“My dere chylde take hede how Trystram doo you tell”: Hunting in English Literature, 1486-1603

Dissertation

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Erin Katherine Kelly, M.A.

Graduate Program in English

The Ohio State University

2013

Dissertation Committee:

Luke Wilson, Advisor
John N. King
Richard Dutton
Christopher Highley

Abstract

Hunting was a widely known and practiced pastime in early modern England. Aristocratic hunting was a complex practice that required knowledge of specific procedures and vocabulary, regardless of the prey being pursued. As such, hunting was an assertion of status in society and of one's identity as a human, dominant over the animal kingdom. My dissertation examines the practice of the hunt in Tudor literature, expanding the chronological and generic focus of previous work. I argue that when early modern English authors cite hunting in their text, or structure a text around an incident or trope of hunting, they are doing so in an attempt to assert a kind of status for themselves, their text, their argument. I focus on moments where the hunt is traditionally and conventionally used as a trope: in a retreat to the country from the city or court, in religious satire, in the love chase, and in progress entertainments. My methodology is to expand on these traditional tropes, demonstrating how the author subtly uses the language and procedures of the practice of the hunt in order to assert his status. These authors go beyond simple metaphors or allegories, using what was a widely known and practiced pastime to their rhetorical advantage.

My first chapter considers hunting in poems written during political exile or disadvantage, with sections on Sir Thomas Wyatt, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, George

Gascoigne, and William Shakespeare. I argue that the authors use the hunt to reconnect with the court, by asserting their prestige and their mastery over the practice.

My second chapter examines the use of hunting in religious polemic by William Turner to appeal to Henry VIII and nobles who are interested in further reform. Turner goes beyond the traditional satirical convention of calling one's opponents foxes and wolves, developing the allegory with practical information about the hunt and about the system of forest laws in England.

In my third chapter, I focus on the hunt as love chase, a conventional trope. I examine how Sir Thomas Wyatt, Michael Drayton, and Edmund Spenser enrich the metaphor with language and procedures from the actual practice of the hunt. With this addition, the poets are able to turn what seems like a failed hunt to their advantage, using their knowledge of the practice to get the better of their prey.

The fourth chapter looks at the hunt on Elizabethan progress. Using the Kenilworth (1575) and Cowdray (1591) entertainments, I examine how the hunt is presented, demonstrating that it is a rich site of conflict and negotiation that Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and Anthony Browne, Viscount Montague, use to navigate their relationship with the queen and that Elizabeth uses to assert and affirm her own status. Examining how writers use the practice of the hunt reveals the nuances of particular texts and demonstrates how important hunting was to early modern English authors.

To my parents

Acknowledgements

I could not have completed this project without the help of quite a number of people. First of all, I would like to thank my advisors John N. King and Luke Wilson for their insight and guidance. I am grateful to John for continuing to work with me even after he retired and to Luke for being a steady presence in Columbus throughout the entire project. I would also like to thank Richard Dutton and Christopher Highley for their advice and encouragement.

My work on this topic began while I was at the University of Virginia. My heartfelt thanks goes to Elizabeth Fowler for guiding me through the earliest version of this argument in her class on Renaissance lyric. I would also like to thank Clare Kinney for guiding me through the process of developing my ideas into a master's thesis.

While at The Ohio State University, I have continually benefited from the generous input of the members of the Renaissance Dissertation Group. My thanks to Alan Farmer for organizing the meetings of the working group during my time as a graduate student. The excellent feedback of the Renaissance faculty as a whole and of my fellow graduate students helped me refine and shape the project, and I sincerely appreciated the ability to share my work and to read the work of others on a regular basis.

As a result of the generous support of a grant-in-aid from the Folger Shakespeare Library, I was able to participate in the dissertation seminar at the Folger at an early and

crucial point of the dissertation. I would like to thank Steven Zwicker and Derek Hirst, the leaders of the seminar, and all my fellow seminarians for their insightful comments on an early draft of my second chapter.

My life as a graduate student would not have been complete without the support of some wonderful friends. Frederick Bengtsson has been my companion in Renaissance studies since my first day of college, and my desire to go to graduate school was spurred in part by our conversations over steak frites after class. Heather Miner has been a constant source of encouragement since our time together at the University of Virginia. My thanks to Amanda Gerber, Eugenia Gonzalez-Posse, Meghan Burke Hattaway, Doug Hattaway, and Lis Lindeman Ravert for all of their support during my time in Columbus. I must particularly thank Meghan and Doug for making Columbus home for me, both while I lived there and once I started commuting from Cincinnati.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for all of their support, financial and otherwise, throughout my entire education. My parents instilled a love of reading in me at a young age, and they have always been my biggest cheerleaders. My thanks to Sarah, Ben, and Tommy for their love and enthusiasm and to my dog Stella for being a constant source of furry encouragement.

Vita

December 18, 1981	Born, Cincinnati, Ohio
2004	B.A. English, Harvard University
2007	M.A. English, University of Virginia
2007-2013	Graduate Teaching and Research Associate, The Ohio State University

Fields of Study

Major Field: English

Table of Contents

Introduction

My dissertation is an examination of the hunt in the literature of Tudor England. I focus on moments where the hunt is traditionally and conventionally used as a trope: in a retreat to the country from the city or court, in religious satire, in the love chase, and in progress entertainments. My methodology is to expand on these traditional tropes, demonstrating how the author subtly uses the language and procedures of the practice of the hunt in order to assert his status. These authors go beyond simple metaphors or allegories, using what was a widely known and practiced pastime to their rhetorical advantage.

Hunting has a long literary history, and by the time of the Renaissance it was a recognized and commonly used trope. Marcelle Thiébaux gives a general overview of the use of hunting in her book examining the chase in medieval literature. She argues that, when using the hunt, a writer was situating himself within a tradition that extends back to classical literature; "the hunt of love occurs at least as early as Plato's *Sophist* where the hunt provides an overriding metaphor."[1] Thiébaux identifies "four principal types of experience traditionally expressed in the form of a hunt in literature: The sacred

[1] Thiébaux, *The Stag of Love: The Chase in Medieval Literature*, 89.

chase, the mortal chase, the instructive chase, and the amatory chase."[2] She also describes the possible outcomes of these chases: "the hunter successful, the hunter turned victim and the hunter doomed to an endless chase."[3]

Hunting was more than just a conventional literary trope, though; it was also a widely practiced pastime defined by formal language and procedures. Elites participated in the elaborate chase of the most esteemed prey while lower members of society used less exalted methods to capture and kill less regarded animals.[4] There is evidence that women participated at all social levels in some manner but that only some aristocratic women actively participated in the chase.[5] While people at all levels of society certainly hunted, legally and illegally, using a wide variety of methods, my focus is on elite hunting. Elite hunting was characterized by a focus on the use of proper language and procedures.[6] An elite hunter demonstrated his status by hunting the right prey in the right

---

[2] Ibid., 58. Also see Rooney, *Hunting in Middle English Literature* for a discussion of the typical uses of the hunt in literature.
[3] Ibid., 50.
[4] For the participation of lower members of society in hunting, see Almond and Pollard, "The Yeomanry of Robin Hood and Social Terminology in Fifteenth-Century England"; Almond, "Medieval Hunting: Ruling Classes and Commonalty"; and Birrell, "Peasant Deer Poachers in the Medieval Forest."
[5] Almond, *Daughters of Artemis: The Huntress in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*.
[6] For the importance of the use of proper language in the hunt, see Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 11; Cartmill, *A View to a Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature through History*, 61-62; Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 56, 80; Madden, *The Diary of Master William Silence: A Study of Shakespeare & of Elizabethan Sport*, 210; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640*, 12; Orme, "Medieval Hunting: Fact and Fancy," 141; Rooney, *Hunting in Middle English Literature*, 13; Semenza, *Sport, Politics, and Literature in the English Renaissance*, 45; Yamamoto, *The Boundaries of the Human in Medieval English Literature*, 102, 107.

way, and hunting was a part of the education of any gentleman.[7] The most esteemed animals were those that were the most difficult to chase and kill, which in England was the hare and the red deer, or hart.[8] By the end of the Middle Ages and the beginning of the Renaissance, the hunting of the red hart was an ever rarer event than it had been heretofore. The rapidly decreasing population levels of the red deer in England in the first half of the sixteenth century, along with the constant infringement of poaching (by people from all class levels, incidentally), meant that this type of hunting occupied a somewhat pressured and threatened position that required protection.[9] The response to this stress was to further solidify and expand the technical vocabulary associated with the hunt at the end of the Middle Ages in order to maintain and increase its status as an elite practice reserved only for those with the skill and knowledge to participate.[10] "The language of the hunt performed a socially divisive function and rendered the hunt elitist, a closed book for the uninitiated".[11] As a result, the act of hunting a deer with dogs and horses was, more than ever, an assertion of self and class.[12] Anne Rooney goes so far as to say, "a hunter's nobility is manifested in the types of animals he hunts," signaling just how important a social marker hunting could be.[13] Other esteemed prey included the boar, generally acknowledged to be the most dangerous animal to hunt, which was nearly

---

[7] Orme, *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy 1066-1530*, 191-198.
[8] Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting: The Hound and the Hawk*, 32-47, 110-119.
[9] Almond, *Medieval Hunting*, 64-65.
[10] Ibid., 72.
[11] Rooney, *Hunting in Middle English Literature*, 13. See also Almond, *Medieval Hunting*, 32-33, 72.
[12] Almond, *Medieval Hunting*, 6; Rooney, *Hunting in Middle English Literature*, 1, 15.
[13] Rooney, *Hunting in Middle English* Literature, 15. For a more detailed discussion of the hierarchy of available prey, please see the Introduction.

extinct in England in the sixteenth century.[14] Other species of deer, the fallow and the roe, were also hunted by the nobility, but they were not as wily or as dangerous as the hart and therefore not as valued. The fox, which was to become the preeminent prey in England after the red deer population declined, was at this time considered to be vermin.[15]

Hunting in England was governed by forest law, which attempted to restrict the right to hunt and was consequently a source of great tension.[16] For example, one of the provisions of the Magna Carta was the disafforestation, or removing of land from the jurisdiction of forest law, of large tracts of land.[17] According to English forest law, all hunting rights derive from the king, regardless of whether one owns the land or not. The king has exclusive and universal hunting rights throughout the kingdom; any hunting rights enjoyed by his subjects have been given to them by the monarch.[18] In addition, Englishmen had to meet a property requirement to hunt in lands legally designated forests, and those who did not meet the requirement were not only forbidden to hunt but could not freely graze their animals, own unmutilated dogs, gather firewood, or protect their crops from damage from deer or hunters within the bounds of a forest.[19] The forest

---

[14] Brander, *Hunting and Shooting from Earliest Times to the Present Day*, 60; Chalmers, *The History of Hunting*, 98; Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 31; Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 3; Whitlock, *Historic Forests of England*, 80.
[15] For the decline of red deer, see Almond and Pollard, "The Yeomanry of Robin Hood and Social Terminology in Fifteenth-Century England," 70. For the status of the fox, see Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 15; Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 34; Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 4.
[16] Manwood, *A Treatise of the Laws of the Forest*.
[17] Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 6.
[18] Manwood, *A Treatise of the Laws of the Forest*, 25r, 33r-38r.
[19] For the property requirements associated with the right to hunt, see Almond, "Medieval Hunting: Ruling Classes and Commonalty," 151; Kirby, "The Stuart Game Prerogative,"

laws were enforced by a system of courts and forest officials, who could attach and fine anyone found breaking the law.[20] Wealthy and privileged Englishmen could not only hunt in forests, they could also be granted chases and parks from the crown.[21] Enclosing land for hunting parks was a source of tension between landowners and tenants.[22] In spite of all the restrictions of forest law, poaching was a widespread practice, from the peasant who wanted the venison for his table or for the black market to the lord who used poaching raids as an aggressive substitute for war in his quarrels with his neighbors.[23] Hunting was a widespread and well-known practice with its own terminology and customs, especially among the upper levels of society.

239, 241; Munsche, *Gentlemen and Poachers: The English Game Laws 1671-1831*, 11; Young, *The Royal Forests of Medieval England*, 169. Dogs were "lawed," chopping off some of their toes to keep them from chasing after deer and other game. See Cox, *The Royal Forests of England,* 47; Schama, *Landscape and Memory,* 146; Yamamoto, *The Boundaries of the Human in Medieval English Literature,* 104. For the other restrictions on forest dwellers, see Chalmers, *The History of Hunting*, 148; Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 3; Whitlock, *Historic Forests of England*, 22.

[20] Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 10-16; Chalmers, *The History of Hunting*, 141-151; Grant, *The Royal Forests of England*; Hammersley, "The Revival of the Forest Laws under Charles I"; James, *A History of English Forestry*, 22; Whitlock, *Historic Forests of England*, 18-21, 23-25; Young, "The Forest Eyre in England during the Thirteenth Century."

[21] Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War*, 27-29; Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 15.

[22] Beaver, "The Great Deer Massacre: Animals, Honor, and Communication in Early Modern England," 199; Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War*, 9, 12, 13, passim; Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 15; Chalmers, *The History of Hunting*, 155; Hammersley, "The Revival of the Forest Laws under Charles I"; Manning, *Village Revolts: Social Protest and Popular Disturbances in England, 1509-1640*, 25.

[23] For a discussion of poaching, see Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War*; Birrell, "Peasant Deer Poachers in the Medieval Forest"; Birrell, "Who Poached the King's Deer?: A Study in Thirteenth Century Crime"; Hanawalt, "Men's Games, King's Deer: Poaching in Medieval England"; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640*; Thompson, *Whigs and Hunters: The Origin of the Black Act*.

Not everyone approved of hunting, though, and there were several strains of opposition to the practice.[24] The humanist opposition, represented by Erasmus, Thomas More and Agrippa of Nettesheim and built on the work of John of Salisbury's twelfth century *Policraticus*, argued that the violence and killing undermined the humanity of the hunter. Furthermore, hunting was a distraction from more worthy concerns and duties. As Erasmus explains in *The Praise of Folly*, "All they achieve by this incessant hunting and eating wild game is their own degeneration – they're practically wild beasts themselves, though all the time they imagine they lead a life fit for kings."[25] Another objection to hunting was grounded in sympathy for the animal, as seen in Michel de Montaigne's essays "Of Cruelty" and "An Apology for Raymond Sebond." Montaigne claims he has "not even been able to witness without displeasure an innocent defenceless beast which has done us no harm being hunted to the kill."[26] During James I's reign, a Puritan opposition to hunting emerged, which condemned the sport on the basis of the doctrine of stewardship; if man's duty was to care for God's creation, then hunting did not fit with those duties. Furthermore, like the humanists, the Puritans considered hunting a dangerous distraction from proper duties and concerns.[27]

---

[24] Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 24.
[25] Erasmus, *The Praise of Folly*, 61.
[26] Montaigne, "Of Cruelty," 484.
[27] For information on anti-hunting discourse, see Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 24-29; Cartmill, *A View to a Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature through History*, 76-91; Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 85-87; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640,* 16-17; Orme, "Medieval Hunting: Fact and Fancy," 145-146; Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England: 1500-1800*, 153-154, 161-163; Uhlig, "'The Sobbing Deer': *As You Like It*, II.i.21-66 and the Historical Context," 79-109.

Those who defended hunting made claims diametrically opposed to those put forward by critics.[28] Supporters did not see hunting as a form of idleness or as a distraction from proper duties and concerns. In fact, hunting was a method to avoid idleness and sin. As George Gascoigne explains in his commendatory poem to *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, "[Hunting] shaketh off all slouth, it presseth downe all pryde, / It cheres the hart, it glads the eye, and through the ears doth glyde."[29] Because a hunter must be up early in the morning to pursue his prey and because the hunt engaged all of his senses, he is a better man, one who has avoided sin. Rather than dehumanize and weaken a man, hunting made men strong, improving their bodies and their character. Edward, Duke of York, explains in the dedication to *The Master of Game*, "men are better when riding, more just and more understanding, and more alert and more at ease and more undertaking, and better knowing of all countries and all passages; in short and long all good customs and manners cometh thereof, and the health of man and of his soul."[30] Hunting also increased the security for all, since its physical rigors and conflict between hunter and prey prepared men for war. Gascoigne makes some explicit comparisons between parts of the hunt and the skills necessary for success in war: "How setting of Relayes, may represent the skyll, / Which souldiours vse in Embushes, their furious foes to kyll. / How Foxe and Badgerd both, make patterns (in their denne) / Of

[28] For discussions of conventional defenses of hunting, see Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 21, 24; Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting: The Hound and the Hawk*, 2-6; Yamamoto, *The Boundaries of the Human in Medieval English Literature*, 100.
[29] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, b4v.
[30] Edward of Norwich, Second Duke of York, *The Master of Game*, 4. Hereafter cited as *The Master of Game.*

Plotformes, Loopes, and, *Casamats,* deuisde by warlike men."[31] Men engage in activities while hunting that mirror what they will face on the battlefield.[32] If nothing else, Gascoigne claims that hunting teaches hunters how to make a proper death when all other options are lost: "How fighting out at Bay, of Hart, Bucke, Goate, or Bore, / Declares the valiant *Romains death,* when might may do no more."[33] Gascoigne is more ambivalent about hunting than Edward, Duke of York, so he includes a the lower status goat in the list of valiant animals bravely accepting death, but he nonetheless defends hunting in his treatise. Not least for defenders of hunting, the hunt was a pleasure, "hunters live in this world more joyfully than any other men."[34] Men delighted in the chase, capture, and kill, and so they hunted.

Par force hunting, the mounted chase of a deer involving the use of relays of hounds and the assistance of a number of huntsmen, was the most elevated form of hunting practiced in England.[35] This type of hunting required the participation of a number of people, from the men who sought out an appropriate hart for the chase, to the men who cared for and set the relays of hounds.[36] The royal hunting establishment was made up of an elaborate system of courts and forest officers who served the monarch's needs and desires. In addition to assisting at *par* force hunts, the king's huntsmen could be expected to provide venison for his table or to eradicate vermin that threatened the

---

[31] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, b5r.
[32] For discussion on the connection between the hunt and war, see Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066,* 80; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640*, 3.
[33] Ibid.
[34] *The Master of Game*, 8.
[35] Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 64; *The Master of Game*, 29.
[36] *The Master of Game*, 165-180; John Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting: The Hound and the Hawk*, 33, 173-184.

countryside or other prey.[37] The manner in which *par force* hunting is conducted, from the finding of the hart to the method of butchering the carcass, continually reaffirmed the social hierarchy in general and the status of the most noble participant in particular. A *par force* hunt really began the day before the chase. Huntsmen, using scent hounds, would seek out a variety of harts that could be chosen for the next day's chase. Noting footprints (slots), feces (fewmets), and marks on trees made by the hart's antlers (fraying), each huntsman would evaluate whether the deer he found was an appropriate target.[38] Leaving signs (blemishes) so that he could find the deer the next day, the huntsman would retire until the morning assembly, a meal for all hunt participants, noble and servant. At the assembly, huntsmen would present their evidence, including fewmets carefully preserved in hunting horns stopped with grass for the judgment of the most senior person at the assembly.[39] Once a hart was chosen, relays of hounds would be placed at intervals on the likely course the hart was to take once unharboured, or chased from its lair.[40] The chase followed the unharbouring of the hart, with noble participants on horseback and men responsible for the hunting hounds on foot. Horn calls would indicate the status of the chase to all involved; perhaps the hart had cunningly doubled

[37] Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 10-53; Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting: The Hound and the Hawk*, 172-186; Williams, "Hunting and the Royal Image of Henry VIII," 48-49.
[38] *The Master of Game*, 130-147; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 61-70.
[39] *The Master of Game*, 163-164; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 90-94.
[40] *The Master of Game*, 165-167; *The Boke of Saint Albans*, E8r-F1r; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 101-104.

back on its track or taken soil (gone to water).[41] A huntsman could tell by the amount of froth on the muzzle of the deer if it was close to the end of its strength. Once the hart was brought to bay by the hounds, on water or land, horns would indicate that the death was nigh for any hunter who needed to rejoin the group.[42] The deer would then be killed with a sword or a knife.[43] The breaking, or butchering, of the hart had to follow a particular procedure, with cuts being made in a certain order and portions of the hart due to specific members of the group according to status.[44] After the breaking, the hounds were rewarded with pieces of the deer, mixed with blood and grain, laid out on its outspread hide.[45] The horns were blown again to indicate the death, and the day's procedures would end with a procession back to the lodge or castle, with choice bits of the hart displayed on forked sticks.[46]

Much of our information about early modern hunting comes from hunting manuals, in print and manuscript, which were aimed at a gentle audience. There are four hunting manuals that are particularly influential in Tudor England: William Twiti's *The Art of Venery* (1327), Edward, Duke of York's *The Master of Game* (1406-1413), *The Boke of Saint Albans* (1486), and George Gascoigne's *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting* (1575). English hunting practice and manuals are greatly influenced by French

---

[41] Twiti, *William Twiti: The Art of Hunting 1327*, 49-51; *The Master of Game*, 165-180; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 105-123.
[42] *The Master of Game*, 173-174; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 124-127.
[43] *The Master of Game,* 174; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 124-127.
[44] Twiti, *William Twiti: The Art of Hunting 1327*, 51; *The Master of Game*, 174-177; *The Boke of Saint Albans*, F2v-F4r; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 129, 132-135.
[45] *The Master of Game*, 177-179; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 127-129, 130-132.
[46] *The Master of Game*, 179-180.

hunting customs and manuals, but, in general, English manuals are more formal and more focused on the use of correct terminology and the placement of animals into appropriate categories. While French manuals like Gaston Phoebus' *Le Livre de Chasse* (1387-1389) include discussions of low status forms of hunting like trapping, English manuals focus nearly exclusively on aristocratic hunting. In addition to information about hunting, the manuals generally include detailed instructions on breeding and caring for the various types of dogs that were integral to many forms of hunting.

William Twiti's manual, *The Art of Venery*, is the earliest extant English hunting manual. William Twiti, or Twici, huntsman to Edward II, seems to have come from a humble family living at Twyford near Reading.[47] The manual survives in two versions, one in English and one in Norman French.[48] Twiti died as a pensioner at Reading Abbey in 1328, and it is assumed that he wrote his manual while in retirement at the end of his life.[49] Unlike the other manuals, which are largely translations of French hunting manuals, *The Art of Venery* is original material based on the practical life experience of the author. The hunting terms and cries that Twiti uses are French, though, which is unsurprising since English hunting practice had been influenced by the French since the Norman Conquest. One of Twiti's overriding concerns is that a hunter use the proper horn blows at the appropriate moment and that he use the correct words when calling to his hounds. For example, when the pack of hounds is following a hart without any difficulty, "for that you should blow the horn in another manner, thus, 'Trorororororout

[47] Chalmers, *The History of Hunting,* 169-170; Rooney, *Hunting in Middle English Literature,* 8; Danielsson, Preface to *William Twiti: The Art of Hunting 1327*, 33-34.
[48] Rooney, *Hunting in Middle English Literature*, 8.
[49] Danielsson, Preface to *William Twiti: The Art of Hunting 1327*, 34.

trout trout trout trout trout trorororororout.' You begin with a long mote and end with a long, so that every man who is around you, who understands Hunting, may know by your blowing exactly where you are and how your chase goes."[50] The specificity serves two purposes: to accurately communicate information about the status of the hunt and to separate those who know the hunt from those who do not. The purpose of Twiti's manual is not just to gather information on the best way to kill a hare or a hart, learned from a lifetime as a huntsman. The technical language and the various horn calls help one hunt in the proper manner; the process is as important as the kill.

Written between 1406 and 1413, *The Master of Game*, by Edward, Duke of York, is mostly a translation of *Le Livre de Chasse*, by Count Gaston de Foix, commonly known as Gaston Phoebus.[51] *Le Livre de Chasse* was written between 1387 and 1389, incorporating material from *Déduits de la Chasse* (1359-1373/77), by Gace de la Buigne and the mid-fourteenth century *Les Livres du Roy Modus et de la Royne Ratio*.[52] Edward translates thirty chapters from Phoebus, rearranging them and adding or altering information to conform to English practice.[53] Edward, Duke of York, was Edward III's grandson, "a chief forest justice of South Trent, master of the hart-hounds to Richard II,

---

[50] Twiti, *William Twiti: The Art of Hunting 1327*, 49, 96. A mote is "a blast of the horn, a bugle note."
[51] Baillie-Grohman, Introduction to *The Master of Game*, xii.
[52] Thomas and Avril, Introduction to *The Hunting Book of Gaston Phébus*, 5; Hands, Introduction to *English Hawking and Hunting in* The Boke of St. Albans, xliii; Dodman, "Hunting to Teach: Class, Pedagogy, and Maleness in *The Master of Game* and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*," 414, fn. 3.
[53] For a detailed discussion of how *The Master of Game* and *Livre de Chasse* are related, see McNelis, "The Uncollated Manuscripts of 'The Master of Game': Towards a New Edition," 25-35.

master of game to Henry IV, and hunting-tutor to the future Henry V."[54] Known to readers of Shakespeare as the traitor Aumerle, Edward died at Agincourt.[55] Edward dedicates his manual to Prince Henry, which McNelis sees as "a bid for continued patronage, for protection against a plethora of enemies in Parliament and elsewhere…and as a reaffirmation of the importance and relative security" of Edward's return to court circles.[56]

In *The Master of Game*, Edward focuses on aristocratic hunting, omitting the chapters in *Le Livre de Chasse* that deal with low status animals or hunting methods. Edward also emphasizes his own status as Master of Game, particularly in a chapter on bow and stable hunting with the king that he adds at the end of the manual. The aristocratic hunting that Edward describes is very elaborate and ceremonial, requiring expert coordination provided by the Master of Game: "The Master of the Game should be in accordance with the master forester or parker where it should be that the King should hunt such a day…the Master of Game should be informed by the forester or parkers what game the king should find within the set…if the king will hunt no more, then should the Master of his Game, if the King will not blow, blow a mote."[57] Edward's manual continues the English focus on proper language and procedure, every moment guided by the need to say and do the right thing.[58]

---

[54] Marvin, *Hunting Law and Ritual in Medieval English Literature*, 117.
[55] Chalmers, *The History of Hunting*, 195.
[56] McNelis, "The Uncollated Manuscripts of 'The Master of Game': Towards a New Edition," 35.
[57] *The Master of Game,* 188, 189, 194.
[58] See Marvin, *Hunting Law and Ritual in Medieval English Literature* 114, for how *The Master of Game* is an endorsement of English as the language of the nation. See Dodman, "Hunting to Teach: Class, Pedagogy, and Maleness in *The Master of Game* and *Sir*

Neither Twiti's *Art of Venery* nor Edward's *Master of Game* were in print in Tudor England, but they are both sources of *The Boke of Saint Albans* (1486), the first printed hunting manual in English. In addition to the material on hunting, *The Boke of Saint Albans* contains a section on hawking and a section on heraldry. The hunting section is first a dialogue between a woman and a child, or at times between a master and a student, and second a list of hunting lore, including the proper names for groups of animals and people. The dialogue section is known as the "Tristram," which derives in part from the English additions in *The Master of Game* and from Twiti's *The Art of Venery*.[59] The collection of hunting lore that follows the dialogue section is known to scholars as the "J.B. Treatise."[60] *The Boke of Saint Albans*, a rather heterogeneous compilation of hunting material, was very influential. A second edition was printed in 1496 by Wynkyn de Worde, and more than twenty-three editions were printed during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.[61]

Gawain and the Green Knight, for an analysis of how Edward uses the hunt as a method for teaching proper aristocratic masculinity.

[59] See Hands, Introduction to *English Hawking and Hunting in* The Boke of St. Albans, xxxvi-xlv for a detailed discussion on the possible relations between the "Tristram," *The Master of Game*, and *The Art of Venery*. The chart on page xliv is particularly helpful in indicating the relationships between these manuals, extending to Gascoigne's *Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*.

[60] See Hands, Introduction to *English Hawking and Hunting in* The Boke of St. Albans, xlv-lv for a discussion of the origins of the "J.B. Treatise." Juliana Berners, once thought to be the author the entire *Boke of Saint Albans,* is now associated by Hands and by Gross with just this section. See Hands, Introduction to *English Hawking and Hunting in* The Boke of St. Albans, lv-lx; Hands, "Juliana Berners and *The Boke of St Albans*"; Gross, "Hunting, Heraldry, and the Fall in the *Boke of St. Albans* (1486)."

[61] Hands, Introduction to *English Hawking and Hunting in* The Boke of St. Albans, xxi-xxii; Gross, "Hunting, Heraldry, and the Fall in the *Boke of St. Albans* (1486)," 192.

The entire *Boke of Saint Albans* is designed to teach "gentill men and honest persones" the proper ways to hunt and hawk.[62] The hunting section begins:

> Lykewyse as in the boke of hawkynge aforesayde are wryten and noted the termys of playsure belongynge to gentylmen: hauynge delyte therin. In the same manere this boke folowynge shewyth: to such gentyll persones the manere of huntynge for all manere of bestys / whether they ben bestys of Venery or of Chace or Rascall. And also it shewith al termys conuenyent as well to the houndes as to the beestys aforesayd. And in certen there ben many dyuers of theym: as is declaryd in the boke folowynge. (E1r)

The book intends to teach gentlemen the proper terminology for hunting. *The Boke of Saint Albans* contains less practical information than the other three manuals; the focus is mostly on the proper terms. As hunting manuals were written and then printed, the technical language became more detailed and more important.[63] This process resulted in two opposing trends; on the one hand, the increase in the extent and emphasis on technical language raises the barrier for entry and acceptance to the practice. On the other hand, the printing of hunting manuals makes this information more widely available.

George Gascoigne's *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting* (1575) continues the English tradition of focusing on the proper language and procedures in elite hunting. Gascoigne was commissioned by Christopher Barker to write the hunting manual, which

---

[62] *The Boke of Saint Albans*, A2r.
[63] See Danielsson, Preface to *William Twiti: The Art of Hunting 1327*, 14 on the increase in technical vocabulary in hunting manuals.

was printed by Henry Bynneman.[64] Gascoigne's manual is almost entirely a translation of a 1573 edition of *La Vénerie* by Jacques du Fouilloux, which derives in part from Gaston Phoebus' *Le Livre de Chasse*.[65] Gascoigne makes additions and changes to his central source to reflect English practice, and these additions come both from Gascoigne's personal experience and from the "Tristram" section of *The Boke of Saint Albans*.[66] Like the previous English manuals, Gascoigne focuses on elite hunting methods to the exclusion of lower status practices, noting the differences between French and English customs.

Scholars see *The Noble Arte* as a bid for patronage by Gascoigne. The text is dedicated to Lord Henry Clinton, Master of the Queen's Hart Hounds and addressed generally to a courtly audience.[67] Throughout the text, Gascoigne demonstrates his knowledge of hunting in what is a more practical manual than some of its predecessors. The manual also aims for patronage by trying to capture the attention of Elizabeth I through its woodcuts. There are thirty-two woodcuts, five of which are original and were probably created by Gascoigne himself. The queen appears in some of the original woodcuts, presiding over the assembly before the hunt *par force*, observing the

---

[64] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 105; Prouty, "George Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie*, and Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth," 639. Gascoigne's name does sign his name to *The Noble Arte.* While Turberville used to be considered the author of *The Noble Arte* because he is the author of a falconry manual printed at the same time (and often bound with Gascoigne's text), Jean Robertson was the first to establish Gascoigne's authorship, and this is now the scholarly consensus. See Robertson, "George Gascoigne and 'The Noble Arte of Venerie and Hunting.'"

[65] Hands, Introduction to *English Hawking and Hunting in* The Boke of St. Albans, xlii-xliii; Prouty, "George Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie*, and Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth," 639-649; Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 105, 108.

[66] Hands, Introduction to *English Hawking and Hunting in* The Boke of St. Albans, xliii.

[67] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 107.

presentation of the fewmets, or deer droppings, by a huntsman, and receiving a sharp knife with which to begin the breaking of the now-dead deer.[68] Gascoigne also addresses an original poem to the queen, urging her "to hunt this day, and recreate [her] mynde."[69] The patronage bid was successful; shortly after the printing of *The Noble Arte*, Gascoigne was commissioned by Robert Dudley, the Earl of Leicester, to write entertainments for the queen's visit to Kenilworth.

Scholars have also noted that some of Gascoigne's additions to the text add a moralizing critique of hunting.[70] For example, the manual includes four poems in the voice of prey: the hart, the hare, the fox, and the otter.[71] While the hart poem, "The wofull words of the Hart to the Hunter," is a translation of Boucher's "Complainte du Cerf" included in du Fouilloux's *Le Vénerie*, the other three animal poems are original to Gascoigne.[72] The hare asks the hunter, "Are mindes of men, become so voyde of sense / That they can ioye to hurte a harmelesse thing?"[73] The moral additions certainly complicate the manual as a wholehearted endorsement of the benefits and joys of

---

[68] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 108-110; Prouty, "George Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie*, and Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth," 662-663. These woodcuts also include what seem to be self-portraits of Gascoigne. For a discussion of Gascoigne's use of self-portraits, see Austen, "Self Portraits and Self Presentation in the Work of George Gascoigne." For a discussion of Gascoigne and the cult of the image of Elizabeth, see Hamrick, "'Set in Portraiture': George Gascoigne, Queen Elizabeth, and Adapting the Royal Image."

[69] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 93.

[70] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 111-112; Prouty, "George Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie*, and Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth," 648.

[71] For a discussion of Gascoigne's animal complaint poems as political complaint, see Shannon, *The Accommodated Animal: Cosmopolity in Shakespearean Locales,* 76-78, 115-118, 151.

[72] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 111; Prouty, "George Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie*, and Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth," 646, 648.

[73] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 176.

hunting, but nonetheless, I would not consider *The Noble Arte of Venerie* to be anti-hunting as a whole; Gascoigne presents too much practical information and clearly delights in his mastery of the practice to be more than ambivalent about it. The Proutys link the tone of the animal poems with another work Gascoigne publishes this year, *The Glasse of Government*, which presents the author as reformed from his youthful folly.[74] Austen reads the animal poems as Gascoigne's attempt to demonstrate his ability to take on various personae, a skill he will shortly put to good use at Kenilworth.[75] A complex text, *The Noble Arte of Venerie* teaches its readers all of the necessary procedures and language to hunt like a nobleman while simultaneously instilling pity in the hunter for his prey.

A number of other scholars have already worked on hunting, and my work will build on and diverge from these prior studies. The previous scholarship can be divided into a number of categories, the first of which is work on the cultural practice itself, establishing exactly what it was and who the participants were. One such study is that of Charles J. Cox (1905), a very thorough examination of hunting that is centered on the extant records of the royal forests of England. Cox is valuable for his focus on terminology, forest law, and the hierarchy of forest officers. More recently, John Cummins and Richard Almond have examined hunting as it was practiced in the Middle Ages. Cummins' book, *The Art of Medieval Hunting: The Hound and Hawk*, is a thorough animal-by-animal account of hunting practices that considers both Continental

[74] Prouty, "George Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie*, and Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth," 653. The Proutys also suggest that Gascoigne does not put his name on *The Noble Arte* because it conflicts with the image he was trying to put forth in works like *The Glasse of Government*.
[75] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 111.

and English practices. Almond uses a wide array of evidence to try to argue for an almost universal participation in hunting of various kinds. Most recently, Emma Griffin (2007) has examined hunting in England from the time of the Norman Invasion up to the present, with a focus on issues of animal population and habitat conservation and how those two factors influence what is considered the most prestigious prey at a particular moment of history.

Other scholars, also focused on the actual practice of hunting, have written about the subversive potential of hunting and poaching. Peter Stallybrass sees the forest and its purlieus as a crucial space for the carnivalesque, connecting his observations to the Robin Hood ballads. Roger B. Manning expanded his consideration of poaching in his 1988 book, *Village Revolts: Social Protest and Popular Disturbances in England, 1509-1640*, into a book-length study in 1993, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640*. In this book, he considers the question of where deer hunting fits in the culture at large, seeing connections between poaching and issue of land use and the awakening of political consciousness in the run up to the English Civil War. More recently, Daniel Beaver (2008) has considered how clashes over the space of the hunt in the early seventeenth century brought honor to the men involved. Beaver's argument is that the non-gentle participants in these conflicts also had opportunities to gain honor and that the social boundaries supposedly firmly in place during the hunt were somewhat flexible.

Another scholarly approach has been to examine the practice of hunting through a more anthropological approach. José Ortega y Gasset claims that the desire to hunt is "a

deep and permanent yearning in the human condition."[76] Hunting is an immersive vocation that allows man both to be fully in the present and to reconnect to the archaic past. For Ortega y Gasset, hunting is rooted in the fundamental inequality between species; by limiting his natural superiority through the rules of the hunt, man returns to nature as he engages with his prey. Matt Cartmill (1993) traces the rise and ascendancy of the hunting hypothesis, the idea that hunting was the key factor in the evolutionary developments of humans, in anthropological thought after the end of World War II and then its collapse in the 1970s. In his attempt to understand how this theory of the beginning of civilization was so persuasive for so long, he considers the historical resonances of hunting from the classical era til the present day. In an essay from 2008, Susan Crane takes a different approach, building on the work of Clifford Geertz in his examination of the Balinese cockfight, considering medieval hunting *a force* as a "cultural performance." She contends that this form of elite hunting is "a mimetic ritual designed to celebrate and perpetuate aristocratic authority…It sets up a performance space in which aristocracy mimes its own myth of itself."[77] Susan E. Whyman, in a study of the Verney family during the Restoration and early eighteenth century, builds on theories of gift giving to discuss the connections between the exchange of venison, obtained through hunting, and the social order of the Verneys' world.

A relatively recent critical field, Animal Studies, has some interesting insights that can be brought to bear on the relationship between hunter and prey. For example, Jacques Derrida's essay "The Animal That Therefore I Am (More to Follow)," from his

[76] Ortega y Gasset, *Meditations on Hunting*, 33.
[77] Crane, "Ritual Aspects of the Hunt *à Force*," 68-69.

1997 lecture at the third Cerisy-la-Salle conference, uses his pet cat to complicate the boundary between animals and humans. He specifically wonders what it means to respond and whether animals can respond to us. Erica Fudge's work in this area specifically considers the early modern period, building on Keith Thomas' work in his book *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800* (1983), to consider two main views of animals: that they are instrumental and that they are dangerous. Fudge contends that as social and cultural history have moved to consider more marginalized groups, animals are just the latest iteration of this trend. Bruce Boehrer (2002) has examined how the differences and similarities between humans and animals were explored, complicated, and used to create social identity on the early modern English stage. More recently (2010), he has applied an exploration of the complex human-animal binary to the development of literary character and, by extension, to the nature of personhood. Susan Crane (2013), expanding on her earlier work on the ritual nature of the hunt, also focuses on the complex and unstable human-animal binary that so interests Animal Studies scholars, but she is interested in changing the humanist and early modern focus of previous scholars. Crane shifts attention to the animal side of the binary, attempting to "emphasize the living animal" as well as "plurality and density of medieval thought about animals."[78] Laurie Shannon (2013) builds on the work of her predecessors and "tracks a particular tradition that accommodates that presence of animals as actors and stakeholders endowed by their creator with certain subjective

[78] Crane, *Animal Encounters: Contacts and Concepts in Medieval Britain*, 5, 8.

interests," connecting this tradition to larger ideas about political forms and cosmopolity.[79]

Scholars have also written about hunting as it appears in literature. One approach has been to trace the influence of literary precursors, as Michael J. B. Allen (1968) does for the figures of Adonis and Acteon in Renaissance literature and as Anne Lake Prescott (1985) does for the psalmic influence on the depiction of deer in Edmund Spenser's *Amoretti*. Marcelle Thiébaux (1974) takes a structural approach to hunting in medieval literature, both Continental and English, dividing the hunt into four categories, as mentioned earlier. Not interested so much in the actual practice of hunting, Thiébaux is more concerned with the iconography of the stag and the hunt as a narrative device in medieval romances and poetry and how those devices appear and are transmitted throughout the Middle Ages.

Other scholars take a similar approach, but focus more on hunting as a trope or metaphor. Anne Rooney, in her 1993 book *Hunting in Middle English Literature*, considers hunting as a motif that can be used to evoke a series of conventional meanings. Rooney establishes the parameters of the motif and its meanings by examining classical literature, Continental literature, the tradition of biblical exegesis, and earlier English literary uses of the hunt. Jean Elizabeth Richardson, in an unpublished dissertation from 2003, turns her attention to the early modern period, arguing that the hunt is used in poetry of the late sixteenth century primarily as a metaphor for violence. She also examines the hunt as a way of explaining political and social relationships in terms of a

[79] Shannon, *The Accommodated Animal: Cosmopolity in Shakespearean Locales,* 18.

predator and prey dynamic in the drama and prose fiction from the late sixteenth century and early seventeenth century.

Some scholars give more direct consideration to the impact of the actual practice of hunting on literary depictions of it. For example, William Perry Marvin (2006) argues in his examination of hunting in medieval English literature that hunting practice and ritual was historically related to developments in hunting law and that representations of hunting in imaginative literature reflect such changes, notwithstanding the conformity exerted by a canon of traditional hunting topoi. More relevant for an early modern focus, Edward Berry (2001) examines the hunt in Shakespeare's work. Berry has a separate argument about the function of hunting in each of the plays that he examines, but his overarching project is to situate Shakespeare's use of hunting, which Berry contends is more frequent than his dramatic contemporaries' use, within anti-hunting discourses of the period. Berry also references the question of whether young Shakespeare poached, and, while not giving a definitive answer on that story, he does examine Shakespeare's connections to and place within the hunting culture of early modern England and contends that his apparent fascination with hunting is experiential, not bookish.

My work adds to the current scholarship in a number of ways. My project is a wide-ranging examination of hunting, in terms of chronology and genre, in early modern literature. Previous studies have been more narrowly focused, and my work provides a sense of the scope of the use of hunting in the imaginative literature of this period. In addition, my dissertation combines an attention to the circumstances surrounding the actual practice of hunting, found in historical work like Beaver's, and a consideration of the history of the trope of hunting in literature, found in work like Anne Lake Prescott's

on thirsty deer in the psalms. Hunting was a skill that required knowledge of specific procedures and vocabulary, regardless of the prey being pursued. As such, hunting was an assertion of status in society and of one's identity as a human, dominant over the animal kingdom. My dissertation argues that when authors cite hunting in their text, or structure a text around an incident or trope of hunting, they are doing so in an attempt to assert a kind of status for themselves, their text, their argument. Authors like Sir Thomas Wyatt, George Gascoigne, and Edmund Spenser do more than merely use the hunt as a convenient and conventional metaphor, allegory, or frame. I examine how these authors complicate and enrich what could be an entirely conventional use of the hunt, such as the hunt as a love chase, with the language and procedures of the actual practice of hunting. Bringing knowledge of the practice of hunting to the trope shows how authors use the hunt to negotiate and ameliorate disadvantaged positions.

My first chapter considers hunting in poems written during political exile or disadvantage, with sections on Sir Thomas Wyatt's "John Poins," Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey's "So cruel prison," George Gascoigne's "Woodmanship," and William Shakespeare's *As You Like It*. It argues that Wyatt and Surrey use the hunt to reconnect with the court, both creating a separate sphere of influence and prestige in the country and asserting their ties to the distant court. Gascoigne frames his patronage request to Lord Grey in terms of a failed hunt, but uses the technical language of hunting to demonstrate his skills and fitness for Grey's service. In *As You Like It,* Duke Senior and his followers-in-exile try to assert some of their lost aristocratic privilege by hunting, but they also try to reform elite hunting to conform with their idealized retreat into the pastoral world.

My second chapter examines the use of hunting in religious polemic by William Turner to appeal to Henry VIII and nobles who are interested in further reform. Turner presents himself as the huntsman that Henry VIII really needs. Turner goes beyond the traditional satirical convention of calling one's opponents foxes and wolves, as can be seen in John Bale's more conventional contribution to the dialogue, developing the allegory with practical information about the hunt and about the system of forest laws in England.

In my third chapter, I focus on the hunt as love chase, a conventional trope. I examine how Sir Thomas Wyatt, Michael Drayton, and Edmund Spenser enrich the metaphor with language and procedures from the actual practice of the hunt. With this addition, the poets are able to turn what seems like a failed hunt to their advantage, using their knowledge of the practice to get the better of their prey.

The fourth chapter looks at the hunt on Elizabethan progress. Scholars have investigated the varied messages and strategies evident in the extant written entertainments for Queen Elizabeth, but have not paid close attention to how the hunt is presented in those same records. Using the Kenilworth (1575) and Cowdray (1591) entertainments, I examine those moments closely, demonstrating that the hunt is a rich site of conflict and negotiation that Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and Anthony Browne, Viscount Montague, use to navigate their relationship with the queen and that Elizabeth uses to assert and affirm her own status.

Chapter 1: Hunting in Exile

One of the ways that writers use the hunt in the sixteenth century is to improve or reverse the conditions of literal or metaphorical exile. The hunt is a useful tool for Wyatt, Surrey, Gascoigne, and Shakespeare because it is a means of bridging the conventional gap between country and city or court that is associated with exile.[80] In the examples examined in this chapter, the speakers or characters are removed from the center of power, and they want to return to or reconnect with that center. One way that the hunt facilitates such reconnection is through the forest laws that govern it. All hunting privileges derive from the monarch, and the forests of England were governed by the forest officials who operated under the crown's authority.[81] Even though the hunter may be far away from the court, he still hunts over land that is regulated by it. Hunting in physical or political exile demonstrates that the hunter still enjoys some favor from the monarch, and it is often used to show that the hunter would like to reestablish a stronger and more intimate connection with the monarch's power. Furthermore, the prestige of

---

[80] For discussions of the conventional divide between court and country, see Dillon, *Theatre, Court and City, 1595-1610: Drama and Social Space in London*; Egan, *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism*; Kernan, "Shakespearean Comedy and its Courtly Audience"; Kingsley-Smith, *Shakespeare's Drama of Exile*; and Williams, *The Country and the City*.

[81] Manwood, *A Treatise of the Laws of the Forest*, 124v; Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 62; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640*, 59-60.

aristocratic hunting, which is the kind of hunting depicted in the examples below, allows the hunters to assert their status, even in reduced circumstances. The practice of aristocratic hunting enforced and reaffirmed the social hierarchy, and exiled hunters benefit from this by taking their place near the top of the social structure.[82] Hunting was also traditionally associated with warfare and with political disputes between factions, so it is unsurprising that these writers found it helpful when trying to overcome a loss of status and influence.[83] Wyatt, Surrey, Gascoigne, and Duke Senior in Shakespeare's *As You Like It* all use hunting to improve and negotiate physical or political exile. Wyatt and Surrey are entirely in favor of hunting, while Gascoigne complicates matters by acknowledging some sympathy for his prey. *As You Like It* is able to present a variety of views on hunting, including the anti-hunting critique of Jaques. Despite the complications in Gascoigne and in the play, hunting is still useful in both texts for regaining favor and patronage.

I

In 1536, Sir Thomas Wyatt was arrested and sent to the Tower after quarreling with Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, and in connection with his possible relationship with Anne Boleyn. While the Queen and her other accused lovers did not escape execution, Wyatt was spared, spending a few weeks in the Tower before being released to

[82] For the connection of the hunt to social hierarchy, see Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War*, 19; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England*, 6; Marvin, *Hunting Law and Ritual in Medieval English Literature*, 129; Yamamoto, *The Boundaries of the Human in Medieval English Literature*, 102.

[83] Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War*; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640*; Thompson, *Whigs and Hunters: The Origin of the Black Act*.

his father. He was sent to exile at his family's estate, Allington, in Kent, warned by the king "to adres hym better then his wit can consyder."[84] Wyatt spent most of the next ten months at Allington before being restored to favor and appointed ambassador to the Emperor Charles V's court.[85] The consensus is that Wyatt wrote his epistolary satire, "Myne owne John Poyntz," during this exile from the court.[86] The speaker of the poem specifically declares, "here I ame in Kent and Christendome" (100), and a reference to "a clogg [that] doeth hang yet at my hele" (86) supports the dating of the poem.[87] While the poem certainly draws on autobiographical elements of Wyatt's life, the speaker of the poem is not necessarily entirely contiguous with the historical Wyatt. In "Myne owne John Poyntz," Wyatt presents a critique of the court from the perspective of a speaker who claims to have chosen the country over the court. Examining how Wyatt creates and describes the space and activities of this country retreat can provide insight into the nature of the court and the actual possibility of any retreat from it. Specifically, Wyatt's

---

[84] Letter from Sir Henry Wyatt to Cromwell quoted in Kenneth Muir, *Life and Letters of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 35. For information about Wyatt's imprisonment, see also Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*, 127; Heale, *Wyatt, Surrey and Early Tudor Poetry*, 131; and Thomson, *Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background*, 33, 37-38, 41-44.

[85] Muir, *Life and Letters*, 37; Thomson, *Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background*, 43.

[86] Daalder, "Are Wyatt's Poems in Egerton MS2711 in Chronological Order?," 215; Heale, *Wyatt, Surrey and Early Tudor Poetry*, 126; Sir Thomas Wyatt, *Collected Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt,* 349. For an argument that the poem was written in 1541, not 1536, see Zagorin, "Sir Thomas Wyatt and the Court of Henry VIII: The Courtier's Ambivalence," 135.

[87] Line numbers for Wyatt's poetry refer to those given in *Collected Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, ed. Kenneth Muir and Patricia Thomson. Muir and Thomson connect the comments in a letter from Wyatt's father to Cromwell that Wyatt has received "warnynges to adres hym better then his wit can consyder" to lines in the poem about having the clog at his heel (line 86) and needing to curb his "will and lust" (line 6) to support the dating of the poem to 1536 (349). Muir and Thomson quote the letter from Muir, *Life and Letters of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 35.

inclusion of hunting in the description of his country activities indicates that he desires to reconnect with the court and reaffirm his place within it, even as he critiques it.

The poem is a translation of a satire by Luigi Alamanni (1495-1556), Satire X, "À Thommaso Sertini." Wyatt faithfully translates much of the poem, but makes alterations to suit his physical and political settings.[88] Wyatt's addressee is the courtier John Poins, who served in the households of both Katherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn and in various other offices, and who met Wyatt when they were both youths.[89] Wyatt's speaker writes to Poins to explain "the cawse why that homeward I me draw" (2), which is that he does not want to live under the restrictions of life at court. He goes on to criticize the falsehood and feigning required of a courtier, and suggests that he has found a better alternative in country living in Kent. Some critics focus on the extent of the country-court divide, emphasizing the speaker's withdrawal from the life of the court and the moral advantage such a distance gives him when critiquing the corrupt practices he has left behind.[90] Patricia Thomson identifies the speaker as a Stoic philosopher, "for he stands only for himself, the true individualist." In her reading of the poem, the speaker isolates himself from every part of society, not only those at court but those in the country as well. From this vantage point, he attacks the society he has renounced.[91] Raymond Southall sees the poem as a contrast between "the luxury and hypocrisy of the Court" and "the simplicity and honesty of the country squire." Southall considers the life of a squire

[88] Muir and Thomson, *Collected Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 349.
[89] Burrow, "Horace at Home and Abroad: Wyatt and Sixteenth-century Horatianism," 38; Ploeg, "Framing Poins," 40.
[90] For a discussion of the convention of the divide between court and country, see Kernan, "Shakespearean Comedy and its Courtly Audience."
[91] Thomson, *Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background*, 251.

as a true alternative to the court, but is sure to emphasize that Wyatt and his speaker are not squires, but courtiers. The country life may be more appealing and moral, but the speaker's ultimate focus is still the court.[92]

Not all critics see such a clear separation between the two modes of life presented in the poem. Following Southall's idea of the speaker-as-courtier, Perez Zagorin acknowledges the fact that Wyatt will have to return to service at court when Henry VIII requires it. The respite in the country is only a temporary one, and the currently scorned manners of a courtier will have to be taken up again.[93] Some critics question whether this time in the country, however brief it may be, even qualifies as a real withdrawal from the concerns of court. Jonathan Crewe considers the Stoic detachment assumed by the speaker undercut by the idea that he has had to leave court because he is "unqualified" to make his way there. The moral force of the critique is lessened if the speaker is merely a sore loser. For Crewe, the speaker is "fixated on that from which he is withdrawing," casting doubt on whether he truly wanted to withdraw.[94] Elizabeth Heale notes that the bulk of the court critique is centered on the misuse of language and that the speaker tries to present himself as a plain speaking man of the country. Of course, the speaker and the poem are, in fact, sophisticated, so the poem seems more of a statement about the loss of Wyatt's gifts to the court than a simple, homely rejection.[95] Stephen Greenblatt argues

---

[92] Southall, *The Courtly Maker: As Essay on the Poetry of Wyatt and his Contemporaries*, 92-93. Cf. Ben Jonson's "To Penshurst" where James I's love of hunting brings him to the Sidney country estate; the world of the court could literally intrude upon a country retreat.
[93] Zagorin, "Sir Thomas Wyatt and the Court of Henry VIII," 137-8.
[94] Crewe, *Trials of Authorship: Anterior Forms and Poetic Reconstruction from Wyatt to Shakespeare*, 45.
[95] Heale, *Wyatt, Surrey and Early Tudor Poetry*, 132-135.

that Wyatt, in any poem, cannot be separated from issues of "linguistic convention, from social pressure, from the shaping force of religious and political power."[96] For Greenblatt, Wyatt's satires are a site of self-fashioning through "negation," "having withdrawn from the court to the country, Wyatt achieves a sense of self-confidence and self-content, of integrity and invulnerability."[97] Wyatt of the satires is still bound up in the structures of court, because this withdrawal is an attempt to gain power that can be used once he returns to court.[98] While I agree with Greenblatt that the poem is an attempt to regain power, I do not agree that Wyatt achieves this power through withdrawal from and rejection of the court. Wyatt does critique the court, and this critique gives him moral authority, but he also tries to reestablish his connection with the court.

While critics may differ in the extent to which they see the poem being concerned with or invested in the courtly world that is the subject of its critique, there seems to be consensus on the idea that life in Kent is, to some degree, a true withdrawal from the court. Time and time again, critics cite the lines in the poem where the speaker describes his daily activities in the country without any real comment:

> This maketh me at home to hounte and hawke
> And in fowle weder at my booke to sitt.
> In frost and snow then with my bow to stawke;
> No man doeth marke where so I ride or goo;
> In lusty lees at libertie I walke,
> And of these newes I fele nor wele nor woo,

[96] Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, 120.
[97] Ibid., 127, 131.
[98] Ibid., 135-136, 142.

Sauf that a clogg doeth hang yet at my hele:

Nor force for that for it is ordered so,

That I may lepe boeth hedge and dike full well. (80-88)

The lines are taken to be an uncomplicated statement of a simple country life that stands in opposition to the deceit and complexity of the court.[99] Of course, some aspects of the lines above do support this reading of the poem. The speaker claims that he has freedom of choice and movement. He no longer has to constantly bend his will and his activities to the desires of those in power. He is free to sit and read when the weather is bad. He is not only reading and spending time alone, though, he is also hunting and hawking. Those activities are connected to power and privilege and the world of the court, and their inclusion in the poem needs to be examined for their impact on the rest of the text.

In fact, the details on hunting and hawking were added by Wyatt; they are not included in Alamanni's version.[100] Where Alamanni says that he stays home in frosty weather, Wyatt adds that he will not stay inside; instead, he will stalk with his bow in the same weather.[101] Wyatt also adds the detail of being encumbered by a clog that nonetheless does not stop him from riding over hedges and ditches (86-88).[102] Besides the hunting details, Wyatt makes some other additions and changes to Alamanni to fit the poem to his circumstances. For example, he inserts a reference to Chaucer instead of

---

[99] Bates, "Wyatt, Surrey, and the Henrican Court," 43; Burrow, "Horace at Home and Abroad," 37; Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, 129; Heale, *Wyatt, Surrey and Early Tudor Poetry*, 10; Southall, *The Courtly Maker*, 93; Thomson, *Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background*, 44, 246, 252; Vander Ploeg, "Framing Poins," 42; Zagorin, "Sir Thomas Wyatt and the Court of Henry VIII," 137.

[100] Muir and Thomson, *Collected Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 353-354

[101] Ibid., 354; Thomson, *Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background*, 252.

[102] Muir and Thomson, *Collected Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 354.

Maevius and alludes to *Piers Plowman* by using the word "Favell" (67) for Alamanni's "l'amico lusinghier."[103] Wyatt is writing an English poem, so he chooses English literary references. Wyatt's English context forces him to make another change to Alamanni's poem. In a section condemning historical examples of dishonorable conduct, Alamanni praises Brutus while condemning Sulla and Caesar.[104] Wyatt would not be wise in Tudor England to praise Brutus, the murderer of Caesar. Instead, Wyatt uses Cato as his counterexample to the excesses of Caesar (37-42).[105] As Thomson explains, "with Cato, Wyatt has come on to safe, orthodox, moral ground. Cato represented the medieval idea of pagan virtue."[106] Wyatt may want to critique the court and Henry VIII, but he does not want to appear to be a rebel. Wyatt's hunting additions are as significant as his change from Brutus to Cato is, and no one has truly analyzed the implications of those additions. Wyatt chose to include these activities in his description of life in the country and the significance of that choice needs to be assessed.

The only critic to admit the possibility of some impact of the inclusion of hunting and hawking is Greenblatt. He acknowledges, "there is, to be sure, both money and social standing associated with the speaker – hunting and hawking, servants, lands on which to walk and ride 'at liberty' – but he is not at all implicated in the processes by which this wealth is secured."[107] True, the fact that Wyatt has an estate with all of the mentioned privileges presumably predates the moment of the poem and is partly the result of the

---

[103] Thomson, *Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background*, 258-259. Thomson translates "l'amico lusinghier" as "the flattering friend." Favell is the name of a character in *Piers Plowman*.
[104] Ibid., 257-258.
[105] Ibid., 258.
[106] Ibid., 258.
[107] Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, 132.

efforts of his forebears. Looking to the historical Wyatt, we know that he was released to his father, on his father's property. Part of the wealth and privilege is the result of Sir Henry's actions, not Sir Thomas'. The speaker does not merely passively inhabit this privilege, though, so he *is* implicated in it. Furthermore, the fact that he is the most recent in a line of family members to enjoy these privileges only emphasizes his connection to them. By hunting and hawking, he exercises and reaffirms his status and his connections to the court.

To fully understand the impact of Wyatt's hunting additions, it is necessary to examine in detail what the speaker describes in order to determine what kind of hunting he is engaged in and why that might matter. The speaker specifically describes one particular method of hunting that he practices, "In frost and snow then with my bow to stawke." (82). When the weather is bad, but not so bad that he stays in to read, the speaker goes out with a bow and arrows to stalk deer. This is not a particularly high status method of hunting, and it is not addressed in English hunting manuals, which are not as comprehensive as their French sources, the French authors content to be more catholic and comprehensive in their discussions of hunting practice. In *Le Livre de Chasse*, the source of the English *Master of Game*, a variety of methods of stalking are detailed.[108] Wyatt's speaker is stalking on foot, using whatever the terrain presents as cover. This method of hunting seems to support Greenblatt's assertion of non-implication as well as other critics' view that these lines simply detail an uncomplicated country retreat. The speaker can hunt this way alone, without the aid of servants or huntsmen, and there would be considerably less ceremony involved in killing and butchering the deer than is

[108] Gaston Phoebus*, The Hunting Book of Gaston Phébus.*, 70.

the case in other methods. On the other hand, no act of hunting, especially of deer (the only animal hunted in this manner), is completely uncomplicated. A subject's ability to hunt derived from the crown.[109] Even in his solitary stalking, the speaker is actively reaffirming his status and privilege and connections to the court. He uses a method of hunting more commonly practiced by poachers (it is much easier to remain undetected by the authorities when one is alone and hunting in silence), but there is certainly no indication that he is hunting illegally in Kent.[110] His hunting and hawking are part of his "libertie" (84), but that liberty is not separate from the court, it derives from it.[111] By hunting, he attempts to reconnect with the court, while still critiquing it; he attempts to overcome the facts of exile and to find a way back into favor.

Stalking may not be the only form of hunting practiced by the speaker. He says initially that he is "at home to hounte and hawke" (80), and later explains that his "clogg" (86) does not prevent him from jumping over "hedge and dike full well" (88). This suggests that the speaker could also be engaged in hunting on horseback. Wyatt was in Allington from June until the following March, so he would have been in exile for the summer hart hunting season.[112] The timeline suggested by the autobiographical nature of the poem plus the inclusion of the detail that the speaker is able to leap hedges and ditches on his horse indicates that the speaker could also be hunting *par force*. If the

---

[109] Manwood, *A Treatise of the Laws of the Forest*, 25r, 33r-38r.
[110] For a discussion of poaching, see Roger B. Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640*.
[111] In fact, Wyatt was a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber, given intimate access to the king, and his responsibilities would have included accompanying the king when he hunted. Hunting was a part of Wyatt's experience of favor and connection at court. Zagorin, "Sir Thomas Wyatt and the Court of Henry VIII," 118.
[112] Thomson, *Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background*, 43; Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 50.

speaker is hunting on horseback, this is the method of hunting he would use. Practicing this method of hunting is very much an assertion of status and a connection to the type of hunting practiced in the highest court circles. Regardless of whether the speaker actually hunts *par force* or merely goes on vigorous rides on horseback throughout the surrounding countryside, any form of (legal) hunting, particularly of deer, is a claim to status, and the speaker is clear that he does hunt. He may be physically separated from the court and scorn its ways earlier in the poem, but he uses the hunt to assert himself and to regain some of what he has lost.

The speaker not only hunts; he also hawks. Hawking is another status-drenched occupation. *The Boke of Saint Albans* famously includes a list of the appropriate hawks or falcons for the relevant members of society. The list explains, "There is a Sacre & a Sacret: and thyse ben for a knyghte. There is a Ianare & a Lanrell: and thyse belonge to a squyre," and includes the appropriate birds for an emperor down to a holy water clerk.[113] Scholars of falconry do not believe that the list reflects actual practice, but it does reflect a perception of hawking, one that indicated the connection of the sport to social rank.[114] In addition, the method of training hawks to hunt with men, called manning a hawk, is significant. Manning a hawk involved completely bending the bird to the man's will. The hawk must suppress its wild nature and act unnaturally, catching its prey and not eating it, returning to the lure when called, and submitting to having its eyes sewn shut when it

---

[113] *The Boke of Saint Albans*, D3v. The list refers to two different kinds of falcons, the saker and the lanner. For information on these birds, see Horobin, *Falconry in Literature: The Symbolism of Falconry in English Literature from Chaucer to Marvell*, 21; Robin S. Oggins, *The Kings and their Hawks: Falconry in Medieval England*, 14-15.
[114] Horobin, *Falconry in Literature: The Symbolism of Falconry in English Literature from Chaucer to Marvell*, 55.

is not hunting.[115] Manning and hunting with a hawk are analogous to the feigning and discipline required of a courtier which the speaker abhors. In hawking, the speaker recreates, with a bird, what he claims to repudiate; he puts himself in the position of power, forcing the bird to act against its will.[116] Of course, courtiers and birds are not the same thing, but neither is hawking an uncomplicated pastime that simply denotes a rustic country withdrawal from the evils of court. With this reference, Wyatt asserts his status and indicates a connection with the court.

Wyatt's speaker chooses to engage in activities that are intimately connected to status and power, and their inclusion in the poem provides insight into the speaker's position relative to the court. On the one hand, the inclusion of these activities seems to create an alternative court in Kent, with the speaker at the center of power. He commands his birds, his horse, possibly his hunt servants, and certainly dominates over the deer he kills. This view of the poem accords with Greenblatt's idea that the purpose of Wyatt's poetry is to gain power.[117] From this alternative sphere of power, Wyatt's speaker is able to speak his mind freely to John Poins, deploy impressive displays of eloquence in a critique of eloquence-in-the-service-of-falsehood at court, and choose his daily activities according to his mood and the weather. On the other hand, the ability of these activities to convey a sense of power derives from their connection to the court. Wyatt's speaker

---

[115] Latham, *Lathams Falconry or The Faulcons Lure, and Cure in Two Bookes*, 9-17; Markham, *Country Contentments*, 88-92; Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 101-102.
[116] See William Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* for the use of the language and procedures of manning a hawk as a method to tame unruly women. See Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 95-132, for a discussion of hawking in the play.
[117] Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, 142.

hunts because he still possesses at least that much favor from the king. Wyatt's inclusion of hunting and hawking in the poem is not evidence of a simpler, squirely, country life to which the speaker can retreat. Instead, it is evidence that Wyatt takes steps, after his critique of the court, to reconnect with it.

II

Like Wyatt, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, had more than his fair share of imprisonments and periods of exile. The imprisonment and exile of interest here is that of 1537, when Surrey was arrested for striking someone, Edward Seymour in some versions of the story, within the precincts of the court. The stated punishment for this offense was the loss of the right hand, but Surrey was spared that fate and sent instead to Windsor until he was restored to favor.[118] Windsor was filled with memories for Surrey because he had spent time there as a companion to Henry VIII's bastard son, Henry Fitzroy, Duke of Richmond.[119] Richmond had died only the year before Surrey's exile, and, despite a lack of much evidence aside from the poems themselves, Surrey's "So crewell prison" is thought to date from this time.[120] Put into place as Richmond's companion by his father to gain a political advantage, Surrey nonetheless became close with the king's son, spending time with him at Windsor and on a trip abroad to France.[121] Surrey was devastated by Richmond's death in July of 1536, with his father writing to Cromwell a

[118] Sessions, *Henry Howard the Poet Earl of Surrey: A Life*, 129-130; Chapman, *Two Tudor Portraits: Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey and Lady Katherine Grey*, 55-6.
[119] Sessions, *Henry Howard the Poet Earl of Surrey*, 71-107; Lines, "The Erotic Politics of Grief in Surrey's 'So crewell prison,'" 2-3.
[120] Since there is not much outside evidence, the dating of the poems is not certain. What is certain is that the poems refer to this period of imprisonment, regardless of when they were written. See Bates, "Wyatt, Surrey and the Henrician Court," 43; Lines, "The Erotic Politics of Grief," 3; Sessions, *Henry Howard the Poet Earl of Surrey*, 130.
[121] Sessions, *Henry Howard the Poet Earl of Surrey*, 71-107.

year later, "his son of Surrey is very weak, his nature running from him abundantly…[Surrey] was in that case a great part of the last year, and as he showed me [the weakness] came to him for thought of my lord of Richmond, and now I think is come again by some other thought."[122] "So crewell prison" is Surrey's elegy for Richmond; in the poem, he contrasts the unhappiness of his current imprisonment with the happy memories of his past time there with Richmond, mentally moving through the castle, recalling games and activities in which he engaged with the king's son. The poem ends with the speaker lamenting and comforting himself with the idea that his current pain is easier to bear when the worse pain of his loss of Richmond is remembered.

Critics have always acknowledged that the poem is not only an elegy for the loss of Richmond, but for the loss of a particular version of the space of Windsor as well. A. C. Spearing analyzes the poem as a mnemonic device, seeing it as self-consciously about the workings of memory. The places remembered by Surrey in the poem are strongly associated with emotions, reminding Spearing of the mnemonic technique of placing thoughts and emotions within a mental architectural space.[123] S. P. Zitner sees the poem as an attempt of "repossession through memory"; Surrey wants to bring back and reclaim the past in the midst of his present troubles.[124] Stephen Guy Bray and C. W. Jentoft analyze the poem in terms of the genre of elegy, both concluding that Surrey does not completely follow elegiac conventions, choosing to personally lament his friend rather

---

[122] Quoted in Sessions, *Henry Howard the Poet Earl of Surrey*, 128-129. It is likely that Surrey had already been arrested when the Duke of Norfolk wrote this letter to Cromwell and that Norfolk was including this detail in an attempt to gain leniency for his son, so Surrey's grief for Richmond was bound up with the circumstances of his imprisonment from almost the moment he was arrested.
[123] Spearing, *Medieval to Renaissance in English Poetry*, 319-320.
[124] Zitner, "Truth and Mourning in a Sonnet by Surrey," 524.

than hold him up as an object for public praise and imitation. Both see Surrey's elegy as a lament for a lost way of life; Surrey makes a political statement by elegizing the end of the noble and chivalric youth he spent with Richmond.[125] Bray sees the poem as a love poem as well as an elegy.[126]

Other critics attribute another sense of loss in the poem to Surrey's present situation at the time of his imprisonment. Sessions considers "all the deaths and imprisonments and losses of 1536" the subject of Surrey's sorrow, the poem a lament for the loss of an old order of power and nobility.[127] Elizabeth Heale sees the poem as a lament for the end of Surrey's current political ambitions.[128] Jonathan Crewe thinks that the loss is so intense for Surrey that the poem reveals a suicidal urge in the poet. In his view, the games and activities described are moments of intense rivalry and competition between Surrey and Richmond, a sort of dress rehearsal for deadly serious adult struggle. Surrey had wanted to replace Richmond and, ultimately, Henry VIII himself, but, doomed as "Priams sonnes" (4), he now embraces failure and defeat.[129]

Candace Lines has combined two strands of work on the poem, connecting the homoerotic nature of the relationship between Surrey and Richmond detailed in the poem with Surrey's political context. Lines sees the elegy as a moment of self-fashioning on Surrey's part, as he attempts to recreate and redefine the intimacy and power of the

---

[125] Bray, "'We Two Boys Together Clinging': The Earl of Surrey and the Duke of Richmond," 138-50; Jentoft, "Surrey's Five Elegies: Rhetoric, Structure, and the Poetry of Praise," 23-32.
[126] See also Davis, "Contexts in Surrey's Poetry," 40-55.
[127] Sessions, *Henry Howard the Poet Earl of Surrey*, 135-136. The deaths of 1536 include Richmond and Anne Boleyn.
[128] Heale, *Wyatt, Surrey and Early Tudor Poetry*, 22-23.
[129] Crewe, *Trials of Authorship*, 51, 56, 70-73. Line numbers for Surrey's poetry refer to those given in *Henry Howard Earl of Surrey: Poems*, ed. Emrys Jones.

institution of the Privy Chamber in a separate court centered on Richmond. Lines agrees with other critics that Surrey mourns the loss of the old political order centered on nobility and chivalry, and Surrey particularly wants to reunite inherited nobility with the politically powerful homosocial, and possibly homoerotic, intimacy of Henry's companions of the Privy Chamber. Surrey becomes the chief member of Richmond's Privy Chamber of sorts at Windsor. Lines disagrees with Crewe's notion of the dangerously competitive nature of the games played by the two men, seeing those moments as evidence of the strength of their friendship, as competition gives way before love. Of course, this site of power is already lost to Surrey when he writes the poem, and the notion that the noble life of chivalry shared with Richmond is gone is a serious critique of Henry VIII. Lines does not see Surrey embracing defeat and loss, but putting himself forward as the sole survivor of an old way of life that should be restored.[130]

Lines' argument is very persuasive, including her notion that the games and activities of Surrey and Richmond's past as described in the poem are evidence of the strength of their friendship. No critic really gives a detailed analysis of any of the particular activities, though; most critics who mention them agree with Lines that they are signs of Surrey's love and affection for Richmond. An analysis of the hunting practiced by Surrey and Richmond is useful because it is different from the other activities described in the poem. Ultimately, the moment of hunting gives a crucial insight into the poem's relationship with power and status, demonstrating that Surrey appeals to Henry VIII even as it critiques him. Additionally, the placement of the hunt comes at a turning point in the poem, just before Surrey depicts the intense intimacy of his shared bedroom

[130] Lines, "The Erotic Politics of Grief," 1-26.

with Richmond. The juxtaposition of these two memories reminds Henry VIII of Surrey's bond with Richmond and indicates the intensity of that bond. The poem may be an elegy for a lost friend and a lost way of life, but it is also a bid for power in the present moment.

Before looking at the hunt, it will be helpful to look at one or two examples of other activities mentioned in the poem to have a sense of how the hunt differs. The speaker remembers:

> The palme playe, where, dispoyled for the game,
> With dased eyes oft we by gleames of love
> Have mist the ball and got sight of our dame
> To bayte her eyes which kept the leddes above. (13-16)

Playing a version of tennis where the players used their hands instead of a racket, Surrey and Richmond are distracted from their game by the presence of the ladies above.[131] Love and women intrude upon the two men, diverting their competition. They are united in their distraction in love and are on display for those watching them. The game seems almost incidental, just another occasion to be together and to be watched by their companions. Later, the speaker recalls:

> With sylver dropps the meades yet spredd for rewthe,
> In active games of nymbleness and strengthe
> Where we dyd strayne, trayled by swarmes of youthe,
> Our tender lymes, that yet shott upp in lengthe. (21-24)

[131] Jones, *Henry Howard Earl of Surrey: Poems*, 122.

Here, the two young men wrestle on the mead, or meadow, this time observed by an audience of other youths, instead of women. Not only is the wrestling remembered, but the setting for the game is important, the speaker recalling the dew on the grass of the mead. Surrey emphasizes the similarities and closeness between himself and Richmond – their bodies are intertwined in the wrestling and they are both still growing, together. The strength of their friendship and their bodies is on display for the youths who follow them, swarming around the center of this little universe to watch. In these examples and the others not cited, Surrey and Richmond are close, competing in a friendly fashion and on display for women and youths at Windsor to observe and mark. The locations of these memories are scattered around the castle, in beautiful settings expressly designed for the games being played. With each detail, Surrey recalls the closeness of his friendship with the king's son.

The moment of hunting is similar in a number of ways, but is crucially different in others. The moment is described as follows:

> The wyld forest, the clothed holtes with grene,
> With raynes avald and swift ybrethed horse,
> With cry of houndes and mery blastes bitwen,
> Where we did chase the fearfull hart a force. (29-32)

Surrey and Richmond are hunting in the forest, the farthest away from the castle they will get in Surrey's memory.[132] Imprisoned in that same castle in the present moment of the poem, the speaker recalls a time, filled with sound and movement, when the two youths had complete freedom of movement, loosening their reins and giving their horses their

[132] See Davis, "Contexts in Surrey's Poetry," 52.

heads to ride as fast as possible. The setting is as beautiful and appropriate as the mead was for wrestling; the holtes, or wood, are dressed especially in green for the hunters.[133] The forest is also "wyld," though; this is a different space from the cultivated grounds of the castle. Surrey and Richmond still engage in a chivalric type of activity like the other games in the poem, but hunting is connected to larger, wilder forces. Unlike the other activities, there is no audience mentioned in this description; although there are other people involved, Surrey presents the two men speeding towards a common purpose, "the fearfull hart" (32).

There is no doubt that Surrey and Richmond hunt *par force*, since the poem explicitly says that they do. It is not surprising, given the noble, chivalric nature of the other activities they engage in, that the two youths practice the most elevated, difficult and aristocratic method of hunting while at Windsor. What makes hunting *par* force so difficult is that there are no nets to help the hunters pursue the hart, and they must get very close to the hart to kill it with a sword or dagger. In addition, the activities of many men and dogs must be coordinated to ensure a successful hunt. This type of hunt is very appropriate for demonstrating physical fitness and leadership; it is a display of power that Surrey is currently unable to exercise but would like to regain. There is no described audience for the hunt, unlike the prior activities, but the hunt would have involved quite a number of people. Instead of watching the two young men, the huntsmen would be following their prescribed roles, assisting in the smooth completion of the chase and kill. Everyone participating would possess the requisite knowledge of the rituals and

[133] *Oxford English Dictionary*, Online Edition March 2013, s.v. "holt," accessed March 15, 2013, http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/Entry/87829.

procedures of the hunt *par force*, and, by fulfilling their place and function within the hierarchy of the hunt, everyone involved would successfully complete a difficult and complex activity.[134] With this coordinated whirlwind of a hunt, Surrey and Richmond create their own alternative court at Windsor, centered on the king's son.[135] *Par force* hunting is a very hierarchical form of hunting. Richmond, as the highest ranked member of the party, would choose the deer to be chased at the breakfast assembly.[136] When the deer is finally brought to bay, the kill would be delayed until Richmond arrived on the scene, if he was not there already. He has the honor of killing the deer.[137] When breaking, or butchering the deer, specific parts of the deer's body go to specific people; the social order is reified and reinforced in the division of the carcass.[138] The hunt is not competitive in the same way the other games are; it is designed so that Richmond will always win and so that Surrey, his closest companion emotionally and in rank, will be right at his side when he does. At other moments in the poem, Surrey and Richmond debate who wins in their games (12, 27). Of course as the king's son, Richmond would probably always win, or be allowed to win, but the outcome is not as certain in a game as it is in a hunt. An aristocratic hunt mimicked social hierarchy, one where Surrey is

---

[134] For a description of *par force* hunting, see Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 109-123; *The Master of Game*, 148-151. For the use of horn calls and the proper deployment of hounds, see Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 40, 160-169; *The Master of Game*, 165, 168; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 29-37, 100-104, 249-252; Twiti, *William Twiti: The Art of Hunting 1327*, 50.

[135] In her analysis of the erotics and power of the poem, Candace Lines also sees the creation of a "microcosm of the royal household." "The Erotic Politics of Grief," 8.

[136] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 90-92, 95-97; *The Master of Game*, 163-164.

[137] Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 41; *The Master of Game*, 174.

[138] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 127-129; *The Master of Game*, 174-180.

second only to the king's son.[139] Surrey would like a return to that stable order and his place within it. In his moment of disfavor, Surrey is recalling his high place in an alternative court. Surrey makes a claim for power and status with this particular memory.

The hunt may make the boldest claim for independent, alternative power (now lost, of course), but is also the activity most directly linked to the king and his center of power. Surrey and Richmond hunt at his pleasure and permission, just as anyone else in the kingdom does. He has absolute rights over hunting in the entirety of the kingdom, and all individual hunting rights have been granted from the crown.[140] The two men may have their structure of power at Windsor, but it is subsumed under Henry VIII. They are hunting a royal animal in an aristocratic manner on royal lands. The presence of the king's authority would not merely be theoretical. The forests in England were governed under a separate set of laws, enforced by a network of forest officials. Besides regulating and caring for the venison and vert, the technical terms for game and trees, these officials were also called upon to assist in hunts when the monarch came to their jurisdiction. Surrey and Richmond may or may not have had their own huntsmen and kennel men, but Henry's local officials would have been a part of any hunt taking place in Windsor

[139] For the connection of the hunt to social hierarchy, see Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War*, 19; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640*, 6; Marvin, *Hunting Law and Ritual in Medieval English Literature*, 129; Yamamoto, *The Boundaries of the Human in Medieval English Literature*, 102.
[140] Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 28; Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 70; Manwood, *A Treatise of the Laws of the Forest*, 25r, 33r-38r; Whitlock, *Historic Forests of England*, 21.

Forest.[141] Henry's authority would be present in the person of these officials. Furthermore, Henry himself hunted in Windsor Forest numerous times during his reign.

"So crewell prison" seems to describe a youthful idyll separate from the center of power which now punishes Surrey, but the inclusion of the hunt indicates a very real connection back to the king and the court. This is not only a reminder of when Surrey was close to Richmond (and the status that went along with that closeness), it is also a reminder of being in favor with the king. Now, Surrey is "alone" (51) at Windsor, the empty rooms "retournes therto a hollowe sound of playnt" (50). The hunt is the one assertion of status in the poem that has any real connection to any future rehabilitation. Without Richmond, Surrey cannot regain any of the other experiences mentioned in the poem. There is no longer a companion with whom to play palm or tilt or wrestle, but Surrey can be included again in a hunt, assuming his rightful place in the king's favor and in the hierarchy of the chase.

This minor gesture towards a desire for restoration puts a different perspective on what follows in the poem, the most striking moments of remembered intimacy between Surrey and Richmond. Surrey recalls sharing a bedchamber with Richmond, exchanging secrets and promises away from the gazes of everyone around them during the day. Just as they were constantly together in their daily pursuits, Surrey depicts their physical closeness at night. In contrast to the sound and movement of the hunt, these moments are still and quiet: "the pleasaunt dreames, the quyet bedd of rest" (36). Just prior to this, Surrey and Richmond hunted in the green forest of summer; now he remembers "the

[141] Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 17-24; Theis, *Writing the Forest in Early Modern England: A Sylvan Pastoral Nation*, 12; Whitlock, *Historic Forests of England*, 18-21.

winter nightes" of physical and emotional intimacy (40). On flying horses, the hunters ranged widely outside the castle; now the two men are enclosed in "the voyd walles," snug and close (33). Surrey specifically says that the two men are "harbourd" within the walls of the castle (33). This is the technical term to describe when a deer is bedded down. In order to start a chase, the huntsmen return to the harbored deer they found the night before, and the chase begins when the deer is unharbored.[142] Surrey and Richmond go from being the hunters to being the deer, safely ensconced and resting, at least until some hunter comes along and forces them to flee. The end of the memory of the hunt marks a big transition in time, space and emotional tone in the poem. Recalling his most intimate memories, Surrey moves away from making assertions of status into a total sadness. Surrey may use his memories of his time with Richmond, particularly his memories of their shared hunts, to make claims for status in the face of his present imprisonment, but the force of sadness, of elegy, overcomes those impulses at the end of the poem. The hunt may mark his biggest attempt to improve his future, but it also marks the moment of transition into complete mourning.

III

George Gascoigne also uses the hunt as part of a strategy to improve a position of political, instead of physical, exile in his poem "Gascoignes wodmanship." Gascoigne is not writing from a position of banishment to the country and political exile like Wyatt and Surrey, but he does write as one who is outside the system of patronage, trying to get (back) in. In fact, he writes and sets the poem during the winter of 1572/3 during a short return to England between tours of military service in the Netherlands, a service

[142] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 106; *The Master of Game*, 29.

necessitated by troubles with debt at home, so he is in a sort of physical as well as political exile when composing the poem.[143] Gascoigne addresses his poem to Arthur, 14th Baron Grey de Wilton, asking Grey for patronage during a winter hunting party where the poet cannot seem to manage to shoot a single appropriate deer.[144] Throughout the poem, Gascoigne tries to explain why he is unable to properly shoot while also excusing his past inability to hit the target of a successful career in philosophy, in the law, in court circles, or in the military. Many critics consider the hunting described in "Gascoignes wodmanship" as an utter failure and as little more than a convenient allegorical frame for the argument that virtuous past failures demonstrate how the poet deserves future success and support from his patron. The hunting depicted in the poem is not such a failure, though, and the hunt is more than just an allegorical frame. Gascoigne uses the hunt to help demonstrate his skills and qualifications to Lord Grey and to make a strong appeal for patronage.

Lord Grey was an appropriate target of patronage for Gascoigne. Gascoigne and Grey both entered Gray's Inn in 1555, where they may have known each other, but their families had been involved before that.[145] G. W. Pigman III explains in his introduction to his edition of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* that "Gascoigne's grandfather was connected with Grey's grandfather, and Sir John Gascoigne was an officer of Grey's

---

[143] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 66; Pigman, "Gascoigne, George (1534/5?-1577)"; Pigman, Introduction to *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, xxvii-xxxi; Prouty, *George Gascoigne: Elizabethan Courtier, Soldier, and Poet*, 45-49; Staub, "George Gascoigne," 129-130.

[144] This is the same Lord Grey who will later be Edmund Spenser's patron and who was responsible for the 1580 Smerwick Massacre in Ireland.

[145] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 67.

father."[146] Furthermore, "during that winter [1572/3] [Lord Grey] was probably residing at his estate at Whaddon in Buckinghamshire, less than 20 miles from the Gascoigne family manor at Cardington in Bedfordshire."[147] In addition to the family connections and the physical proximity, Lord Grey took hunting very seriously, so the approach Gascoigne chose for his appeal was also appropriate. Later in the same year that the poem was written, Grey was arrested and sent to the Fleet prison for "attacking Sir John Fortescue over a quarrel about his rights to hunt home deer that crossed from Whaddon Chase to Salden, Fortescue's adjacent property."[148] Grey considered the right to pursue the deer into Fortescue's property a matter of status, writing, "'for well deserving of prince and contrie I maye without arrogance (I trust) not onlye matche but somewhat better' Fortescue, or, as [Grey] put it more directly to Fortescue, being an inferior, he should 'stuff a turde in your teeth.'"[149] Being a complete failure as a hunter would not endear one to a man like Lord Grey, so Gascoigne is careful to demonstrate success through or in spite of failure in the poem.

Gascoigne's appeal to Lord Grey was successful. He wrote another poem for Grey after he returned again from Holland, "Gascoignes voyage into Hollande, An. 1572" and would also go on to dedicate "The fruites of Warre (Dulce bellum inexpertis)," *The Steele Glas,* and *Complaynte of Phylomene* to him. Gascoigne also dedicated poems to members of Grey's circle, writing an epitaph for Lord Grey's first wife and poems for

---

[146] Pigman, Introduction to *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, xxxi, note 29.
[147] Pigman, *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, 662, note 72.0.1.
[148] Ibid.
[149] Lock, "Grey, Arthur, fourteenth Baron Grey of Wilton (1536-1593)." Lock quotes Lord Grey from TNA: PRO, SP 12/92/26 and TNA: PRO, SP 12/92/34.

Lady Sands, Grey's cousin, and Douglas Dive, a wife of another cousin.[150] One of Gascoigne's biographers asserts that the success of "Wodmanship" and a masque written for a double wedding between the Montague and Dormer families encouraged the poet to publish *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* in 1573.[151] "Gascoignes wodmanship" was published in *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* in the section entitled "Devices of Sundry Gentlemen," and it was not changed when it was republished in *The Posies* in 1575.[152]

Critics have generally agreed that Gascoigne appeals to Grey by claiming virtue and/or success through failure. His prior goals in philosophy, the law, the court, and the military are presented as unworthy of the effort spent pursuing them, and the rhetorical brilliance with which he describes these failures is his true advertisement to Gray.[153] For Richard Helgerson, "Wodmanship" fits into the idea of Gascoigne as a "Reformed Prodigal," "moralizing" his past failures and demonstrating his present changed state.[154] Gillian Austen revises Helgerson's model of the Reformed Prodigal, making it one of a number of personae that the poet adopts instead of a defining trajectory, but sees "Wodmanship" fitting the Reformed Prodigal mode.[155]

For most critics, the hunting that introduces and closes the poem is little more than a convenient frame for Gascoigne's allegory of virtuous failure. Steven May

---

[150] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 66-68.
[151] Staub, "George Gascoigne," 130.
[152] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 3, 80, 87; Pigman, Introduction to *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, li. Pigman does not indicate that there are any extant manuscript copies of the poem.
[153] Alpers, "Renaissance Lyrics and Their Situations," 309-331; Javitch, "The Impure Motives of Elizabethan Poetry," 225-238; Kneidel, "Reforming George Gascoigne," 329-370; McCoy, "Gascoigne's 'Poëma Castrata': The Wages of Courtly Success," 29-55.
[154] Helgerson, *The Elizabethan Prodigals*, 1, 48.
[155] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 66-67.

succinctly states the mostly widespread contention: "Gascoigne's 'Woodmanship' (*Flowres* 72) concerns hunting, but only as a background for the autobiographical narrative that is its true subject."[156] When the hunting is given more attention, Gascoigne's failure to hunt is what is emphasized. Jonathan Crewe sees the poem as a contest of masculine wills between Gascoigne and Grey.[157] For Crewe, Gascoigne resists becoming Gray's woodman under the terms Gray offers; Gascoigne wants to reinvent what it means to be the woodman. Crewe explains,

> To have been made one of Lord Grey's "woodmen," then, can mean having been made answerable to authorized demands for brutal, gender-coded performance, and ones so powerfully authorized as to preclude any simple or putatively emancipated resistance. Even the passive resistance of the persistently failing "woodman" will make him look like a fool or a madman ("amased like a sot"). At best, perhaps, a "humorous" (humoring) deferral of these requirements can be attempted, and that is evidently part of what Gascoigne undertakes in his jocular, protracted allegory…In establishing the putative justification for all these failures, Gascoigne can and does invoke various well-established terms of countercultural humanistic enlightenment and sympathy…Inasmuch as that violence emanates from the schooled and directed will of the "princely" masculine subject,

---

[156] May, "Early Courtier Verse: Oxford, Dyer, and Gascoigne," 64. See also Alpers, "Renaissance Lyrics and Their Situations," 312, 318; Hedley, "Allegoria: Gascoigne's Master Trope," 148-164; Javitch, "The Impure Motives of Elizabethan Poetry," 231; Peterson, *The English Lyric from Wyatt to Donne: A History of the Plain and Eloquent Styles*, 158-159; Prouty, *George Gascoigne: Elizabethan Courtier, Soldier, and Poet*, 121; Winters, *Forms of Discovery: Critical and Historical Essays on the Forms of the Short Poem in English*, 17.

[157] Crewe, *Trials of Authorship: Anterior Forms and Poetic Reconstruction from Wyatt to Shakespeare*, 129.

> sensitively taking the part of the woman/hunted/other, including that "part" of the self, becomes programmatically thinkable. (Crewe, *Trials of Authorship,* 132-133)

Despite really lacking the power necessary to do so, Gascoigne resists the masculine order of violent performance by refusing to kill the deer with which he has identified. Crewe places Gascoigne in the vein of humanistic anti-hunting discourse by Erasmus, More and Montaigne, and sees the hunting failure as part of a rebellious refusal by Gascoigne to submit to the system he nonetheless petitions for support.[158] Agreeing with Crewe, Catherine Bates sees the poem "[articulating] a counter-cultural discourse and [offering] an alternative mode of subjectivity, one as far removed as possible from that of the masterly male."[159] Crewe acknowledges, though, that the speaker's stance toward hunting in the poem is not so one-sided. Citing lines 96-100 of the poem, where the speaker asserts that not everyone in the world shoots better than he does and that he can shoot better than some, Crewe describes this moment as one of "radical duplicity."[160] Gascoigne both wants to accrue the virtue associated with refusing to kill the deer and to benefit from the assertion of masculine status that comes with shooting prowess. Gascoigne would like to create an alternative to the masculine order, but he also wants to benefit from it.

---

[158] For information on anti-hunting discourse, see Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 24-29; Cartmill, *A View to a Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature through History*, 76-91; Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 85-87; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640,* 16-17; Orme, "Medieval Hunting: Fact and Fancy," 145-146; Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England: 1500-1800*, 153-154, 161-163; Uhlig, "'The Sobbing Deer': *As You Like It*, II.i.21-66 and the Historical Context," 79-109.

[159] Bates, "George Turberville and the Painful Art of Falconry," 405.

[160] Crewe, *Trials of Authorship*, 134-135.

At a general level, I agree with Crewe and Bates that the hunting in the poem is more than just an allegorical frame and deserves sustained attention, and more specifically, I agree that there is some resistance on Gascoigne's part to the role offered him by Lord Grey – to be his woodman in the winter hunt. Crewe and Bates overstate Gascoigne's failure, though, evaluating his performance solely on the basis of whether he kills a deer or whether he kills the right kind of deer – more on this later. Of course, killing your prey is the ultimate goal of any hunt, and I would not argue that Gascoigne presents himself as the master of the day's activities. Gascoigne's success or failure as a hunter should not only be evaluated by the number of kills he makes, though; he should also be evaluated by his use of and control of language with regard to the hunt. After all, he is trying to demonstrate his fitness to Lord Grey through a poem asking for patronage; his ability to use language to fit any occasion is the main thrust of the work. Furthermore, language is a vital part of the practice of hunting. As Anne Rooney explains, "the language of the hunt performed a socially divisive function and rendered the hunt elitist, a closed book to the uninitiated."[161] When the poem is examined from this perspective, Gascoigne is not entirely a failure in the hunt, and he uses the hunt as an assertion of his skills and knowledge, even through partial failure. Gascoigne does not resist the world of the hunt; he uses it to his advantage.

[161] Rooney, *Hunting in Middle English Literature*, 13. For the importance of the use of proper language in the hunt, see also Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 11; Cartmill, *A View to a Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature through History*, 61-62; Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 56, 80; Madden, *The Diary of Master William Silence: A Study of Shakespeare & of Elizabethan Sport*, 210; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640*, 12; Orme, "Medieval Hunting: Fact and Fancy," 141; Semenza, *Sport, Politics, and Literature in the English Renaissance*, 45; Yamamoto, *The Boundaries of the Human in Medieval English Literature*, 102, 107.

Gascoigne does not "shoote so ofte awrie" (2) in the poem because he simply does not know how to hunt.[162] He has the necessary skills and knowledge. Just two years after the publication of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, Gascoigne anonymously publishes a successful and popular hunting treatise, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting* (1575). While George Turberville, the author of a hawking treatise published at the same time and often bound with *The Noble Arte*, was once considered the author of the hunting treatise, Gascoigne's identity as the author has been firmly established.[163] Gascoigne was commissioned by the printer Christopher Barker to translate a French treatise, *La Vénerie*, by Jacques du Fouilloux.[164] The treatise is more than a simple translation, though, and Gascoigne adds comments about his own experience and about differences between the French and English methods of hunting.[165] Gillian Austen claims that *The Noble Arte* was published anonymously because its courtly subject matter conflicted with the more reformed, moral persona of Gascoigne's printed works at the time, like the *Glasse of Government*.[166] As Austen also points out, Gascoigne did not acquire all the skills and knowledge he displays in *The Noble Arte* solely in the two years between

---

[162] Gascoigne, "Gascoignes wodmanship," *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, ed. G. W. Pigman III. All subsequent references to the poem will be from this edition.
[163] Robertson, "George Gascoigne and 'The Noble Arte of Venerie and Hunting,'" 484-485; Prouty, "George Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie*, and Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth," 639-665.
[164] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 105; Prouty, "George Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie*, and Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth," 641.
[165] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 111; Prouty, "George Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie*, and Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth," 643-644. For a longer discussion about *The Noble Arte*, please see the Introduction.
[166] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 17.

"Gascoignes wodmanship" and the publication of the hunting treatise.[167] Gascoigne knew how to hunt in reality while he was portraying himself as somewhat inept in a poem to Lord Grey. In fact, Gascoigne's authorship of *The Noble Arte* was most likely part of what attracted the Earl of Leicester's attention, leading to a commission for entertainments to be performed during Queen Elizabeth's stay at Leicester's castle, Kenilworth, later than summer. Gascoigne used hunting in a bid for patronage more than once, and both times, he had some success.

In "Wodmanship," Gascoigne carefully uses language to assert his knowledge of and skills in hunting. The poem is introduced by a prose explanation of the occasion for writing the poem. In this introduction, Gascoigne begins to establish precisely in what kind of hunting he and Lord Grey are engaged. Gascoigne explains that Lord Grey is "chusing of his winter deare, and killing the same with his bowe" (0.3-4). By specifying that the season is winter and that Lord Grey uses a bow to kill the deer, Gascoigne reveals what kind of deer are being hunted and how they are hunted. The winter deer-hunting season is known as the *fermisona*, and it is the time to hunt the female deer of both the red and fallow species.[168] By specifying that Grey uses a bow and that there is a "heard" for Gascoigne to let "passe by" (0.8) without shooting, it is clear that Grey's party is hunting using the bow and stable method. In this type of hunting, shooters are placed at pre-arranged stations, and teams of men and dogs drive the deer towards the shooters.[169] This is a seasonally appropriate way to hunt, and it was a method used, developed and

---

[167] Austen, "Self Portraits and Self Presentation in the Work of George Gascoigne," para 9.
[168] Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 50; *The Master of Game*, 254-255; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 240.
[169] Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 47-67, 87; *The Master of Game*, 189-199.

preserved in England, as opposed to France, where it was considered little better than using traps or snares.[170] The hunting depicted in the poem is aristocratic but not the most prestigious form of hunting, the hunt *par force* – the mounted chase of the red deer.

The prose prologue also specifies that Lord Grey "call[s] [Gascoigne] one of his wodmen." (0.6). Lord Grey, in calling Gascoigne a woodman, is making the poet part of his hunting establishment, the group of men, some well born, who assist Grey when he hunts and maintain the vert and venison on his property year round. Specifically, Grey may be giving Gascoigne the position of woodward. "The woodward, though primarily responsible for the actual timber or underwood…was also, as a rule, a forester – that is, he was at the same time responsible for the venison."[171] In terms of the hierarchy of forest officials, the woodward was not a particularly elevated position. A woodward was responsible for private land; he was not part of the more extensive and prestigious royal hunting establishment. Even if woodman is just meant to be a synonym for forester, a forest official who performed essentially the same duties as a woodward but on royal land, that office is not particularly elevated either.[172] A man like Gascoigne would want to be a warden, verderer, or a chief forester, all offices usually occupied by men of station and responsible not only for preserving the vert and venison but also for presenting offenders to the forest courts.[173]

Gascoigne as Grey's woodman fails to hit any of the deer, and Lord Grey teases him because he's shown skill in the past. Jonathan Crewe claims that Gascoigne resists

---

[170] Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 49-50.
[171] Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 22.
[172] Ibid., 19-20; Ralph Whitlock, *Historic Forests of England*, 18-20.
[173] Ibid.

becoming Grey's woodman and tries to redefine what that office means.[174] The prologue does not present an ideal offer of patronage, and Gascoigne does show reluctance to take up the position offered by Grey as a woodman participating in bow and stable hunting. While Crewe thinks that Gascoigne mostly rejects the hunt, Gascoigne uses hunting in the poem to demonstrate his knowledge and skills and to try and get a better offer from Grey.

As the poem begins, Gascoigne takes on the title offered to him by Lord Grey in the prologue, calling himself "your wodman" (2). The reason he writes the poem is to "excuse [his failure to hit the deer] in verse" (0.11), and he reiterates his failure: "he stands amased like a sot, / And lets the harmlesse deare (unhurt) go by" (3-4). Describing the deer as "harmlesse" suggests that Gascoigne has sympathy for his prey; they do not pose a threat, so they do not deserve to be killed. He is "amased," unable to perform the task that Grey asks of him. Catherine Bates and Jonathan Crewe read this moment as one where Gascoigne identifies with his prey, refusing the masculine imperative to kill and sympathizing with the other.[175] Gillian Austen and the Proutys note that Gascoigne's hunting manual, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, includes complaint poems in the voice of several of the animals and that these poems bring a measure of sympathy for those animals into the text.[176] Gascoigne does have some compassion for the animals killed in the hunt, both in *The Noble Arte* and in this poem, but *The Noble Arte* also

---

[174] Crewe, *Trials of Authorship: Anterior Forms and Poetic Reconstruction from Wyatt to Shakespeare*, 129.
[175] Bates, "George Turberville and the Painful Art of Falconry," 406; Crewe, *Trials of Authorship: Anterior Forms and Poetic Reconstruction from Wyatt to Shakespeare*, 131-133.
[176] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 111-112; Charles and Ruth Prouty, "George Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie*, and Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth," 644-649.

includes extensive and detailed instructions on how to hunt down and kill these animals. In the hunting manual and in "Gascoignes wodmanship," Gascoigne displays and delights in his skills and knowledge of hunting. Gascoigne may also be playing on the meaning of "wood" as mad. Just as Grey teases him for missing the deer, the poet answers back in a joking manner; he is a crazy failure who needs Grey's help. Gascoigne wants to emphasize his skills and his close relationship with Grey in his bid for patronage.

Gascoigne begins to display his knowledge of the language of hunting in the lines that immediately follow. He has just tried to excuse the fact that he "shoote[s] so ofte awrie" (2), and now he imagines an alternative version of failure: "Or if he strike a doe which is but carren, / Laugh not good Lord, but favoure such a fault, / Take well in worth, he wold faine hit the barren" (5-7). First of all, by using the term "doe," Gascoigne indicates which species of deer Grey and his party are hunting. A doe is the name for a female fallow deer.[177] Gascoigne has moved from using the more general term – deer – to using a more specific one, and this matters because of the status of the various species of deer. As one scholar explains, "The fallow buck, except in one respect, was held in markedly lower esteem than the hart, was less generally hunted, and yet was sufficiently similar in habits, size and appearance to engender no folklore or symbolism unique to itself."[178] Fallow deer were more delicious, but that was the only quality that distinguished them from red deer, the most prestigious species of deer. Furthermore, the male of both species were prized above the female, both as sport and as food.[179]

---

[177] Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 27; *The Boke of Saint Albans*, C2r.
[178] Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 84. Gascoigne discusses the difference in prestige between fallow and red deer in *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 141.
[179] Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 52.

Gascoigne demonstrates his hunting knowledge by using language that specifies that Grey is hunting fallow does using the bow and stable method. Perhaps he does not hit the deer because he wants a better choice and a better method, but he still manages to show Grey that he has the requisite command of terminology.

The language gets even more specific when Gascoigne imagines hitting a "carren" deer when he wanted to hit a "barren" doe instead. A barren doe is one that is not currently carrying a fawn, but there has been confusion over what exactly a "carren" doe is. Because of the vision at the end of the poem of the doe with "milke hang[ing] in her teate" (145) and the fact that carren is contrasted with barren, critics have considered that "carren" means pregnant. Gascoigne's failure is amplified, therefore, because when he can finally hit a deer, he shoots a pregnant one instead of a barren one. As Pigman points out, though, later in the poem Gascoigne imagines shooting another deer that "prove[s] a carrion carkas too" (130), so the idea that the deer at the beginning of the poem is pregnant does not hold up, especially because the final deer imagined is lactating, not pregnant.[180] The *Oxford English Dictionary* has a relevant definition for carrion that Pigman uses and that makes sense with how Gascoigne uses hunting language throughout the poem. Carrion is "used of animals: sometimes app. in sense 'noxious beast', 'vermin'; sometimes merely 'poor, wretched, or worthless beast."[181] Hunting language has a term for just such a type of animal: rascal. A rascal is a deer "fit

[180] Pigman, *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, 664, note 72.5.
[181] *Oxford English Dictionary*, Online Edition March 2013, s.v. "carrion," accessed March 16, 2013, http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/Entry/28233.

neither to hunt or kill."[182] When hunting using the bow and stable method, the huntsmen are supposed to "void" the "set" of rascals, in other words clear out the inferior deer from the driven animals, so that the game shot by the waiting shooters is worthy of the effort.[183] After the shoot, the carcasses are separated into piles indicating who shot what, but rascals that were not voided earlier are again separated; their bodies are not worth as much.[184] In his own hunting manual, Gascoigne refers to the idea of deer not worth killing without using the term rascal when he describes the hunting season for does and hinds: it "beginneth when the Male of euery one of them ceasseth, and lasteth as long as they be fatte or in good plight."[185] One may hunt does or hinds as soon as the autumn rut is finished, and the season lasts as long as the female deer are in good enough physical condition to make the effort worth it. In "Wodmanship," Gascoigne uses "carren" as a synonym for "rascal," which allows him to rhyme with barren. He is hunting female fallow deer instead of male red deer, and his two choices are a deer that did not manage to conceive during the autumn rut or a deer that should have been voided from the set by the huntsmen long before she came within range of his bow. Gascoigne simultaneously demonstrates his knowledge of hunting, and thus his appeal to Grey the avid hunter, while delicately indicating that he would like better choices from his patron.

Gascoigne's subtle plea for greater opportunity is reinforced in the next line of the poem. He explains, "But though his harte be good, his happe is naught" (8). At the

---

[182] Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 28. See also *The Master of Game*, 25, 29, 196, 226; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 73; James, *A History of English Forestry*, 36.
[183] *The Master of Game*, 189-193.
[184] Ibid., 196.
[185] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 240.

literal level, Gascoigne is telling Lord Grey that he desires to perform well in front of his patron, but his bad fortune prevents him from doing so. Using the word "harte" immediately after referring so specifically to carren and barren does cannot help but suggest the hart/heart pun, though. The hart, the male red deer, the most prestigious prey to chase, is really the kind of opportunity Gascoigne hopes to receive from Grey.[186] Gascoigne is not failing because he lacks skill; he wants a task that is worthy of his attention.

For the majority of the poem that follows, Gascoigne presents a catalog of his former life. Just as he cannot hit the deer before him, he has failed in his attempts to make his way with philosophy, with the law, with the court, and with the military. The guiding frame shifts from hunting to archery as Gascoigne fails to hit the mark again and again. In critiquing each of his prior choices, Gascoigne manages to make his failures seem like virtues; if he had succeeded, he would have debased himself in one way or another. He is not capable of "pinch[ing] the painefulle souldiers pay" (77), for example. Gascoigne manages to both repudiate and benefit from his past experiences, though, describing in one section all the useful experience he has gained trying and failing to make his way in a number of careers (97-108). Even with all this experience, though, he cannot hit the mark without the help of someone like Grey (109-112).

Even before he turns completely back to hunting at the end of the poem, Gascoigne includes references to hunting throughout the middle section of the poem,

[186] For the reputation of the red deer, please see Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 25-27; Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 32-46; Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 52-56; *The Master of Game*, 23-37, and the extensive treatment of how to hunt the hart in *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*.

keeping his expert knowledge at the forefront through these subtle moments. When describing his life at court, for example, Gascoigne explains that he failed because he spent his money incorrectly, "thinking the purse of prodigality, / Had bene best meane to purchase such a pray" (43-44). Gascoigne's use of the word "prey" reminds the reader and his addressee of the hunt, an activity that Gascoigne does have mastery over, despite his current difficulties. When narrating his attempt to make his fortune as a soldier, Gascoigne describes himself as a man with "long limmes led by a lusty hart" (65). Not only does Gascoigne get to assure Grey that he is in good physical condition, ready to serve, he also gets to suggest the heart/hart pun again. The heart/hart leads the limbs; this is language almost of the chase, again suggesting that Gascoigne's goal is the most prestigious prey or, in other words, secure and lucrative patronage. Shortly thereafter, Gascoigne pleads to Grey, "unless your Lordship deigne, / To traine him yet into some better trade, / It will be long before he hit the veine, / Whereby he may a richer man be made" (69-72). Hitting the vein has a double metaphorical meaning: hitting a vein of precious ore that would make the poet rich and hitting the vein of an animal, draining its blood and killing it. Either way, Gascoigne needs Grey's help to reach his ultimate goal, and hunting is one of the crucial ways in which he makes that appeal. Gascoigne again refers to hunting as he describes his inability to forcefully defraud the weak, an apparent requirement for success as a soldier: "He cannot stoupe to take a greedy pray" (79). "Stoup" is the technical term for describing how falcons attack their prey; Gascoigne displays his knowledge of falconry as well.[187] With this reference, he again tells Grey

[187] *The Boke of Saint Albans*, biiiR-V; Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 210-216; Horobin, *Falconry in Literature: The Symbolism of Falconry in English Literature from*

that he requires the appropriate prey for his efforts; he will not stoup for just anything. In the final reference to hunting before the end of the poem, Gascoigne once again assumes the title that Grey gave him in the prose prologue. Gascoigne has just finished describing the immoral things one needs to do to be a successful soldier, things he cannot bring himself to do: "and nowe adayes, the man that shootes not so, / May shoote amisse, even as your Woodman dothe: / But then you marvell why I lette them go / And never shoote, but saye farewell forsooth" (85-88). Gascoigne is once again Lord Grey's woodman, and he is missing the deer that pass by, not archery targets. As he has been explaining, he cannot hit the targets because they are unworthy of his attention and because he needs Grey's help to achieve true success. Gascoigne presents himself for service, following this reminder of the hunt with a catalog of the valuable skills he learned in all of his failed endeavors.

After listing his virtues for Lord Grey, Gascoigne ends the poem by turning back to the original hunt. He demonstrates control and mastery of the situation through his language skills, creating his own ending to the heretofore unsuccessful hunting party. While he has been explaining his past life to Lord Grey, "the hearde goeth by, and farewell gentle does" (122). Gascoigne has seemingly missed his opportunity to prove himself to Lord Grey by killing one of the gentle does, but he has wanted a different kind of target anyway. Since he cannot kill an actual deer for Lord Grey, he proves his worth by imagining and presenting in verse two alternative endings to this hunting party. He presents the first possible ending,

---

Chaucer to Marvell, 21; Oggins, *The Kings and their Hawks: Falcontry in Medieval England*, 11; Turberville, *The Booke of Faulconrie or Hauking for the Onely Delight and Pleasure of all Noblemen and Gentlemen*, 80.

But since my Muse can to my Lorde reherse

What makes me misse, and why I doe not shoote,

Let me imagine in this woorthlesse verse:

If right before mee, at my standings foote

There stoode a Doe, and I should strike hir deade,

And then she prove a carrion carkas too,

What figure might I fynde within my head,

To scuse the rage whiche ruled me so to doo? (125-132)

Gascoigne shows Grey that what really recommends him for patronage are his rhetorical skills. He may invoke the modesty topos with "this woorthlesse verse," but the two imagined endings to the hunt showcase the poet's ability to adapt to any situation and to exercise control through command of language. In this imagined ending, Gascoigne shoots a deer that also turns out to be carrion, or carren. He recalls his failures from the beginning of the poem, where he also imagined "strik[ing] a doe which is but carren" (5). It may seem strange that he recalls his initial failure at the end of the poem, where he presumably is trying to finally convince Grey to support him. Even as he recounts another possible mistaken kill, though, he demonstrates his hunting knowledge through the use of technical language. He imagines this doe appearing "at my standings foote" (128), which is the proper term for the station where archers would wait and shoot from during bow and stable hunting.[188] Gascoigne may fail to make the imagined kill because it fits the goals of his plea for patronage – he needs Grey's help and he wants a better target – but he simultaneously indicates through his use of technical language that he has

[188] Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 51; *The Master of Game*, 189.

the necessary skills. In addition, as has already been discussed, the carrion, or rascal, deer should have been flushed from the set by Grey's huntsmen long before a carrion doe had a chance to pass by, so the improper imagined kill is not entirely his fault anyway.[189]

Gascoigne does not end the poem with this first imagined kill, though. At the end of this first scenario, he asks himself "What figure might I fynde within my head, / To scuse the rage whiche rulde mee so to doo?" (131-132). While others might blame "lacke of skill or fortune" (134) for Gascoigne's failures, the poet proposes an alternative vision, one that is a product of his powerful and employable brain:

I saye *Jehova* did this Doe advaunce,
And make hir bolde to stande before mee so,
Till I had thrust myne arrowe to hir harte,
That by the sodaine of hir overthrowe,
I might endevour to amende my parte,
And turne myne eyes that they no more beholde,
Such guylefull markes as seeme more than they be:
And though they glister outwardely lyke golde,
Are inwardly but brasse, as men may see:
And when I see the milke hang in hir teate,
Me thinkes it sayth, olde babe now learne to sucke,
Who in thy youth couldst never learne the feate
To hitte the whytes whiche live with all good lucke.
Thus have I tolde my Lorde, (God graunt in season)

[189] *The Master of Game*, 190-193.

A tedious tale in rime, but little reason. (136-150)

In this second vision, the doe Gascoigne kills is sent from God, and it teaches him to distinguish gold from brass, no longer shooting at targets that are unworthy of his attention. The poet kills this deer by "thrust[ing]" his arrow into her heart, and this is an unusual way to describe killing a deer with a bow and arrow. The word "thrust" makes it seem more like Gascoigne buries the point of the arrow into the deer's body using his hands instead of a bow. Gascoigne's word choice makes the death of this deer from Jehova seem more like the ending to a *par force* hunt than a bow and stable hunt. *The Master of Game* describes the end of a *par force* hunt, with the deer brought to bay by the men and hounds, "And when it so is, that they have thought that the bay has lasted long enough, then should he whoso be the most master bid some of the hunters so spay him behind the shoulder forward to the heart."[190] Gascoigne also describes the end of a *par force* hunt in *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, where a hunter should carefully get into position to stab the deer with sword or dagger.[191] He specifies that he thrusts his arrow into the "harte" of this God-sent deer, and the heart/hart pun along with the word "thrust" suggests that Gascoigne is once again delicately hinting to Lord Grey that he would like the opportunity to hunt better prey in the most prestigious way possible.

The death in this second and final imagined scenario is complicated by the fact that this doe is not carren, but is lactating. Killing a nursing mother is a bigger failure than killing a carrion doe or a barren doe, so this seems like a strange way to end a poem where Gascoigne displays knowledge of hunting even as he fails to make a kill. While

[190] *The Master of Game*, 174.
[191] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 124-127.

some have seen the final deer as a complete rejection of the former follies of his life or as a rejection of hunting, the implications of this final change are ultimately positive instead of negative.[192] Gascoigne made very clear at the beginning of the poem that he and Grey were hunting in the winter. In imaginatively changing the doe he kills from "a carrion carkas" (130) to a lactating doe sent from God, Gascoigne not only changes the nature of his prey, but he also changes the season in which he hunts. Fallow deer would not be lactating in the winter; they give birth in the month of June.[193] The time of fawning was known to hunters as the "fence month": "the fence month, or in Latin *mensis vetitus*, which lasted from fifteen days before Midsummer to fifteen days after, was the special time when the deer required quiet and protection, for it was just about the usual time for fawning."[194] The season for hunting the male deer of the red and fallow species, the hart and buck, also called the *pinguedo*, began as soon as the fence month was finished.[195] Gascoigne has been subtly suggesting throughout the poem that he would rather be hunting the hart *par force*, and he imagines a new scenario at the end of the poem where the hart hunting season is either about to begin or is already in progress. The final lines of the poem highlight the change in time by using the word "season": "Thus have I tolde my Lorde, (God graunt in season)" (149).

---

[192] Johnson, *George Gascoigne,* 69; Stephens, "George Gascoigne's *Posies* and the Persona in Sixteenth Century Poetry," 139. Crewe has an interesting reading of this moment, seeing the lactating deer as the intrusion of the female presence of Queen Elizabeth into the realities of patronage. *Trials of Authorship: Anterior Forms and Poetic Reconstruction from Wyatt to Shakespeare*, 136-137.
[193] *The Master of Game*, 38.
[194] Cox, *The Royal Forests of England*, 60.
[195] Ibid., 50.

Of course, Gascoigne does not imagine killing a hart instead of killing a doe. He does still kill a nursing mother, even if she has been sent by God. This hunting failure works in two ways for him. First, the entire goal of the poem has been to show Grey that Gascoigne has the ability to overcome his past mistakes. In the final lines of a poem organized by a hunting metaphor and addressed to an avid hunter, Gascoigne depicts his biggest hunting *faux pas*, especially if the imagined kill occurs during the fence month, when hunting was forbidden. The ability to overcome this mistake and turn it into a positive truly shows Gascoigne's skills of invention and suggests how close he is to Grey that he can almost teasingly represent himself as an even bigger failure than before. Second, the lactating doe becomes a source of nourishment and renewal for the poet. Seeing "the milke hang in hir teate" (145) leads Gascoigne to imagine beginning his life anew, regaining his "youthe" (147) and learning a new approach to success, one that will be made possible through the nurture of a new patron.

In case he has overstepped the mark in suggesting to Grey that he is interested in more than Grey is offering, Gascoigne modulates his approach yet again at the very end of the poem, modestly describing his poem as "a tedious tale in rime, but little reason" (150). He closes the poem with a posy that ends several of the poems assigned to Gascoigne in the "Devices of Sundry Gentlemen" section of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, "Haud ictus sapio," meaning "I have not learned from experience."[196] The posy contradicts everything that Gascoigne has just said in the poem. Just as easily as Gascoigne can imaginatively construct new realities and endings to his failures, he can undo what he makes. Gascoigne ultimately shows Lord Grey that he is worthy of

[196] Pigman, *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, 631, note 54.40.1.

patronage because of his skills as a writer and as a hunter. His past life experiences can prove to be an advantage to Grey since Gascoigne did acquire valuable knowledge despite his failures. To truly succeed, though, Gascoigne needs Grey's help, his money and influence.

Hunting proved to be a very malleable tool for Gascoigne in this poem. Just like Wyatt and Surrey before him, Gascoigne uses hunting as a helpful way to better a position of disadvantage. A very hierarchical pastime, hunting allows Gascoigne to position himself in various positions within that hierarchy, as circumstances dictate. He can accept the title of humble woodman if he thinks it will endear him to Grey, and he can also insist that he deserves better, that *par force* hunting is what he really wants. Through the use of technical language, Gascoigne can demonstrate mastery in hunting even as he fails to kill a deer again and again. Hunting is a rich and meaningful pastime, and examining all the nuances of the hunt when it is used as a vehicle can give new insight into a variety of texts.

IV

William Shakespeare's *As You Like It* provides a depiction of exile, but in a play instead of a poem. Hunting is a key part of understanding and negotiating exile in the play, but the role of hunting is more complicated because more perspectives and voices are present in a play than a poem. The hunt is presented in two ways in the play; it is used to improve the state of exile, as it was in Wyatt, Surrey, and Gascoigne, but an anti-hunting stance, coming from Jaques, is also used to critique the court from which Duke Senior and his followers have been exiled. Critics of hunting had been writing against

the practice for about as long as the practice existed, with the humanists and Puritans adding their voices throughout the sixteenth century.[197] While hunting would become a real focal point of critique during the reign of the Stuarts and the lead up to the English Civil War, anti-hunting critiques are not as intense at the time *As You Like It* was first performed.[198] Jaques' critique of hunting is in keeping with writing against hunting and tensions and conflicts over hunting rights. The form of the play allows the inclusion of this perspective, one that did not figure in poems written by courtiers. Jaques may criticize, but Duke Senior and his followers use the hunt to improve and negotiate their condition of exile.

The references to hunting in *As You Like It* are a key part of the description of Arden as experienced by Duke Senior and his followers. In the first scene in Arden, Duke Senior marvels in the delights and virtues of his exile, but the conversation quickly turns to his regret over the death of deer in the forest, which prompts the First Lord to report Jaques' encounter with and comments on a wounded deer. Shakespeare's focus on the killing of the deer for food differs from his source, Thomas Lodge's *Rosalind*. The first time that Gerismond (Duke Senior in *As You Like It*) and his followers appear,

---

[197] For information on anti-hunting discourse, see Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 24-29; Cartmill, *A View to a Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature through History*, 76-91; Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 85-87; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640,* 16-17; Orme, "Medieval Hunting: Fact and Fancy," 145-146; Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England: 1500-1800,* 153-154, 161-163; Uhlig, "'The Sobbing Deer': *As You Like It*, II.i.21-66 and the Historical Context," 79-109.

[198] For the role of hunting during the reign of the Stuarts and in the lead up to the civil war, see Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War*. Juliet Dusinberre thinks the play was acted for the first time between 1598 and 1600. Introduction to *As You Like It*, 36.

Rosader (Orlando) is approaching their camp in search of food for himself and his servant, Adam. On this particular day, Gerismond and his followers "in honor of [Gerismond's] birth made a feast to all his bold yeomen and frolicked it with store of wine and venison, sitting all at a long table under the shadow of lemon trees."[199] Like Duke Senior and his followers will do later (2.7), Gerismond and his band eat venison together, but Lodge does not include any information or discussion about how the venison appears on the table under the lemon trees. The comments by Duke Senior, the First Lord, and Jaques about hunting are added by Shakespeare. Hunting plays a crucial role in the exile of Duke Senior in a way that it does not in the exile of Gerismond.

Our initial understanding of the forest and Duke Senior's place within it is bound up in this presentation of hunting, so it is not surprising that this scene (2.1) and the later scene of the foresters' song (4.2) have been the focus of critical attention. One approach has been to locate the references within a literary or iconographical tradition.[200] Another approach ties the hunting scenes to related contemporary social or cultural circumstances, such as the political ramifications of poaching, and reads those issues into the play.[201] While these approaches are interesting and illuminate aspects of the place of hunting in

---

[199] Lodge, *Rosalind*, 144.

[200] For this approach, see Bath, "Weeping Stags and Melancholy Lovers: The Iconography of *As You Like It*, II, I"; Daley, "To Moralize a Spectacle: *As You Like It*, Act 2, Scene 1"; Frankis, "The Testament of the Deer in Shakespeare"; Schleiner, "Jaques and the Melancholy Stag"; Sherbo, "Cowper's Stricken Deer and Literary Tradition"; and Uhlig, "'The Sobbing Deer': *As You Like It*, II.i.21-66 and the Historical Context."

[201] See Chris Fitter, "The Slain Deer and the Political Imperium: *As You Like It* and Andrew Marvell's 'Nymph Complaining for the Death of Her Fawn'"; Robert Leach, "*As You Like It*: A 'Robin Hood' Play"; Paul J. Willis, "'Tongues in Trees': The Book of Nature in *As You Like It*"; and Richard Wilson, "'Like the old Robin Hood': *As You Like It* and the Enclosure Riots."

the play, looking at how the scenes correspond to the actual practice of hunting in Elizabethan England can be equally revealing.[202] In this light, we can see that Duke Senior and his loyal followers are trying to find a better approach to hunting, one that mitigates some of the violence that is, of necessity, a part of the hunt and that tempers some of the excesses of aristocratic sport. They remake the hunt to fit their new idyllic order; they use it as part of their attempt to change their exile into a new way of life instead of focusing on their imposed separation from their old way of life. This approach to hunting is indicative of Duke Senior's superior way of life in the forest, especially compared to the court of Duke Frederick.

One significant aspect in Duke Senior's new approach to hunting is that he does not engage in the form of aristocratic hunting that would have been a privilege of his rank. The duke suggests hunting, saying, "Come, shall we go and kill us venison?" (2.1.21).[203] Instead of using any one of a number of technical terms for various species and ages of deer or suggesting a particular mode of hunting, the duke suggests that the men go and procure some meat to eat.[204] Hunting in Duke Senior's Arden has a practical purpose; it is not primarily for sport. A. Stuart Daley's work is even more specific about the type of hunting Duke Senior is suggesting. Daley explains that Duke Senior's statements lamenting the plight of the "poor dappled fools" (2.1.22) indicate that he is thinking of the species fallow deer (*Dama dama*) rather than the red deer, which were the

---

[202] See Edward Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt*, 159-189; A. Stuart Daley, "The Idea of Hunting in *As You Like It*"; A. Stuart Daley, "The Midsummer Deer of *As You Like It*, II.i"; A. Stuart Daley, "Where are the Woods in *As You Like It*?"; and Jeffrey S. Theis, *Writing the Forest in Early Modern England*, 35-90.
[203] All references *to As You Like It* are from the Arden Shakespeare, ed. Juliet Dusinberre.
[204] Venison is "the meat of any wild animal, including deer," Dusinberre, *As You Like It,* 191, n.21. Shakespeare takes the word Lodge uses to describe the meal at the feast.

preferred quarry for aristocrats.[205] Duke Senior shows his familiarity with hunting through his keen observation of the deer. He is able to hunt and to make such observations now because of his prior status. The reference to the "forked heads" that lodge in the haunch of the deer indicates that the hunters are going to use arrows to kill the deer (2.1.23). Duke Senior is not imagining *par force* hunting, with the hunters on horseback pursuing the deer with a pack of dogs until the deer is killed by being stabbed through the heart. Nor does the reference to arrows seem to suggest bow and stable hunting, where foresters, with the aid of nets, would drive a group of deer to a stand where an aristocratic hunter stood waiting with bow and arrow.[206] From the particular situation of hunting that Duke Senior describes, Daley concludes that Shakespeare has no intention of critiquing the aristocratic chase, since "the dialogue avoids mention of any of the unmistakable features of the chase."[207] Not only is there a lack of critique for aristocratic hunting, Daley's view of the hunting in the play is that it casts the Duke and his men in a positive light:

> The idea of hunting in *As You Like It* is to dramatize, first of all, the plight of the noble exiles. The particulars given us prevent our mistakenly supposing that they are carelessly passing the time in a happy, hunting holiday…the idea of their hunting is to make clear the altruism of their sharing their scanty fare with Orlando and old Adam. (Daley, "The Idea of Hunting," 79)

[205] Daley, "Midsummer Deer," 104.
[206] Daley, "The Idea of Hunting," 74-76, 79-81.
[207] Daley, "The Idea of Hunting," 79.

For Daley, the hunting in the play is clearly not implicated in any negativity towards the elaborate aristocratic chase; the men are to be pitied and applauded for the effort it takes them to procure food.[208] While the characters may not engage in a full-blown aristocratic hunt on stage, there are shadows of the aristocratic chase in the way that hunting is portrayed in the play. The play does not just present simple pot hunting, or hunting only for food, as Daley suggests.

When Duke Senior enters the stage for the first time, he is accompanied by "two or three Lords [dressed] as foresters" (2.1.1 SD). Duke Senior addresses these companions as "my co-mates and brothers in exile" (2.1.1); this may be a group of hunters, but it is not a hierarchical aristocratic hunt accompanied by servants of the hunt establishment. Equality between the men is stressed; the Duke's words do seem to suggest a very unstratified group that is going to partake in a much simpler type of hunt than the elaborate *par force* chase. Nonetheless, these men are presented as foresters, officers under the Duke's official authority not that long ago. The aristocratic chase follows them into their virtuous exile, but is remade. In *par force* hunting, rank was maintained even in the butchering of the deer, where there was a carefully managed distribution of the various parts of the animal. When the Duke actually suggests that the men go and "kill us some venison," his next thought brings the question of rank and status to the equation. The duke says, "And yet it irks me the poor dappled fools, / Being native burghers of this desert city, / Should in their own confines with forked heads / Have their round haunches gored" (2.1.22-25). Leaving aside for the moment the issue

[208] Gabrial Egan also considers the hunting in the play to be non-aristocratic, returning to an almost hunter-gatherer approach to getting food. *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism*, 106.

of the Duke's regret at the violence sustained by the deer, I want to instead focus on the fact that the Duke's metaphorical formulation of the hunt is one of imposing his will upon the deer-citizens. The hunt is figured as the domination of a lower rank of society by a higher one. There may not be a distinction in rank among the Duke's foresters, but the idea of the Duke's ability, as an aristocrat, to impose his will on an understandably reluctant group of burghers is still present in this hunt.[209] The First Lord, quoting Jaques, expands upon this idea of hunting as an assertion of rank: "The melancholy Jaques grieves at that, / And in that kind swears you do more usurp / Than doth your brother that hath banished you" (2.1.26-28). The Duke's regret at asserting his status over the deer is amplified by Jaques to be of the same order as Duke Frederick's seizing of the throne. The men in Arden may not practice the aristocratic hunt, but the fraught issues of rank and privilege that surrounded the hunt are suggested in these formulations. As an aristocrat, with men assisting him, the Duke cannot help but assert himself when hunting. He may regret that such dominance is a consequence of hunting, reflecting one of the views on hunting presented in the play, but the hunt is also a big part of how the court in Arden is organized. Duke Senior may engage in a more egalitarian hunt than the classic aristocratic chase, but the underlying hierarchal structure is still there, in the men serving him and in his ability to kill the animals in their native dwelling place. Daley's picture of altruistic pot-hunters does not seem to take this complication into account. Furthermore, the foresters' song in act 4, scene 2, to be considered at length later, is a version of the

[209] For the connection of the hunt to social hierarchy, see Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War*, 19; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640*, 6; Marvin, *Hunting Law and Ritual in Medieval English Literature*, 129; Dorothy Yamamoto, *The Boundaries of the Human in Medieval English Literature*, 102.

procession home after the elite chase. In his happy exiled state, Duke Senior and his men engage in a type of hunting that avoids unnecessary ceremony yet still retains some aspects of the elite form of hunting that is proper to their rank at the court. The hunting, as it is portrayed in the play, seems to be an attempt to meld the utilitarian aspects of hunting while still retaining some of the festivity and ceremony that made the hunt enjoyable as well as useful.

Of course, the violence of the hunt that troubles both Duke Senior and Jaques complicates this happy blending of use and enjoyment. In his work on the play, Edward Berry sees the focus of the violence of the hunt as a critique of "hunting for sport," but he sees the words of Duke Senior as "a series of strategies, at once rhetorical and psychological, to repress the disturbing consequences of the Duke's twinge of conscience."[210] The Duke's use of "venison" is a euphemism to avoid consideration of the animal being killed. The First Lord, in reporting his observations of the deer and of Jaques, "can only feel animal suffering when it is imagined as human suffering, a response that might be said to deny the reality and authenticity of animal experience."[211] Jaques, of course, seems to be much more concerned with the animal suffering than Duke Senior or the First Lord, but his remarks are filtered through the First Lord's impressions.[212] For Berry, the references to violence in general are a critique of hunting, yet the specific characters who speak these lines avoid truly confronting what they describe. I think Berry is correct in his analysis that Duke Senior and the First Lord, at least, are not able to see animal suffering purely as animal suffering. Duke Senior must

---

[210] Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt*, 188, 173.
[211] Ibid., 176.
[212] Ibid., 174-175.

compare the deer to burghers, and the First Lord describes the animal as "a poor sequestered stag, / That from the hunter's aim had ta'en a hurt" (2.1.33-34), shifting the agency and responsibilty for the blow from the hunter to the hunted with the word "ta'en." While they may not confront animal suffering in a manner that satisfies our modern sensibilities, nonetheless, I think that the acknowledgement and description of the violence of the hunt is a significant part of the new approach to hunting seen in the play. After all, the duke and his men are not hunting for sport. The play contains plenty of references to hunger and a lack of available food in the forest to suggest that the meat gained from the men's hunting is a welcome addition to the men's diet. The duke regrets that the deer are injured, conveying his regret through the vivid image of "round haunches gored" (2.1.24) by the hunter's arrows. Furthermore, he suggests a hunt using the word "kill" (2.1.21), which seems to directly confront the end result of a chase. The goal is the meat and the process to get that meat is to end the life of an animal.

The First Lord's description of the wounded deer crying into the stream is equally vivid. He says, "The wretched animal heaved forth such groans / That their discharge did stretch his leathern coat / Almost to bursting, and the big round tears / Coursed one another down his innocent nose / In piteous chase" (2.1.36-40). The terms "groan" and "leathern" used to describe this deer are technically correct. "Groans is a technical term of "voice" for a call peculiar to a buck."[213] Also, "leather specifies the hides of deer and boar used by glovers and whittawers, like Shakespeare's father."[214] Incidentally, Duke Senior's description of "round haunches" is also technically correct in terms of actual

[213] Daley, "Midsummer Deer," 105.
[214] Daley, "To Moralize a Spectable," 152.

deer. Fallow bucks were known to have particularly fat haunches when in season.[215] The descriptions that Duke Senior and the First Lord give are of realistic deer, keenly observed. Their descriptions may imagine animal suffering as human suffering and may also evoke literary or iconographical traditions, but they are rooted in knowledge of real animals. In his description, the First Lord describes the track of the tears down the deer's nose as a hunt. They "course" one another like sight hounds chasing after deer in a "piteous chase." In other words, in his description of the weeping deer, the First Lord calls to mind the action of the chase.[216] His description contains both cause and effect. Like Gascoigne, these men demonstrate their mastery of the hunt even as they confront and regret the violence necessary for the kill. Both Duke Senior and the First Lord do confront and acknowledge the violence that is a part of any hunt, whether elite or not.

In contrast, Lodge's *Rosalind* also mentions wounded deer, but with none of the concern shown by Duke Senior, the First Lord, and Jaques for the animal. The first time a wounded deer is mentioned is when Rosalind-as-Ganymede and Aliena (Celia in *As You Like It*) first meet Rosader, suffering from unrequited love for Rosalind, in the forest. Rosalind-as-Ganymede greets him,

> What news, forester? Hast thou wounded some deer and lost him in the fall? Care not, man, for so small a loss; thy fees was but the skin, shoulder, and the horns. 'Tis hunter's luck to aim fair and miss, and a woodman's fortune to strike and yet go without the game. (149)

---

[215] Daley, "Midsummer Deer," 104.
[216] Egan has also noticed this similarity, seeing this moment as a "fractal" of the chase. *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism*, 100.

Rosalind teases Rosader, imagining the source of his distress as a failed hunt. There is no pity for the imagined deer, wounded and running away from the forester. The critique centers instead on the inequalities inherent in aristocratic hunting. Rosalind comforts the forester with the fact that his portion of the butchered deer would have been small anyway, gesturing towards a cuckold joke with the mention of the horns. Furthermore, a woodman receives even less than a hunter; at least as Gerismond's forester, Rosader would receive some of the reward if he had successfully killed the deer.

The other time a wounded deer is mentioned in Lodge's *Rosalind,* it is more than the imagination of Rosalind. Rosader happens to come upon his sleeping brother Saladyne (Oliver) as he is being threatened by a lion because he had "stricken a deer that, but lightly hurt, fled through the thicket."[217] The wounded deer is merely a plot device that causes Rosader to be at the right place at the right time, armed with a sharp boar spear. The deer that Rosalind imagined becomes a reality, but the text does not dwell on the pain and suffering of the animal, focusing instead on the reconciliation between the brothers. Shakespeare may have taken the idea of a wounded deer from the two mentions in his source, but his focus is entirely different than Lodge's. The division is not between aristocratic hunters and their servants, with little attention paid to the deer, but between all the human hunters and the wounded prey. Duke Senior and his followers hunt in exile because they must do so for food, but they do not ignore the violence of the practice.

The First Lord's report of Jaques' overheard moralizations of the wounded deer take the focus on violence to a new level. Jaques is really the anti-hunting voice in the

[217] Lodge, *Rosalind*, 171. In *As You Like It*, Orlando encounters Oliver not while hunting but when he is walking through the forest, "chewing the food of sweet and bitter fancy" (4.3.100).

play, utterly condemning the hunt and associating it with tyranny.[218] Jaques takes the sight of the deer as an opportunity to explore a variety of meanings and comparisons; he is less interested in the animal itself than in the things that the animal can represent. First, the deer is overly worldly and foolish for contributing its tears to the stream, which has no need of more water (2.1.46-49). Then, Jaques switches focus to himself, pitying himself for being abandoned by the wounded deer (2.1.49-52). The abandonment idea is expanded to include an entire herd of deer, that "full of the pasture, jumps along by him / And never stays to greet him" (2.1.53-54), giving Jaques the opportunity to compare the deer to careless and fashionable society. Jaques concludes his meditation on the deer by returning to Duke Senior's original statement of regret: "swearing that we / Are mere usurpers, tyrants and what's worse, / To fright the animals and to kill them up / In their assigned and native dwelling place" (2.1.60-64). Jaques does have the strongest feelings of sympathy for the wounded deer, to judge by the intensity of his language, yet he uses the spectacle of the deer to imagine and comment upon a succession of societal ills. He is not focused on the body of the deer and the marks of suffering upon it, as are Duke Senior and the First Lord.[219] Furthermore, when he focuses his critique on the hunting itself, his statements echo those already made by the duke. Jaques is less focused on the violence that is a specifically the result of hunting; Duke Senior and the First Lord confront it in a way that he does not. In contrast to their focus on the body, Jaques'

---

[218] Claus Uhlig, "'The Sobbing Deer': *As You Like It*, II.i.21-66 and the Historical Context"; Robert N. Watson, *Back to Nature: The Green and the Real in the Late Renaissance*, 82.

[219] For Jaques' refusal to see the deer as deer, see Egan, *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism*, 101; Watson, *Back to Nature: The Green and the Real in the Late Renaissance*, 82.

various moralizings appear excessive in their variety. The anti-hunting critique presented by Jaques is undermined by his blindness to the actual animals suffering in front of him.

The Duke's position of exile in the forest enables him to approach hunting in a new way, emphasizing its utility over its qualities as a sport and confronting and acknowledging the violence and suffering that is a part of any hunt. He remakes the hunt just as he remakes a court in exile. Duke Senior and the First Lord's response to the violence is tempered: they imagine the effects on the body of the deer, effects that are the result of the hunt. In fact, Duke Senior's image of "round haunches gored" (2.1.24) can be seen not only as concern for the suffering animal, but regret for a bad shot. When hunting with arrows, the goal was to fell the deer with one shot, a shot that would do the most damage to the deer while preserving the largest quantity of available venison. As Daley notes, "a bad hit resulting in the animal's escape (such as is reported by the First Lord), means the loss of a hundred pounds or more of food, and even if the carcass be recovered, the haunch, which was esteemed to be the choice cut, may be totally spoiled."[220] Daley sees this failure solely in terms of the consequence on the men's hunger throughout the play; Daley sees hunting as all about the ability to gather sustenance. Both the imagined deer described by Duke Senior and the reported deer described by the First Lord are suffering from the results of a poor shot. If the hunt, even a pot hunt, is done properly, the animal should not languish in pain for so long. The play may present a version of hunting that can be seen as a mixture and improvement over existing practices, a version only possible in the idealized exile of Duke Senior, but the two examples given or imagined in the play are far from ideal. These failures suggest

[220] Daley, "The Idea of Hunting," 83.

that perhaps hunting cannot be changed to fit into a new order; the critiques are just too strong to be overcome. At least the characters attempt a form of hunting that acknowledges issues of status and violence; this is certainly an improvement over the vicissitudes of poaching and hunting for pure sport. Duke Senior's society in the forest, a society that includes hunting in its activities, is certainly portrayed as an improvement over the "envious court" (2.1.4) of Duke Frederick. He may not actually be living in the "golden world" (1.1.113), as reported by Charles the wrestler, but Duke Senior is at least approaching his world and its effects in a self-conscious way.

The foresters' song in act 4, scene 2 adds a further dimension to the improved qualities of the hunt in the world of Arden.[221] As mentioned before, this scene enacts part of the ritual of the aristocratic chase; the procession home with the proud display of the slaughtered deer.[222] The foresters in Arden may hunt to eat, but they still retain some elements of celebration in their hunt. They are not furtively ferrying away an illegal kill; they are lauding their skill and dominance over their prey. Presumably, they have finally killed the wounded deer mentioned in Act 2, so the suffering of that animal is over. The focus on this scene is not on the animal, though, but on the participants in the hunt. Jaques opens the scene with an apparent desire to undercut the successful completion of

---

[221] The foresters' song does not appear in Lodge. It is likely that Shakespeare used an already existing hunting song as his source for this scene. Because of unique spelling differences in this scene, scholars have argued there was a separate source and copy text for the entire scene, not just the song and that the scene could have been a late addition to the play. Dusinberre, following Bowers, does not consider the scene to be a later addition to the play, however, because its "omission would create a case of instant re-entry by Rosalind and Celia, which was not Shakespeare's usual practice" and because its focus on cuckoldry resonates with Touchstone's comments at 3.3.44-58. See Dusinberre, Introduction to *As You Like It*, 133-134.

[222] Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt*, 183.

the hunt. He wants to present the man who killed the deer to the Duke as "a Roman conqueror" (4.2.3-4), echoing his ideas of political overthrow from the earlier scene. He wants a song for this procession, but "'Tis no matter how it be in tune so it make noise enough" (4.2.8-9). The song that is sung initially supports Jaques' attempt to co-opt this celebration, as the cuckold joke begins as the deer-killer dons the horns of his prey. Jaques urges the men to join in singing, and they all assert, "Take thou no scorn to wear the horn - / It was a crest ere thou wast born" (4.2.14-15). The post-kill moments of the breaking and procession are undermined by the branding of all men as cuckolds. On the other hand, the fact that all the men proclaim their status as cuckolds lessens the individual shame. The men cannot help but be cuckolds: "Thy father's father wore it / And thy father bore it" (4.2.16-17).[223] The post-hunt procession, in Arden, is transformed into a communal experience of shared identity and festivity.[224] The focus is not on the hierarchical distribution of the deer's parts. Some of the ritual of elite hunting is maintained even as the deer are hunted for food and the hunters experience a sense of equality and shared identity. The tensions over hunting are seen in the scene. Duke Senior and his followers try and integrate some aspects of the aristocratic chase in a new order while Jaques attempts to undermine their efforts. Jaques seems to be the loser in this situation and in the play as a whole, but at least his point of view has been presented.

---

[223] For a discussion of the issues of cuckoldry and patriarchy as expressed in this song, see Louis Montrose, "'The Place of a Brother' in *As You Like It*: Social Process and Comic Form," 50.

[224] For a discussion of how relationships to the forest provide a space "to forge and test personal, communal, and national identities," see Jeffrey S. Theis, *Writing the Forest*, 35-89.

As You Like It presents the most complex use of the hunt in negotiating exile. While some characters may completely reject it, the hunt is still a useful tool in exile, just as it was for Wyatt, Surrey, and Gascoigne. Duke Senior and his followers use the hunt in their attempt to create an idealized and alternative society in the forest. The hunt is a bridge between the space of the country and the space of the court; it takes place in the country but derives its authority and procedures from the court. Because of its special ability to connect those two spaces, the hunt can be used to try and overcome the conditions of literal or metaphorical exile, reconnecting to sources of lost power. The variety of the terminology and procedures of the practice of the hunt give writers many ways to use the hunt to their advantage.

Chapter 2: Chasing the Fox and the Wolf: Hunting in Religious Polemic

Between 1543 and 1565, William Turner wrote three tracts urging further reform of the church in England, using the hunt as his central organizing metaphor. In these tracts, Turner's enemies are identified with either foxes or wolves, vermin that need to be driven from England's shores. In choosing his rhetorical frame, Turner was drawing on a long history of animal satire and allegory as well as the proverbial reputation of foxes and wolves from bestiaries and fables. Turner's use of the hunt goes beyond the conventional allegory of ravening wolves and duplicitous foxes, though; his tracts also draw on the early modern practice of hunting. Turner's use of the practice of the hunt allows him to heighten his appeal to his intended audience while simultaneously asserting his status as speaker and potential servant.

William Turner (1509/10-1568) is most well known as a naturalist and physician, and is considered one of the fathers of botany and ornithology. His reputation as a botanist rests on his enormous, three-part *Herball*, and his treatise, *Turner on Birds* (1544), is an important early ornithological text.[225] In addition to his more scientific

[225] William Turner, *Avium praecipuarum, quarum apud Plinium et Aristotelem mentio est, historia. Adiectis nominibus Graecis, Germanicis & Britannicis* (Coloniae: J. Gymnicys, 1544) STC 24350.5; *A new herball wherein are conteyned the names of herbes* (S. Mierdman, 1551) STC 24365; *The seconde part of William Turners herball* (Collen: A. Birckman, 1562) STC 24366; *The first and seconde partes of the herbal*

interests, Turner was also deeply committed to religious reform guided by the principle of *sola scriptura*, and this commitment would structure his entire life, forcing him into two periods of exile and drawing him into published debates over reform in England. Turner wrote a number of polemical tracts about his views, most of which target Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester.[226] Turner was educated at Pembroke College, Cambridge, where he was a member of protestant circles, meeting Nicholas Ridley and being influenced by Hugh Latimer. Turner went into his first exile in 1541, as a result of his illegal marriage to Jane Alder (he had taken deacon's orders in 1536) and of his disappointment over the incomplete Henrician reformation. He traveled quite a bit during this period, and, although existing evidence is scant and uncertain, it is likely that he finished his medical training in Bologna. His stay in Zürich during this period of exile was important because he met Conrad Gesner, an influential naturalist, and came into direct contact with Zwinglianism, which was a major influence on his doctrinal thinking. His first two tracts against Stephen Gardiner, *The huntyng & fyndying out of the romishe fox* (1543) and *The rescuynge of the romishe fox* (1545), were written during this first exile.

---

lately ouersene, corrected and enlarged with the thirde parte, lately gathered (Collen: [heirs of] A. Birckman, 1568) STC 24367.

[226] William Turner, *The huntyng & fyndying out of the romishe fox* (Basyl [i.e. Bonn]: L. Mylius, 1543) STC 24353; *The rescuynge of the romishe fox* (Winchester [i.e Bonn]: Hanse hit prik [i.e. L. Mylius], 1545) STC 24355; *A new dialogue where in is conteyned the examination of the messe* (E. Whitchurch for J. Day and W. Seres, 1548?) STC 24361.5; *A preseruatiue, or triacle, agaynst the poyson of Pelagius* (S. Mierdman for A. Hester, 1551) STC 24368; *The huntyng of the romyshe vuolfe* (Emden: E. van der Erve, 1555) STC 24356; *A new booke of spirituall physik* (Imprented at Rome by the vaticane churche, by Marcus Atonius Constantius, Otherwise called, thraso miles gloriosus [i.e. Emden, E. van der Erve]) STC 24361; *The hunting of the fox and the wolfe*, (London, c.1565), STC 24357.

Turner returned to England on Henry VIII's death, and secured a position with a powerful patron; he became personal physician and auxiliary chaplain to Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset. Despite his relationship with Somerset, he was never able to gain the prestigious offices that he wanted. The relationship he had cultivated with William Cecil protected him during Somerset's fall, and he was appointed the dean of Wells in March 1551. Turner fled England for the second time when Mary I acceded the throne in 1553, traveling around Europe as he had done during his first exile, spending some time at first with the English exile community at Emden before moving on to other "exile centers in Germany."[227] Once again, Turner used the opportunity to write and print another tract against Gardiner and against the restoration of Catholic practices in England, *The huntyng of the romyshe vuolfe* (1555). Turner returned to England on the death of Mary I and managed to resume his office at Wells despite the reluctance of the former inhabitant to vacate the post. During this period, he continued to write additions to his *Herball*, but he did not avoid religious controversy. *The huntyng of the romyshe vuolfe* was reissued with new prefatory materials as *The hunting of the fox and the wolfe* (1565) in the midst of the Vestiarian Controversy. Turner died before he could contribute further to the debate, remaining consistent in his adherence to *sola scriptura* throughout his religious writings.[228]

In his tracts against Bishop Gardiner, Turner laments the incomplete reformation of the church in England and blames conservative bishops, led by Gardiner, for the

---

[227] Pettegree, *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies*, 15-16.
[228] For biographical information on Turner see Carlson, "The Marriage of William Turner," 336-339; Hughes, "Two Sixteenth Century Northern Protestants: John Bradford and William Turner," 104-138; Jones, *William Turner: Tudor Naturalist, Physician and Divine*; Jones, "Turner, William (1509/10-1568)."

continuance of practices like "crepyng of the cross."[229] For Turner, Gardiner is the "major influence" over the 1539 Act of Six Articles, Cromwell's fall in 1540, and the 1543 *King's Book*, so he is the appropriate target for Turner's polemic.[230] Turner writes his satirical attack from the assumption that Henry VIII desires true and complete reform, but is receiving bad advice and being deceived by advisors like Gardiner.[231] Of course, Henry was involved in the slowing of reform in the 1540s, but Turner holds on to the fiction of the evil counselor as a hope for completing reform in England.[232] Turner would like to return the church to what he sees as the scripturally warranted practices of the early apostolic church.[233] The tracts make their point in large part by comparing the Pope and his bishops to foxes and wolves, a conventional satirical formulation.[234] His opponents are not only portrayed as dangerous vermin; the speaker of the tracts is a hunter who pursues these foxes and wolves in order to rid England of its infestation. The references to hunting in the titles and in the content of these tracts do not merely serve as conventional references or as a structural frame; they are also part of a conscious strategy on Turner's part to persuade an aristocratic readership that would have been familiar with the terminology and events from hunting that he uses in his argument.

---

[229] William Turner, *The huntyng & fyndying out of the romishe fox* (Basyl [i.e. Bonn]: L. Mylius, 1543), hereafter cited as *Hunting of the Fox*, A6v.
[230] Jones, *William Turner: Tudor Naturalist, Physician and Divine,* 150-151, 155; Alec Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII: Evangelicals in the Early English Reformation,* 15.
[231] Pineas, "William Turner and Reformation Politics," 194.
[232] Haigh, "The Reformation in England to 1603," 138-142; Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland*, 148-151; Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII*, 13-39.
[233] Pineas, "William Turner's Polemical Use of Ecclesiastical History and his Controversy with Stephen Gardiner," 599-608.
[234] Jones, "The Lambe Speaketh…An Addendum," 292; Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk: Popular Propaganda for the German Reformation,* 27, 50, 54, 57, 62, 75-77, 166-168.

William Turner's first polemical tract, *The huntyng and fyndyng out of the romishe fox* (1543), is explicitly addressed to Henry VIII. The dedicatory epistle addresses the king flatteringly as "the most excellent prince Kyng Henry the eight Kyng of England France & of Ireland supreme gouerner in earth of thes hys realmes Willm Wraghton Wisshethe helthe prosperite of bothe body & soul."[235] Turner is careful to consistently declare his obedience to the legitimate power of the king, and he insists that Henry has authority over religious matters in his realm. As Whitney R. D. Jones explains, however, Turner addresses Henry VIII as "supreme gouerner," not supreme head, in this pamphlet and in the 1545 *The rescuynge of the romishe fox*; Turner acknowledges Henry's power over the church on earth, but, by using governor instead of head, is insisting on Christ's position as true head of the church.[236] Turner appeals to Henry as the proper authority here on earth, flattering his king while simultaneously objecting to policy in England. Regardless of Henry's actual relationship to Gardiner's policies, Turner appeals to the king as the sympathetic authority who can redress the religious issues to which Turner objects. The title page of the book displays Turner's urgent wish that his words reach the eyes of the king:

> Whosoeuer happeneth upon thys book / if he loue god beter then man / et the Kynges Hyghnes better then the bysshoppes fals hypocrisi / let hym gyue it to the Kyng / that he may rede it before the bysshopes condemn it. (*Hunting of the Fox*, title page)

---

[235] *Hunting of the Fox*, A2v. *Hunting of the Fox* and *The rescuynge of the romishe fox* (Winchester [i.e Bonn]: Hanse hit prik [i.e. L. Mylius], 1545), hereafter cited as *Rescuing of the Fox,* were written under the pseudonym William Wraghton.
[236] Jones, *William Turner: Tudor Naturalist, Physician, and Divine,* 157, 160.

Turner figures the religious controversy as a struggle between the competing factions of the false bishops and the king and his loyal followers. Those readers who are truly devoted to God and to Henry should make sure that the king is able to read this book before the bishops prevent him from doing so. In fact, Turner's work would be banned in a proclamation in 1546; it seems that his use of the pseudonym of William Wraghton was a rather thin disguise.[237]

At the very beginning of the dedicatory epistle, Turner presents himself as a willing servant to the king:

> All thoghe sence the tyme that I was a childe / I haue ben more broght up in learnyng then in huntyng / & haue therefore no great skil or experience in huntyng / yit the loue that I bear unto my natural cuntrey compelleth me at thys tyme (most excellent & uictorious Prince) to be a hunter / to hunt & fynde out a certayn cruel beste / whych both hath don et dothe yit still mich harm in your realm & kyilleth both yong & old all that he can cum by. (*Hunting of the Fox*, A2r)

Turner presents himself as a hunter for the king who will rid the realm of the "cruel beast" that kills indiscriminately. In keeping with Turner's strategy of carefully calibrating his approach to Henry, he modestly claims that he was not brought up in the ways of hunting, but is compelled to take up the practice because of his love for his country. In fact, there was a property qualification for certain types of hunting, and the

[237] Jones, *William Turner: Tudor Naturalist, Physician and Divine*, 19; Pineas, "William Turner and Reformation Politics," 200.

king controlled the rights to hunt in the royal forests.[238] Of course, it is Turner's learning that will allow him to refute each objectionable Roman ritual with evidence from history of the pope that instituted the practice later in the tract, but now he wants to present himself as Henry's servant, a member of his hunting establishment, who vigorously pursues a pastime that Henry himself loved.[239] Turner's use of hunting as the frame for his tract is canny because it is both an assertion of status and an expression of utter servility. The speaker claims that he is the one with the knowledge and skill to rid England of the "cruel beste," but he does so only at the behest and in the service of the king. Turner is trying, from exile, to flatter Henry into further reforming the church and creating the opportunity for Turner to return to England.

The title of the work indicates that the "cruel beste" in question is a fox, and the section following the dedicatory epistle develops that comparison. Turner begins his discussion, "The common sort of foxes knowyng that they cannot chuse but be persewed for theyr murder / that they dayly do & intend to commit / haue holes ether in the ground or in great rokkes."[240] Turner immediately introduces the craftiness and the destructive nature of the fox that made it an interesting prey even though it was inedible. Following the traditions of the animal allegories in Aesop's *Fables* and *Reynard the Fox*, foxes were shown "preaching to geese or hens" in conventional anticlerical satire.[241] Foxes were also used in images illustrating a proverb "about stroking a fox's brush as a synonym for

---

[238] Manwood, *A Treatise of the Laws of the Forest*, 124v; Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 62; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640*, 59-60.
[239] James Williams, "Hunting and the Royal Image of Henry VIII," 41-59.
[240] *Hunting of the Fox*, A3r. I have silently expanded contractions throughout this chapter.
[241] Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, 75-76.

flattery."[242] Turner is using an animal conventionally used to critique the clergy, but instead of focusing on the tricky fox's effect on others, Turner highlights the trickiness of the fox as prey. In the categorization of available prey described in *The Boke of Saint Albans*, a hunting manual published in 1486, the fox was considered one of the beasts of the chase.[243] The categories into which prey were divided are not entirely logical or consistent across the hunting manuals, but they do provide insight into the status and reputation of various types of prey. John Manwood, in his *A Treatise of the Laws of the Forest*, an anatomy of English hunting laws from the time of Canute to 1615, when it was published, explains the category of "beasts of the chase" in the following manner:

> And the beasts of the Chase, they doe make their abode, all the daie time, in the fields, and upon the hils, or high mountaines, where they may see round about them a farre off, who doth stirre or come neere them: and, in the night season, when euery body is at rest, and all is quiet, then they doe repaire unto the corne fields and vallies below, where the lawnes, meadowes, and pleasant feedings are for their food and reliefe, and therefore they are called *Campestres*, that is to say, beasts of the field, or beastes that doe haunt the fields, more than the woods." (41r)

Beasts of the chase hide during the day and only come out at night to feed. By their nature, they are evasive and somewhat sneaky. By choosing the fox, Turner is able to not only utilize conventional satirical ideas about the fox, but also to deploy its status within hunting to help make his argument.

---

[242] Ibid., 77.
[243] *The Boke of Saint Albans*, E1r.

The Boke of Saint Albans does not go into detail about the manner of hunting the fox in England at this time, but earlier English manuals that influenced the *Boke*, like Edward, Duke of York's *The Master of Game,* written from 1406-1413, and William Twiti's *The Art of Venery* (1327), give more detail about the reputation of the fox and the manner in which it was hunted in England. The fox is known for its propensity to threaten and destroy the household farm, for its craftiness in evading capture, and for the stink of its pelt and its lair.[244] Because of its status as vermin and because it gave such good chase, the fox was hunted in a variety of ways in England. A less prestigious method of hunting it as described by the scholar John Cummins involved using "traps, snares and poisons, or by driving it out of its earth with sulphurous smoke or by using terriers."[245] The fox was also hunted *par force* in France and England.[246] The fox gave good chase, which is why it was hunted in this manner and how, many years later, it came to be the preeminent prey after the population of red deer declined to the extent that it was not readily available for hunting. At the time that Turner is writing, however, the fox as prey occupied a shifting position in terms of its prestige in the hunt. It could be the object of an elite chase or it could merely be a nuisance that needed to be exterminated. Turner appeals to an aristocratic audience by presenting them with a fast, wily, and worthy opponent while simultaneously denigrating his opponents as disgusting vermin that needs to be eradicated.

---

[244] Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 141-42; *The Master of Game*, 64-67; Twiti, *William Twiti: The Art of Hunting 1327,* 55-57.
[245] Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 143.
[246] Ibid., 143; Twiti, *William Twiti: The Art of Hunting 1327*, 55-57.

Turner is, of course, using the fox as a comparison for the conservative bishops because of the conventional negative associations of that animal. By also drawing upon the actual practice of the hunt and by explicitly positioning himself as a hunter of the fox, though, Turner asserts the skills and knowledge that will allow him to capture and kill his enemy. In the tract, this skill is really a display of learning and argument rather than actual hunting abilities, but Turner uses the resonances of this prey and this practice to bolster his rhetorical position and to appeal to Henry VIII. As the hunting manuals attest and as Turner himself explains in the 1543 text, foxes can be difficult to hunt because of their propensity to hide in their holes, or dens: "for I saw when I was in Englonde in a certayne chirche a great hole in the hie aultare which I could not tell for what purpos the gentlemen of the chirche haue ordened it except it be to hyde theyr father the fox in."[247] Just as a skillful hunter makes certain to roust the fox from his lair and keep it from regaining access to the sanctuary, Turner will expose the disloyalty and doctrinal errors of his opponents for Henry to see.

Turner is careful to make it clear that he only pursues the Romish fox because Henry himself has ordered its extinction. The full title of the work, *The huntyng and fyndyng out of the Romishe fox which more than seuen yeares hath bene hyd among the bisshoppes of Englond after that the Kynges Hyghnes had commanded hym to be dryuen out of hys realme,* is the first assertion of Turner's belief that Henry has ordered the fox hunt. Throughout the tract, Turner often refers to the fact that "the kyng hath commanded hym [the fox] to be utterly bannyshed out of all places of hys dominion."[248]

---

[247] *Hunting of the Fox*, A4r.
[248] Ibid., F2v.

Turner is careful to frame his text so that he is not criticizing Henry directly nor going against the will of his sovereign when he undertakes his hunt, he is only fulfilling what he fervently hopes are the wishes and commandments of the king.

Turner, despite his lack of expertise, must take up this challenge because others, notably Gardiner, have failed to follow the king's commandment. Turner answers the argument of his opponent that the king only commanded them to drive from the realm the bad aspects of the popish religion by insisting that "the Pope that the King commanded yow to dryue out of hys realm is the Popes traditiones et doctrine…ye bysshoppes hold still & mantene the popes traditiones and doctrine therfore ye hold still and mantene the Pope."[249] The bishops not only have failed to uphold what Turner sees as Henry's commandment, in doing so, they have upheld the Pope, an alternate authority to Henry's rightful status as "supreme gouerner" of the realm, as detailed in the address to the dedicatory epistle. Turner may credit Henry with giving the order to drive out the fox, but he does critique Henry's implementation of this plan when he figures the identity of these false bishops in the terms of another beast of the hunt:

> But the houndes that ye set to do thys dede Was and ar / of the same kynde & linage that the wild best is of therfor they bark at hym for a face but they bite not. They make a praetence as they wold worri hym / & yit when he is in ieperdy of taking they help to couer hym wyth tame bestes skinnes…Thes houndes loue thys best so well that if they can catche any other hound persewyng hym which is of an other kynde then they be

[249] *Hunting of the Fox*, A6v.

> of…they will neuer rest til they se the other houndes harte bloude.
>
> (*Hunting of the Fox*, A6v)

The bishops may appear to be Henry's faithful hunting hounds, but they fail to drive the Romish fox from the realm because they are not actually hounds, but foxes. The bishops are of "the same kynde & linage" of the "wild best" that they are supposed to hunt and drive out of England. While Turner may be criticizing Henry for failing to discern the difference between a hunting hound and a fox, he is careful in his approach to the king. Henry may not realize that the Romish fox is still in his realm, not because he is not observant, but because he is being skillfully deceived by his bishops. These bishop-false hound-foxes are willing to go to great lengths to maintain popish practices and to fool the king, displaying their proverbial cunning by disguising the true nature of the Romish fox with "tame bestes skinnes." The fault lies ultimately with the disguised bishops, pretending to be hounds while actually being foxes the whole time. Furthermore, this approach allows Turner to put himself forward as the true servant to Henry who possesses the necessary skills to complete the king's commands. Turner denigrates the status of the bishops by figuring them as the hounds that Henry would use to kill the Romish fox. Turner has just declared himself the reluctant hunter earlier in this passage, a considerable step above the hounds used in the hunt.

The animal human comparisons continue to shift and slide as Turner then imagines himself, and those of his religious persuasion, as hounds when he explains that the false bishops not only hide the Romish fox, but pursue and kill any true hound who attempts to eradicate the vermin – "they will neuer rest til they se the other houndes harte bloude." Turner appeals to Henry as his loyal hunting dog, in comparison to the false

hound-foxes, lessening his presumption that he is in the right compared to what he calls the false bishops. Later in the tract, Turner also calls those bishops hounds who are more of the reforming spirit but who stay silent in fear. In their case, they are "slepyn dogges that dar not bark / and [are] more fit to fallter then to teache goddes word purely."[250] To be called a hound in this polemic can be positive or negative, depending on the immediate context. The frame of the hunt remains constant throughout the tract, but the meanings attached to participants in the hunt, animal or human, change as Turner's argument requires. Turner is willing to assume any guise from the hunt that will increase his appeal to the king, carefully balancing between asserting his skill and authority while simultaneously remaining true and loyal to his king. Henry's subjects are all figured as hounds in his pack who should obey his will in the hunt for the Romish fox, but Turner presents himself as the only one who is obedient and successful in his quest.

Turner mostly appeals directly to Henry in this tract, but he also uses his frame of the hunt to appeal to the nobility who should be sympathetic to his cause. He implores their help, saying, "I besech yow noble men that haue bene brought up in huntyng and are non of the foxes fautores help at this tyme to catch thys fox."[251] Turner wants to recruit powerful support to his cause by appealing to those who really do have the training and skills to hunt out the fox. He has already explained that he is a reluctant and not well-trained hunter; he needs the help of those who are made for this task. In fact, it is their duty "to folow after hym [the fox] to catche hym and to dryue hym out of thys realm."[252] In *The Huntyng of the Romyshe Vuolfe*, published in 1555 during Mary I's reign, Turner

[250] *Hunting of the Fox*, E8v.
[251] Ibid., B5v.
[252] Ibid., B5r.

will have to focus all of his appeal on the nobility, and the hunt will provide him with a convenient and effective vehicle then as well.

Throughout *The Hunting & Fyndying Out of the Romishe Fox*, Turner adds the reality of the practice of the hunt to a conventional, satirical allegory attacking the English clergy. Using the hunt in a more extensive manner allows Turner to further emphasize his critique of his opponents and his appeal to his intended audience. Most importantly, Turner uses the hunt to assert his own status, both as a commentator on religious affairs in England and as a potential loyal servant in a truly reformed England.

Turner's more systematic and thorough use of the hunt can be put against a more superficial use of the trope found in John Bale's *Yet a course at the romyshe fox*.[253] Bale also writes his text from exile, but his target is Edmund Bonner, the bishop of London, specifically his role in the recantation of William Tolwyn. Tolwyn had made his recantation in the company of Alexander Seton on the fourth Sunday of Advent in 1541, and the text of those confessions was printed shortly thereafter.[254] In his text, Bale claims that Bonner forced Tolywn to falsely confess, going so far as to craft the text of the confession himself. In the course of defending Tolwyn and excoriating Bonner, Bale also manages to enumerate the errors in Bonner's doctrinal and theological positions. The title of the tract promises a new attack, a new hunt of the Romish fox, and strongly suggests that Bale was familiar with Turner's *The huntyng and fyndying out of the romish*

---

[253] John Bale, *Yet a course at the romyshe fox. A dysclosynge of the declaratyon by E. Boner wherby W. Tolwyn was professed openlye into Antichristes romyshe relygyon* (Zurik: O. Jacobson [i.e. Antwerp: A. Goinus], 1543.

[254] Alexander Seton and William Tolwyn, *The declaration made at Paules Crosse in the Cytye of London the fourth sonday of Aduent by Alexander Seyton and master William Tolwyn persone of S. Anthonynes in the sayd cytye of London* (London: R. Lant, 1542?).

fox. Bale does attack the Romish fox in the person of Bishop Bonner, and he does use the fox and the wolf as fruitful comparisons, but his use is not systematic like Turner's. The references to foxes and wolves are just one of the strategies that Bale uses.

Bale says of Bonner, "a craftye custome hath the wylye foxe of wanton playe and dallyaunce, whan he myndeth to optayne a praye, which my lorde Boner of London vseth here as one verye subtyle in hys woluyshe generacion."[255] Bale is here referring to the idea that a folk belief about the fox – that it would feign death in order to attract birds close enough to be killed.[256] Bonner is crafty and deceitful like a fox and subtle like a wolf, but this comparison is not developed further in this section nor does Bale organize his text in terms of a hunt, or a course, against Bonner the fox. Bale uses the comparison of the fox or the wolf to make claims about Bonner's destruction of the flock of English believers: "But my lorde ys of an other smokye brode, whose nature vs to rauyshe and destroye, to deuoure the flocke and fede themselues with the fatte, executynge vpon them all tyrannye possyble."[257] Bale also invokes the idea of the fox killing chickens as another description for Bonner's behavior: "Whan the wylye foxe fawneth, beware your chyckens, as the common adage admonysheth yow."[258] Bale emphasizes the destruction that the fox can do to chickens, or good Christians, rather than focusing on its behavior as prey or place in the hunt. Bale capitalizes on proverbial and folk knowledge of the nature of foxes and wolves to score rhetorical points against Bonner, but he does not utilize the hunt to a significant degree. He does accuse prelates of behaving like foxes do when they

[255] Bale, *Yet a course at the romyshe fox*, B7r.
[256] Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 141.
[257] Bale, *Yet a course at the romyshe fox*, D7v.
[258] Ibid., F4r.

are being hunted: "Thys ys an olde practyse of owr holye prelates, euermore to leaue one craftye clause or other as a startynge hole to Rone to, yf daunger happen to them of ther dedes here after."[259] Bale is here referring to the portion of Tolwyn's written recantation, quoted in Bale's text, where it is stated that the confession is partly Tolwyn's own and partly the result of the testimony of witnesses. Bale claims that Bonner and his ilk are crafty like foxes in that they have multiple defenses or justifications for their actions if they are challenged. In addition, his wordplay on "holye" and "hole" undercuts the religious authority of his opponents. If the contents of Tolwyn's confession are later repudiated by Tolwyn, they can be bolstered by the testimony of the said witnesses. Foxes have multiple holes in which to hide and Bishop Bonner has multiple strategies for persecuting true Christians. Unlike Turner, though, Bale is not promising to hunt these foxes down to their holes.

Bale does use a title about coursing foxes in his attack on Bonner, and references to foxes and wolves are scattered throughout the text. Nonetheless, Bale's use of this satirical strategy is just one of many strategies he uses. These examples help illustrate how much more central hunting procedures and vocabulary are to Turner's project. Turner does not simply deploy a common satirical attack; he exploits the vehicle of his metaphor for its full potential to enhance his denunciation of his opponents and his appeal to the king. Turner not only uses hunting as a frame and organizing metaphor in his first tract; he returns to this strategy in his subsequent texts.

Bishop Gardiner promptly responded to Turner's attack in *The huntyng & fyndying out of the romishe fox*, which in turn prompted another response from Turner,

[259] Ibid., D1r-v.

The rescuynge of the romishe fox (1545).[260] Even the publication information on the title page is a swipe at Gardiner. The city of publication, Bonn, has been changed to Winchester, and the printer's name, L. Mylius, changed to "Hanse hit prik." Turner celebrates the fact that his first tract inspired a response from his foe; his arrow has found its mark in the bishop.[261] Turner structures this text as if he is being interrogated by Gardiner, incorporating the words of Gardiner's text. The full title of the text, *The rescuynge of the romishe fox other wyse called the examination of the hunter deuised by Steuen Gardiner: The second course of the hunter at the romishe fox & hys aduocate, & sworne patrone Steuen Gardiner doctor & defender of the popis canon law and hys ungodly cermonies*, and the fact that Gardiner in the person of the "the Rescuer" speaks first structures the text as if Gardiner really has the upper hand and is sitting in judgment of Turner, "the Hunter." Of course, the Hunter's side of the dialogue predominates in the text and he quite nimbly knocks down all of the Rescuer's points. Turner ends up winning the debate just by virtue of the structure of the text, speaking last before an

[260] No copy of Gardiner's response is extant, but Turner utilizes the dialogue form in this tract, quoting what seems to be the entirety of Gardiner's response in his rebuttal to it. J. A. Muller reconstructs the lost Gardiner text from Turner's text, giving it a title from the subtitle of Turner's work: "The examination of a proud praesumptuous hunter, who, under a crafty praetence of huntyng the Romishe fox, breakethe the pale of the enclosed park, and with hys rashe and knavishe houndes entendeth to destroy the dere of the same." See Gardiner, *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 480-92. For Turner's use of the dialogue form in this and other works see Pineas, "William Turner's Use of the Dialogue Form as a Weapon of Religious Controversy," 97-105.

[261] The publication information does not appear on the title page of the copy of *The Rescuing of the Fox* from the Huntington Library that has been scanned into *Early English Books Online*. The jibe at Winchester is recorded in *A Short Title Catalog of Books Printed in England, Scotland & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640*. My thanks to John N. King for calling my attention to this bibliographical joke.

enumerated list of "Twelue new erronius articles of Steuen Gardinars crede taght in hys boke called the examination of the hunter."[262]

On one level, hunting references appear in the text in the form of insults traded back and forth between the Rescuer and the Hunter. Each claims that the other does not know what he is doing, asserting their superior skill in the process. The Rescuer claims "So as thys hunter chasethe far at large / when with the only bissop of romis name / he wold hunt out all and destroy withe the bad the good also."[263] Gardiner accuses Turner of indiscriminate hunting, not targeting the prey that he claims to seek, but being generally destructive to the entire area. Gardiner casts further aspersions on Turner in hunting terms when he says,

> He hath be lyke a meruelous plat form in hys hede to buylde that he wold rid Christis Religion of all thes ornamentes / calleth he thys the huntyng of the fox and Romish fox? Rather goeth the fox a huntyng. The best is the man hunteth by day / and declareth for so miche what he is / only hydying who he is wraghton me semeth shuld not be hys name. (*Rescuing of the Fox,* N4v)

Gardiner chides Turner for writing under the pseudonym William Wraghton; it is not clear whether the bishop knows the true identity of the author, but he at least knows that Wraghton is a false name. Gardiner-as-Rescuer accuses Turner of hunting under false

[262] *Rescuing of the Fox*, N7v.
[263] Ibid., D8r.

pretenses and at night. Essentially, the Rescuer is accusing the Hunter of poaching.[264] Turner was so careful in *The huntyng and fyndying out of the romish fox* to be deferential in his appeal to Henry VIII, to make his claim to hunt the Romish fox seem legitimate, and Gardiner here is questioning his integrity and his intentions. The Hunter is not a skilled practitioner ridding the realm of vermin; he is a criminal despoiling the property and rights of the king. Furthermore, Turner is hunting under the disguise of a false name. During the eighteenth century after the Black Act was passed, hunting in disguise could be punished with death, and it was a serious offense even before the act was passed.[265] Turner accused the false bishops of hiding their true nature under "tame bestes skinnes" in his first tract, and now Gardiner exploits the fact that Turner has written under a pseudonym and turns that criticism back onto Turner. The bishop accuses Turner of hunting without permission, while concealing his identity. Both Turner and Gardiner are drawing on the entire cultural practice of hunting – its procedures, its legal status, its social cachet – to bolster their rhetorical position.

The Hunter uses similar techniques against the Rescuer. In another dedicatory epistle to Henry VIII, Turner once again requests the privilege of hunting the Romish fox on behalf of the king. The speaker reveals that he has been told that Henry VIII has actually seen his first tract, his title page wish coming true, and asks to be defended

---

[264] For information on poaching see Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War*; Manning*, Hunters and Poachers*; Manning, *Village Revolts: Social Protest and Popular Disturbances in England, 1509-1640*.
[265] On the Black Act, see Thompson, *Whigs and Hunters: The Origin of the Black Act*. For a discussion of earlier iterations of the Game Laws, see Manning, *Hunters and Poachers*, 59.

against Gardiner's attacks and granted another license to pursue the fox.[266] Since Gardiner has claimed that he has hunted the fox out of England to the extent that Henry wished, Turner reveals the bishop's failure with the following example:

> If that a duke commanded hys hunt to kyl a certayn fox in a wod whiche had kylled many of hys fyghtyng cokkes / and other pullen / if the hunt shul only cut of the foxes eares / and clip of his nayles and so let hym go / were thys fox kylled / had thys hunt kept hys masters commandement? No. And whi? For his masters mynde was that he shuld kyll no mo cokkes. (*Rescuing of the Fox*, B6r-v)

The Hunter imagines that a duke has ordered his huntsman, his servant, to rid his lands of a fox that threatened his cocks and his pullen, or domestic fowls.[267] In this role, Gardiner has only lopped off the ears of the fox, not killed it nor kept it from destroying his master's property. The Rescuer is either an incompetent or deceitful hunter. The example also illustrates how Turner sees his role relative to Henry. He is petitioning to be Henry's huntsman, asserting his knowledge and skills as a recommendation for that service. Nonetheless, he proves willing to perform more menial tasks like catching and killing a fox in order to protect the king's chickens, or subjects. He appeals to Henry while trying not to step beyond his station.

The Hunter further insults Gardiner in the same section when he compares the Rescuer's deceit in protecting the fox to an old woman whose cat has entered a warren and killed some rabbits. The keeper of the warren hangs the cat as punishment for the

---

[266] *Rescuing of the Fox*, A2r-A3v

[267] *Oxford English Dictionary,* Online Edition March 2013, s.v. "pullen," accessed March 15, 2013, http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/Entry/154330.

trespass, but the woman remonstrates with him to let the cat down quickly, while she knows she can still revive it.[268] Warrens and rabbits were a much less prestigious area of hunting, and this example includes an old woman who uses her cat to poach from the warren.[269] Just as the Rescuer tried to denigrate the Hunter by accusing him of disguised, nighttime poaching, the Hunter uses the hunt to socially demote the Rescuer. The Hunter sees himself as the king's appointed huntsman, competently doing his job while the Rescuer is an incompetent old poacher.

Throughout this tract, Turner claims again and again that Gardiner does not really address the arguments that Turner has made in *The huntyng and fyndying out of the romish fox* and in this text. He figures this failure in hunting terms as well:

> As a fox dar not aduenture to run in the playn way / for fear of the howndes / leste they shuld catche hym / but rumneth in to holes and ledethe them out of the playne way in to busshes brambles and thyk thornes / so do ye the romish foxis protector / for ye leap away from my argumentes and answer nothyng to them / but ye call me craftely away out of my argumentes to bable with yow." (*Rescuing of the Fox*, E5v-E6r)

According to Turner, Gardiner feels the wrath of the hounds of the Hunter's argument and has no other option but to resort to trickery to dodge the attack. The Hunter goes on to answer the Rescuer's off topic objection at some length, thus proving that he can adapt and respond to whatever challenge Gardiner-the-fox can present. Just as the origin of the ceremonies and traditions of the Catholic Church is hidden in the hole of history, the

---

[268] *Rescuing of the Fox*, B7r-v.
[269] Cox, *Royal Forests of England*, 26.

defenders of that tradition cannot make straightforward arguments. Only honest, skilled protestant hunters can defeat such a foe. In *The huntyng & fyndying out of the romishe fox*, Turner used hunting to denigrate his opponents in general and to appeal to Henry VIII. In addition, the dialogue form of *The rescuynge of the romishe fox* allows Turner to use hunting to directly insult Gardiner.

Besides these insults, the more interesting use of the practice of hunting in this tract is centered on the idea of the king's authority, religious and temporal, in his own realm. At the beginning of the dialogue between the Hunter and the Rescuer, the Rescuer claims that the Hunter "under a crafty praetence of huntyng the romishe fox / breakethe the pale of the enclosed park / and with hys rashe and knauishe houndes entendethe to destroy the dere of the same."[270] Gardiner claims that Turner is poaching, as he claims later in the tract with the reference to hunting at night as discussed above, but he also accuses him of mistaking foxes for deer. In the dedicatory epistle, Turner mentions this claim to Henry, and is explicit about the fact that the deer in question are "rede dear."[271] The red deer, or hart, was the most prestigious form of prey and was considered regal.[272] Gardiner is claiming that the foxes that Turner is so eager to pursue are actually the king's most treasured wild beasts. The subjects within his pale, or kingdom, who follow the ways of the Roman church are not vermin, and Turner has no right to hunt them. The animals threatened are red deer, not the barnyard fowl or sheep usually represented when foxes and wolves stand in for enemies. Turner's extensive use of the hunt makes this

---

[270] *Rescuing of the Fox*, A4v.
[271] Ibid., A2v.
[272] Cox, *Royal Forests of England*, 25-27; Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 32; *The Master of Game*, 25; Griffin, *Blood Sport*, 52-56. See the Introduction for further discussion of the red deer's place within the hierarchy of prey.

shift to the red deer a logical next step. The shift to red deer also means that the Hunter and Rescuer will no longer be arguing over who has the right to kill the animal – neither would presume to pursue such an elevated prey – but over who should have the honor of being Henry's forester, the protector of these precious prey.

With this shift, the argument centers on the nature of the "pale" the Rescuer accuses the Hunter of breaking into and on who has authority and duties within that pale. In Manwood's legal discussions of forest law, a forest is defined as "a certaine Territorie of woody grounds and fruitfull pastures, privileged for wild beasts and foules of Forest, Chase and Warren, to rest and abide in, in the safe protection of the King, for his princely delight and pleasure."[273] Manwood further explains the difference between a forest, chase and park: "As a Forest in his owne proper nature is the most highest franchise of noble, and princely pleasure, that can bee incident unto the Crowne and Royall dignitie of a Prince, so the next in degree unto it is a Liberty of a franke Chase. A Chase in one degree is the selfe same thinge that a Parke is, and there is no diuersitie betweene them, saue onely that a Parke is inclosed, and a Chase is alwaies open and not inclosed, and therefore the next in degree unto a franke Chase is a Parke."[274] Forests, hunting grounds, were the privilege of the monarch to the extent that residents of the forest could not impinge upon the needs of the beasts of the forest, even if those beasts were destroying their livelihood. Because of the king's "watch and diligent care" of his kingdom, he has "all honor, dignitie, prerogative and preheminence" in these areas of his kingdom.[275] At this point in the debate, the Rescuer and the Hunter argue over the nature of the pale, or

[273] Manwood, *A Treatise of the Laws of the Forest*, 8r-v.
[274] Manwood, *A Treatise of the Laws of the Forest,* 24r.
[275] Manwood, *A Treatise of the Laws of the Forest*, 25r-v.

park, that encompasses England. While I would not assert that Gardiner or Turner is adhering to the niceties of the categories of forest, chase and park as explained by Manwood, they are using the concept of the king's prerogative in his hunting lands, enshrined since the hunting laws brought to England with the Norman Conquest, to argue over royal supremacy in matters of religion.

In his response to the Rescuer's accusation that he has despoiled the "pale of the enclosed park," the Hunter asks the Rescuer:

> What mean ye by your sayng that I break the pale of the inclosed parke? What meane ye by the pale / and what is thys parke? So far as I can spye / ye mean by the parke / the Chirche of englonde / and by the pale / the unprofitable letworde ceremonies whiche were ones thrust in to the chirche by the Bissop of rome…If ye have made your traditional / and cermonial / pale to kepe the dere within it that they may not go furthe to get them selues sum good meat abrode / when as ye ether gyue hem non but contagious meat / or lok up theyr good meat from them (as ye dyd of late when ye tooke the worde of God / from them and commanded them in payn of deathe to eat your stollen brede that is to kepe your traditiones) ye do the thyng your selfe whiche ye lay falsely unto my charge / that is ye kill sum of the kyngis dere withe poysoned meat and other sum withe hungre. (*Rescuing of the Fox*, A6r-v)

Turner questions the nature of the church in England and, by extension, the kingdom. Turner tries to imagine what Gardiner means by his terms and concludes that the pale, or fence, that keeps the deer, or subjects, in line is the false ceremonies of Rome that do not

belong in the park of the church of England. Gardiner and his ilk are seen as keepers who fail at their task of feeding the deer. For the Hunter, Gardiner's false practices either poison the deer, the king's most protected and cherished prey, or starve them by denying them the true sustenance of the scriptures. Furthermore, Gardiner's practices detract from the value of the red deer, the people of England. Deer that were kept in parks were less wild than deer found in chases and forests, and so were less exciting to hunt. Deer were fed during the winter by keepers in enclosed parks and in royal forests, but the Hunter suggests that the Rescuer is not providing proper care, but impeding the deer from being resourceful and getting their own food, "they [the deer] may not go further to get them selues sum good meat abrode."[276]

Turner not only criticizes Gardiner's treatment of the deer but also questions Gardiner's understanding of the park of the English church. For Turner, "the pale of all the rede dere of christis hyrde / is the word of god / which wil holde all that ar good / with in theyr boundes / if they will not kep them within ther boundes the chefe keper wereth not a wodknyfe in vayn."[277] In keeping with his adherence to *sola scriptura*, Turner re-imagines the boundaries of the church in England as the word of God as opposed to the ceremonies of Rome. Furthermore, he is ready and willing to have the chief keeper of the deer cull the herd of unruly animals with his "wodknyfe." The turn to the red deer in the context of the hunt has some disturbing implications, which are made explicit with the Hunter's reference to the knife. True, red deer are the most highly valued prey, so the comparison suggests that those charged with keeping them have an

[276] Cox, *Royal Forests of England*, 54; *Rescuing of the Fox*, A6r-v.
[277] *Rescuing of the Fox*, A7r.

important duty; the souls of the people of England are at stake here. The deer are valued in the hunt, though, because they are so much fun to kill. Turner does not imagine Henry mounting an elaborate hunt of his subjects, but he does consider that the chief keeper may have to kill deer that refuse to stay within the pale, which he defines as the word of God. In his first tract, Turner only wanted to drive the fox from the realm of England; the stakes are a lot higher now as comparisons to the hunt inevitably lead to a consideration of death, the ultimate goal of the pastime.

The issue of death for those who do not conform is not further explored. Instead, the discussion of England as a pale leads Turner to a statement about Henry's authority. Turner is explicit in how he sees Henry's authority within this park of England: "god hathe inclosed & as it were inparked / the kyngis dere beloued subiectes / vnder the authorite of the kyngis maiesti alone…I beleue that all the subiectes of all kynges and emperourers ar enclosed under theyr autorite alon."[278] Turner would not have Henry's authority qualified by an organizing structure of ceremonies and rituals imposed from without by the Pope. Turner appeals to Henry's desire for control and authority in his own kingdom by claiming precedence for him in religious matters in terms of hunting laws that already assert his undisputed sovereignty. Turner is not willing to grant Henry absolute authority, though. The deer may here be Henry's "beloued subiects, but earlier, they were members of "christis hyrde."[279] Turner may grant Henry authority here on earth, but Christ is the ultimate head and authority.

[278] Ibid., B1v.
[279] Ibid., B1v, A7r.

In this tract, Turner is still appealing to Henry from exile, acting as if Henry wants further reformation of his church but is under the influence of those who would limit his power. The idea of evil counselors controlling a king who truly wants reform is no truer than it was when Turner wrote *The huntyng and fyndying out of the romishe fox* two years earlier, but Turner still has some hope.[280] Turner goes further with his use of the hunt in this second tract, using it more directly as a way to debase Stephen Gardiner. He continues to use the hunt to promote himself and to appeal to his monarch's sensibilities, also helping Henry imagine a legal and political system in which he is completely free from the control of Rome.

In the final original hunting tract, William Turner must employ a different strategy in his continuing attempt to further religious reform in England. *The Huntyng of the Romyshe Vuolfe, made by Quylliam Turner doctor of phisik* (1555) was published during Turner's second exile to the continent, during the reign of Mary I. It may have been composed earlier, however, just at the end of Edward VI's reign and the beginning of Mary's, given the reference to Gardiner's recent release from the Tower of London.[281] Given the transition in power, Turner can no longer consider an appeal to Mary to continue to reform the church as an effective strategy. Nor can he claim loyalty to the monarch by claiming to follow commands that others have neglected. Pineas sees Turner shifting his allegiance from the throne to the nation.[282] Not surprisingly, the book is not dedicated to the queen; instead, it is dedicated to "the ryght honourable Lordes and

[280] Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII*, 13-57.
[281] Hughes, "Two Sixteenth Century Northern Protestants," 134-5; Jones, *William Turner: Tudor Naturalist, Physician and Divine*, 36.
[282] Pineas, "William Turner and Reformation Politics," 199.

worshipfull yonge gentylmen, of Summersetshyre, of Wylshyre…and to the gentylmen of all other shyres in England and Irelande, Wyllyam Turner doctour of Phisyck, wysheth a parfyt knowlege of Goddes worde, and grace of almyghtye God to lyue therafter."[283] Turner's new target is the nobility at large whom he hopes can influence Mary to enact the changes he wants, or at least work at cross-purposes to the monarch. Accordingly, the prey has also changed: "the same Romyshe foxe…is nowe chaunged into a greuous Wolfe, for he leauyng his olde foxye subtyltie, playeth now the playne Tyran."[284] Since Mary has taken the throne, the Romish fox no longer needs to work craftily and in secret; wolves roam in the open in England now.

The wolf did not enjoy a reputation that was any better than that of the fox; in fact, its reputation was worse. Anticlerical allegories using wolves commonly show the wolves threatening the Christian flock of sheep.[285] Again, the emphasis is as much on the effect on the flock as the danger of the wolf. Turner's use of the wolf in the context of the hunt allows him to not just emphasize the danger of the wolf but also the importance of the expertise of the hunter. Wolves certainly had a much bigger reputation for danger than foxes. Wolves were thought to be reprehensibly lecherous, a carrier of rabies with a poisoned bite, and they were willing to attack and kill humans.[286] The change from fox to wolf indicates that the situation in England is so much worse than before. Nevertheless, like the fox, the wolf was considered to be a canny and exciting prey that gave hard chase. Wolves could be hunted *par force*, and are included in *The Boke of*

---

[283] *The huntyng of the romyshe vuolfe* (Emden: E. van der Erve, 1555), hereafter cited as *Hunting of the Wolf*, A1v.
[284] Ibid., A2v.
[285] Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, 27, 50, 54-57, 76.
[286] Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 133; *Master of Game*, 54-63.

Saint Albans with the beasts of venery.[287] To be able to successfully hunt and kill a wolf required a great degree of skill, and it served the important function of ridding the area of a dangerous nuisance. By the time Turner is writing his tract, wolves were no longer common in England, if they were present at all, and one of Turner's points is that wolves have returned and he is the only one who can recognize them.[288]

Turner begins his dedication to the nobility of England by appealing to their love for their leisure activities:

> There hath rysen of late, after the puttyng downe of the hodded and could Monkes, an other kynd of coullesse Monkes, much more precise and earnester in theyr monkery then the olde Monkes, whyche holde nowe that it is unlawfull for a Christen man to exercyse any kynde of playe or pastyme, & therfore vutterly condemne huntyng….I thynke that a gentleman may hunt and hauke, and exercyse such lyke pastymes, so that he occupy it mesurably, and be not hyndered therby from suche workes of hys vocation, as by the lawe of God, he is bounde to exercyse. (*Hunting of the Wolf*, A1v-A2r)

Turner tries to recruit the nobility to his side by claiming that his monkish opponents would forbid hunting. Just as he had earlier written from the assumption that Henry wanted reformation but was just being led astray by his counselors, Turner is creating a fiction to suit his needs. Anti-hunting discourse did exist in this period, but there was

[287] Ibid., 135; *The Boke of Saint Albans*, E1r.
[288] Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 137.

never a serious attempt to ban hunting.[289] Turner tries to frame his religious position within an idea of the rights and prerogatives of the nobility; he wants them to be as zealous in guarding and promoting the study of God's word as they are in promoting their self-interest. Turner also suggests that the Marian regime, instead of being a return to pre-Henrician Reformation England, is a new and unwelcome development. Even though Turner supports the nobility's right to hunt, he would like it to happen in moderation and he would like to channel its energy for his own ends. The nobles may hunt and hawk as long as that does not interfere with their duty to God. He later describes the purpose of hunting to be refreshment, exercise of the body, maintenance of health and to "destroy hurtfull beastes."[290] Turner specifically recommends that his readership hunt "the Otter, the fox and the Wolfe" because they are beasts that interfere with the workings of farms, flocks and fisherman.[291] Turner may be appealing to the nobility, but he does not imagine them pursuing particularly elevated types of game. In addition, given the extended discussion of red deer and authority in his previous tract, Turner may not want to raise such issues here. Hunting for Turner is always to be in the service of the country.

---

[289] For information on anti-hunting discourse, see Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 24-29; Cartmill, *A View to a Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature through History*, 76-91; Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 85-87; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640,* 16-17; Orme, "Medieval Hunting: Fact and Fancy," 145-146; Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England: 1500-1800*, 153-154, 161-163; Uhlig, "'The Sobbing Deer': *As You Like It*, II.i.21-66 and the Historical Context," 79-109.
[290] *Hunting of the Wolf*, A2r.
[291] Ibid., A2v.

Unlike in the previous two texts, Turner uses his own name on the title page and in the dedication. Turner wants to remind his readers of his previous experience and information on hunting the fox out of England. He mentions his books from ten years prior in the dedicatory epistle, and tries to convince his young male readers to follow in their fathers' footsteps:

> All these [foxes] dyd I dryue wyth my houndes to suche a place, that all your fathers sawe them. Who lyke joly hunters, droue quyte out of Englande the Romysh foxe, and hys eldest Sonne into the Toure of London, & the rest of the cubbes into theyr holes. Wherein they haue lurked more then fyve yeares & neuer came abrode untyll thys tyme. (*Hunting of the Wolf*, A2r-v)

Turner exaggerates his role during Edward's reign, rejoicing in the fact that Gardiner was sent to the Tower. If the fathers of these young men were skillful enough to drive off the foxes, surely the nobility will be willing to help Turner rid England of wolves. By referring to his prior books and the work of the noblemen's fathers, Turner tries to establish a sense of continuity with and for his audience; it is not Mary who returns England to its prior and enduring state; the reformers are actually the ones continuing their work against a new incursion.

Turner continues his plea to the noblility by describing the consequences of failure or inaction: "yf ye helpe not to kyll them or dryue them out of thys lande: there shalbe shortly suche murder of shepe, as was not in Englande these CCCCC yeares

before."[292] He appeals to his readers' sense of duty towards the people of England to urge them to protect the flock of the people. He wants the new generation he is targeting to "manfullye dry[ue] out" the fox and wolf from England so that they will never be seen again.[293] Again, this is a rather utilitarian form of hunting; the noblemen will hunt to protect the flock of England and to continue their father's work, not for their own pleasure and status.

The carefully calibrated humility that was evident in the earlier two tracts is discarded in this text. He explains to the dedicatees

> I haue for my parte founde out these wolues, where as they were so dysgysed, that a man unexpert in thys kynde of huntyng, whych I do professe would haue thought that they had ben men, and not onely men, but honest men, and no Wolues. I haue in thys my boke shewed you where they be, & who they be. I can do more for my parte. (*Hunting of the Wolf*, A2v)

No longer is Turner the speaker from *The huntyng & fyndying out of the romishe fox*, who was brought up in learning with no real knowledge of hunting. Now, he has the expertise to spot a wolf where many could not; furthermore, he now "professes" this type of hunting, it is as if he has taken religious orders in hunting down conservatives.[294] Using hunting as the central trope in this dedicatory epistle, Turner appeals to his readers'

---

[292] Ibid., A2v. The potentially troublesome red deer from *The Rescuing of the Fox*, protected only in order to be killed, have been replaced with the less confusing flock of sheep.
[293] *Hunting of the Wolf*, A3r.
[294] *Oxford English Dictionary,* Online Edition March 2013, s.v. "profess," accessed March 15, 2013, http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/Entry/152045.

prerogatives, duty, sense of adventure, and desire to appear and be skilled in order to recruit them in his effort to bring back reformation to England. He has taken a conventional satirical comparison and expanded it to encompass some of the reality of the practice of hunting in order to be persuasive. Turner also reimagines the purpose of hunting in this tract; the hunt is no longer solely for pleasure and a means to assert the authority of the nobility. Things are so bad in England that Turner is now an expert, one of the only ones who can even recognize the prey. Unable to act directly from exile, Turner wants his intended audience to take up the hunt as a duty and as a form of protecting the realm.

The body of the tract also uses hunting to make its rhetorical point, but less extensively than the two prior tracts did. The text is once again structured as a dialogue, this time between three people: the Hunter, the Foster and the Dean. The Hunter meets the Foster, or forester, as he makes his way along some path or road and the two of them encounter the Dean later in their travels. Like the format in *The rescuynge of the romishe fox*, the Hunter's opponents are really there as a foil to his persuasive skill; they do not really have the arguments or space in the text to challenge the Hunter's argument that wolves, otherwise known as false prophets, have returned to England and are wreaking havoc on the people. Having two interlocutors adds an interesting dimension because the Hunter is quite easily able to convince the Foster of his point of view, and then the Foster is able to assist him in attempting to convince the Dean, who regretfully does not change his mind.

The newfound confidence in his skill that Turner claimed in the dedicatory epistle is also evident in the body of the text. In one of the first interchanges, the Foster admits that he has not seen wolves in England and is somewhat chagrined because

> I should know a Wolfe by my office that I haue, as well as an other man should, for I am a keper of Dere by my office, and am euery day among wilde beastes, and I doo dwell in a great Forest whereas, if there were any Wolues in England, they should be more commonly. But I neuer sawe any wolues in my Forest, which is as great as the most part of Forests that are in England, neyther haue I heard tell of anie. (*Hunting of the Wolf*, A5r)

Not only does Turner have more skill than the noblemen to whom he addresses his text, he also has more skill than a man whose job it is to care for the deer in the royal forests. Not only is this man a forester, but a forester in one of the biggest forests in England. The fact that he has not heard from anyone else about the return of wolves suggests that the Hunter is more skillful than a number of woodsmen. Once the Foster realizes that he lacks this knowledge, he is eager to be instructed by the Hunter and instantly agrees with the Hunter's notion that wolves can be found in "diuers Cathedral Churches of England."[295]

The Dean is not so easy to convince of the existence of wolves, and he will ultimately not concede to the Hunter's point of view that these wolves are false prophets. The debate over the existence of wolves allows Turner to display some of the knowledge he has gained as a naturalist. The Hunter and the Dean get into quite a technical debate over the possibilty and nature of spontaneous generation, with the Hunter giving detailed

[295] *Hunting of the Wolf*, A5r..

examples of fish and insects being found on apparently isolated islands. When the Dean suggests that "Dukkes and wilde Gese and such like…cary either the Rownes or Egges of Fishes or els Frie vpon their winges billes or feete," the Hunter replies that the slippery quality of the "Milch" of the male fish renders this ridiculous answer completely impossible.[296] The two go on to debate this issue at some length, arguing about different animals and different historical examples. Throughout it all, the Hunter displays Turner's superior knowledge of the way the animal world works, further illustrating the correctness and validity of the rest of his views.

In addition to the increased confidence of this tract, Turner is also more disillusioned in this text. At the end of the discussion about spontaneous generation, the Hunter brings up the example of the Flood and the fact that dangerous and poisonous creatures clearly survived the destruction because they still exist. He strongly questions the idea that Noah would have brought such animals, like a wolf, onto his ark; therefore, God must have suffered such creatures to live in order to punish humankind. He then extends his reasoning to conclude

> why may hee not also punish vs English men for our sinnes sake / eyther by suffering of Wolues to spring of themselues / or by making newe Wolues here / or by bringing in of other wolues that are made in other landes alreadye to ponishe ys Englishe menne for our synnes sake. (*Hunting of the Wolf*, A8r)

[296] Ibid., A6v-A7r.

Turner does want to rid England of yet another kind of vermin, but he is less than sanguine about the state of England. Perhaps the refusal to enact a complete reformation has contributed to the continuing problems he sees the realm experiencing.

Despite the weak role afforded to him in the text, the Dean does manage to score one major point against the Hunter. After listening to him claim over and over that there are wolves in England and that Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester is one of the worst, the Dean simply asks the Hunter why he does not confront Winchester with this privileged knowledge. The Hunter rather weakly replies, "It is not the manner that the hunter should go him selfe vnto the wilde beast, but he hathe done hys parte if he hath sent his houndes vnto him."[297] Regardless of the renewed confidence and multiple strategies for recruiting noble readers to his cause, all Turner can really do is send out his tracts, his hounds, from exile in the hope that they will be effective. In fact, this very text will be sent out again ten years later, repackaged as one of the salvos in the Vestiarian Controversy.

Turner manages to tap into the cultural importance and resonance of hunting to enrich a conventional comparison made in religious polemical satire, but he still had to endure two separate exiles and the frustration of his dreams for truly prestigious appointments. His work made enough of an impact, at least, that it was banned on two separate occasions, in 1546 and in 1555.[298] Turner's use of the hunt reveals his skill as a writer. He manages to use the hunt to promote himself, to denigrate his opponents, and to flatter his audience, whoever that audience might be. He changes the methods and prey

[297] *Hunting of the Wolf*, B2v.
[298] Pineas, "William Turner and Reformation Politics," 200.

used for comparison depending on his different rhetorical situations; as things worsen in England, the prey gets more dangerous, for example. Turner's tracts also show how the hunt, a practice suffused with terminology and procedures designed as barriers to entry and as vehicles through which to assert status and honor, could be used effectively by one who was really on the outside of the system. The highly structured world of the hunt gave Turner a flexible system of meaning through which to make his religious arguments.

Chapter 3: The Hunt as Love Chase: Success in Failure

Hunting has a long literary history of being used in love poetry. Marcelle Thiébaux gives a general overview of the use of hunting in her book examining the chase in medieval literature. According to Thiébaux, "the hunt of love occurs at least as early as Plato's *Sophist* where the hunt provides an overriding metaphor."[299] One of the most famous classical models for the use of the hunt was, of course, "the famous flights and pursuits from Ovid's *Metamorphoses.*"[300] When using the hunt, a writer was situating himself within a tradition that extends back to classical literature. The hunter is not always successful in his quest, whether in love or when actually hunting. Thiébaux describes the possible outcomes of literary chases: "the hunter successful, the hunter turned victim and the hunter doomed to an endless chase."[301] The literary love hunts that seem to end in failure for the hunter-lover are often the most intriguing and become more so when they are reevaluated using the realities of the practice of hunting to inform and expand the conventional literary trope. This chapter will first examine how the practice of hunting was an appropriate and resonant source of comparison when writing love poetry before turning to failed love chases. Sir Thomas Wyatt, Michael Drayton and, Edmund

[299] Thiébaux, *The Stag of Love: The Chase in Medieval Literature*, 89.
[300] Svensson, "Hunt," 381.
[301] Thiébaux, *The Stag of Love: The Chase in Medieval Literature,* 50.

Spenser use the hunt to redefine their position at the end of what seems to be a failed pursuit.

While the literary trope of the hunt had a long history and would have been recognized by many readers, the actual practice of hunting also had wide cultural resonance. In her study of hunting in Middle English literature, Anne Rooney says, "hunting for the Middle English author was a wholly natural and pervasive part of everyday life," and her observation is also true for the Early Modern period.[302] People from all social classes hunted, and the hunt's procedures and vocabulary were a part of the education of any person of rank.[303] A number of hunting manuals were printed and reprinted during the sixteenth century, disseminating the knowledge among those with access to the printed materials.[304] The system of forest laws impacted the lives of a wide range of people in England, from a wide range of social classes.[305] A poet could assume that just about any reader would have some knowledge of the practice of hunting and that his aristocratic readers had a detailed knowledge of the precise procedures and vocabulary used in the hunt when he invoked the hunt in his work.

The type of hunting that is most frequently referenced in the poems below is the aristocratic hunting of the red deer, or hart, in a mounted chase using hounds – hunting *par force*. Choosing this type of hunt to describe a love chase indicates the importance of both the beloved and the lover. Ultimately, the status accrues more to the hunter than to

[302] Anne Rooney, *Hunting in Middle English Literature*, 1.
[303] Ibid.; Richard Almond, *Medieval Hunting*, 6.
[304] For a discussion of the hunting manuals printed during this period, please see the Introduction.
[305] For a discussion of the system of forest laws, please see the Introduction.

the hunted, so using the hunt to depict a courtship was a way for a man to assert his dominance over his love object.

The two myths of the origin of hunting in England are further evidence of the privileged status of venery. One of Arthur's knights, Tristan, was credited with being "the founder of the exact knowledge of the honorable and delightfull sport of hunting; whose tearmes in Hunting, Hawking, and measures of blowing, I hold to be the best and fittest to be vsed."[306] As Richard Almond explains, this idea of the origins of hunting knowledge stems from Gottfried von Strassburg's *Tristan* (1210).[307] Going even further back in history, George Gascoigne's hunting manual explains that greyhounds and other hunting hounds, utterly essential for hunting the hart on horseback, were first brought to France and then England by Brutus, the descendant of Aeneas who was credited with founding England.[308] While the veracity of these two myths is clearly debatable, these distinguished early hunters are an indication of the elevated position this type of hunting occupied among leisure activities of the period, with roots associated with the pagan gods, with Arthurian legend, with the hero of *The Aeneid*, and with *translatio imperii*. The heroism and physical prowess demonstrated by Tristan and Brutus are traits that an English nobleman would be interested in cultivating, and he would assume the prestige of these myths when presenting himself as a lover-hunter.

The practice of the hunt was also a very social activity that made it appropriate for writing about love, if not actually engaging in love. Gaining prestige and status from

---

[306] Cockaine, *A Short Treatise of Hunting: Compyled for the Delight of Noble Men and Gentlemen*, 3R.
[307] Almond, *Medieval* Hunting, 75; Gottfried von Strassburg, *Tristan, with Surviving Fragments of the Tristran of Thomas*, 78-82.
[308] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 2.

the hunt required that one be seen demonstrating the necessary skills. In the hunt practiced during the Renaissance, being seen would not have been difficult since many people, both male and female, were present during the hunt. Above all things, the aristocratic hunt was a social activity. Men and women of the upper class were present at the hunt as well as members of the king or lord's hunt establishment.[309] Class and gender barriers were weakened during the hunt, leading to opportunities for dalliance that could prove dangerous to the women sought out by the hunters.

Even the technical language and procedures of hunting lent itself to comparisons with love and courtship. The word venery, which, in the context of hunting language, means "the practice or sport of hunting beasts of game," at this time also meant "the pursuit of sexual pleasure."[310] The slot or hoof print of the hart as well as the hoof itself were said to resemble female genitalia. A good hunter would need to be very familiar with and closely examine the slot in order to pick an appropriate prey, and the erotic charge experienced in the presence of these objects and the excitement of the fevered chase was thought to prove too much for some individuals to resist.[311] A number of aspects of the practice of the hunt lent themselves to easy and fruitful comparison with the chase of love, and poets drew on both the literary trope and the actual practice when writing love poetry.

Two emblems from Otto Van Veen's 1608 multilingual collection of emblems, *Amorum Emblemata*, translated by Richard Verstegan, concisely demonstrate a variety of

---

[309] Almond, *Medieval Hunting*, 163.
[310] *Oxford English Dictionary*, Online Edition March 2013, s.v. "venery," accessed March 15, 2013, http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/Entry/222132 and http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/Entry/222133.
[311] Almond, *Medieval Hunting*, 153.

ways that hunting could be used in poetry about love. The first emblem to be discussed from Van Veen's collection, "The chasing goeth before the taking," demonstrates an important resonance between the chase and courtship. The fact that a lover must hunt down his beloved indicates that there is some resistance on her part. This resistance only increases her value to her pursuer, as Gordon Braden explains "the games of courtship, that is, not only have a goal but a point: the annoying paces they put people through are important in themselves, their importance directly linked the earnestness of the wooer's own intent."[312] By prolonging the pursuit, the man proves his interest and the woman proves that she cannot be caught by just anyone. The emblem makes this plain,

> Before the deer bee caught it first must hunted bee,
> The Ladie eke pursued before shee bee obtaynd,
> Payn makes the greater woorth of ought thats thereby gaynd,
> For nothing easly got wee do esteemed see. (1-4)

The text of the emblem lays out the obvious similarity between the chase of the hunt and the chase of love, which is what makes hunting so fruitful in love poetry. After experiencing the pain of the chase, the reward is even sweeter. In the version of the chase presented in this emblem, the violence of the end of the hunt is elided, saying the deer is "caught" instead of killed; the lady is "obtaynd" instead of forcibly won. What is emphasized in this emblem is the skill and effort needed to hunt a stag, a wily opponent, which is compared to the comparable effort needed to win a worthy object of love. The image of the emblem shows Cupid, accompanied by three hunting hounds, chasing a stag. While the hounds are quite close to the stag, suggesting the chase is about to be

[312] Braden, "Pride, Humility, and the Petrarchan Happy Ending," 132.

concluded, Cupid is blowing a hunting horn rather than fitting his arrow to his bow. The violence of the chase is minimized in this poem, but that is not always the case. The final two lines of the text of the emblem explain the focus. The emblem celebrates the chase because "nothing easly got wee do esteemed see." The hunt is an appropriate metaphor here because the speaker is celebrating the difficulty of a good chase. The stag was known for its various stratagems in eluding hunters, and this is what the speaker chooses to emphasize about the women that men pursue. The violent end of a hunt is elided in this comparison because the very resistance of women is valorized, not the possession of the hunter after the fact. This emblem is interesting because it is a reminder that the use of hunting as a metaphor for courtship is not always entirely negative for the beloved. The comparison can serve to celebrate the skills of the hunted as much as the hunter.

A vision of courtship that is modeled on a furious chase that ends with the death of the animal hunted more often has negative repercussions for the beloved-hunted than not. One outcome is that the lover could be more interested in the chase itself instead of the object being chased. The emblem "Onlie for the chase" serves as a warning to any beloved/prey about the intentions of the lover/hunter:

> Loue somtyme doth delight to hold his hunting race,
> And hauing hit the deer that first hee lyked best,
> Some other doth pursue and let the former rest,
> Not seeking for to haue, but onlie for to chace. (1-4)

The text of the emblem describes the chase of love as a "delight" for Love, Cupid, that seems relatively harmless. True, he does leave one love for another, but he only "let[s] the former rest." Using the text alone, one could read the word "rest" as innocuous and

interpret "hit[ting] the deer" as a reference to Cupid's metaphorical arrows, and this sense of a love pursuit as a fun, harmless game is one of the layers of meaning of the emblem. The image of the emblem, however, forcefully reminds the reader of the implications of a comparison to hunting. In the foreground, the first deer-love lies immobile and wounded with an arrow sticking out of its side. Behind this apparently dead stag, Cupid runs after another leaping stag with bow and arrow at the ready. The consequences as portrayed by the image are anything but a game; the rejected beloved is slain and abandoned. A male deer is pictured in this emblem, but the gender of the beloved could be construed as either female or male since women are so frequently compared to deer in love poetry using hunting images. The overall message of this emblem – that one should beware Love because some are only in it for the chase – is amplified by the comparison to hunting; the consequences for a male or female who allows him or herself to be caught could be as disastrous as death.

Clement Robinson's poem, "The Louer compareth some subtile Suters to the Hunter," from the 1584 ballad miscellany *A Handefull of pleasant delites* is another example of how the hunt as love chase can reveal some of the dangers of courtship to women. The poem informs women that men may be interested merely in the chase of love and not in the outcome. The speaker introduces a hunter chasing a hart and explains, "he doth it more to see and view, / Her wilinesse (I tell you true.) / Her trips and skips, now here, now there, / With squats and flats, which hath no pere" (5-8). The speaker, following the established opinion that the hart is a worthy prey because of its ability to evade capture and death, asserts that the hunter really hunts to have the opportunity to observe the deer employing its various strategies. The speaker then explains, "So some

men hunt by hote desire, / To Venus Dames" (13-14). Hunting a deer and hunting an erotic object are conflated, and the speaker's point is that just as some hunters are really only interested in seeing the hart evade capture so are such lovers only interested in the chase of the woman. "For when they see they may her win, / They leaue then where they did begin. / they prate and make the matter nice, / And leaue her in fooles paradice" (20-23). According to this speaker, some men are only interested in women when they cannot have them, so women should not acquiesce to men's entreaties because the men will only leave them. The speaker later advises his audience to "at the first giue them the checke, / Least they at last giue you the geck" (28-29). To get a geck is "to be deceived or tricked," so the speaker is advising women to immediately reject this type of man to avoid being tricked into a bad situation.[313] The poem is interesting because it suggests that a woman could find herself in a "fooles paradice" even if she attempts to evade, like a hart, the male pursuit. Braden's assessment of female resistance is that it indicates the value of the woman; a difficult courtship is a more meaningful, ultimately successful one.[314] The example of this speaker, however, suggests that there is a potential danger to the woman even if she attempts to evade male attention; anything other than a complete and total "checke" at the first sign of interest could lead to disgrace and abandonment. Of course, the speaker has a vested interest in scaring women away from such men; he asserts, "But I am none of those indeed, / beleeue me now: / I am your man if you me need" (32-34). Furthermore, he is not even so certain that hunters really are only interested in the chase instead of the kill as well. In an aside, he insists "(I tell you true.)"

[313] *Oxford English Dictionary*, Online Edition March 2013, s.v. "geck," accessed March 15, 2013, http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/Entry/77281.
[314] Braden, "Pride, Humility, and the Petrarchan Happy Ending," 132.

(6), but later includes the caveat "thus Hunters saie" (12). The reader may not be convinced of the speaker's protestations of innocence and fidelity or be altogether certain that hunters are really only interested in the chase, but, regardless, the sense that the pursuit of courtship can be as disastrous for a woman as a hunt can be for a hart is clear in this poem.

John Wootton's "Damaetas Madrigall in praise of his Daphnis," collected in *England's Helicon* in 1600, provides an interesting example of how a love chase can be quite damaging for the beloved-hunted even when the lover-hunter is truly interested in her and not just in the chase. Wootton's poem begins as a traditional pastoral poem with the shepherd Damaetas praising Daphnis, his love, but the poem quickly incorporates some troubling images and similes. Damaetas praises his love's eyes, saying that they are "like shining Lamps in midst of night, / Night darke and dead: / Or as the Starres that giue the Sea-men light, / Light for to leade / their wandring Ships" (21-25). The objects to which the speaker compares Daphnis' eyes – lamps and stars – are conventional and benign. The contrasts to these sources of light, however, are rather unusual; night is "dark and dead" and the ships are "wandring." The possibility of danger is present in both of these dark spaces, which is not what one would expect in this poem of praise. The unsettling comparisons continue as the speaker goes on praising Daphnis. The color of her cheeks is like "the Rose and Lilly" (26), another conventional form of praise, but the speaker comments that this is "Colour too bright / for Sheepheards eyes" (29-30). In describing the exemplary and conventional beauty of his love, the speaker is also indicating that there are problems with this match. He continues, saying

Her lips like Scarlet of the finest die,

Scarlet blood-red:

Teeth white as Snow, which on the hills dooth lie,

Hills ouer-spread

by Winters force. (31-35)

Again, the speaker uses completely conventional methods of describing his beloved, but he adds a twist that complicates the nature of the praise he gives. Her lips are not only like costly dyed scarlet; they are a particular "blood-red" color. Her teeth are white as snow, but this is a snow that covers the surrounding landscape in a harsh winter. The pastoral scene of this poem is certainly not entirely idyllic; the harsh reality of the changing seasons affects the speaker.

All of these ominous undercuttings of conventional methods of praise take the poem into a more disturbing register; throughout the poem there are undertones of violence and hardship that do not seem to fit the stated purpose of this poem: "Tune on my pipe the praises of my Loue, / Loue faire and bright" (1-2). The final simile of the poem brings the suggestion of violence to a new level.

As swift of foote as is the pretty Roe,

Roe swift of pace;

When yelping Hounds pursue her to and fro,

Hounds fierce in chase,

to reaue her life. (41-45)

The speaker compares his love to a female deer being chased by the hounds during a hunt, and the roe is beautiful in her struggle to avoid death. One cannot merely luxuriate in the image of a deer leaping through the forest, however, because the speaker is clear

that the "yelping," "fierce" hunting dogs want "to reaue her life." The word "reave" can simply mean "to take away (life, rest, sight, etc.)," but it can also mean "to despoil, rob, or forcibly deprive (usually a person) of something" and "to tear, to split, cleave."[315] The word the speaker uses to describe the end of the hunt not only indicates the death of the roe; it also suggests a very violent death that will be forcibly wrung from the hapless deer. Given that the stated purpose of this poem is to praise the attributes of the speaker's beloved, this stanza is deeply troubling. The speaker celebrates Daphnis by imagining her just before the moment when hunting dogs will violently kill her. The roe may indeed appear quite beautiful as she runs away from her death, but the violence that so easily invades the poem through this simile indicates how inappropriate such a comparison can be.

The speaker ends the poem by stating, "Daphnis deserts and beauty are too rare / Then heere conclude / faire Daphnis praise" (48-50) as if nothing untoward had just been said. The undertones of possible hardship and violence throughout the poem, culminating in the comparison to hunting, indicate how easily traditional methods of praise can be used to suggest an entirely different desire on the part of the speaker. Hunting is perfect for this duality because, by its very nature, it always suggests the violence of the conquest and kill.

The violence and domination expressed through a successful chase are not that surprising, given the realities of the practice of the hunt. Just as a hunter asserts his status and virility by chasing down and killing a deer, a lover expresses his dominance and

---

[315] *Oxford English Dictionary*, Online Edition March 2013, s.v. "reave," accessed March 15, 2013, http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/Entry/159124 and http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/Entry/159125.

control over the beloved. Failed love chases would seem to undercut the masculine superiority inherent in the hunt because the ultimate goal is not achieved; the procedure of the hunt is not followed to its conclusion. Sir Thomas Wyatt, Michael Drayton, and Edmund Spenser manage to use the practice of the hunt to mitigate or reverse their failure. Even from a disadvantaged position, the poets are able to use the hunt to assert themselves.

Sir Thomas Wyatt's translation of Petrarch's *Canzone* 190, "Whoso list to hunt," is a well-known example of the use of the hunt in a love poem. Here, the poet depicts a failed hunt. If, indeed, the use of the hunt in poetry is one of the methods of asserting masculinity, class status, dominance, knowledge and skill, it seems contradictory that the hunt represented would be one where the hunter failed. Wyatt uses the hunt to his advantage.

> Who so list to hounte I know where is an hynde;
> But as for me, helas, I may no more:
> The vayne travaill hath wearied me so sore,
> I ame of theim that farthest cometh behinde;
> Yet may I by no meanes my weried mynde
> Drawe from the Diere, but as she fleeth afore
> Faynting I folowe. I leve of therefore,
> Sithens in a nett I seke to hold the wynde.
> Who list her hount I put him out of dowbte,
> As well as I may spend his tyme in vain:
> And graven with Diamondes in letters plain

There is written her faier neck rounde abowte:

'Noli me tangere, for Cesars I ame,

And wylde for to hold, though I seme tame'. (1-14)[316]

The main metaphor of the poem represents a significant change from Petrarch's version, where the Petrarchan speaker follows the vision of a deer in a state of quasi-religious ecstasy. Here, the speaker hunts the woman, who is figured as a female deer, or "hynde" (1). After "vayne travaill" (3), the speaker now is "of theim that farthest cometh behinde" (4), implying that other men are hunting in relays with their dogs, as was common practice.[317] In the first part of the poem, the speaker takes considerable effort to illustrate the great pains that he has undergone in his hunt for this woman. He says of himself, "Faynting I folowe" (7), and that he gives up his chase "Sithens in a nett I seke to hold the wynde" (8). All this effort described may be somewhat tongue in cheek, since, in the final line, the sign around the hind's neck says that she is "wylde for to hold" (14). While this is part of the warning sign around the hind's neck, it also suggests that the speaker knows what holding the hind is like since he has done it in the past. It is important to note that the speaker describes using a net to catch the deer, a non-noble method of hunting deer.[318] Furthermore, the idea that it is only his "weried *mynde*" (5, emphasis mine) that pursues her means that the poem could be seen as rather insulting to the lady in question The speaker suggests that he has had a touch of Caesar's deer in the past and invites other men to try for the same. The reference the speaker makes to the

[316] Line numbers for Wyatt's poetry refer to those given in *Collected Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, ed. Kenneth Muir and Patricia Thomson.
[317] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 101.
[318] Almond, *Medieval Hunting*, 18.

relays when he is "of theim that farthest cometh behinde" (4) further contributes to the idea that other men chase and may catch this supposedly unobtainable woman. Despite the fact that he does not catch the woman, the speaker is revealed to have more power than it may initially seem. Failure to properly finish a hunt does not have to signal complete lack of success.

In his sequence *Idea's Mirror*, Michael Drayton also includes a moment of a different kind of failed hunt ("See, chaste Diana, where my harmless heart"), failure from a male perspective, that is. For in this poem, the man is the prey instead of the woman. The main conceit is that the speaker's heart is like a deer that Diana might chase, but the speaker shows that he gives his heart willingly by describing his heart/hart progressing through the various stages of a typical hunt. First, he says that his heart is "roused from [his] breast, his sure and safest lair, / Nor chased by hound, nor forced by hunter's art" (2-3).[319] These lines refer to what is typically known as "unharboring" a hart, the moment in the hunt when the deer would be flushed from its lair by hunters and hounds.[320] In Drayton's version of the hunt, however, the speaker, embodied in the poem through his heart (although he remains crucially distanced from his heart at the same time), actively chooses to leave the "sure and safest lair." He may position himself as the prey of a hunt, but he allows himself to be caught and killed.

Despite his apparent willingness, the speaker continues to denote the progress of a typical hunt in the lines of the poem, at each moment demonstrating that his heart/hart is being caught and ultimately killed by Cupid's "piercing arrow" (8) solely through

[319] Michael Drayton, "See, chaste Diana, where my harmless heart," *Sixteenth Century Poetry: An Annotated Anthology*, ed. Gorden Braden.
[320] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 105.

independent choice; the death by love is sought, not forced. What is left somewhat unclear by the poem is whether "chaste Diana" welcomes these attentions, the word "chaste" suggesting that she does not. The speaker distances himself from his heart ("my harmless heart" [1] becomes "my deer" [5] which in turn has a "heart" [8] of its own), muting the passion that must motivate these actions. At the same time, however, the fact that the heart/hart ends "stone-cold" (14) from the wound from Cupid, an unusual response to the arrows of love, emphasizes the violence carried through the poem by the hunting metaphor. The speaker may assert that he willingly submits to the onslaught of love, but he is killed at the end of the hunt nonetheless. Even in this more explicit characterization of the hunter as victim, with the man dead at the end of the poem, his power and control are still present within the poem. All along, he submits to the various stages of the hunt and ultimately revels in his death. Furthermore, the distancing of the speaker from his heart mitigates some of the consequences depicted. The speaker manages to demonstrate his power despite the putative failure.

Edmund Spenser's use of the hunt in the *Amoretti* is a depiction, like Drayton's, of the failure to properly finish a hunt, although, like Wyatt and Wootton, the speaker is the hunter and the beloved is hunted. Spenser's use is rather more complicated because he is grappling with writing an entire Petrarchan sonnet sequence with an uncharacteristically happy ending. The *Amoretti and Epithalamion* were published for the first time in 1595, during Spenser's lifetime.[321] Edmund Spenser uses language from and images of the hunt in his *Amoretti* LXVII, a crucial moment in his account of his courtship. Of the many sonnet sequences written after Petrarch, Spenser's *Amoretti* is

[321] Alexander Dunlop, Introduction to *Amoretti and Epithalamion*, 585.

notable for its happy ending of marriage, described in the *Epithalamion*. As Germaine Warkentin explains in the entry on the *Amoretti* in the *Spenser Encyclopedia*, "the poems are recognized as Spenser's tribute to Elizabeth Boyle, whom he married probably on the feast of St. Barnabus, 11 June 1594…[the] *Amoretti*, though it pays homage to the convention of the suffering lover, is paradoxically a book made up of happy leaves, and it moves steadily toward the moment in sonnet 68 when the poet announces the fulfillment of his hopes."[322] Spenser's project in the sequence, therefore, is to find a way to represent a love that is actually requited. Since he uses many of the conventions of the Petrarchan sequence, where the woman is always cruelly resisting and the man is always hopelessly pining, Spenser must find a way to accommodate Petrarchan images and language as well as the successful Protestant marriage that will close the volume. The speaker needs to convince and win his lady in such a way that he does not humiliate her to the point that any possibility of mutuality in the future relationship is destroyed. Gordon Braden sees the pride that the beloved exhibits in the sequence as a crucial aspect of any courtship and observes that the lover/speaker also recognizes the importance and function of this pride.[323] He says of the speaker,

> What he affirms…is an important faith that the womanly pride that will make the goal [marriage] difficult to attain is also what makes it possible to attain; the difficulties are essential to the tying of an enduring knot. (Braden, "Pride, Humility, and the Petrarchan Happy Ending," 132)

[322] Warkentin, "*Amoretti, Epithalamion*," 31.
[323] Braden, "Pride, Humility, and the Petrarchan Happy Ending," 132.

Following Braden's assessment, then, I would say that it is even more important for the speaker to maintain the pride of the woman in some way after he has won her, since that pride will be the very foundation of a good marriage. The logic of valuing the woman's resistance is that a woman who is reluctant to give herself in marriage will be equally reluctant to break the marriage vows once she has made them. Moreover, the lover demonstrates his loyalty and commitment through his persistent attempts to win the woman.

Within the sequence, sonnets LXVII and LXVIII contain the crucial moment of the final struggle to win the woman followed by the first acknowledgement of success. The admission of success, however, is not very explicit in sonnet LXVIII, and is only suggested in the final couplet: "so let us love, deare love, lyke as we ought, / love is the lesson which the Lord us taught" (13-14).[324] After the action of sonnet LXVII, which will be discussed shortly, the speaker then quietly asserts the communion between himself and the beloved with the plural pronoun, "us," the name of "deare love" for the woman, and the notion that "the Lord" has instructed them in the proper manner of loving each other. Generally, critics base their assertion that this poem is a significant, positive development in the sequence on its calendrical alignment with Easter.[325] Regardless of what one may think about the numerological studies of the sequence, this parallel seems to be one of the stronger associations. As Anne Lake Prescott says, "About *Am*. 68, of

---

[324] All references to Spenser's poetry come from *Amoretti*, *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Spenser*, ed. William A. Oram, Einar Bjorvand, Ronald Bond, Thomas H. Cain, Alexander Dunlop, and Richard Schell.

[325] Dubrow, *Echoes of Desire: English Petrarchism and Its Counterdiscourses*, 78; Prescott, "The Thirsty Deer and the Lord of Life: Some Contexts for Amoretti 67-70," 43; Warkinton, "*Amoretti, Epithalamion*," 33.

course, there can be no doubt…it is a brief anthology of scriptural quotations suited to the Easter season."[326] The speaker does delight, in the sonnet, in "this joyous day" (5) and hopes that all may "with love…one another entertayne" (12). Clearly, the speaker's outlook on love has changed from his point of view in earlier sonnets where he described himself as "lyke one that having lost the field: / is prisoner led away with heavy heart, / despoyld of warlike armes and knowen shield" (LII.2-4). The moment that marks the transition from the despair found in sonnets like LII to the hope expressed in LXVIII occurs in sonnet LXVII, when the speaker finally wins his lady. However, the fact that this moment of triumph is conveyed through a conceit of the hunt makes that acceptance complicated and even troublesome.

Amoretti LXVII, from the very beginning, is forthright about its guiding metaphor. The sonnet begins "Lyke as a huntsman after weary chace / Seeing the game from him escapt away: / sits downe to rest him in some shady place, / with panting hounds beguiled of their pray" (1-4). For sixty-six poems, the speaker has been attempting to catch the woman with his stratagems, and, in this sonnet, he represents himself as tired and resigned to failure. With the mention of the "hounds" and the later designation of the "pray" as a "gentle deare" (7), the reader knows that the speaker is referring to hunting *par force*.[327] With the use of the pronoun "her" (8), the reader also knows that there is a twist to this hunt; traditionally, only male deer were hunted in this manner with hounds, so the perceived prestige of this hunt would be diminished somewhat for potential readers of the poem, although the necessity of substituting a

[326] Prescott, "The Thirsty Deer and the Lord of Life: Some Contexts for Amoretti 67-70," 43.
[327] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 109.

female deer as the object would have mitigated that decrease in respect.[328] In general, male deer were considered stronger and craftier and therefore a more worthy prey for the aristocratic hunter, while the need to maintain the herd would also have been a deterrent in pursuing female deer. Nonetheless, the speaker makes it clear that this has been a long and vigorous hunt that has taxed him severely; he is "all weary" (6) and his hounds are "panting" (4) with exertion. As Marcelle Thiébaux explains, when used in literature, "the hounds can embody an aspect of the man himself,"[329] so including the hounds in the poem not only signals that the hunt in this poem is an aristocratic one but also emphasizes the physical state of the speaker at the beginning of this poem.[330]

Of course, the most striking detail about the hunt in this poem is that it has failed; the hunter has not caught and killed his quarry. The poem is clear that the speaker "all weary had the chace forsooke" (6) and that he is '[sitting] downe to rest him in some shady place" (3). As initially presented in the poem, the hunt has ended, and the speaker will no longer try to pursue the "gentle deare." As he is sitting there, though, the "gentle

---

[328] Almond, *Medieval Hunting*, 62.
[329] Thiébaux, *The Stag of Love: The Chase in Medieval Literature*, 102.
[330] Sonnet XXXI from Thomas Lodge's *Phillis* exemplifies Thiébaux's contention that the hounds used in a hunt can be seen as extensions of the hunter. In this sonnet, a translation from Ronsard, the speaker describes himself chasing a "sauage fairie" (2) in a typical hunt through an allegorized landscape (Holmes, "Thomas Lodge's *Amours*: The Copy-Text for Imitations of Ronsard in *Phillis*," 55). The speaker makes it clear in the fifth line of the sonnet, however, that this is a completely imagined, symbolic hunt. He explains, "For leash I beare a cord of carefull griefe, / For brach I lead an ouer forward minde, / My houndes are thoughtes, and rage despairing blind, / Paine, crueltie, and care without reliefe" (5-8). Each dog brought on the hunt is named as a particular type of thought, and the thoughts in this particular case are all negative. In keeping with this theme, the speaker is consumed and destroyed by his angry thoughts when it becomes clear that the "fairie" will not be captured. Besides recalling the story of Actaeon, another hunter who was killed by his own hounds, the sonnet is an explicit example of how the speaker's state of mind can be expressed through the description of the hunt.

deare returned the self-same way" (7), and the poem ends with her "goodly wonne" (14) and in the control of the speaker. Because of the failure reported at the beginning of the poem, it can be said that the deer made the choice to give herself over to the speaker/hunter while still retaining a degree of her pride and agency. If the intent is to represent a plausible moment of acquiescence within the context of the strenuous and often divisive courtship, while still leaving room for a marriage of mutuality, then this moment of failed chase and self-motivated capitulation seems to answer those needs. As will be seen, however, the decision to use the language of the hunt and the manner in which that language is used will severely compromise any initial impression that this acceptance is totally peaceful.

To begin with, the speaker says that he has decided to rest in "some shady place" (3), as if any shady spot would have been suitable and his choice were motivated by nothing other than comfort. Later in the poem, when the deer enters the scene, she does so "to quench her thirst at the next brooke" (8). First, deer are known to be particularly thirsty and have been known to be so since classical times, so deciding to sit next to a body of water when chasing a hot and tired deer is not an entirely innocent choice.[331] Second, before the day of a hunt, the hunt professionals would carefully track and locate a suitable deer and then plot out the possible routes that the deer might take during the chase the next day.[332] On the day of the actual hunt, braces of hounds would be sent to various points on this possible route in order to be ready to replace the flagging main

[331] Prescott, "The Thirsty Deer and the Lord of Life: Some Contexts for Amoretti 67-70," 47.
[332] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 102.

pack of hounds at the appropriate moment.[333] Third, one of the common and well-known strategies of a deer when it is being chased is to double back on its own path in an attempt to avoid the dogs.[334] Finally, it was equally common for the deer, at the end of its strength near the conclusion of the hunt, to seek refuge in the water as a method of throwing the dogs off its scent.[335] Given this information, Spenser's decision for the speaker to rest in this "shady place" (3) is revealed as one final attempt to gain control of the deer. Considering this canny choice greatly lessens the significance of the woman/deer freely giving herself to the man/hunter. In fact, when the speaker says that the deer "sought not to fly, but fearelesse still did bide" (10), the reader could interpret this as a last method of defense on the deer's part, since the end of every hunt involved the deer turning at bay against the men and hounds chasing it.[336] While this does mean that the woman/deer takes more direct action in this view of the poem, actively opposing the attempts of the man/hunter to catch her, it also means that the struggle of the hunt continues up to the moment of acceptance. Aligning the acceptance of a proposal with the end of a hunt suggests that marriage may be a kind of death for Elizabeth Boyle.

While the poem does not go so far as to say that the deer is at bay before she is tied "with her owne goodwill" (12), the specific words from technical hunting language that Spenser chooses to use contribute to the sense of violence that still pervades the poem despite the gesture of a failed hunt that may or may not result in willing submission. After introducing the hounds, the speaker describes what he has been

---

[333] *The Boke of Saint Albans,* E8v-F1r.
[334] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 109-123.
[335] Ibid., 115.
[336] Ibid., 114.

through as "long pursuit and vaine assay" (5). While "assay" has a primary meaning of "the action or process of trying, trial generally," it has a technical meaning as well: "trial of 'grease of a deer,'" which means to try the fat of the deer.[337] In hunting terms, the assay was the first piece of the deer cut from the body after butchering had begun and then presented to the highest-ranking participant in the hunt.[338] To include this word in the poem is to invoke the ceremony of butchering the hart after its slaughter. Furthermore, this significance is not buried within the poem or merely suggested; any person of rank would have understood the double meaning of this word, including the woman to whom the poems are addressed. When the hunter/lover enjoys the best of the deer/woman, then, she will be dismembered.

In addition, when the speaker finally gains control of her at the end of the poem, the deer is "fyrmely tyde" (12) and "halfe trembling" (11). The deer may seem to "fearelesse still…bide" (10) when she encounters the speaker by the side of the stream, but she realizes she still has something to fear as he constrains her and keeps her by his side. The twelfth line of the sonnet, "and with her owne goodwill hir fyrmely tyde," exemplifies the double meaning that runs throughout the poem. On one hand, one can determine that the deer is tied because her "owne goodwill" consents to joining in this manner with the speaker/hunter. On the other hand, one could decide that the speaker capitalizes on the "goodwill" of the deer, which convinces her to stay, exhausted, at the stream despite the presence of the hunter, with the foolish hope that he will not harm her, and takes the opportunity afforded by this trust to finally gain his long sought prize. The

[337] *Oxford English Dictionary,* Online Version March 2013, s.v. "assay," accessed March 15, 2013, http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/Entry/11756.
[338] Cockaigne, *A Short Treatise of Hunting*, 10R.

final line of the poem, "so goodly wonne with her owne will beguyled" (14), supports the second reading. Additionally, the tying of the deer echoes the idea of tying the knot of marriage. In the context of the poem, the knot represents a dangerous captivity instead of the joyful uniting of two souls in marriage. Once again, the poem insinuates that marriage can be a potentially dangerous trap for a woman.

Earlier in the poem, when describing the failure of the hunt, the speaker describes his hounds as being "beguiled of their pray" (4). In contrast to what one might think given the main conceit of this poem, the word "beguiled" does not have a technical meaning within hunting vocabulary. Instead, its meaning is "to cheat (hopes, expectations, aims, or a person in them); to disappoint, to foil."[339] At the beginning of the poem, the speaker considers his dogs cheated of the opportunity to bring down the deer in a violent and bloody manner. The fact that the word is repeated in the final line to describe the process by which the woman was attained is very troubling if the reader is going to be able to fully participate in and understand the transcendent hopes of the Easter sonnet, *Amoretti* LXVIII, which will immediately follow this one. The speaker does refer to the woman as "a beast so wyld" (13), which may be an attempt to justify the ties that bind her, but this suggestion cannot completely mitigate the undertones of violence that have been maintained throughout the poem by the meanings and implications of the language and procedures of the hunt. Within the procedures of courtly hunting, there is no instance of tying the deer with ropes, even during the butchering process. Nets were employed in bow and stable hunting, but tying a deer with

[339] *Oxford English Dictionary*, Online Edition March 2013, s.v. "beguile," accessed March 15, 2013, http://www.oed.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/Entry/17166.

rope was not a method used in aristocratic hunting.[340] Suffice it to say that tying the beloved, clearly an act of control, is not part of the aristocratic hunt proper. With this capture, the speaker violates the conventions of the courtly hunt. While this means that the deer is not killed at the end of the poem, the beloved's status is decreased somewhat by being associated with this ignoble ending. The effect is not as great as Wyatt's insinuation in "Whoso List to Hunt" that he has tasted the forbidden fruit, but Spenser's speaker does subdue his prey in an opportunistic and debased manner.

The overall effect of the use of these hunting terms is that the man does not seem so diminished when he represents himself as having failed in his original aim. True, the speaker has not completed the hunt in the traditional fashion. In this scenario, the hunter would bring the hart to bay, generally in a stream, with a group of dogs and other men, eventually killing the deer by disabling it by cutting "the hough-sinew in a hind leg," and then dispatching it with a sword or knife through the spinal cord or heart.[341] Even though these things have not occurred, they are the events that any noble person of this time would think of when he or she was reminded of the conclusion of a typical hunt. The shadow of these violent acts exists within the poem, and may be the cause of the "trembling" (11) that the deer experiences. The repetition of the verb "beguiled" and the use of the word "assay" further contribute to the violent suggestions of the poem. As one critic so aptly states, "just what *does* one normally do with a captured deer if one does not want to provide it with a diamond collar? The hunting imagery hints at an almost

[340] Cummins, *The Art of Medieval Hunting*, 47-67, 87; *The Master of Game*, 189-199.
[341] Almond, *Medieval Hunting*, 74; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 116.

inevitable anxiety about captivity and dismemberment; deer are not wrong to tremble."[342] The very frame of the poem severely compromises its ability to represent a peaceful end to the tortured courtship, with suggestions that proud women are not wrong to tremble when contemplating marriage. In her book on sonnet sequences from this period, Heather Dubrow identifies a common state of these sequences as a "lurch[ing] between success and failure"; in other words, the lover is frequently uncertain of his position with his lady, and that position may change from poem to poem or line to line.[343] Dubrow characterizes the effect of this "lurching" in the following manner: "failure, whether realized or anticipated, contributes to the antagonism that is manifest even, or especially, in such sequences as the often worshipful *Amoretti.*"[344] Even though Spenser, when writing this sequence, had an "early (and accurate) confidence that his suit [would] be successful," the anxiety that it might not be, added to the reticence and reluctance that Braden sees characterizing any successful courtship, means that the *Amoretti* still exhibit the oscillation that Dubrow attributes to creating and maintaining antagonism.[345]

Despite all of the implied violence, an attempt has at least been made by the speaker, however unsuccessfully, to include a moment within the sequence where the beloved has an opportunity to freely give herself while still maintaining her pride. Of course, the lover must also be able to maintain his pride, and therein is the dilemma that complicates *Amoretti* LXVII. Spenser accommodates both needs through his use of hunting. The male lover is able to assert his status and power when he successfully gains

[342] Prescott, "The Thirsty Deer and the Lord of Life: Some Contexts for Amoretti 67-70," 35.
[343] Dubrow, *Echoes of Desire: English Petrarchism and Its Counterdiscourses*, 250.
[344] Ibid.
[345] Braden, "Pride, Humility, and the Petrarchan Happy Ending," 123, 132.

his prize by using his knowledge of hunting procedures and the behavior of a threatened deer. The female beloved is honored by being compared to the most worthy quarry for a gentlemen and is given some degree of choice in the ultimate outcome. Of course, Spenser can only achieve this by suppressing the violence of the hunt and imagining an alternative ending that does not involve death; his object becomes possession instead of annihilation. The still resonant violence of the images of the hunt can be disturbing in the context of this moment in the sequence, but, ultimately, at least the gesture has been made to try to "find a way for [the woman] to preserve [her pride] while finally saying Yes."[346]

For Spenser and other poets, then, deploying the language, images and habits of hunting in their poetry demonstrates their status and elite knowledge. In the texts examined, the hunt depicted is usually a failed one, but the speaker is still able to demonstrate a power and a latent violence despite this failure. For, after all, a man who could correctly participate in a hunt of this sort was first and foremost an aristocrat, a man of violence accustomed to getting his way. Looking at the poems through the lens of the cultural practice of hunting is a way to see the poems in a new light. Overall, the male speakers of all these poems come across as powerful, masculine figures thoroughly in charge of the action surrounding them. No matter what the circumstances of the situation represented in the poem, the male speaker can win the day through his prowess at hunting. The use of hunting in these poems also allows us to see the chase of love in a new way. The overall impression given by this survey is of the dangerous and difficult nature of amatory pursuit, certainly metaphorically and perhaps literally as well.

---

[346] Ibid., 133.

Through the depiction of different moments of a hunt, the reader can vividly visualize the moment of courtship. While in many cases the outcome of the chase can prove disastrous for the female beloved, the use of the hunt also indicates the effort and skill needed on the part of the male hunter. The violence of the hunting images and language can be shocking, even disturbing, but the expertise needed to follow this pursuit, poetically or otherwise, can just as easily be admirable or fascinating.

Chapter 4: Queen Elizabeth and the Hunt on Progress

During her forty-four year reign, Queen Elizabeth went on twenty-three progresses, visiting towns, royal palaces, and the private homes of a number of her subjects. Hunting was a usual part of the entertainment offered to the queen, especially when she visited private homes and stayed for more than a day or two.[347] While scholars have produced quite a bit of interesting work on the progresses, there has been no sustained focus on hunting as it appears in the records of these entertainments. Information about hunting on progresses is preserved in the printed versions of the entertainments at Kenilworth (1575) and Cowdray (1591) and in the other records compiled by John Nichols in *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth* (1823).[348] By focusing on how hunting is presented in these records, I show how the hunt is a site of conflict and negotiation between the Queen and her hosts. Early modern aristocratic hunting was an elaborate spectacle of power, with nearly countless opportunities for participants to assert their noble status. It was a practice that involved controlling and dominating the surrounding landscape, and these factors, in addition to

---

[347] Cole, "Monarchy in Motion: An Overview of Elizabethan Progresses," 27; Heal, "Giving and Receiving on Royal Progress," 50; Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony,* 91.

[348] For information on the printing of the Kenilworth and Cowdray entertainments, see the relevant discussions below. For a discussion of John Nichols' scholarly practices, see Pooley, "A Pioneer of Renaissance Scholarship: John Nichols and *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*."

the traditional association between war and the hunt, made the hunt a useful tool for asserting and negotiating power during a progress.[349] I also examine the connection between the hunt and the other entertainments offered at Kenilworth and Cowdray. At Kenilworth particularly, the hunt allows for "chance" encounters between the queen and performers as she returns to the castle, structuring the space of entertainment. Both at Kenilworth and at Cowdray, the hunt as presented in the extant records impacts the meaning of the other entertainments offered, emphasizing or contrasting appeals made to the queen.

Of course, the available records do not simply present an uncomplicated version of what happened on a hunt. The hunt may or may not have occurred in the manner detailed, and the details recounted are subject to the influence of the host and the writer, among others.[350] Even if we cannot know exactly what happened, it is still interesting to examine what is reported. Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, the host at Kenilworth and Anthony Brown, Viscount Montague, the host at Cowdray, made more overt pleas to Queen Elizabeth with staged entertainments, but they also used the hunt as another tool of persuasion.

Mary Hill Cole defines a progress as "those lengthy trips away from London that required, over a number of days or weeks, a series of hosts in several counties to provide hospitality for an itinerant court."[351] Progresses generally happened during the summer,

---

[349] Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066,* 80; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640,* 3.
[350] See Heaton, "Elizabethan Entertainments in Manuscript: The Harefield Festivities (1602) and the Dynamics of Exchange," 228-229 on the multiple influences on entertainment texts.
[351] Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony,* 22.

starting in July and ending in September. Scholars have identified a number of reasons why Elizabeth went on progress, including avoidance of the plague and a desire to be seen and make connections with her subjects. Progresses were evidently important enough to Elizabeth that she was willing to subsidize them; despite the notion that the queen traveled to save money by foisting her expenses onto her hosts, the court actually spent more while traveling.[352] During a progress, Elizabeth would stay with a number of hosts, both at private homes and during visits to towns. Most visits were actually quite short, usually lasting two days, but some visits were longer and more elaborate, like Kenilworth and Cowdray.[353] In general, at each visit, Elizabeth would be welcomed and symbolically offered the keys, or some other form of ownership, to the house or town, which she would graciously return.[354] On the shortest and simplest of visits, the queen would be feasted and given a gift.[355] Longer and more elaborate visits also involved entertainments planned by the host and devised by writers hired for the occasion. The queen did not expect an absolute standard of hospitality from her hosts; what was offered was relative to the means of the particular host.[356] Organizing a hunt for the queen was considered one of the customary duties of a host, even for shorter and less elaborate visits.[357] The hunt played a more important role in the progresses of Elizabeth's forebears, Henry VII and Henry VIII, and in those of her successor, James I, determining

---

[352] Cole, "Monarchy in Motion: An Overview of Elizabethan Progresses," 35-36.
[353] Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony*, 22.
[354] Heal, "Giving and Receiving on Royal Progress," 49.
[355] For a discussion of gift giving during progresses, see Heal, "Giving and Receiving on Royal Progress," 46-60.
[356] Smuts, "Progresses and Court Entertainments," 286; Cole, "Monarchy in Motion: An Overview of Elizabethan Progresses," 39.
[357] Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony*, 91; Heal, "Giving and Receiving on Royal Progress," 50.

the itinerary.[358] Even if the hunt played a smaller role, Elizabeth did love to hunt and she did so while on progress.[359]

More recent scholarship on Elizabethan progresses has complicated the prior view of these visits as pure propaganda. Either looking on the progresses as a group or focusing on a specific visit, scholars have noted that there are multiple and, at times, competing viewpoints.[360] One approach has been to examine the progresses in light of the cult of Elizabeth's image.[361] Mary Hill Cole sees Elizabeth using the "climate of chaos" of a progress to her political advantage, strategically delaying decisions and ensuring that she was constantly the center of her courtiers' attention.[362] Other scholars have focused on the surviving texts of progress entertainments.[363] Elizabeth Zeman

---

[358] Cole, "Monarchy in Motion: An Overview of Elizabethan Progresses," 28; Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony*, 26.
[359] Hibbert, *The Virgin Queen: The Personal History of Elizabeth I*, 133. Hibbert mentions how much Elizabeth liked to hunt *par force*, particularly when she was young, preferring to kill the deer herself at the end of the chase.
[360] Smuts, "Progresses and Court Entertainments."
[361] Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry*. Yates examines Elizabeth as the imperial virgin, Astraea, in *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century.* Wilson looks at the influence of medieval romance on Elizabeth's image in *Entertainments for Elizabeth I*. Doran looks at the progresses in terms of depictions of the queen's marriage in "Juno versus Diana: The Treatment of Elizabeth I's Marriage in Plays and Entertainments, 1561-1581."
[362] Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony*, 5; Cole, "Monarchy in Motion: An Overview of Elizabethan Progresses"; see Archer and Knight, "Elizabetha Triumphans," for the contention that Elizabeth used the progresses to make explicit connections between her body and the land.
[363] See Gabriel Heaton, *Writing and Reading Royal Entertainments: From George Gascoigne to Ben Jonson,* for the circulation of progress texts in manuscript and in print. Wendy Wall examines how Gascoigne and Sidney formulate models of Renaissance authority and authorship through their entertainment texts in *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance*. See Stähler, "Imagining the Illusive/Elusive?: Printed Accounts of Elizabethan Festivals," for connections to continental progress text traditions and for the creation of a "virtual reality" through a progress text.

Kolkovich brings welcome attention to the role of women in hosting and presenting progress entertainments.[364] The work of Bruce Smith and Michael Leslie is most relevant to my approach. Smith identifies three different registers of space at play in a country house entertainment, locating the hunt in the "Far Horizon," a far less wild place than it may seem.[365] Leslie examines the role the landscape of country houses plays in progress entertainments, and he sees the hosts using the porous boundaries of their properties to their advantage, forcing the queen to view and respond to entertainments she is unable to ignore.[366]

Aristocratic hunting, on progresses and in general, is primarily a magnificent display of power and prestige. Whether the participants are hunting *par force*, bow and stable, or coursing, many people are involved, following prescribed procedures and using specific, technical language. At times, the hunt is presented as if the spectacle is the entire point, with the chase and kill merely an afterthought. For example, Nichols records that Sir Thomas Pope, Princess Elizabeth's guardian at Hatfield, liked to "gratify the Princess on some occasions with the fashionable amusements of the time; even at his own expense, and at the hazard of offending the Queen."[367] One of the amusements he arranges for Elizabeth is a hunt:

---

[364] Kolkovich, "Lady Russell, Elizabeth I, and Female Political Alliances through Performance" and "Work in Progress: Gender and Politics in Late Elizabethan Progress Entertainments."

[365] Smith, "Landscape with Figures: The Three Realms of Queen Elizabeth's Country-house Revels," 94.

[366] Leslie, "Something Nasty in the Wilderness: Entertaining Queen Elizabeth on Her Progresses."

[367] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth,* i. 16; Clare Hopkins, "Pope, Sir Thomas (*c.*1507–1559)."

> In April of that same year, she was escorted from Hatfield to Enfield-chase, by a retinue of twelve Ladies, clothed in white sattin on *ambling palfreys*, and twenty yeomen in green, all on horseback, that *her Grace* might *hunt the hart*. At entering the chase, or forest, she was met by fifty archers in scarlet boots and yellow caps, armed with gilded bows; one of whom presented her a silver-headed arrow, winged with peacock's feathers. Sir Thomas Pope had the *devising* of this show. By way of closing the sport, or rather the ceremony, the Princess was gratified with the privilege of cutting the throat of a buck. (Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i. 17. Emphasis in Nichols.)

This is more of a "show" or "ceremony" than a sport. Princess Elizabeth is honored by the presence of such a retinue to accompany her on the hunt, and Sir Thomas Pope is honored through his ability to present such a show. One assumes that the hunt was a *par force* hunt since the deer dies by having its throat slit, but the method is not clear or that important to the aim of magnifying Elizabeth. The emphasis is, instead, on the costumes of her attendants and on the gift presented to her. The moment of the kill is the only part of the chase included in the description. By reserving the *coup de grace* to Elizabeth, the company acknowledges her preeminent position.[368] Hosts, or guardian-jailors, could use the hunt to lavish attention and praise on Elizabeth.

Later, as queen, Elizabeth would often entertain foreign ambassadors with hunting at royal palaces close to the Thames or during visits to private homes while on progress. On one occasion, she welcomed the duc de Biron, Henry IV of France's envoy, at Basing

[368] Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 52-53; *The Master of Game*, 175.

House in Hampshire, the home of the William Paulet, Marquis of Winchester.[369] "And one day [the duc de Biron] attended [the queen] at Basing Park at hunting; where the Duke stayed her coming, and did there see her in such Royalty, and so attended by the Nobility, so costly furnished and mounted, as the like had seldom been seen."[370] Despite this magnificent display of the queen's power and prestige, the Duke fails to approach the queen first to salute her. Offended by this slight, the queen forces the Duke to follow her and to bow to her back from twenty yards away, only then deigning to formally greet him.[371] The hunt is a useful tool for asserting status and power, whether through dominance in the chase and kill or through impressive ceremony. What this incident reveals, though, is that the display was not always as effective as desired. The Duke still fails to grant absolute precedence to the queen, even though she appears to full advantage, on a costly horse, surrounded by her nobles.

The hunt may be staged, or reported, in such a way as to bring glory and attention to the queen, but attention could easily be shifted away from the center. For example, the monument of John Selwyn, Under Keeper of the Park at Oatlands during Elizabeth's reign, records the following incident. Selwyn was "attending [the queen], as was the duty of his office" during a "grand Stag-hunt." Apparently inspired in the moment, Selwyn "suddenly leaped from his horse, upon the back of the stag (both running at that time with their utmost speed), and not only kept his seat gracefully in spite of every effort of the affrighted beast, but drawing his sword, with it guided him towards the Queen, and coming near her presence, plunged it into his throat, so that the animal fell dead at her

[369] Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony*, 150.
[370] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, iii.566.
[371] Ibid., 566-567.

feet."[372] The queen's reaction is not recorded, but the focus was certainly on John Selwyn and his impressive abilities rather than on anyone else that day, despite the fact that he does at least guide the deer towards the queen so that she can see the unusual death. While the structure of an aristocratic hunt acknowledges and reinforces the queen's preeminence, other participants could jockey for position and power using its procedures and ceremonies.

I. Kenilworth, 1575

In the two printed versions of the Kenilworth entertainment, hosted by Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, the hunt is a site of negotiation of power between the queen and her host. The Kenilworth entertainment was an especially long and lavish visit. Queen Elizabeth visited Leicester at Kenilworth for nineteen days from 9 July to 27 July, 1575. Quite a number of planned entertainments were presented to the queen, including several hunts, the first water fête in England and a rustic, country bride ale. Leicester spent an enormous amount of time and money preparing his estate, adding to the house, garden, and park.[373]

Robert Dudley was Elizabeth's longstanding and closest favorite. She made him Master of the Horse on the first day of her reign, and when suffering from smallpox in 1562, she issued instructions to appoint him Protector of the Realm if she died.[374] For many years, the rumors of the possibility of marriage had swirled around the two, even

---

[372] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, iii.599.
[373] Dillon, "Pageants and Propaganda: Robert Langham's *Letter* and George Gascoigne's *Princely Pleasures at Kenilworth*," 627.
[374] Nash, "A Subject without Subjection: Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and *The Princely Pleasures at Kenelworth Castle*," 85-86.

though Dudley was already married.[375] By the time of the Kenilworth entertainment, the Earl of Leicester was no longer married and was still Elizabeth's favorite, but he wanted to clarify or change that relationship. Scholars have generally agreed that Leicester used the entertainments and events of the Kenilworth visit to make two major appeals to the queen: to intervene in the Netherlands for the Protestant cause and to recognize, and possibly improve, his status.[376] There is some disagreement over the exact nature of the second appeal. Some argue that Leicester made a serious proposal of marriage to the queen, while others read the offers of marriage more generally: either marry me or let me marry someone else.[377] Whether the proposal is seen as serious or not, Leicester is generally understood to be using Kenilworth to promote himself, either all the way to consort or just somewhat closer to being Elizabeth's equal.[378] In addition to the display of his impressive estate and the lavish entertainments he offers, Leicester uses the hunt to assert and negotiate his status with the queen.[379]

---

[375] Ibid., 86.

[376] For the attempt to persuade Elizabeth to intervene in the Netherlands, see Goldring, "Portraiture, Patronage, and the Progresses: Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and the Kenilworth Festivities of 1575," 177; Nash, "A Subject without Subjection: Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and *The Princely Pleasures at Kenelworth Castle*," 82, 89; Kuin, Introduction,, 1, 3.

[377] Bates, *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature*; King, "Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen"; Nash, "A Subject without Subjection: Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and *The Princely Pleasures at Kenelworth Castle*."

[378] Goldring, "Portraiture, Patronage, and the Progresses: Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and the Kenilworth Festivities of 1575"; Dillon, "Pageants and Propaganda: Robert Langham's *Letter* and George Gascoigne's *Princely Pleasures at Kenilworth*"; Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation*; Kolkovich, "Work in Progress: Gender and Politics in Late Elizabethan Progress Entertainments."

[379] For a discussion of Leicester's display of the virtue of magnificence at Kenilworth, see Hazard, "'A Magnificent Lord': Leicester, Kenilworth, and Transformations in the Idea of Magnificence."

The primary source of information about the Kenilworth entertainment comes from two surviving printed versions of the events: George Gascoigne's *The Princely Pleasures at the Courte at Kenelwoorth*[380] and *A Letter: Whearin, part of the entertainment untoo the Queenz Maiesty, at Killingwoorth Castl, in warwik Sheer, in this sommerz Progress. 1575, iz signified: from a freend officer attendant in Coort, untoo hiz freend a Citizen, and Merchaunt of London*, by Robert Langham.[381] George Gascoigne was a courtier making one of several attempts to gain favor at court with the publication of *The Princely Pleasures*. He had recently anonymously published a hunting manual, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting* (1575), which may have brought him to Leicester's attention.[382] Two of the devices that Gascoigne performs, the Wild Man and the farewell from Sylvanus, take place in the forest. *The Princely Pleasures* is aimed at a gentle audience and records the written entertainments composed by Gascoigne and others. It omits the lower status entertainments – the bride ale and the Hock Tuesday play – but includes planned events that were not performed, like the masque *Zabeta*. A number of

[380] The original edition of *The Princely Pleasures* was printed at London by Richard Jones in 1576, but the earliest extant edition is from the reprint in Gascoigne's *Whole Woorkes*, printed by Abel Jeffries in 1587, STC 11638. All citations from this work will come from the edition printed in Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i. 485-523.

[381] *The Letter* is a small octavo pamphlet that lacks a printer's name, a date of printing, and a colophon. (STC 15190.5 and 15191) The author's name does not appear on the title page, but appears in various forms throughout the text. See Kuin, Introduction to *Robert Langham: A Letter*, 10-11. All citations from this work will come from the edition printed in Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.426-484.

[382] Prouty, "George Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie*, and Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth," 658-661.

scholars have convincingly argued that the Kenilworth entertainment, as presented in *The Princely Pleasures*, is as much a promotion of Gascoigne as anything else.[383]

Using archival materials, Elizabeth Goldring has established that Robert Langham is the author of the *Letter*, with William Patten, the other contender for authorship, involved in bringing the text to print.[384] Langham was Keeper of the Council Chamber, and he had connections to Leicester through the Mercers' Company.[385] Langham wrote his letter to a fellow mercer, Humphrey Martin, and his account differs from Gascoigne's in a number of ways.[386] The *Letter* is aimed at a wider audience than *The Princely Pleasures*, as Langham addresses his remarks to Martin and his fellow merchants in London.[387] Langham does not record transcripts of the courtly entertainments like Gascoigne does, but he describes them in detail, also writing descriptions of the country entertainments that Gascoigne did not include. In addition, Langham provides descriptions of the castle and grounds, and he includes a short autobiographical account.

---

[383] Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 7, 119; Anderson, "A True Copie: Gascoigne's *Princely Pleasures* and the Textual Representation of Courtly Performance"; Austen "Gascoigne's Metamorphoses: *The Princely Pleasures at Kenilworth* 1575"; Wall also argues that Gascoigne critiques the court while promoting himself in *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance*.

[384] Goldring, "'A mercer ye wot az ye be': The Authorship of the Kenilworth *Letter* Reconsidered." Goldring makes a convincing case for spelling the name Langham instead of Laneham, so that is the spelling I will use. Kuin also supports Langham as the author in "Robert Langham and his 'Letter,'" "The Purloined *Letter*: Evidence and Probability Regarding Robert Langham's Authorship," and in his edition of the *Letter*. For the argument that William Patten is the author, see O'Kill, "The Printed Works of William Patten (c.1510-c.1600)" and Scott, "William Patten and the Authorship of 'Robert Laneham's *Letter.*'"

[385] Goldring, "'A mercer ye wot az ye be': The Authorship of the Kenilworth Letter Reconsidered," 257.

[386] Ibid., 248.

[387] Dillon, "Pageants and Propaganda: Robert Langham's *Letter* and George Gascoigne's *Princely Pleasures at Kenilworth*," 624, fn. 4; Kuin, Introduction to *Robert Langham: A Letter*, 11.

The information on hunting at Kenilworth comes from Langham's *Letter*. Gascoigne indicates three times in *The Princely Pleasures* that entertainments start as Elizabeth returns from hunting, but he never provides further details about the hunt. By reading the descriptions of the hunts included in the *Letter*, I will show what aspects of the hunt were considered significant enough for Langham to include them in his account and how those descriptions show Leicester and Elizabeth using the hunt to assert their status. In addition, by reading the hunts alongside the entertainments (included in *The Princely Pleasures*) that they immediately precede, I will show how the order of entertainments offered to Elizabeth allowed Leicester to strengthen his appeal to Elizabeth that she intercede in the Low Countries.

As a whole, hunting at Kenilworth allowed Leicester to demonstrate two things: that he had control and ownership over the estate and that part of his desire was to please and entertain his queen. In preparation for Elizabeth's visit, Leicester enlarged the chase by trading land with inhabitants of the village, allowing for more space for the *par force* hunts he would arrange for the queen.[388] He also improved the chase, adding "many delectabl, fresh, and unbragioos bowerz, arberz, seatz, and walks, that with great art, cost, and diligens wear very pleazauntlie appointed."[389] In making these additions in space and amenities to the chase, Leicester demonstrated his control over his property. In his discussion of landscape in progress entertainments, Smith places hunting in the far

[388] Marty, "The Kenilworth Entertainment, 1575: Staging England in the Age of Elizabeth I," 31; Kuin, Introduction to *Robert Langham: A Letter*, 4, 7.
[389] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.427.

distance, but notes that even that register of space is not as wild as one might think.[390] Even outside the walls of his castle and garden, Leicester is able to provide Elizabeth with a place designed for her delight and ease.[391] Langham records that the issue of ownership was one that Elizabeth was aware of, countering the Lady of the Lake's offer in one entertainment of the estate to the queen, saying "we had thought indeed the Lake had been oours, and doo you call it yourz noow?"[392] Preparing his estate for the most elaborate English country house entertainment to date was one way for Leicester to honor his queen, but it also allowed him to make claims for his own honor and status. Those preparations included making the space of the hunt as big and as comfortably designed as possible.

Including hunting in the planned entertainments was also a smart way to please and entertain the queen. Elizabeth liked to hunt, so Leicester gave her opportunities to do so.[393] Writing to William Cecil, Lord Burghley shortly before the queen arrived at Kenilworth, Leicester reports, "even by and by her Majesty ys going to the Forest, to kill some bucks with her bowe, as she hath done in the Park this morning. God be thanked, she is very merry."[394] Later in her life, the fact that Elizabeth is able to hunt is part of the

---

[390] Smith, "Landscape with Figures: The Three Realms of Queen Elizabeth's Country-house Revels," 94.
[391] Marty reads the chase as an example of the order that Elizabeth encountered while at Kenilworth, "The Kenilworth Entertainment, 1575: Staging England in the Age of Elizabeth I," 123-4.
[392] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.431.
[393] For Elizabeth's love of hunting see Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066,* 77, 79; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640,* 200-201; Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation*, 70 fn 26. Frye also notes that the queen becomes indebted to Leicester for her pleasure.
[394] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.526.

evidence offered to show her good health and spirits. Rowland Whyte, writing to Sir Robert Sidney in 1600, reports that the queen is at Oatlands and that "the Court is now given to hunting and sports: the Lords come are gon one waye and another. Upon Thursday her Majesty dines and hunts at Hanworth Parke: upon Tuesday she dines at Mr. Drake's; and this day she huntes in the new lodge in the forest. God be thanked she is very merry and well."[395]

Leicester arranges a hunt for Elizabeth before she has even arrived at Kenilworth, at Long Ichington, a village not far from the castle. Langham reports, "his Honor made her Majesty great cheer at dinner, and pleazaunt pastime in hunting by the wey after, that it was eight a clock in the evening ear her Highness came too Killingwoorth."[396] Langham emphasizes the pleasure of this event and also indicates how much of a spectacle Leicester provided for the queen. Later in the *Letter*, he describes the temporary structure Leicester had constructed for the pre-hunt dinner: "a tabernacl indeed for number and shift of large and goodlye roomz, for fayr and eazy offices both inward and ooutward, also likesum in order and eysight: that justly for dignitee may be comparabl with a beaitifull pallais."[397] While it is likely that Langham is exaggerating a bit in order to magnify Leicester's largesse or to impress Humphrey Martin with his own proximity to such splendor, it is clear that Leicester wanted to use the hunt and the ceremonies surrounding it, like the meal, to welcome and impress Elizabeth.

This first hunt, and the other hunts described in the *Letter*, performs an important function in how it relates to the other entertainments offered by Leicester. After hunting

---

[395] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, iii.513.
[396] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.429.
[397] Ibid., 479.

on the way to Kenilworth, Elizabeth encounters the character Sybil in the park outside the castle and listens to Sybil's welcoming speech.[398] The hunt allows the host to design "chance" encounters between the queen and performers.[399] Michael Leslie has analyzed how progress hosts exploit outside space to their benefit during the queen's visits. The boundaries between the queen and other audience members and between the queen and performers are far more fluid outdoors than they are indoors. By staging a device outside, a host can force the queen to watch and to formulate a response without much prior warning. Later in the visit at Kenilworth, Elizabeth is able to avoid watching the bride ale presented for her under her chamber windows simply by refusing to look out.[400] Outdoor presentations took away some of the queen's control, and the hunt provided Leicester with the opportunity to bring the queen to the site of such entertainments.

The Sybil's speech of welcome, as described by Langham and transcribed by Gascoigne, is not controversial, simply welcoming the queen and prophesying peace during her reign.[401] The hunt really stands in contrast to the speech, a violent pastime

---

[398] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.429-430, 486-487.

[399] The hunt also allows the queen to be approached by people who would not otherwise have access to her. For example, while the queen was at Theobalds in 1593-4, Robert Carey, Earl of Monmouth, made an attempt to get back into the queen's favor after marrying without her permission. When Burghley declines to intercede on his behalf, Carey makes sure that he is in the area when Elizabeth is hunting at Enfield. He persuades William Killigrew to speak to the queen for him and ends up reconciling with her. His change in status is signaled to the entire court when Elizabeth allows him to escort her to her standing for the bow and stable hunt. For this account, see Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, iii.245-246 and A. J. Loomie, "Carey, Robert, first earl of Monmouth (1560–1639)."

[400] Leslie, "Something Nasty in the Wilderness: Entertaining Queen Elizabeth on Her Progresses," 54, 58, 62.

[401] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.429-430, 486-487.

traditionally associated with war.[402] Later in the visit, Leicester will exploit the association of the hunt with war to bolster his plea that Elizabeth intervene in the Netherlands. In this welcoming moment, the Sybil foretells peace while the magnificence of the hunt and the banquet suggest the delights of aggression and the prominence of the host.[403] This juxtaposition is just one example of the somewhat contradictory nature of Leicester's message during the visit: he honors the queen by putting on the most elaborate progress entertainment to date, but he also asserts himself and critiques the queen's approach to foreign policy.

The hunt on the third day of Elizabeth's stay receives the longest description in the *Letter.* Langham begins, "*Munday* waz hot, and thearfore her Highness kept in till five a clok in the eevening; what time it pleazz'd her to ride foorth into the chace to hunt *the Hart of fors.*"[404] Langham uses the proper terminology to indicate that Elizabeth hunts *par force* on Monday. When Elizabeth decides to hunt, Leicester is able to provide her with the best possible version of hunting. The details Langham provides also indicate that Elizabeth used the hunt to assert herself in the face of Leicester's constant self-promotion. The hunt does not begin until the evening, which is not the usual time to begin such an elaborate chase. A *par force* hunt would normally begin early in the morning, with an elaborate assembly, or breakfast, where the the huntsmen would present information and tokens from possible harts to the foremost person in order that he or she

---

[402] The hunting manuals justify the sport by claiming that it prepares men for war. For a discussion, see Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066,* 80; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640,* 3.

[403] For the use of predictive devices in progress entertainments, see Kapelle, "Predicting Elizabeth: Prophecy on Progress."

[404] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.435.

may choose the best prey.[405] Because Elizabeth wants to avoid the heat, she delays the start of the chase until the evening. Leicester may magnify himself as much as she wants, but she still retains ultimate control. A lot of preparation was required before a *par force* chase could begin, though, from tracking and locating possible harts, to setting relays along the most likely route the chosen hart would take once unharboured, or roused from its lair.[406] The fact that Leicester is able to provide this type of hunt at any moment that the queen chooses reflects well on him and on the management of his huntsmen. The chase that occurs is a good one, with the hart at last forced to "take soil," or retreat to the water, a common ending to a successful *par force* hunt.[407] Langham further emphasizes the good hunting to be had at Kenilworth, describing the chase as "special in this place, that of nature iz foormed so feet for the purpose."[408] All of Leicester's work preparing the chase makes an impression on the author of the *Letter*. As described by Langham, the queen and the earl both use the hunt to claim and assert power.

Langham's description of the hunt on the third day also reflects well on himself. Throughout the passage, Langham uses the correct terminology for the type of hunting he describes. The use of the proper technical language was an important part of early modern hunting, dividing those who knew all the esoteric jargon from those who did not.[409] Elizabeth Goldring sees impressing Humphrey Martin as one of Langham's

---

[405] Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066,* 52; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 91-97.
[406] Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066,* 52; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 61-89.
[407] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 116, 243.
[408] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.436.
[409] For the importance of the use of proper language in the hunt, see Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 11; Cartmill, *A View to a Death in the*

primary motives in writing his account of the festivities at Kenilworth. Martin was younger than Langham, but his social superior within the Mercers' Company.[410] It is possible that Langham sought a position at court because he had failed financially as a mercer, so the *Letter* gave Langham the opportunity to demonstrate his closeness and connections with the court and its amusements.[411] Leicester uses the hunt to impress Elizabeth; Elizabeth delays the start of the hunt to impose her will on the itinerary of the visit; Langham uses his knowledge of the hunt and the court to impress his reader.

For this hunt, Langham provides more details than just the start time and the fact that the hart went to soil at the end of the chase. He includes his impressions of the sights and sounds offered by the hunt, and these details provide connections between the hunt and Leicester's desire for military action in the service of the Protestant cause. Langham describes the hounds pursing the hart into the water once the hart has taken soil:

> Thear to beholld the swift fleeting of the deer afore, with the stately cariage of hiz head in his swimmyng, spred (for the quantitee) lyke the sail of a ship; the hoounds harroing after, az had they bin a number of skiphs too the spoyle of a karvell; the ton no lesse eager in purchaz of his prey, than waz the other earnest in

---

Morning: Hunting and Nature through History, 61-62; Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066*, 56, 80; Madden, *The Diary of Master William Silence: A Study of Shakespeare & of Elizabethan Sport*, 210; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640*, 12; Orme, "Medieval Hunting: Fact and Fancy," 141; Rooney, *Hunting in Middle English Literature*; Semenza, *Sport, Politics, and Literature in the English Renaissance*, 45; Yamamoto, *The Boundaries of the Human in Medieval English Literature*, 102, 107.

[410] Goldring, "'A mercer ye wot az ye be': The Authorship of the Kenilworth Letter Reconsidered," 255.

[411] Ibid., 252.

savegard of hiz life. (Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.435-436)

Langham uses the metaphor of a battle at sea to describe the hounds' pursuit of the deer. The hounds struggle to catch and kill their prey, and the deer struggles to save its life. Langham's description of the hunt, an activity already associated with war, further emphasizes that connection during a progress visit where Leicester is trying to convince Elizabeth to send military forces overseas. Of course, Elizabeth probably did not experience this moment in the same way that Langham did, but the printed version of this experience makes the connection for any reader.

Describing the end of the chase as a hound and hart sea battle has another effect: all the human hunters are displaced from the center of attention. Langham describes Leicester putting on a great show and Elizabeth dictating the time of that show, but neither one is given credit for the kill. Elizabeth enjoyed the privilege of slitting the buck's throat while she was still a princess, and she will intervene at the moment of death at the next hunt that happens at Kenilworth, but all Langham says here is "Wel, the hart waz kild."[412] Furthermore, when Langham describes the sights and sounds of the chase prior to the hart going to soil, the boundaries between human hunters and animal hunters is not so defined: "the swiftness of the deer, the running of footmen, the galloping of horsez, the blasting of horns, the halloing and hewing of the huntsmen, with the excellent echoz between whilez from the woods and waters in valleiz resounding."[413] Just as the deer runs, so do the footmen and the horses. Just as the horn sounds and the valley echoes

[412] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.436.
[413] Ibid.

back, so do the huntsmen. The hunt is an act of domination by humans over nature, but *par force* hunting requires the help of other animals, hounds and horses, so the boundary between human and animal is not so stable.[414] Leicester, Elizabeth, and Langham may use the hunt to assert their status, but they cannot always control the implications of the situation.

The deer may have been killed, but "so ceast not the game yet."[415] On her way back from this hunt, Elizabeth encounters a Savage Man, another chance encounter enabled by her presence in the forest. Just as she was displaced from the moment of the kill in Langham's description, she is once again not the immediate center of attention. In both Langham and Gascoigne's versions, the Savage Man does not recognize who the hunters are when he meets them. Langham describes the meeting; the Savage Man has "never [happened] to see so glorioous an assemble afore; and noow cast into great grief of mind, for that neyther by himself coold he gess, nor knew whear else too be taught, what they should be or whoo bare estate."[416] In Gascoigne's version, the Savage Man has to ask Echo to tell him who is in the company, and he finally learns that it is the Queen of England, but not before mistaking Elizabeth for the Queen of Heaven.[417] After this compliment, the Savage Man and Echo remind their viewers of the entertainments offered to Elizabeth two days prior, managing to praise Leicester as the summary is

---

[414] For a discussion of the porous boundaries between humans and animals and the use of animals to define the concept of the human, see Thomas *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England: 1500-1800*; Erica Fudge *Renaissance Beasts: Of Animals, Humans, and Other Wonderful Creatures*; *Brutal Reasoning: Animals, Rationality, and Humanity in Early Modern England*; and *Perceiving Animals: Humans and Beasts in Early Modern English Culture*.
[415] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.436.
[416] Ibid.
[417] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.494-495.

given. Once again, Leicester's hospitality is mentioned, and it is as if the queen needs to be welcomed into the estate again after she has left it for a short while to hunt in the chase. The entertainment does end with the Savage Man falling to his knees in praise of Elizabeth, but the entertainments and amusements offered during the visit continue to be sites of tension and negotiation between the queen and her courtier.

Langham's account of this moment ends with a detail that Gascoigne chooses to omit from his account. Langham is much happier to include moments where things do not go quite as planned whereas Gascoigne is happy to present events as they were planned, even if they never occurred in real life, like the *Zabeta* masque. Gascoigne's version also indicates that he performed the part of the Savage Man, so he would be even less interested in recounting his own mistake.[418] Langham says,

> Az thiz Savage, for the more submission, brake hiz tree asunder, kest the top from him, it had almost light upon her Highness hors head; whereat he startld, and the gentleman mooch dismayd. See the benignittee of the Prins; as the footmen lookt well to the hors, and hee of generositee soon calmd of himself ---------- "no hurt, no hurt!" quote her Highness. Which words I promis yoo wee wear all glad to heer; and took them too be the best part of the Play. (Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.437-438)

Outdoor entertainments have their advantages in spontaneity, in forcing the queen to watch, but things can also go very wrong in a less controlled environment. Luckily for Gascoigne, Elizabeth does not punish him for his mistake. Langham's inclusion of this anecdote brings the queen back to the center of attention in a way that she is not in

[418] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.498.

Gascoigne's account. The point of the entertainment is no longer the reiteration of Leicester's hospitality and the cleverness of the echo dialogue written by the author under his patronage; instead, the queen's ability to control her horse with the help of her footmen and her mercy in reassuring the Savage man become "the best part of the Play."

> Two days later, the court engages in another hunt *par force*:
>
> *Wednsday,* her Majesty rode intoo the chase, a hunting again of the *Hart of fors*. The deer, after hiz property, for refuge took the soyl: but so master'd by hote pursuit on al parts, that he was taken quik in the pool. The watermen held him up hard by the hed, while, at her Highness' commaundement, he lost hiz earz for a raundsum, and so had pardon of lyfe. (Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.438)

The deer makes the chase exciting by going to soil, as is natural for a hart to do while being chased. Those hunting make the event exciting by making "hote pursuit," quickly mastering the deer. Elizabeth demonstrates the most power, though. Watermen swim out with the hounds to the deer, grabbing and holding it until they receive the queen's command. Unlike the previous hunt, where the only participants at the moment of the kill seemed to be the hounds and the hart, in this hunt, humans are involved and the queen directs the action. Elizabeth further demonstrates her control and preeminence by refusing the kill the deer, taking its ears instead. One of the parts of the hunt that reflected the status of its participants was the breaking, or ritual butchering of the deer. There was a precise manner in which the deer was to be cut up, and specific parts of the carcass were distributed according to rank. As the highest-ranking member of this hunt, the ears of the deer would have been part of Elizabeth's portion if the deer were killed

and butchered in the normal manner.[419] In this hunt, Elizabeth still receives part of her portion, and exerts further control by refusing the kill and pardoning the deer. Given the fact that Leicester will again stage a hunt before an entertainment that makes his most blatant appeal for intervention in the Netherlands in this very "pool" five days later, Elizabeth could be showing that she refuses to enter battle by sparing this deer. A planned skirmish with Sir Bruse, one of the characters featured in the upcoming entertainment, had already been canceled, so it is possible that Elizabeth knew that entertainments around the pool would focus on this appeal. At the very least, the queen changes the end of the hunt to suit her whims. The records of the gamekeeper at Kenilworth support Langham's story of the pardoned deer losing its ears, so this detail is not just an invention of the author.[420]

The queen does not pardon the deer because she is squeamish about killing it; Elizabeth was just as willing to kill deer to make a political point as she was to spare one. During a progress in 1572, Elizabeth and Leicester visited Berkeley Castle while Henry, Lord Berkeley was away and "during which tyme of her [Elizabeth] being there, such slaughter was made, as twenty-seven stagges were slayne in the toyles on one day, and many other on that and the next stollen and havocked."[421] Elizabeth and Leicester destroy all the game in Berkeley's deer park, behaving like a poaching gang. Berkeley had a reputation as a particularly avid hunter, so this was an insult calculated to hurt most

[419] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 134.
[420] Goldring, "'A mercer ye wot az ye be': The Authorship of the Kenilworth Letter Reconsidered," 258.
[421] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.392.

deeply.[422] When Lord Berkeley decided to dispark this land in anger over what had happened, he received a warning from the queen to watch himself, referring to the "good sport" she had there.[423] The warning goes on to explain that Leicester had "contrary to her justice" brought Elizabeth there and was the cause of the "slaughter" and that Leicester might have plans to do further insult to Berkeley, threatening his life and his castle.[424] As Roger Manning explains, all of this was part of a much larger dispute between the Berkeleys and the Dudleys and between Elizabeth and Lord Berkeley.[425] Through her actions, the queen was indicating that she was on Leicester's side.[426] This incident sparked a fifty-year poaching war between the Berkeley's gamekeepers and the followers of Sir Thomas Throckmorton, Leicester's proxy in the area.[427] In fact, poaching raids were a common tactic in disputes, with each side threatening the land, game, and prestige of the other side.[428] What is interesting about Elizabeth's role in this incident, besides the fact that she also uses the hunt as an act of aggression, is that she uses her authority to redefine what occurred. Leicester may have conducted a

---

[422] Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony*, 64; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640,* 12-13.
[423] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.392.
[424] Ibid.
[425] Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640,* 48, 136-143; See also Cole, *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony*, 149; Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study*, 92-93.
[426] Berry, *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study,* 92-93.
[427] Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640,* 137.
[428] For such a discussion of poaching, see Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640* and Beaver, *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War*.

"slaughter," but the queen engaged in "good sport." Poaching is not poaching when the queen does it, and Lord Berkeley could not have mistaken the message of her warning.

Five days later at Kenilworth, the court goes hunting and Elizabeth once again delays the start of the chase until the day has cooled down. The hunt *par force* proceeds,

> That whyther it wear by the cunning of the huntsmen, or by the natural desyre of the deer, or els by both; anon he gat him to soil agayne, which reyzed the accustomed delight; a pastime indeede so intyrely pleazaunt, az whearof at times whoo may have the full and free fruition, can find no more sacietee (I ween) for a recreation, then of theyr good viaundes at times for their sustentation. (Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.456-457)

The hunt is again a big success, with the deer going to soil, through the skill of the huntsmen, the natural desire of the deer, or a combination of both. Langham is effusive as he proclaims hunting to be the most pleasant pastime he can imagine. Unlike the previous two descriptions, there is no power play at the moment of the kill; in fact, Langham gives no description of the kill at all, other than to say, "the game was gotten."[429] This hunt is characterized by deference to the queen's wishes to start in the evening and the general success of the chase for all involved. Langham once again gets to impress his reader by being part of such a wonderful activity; Leicester has successfully entertained and pleased his picky queen; Elizabeth demonstrated control by dictating the terms of the event.

Upon returning from this hunt over the bridge Leicester built over the pool from the chase to the castle, Elizabeth encounters Triton, who starts the entertainment

[429] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.457.

Gascoigne describes as "the deliverie of the Lady of the Lake."[430] In this entertainment, Elizabeth is told that the Lady of the Lake is being threatened, with rape, by Sir Bruse sans pitie, and is confined to the lake. Elizabeth is also told that her presence alone will save the Lady from Sir Bruse. Triton commands the waters of the pool to be still, and the Lady is delivered. Scholars have interpreted this entertainment as a plea from Leicester that Elizabeth intervene in the Netherlands, with Sir Bruse representing Spain and the Lady representing the Low Countries.[431] As has been already mentioned and as Gascoigne includes in his account of the festivities, Leicester had also planned a more direct version of this appeal, staging a skirmish between Sir Bruse's men and men from the "Hearon House," most likely led by Leicester himself.[432] Gascoigne does not give a reason for the cancellation of the skirmish, but Susan Frye argues that Elizabeth had the event canceled because it put Leicester too much at the center of attention and because it made its point too directly.[433]

Leicester does manage to stage this less elaborate device of delivery, and he arranges for it to occur immediately after a hunt. Once again, the entertainment starts as Elizabeth is returning to the castle, so she has no choice but to watch. The hunt also provides helpful echoes to support Leicester's goal. The hunting manuals justify the

---

[430] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.498. For details of the improvements Leicester made to the castle, see Marty, "The Kenilworth Entertainment, 1575: Staging England in the Age of Elizabeth I," 37-39.
[431] Goldring, "Portraiture, Patronage, and the Progresses: Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and the Kenilworth Festivities of 1575," 177; Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation*, 78-86.
[432] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.501; Goldring, "Portraiture, Patronage, and the Progresses: Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and the Kenilworth Festivities of 1575," 178.
[433] Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation*, 78-86.

sport by claiming that it prepares men for war.[434] Langham has just described a wonderful *par force* hunt, perfectly executed by the many huntsmen required for such a chase. Just as Leicester's men are fit to hunt, they are fit to go to war. Just as they are able to successfully conquer the deer and Elizabeth can deliver the Lady of the Lake, the English led by Leicester can win battles overseas. The fact that the hart went to soil echoes the fact that the conflict between Sir Bruse and the Lady of the Lake is located in another body of water. Langham says that this device takes place in the "pool," perhaps the same pool where Elizabeth decided to pardon the deer instead of killing it several days prior.[435] Leicester's martial appeals are not limited to this moment with the Lady of the Lake; successful hunts are also part of that appeal.

The final hunt at Kenilworth does not appear in Langham's account, but in Gascoigne's, and occurs as Elizabeth is leaving Kenilworth. Gascoigne says that Elizabeth decided to leave Kenilworth rather abruptly and that the Earl asked him to devise one last show as farewell. Gascoigne performs a speech as Sylvanus, running besides the queen's horse, "meeting her as she went on hunting."[436] Gascoigne as Sylvanus manages to convey some of the information that was supposed to be presented in the *Zabeta* masque, which was canceled for unstated reasons. The masque makes a quite overt proposal of marriage to Elizabeth, urging her to follow Juno instead of Diana, and scholars have claimed that Elizabeth canceled the masque because of this plea and

[434] Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066,* 80; Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640,* 3.
[435] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.457.
[436] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.515.

possibly because of references to her imprisonment during Mary's reign.[437] Leicester takes the opportunity of the queen's presence in the forest, hunting while leaving, to try and mend fences while still presenting his message of marriage to the queen. Towards the end of Sylvanus' speech, Gascoigne introduces the character Deepedesire, generally thought to represent Leicester.[438] Deepedesire asks the queen to stay, "O Queene commaunde againe / This Castle and the Knight, which keepes the same for you; / These woods, these waves, these foules, these fishes, these deere which are your due! / Live here, good Queene, live here…Diana would be glad to meet you in the chase; / Silvanus and the Forest Gods would follow you apace."[439] Deepedesire boldly asks the queen to stay and live with Leicester, offering the hunt as one of his enticements. In what are the final moments of Elizabeth's visit, Leicester uses the hunt as an opportunity to once again assert himself, to try and convince the queen to improve his status or to release him to marry someone else. The deer and the castle already belong to Elizabeth, though, and she can just as easily use the hunt to further her own ends.

---

[437] Smuts, "Progresses and Court Entertainments," 288; Dillon, "Pageants and Propaganda: Robert Langham's *Letter* and George Gascoigne's *Princely Pleasures at Kenilworth*," 630-632; Stähler, "Imagining the Illusive/Elusive?: Printed Accounts of Elizabethan Festivals," 75; Frye, *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation*, 71-77.
[438] For the argument that Leicester turns Elizabeth from an Arthurian quester to a Petrarchan mistress, see Wall, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance,* 136. For the significance of Leicester's use of the language of courtship in general and of arborification in particular, see Bates, *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature*, 57-60.
[439] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.522.

II. Cowdray, 1591

The queen visited Cowdray, the estate of Anthony Browne, Viscount Montague, on Saturday, the fourteenth of August to Friday, the twenty-first of August, 1591.[440] The printed accounts of this entertainment also include descriptions of the hunting Montague offered for Elizabeth's entertainment. In this entertainment, the hunt becomes a site where Montague and Elizabeth each try to demonstrate that they are in control. Viscount Montague was no favorite securely welcoming the queen to his magnificent estate hoping to impress and woo her. Montague was a Catholic, and Elizabeth had reasons other than pleasure for visiting him. According to Curtis Breight, Elizabeth made a southern progress in 1591 to investigate the maritime readiness of port cities in case of a Spanish invasion and to check on the loyalties of those living in the counties most subject to invasion, specifically the loyalties of Montague, a prominent Catholic nobleman.[441]

Montague was not officially out of favor, but he had lost his position as lieutenant of Sussex in 1585, which had effectively destroyed his local patronage.[442] Elizabeth may have come to Cowdray to investigate Montague's loyalty, but he had his own agenda in hosting the entertainment. Breight, Heale, and Wilson see Montague using the entertainment to try and help his fellow Catholics by suggesting that they are not a threat

---

[440] Heale, "Contesting Terms: Loyal Catholicism and Lord Montague's Entertainment at Cowdray, 1591," 189.
[441] Breight, "Caressing the Great: Viscount Montague's Entertainment of Elizabeth at Cowdray, 1591," 149. See also Heale, "Contesting Terms: Loyal Catholicism and Lord Montague's Entertainment at Cowdray, 1591," 189.
[442] Breight, "Caressing the Great: Viscount Montague's Entertainment of Elizabeth at Cowdray, 1591," 149-150; Heale, "Contesting Terms: Loyal Catholicism and Lord Montague's Entertainment at Cowdray, 1591," 192-197.

to the stability of the realm.[443] Heale uses Michael Questier's biographical work on Montague and sees the lord as wholly loyal, using the language of loyalty throughout the visit.[444] She disagrees with Breight, who identifies much more tension in the entertainments, seeing Montague as neither loyal nor disloyal, more interested how various audiences, including Catholics abroad, will read the printed entertainment.[445] While I cannot make a definitive judgment on the extent of Montague's loyalty to the queen, the hunts as presented in the printed version of the entertainment do suggest tension and negotiation for control between Montague and the queen.

There are two printed editions of the Cowdray entertainment from 1591. *The Honorable Entertainment given to the Queenes Maiestie at Cowdray in Sussex, by lord Montecute* (STC 3907.5) is the version transcribed by Nichols in *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*.[446] The other edition, *The Speeches and Honorable Entertainment given to the Queenes Maiestie in Progresse, at Cowdray in Sussex, by the right Honorable the lord Montacute*, is a partly reimposed version of *The*

[443] Wilson sees Montague affirming his own loyalty and that of all of Sussex as well, *Entertainments for Elizabeth I*, 86.
[444] Heale, "Contesting Terms: Loyal Catholicism and Lord Montague's Entertainment at Cowdray, 1591," 190, 198, passim; Questier, "Loyal to a Fault: Viscount Montague Explains Himself."
[445] Breight, "Caressing the Great: Viscount Montague's Entertainment of Elizabeth at Cowdray, 1591," 147-148, 150, passim.
[446] When citing from this edition, I will use the version in Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, iii.90-96

Honorable Entertainment, with omissions and additions.[447] The author of these editions is still unknown, although John Lyly is one possible candidate.[448]

While at Cowdray, Elizabeth either participates in or watches bow and stable hunting and coursing. She does not hunt *par force* like she did at Kenilworth. As it was usually practiced, nets were set up to create a path for the deer; archers were placed at locations called stands, or trysts; the deer were then driven between the nets by dogs and men so that the archers could shoot at them.[449] The bow and stable hunting Elizabeth does at Cowdray is more controlled than the usual practice, but more on that later. Coursing was a method of hunting using greyhounds. Once again, nets, or toils, were generally used to create a path for the deer, and relays of greyhounds would chase the deer until they could bite and kill them.[450] While bow and stable hunting and coursing are not as elevated as *par force* hunting, they are still aristocratic methods of hunting that require great coordination and preparation.

It was not unusual for the queen to engage in this kind of hunting. At Nonsuch in 1559, "on Monday was a great supper made for [Elizabeth]; but before night she took her standing in the further park, and there she saw a course."[451] At Wilton in 1574, an outdoor banquet organized for the queen has to be canceled because of the weather, but the rain clears up for a while, "during which tyme many deare coursed with greyhounds

---

[447] Pollard, Redgrave, Jackson, Ferguson, and Pantzer, *A Short Title Catalog of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640*, I.173.
[448] Heale, "Contesting Terms: Loyal Catholicism and Lord Montague's Entertainment at Cowdray, 1591," 206.
[449] Griffin, *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066,* 55; *The Master of Game*, 189-190, 193.
[450] Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 246-250.
[451] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.74.

were overturn; soe, as the tyme served, great pleasure was shewed."[452] In a final example, Elizabeth leaves from Hampton Court in 1582 and passes through Kingston "to take the diversion of 'coursing.'"[453] Montague offered this kind of hunting because it was expected of him as a host for a progress and also because he knew it was something that the queen would enjoy. Montague may have offered these forms instead of *par force* hunting because of the queen's age. As Elizabeth got older, she tended to hunt in easier, less strenuous ways, shooting from a tryst or simply enjoying the spectacle of coursing.[454] To hunt in these ways is still a way to assert one's status, but that assertion is made more through the number of deer one kills rather than the difficulty and excitement of the chase of one deer. In some ways, the queen is more at the center of attention with these types of hunts; she is static, either as observer or as archer, so she can be watched as much as she herself watches.

On Monday, August 17 Elizabeth participates in a bow and stable hunt and watches coursing. The two editions of the entertainment differ in their account of this event, so I will cite from *The Honorable Entertainment* first. The author recounts the following:

> On Munday, at eight of the clock in the morning, her Highness took horse, with all her traine, and rode into the parke: where was a delicate bowre prepared, under the which were her Highnesse musicians placed, and a crossebowe by a Nymph,

---

[452] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.409.
[453] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, ii.392.
[454] For Elizabeth's changing hunting habits, see Manning, *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640,* 200-201; Thomas, *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England: 1500-1800,* 147; Semenza, *Sport, Politics, and Literature in the English Renaissance,* 50.

with a sweet song, delivered to her hands, to shoote at the deere, about some thirtie in number, put into a paddock, of which number she killed three or four, and the Countesse of Kildare one.

Then rode her Grace to Cowdrey to dinner, and aboute six of the clocke in the evening, from a turret, saw sixteene buckes (all having fayre lawe) pulled downe with greyhounds, in a laund. All the hunting ordered by Maister Henrie Browne, the Lorde Montague's thirde sonne, Raunger of Windsore forest. (Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, iii.91)

These two moments of hunting show cooperation between the queen and the Montagues, but also some tension over who is in control. The Montagues have prepared the bower for the queen as well as the nymph's gift and song. The song is not recorded in this edition, but it is in the other, and it will be discussed later. The queen's musicians are part of this entertainment, indicating cooperation between host and guest.[455]

The Montagues demonstrate their control through a number of ways. They give Elizabeth her weapon, giving her the power to kill the deer. They have rounded up thirty deer and placed them in a paddock so that the queen can shoot at them. This is not a sporting method of killing deer, and it is a more controlled version of bow and stable hunting than the normal practice. This version of the entertainment includes the fact that all of this hunting, including the coursing that occurs later, was organized by one of Montague's sons, who holds an office within the forest establishment as ranger of Windsor forest. Viscount Montague may not be lieutenant of Sussex anymore, but his

[455] Heale, "Contesting Terms: Loyal Catholicism and Lord Montague's Entertainment at Cowdray, 1591," 199.

family still holds offices and wields influence, enough to provide the queen with a thoroughly controlled hunt.

This version of the hunt also includes the number of deer killed by Elizabeth and the Countess of Kildare. Elizabeth kills the most, which is an astute move on the Countess of Kildare's part. While hunting bow and stable at Hallow Park in 1575, Elizabeth kills one buck and wounds another, while her companion, Mr. Abyngton, when asked by the queen, admits to killing two, or one more than the queen. Upon hearing this, she commands Mr. Abyngton to give one of his bucks to the bailiff and the second buck to the other bailiff.[456] The Montagues may present a lovely, controlled hunt for the queen, but she is the one who kills the most deer – at least until sixteen bucks are killed later that day as the queen watches.

The control and skill of the Montagues is further emphasized in this account of the coursing (and in the other edition) when it is made clear that those sixteen bucks are "all having fayre lawe." One of the challenges of bow and stable hunting or coursing is separating the rascals, or immature or weak deer not fit to hunt, from those deer that are worthy of being killed.[457] Henry Browne is able to put on two hunts in one day, ensuring that the sixteen bucks killed in the second show are all worthy of their deaths.

In the other edition of this entertainment, *The Speeches and Honorable Entertainment*, the fact that the deer are enclosed in a paddock for easier shooting is not included. The number of deer killed by the queen and the Countess of Kildare are also

---

[456] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, i.541-542, 549.
[457] Cox, *The Royal Forests of England,* 28; James, *A History of English Forestry,* 360; *The Master of Game*, 25, 29, 196, 226; Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*, 73, 240.

not included. Henry Browne's role in organizing the hunts is also not mentioned. These omissions lessen the stakes of the original description somewhat. The queen's ability to kill the deer is not undercut by the fact that they are enclosed in the paddock nor are her number of kills explicitly compared to someone else's. The Montagues' ability to put on a hunt are emphasized, but not quite as much since Henry Browne's role as organizer and as Ranger of Windsor Forest is omitted. *The Speeches and Honorable Entertainment* does include the song sung by the nymph when she presents Elizabeth with the crossbow, which is not included in the other version.

The song sung by the nymph addresses Elizabeth in Petrarchan terms:

Behold her lockes like wiers of beaten gold,
her eies like stares that twinkle in the skie,
Her heauenly face not framd of earthly molde,
Her voice that sounds Apollos melodie,
The miracle of time, the worlds storie,
Fortunes Queen, Loues treasure, Natures glory.

No flattering hope she likes, blind Fortunes bait
nor shadowes of delight, fond fansies glasse,
Nor charmes that do inchant, false artes deceit,
nor fading ioyes, which time makes swiftly pas
But chast desires which beateth all these downe,
A Goddesse looke is worth a Monarchs crowne.

Goddesse and Monarch of his happie Isle

vouchsafe this bow which is an huntresse part

Your eies are arrows though they seem to smile

which neuer glanst but gald the stateliest hart,

Strike one, strike all, for none can flie,

They gaze you in the face although they die.

(*The Speeches and Honorable Entertainment*, 3-4)

The poem does compliment the queen for her beauty, her ability to avoid false temptations, and for her overwhelming power. Figuring Elizabeth's power in terms of female desire and refusal was a common move, but it was a move that both enhanced and undermined Elizabeth's authority.[458] She has power, but primarily as a woman, as opposed to having power as a hereditary prince. The queen may not be deceived by false shows or fading joys, meaning she can recognize true and lasting loyalty when she sees it. Of course, the Montagues hope that Elizabeth recognizes such lasting loyalty at Cowdray. On the other hand, she is apparently being constantly tempted by "false artes deceit"; she is always under threat, perhaps needing whatever support she can get. In the final stanza of the poem, the Petrarchan metaphor of eyes as arrows is made literal; Elizabeth's eyes are so powerful that they kill all who look upon them. This is simultaneously a celebration and critique of the queen's power. Michael Leslie reads the final stanza in connection with the hunt, claiming that the violence of the hunt is emphasized in this final stanza; Elizabeth kills her helpless servants just as she kills the

[458] For this idea, see Bates, *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature*, 45, 47, passim; Wall, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance,* 116-117.

helpless deer.[459] The whole hunt, in Leslie's view, becomes a critique of the queen's power and her use of it.

Curtis Breight also reads these two hunts as both a critique of the queen (and even a threat) and as a ritual release of violence and aggression. On the one hand, the hunt can bind participants together in a bond of blood. On the other, the coursing where sixteen bucks are killed while the queen watches could be a way to show the queen that Catholics are equally capable of killing the defenseless, as Elizabeth kills priests and those who help them. Breight also considers the hunts as a way to sublimate the violence that seems to be necessary because of religious differences: it is "plausible, then, that the extensive slaughter displaces not only the possibility but the obligation of mutual violence. In this view, the deer become scapegoats for the threat of reciprocal butchery."[460] Michael Questier seems to be somewhat in agreement with Breight, seeing the hunts as an attempt to satisfy the queen's bloodlust.[461] While killing sixteen bucks during one hunt when four to five have already been killed earlier in the day may seem like "extensive slaughter" to us, the numbers are not unusually high for bow and stable hunting or coursing, where the number of deer killed is the main point of the activity. I agree with Breight and Questier that the Montagues use the hunt to negotiate their relationship with the queen, hoping to improve it, but beyond the rather pointed critique in the nymph's song, I do not think they use the hunt to threaten the queen. The Montagues include the

[459] Leslie, "Something Nasty in the Wilderness: Entertaining Queen Elizabeth on Her Progresses," 66.
[460] Breight, "Caressing the Great: Viscount Montague's Entertainment of Elizabeth at Cowdray, 1591," 153.
[461] Questier, "Loyal to a Fault: Viscount Montague Explains Himself," 230-231.

hunt in their entertainment to demonstrate their status and their control over their land, but they also stage these hunts to include and amuse the queen.

The only other mention of hunting in the Cowdray entertainment happens after the oak tree device, and the versions differ once again. In the oak tree device, Elizabeth is greeted by a pilgrim who asks for her help in conquering a ruffian who is keeping him from approaching an oak tree. The pilgrim brings the queen to the tree, where the ruffian explains that the tree is a microcosm of England or Sussex and that it cannot be felled by inward corruption or outward attacks. The pilgrim turns out to be the true enemy, a disguised priest, and the ruffian the rightful guardian of the tree. The tree is decorated with the arms of all the gentlemen of Sussex, and scholars have interpreted this device as an expression of Montague's loyalty and an assertion of his local status.[462] The queen has nothing to fear from the true oak of Sussex.

There are two versions of what happens next. In *The Honorable Entertainment*, "then, upon the winding of a cornette, was a most excellent crie of hounds, and three buckes kilde by the bucke hounds, and so went all backe to Cowdray to supper."[463] In this version, the buck hounds kill three bucks without any apparent intervention from human hunters. Coming immediately after the protestations of loyalty in the oak tree device, this seems to be a display of violence by Montague to suggest what he can do, either in the service of the queen or not. The men of Sussex are loyal but not helpless. On the other hand, the oak tree device also unmasks a disguised priest, so the violence of the hunt

[462] Heale, "Contesting Terms: Loyal Catholicism and Lord Montague's Entertainment at Cowdray, 1591," 199-200; Breight, "Caressing the Great: Viscount Montague's Entertainment of Elizabeth at Cowdray, 1591," 154.
[463] Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, iii.94.

could be a demonstration of Sussex's ability to defend the realm against incursions from foreign Catholics, like the Spanish. The interpretation would depend on the reader's perspective.[464] The moment does end with everyone returning together to Cowdray for a meal, so unity is ultimately emphasized.

In *The Speeches and Honorable Entertainment*, the hunt after the oak tree device is described differently: "then vppon the winding of a Corne[t] was [a] most excellent crie of hounds, with whom her Maiestie hunted and had good sport."[465] In this version, the queen is included in the hunt, enjoying good sport. This is not presented as a spectacle of violence to remind her of the power of her Catholic subjects. Elizabeth's power and her cooperation with the Montagues are emphasized in this version. Elizabeth is described hunting with the hounds, not with other hunters, so this could also be a subtle jibe, giving her equal status in the hunt with the dogs. Regardless of which version one reads, the hunt is both a critique and a moment of fellowship, a gesture of loyalty from Montague and an assertion of his control and independence.

The hunt was an important and yet ordinary part of progress visits for Queen Elizabeth. When the hunt is presented in records of progress entertainments, it is clear that is a site of conflict and negotiation and that it is a useful tool for presenting other entertainments and reinforcing the messages of those entertainments. Both Leicester and Montague exploit a well-known pastime practiced by the queen, a pastime with a variety

---

[464] See Breight, "Caressing the Great: Viscount Montague's Entertainment of Elizabeth at Cowdray, 1591," for further discussion of how the Cowdray entertainment reads to different audiences.

[465] *The Speeches and Honorable Entertainment given to the Queenes Maiestie in Progresse, at Cowdray in Sussex, by the right Honorable the lord Montacute*, 8.

of ceremonies and procedures that could be used in the ongoing struggle to define their relationship with the queen.

Conclusion

Aristocratic hunting provided writers with a flexible and useful form of discourse that could be used for a variety of ends. When a writer moved beyond a conventional literary use of the hunt to include more detailed elements from the practice of hunting, the widely known language and procedures could be used to assert his status and bolster his rhetorical aims. William Turner was certainly not as well versed in the specifics of aristocratic hunting as Sir Thomas Wyatt, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, or George Gascoigne were, but he was still able to use his general knowledge about hunting, about forest law, and about the conventional reputations of animals in his appeal to Henry VIII for further church reform. George Gascoigne was able use his incredibly detailed and intimate knowledge of hunting language and procedure to make multiple and contradictory claims. He is a failed hunter who should be pitied by his patron, yet he is simultaneously an incredibly skilled hunter who deserves better prey. He is a knowledgeable woodsman, delighted to translate and assemble all of the latest hunting techniques for English gentlemen and nobles, yet he is also a critic of hunting, who sympathizes with his prey and with the lowly hunt servants who do all of the work for none of the reward. Wyatt, Michael Drayton, and Edmund Spenser used their knowledge of the practice of hunting to alter the conventional failed love hunt in their favor. Like Gascoigne with his patron, failure could be mitigated by mastery of the practice. The earl

of Leicester and viscount Montague could stage actual hunts to honor Queen Elizabeth or to honor themselves instead, and the records of their entertainments provide one version of what may have happened, with carefully chosen details to support one interpretation or another.

"The Blazon Pronounced by the Huntsman," from Gascoigne's *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting* incorporates all of the elements of hunting that made it such an appealing and useful tool for early modern writers:

I am the Hunte, whiche rathe and earely ryse,
(My bottell filde, with wine in any wise)
Twoo draughts I drinke, to stay my steppes withall,
For eche foote one, because I would not fall.
Then take my Hownde, in liam me behinde,
The stately Harte, in fryth or fell to finde,
And whiles I seeke his slotte where he hath fedde,
The sweete byrdes sing, to cheare my drowsie hedde.
And when my Hounde, doth streyne vpon good vent,
I must confesse, the same dothe me content.
But when I haue, my couerts walkt aboute,
And harbored fast, the Harte for commyng out:
Then I returne, to make a graue reporte,
Whereas I finde, th' assembly doth resorte.
And lowe I crouche, before the Lordings all,
Out of my Horne, the fewmets lette I fall,

And other signes, and tokens do I tell,

To make them hope, the Harte may like them well.

Then they commaunde, that I the wine should taste,

So biddes mine Arte: and so my throte I baste,

The dinner done, I go streightwayes agayne,

Vnto my markes, and shewe my Master playne.

Then put my Hounde, vpon the view to drawe,

And rowse the Harte, out of his layre by lawe.

O gamsters all, a little by your leaue,

Can you such ioyes in triflying games conceaue? (60-61)

Throughout the poem, Gascoigne's Hunter uses the proper terminology for the hunt, from the slot to the fewmets, demonstrating his mastery over his craft. He may have to kneel before the lords, his social superiors, but he is responsible for choosing the prey that they will chase after the assembly. Just as the lords command him to present his evidence and to taste the wine once they have approved, the Hunter controls his scent hound that seeks the hart at his direction. On the other hand, despite all of the skill of the Hunter, he could not find the hart without the assistance and superior smell of the hound.

The hunt is a complicated social occasion that involves cooperation as well as the maintenance of social difference. The aristocratic chase cannot occur unless and until the Hunter finds an appropriate hart and leaves marks so he can find it again. The hart is unharbored only when the lords are ready to begin the day's chase, accompanied by the knowledgeable Hunter and his hound. By framing the hunt in terms of the Hunter's presentation of an appropriate hart, Gascoigne emphasizes the role and importance of the

huntsman, a role that Gascoigne imagines for himself throughout *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting*.

If the poem had included an account of the exciting chase of the wily hart, the emphasis could have been on the skill of the mounted, noble hunters in following the chase or on the skill of the huntsmen responsible for the hounds in keeping the pack on the trail of the deer or on the skill of the hounds themselves or on the skill of the noble hart in eluding his pursuers. If the poem had included an account of the death and breaking of the deer, the emphasis could have been on the skill of the hunter who butchered the carcass in the proper manner or on the social status of the participants in the hunt, reflected in the portion of the deer they received. For writers like Gascoigne, the hunt was a complex and widely known social practice that could be adapted for use in a variety of genres of writing and for a variety of rhetorical ends. Examining how writers use the practice of the hunt reveals the nuances of particular texts and demonstrates how important hunting was to early modern English authors.

Bibliography

Allen, Michael J. B. "The Chase: The Development of a Renaissance Theme." *Comparative Literature* 4 (Fall 1968): 301-312.

Almond, Richard. *Daughters of Artemis: The Huntress in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2009.

—. *Medieval Hunting.* Phoenix Mill, England: Sutton Publishing Ltd., 2003.

—. "Medieval Hunting: Ruling Classes and the Commonalty." *Medieval History* 3 (1993): 147-155.

Almond, Richard and A. J. Pollard. "The Yeomanry of Robin Hood and Social Terminology in Fifteenth-Century England." *Past and Present* 170 (2001): 52-77.

Alpers, Paul. "Renaissance Lyrics and Their Situations." *New Literary History: A Journal of Theory and Interpretation* 38.2 (2007): 309-331.

Anderson, Susan. "A True Copie: Gascoigne's *Princely Pleasures* and the Textual Representation of Courtly Performance." *Early Modern Literary Studies: A Journal of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century English Literature* 14.1 (2008): 43 paragraphs.

Anonymous. *The Speeches and Honorable Entertainment given to the Queenes Maiestie in Progresse, at Cowdray in Sussex, by the right Honorable the lord Montacute.* London: T. Scarlet, solde by W. Wright, 1591.

Archer, Jayne Elisabeth, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight, eds. *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Elizabeth I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Archer, Jayne Elisabeth and Sarah Knight. "Elizabetha Triumphans." In *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Elizabeth I*, edited by Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight, 1-26. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Austen, Gillian. "Gascoigne's Metamorphoses: *The Princely Pleasures at Kenilworth* 1575." *Imaginaires: Revue du Centre de recherché sur l'imaginaire dans les litteratures de langue anglaise* 4 (1999): 9-29.

—. *George Gascoigne.* Studies in Renaissance Literature 24. Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2008.

—. "Self Portraits and Self Presentation in the Work of George Gascoigne." *Early Modern Literary Studies: A Journal of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century English Literature* 14 (2008): 34 paragraphs.

Baillie-Grohman, William A. and F. N. Baillie-Grohman. Introduction to *The Master of Game,* by Edward of Norwich, Second Duke of York, xi-xvii. London: F. Duffield and Co.; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1909, 2005.

Bale, John. *Yet a Course at the Romyshe Fox. A Dysclosynge of the Declaratyon by E. Boner wherby W. Tolwyn was Professed Openlye into Antichristes Romyshe Relygyon.* Zurik: O. Jacobson [i.e. Antwerp: A. Goinus], 1543.

Bates, Catherine. "George Turberville and the Painful Art of Falconry." *English Literary Renaissance* 41.3 (2011): 403-428.

—. *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

—. "Wyatt, Surrey, and the Henrician Court." In *Early Modern English Poetry: A Critical Companion*, edited by Patrick Cheney, Andrew Hadfield, and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., 38-47. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Bath, Michael. "Weeping Stags and Melancholy Lovers: The Iconography of *As You Like It*, II, I." *Emblematica* 1 (1986): 13-52.

Beaver, Daniel C. "The Great Deer Massacre: Animals, Honor, and Communication in Early Modern England." *The Journal of British Studies* 38.2 (1999): 187-216.

—. *Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War.* Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Berry, Edward. *Shakespeare and the Hunt: A Cultural and Social Study.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Birrell, Jean. "Peasant Deer Poachers in the Medieval Forest." In *Progress and Problems in Medieval England*, edited by Richard Britnell and John Hatcher, 68-88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

—. “Who Poached the King’s Deer?: A Study in Thirteenth Century Crime.” *Midland History* 7 (1982): 9-25.

Boehrer, Bruce Thomas. *Animal Characters: Nonhuman Beings in Early Modern Literature*. Haney Foundation Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

—. Shakespeare *Among the Animals: Nature and Society in the Drama of Early Modern England*. Early Modern Cultural Studies. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

The Boke of Saint Albans or *The Book of Hawking, Hunting, and Blasing of Arms*. St. Albans, 1486.

Bray, Stephen Guy. “’We Two Boys Together Clinging’: The Earl of Surrey and the Duke of Richmond.” *English Studies in Canada* 21.2 (1995): 138-50.

Braden, Gordon. “Pride, Humility, and the Petrarchan Happy Ending.” *Spenser Studies* 18 (2003): 123-142.

Brander, Michael. *Hunting and Shooting from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*. New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1971.

Breight, Curtis. “Caressing the Great: Viscount Montague’s Entertainment of Elizabeth at Cowdray, 1591.” *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 127 (1989): 147-166.

Burrow, Colin. “Horace at Home and Abroad: Wyatt and Sixteenth-century Horatianism.” In *Horace Made New: Horatian Influences on British Writing from the Renaissance to the Twentieth Century*, edited by Charles Martindale and David Hopkins, 27-49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Carlson, Eric Josef. “The Marriage of William Turner.” *Historical Research* 65 (1992): 336-339.

Cartmill, Matt. *A View to a Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature through History.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Chalmers, Patrick. *The History of Hunting*. The Lonsdale Library of Sports, Games & Pastimes XXIII. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1936.

Chapman, Hester W. *Two Tudor Portraits: Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey and Lady Katherine Grey.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1960.

Cockaine, Sir Thomas. *A Short Treatise of Hunting: Compyled for the Delight of Noble Men and Gentlemen.* London: Thomas Orwin for Thomas Woodcocke, dwelling in Paules Churchyard at the signe of the black Beare, 1591.

Cole, Mary Hill. "Monarchy in Motion: An Overview of Elizabethan Progresses." In *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Elizabeth I*, edited by Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight, 27-45. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

—. *The Portable Queen: Elizabeth I and the Politics of Ceremony*. Massachusetts Studies in Early Modern Culture. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999.

Cox, Charles J. *The Royal Forests of England.* London: Methuen & Co., 1905.

Crane, Susan. *Animal Encounters: Contacts and Concepts in Medieval Britain*. The Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.

—. "Ritual Aspects of the Hunt *a force.*" In *Engaging with Nature: Essays on the Natural World in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, edited by Barbara A. Hanawalt and Lisa J. Kiser, 63-84. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.

Crewe, Jonathan. *Trials of Authorship: Anterior Forms and Poetic Reconstruction from Wyatt to Shakespeare.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Cummins, John. *The Art of Medieval Hunting: The Hound and the Hawk.* London: Castle Books, 1988.

Daalder, Joost. "Are Wyatt's Poems in Egerton MS2711 in Chronological Order?" *English Studies: A Journal of English Language and Literature* 69.3 (1988): 205-223.

Daley, A. Stuart. "The Idea of Hunting in *As You Like It.*" *Shakespeare Studies* 21 (1993): 72-95.

—. "The Midsummer Deer of *As You Like It*, II.i." *Philological Quarterly* 58 (1979): 103-105.

—. "To Moralize a Spectacle: *As You Like It*, Act 2, Scene 1." *Philological Quarterly* 65 (1986): 147-170.

—. "Where are the Woods in *As You Like It*?" *Shakespeare Quarterly* 34 (1983): 172-180.

Danielsson, Bror. Preface to *William Twiti: The Art of Hunting 1327*, by William Twiti, 1-38. Cynegetica Anglica 1. Stockholm Studies in English XXXVII. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell International, 1976.

Davis, Walter R. "Contexts in Surrey's Poetry." *English Literary Renaissance* 4 (1974): 40-55.

Derrida, Jacques. *The Animal That Therefore I Am*. Translated by David Wills. Edited by Marie-Louie Mallet. Perspectives in Continental Philosophy, edited by John D. Caputo. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008.

Dillon, Jeanette. "Pageants and Propaganda: Robert Langham's *Letter* and George Gascoigne's *Princely Pleasures at Kenilworth*." In *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603*, edited by Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank, 623-236. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

—. *Theatre, Court and City, 1595-1610: Drama and Social Space in London.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Dodman, Trevor. "Hunting to Teach: Class, Pedagogy, and Maleness in *The Master of Game* and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*." *Exemplaria* 17.2 (2005): 413-444.

Doran, Susan. "Juno versus Diana: The Treatment of Elizabeth I's Marriage in Plays and Entertainments, 1561-1581." *The Historical Journal* 38.2 (1995): 257-274.

Drayton, Michael. "See, chaste Diana, where my harmless heart." In *Sixteenth Century Poetry: An Annotated Anthology*, edited by Gordon Braden. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Dubrow, Heather. *Echoes of Desire: English Petrarchism and Its Counterdiscourses.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Dunlop, Alexander. Introduction to *Amoretti and Epithalamion*. In *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Spenser*, by Edmund Spenser, 585-597. Edited by William A. Oram, Einar Bjorvand, Ronald Bond, Thomas H. Cain, Alexander Dunlop, and Richard Schell. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1989.

Dusinberre, Juliet. Introduction to *As You Like It*, by William Shakespeare, 1-142. The Arden Shakespeare, Third Series. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006.

Edward of Norwich, Second Duke of York. *The Master of Game*. Edited by William A. Baillie-Grohman and F. N. Baillie-Grohman. London: F. Duffield and Co.; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1909, 2005.

Egan, Gabriel. *Green Shakespeare: From Ecopolitics to Ecocriticism*. Accents on Shakespeare. London: Routledge, 2006.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *The Praise of Folly and Letter to Maarten Van Dorp 1515.* Translated by Betty Radice. London: Penguin Books, 1971, 1993.

Fitter, Chris. "The Slain Deer and the Political Imperium: *As You Like It* and Andrew Marvell's 'Nymph Complaining for the Death of Her Fawn.'" *The Journal of English and German Philology* 98 (1999): 193-218.

Frankis, P. J. "The Testament of the Deer in Shakespeare." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* LIX (1958): 65-68.

Frye, Susan. *Elizabeth I: The Competition for Representation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Fudge, Erica. *Brutal Reasoning: Animals, Rationality, and Humanity in Early Modern England*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

—. *Perceiving Animals: Humans and Beasts in Early Modern English Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002.

—. *Renaissance Beasts: Of Animals, Humans, and Other Wonderful Creatures*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004.

Gardiner, Stephen. *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, edited by J.A. Muller. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1933.

Gascoigne, George. "Gascoignes wodmanship." In *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, edited by G. W. Pigman III. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

—. *The Noble Arte of Venerie or Hunting.* London: Imprinted by Henry Bynneman for Christopher Barker, 1575.

Gaston Phoebus, Count of Foix. *The Hunting Book of Gaston Phébus. Manuscrit français 616. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale.* Introduction by Marcel Thomas and François Avril. Commentary by Wilhelm Schlag. Manuscripts in Miniature No. 3. London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1998.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Goldring, Elizabeth. "'A mercer ye wot az ye be': The Authorship of the Kenilworth *Letter* Reconsidered." *English Literary Renaissance* 38.2 (2008): 245-269.

—. "Portraiture, Patronage, and the Progresses: Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and the Kenilworth Festivities of 1575." In *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Elizabeth I*, edited by Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight, 163-188. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Gottfried von Strassburg. *Tristan, with Surviving Fragments of the Tristran of Thomas*, translated by A. T. Hatto. London: Penguin Books, 1960, 1967.

Grant, Raymond. *The Royal Forests of England*. Phoenix Mill: Alan Sutton Publishing Limited, 1991.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980, 2005.

Griffin, Emma. *Blood Sport: Hunting in Britain Since 1066.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Gross, Karen Elizabeth. "Hunting, Heraldry, and the Fall in the *Boke of St. Albans* (1486)." *Viator* (38): 191-251.

Haigh, Christopher. "The Reformation in England to 1603." In *A Companion to the Reformation World*, edited by R. Po-chia Hsia, 135-149. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Hammersley, George. "The Revival of the Forest Laws under Charles I." *History: A Journal of the Historical Association* 45.154 (1960): 85-102.

Hamrick, Stephen. "'Set in Portraiture': George Gascoigne, Queen Elizabeth, and Adapting the Royal Image." *Early Modern Literary Studies* 11.1 (2005): 1-30.

Hanawalt, Barbara. "Men's Games, King's Deer: Poaching in Medieval England." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 18 (1988): 175-193.

Hands, Rachel. Introduction to *English Hawking and Hunting in* The Boke of St. Albans: *A Facsimile Edition of Sigs. A2-F8 of* The Boke of St. Albans (1486), xiii-lxix. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

—. "Juliana Berners and *The Boke of St. Albans." The Review of English Studies* 18.72 (1967): 373-386.

Heal, Felicity. "Giving and Receiving on Royal Progresses." In *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Elizabeth I*, edited by Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight, 46-64. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

—. *Reformation in Britain and Ireland.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Heale, Elizabeth. "Contesting Terms: Loyal Catholicism and Lord Montague's Entertainment at Cowdray, 1591." In *The Progresses, Pageants, and*

Entertainments of Elizabeth I, edited by Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight, 189-206. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

—. *Wyatt, Surrey and Early Tudor Poetry.* London and New York: Longman, 1998.

Heaton, Gabriel. "Elizabethan Entertainments in Manuscript: The Harefield Festivities (1602) and the Dynamics of Exchange." In *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Elizabeth I*, edited by Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight, 227-246. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

—. *Writing and Reading Royal Entertainments: From George Gascoigne to Ben Jonson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Hedley, Jane. "Allegoria: Gascoigne's Master Trope." *English Literary Renaissance* 11.2 (1981): 148-164.

Helgerson, Richard. *The Elizabethan Prodigals.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

Hibbert, Christopher. *The Virgin Queen: The Personal History of Elizabeth I*. London: Viking, 1990.

Holmes, John. "Thomas Lodge's *Amours*: The Copy-Text for Imitations of Ronsard in *Phillis*." *Notes and Queries* 53.1 (March 2006): 55-57.

Hopkins, Clare. "Pope, Sir Thomas (*c.*1507–1559)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Accessed March 16, 2013. http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/article/22533.

Horobin, David. *Falconry in Literature: The Symbolism of Falconry in English Literature from Chaucer to Marvell.* Surrey, B.C.: Hancock House, 2004.

Howard, Henry, Earl of Surrey. "So crewell prison howe could betyde, alas." In *Henry Howard Earl of Surrey: Poems*. Edited by Emrys Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Hughes, Celia. "Two Sixteenth Century Northern Protestants: John Bradford and William Turner." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 66 (1983): 104-138;

James, N. D. G. *A History of English Forestry.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.

Javitch, Daniel. "The Impure Motives of Elizabethan Poetry." *Genre: Forms of Discourse and Culture* 15 (1982): 225-238.

Jentoft, C. W. “Surrey's Five Elegies: Rhetoric, Structure, and the Poetry of Praise.” *PMLA* 91.1 (1976), 23-32.

Johnson, Ronald C. *George Gascoigne.* Twayne’s English Authors Series, edited by Sylvia E. Bowman. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1972.

Jones, Emrys, ed. *Henry Howard Earl of Surrey: Poems*. By Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.

Jones, Malcolm. “The Lambe Speaketh…An Addendum.” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 63 (2000): 287-294.

Jones, Whitney R. D. *William Turner: Tudor Naturalist, Physician and Divine*. London: Routledge, 1988.

—. “Turner, William (1509/10-1568).” In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Accessed March 16, 2013. http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/article/27874.

Kapelle, Rachel. “Predicting Elizabeth: Prophecy on Progress.” *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England: An Annual Gathering of Research, Criticism and Reviews* 24 (2011): 83-105.

Kernan, Alvin B. “Shakespearean Comedy and its Courtly Audience.” In *Comedy from Shakespeare to Sheridan: Change and Continuity in the English and European Dramatic Tradition*, edited by A. R. Braunmller and J. C. Bulman, 91-101. Newark, London: University of Delware Press, 1986.

King, John N. “Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 43.1 (1990): 30-74.

Kingsley-Smith, Jane. *Shakespeare’s Drama of Exile.* Palgrave Shakespeare Studies. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Kirby, Chester and Ethyn Kirby. “The Stuart Game Prerogative.” *The English Historical Review* 46.182 (1931): 239-254.

Kneidel, Gregory. “Reforming George Gascoigne.” *Exemplaria: A Journal of Theory in Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 10.2 (1998): 329-370.

Kolkovich, Elizabeth Zeman. “Lady Russell, Elizabeth I, and Female Political Alliances through Performance.” *English Literary Renaissance* 39.2 (2009): 290-314.

—. "Work in Progress: Gender and Politics in Late Elizabethan Progress Entertainments." PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. 2009. ProQuest (AAT 304897785).

Kuin, R. J. P. Introduction to *Robert Langham: A Letter,* by Robert Langham, 1-33. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983.

—. "The Purloined *Letter*: Evidence and Probability Regarding Robert Langham's Authorship." *The Library: Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* s.6 7.2 (1985): 115-125.

—. "Robert Langham and his 'Letter.'" *Notes and Queries* 25 (1978): 426-427.

Latham, Symon. *Lathams Falconry or The Faulcons Lure, and Cure in Two Bookes.* The English Experience 812. London: Printed by I. B. for R. Iackson, 1615; Amsterdam and New Jersey: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, Ltd., 1976.

Leach, Robert. "*As You Like It*: A 'Robin Hood' Play." *English Studies: A Journal of English Language and Literature* 82 (2001): 393-400.

Leslie, Michael. "Something Nasty in the Wilderness: Entertaining Queen Elizabeth on Her Progresses." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England: An Annual Gathering of Research, Criticism and Reviews* 10 (1998): 47-72.

Lines, Candance. "The Erotic Politics of Grief in Surrey's 'So crewell prison.'" *Studies in English Literature* 46.1 (2006): 1-26.

Lock, Julian. "Grey, Arthur, fourteenth Baron Grey of Wilton (1536-1593)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Accessed March 16, 2013. http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/article/11524.

Lodge, Thomas. *Rosalind: Euphues' Golden Legacy Found After his Death in his Cell at Silexedra*. Edited by Donald Beecher. Publications of the Barnabe Riche Society 7. Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions Inc., 1996.

—. "Sonnet XXXI." In *Phillis*. London: Imprinted by T. Este, for Sampson Clarke, 1593.

Loomie, A. J. "Carey, Robert, first earl of Monmouth (1560–1639)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Accessed March 16, 2013. http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/article/4656.

Madden, D. H. *The Diary of Master William Silence: A Study of Shakespeare & of Elizabethan Sport.* London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1907.

Manning, Roger B. *Hunters and Poachers: A Cultural and Social History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485-1640.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

—. *Village Revolts: Social Protest and Popular Disturbances in England, 1509-1640.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Manwood, John. *A Treatise of the Laws of the Forest.* The English Experience 814. London: Printed for the Society of Stationers, 1615; Amsterdam and New Jersey: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, Ltd., 1976.

Markham, Gervase. *Country Contentments.* The English Experience 613. London: Printed by I. B. for R Iackson, 1615; Amsterdam and New York: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, Ltd., 1973.

Marty, Paulette J. W. "The Kenilworth Entertainment, 1575: Staging England in the Age of Elizabeth I." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2003. ProQuest (AAT 305296338).

Marvin, William Perry. *Hunting Law and Ritual in Medieval English Literature.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2006.

May, Steven. "Early Courtier Verse: Oxford, Dyer, and Gascoigne." In *Early Modern English Poetry: A Critical Companion*, edited by Patrick Cheney, Andrew Hadfield, and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., 60-69. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

McCoy, Richard C. "Gascoigne's 'Poëma Castrata': The Wages of Courtly Success." *Criticism* 27.1 (1985): 29-55.

McNelis, James. "The Uncollated Manuscripts of 'The Master of Game': Towards a New Edition." PhD diss., University of Washington, 1996. ProQuest (AAT 304321065).

Montaigne, Michel. "Of Cruelty." In *Michel de Montaigne: The Complete Essays*, translated and edited by M. A. Screech, 472-488. London: Penguin Books, 1987, 2003.

Montrose, Louis. "'The Place of a Brother' in *As You Like It*: Social Process and Comic Form." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 32 (1981): 28-54.

Muir, Kenneth. *Life and Letters of Sir Thomas Wyatt.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1963.

Munsche, P. B. *Gentlemen and Poachers: The English Game Laws 1671-1831*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Nash, Ilana. "A Subject without Subjection: Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and *The Princely Pleasures at Kenelworth Castle*." *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 25 (1994): 81-102.

Nichols, John. *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth.* 3 volumes. London: Printed by and for John Nichols and Son, (Printers to the Society of Antiquaries), 1823.

Oggins, Robin S. *The Kings and their Hawks: Falconry in Medieval England.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

O'Kill, Brian. "The Printed Works of William Patten (c.1510-c.1600)." *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 7.1 (1977): 28-45.

Orme, Nicholas. *From Childhood to Chivalry: The Education of the English Kings and Aristocracy 1066-1530.* London and New York: Methuen, 1984.

—. "Medieval Hunting: Fact and Fancy." In *Chaucer's England: Literature in Historical Context*, edited by Barbara A. Hanawalt, 133-153. Medieval Studies at Minnesota 4. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1992.

Ortega y Gasset, José. *Meditations on Hunting*. Translated by Howard B. Wescott. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972.

Peterson, Douglas L. *The English Lyric from Wyatt to Donne: A History of the Plain and Eloquent Styles.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Pettegree, Andrew. *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies.* Aldershot: Scolar Press; Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 1996.

Pigman III, G. W. "Gascoigne, George (1534/5?-1577)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Accessed March 16, 2013. http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/view/article/10421.

—. Introduction to *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, by George Gascoigne, xxiii-lxv. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Pineas, Rainer. "William Turner and Reformation Politics." *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 37 (1975): 193-200.

—. “William Turner’s Polemical Use of Ecclesiastical History and his Controversy with Stephen Gardiner.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 33 (1980): 599-608.

—. “William Turner’s Use of the Dialogue Form as a Weapon of Religious Controversy.” *Journal of the Rocky Mountain Medieval and Renaissance Association* 4 (1983): 97-105.

Ploeg, Scott Vander. “Framing Poins.” *Kentucky Philological Review* 14 (1999): 40-44.

Pollard, A. W. G. R. Redgrave, W. A. Jackson, F. S. Ferguson, and Katharine F. Pantzer, eds. *A Short Title Catalog of Books Printed in England, Scotland & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640*. Second Edition. 3 volumes. London: The Bibliographical Society, 1976.

Pooley, Julian. “A Pioneer of Renaissance Scholarship: John Nichols and *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*.” In *The Progresses, Pageants, and Entertainments of Elizabeth I*, edited by Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring, and Sarah Knight, 268-286. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Prescott, Anne Lake. “The Thirsty Deer and the Lord of Life: Some Contexts for Amoretti 67-70.” *Spenser Studies* 6 (1985): 33-76.

Prouty, C. T. *George Gascoigne: Elizabethan Courtier, Soldier, and Poet.* New York: Benjamin Blom, 1942, 1966.

Prouty, Charles and Ruth Prouty. “George Gascoigne, *The Noble Arte of Venerie*, and Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth.” In *Joseph Quincy Adams Memorial Studies*, edited by James G. McManaway, Giles E. Dawson, and Edwin E. Willoughby, 639-665. Washington, D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1948.

Questier, Michael. “Loyal to a Fault: Viscount Montague Explains Himself.” *Historical Research* 77.196 (2004): 225-253.

Richardson, Jean Elizabeth. “Writing the Hunt in England, 1558-1649.” PhD diss., University of Alberta, 2003. ProQuest (AAT 305267966).

Robertson, Jean. “George Gascoigne and ‘The Noble Arte of Venerie and Hunting.’” *Modern Language Review* 37 (1942): 484-485.

Robinson, Clement. “The Louer compareth some subtile Suters to the Hunter.” In *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites.* London: Printed by Richard Ihones, 1584.

Rooney, Anne. *Hunting in Middle English Literature.* Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1993.

Ryrie, Alec. *The Gospel and Henry VIII: Evangelicals in the Early English Reformation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Schama, Simon. *Landscape and Memory*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995.

Schleiner, Winfried. "Jaques and the Melancholy Stag." *English Language Notes* 17 (1980): 175-179.

Scott, David. "William Patten and the Authorship of 'Robert Laneham's *Letter.*'" *English Literary Renaissance* 7 (1977): 297-306.

Scribner, R. W. *For the Sake of Simple Folk: Popular Propaganda for the German Reformation.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981, 1994.

Semenza, Gregory M. Colón. *Sport, Politics, and Literature in the English Renaissance.* Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 2003.

Sessions, W. A. *Henry Howard the Poet Earl of Surrey: A Life.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Seton, Alexander and William Tolwyn. *The Declaration made at Paules Crosse in the Cytye of London the Fourth Sonday of Aduent by Alexander Seyton and Master William Tolwyn Persone of S. Anthonynes in the Sayd Cytye of London.* London: R. Lant, 1542?.

Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It.* Edited by Juliet Dusinberre. The Arden Shakespeare, Third Series. London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006.

Shannon, Laurie. *The Accommodated Animal: Cosmopolity in Shakespearean Locales.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2013.

Sherbo, Arthur. "Cowper's Stricken Deer and Literary Tradition." *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities* 85 (1982): 336-340.

Smith, Bruce R. "Landscape with Figures: The Three Realms of Queen Elizabeth's Country-house Revels." *Renaissance Drama* 8 (1977): 57-109.

Smuts, R. Malcolm. "Progresses and Court Entertainments." In *A Companion to Renaissance Drama*, edited by Arthur F. Kinney, 281-293. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2002, 2004.

Southall, Raymond. *The Courtly Maker: As Essay on the Poetry of Wyatt and his Contemporaries*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.

Spearing, A. C. *Medieval to Renaissance in English Poetry.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Spenser, Edmund. *Amoretti*. In *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Spenser*, edited by William A. Oram, Einar Bjorvand, Ronald Bond, Thomas H. Cain, Alexander Dunlop, and Richard Schell. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1989.

Stähler, Axel. "Imagining the Illusive/Elusive?: Printed Accounts of Elizabethan Festivals." In *Queen Elizabeth I: Past and Present*, edited by Christa Jansohn, 61-88. Studien zur englischen Literatur 19. Münster: LIT Verlag Münster, 2004.

Stallybrass, Peter. "'Drunk with the Cup of Liberty': Robin Hood, the Carnivalesque, and the Rhetoric of Violence in Early Modern England." In *The Violence of Representation: Literature and the History of Violence*, edited by Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse, 45-76. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.

Staub, Susan C. "George Gascoigne." In *Dictionary of Literary Biography: Sixteenth Century Non-Dramatic Writers: Second Series,* Volume 136, edited by David A. Richardson, 127-139. Detroit, Washington, D.C., London: A Bruccoli Clark Layman Book, Gale Research, Inc., 1994.

Stephens, John. "George Gascoigne's *Posies* and the Persona in Sixteenth Century Poetry." *Neophilologus* 70 (1986): 130-141.

Strong, Roy. *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977.

Svensson, Lars-Håkan. "Hunt." In *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, edited by A. C. Hamilton, 381-382. Toronto: University of Toronto Press; London: Routledge, 1990.

Theis, Jeffrey S. *Writing the Forest in Early Modern England: A Sylvan Pastoral Nation.* Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2009.

Thiébaux, Marcelle. *The Stag of Love: The Chase in Medieval Literature.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974.

Thomas, Keith. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England: 1500-1800.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Thomas, Marcel and François Avril. Introduction to *The Hunting Book of Gaston Phébus. Manuscrit français 616. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale,* by Gaston Phoebus, Count of Foix, 1-21. Commentary by Wilhelm Schlag. Manuscripts in Miniature No. 3. London: Harvey Miller Publishers, 1998.

Thompson, E. P. *Whigs and Hunters: The Origin of the Black Act.* New York: Pantheon Books, 1975.

Thomson, Patricia. *Sir Thomas Wyatt and His Background.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.

Turberville, George. *The Booke of Faulconrie or Hauking for the Onely Delight and Pleasure of all Noblemen and Gentlemen: Collected out of the Best Aucthors, as well Italians as Frenchmen, and some English Practices withall Concerning Faulconrie, the Contents Whereof are to be Seen in the Next Page Folowyng.* London: H. Bynneman for C. Barker, 1575.

Turner, William. *The Huntyng & Fyndying out of the Romishe Fox.* Basyl [i.e. Bonn]: L. Mylius, 1543.

—. *The Hunting of the Fox and the Wolfe*. London, c.1565.

—. *The Huntyng of the Romyshe Vuolfe.* Emden: E. van der Erve, 1555.

—. *The Rescuynge of the Romishe Fox.* Winchester [i.e Bonn]: Hanse hit prik [i.e. L. Mylius], 1545.

Twiti, William. *William Twiti: The Art of Hunting 1327.* Edited by Bror Danielsson. Cynegetica Anglica 1. Stockholm Studies in English XXXVII. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell International, 1976.

Uhlig, Claus. "'The Sobbing Deer': *As You Like It*, II.i.21-66 and the Historical Context." *Renaissance Drama* n.s. III (1971): 79-109.

van Veen, Otto."The chasing goeth before the taking." In *Amorum emblemata, figuris aeneis incisa studio Othonis VaenI Batauo-Lugdunensis.* Antuerpiae : [Typis Henrici Swingenij.] Venalia apud auctorem, M.DC.IIX. [1608].

—. "Onlie for the chase." In *Amorum emblemata, figuris aeneis incisa studio Othonis VaenI Batauo-Lugdunensis.* Antuerpiae : [Typis Henrici Swingenij.] Venalia apud auctorem, M.DC.IIX. [1608].

Wall, Wendy. *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1993.

Warkentin, Germaine. "*Amoretti, Epithalamion*." In *The Spenser Encyclopedia*, edited by A. C. Hamilton, 30-38. Toronto: University of Toronto Press; London: Routledge, 1990.

Watson, Robert N. *Back to Nature: The Green and the Real in the Late Renaissance.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Whitlock, Ralph. *Historic Forests of England.* South Brunswick and New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, 1979.

Whyman, Susan E. *Sociability and Power in Late-Stuart England: The Cultural Worlds of the Verneys 1660-1720*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Willis, Paul J. "'Tongues in Trees': The Book of Nature in *As You Like It.*" *Modern Language Studies* 18 (1988): 65-74.

Williams, James. "Hunting and the Royal Image of Henry VIII." *Sport in History* 25 (2005): 41-59.

Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Wilson, Jean. *Entertainments for Elizabeth I*. Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 1980.

Wilson, Richard. "'Like the old Robin Hood': *As You Like It* and the Enclosure Riots." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43 (1992): 1-19.

Winters, Yvor. *Forms of Discovery: Critical and Historical Essays on the Forms of the Short Poem in English.* Chicago: Alan Swallow, 1967.

Wootton, John. "Damaetas Madrigall in praise of his Daphnis." In *Englands Helicon.* London: Printed by I. R. for Iohn Flasket, 1600.

Wyatt, Sir Thomas. "Myne owne John Poyntz, sins ye delight to know." In *Collected Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt.* Edited by Kenneth Muir and Patricia Thomson. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1969.

—. "Who so list to hounte I know where is an hynde." In *Collected Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt.* Edited by Kenneth Muir and Patricia Thomson. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1969.

Yamamoto, Dorothy. *The Boundaries of the Human in Medieval English Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Yates, Frances A. *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Young, Charles R. "The Forest Eyre in England during the Thirteenth Century." *The American Journal of Legal History* 18.4 (1974): 321-331.

—. *The Royal Forests of Medieval England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979.

Zagorin, Perez. “Sir Thomas Wyatt and the Court of Henry VIII: The Courtier's Ambivalence.” *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23.1 (1993): 113-141.

Zitner, S. P. “Truth and Mourning in a Sonnet by Surrey.” *English Literary History* 50.3 (1983), 509-529.