centred around the figures of William Baldwin and George Ferrers.[15] Moreover, the narrative framing of *A Mirror for Magistrates* diverges in a significant way from *The Fall of Princes*. Each tragedy in the Tudor collection is

---

publication history of *A Memorial of Suche Princes* and *A Mirror for Magistrates*, see Eveline Iris Feasey, "The Licensing of the *Mirror for Magistrates*," *The Library,* 4th ser. 3 (1923): 177-93; William Alexander Jackson, "Wayland's Edition of the *Mirror for Magistrates*," *The Library,* 4th ser. 13 (1933): 155-57; Lily B. Campbell, "The Suppressed Edition of *A Mirror for Magistrates*," *Huntington Library Bulletin* 6 (1934): 1-16; Lily B. Campbell, "Introduction," in *The Mirror for Magistrates*, 3-60; John N. King, *English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 414-18; Scott Campbell Lucas, "The Suppressed Edition and the Creation of the 'Orthodox' *Mirror for Magistrates*," *Renaissance Papers* (1994): 31-54; Paul Budra, *A Mirror for Magistrates and the* de casibus *Tradition* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 4-13; and Gillespie, *Print Culture and the Medieval Author*, 213-23.

[14] Arber, 1.33.

[15] In the opening pages of the 1559 edition, Baldwin notes that, in addition to himself, seven other men contributed to the volume. However, critics have only been able to definitively connect the names of George Ferrers, Thomas Chaloner, and Thomas Phaer with the work.

confessional in nature, a first person lament recounted in the mediated and imagined voice of a fallen historical character.[16]

Over the next several decades, Marshe and other printers would go on to issue a stream of literary expansions, sequels, and prequels to *A Mirror for Magistrates*. A number of scholars have noted how these successive additions to and continuations of *A Mirror for Magistrates* fundamentally altered the character of the work over time. Ronald Primeau claims that "in subsequent editions, *A Mirror* grew in volume and range, and there evolved a 'Mirror' tradition which resulted from the development of dramatic as well as homiletic poetic techniques."[17] In the words of Paul Budra, what initially functioned as a "politically corrective exemplar of the poetry/history combination" gradually morphed into a "sentimental book of moral platitudes," becoming, more and more, "a piece of Tudor propaganda…and atavistic historiography…that was increasingly divorced from the social and value structures" that the work, in its original conception, had "purported to reflect."[18] Just as the tone and functions of *A Mirror for Magistrates* changed, the demographics of its readership shifted and broadened as well. Although the work had ostensibly been composed as advice literature directed at an audience of legislators and politicians—perhaps the reason why the Marian government

---

[16] In the medieval era, the word *historia* was largely interchangeable with the word *fabula*, and these meanings of "history" and "story" were still generically and conceptually intertwined in the Tudor era. In "Erudition and the Idea of History in Renaissance England." Woolf explains (15-17):

> Men who wrote histories were called historians (*historici* in Latin) in Elizabethan England, or historiographers, or sometimes "historicians." Occasionally they were called chroniclers....The meaning of the word *history* (Latin, *historia*) itself is much more problematic and fluid. Different writers used it in different contexts to mean different things. At its most fundamental level, however, it almost always meant either a *story* (the two words are often used interchangeably) of some sort or, less commonly, an *inventory* of factual knowledge, for example a 'natural history'....History as 'story' is...complex. In common parlance, a play could be a history, or a 'tragical history,' or a 'historical comedy,' or even, somewhat redundantly, a 'chronicle history'....All these genres have two features in common: they tell stories, true or false, about real and imaginary men and women who lived in the remote or recent past, and they take the form not of a synchronic inventory of information but of a diachronic narrative.

[17] "Daniel and the *Mirror* Tradition: Dramatic Irony in *The Complaint of Rosamond*," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 15 (1975): 21. The idea of book-as-mirror was prevalent during the period. Herbert Grabes notes that the metaphor of "the mirror appears with especially marked frequency...between 1550 and 1650" (a period that he aptly terms "The Age of the Mirror"), and his study ennumerates nearly four hundred works with mirror titles printed in England between 1500 and 1700: *The Mutable Glass: Mirror-Imagery in Titles and Texts of the Middle Ages*, trans. Gordon Collier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 12, 14. For Grabes' list of titles, see 235-329.

[18] "*The Mirror for Magistrates* and the Politics of Readership," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 32 (1992): 3.

initially reacted so strongly to the work—*A Mirror for Magistrates* quickly became a staple text for all literate classes. Progressing through subsequent editions, *A Mirror for Magistrates* attracted a steadily increasing body of readers from amongst London's citizens.[19] By the close of the sixteenth century, it had become one of England's most popular and influential works, earning the praise of Philip Sidney, who esteemed *A Mirror for Magistrates*—along with *Troilus and Criseyde*, Surrey's poems, and *The Shepherd's Calendar*—one of the crown jewels of English literary achievement to date, "meetly furnished of beautiful parts."[20]

In spite of, or perhaps because of, the political censorship that *A Mirror for Magistrates* initially attracted, we know much about the circumstances of its early publication history. In addition to this external and largely materially based historical and bibliographical narrative surrounding the collection's textual past that I have just related, I am also interested in the aetological fictions that *A Mirror for Magistrates* tells about itself, for its fictive portrayals of the Tudor communications circuit would spark a chain of related bibliofictions that would intersect with and inform the Elizabethan reception of Ovidian complaint poetry. *A Mirror for Magistrates* contains an elaborate, inscribed account of its own creation, and this fictive bibliogenesis is extensively documented by the narrative *persona* of its primary interlocutor, William Baldwin. In the paratext as well as the prose frame that emerges between and links the individual histories in the 1559 edition, Baldwin's *persona* provides what Sherri Geller has called

---

[19] Budra points out that, while even the first edition of the work attracted citizen readers, successive editions became increasingly oriented and marketed towards that audience. He elaborates that *A Mirror for Magistrates* metamorphosed "from a politically corrective exemplar of the poetry/history combination into a mundane and sentimental book of moral platitudes….As it did, its intended readership shifted from the originally targeted political authorities to the urban citizenry": "*The Mirror for Magistrates* and the Politics of Readership," 2-3. As a potential point of contrast to Budra's emphasis on the citizen readers of the work, Stephen Orgel has examined in detail how a particular aristocratic woman, Lady Anne Clifford, read *A Mirror for Magistrates*: "Marginal Maternity: Reading Lady Anne Clifford's *Mirror for Magistrates*," in *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England*, 267-90.

[20] *An Apology for Poetry (or The Defence of Poesy)*, 3rd ed., ed. Geoffrey Shepherd, rev. R.W. Maslen (1973; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 110. Gary Waller suggests that, as far as vernacular poetry goes, only the *Metrical Psalms* had a greater audience in sixteenth-century England: *English Poetry of the Sixteenth Century* (London: Longman, 1986), 40.

a "pseudo-nonfictional behind-the-scenes account of the process of research and composition."[21]

Baldwin's *persona* provides two slightly different creation stories. Both help to characterize his editorial vision of the work, even as they meld fact with probable fiction:

> The wurke was begun, & part of it printed .iiii. yeare agoe, but hyndred by the lord Chauncellour that then was, nevertheles, through ye meanes of my lord Stafford, lately perused & licenced. Whan I first tooke it in hand, I had the helpe of many graunted, & I offred of sum, but of few perfourmed, skarce of any: So that wher I entended to have continued it to Quene Maries time, I have ben faine to end it much sooner: yet so, that it may stande for a patarne, till the rest be ready: which with Gods grace (if I may have anye helpe) shall be shortly.
>
> (66)

> Whan the Printer had purposed with hym selfe to printe Lidgates booke the fall of Princes, and had made priuye thereto, many both honourable and worshipfull, he was counsailed by dyuers of theim, to procure to haue the storye contynewed from where as Bochas lefte, vnto this presente time, chiefly suche as Fortune had dalyed with here in this ylande.
>
> (68)

Though the precise impetus for the work and levels of agency attributed to Wayland and Baldwin varies in each of the above excerpts, in both passages Baldwin characterizes *A Mirror for Magistrates* as the conceptual and yet-unfinished product of a series of social and intertextual negotiations. These transactions involve not only the pesky 'Chauncellour' of 'Quene Maries time,' 'lord Stafford,' 'the Printer' Wayland, and 'many both honourable and worshipfull,' but also Lydgate and Boccaccio—whose authorial identities and textual products are effectively conflated and collapsed in the second passage—as well as the contemporary author or authors of 'this ylande' whose 'helpe' is required to continue the project 'vnto this presente time.' As his narrative of fictionalized textual production unfolds further, Baldwin calls increasing

---

[21] "Editing Under the Influence of the Standard Textual Hierarchy: Misrepresenting *A Mirror for Magistrates* in the Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Editions," *Textual Cultures: Text, Contexts, Interpretation* 2.1 (2007): 47. Geller rightly notes that modern editors have tended to impose "a standard textual hierarchy upon the two primary textual components" and, hence, subordinate "Baldwin's frame tale… to the *Mirror's* embedded text." I would point out that this is particularly curious, given that, in the early editions of the work, the prose frame is demarcated and emphasized by the fact that it is printed in a larger type than the inset poems. As Jessica Winston has remarked, "In the *Mirror*, physical form shifts the reader's attention from the tragedies to the prose frame and indicates a political and ideological shift from admonitory history to conversations among the writers themselves": "*A Mirror for Magistrates* and Public Political Discourse in England," *Studies in Philology* 101.4 (2004): 390. In addition to Geller and Winston, Meredith Skura has also recently discussed the often-neglected prose frame: "*A Mirror for Magistrates* and the Beginnings of English Autobiography," *English Literary Renaissance* 36.1 (2006): 26-56.

attention to his own role in this complex and bookish matrix. Explaining that Wayland "required [him] to take paynes" to construct *A Mirror for Magistrates*, Baldwin narrates:

> because it was a matter passyng my wyt and skyll, and more thankles than gaineful to meddle in, I refused vtterly to vndertake it, excepte I might haue the helpe of suche, as in wyt were apte, in learning allowed, and in iudgemente and estymacion able to wield and furnysh so weighty an enterpryse, thinkyng euen so to shift my handes. But he earnest and diligent in his affayres, procured Athlas to set vnder his shoulder: for shortly after, dyuers learned men whose many giftes nede fewe praises, consented to take vpon theym parte of the trauayle.
>
> (68-9)

Thus, Baldwin's reluctant *persona* is faced with a strong-minded printer determined to publish a modernized extension to *The Fall of Princes*. Having refused to undertake sole authorship of the work, Baldwin instead becomes a textual collaborator who operates alongside Ferrers and six other unnamed poets whom Wayland has procured.

Baldwin takes pains to justify and authenticate his own role as narrator within this aetiological publication-fiction. In an opening section of the prose narrative, which recounts a purported conversation between Baldwin and the other contributors to *A Mirror for Magistrates*, he describes his own election by Ferrers as the group's secretary. Ferrers' character tells Baldwin's: "it shalbe your charge to note, and pen orderly the whole proces" (73). Thus, Baldwin reiterates his fundamental narrative role and again gives credence to both the book and its framing bibliofictions. Once he has begun to establish his own narrative authority, Baldwin's *persona* describes in further detail the fictional processes by which he, Ferrers, and their coterie conducted research for the volume. Having assembled an impressive collection of historical books and documents, Baldwin and his companions set aside a particular day to collectively organize, prioritize, and interpret these materials. The creative process is made performative in more than one sense, as the inscribed poets read and recite lengthy segments from historical texts to one another. Their own stated purpose is didactic and exemplary in nature, as they aim to create "a myrrour for al men as well noble as others, to shewe the slyppery deceytes of the waueryng lady, and the due rewarde of all kinde of vices" (68). Baldwin's *persona* relates that when the group encounters a figure who is deemed an appropriate

subject, one of the inscribed authors composes an impromptu complaint—invariably a first person lament told from that historical personage's point of view—and recites it orally then and there. Sorting through the often-contradictory textual monuments of the past, they fictionally deliver the volume's nineteen complaints, and, over the course of the day, these successive rhetorical performances function simultaneously for the benefit of the other collaborators within the framing fiction and as textual segments intended for inclusion in Wayland's projected 'continuation' of Lydgate. Baldwin's *persona* describes how his collaborators urged him to act as a surrogate Boccaccio. This effectively aligns him with the historical Italian and establishes his narrative authority by metaphorically "usurp[ing] Bochas rowme." The collaborators ally their own project in very specific ways with Boccaccio's as well as Lydgate's. Hence, within the work's framing fiction, Ferrers' *persona* "mervaile[s]" that Boccaccio neglected "among his myserable princes, such as wer of our nacion, whose numbre is as great, as their adventures wunderful" (69). In this sense, their efforts are portrayed as corrective as well as derivative.

In contrast to *De casibus virorum illustrium*, however, the narrative novelty of *A Mirror for Magistrates* becomes apparent when Baldwin says of himself and his companions that they "tooke upon themselves every man for his parte to be sundrye personages, and in theyr behalfes to bewayle unto me theyr grevous chaunces, hevy destinies, & wofull misfortunes" (69). This frame dramatizes the reading process by describing how the assorted men individually and communally interpreted diverse textual fragments, thereby implicitly characterizing history as a series of consensual, mediated fictions. This framing fiction of origins shows the writers and publishers of these historical tragedies engaged in constructing and imagining their readership as well. Drawing upon a humanist literary convention that treated the text as the product of a series of exchanges amongst a network of producers and friends, it also emphasizes the internal authors' crucial roles as inscribed author-compilers who rhetorically fashion a new body of historical documents out of existing textual remains.

The inscribed poets of the narrative frame, themselves interpretative intermediaries, following in the tradition of Boccaccio and Lydgate, 'bewayle' and speak *as if* and *on behalf of* the 'sundrye personages' whom they have selected for inclusion in their project. Geller summarizes: "The 'real' people who speak in the frame signal that ghosts do not speak in the complaints even though the complaints are in the first person."[22] There is less the atmosphere of a séance than the Tudor schoolroom in the framing fiction of *A Mirror for Magistrates*. The gathered men are completing elaborate exercises in *prosopopoeia*, or personification. Though they attempt to, in John Hoskyns' phrasing, make "dead men speake" through their role playing, they do not pretend to convene with the dead in any literal sense.[23] To use the definition of *prosopopoeia* provided by Abraham Fraunce in *The Arcadian Rhetorike*, the inscribed authors of *A Mirror for Magistrates* participate in a rhetorical game whose participants aim to "fayn[e]" or fabricate "any person" and "make it speake as though he were in the present."[24] The inscribed authors thus perform opposing oratorical roles as they simulate diverse historical personalities, and they imaginatively recreate characters, treating textual sources as discursive mediators.[25]

In the bibliofictional frame of the 1559 *Mirror for Magistrates*, the work draws to a close when "nyghte was so nere cum that [the group of authors] could not conveniently tary together any longer" (235). Ferrers' *persona* suggests to the assembled men that they meet again in seven days time to continue their project, and, in the 1563 version (STC 1248), this anticipated meeting is documented.[26] Just as Ferrers proposed in the first part, in the second part of *A Mirror for Magistrates*, the inscribed members of the enlarged and growing Baldwin-

---

[22] Geller, 48.
[23] "Direccions for speech and style," in *Life, Letters and Writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638,* ed. Louise Brown Osborn (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937), 163.
[24] *The Arcadian Rhetorike* (STC 11338; London, 1588), G2^{r}.
[25] Kerrigan makes the related observation: "It is no accident that John Higgins, adding episodes [to a subsequent edition of the work], should have pioneered the use of inverted commas for direct speech, distinguishing the complainant's discourse from that of narrator and compiler": *Motives of Woe*, 26.
[26] Although the lament of the fifteenth-century noblewoman and indicted witch Eleanor Cobham seems to have been originally intended for inclusion in the first edition, her story did not actually appear in print until nearly a decade later in the edition of 1578. Heather Dubrow suggests that *A Mirror for Magistrates* moved towards increasing gender equality. "Most obviously," she remarks, "the later volumes include women among their speakers": "A Mirror for Complaints: Shakespeare's *Lucrece* and Generic Tradition," in *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation,* ed. Barbara Kiefer Lewalski (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986), 400.

Ferrers literary coterie (the printer and an assortment of other "frendes and furderers") reconvene for another session (243). This second meeting is markedly different from the first, not only because of the larger crowd, but also because the poets have arrived with pre-composed tragedies in hand. Furthermore, a number of participants, including Ferrers—despite the fact that *he* set the date only one week prior in the frame's fictive reality—discharge themselves from the day's proceedings with excuses of pressing, "great & weighty" business elsewhere. After this exodus, Baldwin and the remaining author-compilers read and discuss a collection of new materials: eight new tragedies and Sackville's "Induction."

SHORE'S WIFE

When the first successful edition of *A Mirror for Magistrates* was printed in 1559, its tragedies featured an array of complaints in the voices of English lords, kings, dukes, and even a solitary rebel, conspicuously, all of the characters were male. Nevertheless, the incorporation of exemplary *women* into *A Mirror for Magistrates*—and the genre of English *de casibus* tragedy more broadly—began in the much-expanded 1563 edition. This initial inclusion of a female-voiced complaint, generically reminiscent of Ovid's *Heroides*, came in the form of Thomas Churchyard's Shore's Wife.[27] The historical character upon which Churchyard's contribution is based was Elizabeth Shore *née* Lambert, mistress of Edward IV.[28]

It was Thomas More who first inducted Shore's Wife—or 'Jane Shore' as she would be popularly referred to by the Elizabethans—into the realm of textual history. Although More

[27] Churchyard was the only poet other than Spenser to receive a pension from Elizabeth I. Despite his contemporary royal recognition and prolific body of writings, little scholarship exists on his career or literary works. For biographical information on Churchyard, see Raphael Lyne, "Churchyard, Thomas (1523?–1604)," in the *ODNB* and M. Harvey Goldwyn, "Notes on the Biography of Thomas Churchyard," *Review of English Studies* 17 (1966): 1–15.

[28] Elizabeth Shore, the historical woman upon whom the character of Shore's Wife is based, was the daughter of a London citizen. She became estranged from her husband, also a London citizen, when she became a royal mistress of Edward IV. Elizabeth Shore faced a series of social, political, and financial troubles after Edward's death. According to tradition, Richard III, Edward's successor, accused her of sorcery; she was imprisoned and her property seized. She subsequently found herself brought before the Bishop of London as a harlot, was forced to do open penance, and, after a stint as a prisoner, died financially and socially destitute in 1526 or 1527. On the historical Elizabeth Shore, see Nicholas Barker, "The Real Jane Shore," *Etoniana* 125 (1972): 383-91 and Rosemary Horrox, "Shore, Elizabeth [Jane] (d. 1526/7?)," in the *ODNB*.

admitted that many might find a "woman too slight a thing to be written of and set among the remembrances of great matters," her character appears in his sole attempt at historical writing, his unfinished *History of King Richard the Third*.[29] For More, born in 1478, Shore's Wife was something of a contemporary. Although More experienced little of Richard III's reign, nonetheless, Shore's Wife, approximately thirty years his elder, was still in London during his own lifetime. More crucially, she was still alive in 1513, the year in which he likely composed his portrait of her. Even as he writes, More tells us, Shore's Wife is an "old, lean, withered, and dried up" woman with "nothing left but rivelled skin and hard bone" (431).[30] Hence, his textual account incorporates tantalizing elements of living memory, circulating rumour, and personal observation.

More describes Shore's Wife, during her tenure as Edward IV's "meriest" mistress, as a lively and charismatic character "in whom the King therefore took special pleasure" (432). "She delighted not men so much in her beauty, as in her pleasant behaviour," More reports: "a proper wit had she, and could both read well and write, merry in company, ready and quick of answer" (431). During her period of royal favour:

> Where the King took displeasure, she would mitigate and appease his mind; where men were out of favour, she would bring them in his grace; for many that had highly offended, she obtained pardon; of great forfeitures she got men remission; and finally, in many weighty suits, she stood many men in gret stead, either for none or very small rewardes, and those rather gay than rich: either for that she was content with the deed self well done, or for that she delighted to be sued unto and to show what she was able to do with the King, or for that wanton women and wealthy be not always covetous.
> (432)

More's above report of Shore's Wife would prove to be influential throughout the Tudor era and beyond, and its influence is tangible in the 1563 *Mirror for Magistrates*.[31] Shore's

---

[29] I cite the text of *The History of King Richard the Third* from *The English Works of Sir Thomas More*, vol. 1, ed. W.E. Campbell, (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1913), 432. This text is based on William Rastell's 1557 English version of More's work. Subsequent parenthetical page numbers refer to this edition.

[30] Having been neglected, "unfriended and worn out of acquaintance," Shore's Wife is reduced to begging (432). "For men," More ominously explains, "if they haue an evil turn," are accustomed "to write it in marble; and whoso doth us a good turn, we write it in dust: which is not worst proved by her" (432).

[31] Although the work, which remained unfinished, was not printed during More's own lifetime, it did enjoy limited manuscript circulation; several distinct versions of the work were disseminated in both English and Latin. For a discussion of how Jane Shore's story in particular was used during the era to create a space for women in historical writing, see Wendy Wall's "Forgetting and Keeping: Jane Shore and the English

Wife is there introduced as an "eloquent wench," and the reading of her tragedy by Baldwin's poetic *persona* marks the loquacious woman's dramatic entry into the previously male-dominated milieus of chronicle history and *de casibus* tragedy (372). Indeed, to introduce Shore's Wife as an 'eloquent wench' is apt; More's version of her story had remarked upon Shore's Wife's remarkable literacy—uncharacteristic in a woman, particularly in one of her social station—and this idea that she is a manipulator of language, both oral and written, is carried through and expanded in Churchyard's conception.[32] With her use of "sweete wordes," she "could the kyng perswade" to the extent that she "governed him that ruled all this land" (379). Churchyard's version of Shore's Wife is clearly confident in the efficacy of her own words, and her references to rhetorical persuasion carry over into the use of legal language. Inviting her audience to "trye [her] case who lyst," she begs leave to "pleade [her] case at large" (378, 377).

Churchyard's character locates herself literally and figuratively amongst *A Mirror for Magistrates'* ranks of the fallen great by looking out and comparing her "dolefull destenie" to theirs. She has already "heare[d] the lives and falles of many wyghtes" and wants her own "tragedy… place[d] among the rest" (375). She insists that, despite her gender, she is "not least" amongst the group to "wayle her fate" (373). Aligning her own "wealaway" with theirs and demonstrating her authenticating knowledge of the genre in which she operates, Shore's Wife begins her complaint in typical *Mirror for Magistrates* fashion. She posits the story of her rise and fall as a looking glass (377). To this effect, she forebodingly instructs her audience: "A mirror make of my great overthrow: | Defy the world and all his wanton ways, | Beware of me that spent so ill her days" (386).

Domestication of History," in which she argues: "By including the story of a penitent woman, More constructed the political sphere of history defined in part by its peculiar interruption by the 'feminine' that it cannot contain. His text signals anxieties about the potential crisis caused by the intrusion of the private into the public realm, sexuality into court matters, women into history": *Renaissance Drama,* new ser. 27 (1998): 130.

[32] Mary Stebile argues that "Churchyard's treatment of Shore differs little from historical and chronicle antecedents upon which he based his text…except in one significant manner: Churchyard's Shore curses Richard III": "Jane Shore and the Politics of Cursing," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 43.1 (2003), 1.

Churchyard's account, taking its cue from More's, contains a myriad of excuses and rationalizations for the fallen woman's behaviour in an attempt to explain and rationalize the convoluted processes by which the formerly good name of Shore's Wife was slandered. More's history had reported that, although she was "worshipfully friended, honestly brought up," Shore's Wife was prematurely "coupled ere she were well ripe" (431). Finding herself too soon attached to a man "for whom she never longed," she was made vulnerable "unto the King's appetite when he required her" (431). Churchyard's Shore's Wife borrows upon this same argument to exonerate herself. In presenting her case, she emphasizes how her naïveté was abused and exploited: "In maryage, a prentyse was I bound, | When that meere love I knewe not howe to use" (377). Additionally, she traces the origins of her resounding "lowde reproche" to a second causative factor: her great beauty (374). "Natures gyftes," she laments, were the "cause of all [her] griefe" (376). In her vacillating and inconsistent self-characterizations, Shore's Wife claims both that she was bodily besieged by a king whom she had no hope of fending off and that she became "a prisoner willynglye" to this same conqueror of her body and chastity (378).

Within the framing fiction of *A Mirror for Magistrates*, Shore's Wife had already achieved a certain esteem before Churchyard's tragedy was even published. Baldwin's *persona* records that after the piece was read out before the inscribed assemblage: "This was so well lyked, that all together exhorted me instantly, to procure Maister Churchyarde to undertake and to penne as manye moe of the remaynder as myght by any meanes be attaynted at his handes" (387). Helgerson notes that the instantaneous success of Churchyard's lament was due in part to its subject's gender, which distinguished the complaint from others in the collection: "At once desired object and suffering subject, she engaged her readers, including her male readers, more powerfully than did the fallen princes surrounding her, even when she mouthed the same platitudes about fickle Fortune as they."[33] To a similar end, Richard Danson Brown has

[33] Helgerson, 459.

characterized the "sexual encoding" of the tragedy, arguing more pointedly that, as a "performer reciting her story for the audience's delectation," Shore's Wife functions as "a kind of poetic stripper" and that her character engages in "a staged flirtation."[34] It is hardly surprising, then, that Churchyard's titillating lament detailing Shore's Wife's public and published transgressions—transgressions both sexual and social in nature—quickly emerged as one of the most, if not *the* most, popular of *A Mirror for Magistrates'* tragedies.[35]

The pressures of Shore's Wife's real and fictive popularity are evident in the—again revised—1587 edition of *A Mirror for Magistrates* (STC 13445). Under the watch of a new editor, John Higgins, the bibliofictional frame in which Shore's Wife's lament was earlier embedded disappears and is replaced with a narrative frame of an entirely different nature, a frame that recasts the extant lament as a putative act of entextualization. The new introduction to Churchyard's piece, found under the heading "Shores Wife," is worth quoting in full:

> The open bruite of Princes falles and such as bare sway in this Realms, made mee poore haplesse woman (though once in great place) presume to shew my selfe emong that infortunate flock. And making more haste then good speede, I appeared fyrst to one *Baldwine* a Minister and a Preacher: whose function and calling disdaynes to looke so lowe, as to searche the secrets of wanton women, (though commonly a Preacher with sufferaunce may rebuke vice.) Wherefore I haue better bethought mee, and so doe sodaynly appeale and appeare to some martiall man, who hath more experience both in defending of womens honour, and knowes somwhat more of theyr conditions and qualityes: and the rather, because my tragedy was in question among some that would not spare due commendation to the autor thereof I now appeare to him that fyrst set me forth, a writer of good continuance, and one that dayly is exercised to set out both matter tragicall, and other prophane histories and verses, whose name is Churchyard: hee shall not only haue the fame of his owne worke (which no man can deny) but shall likewise haue all the glory I can gieue him, if hee lend mee the hearing of my woefull tale, a matter scarce fit for womans shamefastnes to bewray. But since without blushing I haue so long beene a talkatiue wench. (whose words a world hath delighted in) I will now goe on boldly with my audacious manner: and so step I on the stage in my shrowdeing sheete as I was buried.
>
> (372)

[34] "'A Talkatiue Wench (Whose Words a World Hath Delighted in)': Mistress Shore and Elizabethan Complaint," *Review of English Studies* 49 (1998): 402.
[35] Over the next two centuries, the character of Jane Shore frequently appeared in ballads, poems, plays, and even operas. See James L. Harner, "Jane Shore in Literature: A Checklist," *Notes and Queries* 28 (1981): 496–507 and Maria M. Scott, *Re-presenting "Jane" Shore: Harlot and Heroine* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005).

The above prefatory remarks to Shore's Wife's complaint reveal that something curious has occurred: it is delivered in the voice of the character herself. The new introduction of 1587 plays upon imagery found within Shore's Wife's complaint of earlier editions. She had, within the complaint proper, offered her "selfe for proofe" and rhetorically suggested "loe here I nowe appeare" (374). In her ventriloquized complaint, the interconnections between senses of hearing and sight are thus highlighted as Shore's Wife makes the Ovidian suggestion that the process of hearing a lament makes it seem almost as if there is a complaining body present: "A whole dicourse of me Shores wife by name | *Now shalt thou heare as thou hadst sene the same*" (375).[36] The presence of this complaining female body suggested in Shore's Wife's earlier lament has become realized in the 1587 edition's introductory frame.

Even as Shore's Wife purportedly defends Churchyard, the 1587 introduction problematizes and subtly undermines his authorial status. The fictively entextualized character implicitly challenges her transcriber when she says of Churchyard that 'hee shall not only haue the fame of his owne worke (which no man can deny) but shall likewise haue all the glory I can gieue him, if hee lend mee the hearing of my woefull tale.' External author, inscribed author(s), and subject become hopelessly conflated in this line. Where do the distinctions lie between Churchyard's 'owne worke' and Shore's Wife's 'woefull tale'? It is, in the end, Shore's Wife who theatrically steps 'on the stage' to deliver her complaint. The 'fame' that Shore's Wife seems to promise for Churchyard is the celebrity of transcription secretary rather than creative genius. He is, at least according to her character, merely the means by which her verbalized lament has been recorded and converted to textual artifact.

In Churchyard's inscribed relationship with his literary creation, we see a dynamic reworking of Chaucer's 'Non other auctour alegge I' dynamic—convoluted relations between Ovidian poet and ostensible speaking subject that are familiar from my last chapter. Nonetheless, in the case of Shore's Wife, this authorial palimpsest has been exacerbated by

[36] Emphasis my own.

prior publication. By 1587, the character of Shore's Wife would already have been well known as a constituent piece 'emong that infortunate flock' of the fallen in the immensely popular *Mirror for Magistrates*, and the 1587 character displays a fascinating metatextual self-consciousness by referring explicitly to this fact. This is no literary debut, for 'a world hath delighted in' her putative 'words' already. It is thus that Shore's Wife, as a viable *character*, has become a contending *author* through the widespread dissemination and consumption of 'her' complaint in its printed textualized form.

That we are meant to recognize Shore's Wife as an authorial character is underscored by the striking parallels between the bibliofictions recounted in the 1587 frame and Baldwin's earlier, and now defunct, narrative of *A Mirror for Magistrates'* composition. Like the work's original fictive frame, the story now delivered by a 'poore haplesse woman (though once in great place)' is one of reading and writing. She signals her usurpation of and debt to the original frame in her comment 'I haue so long beene a talkatiue wench,' which borrows directly from the inscribed Baldwin-Ferrers coterie's introduction of her as a 'talkatiue wench' in the earlier editions of *A Mirror for Magistrates*. The wraithlike character, like Baldwin before her, inscribes herself within a bibliofictional tale of textual genesis, describing how she first intended to solicit the help of Baldwin to tell her tale on her behalf, but, upon reflection, chose Churchyard as the more appropriate poet-medium. Her framing fiction even provides an explanation for its own inclusion in the 1587 volume; Shore's Wife relates that, after more than two decades of the printed success of her lament, her ghost has again opted to visit Baldwin, 'now appear[ing] to him' for a second time 'that fyrst set [her] forth.'

In 1559, the inscribed group of author-compilers in *A Mirror for Magistrates* was not explicitly calling up—nor being called upon by—the ranks of the dead. Rather, they delivered impromptu performative laments in which they imagined what each character *would* have said had he been present, imagining the instantiation of the historical men only insofar as visualization techniques would enhance the group's own rhetorical ends. The identification of

the volume's complaints as deliberate experiments in *prosopopoeia* is further exaggerated in the framing fiction of the 1563 *Mirror for Magistrates*, in which Shore's Wife first appeared, where the laments are no longer posited as ad lib poetic deliveries, but, instead, rhetorical homework pre-composed and read aloud to the group for discussion and approval. Yet, by the 1587 edition, Shore's Wife is undoubtedly a ghost with the ability to 'shew [her] selfe' at will and 'sodaynly appeale and appeare' to whom she desires. She is corporeal enough to refer not only to her state of *déshabillé* in her 'shrowdeing sheete,' but also to the fact that she immodestly speaks 'without blushing.'[37] Just as the existence and circulation of the Ovidian heroines' letters propagates the fiction of authorial female bodies, Churchyard's Shore's Wife takes on an increasingly corporeal presence through the publication of *A Mirror for Magistrates*. The specter of Shore's Wife materializes through her subsequent publication, so that by 1587 she is endowed with ghostly body and face as well as voice.

That the authorship of the seminal piece on Shore's Wife's had been contested between its 1563 and 1587 printed appearances is insinuated in the new framing fiction that Churchyard designed for the 1587 *Mirror for Magistrates*. I deliberately use the word *insinuated* here because I think that we are not necessarily meant to take this assertion at face value, a point to which I will return. Shore's Wife, in defending Churchyard's authorship of the piece, suggests that her 'tragedy' had been 'in question among some that would not spare due commendation to the autor thereof.'[38] These assurances of Churchyard's role, as voiced by the Shore's Wife, seem to have done little to resolve this problem, however, considering that the ghostly character-author herself presents a challenge to his authority.

---

[37] This reference to blushing seems to allude to More's version, where he reports: "the Bishop of London put her to open penance, going before the cross in a procession upon a Sunday, with a taper in her hand, — in which she went…so womanly, and albeit she were out of all array save her kirtle only, yet went she so fair and lovely, namely while the wondering of the people cast a comely rud in her cheeks (of which she before had most miss), that her great shame won her much praise among those who were more amorous of her body than curious of her soul": 431.

[38] In 1571, when the third edition of *The Mirror for Magistrates* was again printed, the 1563 prose link with its glowing praise of Churchyard was omitted. Instead, Shore's Wife's complaint was attributed to the poet only by the notation "Tho. Churchyarde" at the poem's end.

Much to Churchyard's annoyance (either real or staged), the fame of Shore's Wife's seems to have become fragmented from the poet's own. He contends as much in several of his works from the 1590s in which he returns to the subject of Shore's Wife, repeatedly expressing the desire to have his authority regrafted onto the rebellious and autonomous textual creation now in free circulation. In his prefatory remarks to *A Reuyuing of the Deade*, published in 1591, Churchyard again attempts to lay claim to Shore's Wife by announcing his plan to document his authorship of the poem in a future work: "thereby the world shall see what wrong I haue suffred to endure a deniall (by busie tunges) of mine own workes: Shores wife shall speake in her kinde, to defend me and…shall tell the world I haue beene abused, and not lustly and rightly vnderstood."[39] In *A Handeful of Gladsome Verses*, a work printed in the following year, Churchyard uses "A few voluntary verses to the general readers" to again remind readers of his disputed authorial claim:

> A Booke in Presse, that I my challenge name
> Shall tell you more, of workes that I haue done
> But blame me not, (since each man striues for fame)
> To holde on right, the course wherein I runne
> I ought to weare, the cloth my fingers spunne
> …….
> I haue as yet, some tragedies in store
> That like Shores wife, in verses shalbe tolde
> Condemne no man, though he be waxen olde.[40]

This 'Booke in Presse' was *Churchyards Challenge*, which appeared in 1593. Three times in the volume's paratext Churchyard indicates his ongoing, and perhaps disingenuous, frustration that he had not received proper authorial credit for his circulating literary creations, including the complaint of Shore's Wife. Attempting to remedy this situation, says he will set "forth…a great number of [his] works in this booke."[41] Churchyard's preoccupation with his own literary fame, or lack thereof, is further expanded in his appeal "To the worthiest sorte of

---

[39] *A Reuyuing of the Deade* (STC 5253; London, 1591), A2^{v}.
[40] *A Handeful of Gladsome Verses* (STC 5237; London, 1592), A3^{v}.
[41] *Churchyards Challenge* (STC 5220; London, 1593), A2^{v}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.

People, that gently can reade, and iustly can iudge" his case, in which he explains that he has been motivated to publish the current volume "for three or foure causes":

> the one to keep the reputation of a writer, the second to pleasure my freendes with the reading of new inuentions, and thirdly to desire my foes to giue me true reporte of those workes I haue made, and last of all to affirme that euery thing in this booke of Challenge is mine owne dooing, which iustlye no man can deny.
> (A3^{v})

Lest there be any doubt about which pieces Churchyard is attempting to publicly reclaim, he affixes a two page, inclusive bibliography of his literary works in the paratext to *Churchyards Challenge*. At the top of his list, he claims: "First in King Edwards daies, a book named Dauie Dicers dreame, which Camel wrote against, whome I openly confuted. Shores wife I penned at that season."[42] According to this bibliographical account, the lament of Shore's Wife was originally written around 1550, over a decade before its first inclusion in *A Mirror for Magistrates*.[43]

The complaint of Shore's Wife was extracted from its prior printed context and reprinted—for the first time presented as a standalone *de casibus* piece rather than as a constituent part of *A Mirror for Magistrates*—in *Churchyards Challenge*. In addition to the prefatory defenses of his intellectual property, Churchyard again insists upon his authorship of this particular literary piece in a long, separate dedication addressed to "the right honorable the Lady Mount Eagle and Compton." In this internal dedication, Churchyard reiterates and reamplifies his claim to the work:

> Good madame for that the vertuous and good Ladie Carie your sister, honourablie accepted a discourse of my penning, I beleeued your Ladiship would not refuse the like offer, humbly presented and dutifully ment, I bethoght mee of a Tragedie that long laye printed and many speake well of, but some doubting the shallownesse of my heade (or of meere mallice disdaineth my doeings) denies mee the fathering of such a worke, that hath won so much credit, but as sure as god liues, they that so defames me or doth disable me in this cause, doth me such an open wrong as I would be glad to right with

---

[42] This list is subdivided into both 'The bookes that I can call to memorie alreadie Printed' and unprinted works that were 'gotten from [him] of some such noble freends as [he is] loath to offend.'

[43] These measures obviously did not resolve Churchyard's alleged problem; his remarks "To the generall Readers" in a subsequent work admonish his audience to "*bring* Shores *wife, in question now no more*": *A Musicall Consort of Heauenly Harmonie…Called Churchyards Charitie* (STC 5245; London, 1595), 2A4^{v}. Once again, he definitively claims the work as his own. He tells his audience that he alone "*set hir foorth, in colours as she goes*," and he also adds the authority of a witness: "Sir Rafe Bowser a worshipfull knight witnesseth where and when I penned that": 2A4^{v}.

> the best blood in my body, so he be mine equall that moued such a quarrell, but mine old yeares doth vtterly forbid me such a combat, and to contend with the malicious I thinke it a madnesse, yet I protest before God and the world the penning of Shores wife was mine, desiring in my hart that all the plagues in the worlde maie possesse me, if anie holpe me either with scrowle or councell, to the publishing of the inuencion of the same Shores wife.
>
> ($L1^{r}$-$L1^{v}$)

As part of his obsessive paratextual project of recouping authority over his wayward text—and also to demonstrate that, despite his age, "yet [his] spirits faile [him] not in as great matters"—Churchyard informs his dedicatee that he has "augmented" the "Tragedie" of Shore's Wife and "hath sette forth some more Tragedies and Tragicall discourses, no whit inferiour" to his original version ($L1^{v}$). Inviting the "honourable censure" of his patroness, Churchyard actively solicits the "good Ladiships iudgement" in hopes that he will procure her "supportation" and endorsement as the complaint's "true writer" ($L1^{v}$-$L2^{r}$).

This printed sequence of elaborate authorial defenses outlined above are defenses that uniformly present Shore's Wife as a text that somehow escaped its author and has taken on a life of its/her own. These narratives, whether or not they have some basis in real-life challenges to Churchyard's authority, are most definitely grounded in Ovidian ideas about books. In particular, Churchyard's paratextual developments of Shore's Wife and her ghostly gambits disclose an Ovidian fascination with representing texts as metonyms for the bodies that produce (or, as the case may be, *putatively* produce) them. A fact that has gone curiously unremarked in the scholarship on Shore's Wife is that, between the first printed appearance of her lament in 1563 and the moment where she 'presume[s] to shew [her]selfe' and take on a new, independent role in the 1587 *Mirror for Magistrates*, Churchyard had translated the first three books of Ovid's Latin *Tristia* into English. I contend that Churchyard's post-1587 portrayals of Shore's Wife and the independent circulation that he ascribes to his *scripta puella* owe much to the portraits of anthropomorphized Ovidian books in *Tristia* 1.1 and 3.1, which Churchyard translated under the respective titles "Ouid to his booke" and "The booke to the Reader."

In 1587, the appearance of Shore's Wife as a speaking text, capable of addressing her readership directly, is reminiscent of the stance taken in the opening lines of Ovid's *Tristia* 3.1, translated by Churchyard as: "In feareful wyse an exiles booke, am sent the towne to see, | Thy helpinge hand, to weary frend (O Reader) lend thou mee."[44] Even more evocative, however, is Churchyard's redeployment of a inimitably Ovidian image wherein the anthropomorphized book bravely undertakes a first-person defense of its maker:

> At royall place and mighty man, O wretche for feare I shake,
> And dolefull wofull letters small, through trembling dred do quake.
> Thou doest behold to sickely hewe, my paper pale do chaunge,
> And dost regard eche other foote, to hault with tremblinge straunge.
> And at what time before the Lords, and rulers of the place,
> In sight thou shalbe set: I pray the plead the parentes case.
> (C2^{v})

His own self-characterization as beleaguered parent unfairly 'denie[d]…the fathering of such a worke' borrows on a conceit well-developed in the *Tristia,* wherein the book is both a simulacrum and heir to a loving, yet publicly dishonoured, father. Churchyard's accounts of his own anthropomorphized text's independent circulation likewise have an Ovidian flavour. In his bibliofictional reports of Shore's Wife's post-1563 transmission, Churchyard consistently adopts the stance of the persecuted *Tristia* poet, and, in his corresponding interest in representing the severance of a text from its maker, we hear echoes of *Tristia* 1.1, where, taking leave of his book, Ovid encourages the bashful text to "go thou on…in my steede" yet laments "that where thou go, thy maister may not so" (A1^{v}, A1^{r}).

Churchyard's sustained interest in text's capacity to give fictive body to abstract forms and illusory voices—or in the ontological status of viable characters—is a metafictional concern that he shares with Ovid. The Tudor translator of the Roman poet's works must have been acutely aware of the parallels between the seemingly autobiographical, yet metaphorically *ghost*written complaints of the *Heroides,* with their constructions of female authorial presences, and his own ventrilocution of Shore's (increasingly ghostly and increasingly autonomous) Wife.

---

[44] *The Thre First Bookes of Ouids De tristibus,* (STC 18977; London, 1572), C2^{r}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures refer to this edition.

No doubt Churchyard and his contemporaries perceived in the genre of *de casibus* complaint what Clark Hulse has referred to as "the Ovidian desire to interweave the private suffering of individuals with the grand and impersonal schemes of history."[45] Additionally, drawing upon both the anthropomorphized book of the *Tristia* and paradoxical fictions of female authorial presence—as cultivated both in the *Heroides* and also in the Ovidian heroines' vernacular reworkings such as Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women*—Churchyard, in the bibliofictions of reception with which he surrounds his own female-voiced lament, explores the possibilities of the Tudor *scripta puella scriptor's* seemingly autonomous textual embodiment.

DANIEL AND *DE CASIBUS* COMPLAINT

In 1591, four years after the rescripting of Shore's Wife's framing fiction, London bookseller and publisher Thomas Newman, in conjunction with John Charlewood, produced a controversial edition of the late poet Sir Philip Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*.[46] Although the printed volume took its title from Sidney's collection, the content of Newman's apparently surreptitious edition was not limited to England's first major sonnet sequence. Rather, it was something of a poetical miscellany, wherein Sidney's poetry was prefaced with a letter by the pamphleteer and satirist Thomas Nashe and followed by a collection of 'sundry other rare Sonnets of diuers Noble men and Gentlemen.'

Precisely how Newman obtained access to the poetry of Sidney included in the edition is not certain. Although many of Sidney's sonnets, written in the early 1580s, had been circulated in manuscript amongst a relatively limited audience during his lifetime, Sidney had not intended to publish these poems in printed format. Accordingly, Nashe's preface to Newman's edition responds directly to what he—and, presumably, Newman—saw as the prior

---

[45] "Ovidian Epic," in *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, ed. A.C. Hamilton (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 524.

[46] For *Astrophil and Stella's* textual history, see: Woudhuysen, 365-84; J.A. Lavin, "The First Two Printers of Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*," *The Library,* 5th ser. 26 (1971): 249-55; MacDonald P. Jackson, "The Printer of the First Quarto of *Astrophil and Stella* (1591)," *Studies in Bibliography* 31 (1978): 201-203; and Germaine Warkentin, "Patrons and Profiteers: Thomas Newman and the 'Violent Enlargement' of 'Astrophil and Stella,'" *Book-Collector* 34.4 (1985): 461-87.

hoarding of Sidney's work. Nashe suggests that coterie poetry remains physically captive within the limited social circles in which it was composed until it manages to break loose and inevitably circulate amongst the public at large: "although it be oftentimes imprisoned in Ladyes casks, & the president bookes of such as cannot see without another mans spectacles, yet at length it breakes foorth in spight of his keepers, and useth some private penne (in steed of a picklock) to procure his violent enlargement."[47] Nashe's preface hearkens the liberation of such material into the general, print circulation, and, moreover, cheekily excuses the edition as a mere hastening of the ineludible process of literary dissemination.[48] The Sidney set did not, it would seem, see things in quite the same light and were apparently displeased with the emergence and presentation of Newman's edition. The book, whose text of *Astrophil and Stella* was allegedly riddled with transcription errors, was seized shortly after its publication.[49]

Amongst the number of 'diuers Noble men and Gentlemen' whose poems were included in Newman's first, recalled edition of *Astrophil and Stella* was Samuel Daniel. Newman's edition had featured twenty-eight of Daniel's sonnets, the majority of which would later come to form his famed *Delia* sonnet sequence. Though Daniel would later complain that he was "betraide by the indiscretion of a greedie Printer" who had published some of his sonnets along with those of Sidney, the first edition of *Astrophil and Stella* provided an auspicious entrée into the world of print publication, launching Daniel into the public view as the implicit protégé of the much-lamented poet.[50] Daniel helped to perpetuate this conceptual

---

[47] *Syr P.S. His Astrophel and Stella,* A3^{r}.
[48] Nashe's commentary is a pithy summation of Marotti and Bristol's more recent argument that print "democratically opened up texts to potentially broad and heterogeneous readerships… knowledge was liberated from the control of a social (and academic) elite for an increasingly literate general populace whose access to texts entailed politically charged rights of interpretation and use." "Introduction," in *Print, Manuscript, and Performance*, 5.
[49] Nonetheless, Newman seems to have persuaded authorities to let him try again because later in that same year he issued a second, corrected edition of Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella* (STC 22537). This new version, which amended many of the first version's apparent textual errors, also removed both of the prefatory letters and all of the poems by other authors.
[50] *Delia…With the Complaint of Rosamond* (STC 6243.2; London, 1592)*,* A2^{r}. Subsequent parenthetical signatures for Daniel's dedicatory epistle refer to this edition.

link between Sidney and himself when, the following year, he dedicated an authorized edition of his own poetry to Mary Herbert, the sister of England's late author.[51]

Daniel's prose dedication borrows upon imagery that explicitly recalls Nashe's comments in the 1591 preface to *Astrophil and Stella* to construct an altogether flattering narrative of bibliogenesis. He claims that the *Delia* sonnets, or "priuate paßions of [his] youth," had, like Sidney's poetry, been "consecrated to silence," or intended for 'Ladyes casks,' as Nashe had phrased it ($A2^{r}$). Nonetheless, Daniel reminds his patroness and audience alike that these poems had come to light through the 'indiscretion' of a printer (that very same printer who had simultaneously freed Sidney's work from limited coterie circulation). Implicit to Daniel's narrative is the suggestion, earlier made by Nashe, that great poetry inevitably will free itself and begin to circulate. In Daniel's preferred version of his text's history, Newman had "thrust" both poet and poetry alike "out into the worlde" ($A2^{v}$). Having been unwillingly exposed, already in print and before the view of the masses, Daniel explains that—like the Sidney set before him, who insisted that Newman's second edition of *Astrophil and Stella* contains a corrected text—he felt obliged to see an authoritative and corrective version of his own work in print.

In addition to the fifty *Delia* sonnets, the 1592 quarto volume of Daniel's works contained a short ode and the *Complaint of Rosamond.*[52] The latter—a narrative poem about the twelfth-century Rosamond Clifford, seduced and imprisoned in a labyrinth by King Henry II and subsequently poisoned by the jealous Eleanor of Aquitaine—was a female-voiced *de casibus*

---

[51] As Marotti notes, "the function of patron was split between siblings in an interesting way, the brother [Philip Sidney] authorizing the publication of such verse and the sister [Mary Herbert] serving as dedicatee and protector": "Patronage, Poetry, and Print," in *Patronage, Politics, and Literary Traditions in England, 1558-1658*, ed. Cedric C. Brown (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993), 17.

[52] I cite the text of *The Complaint of Rosamond* from Kerrigan's *Motives of Woe*. Subsequent parenthetical line numbers refer to this edition. There has been a small surge of scholarship on this poem in recent years (likely a response to its inclusion in *Motives of Woe*): Kelly A. Quinn, "Ecphrasis and Reading Practices in Elizabethan Narrative Verse," *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 44.1 (2004): 19-35; Kenji Go, "The Bawdy 'Talent' to 'Occupy' in *Cymbeline,* the *Complaint of Rosamond*, and the Elizabethan Homily for Rogation Week," *The Review of English Studies* 54 (2003): 27-51; Heather Dubrow, Lending soft audience to my sweet design': Shifting Roles and Shifting Readings in Shakespeare's 'A Lover's Complaint,'" *Shakespeare Survey* 58 (2005): 23-33; Kenji Go, "Samuel Daniel's *The Complaint of Rosamond* and an Emblematic Reconsideration of *A Lover's Complaint*," *Studies in Philology* 104.1 (2007): 82-122; and Stephen Guy-Bray "Rosamond's Complaint: Daniel, Ovid, and the Purpose of Poetry," *Renaissance Studies* 22.3 (2008): 338-50.

complaint. Like Churchyard and the other contributors to *A Mirror for Magistrates*, Daniel presents the first-person narrative in the *Complaint of Rosamond* as the autobiography of a character resurrected from the pages of chronicle history. His subject, Rosamond Clifford, had been previously treated in a number of the same sources (Giraldus Cambrensis, Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*, Richard Grafton's *Chronicle*, Robert Fabyan's *Concordaunce of Hystoryes,* Holinshed's *Chronicle*, and Stow's *Chronicles of England*) that the Baldwin-Ferrers coterie consulted, though her particular story had been bypassed by the authors of *A Mirror for Magistrates*. More significantly still, like Churchyard's unfolding bibliofictional drama with Shore's Wife, Daniel's *Complaint of Rosamond* was the textual product of putative collaboration between the living male poet and a willful female phantom.

Overtly signaling its generic and intertextual debt to the English *de casibus* tradition, the content of Rosamond's defensive narrative of how she came to be "vnparadis'd" owes much to the precedent of Shore's Wife (449). In effect, Rosamond uses Shore's Wife's prior 'case' as a paradigm for her own exploration of the tensions between exploited sexuality, literary fame, feminine subjectivity, and masculine power. Although the *Complaint of Rosamond* adds the novel element of a wholesome country life versus corrupt court life dichotomy—with Rosamond asserting that she would not have fallen had she "neuer strayde: | But liu'd at home a happy Country mayde"—the main tenets of the heroine's defense are borrowed from the earlier legalistic complaint of Shore's Wife (538-39). The tenor of Rosamond's argument that "though [she] sinn'd, [her] sinne had honest cause" is familiar (89), and, like Shore's Wife before her, Rosamond portrays her devolvement from chaste woman to royal mistress as inevitable. Additionally appropriated from Shore's Wife is the paradoxical portrait of willing prisoner and the complex fictions of agency (rhetorical and otherwise) that Daniel's character posits for herself; she implies that she had no choice but to physically submit and surrender her body to the elderly and unattractive male monarch since "he [was her] King and may constraine" her (337).

Although the female-voiced *Complaint of Rosamond* is contained within the same volume as *Delia*, it is embedded within an independent bibliofictional frame of textual genesis.[53] Like the complaint proper, this framing fiction liberally borrows both form and content from Churchyard's Shore's Wife and *A Mirror for Magistrates*. Like Shore's Wife in the 1587 introduction to her lament, Rosamond haunts her own complaint as a quasi-physical presence, a "poore afflicted ghost" rising up "from the horror of Infernall deepes" (1, 2). She is a wraith with a particular dilemma: she suffers for lack of a reading public. She has been refused passage across the Acheron until her fare is paid in the form of "Louers sighes on earth" (14). Lest her beauty and fame be forgotten, she requires a poet to entextualize her speech and "register [her] wrong" in what Wendy Wall describes as an act of "redemption… predicated on the very power of poetry."[54]

Much as Shore's Wife indicated that she specifically selected Churchyard as an appropriate poet-medium for her lament, Rosamond's ghost purposefully solicits Daniel as her own poet-medium who will help her garner sympathy (and the requisite number of sighs) and ensure her passage into the underworld. Daniel's authorial *persona* thus works both as authorial character and putative audience for Rosamond's performative lament. He simultaneously records and composes in the voices of plaintive ghost and living poet, and these characters' voices seem to mutually inflect one another as Daniel fictively entextualizes his subject's speech, transforming their discursive interchange into a patently stylized poetic form. Like the relationship between Shore's Wife and Churchyard, the fictive female ghost is dependent upon the male poet for the textual monumentalization of 'her' verbally articulated outpouring, and the authorial voices of poet and subject deliberately overlap and are interwoven throughout the

---

[53] In some editions, Daniel's *Complaint of Rosamond* is also physically marked as a separate work by an internal title page. Dubrow, commenting on the "mixed and inconclusive signals about the relationship" between *Delia* and the *Complaint of Rosamond*, notes how the "apparent interventions of printer and publisher" have had an effect on their interplay: "Lending soft audience to my sweet design,'" 26. Dubrow further explains that, whereas in STC 6243.2 of 1593, "the complaint is not introduced with a half-title page, an ansence that facilitates relating it to the preceeding texts," STC 6243.3 of the same year "distinguishes the sonnets and 'The Complaint of Rosamond' through the addition of such a page" and "the complaint is further set off by the use of a large capital": 26

[54] *The Imprint of Gender*, 267.

opening frame of the *Complaint of Rosamond*. Significantly, Daniel's character refers to the product of her converse with the poet as "our story" (43).[55] Thus, the first-person is used in turn both by Daniel's inscribed authorial *persona*, who relates how he "tooke this charge assignd, | Because her griefes were worthy to be knowne," and by Rosamond's ghost, who delivers a series of forceful imperatives to the inscribed Daniel:

> Then write (quoth shee) the tuine of my youth,
> Report the downe-fall of my slippry state,
> Of all my life reueale the simple truth,
> To teach to others what I learnt too late.
> Exemplifie my frailtie, tell how Fate
> Keepes in eternall darke our fortunes hidden,
> And ere they come, to know them tis forbidden.
> (64-70)

Rosamond is a markedly literary ghost. Her acquaintance with Daniel's own sonnets is divulged by her seemingly offhand comment that "*Delia,*" the addressee of Daniel's sonnet sequence, "may happe to deynge to read our story | And offer vp her sigh among the rest" (43-44).[56] Even in death, Rosamond has kept up with her reading, for she complains:

> No Muse suggests the pittie of my case,
> Each penne doth ouer-passe my iust complaint,
> VVhilst others are preferd, though farre more base;
> *Shores* wife is grac'd, and passes for a Saint;
> Her Legend iustifies her foule attaint.
> Her wel-told tale did such compassion finde,
> That shee is pass'd, and I am left behind.
> (22-28)

Knowledgeable about recent English literary trends, Rosamond resentfully remarks upon the close parallels between the material of her own, yet unwritten, 'iust complaint' and those 'preferd' and already collected in *A Mirror for Magistrates*. Projectively imagining herself as a character being read *in* Daniel's narrative, she highlights the appropriateness of her own story for the *de casibus* genre, and Rosamond suggests her own inclusion amongst the historical ranks of the fallen as a solution to her plight. Jealously looking to the example of Shore's Wife and the contemporary popularity of her 'Legend,' Daniel's character recognizes that a 'wel-told tale'

---

[55] In relation to this line, Dubrow similarly comments: "the narrator is now at once its animator, its co-author, and, as the pronoun 'our' implies, its co-owner": 25.
[56] As Guy-Bray remarks, "Rosamond must have read *Delia* either in manuscript or in press as the sequence as a whole was unpublished until the 1592 volume in which it was paired with the complaint": 340-41.

might be her saving grace, for *de casibus* tragedy had already proven itself to evoke Elizabethan audiences' 'compassion.'

Rosamond's concerns in these aetiological bibliofictions do much to link her with Daniel's own extratextual literary enterprise. In a by now well-known formula, their *fama* is mutually dependent—a point that was not lost upon contemporary reader Richard Barnfield, who noted that the "fame" of "*Daniell,* praised for [his] sweet-chast Verse: | …is grav'd on *Rosamonds* blacke Herse."[57] Indeed, one of Rosamond's opening statements, "A sheete could hide my face, but not my sin, | For Fame findes neuer tombe t'inclose it in," is particularly relevant (6-7); her belief that her notoriety can be temporarily suppressed yet not permanently entombed is reminiscent of Daniel's own opening remarks in the volume's dedication, where he describes his inability to contain the material markers of his own literary fame, those 'priuate paßions of [his] youth' that are now published in print.

Both Rosamond's putative desire to achieve fame as the subject of a 'wel-told' *de casibus* tragedy and Daniel's congruent desire to achieve fame as such a tragedy's inscribed and extratextual author further elucidate and comment upon the nature of writing itself and the processes of textual dissemination and consumption. Subject's and author's underlying obsessions with renown and recognition underscore the paradox of literary fame itself, which is at once powerful and elusive. Rosamond muses:

> And were it not thy [Daniel's] fauourable lynes,
> Re-edified the wrack of my decayes,
> And that thy accents willingly assignes,
> Some farthar date, and giue me longer dayes,
> Few in this age had knowne my beauties prayse.
> But thus renewd, my fame redeemes some time,
> Till other ages shall neglect thy rime.
> (715-21)

The words of Rosamond's ephemeral complaint, through the efforts of Daniel, are converted into a reproducible material artifact, recorded on paper and printed in ink. Yet, the continuity

---

[57] "A Remembrance of some English Poets," from *Poems in Divers Humors,* in *The Encomion of Lady Pecunia: or the Praise of Money* (STC 1485; London, 1598), E2^{v}.

of her words, the textual monumentalization that will ensure Rosamond's delivery from the depths of oblivion, is utterly dependent upon an ongoing and enduring succession of readers who will maintain her memory through a continuous line of literary transmission and consumption.

Daniel's erudite specter is not only conversant with recent developments in vernacular literature, but she also displays an acquaintance, both direct and indirect, with classical poetry. It is thus that, in the midst of her soliloquy, the bibliophage recounts how she became "wel-schoold" in the arts of amatory intrigue, courtly artifice, and rhetorical deception by "One of [her] Sexe" (212). This "seeming Matron"—exposed as "a sinfull Monster" in disguise—functions as a readable, Ovidian text-within-the-text, inviting Rosamond to "Reade in [her] face the ruines of [her] youth" (216, 246). Employing "the smoothest speech | That Court and age could cunningly deuise," the sly book-woman presents a *suasoria* to persuade Rosamond to adultery (218-19), advising the girl not to sacrifice potential bliss in the name of meaningless ideals such as reputation: "Pleasure is felt, opinion but conceau'd, | Honour, a thing without vs, not our owne" (267-68). Rather, the voice of womanly wisdom advocates mercenary love. She suggests Rosamond ought to be dissimulating and "vse [her] tallent" for personal, and particularly fiscal, gain (281). The bawd informs her young protégé that, even if Henry is old and unattractive, fiscal reward is in itself a type of pleasure, and the young beauty's physical "pleasures want shall be supplyd with gold" (297). It is through this schooling that Rosamond learns to "wantonise" for profit (364).

The lessons of the readable bawd borrow liberally from *Amores* 1.8, where Ovid's poetic *persona* records the content of a conversation overheard between his mistress and "*quaedam nomine Dipsas anus*" [a certain old woman named Dipsas]. Dipsas is vilified in Ovid's account—though, admittedly, less because "*Haec sibi proposuit thalamos temerare pudicos*" [She delights to profane the chastity of the marriage bed] than the fact that she encourages Ovid's mistress to seek other lovers besides the poet. Rosamond's counselor seems to have learned

her *sermoni* directly from this Roman *lena*. Dipsas' words as she counsels the blushing girl to accept the advances and pecuniary rewards of wealthier lovers could be the English matron's own: "*decet alba quidem pudor ora, sed iste,* | *si simules, prodest*" [Modesty becometh a fair cheek, but it is useless, save when feigned].[58] Teaching the formerly innocent young girl the licentious arts of love and select methods of feminine guile (as described in the *Amores* and erotodidactically laid out in *Ars Amatoria* 3), she also relies upon Ovidian storytelling as a means of rhetorical persuasion. Rosamond's *lena* tells the girl that, like Danae before her, Rosamond has been singled out by a majestic suitor and should succumb and accept her "good fortune" (230). The bawd insists upon this parallel, calling Henry "thy King (thy *Ioue,*)" who "showres downe golde and treasure from aboue, | Whilst thou doost shut thy lap against thy fate" (232, 234-5).

A further embedded scene of Ovidian reading—albeit the reading of visual images—occurs at the climax of Rosamond's narrative. "The day before the night of [her] defeature" by Henry (372), the aging king sends the girl "a Casket ritchly wrought; | So rare, that arte did seeme to striue with nature, | T' expresse the cunning work-mans curious thought" (373-75). Seeking to understand the semiotic "mistery" of the highly wrought gift and compelled to decipher the 'curious thought' which the object 'expresse[s],' Rosamond examines the depictions of Amymone's and Io's rapes engraved upon its lid. The ghost describes how she employed mythological patterns as a method of self-exoneration, as a way of excusing her intended behaviour: these women ultimately lacked agency when faced with powerful paramours, and Rosamond, as she recalls, used these comparisons to downplay the element of choice that informed her own downward trajectory into the realm of adulterous behaviour. Demonstrating a Tudor *rhetor's* understanding of *argumentum in utramque partem*, however, Rosamond's analogical reading of the Ovidian scenes, as the ghost herself admits, was only one possible interpretation. She *might*, she acknowledges, have read such "presidents presented to

[58] This *lena's* speech also recalls Ovid's own advice in *Amores* 1.4.

[her] view" differently, instead seeing in the polysemous *exempla* "the presage of [her] fall" (407, 408).

This abundance of references to Rosamond's reading materials and habits affirms that, in Daniel's *Complaint of Rosamond,* the dynamics of the poem's own literary appropriations (both classical and native) are figured in images of books. These inscribed texts are not inert relics but, instead, intertexts with narrative roles. Rosamond's direct engagement with the variety of poems in her anthropomorphic library mirrors the multiform intertextual relationships that converged to shape Daniel's own work. Indeed, they constitute a bookish series of what classicists would refer to as "double allusions," or "simultaneous allusion to two antecedents, one of which is based on the other."[59] In such allusions—also sometimes conceived as "window references"—the poet refers to a source through its adaptation in an intervening, second text.[60] Key to this concept is the idea that the two distinct targets of the allusion are *already* related, and the double allusion serves to highlight this preexisting relationship. His doubling, or intertwining and layering, of references to both the recent *de casibus* tragedies of *A Mirror for Magistrates* and older, Ovidian models of female victimization, metamorphosis, and complaint, points to Daniel's recognition of Churchyard's piece on Shore's Wife as itself a conduit for Ovidian discourse.[61] Daniel's series of double allusions are just as much about reading Ovid through Churchyard as about reading Churchyard through Ovid, and, in looking through the intertextual 'window' that the *Complaint of Rosamond* constructs, we see that the Tudor identities of Ovid and his expansive troupe of mythological heroines were altered and coloured by the new genres and characters they engendered.

---

[59] I here borrow the definition provided by J. C. McKeown, ed., *Ovid, Amores: Text, Prolegomena and Commentary*, vol. 1 (Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1987), 37.
[60] On the concept of a 'Window Reference,' see Richard F. Thomas, "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 90 (1986): 171-98.
[61] I would emphasize that my reading of Churchyard's prior text as an overtly Ovidian piece—and one that was perceived as such by Daniel—is distinctly different from the position taken in most scholarship. For example, a recent article by Bart Van Es replicates the prevailing view: "Daniel…developed upon Churchyard by introducing a rhetorical sophistication taken partly from Ovid's *Heroides*": Michael Drayton, Literary History and Historians in Verse," *Review of English Studies* 239 (2008): 258. The underlying assumption here is that Daniel *introduces* Ovidianism to the *de casibus* complaint, a widely held position that takes an all too narrow view of what constitutes Ovidianism.

ANGLO-OVIDIAN COMPLAINT AS AN EMERGENT GENRE

The controversy (or at least the alleged controversy) over the authorship of Shore's Wife was not Churchyard's only motive for reissuing "the Tragedie of Shores Wife, much augmented with diuers newe aditions" in *Churchyards Challenge* of 1593. One year prior to the publication of this 'much augmented' text, Nashe had praised Churchyard's enduring and increasingly influential literary accomplishment, complimentarily writing that "*Shores wife* is yung, though [he] be stept in yeares, in her shall [Churchyard] liue when [he is] dead," and, in an apparent reference to Daniel's derivative *Complaint of Rosamond*, he hailed Shore's Wife as the "grand-mother to our grand-eloquentest Poets at this present."[62] In turn, reinspired by the success of Shore's Wife's textual progeny (i.e. "Rosimond…so excellently sette forth" by Daniel), Churchyard, as he explains to the Lady Mount Eagle and Compton, "somewhat beautified" and updated his own piece for its 1593 publication (L1^{v}). Churchyard's reworking of Shore's Wife for *Churchyards Challenge* is an attempt to modernize his literary 'grand-mother' and keep her 'yung,' or enduringly relevant, in relation to a new generation of derivative complaints. Although Churchyard protests that his 1592 changes to Shore's Wife are "not in any kind of emulation" of Daniel, nonetheless, the influence of the *Complaint of Rosamond* is felt in his additions to a poem 'that long laye printed' and had once served as Daniel's primary source (L1^{v}). Thus, Shore's Wife and textual granddaughter Rosamond came to play off of one another in what becomes a parturitional metaphor of incestuous literary heritage and bibliographical genetics.

That this emergent genre of complaint poetry, as defined between Daniel and Churchyard in the early 1590s, was popularly recognized *as such* is evident. For example, in Giles Fletcher's *The Rising to the Crowne of Richard the Third,* a piece appended to his sonnet

---

[62] *Strange Newes* (STC 18377a; London, 1592), I1^{r}. Such praise continued to be heard for at least another decade. For instance, in the 1601 *Return from Parnassus*, Ingenioso says: "Hath not Shore's wife, although a light skirts she, | Given [Churchyard] a chaste long-lasting memory?": *The Three Parnassus Plays*, ed. J.B. Leishman (London: Nicholson and Watson, 1949), 245.

sequence *Licia,* the titular character comments on the late sixteenth-century literary milieu when he mockingly notes that "the poets of this age, | Like silly boats in shallow rivers tossed" commonly "write of women, and of women's falls, | Who are too light for to be Fortune's balls."[63] There is a comical moment along these same lines in *The True Tragedie of Richard the Third* when Shore's Wife, pitifully reduced to poverty and transience in the streets of London, accosts her former supporter Lodowick and begs him for aid. Lodowick, fearful of the royal "proclamation…that none shall succour her," justifies his inaction: "for feare I should be seene talke with her, I will shun her company and get me to my chamber, *and there set downe in heroicall verse, the shameful end of a Kings Concubin*, which is no doubt as wonderfull as the defoliation of a kingdome."[64]

While historical female complaint in this vein (which I have elected to call "Anglo-Ovidian" poetry) was becoming a genre unto itself, its narrative patterns and formulae—including the genre's characteristic reliance on elaborate bibliofictions and double allusions to English and Ovidian sources—were also being set: an astoundingly beautiful woman attracts the amorous attentions of a king; she falls from a position of royal favour to misery and, ultimately, death; her classically-allusive post-mortem lamentation is then overheard by or dictated to a contemporary male poet who monumentalizes her by translating fictive voice to equally fictive ink and paper. In the early 1590s, new stories of historical heroines along these lines appeared. In 1593, one year after Daniel's Rosamond began her printed lamentation and the same year that Churchyard's Jane Shore underwent her own 'beautification,' Thomas Lodge's *Phillis: Honoured with Pastorall Sonnets, Elegies, and Amorous Delights* was published. 'Annexed' to these 'amorous delights,' as the work's subtitle informs us, was 'the tragical complaynt of Elstred.' In 1594, another piece in this genre, Michael Drayton's *Matilda: The Faire and Chaste Daughter of the Lord Robert Fizwater* made its print debut. And it is to these female voiced complaints by Lodge and Drayton that I here turn.

---

[63] *The Rising to the Crowne of Richard the Third*, in *Licia* (STC 11055; London, 1593), L2^{v}.
[64] *The True Tragedie of Richard the Third* (STC 21009; London, 1594), E2^{r}. Italics my own.

After the first inclusion of Jane Shore's complaint in the 1563 edition, greater numbers of female voices were integrated into the successive volumes of *A Mirror for Magistrates*. John Higgins' 1574 edition had included the tragedies of Elstride, wife of Humber and Elstride's daughter Sabrine, as well as the story of Lear's daughter Cordeila. Like Churchyard and Daniel, Lodge looked to English chronicle history for inspiration for his own "dolefull Queene."[65] More particularly, in selecting a "storie" that "merrits some regard to haue," he looked to Higgins' tragedies of Elstride and Sabrine, or textual exemplars of chronicle history that had already been reinterpreted in the English *de casibus* tradition. Lodge's "wofull vision" of Elstred—the unfortunate daughter of "a *Germaine* Peere" who became the mistress of King Locrinus and was eventually, along with her innocent daughter, murdered at the command of her paramour's jealous wife—is typical of the emergent Anglo-Ovidian complaint genre (59, 61).

As in Daniel's prior poem, in Lodge's *Complaynt of Elstred,* the act of reading intertextually is metaphorically figured through anthropomorphized books that interact within a bibliofictional drama. Well aware of her own status as one "Amidst the troopes of those whom tyrant Fate | Hath ledde in tryumph to their time-lesse graue" (59)—an historical character ripe for *de casibus* entextualization—Lodge's Elstred, though less well read than Daniel's Rosamond, is similarly book-ish.[66] Her lament, the putative confession of "a poore vnwilling wedlock breaker," is "weepingly…pend" by Lodge's poetic *persona* (80, 84). It contains the by-now-formulaic warning that we ought to "Behold in [Elstred] the tragedy of

---

[65] I cite the text of *The Complaynt of Elstred* from *The Complete Works of Thomas Lodge,* vol. 2, ed. Edmund Gosse (1883; New York: Russell and Russell, 1963), 59. Subsequent parenthetical page numbers refer to this edition, which lacks running line numbers.

[66] In addition to its obvious generic affiliations with Daniel's earlier poem, I have noted two intertextual echoes within the complaint that explicitly link Elstred's figure with Daniel's dejected royal mistress. Firstly, on the level of narrative imagery, Lodge gestures towards the story of Rosamond Clifford entrapped in the labyrinth at Godstow when he describes how Elstred, too, is lodged by her royal lover in a Daedelan "Maze and curious Caue" (71). A second, more subtle intertextual moment occurs when Sabrine interrupts her mother to quote Daniel. Whereas Rosamond had lamented "I sawe the sinne wherein my foote was entring, | I sawe how that dishonour did attend it, | I sawe the shame whereon my flesh was ventring" (421-23), Sabrine reworks this 'I sawe' formulation into "*I* saw the death prepared for my life, | I saw the teares my Mother wept for me: | *I* saw the wofull louer and the wife" (81).

fate" so that we can learn by example "to auoyde [her] fall" (68, 59). This injunction to 'behold' Elstred exposes a slippage between the heroine's speaking body and the textual record of her putative lament, and this reciprocity between *corpus* of character and poem extends to Elstred's daughter (who also has a speaking-part) as well, for Sabrine's body is "in royall characters inchased" (80). Both characters are thereby, as Wall perceives, "transformed into historical texts justified by their didactic purpose" and poetically interred in "the *A*nnals of mishap | Wherein woe-tempted men may read theyr fortune" (83).[67]

Drayton, too, looked to English history for inspiration when selecting the story of the thirteenth century noblewoman Matilda Fitzwater, another character relentlessly pursued by a Jove-like English king who "roysting comes, in thunder-bolts and rayne."[68] Like Lodge's piece, Drayton's adheres to the generic rules of historical female complaint earlier worked out between Churchyard and Daniel. Matilda, victim to her own beauty, is yet another 'talkative wench' endowed with remarkable powers of eloquence, both in life and after death:

> My words were gracefull, pleasing to the wise,
> My speech retayning modest decencie,
> Not fondlie vaine, nor foolishlie precize,
> But sweetlie tun'd, with such a simphony,
> Mooving all hearers with the harmonie.
> Gracing my tale with such an Emphasis,
> As neuer Musicke could delight like this.
> (106-12)

Drayton's Matilda, who wryly remarks that "inck to love, [is] like oyle unto the fire" (721), figures both herself and the other characters in her "tragike story" as anthropomorphized texts (748). She evocatively describes her own countenance as "The Booke where heaven her wonders did enrole" (114), and her amatory tormenters' "browes" are figured as a "Map of care": "wrinckled lines where sorrowes written are, | Where Time still

---

[67] *The Imprint of Gender*, 258.
[68] I cite the text of *Matilda* from *The Works of Michael Drayton*, vol. 1, ed. J. William Hebel (Oxford: Shakespeare Head Press, 1931), 646. Subsequent parenthetical line numbers refer to this edition

reades on Loves Anotomy" (379-80).[69] Additionally, in recounting a lecture given by her "vertuous father" (190)—in which he suggestively warns his daughter not to "blot" (235) herself and cautions that "Gainst open shame, no Text can be well cited" (270)—Matilda narrates of the moment where his speech breaks off:

> Loe, heere he makes a period with his teares,
> Which from his eyes now make a sudden breache,
> By which the weight of all his speech appears,
> In wordes so grave as seemed still to preach,
> This *Idioma* with such power doth teach.
> Whose tuned cadence doth such rules impart,
> As deepely fixt each sentence in my heart.
> (295-301)

Positing her father's voice as punctuated, written text, Matilda, in turn, recopies his 'wordes' so that 'each sentence' becomes 'deepely fixt' in her own textualized body. Given the resonant bookishness of the characters within *Matilda*, it is hardly surprising that the titular heroine also imagines the extratextual dissemination of knowledge about her violation and murder in written form.

Alluding to her own status as a character—albeit a minor character—in chronicle history, Matilda also makes reference to her audience's preexisting knowledge of her character through their acquaintance with such history books:

> This act enrold in Booke of black Defame,
> Where, men of death and tragick murders reed,
> Recorded in the Register of shame,
> In lines whose letters freshlie euer bleed,
> Where all the world shall wonder my misdeed.
> And quote the place, (thus ever) passing by,
> Note heere King *Johns* vile damned tyranny.
> (1065-71)

Self-aware of her status as a textual and intertextual character whose story has been formed through the real and imagined inky 'lines' and 'letters' of successive authors and audiences, Matilda thus presents both herself and her larger narrative context as things to 'reed' and 'quote.'

---

[69] In turn, King John, himself something of a poet, offers to immortalize Matilda in "well tun'd rymes" (415) so that she will be "enrol'd" in the annals of memory "with never-dated stile" (405, 406).

Unlike the other historical female complaint poems touched upon in this chapter, the narrative proper of Drayton's *Matilda* does not explain how the contemporary male poet came to overhear Matilda's lament. *Matilda* contains no explicit record of the woman in her weeds approaching Drayton or of his vow to transcribe her story accurately and hence achieve their mutual literary fame. Instead, Drayton's role as poet is described in terms of internal predictions and material fulfillments. The poem *Matilda* becomes the realization of a prophesy made by Matilda's father after her death:

> *England*, when peace vpon thy shores shall flourish,
> And that pure Maiden [Elizabeth] sit upon thy Throne,
> Which in her bosome shall the Muses nourish,
> Whose glorious fame shal through the world be blown,
> (O, blessed Ile, thrice happy *Albion*;)
> Then let thy Poets in their stately rymes,
> Sing forth [Matilda's] praises to succeeding tymes.
> (1030-36)

Even if Drayton avoids repeating the paradigmatic Anglo-Ovidian scene whereby the inscribed poet is solicited by a ghost, prior treatments of Shore's Wife, Rosamond, and Elstred nonetheless informed readers' understandings of the bibliofictional relationship between female character and male author. Indeed, "The Vision of *Matilda*," a prefatory poem in Drayton's work, describes the ghostly heroine's reaction to Drayton's monumentalization of the story:

> Me thought I saw vpon *Matildas* Tombe,
> Her wofull ghost, which Fame did now awake,
> And crav'd her passage from Earths hollow wombe,
> To view this Legend, written for her sake;
> No sooner shee her sacred Name had seene,
> Whom her kind friend had chose to grace her story,
> But wiping her chast teares from her sad eyen,
> Shee seem'd to tryumph, in her double glory.
> (212)

Like Daniel's Rosamond, Drayton's Matilda complains pointedly and directly about what she perceives as her prior literary neglect. Having been "Three hundreth yeeres by all men ouer past," she hopes that her "life may be reveald, | Which blacke oblivion hath too long conceald" (13, 6-7). Again like Rosamond, she points to specific and recent developments in

English poetry to make a case for her own story and to explain why she, too, deserves literary fame:

> Faire Rosamond, of all so highly graced,
> Recorded in the lasting Booke of Fame,
> And in our Sainted Legendarie placed,
> By him who striues to stellifie her name,
> Yet will some Matrons say she was to blame.
> Though all the world bewitched with his ryme,
> Yet all his skill cannot excuse her cryme.
> (29-35)

> *Shores* wife is in her wanton humor sooth'd,
> And modern Poets, still applaud her praise,
> Our famous *Elstreds* wrinckled browes are smooth'd,
> Call'd from her grave to see these latter daies,
> And happy's hee, their glory high'st can raise.
> (43-47)

Matilda's outward references to Daniel's Rosamond, Churchyard's Shore's Wife, and Lodge's Elstred serve a double function. Not only does the literary success of these other women's tragedies provide justification for retelling her own story, but her pointed reference to these other characters 'stellifie[d]' at the hands of 'modern Poets' also points to her desire to be seen as a part of this emergent group of literary heroines. I would draw particular attention to Matilda's above reference to 'our Sainted Legendarie.' In speaking of this nascent canon of literary characters, she is referring to the process of mythologization that Shore's Wife, Rosamond, and Elstred, three distinct women from three different periods of history, had undergone as they were excerpted from chronicle history, revised, and revived in a new genre. The 'our' is particularly revealing, for the link that binds all of these women together is one of identity: they are all connected to England. Even as she complains that these other characters are 'looser wantons' than herself—appealing and 'praisd of many' merely because their 'cryme' has been eclipsed by the beauty of the male poets' admirable 'ryme' and 'skill'—Matilda shows her own desire to join their ranks and become part of this imaginary book.

In the previous chapter, I referenced Fulkerson's argument that the heroines of the *Heroides* function as constituent members of a "fictional community created by their shared

presence in a poetic book."[70] I want here to draw upon the implications of Fulkerson's further suggestion that the interpretation of the *Heroides*' heroines as character-authors "is predicated upon the notion that they themselves create influential texts."[71] Just as Ovid's epistolary heroines are motivated by, react to, or borrow from one another's 'influential texts,' the Anglo-Ovidian characters similarly operate as the members of a fictional poetic community. In this anthropomorphized intertextual network, the mutual inflection of characters' voices is metaphorically figured through representations of these characters' putative access to one another's texts.

'OVIDS SOULE REVIVES IN DRAYTON NOW'

That, at least conceptually speaking, the Anglo-Ovidian 'Sainted Legendarie' described in Drayton's *Matilda* was taking shape in the popular imagination is elsewhere attested in contemporary literature. For example, in Fletcher's previously mentioned *Rising to the Crowne of Richard the Third*, King Richard begins his own speech by referring to the tragic triad of Shore's Wife, Rosamond, and Elstred:

> *Shores* wife, a subject, though a Princesse mate,
> Had little cause her fortune to lament.
> …….
> *Rosamond* was fayre, and farre more fayre then she,
> Her fall was great, and but a womans fall.
> Tryfles are these, compare them but with me,
> My fortunes farre, were higher then they all.
> …….
> *Elstred* I pitie, for she was a Queene,
> But for my selfe, to sigh I sorrow want,
> Her fall was great, but greater falles have beene,
> Some falles they have, that use the Court to haunt.[72]

And, in the following year, the same three heroines were grouped together by John Ogle:

> How hath she to queene *Elstred* done?
> And how causd faire *Rosamond* to mone?
> And how (though she was meanly borne)
> Hath she made *Shores* wife forlorne,

[70] Fulkerson, 2.
[71] Fulkerson, 2.
[72] *The Rising to the Crowne of Richard the Third*, in *Licia*, L2^{r}.

> After estate and high calling,
> And brought hir to most wofull falling?[73]

This pre-existing, conceptual 'Sainted Legendarie' of Anglo-Ovidian heroines was realized as a book by Drayton in 1597. The poet undertook a codification of the native heroines, collecting them together in *Englands Heroicall Epistles*, a work that recounts (as enumerated in its final "Catalogue of the Heroicall Loves"):

> The World's faire Rose, and HENRIES frosty fire,
> JOHN'S tyrrany, and chaste MATILDA'S wrong,
> Th'inraged Queene, and furious MORTIMER,
> The Scourge of *France*, and his chaste love…
> Deposed RICHARD, ISABEL exil'd,
> The gallant TUDOR, and faire KATHERINE,
>
> Duke HUMPHREY, and old COBHAMS haplesse Child,
> Couragious POOLE, and that brave spititfull Queene,
> EDWARD, and the delicious *London* Dame,
> BRANDON, and that rich Dowager of *France*,
> SURREY, with his faire Paragon of Fame,
> DUDLEY'S Mis-hap, and vertuous GRAY'S Mischance.[74]

Destined to be amongst the most popular of Drayton's works in his own lifetime, this collection of epistolary exchanges also represents the culmination of Elizabethan Anglo-Ovidianism and its attendant bibliofictions.[75] Sequenced chronologically, the verse missives were putatively written by a dozen royal and noble couples whose tragic stories were drawn from the annals of history. Many of the historical characters included in the *Englands Heroicall Epistles* are familiar from Anglo-Ovidian complaints composed earlier in the decade.[76]

---

[73] "An Olde Womans Tale in her solitarie Cell," in *The Lamentation of Troy* (STC 18755; London, 1594), F3^{r}.
[74] I cite the text of *Englands Heroicall Epistles* and its attendant poems from *The Works of Michael Drayton*, vol. 2, ed. Hebel. Subsequent parenthetical line numbers and page numbers refer to this edition.
[75] *Englands Heroicall Epistles* achieved immediate commercial success and was frequently reprinted during Drayton's lifetime. After its initial publication in late 1597 (STC 7193), it was reissued in quick succession in 1598, 1599, 1600, and 1602, and reappeared at least seven more times before 1631, the year of Drayton's death. Although later editions would add additional epistolary exchanges, the initial work of 1597 featured twenty-four letters. For details of the repeated revisions Drayton made to his text, see the variants recorded in *The Works of Michael Drayton*, vol. 5, 97–136. As Andrew Hadfield notes in "Michael Drayton's Brilliant Career," there remains much work to be done on Drayton's engagement with print culture: *Proceedings of the British Academy* 125 (2004): 119–47.
[76] The collection begins with letters putatively sent between "Henrie the second of that name, King of England, the sonne of Geffrey Plantaginet, Earle of Aniou, & Maude the Empresse" and the object of his affections, the "poore distressed Lady" Rosamond. Also included in the collection is an exchange between "Mistresse *Shore,* King *Edward* the fourths beautious paramore" and King Edward himself, as well as a rendition of the lines written by the "lasciuious King" John to "fayre and chast *Matilda*. I cite these descriptions from the prose summaries which preface these respective letters. While these prose frames appeared in the early editions, they were later replaced by verse arguments.

Essentially, the book represents the collection and canonization of the English 'Sainted Legendarie,' for "*the most and greatest Persons*" that it treats "*were* English; *or else, that their Loves were obtained in* England" (130, "To the Reader").

Exhibiting the tendency of postclassical adapters to embed Ovidian letters in larger narrative frameworks—a format that is evident in Turberville's English translation of the *Heroides* as well as in Latin editions of the epistles—each letter in Drayton's similarly titled collection is framed by a contextualizing *argumentum*. Thus, each textual exchange begins with an act of dramatic scene setting. Drayton also "*annexed Notes to euery Epistles end*" that provided explanations and glosses for topical references found within each letter. He explains his motivation for the inclusion of these notes in the prefatory materials: "*because the Worke might in truth be iudged Braynish, if nothing but amorous Humor were handled therein, I haue inter-woven Matters Historicall, which unexplained, might defraud the Mind of much Content*" (130). In addition to combating exclusively 'brainish' interpretations, Drayton's decision to frame each 'amorous' letter with a detailed commentary on 'matters historicall' also creates a multi-layered text, imbuing the new, vernacular work with an aura of established authority and giving the book instant status as a repository of historical information as well as a significant literary object. Indeed, one is reminded of E.K.'s "certain Glosse or scholion" in Edmund Spenser's 1579 *Shepheardes Calender*. Much like E.K.'s editorial commentary, Drayton's apparatus "accentuates the literary significance and cultural prestige of the work" and provides "his poem with both built-in directions for reading and its own pre-scripted critical reception."[77] The physical layout of *Englands Heroicall Epistles*, complete with elaborate historical notations, mimics the conventions of humanist editions of ancient classical authors, including Ovid. Thus, its scholarly apparatus calls particular attention to the resemblances between the epistles in Drayton's collection and those of Ovid's *Heroides*, a work that had accumulated centuries of postclassical glosses.

---

[77] See Richard Rambuss, "Spenser's Life and Career," in *The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*, ed. Andrew Hadfield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 23.

In *Englands Heroicall Epistles*, Drayton conspicuously appropriates the Ovidian verse epistle and transforms it into a specifically English textual product.[78] In the words of Rosamond/Daniel, "Thames had Swannes as well as ever Po" (728), and Drayton responds to such logic in making heroines such as Shore's Wife or Matilda the textual equals, if not precise contemporaries or colleagues, of Ovid's letter-writing heroines of the *Heroides*. In his preface "To the Reader," Drayton points to his Ovidian sources when explaining his decision to "*entitle this Worke* ENGLANDS Heroicall Epistles":

> *And though (Heroicall) be properly vnderstood of Demi-gods, as of* HERCULES *and* ÆNEAS, *whose Parents were said to be, the one, Cœlestiall, the other, Mortall, yet is it also transferred to them, who for the greatnesse of Mind come neere to Gods. For to be borne of a cœlestiall* Incubus, *is nothing else, but to have a great and mightie Spirit, farre above the Earthly weakenesse of Men; in which sence* OVID (*whose Imitator I partly professe to be*) *doth also vse Heroicall.*
>
> (130)

Francis Meres would later comment: "As *Virgil* doth imitate *Catullus* in ye like matter of *Ariadne* for his story of Queene *Dido: so Michael Drayton* doth imitate *Ouid* in his *Englands Heroical Epistles*."[79] William Alexander apparently agreed, and he expresses this intertextual relationship in similar terms in his commendatory poem "To M. Michael Drayton":

> *These Love-sicke Princes passionate estates,*
> *Who feeling reades, he cannot but allow,*
> *That* OVIDS *Soule revives in* DRAYTON *now,*
> *Still learn'd in Love, still rich in rare Conceits.*
>
> (131)

Indeed, Drayton's work seems aptly titled, for the mingling of *history* and lamentation in *Englands Heroicall Epistles* is patently related to Ovid's mingling of *mythology* and lamentation in the *Heroides*. From Ovid, Drayton also adapts the technique of drawing upon prior textual incarnations to characterize his *epistolers*. Setting the letters' composition at recognizable literary moments, Drayton references the extant *corpus* through which each of his historical characters

---

[78] Drayton's epistles contain no end of allusions to their Ovidian models. For just a few examples: like Hero and Leander, Queen Mary and Charles Brandon are separated by their own Hellespont in the form of the English Channel; a boastful Owen Tudor describes and traces his mythological lineage in a way that is similar to the boastful Paris of Ovid's *Heroides*; Surrey's mistress Geraldine refers to herself as a Penelope; and Shore's Wife (sounding much like Isabella Whitney's authorial *persona*) complains about the antifeminism of the *querelle* des femmes with specific reference to "*Romes* wanton OVID" (103). Lyne has detailed the collection's sustained engagement with the *Metamorphoses*: *Ovid's Changing Worlds*, 142-97.

[79] Although Meres first made this comment in 1598, I here cite from a later edition: *Palladis Tamia: Wits Common Wealth, The Second Part* (STC 17835; London, 1634), 621. .

has been previously animated. Whereas, for instance, in *Matilda*, the heroine received "a packet" of "Letters writ in blood" from King John and, in turn, was provided with "pen and inck" to compose a reply, their respective letters in *Englands Heroicall Epistles* obliquely insinuate themselves into this earlier narrative as material artifacts (751, 755, 806).

Bart Van Es has recently posited that the myriad of intertextual and intratextual "echoes" in *Englands Heroicall Epistles* indicate Drayton's "interest in the *process* of retelling."[80] I would further this observation by suggesting that Drayton's interest in literary processes is equally signaled by the letters' elaborate bibliofictions of inscription and transmission: the penning, the sending, the receipt, and the reading of missives.[81] Drayton's letters, like the putative dispatches of the *Heroides* upon which they were conspicuously modeled, demonstrate a concern with their own verisimilitude as documents. The overtly Ovidian impulse to inscribe the movements of pens and bodies in epistolary texts is seen from the first letter of the collection, where Rosamond's epistle begins by drawing the attention of her *lector* to its "tainted Lines, drawne with a Hand impure" (2), and, as we progress through the letters, we are presented with a multitude of further references to what Matilda calls "the Pen, the Paper, and the Waxe" (31). Drayton also follows Ovid's lead in imbuing the products of writing itself with ghostly, seemingly physical traces of the putative authorial bodies. To again quote Matilda:

> I write, indite, I point, I raze, I quote,
> I enterline, I blot, correct, I note,
> I hope, despaire, take courage, faint, disdaine,
> I make, alledge, I imitate, I faine:
> Now thus it must be, and now thus, and thus,
> Bold, shame-fac'd, fearelesse, doubtfull, timerous;
> My faint Hand writing, when my full Eye reads,
> From ev'ry word strange Passion still proceeds.
> (35-42)

---

[80] Van Es, 261. Italics my own.

[81] Noting that Drayton's collection exhibits "a self-conscious attention to textual traces—often in powerfully metaphoric terms," Danielle Clarke has similarly remarked the "encoding [of] the letters' reception into the volume" and the "individual letters' concentration on the circumstances of their production": "Ovid's *Heroides*, Drayton and the Articulation of the Feminine in the English Renaissance," *Renaissance Studies* 22 (2008): 394.

The written *materia*—'euery word,' or the semiotic ciphers of the textual *corpus*—is linked to the physical *corpus* and subjective 'Passion' of the inscribed elegiac author.

A detailed consideration of the collection's first epistolary exchange between Rosamond Clifford and King Henry II reveals that in *Englands Heroicall Epistles,* as in the Anglo-Ovidian complaint genre more generally, intertextual activity is metaphorically recast as the interplay of embodied voices and anthropomorphized texts. Drawing upon and clearly articulating the Ovidian dynamic whereby the body of a heroine's circulating letter is posited as a simulacrum for both the emotive voice it carries and the human form that allegedly inscribed it, Rosamond—a bookish character who tellingly fears her "Looks might prove the Index to [her] Fault" (104)—writes to Henry:

> This scribled Paper which I send to thee,
> If noted rightly doth resemble mee:
> As this pure ground, whereon these Letters stand;
> So pure was I, ere stayned by thy Hand;
> Ere I was blotted with this foule Offence,
> So cleere and spotlesse was mine Innocence:
> Now, like these Markes which taint this hatefull Scroule,
> Such the blacke sinnes which spot my leprous Soule.
> (11-18)

When this letter is intratextually delivered in "the Post," as the following epistle attests, Henry "unrip[s] the Seale" of the fictitiously materialized dispatch to behold the form of his lover (1, 12). "O how my Heart at that blacke line did tremble," he relates, "That blotted paper should [Rosamond] resemble" (23, 24). In this Ovidian correlation of authorial *corpus* and literary *corpus*, the mutually interactive letters explore the possibilities of the textualized body and the corporeal text, inscribing fictive flesh into imaginary ink.

Henry's remark that the 'blotted paper' looks like Rosamond has a second meaning, as well: it reminds us that Rosamond of Drayton's epistle looks a lot like the character of Rosamond as established in Daniel's prior poem. Complimentary to my own reading of this passage is Clarke's observation that the resultant "metaphor is dizzyingly self-referential," as it "is played out on the ground of Drayton's own poetic competition with Daniel," and, like

Clarke, I point to Drayton's 1597 internal dedication to these epistles of Rosamond and Henry as an important declaration of his intertextual intent.[82] Addressed to Lucy Harrington, the dedication promises: "Heere must your Ladiship behold variablenes in resolution: woes constantly grounded: laments abruptly broken off: much confidence, no certainty, wordes begetting teares, teares confounding matter, large complaints in little papers: and many deformed cares, in one uniformed Epistell."[83] Drayton also provides something of an oblique bibliography for these 'large complaints in little papers.' Foreshadowing the commentary of Meres—who would, one year later, comment that "euery one passionateth, when he readeth the afflicted death of *Daniels* distressed *Rosamond*"—Drayton's dedication aligns his own epistles with a tradition forged by Daniel and "all the admired wits of this excellent age, which have laboured in the sad complaintes of faire and unfortunate Rosamond, and by the excellence of invention, haue sounded the depth of her sundry passions."[84]

Clarke observes how Drayton pays careful "forensic attention to the source from which he is about to depart," and, while "Drayton's characterization of Rosamond's epistle is not a very accurate description of his own poem, …it is a clear allusion to Daniel's earlier *Complaint of Rosamond*…and by extension the more diffuse complaint tradition against which *Englands Heroicall Epistles* is juxtaposed."[85] Further examination of the relevant letters shows that Drayton's Rosamond bears an obvious resemblance to her most immediate Anglo-Ovidian antecedent. The most arresting of their similarities is undoubtedly the 'faire Casket' possessed by both Rosamonds, and a profound double allusion occurs when Drayton's heroine views Ovidian mythology through the lens of Daniel's English poetry:

> In that faire Casket, of such wond'rous Cost,
> Thou [Henry] sent'st the Night before mine Honour lost,
> AMIMONE was wrought, a harmelesse Maid,
> By NEPTUNE, that adult'rous God, betray'd;
> She prostrate at his Feet, begging with Prayers,

[82] Clarke, 395.
[83] This dedication, which was removed from later editions, is reprinted amongst the textual variants in vol. 5 of *The Works of Michael Drayton*, 103.
[84] Meres, 620.
[85] Clarke, 389.

> Wringing her Hands, her Eyes swolne up with Teares;
> This was not the entrapping Bate from thee,
> But by Vertue gently warning mee,
> And to declare for what intent it came,
> Least I therein should ever keepe my shame.
> And in this Casket (ill I see it now)
> That JOVES Love IÖ, turn'd into a Cow;
> Yet was she kept with ARGUS hundred Eyes,
> So wakefull still be JUNO'S Jealousies;
> By this I well might have fore-warned beene,
> (153-67)

Present meaning is filtered through multiple pretexts, and this complex portrait of Ovidian and Danielian intertextuality carries over into the following letter, where, in what now functions not merely as a double allusion, but as a *triple* allusion, Henry himself reinterprets these same mythological signs and symbols to a new end:

> Of JOVE, or NEPTUNE, how they did betray,
> Speake not; of IÖ, or AMIMONE,
> When she for whom JOVE once became a Bull,
> Compar'd with Thee, had been a Tawny Trull
> (171-74)

A collection of poems that is itself *about* reading and the appropriation of prior texts, *Englands Heroicall Epistles* depends upon a complex postal system of textual allusions in which its missives, engaging both with Ovid and with vernacular poetry through which Ovidian narrative was refracted, respond to and inflect one another. We find the dynamics of textual circulation and consumption metaphorically presented not only through double or triple intertextual allusions, but also intratextually. The conversations within *Englands Heroicall Epistles* transcend the structured dialogic exchange of the paired letters, such that Drayton's own characters appear to be literary critics reading one another's documents. Jean R. Brink has noted that such allusive links between missives ask us to "read them reflexively as commentaries on each other."[86] It is thus that Matilda (whose own narrative runs into Rosamond's not only through textual echoes but also through bloodlines) alludes to her own knowledge of the heroine's epistle:

> Had ROSAMOND (a Recluse of our sort)

[86] *Michael Drayton Revisited* (Boston: Twayne, 1990), 39.

> Taken our Cloyster, left the wanton Court,
> Shadowing that Beautie with a holy Vale,
> Which she (alas) too loosely set to sale,
> She need not, like an ugly Minotaur,
> Have been lock'd up from jealous ELENOR,
> But beene as famous by thy Mothers Wrongs,
> As by thy Father subject to all Tongues
> (165-72)

My observations about Baldwin's bibliofictional frame narrative in *A Mirror for Magistrates* at the opening of this chapter find relevance here, since a strikingly similar dramatization of the bibliographical process is evidenced in the mutually reflective intratextual glances exchanged amongst Drayton's cast of *epistolers*. Like the assorted men in Baldwin's narrative, the character-authors of *Englands Heroicall Epistles* are shown in the act of individually and communally interpreting diverse textual fragments. This series of inscripted exchanges creates a network of reading writers, themselves textual metonyms, who rhetorically fashion new historical documents from their intertextual interactions with existing literature.

Ultimately, the imaginary lines of exchange—these anthropomorphized, bookish fictions of intertextuality, community, and reception within the conceptual 'Sainted Legendarie'—provide us with an alternative aetiology of the collection's own poetic creation. Drayton's cohesive and dynamic group of Anglo-Ovidian characters, a fictional literary coterie, interact with and animate disparate and fragmentary pieces of historical and literary text. In the various letters' repetitions and citations, we find meaningful echoes and refrains; their epistles simultaneously speak with one another, with contemporary literature, and with the products of the classical past, creating an intertextual dialogue amongst sources and characters as well as an intratextual dialogue amongst the members of the 'Sainted Legendarie.' In so doing, Drayton's Anglo-Ovidian epistles also realize Ovid's prophesies that "*me tamen extincto fama superstes erit*" [when I am dead my fame shall survive] (*Tr.* 3.7.50)—albeit in ever-changing textual forms.

APPENDIX:
LATIN EDITIONS OF OVID IN TUDOR ENGLAND

OVERVIEW

Although the *editio princeps* of Ovid in Latin had been published in Italy in the 1470s and had been quickly succeeded by numerous editions both in Italy and elsewhere on the continent, English printers were slow to produce Latin editions of their own. In the early Tudor era, few Latin editions of Roman poets were printed in England. This is not to say, however, that such printed editions of Ovid's Latin works were not *present* in England. Rather, they appear to have been imported in large numbers from continental presses.[1]

The demand for Latin editions of Ovid amongst student populations at both the school and university levels must have been high since the *Metamorphoses*, *Heroides*, *Fasti*, and *Tristia* were often incorporated into curricula. In 1517, Bishop Richard Fox made a set of provisions for Corpus Christi College in Oxford in which he specified that on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays Ovid was to be studied along with Virgil, Lucan, Juvenal, Terence, and Plautus.[2] Ovid's influence was also felt keenly in the grammar schools, where his works were often prescribed for intermediate students of Latin. Wolsey's recommendations for the curriculum at Ipswich in the late 1520s suggested the use of either Ovid's *Metamorphoses* or *Fasti* for students in the seventh form; by 1528, epistles from the *Heroides* were being used at Eton as models for versification and composition; at Winchester in the 1530s, boys memorized twelve lines of the *Metamorphoses* per week; and the *Tristia* first entered school curriculum at Bury St. Edmund's in 1550 and quickly became a grammar school staple thereafter.[3] Hence, it is hardly surprising that that an examination of surviving library inventories prior to 1555 demonstrates that it was not uncommon for students and scholars

[1] Furthermore, manuscript copies of Ovid's Latin texts continued to circulate in England well after the advent of print.
[2] Baldwin, 1.103-104.
[3] Baldwin, 1.125 and 2.419.

at Cambridge and Oxford to own copies of Ovid's various Latin works, all of which must necessarily have been manuscript or imported print copies.[4] Though English printers and publishers did not begin issuing full Latin editions of Ovid's works until 1570, their output was relatively prolific after this date. No doubt as a result of the potential profits to be made by printing editions of these popular school texts, two men, Thomas Vautrollier and John Harrison (the elder), successfully and controversially dominated the publishing of Latin editions for the vast majority of the Elizabethan era.

Tudor booksellers' records demonstrate that Latin editions of Ovid, whether continental or English, were readily available in university and school communities by the later half of the sixteenth century. In 1578, the will of John Denys, a Cambridge stationer and bookbinder, mentions that he possessed "Ovidius de ponto" bound in parchment.[5] When he died in 1588, the Cambridge binder Bennet Walker had a copy of "Metamorph Ovidi" in his possession.[6] Moreover, the 1585 inventory from Roger Ward's bookshop in Shrewsbury demonstrates that he was selling many of Ovid's titles. With the exception of one copy of "Ovid metamorphosis english," Ward appears to have had mostly Latin editions in his inventories.[7] He had thirty-two copies of various editions of the *Heroides*, including one copy of an edition referred to as "olde ovides epistols" as well as five copies of an edition identified as "Ouides epistolls alone."[8] Moreover, Ward's stock contained thirteen copies of the *Metamorphoses*, four of the *Tristia*, and two of the *Fasti*.[9]

---

[4] For examples, see Robert Fehrenbach and Elisabeth Leedham-Green, eds., *Private Libraries in Renaissance England,* vols. 1-5 (Binghamton, N.Y and Marlborough, England: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1992-2004), 2.22.14, 43.36, 45.7, 50.2, 60.10, 60.40, 60.53, 65.4, 65.90. Copies of the *Fasti*, and *Metamorphoses* appear slightly more common than the *Tristia* or *Heroides*, which reflects the tendencies of the grammar school curriculum during this era. In addition, as Baldwin notes, a notebook kept by an Oxford student between approximately 1535-1540 contains a list of books in circulation at the university which includes "ovidij opera ij voluminib[us]": 1.174.

[5] George J. Gray and William Mortlock Palmer, *Abstracts from the Wills and Testamentary Documents of Printers, Binders, and Stationers of Cambridge, from 1504 to 1699* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1915), 50.

[6] Gray and Palmer, 74.

[7] See Alexander Rodger, "Roger Ward's Shrewsbury Stock: an inventory of 1585," *The Library* 5th ser. 8 (1958): 247-268. This is item 40 in Rodger's list; I have used Rodger's numbering system in the following notes.

[8] Rodger, 156, 280, 436, 437, 469.

[9] Rodger, 163, 178, 434, 438, 490.

WYNKYN DE WORDE

In 1513, Wynkyn de Worde produced an edition entitled *The Flores of Ovide de Arte amandi* (STC 18934). Though it is sometimes referred to as such in modern scholarship, strictly speaking, this twenty-two leaf quarto was not a Latin edition of Ovid. Nonetheless, its singularity makes it worthy of note. In the tradition of *florilegia* such as Mirandula's *Illustrium Poetarum Flores*, de Worde's production culled and translated passages from Ovid for pedagogical purposes. Thus, *The Flores of Ovide de Arte amandi* amounts to a selection of short Latin aphorisms from the *Ars Amatoria* glossed in English.

JOHN KINGSTON AND HENRY BYNNEMAN

The year 1570 marked the appearance of the first full Latin edition of an Ovidian text to be printed in England—one century after the production of Ovid's continental *editio princeps*. This edition (STC 18926.1) was printed in octavo format by John Kingston and was the only book that the London Grocer definitively printed in that year.[10] Although the title of this edition, *P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera,* would suggest an *opera omnia*, the book actually includes only a text of the *Metamorphoses*.[11] The Latin text is prefaced by an "Ovidii vita" that is largely made up of excerpts from the poet's own exile poetry and also by a comprehensive, alphabetized index of stories and characters. The text of the *Metamorphoses* is itself heavily annotated, both in-text and marginally, and, at the end, the edition contains an extensive book-by-book commentary by Swiss humanist Henricus Glareanus. Kingston's 1570 edition must have sold well, for a mere two years later, Henry Bynneman reprinted a second octavo edition of Ovid's

[10] Kingston did not register this work with the Stationers' Company. According to Peter Blayney, this may have been because of his status as a grocer rather than a stationer; by this date the Stationers' Company was generally unwilling to let non-Stationers have access to the resister.
[11] This misleading title has lead scholars such as David McKitterick, for example, to erroneously assumed that the 1584 Cambridge edition, rather than the 1570 London edition, "was the first separate [Latin] edition of the *Metamorphoses* to be published in England": *A History of Cambridge University Press*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 92.

so-called *Opera* (18926.3).[12] It is unclear whether Kingston had established rights to the work in his first printing. If so, he may have signed over these rights or worked out an arrangement with Bynneman for the second edition. By the time of Bynneman's death eleven years later, there were no copies of this *Opera* left in his stock.[13]

THOMAS VAUTROLLIER

On the 19th of June 1574, Thomas Vautrollier, a French refugee printer who had became affiliated with the London Stationers as a "brother" of the Company ten years earlier, received letters patent for privileges on a number of books.[14] These controversial letters patent stipulated that "oure wellbeloued Subiecte T. vautroullier of the Citye of London Prynter and Stacyoner and…his assignes" were given exclusive rights to print seven Latin titles, including Ovid's *Opera Omnia*, "for the terme of ten yeres."[15] Violation of this patent came with a penalty of "fortye shyllinges" for all offenders. Vautrollier was also given permission "to haue and entertayne in the printyng of the said Bookes…six woorkemen Ffrenchmen or Du[t]chemen, or suche lyke, for the sayd space and terme of tenne yeres." It was specified that no other "printers and booke sellers as also all other persons within our Realmes and dominions" would be allowed to print these seven books or any part of them for the term of his patent. Although there is no definitive evidence to suggest that the actual sale and importation of Vautrollier's patented texts were ever restricted to himself or his assigns during the ensuing decade, his patent also indicates that "onely the sayd Thomas vautroullier his assignes or deputyes…shall brynge or cause to be brought wythin this oure realme of England…[or] shall sell vtter or put to sale, or cause to be solde vttered or put to

[12] I have not been able to consult this edition for purposes of comparison, but its identical title and format leads me to believe that STC 18926.3 was a reprint of the Glareanus *Metamorphoses*.
[13] See the transcription of Bynneman's inventories in John Barnard and Maureen Bell, "The Inventory of Henry Bynneman (1583): A Preliminary Survey," *Publishing History* 29 (1991): 5-46.
[14] For Vautrollier's induction as a brother, see Arber, 1.279. Prior to 1574, Vautrollier had already been granted exclusive rights to a few books, but this second patent greatly augmented his list.
[15] It is uncertain whether either John Kingston or Henry Bynneman—or perhaps both—would have held any rights to Ovid in Latin at this date.

sale any booke or bookes of Suche copye or copyes beyng or to be emprynted" during this time.[16] Over the next decade, Vautrollier seems to have made extensive use of his exclusive right to print editions of Ovid in Latin, for he did so at least eight times.

In 1574, the same year that his patent was granted, Vautrollier printed a marginally annotated edition of the *Tristia* in octavo (STC 18976.4)—in which, clearly eager to publicize the terms of his patent, he included a notice to that effect:

> REGIÆ MAIESTATIS PRI-
> uilegio cautum est, ne quis P. Ouidij Na-
> sonis Tristium libros, aut alia quæcumque eius
> opera: infra decennium imprimiat, aut alibi
> extra Angliæ regnum impressos diuendat, pre-
> ter eos quos Thomas Vautrollerius typogra-
> phus Londinensis in claustro vulgo Blackfriers
> commorans, suis typis excuderit.
> (H4v)

Also in 1574, Vautrollier printed Ovid's *Fasti* and Caesar's *Germanicum* in a single octavo edition (18947.5), and two years later, in 1576, Vautrollier printed an octavo edition of the *Opera* (18926.5).[17] Following this *Opera* of 1576, there was a five year lull in Vautrollier's printing of Ovid. When he took up Ovid's texts once more in 1581, he began by reprinting the *Tristia* in octavo (STC 18976.6). After this point, Vautrollier appears to have switched his preferred format for editions of Ovid from octavo to 16mo. In 1582, Vautrollier printed a new version of the *Metamorphoses* (18951.5). This edition was based on the Aldine text edited by Venetian-born Andrea Navagero, who had, earlier in the century, edited Latin poets including Lucretius and Vergil, as well as Ovid, for Aldus Manitius' press. The heavily annotated Latin text (interspersed with a dazzling number of prose *argumenta*) was prefaced by a letter from the Flemish humanist Victor Giselin to George Fabricus and a brief book-by-book synopsis of the work by William Canter. In addition to having numbered lines in-text, the text is followed by a list of textual variants and an index of fables. In 1583, the year before the expiry

[16] Arber, 2.746-47. See also Arber, 2.886. This same stipulation limiting the selling and importation of the specified books had also appeared in Thomas Marshe's earlier patent of 1573, a patent which likewise included a number of Latin schoolbooks.
[17] While I have not been able to consult this edition, again, I suspect that STC 18926.5 is a reprint of the Glareanus *Metamorphoses*.

of his ten year patent, Vautrollier produced three more 16mo editions. Two of these were multi-text editions that included the *Heroides*, *Amores*, *Ars amatoria*, and *Remedia amoris* (18928, 18928a). These texts were edited by Navagero, and they include line numbers and marginal annotations. *Argumenta* for the *Heroides* were authored by Guy Morillon. Prefaced by a letter from Andreas Asulanus, the edition also contains a range of Ovidian *apocrypha* (duly labelled "*incerti auctoris*" where appropriate), including the fifteenth-century epistolary responses to the *Heroides* penned by Angelus Sabinus. Vautrollier's other 1583 edition was likewise a collection of texts but included different works: *Fasti*, *Tristia*, *De ponto*, and *Ibis,* along with the spurious *Ad Liviam* (STC 18927). Prefaced by Angelus Politanus' epigram of the life and death of Ovid as well as a poem by Julius Caesar Scaliger, its line-numbered Latin texts are based on continental editions edited and annotated by Giselin, Navegero, Fabricus, and Joseph Justus Scaliger.

Although no other printers seem to have infringed upon it, from the outset, Vautrollier's patent on Ovid's works and other Latin texts was unpopular. Vautrollier's patent had come at a time when there was growing unrest in the Stationers' Company, as certain factions questioned the legitimacy and justice of royal privileges and patents in the book trade. Between Vautrollier's patent and that of Thomas Marshe, a stationer who had also been granted exclusive rights to several Latin works in the early 1570s, the potentially lucrative business of publishing Latin school texts had been limited to essentially two men.[18] In early 1575, a group of London printers submitted a complaint to Lord Burghley about the printing monopolies in the trade, which they claimed would be "the overthrowe of the Printers and Stacioners within the Cittie." In their complaint, they enumerate the "privilidges latelie granted by her Maiestie vnder her highness greate seale of England." The complaint mentions ten printers by name, including Vautrollier, "a stranger" who "hathe the sole

[18] In addition, Francis Flower—one of Queen Elizabeth's footmen who had no connections whatsoever to the book trade—was, at that time, in possession of a patent which included the single most important grammar school text of the era. He was farming out this patent to a syndicate of six disgruntled London printers and collecting royalties on the text.

printinge of other *latten bookes,*" and Marshe, who "hathe a great licence for *latten books used in the gramer scoles of Englande*, the whiche was the generall livinge of the whole Companie of Stacioners." The names of thirty-five "stationers and printers as are hindred by reson of the foresaid privilidges" as well as an additional other ten non-stationers who "do lyve by bookselling being free of other Companies" appear at the end of this complaint.[19]

On the 23rd of October 1582, Thomas Norton, the Stationers' legal advisor, exchanged a series of three letters with George Goring regarding the ongoing patent controversies. In this exchange, the two men discussed the "inferiors" amongst the stationers who had "made petition to the Counsell that they may be allowed" to print privileged books. In the Goring-Norton correspondence, the extant patents are catalogued. Of Marshe and Vautrollier, it is said that they "haue certaine speciall schole bokes, wherein yet when they be spoken with it is thought they wilbe reasonable," and it is further noted that "it were greatly to the hurt of the vniuersities and learning, to take from them [the holders of the patents] the reward for trauailing in making or translating of bokes, which must nedes be if he that rewardeth the Learned man shold not haue the profit thereof."[20]

Two months after the Norton-Goring exchange, in December of 1582, Christopher Barker, who was then the Upper Warden of the Stationers' Company, reported to Lord Burghley about the extant printing patents. In this report, he notes that one "Thomas Vautrovillere" held the patent for "the printing of TULLIE, OVID, and diuerse other great workes in Latin." Barker comments that Vautrollier—who, by this point, had produced several Latin editions of Ovid—"doth yet, neither great good, nor great harm withal." Presumably, Barker felt that Vautrollier was not taking full advantage of the patent, and he further questioned whether the printing of Latin school texts was indeed a profitable venture: "This patent if it were fully executed, it were verie doubtful, whether the Printer

[19] Arber, 1.111. Arber and many others date this to 1577; I have followed Peter Blayney's dating of this document to early 1575.
[20] Arber, 2.773-776.

[Vautrollier] should be a gayner, or a looser: He hath other small thinges wherewith he keepeth his presses on work, and also worketh for booksellers of the Company, who kepe no presses."[21]

Over the next few years, the controversies continued within the company. In 1583, several suggested reforms were submitted to the Privy Council. Some of these reforms were specifically concerned with the patents on Latin schoolbooks.[22] As a result of the ongoing disagreements, something of a compromise was suggested, and, in 1584, the more affluent patentees were asked to surrender some of the titles for which they held privileges to the company.[23]

THOMAS THOMAS

In the sixteenth century, printing in England was overwhelmingly London-based, and, after the incorporation of the Stationers in 1557, had largely come under the jurisdiction of their Company. However, in the late 1570s, Cambridge began to show signs of interest in establishing its own university press. In 1534, Henry VIII had made an agreement which allowed Cambridge "tres Stationarios et Librorum Impressores seu Venditores,"[24] that is, three stationers and printers or sellers of books. For the next fifty years, the men who held these offices were bookbinders or sellers, not printers. However, John Kingston, the same London grocer who had produced the first Latin edition of Ovid in England, was appointed University Printer in 1576. Although Kingston never printed anything for the university

[21] Arber, 1.144. Barker's remarks should be contextualized by noting that Vautrollier had a particularly prolific career and printed approximately 150 books between 1570 and 1587.
[22] Arber, 2.785.
[23] Arber, 2.786-9. Also summarized in the STC's Appendix C, 3.198-99. The debate was far from over, however. For example, on May 4, 1586, the patentees sent a letter to the Privy Council which set forth the arguments in favour of retaining the privilege system for books (Arber, 2 804).
[24] Qtd. from McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press,* 35.

during his tenure, his very appointment indicates that Cambridge may already have been preparing to launch its own press.[25]

On May 3rd 1583, Thomas Thomas, a former fellow of King's College, was made University Printer. Though neither a printer nor a publisher by trade, Thomas had recently married the widow of a local bookbinder and, subsequently, commenced to establish a printing house at Cambridge. Immediately, Thomas found himself faced with hostility from the London Stationers. In May of 1583, a search was conducted for "sundrie presses and furniture for printinge in secrete corners and Darke cellers." In a letter addressed to Lord Burghley, John Aylmer, the Bishop of London, wrote that in the course of this search, "[t]here was alsoe found one presse and furniture which is saide to belonge to one THOMAS a man…vtterlie ignoraunte in printinge, and pretendinge that he entendeth to be the printer for the vniuersitie of Cambridge."[26] The irate stationers, who felt that Thomas was infringing upon their rights, apparently seized his aforementioned 'presse and furniture.'[27]

On the 14th of June, officials at Cambridge were forced to appeal to Lord Burghley for aid. The Cambridge officials complained that "certaine of the company of the Stationers in London" had tried to halt their "erectinge of a print…and to impunge ye auntient privilege graunted and confirmed by divers Princes for yat purpose to the greate benefit of ye vniuersitie and advancement of Learning." In contrast to the negative portrait of Thomas given to Burghley by the Bishop of London only weeks before, the Cambridge officials refer to him as "a very godly and honest man" and persuasively promise that if their press were restored it would "not be abused eyther in publishinge thinges prohibited, or otherwise

---

[25] Basing his judgement upon a university proclamation from this era, S.C. Roberts remarks that at this date "the university seems definitely to have contemplated the establishment of a printing press": *A History of the Cambridge University Press, 1521-1921* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1921), 22.
[26] Arber, 1.246. This correspondence is dated June 1, 1583.
[27] This search was related to the ongoing struggle between the patent holders and the pirates in the London printing trade. Although no further records exist detailing the seizure of Thomas' printing equipment, the Stationers' Company accounts for 1583-84 record that Thomas Norton, their legal advisor, was paid the sum of ten shillings "for his counsel for Cambridge matters" (Arber, 1.505).

inconvenient for ye Churche and state of this realme."[28] With the assistance of Lord Burghley, matters were arranged in Cambridge's favour.[29] From 1584 to his death in 1588, Thomas printed approximately twenty books.

Although much of Thomas' output was Puritan in tone or associated with the Continental reformers, one of his very earliest productions was an octavo edition of the *Metamorphoses* (STC 18951), which has often been misidentified as the first separate Latin edition of the *Metamorphoses* to have been printed in England.[30] Prefaced with a dedicatory epistle by George Sabinus to Albert of Brandenburg, an excerpt on fable from Natalis Comes' *Mythologiae*, and a note by Sabinus delineating the utility and argument and explaining the title of the work, the annotated text is also followed by an alphabetical index ("*verborum et rerum*"). Upon Thomas' death in 1588, records show that he had remaining only "26 Ovides w sabinus com~ in quiers in the garret and 2 in the shoppe in quiers, & 1 bounde in leather in the garret."[31]

JOHN HARRISON

Vautrollier's ten year patent on Ovid's Latin works patent ran out in 1584, and John Harrison (the elder), one of the men to have complained about the restrictive "privilidges latelie granted by her Maiestie vnder her highness greate seale of England" nine years earlier, began to publish Ovid's Latin works.[32] There is no extant record of Harrison ever having had the rights to these works, but he certainly behaved as if he had.[33] Harrison immediately began

---

[28] Arber, 2.782.
[29] The Stationers' Company, however, remained unhappy about the press at Cambridge and continued to make trouble for Thomas in the ensuing years. See, for example, Arber 2.819, which demonstrates that in 1591 Cambridge was again forced to appeal to Lord Burghley about Thomas' harassment by the Stationers' Company.
[30] If the book was issued before the 19th of June in 1584, it may have been the only instance of a rival printer infringing upon Vautrollier's patent. After that date, however, Vautrollier's patent expired and Ovid's Latin works would have been perfectly legal for Thomas to print. It is notable that the next Cambridge edition of the *Metamorphoses* would not be produced until 1631 (STC 18954).
[31] Gray and Palmer, 68.
[32] Arber, 1.111.
[33] Indeed, on the 21st of September, 1612, John Harrison senior appears to have turned over his alleged rights for the *Metamorphoses*, *Heroides*, *Fasti*, *Tristia*, and *de Ponto* to the Stationers' Company (Arber, 3.497).

to publish Latin editions in conjunction with various printers, including Henry Middleton, Richard Field, and his son, John Harrison (the younger). In 1585, Harrison published an edition of the octavo *Opera* (STC 18926.7). In 1589, he published a 16mo reprint of the Navagero and Giselin *Metamorphoses* (STC 18952). In 1594, he published an octavo reprint of the compilation of the *Heroides* and amatory works edited and annotated by Navagero and Morillon (STC 18929). And, in the final years of Elizabeth's reign, Harrison published a 16mo *Metamorphoses* in 1601 (STC 18952.1), an octavo *Opera* in 1602 (18926.9), and, also in 1602, an octavo edition containing Ovid's *Heroides* and amatory works (18929.3).[34]

HENRY STRINGER

As a final note on the subject, there has been some confusion—perpetrated in Appendix D in the third volume of the STC—about Henry Stringer and his rights to the Latin editions of Ovid in the Elizabethan era. It is true that on the fourth of July 1597, there is an entry in the Stationers' Register which reads: "Entred for their Copie by virtue of her maiesties letters patentes this daye by them produced, the printinge and settinge forthe of the schoole bookes that Master Marsh had / which was graunted by her maiestie vnto master STRYNGER for xiiij yeares to commense from the derterminacon of master marshes letters patentes."[35] Stringer received the rights to several Latin school texts, which he farmed out over the next fourteen years. However, contrary to the information provided in Appendix D, Stringer's patent had nothing whatsoever to do with Latin editions of Ovid, which were never among 'the schoole bookes that Master Marsh had.'

[34] I suspect both STC 18926.7 and STC 18926.9 to be reprints of the Glareanus *Metamorphoses*, while I think it likely that STC 18952.1 was a reprint of the Navagero and Giselin version of this same text.
[35] Arber, 3.87

EARLY PRINTED MATERIALS CONSULTED

Anon. *Lyttell Treatyse Cleped La Conusaunce Damours*. STC 5631; London, 1528.

Anon. *A Poore Knight his Pallace of Priuate Pleasures*. STC 4283; London, 1579.

Anon. *Tales and Quicke Answers Very Mery and Pleasant to Rede*. STC 23665; London, 1532.

Anon. *The True Ttragedie of Richard the Third*. STC 21009; London, 1594.

Anon. *The Wandring Prince of Troy*. STC 24293.5; London, 1630.

Baldwin, William et al. *The Mirour for Migistrates*. STC 13445; London, 1587.

Baldwin, William et al. *A Myrrour for Magistrates*. STC 1248; London, 1563.

Baldwin, William et al. *A Myrrour for Magistrates*. STC 1249; London, 1571.

Baldwin, William et al. *A Myrroure for Magistrates*. STC 1247; London, 1559.

Barnfield, Richard. *The Encomion of Lady Pecunia: or the Praise of Money*. STC 1485; London, 1598.

Bateman, Stephen. *A Christall Glasse of Christian Reformation*. STC 1581; London, 1569.

Benson, George. *A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse the Seaventh of May MDCIX*. STC 1886; London, 1609.

Burdet, Robert. *A Dyalogue Defensyue for Women, Agaynst Malycyous Detractoures*. STC 24601; London, 1542.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Boke of Fame Made by Geffray Chaucer: With Dyuers Other of His Workes*. STC 5088; London, 1526.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Noble and Amerous Au[n]cyent Hystory of Troylus and Cresyde*. STC 5095; London, 1517.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Workes of Geffray Chaucer*. STC 5068; London, 1532.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Workes of Geffrey Chaucer*. STC 5075; London, 1561.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Workes of Our Antient and Lerned English Poet, Geffrey Chaucer*. STC 5077; London, 1598.

Churchyard, Thomas. *Churchyards Challenge*. STC 5220; London, 1593.

Churchyard, Thomas. *A Handeful of Gladsome Verses*. STC 5237; London, 1592.

Churchyard, Thomas. *A Musicall Consort of Heauenly Harmonie…Called Churchyards Charitie*. STC 5245; London, 1595.

Churchyard, Thomas. *A Reuyuing of the Deade*. STC 5253; London, 1591.

Churchyard, Thomas. *The Thre First Bookes of Ouids De tristibus*. STC 18977; London, 1572.

Colse, Peter. *Penelopes Complaint: Or, A Mirrour for Wanton Minions*. STC 5582; London, 1596.

Copland, Robert. *The Seuen Sorowes that Women Haue When Theyr Husbandes Be Deade*. STC 5734; London, 1565.

Cox, Leonard. *The Art or Crafte of Rhetoryke.* STC 5947; London, 1524.

Daniel, Samuel. *Delia…With the Complaint of Rosamond.* STC 6243.2; London, 1592.

Drayton, Michael. *Englands Heroicall Epistles.* STC 7193; London, 1597.

Drayton, Michael. *Matilda: The Faire and Chaste Daughter of the Lord Robert Fizwater.* STC 7205; London, 1594.

Edwards, Richard, ed. *The Paradyse of Daynty Deuises.* STC 7516; London, 1576.

Feylde, Thomas. *A Contrauersye Bytwene a Louer and a Iaye.* STC 10839; London, 1532.

Fletcher, Giles. *Licia*. STC 11055; London, 1593.

Fraunce, Abraham. *The Arcadian Rhetorike*. STC 11338; London, 1588.

Gosynhyll, Edward. *Lytle Boke Named the Schole House of Women* STC 12104.5; London, 1541.

Gosynhyll, Edward. *The Prayse of All Women Called Mulierum Pean.* STC 12102; London, 1542.

Lefèvre, Raoul. *The Recuyell of the Historyes of Troye.* Trans. William Caxton. STC 15375; Bruges, 1473.

Lodge, Thomas. *Phillis: Honoured with Pastorall Sonnets, Elegies, and Amorous Delights*. STC 16662; London, 1593.

Meres, Francis. *Palladis Tamia: Wits Common Wealth*. STC 17835; London, 1634.

Middleton, Thomas and Thoman Rowley. *A Courtly Masque: the Deuice Called the World Tost at Tennis* STC 17909; London, 1620.

Mirandula, Octavianus. *Illvstrivm Poetarvm Flores*. STC 17954; London, 1598.

More, Edward. *A Lytle and Bryefe Treatyse Called the Defence of Women...Made agaynst the Schole Howse of Women.* STC 18067; London, 1560.

Nashe, Thomas. *Strange Newes.* STC 18377a; London, 1592.

Ogle, John. *The Lamentation of Troy*. STC 18755; London, 1594.

Ovid. *Fabularum Ouidii Interpretatio, Ethica, Physica, et Historica.* STC 18951; Cambridge, 1584.

Ovid. *The Flores of Ovide de Arte Amandi.* STC 18934; London, 1513.

Ovid. *The Heroycall Epistles of the Learned Poet Publius Ouidius Naso, in English Verse.* Trans. George Turberville STC 18940; London, 1567.

Ovid. *Ouidius Naso His Remedie of Love*. Trans F.L. STC 18974; London, 1600.

Ovid. *P. Ouidii Nasonis Fastorum...Tristium…De ponto…In Ibim…Ad Liuiam.* STC 18927. London, 1583.

Ovid. *P. Ouidii Nasonis de tristibus.* STC 18976.4; London, 1574.

Ovid. *P. Ouidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistolae…Amorum…De arte amandi…De remedio amoris.* STC 18929; London, 1594.

Ovid. *P. Ouidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon.* STC 18951.5; London, 1582.

Ovid. *P. Ovidii Nasonis Opera.* STC 18926.1; London, 1570.

Ovid. *Publii Ouidii Nasonis Heroidum epistolae. Amorum…De arte amandi…De remedio amoris.* STC 18928; London, 1583.

Ovid. *The Thre First Bookes of Ouids De tristibus*, Trans. Thomas Churchyard. STC 18977; London, 1572.

Procter, Thomas, ed. *A Gorgious Gallery, of Gallant Inuentions.* STC 20402; London, 1578.

Pyrrye, Charles. *The Praise and Dispraise of Women.* STC 20523; London, 1569.

Rich, Barnabe. *The Straunge and Wonderfull Aduentures of Don Simonides.* STC 21002; London, 1581.

Robinson, Clement, ed. *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites.* STC 21105 STC; London,1584.

Sidney, Philip. *Syr P.S. His Astrophel and Stella.* STC 22536; London, 1591.

Skelton, John. *The Boke of Phyllyp Sparowe.* STC 22594; London, 1545.

Skelton, John. *A Goodly Garlande or Chapelet of Laurel.* STC 22610; London, 1523.

Skelton, John. *Pithy Pleasaunt and Profitable Workes of Maister Skelton.* STC 22608; London, 1568.

Vergil. *Thee First Foure Bookes of Virgil his Aeneis.* Trans. Richard Stanyhurst. STC 24806; Leiden, 1582.

Walter, William. *The Spectacle of Louers.* STC 25008; London, 1533.

Whitney, Isabella. *A Sweet Nosgay, Or Pleasant Posye: Contayning a Hundred and Ten Phylosophicall Flowers .* STC 25440; London, 1573.

Whitney, Isabella. *The Copy of a Letter.* STC 25439; London, 1567.

Wilson, Thomas. *The Arte of Rhetorique.* STC 25799; London, 1553.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, H. Porter. *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Allen, Peter L. "Reading Chaucer's Good Women." *Chaucer Review* 21 (1987): 419-34.

Altman, Joel. B. *The Tudor Play of Mind: Rhetorical Inquiry and the Development of Elizabethan Drama.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Arber, Edward, ed. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 A.D.* 5 vols. 1875-94; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Archibald, Elizabeth. "Declarations of 'Entente' in *Troilus and Criseyde*." *The Chaucer Review* 25.3 (1991): 190-213.

Bacon, Francis. *Novum Organum.* Ed. Thomas Fowler. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1878.

Bacon, Francis. *The New Organon*. Trans. Michael Silverthorne. Eds. Lisa Jardine and Michael Silverthorne. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Baird, Joseph L. and John R. Kane, eds. and trans. *La Querelle de la Rose*: *Letters and Documents.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978.

Baker, Herschel C. "Classical Material in Broadside Ballads, 1550-1625." *PMLA* 54.4. (1939): 981-89.

Baldwin, T. W. *William Shakespere's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*. 2 vols. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1944.

Barchiesi, Alessandro. *The Poet and the Prince: Ovid and Augustan Discourse.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Barclay, Alexander. *The Ship of Fools Translated by Alexander Barclay*. Ed. T.H. Jamieson. 2 vols. 1874; New York: AMS, 1966.

Barkan, Leonard. *The Gods Made Flesh: Metamorphosis and the Pursuit of Paganism.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

Barker, Nicholas. "The Real Jane Shore." *Etoniana* 125 (1972): 383-91.

Barnard, John and Maureen Bell, "The Inventory of Henry Bynneman (1583): A Preliminary Survey." *Publishing History* 29 (1991): 5-46.

Barnard, John and D. F. McKenzie, eds. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume IV: 1557-1695*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Bassanese, Fiora A. *Gaspara Stampa.* Boston: Twayne, 1982.

Bate, Jonathan. *Shakespeare and Ovid.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Beecher, Donald, ed. *Critical Approaches to English Prose Fiction 1520- 1640*. Ottawa: Dovehouse, 1998.

Beer, Barrett L. *Tudor England Observed: The World of John Stow.* Phoenix Mill: Sutton Publishing, 1998.

Bell, Ilona. *Elizabethan Women and the Poetry of Courtship.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Benedict, Barbara M. *Making the Modern Reader: Cultural Mediation in Early Modern Literary Anthologies.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Benson, C. David and David Rollman. "Wynkyn de Worde and the Ending of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*." *Modern Philology* 78.3 (1981): 275-79.

Benson, Pamela. *The Invention of the Renaissance Woman: The Challenge of Female Independence in the Literature and Thought of Italy and England.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.

Birchenough, Edwyn. "The Prymer in English." *The Library.* 4th ser. 18 (1937): 177-94.

Blake, N. F. *William Caxton and English Literary Culture.* London: Hambledon Press, 1991.

Blake, N. F. "Wynkyn de Worde: a review of his life and work." *Études de linguistique et de la littérature en l'honneur d'André Crépin.* Eds. Danielle Buschinger and Wolfgang Spiewok Greifswald: Reineke-Verlag, 1993. 21–40.

Blamires, Alcuin. *The Case for Women in Medieval Culture.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Blamires, Alcuin, Karen Pratt, and C. W. Marx, eds. *Woman Defamed and Woman Defended: An Anthology of Medieval Texts.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Bloch, R. Howard. *Medieval Misogyny and the Invention of Western Romantic Love*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Bock, Gisela and Margarete Zimmermann. "The European *Querelle des femmes*." *Dispulatio* 5 (2002): 127-56.

Boffey, Julia. "Richard Pynson's 'Book of Fame' and 'The Letter of Dido.'" *Viator* 19 (1988): 339-53.

Boffey, Julia. "'Withdrawe your hande': the Lyrics of 'The Garland of Laurel' from Manuscript to Print." *Trivium* 31 (1999): 81-83.

Boitani, Piero. *Chaucer and the Imaginary World of Fame*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1984.

Boitani, Piero, ed. *Chaucer and the Italian Trecento*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Boitani, Piero, ed. *The European Tragedy of the Troilus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Bornstein, George and Theresa Tinkle, eds. *The Iconic Page in Manuscript, Print, and Digital Culture.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998.

Bouwsma, William J. "Anxiety and the Formation of Early Modern Culture." *After the Reformation: Essays in Honor of J.H. Hexter.* Ed. Barbara C. Malament. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980. 215-46.

Boyd, Barbara Weiden, ed. *Brill's Companion to Ovid.* Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Braden, Gordon. "Beyond Frustration: Petrarchan Laurels in the Seventeenth Century."*Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 26.1 (1986): 5-23.

Braekman, Martine. "A Chaucerian 'Courtly Love Aunter' by Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey." *Neophilologus* 79.4 (1995): 675-87.

Braekman, Martine. "Prolegomena to an Edition of the Poem *La Conusaunce Damours*, Printed around 1528." *Studia Neophilologica* 68 (1996): 25-28.

Brink, Jean R. *Michael Drayton Revisited*. Boston: Twayne, 1990.

Brooks, Douglas A., ed. *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.

Brown, Carolyn E. "Katherine of *The Taming of the Shrew*: 'A Second Grissel.'" *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 37.3 (1995): 285-313.

Brown, Cedric C., ed. *Patronage, Politics, and Literary Traditions in England, 1558-1658*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1993.

Brown, Cynthia J. *Poets, Patrons and Printers: Crisis of Authority in Late Medieval France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Brown, Georgia. *Redefining Elizabethan Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Brown, Richard Danson. "'A Talkatiue Wench (Whose Words a World Hath Delighted in)': Mistress Shore and Elizabethan Complaint." *Review of English Studies* 49 (1998): 395-415.

Brownlow, F.W. "*The Book of Phyllyp Sparowe* and the Liturgy." *English Literary Renaissance* 9 (1979): 5-20.

Budra, Paul. *A Mirror for Magistrates and the* de casibus *Tradition*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.

Budra, Paul. "*The Mirror for Magistrates* and the Politics of Readership." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 32 (1992): 1-13.

Byrom, Henry J. "John Wayland—Printer, Scrivener, and Litigant." *The Library*. 4th ser. 11 (1931): 312-49.

Calabrese, Michael A. *Chaucer's Ovidian Arts of Love*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1994.

Callaghan, Dympna. "The Book of Changes in a Time of Change: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in Post-Reformation England and *Venus and Adonis*." In *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works. Vol. IV: The Poems, Problem Comedies and Late Plays*. Eds. Richard Dutton and Jean Howard. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.

Campbell, Jennifer. "Figuring Criseyde's 'Entente': Authority, Narrative, and Chaucer's Use of History." *Chaucer Review* 27.4 (1993): 342-58.

Campbell, Lily B., ed. *The Mirror for Magistrates* . 1938; New York: Barnes & Noble, 1960.

Campbell, Lily B. "The Suppressed Edition of *A Mirror for Magistrates*." *Huntington Library Bulletin* 6 (1934): 1-16.

Carlson, David. "Alexander Barclay and Richard Pynson: A Tudor Printer and His Writer." *Anglia* 113 (1995): 283-302.

Carlson, David R. "Skelton and Barclay, Medieval and Modern." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 1.1 (1995): 2.1-17. <http://purl.oclc.org/emls/01-1/carlskel.html>. Last retrieved 5 June 2008.

Carruthers, Mary J. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Carruthers, Mary. "The Wife of Bath and the Painting of Lions." *PMLA* 94 (1979): 209-22.

Casali, Sergio. "Tragic Irony in Ovid, *Heroides* 9 and 11." *Classical Quarterly* 45 (1995): 505-11.

Caxton, William. *Caxton's Own Prose*. Ed. N.F. Blake. London: Andre Deutsch, 1973.

Caxton, William. *Six Bookes of Metamorphoseos in whyche ben conteyned the Fables of Ovyde*. Ed. George Hibbert. London: Roxburghe Club, 1814.

Charnes, Linda. "'So Unsecret to Ourselves': Notorious Identity and the Material Subject in *Troilus and Cressida*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40 (1989): 413-40.

Chartier, Roger. *Inscription and Erasure: Literature and Written Culture from the Eleventh to the Eighteenth Century*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Chartier, Roger. "Texts, Printing, Readings." *The New Cultural History*. Ed. Lynn Hunt. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989. 154–75.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. *The Riverside Chaucer*. 3rd ed. Ed. Larry D. Benson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

Cheney, Patrick. *Marlowe's Counterfeit Profession: Ovid, Spenser, Counter-Nationhood*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

Cicero. *Epistulae Ad Familiares*. Vol. 1. Ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Cicero. *Letters to Friends*. Vol. 1. Trans. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Clarke, Danielle. "Ovid's *Heroides*, Drayton and the Articulation of the Feminine in the English Renaissance." *Renaissance Studies* 22 (2008): 385-400.

Collins, Christopher. *Authority Figures: Metaphors of Mastery from the* Iliad *to the Apocalypse*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1996.

Cook, Carol. "Unbodied Figures of Desire." *Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre*. Ed. Sue-Ellen Case. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990. 177-95.

Cotton, Charles. *Chaucer's Ghoast, or, a Piece of Antiquity*. London, 1672.

Cox, Catherine S. *Gender and Language in Chaucer*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1997.

Crane, Mary Thomas. *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Crick, Julia and Alexandra Walsham, eds. *The Uses of Script and Print, 1300-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Crocker, Holly A. "Affective Resistance: Performing Passivity and Playing A-Part in *The Taming of the Shrew*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54.2 (2003): 142-59.

Daileader, Celia R. "When a Sparrow Falls: Women Readers, Male Critics, and John Skelton's *Phyllyp Sparowe*." *Philological Quarterly* 75.4 (1996): 391-409.

Dane, Joseph A. *Who Is Buried in Chaucer's Tomb?: Studies in the Reception of Chaucer's Book*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1998.

Davies, R.T., ed. *Medieval English Lyrics: A Critical Anthology*. 2nd ed. 1963; Chicago: Northwestern University Press, 1991.

Davis, Peter J. "Rewriting Euripedes: Ovid, *Heroides* 4." *Scholia* 4 (1995): 41-55.

de Grazia, Margreta. "The Modern Divide: From Either Side" *The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 37.3 (2007): 453-67.

de Grazia, Margreta and Peter Stallybrass. "The Materiality of the Shakespearean Text." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 44.3 (1993): 255-83.

de Grazia, Margreta and Stanley Wells, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

de Pisan, Christine. *Epistre au dieu d'amours. Oeuvres poétiques de Christine de Pisan*. Ed. Maurice Roy. Vol. 2. Paris: Firmin Didot, 1886.

de Pisan, Christine. *The Selected Writings of Christine de Pizan*. Trans. Kevin Brownlee and Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinki. Ed. Renate Blumenfeld-Kosinki. New York: Norton, 1997.

de Sainte-Maure, Benoît. *Roman de Troie*. Ed. Leopold Constans. Paris: Société des Anciens Textes Français, 1904-1906.

Desmond, Marilynn. *Ovid's Art and the Wife of Bath: The Ethics of Erotic Violence*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Desmond, Marilynn. *Reading Dido: Gender, Textuality, and the Medieval* Aeneid. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Dinshaw, Carolyn. *Chaucer's Sexual Poetics*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Donaldson, E. Talbot. "Briseis, Briseida, Criseyde, Cresseid, Cressid: Progress of a Heroine." *Chaucerian Problems and Perspectives: Essays Presented to Paul E. Beichner, C.S.C.* Eds. Edward Vasta and Zacharias P. Thundy. Chapel Hill: University of Notre Dame Press, 1979. 3-12.

Donaldson, Ian. *Jonson's Magic Houses: Essays in Interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Donno, Elizabeth Story, ed. *Elizabethan Minor Epics*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.

Dowling, William C. *The Epistolary Moment: The Poetics of the Eighteenth-Century Verse Epistle*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Drayton, Michael. *The Works of Michael Drayton*. 5 vols. Ed. J. William Hebel. Oxford: Shakespeare Head Press, 1931.

Drinkwater, Megan O. "Which Letter? Text and Subtext in Ovid's *Heroides*." *American Journal of Philology* 128 (2007): 367–87.

Dryden, John. "Preface." *Troilus and Cressida: Or, Truth Found Too Late. Dryden's Works*. Ed. Walter Scott. Rev. George Saintsbury. Vol. 6. Edinburgh, 1881-93. 255.

Dubrow, Heather. "'Lending soft audience to my sweet design': Shifting Roles and Shifting Readings in Shakespeare's 'A Lover's Complaint,'" *Shakespeare Survey* 58 (2005): 23-33.

Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580*. New Haven:Yale University Press, 1992.

Duncan, Thomas G., ed. A *Companion to the Middle English Lyric*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2005.

Edwards, A.S.G., ed. *A Companion to Middle English Prose*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2004.

Edwards, A.S.G. "From Manuscript to Print: Wynkyn de Worde and the Printing of Contemporary Poetry." *Gutenberg Jahrbuch* (1991): 133-48.

Edwards, A.S.G. "The Influence of Lydgate's *Fall of Princes* c. 1440-1559: A Survey." *Mediaeval Studies* 39 (1977): 424-39.

Edwards, A.S.G. "Poet and Printer in Sixteenth-Century England: Stephen Hawes and Wynkyn de Worde." *Gutenberg Jahrbuch* (1980): 82-88.

Edwards, A.S.G. "Pynson's and Thynne's Editions of Chaucer's *House of Fame*." *Studies in Bibliography* 42 (1989): 185-86.

Edwards, A.S.G. *Skelton: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.

Edwards, A.S.G. and Carol M. Meale. "The Marketing of Printed Books in Late Medieval England." *The Library* 6th ser. 15 (1993): 95–124.

Edwards, Robert R. "Translating Thebes: Lydgate's *Siege of Thebes* and Stow's Chaucer." *ELH* 70.2 (2003): 319-341.

Ellinghausen, Laurie. "Literary Property and the Single Woman in Isabella Whitney's *A Sweet Nosgay*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 45.1 (2005): 1-22.

Elliott, Alison G. "Accessus ad Auctores: Twelfth-Century Introductions to Ovid." *Allegorica* 5.1 (1980): 6-48.

Enterline, Lynn. *The Rhetoric of the Body from Ovid to Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *De duplici copia verborum ac rerum commentarii duo*. *Collected Works of Erasmus: Literary and Educational Writings 2*. Trans. Betty I. Knott. Ed. Craig R. Thompson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978. 279-659.

Evans, Ruth. "Chaucer in Cyberspace: Medieval Technologies of Memory and *The House of Fame*." *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 23 (2001): 43-69.

Ezell, Margaret J. M. *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Farrell, Joseph. "Reading and Writing the *Heroides*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 98 (1998): 307-38.

Fear, Trevor. "The Poet as Pimp: Elegiac Seduction in the Time of Augustus." *Arethusa* 33.2 (2000): 217-40.

Feasey, Eveline Iris. "The Licensing of the *Mirror for Magistrates*." *The Library*. 4th ser. 3 (1923): 177-93.

Fehrenbach, Robert J. "Isabella Whitney (fl. 1565-75) and the Popular Miscellanies of Richard Jones." *Cahiers Elisabethains: Late Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 19 (1981): 85-87.

Fehrenbach, R. J. "Isabella Whitney, Sir Hugh Plat, Geoffrey Whitney, and Sister Eldershae." *English Language Notes* 21 (1983): 7-11.

Fehrenbach, Robert and Elisabeth Leedham-Green, eds. *Private Libraries in Renaissance England*. Vols. 1-5. Binghamton, NY: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1992-2004.

Fenster, Thelma S. and Daniel Lord Smail, eds. *Fama: The Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Finkelstein, David and Alistair McCleery, eds. *The Book History Reader*, London: Routledge, 2002.

Fish, Stanley E. *John Skelton's Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.

Fleming, John V. *Classical Imitation and Interpretation in Chaucer's* Troilus. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990.

Fletcher, Bradford Y. "Printer's Copy for Stow's *Chaucer*." *Studies in Bibliography* 31 (1978): 184-201.

Forni, Kathleen. *The Chaucerian Apocrypha: A Counterfeit Canon*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001.

Fränkel, Hermann. *Ovid: A Poet between Two Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1945.

Frazer, R.M., Jr., trans. *The Trojan War: The Chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966.

Fulkerson, Laurel. *The Ovidian Heroine as Author: Reading, Writing, and Community in the* Heroides. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Fumo, Jamie C. "'Little *Troilus*': *Heroides* 5 and Its Ovidian Contexts in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*." *Studies in Philology* 100.3 (2003): 278-314.

Fyler, John. *Chaucer and Ovid*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.

Gascoigne, George. *The Posies*. Ed. John W. Cunliffe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907.

Geller, Sherri. "Editing Under the Influence of the Standard Textual Hierarchy: Misrepresenting *A Mirror for Magistrates* in the Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Editions." *Textual Cultures: Text, Contexts, Interpretation* 2.1 (2007): 42-77.

Ghisalberti, Fausto. "Mediaeval Biographies of Ovid." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 9 (1946): 10-59.

Gibson, Roy, Steven Green, and Alison Sharrock, eds. *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's* Ars Amatoria *and* Remedia Amoris. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Gillespie, Alexandra. "Poets, Printers, and Early English *Sammelbände*." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67.2 (2004): 189-214.

Gillespie, Alexandra. *Print Culture and the Medieval Author: Chaucer, Lydgate, and Their Books 1473–1557*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Gillespie, Alexandra and Ian Gadd, eds. *John Stow (1525-1605) and the Making of the English Past*. London: British Library, 2004.

Gillespie, Stuart and Neil Rhodes, eds. *Shakespeare and Elizabethan Popular Culture*. London: Cengage Learning, 2006.

Gilmore, John. "Parrots, Poets and Philosophers: Language and Empire in the Eighteenth Century." *EnterText* 2.2 (2003): 84-102.

Go, Kenji. "'The Bawdy 'Talent' to 'Occupy' in *Cymbeline,* the *Complaint of Rosamond*, and the Elizabethan Homily for Rogation Week." *The Review of English Studies* 54 (2003): 27-51.

Go, Kenji. "Samuel Daniel's *The Complaint of Rosamond* and an Emblematic Reconsideration of *A Lover's Complaint*." *Studies in Philology* 104.1 (2007): 82-122.

Goldwyn, M. Harvey. "Notes on the Biography of Thomas Churchyard." *Review of English Studies* 17 (1966): 1–15.

Gordon, Ian A. *John Skelton, Poet Laureate.* 1943; New York: Octagon, 1970.

Gower, John. *The Complete Works of John Gower*. Ed. G.C. MacAulay. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901.

Grabes, Herbert. *The Mutable Glass: Mirror-Imagery in Titles and Texts of the Middle Ages*. Trans. Gordon Collier. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Gray, George J. and William Mortlock Palmer. *Abstracts from the Wills and Testamentary Documents of Printers, Binders, and Stationers of Cambridge, from 1504 to 1699*. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1915.

Greene, Gayle. "Shakespeare's Cressida: 'A Kind of Self.'" *The Woman's Part: Feminist Criticism of Shakespeare*. Eds. Carolyn Ruth Swift Lenz et al. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980. 133-49.

Greenhut, Deborah S. *Feminine Rhetorical Culture: Tudor Adaptations of Ovid's* Heroides. New York: Peter Lang, 1988.

Griffiths, Jeremy and Derek Pearsall, eds. *Book Production and Publishing in Britain, 1375-1475*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Grove, Laurence. *Text/Image Mosaics in French Culture: Emblems and Comic Strips.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.

Guy-Bray, Stephen. "Rosamond's Complaint: Daniel, Ovid, and the Purpose of Poetry." *Renaissance Studies* 22.3 (2008): 338-50.

Hadfield, Andrew, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Spenser*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Hadfield, Andrew. "Michael Drayton's Brilliant Career." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 125 (2004): 119–47.

Halasz, Alexandra. *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Hamilton, A.C., ed. *The Spenser Encyclopedia.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Hampton, Timothy. *Writing from History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Hanna, Ralph, III. "Jankyn's Book." *Pacific Coast Philology*. 21.1-2 (1986): 30-36.

Hanna, Ralph, III and Traugott Lawler, eds. *Jankyn's Book of Wikked Wyves: The Primary Texts.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1997.

Hanning, Robert W. "'I Shal Finde It in a Maner Glose': Versions of Textual Harassment in Medieval Literature." *Medieval Texts & Contemporary Readers.* Eds. Laurie Finke and Martin B. Shichtman. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987. 27-50.

Hansen, Elaine Tuttel. *Chaucer and the Fictions of Gender.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Hansen, William. "Strategies of Authentication in Ancient Popular Literature." *The Ancient Novel and Beyond.* Eds. Stelios Panayotakis, Maaike Zimmerman, and Wytse Keulen. Leiden: Brill, 2003. 301–13.

Hardie, Philip, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Hardie, Philip. *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Hardie, Philip, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds, eds. *Ovidian Transformations: Essays in the "Metamorphoses" and its Reception.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Hardin, Richard F. "Ovid in Seventeenth-Century England." *Comparative Literature* 24.1 (1972): 44-62.

Harner, James L. "Jane Shore in Literature: A Checklist." *Notes and Queries* 28 (1981): 496–507.

Harvey, Elizabeth D. *Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and English Renaissance Texts.* London: Routledge, 1992.

Harvey, Gabriel. *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia.* Ed. G. C. Moore Smith. Stratford-upon-Avon: Shakespeare Head Press, 1913.

Havely, N. R. *Chaucer's Boccaccio: Sources of* Troilus *and the* Knight's *and* Franklin's Tales. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1980.

Haydock, Nickolas. "False and Sooth Compounded in Caxton's Ending of Chaucer's *House of Fame*." *Atenea* 26.2 (2006): 107-29.

Heale, Elizabeth. "'Desiring Women Writing': Female Voices and Courtly 'Balets' in Some Early Tudor Manuscript Albums." *Early Modern Women's Manuscript Writing.* Eds. Victoria E. Burke and Jonathan Gibson. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004. 9-31.

Heale, Elizabeth. "Misogyny and the Complete Gentleman in Early Elizabethan Printed Miscellanies." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 33.1 (2003): 233-47.

Hecter, Ralph J. *Ovid and Medieval Schooling: Studies in Medieval School Commentaries on Ovid's* Ars Amatoria, Epistulae ex Ponto, *and* Epistulae Heroidum. München: Arbeo-Gesellschaft, 1986.

Helgerson, Richard. "Weeping for Jane Shore." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 98.3 (1999): 451-76.

Henderson, Katherine Usher and Barbara F. McManus. *Half Humankind: Contexts and Texts of the Controversy about Women in England, 1540-1640.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985.

Henryson, Robert. *The Poems of Robert Henryson.* Ed. Robert L. Kindrick. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1997.

Henze, Catherine. "Author and Source of 'A Dyalogue Defensyue For Women.'" *Notes and Queries* 23.1 (1976): 537–39.

Heslin, P.J. *The Transvestite Achilles: Gender and Genre in Statius'* Achilleid. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Hindman, Sandra, ed. *Printing and the Written Word: The Social History of Books, circa 1450-1520*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Hinds, Stephen. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Hodnett, Edward. *English Woodcuts, 1480-1535*. 1935; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Horowitz, Deborah. "An Aesthetic of Permeability: Three Transcapes of the *Book of the Duchess*." *The Chaucer Review* 39.3 (2005): 259-79.

Hoskyns, John. *Life, Letters and Writings ofJohn Hoskyns, 1566-1638*. Ed. Louise Brown Osborn. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937.

Howard, Jean F. "Textualizing an Urban Life: The Case of Isabella Whitney." *Early Modern Autobiography: Theories, Genres, Practices*. Eds. Ronald Bedford, Lloyd Davis, and Philippa Kelly. University of Michigan Press, 2006. 217-33.

Hulse, Clark. *Metamorphic Verse: The Elizabethan Minor Epic*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Jackson, MacDonald P. "The Printer of the First Quarto of *Astrophil and Stella* (1591)." *Studies in Bibliography* 31 (1978): 201-03.

Jackson, William Alexander. "Wayland's Edition of the *Mirror for Magistrates*." *The Library*. 4th ser. 13 (1933): 155-57.

Jacobson, Howard. *Ovid's* Heroides. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Jager, Eric. *The Book of the Heart*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Jahn, Robert. "Letters and Booklists of Thomas Chard (or Chare) of London, 1583-4." *The Library* 4th ser. 4 (1923): 219-37.

James, Heather. *Shakespeare's Troy: Drama, Politics, and the Translation of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

James, Sharon L. *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Jardine, Lisa and Anthony Grafton."'Studied for Action': How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy." *Past and Present* 129 (1990): 30-78.

Jaster, Margaret Rose. "Controlling Clothes, Manipulating Mates: Petruchio's Griselda." *Shakespeare Studies* 29 (2001): 93-108

Johns, Adrian. *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Jonson, Ben. *Poetaster*. Ed. Tom Cain. Manchester: Manchester University, 1995.

Jordan, Constance. *Renaissance Feminism: Literary Texts and Political Models*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Kastan, David Scott. *Shakespeare After Theory*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Kastan, David Scott. *Shakespeare and the Book*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Keach, William. *Elizabethan Erotic Narratives: Irony and Pathos in the Ovidian Poetry of Shakespeare, Marlowe and Their Contemporaries.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1977.

Keith, A.M. "*Corpus Eroticum*: Elegiac Poetics and Elegiac *Puellae* in Ovid's *Amores*." *The Classical World* 88 (1994): 27-40.

Keith, Alison and Stephen Rupp, eds. *Metamorphosis: The Changing Face of Ovid in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2007.

Kelly, Joan. "Early Feminist Theory and the 'Querelle des Femmes,' 1400-1789." *Signs* 8 (1982): 4-28.

Kelso, Ruth. *Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956.

Kennedy, Duncan F. "The Epistolary Mode and the First of Ovid's *Heroides*." *Classical Quarterly* 34 (1984): 413-22.

Kenney, E.J. and V.W. Clausen, eds. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. Vol II: Latin Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982. 420-57.

Kerrigan, John. *Motives of Woe: Shakespeare and the 'Female Complaint'.*' Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

King, John N. *English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Kinney, Arthur F., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature, 1500-1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Kinney, Arthur F. *Humanist Poetics: Thought, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century England.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986.

Kinney, Arthur F. *John Skelton, Priest as Poet: Seasons of Discovery*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Kinsman, Robert S. *John Skelton, Early Tudor Laureate: An Annotated Bibliography, c 1488-1977*. Boston : G. K. Hall, 1979.

Kittredge, George Lyman. "Chaucer's Discussion of Marriage." *Modern Philology* 9 (1911-1912): 435-67.

Knox, Peter, ed. *A Companion to Ovid*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2009.

Knox, Peter E., ed. "Introduction." *Heroides: Select Epistles.* By Ovid. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 1-37.

Kooper, Erik, ed. *This Noble Craft: Proceedings of the 10th Research Symposium of the Dutch and Belgian University Teachers of Old and Middle English and Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Rodolphi, 1991.

Krier, Theresa M., ed. *Refiguring Chaucer in the Renaissance.* Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998.

Lathrop, H. B. Translations *from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman, 1477-1620*. 1933; New York: Octagon Books, 1967.

Lavin, J.A. "The First Two Printers of Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella*." *The Library.* 5th ser. 26 (1971): 249-55.

Leishman, J.B., ed. *The Three Parnassus Plays*. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1949.

Lerer, Seth. *Chaucer and His Readers: Imagining the Author in Late-Medieval England*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Lerer, Seth. *Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII: Literary Culture and the Arts of Deceit*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Lerer, Seth. "Medieval English Literature and the Idea of the Anthology." *PMLA* 118.5 (2003): 251-60.

Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer, ed. *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Lewis, C.S. *The Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936.

Lewis, C.S. *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century Excluding Drama*. 1954; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Lindheim, Sara H. *Mail and Female: Epistolary Narrative and Desire in Ovid's* Heroides. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003.

Linn, Irving. "If All the Sky were Parchment." *PMLA* 53 (1938): 951-70.

Lodge, Thomas. *The Complete Works of Thomas Lodge*. Vol. 2. Ed. Edmund Gosse. 1883; New York: Russell and Russell, 1963.

Loewenstein, David and Janel Mueller, eds. *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Loomba, Ania. "Periodization, Race, and Global Contact." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 37.3 (2007): 595-620.

Lorch, Lavinia. "Human Time and the Magic of the *Carmen*: Metamorphosis as an Element of Rhetoric in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 15.4 (1982): 262-73.

Love, Harold. *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Lucas, Scott Campbell. "The Suppressed Edition and the Creation of the 'Orthodox' *Mirror for Magistrates*." *Renaissance Papers* (1994): 31-54.

Lydgate, John. *Lydgate's Fall of Princes*. Ed. Henry Bergen. 4 vols. Washington, DC: The Carnegie Institution, 1923.

Lydgate, John. *Lydgate's Troy Book, A.D. 1412-1420*. Ed. Henry Bergen. 4 vols. London: The Early English Text Society, 1906-1935.

Lynch, Stephen J. "Shakespeare's Cressida: 'A Woman of Quick Sense.'" *Philological Quarterly* 63 (1984): 357-68.

Lyne, Raphael. "A Case for Isabella Whitney." Cambridge University CERES project. <www.english.cam.ac.uk/ceres/aeneas/attrib.htm>. Last retrieved 2 April 2009.

Lyne, Raphael. "Intertextuality and the Female Voice after the *Heroides*." *Renaissance Studies*: 22 (2008): 307-23.

Lyne, Raphael. *Ovid's Changing Worlds: English Metamorphoses, 1567-1632*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Malcolmson, Cristina and Mihoko Suzuki, eds. *Debating Gender in Early Modern England, 1500-1700*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

Mann, Jill. "Chaucer and the 'Woman Question." *This Noble Craft: Proceedings of the 10th Research Symposium of the Dutch and Belgian University Teachers of Old and Middle English and Historical Linguistics*. Ed. Erik Kooper. Amsterdam: Rodolphi, 1991.

Mapstone, Sally. "The Origins of Criseyde." *Medieval Women: Texts and Contexts in Late Medieval Britain: Essays for Felicity Riddy*. Eds. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne et al. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2000. 131-147.

Marcus, Leah S. *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Marlowe, Christopher. *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe*. Vol. 1. Ed. Roma Gill. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

Marotti, Arthur F. *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Marotti, Arthur F. and Michael D. Bristol, eds. *Print, Manuscript, and Performance: The Changing Relations of Media in Early Modern England*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2000.

Marquis, Paul A. **"**Oppositional Ideologies of Gender in Isabella Whitney's 'Copy of a Letter.'" *The Modern Language Review* 90.2 (1995): 314-24.

Martindale, Charles and A. B. Taylor, eds. *Shakespeare and the Classics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Massai, Sonia. *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Mayer, Lauryn S. *Worlds Made Flesh: Reading Medieval Manuscript Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Maynard, Winifred. "*The Paradyse of Daynty Deuises* Revisited." *Review of English Studies* 24 (1973): 295-300.

McCarthy, Kathleen. "Servitium amoris: Amor servitii." *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations*." Eds. Sandra R. Joshel and Sheila Murnaghan. London: Routledge, 1998. 174–92.

McKenzie, D.F. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. London: British Library, 1986.

McKenzie, D.F. *Making Meaning: "Printers of the Mind" and Other Essays*. Eds. Peter D. McDonald and Michael F. Suarez. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002.

McKeown, J. C., ed. *Ovid, Amores: Text, Prolegomena and Commentary*. Vol. 1. Liverpool: Francis Cairns, 1987.

McKinley, Kathryn. *Reading the Ovidian Heroine: Metamorphoses Commentaries 1100-1618*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

McKitterick, David. *A History of Cambridge University Press*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

McKitterick, David. *Print, Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450-1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

McLeod, Glenda. *Virtue and Venom: Catalogs of Women from Antiquity to the Renaissance.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991.

Meale, Carol M. "Caxton, de Worde, and the Publication of Romance." *The Library*. 6th ser. 14 (1992): 283-98.

Melnikoff, Kirk. "Jones's Pen and Marlowe's Socks: Richard Jones, Print Culture, and the Beginnings of English Dramatic Literature." *Studies in Philology* 102.2 (2005): 184-209.

Melnikoff, Kirk. "Richard Jones (fl. 1564-1613): Elizabethan Printer, Bookseller and Publisher." *Analytical and Enumerative Bibliography* 12.3 (2001): 153-84.

Mieszkowski, Gretchen. "The Reputation of Criseyde 1150-1500." *Transactions Published by the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 43 (1971): 71-153.

Minnis, A.J. *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*. London: Scolar Press, 1984.

Miskimin, Alice S. *The Renaissance Chaucer*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975.

More, Thomas. *The English Works of Sir Thomas More*. Vol. 1. Ed. W.E. Campbell. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1913.

Morgan, Kathleen. *Ovid's Art of Imitation: Propertius in the* Amores. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Mortimer, Anthony, ed. *Petrarch's Canzoniere in the English Renaissanc*e. Rev. ed. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005.

Moss, Ann. *Ovid in Renaissance France: A Survey of the Latin Editions of Ovid and Commentaries Printed in France before 1600*. London: The Warburg Institute, 1982.

Murphy, Andrew. *A Concise Companion to Shakespeare and the Text*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.

Nashe, Thomas. *The Unfortunate Traveller. An Anthology of Elizabethan Prose Fiction.* Ed. Paul Salzman. 1987; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. 205-309.

Nelson, William. *John Skelton, Laureate*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.

Newman, Karen. "Renaissance Family Politics in Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew*." *English Literary Renaissance* 16 (1986): 86-100.

Nichols, Stephen G. and Siegfried Wenzel, eds. *The Whole Book: Cultural Perspectives on The Medieval Miscellany*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.

O'Gorman, Ellen. "Love and the Family: Augustus and the Ovidian Legacy." *Arethusa* 30.1 (1997): 103-23.

O'Mara, V. M. "'Perauenture the wynde had blowe ouer the leef': Caxton, *The Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers*, and the Woman Question." *Poetica* 49 (1998): 27-47.

Oakley-Brown, Liz. *Ovid and the Cultural Politics of Translation in Early Modern England.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Oakley-Brown, Liz. "Translating the Subject: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in England, 1560-7." *Translation and Nation: Towards a Cultural Politics of Englishness.* Eds. Roger Ellis and Liz Oakley-Brown. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2001.

Onians, R.B. *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Otis, Brooks. *Ovid as an Epic Poet.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Ovid. *The Art of Love and Other Poems*. Loeb Classical Library 232. 2nd ed. Trans. J.H. Mozley. Rev. G.P Goold. 1979; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Ovid. *Fasti.* Loeb Classical Library 253. 2nd ed. Trans. James George Frazer. rev. G.P Goold. 1989; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Ovid. *Heroides, Amores*. Loeb Classical Library 41. 2nd ed. Trans. Grant Showerman. Rev. G.P Goold. 1977; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses, Books I-VIII*. Loeb Classical Library 42. 3rd ed. Trans. Frank Justus Miller. Rev. G.P Goold. 1977; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses, Books IX-XV*. Loeb Classical Library 43. 2nd ed. Trans. Frank Justus Miller. Rev. G.P Goold. 1984; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Ovid. *Ovid's Metamorphoses: The Arthur Golding Translation.* Rev. ed. Trans. Arthur Golding. Ed. John Frederick Nims. Intro. Jonathan Bate. 1965; Philadelphia: Paul Dry Books, 2000.

Ovid. *Tristia, Ex Ponto*. Loeb Classical Library 151. 2nd ed. Trans. Arthur Leslie Wheeler. Rev. G.P Goold. 1988; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Painter, George D. *William Caxton: A Quincentenary Biography of England's First Printer*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1976.

Panofsky, Richard. "Love Poetry of Isabella Whitney, a Woman Author of the English Renaissance." *New Mexico Highlands University Journal* 6.1 (1983): 1-8.

Parkes, M. B. "The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book." *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to R.W. Hunt.* Eds. J.J.G. Alexander and M.T. Gibson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976). 115-41.

Patterson, Lee. "'For the Wyves love of Bathe': Feminine Rhetoric and Poetic Resolution in the *Roman de la Rose* and the *Canterbury Tales*." *Speculum* 58 (1983): 656-95.

Peacham, Henry. *The Compleat Gentleman.* Ed. G. S. Gordon. Oxford: Clarendon, 1906.

Pearcy, Lee T. *The Mediated Muse: English Translations of Ovid, 1560-1700*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1984.

Pearsall, Derek, ed. *Manuscripts and Readers in Fifteenth-Century England: The Literary Implication of Manuscript Study*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1983.

Pearsall, Derek. "The 'Troilus' Frontispiece and Chaucer's Audience." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 7 (1977): 68-74.

Percival, Florence. *Chaucer's Legendary Good Women*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Pettie, George. *A Petite Pallace of Pettie His Pleasure Containing Many Pretie Histories by him Set Forth in Comely Colours and Most Delightfully Discoursed*. 2 vols. Ed. I. Gollancz. London: Chatto and Windus, 1908.

Phillippy, Patricia B. "'Loytering in love': Ovid's *Heroides*, Hospitality, and Humanist Education in *The Taming of the Shrew*." *Criticism* 40.1 (1998): 27-53.

Phillips, Susan E. *Transforming Talk: The Problem with Gossip in Late Medieval England*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007.

Pinti, Daniel J., ed. *Writing After Chaucer: Essential Readings in Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century*. New York: Garland, 1998.

Pliny. *Natural History, Libri XXI-XVI*. Loeb Classical Library. Trans. H. Rackham. 1945; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Pratt, Robert A. "Jankyn's Book of Wikked Wyves: Medieval Antimatrimonial Propaganda in the Universities." *Annuale Medievale* 3 (1962): 5-27.

Pratt, Robert A. "Saint Jerome in Jankyn's Book of Wikked Wyves." *Criticism* 4 (1963): 316-22.

Primeau, Ronald. "Daniel and the *Mirror* Tradition: Dramatic Irony in *The Complaint of Rosamond*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 15 (1975): 21-36.

Propertius. *Elegies*. Loeb Classical Library 18. Trans. G.P Goold. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Prouty, Charles T., ed. *The sources of* Much Ado About Nothing: *A Critical Study, Together with the Text of Peter Beverley's* Ariodanto and Ieneura. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Pugh, Syrithe. *Spenser and Ovid*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.

Quain, Edwin A. "The Medieval *accessus ad auctores*." *Traditio* 3 (1945): 215-64.

Quinn, Kelly A. "Ecphrasis and Reading Practices in Elizabethan Narrative Verse." *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 44.1 (2004): 19-35.

Rebhorn, Wayne A. "Petruchio's 'Rope Tricks': *The Taming of the Shrew* and the Renaissance Discourse of Rhetoric." *Modern Philology* 92.3 (1995): 294-327.

Rigby, S.H. "The Wife of Bath, Christine de Pizan, and the Medieval Case for Women." *Chaucer Review* 35 (2000): 133-65.

Ringler, William A., Jr. *Bibliography and Index of English Verse Printed 1476-1558*. London: Mansell, 1988.

Roberts, Jeanne Addison. "Horses and Hermaphrodites: Metamorphoses in *The Taming of the Shrew*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 34.2 (1983): 159-71.

Roberts, S.C. *History of the Cambridge University Press, 1521-1921*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1921.

Roberts, Sasha. *Reading Shakespeare's Poems in Early Modern England*. New York: Palgrave, 2003.

Rodger, Alexander. "Roger Ward's Shrewsbury Stock: an inventory of 1585." *The Library* 5th ser. 8 (1958): 247-68.

Rollins, Hyder E. "The Troilus-Cressida Story from Chaucer to Shakespeare." *PMLA* 32 (1917): 383-429.

Rollins, Hyder E. "The Black-Letter Broadside Ballad." *PMLA* 34 (1919): 258-339.

Rollins, Hyder E., ed. *A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions (1578)*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Rollins, Hyder E., ed. *A Handful of Pleasant Delights (1584)*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924.

Rollins, Hyder E., ed. *The Paradise of Dainty Devices (1576-1606)*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Rollins, Hyder E. ed. *Tottel's Miscellany (1557-1587)*. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Ruggiers, Paul G., ed. *Editing Chaucer: The Great Tradition*. Norman, OK: Pilgrim Books, 1984.

Salu, Mary, ed. *Chaucer Studies III: Essays on* Troilus and Criseyde. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1979.

Schibanoff, Susan. "Taking Jane's Cue: *Phyllyp Sparowe* as a Primer for Women Readers." *PMLA* 101.5 (1986): 832-47.

Scott, Charlotte. *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Scott, Maria M. *Re-presenting "Jane" Shore: Harlot and Heroine*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.

Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.

Sharrock, Alison. *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's* Ars Amatoria *2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Sharrock, Alison."Womanufacture." *Journal of Roman Studies* 81 (1991): 36-49.

Shoaf, R.A. and Catherine S. Cox, eds. *Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde: 'Subgit to alle Poesye.'* Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Text Studies, 1992.

Sidney, Philip. *An Apology for Poetry (or The Defence of Poesy)*. 3rd ed. Ed. Geoffrey Shepherd. Rev. R.W. Maslen 1973; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.

Simpson, James. "Breaking the Vacuum: Ricardian and Henrician Ovidianism." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 29.2 (1999): 325-55.

Skeat, Walter W. *The Chaucer Canon: With a Discussion of the Works Associated with the Name of Geoffrey Chaucer*. 1900; New York, Haskell House, 1965.

Skelton, John. *The Book of the Laurel*. Ed. F.W. Brownlow. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1990.

Skelton, John. *John Skelton: The Complete English Poems*. Ed. John Scattergood. New York: Penguin, 1983.

Skura, Meredith. "*A Mirror for Magistrates* and the Beginnings of English Autobiography." *English Literary Renaissance* 36.1 (2006): 26-56.

Smith, Bruce R. *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Smith, Bruce R. "Female Impersonation in Early Modern Ballads." *Women Players in England, 1500-1660: Beyond the All-Male Stage*. Eds. Pamela Allen Brown and Peter Parolin. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.

Smith, Bruce R. "Listening to the Wild Blue Yonder: The Challenges of Acoustic Ecology." *Hearing Cultures: Essays on Sound, Listening, and Modernity*. Ed.Veit Erlmann. New York: Berg, 2004. 21-41.

Smith, Julie A. "Woodcut Presentation Scenes in Books Printed by Caxton, de Worde, and Pynson." *Gutenberg Jahrbuch* (1986): 322-43

Smith, R. Alden. "Fantasy, Myth, and Love Letters: Text and Tale in Ovid's *Heroides*." *Arethusa* 27 (1994): 247-73.

Solodow, Joseph B. *The World of Ovid's "Metamorphoses."* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

Spearing, A.C. *The Medieval Poet as Voyeur: Looking and Listening in Medieval Love-Narratives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Spenser, Edmund. *Edmund Spenser's Poetry*, 3rd ed. Eds. Hugh Maclean and Anne Lake Prescott. 1968; New York: Norton, 1993.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene*. Ed. A.C. Hamilton. London: Longman, 1977.

Spentzou, Efrossini. *Readers and Writers in Ovid's* Heroides*: Transgressions of Genre and Gender*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Stapleton, M.L. *Harmful Eloquence: Ovid's* Amores *from Antiquity to Shakespeare*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.

Stauivukovic, Goran V., ed. *Ovid and the Renaissance Body*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Stebile, Mary. "Jane Shore and the Politics of Cursing." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 43.1 (2003): 1-17.

Steirle, Karlheinz. "Story as Exemplum—Exemplum as Story: On the Pragmatics and Poetics of Narrative Texts." *New Perspectives in German Literary Criticism*. Eds. Richard E. Amacher and Victor Lange. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979. 389-417.

Sterne, Laurence. *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*. Ed. Ian Watt. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

Strohm, Paul, ed. *Middle English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Summers, Claude J. and Ted-Larry Pebworth , eds. *Representing Women in Renaissance England*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1997.

Summit, Jennifer. *Lost Property: The Woman Writer and English Literary History, 1380-1589*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Summit, Jennifer. "William Caxton, Margaret Beaufort, and the Romance of Female Patronage." *Women, the Book, and the Worldly: Selected Proceedings of the St. Hilda's Conference, 1993*. Eds. Lesley Smith and Jane M.H. Taylor. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1995.

Summit, Jennifer and David Wallace. "Rethinking Periodization." *The Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 37.3 (2007): 447-51.

Suzuki, Mihoko. *Metamorphoses of Helen: Authority, Difference, and the Epic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.

Tarnoff, Maura. "Sewing Authorship in John Skelton's *Garlande or Chapelet of Laurell*." *ELH* 75.2 (2008): 415-38.

Tatlock, John S. P. "The Epilog of Chaucer's 'Troilus.'" *Modern Philology* 18.12 (1921): 625-59.

Taylor, A. B., ed. *Shakespeare's Ovid: The Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Thomas, Richard F. "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 90 (1986): 171-98.

Thorne, Alison. "'Large Complaints in Little Papers': Negotiating Ovidian Genealogies of Complaint in Drayton's *Englands Heroicall Epistles*." *Renaissance Studies* 22 (2008): 368-84.

Tissol, Garth. *The Face of Nature: Wit, Narrative, and Cosmic Origins in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Travitsky, Betty. "The 'Wyll and Testament' of Isabella Whitney." *English Literary Renaissance* 10 (1980): 76-94.

Trigg, Stephanie. *Congenial Souls: Reading Chaucer from Medieval to Postmodern*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

Tylee, Claire M. "The Text of Cressida and Every Ticklish Reader: *Troilus and Cressida* and the Greek Camp Scene." *Shakespeare Survey* 41 (1989): 63-76.

Utley, Francis Lee. *The Crooked Rib: An Analytical Index to the Argument about Women in English and Scots Literature to the End of the Year 1568*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1944.

Van Es, Bart. "Michael Drayton, Literary History and Historians in Verse." *Review of English Studies* 239 (2008): 255-69.

Verducci, Florence. *Ovid's Toyshop of the Heart*: Epistulae Heroidum. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Voss, Paul J. "Books for Sale: Advertising and Patronage in Late Elizabethan England." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29 (1998): 733-56.

Wakelin, Daniel. "Possibilities for Reading: Classical Translations in Parallel Texts ca. 1520-1558." *Studies in Philology* 105.4 (2008): 463-86.

Walker, Greg. *Skelton and the Politics of the 1520s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Walker, Greg. *Writing Under Tyranny: English Literature and the Henrician Reformation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Walker, Kim. *Women Writers of the English Renaissance*. New York: Twayne, 1996.

Wall, Wendy. "Forgetting and Keeping: Jane Shore and the English Domestication of History." *Renaissance Drama*. New ser. 27 (1998): 123-56.

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

Wallace, David, ed. *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Waller, Gary. *English Poetry of the Sixteenth Century*. London: Longman, 1986.

Wang, Yu-Chiao. "Caxton's Romances and Their Early Tudor Readers." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 67.2 (2004): 173–88.

Warkentin, Germaine. "Patrons and Profiteers: Thomas Newman and the 'Violent Enlargement' of 'Astrophil and Stella.'" *Book-Collector* 34.4 (1985): 461-87.

Warren, Victoria. "Misreading the 'Text' of Criseyde: Context and Identity in Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*." *Chaucer Review* 36 (2001): 1-15.

Watt, Tessa. *Cheap Print and Popular Piety 1550–1650*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Watt, Tessa. "Piety in the Pedlar's Pack: Continuity and Change, 1578-1630." *The World of Rural Dissenters*. Ed. Margaret Spufford. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 235-72.

Webbe, William. *Discourse of English Poetrie*. Ed. Edward Arber. London, 1870.

Wheeler, Stephen M. *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.

Wilcox, Helen, ed.. *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Wilkinson, L.P. *Ovid Recalled*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955.

Williamson, Karina. "Voice, Gender, and the Augustan Verse Epistle." *Presenting Gender: Changing Sex in Early-Modern Culture*. Ed. Chris Mounsey. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2001. 76-93.

Wilson, Katharina M. and Elizabeth M. Makowski. *Wykked Wyves and the Woes of Marriage: Misogamous Literature from Juvenal to Chaucer*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990.

Wiltenburg, Joy. *Disorderly Women and Female Power in the Street Literature of Early Modern England and Germany*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1992.

Windeatt, Barry, ed. "Introduction." *Troilus and Criseyde*. By Geoffrey Chaucer. London: Penguin, 2003. xv-liv.

Winston, Jessica. "*A Mirror for Magistrates* and Public Political Discourse in England." *Studies in Philology* 101.4 (2004): 381-400.

Woodbridge, Linda. *Women and the English Renaissance: Literature and the Nature of Womankind, 1540-1620*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984.

Woolf, Daniel. "Erudition and the Idea of History in Renaissance England." *Renaissance Quarterly* 40.1 (1987): 11-48.

Woolf, D.R. "Hearing Renaissance England." *Hearing History: A Reader*. Ed. Mark M. Smith. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004. 112-135.

Woudhuysen, H. R. *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Wyke, Maria. "Mistress and Metaphor in Augustan Elegy." *Helios* 16 (1989): 25-47.

Wyke, Maria. "Taking the Woman's Part: Engendering Roman Love Elegy." *Ramus* 23.1-2 (1994): 110-28.

Wyke, Maria. "Written Women: Propertius' *Scripta Puella*." *Journal of Roman Studies* 77 (1987): 47–61.

Zimmerman, Margarete. "The *Querelle des Femmes* as a Cultural Studies Paradigm." *Time, Space, and Women's Lives in Early Modern Europe*. Eds. Anne Jacobson Schutte, Thomas Kuehn, and Silvana Seidel Menchi. Kirksville, MO: Truman State University Press, 2001. 17-28.