



FACULTAD DE FILOLOGÍA

**GRADO EN ESTUDIOS INGLESES**

**TRABAJO DE FIN DE GRADO**

**CURSO 2015/2016**

**TÍTULO:**

From Manuscript to Print Culture: a Study of Thomas Wyatt's Sonnets

**AUTOR/A:**

Marta Jiménez Beato

**Fecha:**

**Vº Bº del Tutor:**

**Firma:**

**Firmado:**

## INDEX

1. Introduction .....	3
2. The Sonnet from Italy to England .....	6
3. Wyatt's Sonnets from Manuscript to Print.....	10
3.1. Changes to Update the Language .....	10
3.2. Metrical Changes to Regularise the Verse.....	13
3.3. Literary Simplification.....	16
4. Conclusions .....	24
Works Cited.....	25
Appendix 1 .....	28
Appendix 2 .....	29



## 1. Introduction

This dissertation focuses on the process of transmission of Tudor poetry from manuscript to print culture, analysing one particular case: the changes made to Thomas Wyatt's sonnets in the famous miscellany published by Richard Tottel in 1557 as *Songes and Sonettes, Written by the Right Honorable Lorde Henry Haward Late Earle of Surrey, and Other* (which will be henceforth referred to as Tottel's *Miscellany*). These changes were presumably carried out by the editor of this book, Richard Tottel, who revised and altered some elements from Wyatt's sonnets when he translated the poems from manuscript to print.

The poetry of Thomas Wyatt (c.1503–1542) survives in several manuscript collections. Peter Beal's online *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts, 1450-1700* (CELM) lists five major compilations: the Egerton MS (BL MS Egerton 2711), the Devonshire MS (BL MS Add. 17492), the Blage MS (Trinity College, Dublin, MS 160), the Arundel Harington MS (Arundel Castle, Harington MS Temp. Eliz) and another Harington MS (BL MS Add. 36529). Of these five, the most important is undoubtedly the Egerton MS, a folio volume of 120 leaves which contains almost exclusively Wyatt's work (Beal et al). The collection was probably started about 1526 or later, although some of the poems could have been written before that year (Harrier 4–5). It is copied in several hands, including Wyatt's, and there are authorial corrections throughout the manuscript (Beal). Harrier concludes that this manuscript is without question Wyatt's own, and that his revisions within this volume are clearly identifiable from later amendments (13).

Tottel's *Miscellany* is a collection which consisted of 271 poems never printed before. Forty of these were by Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, ninety-seven by Wyatt, forty by Nicholas Grimald, and ninety-five poems by unknown authors. The purpose of this miscellany was to popularize courtly poetry, which up until that moment had circulated exclusively in Henry VIII's court. This aim can be appreciated in the prologue that the editor wrote for the readers. As it was argued by May in his essay "Popularizing Courtly Poetry: Tottel's *Miscellany* and Its Progeny" (2009), in this prologue "Tottel does congratulate purchasers of the *Miscellany* for acquiring work denied them by 'the ungentle horders up of such treasure'" (419–20).

Marotti explains that “Tottel depicted himself simultaneously as a connoisseur, a patriot, and an educator, as someone doing a public service for his clientèle rather than as a mercantile exploiter of texts belonging to a social and intellectual élite” (1991: 3). Tottel’s aim was to make poetry more readily available for common people in the hopes that they would benefit and learn from it. In order to reach this new readership, he used a public figure to advertise his book, the Earl of Surrey, thus unveiling the editor’s belief in social and political preeminence as a better advertisement for printed works than literary reputation (Marotti 1995: 215–16). Another reason behind the printing of the miscellany, which May discusses in his article, could be simply a sense of patriotism, with Tottel alleging that printed versions of lyrical poems in Latin and Italian already existed and that his book would prove that “our tong is able in that kynde to do as praiseworthely as the rest” (420).

If the poems included in this collection had, up to that point, circulated exclusively among courtly circles, the question arises as to how Tottel acquired his copies. Since only the Arundel Harington MS and the other Harington family anthology (BL MS Add, 36529) combine a significant number of pieces by both Wyatt and Surrey, several scholars have speculated that Sir John Harington (c. 1517-1582) might have been the person who gave the poems to Tottel and there is some consensus that the Arundel MS was his main source (May 420). However, an alternative theory has recently been put forth by Jason Powell who, on the basis of a series of letters addressed to the widow of Wyatt’s son asking for copies of the poet’s works, claims that Tottel may have had access to the Egerton MS or a transcription of it (Warner 12).

Critical opinion is not unanimous either on the issue of who was responsible for the editing of Tottel’s *Miscellany*. Some scholars argue that it could have been Nicholas Grimald who revised the text of the poems (Marquis 2000: 148), whereas others consider Tottel himself to be the editor. To the latter group belongs May, who offers some reasons to substantiate his claim. It is true that Tottel was known for his printing of law books; however several of the other works he printed in 1557 were in verse, such as the first edition of Thomas Tusser’s *Hundred Points of Good Husbandry* or Surrey’s *Aeneid* (May 425). May also explains that the miscellany “was not the first book of poetry to issue from Tottel’s press with its metrics significantly regularized” (425). There is also proof that Tottel admitted to having corrected and augmented a reprinted version of another book of poetry he brought out in 1554: Lydgate’s *The Fall of Princes*

(426). Moreover, Tottel revised his *Songes and Sonetes* immediately after publication: a first edition (Q1) was issued on 5 June 1557 and a second version followed in less than two months, on 31 July (Q2). As Paul Marquis has noted, Q2 is more thoroughly edited than Q1:

Hundreds of substantive changes in diction and prosody are included in the eight weeks separating the two versions [...] and an entirely new arrangement given to the lyrics in Q2 as a whole. [...] That Tottel would redesign Q1 is understandable, given the impression left by that version and his penchant for producing coherent texts evidenced in his other publications. He would have understood that a more carefully impressed text, ordered and arranged in a significant manner, would influence the success of Q2. (2013: 14).

For these reasons, Tottel will be considered the editor of the miscellany in this essay.

Apart from editing the text of the poems, Tottel also created titles for each of them, which provided the readers with the necessary context to help interpretation. Those poems participated in the social world in which they were produced and thus they portrayed impressions of that exclusive environment which were not accessible for Tottel's reader (O'Callaghan 83). Marotti further explains this point:

When the poems themselves were cut off from the contexts of their production and initial reception, a recontextualizing process began in which the works lost their vivid particularity of meaning and began to speak a language whose general and abstract terms were a hybrid of poetic conventionality and culture specific code words. [...] It was not until lyrics were committed to print that titles or introductory comments were necessary to allow readers to perceive the poems' connection either to an actual social world or to the traditional fictional world of love experience. (1995: 218)

However, this re-contextualizing process was not always very accurate in recreating the context of the poem. In his article "Thomas Wyatt's Poetry: The Politics of Love" (1978), Kamholtz argues that "the titles that Tottel's editor assigned the lyrics virtually created the persona of 'the lover' through whose complaining lips we hear an enormous number of the anthologized lyrics" (351). He notes that some of Tottel's titles oversimplify the argument of the text and impose "some distortion on the courtly lyrics"

(351), because these poems were often based on political issues which would not be current knowledge to this new readership; thus, the easiest way to re-interpret them was to treat them all as love poetry. Such is the case in sonnet 98. In her edition of Wyatt's poems, Foxwell comments on the background of this poem explaining that it was composed in May 1538, when Wyatt was in the midst of difficult diplomatic services. She also adds that May had been an eventful month for the author; he had been imprisoned on two occasions in this particular month, in the years 1534 and 1536 (51–52). All of this happened nineteen years before the miscellany was printed and Tottel's readers were not likely to know; hence, he decided to re-contextualize the sonnet, using a title that associated it with a fictional love story: "The louer vnhappy biddeth happy louers reioise in Maie, while he wailleth that month to him most vnlucky."

In order to analyse the transformations undergone by Wyatt's poems as they were edited for the printing press, this essay will compare a selection of sonnets in their original form, as preserved in the Egerton MS, with the versions given by Tottel. The transcription of the Egerton MS used for this essay is that available in Richard Harrier's *The Canon of Sir Thomas Wyatt's Poetry* (1975). In the case of the miscellany, the second edition, printed on July 31 1557 (Q2), is the one chosen for this project, as no copies of the first edition are accessible through EEBO and, in any case, Q2 presents a text that was thoroughly revised by Tottel.

## 2. The Sonnet from Italy to England

The sonnet was invented about the year AD 1230 in southern Italy, at the court of the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II. There are some similarities as to the place in which the sonnet was created and the first time it entered England. Frederick II was an enlightened, cultured and also ruthless despot, much like Henry VIII. This poetic composition was created by Giacomo Da Lentini, a courtier academically trained for diplomatic service, writing for and in a group of courtiers (coteries). The same thing happened in the case of England, where Wyatt, a courtier academically trained for royal service, introduced the new sonnet form (Spiller 84).

It was Francis Petrarch's sonnet structure the one which was introduced in England by Wyatt, at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Said structure consisted of

fourteen lines with eleven or ten syllables each, divided into an octave and a sestet. These last two were also divided into two quatrains and two tercets, respectively (Spiller 3). Wyatt might have become acquainted with Italian sonnets when he visited the French court in 1526. However, it was not until 1527 that he started writing sonnets.

The sonnet Wyatt wrote could not have been modelled after the same fashion as those from Italy. Wang and Niu give two reasons as to why it is complicated to use an Italian pattern while writing in English. On the one hand, the fact that “the main instinct in English poetry is for iambic or occasionally anapestic movement and [...] poetry seems to shape itself in lines of moderate length” (41). On the other hand, English has more vowel sounds than Italian, which reduce the number of words to each sound, making it harder to find rhyming words in English than in Italian (41). For these reasons, Wyatt experimented with sonnet patterns until he reached one that served his needs. Wyatt’s sonnets differ from Petrarch’s in the division of the fourteen lines; they changed from two quatrains and two tercets to three quatrains and a rhyming couplet.

This new sonnet pattern could be derived from a mixture of two poetic forms that Wyatt was exposed to: one of them was the Italian sonnet, the other the strambotto. Spiller goes on to explain that the strambotto, originally a popular song, was a “short, witty, pseudological poem that concluded with a couplet” (85). The poet might have changed the original Petrarchan pattern to incorporate a couplet because he was inspired by this poetic form.

From this point onwards, Wyatt’s work was continued by the Earl of Surrey who, according to Wang and Niu, “developed and improved the form, and thereafter the sonnet was widely used and won increasing popularity” (42). By improving Wyatt’s sonnet pattern, the Earl of Surrey gained the reputation of being the creator of the English sonnet, and many people—not only his contemporaries—preferred him over Wyatt. Mason further discusses this issue in his article “Editing Wyatt”:

What had sunk Wyatt below Surrey was the inability of readers to find any agreeable scansion in so many of his poems. This ‘roughness’ was put down to his being a pioneer, slow to learn his trade, even if that trade were the simple matter of counting syllables correctly up to ten. (676)



The “roughness” Mason mentions is the main flaw that Tottel tried to correct when he translated the poems from the manuscript medium into print.

The manuscript tradition was carried out by literary communities of courtiers, also known as coteries, in the court of Henry VIII. These coteries ranged from family circles to patronage networks to other kinds of institutionally determined groupings (Perry 108). In order to enter one of these exclusive coteries, one had to be considered a courtier, a position highly valued in sixteenth century England. According to Castiglione in *Book of The Courtier*, a “courtier was to be equipped not only with the already formidably wide intellectual attributes of Cicero’s orator, but also with the social graces and physical skills of the late medieval knight” (Starkey 233). Wyatt was one of these courtiers, but also a scholar and a gentleman. His father, Henry Wyatt, had been appointed a member of the Privy Council of Henry VII and he would, later on, be made Knight of the Bath by Henry VIII (Baldi 7).

The fact that coteries were small groups of people allowed for the circulation of “politically charged or libelous writings that would have been too dangerous for the more public mechanisms of print publication” (Perry 109). Because of Wyatt’s role in the court of Henry VIII, it was expected that some of his poems could have political connotations, but they were safe as long as they were kept inside these exclusive circles.

The texts that circulated in the coteries or “scribal communities” (Love 146) were often modified. Scribes usually “transcribed, revised, supplemented, and answered them, not particularly worried about changing an authorial ‘original’” (Marotti 1993: 160). It was not only authors like Wyatt himself who revised their own work, but the scribes who copied them into the circulating manuscripts. An example of this can be seen in sonnet 28 (“My galley...”), where the original sonnet was copied from the Egerton MS into the Arundel Harington MS, and some changes were introduced afterwards in the latter by a different hand. This example will be more thoroughly analysed further on in the essay (see below, p.11).

In *The Culture and Commerce of Texts*, Love differentiates three modes of scribal publication: author publication, containing texts written by the author himself; entrepreneurial publication, which were copies of manuscripts sold by people other than the author; and user publication, meant to be only for the owner’s use. This last mode of scribal publication derived ultimately in personal miscellanies or volumes of collections

(46–47). Some manuscripts and printed miscellanies of the Tudor era are simply transpositions of manuscript miscellanies into typographic form; such, according to Marotti, is the case with Tottel's *Miscellany* and the Arundel Harington MS (1993: 170).

The transformation from manuscript form to print brought about some changes in the area of patronage. In the manuscript tradition, writers “sought from their patrons legitimacy, reward, and prestige” by mentioning them in their dedications. This was also carried out in print culture, with portraits of members of royalty and the aristocracy, which conveyed the sometimes false proof of celebrity endorsement as a form of publicity (Marotti 1995: 292). As the printing business evolved, so did the concept of the patron. At the beginning, it was the patron who provided financial aid to the writer and publisher of the book, but in the printing era the readers were slowly eclipsing the original patrons, for they were ‘modern patrons’ themselves in the sense that they were the consumers of the products. This new concept of readers as patrons can be seen in the dedicatory letters that publishers addressed to their readership, such as Tottel's prologue in the miscellany (Marotti 1991: 2). However, O’Callaghan concludes that the economic reward that authors received for their printed works was not enough for them to manage without patrons, and so “the patronage system continued to dominate literary production in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries” (87). Overall, “print transformed early modern literary culture, giving poetry a new value as a national institution and generating new models of authorship” (O’Callaghan 85).

Hunter discusses further changes that were carried out in the printing process that aimed at creating a unified aesthetics for printed texts. Printers eliminated tricks that were designed to speed composition, such as abbreviations or tildes. They also introduced capitalization and transformed punctuation; in medieval manuscripts, punctuation was characterized by “marks indicating the pauses that should be observed when reading out loud,” such as the virgule (/), which would be replaced by the comma in 1521, the colon (:), and the point (.). Other additions to texts were the question mark, the semi-colon, the exclamation mark, the apostrophe, the hyphen, and brackets. Printing also contributed to the standardization of spelling, for instance, accelerating the removal of final ‘e’ and doubled consonants with no linguistic function (Hunter 30–32). This drift towards standardization given impulse by the printing press underlies many of the changes that can be appreciated in the process of transmission of Wyatt's sonnets.

### 3. Wyatt's Sonnets from Manuscript to Print

A total of twenty of Wyatt's sonnets available in Tottel's *Miscellany* were analysed for this essay. Of those twenty poems, only twelve were finally used for this section. The comparison and analysis of the texts of the Egerton MS and Tottel's *Miscellany* will be divided into three main categories: changes made in order to update the language, metrical changes to help regularise the verse, and literary simplifications.

The sonnets proposed for the analysis will be cited by number instead of their first line. These numbers have been taken from *The Canon of Sir Thomas Wyatt's Poetry* (Harrier, 1975), which arranges the poems according to their order in the Egerton MS. Appendix 1 offers a list of the sonnets identified by number and first line, and Appendix 2 reproduces the full texts.

#### 3.1. Changes to Update the Language

Changes to update the language are not the most common ones within the modifications introduced by Tottel, but are worth mentioning. The first and second editions of Tottel's *Miscellany* were printed in 1557, fifteen years after Wyatt's death and two or three decades after the sonnets were written. In this short period of time, from the starting of the Egerton MS c. 1526 until the author's death, the English language kept changing and evolving. Thus, Tottel made it his mission to update words or phrases which were becoming obsolete or slowly dying out in the language.

An example of this modernization of linguistic forms can be the replacement of *again* in the manuscript with *against* in the miscellany. This change appears in several of the sonnets analysed, for instance 24 and 30.

*E:* Som fowles there be that have so perfaict sight  
Agayn the Sonne their Iyes for to defend

*T:* Some fowles there be that haue so perfite sight  
Against the sunne their eyes for to defende. (24.1-2)

Nowadays, *again* is only used as an adverb, whilst in Middle English it was also a preposition which would, in the end, be superseded by *against*. As Barber observes,

some prepositions such as *again* were “not uncommon in the sixteenth century, but [fell] out of use in the seventeenth” (203).

*E:* Leve to conspire again me wrongfully

*T:* Leauē to conspire against me wrongfully (30.11)

Tottel might have noticed the tendency to use the form *against* instead of *again*, and he chose the latter for the printed version of the poems.

Another change in the revision of the sonnets, which was carried out in sonnet 28, is the shift from *sight* in the manuscript to *sigh* in the printed version. Either as a verb or a noun, the OED gives a definition of *sight* as an obsolete form of *sigh* (OED *sight* v.<sup>2</sup>, *sigh* n.<sup>2</sup>). There are only a few citations provided for *sight* as a noun, the last one dating from 1584. Obviously, the fact that Wyatt clearly uses the noun in this sense indicates that he was familiar with this form, but the scarcity of references in the OED suggests that it was dying out. Tottel chose instead the more current form *sigh*:

*E:* An endles wynd doeth tere the sayll a pase

Of forced sightes and trusty ferefulnes

*T:* An endelesse winde doth teare the sayle apac

Of forced sighes and trusty fearefulnesse (28.8-9)

In his collation of the text, Harrier notes that the reading “sighes” in line 8 is also present in the Arundel Harington MS (125). In the 1960 edition of the Arundel Harington MS, Hughey points out that this version of the sonnet was in fact copied from the Egerton MS; she notes, moreover, that originally the Harington text read “sightes,” but was later corrected above the line to “sighes” in another ink and in secretary hand (2: 145). It seems likely then that when Tottel copied the sonnet from the Arundel Harington MS this correction had not yet been made.

Another example of linguistic modernization, this time introducing an idiom, appears in sonnet 47. In the Egerton MS, the poem begins in his fashion:

*E:* The lyvely sperkes that issue from those Iyes

Against the which ne vailleth no defence

Have prest myn hert and done it non offence (47.1-3)

The form *prest* is a variant spelling of the past participle of *press*, which can be interpreted as “To affect with a feeling of (physical or mental) pressure, constraint, or distress” (OED *press* v.<sup>1</sup> 11a). Consequently the meaning of that phrase not only has to do with physical pain, but a more abstract one as well. In the printed version, however, Tottel used a different verb, i.e. *perst*. If looked up on the OED, the results show that *perst* was the form of the past participle of the verb *pierce* used during the sixteenth century. Moreover, one of the senses listed— “to affect keenly or deeply with emotion”—suits the context perfectly and is often used in the idiom *to pierce one’s heart* (OED *pierce* v. 5), whose first citation dates from the late fourteenth century. This meaning is similar to that of the verb *prest* in the manuscript version; however, this time the editor used a known idiom that could be more familiar to the readers:

*T*: The liuely sparkes, that issue from those eyes,  
 Against the which there vaileth no defence  
 Haue perst my hart and done it non offence (47.1-3)

Sonnet 47 also displays two instances of the word *ne* in the manuscript version that are rendered differently in the printed text. The first occurrence appears in line 2, where *ne* is an adverb (OED *ne* adv.<sup>1</sup> 2a):

*E*: Against the which ne vaileth no defence  
  
*T*: Against the which there vaileth no defence (47.2)

Cumulative or multiple negation, as Barber poses, was commonly used in Old English and Middle English by putting *ne* early in a sentence. This form started to fall into disuse, although it was still current in the early sixteenth century. With the disappearance of *ne* “it became common to negate with *nat* (or *not*) alone. Nevertheless, multiple negation continues to be found alongside simple *not* throughout the sixteenth century” (199). However, Tottel chose to avoid a double negative and substituted *there* for *ne*. This new form could be an instance of unemphatic *there* (OED *there* adv. 4a), where the word is only used to introduce a verb, carrying no meaning. This explanation makes sense, since Tottel would have needed a one syllable word to fill the place of *ne* and maintain the metre.

The second occurrence of *ne*, however, is not an adverb but a conjunction (OED *ne* conj.<sup>1</sup> 1a). This is a very straightforward change, for the OED explains that *ne* was used in the same way as *nor*. Although the dictionary entry records occasional examples until the end of the eighteenth century, Barber has noted that by Spenser's time its use was deliberately archaic (206).

*E:* So call I for helpe I not when ne where

*T:* So call I for helpe, I not when, nor where (47.11)

A last example that supports the initial claim that Tottel revised the work of Wyatt updating old-fashioned words is the shift from an obsolete—even in Tottel's time—impersonal verb such as *lust* to another one which was still commonly used: *list*.

*E:* Me lusteth no lenger rotten boughs to clyme

*T:* Me list no lenger rotten boughes to clime (13.14)

In the manuscript version, on the one hand, the verbal form used is “Me lusteth,” which appears in the OED as an obsolete impersonal verb meaning “I have a desire” (OED *lust* v. 1b), the last citation dating from 1556. On the other hand, the printed version displays the verb “Me list,” which the OED glosses as “I desire” and is a perfect alternative for the old-fashioned “Me lusteth” (OED *list* v.<sup>1</sup> 1a). As attested by the OED citations, this form remained current until the first half of the seventeenth century. There is a citation dating from the nineteenth century from Walter Scott's *Marmion*, but it is clearly an archaism. It has to be noted that, according to Harrier's collation (114), the form *list* appears also in the Devonshire MS (Harrier 114). However, it would be difficult to prove that Tottel had access to this manuscript, which was compiled chiefly by three ladies in Anne Boleyn's household: Mary Shelton, Mary Fitzroy, and Margaret Douglas. In the 1550s it was in the possession of the latter, then Duchess of Lennox (Southall 144–47).

### 3.2. Metrical Changes to Regularise the Verse

The largest percentage of the changes analysed in Tottel's revision of the sonnets corresponds to those changes that attempted to regularise the verse. As Daalder

discussed in his article “Rhetoric and Revision in Wyatt’s Poems” (1969), Wyatt did not attempt to write iambic pentameter. He further explains this point by stating that for a metrical system to exist, it “must have a basis in the facts of the spoken language” and, since “[There were no] practices of accentuation and syllabification in the spoken language of W[yatt’s] time,” one cannot simply assume that the author was indeed writing in iambic metre (Daalder 64–65). Galván also discusses this issue, stating that maybe what Wyatt tried to write was not iambic pentameter but a four-stress line, following the English poetic tradition (232).

These metrical modifications could also be classified into two categories: changes intended to rearrange the accents to impose an iambic pattern, and those made simply to shorten or lengthen the metre to adjust it to five feet. However, the line that divides these two categories is sometimes too thin to differentiate one group from the other. Furthermore, there are also some instances in which Tottel both rearranged the accents and shortened or lengthened the metre, which made it preferable to unite the two categories into one.

The first example is a case of rearranging of the words to smooth out the rhythm. The original line has only two clear iambs:

*E:* But syns | it pléase | the to | fáin a | defáult

*T:* But, sins | it pléas- | eth thée | to fáin | defáult (14.11)

Tottel solved this problem by adding one more syllable to “please,” using the form of the verb in *-eth*. He did not only change the inflection of the verb, but also the mood. The original line contains a subjunctive form of *please*, which was usually formed in the second- and third-person singular with the base-form of the verb used (Barber 171). According to Barber, “the selection of the subjunctive signals doubt, hypothesis, or incredulity” (173), and this suits the tone of the poem really well. Tottel’s decision to rewrite the verb in the present indicative seems to have been designed to rearrange the accents, as the ending *-eth* for the third person singular allowed him to add one extra unstressed syllable before the object. With this change, Tottel had to omit another syllable for the verse to remain a pentameter. The editor deleted the article *a*, creating thus an effortless iambic verse.

Another example of deletion of syllables in order to straighten the metre can be found in sonnet 31:

*E:* But dáí | ly yét | the íll | doeth cháunge | into | the wóurs

*T:* And dáy | ly doth | mine ýll | chánge to | the wórse (31.10)

Although the rhythmic pattern of the original line has more iambs than Tottel's version, it is the number of feet which disqualifies it as the expected pentameter: it has six feet. In the printed version, on the other hand, the deletion of "doeth" and the shortening of *into* allow the line to fit better in the sonnet pattern despite having fewer iambs, because this version has five feet.

However, in his attempt to regularise the metre, Tottel sometimes produces lines that do not scan as perfect iambic pentameters either. There is an instance of this in sonnet 10.

*E:* Ffor in | évery | cás to | képe still | oon gýse

*T:* For in | eche cásé | to képe | stíll | one guíse (10.4)

The manuscript version has five feet, but the rhythm is clearly not iambic as three of the feet are trochees. In this case, Tottel deleted one syllable by changing "every" to "eche," leaving the line with only nine syllables. The result is a more homogeneous rhythmic pattern than the one in the original version, having three iambs.

In sonnet 30, the case is reversed. The line taken from the Egerton MS has, as in the previous example, ten syllables; however, they metrically count as nine since the poet uses feminine rhyme and the last syllable is unstressed:

*E:* Alás | the snów | shalbé | bláck & | scálding

*T:* Alás | the snów | blácke shall | it bée | and scálding (30.5)

What seems more problematic is the verb "shalbe," which could have either its first or second half accentuated. Whether one chooses the first or second half, the result is the same; two strong syllables following each other. In order to solve this problem, Tottel rearranged the words and added a new one; *it*. Thus, the editor created one more iamb that did not exist in the original line.



Tottel's attempts to standardize also extend occasionally to rhyming schemes. As it has been explained in this essay, the English sonnet was introduced by Wyatt, who changed the structure of the Petrarchan sonnet from an octave and a sestet, to three quatrains and a rhyming couplet, a pattern developed by the poet himself about 1525 (Spiller 3). However, in sonnet 26 the final couplet in the Egerton text seems defective, as the rhyme is at best approximate:

*E:* Likewise displeaseth me boeth lyff & deth  
And my delite is cause of this stryff (26.13-14)

In her edition of Wyatt's poems Foxwell dismisses "lyff & deth" as a scribal error and emends the text adopting the reading in the Devonshire MS: "deth and lyff" (24). Harrier does not emend, but he duly records the Devonshire variant as well (124). As it has already been discussed, it is highly unlikely that Tottel had access to the Devonshire MS and it is impossible to know if the copy he used incorporated the same correction. In the Arundel Harington MS the text of this sonnet has not been preserved, as it was apparently copied in one of two folios (61–62) which have been lost (Hughey 1: 22–23). Whatever the case, Tottel's version inverts the order of the words in the collocation "life and death" to normalise the rhyming pattern:

*T:* Lo, thus displeaseth me both death and life,  
And my delight is causer of this strife (26.13-14)

### 3.3. Literary Simplification

One of the goals of printing this miscellany was to "refine the unrefined," as Tottel put it in his prologue to the readers. Right from the beginning of the elaboration of the book, the editor knows its intended readers, that is, common people who might not have had access to courtly poetry before, and more particularly, to Petrarchan poetry. This style of poetry has some common characteristics that someone who has not been exposed to it might find difficult to understand. For example, metaphors: those drawn from the lady's eyes, those describing the lover's suffering, etc. Tottel also suspected that this new readership might not be accustomed to learned words with Latin

or Romance etymology, although this type of simplification is not the most common one.

The starting point to illustrate the simplification of literary devices will be the analysis of sonnet 32. Tottel gave this sonnet an explanatory title that reads “The louer prayeth his offred hart to be receaued.” The opening lines display significant differences between the manuscript and the printed version:

*E:* How oft have I my dere & cruell foo  
With those your Iyes for to get peace & truyse  
Profferd you myn hert

*T:* How oft have I, my deare and cruell fo:  
With my great paine to get some peace or truce,  
Geuen you my hart: (32.1-3)

In line 2 the texts differ. The manuscript version reads “With those your iyes,” whilst the printed version is “With my great paine.” Tottel’s modification simplifies the original text eliminating one image that an audience unfamiliar with the conventions of Petrarchanism—or of Latin amatory poetry—might have difficulty interpreting. One of these conventions was the conceit of the war of love: the poet presents himself as engaged in a deadly war against a cruel foe (the lady) and trying to obtain a truce from her eyes. Petrarchanism makes use of the Latin topos of Cupid shooting his darts from the lady’s eyes, which serve as the epitome of her beauty. Her looks are a source of love (i.e. kindling love with her looks), but since the beloved in Petrarchan poetry is characteristically disdainful, these love-kindling looks inevitably inflict metaphorical pain, i.e. the lover’s suffering.

In Tottel’s version of this line, the emphasis on the lover’s pain has been substituted for its cause—the lady’s eyes—which completely eradicates the original image. The lover’s “great paine” is obviously a side effect of the unrequited love which is the subject of the sonnet. In the printed version, however, the reader is invited to assume that this pain derives from the lady’s rejection, without being pointed to its source through an image that requires familiarity with the poetic convention to decode it. The courtly coterie among which these poems originally circulated would have no difficulty interpreting them. However, the new readership which the miscellany was

intended for did not have access to the restricted cultural milieu of the court, and would not be familiar, hence, with the conventions of Petrarchanism.

The opening lines of this sonnet also display another form of simplification in line 3, this time in vocabulary. While revising the manuscript version, Tottel encountered a word—“profferd”—which is a borrowing from French (OED *proffer* v.). One of the definitions of this verb is “to offer, present,” which could be easily replaced by *to give* (OED *proffer* v. 1b). The verb *to give*, on the other hand, comes from Old English (OED *give* v.), which makes it a perfect substitute for the French borrowing.

*E:* Profferd you myn hert

*T:* Geuen you my hart (32.3)

Another fact to support this claim that Tottel preferred the native word is the metrical analysis. Both “géuen” and “prófferd” have their strong syllable in the same position, and in addition to that, they are also two-syllable long. One could arrive at the conclusion that Tottel changed the verb, not to alter the rhythmic pattern or length of the line, but to use a more familiar word.

As indicated in the first quatrain, sonnet 32 narrates the story of a lover that has offered his heart to his beloved. However, as we learn in the second quatrain, she refuses it and, as a consequence of that, the poet himself scorns it. This holds true for both versions:

*E:* Yf any othre loke for it as ye trowe

There vayn weke hope doeth greatly theim abuse

And thus I disdain that that ye refuse

It was ones mine it can no more be so

*T:* If any other loke for it, as you trow,

Their vaine weake hope doth greatly them abuse.

And that thus I disdaine that you refuse,

It was once mine it can no more be so. (32.5-8)

However, as the argument moves towards a resolution, the sestet unfolds differently. The Egerton version is more complex and builds on two actions: the poet’s

driving out his rejected heart (OED *chase* v.<sup>1</sup> 8) and the lady's refusal to give it shelter. This is explained through lines 9 to 11 of the sonnet.

*E:* Yf I then it chase nor it in you can fynde  
In this exile no manner of comfort  
Nor lyve alone nor where he is called resort  
He may wander from his naturall kind (32.9-12)

Spiller discusses this change in his book *The Development of The Sonnet: An Introduction*, explaining that

The point is that if the *lover* rejects his own heart, which cannot any longer be his, since it has been formally proffered, then the heart is exiled; if the *lady* now also rejects it, it cannot as an exile find sanctuary anywhere else, and cannot live alone (since a heart needs a body). (101)

However, in Tottel's version, the focus is exclusively on the lady's disdain, making the argument of the poem simpler; as Spiller notes: "the whole bitterness of exile [...] is lost if the sestet does not start with 'If I...'" (101), which also emphasizes the point that the lover will not take his heart back. In the printed version, there is only one person refusing the heart, and that is the lady:

*T:* If you it chase, that it in you can finde,  
In this exile, no maner of comfort:  
Nor liue alone, nor where he is calde, resort  
He may wander from his naturall kinde (32.9-12)

Sonnet 81 ("Unstable dream...") provides another example of simplification in the argument, which in this case involves also a modification of the rhyming scheme. In this poem, the lover has dreamed that he enjoyed his lady, and addresses his dream complaining that it was too brief and that it is, obviously, not true. The original argument compares the speaker's mind with a "tossing mew" which "the unstable dream" ("thou" in the text) filled with images of his beloved:

*E:* By goode respect in such a daungerous case  
Thou broughtes not her into this tossing mew

But madest my sprite lyve my care to renew  
My body in tempest her succour to embrace (81.5-8)

With this metaphor, the mind is described as a place of confinement or a cage (OED *mew* n.<sup>2</sup> 1b) which is agitated or disturbed by shifting feelings or circumstances (OED *toss* v. 4b). This metaphor fits perfectly in the Petrarchan tradition, where the lover is always agitated by the presence of the lady, not only in reality but in dreams too, thus making him feel a prisoner even in his own head.

Tottel, however, decided to omit this metaphor and to rearrange the whole poem. Again, one his motives might have been to make it easier for the new, untrained readership to understand the sonnet. Another reason could have been that the word *mew* was slowly dying out, but the fact that he did not substitute an updated term for the obsolete word (as he did in some other instances), suggests that he changed it to simplify the argument. Tottel might have seen that “tossing” could more naturally be said of waves or the sea in general (OED *toss* v. 1a), which provided him with a convenient substitute for *mew*.

T: By good respect in such a dangerous case  
Thou broughtest not her into these tossing seas.  
But madest my sprite to liue my care tencrease,  
My body in tempest her delight timbrace (81.5-8)

Nevertheless, changing the last word in line 6 (i.e. *mews* to *seas*) had its consequences; the rhyming scheme was no longer valid for a sonnet. Hence, he had to change the last word of the following line, “tencrease” instead of “to renew.” The rhyming scheme changed from a perfect pattern abba abba cddc ee in the manuscript, to abba acca deed ff in the printed version. It has been debated whether it was the editor of the miscellany who changed the word *mew*, and Parker adds to this that “it is certainly conceivable that if the word *mew* could worry Tottel, it might also have worried Wyatt, and that the alteration was made by him” (670). However this cannot be proved, because the change was not incorporated in any of the manuscripts, only in the miscellany (Foxwell 38; Harrier 180; Hughey 1: 156; Rollins 162).

Tottel’s substitution of *seas* also had the advantage of facilitating comprehension, as it is semantically cohesive with the image of the tempest introduced

in line 8: “My body in tempest her succour to embrace.” After dreaming about his lady, it is not only the lover’s mind that is agitated because of these images, but his body too. This agitation of mind and body could have sexual connotations if one links it with the following line: “The body dead, the sprite had his desire” (*E* 81.9). His body is asleep (i.e. “dede”), but his mind or “spryt” is dreaming about her. In order to satiate this desire but also to calm the tempest, he seeks his lady’s body, which would also act as a shelter (OED *succour* n. 4) from the tempest that is his mind. However, this image of the shelter for the storm has been erased by the editor of the miscellany, who renders line 8 as “My body in tempest her delight timbrace” (*T* 81.8). He might have considered the metaphor difficult to understand, and thus he substituted *delight* for *succour*. The resulting line merely emphasizes the pleasure derived from the lady in the lover’s dream.

Another example of simplification of literary devices can be discerned in sonnet 47. In this poem, as Tottel’s title explains, “The louer describeth his being striken with sight of his loue.” The poet focuses once again on the lady’s eyes and claims that their brightness is such that they hurt him:

*E:* The lyvely sperkes that issue from those Iyes  
 Against the which ne vailleth no defence  
 Have prest myn hert (47.1-3)

Further on in the sonnet, the poet emphasizes his complaint comparing the way her eyes affect him with a bolt of lightning:

*E:* Dased ame I muche like vnto the gyse  
 Of one I stricken with dynt of light<e>ning  
 Blynded with the stroke / erryng here & there  
 So call I for helpe I not when ne where  
 The pain of my fal<s> patiently bering. (47.8-12)

The manuscript and the printed version do not differ significantly up to this point, but they do in the final couplet. The last two lines in the composition develop the image of the storm introducing what follows the lightning, that is, thunder. In the manuscript version, Wyatt integrates this image in the presentation of the lover’s

response: her voice when she refuses the poet's love (OED *nay* n. 3a) is equated with a blast of thunder:

*E:* For after the blase / as is no wounder  
Of dedly nay here I the ferefull thounder (47.13-14)

Thunder can be fearful, and the lady's refusal in Petrarchan poetry is usually the cause of the lover's extreme pain, hence "dedly nay."

The editor of the miscellany, however, substituted the word *noyse* for *nay*:

*T:* For streight after the blase (as is no wonder)  
Of deadly noyse heare I the fearfull thounder (47.13-14)

By changing the original word to *noyse*, Tottel omitted the last metaphor, which emphasized the impact of the lady's refusal associating it with thunder. This, once again, simplified the argument of the sonnet.

Sonnet 28 ("My galley charged with forgetfulness") is a translation from Petrarch's poem CLXXXIX or "Passa la nave mia colma d'oblio," and it provides the last example of changes that simplify the images used in the texts. In this case, however, the modification is more likely to be the result of misinterpretation, owing to the lack of knowledge of the original Italian sonnet, rather than a change to facilitate comprehension. As Tottel aptly summarises the argument in his title, "The louer compareth his state to a shippe in perilous storme tossed on the sea." At the beginning of the second quatrain, the poet emphasizes the extremity of his suffering suggesting that death would be preferable:

*E:* And every owre a thought in redines  
As tho that deth were light in suche a case (28.5-6)

In the manuscript version, it is clear that Wyatt's intention was to use *oar*, as it is consistent with the image of the boat and it is the word that appears in Petrarch's sonnet (i.e. "remo"). For someone who was not acquainted with the original poem, the spelling of the word in the Egerton text could have been misleading because, according to the OED, in the sixteenth century the term *oar* could be spelled as *ower* or *owre* (OED *oar* n.), which was very similar to some of the spellings attested for *hour* also in that period:

*howre/hower* or *oware* (OED *hour* n.); in fact, since the <h> in *hour* was mute, it was often dropped in writing. When the sonnet was copied into the Arundel Harington Ms and, eventually into Tottel's collection, the form "owre" was reinterpreted as "hour":

T: And every houre, a thought in readinesse  
As though that death were light in such a case (28.5-6)

Moreover, as Hunter observes, the printing press "encouraged standardisation in spelling" (31), and *owre* was not the most usual spelling for *oar*. Hunter discusses the changes in spelling that took place with the conversion of texts from manuscript to print, such as the categorization of 'v' as a consonant and 'u' as a vowel (30–31). Originally, the letters 'v' and 'u' represented the same sound (/v/) and were used separately in initial and medial position, respectively. It was the Italian printers who first introduced the distinction of the two graphical symbols in the early sixteenth century, which can be found "in English books from the late 1570s onwards, becoming increasingly widespread so that by about 1630 it was universal" (Hunter 30–31). If this process was already beginning when Tottel edited his miscellany, the transformations that *owre* would have suffered when translated from manuscript to print would have made it change from *owre* to *ouure/ouere*, taking into account that the letter 'w' was made of two 'v'. This change would have drawn even closer the similarities between the spellings of *oar* and *hour* in the mid-sixteenth century.

There is no proof as to who chose to write *oar* as *owre* instead of *oare*—which was also used in the sixteenth century—, whether it was Wyatt himself or the person who copied the poem in the Egerton MS; however, what is important is that the scribes who copied the sonnet from the Egerton MS into the Arundel Harington MS misinterpreted the word and they chose *hour* because they were not acquainted with Petrarch's original composition. The line made perfect sense to Tottel, who was not familiar with the Italian original either, and thus this change made its way from the Arundel Harington MS to Tottel's *Miscellany*.



#### 4. Conclusions

In sum, this analysis has served to prove that Tottel revised Thomas Wyatt's sonnets for literary and marketing purposes. He helped to smooth out those sonnets which did not comply with the norm, he updated old-fashioned words and phrases, and he simplified some of the literary devices used in the sonnets so they could be more easily understood not only by courtly coteries, but by the general reader. There are instances in this essay that indicate that some of the changes in the language and some of the simplifications were also carried out in the process of manuscript transmission, although they were clearly increased in the printed version of the sonnets: when faced with complex argumentation or use of imagery, Tottel's version typically chooses the more direct rendering at the expense of conceptual difficulty. Moreover, there are changes which are exclusive to Tottel's edition and are aimed at facilitating comprehension, such as the titles or summaries that preceded the poems.

## Works Cited

- Baldi, Sergio (1971). *Sir Thomas Wyatt*. Trans. F. T. Prince. London: Published for the British Council by Longman Group. Print.
- Barber, Charles (2001). *Early Modern English*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. Print.
- Beal, Peter, et al., eds. (2013). "The British Library: The Egerton MSS." *Catalogue of English Literary Manuscripts 1450-1700*. <[http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/repositories/british-library-egerton.html#british-library-egerton\\_id665019](http://www.celm-ms.org.uk/repositories/british-library-egerton.html#british-library-egerton_id665019)>
- Daalder, Joost (1969). "Rhetoric and Revision in Wyatt's Poems." *Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association: A Journal of Literary Criticism, Philology and Linguistics* 31: 63–75. Web. 5 Mar. 2016.
- Foxwell, Agnes K. (1913). *The Poems of Sir Thomas Wyatt, from the Mss. and Early Editions*. Vol. 2. London: University of London Press. Web. 25 Apr. 2016.
- Galván, J.F. (1986). "Los Ritmos de los Sonetos de Sir Thomas Wyatt." *Estudios Literarios Ingleses: Renacimiento y Barroco*. Ed. Susana Onega. Madrid: Cátedra. 225–40. Print.
- Harrier, Richard C. (1975). *The Canon of Sir Thomas Wyatt's Poetry*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Print.
- Hattaway, Michael, ed. (2000). *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. Print.
- Hughey, Ruth, ed. (1960). *The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press. 2 Vols. Web. 3 May 2016.
- Hunter, Michael. (2007). *Editing Early Modern Texts: An Introduction to Principles and Practice*. Basingstoke [etc.]: Palgrave Macmillan. Print.
- Kamholtz, Jonathan Z. (1978). "Thomas Wyatt's Poetry: The Politics of Love." *Criticism: A Quarterly for Literature and the Arts* 20: 349–65. MLA International Bibliography. Web. 5 Mar. 2016.

- Love, Harold. (1998). *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press. Print.
- Marotti, Arthur F. (1991). "Patronage, Poetry, and Print." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21: 1–26. Web. 4 Mar. 2016.
- . (1993). "Malleable and Fixed Texts: Manuscript and Printed Miscellanies and the Transmission of Lyric Poetry in the English Renaissance." *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1985–1991*. Ed. W. Speed Hill. Binghamton, NY: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies in conjunction with Renaissance English Text Society. 159–74. Print.
- . (1995). *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. Print.
- Marquis, Paul A. (2000). "Politics and Print: The Curious Revisions to Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes*." *Studies in Philology* 97.2: 145–64. Web. 4 Mar. 2016.
- . (2013). "Printing History and Editorial Design in the Elizabethan Version of Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes*." *Tottel's Songes and Sonettes in Context*. Ed. Stephen Hamrick. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013. 13–36. Print.
- Mason, H. A. (1976). "Editing Wyatt." *The Sewanee Review* 84.4: 675–83. Web. 10 Mar. 2016.
- May, Steven W. (2009). "Popularizing Courtly Poetry: Tottel's Miscellany and Its Progeny." *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485–1603*. Eds. Mike Pincombe, Cathy Shrank. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 418–35. Print.
- O'Callaghan, Michelle. (2000). "Publication: Print and Manuscript." *Hattaway* 81–94. Print.
- Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Oxford University Press, March 2016.  
<<http://www.oed.com>>
- Parker, William R. (1939). "The Sonnets in Tottel's Miscellany." *PMLA* 54.3: 669–77. Web. 4 Mar. 2016.

- Perry, Curtis. (2000). "Court and Coterie Culture." Hattaway 106–18. Print.
- Petrarca, Francesco. (1989). *Cancionero*. Ed. and Trans. Jacobo Cortines. Madrid: Cátedra. Print.
- Rollins, Hyder E. (1966). *Tottel's Miscellany (1557-1587)*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Print.
- Southall, Raymond. (1964). "The Devonshire Manuscript Collection of Early Tudor Poetry, 1532-41." *Review of English Studies*, NS 15: 142-50. Web. 14 May 2016.
- Spiller, Michael R. G. (1992). *The Development of The Sonnet: An Introduction*. London: Routledge. Print.
- Starkey, David (1982). "The Court: Castiglione's Ideal and Tudor Reality; Being a Discussion of Sir Thomas Wyatt's Satire Addressed to Sir Francis Bryan." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 45: 232–39. Web. 8 Mar. 2016.
- Tottel, Richard, ed. (1557). *Songes and Sonettes, Written by the Right Honorable Lorde Henry Haward Late Earle of Surrey, and Other*. London. Web. 3 Mar. 2016.
- Wang, Jiancheng, and Jilian Niu (2014). "Metrical Art of Thomas Wyatt's Sonnets." *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)* 2.8: 40–43. Web. 5 Mar. 2016.
- Warner, J. Christopher. (2013). *The Making and Marketing of Tottel's Miscellany: Song and Sonnets in the Summer of the Martyrs' Fires*. Farnham: Ashgate. Print.

## Appendix 1

The following list contains the first line of each sonnet with the number attached to them in the Egerton MS. The normalised spelling version of the lines has been taken from *The Canon of Sir Thomas Wyatt's Poetry* (Harrier, 1975). Because only the sonnets were chosen for this dissertation, and Harrier's book contains every poem by Wyatt, there could be discontinuity in the numbers.

- 10. Each man me telleth I change most my device
- 13. Farewell love and all thy laws for ever
- 14. My heart I gave thee not to do it pain
- 24. Some fowls there be that hath so perfect sight
- 26. I find no peace and all my war is done
- 28. My galley charged with forgetfulness
- 30. Ever mine hap is slack and slow in coming
- 31. Love and fortune and my mind remember
- 32. How oft have I my dear and cruel foe
- 47. The lively sparks that issue from those eyes
- 81. Unstable dream according to the place
- 98. You that in love find luck and abundance

## Appendix 2

This appendix has been designed to display the entirety of the poems, both the versions from the Egerton MS (via *The Canon of Sir Thomas Wyatt's Poetry*, 1975) and from Tottel's *Miscellany* (Q2, 1557). Again, each sonnet is identified by the number they carry in the Egerton MS, and since not all the sonnets were chosen for this dissertation, there will be discontinuity within the numbers. In addition to the sonnets, the titles or summaries written by Tottel will also be provided.

### The Egerton MS

### Tottel's *Miscellany*

10.

Of change in mynde.

Eche man me telleth I chaunge moost my devise  
and on my faith me thinck it goode reason  
to chaunge propose like after the season  
ffor in every cas to kepe still oon gyse  
ys mytt for theim that would be taken wyse  
and I ame not of suche maner condition  
but treted after a dyvers fasshion  
and thereupon my dyvernes doeth rise  
but you that blame this dyvernes moost  
chaunge you no more but still after oon rate  
trete ye me well & kepe ye in thesame state  
And while with me doeth dwell this weried goost  
my word nor I shall not be variable  
but alwaies oon your owne boeth ferme & stable.

Eche man me telth, I change most my deuse:  
and on my faith, me thinke it good reason  
to change purpose, like after the season.  
For in eche case to kepe still one guise  
is mete for them, that would be taken wise,  
and I am not of such maner condicion:  
but treated after a diuers fashion:  
and thereupon my diuersenesse doth ryse:  
but you, this diuersnesse that blamen most  
change you no more, but still after one rate  
treat you me well: and kepe you in that state,  
and while with me doth dwell this weried gost,  
my word nor I shall not be variable.  
But alwayes one, your owne both firme and stable.

13.

A renouncing of loue.

ffarewell Love and all thy lawes for ever  
thy bayted hookes shall tangill me no more  
Senec and Plato call me from thy lore  
to perfaict welth my wit for to endever  
In blynde error when I did perseuer

Farewell, Loue, and all thy lawes for euer,  
thy bayted hookes shall tangle me no more.  
Senec, and Plato call me from thy lore:  
To parfit wealth my wit for to endeuer,  
in blinde error when I did parseuer:

thy sharpe repulce that pricketh ay so sore  
hath taught me to sett in tryfels no store  
and scape fourth syns libertie is lever  
Therefore farewell goo trouble yonger hertes  
and in me clayme no more authoritie  
with idill yeuth goo vse thy perpertie  
And theron spend thy many britill dertes  
for hetherto though I have lost all my tyme  
me lusteth no lenger rotten boughes to clyme.

14.

My hert I gave the not to do it payn  
but to preserue it was to the taken  
I serued the not to be forsaken  
but that I should be rewarded again  
I was content thy serunt to remain  
but not to be payed vnder this fasshion  
nowe syns in the is none othre reason  
displease the not if that I do refrain  
Vnsaciat of my woo and thy desire  
assured be craft to excuse thy fault  
but syns it please the to fain a default  
farewell I say perting from the fyre  
for he that beleueth bering in hand  
[                    ] weth in the sand.

24.

Som fowles there be that have so perfaict sight  
agayn the Sonne their Iyes for to defend  
and som bicause the light doeth them offend  
do never pere but in the darke or nyght

thy sharp repulse, that pricketh aye so sore:  
Taught me in trifles that I set no store:  
But scape forth thence: since libertie is leuer.  
Therefore, farewell: go trouble yonger hartes:  
And in me claime no more auctoritie.  
With ydle youth go use thy propertie.  
And theron spend thy many brittle dertes.  
For, hitherto though I haue lost my time:  
Me list no lenger rotten boughes to clime.

The louer forsaketh his vnkinde loue.

My hart I gaue thee, not to do it pain:  
but to preserue, lo it to thee was taken.  
I serued thee not that I should be forsaken:  
but, that I should receiue reward again,  
I was content thy seruant to remain,  
and not to be repayed on this fashion.  
Now, since in thee there is none other reason:  
dispiease thee not, if that I do refrain.  
Unsaciat of my wo, and thy desire  
assured by craft for to excuse thy fault.  
But, sins it pleaseth thee to fain default:  
farewell, I say, departing from the fire.  
For, he that doth beleue bearing in hand:  
ploweth in the water: and soweth in the sand.

How the louer perisheth in his delight, as the  
flie in the fire.

Some fowles there be that haue so perfite sight.  
Against the sunne their eyes for to defende:  
and some, because the light doth them offende.  
Neuer appere, but in the darke or night.

Other reioyse that se the fyer bright  
and wene to play in it as they do pretend  
and fynde the contrary of it that they intend  
Alas of that sort I may be by right  
for to withstond her loke I ame not able  
and yet can I not hide me in no darke place  
remembraunce so foloweth me of that face  
so that with tery yen swolne & vnstable  
my destyne to behold her doeth me lede  
yet do I knowe I run into the glede.

26.

I fynde no peace and all my warr is done  
I fere & hope I burn & freise like yse  
I fley above the wynde yet can I not arrise  
and nought I have & all the worold I seson  
That loseth nor locketh holdeth me in prison  
and holdeth me not yet can I scape no wise  
nor letteth me lyve nor dye at my devise  
and yet of deth it gyveth me occasion  
Withoute Iyen I se & withoute tong I plain  
Idesire to perisshe and yet I aske helthe  
I love an othre and thus I hate my self  
I fede me in sorrowe & laught in all my pain  
likewise displeaseth me boeth lyff & deth  
and my delite is cause of this stryff.

28.

My galy charged with forgetfulnes  
thorrough sharpe sees in wynter nyghtes doeth

Other reioyce, to se the fire so bright,  
and wene to play in it, as they pretende:  
but finde contrary of it, that they entende.  
Alas, of that sort may I be by right.  
For to withstand her loke I am not able:  
yet can I not hide me in no darke place:  
so foloweth me remembrance of that face:  
that with my teary eyen, swolne, and unstable,  
my desteny to beholde her doth me leade:  
and yet I know I runne into the gleade.

Description of the contrarious passions in a  
louer.

I finde no peace, and all my warre is done:  
I feare and hope: I burne, and frese like yse:  
I flye aloft, yet can I not arise:  
and nought I haue, and all the worlde I season  
that lockes nor loseth, holdeth me in prison.  
And holdes me not, yet can I scape no wise:  
nor lettes me liue, nor dye, at my deuise,  
and yet of death it geueth me occasion.  
Without eye I se, without tong I playne:  
I wish to perish, yet I aske for helth:  
I loue another, and I hate my selfe.  
I fede me in sorow, and laugh in all my paine,  
Lo, thus displeaseth me both death and life,  
and my delight is causer of this strife.

The louer compareth his state to a shippe in  
perilous storme tossed on the sea.

My galley charged with forgetfulnesse,  
through sharp seas, in winter nightes doth passe,



twene Rock and Rock & eke myn enemy Alas  
 that is my lorde sterith with cruelnes  
 And every owre a thought in redines  
 as tho that deth were light in suche a case  
 an endles wynd doeth tere the sayll a pase  
 of forced sightes and trusty ferefulnes  
 A rayn of teris a clowde of derk disdain  
 hath done the wered cordes great hinderaunce  
 wret<c>hed wth errorr & eke with ignorance  
 The starres be hid that led me to this pain  
 drowned is reason that should me comfort  
 and I remain dispering of the port.

[pas twene rocke, and rocke: and eke my fo (alas)  
 that is my lord, stereth with cruelnesse:  
 and every houre, a thought in readinesse,  
 as though that death were light in such a case.  
 An endelesse winde doth teare the sayle apace  
 of forced sighes and trusty fearefulnesse,  
 a rayne of teares, a clowde of darke disdaine  
 haue done the weried cordes great hinderance.  
 Wrethed with errorr and with ignorance,  
 the starres be hidde, that leade me to this paine,  
 drownde is reason that should be my comfort:  
 and I reamaine, despairing of the port.

30.

How vnpossible it is to finde quiet in loue.

Ever myn happ is slack & slo in comyng  
 desir encreasing myn hope vncertain  
 that leve it or wayt it doeth me like pain  
 and Tigre like swift it is in perting  
 Alas the snow shalbe black & scalding  
 the See waterles fische in the moyntain  
 the Tamys shall retorn back into his fontain  
 and where he rose the sonne shall take lodging  
 Ere that I in this fynde peace or quyetenes  
 o<r>n that love or my lady rightwisely  
 leve to conspire again me wrongfully  
 And if that I have after suche bitternes  
 any thing swete my mouth is owte of tast  
 that all my trust & travaill is but wast.

Ever my hap is slacke and slow in comyng  
 Desire encreasing ay my hope uncertaine:  
 with doubtfull loue that but increaseth paine  
 for Tigre like so swift it is in parting.  
 Alas the snow blacke shall it bee and scalding,  
 the sea waterlesse and fische upon the mountaine:  
 The Temmes shall backe retourne into his  
 [fountaine  
 And where he rose the sunne shall take his  
 [lodging.  
 Ere I in this finde peace or quietnesse,  
 Or that loue or my ladie rightwisely  
 Leave to conspire against me wrongfully.  
 And if I haue after such bitternesse,  
 One drop of swete, my mouth is out of taste:  
 that al my trust and traueil is but waste.

31.

Love and fortune and my mynde remembre  
of that that is now with that that hath ben  
do torment me so that I very often  
envy them beyonde all mesure  
Love sleith myn hert fortune is depriver  
of all my comfort the folisse mynde then  
burneth & plaineth as one that sildam  
lyveth & rest still in displeasure  
My plaisaunt dayes they flete away & passe  
but daily yet the ill doeth chaunge into the wours  
and more then the half is run of my cours  
Alas not of steill but of brickell glasse  
I see that from myn hand falleth my trust  
and all my thoughtes are dassed into dust.

32.

How oft have I my dere & cruell foo  
with those your Iyes for to get peace & truye  
profferd you myn hert but you do not vse  
emong so high thinges to cast your mynde so  
[lowe  
Yf any othre loke for it as ye trowe  
there vayn weke hope doeth greatly them abuse  
and thus I disdain that that ye refuse  
it was ones mine it can no more be so  
Yf I then it chase nor it in you can fynde  
in this exile no manner of comfort  
nor lyve allone nor where he is called resort  
He may wander from his naturall kynd  
so shall it be great hurt vnto vs twayn  
and your the losse and myn the dedly pain.

Of loue, fortune, and the louers mynde.

Loue, fortune, & my mind which do remember  
eke that is now, & that, that once hath bene:  
torment my hart so sore that very often  
I hate and enuy them beyonde al measure.  
Loue sleeth my hart while Fortune his depriuer  
of all my comfort: the folisse minde than:  
burneth and plainth, as one that very seldain  
liueth in rest. So still in displeasure  
my pleasant dayes they flete away and passe:  
and dayly doth mine yll change to the worse:  
whyle more then halfe is runne now of my course.  
Alas not of steele, bot of brittle glasse,  
I se that from my hand falleth my trust:  
and all my thoughtes are dashed into dust.

The louer prayeth his offred hart to be  
receaued.

How oft haue I, my deare and cruell fo:  
with my great paine to get some peace or truce,  
geuen you my hart: but you do not use,  
In so hie thinges, to cast your minde so low.  
If any other loke for it, as you trow,  
their vaine weake hope doth greatly them abuse.  
And that thus I disdaine that you refuse,  
it was once mine it can no more be so,  
if you it chase, that it in you can finde,  
in this exile, no maner of comfort:  
nor liue alone, nor where he is calde, resort,  
he may wander from his naturall kinde.  
So shall it be great hurt unto us twayne,  
and yours the losse, and mine the deadly payne.

47.

The lyvely sperkes that issue from those Iyes  
against the which ne vailleth no defence  
have prest myn hert and done it non offence  
with qwaking pleasure more then ons or twice  
Was never man could any thing devise  
the sonne bemes to torn wth so great vehemence  
to dase mans sight as by their bright presence  
dased ame I mucche like vnto the gyse  
Of one I stricken with dynt of light<e>ning  
blynded with the stroke / erryng here & there  
so call I for helpe I not when ne where  
The pain of my fal<s> patiently bering  
for after the blase / as is no wounder  
of dedly nay here I the ferefull thounder.

81.

Vnstable dreme according to the place  
be stedfast ons or els at leist be true  
by tasted swetenes / make me not to rew  
the sudden losse of thy fals fayned grace  
By goode respect in such a daungerous case  
thou broughtes not her into this tossing mew  
but madest my sprite lyve my care to renew  
my body in tempest her succour to embrace  
The body dede the spryt had his desire  
paynles was thone thothre in delight  
Why then Alas did it not kepe it right  
retorning to lepe into the fire  
And where it was at wysshe it could not remain

The louer describeth his being stricken with  
sight of his loue.

The liuely sparkes, that issue from those eyes,  
against the which there vailleth no defence,  
haue perst my hart and done it none offence,  
with quaking pleasure, more then once or twice.  
Was neuer man could any thing deuise,  
sunne beames to turne with so great vehemence  
to dase mans sight, as by their bright presence  
dased am I, much like unto the gise  
of one stricken with dint of lightening,  
blinde with the stroke, and crying here and there,  
so call I for helpe, I not when, nor where,  
the pain, of my fall paciently bearing.  
For streight after the blase (as is no wonder)  
of deadly noyse heare I the fearfull thunder.

The louer hauing dreamed enjoying of his  
loue, complaineth that the dreame is not either  
longer or truer.

Vnstable dreame according to the place,  
be stedfast ones, or els at least be true.  
By tasted swetenesse, make me not to rew  
the sodeyn losse of thy false fayned grace.  
By good respect in such a dangerous case  
thou broughtest not her into these tossing seas.  
But madest my sprite to liue my care tencrease,  
my body in tempest her delight timbrace,  
the body dead, the sprite had his desire.  
Painlesse was thone, the other in delight.  
Why then alas did it not kepe it right,  
but thus returne to leape into the fier:  
and where it was at wish, could not remaine:

such mockes of dremes they torne to dedly pain.

such mockes of dreames do turne to deadle paine.

98.

You that in love finde lucke and habundance  
and live in lust and Ioyful Iolitie  
arise for shame do away your sluggardie  
arise I say do may some obserunce  
Let me in bed lye dreming in mischaunce  
let me remembre the happs most vnhappy  
that me betide in may most comonly  
as oon whome love list litil to avaunce  
Sephame saide true that my natiuitie  
mischaunced was wt the ruler of the may  
he gest I prove of that the veritie  
In may my welth and eke my liff I say  
have stonde so oft in such perplexitie  
reioyse let me dreame of your felicitie.

The louer vnhappy biddeth happy louers  
reioise in Maie, while he waiileth that month to  
him most vnlucky.

Ye that in loue finde luck and swete abundance  
and liue in lust of ioyfull lolitie,  
arise for shame, do way your sluggardy:  
arise I say, do May some obseruance.  
Let me in bed lye, dreamyng of mischance.  
Let me remember my mishappes unhappy,  
that me betyde in May most commonly  
as one whom loue list little to aduance.  
Stephan saide true, that my natiuitie  
mischaunced was with the ruler of May.  
He gest (I proue) of that the veritie.  
In May my welth, and eke my wittes, I say,  
haue stand so oft in such perplexitie.  
Ioy: let me dreame of your felicitie.