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CHAPTER I

THE EVOLUTION OF SURREY'S REPUTATION

The purpose of this study is to arrive at a just estimate of the poetry of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, by examining his better poems in relation to the traditions of rhetoric and logic prevalent during his day. I am particularly interested in the influence of basic rhetorical patterns on the structure of his verse, on the elements of inventio and dispositio, rather than of rhetorical figures of speech related to style and diction, which were part of the third division of Ciceronian rhetoric, elocutio. Of course, merely to point out such an influence is to provide nothing more than interesting comparisons; thus I hope to show that within the framework of traditional rhetorical patterns, individual genius and artistic excellence show themselves in his work also, that he demonstrates not only the poetic values of his age but also qualities which are universally considered marks of good poetry.

Before I consider such matters, I think it necessary to account for the present critical reputation of Surrey's poetry. To demonstrate a method for studying the work of a
Wyatt, a Sidney, or a Donne carries with it no obligation other than the demonstration itself; such is not the case with Surrey, for he is one of those poets who has in the twentieth century been more read about than read. On those rare occasions when he is read, the critical reaction is usually one of only nominal interest, or worse, complete disdain. This situation requires not only pedagogy, but also a degree of evangelism. Before examining the reasons that he should be read seriously, therefore, I shall indicate in this chapter the reasons why he is not so read.

One of the major causes for the lack of interest in his poetry during the twentieth century is the absence of a truly definitive edition of his works. One need only consider the critical impact of William Ringler’s edition of Sidney to realize that a sound text of an author’s work encourages scholarly criticism. The definitive edition of Surrey’s poetry still needs to be done. While G. F. Nott’s nineteenth-century combined collection of Wyatt and Surrey\(^1\) is extremely valuable for bringing together much material not available before, it unfortunately displays the hap-hazard, inexact quality of the editorial practice of his day. Hyder Rollins’ edition of the *Songes and Sonettes*\(^2\)


reproduces a miscellany of many poets, including only some of Surrey's poems, and it can be shown that even those were changed before being printed. Furthermore, the complete edition of Surrey brought out by F. M. Padelford a century after Nott's shows editorial practices which are now considered questionable (silent changes in punctuation, for one—a dangerous practice when transcribing poetry in which punctuation is more often than not rhetorical), and it contains serious misreadings (for example, "sinke" for "sucke" in "The sonne hath twyse brought forthe the tender grene"). Thus one would have to supplement use of Padelford's text with corrected readings from manuscript sources. Furthermore, his edition is out of date simply because he did not have the manuscript information provided by Professor Hughey's *The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry*, which, while not concerned with Surrey's poetry alone or in toto, does provide the authoritative word on the most significant early manuscript and printed sources which include poems by Surrey.


5. Two vols. (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press, 1960).
One might suppose that the textual problem would have been solved in 1964, when Emrys Jones brought out a new edition, *Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey: Poems*. Unfortunately, however, Jones' edition does little to clarify the textual problems connected with Surrey's poetry. As an indication of the questionable scholarship which went into the book, I point to the fact that despite having Professor Hughey's edition to work with, Jones claims to have used Add. MS. 28635, which is Nott's transcription of the Arundel Harington manuscript, as copy text for four poems (p. xviii). If he did, he is guilty of an oversight. In fact, Kenneth Muir has suggested that Jones did in fact use Professor Hughey's edition without indicating that he had.

But that is not all. Jones chooses questionable copy texts for other poems. Furthermore, his edition is not complete; he apparently selects with no obvious basis the poems to be included, stating that he omitted "five short lyrics of small merit" (p. xxvii); actually, he omits seven poems, not all of which are either short or of small merit. He also fails to include significant textual notes, indicating his emendations only. The liberties he takes with the texts of the poems are equally curious: he provides silent editorial punctuation, and he preserves

---


7 *MLR, LX, No. 2 (April, 1965), 245.*
original capitalization only when, as he explains, "it seemed to be used for emphasis" (p. xxviii).

Because of the unsatisfactory texts of Surrey, I have provided an appendix of my own transcripts of those poems which I discuss or mention in the study. My sources for the appendix are the earliest manuscript and printed versions of the poems.

The unsatisfactory state of Surrey's critical reputation has not been caused only by his editors. Ironically, at least part of the blame must rest on the high regard with which Surrey the nobleman was held during and even after the sixteenth century. His contemporaries regarded his nobility of station and manner at least as highly as they did his poetry. I suspect that it was his birth rather than his poetry which caused the first printed anthology containing his poems to be entitled, *Songes and Sonettes, written by the ryght honorable Lorde Henry Haward late Earle of Surrey, and other*. Certainly we must ascribe the motive for giving Surrey such prominence at least partly to social rank, particularly when we consider that among the "other" in the collection were Thomas Wyatt and Nicholas Grimald. The manner in which Sidney praises Surrey in *The Defence of Poesy* also suggests something more than respect for Surrey's poetry: his lyrics have

---

8I am indebted to Professor Ruth Hughey and The Ohio State University Library for permission to use photographic reproductions of the early sources.
"many things tasting of a noble birth, and worthy of a noble mind."⁹ Even two centuries later, Pope, when adding Surrey's name to his galaxy of poets in Windsor-Forest, refers to him as "noble Surrey," and praises his chivalric virtues equally with his poetic talents: "Matchless his Pen, victorious was his Lance;/Bold in the Lists, and graceful in the Dance" (lines 293-294).

As the interest in Surrey as representative of a social class tended to subvert his reputation as a poet, so also did the inclination to see him as a representative of a related social institution, the courtly lover. In this case the interest was at least influenced by his poetry. He wrote some poems in the Petrarchan manner, including a few translations and adaptations of sonnets by Petrarch as well as other poems which can be labelled "Petrarchan" in a more general way. But the one poem which served to establish him for centuries as Petrarchan lover as well as Petrarchan poet was his sonnet tribute to Lady Elizabeth Fitzgerald, "ffrom Tuscan cam my ladies noble race" (P, VI).¹⁰ It is in this poem that later readers found what they thought was the identity of the object of

---


¹⁰Letters and numbers of poems by Surrey refer to their place in the appendix. P, for example, designates Add. MS. 36529. For a complete explanation, see the Table of Abbreviations, p. vi.
all of Surrey's love poems. Elizabeth Fitzgerald became Surrey's Laura, and Surrey the man again became as interesting as Surrey the poet.

The most influential source in the establishment of the love affair was Thomas Nashe's *The Unfortunate Traveller or The Life of Jacke Wilton*, a completely fictionalized story in which the hero, who was, he says, Surrey's page, meets his "late master," who tells him that "There is a little God called Loue... he it is that, exercising his Empire in my eyes, hath exorcised and cleane conjured me from my content." He is in love with "Geraldine," the lady of "from Tuscan cam," and with her approval, he is traveling in Italy because of its fame and, as he puts it, because of "an especiall affection I had vnto Poetrie, my second Mistris, for which Italy was so famous." The two travel together, encountering various situations and people open to Nashe's satirical thrusts. Surrey is pictured as a rogue at times, but for the most part he comes off as a great medieval knight-errant in love: Cornelius Agrippa conjures a vision of Geraldine in a glass, which inspires Surrey (actually Nashe) to write a love poem; he becomes involved with an unfaithful wife and deliriously thinks her Geraldine, as Nashe writes him a love sonnet; he visits Florence, the birthplace of Geraldine, and "composes" a sonnet to her bedroom on the spot. He ends by appearing in the lists at Florence and
defeating all who would challenge his assertions of Geraldine's beauty, after which he parts from Wilton and the story. Significantly, poetry is always his "second Mistris" in the story; only thoughts of Geraldine are worthy enough to inspire him to poetry.

Unfortunately for criticism of Surrey's poetry, the story itself stayed lodged in the minds of readers until relatively recently. In addition to eleven other letters between famous English lovers in *Englands Heroicall Epistles*, Michael Drayton includes two between Surrey and Geraldine. And Pope emphasizes Surrey's reputation as a lover equally with his reputation as a nobleman and poet (*Windsor-Forest*, lines 295-298). In the same century Thomas Warton includes in his criticism of Surrey's poetry in *The History of English Poetry* a detailed recounting of Nashe's legend of the two lovers, finally concluding his remarks by lamenting that "Surrey's devotion to his lady did not end in a wedding, and that all his gallantries and verses availed so little!" In the nineteenth century Nott punctuates his notes to the love poems with a credulity equal to Warton's. The story gradually lost support in the twentieth century, but it was not finally

---


laid to rest until Professor Hughey corrected it completely in 1960.\textsuperscript{13} Up to that time Surrey's literary reputation had been sporadically overshadowed by his reputation as a courtly lover.

The legendary accounts of Surrey and Geraldine were far from the sole matter of biographical interest concerning Surrey, however. The true life of the poet is itself a fascinating one, punctuated by an unyielding sense of pride, an idealistic sense of his own inherited nobility, a sometimes uncontrollable temper, and, partly as a result of these, a premature death at the hands of the executioner. Had Shakespeare been inclined to concern himself with more recent English historical figures, he might well have written *The True and Tragical History of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey* without embellishing his drama with other than real events. Unfortunately he did not, and we are left with accounts like Padelford's "Dramatic Career of Surrey," which views the poems as "the lyrical accompaniment of an impressive tragedy," and suggests that they should be read "while the imagination is filled with the tragedy of the young poet's life, a tragedy of superb depth and range, from which these poems were thrown off like chance sparks."\textsuperscript{14} While this is an improvement over seeing the

\textsuperscript{13}The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry, II, 78-84.

\textsuperscript{14}Padelford, p. 12.
poems as the lyrical accompaniment of an imaginary love affair, it is still a view which subordinates them to biography—and thus makes critical evaluation difficult.

Biographical accounts are, however, usual ingredients in editions of writers' works. Nevertheless, the problem becomes more obvious—and more acute—when one realizes that only three monographs on Surrey have appeared in the last century, and that all three are biographies. Of the three, Edmund Bapst's Deux Gentilshommes-Poètes de la Cour de Henry VIII is the least concerned with Surrey's poetry. And while Edward Casady does include some critical comments in his Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, his treatment is also biographical, his main object being to lay to rest the old opinion that Surrey was "the most foolish proud boy in England." In the most recent book on Surrey, Two Tudor Portraits: Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey and Lady Katherine Grey, Hester Chapman psychoanalyzes Surrey to show that, in a way, he really was foolish and proud, also making, as Casady had, only passing remarks on his poetry—and then only in a biographical context.

Even in studies of Surrey which are primarily critical, biographical bias appears. I have already mentioned

---

15 Paris, 1891.
16 New York, 1938.
17 Quoted in Casady, p. 3.
Sidney's interest in Surrey's noble birth over his poetry and Nott's notes concerning Geraldine; even more alarming is the fact that we can seldom find a modern critical essay on Surrey which does not concern itself at some point with his life. In some cases, moreover, a major case is made from the poetry itself to prove a point about Surrey the man. For example, one of H. A. Mason's suggestions in his chapter on Wyatt and Surrey in Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period is that in his paraphrases of the Psalms and Ecclesiastes Surrey shows himself to be a Protestant at heart.

One further example will suffice. Surrey wrote his satire on the citizens of London (AH, I) while in prison for breaking windows with a stone bow. The poem is a remarkable work of art, as I shall attempt to demonstrate in Chapter III. Others have commented critically on the poem also, but not without finding it necessary to moralize on Surrey's behavior during the incident itself. Mason sees the incident and the poem as another example of Surrey's Protestantism, and J. M. Berdan, despite seeing literary merit in it, calls the poem an "absurd explanation of the affair." Such comments are certainly appropriate to

---

20 Page 243.
scholarship, but I suggest that they point even more em­
phatically to the problem I have tried to suggest: the
overemphasis in scholarship on Surrey the man at the ex­
pense of interest in Surrey the poet.

When critics do focus on Surrey the artist, they pay
little attention to the individual qualities of his verse.
In this case also he is seen not as an individual, but as a
representative of something larger. It is ironic that, in
contrast to the general lack of interest in his individual
poetical accomplishments, his reputation as an important
force in English literary history has always been appreci­
ated. This fact is certainly understandable, for Surrey
lived and wrote in an age which was extremely significant
in literary history. Unfortunately, however, the emphasis
upon his role as a representative has resulted in critical
neglect of his own individuality as a poet.

The poetry written in Tudor England before Wyatt and
Surrey has usually been viewed as an ineffective prologue
to the greatness that was to come. Helen Morris expresses
the standard opinion in Elizabethan Literature:

It is true that English poetry [up to the six­
teenth century] had been in the doldrums. Except
in carols and ballads and the unique Nut Brown
Maid, writers had shuffled and jolted along, un­
able to reproduce either the bold stresses of
Langland's alliterative verse or the controlled
accents of Chaucer. Chaucer's rhythm was mis­
understood . . . . Early Tudor poets had
stuttered and hesitated, and Skelton had poured
forth his helter-skelter lines in effective but inimitable style. Thus there were no English models.22

Berdan, writing of the same period, points out that "the change in the language . . . had broken the literary continuity," that "in this new age there was no one dominant literary tradition." As a result, he concludes, "this age, then, will not produce great literature."

His final view is that "early Tudor literature is primarily interesting . . . because it is 'prentice work." 24

Berdan gives the key to Surrey's place in this development: "this age does not reach its intellectual maturity until the second half of the reign [of Henry VIII], writers [represented] for us by Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey." 25

The italics are mine, for they emphasize my point: Surrey's critical reputation is inextricably bound to his place as the representative of something larger in English literary history.

That "something larger" is nothing less than the rise and triumph of English humanism in its sixteenth-century sense: the revival of purely literary interest in the works of classical antiquity, and the desire to improve the vernacular by means of imitating those works. One of

---

23 *Early Tudor Poetry*, pp. 504, 505.
24 *Early Tudor Poetry*, p. 545.
25 *Early Tudor Poetry*, p. 505.
Sir Thomas Elyot's avowed purposes in writing The Governour was to "augment" the English tongue. The aureate language that resulted from fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century borrowings from Latin and French had been met with the famous humanistic reaction against "ink-horn" terms. The English humanists, as did the French and Italians before them, desired their own "classical" eloquence. Humanism was, as Paul O. Kristeller has defined it, "a cultural and educational program which emphasized and developed an important but limited area of studies" that included the principles of grammar, rhetoric and poetry and the study and imitation of standard ancient writers.

Surrey has usually been considered the poet who first exemplified the virtues of what the humanists wanted in English poetry. Wyatt, it is true, is credited with importing products of French and Italian humanism into England, but to Surrey has gone most of the credit for anglicizing the principles of humanism in their more perfect form. "He succeeds," says W. J. Courthope, "where Wyatt failed, in naturalizing the ideas he borrows by the beauty of his style." He was the first to see clearly that Chaucer's principle of harmony in the movement of


English decasyllabic verse was obsolete because of changes in accentuation and loss of the final e, and thus usually placed the tonic accent in his lines only on even syllables. His verses are, as a result, extremely even. Furthermore, he rejected weak syllables for the sake of rhyme (such as Wyatt's "harbór," "bannér," "displeasúre"). He also defined the place of the rhythmical pause, both in the middle of a line and at the end.

For his accomplishments in meter and style, Surrey has been amply appreciated. George Puttenham, whose Arte of English Poesie (1589) reflects the attitude toward poetry of the sixteenth century, was more than aware of Surrey's contributions. He quotes various lines from Surrey in his chapter "Of Proportion" to point out examples of excellence in meter (although it must be considered that he was quoting from the metrically "improved" Songes and Sonettes). He also quotes Surrey's "When ragyng loue with extreme payne" (T. V) twice, once to show an example of the octosyllabic measure with the caesura falling in the proper place, and once to praise its versification as "passing sweet and harmonical, and having all the feet iambic." With true humanistic patriotism, he praises both Wyatt and Surrey for having "greatly pollished our

---


rude & homely manner of vulgar Poesie, from that it had bene before, and for that cause may justly be sayd the first reformers of our English metre and stile." Thomas Warton was later to echo this praise—but only in reference to Surrey: "Surrey, for his justness of thought, correctness of style and purity of expression, may justly be pronounced the first English classical poet."

Surrey has also been appreciated because of his pioneering inventiveness in developing English blank verse and the "Shakespearian" sonnet. Although it is not certain, it is probable that he adapted blank verse from the Italian verso sciolto, which had become extremely popular with the Italian poets of the early sixteenth century. Surrey could very well have become acquainted with the form during his stay in France, for at the French court at that time was Luigi Alamanni, a Florentine poet who had written several poems in verso sciolto and had published at this time (1532) his Opere Toscane, which contained many of those poems. Surrey's experiments resulted, of course, in his blank-verse translations of Books II and IV of The Aeneid, the first published examples of English blank verse. It is remarkable that Surrey, writing as early as

---

31Casady, pp. 65, 66.
32It is possible that Nicholas Grimald wrote blank verse before Surrey's translations, but Surrey's Aeneid, Book IV, was the first published blank verse. Tottel printed
he did, knew so well the possibilities and limitations of
English prosody; later in the century the great debate over
English unrhymed verse was still raging.

His invention of the sonnet form which was to be
chosen by Shakespeare also shows his understanding of the
English tongue. Wyatt came close to inventing the form
when he added the closing couplet to the regular octave-
sestet arrangement of the Petrarchan form, but unfortu-
nately, such a combination is only illogical: the epigram-
matic couplet cannot function in the proper way when it is
part of a larger division; it seems reasonable that a
sonnet-writer should consistently follow the Petrarchan
form or choose a form better suited to the couplet ending.
This Surrey was the first to realize, and he usually
divided his sonnets into three quatrains and a couplet. His
knowledge of the limitations of his native tongue is
further evidenced by his choosing a form less demanding of
rhyme; as in his composition of blank verse, he obviously
realized the difficulty of multiple rhyming in English.

Surrey's reputation as an influential force in
literary history has been well-established since
Puttenham and before, and the praise of him has been well-
---

deserved; not even his most antagonistic critics have
denied the value of his legacy. But it is one of the
curious paradoxes of literary scholarship that his genius
at developing the potential of native English poetry, his
value as a practicing exemplar of sixteenth-century
humanism, should becloud our appreciation of his true
poetic talent. Such, unfortunately, is the case. The
standard opinion, again in the words of Helen Morris, is
that Surrey's work "is less valuable for its own sake than
as an exemplar for the poets to come"—even though, as she
admits, it does contain "some moments of feeling and of
elocuence." Such statements are numerous. Berdan thinks
that

it was Surrey's fortune rather than his merit,
that in his work are crystallized the beginnings
of modern English literature. And it was equally
the good fortune of the age that it found in
Surrey a writer that could so crystallize them.
Because of the junction of time and the man, the
result is that Surrey's work marks an epoch, the
line of cleavage between the old and the new. 34

Even Casady, who spends a good deal of space defending
Surrey the man, can only voice the standard view:
"Surrey's greatest contribution to England was a new poetic
tradition. Although the writing of verse was to him
merely a pleasant pastime, an amusing means of filling his
idleness, he established a firm foundation for the

33 Elizabethan Literature, p. 23.
34 Early Tudor Poetry, p. 544.
development of English poetry."\(^{35}\) Surrey, says Casady, was "the first English courtier of noble blood who took an interest in the Revival of Learning and possessed both the knowledge and the ability to contribute to the advancement of English literature."\(^ {36}\)

Opinions on the particular advancements made by Surrey are much the same. Praise is plentiful for his invention of blank verse, but more reserved for his use of it: "although it cannot be maintained that he was master of this medium, which he imitated, there were present in Surrey's blank verse all the possible metrical variations . . . for those English poets who came after him to master."\(^ {37}\) We are to see him mainly as a convenient catapult used by Shakespeare and Milton to reach the heights of the best English blank verse. His sonnets occupy a similar critical position: "Although he occasionally drew from other authors, Petrarch was clearly his favourite . . . and the little garland of flowers which Petrarch taught him to weave offers an image of those more splendid offerings which 'Astrophel' was to make to 'Stella' and Spenser to his

\(^{35}\) Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, p. 221.

\(^{36}\) Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, pp. 84-85.

\(^{37}\) Casady, p. 67.
beloved." And of his love poetry, more of the same:

Surrey's reputation and example must have played a greater part than is usually perceived or acknowledged in developing in sixteenth-century England the writing of love lyrics. Following his lead, the Elizabethans, with a vigor possessed only by a people who have recently been close to the soil, began the greatest outburst of lyric poetry in the history of the language.

Again we are told to see Surrey as an influence on, and a foreshadowing of, far greater things to come. Considering what did come during the century following his death, one can understand the point; but the approach does not help one to understand and appreciate his poetry.

This is not to say that his poetry has not been praised during the past hundred years. Courthope applauds his treatment of Italian themes, and his "terseness, sweetness, purity, and facility of style." C. S. Lewis, in spite of himself, compliments the "completeness" and "shape" of his lyrics. Even J. W. Lever, a Wyatt enthusiast in The Elizabethan Love Sonnet, admits that Surrey does have gifts that should not be overlooked. However, the com-

---

39 Casady, p. 85.
merits of all three critics are related to their opinions of Surrey's influence. Courthope in an earlier statement had written that "style is ... Surrey's predominant poetical virtue," but he goes on to say, "appearing as he did when art was the one thing needful for the development of the language, it is to his style that he owes his great position in the History of English Poetry." Lewis had pointed out earlier that Surrey was preferred over Wyatt by the Elizabethans simply because he was more "useful." Finally, Lever's plea for fair treatment of Surrey's gifts is simply a sop thrown in after he had observed that "it is unlikely that Surrey will again be as highly rated as he was in the eighteenth century, when it was customary to praise his facility for versification to the detriment of Wyatt's more rugged style."

The comments of Lewis and Lever suggest the fourth—and perhaps most important—reason for the modern eclipse of Surrey's reputation. The inadequate textual scholarship and the comparatively extensive interest in him as a subject of biography and a link in the chain of the history of English prosody have contributed to a lack of interest in his poetry, but the revival of Wyatt's reputation in the twentieth century has resulted in disdain for, rather than

44 English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, p. 231.
45 The Elizabethan Love Sonnet, p. 37.
a simple lack of interest in, the poetry of Surrey.

Previous to the last thirty years, Wyatt's reputation was somewhat similar to Surrey's. He was seen as a significant influence in the history of English poetry for his innovation in verse forms, particularly for his importation of various foreign forms from France and Italy (rondeaux, terza rima, ottava rima, and the sonnet). His name has always been coupled with that of Surrey, beginning with the inclusion of poems by both of them by the editor(s) of the Songes and Sonettes. Puttenham, for one, sees little difference between them:

Henry Earle of Surrey and Sir Thomas Wyat, betwene whom I finde very little difference, I repute them . . . . for the two chief lanternes of light to all others that have since employed their pennes vpon English Poesie, their conceits were loftie, their stiles stately, their conveyance cleanly, their termes proper, their meetre sweete and well proportioned, in all imitating very naturally and studiously their Maister Francis Petrarcha.46

Outside of Puttenham's comments, Wyatt is seldom mentioned in the Elizabethan and Jacobean ages, and then only in passing. After being virtually ignored in the late seventeenth century, he is viewed as a kind of inferior Surrey in the eighteenth, when the "classical" virtues of style as practiced by Surrey were valued highly. Warton reflects this view in his History:

Wyat, although sufficiently distinguished from the common versifiers of his age, is confessedly

inferior to Surrey in harmony of numbers, perspicuity of expression, and facility of phraseology. His feelings are disguised by affectation, and obscured by conceit. His declarations of passion are embarrassed by wit and fancy; and his style is not intelligible, in proportion as it is careless and unadorned.

In the nineteenth century, Surrey is still considered superior to Wyatt, for most of the same reasons that Warton put forth. But there takes place during the century a gradual shift toward a juster view of Wyatt. Though Nott still takes Surrey's superiority for granted, he observes "a certain earnestness of expression, and a dignified simplicity of thought, which distinguishes Wyatt's amatory effusions from Surrey's, and . . . from those of any other writer in the language." While Courthope believes that "Wyatt had not the skill enough so to refine the genius of the English language as to make it an instrument for the expression of these qualities [i.e., Surrey's terseness, sweetness, purity and facility of style]," he nevertheless sees with Nott the individual qualities in Wyatt which had gone unobserved before, particularly "the individual energy of his thought . . . when his fiery genius can find out a way for itself untramelled by the precedents of art." Surrey's poems, writes Courthope, "have none of the

48 Works, II, cxxvi.
vehement individuality and character which distinguish the style of his predecessor and contemporary. By the end of the nineteenth century, then, the tide has begun to shift a bit, with Wyatt being guardedly praised for his individual qualities. It is significant, however, that at this point real battle-lines are being drawn: Surrey's poetical virtues are regarded (as they had been since he was first seen as a humanistic reformer of English prosody and later as England's first classical poet) as mainly prosodic and stylistic; Wyatt, on the other hand, is praised for his thought rather than for his style. Such a difference in approach becomes more significant in the twentieth century.

In the early part of this century, two significant books shifted the balance of interest from Surrey to Wyatt. One of them was an authoritative textual edition and textual study of Wyatt's poetry, Miss A. K. Foxwell's *The Poetry of Sir Thomas Wyatt*. Thus in contrast to the lack of textual authority for students of Surrey's poetry, those who were interested in studying Wyatt had a good text of his poetry to work with. The second book was E. M. W. Tillyard's *The Poetry of Sir Thomas Wyatt: A Selection and a Study*, a work which not only made clear
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52 London, 1929.
many of the individual characteristics of Wyatt's poetry which influenced the comments of later critics, but did so at the expense of many of the earlier facile generalizations about the excellence of Surrey.

Significantly, Tillyard concentrates on what we might call the "modern" virtues of Wyatt's poetry. He rejects as academic the poet's experiments in various traditional verse forms; instead he chooses to point out those qualities in Wyatt which look forward to the poetry of Donne and the poetic theory of Wordsworth. Tillyard is aware that since the revival of Donne's reputation, "roughness" has become a virtue in poetry, and he does not hesitate to suggest it as a mark of Wyatt's excellence:

Wyatt's roughness can easily be misunderstood by those who forget that there are two kinds of roughness: the unconscious and the deliberate; the barbaric and the cultured; the roughness of Barclay and the roughness of Donne. In Barclay the roughness is no part of the sense; in Donne it is the very stamp of his passion.53

He is also aware that since Wordsworth's "Preface" artlessness has been a critical virtue in English poetry; thus he can assert that Wyatt's technical virtues are "an extreme simplicity of language and an almost conversational cadence," and suggest that "Wordsworth might well have quoted some of Wyatt to illustrate his theory of poetic diction."54 Indeed, the language of Tillyard's praise even

53 Poetry, p. 20.
54 Poetry, p. 40.
recalls Wordsworth: Wyatt's poems have "a certain unexpectedness," which gives them "the feeling of having had their birth spontaneously in some unexplored region of Wyatt's brain." In thus stating the case for Wyatt, Tillyard began the real renaissance of the poet's reputation by viewing him not as a man of his age, but of ours, because the qualities of his style are those which are valued now.

The same can be said of the comments by various critics on his ideas. Wyatt is often seen today as a solitary rebel against the traditions of his age and society, an anti-court, anti-Petrarchan individualist who refused to submit himself to worn-out verities of society and literature. Even Courthope admires the satires as they expressed "all the disdain and indignation proper to a lofty mind familiar with the mean servility prevalent among the Creatures of a Court." According to Douglas Peterson, "Wyatt appears to have been constitutionally at odds with the values and mores of court society. If we are to judge from the tone of his poetry he found the empty rhetoric of courtly verse and the mock subservience of the courtly lover about equally offensive." It is not only Wyatt's

55Poetry, p. 42.


style that has caused the critics to see similarities between him and Donne, for he anticipated Donne in reacting against the conventional Petrarchan pose of abject lover; his later poems on love, what Lever calls his more "mature" verse, suggest that if the lady continues in her cruelty, there are other things for a man in life than love. (See, for example, the poems "Hate whom ye list" or "My lute, awake." ) As the qualities of his style, so the qualities of Wyatt's mind are those which are valued now.

Since Tillyard's book appeared, Surrey has usually been studied only in relation to the criteria by which Wyatt has been revived. In relation to Wyatt's more modern characteristics, Surrey is now seen as the inferior poet. Even Courthope points out that, while Surrey merely repeats in various forms the ideas of courtly love and Petrarch, Wyatt is superior in seeking "to impart an air of originality to his thought by the extremely metaphysical character of the conceits which he expresses." Tillyard judges that "Wyatt, by virtue of his profounder and more passionate temperament is a greater poet than Surrey." Surrey, according to Lever, "lacked Wyatt's power, perhaps his inclination, to voice intimate experience." In the same

58 The Elizabethan Love Sonnet, pp. 34-35.
60 Poetry, p. 56.
61 The Elizabethan Love Sonnet, p. 45.
vein, Tillyard believes that "there is no more drama, no more sense of the here and now [in Surrey's poetry] than in most of the lyrics of Matthew Arnold." 62

The stylistic criterion yeilds the same result: Wyatt is considered superior to Surrey in light of his more modern qualities. Style for its own sake is hardly an exclusively twentieth-century consideration; thus it is not difficult to understand Surrey's unpopular position now when even Courthope had referred to style _per se_ as "Surrey's preeminent poetical virtue." With Wyatt, on the other hand, style is a tool of content; Lever, for instance, says of Wyatt's sonnets that "he had . . . designed a verse-form suited to his own impetuous ego. He had patterned his diction upon the modulations of the speaking voice; he had rhyme and syntax express his scorn, eagerness, truculence or whatever mood was called forth by the occasion." 63 Edward Bliss Reed expresses a common view: "Wyatt's verse has more fervor, Surrey's is more refined, more polished. In a word, Wyatt has the stronger poetic nature while Surrey is the better artist." 64 Even that is perhaps too strong an endorsement of Surrey (one must consider that it was written in 1912). Closer to the modern consensus is

62 _Poetry_, p. 35.

63 _The Elizabethan Love Sonnet_, p. 45.

the following statement by A. Lytton Sells: "Surrey was not perhaps a better poet than his friend Wyatt, but his verse is so much more finished that one has, in reading him, the impression of a greater poet."  

Surrey is the stylist, Wyatt the poet: such is the general impression one receives from this criticism. And the antipathy that twentieth-century critics feel toward Surrey is clearly connected with that distinction. Peterson perhaps clarifies best the reason for the antipathy when he points to what he calls "a certain notion of style" as part of what he considers the weakness of early Tudor poetry:

This preoccupation is the obvious source of weakness in all fashionable Tudor verse. When a poem exists for the sake of ingenuity and ornament, when feeling in a poem is assumed and described rather than examined, the effect of the poem can only be static—the feeling at the end of the poem must remain qualitatively the same as it was in the beginning. Qualification and control of feeling in poetry can only proceed from an attempt to understand feeling in the light of what has occasioned it. But this was not the gentleman poet's concern; he sought only to portray those feelings that were expected of the courtiers.  

The critics tell us that Wyatt does not share this preoccupation but that Surrey does. In short, as Tillyard writes in a later essay, "Wyatt, so close to the Middle Ages in the lyrical forms he used and prophetic of Donne
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65 The Italian Influence in English Poetry, p. 75.
66 The English Lyric from Wyatt to Donne, p. 97.
in the dramatic and introspective substance of his lyrics, extends beyond his age. Surrey, with less originality, is centrally of it." 67

According to the standards for excellence selected by modern critics of Wyatt and Surrey, then, Surrey has come to be regarded as impersonal and undramatic, of value only as a stylist, and a literary conservative. As a result, Maurice Evans' contention that, after one reads Wyatt, Surrey "may come as an anticlimax" 68 is the accepted one, and H. A. Mason could make the following observation in 1959 without expecting strenuous objection: "That Surrey comes in merely as a foil to Wyatt, as a supplementary demonstration of Wyatt's isolated superiority, is a verdict that will astonish nobody today." 69

It has been necessary, I think, to present in the preceding pages a rather detailed account of the causes for the decline in Surrey's reputation in the twentieth century, mainly because those causes have never been fully recognized. I have suggested that in dealing with Surrey we are dealing with a case of neglect that has led to

68 English Poetry in the Sixteenth Century, p. 77.
69 Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period, p. 236.
unjust disdain. His merits as a poet have been under-emphasized because of inferior textual scholarship, because of an overemphasis upon his life and his place in literary history, and because of the modern rise in Wyatt's reputation, which has overshadowed Surrey. In order to arrive at a more reasonable estimate of his poetry, it would be first necessary to complete a definitive edition; unfortunately, I cannot attempt that here and thus offer only the appendix of transcripts (pp. 161ff.). I must ignore his biography and deemphasize his advances in English prosody and diction if I am to attempt to judge him as something more than an interesting character and the advance guard of a new literary generation. To borrow a point which Lever makes about Wyatt, "we shall perhaps see our way more clearly if at the start we avoid any assumption of a necessary polarity between historical importance and poetic merit." 70 With John Buxton, one of Surrey's few twentieth-century apologists, I suggest that the best of Surrey's poetry "can give pleasure not only for the suggestion of greater things to come, but for itself; ... not historic therefore but true poetic pleasure." 71

Finally, I shall avoid as much as possible the temptation of comparing Surrey extensively with Wyatt. Such a prac-


tice can only lead to the kind of error Mason makes when he condemns Surrey to oblivion simply because he "nowhere seems to have penetrated Wyatt's poetical intentions or to have carried on (much less extended) his practice." I should rather assume that for too long we have followed the survey-course mentality in considering Surrey's name the second half of Wyatt's, his poetry as a neater but less effective copy of his older contemporary's. We shall be more accurate to point out that the two poets were attempting different ends, and that Surrey's ends were less "modern" than Wyatt's.

This final realization serves not only to explain the twentieth-century preference for Wyatt, but it also provides the theme for this study: "the Elizabethans valued Surrey's poetry," writes John Buxton, "because Surrey was good at the kind of thing they were trying to achieve, just as we tend to prefer Wyatt because he was better than Surrey at what we attempt." With an understanding of the irony involved, I should like to use another of Lever's comments on Wyatt's sonnets and apply it again to Surrey's poems: we should view them "in their own perspective... not by our own unguided impressions, but by our under-
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73 A Tradition of Poetry, p. 20.
standing of what the poet was trying to achieve as a man of his age.\textsuperscript{74}

Surrey was, if anything, a man of his age, and his poetry reflects an essential relationship to the values of verse-writing dominant in the sixteenth century. The most significant prerequisite to composition of any kind—whether in verse or in prose—in the age was an understanding of the principles of rhetoric and logic; the major purpose of this paper is thus to demonstrate the importance of the rhetorical-logical tradition to Surrey's own composition. In Chapter II, I shall discuss at some length the predominance of rhetoric and logic in the education and literary composition of the age and follow by illustrating the way in which those arts inform the structure of several of Surrey's lesser-known poems. Chapter III will be a consideration of what I have called Surrey's "oratorical poems" and their relationship to the structural outlines of the classical oration. Chapter IV will be a discussion of the relationship of a particular kind of rhetorical poetry, the personal elegy, and the relationship between Surrey's elegaic poetry and the rhetorical teachings related to the structure of that form. In Chapter V I shall show that in Surrey the Renaissance traditions of imitation and translation were also connected with rhetoric by studying in detail the structure of some of his "Petrarchan" poems. In

\textsuperscript{74}The Elizabethan Love Sonnet, p. 15.
the final chapter I shall synthesize four individual characteristics which appear throughout the poems I discuss in the preceding chapters for the purpose of showing more clearly that Surrey's best poetry combines perfectly the values of tradition and the individual talent.
CHAPTER II

RHETORIC AND POETRY

Although an oversimplification, J. M. Berdan's assessment of the composition of poetry in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries is quite reasonable: "the art of verse," he writes, "had become a science; poetry was an affair, not of the heart, but of the head; it is not an emotional outburst, so much as an intellectual exercise." A statement on Surrey in a later critical work is strikingly parallel to Berdan's: some of Surrey's poems "lack Wyatt's virile personal note; they read rather like literary exercises." Although in my first chapter I pointed to such statements with the hope of showing the way in which Surrey has been misunderstood in the twentieth century, I would agree that both are, in one sense, accurate, because they take into account the traditional philosophy of composition to which Surrey adhered. Before discussing any of his poems within the context of their
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1Early Tudor Poetry, p. 126.

tradition, however, it is necessary to say something of the tradition itself.

i. The Tradition of Rhetoric and Logic

The poetry written during the Renaissance was informed by ideas on logic and rhetoric that had their roots in classical Greece and Rome. According to Aristotle, logic and rhetoric are related in that rhetoric is the counterpart of dialectic, one of the three divisions of logic. Poetic is distinguished from both because it communicates experience through illusion while the other two disciplines communicate ideas directly. Poetic is further distinguished from rhetoric by their different functions: rhetoric having persuasion as its end and opinion as its essence, poetry having pleasure as its end and fiction as its essence. Nevertheless, as Aristotle points out in the Poetics, poetry functions together with the other two arts when diánoia, or thought, is most important in tragedy; furthermore, both poetic and rhetoric use the same rhetorical figures and tropes, despite the difference in their aims.

The theoretical relationship between rhetoric and poetry was strengthened by Horace, when he assigned to poetry the rhetorical function of teaching through pleasing. The main thrust of Roman theory, however, was in the direction of rhetoric. Cicero subordinated logic to rhetoric by incorporating logic into his rhetorical treatises;
significantly, he followed Isocrates rather than Aristotle in giving more emphasis to the figures, and even more significantly, he established firmly the division of rhetoric into its five parts— invention, disposition, elocution, memory, and delivery. The pseudo-Ciceronian Rhetorica ad C. Herennium was principally responsible for preserving and transmitting the figures of Gorgias and Isocrates, and Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria, based mainly on Cicero, showed, as Cicero had, the part which rhetoric had played in Roman society and Quintilian revealed again the possible uses to which rhetoric could be put.  

During the Middle Ages, although rhetoric continued to be of importance, and was particularly valuable to the sermon, the art suffered a decline in other areas as oratory became less important in the administration of the state and public life and as it became subordinated to the logical methods of scholasticism. The art of rhetoric became principally the art of verbal embellishment. However, with the translation of Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics into
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3 The preceding information comes from various sources, the most helpful of which is Sister Miriam Joseph's Rhetoric in Shakespeare's Time (New York and Burlingame, Calif.: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1962). This is an abridgement of her Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language (New York: Columbus University Press, 1947).

4 My statements on medieval rhetoric are obviously oversimplifications; for an excellent account of the subject, see Richard McKeon, "Rhetoric in the Middle Ages," Speculum, XVII (January, 1942), 1-32.
Latin in the fifteenth century (1430 and 1498, respectively) and with the rediscovery of, among other works, the complete De Oratore in 1421 and the Institutio Oratoria in 1416, rhetoric regained its former prominence as part of the revival of interest in the classics which we call Renaissance humanism.

The particular influence of the classical rhetorical works on sixteenth-century English humanism is abundantly evident. Handbooks imitating them or influenced by them were published and republished in England throughout the century. Although only one of the English books, Leonard Cox's The Arte or Crafte of Rhethoryke (1530) came out before Surrey's death, we can assume that the later proliferation of such works reflects the emphasis on rhetoric during his time as well. The most significant English rhetorician during the first three quarters of the century was Thomas Wilson, whose two works on logic and rhetoric, The Rule of Reason and The Arte of Rhetorique, were published only a few years after Surrey's death (1551 and 1553). Many later English works followed Wilson's, but in considering only the early part of the century we must

Contemporary with Wilson's works was Richard Sherry's A Treatise of Schemes and Tropes (1550) and A Treatise of the Figures of Grammer and Rhetorike (1555). Similar works were published later by Richard Rainolde (1563), Ralph Lever (1573), and Dudley Fenner (1584). The most significant later handbooks were The Garden of Eloquence (1577) by Henry Peacham, The Lawiers Logike and The Arcadian Rhetorike (1588) by Abraham Fraunce, and The Arte of English Poesie (1589) by George Puttenham.
point to Aphthonius' Progymnasmata, a fourth-century Greek work which in Latin became a standard rhetorical text in schools both on the Continent and in England.

The significance of rhetoric to sixteenth-century composition is clear from the popularity of Wilson's two works. In the forty years following their publication, his Rule of Reason went through at least seven editions and his Arte of Rhetorique eight. Such works were not merely used as school texts. While the Latin treatises were adopted mainly in the schools, the English handbooks were used in court and among the upper and middle classes.

Even more significant, for my purposes, is the fact that, as W. G. Crane has pointed out, "rhetorical figures were used no less extensively in poetry than in prose" during the century. The recognition of the theoretical relationship between poetry and rhetoric was reflected by Sidney in his Defence of Poesie, when he added Cicero's rhetorical movere to Horace's utile and dolce as an essential function of poetry. The more practical relationship between the two is exhaustively documented in Puttenham's Arte, where the many rhetorical figures and principles are illustrated with examples from earlier poetry, including Surrey's. Despite the fact that, in
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W. S. Howell's words, poetry was "one important aspect of communication... which logic and rhetoric did not seek fully to explain or to teach during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries," and despite the Platonic doctrine of inspiration which still served to distinguish poetry theoretically from the other two arts, the practical evidence shows that logic and rhetoric were indeed essential to the creation of poetry. "Artificial" was not a pejorative term; the poet as well as the orator derived his skill from close study of the three arts of language, grammar, rhetoric, and logic, and learned how to use them in poetry by imitating the great authors who had used them before him.

The education of the Renaissance schoolboy presents evidence of the practical value of the arts of language to the literature of the age. The basis of this education was a thorough grounding in grammar, logic, and rhetoric. Grammar was the main occupation of the student's early schooling, while logic and rhetoric formed the heart of his later school years. During those years, he devoted himself to learning the principles explicated in works like the De Oratore and then to applying those principles to his own compositions with the help of the more practical handbooks, such as the Rhetorica ad C. Herennium, the Institutio

Oratoria, or Aphthonius' Progymnasmata. The relationship between the handbooks and composition was particularly significant in the upper forms. The boy would thoroughly study, for example, Cicero's Topica, the topics of logic, in order to better understand the figures defined and illustrated in works like the Herennium; he would next observe the masterly workings of those topics in classical writings; finally he would apply them in writing his own compositions; being careful to follow the rhetorical-logical precepts of invention, disposition, and elocution to the letter. Proper imitation was the only criterion; there was no place for originality.

In his prose compositions, then, the student took care to follow classical precept and classical example. He would study Cicero's orations for help in understanding grammatical constructions, logical arguments, and rhetorical methods of arrangement and form; he would then compose the three kinds of orations—judicial, deliberative, and demonstrative. And much the same procedure went into the process of reading and writing poetry, as Sister Miriam Joseph points out:

The method of studying poetry involved daily exercises in grammar, rhetoric and logic. In a work

like Melanchthon's Erotema dialectices the boy learned the forms of propositions and the rules of the syllogism. In reading a poem he would construe, parse, scan, describe the metrical form, point out the topics and forms of logic and the figures of rhetoric, and then write verses of his own in imitation. The figures were particularly valued as an aid in the reading and writing of poetry.\textsuperscript{10}

Unfortunately, almost all records of education in Renaissance England relate to the schools, and Surrey, as the son of a nobleman, did not attend a school. The school students were largely the sons of the squararchy, of lawyers, and of merchants, along with some of the more promising needy scholars. The sons of the nobility, Surrey included, were for the most part taught by private tutors.\textsuperscript{11} We can assume, however, that the content of Surrey's education was much like that in the grammar schools, although perhaps superior in quality. His tutor is generally thought to be John Clerke, whom his father hired as his secretary shortly after acceding to the Dukedom of Norfolk. Clerke was reputedly an excellent scholar who, after receiving an M. A. from Magdalen College, Oxford, travelled extensively on the Continent, particularly in Italy. According to Casady, "Clerke seems to have been the chief intellectual influence upon the young Henry

\textsuperscript{10}Rhetoric in Shakespeare's Time, p. 10.

\textsuperscript{11}Charlton, p. 97. Notable exceptions were Sidney and Greville, who were pupils at Shrewsbury.
Howard," and he certainly must have passed on his wide interests in the New Learning to his young pupil.  

Further indirect testimony to the rhetorical training of men like Surrey comes from Sir Thomas Elyot's humanistic treatise, *The Governour* (1531), which he wrote explicitly for "the education of them that hereafter may be deemed worthy to be governours of the publike weale" under Henry VIII—for the sons of noblemen. Surrey fits into this category perfectly; he grew up as the eldest son in the family which at the time was probably the most powerful one beneath the throne. Elyot suggests that the "fyrst lerning in chyldehode" for such children be Greek and Latin authors, with a particular emphasis on grammar, which he calls "an introduction to the understanding of autors." By the student's fourteenth year, his tutor should educate him in the other two arts of language:

After that xiv. yeres be passed of a childes age, his maister if he can, or some other, studiouslye exercised in the arte of an oratour, shall firste rede to hym some what of that parte of logike that is called *Topica*, eyther of Cicero, or els of that noble clerke of Almaine, which late flourid, called Agricola: whose warke prepareth inuention, tellynge the places from whens an argument for the profe of any mater may be taken with litle studie ... Immediately after that, the arte of Rhetorike would be sembably taught, either in greke, out of Hermogines, or
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of Quintilian in latine . . . and instructyng diligently the childe in that parte of rhethoryke, principally, whiche concerneth persuasion.\textsuperscript{14}

Elyot includes this discussion in a chapter entitled, "the most commodious and necessary studies succedyng ordintly the lesson of poets," an indication of the importance of this training to reading (and writing) poetry.

As a result of his education, then, the Renaissance poet concerned himself not with the expression of personal experience, but with logical and rhetorical persuasion. He was not so much interested in the relationship between his poem and his own thoughts as with the relationship between his poem and his audience, much as the orator was concerned about the effect his oration would have on his listeners. As the orator, his major concern was his poem's aim, and he accomplished that aim by directing his poem to his listeners' reason (logos), to their feelings (pathos), and/or to their confidence in his character (ethos), the three directions which Aristotle lists in his \textit{Rhetoric}.

Although Aristotle was less significant to Tudor poets than the Roman rhetoricians who modified and preserved his ideas, his division of rhetorical aims is useful for one's understanding of Tudor composition. The relationship between these three appeals and the later rhetorical tradition is clarified by Sister Miriam Joseph when she

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Governour}, I, 72-73.
classifies the rhetorical figures appropriate to each. Under *logos* she includes the logical topics of invention (for example, definition, division, contraries, contradictories, comparison, cause and effect) through which the rhetorician (or poet) amplified his subject. Also under *logos* she includes the disposition, or arrangement of the argument (such as by syllogistic reasoning, fallacious reasoning, or disputation). In a classical oration, the writer would follow the standard disposition: exordium, narration, confirmation, confutation, peroration; in less formal works, the topic of invention chosen would often determine the arrangement of the argument. The writer would also take care to make use of figures like *excuscitatio*, the stirring up of the audience to dislike or like, which fall under the aim of *pathos*, or to keep in mind the principle of *ethos* so that his audience—particularly at the beginning—would have confidence in him. He would also take particular notice of the possibilities offered him by the various schemes of grammar to achieve grace in style, the third of Cicero's divisions of rhetoric (invention, disposition, eloquence, memory, utterance).

The two most significant elements of rhetoric for my purposes are invention and disposition; Surrey's diction
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*Rhetoric in Shakespeare's Time*, pp. 308-399.
has been treated adequately, as I pointed out in Chapter I, and memory and utterance were of little significance in the sixteenth century, rhetorical practice having long before moved from the forum to the study (with, again, the exception of the pulpit). The significance of the first two, however, needs to be emphasized more than it has been, particularly in examinations of sixteenth-century poetry.

One can envision a Renaissance poet, after deciding upon his subject, arranging his argument according to one of the topics. For example, Wyatt (who does not, after all, merely pour forth "spontaneous" personal feelings), in "They flee from me, that sometime did me seek," voices his complaint by choosing allegoria, a figure belonging to the topic of similarity. While his aim is to make known his complaint, the persons about whom he is speaking are (for his own safety, no doubt) cloaked in the figure. In "I fynde no peace," on the other hand, he chooses to argue by contraries, another topic of invention. It is characteristic of the Renaissance poet that he carries the arrangement of his argument completely and logically to the end, a virtue which is even more pronounced in Wyatt's "Like to these unmeasurable mountains," where the argument by similitude is a part of each two-line statement in the poem.

See, for example, Veré L. Rubel, Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance From Skelton Through Spenser (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1941).
I mention the examples from Wyatt only to demonstrate more concretely the influence of rhetoric and logic on the poetry of the early sixteenth century. Similar examples can be drawn from Surrey's verse to show that it was indeed in the mainstream of the rhetorical-logical tradition so prevalent during his time. Even those of his poems which are not as impressive to twentieth-century readers as others indicate conclusively that they are well-wrought examples of the knowledgeable and sophisticated use of the tools provided in the rhetorical handbooks. In this section I wish to discuss three of those poems: "If care do cause men cry" (T, XI), "When raging loue" (T, V), and "As ofte as I behold and see" (P, III).

"If care do cause men cry" relies, perhaps, too heavily on Petrarchan conventions, and it is written in poulter's measure, which some critics have excoriated for its "jog-trot" rhythm; furthermore, it can be argued that its sixty lines make it too long for its content, the development of the thought being much like that which occurs in numerous sixteenth-century sonnets. Nevertheless it is interesting in its demonstration of two logical topics of invention and in their intricate relationship to the disposition, or arrangement, of its structure.

The major topic of invention which Surrey uses in the poem is cause and effect. His aim is to demonstrate
logically the cause of the effect which he presents in the first two lines:

If care do cause men cry, why do I not complaine?
If eche man do bewaile his wo, why, shew I not my paine?

These two rhetorical questions bring up the basic problem of cause and effect in the poem: why does not the normal cause (care) produce in him the normal effect (crying)? Thus as he asks the question, he is presenting an effect, the cause of which he will seek in the rest of the poem.

Of incidental interest here is Surrey's use of rhetorical schemes of grammar to affect his imaginary audience: polyptoton, or the "translacer," the repetition of words in different forms, and anaphora, the repetition of a word at the beginning of two sentences of clauses; both occur in line two. These two figures are common in the handbooks, but Surrey is not using them merely as examples. They obviously contribute to ethos, the regard of the audience for him; furthermore, the two lines are related to memphis, a figure of pathos which the orator would use in making a complaint. Thus in the first two lines of his poem, Surrey has established his basic topic of invention, determined the course of his logical exploration, and drawn his audience to his side.

After confirming in line four that he is "far from weale" and "full of woe" (paroemion, the figurists' word for alliteration), that he does, in fact, suffer the normal
cause for woe. Surrey goes on in lines five through eight to establish the second topic of invention which he will use in amplifying his poem: Cicero himself had recommended division as a great help to amplification, and Surrey chooses that topic in order to develop more fully the paradox of his condition; he divides the genus ("all thynges hauing life") into its species (various living things, both animals and men). Specifically, the handbooks identify this type of division as diaeresis, which is used "in a rhetorical manner for amplification's sake." This particular addition of detail might be considered a weakness—amplification for its own sake. But that is arguable; the listing of the various living things does serve to emphasize rhetorically the poet's unique and isolated condition.

A more serious problem for the reader begins at line nine, where the poet seems to contradict the statement of his condition in the first line: he differs from other living things, who can "take their ease," because he is constantly constrained by care

To waile the day and wake the night continually in paine,
From penslueness to plaint, from plaint to bitter teares,
From teares to painfull plaint againe.

He does, in fact, complain, an apparent contradiction of

18 Peacham, quoted from Sister Miriam Joseph, p. 315.
line one. But the contradiction can be explained, I think, in two ways, the first less satisfactory than the second. First, it is possible that Surrey has allowed his poem to become second in importance to its tradition; lines ten through twelve express a common Petrarchan malady; they also rely on the rhetorical handbooks: the *paroemion* ("waile" and "wake," l. 10) was perhaps too tempting to forego, as was perhaps the grammatical figure of *climax*, or *gradatio*, the repetition of the ending of one clause at the beginning of another through three or more clauses or sentences. The explanation more complimentary to Surrey can be understood if one looks ahead to line twenty-two, where the poet makes clear that his complaining is done in "some secrete place"; this explanation would also strengthen the reasons for the *polyptoton* of line two: the poet does complain, but in secret ("shew I not my paine").

Surrey goes on in lines thirteen through twenty to amplify in more detail the secret effects of the cause ("care") in standard courtly terms. But conscious of the rhetoricians, he presents those details in a series of two-line statements which make use of both cause-effect and division of whole into parts. Everything "vnder the sunne" (the whole) *causes* him to bewaile (the effect). Wherever "men do reioyce" (part of the whole) results, paradoxically, in the doubling of his woe (the effect). Even the "sound of song or instrument" (another part) only
causes him to lament the more (another effect). Finally, seeing men who are more fortunate (part) causes him to be more conscious of his woeful state (effect). The simplicity of these lines conceals the complex combination of two topics of invention; they indicate that Surrey's understanding of rhetoric was sophisticated enough to make complexity seem simple.

At line twenty-one the poet begins a discussion of what is essentially the effect of the effects detailed in lines thirteen to twenty; the suffering which he undergoes in the world, with its happy places and music and men, causes him to withdraw from that world:

Then as the striken dere withdrawes him self alone, So do I seke some secrete place where I may make my more, where, in short, he can suffer in silence. Effects have become causes; the "care" of the first line of the poem, which is amplified in lines thirteen through twenty as an effect, becomes again a cause, the cause for his withdrawal from the world.

This short section begins and ends with a figure of similitude, interrupted only by a traditional Petrarchan conceit ("my flowing eyes shew forth my melting hart," l. 23). The first simile ("the striken dere") served to introduce the poet's withdrawal; the second ("And in those cares so colde I force my selfe a heate,/ As sick men in their shaking fittes procure them self to sweate"), which
presented with the application coming first for purposes of smooth transition, serves to introduce another part of the poem: by a sheer act of will, the lover forces himself to think "thoughtes that for the time do much appease my paine" (l. 27). But at this point comes another statement of cause and effect—with a rehearsal of other effects: paradoxically, the good thought of his lady, which were the effects of his act of will (lines 25-26) become themselves causes for "ferther fere" that brings back the woe (l. 28).

These two lines (27-28), in turn, serve as an introduction to the next part of the poem, which is based again on the topic of division. The good thoughts of his lady and the "ferther fere" which they cause serve as wholes, to be divided into parts. The comforting images of his lady are detailed in lines twenty-nine through thirty-six: he sees her as his "hartes delight," his "sorowes leche"; he remembers her "every sondry grace," he "bewties," her "laughing chere," her "lovely looke," her shyness ("straunegeness"), and her smiling pity for him. The explanation for the "ferther fere" and its cause-effect relationship to those pleasant thoughts comes in lines thirty-seven and thirty-eight: the pleasant thoughts of the past make him realize abruptly that she is absent from him. And this, even more significantly, explains the "care" of the first line of the poem: it is an effect of the cause we finally find in line thirty-eight—her absence, which, in turn, causes him to fear that she will forget him.
Immediately following the statement of that cause, moreover, the poet explains the cause of the paradoxical first two lines: he does not complain, he does not show his pain, because he believes that, though absent, she is true to him:

For loth she was to loue, and wawering is she not. The farther of the more desirde thus louers tie their knot.

Absence makes the heart grow fonder. As the true lady of courtly love, she was hesitant to love in the first place, but certainly she will be true after she has given her heart. Despite this confidence, however, the lover realizes that his belief in her is somewhat shaky. In an explanation of the division expressed in lines twenty-seven and twenty-eight, he suggests the final effect of the conflict between the pleasant thoughts and the fear:

So in dispaire and hope plonged am I both vp an doune, As in the ship with wind and waue when Neptune list to froune.

(lines 45-46)

Immediately thereafter (lines 47-60), however, he returns to the larger context to further explain why, even though he suffers from care and woe, he does not complain or show his pain: the cause, after all the wavering between confidence and fear ("in dispaire and hope plonged am I both vp and doune") is hope (introduced, appropriately, with a calm sea image in contrast to the turbulent one before it). This hope causes him to "serue and suffer pacientlie" (l. 49), which is as much to say that he will
not complain or show his pain publically. Having finally explained his calm in the face of care, he can confidently see himself retaining that calm through life—and even after death (lines 57-60).

Although "If care do cause men cry" is one of Surrey's lesser efforts, "When ragyng loue" is one of his better ones—mainly because of its interesting combination of resources from rhetoric and logic. Puttenham, as I have already mentioned (above, p. 15), praised its even meter. What he fails to notice, however, is that the even rhythm in the poem results at least partly from Surrey's use of a long periodic sentence, called hirmus by the rhetoricians. Ciceronian prose is marked particularly by the rounded, closed period which builds to a climax near or after its center and then falls to a cadenced, rhythmic conclusion. Surrey's poem follows this movement quite closely. He makes use of the grammatical figure anaphora in repeating, in three two-line subordinate clauses, the word "when"; he then uses the three clauses to build up to the center of the period ("I call to minde the nauye greate," l. 7), then follows through to the conclusion with a series of rhythmic, parallel constructions: "And how the boysteous windes did beate" (l. 9), "And how that in those ten yeres warre" (l. 13), "And man a lord, that came full farre" (l. 15), "And many a good knight ouerronne" (l. 17), finally ending his period at line eighteen ("Before the Grekes had Helene wonne").
The topics of invention in the poem are comparison and similarity, which appear in the lines immediately following the hirmus:

Then think I thus: sith suche repayre,
So longe time warre of valiant men,
Was all to winne a ladye fayre:
Shall I not learne to suffer then,
And thinke my life well spent to be,
Seruyng a worthier wight than she (lines 19-24)

The Ciceronian period is, then, an extended figure of similitude (homoeosis or, in its more extended form, paradigma) which serves as a hyperbolic comparison between Helen of Troy and the poet's lady. Comparison and similarity/dissimilarity were traditionally favorite topics of invention among Renaissance love poets, as were the figures which were part of them (particularly hyperbole). Surrey uses them here in a very sophisticated way, making them govern the disposition of the first eighteen lines of the poem and serve as an introduction to the last eleven.

But the disposition of the argument in the poem is even more explicitly related to logic than to rhetoric, for the structure follows the progress of a syllogism. The extended period serves to point out the established truth that the Greeks fought a "ten yeres warre" over Helen. This establishes an uncontested fact, a preliminary premise, from which Surrey builds an enthymeme, which I have quoted in the preceding paragraph. Extended into more formal language, the enthymeme reads thus:

Given that the Greeks spent ten years fighting over a woman;
Given that you are a "worthier wight" than that woman, it is therefore ungrateful of me to object at the "extreme payne" which the "ragyng loue" for such a woman causes.

The poem's theme is emotional, but it is hardly an emotional expression. Its structural movement is governed completely by the precepts of grammar, rhetoric, and logic as suggested in the rhetorical handbooks. In this sense, it is indeed something of a "literary exercise," as Berdan says of Surrey's poems. Nevertheless, Surrey's well-informed combination of the three arts of language in constructing the poem demonstrates his ability to use tradition to good advantage.

While the poem, as well as "If care do cause men cry," illustrates Surrey's knowledge of rhetoric and logic as well as his ability to use them, it does not illustrate as well as others his individual merits as a poet. However, another of his love poems, "As ofte as I behold and see," can justly be called both traditional and unique.

The first stanza of the poem presents a general statement, a favorite opening for Surrey. He seldom begins with specifics, as will be illustrated in other poems in this study. This characteristic can be at least partly explained, I think, by his logical training, which was more deductive than inductive. In this case, the statement is simply an account of a lover's condition:

As ofte as I behold and see
the soveraigne bwertie that me bound
the ner my comfort is to me
alas the fressher is my wound.
The periodic movement of the first three lines is interrupted abruptly by the closing of the period in the last, which makes the opening statement of the poet's condition a paradox. In "If care do cause men cry," the reason for the lover's pain is his lady's absence; here, the wound is reopened whenever she is present. This is a conventional courtly situation, but it is one which the poet must explain.

The second stanza seems at first an amplification, in the form of similitude, of the statement of the lover's condition in the first. But it is not; it only adds to the complexity of the poem. The words of the comparison themselves are very curious: we do not usually think of "quenche" (1. 5) as the proper term for the process by which a fire goes out, nor are we accustomed to thinking that streams are "consumed" by rain (1. 6). The two lines seem to reflect a reversal of nature's way of doing things: it is usually rain, not fire, that quenches the flame, and streams are usually augmented, not consumed, by rain.

When we look more closely at the imagery of these two lines, however, we see that Surrey is not only being true to nature, but to logic as well. The choice of "quenche" and "consumes" in contexts other than their normal ones serves to emphasize the strange behavior of nature in order to make the reader understand the paradox of the lover's reactions. If the reader exercises his thoughts, he can understand that the natural process described in the two
lines is accurate: flames finally do burn out a fire, and an excess of rain does, in fact, obliterate the identity of a stream by causing it to overflow its banks. In constructing the simile, he has thus set up a logical situation for the application in the last two lines of the stanza:

So doth the sight that I desire
apeace my grief and deadly payne.  

(lines 7-8)

The relationship between the simile and the application depends upon logical understanding: as the natural situation seems unnatural but is actually true to nature, so also does the fact that the sight of his lady causes the appeasement of his pain seem unlikely (according to the Petrarchan code) but is also the actual truth. This stanza is an excellent example of the logic involved in Renaissance imagery and figures; the whole stanza, both image and application, is paradoxical, yet the paradoxes in the figure of similitude contribute to—in fact are responsible for—our logical, intellectual understanding of the paradox in the application.

But the logical complexity does not end there. The second stanza is actually a complete contradiction of the first. In stanza one, the poet had said that the nearer his love is to him, "alas the fresher is my wound"; in stanza two, on the other hand, the sight of her "doth . . . appeace my grief and deadly payne." The flat contradiction
between the two statements cannot be explained by logic; instead I suggest another reason for it, one which is part of the tradition in which Surrey was writing, and also related to two individualistic qualities which we will see in many of his other poems. The contradiction is, I suggest, a dramatic objectification of the contrary states of a Petrarchan lover. Renaissance sonneteers were fond of explicating this contradictory condition. Wyatt, for example, expresses it in the sonnet I mentioned earlier:

I find no peace, and all my war is donne;
I fear and hope; I burn, and freeze like ice;
I fly above the wind, yet can I not arise;
And nought I have, and all the world I season . . .

Likewise displeaseth me both death and life,
And my delight is causer of this strife.
(lines 1-4, 13-14)

This poem expresses the same state as that in Surrey's two stanzas; the difference between Wyatt's poem and Surrey's, however, is the difference between an outright statement of the condition and a dramatic presentation of it. Surrey could have said, in effect, "the sight of my lover opens the wound, and yet it heals the wound"; instead he prefers to objectify the contraries, to dramatize them by showing them actually at work in a lover who does not even realize that he is contradicting himself. This allows the poet to have the lover state his condition without using the transitions ("yet" and "however") and explanatory devices which are usually a necessary part of expressing such a situation. The two stanzas are dramatic and concise, the
drama allowing the conciseness, the conciseness contributing to the drama.

The remainder of the poem continues in the same fashion as the first two stanzas: complexity in apparent simplicity, traditional language and images mixed with unique concepts. Stanzas three, four, and five comprise an extended figure of similitude in which traditional Petrarchan patterns (e.g., "whose griefe did growe by her desire," l. 12, and "whose bewtie made this mortall wound," l. 14) are present, but which is finally far more complex than the tradition would allow for. Stanza three presents the figure itself, the time-honored image of the flea drawn to the flame and endangering itself by getting too close. Stanza four at first seems a reasonable, traditional application: as the flea is drawn into danger by the attraction of the flame, the lover is drawn to his "mortall wound" (l. 14) by the beauty of the beloved. The complexity begins with the last two lines of stanza four:

I litle thought win these beames
so sweete a venyme to have found.  
(lines 15-16)

The venom of the woman is the counterpart of the fatal hurt of the flame in the figure, obviously. But I think that Surrey intends the reader to think of venom in another sense also: the venom of the poisonous predator as it works on its victim. This is not simply conjecture, for Surrey develops the image in the next stanza: he is speaking of the venom
Wherein is hid the crewell bytt
whose sharpe repulse none can resist
and eake the spoore that strayn' th eche wytt
to roon the race against his list.  

(lines 17-20)

The language is associated only with venom: the "crewell bytt" causes a "sharpe repulse," which causes the victim to lose "eche wytt" because of the "spoore" which the predator has injected. The associations of these words suggest, in fact, that Surrey is in these stanzas thinking of another, related situation: the flea in the spider's web—a suggestion strengthened by the last stanza, when he begins another simile with "And as the spyder drawes her line" (l. 29).

The spider-flea image is not explicit, but it is strongly implied in Surrey's highly associative imagery. But this is associative only on the surface; the similitude seems erratic, but actually Surrey is very much in control throughout. What seems almost stream-of-consciousness in his imagery allows him to be very concise because it does not demand explicit connections between the two flea images. Furthermore, it contributes to the dramatic quality of the poem, for it is not the poet who is erratic, but the lover himself, who, as in the first two stanzas, is presented as a delirious victim, going erratically from thought to thought. The poet himself, in the meantime, constructs a completely logical connection between two traditional conceits, the flea and the flame and the flea and the spider.
The last stanza presents the final, and most fascinating, complexity of the poem. The poet reverses the roles of the lover and the lady, he becoming the predator, the spider, she becoming the victim:

And as the spyder drawes her lyne
W labour lost I frame my sewt
the fault is hers the losse ys myne
of yll sown seed such ys the frewte.

(lines 29-32)

Again it is the lover who, in his delirium, has associated another situation which is logical in relation both to the figure of the spider and the flea and to the situation of the lover and the lady. In his delirium, he constructs a sexual fantasy. In the two preceding stanzas he had become the victim not of the woman, not of the spider, but of Cupid, "the king that breadythe his vnrest" (l. 28), who caused the flame to burn in his breast (l. 26). Having become a slave to his passions, then, he can picture himself as the attacker who injects the "spore"—which, ironically, is only "yll sown seed," bearing not the normal fruit of love but only bitterness and madness.

"As ofte as I behold and see" shows more clearly than the two previous poems the individual brilliance of Surrey within his use of traditional patterns. The poem is in part Petrarchan, and it does make use of the rhetorical topics of similitude and composition by contraries and contradictories. Furthermore, its imagery is precisely logical, an essential characteristic of sixteenth and
seventeenth-century poetry. Indeed, we can say much the same of Surrey's poem that Rosemond Tuve says of a poem by Donne: the most definite characteristic is "the strict logical coherence of the images. This does not mean that the images are not sensuously vivid; only that they are not primarily so. Each is chosen and presented as a 'significant' part of an ordered pattern, and every care is taken to make that order rationally apprehensible." 19 As obvious as the tradition, however, is the talent. The poem is highly dramatic. (The lover does not see its "rationally apprehensible" order, but the poet and the reader do). It is associative yet highly logical in its imagery. And it demonstrates perhaps the most consistent virtue in all of Surrey's poetry, his ability to economize.

19 Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1947), pp. 43-44.
CHAPTER III

RHETORIC AND SURREY'S "ORATORICAL" POEMS

The three poems discussed in Chapter II all demonstrate Surrey's debt to the rhetorical tradition for the selection of topics of invention and for the disposition of his argument. I should like at this point to discuss the relationship of several of his poems to the particular disposition which the rhetoricians suggest for the classical oration itself. Surrey wrote four poems which I shall call "orations": "Good Ladies you that haue/ your pleasure in exyle" (AH, V), "O Happy dames, that may embrace" (T, VI), "Geue place ye louers, here before" (T, VIII), and "London hast thow accused me" (AH, I). I call these poems "orations" because of one particular quality which they all share: they are addressed to a specific, identifiable group of people in a fictitious "rhetorical situation."

1"O Happy dames" is ascribed to John Harington in the eighteenth-century collection of Haringtoniana, the Nugae Antiquae, but I agree with Professor Hughey's observation that "the style of the poem and the fact that it is printed in the midst of other poems by Surrey point rather to his authorship than to Harington's" (in The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry, I, 22).
Surrey often, of course, addresses his poems to particular people: Martial is the listener in one epigram (P, V); a lady is addressed in "I neuer saw youe madam laye aparte" (P, VIII); and the dead Wyatt is apostrophized in "Dyvers thy death doo dyverselye bemone" (P, XII). But in these poems, as well as in others like them, the addressee is only one person (or, as in "So crewell prison," P, II, one object); only in the four poems mentioned above does Surrey present his speaker as an orator addressing an audience of more than one.

The particular rhetorical tradition behind the disposition of the classical oration is a long one. Cicero had delineated three major kinds of orations in De Inventione:

De Inventione:

... some [questions] have their place in courts of justice, others in deliberations; while there was yet a third kind, which had to do with the extolling or reviling of particular persons; and that there were prescribed commonplaces which we were to employ in the law-courts where equity was our aim; others for use in deliberation, all of which were arranged for the benefit of those to whom we might be giving counsel; and others again in panegyric, wherein the sole consideration was the greatness of the individuals concerned.²

The three kinds of orations, the judicial, the deliberative, and the demonstrative, were distinguished by their aim. The judicial oration was designed to determine—in a court of law—whether a thing was right or wrong; the aim of the deliberative speech was to persuade or dissuade; and the

purpose of the panegyrical (or demonstrative) presentation was to praise a worthy man or woman or to vilify an unworthy one. Later rhetoricians, from Quintilian to England's Wilson, followed Cicero's classification.

The arrangement of the oration was equally well-documented, though more pliable. Cicero divides its structure into six parts: exordium, narratio, partitio, confirmatio, reprehensio, and peroratio. Quintilian, however, lists only five parts, while Wilson includes seven, listing "proposition" as one of the parts. The function of each of these parts is precisely set down by each of the rhetoricians. Wilson tells us that the purpose of the exordium, or "entraunce," is to gain the listener's attention, either through "a plaine beginning, when the hearer is made apt to glue good eare out of hande, to that which shall followe," or a "prlue twining, or close creeping in, to win fauour with much circumstance, called insinuation." In the narration, "the matter must be opened, and every thing lively tolde, that the hearers may fully perceive what we goe about"; often the narration is called the "statement of facts." "After our tale is tolde, and the hearers haue well learned what we meane," writes Wilson, "the next is to reporte wherein the aduersarie and

---

3Tuve, pp. 82-87.
4Essays on Rhetoric, "Cicero."
5Institutio Oratoria, Books IV-V.
we can not agree, and what it is, wherein wee doe agree"; this section is called the division (partitio). The proposition is a pithy statement of the whole argument of the oration. The confirmation is the argument and proof of the orator's contentions. In the confutation (Cicero's reprehensio) he refutes the arguments of his opponents, using good logic as much as possible. The conclusion (peroratio) is "the handsomely lapping vp together, and briefe heaping of all that which was saied before, stirring the hearers by large utterance, and plentiful gathering of good matter." The number of the parts of the oration is not as important as the presence of an order similar to the one proposed by Wilson. Cicero himself had said that whether the speech contains four, five, six, or seven parts is of less consequence than that the general order he prescribes is the determinant of the structure.  

Each of Surrey's four "orations" can be classified into one of the three types distinguished by the rhetoricians: "Good Ladies" and "O Happy dames" are clearly demonstrative; "Geue place ye lovers" is deliberative, and "London" is judicial. Cicero's openmindedness about the number of parts in an oration is important for my purposes, for none of the four poems follows strictly the order prescribed by any of the rhetoricians. In fact I should rather prefer to

---

6 Arte of Rhetorique, pp. 99-114.
7 Essays on Rhetoric, p. 88.
call the first three "oratorical" in spirit rather than in quantitative fact. Only the "London" poem follows more or less precisely the part-by-part order of the classical and English prescriptions; furthermore, it is the only one of the four in which departures from the normal progression can be explained with any satisfaction. Significantly, it is also the best poem of the four in its combination of the rhetorical tradition and Surrey's individual talent.

The common ingredient in the first two poems which marks them as orations is the unmistakable presence of an exordium. The first opens with a request for attention from the audience:

Good Ladies you that have/ your pleasure in exyle
Stepp in your foote, come take a place/ and mourn
with me a whyle
And suche as by their Lords/ do sett but lytle pryce
Lett them sytt still it skills them not/ what chaunce
come on the dyce
but you whome love hath bound/ by order of desyre
to love your Lordes whose good desertes/none other
wold requyre
Come you yet once agayne/ and sett your foote by myne
whose wofull plight and sorowes great/ no tongue may
well defyne.

The second opens with a similar plea:

O Happy dames, that may embrace
The frute of your delight,
Help to bewaile the wofull case,
And eke the heauy plight
Of me, that wonted to reioyce
The fortune of my pleasant choyce;
Good ladies, help to fill my mourning voyce.

The similarity between the two openings is obvious; in both a lady is speaking to other ladies, asking for their attention so that she might tell them of her sorrow at the
problems of an absent love. The closeness is emphasized even more by the presence of the words "Good Ladies" in both (l. 7 of "O Happy dames"). The parallel contents come, no doubt, from the probability that both poems are on the same subject; most critics assume that both are to be read as complaints which Surrey put into the mouth of his wife while he was participating in battles in France. They fail to notice, incidentally, the fact that the two poems are completely unique to Surrey in that they are written as love complaints by a woman. He also has a woman speak the lines in "Gyrtyt in my giltlesse gowne" (AH, II). I know of no other poet of the period who attempts this.

Other parallels in the two entrances are also significant because they show the influence of rhetoric and its relationship to the dramatic quality so characteristic of Surrey's poetry. He has constructed in both a definitely dramatic situation; but it is a dramatic situation which is actually a rhetorical one: he has placed his characters on his stage not in order to write a dialogue, but rather so that one of them might make a speech. The fact that he would create such a situation (one which Wyatt, for all the drama in his poetry, never tried) suggests not only his understanding of the dramatic situation, but his grasp of the relationship of it to the rhetorical situation as well.

The differences between the two reveal the workings of rhetoric on the drama even more. The first is that kind of
exordium which Wilson called a "close creeping in"; the second is a "plaine beginning." The more extended form of the first allows Surrey to include a few realistic details in his "setting" ("Stepp in your foote, come take a place." "Lett them sytt still," "sett your foot by myne"); the second includes no such dramatic elements. The same distinction can be seen in the use of pathos and ethos in the sections. Both make use of the generic figure of pathos, called pathopopeola, by which an orator tries to put his listeners in the same state of mind as he; in this case the lady wants her audience to share her mournful mood. But the speaker in the first is less concerned with pleading for consideration than the second: she simply wishes to tell of her sorrow, while the second makes use of the figure memphis, which not only makes a complaint but also asks for help ("Good Ladies, help to fill my mourning voyce"). The less helpless attitude of the first lady is also evident in her use of another figure of pathos, sarcasmus, when she uses the topic of division to distinguish between the two types of "Good Ladies," those who "by their Lords/ do sett but lytle pryce" and those "whom love hath bound"; her sarcastic request that those of the first type sit still and listen even though they care little for their absent lords is a fine dramatic touch not present in the second poem. Furthermore, it contributes to the ethos of the poem in encouraging all the ladies in the
audience to identify with the speaker and listen to her; none of them, after all, would want it known that they do not love their husbands. Thus pathos contributes to ethos, which is a common occurrence in orations; "ethos," writes Sister Miriam Joseph, "is, in a sense, included in pathos, for the attitude of the audience toward the personal character of the speaker, their confidence in him and in his good will toward them, constitutes part of their feelings or frame of mind as they listen."

In one sense, the beginning of "Geue place ye louers" is more similar to the opening of "Good Ladies" than is that of "O Happy dames": its opening lines refer to a particular place ("here before," l. 1), and thus present a rhetorical situation which is more realistic and dramatic than that of the latter poem. Aside from that one similarity, however, it is completely different from the other two "entraunces": it is only two lines long, and it contains no appeal to the devices of either pathos or ethos. Instead of spending time gaining his audience's emotional surrender and building their confidence in him as a speaker, the poet goes directly from his two-line exordium into his propositio, or statement of his argument:

My Ladies beawtie passeth more
The best of yours I dare well sayen,
Than doth the sonne, the candle light:
Or brightest day, the darkest night.  

(lines 3-6)

---

I suspect that there is a combination of two reasons for Surrey's abrupt exordium in this poem, one personal, the other dramatic and rhetorical. Surrey was not one to be in the least conciliatory in his poetry any more than he was in his actions. His reputation as "the most foolish proud boy in England" could be applied to his poetry as well as to his life. Seldom in his poetry does he adopt an attitude which could be considered obsequious; nowhere does he attempt to develop rapport with his listeners except in "Good Ladies" and "O Happy dames," where his persona cannot be mistaken for himself. The other explanation is more satisfactory. It is true that, as Quintilian pointed out, we should in our exordium "prepare our audience in such a way that they will be disposed to lend a ready ear to the rest of our speech"; however, the dramatic and rhetorical situations of Surrey's poem make this impossible. The speaker, whom we can almost visualize mounted with poised lance on the field of honor, is saying that his lady is superior in beauty to the ladies of his listeners; obviously he will not be able to bring them to his side. The more effective rhetorical stance in such a situation is

9 It must be pointed out that "Geue place ye louers" is an imitation of a poem ascribed to John Heywood, "Geue place you Ladies and be gon!" (Tottel's Miscellany, I, 155-56). A close comparison of the two, however, reveals that Surrey's differs from Heywood's mainly in its closer relationship to rhetoric and logic.

10 The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian, ed. H.E. Butler, II (London, 1921), 9.
to overpower whatever arguments his opponents might have; thus he includes his propositio in his exordium, choosing, perhaps, to follow the advice of another statement of Quintilian: "it is the function of the exordium not merely to excite the feelings . . . but to do all that is possible to show that our opponents' case is not deserving of them." As we shall see in looking at the London satire, Surrey was sufficiently sophisticated in his understanding of rhetorical precepts for the oration to know that those precepts were to be manipulated by the writer to fit the particular rhetorical situation; he saw those precepts as tools to be used, not as inexorable laws to be blindly followed.

All three of the "oratorical" poems discussed so far contain recognizable "entraunces"; so also does each include a narratio. In this section also, "Good Ladies" and "O Happy dames" are almost identical; in both, the statement of facts is a rehearsal of the reason for the lady's woe, the absence of her lord. In "Good Ladies" she laments,

My lord and love alas/ in whom consystes my wealth
Hath fortune sent to passe the seas/ in haserd of his health.

(lines 9-10)

In "O Happy dames" she almost repeats herself:

In ship, freight with rememberance
Of thoughts, and pleasures past.

\footnote{11 Institutio Oratoria, II, 21.}
He sailes that hath in governance
My life, while it wil last.

(lines 8-11)

In "Geue place ye louers," the narratio is far more sophisticated. The statement of facts which he wishes to present to his audience is the traditional conceit in which nature is presented as having made one perfect woman and after creating such perfection no longer having the perfect model to recreate such perfection (lines 15-16). But in presenting this idea, he uses another traditional rhetorical ploy: "I coulde rehearse, if that I wolde,

The whole effect of natures plaint" (lines 13-14); we are to assume, of course, that he will not bother to repeat a narratio which should be so obvious to everyone; he then follows by doing just that. Again Surrey manipulates the tradition for his own purposes.

In both "Good Ladies" and "O Happy dames" the classical structure becomes largely unrecognizable after their narrations. In both, the speaker turns from the statement of facts to a demonstration of the effects of her lord's absence on her. And again the parallel structure of the two is immediately apparent:

The fearefull dreames I have/ oft tymes they greeve me so
that then I wake and stand in dovb/ yf they be trew or no.

("Good Ladies," lines 15-16)

Alas, how oft in dreames I se
Those eyes, that were my food,
Which sometime so delighted me,
That yet they do me good.
Wherwith I wake with his returne,
Whose absent flame did make me burne.
("O Happy dames," lines 15-20)

Indeed, the last line quoted above from "O Happy dames" is echoed in line twenty of "Good Ladies": "Thus euery way you see/ with absence how I burne."

The similarities go deeper than that, however; for the two poems not only echo one another in words and structure, but also in that quality which I have been wanting to call "rhetorical drama." In each poem the lady tells her audience of how she often imagines that her beloved is present. In "Good Ladies," the speaker's dreams not only make her think of her lover's danger (l. 18), but also of an imaginary visit which "doth tell me he is come/ and playing wheare I shall hym fynd/ with. T. his lytle sonne" (lines 19-20), which is the most pathetic moment in the poem. She then imagines herself going to him,

and with a kysse me thinckes I say/ now well come home my knight
welcome my sweete alas/ the staye of my welfare thye presence bringeth forthe a truce/ betwixt me and my care
Then lyvelye doth he looke/ and saluith me agayne and saith my deare how is it now/ that you haue all this payne wheare with the heavie cares/ that heapt are in my brest
breakes forth and me dischardgeth cleane/ of all my great vnrest (lines 22-28)

I have already quoted the shorter account of the happy dreams of the lady in "O Happy dames"; later, however, she recounts for her audience that when she stands lonely by the window,
A thousand fansies in that mood
Assayle my restlesse mind.
Alas, now drencheth my swete fo,

And left me but (alas) why did he so? (lines 31-33, 35)

In both poems, these sections comprise dramatic situations within the larger rhetorical dramas of the poems. The lady in each is almost acting out her dreams; her "fansies" have become a dramatic part of the oration, in which she demonstrates for her audience the madness which the absence of her beloved causes. The drama is punctuated in "Good Ladies" by the imaginary dialogue between the lovers (lines 22-28), and by the angry peroratio, in which she shouts an angry apostrophe to the winds (lines 39-42). It is emphasized in "O Happy dames" when, in the last line, she objectifies for her listeners the mad combination of optimism and pessimism which she continually undergoes while her man is gone: "Now he comes, will he come? alas, no no." The elements of pathos and ethos are unmistakable in the two poems not only in their openings, but throughout.

While "Geue place ye louers" does not contain the drama of the other two poems, it retains a more consistent classical structure and, as we might expect, a more logical framework. I have already pointed out its exordium, propositio, and narratio. I suggest that it also contains a confirmatio, a refutatio, and a peroratio, all of which are concisely presented in the last six lines. To set up the confirmatio, or proof, Surrey has used the narratio as
a logical premise: Nature praised his lady above all others.
With this premise as a base, then, he proceeds to his conclusion:

Sith nature thus gave her the prayse,
To be the chiepest worke she wrought:
In faith, me thinke, some better waies
On your behalfe might well be fought,
Then to compare (as ye haue done)
To matche the candle with the sonne.  

(lines 25-30)

Given the premise, the conclusion is obvious. Not only has he proved his point, he has presented his proof according to the precepts of logic: "the places of Logique," writes Wilson, "cannot be spared for the confirmation of any cause." The poet has at the same time refuted the argument of his adversaries, who were wont to compare their lovers with his. It is in both the "confutation" (refutatio) and confirmation that logic is most useful to the orator, according to Wilson, and Surrey follows his advice admirably. He has done it all in his "conclusion" (peroratio), which, to repeat Wilson, "is the handsomely lapping vp together, and briefe heaping of all that was saied before."

All three of the "oratorical" poems which I have discussed so far have, to a greater or lesser degree, followed the formula for the classical oration. "Geue place ye louers" certainly follows it more faithfully than

---

12Arte of Rhetorique, p. 113.
13Arte of Rhetorique, p. 113.
the other two, which partake of the spirit of the oration more closely than the letter. All three also show Surrey's sophisticated understanding of the formula which resulted in poems which were not subordinated to it, but rather made more effective because of his use of it. It is in "London hast thow accused me," however, that Surrey demonstrates completely his mastery of the tradition of the classical oration and also his splendid individuality in creating out of the tradition an original poem.

Some background is necessary for a complete understanding of what Surrey is doing in the poem. On April 1, 1543, Surrey, along with William Pickering and Thomas Wyatt the Younger, was brought before the Privy Council and charged with eating meat during Lent and with "a lewde and unsemely manner of walking in the night abought the stretes and breaking wyth stone bowes of certayne wyndowes." Casady marks the date of the offense as the evening of January 19, when Surrey and his friends, having "eaten well and imbibed freely," went out into the London streets in search of more exciting entertainments. Their main occupation seems to have been with tormenting London citizens, and Casady reports that at least once they engaged in a brawl with some London apprentices. Their ultimate

---

15*Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, p. 98.*
16*Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, p. 98.*
success in that encounter was effected by their use of the ingenious weapon, the stonebow, a crossbow with stones instead of arrows for missiles. Unfortunately, having run out of human targets, the young companions turned to shooting at windows, an activity which led to their arraignment before the Council. Wyatt and Pickering denied their guilt, but were convicted and sent to the Tower; Surrey, while claiming a license for eating meat, admitted his guilt in the stonebow incident, "submitting himself therefore to suche ponisshement as sholde to them be thought good," and was committed to the Fleet.

Surrey was not so humble in the poem which he is said to have written on the incident while in the Fleet. In "London hast thow accused me," he defends his behavior of January 19 by attributing it to a highly moral and religious motive: he was acting as "a fygure of the lorde behest" (l. 21), striving to awaken London to a realization of her sins. He accomplishes this remarkable transformation by creating a small drama in an imaginary courtroom, where he becomes not the defendant, but the prosecutor of those who would prosecute him. By elevating the subject-matter of the trial from an ignoble discussion of the pranks of an inebriated nobleman to a mock-heroic consideration of the sins of a corrupt city, he establishes

17Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, p. 96.

the basis for a masterful poem composed in the best tradition of the judicial oration.

The poem's dramatic scene opens in the courtroom, and we are given to understand that the prosecutor has just stated his case, accusing Surrey of eating meat in Lent and of breaking the windows of London citizens. Then Surrey, rising to defend himself, opens his oration with the *exordium*:

> London hast thou accused me of breache of lawes the roote of stryfe.

While Quintilian advises against addressing anyone but the judge in an oration, he admits that "occasionally... some striking expression of thought is necessary in the *exordium* which can be given greater point and vehemence if addressed to some person other than the judge."\(^{19}\) When we consider Surrey's obvious intention to become accusor instead of accused, it is most appropriate that he begin with an explosive trochaic apostrophe aimed at his prosecutor; the difference is that he continues addressing London throughout the poem. It is also appropriate that he choose what Quintilian calls the "*transferred exordium,*" i.e., that type which is drawn from another speech,\(^{20}\) for the unspoken speech of the prosecutor is very much a part of his own.

---

\(^{19}\) *Institutio Oratoria*, II, 41.

\(^{20}\) *Institutio Oratoria*, II, 45.
The next six lines of the *exordium* make use of two of the four devices suggested in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as helpful in making one's hearers well-disposed: discussion of oneself and discussion of one's adversary:

within whose brest did boyle to see so fervent hote thye dissolute lyf that even the hate of syns that groo within thie wicked walls so ryfe for to breake forthe did convert so that terrour could it not represse.

(lines 3-8)

In speaking vehemently of the faults of his adversary, and thus stirring up immediate dislike of him (*exuscitatio*), Surrey makes very clear that he has chosen the "plaine beginning" instead of the "close creeping in." The earlier term for "creeping in" was the "subtle approach," which is of use when one has a weak case. Surrey the accused obviously wants it known that he thinks enough of his case to use the "direct opening," a device which is consistent with the angry tone which he holds throughout the poem. As in "Geue place ye louers," a "creeping in" in a poem which is assertively self-confident would be completely ineffective. In this respect, it is as valuable to notice what he does not do as well as what he does do: he omits the use of the four figures of *ethos*—*comprobatio*.

---


22 *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, p. 17.
parrhesia, eucharistia, and sygnome—which show humbleness or gratitude.

Surrey's exordium, then, is marked by its directness and by its lack of humility. The conciliatory gestures, if they can be called such, come in his portrayal of himself. The parenthesis in line two (by which he explicitly affirms his agreement that "breache of lawes" is indeed the "root of stryfe") fulfills Quintilian's advice that "the exordium may sometimes derive its conciliatory force from the person of the pleader . . . if he is believed to be a good man" in this case, no anarchist. His moving portrayal of his angry desire to "breake forthe" (reinforced by the alliteration of "brest" and "boyle") shows this also, and demonstrates his ability to make use of another piece of advice from Quintilian: "where we cannot deny the truth of facts that are urged against us, we must try to show that the purpose of the act was not what is alleged." But it is in his narratio that Surrey amplifies this last point. He has been accused of breaking windows, but the crux of his defence lies in his reason for doing so. Quintilian points out that if the facts against one are true, he should restate those facts through the narratio "in a different way, alleging other motives and another

23 *Institutio Oratoria*, II, 9.
24 *Institutio Oratoria*, p. 31.
purpose and putting a different complexion on the case." Thus Surrey explains that because words would not suffice in making London's sinners realize their faults, he had to choose "vnknownen meanes" in order to express his "hydden bourden" (lines 11-12). In the words of the author of the Rhetorica ad Herennium, one type of narratio occurs "when we set forth the facts and turn every detail to our advantage so as to win the victory." This is precisely what Surrey has done, excusing his unorthodox method of alarm by use of another parenthesis: "by wordes synce preachers knoo/ what hope is left for to redresse" (lines 9-10). The stonebow succeeded where words could not in making London listen. The magnificent irony of the poem is nowhere better shown than here.

It is permissible also to "make the statement of facts the opening of an incrimination of the other party." Surrey takes advantage of this permission to further his condemnation of the city—and to issue a warning:

wherby it might appeare to the that secreat synne hath secreat spight from justice rodde no faulte is free but that all suche as workes vnright in moste quyet are neste ill rest. (lines 13-17)

The s-alliteration ("secreat synne hath secreat spight")

---

25 Institutio Oratoria, pp. 91-92.
26 Page 23.
27 Institutio Oratoria, II, 63.
eloquently expresses the seething emotions behind Surrey's statement, and makes his listeners recall his "boyling brest." Line seventeen, moreover, serves as a transition to the next line; the quietness of the sinners is paralleled by Surrey's action against them, for it was "in secret scylence of the night" (l. 18) that he rose up to warn them. His fine sensitivity to the virtues of alliteration are shown here: instead of using the s-sounds to connote anger, he uses them to force the reader into actually hearing the silence of the night. But the s-alliteration again becomes a means to express vehemence four lines later, when he hints that God, "whose skourdge for synne the scryptures shew" (l. 22), is similarly disposed to the corrupt city.

The next five lines serve further to emphasize the similarity between Surrey and the Lord. He had likened himself to a prophet of God ("A fygure of the lorde behest," l. 21) earlier, and at this point he likens (by homeosis) his warning to God's:

that as the fearefull thonder clapp
by Suddayne flame at hand we know
of peoble stones the soundlesse rapp
ye dredfull plague might make the see
of goddes wrathe that doth thee enwrapp.

(lines 23-27)

The similarity between the "thonder clapp" of God and the paradoxical "soundlesse rapp" of the stones as they strike the windows is emphasized by the fact that they rhyme; through hyperbole, a figure which plays a part in the whole
poem, Surrey implies that the breaking of the windows was not only his warning, but the voice of God as well, a magnificent mock-heroic assertion.

It is in the next section that the pattern of the classical oration seems to break down in the poem. There is no propositio as such, and no statement of the partitio before the proof. Instead, the partitio follows immediately the statement of facts, and is given as part of the proof. Surrey had authority for ignoring the propositio, for Quintilian had said that it is not always necessary, especially when the statement of facts has already included it.28

His failure to include a clearly-marked propositio and partitio does not, however, suggest to me that Surrey lacked control, nor does it mean that he was unable to understand the subtleties of the judicial oration. It suggests, rather, his unusual ability to compress his material. He had implied his propositio throughout the narratio, and thus found it unnecessary to include an explicit statement of it. Nor, apparently, did he see a need for a formal enumeration of the points of a partitio before he explicated them. The enumeration comes in his argument when he defines more completely that which he is attacking by dividing the genus, Sin, into its species, the Seven Deadly Sins (lines 28-41). And even in the proof itself

28Institutio Oratoria, II, 131.
the virtue of compactness is evident: each of the sins is allotted two lines, no more. At a point when one would expect a more discursive exposition, Surrey chooses to economize. The examination of his brief treatment of one of the sins will demonstrate the success of his compression:

and ydle slowth that never wrought
to heaven his spirite lift may begun.  

(lines 34-35)

The complete description of "slowth" is contained in the parenthesis, "that never wrought," which pierces to the very nature of the sin. And in the second line, the use of the word "lift" instead of the more usual "rise" indicates as briefly as possible the point that the slothful will find it necessary to change their nature, to struggle, if they are to reach salvation at all.

Related to the compactness of the poem is its coherence. My division of the exordium from the narratio, for instance, is far more artificial than Surrey's; instead of wasting lines in constructing a marked separation between the two parts, he joins them by means of the referent "whiche" (1. 9), thus preserving a coherent flow in the progress from one part to another. He does the same in line nineteen when he summarizes his statement of facts by using the word "this" to refer back to the justification for his crime. Furthermore, the parallel construction of the final lines of his narratio with those of his confirmatio, or proof, serves admirably to avoid making a definite break
between them; the periodic "that" clause beginning "that as the fearefull thonder clapp" (l. 23) runs smoothly into the series of similar clauses which make up the enumerative discussion of the Seven Deadly Sins in the *confirmatio*. Finally, in arranging his list of the Sins, he saves gluttony (lines 40-41) for last, thus providing an easy transition into the next part of the oration, which begins with a reference to the related vice of drunkenness (l. 42).

The qualities of compactness and coherence are served not only by Surrey's genius at compression and transition, however; for his use of *terza rima* is eminently appropriate to his purposes in the poem. The interlocking rhyme pattern (*abababode*) provides the poem with a forward movement which supplements the uninterrupted flow of thought, as well as emphasizing the relationship between its parts. However, it should be noted that the treatment of the Seven Deadly Sins (lines 29-40) is not in *terza rima*, rhyming instead *abababodcod*. Padelford suggests two reasons for the change: that through it Surrey was implying that the subject of the Seven Deadly Sins was not worthy of the dignity of *terza rima*, and also that it contributed to the rapid movement of the section. 29

In the line referring to drunkenness, Surrey begins his *refutatio*, which opens as a summary of earlier points--

in lothsome vyce eache droncken wight
to styrr to god this was my mynd--  

*(lines 42-43)*

29Poems, p. 190
but becomes a complete destruction of his opponent's case when in a single line he at once admits the truth of their charge and passes over it as unimportant: "thie wyndowes hadd done me no spight" (l. 44); certainly here there is the comic spirit, but the line also serves as a succinct obliteration of everything that the former prosecutor could possibly have brought up in his argument.

In the remainder of the refutatio, Surrey explains in final terms the reason for his crime: it was not against the windows that he was shooting stones,

but proud people that dread no fall
clathed with faulshed and vnright
bredd in the closures of thie wall
but wrested to wrath in fervent zeale
thow hast to strif my secreat call.

(lines 45-49)

In thus restating his motives, he follows the advice of the Rhetorica Ad Herennium in which the author speaks of the "Type of Issue": "an Issue is Juridicial when there is agreement on the act, but the right or wrong of the act is in question"; in the refutation of an oration on a Juridicial Issue, the speaker must set forth the "Justifying Motive." 30 Surrey has done this earlier, but he makes his Justifying Motive unmistakably clear here.

At this point, he breaks off again and presents another emphatic single line: "endured hartes no warning feele" (l. 50). G. F. Nott suggests that Surrey is using

30Pages 43, 51.
"endured" in the sense of "obdurate"; perhaps a better—though not different—suggestion is "hardened." The importance of this line in the movement of the poem lies in the strength of *apocaracteresis*, a figure of pathos by which the speaker casts away all hope. And it is the utter hopelessness of trying to reach the soul of the city that prompts Surrey to launch into his *peroratio* with all the latent animosity that had been suggested in his *exordium*. That same "boyle" which he says erupted in the stonebow incident erupts before his listeners' eyes in the courtroom, and his *peroratio* expresses a dramatic shift in the poem itself: he changes from tightlipped anger to raging wrath when he realizes the lack of effect his oration has had:

Oh shamelesse whore is dread then gon
by suche thie foes as meantt thie weale
Oh membre of falce Babylon
the shopp of crafte, the den of yre.

(lines 51-54)

His artistry is graphically illustrated in the dramatic quality of the change. From his calm, somewhat humorous explanation of his lack of animosity toward windows, Surrey's tone gains vehemence through the rest of the *refutatio* until, with an almost audible sigh he resigns himself to being unheard—a resignation which lasts one line, after which the explosive *peroratio* unexpectedly and dramatically begins.

Thomas Wilson was later to define two kinds of rhetorical conclusion. "The one," he says, "resteth in gathering together briefly, all such arguments as were before rehearsed"; Surrey, obviously interested in keeping his poem free of unnecessary words, does not choose the first type; he uses, instead, the second, which "resteth ... in augmenting and vehemently enlarging that, which was in few wordes spoken to set the Judge or hearers in a heate." In order to better emphasize his vehemence, Surrey begins with an apostrophe which makes use of exuscitatio and ecphonesis, two figures of pathos which are admirably suited to that purpose. And using the figure autonomasia, he replaces the name "London" in the apostrophe with descriptive phrases ("shamelesse whore" and "membre of falce Babylon") which further clarify his opinion of his opponent. He has saved the best for last.

The remainder of the peroratio is a combination of the figure of warning (paraenesis) and ominatio, a description of the effect of the evil behavior of London:

thye dreadfull dome drawes fast vpon
thie Martyres blood by sword and fyre
in heaven and earth for iustice call
the lord shall heare their iust desyre
the flambe of wrathe shall on the fall
with famyne and pest lamentable
stryken shall be thie Lechers all
thie proud towers and turrettes hye
enmyes to god beat stone from stone
thyne Idolls burnt that wrought iniquitie.

(lines 55-64)

---

32 Arte of Rhetorique, p. 114.
Another rhetorical device which he uses is inartificial testimony (testimony from other sources);\(^{33}\) while he does not explicitly make use of individual figures, he has here strongly implied the relationship of Holy Scripture to his case. As Professor Hughey points out, he had scriptural authority for using the bow from Jeremiah 50.14: "Put yourselves in array against Babylon round about: all ye that bend the bow, shoot at her, spare no arrows: for she hath sinned against the Lord."\(^{34}\) But it is in the peroration, where Surrey has thrown off whatever restraints he had held, that he best portrays himself as "A fygure of the lorde's behest." Comparing London to a corrupt Babylon and a sinful Israel, he parallels, among other scriptural passages, Revelation 17.5: "And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH," which is an obvious source for line fifty-one. Revelation 18.24 ("And in her was found the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth") relates to line fifty-six, and the specific fate of the city mentioned in lines fifty-nine and sixty have a source in Revelation 18.8: "Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and

\(^{33}\)Rhetoric in Shakespeare's Time, p. 309.

\(^{34}\)The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry, II. 90. Professor Hughey also cites several other sources: Jeremiah 50.9, 29, Jeremiah 51, Revelation 17.5 and 18, and Ezekial 7.12, some of which I quote in the text; Padelford suggests Ezekial 5.12-17 and 6.11-14.
famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire."

Nott considers Petrarch's sonnets attacking the papal courts at Avignon (nos. cxxvi-cxxviii) as sources for the religious ending in the poem as well. He cites the parallel of Surrey's conclusion with Petrarch's anti-papal feelings in order to show, as H. A. Mason was to do much later, that Surrey was attached to the Protestants. However, I agree with Professor Hughey's opinion that this gives the poem "a slant not intended." It seems but another attempt at biographical criticism.

In any event, such considerations are beside my point. The most important consideration of "London hast thow accused me" is neither its sources nor its biographical interest. It is rather that here Surrey has constructed an oration in the best classical tradition without slavishly following the precepts and examples which were his to follow and to imitate, and that he has made use of many of the rhetorical devices common to his age without losing sight of their relationship to his purpose. In short, he has written an original poem, in the best sense of the term.

---

35 Works, I, 365.
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CHAPTER IV

RHETORIC AND SURREY'S ELEGIAC POEMS

The influence on Surrey's poetry of the training which he undoubtedly underwent as a child and young man left an indelible mark on his poetry. This is especially true, as I have tried to show in Chapter III, of his "oratorical" poems. The term "oratorical," however, is somewhat artificial, for all of Surrey's poems are "oratorical" in the sense that they are addressed to an audience with a particular rhetorical aim in mind rather than explorations of a poet's state of mind. This is true even of his "elegiac" poetry, where we might expect him to be more introspective than he would be, for instance, in a courtroom. Before discussing the rhetorical basis of the form of the elegy in the sixteenth century, however, it is necessary to clarify the evolution of the meaning of the word itself, for the term "elegy" might not have been recognized by Surrey and his contemporaries as the same kind of poem that modern readers think of. We generally use the term to indicate any funeral poem or lament for the dead or, more specifically, a poem which either mourns for a deceased person or sorrows in more universal terms over the tragedy
of mortality itself. The history of the word, however, as well as the rhetorical tradition behind the elegy, is far more complex than that.

"Elegy" was originally a Greek word and had nothing to do with subject-matter. It was metrical in meaning, referring to a type of iambic couplet. The earlier Greek "elegies" were not usually concerned with death; often they were martial or amatory; later ones were political or moral. In more popular usage, however, the Greeks and later the Romans used the elegiac meter for epitaphs, "a plaintive subject matter," writes John W. Draper, "to which its syncopated rhythm gave it special adaptation." ¹

These two facts contributed to the Renaissance conception of the elegy. Puttenham, in his chapter on the form, described it as "a limping Pentameter after a lustie Exameter."² And Gabriel Harvey includes in his Familiar Letters "English elegiacs" as well as "English hexameters."³ Sidney includes them in the Arcadia as forms, and Thomas Campion, in his Observations suggests that the English return to constructing real elegiac numbers.⁴ On the other hand, with their gradual realization that

²Arte, p. 49.
⁴Elizabethan Critical Essays, II, 344.
classical meters could not easily be naturalized in English, the English poets began to apply the name to poems which were similar in subject-matter to those of the classical elegists. 5

The result was a large and varied group of meanings for the term in the sixteenth century. One was the metrical meaning, as I mentioned above. Another linked the word with epistolary poems which dealt with expressions of love or complaint (for example, Drayton's *Elegies upon Sundry Occasions*). Sometimes the term was used to indicate a didactic poem, the most notable of these being Davies's *Nosce Telpsum*, the subtitle of which states, "This Oracle expounded in Two Elegies." The term also implied to the Elizabethans a love lyric, particularly a plaintive one, as suggested in *The Two Gentleman of Verona*, where Proteus calls love complaints both "wailful sonnets" and "dire-lamenting elegies" (III, ii, 69, 82), and in *Palladis Tamia*, where Francis Meres writes that as the ancients were "famous for Elegie," so the English "are the most passionate among us to bewaile and bemoane the perplexities of love." 6 In some cases, the "love elegy" did not even have a plaintive tone, as is evidenced by Donne's erotic *Elegies*. The first to use the term for a poem of personal


6Elizabethan Critical Essays, II, 320.
grief over the loss of a beloved person was Spenser, in his "Daphnaida and Astrophel; this was followed later by Donne's "Funeral Elegie" for Elizabeth Drury and Jonson's on Lady Venetia Digby.  

Whatever the nomenclature used, however, the fact is that, as A. L. Bennet points out, "in the English Renaissance the writing of memorial verses on the death of great men became a literary fashion." Of course, the term "personal elegy," which Bennet gives to this kind of poetry is his own, and he admits that in the sixteenth century it was known by any number of names: "epitaphe," "mournful dittie," "doleful dittie," "dump," "deploratioun," "lamentacioun," "lamentable motion," "lamentable discourse," "lamentable dittie," "funeral song," "funeral poem," or "funeral sonnet"; in the plural the poems were called "hearses," "teares," "epicedes," or "sorrowful verses." But Bennet's selection of the term "personal elegy" is not less artificial than my selection of "oratorical" to designate several of Surrey's poems in Chapter III; both are convenient tools for classification.

The two most prominent features of the Renaissance personal elegy were its relationship to the doctrine of praise and its dependence upon the rhetorical treatises for its

7 See Weitzmann, pp. 436-443.
9 Bennet, p. 107.
form and content. O. B. Hardison, in his illuminating study, *The Enduring Monument*, has made a strong case for the importance of the elements of praise and dispraise—of epideictic motives—in the literature of the Renaissance. Perhaps the most essential element in that literature, as Hardison's book shows, is the desire of the writer to create an "enduring monument" to his subject which can be looked to for instruction by those who will read the poem in the future. Obviously, this is particularly relevant in the elegy. As Bennet suggests, the object of the personal elegy is not only to lament the death of the subject, but also to praise his life, and such titles as Baldwin's *The Death playnt or life praise of the most noble and virtuous Prince, King Edward Syxt*, Marston's *An Elegiacal Poem upon the ever admired life, and never sufficiently deplored death of Thomas Lord Gray*, and James Maxwell's *The Laudable Life and Deplorable Death of our late peerlesse Prince Henry* suggest the double intention of the elegists. Often the writer also attempted to comfort the bereaved; indeed, praise and comfort are the most important elements of the personal elegy; they usually become more important than the expression of grief, despite the occasion of composition.

The emphasis upon purposes other than the outright expression of personal grief in the Renaissance elegy suggests


11Bennet, p. 108.
its formal nature. Indeed, in the sixteenth century it be­
came, says Bennet, "a new literary type with its own laws, 
its own conventions and structure . . . . The personal, 
non-pastoral lament became in Tudor times as highly 
stylized as the pastoral elegy." 12

The principal influences on the formalization of the type were the classical treatises on rhetoric and those Renaissance treatises which imitated them. Particularly important was the influence of the rhetorics on the struc­
ture of the elegy. Wilson, for example, suggests that in praising a man's life, six parts should be included: "The birthe, and infancie," "The childhood," "The Striplyng age, 
or Springtide," "The mannes state" ("Frowesse doen, either abrode, or at home"), "The olde age," and "the tyme of his departure, or death." These might be amplified further by including his "house or auncestrie," his "Realme," his "Shire or Towne," his education and "Inclination of nature." 13 If the poet does not wish to keep this bio­
ographical order, he may praise his subject by discussing his virtues; Wilson suggests "fower especiall and chief 
vertues, vnder whom all other are comprehended": "Prudence, 
or wisedome. Justice, Manhood. Temperaunce." 14 The dis­
position of the section on consolation is also prescribed

12 Bennet, p. 107.
14 Arte of Rhetorique, p. 31.
more or less fully by the rhetoricians; such Christian themes as the immortality of man in heaven, the commonness of death, the transcience of life, the happiness of a short life, and the ugliness of life on earth are suggested.\footnote{Arte of Rhetorique, pp. 65-86; Bennet, pp. 111-113.}

The formal characteristics of the elegy are thus part of rhetorical principle. Hardison, in his chapter on the elegy, suggests the logical relationship among the three formalized parts:

The elegy begins with personal praise, and the lament is a logical consequence—hence dependent on it . . . . Without the praise the lament would be unmotivated . . . . Grief, however, must be assuaged. Consolatio often involves a summary of the virtues of the deceased, but its major function is to persuade the mourner that his sadness is unnecessary . . . . Praise has shown the virtues of the deceased and his earthly rewards. Consolation has shown the eternity of his fame among men and predicted his speedy transfiguration. He, therefore, stimulates emulation in every way.\footnote{The Enduring Monument, p. 115.}

Surrey comes closest to following the rhetoricians' prescriptions for elegiac poetry in a sonnet, "Norfolk sprang thee" (C), and in "Wyat resteth here" (EE), which is considered by Bennet to be the first English personal elegy. His other elegiac pieces partake of, and depart from, the prescribed patterns in various ways, but they demonstrate one consistent characteristic: as the poems discussed in Chapters II and III, they partake of basic rhetorical pat-
terns without becoming subordinated to them. They show again that he understood rhetorical principles so completely that he could use them eclectically, and thus could write poetry that included the traditional rhetorical matter and transcended it at the same time.

The poem in which Surrey approximates closest the rhetoricians' concept of the epitaph is his sonnet on Thomas Clere, "Norfolk sprang thee, Lambeth holds thee dead." The subject of the poem was Surrey's companion and squire, who received a wound at the siege of Montreuil (September 19, 1544) while saving the life of his master. He died from the wound on April 14, 1545, and was buried in Lambeth in the chapel assigned to the Howard family. The poem itself was inscribed over Clere's tomb.

As one might expect, the poem, being a real epitaph in the physical as well as the literary sense, includes most of the traditional required "places" of the funeral poem. Nevertheless, even in this poem, Surrey departs from tradition when it suits his purpose. This is noticeable in the very first line when, after naming the place of Clere's birth ("Norfolk sprang thee"), he immediately follows by announcing his place of entombment ("Lambeth holds thee dead"). The startling bluntness of the opening is, I suggest, purposeful: in summarizing Clere's life so abruptly, Surrey emphasizes the tragic brevity of that life. In one

17 Padelford, p. 228.
line Surrey has satisfied the rhetorical instructions to include place of birth and place of death in an epitaph.

The next five lines (2-6) demonstrate the conciseness which is a Surrey trademark. Line two ("Clere, of the County of Clermont, though hight") not only gives the subject's ancestry, but also his name, two requirements of the personal elegy. Line three ("Within the womb of Ormonds race thou bred") presents the details of his ancestry, but more significantly, serves as an introduction to one of the most significant happenings in Clere's life: the crowning of Anne Boleyn, also a descendent of the Earl of Ormond ("And sawest thy cousin crowned in thy sight," l. 4). The next line, "Shelton for love, Surrey for lord, thou chase," provides us with information on Clere's love-life (he was in love with Mary Shelton, a lady of the court), but also, in an alliterative, parallel clause, his relationship to Surrey. This, in turn, quite in keeping with the association of his emotion, causes Surrey to present his lament immediately: "Aye me! while life did last that league was tender" (l. 6). Surrey has presented a great deal of compact information in these lines, and he has also kept logical control over his expression of "emotion": he objectifies, dramatizes his part in the poem by showing a free association between lines five and six without losing

---

18 Padelford, p. 228.
19 Padelford, p. 228.
control of his larger aim, the praise of his subject.

The last eight lines repeat the associative pattern. They do not have the compactness of the first six because their purpose is to document the most significant period in Clere's life: his participation in battles abroad. In including these facts, Surrey not only follows the prescription for presenting "Prowesse doen, either abrode, or at home," but he also presents the drama which will lead to his second lament (lines 13-14): he travels geographically and chronologically to the place and time in which Clere receives his fatal wound ("Thine Earl, half dead, gave in thy hand his will; Which cause did thee this pining death procure," lines 10-11), and moves from that thought to what very reasonably follows, the totally "unrehearsed" expression of a sorrow which is uncontrollable—at least in the eyes of his audience.

Surrey wrote three elegies on the death of Wyatt; two of them are sonnets, which I shall discuss later. The third, "Wyat resteth here" (EE), is similar to the epitaph on Thomas Clere in being an explicitly public tribute. It was, in fact, published in 1542, the year of Wyatt's death, and thus is the only Surrey poem published during his lifetime. 20 It is also one of his best, partly because of his

admirable combination of traditional rhetorical elements
prescribed specifically for the structure of the elegy with
other structural devices prescribed in the rhetorical hand-
books. The poem's structure relies on both the praise-
consolation pattern of the elegy and on division, one of
the most common topics of invention in Surrey's poetry.

In the praise section of the poem Surrey chooses to
concentrate on the virtues of Wyatt instead of following
the alternative biographical order. He even includes in
his praise Wilson's "fower especiall and chief vertues,"
prudence ("A Head, where wysdom mysteries dyd frame,"
1. 5), justice ("A Vysage sterne and mylde, where both did
groo/ Vyce to comtempne, in vertues to rejoyce,", lines 9-
10), manhood ("Lyued, and ran the race that nature set/
Of manhodes shape, where she the mold did loos," lines 31-
32), and temperance ("To lyue vprlghte and smyle at
fortunes choyse," l. 12). He also includes within the
larger order of the virtues some of the elements of bio-
graphical praise which Wilson calls "Prowesse doen, either
abrode, or at home": "A Head . . . where some worke of
Fame/ Was dayly wrought, to turn to Brytayns gayn" (lines
5-8), and "A Tonge," which would bring "Our Englysshe
youth, by trauayle vnto fame" (lines 17-20). In fact,
Bennet cites line 17 ("A Tonge, that serued in foraine
realms his king") to demonstrate an example of the pre-
scribed treatment of old age in the personal elegy.  

As I mentioned earlier, the principal purpose of the Renaissance personal elegy was to praise the deceased; Surrey follows this prescription by devoting eight of the nine stanzas of his poem to praise of Wyatt. Only in the last does he present the lament and consolation; and typically, he very economically presents both in the first line of the stanza: "But to the heavens, the symple soule is fleed" (l. 33). The line serves to change the emphasis from praise of life to lament at death; but it also includes within the lament the consolation: Wyatt is dead, but his soul is in heaven. In fact, Bennet cites the line as an example of one of the principal motifs included by the rhetoricians for the consolation section: the Christian theme that the subject is not dead, but in heaven, borrowed from the pastoral elegy and the planctus mariae of medieval elegy.  

The remainder of the final stanza turns from lament for Wyatt to lament for those left alive:  

Which lefte with such, as couet Christe to knowe  
Witness of faith that neuer shalbe deade  
Sent for our welth, but not receiued so  
Thus for our gylt, that ieuell haue we lost  
The earth his bones, the heuen posseesse his goost.  

Surrey borrows here another motif from the planctus mariae, the theme of Christ dying for our sins; but he does it with  

21"Principal Rhetorical Conventions," p. 113.  
a significant—and startling—difference: God took the
man's life to punish Englishmen for their sins. Bennet
says that this theme first appeared in Surrey's poem, "and
had such vitality that elegists were still using it in the
mid-seventeenth century."²³ We might say that in this case
Surrey's manipulation of tradition created a new tradition.

The praise section of the poem (stanzas 1-8) demonstrates, as do most of his good poems, Surrey's ability to select and combine various structural patterns from the rhetorics. For he not only follows the pattern of the praise of the virtues, but also the pattern of the topic of division, through the figure of partitio. He arranges the poem into a complete division of a whole (Wyatt himself) into its parts (the various parts of Wyatt's anatomy), singling each part out for praise. And at the same time that he is enumerating the various parts of Wyatt's body, he amplifies still further by dividing each of the parts, which then become themselves subjects, into their proper adjuncts, thus using one kind of rhetorical division to supplement another, and giving significance to the division.

As might be expected, Surrey wastes no words in getting to his point. Wyatt, who represents the whole which is to be divided into its parts throughout the poem, also serves as the subject of two important adjuncts, "dysdayne" and

²³"Principal Rhetorical Conventions," p. 120.
"vertue." Thus, instead of merely providing a stanza of introduction, Surrey makes use of his opening to serve a second purpose as well, and constructs the stanza as he does the others. Furthermore, the two adjuncts which adhere to Wyatt the subject in the first stanza are more significant than those which are adjuncts of the parts of his anatomy, for they serve as summary adjuncts relating to the whole poem; "dysdayne," for instance, occurs in stanza three, where it appears as the "sterne" side of the subject of that stanza, Wyatt's visage; and again in stanza seven, where it is seen as the adjunct of another subject, Wyatt's heart, and portrays a different kind of "dysdayne"—Wyatt's disdain for his own well being. It appears again in stanza eight as the "force" of the "valiaunt Corps." At the same time, "vertue" is repeated in stanzas three, five, and six, and is present, though unspoken, in every other stanza as Surrey succeeds in including the four cardinal virtues themselves.

The paradoxical juxtaposition of "dysdayne" and "vertue" is itself a significant element in the poem. In the first stanza they are equal "encreasers" of Wyatt's "heauenly giftes." One is at first confused by the coupling of two such opposite qualities—until he encounters a similar paradox in stanza three, where the two adjuncts of Wyatt's "Vysage" are its sternness and its mildness. The paradox is explained here, however: the "sterne" face condemns vice, the "mylde" face rejoices in
virtue. More important is Surrey's joining of the two with the coordinating conjunction; by doing so he has shown that the two adjuncts are indeed not contradictory, that they both contribute to virtue—virtue not only in Wyatt, but in those whom Wyatt has influenced. A similar conclusion can be drawn regarding the confrontation of "force" and "beauty" in stanza eight. These two stanzas serve to amplify the coordination of the two qualities of the first stanza, and thus contribute to a concise, organic unity throughout the poem.

C. S. Lewis and J. M. Berdan both issue similar complaints against "Wyat resteth here"; Lewis complains that it is "a little too like a catalogue," and Berdan dislikes the "inventory nature of its structure." Both comments are simply not true of Surrey's progression of ideas. This point becomes obvious when one sees the relationship of Surrey's conceptions, as I pointed out above, and also by the great variety with which those conceptions progress rhetorically and logically through the poem. In stanza two, the adjunct "wysdom" serves also as a cause for "worke of Fame," which in turn becomes a cause for "Brytayns gayn." In stanza seven we find a curious twist on the subject-adjunct relationship: Surrey here discusses an adjunct ("drede") which the subject does not have. And in

---

stanza eight, the subject, "Corps," represents not only the older meaning, the body itself, but also the modern, the corpse as it lies in the grave. The suggestion that Surrey is speaking of the living body is emphasized by the anatomical organization of the whole poem and by the obvious fact that we do not usually think of "force" and "beautye" as adjuncts of a dead body. At the same time, the use of the word in the modern sense serves to bring us back to the grave beside which Surrey imaginatively and dramatically sees himself standing; thus he saves himself an extra stanza to provide a transition to the lament and consolation in the last stanza, which reminds us, as does the first statement of the poem, that Wyatt is dead.

Considering the extravagant praise in "Wyat resteth here," it is curious that in the two sonnets on Wyatt's death, "In the rude age" (P, X) and "Dyvers thy death" (P, XII), Surrey spends more time in dispraise of Wyatt's enemies than in creating an enduring monument to the poet. This is not to say that the sonnets do not praise, only that the praise is implicit rather than explicit. Actually, both are expansions of the twist that Surrey gives to the planctus mariae in the last stanza of "Wyat resteth here": he becomes more explicit in his account of the guilt of all Englishmen in not accepting Wyatt. "In the rude age" is an ironic comparison/contrast between an earlier, "uncivilized" time, when virtue was nevertheless appreciated, and the
present, when men cannot even appreciate a man like Wyatt. "Dyvers thy death" recounts, again ironically, the duplicity of those who falsely mourn at Wyatt's grave when they are actually mourning at the continuation of his fame even after his death. Surrey's obvious anger in the poems suggests the possibility that he had specific people in mind in the poems, but it is not my purpose to dwell on biography; it is sufficient to point to his anger as the main reason for his departure from the normal praise-lament-consolation structure in the two elegies.

It is interesting, however, to speculate on why Surrey chose to write the two poems in sonnet form—on why he chose to write sonnets at all. Of course, the most obvious reasons are his interest in the Italians and in Wyatt's trailblazing with the sonnet form in English. But I think that Surrey might also have been influenced in his choice by the demand for economy that the sonnet form makes on the poet. This principle of the form was explained early in the next century by Samuel Daniel in his Defence of Ryme: discussing the sonnet in terms of order and chaos, he writes,

is it not most delightful to see much excellently ordred in a small roome, or little, gallantly dis-

---

25 The most likely candidate is Dr. Edmund Bonner, whose jealous criticisms of Wyatt the ambassador ultimately resulted in Wyatt's imprisonment. See Kenneth Muir, Life and Letters of Sir Thomas Wyatt (Liverpool: Liverpool Univ. Press, 1967) for the best account.
posed and mad to fill up a space of like capacitie, in such sort, that the one would not appeare so beautifull in a larger circuite, nor the other do well in lesse. 26

"In the rude age" is perhaps an example of economy carried to the point of obscurity. Nott suggests that "it is probably either that the whole did not receive Surrey's last corrections, or that it has come down to us imperfect." 27 This is possible, but I choose to think that the apparent confusion in the sonnet is a result of Surrey's efforts to be concise as possible.

The poem can best be understood by examining first its rhetorical and syntactic elements. It is constructed according to the topic of comparison. The comparison is between the "rude," or pagan, age, when knowledge ("Science") was not widespread ("rife"), and "dayes of treuthe," or the present, Christian, age. The two elements of the comparison are not, however, set off from each other syntactically, but are concisely run together through the hirmus, or periodic sentence. While there is thus no syntactic division as such, the poem nevertheless divides nicely into the two elements of comparison through the use of other devices. The two dependent clauses of the sentence (beginning "if love in crete" and "If vertue yet") serve as one

26 Quoted from Poems and a Defence of Ryme, ed. Arthur Colby Sprague (Cambridge, 1930), pp. 138-139.
27 Works, I, 342.
section, and the independent clause (beginning "In dayes of treuth") serves as the other. Thus we can perceive an obvious division and contrast between the two sections without their being divided syntactically. The division between the two is also effected by the traditional octave-sestet division of the Italian sonnet, which reinforces the division of the two dependent clauses from the independent one. The figure of chronographia, description of time, also serves this purpose. Thus the poem is divided completely, as a comparison must be, but it is nevertheless held tightly together by the syntax of the periodic sentence, which is interrupted by two parentheses of amplification ("a goodlie meane bothe to deter from cryme/ and to her steppes our sequell to enflame" and "the onelye debte that ded of quycke may clayme"). It is noteworthy that Surrey chose the figure of parenthesis, for only it could supply amplification without slowing the flow of the periodic sentence. Considered strictly according to form, therefore, the sonnet is remarkable for its combination of several elements into a remarkably compact statement.

The first dependent clause (lines 1-4) is specific, referring us to a particular "rude age," when Jove and others were given thanks for teaching through "Artes" the way men might better profit in their lives. The second (lines 5-8) shifts the chronographia into a more universal context—into any "rude age"—and restates the condition proposed in
the first: that virtue has in every "vnthankfull tyme" been extolled and appreciated by some. The parenthesis which follows suits Surrey's ultimate purpose well, in presenting a piece of advice to those who would detract from Wyatt's fame: to extoll virtue ("blast her endless fame") will encourage others to be virtuous. The independent clause then returns to the specific again—brings us, in fact, to the most specific time in the poem, when Wyatt, not yet cold in the grave, is in need of praise. "Treuthe" is certainly an ironic adjunct of "dayes," for Surrey is here looking in disgust (as one of the "wailers") at an age "where Christe is tought" refusing to praise virtue as even the pagans did. The impression of Surrey standing at Wyatt's grave as one of the mourners and at the same time standing above his age as its critic is further evidence of his ability to create drama.

Surrey's point in line twelve, that those who fail to praise Wyatt after his death deserve "Momus blame," provides another instance of his economy which further strengthens the conciseness of the whole poem. The reference to Momus, a creature from Greek myth, puts Surrey's contemporary criticism into a universal context, suggesting that the present age is perhaps as "rude" as the former because its actions are no better. At the same time the reference takes the reader toward an even more specific target than the general lot of those who do not praise
Wyatt. Momus, the god who found fault with everyone and everything, was the personification of mocking censure, the complaining, carping critic who felt it necessary to scold the wrongdoings of everyone, no matter how insignificant those wrongdoings might be.

The reference also explains the last two lines of the poem. While the structure of the sonnet up to "Momus blame" is Italian, the last two lines form a couplet, suggesting the English form. I think that the last two lines are separate because they are directed specifically at Dr. Edmund Bonner. Surrey seems to take real pleasure in the image of Wyatt's face chafing ("fretting") his enemy's breast, and the glowing cinders of his fame creating envy in the heart of his detractors. Thus the reference to Momus, while on one level making the poem more universal, at the same time gives Surrey a chance to be perversely specific.

The accusation that "In the rude age" is obscure can be partly defended by pointing to Surrey's allegorical use of Momus to represent Wyatt's enemies. In explanation of the obscurity of the rest of the poem, one need only point to Surrey's ability to say so much in so few words. However, if one finds objectionable the obscurity of the poem despite its conciseness, he need only turn to the second sonnet on Wyatt's death, "Dyvers thy death doo dyverslye

bemone," to find the economy without the obscurity. The subject matter of the poem is much the same as that of the other's: the ingratitude and evil of those who attacked Wyatt when he was alive and attack him even after his death. The sonnet also provides a strong argument for the thesis that Surrey and Wyatt were intimately acquainted: lines nine and ten ("But I that knew what harbourd in that hedd/ what vertues rare were tempred in that brest") are not the words of a man who admired someone's poetry from afar and who is simply writing a conventional tribute to a fellow poet.

Surrey has combined two rhetorical principles of invention in writing this poem. The device of comparison is obvious; in fact it plays much the same organizational role in this poem as in the last: Surrey compares the two quatrains of the octave with the sestet—in this case, two types of Wyatt's mourners with himself. Nott's title for the poem suggests its organization: "Of the feigned grief which some expressed at the death of Sir T. Wyatt compared with Surrey's deep and reverential sorrow."²⁹ The sonnet form of the two poems is also similar (although there is slight variation in rhyme): the Wyatt-like division into the Italian octave and sestet (serving the purposes of comparison) and the couplet, which is explainable within the sense of the poem.

²⁹Works, I, 46.
At the same time that he has used comparison, however, Surrey has also built the poem according to the rhetorical principle of division, specifically, *merismus*, or *partitio*, the distribution of the whole into its parts. Examining the poem from this point of view, the reader can see the three-part division, corresponding to the three types of mourners at Wyatt's grave. Furthermore, the combination of the two topics of invention enables Surrey to move from the general to the specific, as he did in the last poem, and thus to organize the poem climactically, ending it with its most important element, his own very personal expression of grief, an expression which does not simply repeat the sentiment of the last poem, but expresses a new one.

Economy is obvious in the first quatrains, which not only presents the principle introduction (1, 1), which itself summarizes the elements of the *partitio*, but also includes the first of those elements, the first group of "mourners." In the first line, Surrey is following an important rhetorical guideline for the classical oration itself by beginning his *partitio* with a *propositio*, which, as Peacham was to write later, "comprehendeth in few words the summe of the matter whereof we presently intend to speak."30 The figure is a natural one for one so disposed to comprehending in a few words as Surrey. He displays that skill again in line four when, speaking of those who

---

30Quoted from *Rhetoric in Shakespeare's Time*, p. 316.
during Wyatt's life ("livelye hedd") envied him, he pictures them shedding "Cesars teres vpon Pompeius hedd," an example of the figure paradigma which is excellent because of its concise "comprehending" of a great deal again in one line: the false mourners remind Surrey of the way Caesar might have mourned over the body of Pompeius, a man who had caused him a great deal of inconvenience and cost him many soldiers. He uses the figure with equal precision in the last line to emphasize his own very real grief (although he has the end of the Pyramus-Thisbe story turned around).

There is also a very precise and logical relationship between the second quatrain and the first: having mentioned Caesar in line four, Surrey provides himself with an admirable associative transition to the next line, in which he relies on the history of Caesar's death by traitors to furnish an imaginative backdrop for his discussion of Wyatt's enemies. Ironically, however, their desire to cause the death of Wyatt is not even satisfied by his death, for, says Surrey, his fame will remain (l. 8). In both this poem and "In the rude age," Surrey is explicitly concerned with providing his subject with an "enduring monument" by guaranteeing Wyatt's fame through poetry. It is interesting, therefore, that the specific application of this theme provides him in "Dyvers thy death" with a comparison within his comparison: the tears of those who
weep at Wyatt's fame as opposed to his own tears ("vaporde eyes," l. 13) which mourn Wyatt's death.

The last elegy I wish to discuss in this chapter, "So crewell prison howe could betyde alas" (P, II), is also, I think, the best. Judged according to the criterion by which I have measured all of Surrey's better poems, i.e., the combination of his use of traditional rhetorical patterns with his individual manipulation of those patterns, this poem stands out even more than "Wyat resteth here," Surrey wrote it while imprisoned in Windsor in 1537. Its subject is Henry VIII's bastard son, the Earl of Richmond, with whom Surrey spent the years 1530 to 1532 as companion and friend both at Windsor and in France, and who died a premature death in 1536, leaving as his young widow Surrey's own sister, Mary. The relationship between the two young men was no doubt very close, and the poem itself, despite elements of rhetorical formality, reflects more passionately than his other elegies Surrey's strong sense of personal loss.

As we might expect, traditional elegiac patterns are unmistakably a part of the poem, despite Surrey's personal involvement with its subject. The structure is built partly upon the biographical order of the elegy: the poet gives Richmond's lineage in the third line ("a kinges soon"), and through most of the first forty lines he
accounts for the details of Richmond's early training and education in the knightly and courtly arts. The apostrophe at the end, which begins, "O place of blys renewer of my woos/ geve me accompt wher is my noble fere," begins the second part, the lament.

Rhetorical patterns other than those related specifically to the elegy play an important part in the structure of the poem also. The antithesis in line 5 ("where eche swete place retournes a taste full sowre") serves as a kind of statement of division for the enumeratio which follows, the cataloguing of "eche swete place" individually (lines 6-40). The "places" are the actual parts of Windsor, "the large grene courtes" (l. 6), "the maydens towre" (l. 7), "the graveld ground" (l. 17), "the secret groves" (l. 25), "the wyld forest" (l. 29), and "the voyd walles" (l. 33) of the castle itself. They are also the activities that Surrey remembers participating in while there—"the daunces short" (l. 10), "the palme play" (l. 13), "the pleasaunt dreames," "secret thoughtes," and "wanton talke" (lines 36-38). The elegiac lament at the end also follows the rhetorical division. The antithesis in the fifth line had also mentioned that a "taste full sowre" was the result of his thoughts on "eche swete place."

Surrey remains consistent, then, by turning abruptly to his lament, which completes the logical progression of the antithesis by giving the "taste full sowre" in the form of the lament.
But the impressiveness of the poem depends less on the elegiac and rhetorical conventions than on Surrey's ability to transcend those conventions—or at least to subordinate them to his own feelings of personal loss. In the two sonnets on the death of Wyatt, he did not include a consolation because he was interested mainly in excoriating Wyatt's enemies. In "So crewell prison" he ends with lament because the death of Richmond was too close to him to allow a resort to the comforting Christian cure for sorrow. His only comfort is the bitter realization that the "remembrance of the greater greif" makes his present imprisonment less painful in comparison.

The rhetorical division of lines 6 through 40 is also subordinate to the feeling in the poem. The incredibly detailed account of the various places and activities which he remembers is too specific and too personal to be labeled only as rhetorical amplification of biographical "places." Furthermore, the order in which he presents the "places" is less rhetorical than associative and natural. The progress of the division in this poem, as opposed to the one in "Wyat resteth here," gradually obscures the original topic of division and moves in a chronological and spatial order rather than a rhetorical one. Surrey moves spatially from place to place, from "large grene courtes" to "the wyld forest," finally ending the progression inside the "voyde walles" of the palace itself. At the same time that he
moves from outdoors to indoors, he moves from day to night, a natural, associative—and logical—progression which provides him with the opportunity to move from the activities of the day ("palme play" and jousts on "fomynge horse") to those of the night ("pleasant dreams" and "secret thoughtes"). In finally bringing the activities to the "secret thoughtes" of night, he associates quite naturally those thoughts with his own night-thoughts on his present state, which lead him to his lament.

"Socrewel prison" is a remembrance of things past. But it is not the remote past that Surrey recollects in the poem; he wrote it, after all, at most five years after he had been at Windsor with Richmond. Nor is it a remembrance of only "things"; Richmond is a part of every bittersweet recollection. The biographical and rhetorical order persist in the poem, but not at the expense of its profound personal sorrow. Written in the same stanza as "Wyat resteth here," the stanza which Gray later chose for his "Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard," the poem is more profoundly sorrowful than either; Courthope aptly called it "the most pathetic personal elegy in English poetry."

---

Surrey's sonnet, "When windesor walles," which I shall discuss in Chapter VI, was probably written during the same period. While not an elegy as such, the poem expresses sentiments which are similar to those of "So crewell prison": sitting in prison, the poet remembers "the Iolly woes the hateles shorte debate/ the rakhell life that longes to loves disporte," which cause him similar sorrow.

CHAPTER V

RHECTORIC AND SURREY'S "PETRARCHAN" POEMS

In examining the relationship between Surrey's poetry and the tradition behind it, I have found it impossible to avoid confronting his debt to Petrarch. The inevitability of such a discussion is dictated partly by the emphasis placed on Surrey as a "Petrarchan" poet. Puttenham characterized Wyatt and Surrey as serious imitators of "their Maister Francis Petrarca." ¹ and Warton carefully stated that when Surrey "copies Petrarch, it is Petrarch's better manner." ² Courthope later classified most of Surrey's love poems as sonnets and canzoni, and observed that they are "invariably composed upon the principle approved by the example of Petrarch." ³ Modern opinion is much the same: Surrey "found the Italian manner far more congenial than did Wyatt"; his "technical master was Petrarch." ⁴ and at

¹Arte, p. 62.
²The History of English Poetry, p. 298.
⁴Anon., "Virgil's Englishman," TLS, Nov. 5, 1964, p. 998
⁵Chapman, p. 41.
the same time the influence of the Italians is seen in "the general spirit of his verse."\(^6\) The modern predilection for showing Surrey's deficiencies also includes his "failures" as a Petrarchan: Mason does not consider him a translator in the "critical-creative" sense of the term;\(^7\) Lever believes that his Petrarchan poetry "has a minimal appeal as poetry; and need not be described in detail";\(^8\) and Surrey's own editor, Emrys Jones, considers his Petrarchan pieces as interesting only "as performances in elocution."\(^9\) Finally, the pervasiveness of the interest in the Petrarch-Surrey relationship shows itself in all the editions of Surrey's poetry, where the most consistent inclusions in the critical notes are the parallels demonstrated between Surreyan poems, lines, and images and their Petrarchan "originals."

The relationship has, in fact, been exaggerated. Surrey actually "translated" only three of Petrarch's poems and "adapted" three more. His editors have found echoes from Petrarch in various other poems also, but this can hardly be interpreted as a pervading influence. Wyatt made much more extensive use of Petrarch. Furthermore, the emphasis upon Petrarch's influence has overshadowed Surrey's con-

\(^6\) Reed, p. 130.

\(^7\) Humanism and Poetry in the Early Tudor Period, pp. 24; 240.

\(^8\) The Elizabethan Love Sonnet, p. 45.

siderable debt to Chaucer. Raymond Southall has pointed out Chaucer's influence—particularly the influence of *Troilus and Criseyde*—on the love poetry that followed his; and Surrey's editors have commented on some of the Chaucerian echoes in his poems; several studies have also noted his "Chaucerian" diction. We can also see Chaucerian situations as often as Petrarchan ones in Surrey. "In winters lust retume" (P. VII) is very similar to the encounter with the mourning lover in *The Book of the Duchess*: "If care do cause men cry" is similar in spirit to various lovers' plaints, but is particularly similar to those of Troilus and those in *The Knight's Tale*, *Anelida* and *Arcite*, and *A Complaint to His Lady*; finally "When windesor walles" (P. VII) pictures Surrey complaining in prison as *The Knight's Tale* does Palamon.

Other parallels do exist between Chaucer and Surrey, but it is not within the scope of this study to dwell on them. One poem is of particular importance here, however, because it shows Surrey making use of both the Petrarchan and Chaucerian traditions to create his own poem. His son-

---


12. Eckert's dissertation (pp. 41-48) presents the most complete coverage.
"The soote season, that bud and blome furth brings" (T. I) has been identified as an adaptation of Petrarch's sonnet *In Mortem*, cccx:

Ze'iro torna, e 'l bel tempo rimena,
E i fiori e 'l erbe, sua dolce famiglia,
E garrir Progne, e pianger Filomena
E primavera condida e vermiglia.

Ridono i prati; e 'l ciel se rassera
Giove s'allegra di mirar sua figlia;
L'aria, e l' acqua, e la terra e d'amor piena;
Ogni animal d'amor si ricogsglia.

Ma per me, lasso, tornano i puri gravi
Sospiri, che del cor profondo tragge
Quella ch'al ciel se ne portò le chiavi;

E cantar agnelletti, e fiorir piagge;
E 'n belle donne oneste atti scavi
Sono un deserto, e fere aspre e selvagge. 13

If Surrey's poem can be called an adaptation of this sonnet, it is certainly a very liberal rendering. Various critics have pointed out how Petrarch's conventional generalizations, classical references, and conceited ending contrast with Surrey's "typically English" concrete details. 14 The details of Spring, in fact, take up all but the couplet in the English sonnet, while Petrarch's whole sestet is concerned with the application of the season to the lover's problem; Surrey includes the activities of eight different animals (lines 2-10), while Petrarch simply refers to the

---

13 *Petrarch: Sonnets and Songs*, trans. Anna Maria Armi (New York, 1946), p. 432. I have used Miss Armi's very literal renderings of Petrarch's poems from the same edition.

14 Padelford, p. 207; Emrys Jones, p. 103; Mason, p. 239.
activities of "ogni animal." The English poem is, in fact, only generally similar to the Italian; it is far closer to medieval lyrics like "Sumer is icumen in" (cf. "Somer is come," l. 5), and particularly to lines 176 ff. of The Parliament of Fowls:

The byldere ok, and ek the hardy asshe;
The piler elm, the cofre unto carayne . . .
On every bow the bryddes herde I synge,
With voys of aungel in her armonye;
Some besyede hem here bryddes forth to brynge;
The litel conyes to here pley gonne hye;
And ferther al aboute I gan aspye
The dredful ro, the buk, the hert and hynde Squyrels, and bestes smale of gentil kynde.

(lines 176-177, 190-196) 15

We can assume, I think, that while Surrey perhaps received the inspiration to write "The soote season" after reading Petrarch's poem, he was influenced at least as much by a thorough reading of Chaucer when he wrote it.

Such diverse source-material for a single poem supports my central thesis in this paper: that Surrey applied tradition to his writing only insofar as it helped him to write his own poems. Whether he follows the directions of the rhetorical handbooks in the disposition of his "argument," uses Petrarchan conceits, or writes Chaucerian celebrations of the English countryside, he still, in most cases, writes his own poetry.

This is not true, however, of two of the three poems.

which are definite translations of Petrarch. "Love that doth raine and liue within my thought" (P, IX) is almost an exact rendering (much closer than Wyatt's version "The long love that in my hart doth harbar") of "Amor, che nel penser mio vive e regna" (In Vita, cxl), and "I neuer saw youe madam laye aparte" (P, VIII) almost duplicates "Lassare il velo o per sole o per ombra" (In Vita, xi). In the latter, even though he divides the sonnet into the "English" version of three quatrains and a couplet, Surrey follows Petrarch's octave-sestet division in the thought; not only are his words the same, but the disposition of his argument follows Petrarch as well.

"Set me wheras the sonne, dothe perche the grene" (P, XI), the other poem which can be called a translation of Petrarch, is almost as close to its original, "Pommi ove 'l sole occide i fiore e i' erbe" (In Vita, cxlvi), as the other two. Two significant differences, however, between the two make Surrey's the better poem. First, whereas Petrarch repeats "Pommi" ("Lay me") in every other line of the octave and every third line of the sestet, Surrey repeats "set me" three times, making the repetitions conform logically to the three-quatrain pattern of his English sonnet. The advice of the rhetorics might have influenced his decision also, for the repetition might have been considered a vice of language in the handbooks—specifically, either the vice tautologia or homiologia, both of which
relate to monotony through too much repetition. His second departure from Petrarch comes in his last quatrain:

set me in earthe, in heauen or yet in hell in hill, in dale, or in the fowling floode Thrawle, or at large, a liue whersoo I dwell sike, or in healthe, in yll fame, or in good,

which follows roughly the first four lines of Petrarch's sestet:

Pommi in cielo, od in terra, od in abisso, In alto poggio, in valle ima e palustre, Libero spirto, od a' suoi membri affisso; Pommi con fama oscura, o con illustre.

Both poets begin by mentioning three possible fates, but Petrarch returns to the juxtaposition of two fates in each of his next three lines while Surrey expands his possibilities by including three, four, and four in the corresponding three lines. In fact, he doubled the juxtapositions in the last two lines of the quatrain: "Thrawle"/ "at large," "a liue"/ "whersoo I dwell," "sike"/ "in healthe," "in yll fame"/ "in good." The result illustrates again the incredible conciseness of which Surrey was capable, and which I have tried to point out throughout this paper. I suspect that the changes he made in translating "Pommi ove 'l sole" were conscious attempts not only to follow the advice of the rhetoricians, but also to achieve a structural cohesion and a tightly-packed economy that would make his poem an improvement on Petrarch's.

Except for the possibility that Surrey avoided the rhetorical "vice" in "Set me wheras the sonne," none of the
Poems discussed so far in this chapter depart from Petrarch's originals to much extent at all. With the notable exception of the enumeratio which includes the concrete details in "The soote season," whatever rhetorical patterns we might observe in the poems are the rhetorical patterns constructed by Petrarch. But when Surrey departs from Petrarch, as he does in several adaptations of Petrarch's poems, his departures reveal the influence of his own rhetorical training. And in this he is one with the larger tradition of humanism; the motives which led the poets of the early sixteenth century to turn to Petrarch as a model were essentially the same as those which caused them to use the rhetorics: they wanted to enrich the quality of English poetry. Furthermore, the enthusiasm for Petrarch was related to the interest in rhetoric. As Douglas Peterson points out, when the poets turned to Petrarch, "they read him in light of the rhetorical theory in which they had already been trained."\(^{16}\) This is a crucial point, and in the rest of this chapter I wish to demonstrate the truth of Peterson's statement as it relates to several of Surrey's poems, and also to show how Surrey, as always, manipulates the two traditions to suit his own aims.

His "Alas so all thinges nowe doe holde their peace" (T, III) is an excellent example of Peterson's observation.

\(^{16}\)The English Lyric from Wyatt to Donne, p. 4.
It is an adaptation of Petrarch's sonnet *In Vita* (clxiv):

Or che 'l ciel e la terra e 'l vento tace
E le fere e gli augelli il sonno affrena,
Notte il carro stellato in giro mena,
E nel suo letto il mar senz' onda giace.

Veggio, penso, ardo, piango; e chi mi sface
Sempre m'è inanzi per mia dolce pena;
Guerra è 'l mio stato, d'ira e di duol piena;
E sol di lei pensando ho qualche pace.

Così sol d' una chiara fonte viva
Move 'l dolce e l'amaro; ond'io me pasco;
Una man sola mi risana e punge.

E perché 'l martir no giunga a riva
Mille volte il dì moro e mille nasco;
Tanto da la salute mia son lunge.17

But it is hardly a literal rendering, as much as are the three translations discussed above. The major difference between Surrey's poem and Petrarch's is apparent in the first line of each. Petrarch begins with details of nature at night; Surrey begins with an observation which seems at first a paradox: it does not seem usual, after all, to mourn the presence of peace. In simply observing the stillness of the sky, the earth, and the wind, Petrarch has only presented an atmosphere; Surrey, on the other hand, has presented an intellectual problem; we expect nothing from Petrarch's first line; we expect a logical solution from Surrey's. In short, Petrarch has begun as a poet (at least in the modern sense) while Surrey, even though he is writing a poem which is essentially reflective, has begun as an orator by presenting an "entraunce"—not, certainly, a

17Armi, p. 256.
"creeping in," for that is not his way, but an "entraunce" nevertheless.

The following three lines in Petrarch contain more images; as we might expect from a poet; the next four lines in Surrey contain an amplification of the first line—in this case a division of the whole ("all thinges" holding their peace) into its parts ("Heauen and earth," "The beastes, the ayre, the birdes," "The nightes chare," "the starres" and "the Sea" all holding their peace); this we would expect from the orator. Up to this point, we still have only an image from Petrarch and an amplified paradoxical statement from Surrey.

The next four lines in each continues what a modern poet or critic might call the poet/orator contrast between the two. Petrarch moves from his series of images, without transition, to speak of his persona's love-sickness, again in very specific terms without general statement: the lover watches, burns, weeps; war is his state. Although he makes clear that the cause of both his suffering and his relief is the lady, he does not do so through an outright statement, but incorporates it within the love-imagery itself. The opening line of the corresponding passage in Surrey begins with a comment on himself, "So am no I, whom loue alas doth wring" (l. 6), an explicit statement which marks his topic of invention as comparison/contrast and clarifies the opening statement of the poem in two logical ways.
First, it explains fully for his audience that the reason for his observation of nature's peacefulness was to contrast that peacefulness with his inner turmoil; second, by presenting the contrast, it presents the solution for the paradoxical "Alas," his sadness at the peace in nature. It is not just a statement of contrast, however, for Surrey includes very concisely the cause for the contrast and for his state in the subordinate clause "whom loue alas doth wring." The next three lines of the quatrain amplify the "wringing" in rhetorical contraries: "I wepe and syng;/ In ioye and wo" (lines 8-9).

The differences between the two poems remain the same through to their conclusion. Petrarch switches from the burning and warring images to the image of his lady as a spring and then to the image of himself as a waverling ship; again he does not attempt to construct transitions between his thoughts but simply presents them as a disconnected series of imaginary pictures. The relationship between the images is implicit rather than explicit. In contrast, Surrey begins his next section with a logical explanation for his antithetical "ioye and wo": "For my swete thoughtes sometyme doe pleasure bring;/ But by and by the cause of my desease/ Givens me a pang . . . " (lines 10-12). These lines simply amplify an amplification, the "swete thoughtes" explaining the "ioye," the "pang" developing the "wo." The transitions, "For" and "But" make the connection completely explicit and logical.
Surrey's version of Petrarch's theme gives strong support to Peterson's observation that the poets of the early sixteenth century read Petrarch in the light of rhetorical theory. The essential difference between the two poems is not in general conception, but in the treatment of the conception, which is in turn dictated by the difference in attitude toward their poems by the poets. Petrarch is mainly interested in presenting an atmosphere; Surrey is obviously concerned with presenting a poem which has a logical, deliberative aim; he presents not a series of images but the rhetorical amplification and logical explanation of a paradox, as well as a public demonstration of the lover's state.

Whether one of the poems is significantly better than the other is not a crucial point in this paper. In Surrey's favor I can point to the admirable conciseness of the pregnant first line and the all-inclusive sixth as well as to his perfect depiction of the very gradual calming of the sea as night slowly comes ("the waues worke lesse and lesse," 1. 5). I can also fault him for the ultra-conventional Chaucerian "ioye and wo, as in a doutful case" (1. 9), or for the object-verb syntax of "The beastes, the ayer, the birdes their song do cease" (1. 3). But to assess the relative value of the two poems is not possible because there is no logical basis for comparison aside from the general conceptions out of which they arose. J. W.
Lever compares this and other Surrey poems to their originals in Petrarch, and his general conclusion is that Surrey was concerned only with technical proficiency and that he used Petrarch as "a mere springboard for his own reflections." But he errs in requiring Surrey to duplicate Petrarch when, in fact, Surrey was not attempting duplication. One can, as Lever also does, compare methods of composition in Petrarch and Surrey, but it is finally fruitless and illogical to make value judgments on their comparative excellence except in cases of direct translation.

We also find rhetoric playing a major role in the only other poem which Surrey adapted from Petrarch. "Suche wayward ways hath loue that most part in discord" (B), a long love poem in poulters measure, is what the critics would call Petrarchan in spirit. It is curious, however, that no one calls the poem an adaptation, for not only is the traditional language of Petrarchan love poetry evident in most of the lines, but the largest section of the poem (lines 15-50) is clearly drawn from lines 151-190 of the third section of Petrarch's Trionfo D'Amore, which reads as follows:

Or so come da sé il cor si disgiunge,
E come sa far pace, guerra e tregua
E coprir suo dolor quand, altri 'l punge.
E so come in un punto si diliegua

18The Elizabethan Love Sonnet, chap. 3.
E poi si sparge per le quance il sangue,
Se paura o vergogna avvien che 'l segue.
So come sta tra' fiori ascoso 'l augue;
Come sempre fra due si vegghia e dorme;
Come senza languir si more e languis.
So della mia nemica cercar l'orme,
E temer di trovarla; e so in qual guisa
L'amante nell' amato si trasforme.
So fra lunghi sospiri e brevi risa
Stato, voglia, color cangiare spesso;
Viver, stando dal cor l'alma divisa.
So mille volte il di ingannar me stesso;
So, seguendo 'l mio foco obunqu' e' fugge.
Arder da lunge ed agghiacciar da presso.
So com' Amor sopra la mente rugge,
E com' ogni ragion indi discaccia;
E so in quante maniere il cor si strugge.
So di che poco canape s' allaccia
Un' anima gentil, quand' ella è sola
E non e chi per lei defesa foccia.
So com' Amor saetta e come vola;
E so som' or minaccia ed or percote;
Come ruba per forza e come invola;
E come sono instabili sue rote;
Le speranze dubbiose e 'l dolor oerto;
Sue promesse di fe' come son vote;
Come nell' essa il suo foco coperto
E nelle vene vive occulta piaga,
Onde morte e palese e 'ncendio aperto
In somma so com' è inconstante e vaga,
Timida, ardita vita degli amanti;
Ch' un poco dolce molto amaro appaga;
E so i costumi e i lor sospiri e canti
E 'l parlar rotto e 'l subito silenzio
E 'l brevissimo riso e i lunghi pianti.
E qual e 'l mel temperato con 'l assenzio.19

Surrey follows Petrarch closely in the general intent of the passage: the corresponding sections of the two poems are catalogues of what the lover has learned about love. He also follows him closely in diction, the repetition of "I know," "I know how," "and how" following Petrarch's "so,"

"so come," and "e come" throughout. At times he even expresses knowledge of the same things; for example, "I know how soon an hart can torn/ from warr to pease from trewse to stryfe & so agayn Retorn" (lines 15-16) corresponds closely to Petrarch's "Or so some da se il car si disgiunge,/ E come sa far pace, gureea e tregua" (lines 151-152); both poets also express knowledge of the serpent, Surrey observing "vndex the grene the sarpent how he lurkes" (l. 23) and Petrarch seeing "tra' fiori ascoso 1' augue" (l. 157); and sometimes the traditional language of love is more than a remote echo, as can be seen by comparing Surrey's "in slepyng how he wakes" (l. 28) with Petrarch's "fra due si vegghia e dorme" (l. 158) or "lovers must transforme in to the thing beloved" (l. 35) with "L' amante nell' amato si trasforme" (l. 162).

Close reading of the two passages reveals other similar echoes, but I am more interested here in the difference between Surrey's poem and its Petrarchan source. It is significant for my purposes that the essential difference between the two lies in the structure of Surrey's poem and the influence of rhetoric on that structure. The knowledge which Petrarch's lover gains about love comes from an allegorical dream vision in which he observes a

---

20 For example, Surrey, 11. 25-26 corresponds with Petrarch, lines 187-188, 39 with 166, 41 with 168, 43-44 with 169-171, 45 with 186, 47 with 177, 49 with 178, and 50 with 179, 182-183. See Padelford, pp. 216-217.
pageant of mythological and historical figures who have been captured by Love and from his own entrapment in the procession after he falls victim to the same malady. Surrey's lover, on the other hand, demonstrates through very logical deliberations how he came to know love's "Rewles."

While the major structural elements in the poem are obviously based on Surrey's rhetorical training, it is clear that in this poem also he does not allow it to control him. This is evident when we see that he again makes use of more than one rhetorical topic of invention to build the poem. In one sense, the poem depends on cause and effect: in line one Surrey summarizes the principal idea on which the poem depends in terms of the relationship between a cause, the "wayward ways" of love, and its final effect, the parting in "dyscord" of the lovers. In line two occurs a statement of the event which occurs between the advent of love and the final parting: the wills of the lovers stand against each other, and as a result the lovers' hearts no longer remain in accord. The second line demonstrates again Surrey's economy: the stubborn wills and alienated hearts are at once the effect of the "wayward ways" and an efficient cause of the final parting; at the same time they relate to each other in a miniature cause-effect relationship, the collision of the wills serving as the cause of the rupture in the relationship between the hearts.
That is not the full account of the content that Surrey has packed into those first two lines. The second topic of invention which he uses in the first part of the poem is division. It is the principal figure of amplification in lines three to fourteen, which enumerate individually the "wayward ways" of line one; thus the first phrase of line one not only serves as the cause of the effect Surrey is describing, but it also serves as the propositio for the division in the first part of the poem. Again we observe the results of Surrey\'s ability to comprehend "in a few words."

This impression is only strengthened by lines three and four: line three begins the specific enumeration of the "wayward ways" and also, together with line four, serves as an introduction to the synecesis (composition of contraries) in the next four lines. The words "dyuerse strok" serve as a kind of propositio for the division in lines five through eight: the "dysceyt" of love attacks different hearts in different ways, causing some to "rage w golden bournyng dart," while at the same time allaying others with "leden cold," In the next two lines (7 and 8) of this particular division, however, the lovers\' wounds are seen not as different in kind, but as different in degree: the amount of love in one is in "vnegall wayght" to the other. This image gives new meaning to "accord" (1. 2); the two loves do not accord, or balance, on the scale of love.
The last six lines of the division in the first part of the poem carry further the idea of the ambivalence felt by the lover. At line fifteen, however, we find a break in the poem; from this point on, Surrey no longer records the devices which Love uses to upset the lover; instead he begins to follow Petrarch, and presents to his audience the facts of life which he has learned from the experience he has narrated in the first fourteen lines. The break is accentuated by line fifteen, "Law by these rewles I know how soon an hart can torn," a statement which is admirable for its conciseness. The Songes and Sonettes version of the poem records "Lo" rather than the manuscript reading "Law," a change which seems editorial, and decided upon by editors who did not understand Surrey's economy. "Lo" is certainly a more obvious choice, because it expresses better the introduction of the next section of the poem; however, I submit that Surrey's purpose is better served by "Law," because it relates to "rewles," thus standing double duty. Such a choice, it seems to me, is consistent with the poet's obvious desire for compactness.

It is interesting, I think, that the structure of this poem is similar to that of the sonnet. As in a Petrarchan sonnet, the first part (lines 1-14) presents a situation, and the rest of the poem (lines 15-50) corresponds to a sestet in containing the comment on the situation presented in the first part. At the same time, it resembles an
English sonnet in that the last thirty-six lines consist of a series of epigrammatic statements which function much the same way as the couplet at the end of the later form. The couplets of poulter's measure serve to strengthen this impression. If such an observation is not completely gratuitous, it might be interesting to ask why Surrey did not simply write a sonnet. The answer, I suggest, lies in the sixteenth-century desire for amplification: Surrey wanted a complete catalogue of the lover's knowledge-from-experience, and not even he could pack so much into fourteen lines.

The last, and longer, section of the poem, the adaptation of the lines from the *Trionfo D'Amore*, demonstrates the point I have constantly made about Surrey's poetry: it shows his ability to synthesize his words and lines into a compact package, and it indicates both his use of, and his independence from, his traditional rhetorical background. It also shows that, while Petrarch's poem influences imagery, diction, and conceits, it does not affect the relationship of the section to Surrey's guiding rhetorical structure.

The opening line (15) of the section not only demonstrates the double meaning of "Law" and serves as a dividing-point between the first and second sections, but it serves both as an introduction to the second section and as a statement of the first effect of the lover's
acquaintance with the "rewles"; one of the lessons he has learned from those "rewles" has been "how soon an hart can torn/ from warr to pease frome trewse to stryfe & so agayn return." By making the introduction both general and specific, Surrey effects the economy of the first line of "Dyvers thy death" and the first stanza of "Wyat resteth here."

Surrey's rhetorical background taught him the organization of cause and effect; and, along with Petrarch's example, it also showed him that the traditional topic of invention, composition of contraries, was a valuable tool for the expression of the plight of the lover. He follows the first of these lessons well in enumerating the effects of his knowledge of the "rewles," but he makes it far more sophisticated by relating it to the intricate cause and effect relationship of the first two lines of the poem. He also refines the traditional composition of contraries by relating the various epigrammatic statements to one another to avoid the choppiness that would inevitably result from an extended use of that rhetorical principle.

He begins line nineteen, for example, with the coordinating conjunction, thus connecting it with the previous epigram (ll. 17-18); at the same time he joins it to the next statement (l. 20) by depending on the couplet—a connection which is necessary because the "softe dyssymled chere," while a part of the effort of the poet to "convert"
his will of line seventeen, also relates to the "face" of line twenty. Furthermore, the "paynted thoghtes" in the face in that line also relate associatively to the next two lines (21-22), which contain the description of the lover's face as it is affected by the "wayward ways of loue." Thus the six lines (17-22) form a single unit of thought, while at the same time providing three separate statements of the all-too-well-experienced lover's knowledge.

After two separate two-line epigrams (lines 23-26), Surrey presents another six-line unit (lines 27-32), the lines of which are joined by conventional Petrarchan statements of the paradox of the lover's condition. The first four are short epigrams which contain paradoxes within themselves:

I knowe in hete and cold the lover how he shakes
in syngyng how he can complayn in slepyng how he wakes
to languis & owt ache sykles for to consume
a thousand thynge for to devyse resolvyng all in fume;

They are not, however, all constructed the same: the first contains a single paradox, the second and third two each, and the fourth one again. The last part of the unit, moreover, begins an entirely new epigram, but it is connected to the previous lines because it also presents a paradox:

and thoghe he lyke to see his ladyes face full sore
suche plesuer as delytes his ey dothe not his helthe restore;

but this time the paradox is extended to two lines. The variety—both mechanical and philosophical—within the unity of the paradox of love shows that Surrey is hardly
a slave to convention, despite the conventional nature of his subject.

Line thirty-three begins a flurry of two-line epigrams. The first two lines of the section contain not only the first of these short statements, but also the introduction ("but chiefly I do know") to the rest, demonstrating again in the same familiar way Surrey's ability to make use of every part of a line or phrase. The impression that one receives from the lines that follow (35-46) is one of a growing intensity as the poet moves toward a flourishing climax. The repetition of "I know," borrowed from Petrarch, and the abrupt separation of each of the statements (as opposed to the unity of the earlier ones) contributes to the hurried, almost insane state of mind which Surrey, keeping in mind the effect the poem will have on his audience, dramatically creates.

At the same time that we observe the mechanical separation of the elements in this last section, however, we also observe a connection in thought which gives it necessary unity. The reference to the "lyon" in line forty provides a basis for a string of associations through the next several lines which associate the line with the discussion of love. The following two lines (41-42), suggesting fire and waste, relate "rage" (l. 43), which in turn makes one think of the lion again; the next line, containing "net," suggests the process of capturing a lion,
but at the same time refers to the "mashing" of a gentle heart. While the separation in this section is necessarily more pronounced than in earlier parts of the poem, the connections in thought keep the reader moving in one direction.

As suddenly as the climax rose in line thirty-four, however, it dies at line forty-seven: "the hyden trams I know and secret snares of loue" brings the reader back to the beginning of the poem—or at least to the beginning of the second section. Surrey, with no obvious transition, slows the poem down to a complete halt, not by adding a conclusion (for the "I know" construction also occurs in line forty-seven), but simply by changing the "knowledge" that he is recording to the general context of the earlier part of the poem. He thus very concisely provides the poem with a conclusion without interrupting its movement. He has used his rhetoric and he has relied upon Petrarch, but he has not allowed them to control his own invention. This is certainly imitation which is essentially creative.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION: TRADITION AND ORIGINALITY

My purpose in the first chapter of this study was to examine the reasons for the modern blight in the critical reputation of Surrey's poetry and in the next four to demonstrate that the best method for examining—and appreciating—his work is by reading it through the structural patterns which he learned from an education centered in rhetoric and logic. At the same time, I have tried to show the individual qualities which appear most often in his poetry, and which, therefore, might be called "Surreyan": (1) the use of a generalized opening statement; (2) a sense of the dramatic situation; (3) an ability to economize; and (4) a tendency to construct images which seem at first glance to be highly associative and disconnected but which are actually logically linked. In this chapter I shall examine those four qualities individually, and quite apart from rhetorical considerations. For they indicate that although he made excellent use of his tradition, Surrey was also an original poet.

We have observed the generalized opening statement in "Alas so all thinges nowe doe holde their peace" and con-
trasted it with Petrarch's very specific series of images at the beginning of the poem from which Surrey adapted his. We find it also in "Laid in my quyet bedd" (AH, III), where the speaker spends the first four lines introducing, in generalities, the "heape of thoughtes" (l. 2) which he goes on to specify after his four-line introduction. The same opening generalities appear in "Gyrtt In my giltesse gowne" (AH, II), where the speaker makes first the general observation that "thinges are not in dead/ as to the outward showe" (l. 2) before detailing those "thinges." And in "Wrapt In my careless cloke" (T, X), he first records the general activities which show "what force there reigneth in his [Cupid's] bow" (l. 2) before applying those to a specific "wounded wight" (l. 9, ff.). Even in a narrative of a lion and a wolf he chooses to begin with the observation, "Eache beast can chuse his feere/ according to his minde" (AH, IV).

The dramatic qualities of the particular situations in the Wyatt elegies and the "oratorical" poems is quite apparent. We can also observe them in "Laid in my quyet bedd," which is not only presented in a particular dramatic setting, but is spoken by a character who is extremely old:

I saw my with'ryd skyne
how it doth shew my dynted Iawes/ the flesh was worne so thynne
And eke my tothelesse chapps/ the gates of my right way that opes and shuttes as I do speake/ do thus vnto me say
Thle whyte and horishe heares/ the messengers of age.
bides thee lay hand and feele/ them hanging on this chyn
the which do wryt twoe ages past/ the thurd now comming in.

(lines 15-19, 21-22)

This is a poem written by a man who died when he was twenty-nine years old. The same kind of dramatic situation appears in "In winters lust returne" (T. VII), where the persona identifies himself in this way:

I am (quoth I) but poore, and simple in degree:  
A shepardes charge I haue in hand, vnworthy though I be.

(lines 35-36)

This written by a man who was hardly poor, far from simple, and who had been called "the moste folish prowde boy in England." Of course, there is nothing unique about the dramatic dialogue of "In winters lust returne" or in the picture of the old man in "Laid in my quyet bedd," but they do reemphasize the dramatic qualities of Surrey's poetry which we have seen in his better works. It is interesting that we find little of this in Wyatt. John Erskine has pointed out, rightly or wrongly, that in Wyatt's love lyrics, the reader feels "a common personality in them all;"¹ Whether this is true of Wyatt or not I have not decided; but it is definitely not the case with Surrey, who ranges from courtly praise in "ffrom Tuscan cam my ladies worthi race" to suffering victim in "As ofte as I behold and see" to angry avenger in "Although I had a check"

¹The Elizabethan Lyric, p. 72.
(T. IX), which he ends with a transparently sexual warning to a lady who had rejected him:

Defend it; if thou may:
Stand stiffe, in thine estate.
For sure I will assay
If I can glue the mate.

(lines 29-32)

His conciseness is probably the most pervasive quality in Surrey's poetry. We have found it in most of his better poems in the previous three chapters. We can also see it in another, "When windesor walles" (P. VII), one of his finest sonnets. He begins the poem with a very concrete picture of himself in Windsor Prison:

When windesor walles sustain'd my wearied arme
my hand, my chyn, to ease my restles hed.

It is not difficult to imagine the exact scene in these lines: Surrey, bored with prison life, leaning his arm on the stones of his cell and (in the elliptical second line) cradeling his chin in his hand, which in turn supports his head. In two lines he has painted a portrait as clear as an artist's. But the opening lines are not only concise in themselves; they also present, as many of Surrey's openings do, a key to the development of the rest of the poem. The crucial word in the opening is "restles." At first Surrey presents it as part of a purely physical picture of a man resting his restless head on his hand. But after describing the physical scene that his eyes had observed at Windsor (lines 3-6), he begins painting the mental picture of what had passed at the palace in his childhood:
than did to mynd resort
the Io\^lly woes the hateles short debate
the rakhell life that longes to loves disporte
(lines 6-8)

The "restles hedd" is no longer part of a physical portrait; it has become a restless mind, and the picture here is one of a mental process in which the memory brings back the pictures of "So crewell prison." This in turn causes his sorrowful reaction in the last six lines, where the restless mind becomes a "hevy charge" (l. 9) which is both physical and mental: it is heavy in a physical sense, much as the head resting on the "wearied arme" in the first two lines; but it is also heavy in the emotional sense, the "Io\^lly woes" in his restless mind becoming lodged in his breast (l. 10), and finally breaking out in "smoky sigh's" (l. 11) and "drery teares" (l. 12). In short, Surrey has moved from a physical picture to a mental one and back to a physical one again, all of which is keyed by the opening image of a man resting his head on his hand.

"When windesor walles" is admirable not only for its economy, but also for the last "Surreyan" quality which I wish to discuss, the associative yet logical movement of his imagery. The movement from restless head to restless mind to restless breast is very natural, but at the same time highly logical. We saw the same quality in the movement from the flea and the flame to the flea and the spider in "As ofte as I behold and see." It is also apparent in "When youthe had led me half the race" (P, IV), where it is
the very basis of the structure. The key word in the poem is "eyes"; each stanza relates the eyes to the functions and problems of the lover. In the first stanza, the experienced lover looks back on the lessons he has learned; in the second he sees how his eyes, "to greedye of their hire/ had lost me manye a noble praye" (lines 5-8). He implies through the imagery of his eyes in the next four stanzas how his eyes had betrayed him: spending the day "in sightes," he could not hide his grief because the "boyling smoke" in his eyes indicated to all "the fervent rage of hidden flame" (stanza 3); "salt teares" (stanza 4) and "greedye lookes" also "did oft renewe/ the hydden wound within my brest" (stanza 5). In the next stanza (6) he explains that "everye looke," presumably at his lady, betrayed him. At this point (stanza 7), he switches to a consideration of the eyes of others: Cupid taught him too late that he must not betray himself, that he must "paynt all kynd of coloure newe/ to blynde their eyes that elles should see/ my sparskled chekes ḟ Cupydes hewe." He concludes (stanza 8) by saying that now that he is more experienced, he no longer allows his eyes to send out the "blasing sparkes" which would betray the "sacred flame" in his breast. The poem begins in maturity, recounts logically the pains of immaturity, and returns, logically, to maturity again, through all of which the eye imagery remains a consistent, logical part of the tale.
The best example of Surrey's associative-logical imagery, however, is also one of the best poems, "The sonne hath twyse brought forthe the tender grene" (P. I). On the surface it seems quite simple, a combination of Chaucerian nature with Petrarchan love. Actually it is quite complex, and the complexity is not a little caused by the logical manipulation of images which seem at first glance to be only tenuously and associatively connected. Surrey begins, properly enough, by giving the setting for his poem. We learn, in a roundabout way, that two springs and one winter have passed:

The sonne hath twyse brought forthe the tender grene,
and cladd the yerthe in livelye lustynes,
once have the wyndes the trees dispoyled clene,
and now agayne begynnes their cruelnes. (lines 1-4)

Puttenham would have called such an opening merismus ("when we may conueniently vtter a matter in one entier speach or proposition and will rather do it peecemeale and by dis tribution of every part for amplification sake") or periphrasis ("as when we go about the bush").

Surrey does not choose the figure for its own sake; he is attempting to emphasize the length of time that has passed "sins I have hidd vnder my brest the harms/ that never shall recouer helthfulnes" (lines 5-6). More important, the opening prepares the reader for the structural basis of the major part of the poem: the passage of time and its

Arte, pp. 222-223, 193.
relationship to the "harme" suffered by the lover. Surrey divides the poem into three parts: first, he constructs an extended figure of similitude and dissimilitude between the trials of love and the passage of the seasons; second, he discusses love as it relates to the passage from day to night, not in a simile, but in the reality of day-night experience; in the third part, he returns to a simile, the Petrarchan comparison between the lover and the ship at sea, at which point he changes from time to space as a structural device. Within this larger pattern, he moves from point to point with highly associative yet logical transitions.

Having established his subject as the passage of the seasons and the pain of love in the first six lines, he goes on in the next six to construct a logical analogy between the two. He has simply associated one kind of thinking about seasons and love with another. Comparative thinking leads him to the realization of the difference between the seasons and himself:

```
the wynters hurt recovers \ the warme;
the perched grene restored is \ shade
what warmth alas may sarve for to disarm
the froosyn hart that my inflame hath madel
what colde agayne is hable to restore
my freshe grene yeres that wither thus & faade!
```

In associating the seasons with love, he naturally utters the Petrarchan paradox in the language of the seasons ("froosyn hart," "colde," "freshe grene yeres that wither thus & faade"). The associations not only influence the
relationship between the first six lines and the second, but also the language of love. The logic of the cold-warm analogy is consistent with the paradox of love: either cold or warm will relieve him because his "harme" is the paradoxical hot-cold condition of love.

The relationship between the seasons and his love then leads the lover to consider explicitly the relationship between his condition and the passage of time:

\[
\text{but tyme somtyme reduceth a retoume; yet tyme my harme increseth more & more.} \quad (\text{lines 14-15})
\]

Again the only conclusion is that his condition is contrary to the natural one; time does not heal his wound; his condition, unlike that of the "wynters hurt" and "perched grene," is not cyclical, but linear; time does not heal the wound of the lover. This abrupt realization of another contrast between natural and unnatural leads him to consider in more detail the death-in-life state (l. 17) of the lover, a state which is unnatural not only when compared to the larger, seasonal fluctuations, but also when compared to the daily changes in the lives of other creatures:

\[
\text{echo thing aliue that sees the heaven \& eye}
\w \text{croke of night maye cover and excuse}
\text{him self from travaile of the days vnrest}
save I alas . . .
\text{and when the somhe hath eke the darke represt}
\text{and brought the daie \& doth nothing abaat}
\text{the travaile of my endles smart \& payne.} \quad (\text{lines 19-27})
\]

He has moved from seasons to days, and he has emphasized his sorrowful state by showing that the paradoxical contrast
between himself and others in their daily existence is the same as the contrast between himself and the seasons.

While ruefully thinking about these things he begins to think in terms of space as well as time:

and w my mynd I measure paas by paas
to seke that place where I my self haad lost
that daye that I was tangled in that laase.
(lines 32-34)

In thinking of moving "paas by paas" he obviously begins to associate himself with the Petrarchan sea-traveler. This change, however, is strengthened by an earlier thought: when remembering the torment of his night-thoughts, he had cursed "eche starr" as the "cawser" of his woe (1. 24); it is tempting to imagine that the poet had his lover mention those earlier stars so that he could bring them in again in the later section, when they are portrayed not as arbiters of fate but as guides for the sailor. In any case, the association between the two thoughts results again in the same logical paradox:

for yf I fynde somtyme that I have sought
those starres by whom I trusted of the port
my sayles do fall and I advaunce right nought
as anchord fast my sprites do all resort
to stand atgaas and sucke in more & more
(lines 38-42)

As his condition was changeless in contrast to the changes of the seasons and the days, so it is changeless in contrast to the spatial progress of the star-guided sailor. The complete changelessness of the lover's state in all three parts of the poem is emphasized again in the last few
lines when the imagery of travel in space is linked with the imagery of the seasons:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{and yf I flye I carrey & me still} \\
\text{the venymd shaft which dothe his force restore} \\
\text{for alas in sylence all to long} \\
\text{of myne old hurt yet fele the wound but grene.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(lines 45-46, 49-50)

And Surrey's sailor is left to a fate which he was later to share with Coleridge's Ancient Mariner.

"The sonne hath twyse brought forthe the tender grene" certainly illustrates Surrey's individual abilities, as do all of his better poems. However, in a discussion of the individual characteristics of his poetry, it is necessary to temper extravagant claims for individuality just as it is important not to overemphasize the dominance of the rhetorical handbooks over his best works. This becomes clear when one realizes that each of the unique, "Surreyan" characteristics that I have been discussing can be related to the rhetorical tradition itself. The generalized beginning is obviously better adapted to a major premise or to a rhetorical thesis that is to be deliberated or demonstrated than is a specific one; and certainly it is more useful for setting up a logical topic of invention. As for Surrey's drama, his dramatic situations are more often than not the result of his desire to set up rhetorical situations, as is obvious particularly in his "oratorical" poems. Furthermore, the quality of conciseness which is evident in all of his best poems is not to be taken as Surrey's own private
ideal; on the contrary, the major emphasis in discussions of *elocutio* in the rhetorical handbooks during his time was on the quality of clarity, succinctness, and directness of speech, all three of which would help to "augment" the English tongue. Finally, the logical qualities in Surrey's "associative" imagery were also prescribed to him by the rhetoricians, and were part of that which made most of the imagery in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries distinctive, as Rosemond Tuve has clearly shown in *Elizabethan and Metaphysical Imagery*.

It is also necessary, perhaps, to say that Surrey obviously does not demonstrate all of those "individual" qualities in all of his poems— or even one of them in some. Although he chooses the general beginning for one narrative, "Eache beast can chuse his feere," he does not for "When somer toke in hand" (T. II) or for "In winters iust returne," but begins, in the ordinary narrative way, by giving the setting. Nor does one find dramatic moments in all of his poems. Conciseness is not usually apparent in his narratives, for example, because the form itself is given to more discursiveness.

What all of this comes to is the conclusion that Surrey brought to each poem whichever traditional patterns and individual qualities were useful for that particular poem.

---

As he was dramatic or general, concise or associative depending on his understanding of the quality needed in a poem, so he used a particular rhetorical pattern only when it served his purpose. Perhaps his manipulation of established patterns is a more significant indicator of his individual talent than the qualities which I have discussed in this chapter. Two final examples will suffice to illustrate such a conclusion.

Surrey has always justly been given credit for inventing what we call the "Shakespearian" or "English" sonnet, a form which requires less rhymes than the Petrarchan form and which was valuable for the epigrammatic ending. What is universally ignored, however, is that Surrey, who was probably interested in experimenting with various sonnet patterns, was no more tied to the rhyme-scheme of his own invention than he was to the traditional patterns of the oration or the elegy. In "Alas so all thinges nowe doe holde their peace" his opening generalization does not allow the sonnet to follow the three-quatrains-plus-couplet structure which one would assume necessarily follows the rhyme-pattern. And in "When windesor walles," he divides the thought-structure in the middle of the sixth line and closes with a Petrarchan sestet—again despite the rhyme-scheme.

His most significant departure from the English structure, however, occurs in "The golden gift that nature did
thee gene" (T. IV), for in it we see most clearly his manipulation of tradition. The rhyme-scheme is his own English form, but, as in "When windesor walles," the thought pattern is Petrarchan. Significantly, the reason for this deviation is to be found in the rhetorical-logical tradition. The "octave" of the sonnet presents what are essentially two logical premises: the first states that "the golden gift," given to the lady by nature, proves to the lover that she was created to show nature's skill at the creation of beauty (lines 1-4); the second follows this with the obvious point that if nature troubled herself to create such beauty in one woman, she must have created "other graces" in the woman also (lines 5-8). The "sestet" is the logical conclusion to the two premises: "Now certesse Ladie, sins all this is true" (l. 9), i.e., given the already-established fact that the lady possesses outward beauty given by nature, and given also the fact that outward beauty is an indication of inner "graces" (a standard courtly truism), it logically follows that the lady must "not deface them than with fansies newe" (l. 11); she must not, in short, betray the lover. The poem is a syllogism, and because a syllogism does not fit with the four-part structure of his own sonnet-form, Surrey chooses to follow the Petrarchan, still keeping his own rhyme-pattern.

We see the manipulation of a different pattern in "ffrom Tuscan cam my ladies worthi race" (P. VI), the
"love" poem which began the legend that Elizabeth Fitzgerald was Surrey’s Laura. It is usually thought of as a love complaint, and if one only considers its last section, it qualifies as that. However, the major part of the poem marks it less as a love complaint than as a courtly encomium, a poem of praise for a living person. And as such, its structure, logically enough, parallels the pattern outlined by the rhetoricians for the biographical praise section of the personal elegy.

It is in the organization of the first eight lines of the sonnet that the prescribed pattern of praise occurs. The first two lines,

ffrom Tuscan cam my ladys worthi race
faire fflorence was sometime her auncient seate,

present "Geraldines" lineage, her "house or ancestrie" as well as her "Realme," to use Wilson’s terms. The next two lines record the place of her birth:

the westorne Ile (whose pleasaut shore doth face
wyld Chambares Clifford) did geve her lyvely heate,
the words "did geve her lyvely heate" referring to her entrance into life. The next four lines take her through infancy and childhood:

ffostred she was ♦ mylke of Irishe brest
her Syer ♢ erle, hir dame, of princes bloud
from tender yeres in britaine she doth rest
♦ a kingses child where she tastes gostly foode.

In these eight lines, Surrey has included two of the three parts of biographical praise—before birth and in life;
obviously, he could not include the "mannes state," or adulthood, the subject of his praise being only a young girl.

It is not until the third quatrain that the sonnet turns from praise to plaint:

Honsdon did furst present her to myn eyen
bryght ys her hew and Geraldine she hight
Hampton me taught to wishe her furst for myne
and Wind'sor alas doth chace me from her sight.

While the second line of the quatrain follows the praise formula of bringing in other virtues as well as including the name of the subject, this section mainly presents the poet's first meeting and first feeling of love for Geraldine. It is therefore quite interesting to notice that, while the direction of the poem changes at this point, the structure of its sentences does not. Through the first two quatrains the major "characters" in the sonnet were places—"Tuscan," "the westorne Ile," and "britaine," all of which acted upon, or were causes for, the existence of Geraldine. In the third quatrain, the actors are also places: Honsdon first presented Geraldine to the poet. Hampton taught him to love her, and (in a fine climactic understatement) Windsor tower prevents him from seeing her. Surrey has cleverly made use of the traditional pattern of praise in the first two quatrains to move smoothly and unobtrusively into the love complaint of the third. The controlling structure of the poem—even the controlling pattern of its sentences—comes from the same rhetorical advice which we
have already seen manifested in Surrey's personal elegies.

In "The golden gift" and "ffrom Tuscan cam." then, Surrey demonstrates what is finally his most prominent "individual" characteristic: his ability to make use of any pattern, any resource, from the traditional poetic and rhetorical traditions available during his time to write poems which are both traditional and original at the same time. It is fruitless to study his poetry without understanding the necessity for seeing both the resources and his significant departures from, and manipulations of, those resources in his best poems, for Surrey's poetry is a perfect example of the wisdom of the following statement by J. A. K. Thomson:

The entirely original poet does not exist; if he did, we could not understand him. He must occupy some ground in common with his audience . . . . In particular the poet's mind is forever echoing with words and rhythms that have been suggested to it. He may be so far original that he can made new combinations of these, but he needs them in order to make the combinations.*

---

APPENDIX

Note on the Transcripts

Any edition of the poetry of Surrey must necessarily be considered with caution because of the lamentable fact that there is available no autograph copy of a single one of his poems. Thus only external evidence is available to identify Surrey’s poetry as his own. The only course open for one who wishes to provide transcripts of Surrey’s poetry, therefore, is to attempt to determine the earliest and most dependable text, and to record it as accurately as possible. I include here a short discussion of those texts which I have chosen as well as my policies in copying them.

My two principal sources are Professor Hughey's The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry (AH), and BM Add. MS. 36529 (P), another Harington manuscript. These two collections, according to Professor Hughey, are the two most important manuscript sources for Surrey’s poetry. She estimates that AH was compiled between 1550 and 1560, and that it perhaps goes back even to the final period of the reign of Henry VIII. Although P is called a late

1 "The Harington Manuscript at Arundel Castle and Related Documents," p. 413

2 The Arundel Harington Manuscript, I.
sixteenth-century manuscript in the British Museum's Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts. Professor Hughey believes that it actually dates between 1555 and 1560, and that it is made up "almost completely of English poetry composed before 1565." The manuscript was later owned by Thomas Park, who used it for his 1804 edition of Nugae Antiquae, and later by Thomas Hill, who allowed Nott to use it for his edition. After being lost for some time after that it came into the possession of the British Museum.

The value of the two collections is obvious: both are roughly contemporary with the Songes and Sonettes (1557); in fact Professor Hughey, in her notes to one of Surrey's poems, states that both are earlier, and that P stands between AH and the Songes and Sonettes. AH contains seventeen complete poems that are certainly Surrey's. Of these, eleven are either fragments, paraphrases of the Psalms and Ecclesiastes, or prologues to the paraphrases, none of which I am including; another appears in an earlier manuscript (B; see below). P contains twenty-eight poems by Surrey, one of which is also included in AH, ten of which

5 The Arundel Harington Manuscript, II, p. 94. For a complete discussion of both AH and P, see this work.
are prologues or paraphrases, and one of which is in B. My basis of selection has been to consider AH earlier than P, and thus I have used AH for transcripts of five poems and P for transcripts of sixteen. For the transcripts I have used Professor Hughey's book and her photographic copy of P.

Unfortunately, significant manuscript sources are not available for twenty of Surrey's poems; thus I have been forced to transcribe nineteen from the first edition of the Songes and Sonettes (T, June 5, 1557), a photographic copy of which Professor Hughey has also consented to let me use. While these sources are early enough, they are not dependable because the editor(s) "improved" the poetry before printing it. Nevertheless it is the only available early version of those poems.

For three poems, separate sources are available. One of them, "Wyat resteth here," is valuable for two reasons: it is the only poem by Surrey published during his lifetime, and it is the only poem by him which appears in a printed version earlier than any of the extant manuscripts. It appeared in 1542 in a small, separately-published pamphlet which included two other poems, and which was entitled as follows:

An excellent Epi=| taffe of syr Thomas Wyat
With two | other compendious dytties, wherin
are touchyd, and set furth the state of mannes life.6

The pamphlet is printed in black letter, with a wood-cut of Wyatt, identified in another source as done by "a Dutch-Man commonly call'd Hans Holben" from his own painting.7 The colophon reads, "Imprynted at London by John Her = forde for Roberte Toye." The other two poems included in it are not by Surrey and have nothing to do with Wyatt.

One poem, "Suche wayward ways," exists in \textit{AH}, \textit{P}, and the so-called "Blage Manuscript" (\textit{B}). I have chosen \textit{B} because it is without doubt the earliest version, having been written, according to Professor Hughey, in the hand of John Harington of Stepney. Since Harington was a contemporary of Surrey's and possibly had access to the poet's autograph manuscript, we have in this source the earliest known manuscript version of a Surrey poem. It belonged to Sir George Blage (1512-1551), a friend of both Wyatt and Surrey.8 It is catalogued as MS. D. 2. 7 in the library at Trinity College, Dublin. For my transcript I have used Professor Hughey's photograph of the manuscript.

\footnote{6\textit{STC 26054}; I have examined a photostatic copy of the Surrey poem, which is owned by Professor Hughey, and also a microfilm of the whole pamphlet on a microfilm of the copy in the Huntington Library.}

\footnote{7\textit{The Itinerary of John Leland the Antiquary} \ldots, II, \textit{sig A}^5v.}

The earliest known source for "Norfolk sprang thee" is in *Remaines of a Greater Worke, Concerning Britaine*, compiled by William Camden and published in London in 1605. Its contents include a history of the British peoples, a dissertation on the English language, lists of English Christian names and surnames, anagrams, famous speeches, and "Certaine Poems, or Poesies, Epigrammes, Rythmes, and Epitaphs of the English Nation in former times." Surrey's poem (sig g⁵, p. 50) is included among the epitaphs and is wrongly ascribed by Camden to "The noble Thomas Earle of Surrey."

With a few exceptions, I have attempted here to present a literal transcript of each of the poems; thus I have preserved the original spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and contractions. My only consistent silent emendations have been the changing of the long s to the modern form, the omission of virgules, and, in the Wyatt *excellente Epitaffef*, the replacement of broken letters. I have also silently omitted decorative devices, such as the pilcrum.

All other emendations are individual, or are few enough in number to be recorded here. I have used the *AH* reading of "dothe not" in line thirty-two of "Suche wayward ways," first because it completes the sense of the contrary construction, and second because it preserves the regularity of the meter; its omission, I think, suggests that the
error is the transcriber's. In line three of "Wyat resteth here," I have placed the comma in another position because of what looks like an error by an editor or printer. For the same reason I have also changed "game" in the same poem to "gayn" from the Songes and Sonettes. I have replaced the macron with the n in "convert" in line seventeen of "Suche wayward ways," and have omitted the single parenthesis mark from line ten of "In the rude age" because there seems no reason for its being there. Finally, I have changed the "seuen" to "four" in "Norfolk sprang thee" because of an obvious printer's error.
From MS. D. 2. 7, Trinity College, Dublin
(The "Blage" Manuscript)
Suche wayward ways hath
dysoncords wills do the stand
wherby
dysoncords hartes but seldom do the
acord
Dysceyt is his deyght and to begyll and mok
the symple hartes whyche he do the stryke
[strok]
he causeth the hartes to rage
golden bournyng darts
and do the aley leded cold agayn the others hart
hot glaymes of bournyng fyer and easy sparkes of flame
in balance of vnegall wayght he ponderythe by ayme
frome easy ford wher I myght wade and pase full well
he me wdraws and do the me dryue in to the dark depe
well
and me withholdes wher I ame cald and offerd place
and wylethe that styll my mortall fo I do beseche of grace:
he letes me to purswe a conquest well ner woon
to folow wher my paynes wer spylt or that my sewt begoon
Law my thes Hewles I know how soon an hart can torn
from warr to pease frome trewse to stryfe & so agayne

Retorn

I know how to convert my wyll in others lust
of lytle stuf vn to my self to weve a webb of trust
and how to hyd my harme lede dyssymyled chere
What in my face the pyned thohtes kold owtwardly
apere

I know how that the blood forsakes the face for dred
and how by shame yt staynes agayn the chekes w flamyng red
I know und the grene the serpent how he lurkes
the hamar of the restles forge I know eke how yt wurkes
I know and can by Rot the tale that I wold tell
but ofte the wordes come forthe a wry of hyme that loveth
well
I know in hete and cold the lover how he shakes
in syngyng how he can compleyn in slepyng how he wakes
to languis w owt ache sykles for to consume
a thosand thynges for to devyse resolvyng all in fume
and thoghe he lyke to see his ladyes face full sore
suche plesuer as delytes his ey dothe not his helthe
restore
I know to seake the trake of my desyered fo
yet fear to fynd that I do seake but chefly I do know
that lovers must transforme in to the thing beloved
and lyve alas who cold beleue w spryt frome lyf removed
I know in harte syghes and laghters of the spleen
at once to change my stat my wyll and ek my colur clean
I know how to dyseaue my self w owten helpe
and how the lyon chastned is w beatyng of the whelpe
in standyng nere my fyer I know how that I freese
far of to burn in bothe to wast and so my self to leese
I know how loue dothe rage vpon an yolden mynd
how small a net may take and mashe an hart of jentle kynd
that.seldome tasted sweet to seasonid heps of gall
revyved w a glynt of grace old sorows to let fall
the hyden trams I know and secret snares of loue
how sone alooke may prynt a thoght that nev'rwyl remove
the slyper state I know and sodayn torns from welthe
that dowt full hope that sartayn wo & suer dyspayr of
helthe
From An excellent Epitaff e

of syr Thomas Wyat . . . (1542)
Wyat resteth here, that quicke coulde neuer rest.
    Whose heuenly gyftes, encreased by dysdayne
And vertue, sanke the deper in his best
    Suche profyte he, of enuy could optayne

A Head, where wydom mysteries dyd frame
    Whose hammers beat styll in that lyuely brayne
As on a styth, where some worke of Fame
    Was dayly wrought, to turn to Brytayns gayn

A Vysage sterne and mylde, where both did groo
    Vyce to contempne, in vertues to rejoyce
Amyd great stormes, whome grace assured soo
    To lyue vprighte and smyle at fortunes choyse.

A Hand that taught, what might be saide in rime
    That refte Chaucer, the glorye of his wytte
A marke, the whiche (vnperfited for tyme)
    Some may approche but neuer none shall hyt:

A Tonge, that serued in foraine realmes his king
    Whose curtoise talke, to vertu dyd enflame.
Eche noble harte a worthy guyde to brynge
    Our Englysshe youth, by trauayle vnto fame.

An Eye, whose judgement, no affect coulde blind
    Frendes to allure, and foes to reconcyle
Whose pearcynge looke, dyd represent a mynde.
    with vertue fraught, reposed, voyde of gyle.
A Harte, where drede, yet neuer so imprest
To hide the thought y might the trouth auaunce
In neyther fortune, lyfte nor so represt
To swell in welth, nor yelde vnto mischaunce

A valiaunt Corps, where force and beautye met
Happy, alas, to happy but for foos.
Lyued, and ran the race that nature set
Of manhodes shape, where she the mold did loos
But to the heauens, the symple soule is fleed.
Which lefte with such, as couet Christe to knowe
witnes of faith that neuer shalbe deade
Sent for our welth, but not receiued so
Thus for our gylt, that ielowell haue we lost
The earth his bones, the heuen possesse his goost

AMEN.
Poems from The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry
London hast thou accused me  
of breache of lawes the roote of stryfe  
within whose brest did boyle to see  
so fervent hote thye dissolute lyf  
that even the hate of syns that groo  
within thie wicked walls so ryfe  
for to breake forthe did convert so  
that terreur could it not represse  
the whiche by wordes synce preachers knoo  
what hope is left for to redresse  
by vnknowen meanes it lyked me  
my hydden bourden to expresse  
wherby it might appeare to the  
that secreat synne hath secreat spight  
from iustice rodde no faulte is free  
but that all suche as workes vnright  
in moste quyet are nexte ill rest  
in secreat scylence of the night  
this made me with a recklesse brest  
to wake thie sluggards with my bowe  
A fygure of the lordes behest  
whose skourdge for synne the scryptures shew  
that as the fearfull thonder clapp  
by Suddayne flame at hand we know
of peoble stones the sowndlesse rap;
ye dredfull plague might make the see
of goddes wrathe that doth thee enwrapp
that pryde might know from conscience free
howe loftie workes may her defend
and envye fynde as he hath sought
how other seke hym to offend
and wrath tast of eache crewell thought
the just shape hyer in the end
and ydle slowth that never wrought
to heaven his spirite lift may begyn
and greedye lucker lyve in dred
to see what hate ill gote goodes wyn
the lechers ye that lustes do feede
perceave what secreacye is in syn
and gluttons hartes for sorow bleede
awaked when their fault they fynde
in lothsome vyce eache dronken wight
to styrr to god this was my mynd
thie wyndowes hadd done me no spight
but proud people that dread no fall
clothed with falsheid and vnright
bredd in the closures of thie wall
but wrested to wrath in fervent zeale
thow hast to strif my secrete call
endured hartes no warninge feele
Oh shameless whore is dread then gon
by suche thie foes as meantt thie weale
Oh menbre of falce Babylon
the shopp of crafte, the den of yre
thye dreadfull dome drawes fast vppon
thie Martyres blood by sword and fyre
in heaven and earth for justice call
the lord shall heare their iust desyre
the flambe of wrathe shall on the fall
with famyne and pest lamentable
stryken shall be thie Lechers all
thie proud towers and turretes hye
enmyes to god beat stone from stone
thyne Idolls burnt that wrought iniquitie
when none thie ruyne shall bemone
but render vnto the rightuous lord
that so hath iudged Babylon
Immortall prayse with one accorde

II
Gyrtt in my giltlesse gowne / As I sytt heare and [Fol.]37
sowe
I see that thinges are not in dead / as to the owtward shows
And who so lyst to looke / and note thinges somwhat neare
Shall fynde wheare playnesse semes to haunte / nothing but craft appeare
ffor with indifferent eyes / my self can well discearme 5
how som to guyd a shyppe in stormes / styckes not to take
the stearne
whose skill and Comminge tryed / in calme to steare a bardge
they wolde sone shau yow shold sone see / it weare to great
a chardge
And some I see agayne / sytt still and say but small
that can do ten tymes more than they / that say they can do
all
whose goodlye gyftes are suche / the more they understand
the more they seeke to learne and know / and take lesse
chardge in hand
And to declare more playne / the tyme flyttes, not so fast
but I can beare right well in mynd / the song now sung and
past
The Awctour whearof cam / wrapt in a craftye cloke 15
in will to force a flamyng fyre / wheare he could rayse
no smoke
If powre and will had mett / as it appeareth playne
the truth nor right had tane no place / their vertues had
bene vayne
So that you may perceave / and I may safelye see
the innocent that gyltless is / condemnpd sholde have
be
Muche lyke vntruth to this / the storye doth declare
Wheare th' elders layd to Susans chardge / meete matter to
compare
They did her both accuse / and eke condempne her to
and yet no reason right nor truthe / did lead them so to do
And she thus iudg'd to dye / toward her death went
forthe
ffraughted wth faith a pacient pase / taking her wrong in
worthe
But he that doth defend / all those that in hym trust
Did Raise a Childe for her defence / to shyeld her from th'
uniust
And Danyell chosen was / then of this wrong to weete
How, in what place and eke with whome / she did this
Cryme comytt
He caws'd the Elders part / the one from th' others sight
and did examyne one by one / and chardg[e]o) them bothe say
right
Vnd*ra Mvlberye trye / it was fyrst sayd the one
The next nam’d e a Pomegranate trye / whereby the truth was
knowne
Than Susan was dischardg’d / and they condempen’d to
dye
as right requereas and they deserve / that fram’d e so fowll
a lye
And he that her preserv’d / and lett them of their lust
Hath me defendyd hetherto / and will do still I trust
Laid in my guyet bedd, in study as I weare
I saw within my troubled hed, a heape of thoughtes appeare
And every thought did shew, so lyvelye in myne eyes
that now I sight, and then I smylde, as cause of thought
did ryse
I saw the lytle boye, in thought how ofte that he
Did wishe of god to scape the rodd / a tall yong man to be
The yong man eke that feeleth, his bones with paynes opprest
how he wold be a riche olde man / to lyve and lye att rest
The ryche olde man that sees / his end draw on so sore
how he wolde be a boye agayne / to lyve so moche the
more
wheare at full ofte I smylde / to see how all theise three
ffrom boy to man, from man to boy / wold chopp and chaunge
degree
And myssinge thus I thinck / the case is very straunge
that man from wealth to lyve in woe / doth ever seeke to
chaunge
Thus thoughtfull as I lay / I saw my with'ryd skynne
how it doth shew my dynted lawes / the flesshe was worn
so thynne
And eke my tothelesse chapps / the gates of my right way
that opes and shuttes as I do speake / do thus vnto me say
Thie whyte and horishe heares / the messenger of age
that shew lyke lynes of true belief / that this lif
dothe asswage
bides thee lay hand and feel / them hanging on thie chyn
the whiche do wryte twoe ages past / the thurd now comming
in
Happ vpp therfore the bitt / of thie yonge wanton tyme
and thow that theare in beaten art / the happyest lif
defyne
Whereat I sight and said / farewell my wonted ioye
trusse vpp thie pack and trudge from me / to every lytle boye
And tell them thus from me / their tyme moste happie is
Yf to their tyme they reason had / to know the truthe of this.

IV
Each beast can chuse his feere / according to his minde
and eke to shew a frindlie cheare / lyke to their beastlye kynd
A Lyon saw I theare / as whyte as any snow
which seemyd well to leade the race / his porte the same did shew
Uppon this gentyll beast / to gaze it lyked me
ffor still me thought it seemyd me / of noble blood to be
And as he prauunced before / still seeking for a make
as whoe wolde say there is none heare / I trow will me forsake
I might perceave a woolf / as whyte as whale his bone
A fayrer beast, a fressher hew / beheld I never none  
Save that her lookes wear fearce / and froward eke her grace  
toward the whiche this gentle beast / gan hym advaunce  
space  
And with a beck full low / he bowed at her feete  
in humble wyse as who wold say / I am to Farr vnmeete  
but suche a scornfull cheere / wheare with she hym rewarded  
Was never seene I trowe the lyke / to suche as well deservid  
Wheare with she startt a syde / well neare a foote or twayne  
and vnto hym thus gan she saye / with spight and great disdayne  
Lyon she said yf thou / hast known my mynde beforne  
thow hadst not spentt this travaile thus / and all thi payne forlorne  
Do waye I lett the weete / thou shalt not playe with me  
but raunce aboute, thow maiste seeke oute / some meeter feere for the  
fforthwith he beatt his taile / his eyes begonne to flame  
I might perceave his noble harrt / moche moved by the same  
Yet saw I hym refrayne / and eke his rage asswage  
and vnto her thus gan he say / whan he was past his rage  
Crewell you do me wronge / to sett me thus so light  
Without desert for my good will / to shew me suche dispight  
How can you thus entreat / a Lyon of the race
that with his paws a Crowned Kinge / devoured in the
place
Whose nature is to prea / vpon no symple foode
as longe as he may suck the fleshe / and drinck of noble
bloode
Yf you be faire & freshe / am I not of your hew [Fol. 51\(^v\)]
and for my Vaunte I dare well say / my blood is not untrew
ffor you your selfe dothe know / it is not long agoe
sins that for love one of the race / did end his life in woe
In towre both strong and highe / for his assured truthe
wheare as in teares he spent his breath / alas the more
the ruthe
This gentle beast lyke wise / who nothinge could remove
but willingly to seeke his death / for losse of his true
love
Other there be whose lyfe / to lynger still in payne
against theire will preservid is / that wold have dyed
right fayne
but well I may perceave / that nought it movid you
my good entent my gentle hart / nor yet my kynd so true
but that your will is suche / to lure me to the trade
as other some full many years / to trace by crafte you made
And thus beholde my mynd / how that we differ farr
I seeke my foes and you my frends / do threaten still with
warr
I fawne wheare I am fedd / you flee that seekes to you
I can devour no yielding pray / you kill wheare you
subdue
My kynd is to desyre / the honour of the field
and you with blood to slake your thurst / of suche as to
you yelde
Wherefore I wolde you wist / that for your Coy lookes
I am no man that will be traynd / nor tanglyd bye suche
hookes
and thoughhe some list to bow / wheare blame full well they
might
and to suche beastes a Currant fawne / that shuld have
travaile bright
I will observe the law / that nature gave to me
to conquere suche as will resist / and let the rest go free
And as a ffaulcon free / that soreth in the ayre
which never fedd on hand or lure / that for no stale doth
care
While that I live and breathe / suche shall my custome be
in wildnesse of the woodes to seeke / my prea wheare
pleasith me
where many one shall Rew / that never made offence
thus your refuse against my powre / shall bode them no
defence
in the revendge wherof / I vowe and sweare therto
a thowsand spoyles I shall commytt / I never thought to do
and yf to light on you / my happ so good shall be
I shall be glad to feede on that / that wold have fed on me
and thus farewell vnkynd / to whome I bent to low
I would you wist the shipp is safe / that bare his saile
so low
Syns that a Lyons hart / is for woolfe no pray
with blooddye mowth of symple sheepe / go slake yowr wrath
I say
With more dispight and Ire / than I can now expresse
Whiche to my payne though I refrayne / the cause you may
well gesse
As for becawse my self / was awtothour of this game
It bootes me not that by my wrath / I shuld disturb the
same.

V
Good Ladies you that have / your pleasure in exyle
Stepp in your foote, come take a place / and mourne with me
a whyle
and suche as by their Lords / do sett but lytle pryce
Lett them sytt still it skills them not / what chaunce come
on the dyce
but you whome love hath bound / by order of desyre
to love your Lordes whose good desertes / none other wold
requyre
Come your yet once agayne / and sett your
foote by myne
whose wofull plight and sorowes great / no tongue may well
defyne
My lord and love alas / in whome consystes my wealth
Hath fortune sent to passe the seas / in haderd of his
health
That I was wontt for to enbrace / contentid myndes
ys now amydd the foming floodds / at pleasure of the wyndes
Theare god hym well preserve / and safelye me hym send
without whiche hope my lyf alas / weare shortlye at an ende
The fearefull dreames I have / oft tymes they greeve
me so
that then I wake and stand in dawbt / yf they be trew or no
Somtyme the Roring Seas / me seemes they grow so hye
that my sweete lorde in dawnger greate / alas doth oftenlye
Another tyme the same / doth tell me he is come
and playng wheare I shall hym fynd/with. T. his lytlesome
So forthe I goe a pace / to see that lyfesome sight
and with a lysse me thinckes I say / now well come home my
knight
welcome my sweete alas / the staye of my welfare
thy presence bringeth forthe a truce / tetwixt me and my
care
Then lyvelye doth he looke / and saluith me agayne
and saith my deare how is it now / that you haue all this
payne
wheare with the heavie cares / that heapt are in my brest
breakes forth and me dischardgeth cleane / of all my great
vnrest
butt when I me awake / and fyndes it but a dreame
the angwyshe of my former woe / beginneth more extreame 30
and me tournentith so / that vnneth may I fynde
some hydden wheare to steale the gryfe / of my vnquyet mynd
Thus euery way you see / with absence how I burne
and for my wound no Cure there is / but hope of some
reowntne
Save when I feele the Sower / how sweete is felt the
more 35
it doth abate some of my paynes / that I abode before
and then vnto my self I saye / when that we two shall meete
but lyttle tyme shall seeme this payne / that ioye shall be
so sweet
Ye wyndes I you convart / in chieffest of your rage.
that you my lord me safelye send / my Sorowes to asswage
and that I may not long / abyde in suche excessse
Do your good will to cure a wight / that lyveth in
distresse
Poems from Add. MS. 36529
I
The sonne hath twyse brought forthe the tender grene,
and cladd the yerthe in livelye lustynes,
one have the wyndes the trees dispoyled clene,
and now agayne begynnes their cruelties;
sins I have hidd vnder my brest the harme
that never shall recover helthfulnes
the wynters hurt recovers w the warme;
the perched grene restored is w shade
what warmth alas may serve for to disarme
the froosyn hart that my inflame hath made!
what colde agayne is hable to restore
my freshe grene yeres that wither thus & faadel
alas I see nothinge to hurt so sore
but tyme somtyme reduceth a retourne;
yet tyme my harme increaseth more & more,
and semes to have my cure allwayes in skorne;
straunge kynd of death, in lief that I doo trye
at hand to melt farr of inflame to bourne
eche thing alive that sees the heaven w eye
w cloke of night maye cover and excuse
him self from travaile of the dayes vnrest
save I alas against all others use
that then sturres vpp the torment of my brest
to curse eche starr as cawser of my faat
and when the sonne hath eke the darke represt
and brought the daie yet doth nothing abaat
the travaile of my endles smart & Payne
ffor then as one that hath the light in haat
I wyshe for night more covertlye to playne
and me w' drawe from everie haunted place
lest in my chere my chaunce should pere to playne
and w my mynd I measure paas by paas
to seke that place where I my self hadd lost
that daye that I was tangled in that laase
in seming slacke that knytteth ever most
but never yet the trayvaile of my thought
of better state could catche a caause to bost
for yf I fynde somtyme that I have sought
those starres by whome I trusted of the port
my sayles do fall and I advance right nought
as anchord fast my sprites do all resort
to stand atgaas and sinke in more & more
the deadlye harme which she dooth take in sport
loo yf I seke how I do fynd my sore
and yf I flye I carrey w' me still
the venymd shaft which dothe his force restore
by hast of flight and I maye playne my fill
vncto my self oneles this carefull song
prynt in yo' hert some cell of my will
for I alas in sylence all to long
of myne old hurt yet fele the wound but grene
rue or me lief or elles yo\textsuperscript{r} crewell wrong
shall well appeare and by my deth be sene.

II

So crewell prison how could betyde alas
as prowde wyndsor, where I in lust & 乔ye
\textit{t} a kings soon my childishe yeres did passe
in greater feast then Priams sonnes of Troye
where eache swete place retournes a tast full sowre
the large grene courtes, where we wer wont to hove
\textit{t} eyes cast vpp vnto the maydens towre
and easye sights such as folke draws in love
the statelye sales, the Ladiyes bright of hewe
the daunces short, long tales of great delight
\textit{t} wordes & lookes, that Tygers could but rewe
where eche of vs did plead the others right
the palme playe where dispoyled for the game
\textit{t} dased eyes oft we by gleames of love
have mist the ball and got sight of o\textsuperscript{r} dame

to bayte her eyes which kept the leddes above
the graveld ground \textit{t} sleves tyed on the helme
on fomyng horse \textit{t} swordes and frendlye hertes
\textit{t} chere as thoghe the one should overwhelme
where we have fought & chased oft \textit{t} dartes
\textit{t} sylver dropps the meades yet spredd for rewthe
in active games of nymblenes and strengthe
where we dyd strayne, trayled by swarmes of youthe
our tender lymes that yet shortt vpp in lengthe
the secret groves which oft we made resound
of pleasaut playnt, & of o7 ladyes prayes
recording soft, what grace eche one had found
what hope of sped what dred of long delayes
the wyld forest, the clothed holtes w grene
t w raynes avald, and swift ybrethed horse
with crye of houndes and merey blastes bitwen
where we did chase the fearfull hart a force
the voyd walles eke that harbourd vs eche night
wherw alas revive within my brest
the swete accord such slepes as yet delight
the pleasaut dreames the quyet bedd of rest
the secret thoughtes imparted w such trust
the wanton talke, the dyvers chaung of playe
the frendshipp sworne eche promyse kept so lust
wherw we past the winter nightes awaye
and with this thought the blood forsakes my face
the teares berayne my cheke of dedlye hewe
the which as sone as sobbing sighes alas
vpsupped have thus I my playnt renewe
O place of blys renewer of my woos
[fol. 51V]
geve me accompt wher is my noble fere
whome in thy walles thow didest eche night enclose
to other lief, but unto my most dere

eache alas that dothe my sorowe rewe

retournes therto a hollowe sound of playnt

thus I alone where all my fredome grew

{\text{I}}\text{n pryson pyne w bondage and restraynt}

{\text{I}}\text{and w remembran}c\text{ce of the greater greif}

To bannishe the lesse I fynd my chief releif

III

As ofte as I behold and see

the soveraigne bewtie that me bound

the ner my comfort is to me

alas the fressher is my wound

As flame dothe quenche by waye of fier

and roonnyng streames consumes by raine

so doth the sight that I desire

apeace my grief and deadly payne

Like as the flee that seethe the flame

and thinkes to plaie her in the fier

that found her woe and sowght her game

whose grief did growe by her desire

When first I saw theise christall streames

whose bewtie made this mortall wound

{\text{I}}\text{litle thought win these beames}

so sweete a veny}m\text{e to have found}
Wherein is hid the crewell bytt
whose sharpe repulse none can resist
and eake the spoore that straun' th eche wytt
to roon the race against his list

But wilfull will did prick me forthe
blynd cupide dyd me whipp & guyde
force made me take my grief in worth
my fruytiles hope my harme did hide

I fall and see my none decaye
as he that beares flame in his brest
fforgetes for paine to cast awaye
the king that breadythe his vnrest

And as the spyder drawes her lyne
w labour lost I frame my sewt
the fault is hers the losse ys myne
ofyll sown seed such ys the frewte.

IV

When youthe had ledd me half the race,
That Cupides scourge did make me rune,
I loked backe to mete the place
ffrom whence my werye course begune.

And then I sawe how my desyre
by ill gydyng had let my waye
whose eyes to greedye of their hire
had lost my manye a noble praye

ffor when in sightes I spent the daye,
and could not clooke my grief by game,
their boyling smoke did still bewraye
the fervent rage of hidden flame:

And when salt teares did bayne my brest
where love hys pleasaunt traynes had sowne
the brewt therof my frewt opprest,
or that the bloomes were sprunge & blowne.

And where myne eyes did still pursewe
the flying chace that was their quest
their gredye lookes did oft renewe
the hydden wounde within my brest

When everye looke these cheekes might stayne
from dedlye pale to flaming redd
by outward signes apperyd playne
the woo wherw my hart was fedd

But all to late love learneth me
to paynt all kynd of colours newe
to blynde their eyes that elles should see
my sparskled checkes w Cupydes hewe

And now the covert brest I clayme
that worshipps Cupyd secretlye
and nourysheth hys sacred flame
ffrom whence no blasing sparkes do flye

V
Marshall the thinges for to attrayne
the happy life be thes I fynde
t the riches left, not got w payne
t the frutfull ground the quyet mynde
t the equall freend no grudge nor stryf
t no charge of rule nor governance
t wout disease the helthfull life
the howshold of eentemane cotynvance
t the meane dyet no delicate fare
t wisdom loyn'd w simplicitye
the night discharged of all care
t where wyne may beare no seventy soveranty
t the chast wise wyfe wout debate
t suche sleapes as may begyle the night
contented w thyne owne estate
neyther wisshe death nor fear his mght

VI
ffrom Tuscan cam my ladles worthi race
faire fflorence was sometime her auncient seate
the westorne lle (whose pleasaut showre doth face
wylde Chambaraes clifffes) did geve her lyvely heate
ffostred she was w mylke of Irishe brest
her Syer an erle, hir dame, of princes bloud
from tender yeres in britaine she doth rest
w a kinges child where she tastes gostly foode
Honsdon did furst present her to myn eyen
bryght ys her hew and Geraldine shee hight
Hampton me tawght to wishe her furst for myne
and Wind'sor alas doth chace me from her sight
of kind
bewty her name, her vertues from a bove
happy ys he, that may obtaigne her love.

VII
When windesor walles sustain'd my weared arme
my hand, my chyn, to ease my restles hedd
ech pleasant plot revested green w warm
with lustie
the blossom'd bowes whiche lively yeare yspred
the flowred meades the weddyd bird's so late
myne eyes discou'd. than did to mynd resort
the IoAly woes the hateles shorte debate
the rakhell life that longes to loves disporte
wherw alas myne hevy charge of care
heapt in my brest brake forth against my will
and smoky sigh's that over cast the ayer
my vapored eyes such drery teares distill
the tender spring to quicken wher thei fall
and I havent to thowe me downe wall.
VIII

I neuer saw youe madam laye aparte
your cornet black in colde nor yet in heate
sythe first ye knew of my desire so grete
which other fances chac'd cleane from my harte
whiles to my self I did the thought reserve
that so vnware did wounde my wofull brest
pytie I saw win your hart dyd rest
but since ye knew I did youe love and serve
your golden treese was clad alway in blacke
all that wdrawne that I did crave so sore
so doth this cornet governe me a lacke
In someres sone in winter breath of frost
of your faire eies whereby the light is lost

IX

Love that doth raine and liue within my thought
and buylt his seat within my captyve brest
clad in the armes wherein w me he fowght
oft in my face he doth his banner rest
but she that tawght me love and suffre paine
my doubfull hope & eke my hote desire
with shamfast clooke to shadoo and refrayne
her smyling grace convertyth streight to yre
and cowarde love then to the hart apace
taketh his flight where he doth lorde and playne
his purpose lost and dare not shew his face
for my lordes gylt thus fawtles byde I payne
yet from my lorde shall not my foote remove
sweet is the death that taketh end by love

X

In the rude age when Scyence was not rife

if love in crete and other where they taught
Artes to reverte to profyte of our lyfe
wan after death to have their temples sought
If vertue yet in no vnthankfull tyme
fayled of some to blast her endles fame
a goodlie meane bothe to deter from cryme
and to her steppes our sequell to enflame
In dayes of treuthe if wyattes frendes then waile
the onelye debte that ded of quycke may clayme
That rare wit spent employde to our avayle
where Christe is tought deserve they Momus blame
his livelie face thy brest how did it freate
whose Cynders yet with envye doothe eate

XI

Set me wheras the somne, dothe perche the grene
or whear his beames, may not dissolue the Ise
In temprat heat, whear he is felt and sene
w prowde people, in presence sad and wyse
set me in base, or yet in highe degree
in the long night, or in the shortyst day
in clere weather, or whear mysts thikest be
in loste yowthe, or when my heares be grey
set me in earthe, in heauen or yet in hell
in hill, in dale, or in the fowming floode
Thrawle, or at large, a liue whersoo I dwell
sike, or in healthe, in yll fame, or in good
yours will I be, and w that onely thought
comfort my self when that my hape is nowght.

XII
Dyvers thy death doo dyverslye bemone
Some that in presence of that livelye hedd
Lurked whose brestes envye with hate had sowne
yeld Cesars teres vppon Pompeius hedd
Some that watched with the murdres knyfe
with egre thurst to drynke thy guyltes blood
whose practyse brake by happye end of lyfe
weape envyous teares to here thy fame so good
But I that knewe what harbourd in that hedd
what vertues rare were tempred in that brest
hono the place that such a j ewell bredd
and kysse the ground where as thy coorse doth rest
with vaporde eyes from whence suche streames avayle
as Pyramus did on Thisbes brest bewayle
Poems from the Songes and Sonettes, June 5, 1557
I

The soote season, that bud and blome furth bringes,
With grene hath clad the hill and eke the vale:
The nightingale with fethers new she singes:
The turtle to her make hath tolde her tale:
Somer is come, for every spray nowe springes,
The hart hath hung his olde hed on the pale:
The buck in brake his winter cote he flinges:
The fishes flote with newe repaired scale:
The adder all her sloughe awaye she slinges:
The swift swalow pursueth the flyes smale:
The busy bee her honeye how she minges:
Winter is worn that was the flowers bale:
And thus I see among these pleasant things
Eche care decayes, and yet my soroew springes.

II

When somer toke in hand the winter to assail,
With force of might, & vertue gret, his stormy blasts
to quail,
And when he clothed faire the earth about with grene,
And euery tree new garmented, that pleasure was to sene:
Mine hart gan new reuieue, and changed blood dyd stur
Meto withdraw my winter woe, that kept within the dore.
Abrode, quod my desire: essay to set thy fote,
Where thow shalt finde the sauour swete: for sprong is euery rote.
And to thy health, if thou were sick in any case,
Nothing more good, than in the spring the aire to feel a space.

There shalt thou here and see all kindes of birds wrought,
Well tune their voice w warble smal, as nature hath them taught.

Thus pricked me my lust the sluggish house to leave;
And for my health I thought it best suche counsail to receaue.

So on a morow furth, vnwist of any wight,
I went to proue how well it would my heauy burden light.

And when I felt the aire so pleasant round about,
Lorde, to my self how glad I was that I had gotten out.

There might I see how Ver had euery blossom hent;
And eke the new betrothed birdes ycoupled how they went.

And in their songes me thought they thanked nature much,
That by her lycence all that yere to loue their happe was such.

Right as they could deuise to chose them feres through-out;
With much rejoyisng to their Lord thus flew they all about.

Which when I gan resolue, and in my head conceaue,
What pleasant life, what heapes of ioy these little birdes receaue,
And sawe in what estate I wery man was brought.
By want of what they had at will, and I reliect at nought:

Lorde how I gan in wrath vnwisely me demeane.
I curssed love, and him defied: I thought to turne the streame.

But when I well behelde he had me vnder awe,
I asked mercie for my fault, that so transgrest his law.
Thou blinded god (quod I) forgeue me this offense.
Vnwillingly I went about to malice thy pretense.

Wherewith he gaue a beck, and thus me thought he swors,

Thy sorow ought suffice to purge thy fauhte, if it were more.

The vertue of which sounde mine hart did so reuiue,
That I, me thought, was made as hole as any man aliue.

But here ye may perceiue mine errour all and some,
For that I thought that so it was: yet was it still undone:

And all that was no more but mine empressed mynde,
That fayne woulde haue some good reliefe of Cupide wel assinde.

I turned home forthwith, and might perceiue it well,
That he agreued was right sore with me for my rebell.

My harms haue euere since increased more and more
And I remaine, without his help, undone for euere more.

A miror let me be vnto ye louers all:
Striue not with loue: for if ye do, it will ye thus befall,
III

Alas so all things nowe doe holde their peace.

Heauen and earth disturbed in nothing:
The beasts, the ayer, the birdes their song doe cease:
The nightes charre the starres aboute dothe bring:
Calme is the Sea, the waues worke lesse and lesse:
So am not I, whom loue alas doth wring,
Bringing before my face the great encrease
Of my desires, wherat I wepe and syng,
In ioye and wo, as in a doutfull case.
For my swete thoughtes sometyme doe pleasure bring:
But by and by the cause of my disease
Geues me a pang, that inwardly dothe sting,
When that I thinke what griefe it is againe,
To liue and lacke the thing should ridde my paine.

IV

The golden gift that nature did thee geue,
To fasten frendes, and fede them at thy wyll,
With fourme and fauour, taught me to beleue,
How thou art made to shew her greatest skill.
Whose hidden vertues are not so ynnowen,
But liuely domes might gather at the first
Where beatyfe so her perfect seede hath sownen,
Of other graces folow nedes there must.
Now certesse Ladie, sins all this is true,
That from above thy gyftes are thus elect:
Do not deface them than with fansies newe,
Nor chaunge of mindes let not thy minde infect:
But mercy him thy frende, that doth thee serue,
Who seeks alway thine honour to preserue.

When ragyng loue with extreme payne
Most cruelly distrains my hart:
When that my teares, as floudes of rayne,
Beare witnes of my wofull smart:
When sighes haue wasted so my breath,
That I lye at the poynte of death:
I call to minde the nauye greate,
That the Grekes brought to Troye towne:
And how the boysteous windes did beate
Their shypps, and rente their sayles adowne,
Till Agamemmons daughters blood
Appeasde the goddes, that them withstode.
And how that in those ten yeres warre,
Full many a bloudye dede was done,
And many a lord, that came full farre,
There caught his bane (alas) to sone:
And many a good knight ouerronne,
Before the Grekes had Helene wonne.

Then thinke I thus: sithe suche repayre
So longe time warre of valiant men,
Was all to winne a ladye fayre:
Shall I not learne to suffer then,
And thinke my life well spent to be,
Seruyng a worthier witht than she?

Therefore I neuer will repent,
But paynes contented stil endure.
For like as when, rough winter spent,
The pleasant spring straight draweth in vre:
So after ragyng stormes of care
Joyful at length may be my fare.

O Happy dames, that may embrace
The frute of your delight,
Help to bewaile the wofull case,
And eke the heavie plight
Of me, that wonted to rejoyce
The fortune of my pleasant choyce:
Good Ladies, help to fill my mourning voyce.

In ship, freight with rememberance
Of thoughts, and pleasures past,
He failes that hath in gouernance
My life, while it wil last:
With scalding sighes, for lack of gale,
Furdering his hope, that is his sail
Toward me, the swete port of his auail.
Alas, how oft in dreams I see
Those eyes, that were my food,
Which sometime so delighted me,
That yet they do me good.
Wherewith I wake with his returne,
Whose absent flame did make me burne.
But when I find the lacke, Lord how I mourn!

When other lovers in armes across,
Rejoyce their chiefe delight;
Drowned in tears to mourn my losse,
I stand the bitter night,
In my window, where I may see,
Before the winde how the cloudes flee.
Lo, what a mariner love hath made me.

And in grene waves when the salt flood
Doth rise, by rage of wind:
A thousand fancies in that mood
Assayle my restlesse mind.
Alas, now drencheth my sweete fo,
That with the spoyle of my hart did go,
And left me but (alas) why did he so?

And when the seas were calme againe,
To chase from me annoy.
My doubtfull hope doth cause me plaine:
So dreade cuts of my joye.
Thus is my wealth mingled with wo,
And of ech thought a dout doth growe,
Now he comes, will he come? alas, no no.

VII

In winters iust returne, when Boreas gan his raigne,
And euery tree unclothed fast, as nature taught them plaine.
In misty morning darke, as sheepe are then in holde,
I hyed me fast, it sat me on, my sheepe for to vnfolde.
And as it is a thing, that louers haue by fittes,
Vnder a palm I heard one crye, as he had lost hys wittes.
Whose voice did ring so shrill, in vttering of his plaint,
That I amazed was to hear, how loue could hym attaint.
Ah wretched man (quod he) come death, and ridde thys wo:
A iust reward, a happy end, if it may chaunce thee so.
Thy pleasures past haue wrought thy wo, without redresse.
If thou hadst neuer felt no ioy, thy smart had bene the lesse.
And retchlesse of his life, he gan both sighe and grone,
A rufull thing me thought, it was, to hear him make such mone.
Thou cursed pen (sayd he) wo worth the bird thee bare
The man, the knife, and all that made thee, wo be to their share.
Wo worth the time, and place, where I so could endite.
And wo be it yet once agayne, the pen that so can write.

Unhappy hand, it had been happy time for me.
If, when to write thou learned first, unloynted hadst thou be.

Thus cursed he himself, and every other wight,
Saue her alone whom loue him bound to serve both day & night.
Which when I heard, and saw, how he himselfe fordid,
Against the ground with bloudy strokes, himself even there to rid:

Had ben my heart of flint, it must haue melted then.
For in my life I never saw a man so full of wo. [Ci]

With teares, for his redresse, I rashly to him ran,
And in my armes I caught him fast, and thus I spake hym than.

What woffull wight art thou, that in such heavy case
Tormentes thy selfe with such despite, here in this desert place?

Wherwith, as all agast, fulfild wyth ire, and dred,
He cast on me a staring loke, with colour pale, and ded.

Nay, what art thou (quod he) that in this heavy plight,
Dost finde me here, most woffull wretch, that life hath in despight?

I am (quoth I) but poore, and simple in degree:

A shepardes charge I haue in hand, unworthy though I be.
With that he gaue a sighe, as though the skye should fall:
And lowd (alas) he shryked oft, and Shepard, gan he call.
Come, hie the fast at ones, and print it in thy hart:
So thou shalt know, and I shall tell thee, giltlesse how I
smart.

His back against the tree, sore febled all with faint,
With weary sprite he stretocht him vp: and thus hee told his
plaint.

Ones in my hart (quoth he) it chanced me to loue
Such one, in whom hath nature wrought, her cuning for to
proue.

And sure I can not say, but many yeres were spent,
With such good will so recompenst, as both we were content.
Wherto then I me bound, and she likewise also,
The sonne should runne his course awry, ere we this faith
forgo.

Who ioied then, but I: who had this worldes blisse?
Who might compare a life to mine, that neuer thought on
this?

But dwelling in thys truth, amid my greatest joy,
Is me befallen a greater losse, than Priam had of Troy.

She is reversed clene: and beareth me in hand,
That my desertes haue giue her cause to break thys faith-
ful band.

And for my iust excuse auaileth no defense.

Now knowest thou all: I can no more, but shepard, hye the
hense:
And glue him leave to die, that may no longer live:
Whose record lo I claim to have, my death, I do forgive.
And eke when I am gone, be bold to speak it plain:
Thou hast seen dye the truest man, that ever love did pain.
Wherewith he turned him round, and gasping oft for breath,
Into his arms a tree he caught, and said, welcome my death:
Welcome a thousand fold, now dearer unto me,
Than should, without her love to live, an emperor to be.
Thus, in this wofull state, he yielded up the ghost: 65
And little knoweth his lady, what a lover she hath lost.
Whose death when I beheld, no marvel was it, right
For pity though my heart did blood, to see so piteous sight.
My blood from heat to cold oft changed wonders sore:
A thousand troubles there I found I never knew before. 70
Twene dread, and dolour so my sprites were brought in fear,
That long it was ere I could call to mind, what I did there.
But, as each thing hath end, so had these paynes of mine:
The furies past, and I my wits restored by length of time.
Then, as I could devise, to seek I thought it best, 75
Where I might find some worthy place, for such a corpse to rest.
And in my mind it came: from thence not farre away,
Where Chreseids loue, king Priams sone, \( y \) worthy Troilus lay.

By him I made his tomb, in token he was treew:
And, as to him belonged well, I couered it with bleew.

Whose soule, by Angels power, departed not so sone,
But to the heauens, lo it fled, for to receiue his dome.

VIII [Cii]
Gseau place ye louers, here before
That spent your bostes and bragges in vaine:
My Ladies beawtie passeth more
The best of yours, I dare well sayen,
Than doth the sonne, the candle light:
Or brightest day, the darkest night.

And thereto hath a trothe as iust,
As had Penelope the fayre.
For what the faith, ye may it trust,
As it by writing sealed were.

And vertues hath she many moe,
Than I with pen haue skill to showe.

I coulde rehearse, if that I wolde,
The whole effect of natures plaint,
When she had lost the perfitt mold,
The like to whom she could not paint:

With wringlyng handes howe she dyd cry.
And what she said, I know it, I.

I knowe, she swore with ragyng mynd:
Her kingdom onely set apart,
There was no losse, by lawe of kind,
That could haue gone so nere her hart.
And this was chiefly all her payne:
She coulde not make the lyke agayne.

Sith nature thus gaue her the prayse,
To be the chiepest worke she wrought:
In faith, me thinke, some better waies
On your behalfe might well be sought,
Then to compare (as ye haue done)
To matche the candle with the sonne.

Although I had a check,
To geue the mate is hard.
For I haue found a neck,
To kepe my men in gard.
And you that hardy ar
To geue so great assay
Vnto a man of warre,
To drlue his men away.
I rede you, take good hede,
And marke this foolish verse:
For I will so prouide.
That I will haue your ferse.
And when your ferse is had,
And all your warre is done:
Then shall your selfe be glad
To ende that you begon.
For yf by chance I winne
Your person the in feeld:
To late then come you in
Your selfe to me to yeld. [Ci1i1]
For I will vse my power,
As captain full of might,
And such I will deuour,
As vse to shew me spight,
And for because you gaue
Me checke in such degre,
This vantage loe I haue:
Now checke, and garde to the.
Defend it, if thou may:
Stand stiffe, in thine estate.
For sure I will assay,
If I can giue the mate.

X [Di1]
Wrapt in my carelesse cloke, as I walke to and fro:
I se, how loue ca shew, what force there reigneth in
his bow
And how he shoteth eke, a hardy hart to wound:
And where he glanceth by agayne, that little hurt is found.

For seldom is it sene, he woundeth hertes alike.

The tone may rage, when tothers loue is often farre to seke.

All this I se, with more: and wonder thinketh me:
Howe he can strike the one so sore, and leave the other fre.

I se, that wounded wight, that suffreth all this wrong;
How he is fed with yeas, and nayes; and liueth all to long.

In silence though I kepe such secretes to my self:
Yet do I se, how she somtime doth yeld a loke by stelth:
As though it seemd, ywys I will not lose the so.

When in her hart so swete a thought did neuer truely go.

Then say I thus: alas, that man is farre from blisse:

That doth receiue for his relief none other gayn, but this.

And she, that fedes him so, I fele, and find it plain:
Is but to glory in her power, that ouer such can reign.

Nor are such graces spent, but when she thinkes, that he,
A weried man is fully bent such fansies to let flie:

Then to, retain him stil she wrasteth new her grace,
And smileth lo, as though she would forthwith the man embrace.

But when the proofe is made to try such lokes withall:
He findeth then the place all voyde, and fraighted full of gall.

Lorde what abuse is this: who can such women praise?
That for their glory do devise to use such crafty ways.

I, that among the rest do sit, and mark the row.

Fynde, that in her is greater craft, then is in twenty mo.

Whose tender yeres, alas, with wyles so well are spedde:

What will she do, when hory heares are powdered in her hedde?

XI

[Ddi]

If care do cause men cry, why do not I complaine?

If eche man do bewaile his wo, why shew I not my paine?

Since that amongst them all I dare well say is none,

So farre from weale, so full of wo, or hath more cause to mone.

For all thynges having life sometime haue quiet rest.

The bering asse, the drawing oxe, and euery other beast.

The peasant and the post, that serve at all assayes.

The shyp boy and the galley slave haue time to take their ease,

Save I alas whom care of force doth so constraine

To waile the day and wake the night continually in paine.

From pensiuenes to plaint, from plaint to bitter teares,

From teares to painfull plaint againe: and thus my life it wears.

No thing vnder the sunne that I can here or se,

But moueth me for to bewaile my cruell destenie.
For wher men do rejoyce since that I can not so,
I take no pleasure in that place, it doubleth but my woe.
And when I heare the sound of song or instrument,
Me thinke eache tune there dolefull is and helps me to lament.
And if I se some haue their most desired sight,
Alas think I eche man hath weal saue I most wofull wight.
Then as the striken dere withdrawes him selfe alone,
So do I seke some secrete place where I may make my mone.
There do my flowing eyes shew forth my melting hart,
So y' the stremes of those two welles right wel declare my smart
And in those cares so colde I force my selfe [Ddi^]
As sick men in their shaking fittes procure them self to sweate,
With thoughtes that for the time do much appease my paine.
But yet they cause a ferther fere and brede my woe agayne.
Me thinke within my thought I se right plaine appere,
My hartes delight my sorowes leche mine earthly goddesse here.
With euery sondry grace that I haue sene her haue.
Thus I withing my wofull brest her picture paint and graue.
And in my thought I roll her bewties to and fro.
Her laughing chere her louely looke my hart that perced so.

Her strangenes when I sued her servuant for to be. 35

And what she sayd and how she smiled when that she pitied me.

Then comes a sodaine feare that riueth all my rest
Lest absence cause forgetfulnes to sink within her brest.

For when I thinke how far this earth doth vs deuide,
Alas me semes loue throwes me downe I fele how that I slide.

But then I thinke againe why should I thus mistrust,
So swete a wight so sad and wise that is so true and inst.

For loth she was to loue, and wauering is she not.
The farther of the more desirde thus louers tie their knot.

So in dispaire and hope plonged am I both vp an doun,

As is the ship with wind and wawe when Neptune list to froune.

But as the watry showers delay the raging winde,
So doth good hope clene put away dispayre out of my minde.

And biddes me for to serue and suffer pacientlie,
For what wot I the after weale that fortune willes to me.

For those that care do knowe and tasted haue of trouble.
When passed is their woful paine eche ioy shall seme them double.

And bitter sendes she now to make me tast the better.
The plesant swete when that it comes to make it seme the sweter.

And so determine I to serue vntill my brethe. 55

Ye rather dye a thousand times then once to false my feithe.

And if my feble corps through weight of wofull smart,
Do fayle or faint my will it is that still she kepe my hart.

And when thys carcas here to earth shalbe reforde,
I do bequeth my weried ghost to serue her afterwarde. 60
From William Camden's *Remaines of a Greater Worke, Concerning Britaine* (1605)
Norfolk sprang thee, Lambeth holds thee dead,

   Clere of the County of Cleremont though hight
Within the wombe of Ormondes race thou bread
   And sawest thy cosin crowned in thy sight;
Shelton for loue, Surrey for Lord thou chase.

   Aye me, while life did last that league was tender:
   Tracing whose steps thou sawest Kelsall blaze,
   Laundersey burnt, & battered Bullen render,
At Muttrel gates hopeles of all recure,

   Thine Earle halfe dead gaue in thy hand his will:
Which cause did thee this pining death procure,

   Ere summers four times seauen, thou couldest fulfill.
   Ah, Clere, if loue had booted, care, or cost;
   Heauen had not wonn, nor earth so timely lost.
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