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ABSTRACT

This thesis analyses the life and works of the courtier and writer Sir Arthur Gorges, reading Gorges’s poetic and prose texts as a sequence of attempts to come to terms with the pressures of the renaissance patronage system.

The first chapter is a survey of Gorges’s career. Further chapters analyse texts by genre. Chapter 2 studies Gorges’s manuscript letters, most of them written to his patron Sir Robert Cecil, in the light of renaissance epistolographic conventions. Chapter 3 gives an account of the textual history of Gorges’s manuscript poetry and the context of its composition at the Elizabethan and Jacobean courts. Chapter 4 analyses three poems which present the reader with the spectacle of Gorges mourning the death of a patron-figure: Daphnaida (Spenser’s elegy on the death of Gorges’s first wife), ‘A Pastoral Unfinished’ (Gorges’s response to Daphnaida), and The Olympian Catastrophe, (Gorges’s long elegy on the death of Prince Henry). Chapter 5 provides a textual history of Gorges’s manuscript treatises and analyses the ways in which Gorges revised his treatises in response to the changing nature of his patronage relationships. Chapter 6 looks at Gorges’s late translations, reading his version of Lucan’s Pharsalia as a patronage text undertaken initially for Prince Henry but fatally undermined by Henry’s death before its publication. The thesis ends with an account of Gorges’s translations of Bacon’s Essays (1612) into French and Bacon’s De sapientia veterum into English. I argue that Bacon conceived of these two works as closely related texts and encouraged their joint publication in a number of languages as a means of advancing his European reputation and extending his patronage contacts in preparation for the publication of the Novum organum.
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CONVENTIONS

An author-date form of citing texts has been used, keyed to the bibliography. In the text of the thesis I have used the following abbreviations:

APC  Acts of the Privy Council. References are to page numbers.
BL   British Library
Bodl. Bodleian Library
CSPD Calendar of State Papers Domestic. References are to page numbers.
CSPF Calendar of State Papers Foreign. References are to page numbers.
CSPV Calendar of State Papers Venetian. References are to page numbers.
DRO  Dorset County Record Office, Dorchester
Hatfield CP Cecil Papers, Hatfield House
HMC  Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports
PRO  Public Record Office
Katharine F. Panzer (London, 1976-91, 3 vols.). References are to item numbers.

VCH  *Victoria County History*

Gorges manuscripts currently in the collection of Cecil Papers at Hatfield House are cited by volume and item number. Volume and page numbers from the HMC calendar are given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CP</th>
<th>Calendar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.55</td>
<td>4.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.67</td>
<td>4.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.49</td>
<td>4.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.67</td>
<td>5.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.83</td>
<td>5.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.58</td>
<td>5.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.97</td>
<td>5.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.74</td>
<td>6.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>6.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.59</td>
<td>6.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.102</td>
<td>7.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.30</td>
<td>7.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.30</td>
<td>7.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.54</td>
<td>7.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.86</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.55</td>
<td>8.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.101</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>9.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.73</td>
<td>9.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.45</td>
<td>11.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.61</td>
<td>10.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.160</td>
<td>11.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.38</td>
<td>11.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.65</td>
<td>17.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.37</td>
<td>11.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.38</td>
<td>11.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.20</td>
<td>12.581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Chapters 3 and 5, for ease of reading, I have used italicised words to identify the sources of texts of material by Gorges. In my transcriptions of manuscript texts I have expanded abbreviations, italicising added letters. 'Y' used for 'th' and the words in which it occurs have, however, been left unaltered. Superscript and tied letters have not been registered.
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PREFACE

This thesis analyses the career of Sir Arthur Gorges (1557-1625), a courtier, poet and translator active at the courts of Elizabeth I, James I and Prince Henry. Gorges wrote lyric poetry in Elizabeth’s reign¹ and made translations of Lucan and Bacon in James’s. He wrote a substantial narrative elegy, The Olympian Catastrophe, on the death of James’s son Prince Henry, and was himself the subject of Spenser’s Daphnaïda (1591), an elegy for Gorges’s first wife, Douglas Howard. In collaboration with Sir Walter Ralegh, a cousin and lifelong friend, he wrote a number of naval treatises. All of Gorges’s texts can be linked to his attempts to win favour from patrons. Accordingly, the relationship between written texts and the renaissance patronage system is an important secondary topic in the thesis.

In the first chapter, I offer an overview of Gorges’s career as a client. To stress the importance of the monarch to Gorges’s patronage relationships, I have divided this chapter into sections concentrating respectively on the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods of Gorges’s career. Cutting across this fundamental division by monarch is a sequence of other patrons with whom Gorges, a ‘serial’ client, forged close connections. Later chapters look at Gorges’s works genre by genre: letters (Chapter 2); poetry (Chapter 3); treatises (Chapter 5); printed translations (Chapter 6). The exception is Chapter 4, in which I look at three texts presenting the reader with the spectacle of Gorges mourning. Central to this chapter is Spenser’s depiction of Gorges as the bereaved shepherd Alcyon in Daphnaïda.

¹ Gorges’s poetry has recently begun to appear in anthologies (e.g. Jones 1992; Norbrook and Woudhuysen 1992).
It seems to have been a reading of *Daphnaida* that inspired Gorges’s biographer and editor Helen Sandison to start working on Gorges. Sandison began her academic career with the publication of a study of *The Chanson D’Aventure in Middle English* (1913). Sandison’s taxonomy of *chanson d’aventures*—short narrative poems generally embedding a third party lyrical ‘complaint’—stops at 1550. Her next major piece of published research, a detailed biographical study of ‘Arthur Gorges, Spenser’s Alcyon and Ralegh’s friend’ (1928), represents a striking shift in methodology from ‘literary’ genre-study to empirical historical research. At first sight it seems unrelated to Sandison’s earlier work on the *chanson d’aventure*. Gorges’s chief claim to fame, though, is as ‘Spenser’s Alcyon’, the speaker of the complaint in *Daphnaida*, a post-1550 *chanson d’aventure*. It seems that Sandison’s decision to write about Gorges was prompted by her encounter, within the *chanson d’aventure* genre, with Spenser’s Alcyon.

Sandison used the figure of Alcyon as a means of switching the subject-matter of her scholarly activities from genre to history. In this thesis, heavily indebted to Sandison’s work (1928; 1938; 1940; 1946; 1953; 1962), I have attempted, by analysing some of the different ways in which Gorges’s texts dealt with the tensions of the patronage system, to reverse Sandison’s route—to read genre back into history and thus blur the lines of division between the ‘generic’ figure of ‘Alcyon’ and the ‘historical’ figure of ‘Arthur Gorges’.
1

CAREER¹

Gorges was born in about 1557 (Sandison 1953, xiii) into an old landed family which could trace its roots back past the Norman conquest to the French village of Gorges, near Périers (Gorges 1944; Pine 1952, 1022-6; Preston 1953, 16-22). The senior line of the family was associated with land in Wraxall, Somerset. Gorges’s great-grandfather, Sir Edmund of Wraxall, married Lady Anne Howard, eldest daughter of the first Duke of Norfolk, establishing an important link with the Howards (cf. Chapter 4.1.1). Gorges’s father, Sir William, was the second son of Sir Edmund’s heir, Sir Edward of Wraxall, killed at Flodden. His mother, Winifred Budockside, was related to many important West Country naval families: Raleghs, Gilberts, Champernownes, Carews.² Gorges probably grew up in Devon, on the Butshead estate his mother inherited from her father, not far from his cousin Walter Ralegh (Sandison 1928, 655-6).

Underpinning the ideology in which Gorges grew up were two key concepts: the feudal idea of military service as the seal of ‘gentle’ status (James 1986, 308-415) and the Tudor requirement that high social status coexist with and be dependent upon loyalty to the crown (Heal and Holmes 1994, 195-8). The idea of oneself as the monarch’s servant and the idea of oneself as an honourable man of high status and military experience were notionally interdependent. Gorges’s writings make it clear that throughout his life, most

¹ The standard life is Sandison 1928; for additional data see Sandison 1953, xiii-xxvii; Eccles 1982; May 1991, 109. Brief lives include DNB; HP; Gorges 1944, 57-78; Davies 1914, 57-81.
² Her mother, Frances Champernowne, was the sister of the mother of Ralegh and Sir Humphrey Gilbert.
of it not spent in military service, he (wrongly) thought of himself primarily as a military servant of the crown. Insecurities about how to identify ‘gentry’, high social mobility and increasingly frenetic competition for patronage, though, meant that Gorges had to struggle hard throughout his life to assert and confirm, probably in his own eyes as well as in others’, this deluded sense of self and communicate it persuasively to patrons.

Setting the parameters for Gorges’s own ambitions, his paternal male relatives carved out their careers in three key arenas where royal service was required: the court, the landed estate, and the armed forces. Elder sons settled down on their estates; younger sons went off to war and to court and aimed to make advantageous marriages. Gorges’s father, Sir William had a successful naval career and married an heiress. A Gentleman Pensioner at court, he saw naval service on numerous occasions. In the 1560s he fought against the Turks and was praised by the Emperor Maximilian III. He was knighted in Ireland in 1580. In his last years (he died in 1585), he was Gentleman Porter of the Tower of London. Sir William’s oldest brother, Edmund, who inherited Wraxall, based his career around his estate and county. Much more influential on Arthur’s career was Sir Thomas, a second brother of Sir William. Sir Thomas was an important court figure. One of the few Grooms of the Privy Chamber in Elizabeth’s reign, he received many favours from the Queen and was used as a messenger on occasions when it was particularly important that the Queen’s will be enforced. He married Helena, Marchioness of

---

3 In the absence of precise criteria for gentle status Heal and Holmes conclude that ‘the gentry were that body of men and women whose gentility was acknowledged by others’ (1994, 19).
4 Lives of all these people are in Gorges 1944. See also: for Sir William, HP, Tighe 1983; for Sir Thomas, HP, Fletcher 1932, Bradford 1936; for Nicholas, HP; for Sir Ferdinando, DNB, HP, Baxter 1890, Preston 1953, Bettey 1978, 1982.
5 His knighthood came after he had gone to oversee the removal of Mary, Queen of Scots to Fotheringay from Chartley, where his clothing, ‘serge verte passémentée’ (Chantelauze 1876, 467), excited comment. On such errands Thomas functioned as metonym for the royal presence: his status as a Privy Chamber
Northampton (‘the Lady Marquis’ (Sjögren 1978)), first Lady of the Queen’s Bedchamber and widow of William Parr, the first Marquis of Northampton. Helena’s title meant that she was the highest-ranking woman in England after the Queen. For many years Sir Thomas and the Lady Marquis exchanged New Years’ gifts with Elizabeth, the Lady Marquis coming at the head of the list of courtiers honoured with a gift (Bradford 1936, passim). Longford Castle in Wiltshire, built by Sir Thomas, was one of the grandest houses in the country. The captain of Hurst Castle, Sir Thomas was interested in naval matters, though his primary area of activity was always the court. Sir William’s other brother Nicholas was a naval captain, on active service throughout the 1570s and 80s—given glowing references by both Burghley and Leicester—and was an MP in 1585. He collaborated with his brother Thomas in running the subpoena-issuing office. Gorges’s elder brother, Tristram, was based on his estate in Devon. He had maritime interests and was named as executor in Thomas Cavendish’s will. The other brother, Sir Edward, was a soldier and courtier with strong French connections. In 1595, delivering messages for the Queen in France, he was briefly imprisoned in Soissons castle. Another Edward, the elder of Arthur’s two male Wraxall cousins, sons of Edmund, stayed in Somerset and became High Sheriff. His younger brother Sir Ferdinando became a soldier and colonist—veteran

servant made the message personal and urgent (Starkey 1977; for the particularly high status of male Privy Chamber servants in Elizabeth’s reign see Wright 1987). It is striking that his wife the Lady Marquis often stood proxy for the Queen, for example as godmother at prestigious christenings (Fletcher 1932, 27).

According to ‘old Mrs. Bampton of Odstock’, interviewed in the seventeenth century, it was Thomas’s dress sense (cf. previous note) that won Helena. The two got caught up dancing, then, the next day, Thomas ‘appeared in the royal presence with his right leg splendidly decked out and adorned; and on the Queen demanding why he made such a difference between his legs, he informed her Majesty that his right leg had been honoured in such a manner as he never could hope his left would; that in fact, during the faux pas of last night, it had got betwen those of the beautiful Countess of Northampton. The Virgin Queen laughed aloud, and bade him not despair, as perhaps he might succeed in getting both his legs in the same position’ (Hoare 1830, 4. Hundred of Cawden, 28). For the Lady Marquis’s Swedish background see Bradford 1936; Sjögren 1978.
of many campaigns, captain of Plymouth fort, and in later years Lord Proprietor (in England) of the province of Maine. A client of the Earl of Essex in the 1590s, Sir Ferdinando played a prominent role in the Essex rebellion, botching an attempt to assassinate Ralegh.

These careers are plotted onto the same basic co-ordinates as Gorges’s. Yet one element sets Gorges’s apart: writing. Gorges’s relatives wrote letters (and Sir Ferdinando wrote prose treatises (see Baxter 1890)), but none of them deployed as many different genres in the course of their search for patronage as Gorges did. Gorges’s texts aim to influence patrons and, in doing so, ponder issues of honour, service, desert and status. Gorges experiments with ways of carving out positions of relative power for himself within the ineluctably submissive discourse of clientage. Underlying all his efforts, though, is the spectre of failure. In the context of early modern court life, writing often signifies failure. Those in power and in favour communicate with each other orally—writing is the project of the marginal figure trying to get in. Gorges’s writing has as its ultimate subject-matter his failure to advance adequately in his courtly/military career.

1. Gorges’s Elizabethan Career

No details are known of Gorges’s youth. He was registered at Oxford in 1574 (Sandison 1928, 646). As was common at the time, he does not seem to have completed a degree. His college is not recorded and nothing is known of his university career.

---

7 Thus, for Martin Elsky, Bacon’s periods of authorship are manifestations ‘of his distance from the center of political life’ (1989, 189).
8 In 1612 he counted himself ‘Academiae Oxoniensis amicum et alumnun studiosissimum’ (Bodl. MS. Additional C.206, f.26r, quoted by Sandison 1928, 647).
Ralegh, at Oriel a little earlier, left Oxford for the Inns of Court at about the time of Gorges’s arrival (May 1989, 2). By 1576 (Sandison 1928, 646, n.5), Gorges was at court. In this year he was paid for delivering letters to the English ambassador in France, as he was again in 1578 (May 1991, 104; 321). It has been suggested that he was introduced to court by the Marchioness of Northampton (Sandison 1928, 647). This is quite plausible, as it was, apparently, in 1576 that the Lady Marquis married Thomas Gorges (Merton 1991, 146). Thomas Gorges himself though, had been a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber since 1571 and as a ‘high grade messenger’ (HP) would have been well placed to get his nephew the job of delivering messages abroad. Gorges’s father, Sir William, was a figure of some status, too. In 1579, as Vice-Admiral to Sir John Perrott, he seems to have taken Gorges with him on a naval mission to Ireland, perhaps the means by which Gorges’s enthusiasm for the sea-service (see Chapter 5) was sparked. Ralegh began his court career at about the same time as Gorges (Eccles 1982, 110). It is just possible, such was the status of his uncle and the Lady Marquis, that Gorges could have provided Ralegh with his *entrée* to court.

Early in his court career, Gorges gained a place in the band of Gentleman Pensioners. He seems to have been a Pensioner extraordinary for several years before officially joining the band in the second quarter of 1583 (Tighe 1983, 47)—records refer to him as a Gentleman Pensioner in 1579/80 (APC 11.422) and in 1582 (Tighe 1983, 16). Gorges probably owed his Pensioner’s place in the first instance to his father, a Pensioner from 1553 to 1583. Gorges became a Pensioner while his father was still a member of the

---

9 Sources differ as to the date of the marriage—cf. HP.
10 Though this is not certain: see Chapter 5.6.
band, though Sir William left later that same year, to be replaced by George Carew, Gorges’s cousin and friend. The timing of Gorges’s first appearance as a Gentleman Pensioner extraordinary in 1579/80 coincides roughly with his father’s knighthood and appointment as Gentleman Warder of the Tower of London (Tighe 1983, 174). Presumably Sir William’s newly acquired status helped the advancement of his son.

The Gentleman Pensioners had originated in Henry VIII’s reign as an élite royal bodyguard (Tighe 1983). Each Pensioner ‘waited’ half a year, in alternate quarters, in the Presence Chamber and was required to provide three horses and two servants. All Pensioners wore a uniform, and in procession carried an ornamental battleaxe. The Pensioners swore fealty only to the queen, a commitment which ‘appears to have been universally ignored throughout the reign’ (Tighe 1983, 126), and also swore they would abstain from oaths. The Gentleman Pensioners were in a prominent position at court. Steven W. May argues that because the social status of members of the band ‘was rather above that of most other chamber officers’ a Pensioner’s place was ‘one of the few offices in the presence chamber to facilitate courtiership’ (1991, 15-6). Because Elizabeth’s Privy Chamber was staffed largely with women (Wright 1987; Merton 1991), the band of Pensioners was effectively a male Privy Chamber in suspension (Tighe 1983).

Competition for places in the band became increasingly intense as Elizabeth’s reign wore on and it became plain that she did not plan to marry (Tighe 1983, 87). The Pensioners, however, not being constantly in the monarch’s presence,

---

11 Of the eight sons who succeeded their fathers in the band during the period studied by Tighe, Gorges was the only one not to be his father’s heir (1983, 53, n.26; cf. 74-6), evidence obliquely corroborative of Gorges’s assertion that his older brother Tristram was illegitimate (BL MS Additional, f.244r). Like Gorges, most Gentleman Pensioners were appointed between the ages of 21 and 30 (Tighe 1983, 49-50).
were somewhat at a disadvantage vis-à-vis the Privy Chamber staff when it came to seizing the right occasion to present a suit. The small size of the Elizabethan Privy Chamber must have increased the gentleman Pensioners' importance at court, but would not necessarily have facilitated their access to the queen (Tighe 1983, 253).

Membership of the band, then, was prestigious but frustrating. Tighe (313-6) concludes that membership did not on the whole do Pensioners much good.12

The problematic status of his position as Gentleman Pensioner (an office he held for more than twenty years) almost certainly caused much of the anxiety in Gorges’s career, simultaneously elevating and belittling his sense of himself as a courtier. As a Pensioner, he was close to the centre of power yet not close enough to enjoy substantial benefits, engaged in ersatz ‘military’ service that was purely ceremonial (having long outlived any real martial significance) and that could not in itself possibly lead to advancement. His ‘honour’ was recognised but also contained, forbidden to manifest itself in significant action. Throughout his career, Gorges’s letters protest at the tyranny his status as a Pensioner brought him (e.g. Hatfield CP 46.59). Forced to stay at court, he was unable, he argued, to go out into the world and do his monarch service.

In these early years, Gorges must have been very largely dependent on his more powerful relatives, particularly Thomas Gorges and the Lady Marquis, then in high favour.13 For a short period, he was closely involved, together with Ralegh, with a group of Francophile Catholic courtiers centred on the Earl of Oxford. Many of these were Howards, related to Gorges through his great-grandfather. John Bossy (1959) and D.C. Peck (1978) list as members of the clique in addition to Oxford, Lord Henry Howard, Charles Arundell, Francis Southwell, Lord Windsor, Lord Compton, Lord Charles

---

12 Cf. Gorges’s uncle, Thomas, whose status as a Privy Chamber servant entailed close access to the Queen.
13 In 1582, the kindred of ‘Gorge’ was one Elizabeth ‘seems to make much of’ (CSPF 1582, 320).
Howard, Lord Thomas Howard, George Gifford, Henry Noel, William Tresham, William Cornwallis, the Earl of Northumberland, the Earl of Southampton, Thomas Lord Paget, and Philip Howard. Court ladies were involved too, according to John Bossy, who singles out Edward Stafford’s mother and sister (1959, 13, n.13). In 1578, Mauvissière, the French ambassador, was seeking to gain court support for the proposed marriage between Elizabeth and the Duke of Anjou:

The negotiation resolved itself into the task of creating at Court and on the Council a body of favourable opinion strong enough to carry her over the hump of decision. Burghley, it might be supposed, would go with the majority; Leicester and his party, after a period of uncertainty, settled down into strenuous opposition; all depended then on gaining the support of their enemies. (Bossy 1959, 4-5)

The group of courtiers around Oxford were an ideal group for the French to approach, luring them on with promises of a relaxation of restrictions on Catholics. By 1580, however, things started to fall apart. England began to move politically closer to France, and France ceased to be interested in the rights of English Catholics. Oxford was persuaded by Leicester to swap sides and betray his co-religionists. Abandoned by the French, the Catholics turned instead to Spain. The affair led to a round of accusations and counter-accusations in which Ralegh and Gorges were named several times among Oxford’s associates, ‘a set of boon companions who had passsed whole days in conversation ... but had now fallen to recriminations’ (Peck 1978, 429). Oxford, it was accused, had tried at one point to have Gorges murdered on Richmond Green returning home at midnight to his lodgings (PRO SP12/151/46, f.118r; see Peck 1978, 431, n.15). In March 1579/80, Gorges was committed to the Marshalsea ‘for giving the lye and other

---

14 For more on this group see Peck 1985.
speaches passed between him and the Lord Windesour’, another associate of Oxford’s, ‘in the Chamber of Presence’ (APC 11.422).^{15}

Gorges was Charles Arundell’s cousin, and Peck suggests he may have introduced Ralegh to the group (1978, 431). There is no evidence that either Gorges or Ralegh were Catholic. Gorges, like his brother Edward and Edward Stafford (DNB) had recently been delivering messages to France (May 1991, 104; 321), and Ralegh also had links to France. Probably it was these links that led Gorges and Ralegh to associate with Oxford and the rest. Oxford’s group was glamorous and attractive, in any case, as Peck points out:

the Earl of Oxford himself, the Lord Treasurer’s son-in-law and a brilliant courtier who enjoyed the favour of the Queen, must have seemed an attractive star to hitch upon, and there was a time when all of the Catholic courtiers, with Burghley and Sussex behind them in the marriage cause and their French ally thought soon to be married to the Queen, seemed bound for brighter days. (1978, 431)

By the Summer of 1580 Ralegh had transferred his allegiance from Oxford to Leicester (May 1989, 4). The ‘Oxford group’ fell apart at about this time, many of its members, unlike Ralegh and Gorges, turning in disillusionment to Spain for support. Gorges probably left this patronage grouping at about the same time as Ralegh."^{16}

Gorges’s earliest poetry dates from the period of his association with the ‘Oxford group’ (see Chapter 3.1.1); it was written within a Frenchified courtly aesthetic which I argue (Chapter 3.1.2) originated in the Oxford group of courtiers as a means of expressing support for the French marriage.

^{15} Probably less significant in ‘political’ terms was the skirmish with a servant of fellow Pensioner Sir John Scudamour on 7 June 1582 recently uncovered by Steven W. May, an incident that may be reflected in one of Gorges’s poems (Gorges 1953, poem 8; May 1991, 109, citing PRO C115 (Box M 18, letter 7430), June 7, 1582).

^{16} It is perhaps significant that Gorges’s father had a row with Oxford a bit later at the Fleet prison (APC 13.74).
In 1584, momentously, Gorges married Douglas Howard, daughter of Henry Howard, second Viscount Bindon. Henry Howard’s father, Thomas, the first Viscount, was the second son of Thomas Howard, third Duke of Norfolk. Through his wife, the first Viscount had gained control of extensive Dorset lands centred on Bindon Abbey (Hutchins 1973, 1.364-70). Gorges probably met Douglas as a result of his connection with the Howards in the late 1570s and early 1580s, a move made in the wake of the collapse of the ‘Oxford group’. Such a lucrative match, comparable to his uncle Thomas’s marriage to the Lady Marquis, should have provided Gorges with the resources necessary for an expansive court or country career. Instead, it embroiled him in a frustrating series of interlocking legal wrangles.

It was in the summer of 1584 that Gorges first, according to his own testimony, decided that he would court Douglas (PRO STAC5 H20/3; see Sandison 1928, 648-9). At Whitsuntide that year, Hercules Mewtas, brother of Douglas’s mother, Frances Mewtas, had gone to Bindon Abbey with orders from the Privy Council to remove Douglas and Lady Howard from the custody of the Viscount (BL MS Lansdowne 43, ff.53r, 56r; summarised in Lloyd 1967, 145-6). Reports of Howard’s mistreatment of his family had reached the Queen. Mewtas was successful, after a rough ride from the Viscount, in rescuing Frances and Douglas. Gorges’s decision to woo Douglas, then, took effect at a time when she and her mother were on the run from the Viscount in London.

May argues on the basis of four poems in Gorges’s auto-anthology that Gorges ‘may have pursued another heiress before courting Lady Howard, who caught him ‘on the rebound’ from a woman who was herself a fortune hunter’ (1991, 111). I argue against this theory in Chapter 3.1.4. He had been imprisoned for this already in 1580 (Lloyd 1967, 41).

Gorges might have known Douglas before deciding to woo her: Spenser’s *Daphnæda* locates the first meeting between Alcyon (Gorges) and Daphne (Douglas) in the west country, ‘Not far from whence *Sabrinae streame doth flow*’ (1912, 529, line 101).
In September, when the Viscount was in prison, Gorges wooed and won Douglas, gaining the consent of her mother, ‘thinking it a matter almost Impossible to obtayne the good will and consent of bothe the parentes in suche theire discord and discontentment of myndes’ (PRO STAC5 H20/3). Gorges’s suit was greatly strengthened by the anxiety felt by both women about Bindon’s ‘hard and vnnaturall’ behaviour. According to Gorges, they ‘greatly feard that the...Vicounte sought rather to matche ... dowglas for his pryvate gayne of money then otherwyse to bestowe her in maryage to their lyking or contentacions’ (PRO STAC5 H20/3). The Viscount later accused Gorges of using unnatural means to woo away his daughter, naming Thomas Turberville and John Fleire as two of Gorges’s accomplices. When Turberville was interrogated later on behalf of the Viscount, he rebutted the latter’s accusation that he enticed Douglas away with ‘fayer speches’ and ‘offeres of gyfts’ ‘in hope of a gayne to be had att the hande of...Gorges’ (PRO STAC5 H20/3). Gorges and Douglas were betrothed, without the Viscount’s permission, on 13 October, and married the next day in Sir Thomas Gorges’s house in Whitefriars (Sandison 1953, xvii). Gorges’s uncle and aunt doubtless helped him in other ways in his dispute with Bindon. Bindon brought a Star Chamber case against Gorges two months after the wedding, claiming that Gorges had illicitly enticed Douglas away (PRO STAC5 H20/3). He emphasised that Douglas was his only child and that he had hoped to match her in accordance with her rank. No action against Gorges seems to have been taken: Sandison suggests that the Lady Marquis and Ralegh, now a significant court figure, stepped in to plead Gorges’s case, and that the Queen’s kinship with Douglas was useful too (1928, 649). Presumably Gorges lived at this period with Douglas in London.

---

20 The naming of a Turberville here, given George Turberville’s important influence on Gorges’s poetry, is
Commonly, marriages in the 'gentle' classes were arranged at least in part with a view to cementing and creating alliances between families, son and father-in-law playing the roles respectively of client and patron. In Gorges’s case, the role of masculine patron (father-in-law) was completely removed. Instead, in negotiating the marriage, Gorges dealt only with Douglas herself and her mother. Bindon emptied out honour, dignity and authority from his behaviour, carnivalising his noble status (possibly as a result of 'dementia' (Sandison 1928, 648, n.14)). When Herewkes Mewtas had come to Bindon in Whitsuntide 1584 to rescue Douglas and Lady Frances, Howard’s actions (breaking wind; flailing at Mewtas with his crutch; making ribald comments about the Queen and Henry VIII; asserting that his wife was a ‘pocky whore’ and Douglas his only jewel, his treasure) had been bizarre (BL MS Lansdowne 43, ff.53, 56). In Spring 1584/5, Bindon was in the Fleet prison, perhaps on a charge associated with his pursuit of Gorges (HMC Longleat 4.159). 21

There are no records of Gorges’s and Douglas’s career at court during their married life. Maybe no news was good news, as Sandison guesses (1928, xvii). Spenser paints a vivid picture in Daphnæida of Douglas (as 'Daphne') leading 'The Shepheardes daughters dauncing in a rownd', singing sweetly, 'with rosie garland crownd' (1912, 531, lines 309, intriguing. See Chapter 3.1.4.

21 A document dated 11 October 1587 (BL MS Lansdowne 54, 82), possibly drawn up by someone connected with Gorges, itemises the ways in which Bindon's behaviour violated early modern expectations of aristocratic behaviour: 'he vseth such Apparell as the poorest man in London can goe noe worse'; he appears in public 'where he might well spared'; at the lord mayor’s house he makes offensive talk; he made a nuisance of himself at the admiralty court in Southwark, refusing to sit down and rambling on about the Earl of Leicester; he refers to Elizabeth as 'Bess'; 'He showed lettres at my Lord: maiors by which it appeared that a certen gentlewoman had somwhat sharplie written vnto hym an Aunswere of refiisall to marie wth him because he had a wief lyvinge.' 'In his well doinge w/z/ch is seldome he is greatlie comended ...,' the document concludes, 'It were verie good that he should remaine at his house in the country ... His lordship is most tymes so farre out of order that it is nowe come to passe that no man regardeth or heedeth any of his wordes...' A separate manuscript drawn up at the same time on behalf of Julius Caesar (BL MS
312). Raymond Gorges hypothesises that Gorges and Douglas were a ‘debonair and gay’ couple (1944, 58). If ‘Daphne’ was the life and soul of the court, as Spenser’s Alcyon (a figure for Gorges (see Chapter 4.1)) says,\(^2\) the days of her glory cannot have lasted long, as her mother testified that at the time of her death in 1590 Douglas had for several years been bedridden as a result of a wasting disease (DRO D10/L8, quoted in Chapter 4.1.1).

Not long after his wedding, Gorges entered parliament as MP for Yarmouth, Isle of Wight, the client of Sir George Carey, Captain of the Isle of Wight (HP). Ralegh, like Gorges, served as an MP for the first time this year. Gorges made no impression on the business of the House (HP 1981, 206), a pattern he was to follow four years later as MP for Camelford, indebted for his seat to Ralegh, Lord Lieutenant of Cornwall and Warden of the Stannaries (HP).

At around this time Gorges took part in a courtly entertainment in honour of the Earl of Leicester. Writing in 1593, Thomas Churchyard included among a list of his works

> A book of a sumptuous shew in Shrouetide, by sir Walter Rawley, sir Robert Carey, M.Chidley, and M. Arthur Gorge, in which book was the whole servise of my L. of Lester mencioned, that he and his traine did in Flaunders, and the gentlemen Pensioners proued to be a great peece of honor to the court: all which book was in as good verse as euer I made: an honorable Knight dwelling in the black Friers, can witnes the same, because I read it vnto him. (Churchyard 1593, **lr**)

It is not clear whether Churchyard is claiming here that he wrote the ‘shew’ itself or just an account of it. Gorges might then have had a hand in the show’s composition.

Presumably staged in Shrovetide 1587, after Leicester’s return from the Netherlands, as Chambers (1923, 3.267-8) and Sandison (1953, xv) suggest, the entertainment could conceivably have had an Arthurian content (like the archery match put on about the same time (Chambers 1923, 4.102)) and thus just might have contained material later used for

Lansdowne 54, 81) records Bindon’s farcical disruption of a piracy trial: Bindon told the jury that the
Gorges’s *Olympian Catastrophe* (see Chapter 4.3). Gorges’s involvement suggests he was, like his uncles Nicholas and Sir Thomas (Gorges 1944, 94) within Leicester’s sphere of influence at the time. The involvement of Robert Carey, brother of Sir George (Gorges’s patron for his parliamentary seat of 1584) is significant too. Meanwhile Gorges’s career as a Pensioner was a drain on his purse. In a lawsuit some years later, Ralegh’s financier William Sanderson claimed that Gorges had been borrowing substantial sums of money from him since at least 1586 (PRO REQ2/28/54).

In 1588, Gorges fought the Armada as a volunteer, (though no official record of his involvement survives (Sandison 1928, 656-7)), having previously mortgaged land to prepare himself for hostilities (APC 18.184-5). In manuscript tracts put together in James’s reign, Gorges makes great play of his participation in the Armada campaign, using it to underpin the validity of his arguments for naval reform (see Chapter 5). He denies that the Armada was beaten primarily by the weather, pointing instead to the superior design of the English ships, and remembers vivid details: great anchors in the storehouse at Deptford left behind by Spanish ships forced to cut their cables to get away in a hurry (Trinity College, Cambridge MS R. 7.23* (Prince Henry’s Copybooks 3), f.14v); plough chains used as bullets when ammunition supplies gave out (Glasgow 1973, 184).

The birth of a child to Douglas, a little later had important consequences for Gorges’s career. According to evidence given by a Mistress Sherwin before a commission two years later Douglas Howard felt a child move within her on All Saints Day 1588. She

---

22 Spenser had not met Douglas (Spenser 1912, 528), though he had obviously been told about her.
23 May suggests that Ralegh’s ‘Now we have present made’ was performed at this ‘shew’ (1989, 36).
laboured from Christmas morning till night, giving birth at about nine-o-clock to a daughter with 'whitish Awborne' hair, who was named Ambrosia. Present at the birth, in addition to the two grandmothers, were a group of prominent ladies of the court: Lady Jane Stafford, Anne Cooke, Alice Cooke, Anne Cooke.25 Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick, Mary Sidney and Lady Elizabeth Carey, wife of Sir George, attended the christening as godparents (Sandison 1928, 649-50; DRO D10/L8).

Just two years later, on 13 August 1590, Douglas died. Ambrosia now inherited the Howard lands and became a ward of the crown.26 Aware of an imminent challenge to his daughter's legitimacy, Gorges acted swiftly. According to records kept by his later antagonist, Thomas Howard (DRO D10/L8), on 17 August 'Gorge procured a certificate under the hande of diverse woemen of Ambrosias birth: written by Philips Scrivener by charing crosse', rounding up all the women who had been present at Ambrosia's birth to testify that Ambrosia was Douglas's child.27 On 17 November Gorges exhibited a bill in Chancery, exclaiming against the accusation being made by Viscount Bindon and others that Ambrosia was not Douglas's child (PRO C3/225/41). Bindon died soon after, on 1 December. Ambrosia, Bindon's heir, became ward to the crown for her lands, which Gorges leased (Sandison 1928, 652). The heir to the Bindon title, Thomas Howard, took up the cudgels. According to the account given a year later in a manuscript compiled for Gorges (BL MS Lansdowne 43, f.59r) he promptly intruded on Ambrosia's property, 'making great waste and spoile of the woods', giving out that Ambrosia was 'a forged or

24 Gorges also wrote an elegy for Sir Philip Sidney (Gorges 1953, poem 97).
25 Douglas was related to the Cookes through her mother's family, the Mewtases.
26 For the legal background to wardship, central to Gorges's problems with Ambrosia, see Hurstfield 1973.
27 Thomas Howard later claimed that the servants' signatures were 'drawne without their privety by Gorge' (DRO D10/L8).
changed childe; and yt so by triall he would proue her’. Asked to explain himself by the
Queen, Howard said that he believed Ambrosia was legitimate and promised he would
proceed no further in the matter—a promise he swiftly broke:

he both affirmed the same presentlie after by his own speaches and publique suit in lawe, and doth so
still contynewe therein, and yet cannot avouch anyone other aucthor or reason of this sclander, but his
owne false suggestions (ibid.).

Spenser dedicated *Daphnaïda*, an elegy for Douglas, much of it spoken in the voice of
‘Alcyon’ (Gorges), to the Lady Marquis on 1 January 1590/1. Spenser had been brought
to London by Ralegh and was probably introduced to Gorges by him. *Daphnaïda* is a
striking intervention in the legal dispute between Gorges and Thomas Howard, an
unusual means of countering Howard’s allegations (see Chapter 4.1.1). In the event,
though, the publication of *Daphnaïda* marked the beginning, rather than the end, of
Gorges’s legal problems with the Howards. During the 1590s, Gorges’s life was
dominated by his struggle to assert his right, through Ambrosia, to the inheritance from
Douglas.

Bindon exhibited a case in the Court of Wards the Easter term after the appearance of
*Daphnaïda*. One of his servants carefully recorded gossip about Douglas and Ambrosia in
a notebook (DRO D10/L8). Informants told Bindon that, *inter alia*, ‘Mistris Dowglas had
a grievous disease, & it was thought she could not beare a child, & when it was borne,
both mother & child were so weake, as it was thought impossible for either of them to live
longer’, that ‘a gentlewoman had confessed in her deathbed for discharge of her
conscience, that the child of Mistris D. Gorge was dead & this child nowe living, is but a
supposed child’. Replies and rejoinders multiplied. There was considerable dispute over
the sitting of a commission to examine witnesses in Dorset in the Summer, each party claiming that the other had obstructed the course of justice (DRO D10/L8; MS Lansdowne 43, f.59r). In a striking show of official support, the privy council wrote a letter to the commissioners when Gorges was away on progress to warn them about Bindon’s tricksiness and to put Gorges’s side of the case (APC 21.416): Bindon had, the letter said, ‘purposely already retained all the learned counsell in that countie’.

Judgement was delivered on 6 October 1591 that Ambrosia was the true heir (Sandison 1928, 651), though this failed to pacify Bindon (DRO D10/L8; BL MS Lansdowne 43, f. 59r). In the middle of it all, in December, Spenser addressed ‘Alcyon’ (Gorges) in Colin Clovts come home againe, encouraging him to stop mourning and to pursue a poem in honour of the Queen. Gorges’s ‘A pastorall unfynyshed’ represents his abortive answer to this request (see Chapter 4.2). Bindon was committed to the Fleet on 12 February 1591/2 (Sandison 1928, 651, n.22; DRO D10/L8). Shortly afterwards, a document prepared on Gorges’s behalf itemised the details of Bindon’s behaviour, recording that, annoyed by Bindon’s behalf itemised the details of Bindon’s behaviour, recording that, annoyed by Bindon’s constant petitions, the Queen had commanded that

the Lord Treasurer, the Lord Admirall, the Lord Chamberlain & master Vicechamberlaine should call the said Viscount and Arthure Gorges before them, there to manifeste the wrong, which [Bindon] pretended was offered him for his tytle, and to shew what he could produce against the right of this child, and to cleare hymself of all theis above rehearsed misdemeanors. But so he satisfied theis Lords; disproued the title of his childre: and cleared hymself: as that in conclusion, some of them, of his owne name and kynne, did there openlie and vehementlie protest against those his vniust proceedings: and as for his allegacions against the childe, they were so little or nothing, as their Honours did there, vppon his allegeaunce, commaunde hym to surcease his sclanderous and wicked suggestions against the said Arthure Gorges, and Ambrosia his daughter; of whose true birth and being, so apparant proof is made & recorded, as that no man in England can make more for any childe that ever was borne. (BL MS Lansdowne 43, f.59r)

28 See PRO C24/423/76 for the claim that at this time Thomas Howard was in desperate straits, ‘verie poore and makinge the best living by Oding and Brewinge’ in Wareham where he ‘ledd a poore life’.

29 Spenser’s address to Alcyon (Spenser 1912, 540, lines 384-90) presumably belongs to 1591, the date of the dedication and not to 1595, the date of publication (Sandison 1928, 650, n.19).
After his release, Bindon continued the battle, focusing now on Ambrosia’s rights to the dead Viscount’s farms (DRO D10/L8). Though he did get some land from Gorges, he remained unsatisfied. On 17 September 1593, Gorges wrote a frustrated letter to Robert Cecil, complaining at Burghley’s indulgent approach (as Master of the Wards) to Howard, which he said was annoying the Queen (Hatfield CP 23.55). Gorges made a very similar complaint two years later (Hatfield CP 32.83). Bindon also appealed to Cecil and Burghley (Hatfield CP 24.104).

Henry Howard’s widow, Frances, meanwhile, with her second husband Edmund Stansfield, entered into a dispute with Gorges over dower rights, an issue that seems to have arisen for the first time in 1595 (Hatfield CP 35.97; 172.94; BL MS Harley 6997, f.192r; Hatfield CP 55.54). After Frances’s death in February 1600, a judgement was given in the Court of Wards that Stansfield should be fined for plundering Ambrosia’s lands. To enforce the judgement Gorges took out a commission of rebellion. The serving of the commission on Stansfield outside the manor house at East Lulworth (with Frances’s corpse still inside) seems to have turned into a pitched battle between Gorges’s and Stansfield’s associates: at its climax, in Stansfield’s account, Stansfield cut through a blockade of Gorges’s chanting men on horseback, lance in hand (STAC5 S27/25; Hatfield CP 180.49; 82.25; Hatfield CP Petitions 119). Stansfield took Frances’s body to Clerkenwell for burial and tried ‘to make my peace with Sir Arther’ only to be ‘by his procurement sore wounded in three places, & Imprisonede’; in 1601 he brought a Star Chamber action against Gorges (PRO STAC5 S27/25).

The Stansfield dispute overlapped with the final instalment of Gorges’s struggle to establish his claim to Ambrosia (Sandison 1928, 652). In 1596 Gorges petitioned for ‘the
reuersion of the wardship of my Daughters marryage, yf it should fale into hyr highnes hands by my death’ (Hatfield CP Petitions 56), seconding his request with letters to Cecil (Hatfield CP 45.25; 44.74). The suit was not ambitious, he claimed: all he wanted to do was to make sure, were he to die, that during the five years remaining of Ambrosia’s wardship the right to negotiate her marriage would be in friendly hands. At about the same time he secretly arranged a marriage between Ambrosia and her cousin Francis Gorges, eldest son of Sir Thomas Gorges and the Lady Marquis, only for Francis to die on his continental tour soon afterwards (Sandison 1928, 661). In 1596 Gorges married his second wife, Elizabeth Clinton, daughter of the Earl of Lincoln. The marriage, contracted without the Queen’s knowledge, led to a spell in prison for Gorges (APC 26.410). In a letter of complaint to Cecil, Gorges claims that the marriage was a last-ditch attempt to salvage his blighted career:

If I had relyed vpon any hoapes or happes in the place where I serued, I mought no doubt haue taken a course more wordly [sic] wyse, and behoofull for my selfe, then this marryage. But when I sawe euen in very base and bare requests my selfe often refused, and my successse fruitles and that by the tye of my petitioners place I was euer restrayned from all forrayne aduenture for honor and good happe whiche many inferior persons attayned vnto; it strake flatt the sayles o f all my poore ambition, and conuerted in me all these frayle desires of happe and honour vnto the Lowly humor o f quyett and content. (Hatfield CP 46.59)

The birth of a son to Gorges and his second wife on 8 March, 1598 meant that Ambrosia was no longer Gorges’s heir apparent. She was claimed by the Queen as a royal ward. A letter from the Attorney General and an injunction from the Court of Wards were sent to Gorges, ordering him ‘to deliuer vpp ye bodie of his saide daughter to ye Master of ye wardes; or else to enter into six thowsand pound bonds, not to contract her but by leaue and order of ye said courte’ (Hatfield CP 187.123). Gorges was at that moment, he said,
on the verge of being paid £10,000 for Ambrosia's marriage (ibid.).

Gorges’s desperation is expressed in perhaps his most elaborately structured petitionary letter (4 June 1598; Hatfield CP 61.55). In the succeeding two years, Gorges struggled to assert his rights over Ambrosia, the case at issue 'being found verie hard and doubtfull to determine' (Hatfield CP 187.123). In the middle of the negotiations, in November 1599, Gorges presented Elizabeth with 'a bracelett of greate pearles; fastned with a locker of Diamond and Rubyes which cost 500li', 'as she past upon the Thames to Sir Arthur Gorges house at Chelsey' whilst a mermaid sung verses specially composed by Gorges (Gorges 1953, poem 109; HMC De Lisle and Dudley 2.416). Viscountess Bindon's death in March 1599/1600 brought Gorges some financial consolation, though, not, Gorges says, very much (Hatfield CP 69.1). The stress of the situation made him ill (Hatfield CP 187.123), so that, Gorges said, he was 'scant able to walke three turnes in my gallerie' (Hatfield CP 78.61). In May 1600 it was finally decreed that Ambrosia was the Queen's ward for her marriage (PRO WARDS Decree Book 87, ff.152v-153r). Gorges was required to pay £1000 for Ambrosia's wardship (Hatfield CP 187.123).

On 10 October 1600, Gorges having already paid the Queen £100 and entered into bonds for the rest of the £1000 (Hatfield CP 187.123), Ambrosia inconveniently died. She was buried near her mother in St. Paul's Chapel, Westminster, twelve days later. Gorges

---

30 For more details see Sandison 1928, 653. Two of the competitors for the marriage were Lord Thomas Howard's son (to whom the Queen eventually granted it) and Philip Herbert. Gorges was also negotiating with Edward Fynes, the son of Gorges's father-in-law the Earl of Lincoln (PRO C24/287/27; see below).

31 Gorges himself explains that the gift was intended to gain Elizabeth's 'fauour' in the matter of the wardship (Hatfield CP 187.123). Pace May 1991, 110, it had nothing to do with Gorges's marriage. In a letter written a month after the presentation Gorges rather confusingly protests that this gift, 'in a larger proportion; then eyther agrees with my pouertie; or as I thincke; wolde haue bynn requyred; in her princlye bountye; when she shall trulye vnderstande; howe much heeretofore hathe bynn taken fi'om mee; to my great impourishinge', was offered 'whilst ye matter was in suspense; because her Maiestie shoulde perceae, yt my gratytud, was free and cynceare, and not drawne on, by necessitie' (Hatfield CP 75.53).
or someone near him must have described the effect of the bereavement as ‘shrewd’, for the word is used in this context by two contemporary correspondents (Sandison 1928, 653). Ambrosia’s land reverted in full to Thomas Howard, Viscount Bindon, who settled an annuity of £4000 on Gorges (Hatfield CP 251.73).

Alongside his struggles with the Howards, Gorges had to deal with the intense competition for court patronage in the 1590s. At many points his interests and enthusiasms overlap with Ralegh’s. Gorges’s earliest surviving letter to his cousin Robert Cecil (Bodl. MS Ashmole 1729, ff.177r-177v) describes Ralegh’s melancholic behaviour when under house arrest in the wake of his marriage to Elizabeth Throckmorton. The letter was designed to be shown to Elizabeth to win back favour for Ralegh (see Chapter 2.4). Gorges’s correspondence with Cecil is the major source for Gorges’s career between 1593 and 1610. Cecil’s first appearance as Gorges’s key patron coincides with the imprisonment and disgrace of Ralegh—Gorges seems to have turned from one to the other.

Gorges’s letters to Cecil cover a range of topics, though the most consistent presence is his dispute with his Howard in-laws. The tone varies: on occasion his letters refer with some confidence to favour shown him by the Queen (Hatfield CP 23.55; 32.83). In September 1593, Gorges, with his relative Sir Edward Stafford, accompanied the Vidame de Chartres to Southampton, discreetly spying on him for Cecil (169.127; 23.67). With his cousin Sir George Carew he sought Cecil’s help for an unspecified suit in July 1594, offering a £500 bribe (27.49). In 1595, as well as sending Cecil news of Ralegh from Plymouth (31.67), Gorges wrote in excitement at a ‘concayte of my Lord Admyrals
goinge to the seas’ (33.58), stressing his capacity for naval service and expressing anxiety that he did not have as martial a reputation as he deserved. He has served ‘foure or fyue [the ‘fyue’ is careted in as an afterthought] in hyr Hyghnes shipes ... The which I speake not with ostentation; but only to make knowne; yt I haue not allways lyued Ildelly att home, nor ame vnexperymented in the seaseruyce’.

Later the same year Gorges made suit for the Great Park of Windsor and was rumoured to be about to be sent on a mission to France (HMC De Lisle and Dudley 2.203; Sandison 1928, 659, n.47). Following his marriage in 1596, Gorges was temporarily out of favour. In April 1597, still ‘a banished man from the Courte and a strauznger to that parte of the Towne’ (Hatfield CP 50.30) he nevertheless felt able to send Cecil two letters of recommendation for young acquaintances (ibid.; 49.102). During the Islands Voyage of 1597 (for which see below), Gorges found time to write letters maintaining his patronage relationship with Cecil (SP12/264/44, f.60r-60v; Hatfield CP 54.30; 55.54). Cecil, it appears, wrote to Gorges aboard ship assuring him that he had returned to the Queen’s favour. In reply, Gorges was effusive:

This [lettters] Amongst many others, are the oblygations whearwith from tyme, to tyme yow haue faste bounde the harte of a poore lentleman wrth vnfayned affection to follow yow ... It hathe lyfted my very sowle from the graue; to vnderstande; yt hyr Ma/ejtie doothe more gratiously conceaue; o f my deuotion to virtue and honor; the only portions and ryches of my Maryage; for beinge shadowed with the dreade of hyr Pryncly displeasure I helde my selfe as buryed alyffe. (SP 12/264/59, f.85r)

The Queen’s claiming of Ambrosia as a royal ward marked a low point in Gorges’s patronage relationship with Cecil. In a letter of 4 June 1598, Gorges confronts the possibility that Cecil will not act as intermediary with Elizabeth for him and that he will be enforced, euen with common sewters as one forsaken of all other meanes; to

---

32 For which see MacCaffrey 1991, 33.
importune her Maiestie with publique, and contynewall petitions' (Hatfield CP 61.55).

Gorges’s relations with Cecil improved, though, when, a little later, he acted as a go-between for his father-in-law, the Earl of Lincoln, over Lincoln’s purchase of Cecil’s Chelsea estate (Hatfield CP 59.86; 68.76; 117.18; Chamberlain 1939, 1.73). The estate included the Great House at Chelsea, once lived in by Sir Thomas More, and was at the time of its sale settled by Lincoln on Gorges and Elizabeth (Davies 1904, 113). Gorges later claimed that this settlement had been made formally and unconditionally. Lincoln, however, claimed that the agreement was a ‘matter of trust’ only, and that it had been conditional on the marriage of Ambrosia to his second son Edward Fynes, an arrangement involving the payment of £10,000 to Gorges and Elizabeth (PRO C24/287/27). At this period, Gorges and his family were living in a newly-built house on the Chelsea estate (HMC De Lisle and Dudley 2.416).

Gorges’s friendly relationship with his new father-in-law did not last long, for in September 1600 Lincoln was threatening to make Chelsea over to Edward Fynes (Hatfield CP 251.45; Davies 1914, 48-50). Gorges claimed that the problems had started when he refused to lend £500 to Lincoln ‘vpon his bare word’. Lincoln had retaliated by reneging on the marriage agreement and claiming back Chelsea (PRO STAC8/244/4).

The death of Ambrosia, Gorges’s only bargaining counter, in October 1600, cannot have

---

33 Cecil stood godfather for Gorges’s son William (named after Burghley?), born in 1599 and christened at Chelsea (Sandison 1928, 668, n.85; Davies 1904, 123). William died within the year (Hatfield CP 69.1).
34 For details about the Chelsea house and Gorges’s residence see Davies 1904; 1914.
35 He provided picturesque details about the signing of the agreement to confirm this: on hearing the words ‘The Ladye Elizabeth Gorges only daughter of the said Earle’ Lincoln joked that ‘That was more then all yee knowe, And yet all the daughters, That he durst Avouch’; he was happy to be praised by Cecil for his generosity; Cecil gave Elizabeth a large china gilt cabinet; Lincoln sent Elizabeth some turf from the garden at Chelsea with the message ‘That he had sent her syxe thousand pownds to her Breakfaste, in that lyttle Turfe of Earth’ (PRO STAC8/244/4).
helped matters. Shortly afterwards, Gorges temporarily left Chelsea. Relations with Lincoln remained sour: Gorges claimed in later life that over a period Lincoln had taken out about fourteen lawsuits against him (STAC8/91/29). ‘Hys wyckednes, hys miserye; hys crafte; his repugnancie to all humanytie; and perfidius mynde, is not I thinck amongst the hethens to be matched’, Gorges wrote in September 1600, ‘God bless me from hyme’ (Hatfield CP 251.45).

From the mid-1590s to the end of Elizabeth’s reign Gorges was in close contact with Ralegh and Ralegh’s powerful friend Lord Cobham. Ralegh’s relationship with the Howards of Bindon, Dorset neighbours, was as hostile as Gorges’s, for the Viscount was behind the accusations of atheism confronting Ralegh in 1594. Gorges, a beneficiary of Ralegh’s patronage, was MP for Dorset in the parliament of 1593, sitting on a committee for the relief of maimed veterans (HP), alongside Ralegh and his cousin, Ferdinando Gorges (Sandison 1928, 656). Gorges wrote letters from Ralegh’s Durham House on 3 June 1595 (Hatfield CP 32.83) and 8 September 1596 (Hatfield CP 44.74); next year, Ralegh wrote a letter to ‘cosin Arthur’, probably Gorges, from Cadiz (Lefranc 1966; Beal 1980, 374). Some time before 1603 Gorges leased the Cornish manor of Pawton from Cobham (Hatfield CP 105.146). In 1601 Cobham, as Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, secured for Gorges the parliamentary seat of Rye (HP). Cobham was at this period an

---

36 The death of Ambrosia is the last Gorges entry in the Chelsea parish register before 1615 (Davies 1914). Gorges’s judgement of Lincoln, his second mad father-in-law, was widely shared (Sandison 1928, 666).
37 Ralegh had been present as a witness to the transfer of Chelsea to Gorges and Elizabeth (PRO STAC8/244/4; Eccles 1982, 110-1).
38 See Lloyd 1967, 233-92. Lloyd claims that ‘Dorset was torn into two halves during the nineties by the clash between the Howards and Arthur Gorges’, though without giving any evidence. She also links Gorges’s and Ralegh’s hostility to the Howards of Bindon to Lord Henry Howard’s later plotting against Ralegh, again without hard evidence (242).
40 In parliament this year Gorges was appointed to a committee on the penal laws and ‘moved that the Privy Council should check the subsidy assessments of j.ps’ (HP).
important figure at court, as the deferential tone of Ralegh’s letters to him at this period (Edwards 1868, 2.205-6) implies. The high-point of Cobham’s influence came in the summer of 1598, when, shortly after his installation as Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, he and Ralegh were ‘in speach to be sworne shortly of the counsayle’ (Chamberlain 1939, 1.43). Ralegh and Cobham were at this period in a temporary alliance with Cecil, Cobham’s brother-in-law, Cecil’s tactic being to build up the influence of Ralegh and Cobham in to counterbalance the power of Essex’s faction.

Gorges’s most significant involvement with Ralegh came in 1597, when both took part in Essex’s ‘Islands Voyage’ to the Azores, Gorges sailing as captain of the Wastspight, Ralegh’s flagship. Before setting out, Ralegh made his will, symbolically leaving Gorges his best rapier and dagger (Latham 1971). The voyage, Gorges’s ‘one great adventure’ (Sandison 1928, 660), was an expensive ‘non-event’ (Loades 1992b, 267). Its aims were to disable the Spanish navy (either in port at Ferrol or on the seas), to intercept the Spanish treasure fleet, and to invade Tercera. Unsuccessful in all three objectives, the voyage was dogged by rivalry and bitterness between Essex (Admiral) and Ralegh (Rear-Admiral), Lord Thomas Howard (Vice-Admiral), acting as mediator.

The voyage was heavily delayed by bad weather. Once under way, many of Ralegh’s ships, together with the Wastspight, got separated from the rest of the fleet, provoking bitter suspicions amongst Essex’s followers that the Rear-Admiral had been seeking glory

---

41 Gorges’s appointment might have been a last minute one, secured by Ralegh, as he is not on the official list of captains (Oppenheim 1902-14, 2.38-9).
42 Gorges made preparations too. The request for the reversion of the wardship of Ambrosia’s marriage was made partly so that Gorges should not be restrained ‘from exposinge my selfe to any seruyces of haszard’ (Hatfield CP Petitions 56). In a parallel move, on 15 October 1596 Gorges made a fruitless attempt to discharge all his debts to William Sanderson (PRO REQ2/28/54), an agent of Ralegh’s (Shirley 1949b).
43 For Gorges’s account of the voyage, see Chapter 5.1, 3. For a lucid modern narrative account see Wernham 1994, 171-90. Detailed documentation is given in Oppenheim 1902-14, 2.21-83.
on his own account. In a parallel incident later in the voyage, Ralegh, having been ordered by Essex to join him for an attack on Fayal, found on arrival that Essex was not there. After waiting two days, he attacked alone. (During the attack Gorges was wounded in the leg.) When Essex arrived, his instinct, encouraged by his followers, was to court-martial Ralegh for acting independently. Ralegh argued that his status as one of the three principal commanders legitimised his actions. With the help of Lord Thomas Howard's mediation all ended peaceably—the upshot of the disagreement, however, was that the Spaniards abandoned the town, taking everything of value with them. Later, off Tercera, there was further disagreement: Essex's land commanders wanted, against the advice of the sea commanders, to attack the Indies fleet at anchor in the harbour. Again, Lord Thomas Howard resolved the dispute, and no attack was made. The fleet moved on to St. Michael's, Ralegh's ships standing off Punta Delgada, the main town. The wish of some people (including Gorges (Purchas 1905-7, 116)) to attack Punta Delgada was scotched by the absence of Essex's ships, taking easy pickings on the other side of the island, at Villa Franca. A rich East India carrack, meanwhile, not having noticed the English ships, anchored off Punta Delgada. Ralegh's orders to his ships not to fire on the carrack were ignored and the Spanish, alerted, set it alight. Returning home in chaotic disarray, the fleet discovered that a large Spanish armada had set sail for England and, having 'come tantalizingly close to spectacular success' (Wernham 1994, 181), had been scattered by bad weather. The voyage had been an unmitigated disaster. Gorges, knighted by Essex during the voyage, later compiled a long narrative account for Prince Henry, based on notes made at the time (see Chapter 5).

---

44 The plan to attack Punta Delgada was ill-advised anyway (Wernham 1994, 181).
The turn of the century was one of Gorges's lowest points: he had not only lost Ambrosia and the land she brought him, but had been turned out of Chelsea by Lincoln. He was reduced to living in rented accommodation (Hatfield CP 85.160; 77.45). In a letter of 9 March 1600/1 to Cecil and the Earl of Nottingham, Gorges describes himself as 'of all the poore gentlemen that euer serued her Maiestie with duty and zeale ... the most vnfortunate, and miserable'. Gorges’s reading of his situation is as the conspiracy of circumstances against desert. His misfortunes, that is, 'haue not lyghted on me, by myne owne Idlenes, or improuidence; but by the hynderance, and detraction of those seuerall fortunes, which by myne owne industry I had attayned vnto; yf I mought haue byne suffered fauorably to haue enjoyed them' (Hatfield CP 77.45). He threatens to go and 'lyue priuately and poorely abroade'. A month later, telling Cecil that the Queen has referred him to Cecil for 'ye furtheraunce of my hoaped conforte', Gorges repeats much of the substance of his earlier letter (85.160).

Essex’s rebellion in 1601 brought Gorges’s fortunes lower. Essex had focused his grievances on Gorges’s associates Cecil, Ralegh and Cobham. After Essex’s fall, Cecil dissociated himself from Ralegh and Cobham. With Lord Henry Howard, he entered into secret correspondence with James VI of Scotland, planting the seeds of Ralegh’s and Cobham’s disgrace in 1603. Ultimately, the elimination from court of Essex (1601) and Ralegh (1603) were to clear the way for the predominance of Cecil and a new 'Howard faction' built around Lord Henry Howard (Peck 1982).

In the immediate aftermath of the rebellion Gorges petitioned Cecil for land surrendered by the rebels, with modest success (Hatfield CP 87.37; 87.38; APC 32.149). Unable to afford the expense of following the Queen on her progress that Summer
(Hatfield CP 87.37, 87.38), Gorges stayed in London, where, in September 1601, he helped Ralegh entertain the visiting ambassador the Duke of Biron and an entourage of ‘one hundred gentlemen of quality’ (CSPV 1592-1603, 473).\(^4\) Ralegh enlisted Gorges together with Sir Arthur Savage to help show the visitors around while he ‘labored like a moyle’ (Edwards 1868, 2.233-34) to arrange transport to Hampshire. The visitors went to see the monuments at Westminster Abbey\(^4\) and the Bear-Garden (of ‘which they had great pleasure’). ‘It weare good that A. Savage and A. Gorges weare cummanded to cum’, wrote Ralegh, ‘because they speak French well, and ar familiar with them’ (Edwards 1868, 2.233-34). In 1602 Henry Howard suspected Gorges of having been to Scotland to take part in Ralegh’s and Cobham’s futile negotiations with the Duke of Lennox (Dalrymple 1766, 133).\(^4\) In an anxious letter to Cecil a little later (November 27, 1602) Gorges desperately tried to curry favour and protest loyalty (Hatfield CP 185.72). Cecil’s hostile response to Gorges’s attempt, on 1 January, 1602/3, to present him with a New Year’s gift of some hangings, meanwhile, bore ominous witness to Cecil’s increasing antipathy to Ralegh and his associates (Hatfield CP 91.20; 91.48).

2. Gorges’s Jacobean Career

Gorges’s works are peppered with bitter comparisons between James’s approach to patronage and Elizabeth’s. Though during Elizabeth’s reign Gorges had felt desperately

\(^4\) This was just months before Biron’s execution for treason. Contingency plans in London had broken down—‘I never saw so great a person so neglected. He hathe bynn here now left; not on nobelman nor gentleman them to guyde’, Ralegh wrote to Cecil (Edwards 1868, 2.233-34).

\(^4\) Perhaps including the graves of Gorges’s wife and daughter.

\(^4\) A letter of July 29, 1602, in which Gorges promises Robert Cecil he will, as instructed, ‘wayte on [him] att ye Dvtchye’ the next day, is perhaps connected to this affair (Hatfield CP 94.81).
hard done by, after her death he constantly held her up as a model patron, demonising James:

In the late Queenes tyme, it is certaine: that she raysed many, but it was many yeares adooinge: for shee euer was warie, not to cloye any so much, with her liberalities at once: but shee would still keepe them in an appetite to frugaletie, and in hope of more by theire deserts, and seruice: and thereby shee had euer this comfort of her fauouretts, that those seruaunts, whome shee had aduaunced: did alwayes reserve a greate parte of her liberalitie, to serue her withall, in tyme of neede of which shee had good triall in the yeare 1588: when ye Spanish fleete was on our coste: (A Breefe Discourse (Trinity College, Cambridge MS R. 7.23* (Prince Henry's Copy books 3), f.9r)

It was to be expected that Gorges, sharing Ralegh's hawkish foreign policy, would be hostile to the values of James's court. He was not helped, either, by other circumstances: the cooling of Cecil's relationship with Ralegh and Cobham; Ambrosia's recent death; the loss of Chelsea. Gorges's situation became desperate, though, when, on 13 July, 1603, he was arrested in connection with the Bye Plot at his house in Kew. He was closely associated with the plotters and knew what was going on, but was not directly involved in the conspiracy (Sandison 1928, 661-2). He was soon released, after his wife had written three letters protesting his innocence to Robert Cecil (quoted by Sandison 1928, 662). It is likely that Gorges's connection to the plot was partly responsible for some of his disappointments in James's reign: 'in this newe age', he wrote in 1604, 'I am caste behynde all men in preferment, by reason that the daynger and Jelosie of ye tyme did cast vpon mee suspect; and restraynt from ye courte, whilst ye bountie of his Ma/e^tie was a dealinge' (Hatfield CP 108.98). Following his release he wrote to Cecil to request the return of some papers confiscated at the time of his arrest,

nowe of smale moment, haveinge relation to former governement [sic], and beinge in deed but needlesse remembrances of matters farr better considered of and ordred since ... written in a tyme vnsettled when ye authoritie of the former age surceeded, and all justice and magistracye was to take newe Life, from the power of a newe prince. (Hatfield CP 188.12)

48 'Cobham, at Ralegh's trial, cleared Gorges, though with equivocal compliment: 'Being of Sir Arthur Gorge, he freed him saying, they never durst trust him; but Sir Arthur Savage they intended to use, because they thought him a fit man' (Sandison 1928, 661-2).
These papers may have been connected with Gorges’s extant manuscript treatises (see Chapter 5). Gorges asks disingenously that they may be ‘as heretiques ... committed to ye fyer ... and I my selfe ... to bee ye executioner’.

Gorges had been based at Kew since about 1602. (He had pawned a thousand pounds’ worth of jewels to buy a ‘small cottage’ there (Hatfield CP 121.64), some time after April 1601 (85.160; 77.45)). Part of Gorges’s Kew property was held in copy from from his uncle Sir Thomas Gorges, to whom the manor of Richmond (which included Kew) had been granted in 1597 (VCH Surrey 4.543). It seems Sir Thomas came to Arthur’s help after Lincoln’s temper had temporarily removed the Chelsea property in 1600-1.\(^{49}\)

Neighbours included between 1608 and 1612 James I’s daughter, Princess Elizabeth, in the care of John, first Lord Harington and his wife.\(^{50}\) At this period Gorges spent the Winter months in London (at a variety of addresses), passing the Summer at Kew.\(^{51}\)

---

\(^{49}\) The manor was granted to Prince Henry in 1610, after Sir Thomas’s death (VCH Surrey 4.411), a point later denied by Gorges (PRO STAC8/244/4). Gorges’s land, held presumably from Sir Thomas, included ‘a private inclosed meadowe’ of seven or eight acres, which produced three or four haycocks annually, abutted the Thames and lay near the ‘Little’ common of Kew, and ‘a great pasture’ of twelve or fourteen acres for cattle. To oversee the holdings, Gorges employed, in addition to a coachman and a page, a bailiff and several servants (PRO STAC8/158).

\(^{50}\) See DNB; CSPD 1607-10, 552. Some time before 1612, Gorges, in his capacity as a JP, helped out Daniel Dyke, Princess Elizabeth’s puritan chaplain, who had rented rooms in Kew from Alexander Prescott (PRO STAC8/158).

\(^{51}\) He wrote letters from Kew on 29 July 1602 (Hatfield CP 94.81), 4 July 1604 (105.146), 29 May 1605 (86.65), 20 August 1605 (PRO SP 14/15/33 f.54r), 23 April 1606 (Hatfield CP 116.17), 27 August 1606 (117.74), 24 May 1607 (121.56), 28 May 1607 (121.64) and 7 October 1610 (125.156). A letter of 4 September 1610 (PRO SP 14/48/7 f.8r), describing the startling dawn arrival of Lady Kennedy, Elizabeth Gorges’s cousin- ‘bare-legged in hyr petycott and an olde cloake, all hyr night geare; in greates fiyght and almoste starved for colde ... beinge as shee sayde dryven oute of hyr howse by Sir John Kennedy yt with grete violence brake in upon hyr’ - was probably also written from Kew, just a few miles down-river from ‘Baremos’, then belonging to Kennedy (VCH Surrey 4.5; for the Kennedys, cf. Chamberlain 1939, 1306, 1.104-5). He wrote letters from ‘Walebrooke’ in London on 18 January 1605/6 (Hatfield CP 109.130), 29 January 1605/6 (190.34) and 4 March 1606 (115, 126). Gorges’s daughter Frances was baptized in the Church of St. Stephen’s Walbrook on 27 February 1606. On 18 April, 1604 Gorges’s son Carew was baptized in the Church of All Hallows, Bread Street, Gorges then ‘having a house in this parish’ (Sandison 1928, 665, n.74). A lawsuit of 1601 refers to Gorges’s house near Ivy Bridge (PRO/24/287/27).
Gorges left the band of Pensioners early in James's reign, in either 1604 or 1605 (Tighe 1983, 71). During this period, with Ralegh in the Tower, Gorges's court fortunes declined. His petitioning of Cecil grew unfocused, as he frantically turned his attention from one field of potentially profitable activity to another. In 1604 Gorges requested that his Pawton lease be converted to a fee farm (Hatfield CP 105.146), a request not granted till 1606 (116.17; 117.74; CSPD 1607-10, 330). On 12 March 1604/5 he had a publication project in hand, of which no traces now remain, and wrote to Cecil for approval, sending him a bundle of

poore papers ... to be disposed, altred, or suppressed, as yr honar pleaseth, it is but ye dutye yt I ame tyed vnto before it be prynted. For being as yr Lordship: is the Eye of ye state, it wolde argue greate neglecte and presumption in me, to publyshe matters of thys Nature without your honorable Knowledg and approbations (Hatfield CP 104.85)

In 1605 Gorges petitioned Cecil with a scheme to regulate the production and sealing of fustians (Hatfield CP 114.22). There were to be representatives in the two chief towns of every county to check local fustians for size and quality. Fustians found being sold or dyed without a seal or under a forged seal would be forfeited, the profit being split three ways between the office's representative, the King and the informant. This abortive scheme, with its system of national offices, anticipates Gorges's slightly more successful 'Public Register' project of 1611/12. The interest in promoting the local clothing industry connects it to the Breefe Discourse Gorges wrote for Henry in 1610 (Chapter 5.2).

---

52 The reappearance under James of a male Privy Chamber, together with his decision to increase the number of Privy Chamber staff, had considerably weakened the Pensioners' position (Tighe 1983, 89-90). Tighe says that Gorges became a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber at this time (71), though without providing documentation. This seems unlikely given the fact that in 1610 Gorges referred to himself as 'masterless in ye worlde ... one of ye outcasts of Queene Elyzabeths auncyent and faythull seruaunts' (Hatfield CP 128.156).

53 These papers could be an early draft of Gorges's Islands Voyage narrative, as Sandison suggests (1928, 670). It is interesting that Gorges is thinking in terms of publication at this early stage: the earliest extant printed work authorised by Gorges is a pamphlet of 1611 (Gorges 1611).
In the wake of the Gunpowder Plot, in 1605/6, Gorges warned against the possibility that Catholics might be hiding in London cellars (Hatfield CP 109.130) and protested at the plan to quarter the plotters outside that ‘fayrest’ gate of St. Paul’s hallowed by happy memories of Queen Elizabeth and the defeat of the Armada (190.34). In 1607, Gorges petitioned Robert Cecil unsuccessfully for the wardship of his nephew, suggesting that Cecil redeem for his personal use 1,100 worth of jewels Gorges had pawned to buy his cottage in Kew (121.64).

Cecil was no longer Gorges’s sole mediator. In a letter of 29 May 1605, Gorges mentions a petition addressed jointly to Cecil and to the Earls of Worcester, Suffolk and Northampton (86.65). In 1605 these four, ‘the Howard faction’, all related to Gorges though not particularly sympathetic to his interests, formed an ‘inner circle of the Privy Council’ (Peck 1982, 27). Three months later Gorges asked Suffolk and Cecil to support him in token of their past service to Queen Elizabeth, an unsubtle gibe at Northampton and Worcester (PRO SP14/15/33, ff.54r-54v). In 1604-5 (Hatfield CP 108.99; 86.65) Gorges used Sir Philip Herbert (Earl of Montgomery from 1605), James’s then ‘prime favourite’ (CSPV 1603-1610, 206). Cecil remained Gorges’s most important patron, though. In May 1605 Gorges petitioned Cecil to ensure that Montgomery pleaded his suit to James when Cecil and the rest of the ‘inner circle’ were present (Hatfield CP 86.65). Cecil clearly remained last resort, with Gorges uncertain of the power and commitment of the favourite.

An associate of both Gorges’s and Ralegh’s at this uncertain time was Sir George Carew, a well-rewarded servant of Elizabeth’s who had on James’s accession remained in

---

54Thus asserting his loyalty at a time when his associate, Ralegh, was suspected of involvement with the
favour. In 1604-5 both Ralegh and Gorges chose to baptize their new-born sons ‘Carew’ (Coote 1993, 320; Sandison 1928, 665, n.74). In 1606, when Carew, Lieutenant of the Ordnance, was in line for the vacant job of Master of the Ordnance, Gorges petitioned for the lieutenantship conditional upon Carew’s winning the mastership. (Other jobs vacant at that time, as a result of the death of the Earl of Devonshire, included the wardenship of the New Forest and the government of Portsmouth, both of which Gorges, in his letter to Cecil (Hatfield CP 115.126), admitted were out of his league.) Carew did become Master of the Ordnance, though Sir Roger Dallison, not Gorges, was appointed Lieutenant. Carew’s appointment as Master meant that he was stationed in the Tower of London, near Ralegh.

In these years Gorges’s relationship with Cecil was bumpier than before. In August 1605 Gorges apologised for the use of ‘such chargable meanes ... to cumm neare about him, for ye procureinge his Highness favour’ (PRO SP14/15/33). The suit pleaded by Montgomery was apparently shamefully slight—‘I protest before Almightye God’ wrote Gorges, ‘yt those yt dealt in it, haue often tolde mee, yt they weare ashamed to see mee aske soe poore a suite att [James’s] bountious hands’ (PRO SP15/15/33, f.54r). Gorges’s correspondence with Cecil began to peter out at about this time, as Gorges turned to Prince Henry, then establishing himself as the major fount of patronage for disappointed Elizabethan hawks. To such figures the prince’s combination of youth, Protestant militarism and high moral standards proved irresistible (Wilson 1946; Williamson 1978; Strong 1986; Wilks 1987). In many ways Henry was the opposite of James (Williamson 1978, 41).
Gorges's patronage texts for Prince Henry have a didactic edge. Henry's age meant that clients such as Gorges could pose as teachers, deploying their accumulated experience and wisdom as acts of service. This was a favourable situation within which to compose a patronage text: mastery of his subject enabled the writer-client to establish a momentary superiority over the patron that confirmed the client's worth and honourable status without disrupting the patron-client bond. Henry's interest in martial topics must have been pleasing, too. Though unable to serve Henry in military action, clients such as Gorges could nevertheless present themselves as honourable martialists by means of texts on military topics. Gorges wrote a sequence of texts of this sort for Henry, some of them probably in association with Ralegh (see Chapter 5; Chapter 6.1). In their writings for Henry both Gorges and Ralegh are careful to stress to the prince the value of prudence and restraint. Whilst clearly keen for him to pursue an aggressively anti-Spanish foreign policy, Gorges and Ralegh remain anxious that Henry should not be reckless and irresponsible.

It is likely that Gorges acted as a point of contact for Henry and Ralegh (Williamson 1978, 117; Strong 1986, 41, 51), though there is no hard evidence of this (Wilks 1987, n.3). What is certain is that Gorges wrote works for Henry in which Ralegh looms large (see Chapter 5.1-2; Chapter 6.1). The first text he composed for the prince was his narrative account of his service as captain of Ralegh's flagship on the Islands Voyage of 1597. Gorges dedicated this to Henry in 1607, coupling it with a set of 'Notes' on the navy originally written by Ralegh for Queen Elizabeth (Chapter 5.1)—a presentation astutely appealing both to Henry's naval interests and to his sympathy with the anti-
Spanish foreign policy of Elizabeth’s reign. Contact between Henry and Gorges is confirmed by the Prince’s Privy Purse accounts (PRO SP14/57): on 7 June, 1609, a payment of one pound was recorded ‘To Sir Arthur Gorges man with a cros-bow and a hanger’. (Henry clearly took to the present for he bought ‘a dissone of crosbow arrowes’ (for 14s) later that same month). Further contact between Gorges and the prince is recorded in the accounts on 29 September, 1610.

In November 1609, Henry was setting up his household (Strong 1986, 26). In common with many others, Gorges sought a place with the prince. He sent the royal family a collection of verses for New Year’s Day 1610, including two poems to Henry (see Chapter 3.2), and, some time in 1610 presented the prince with his manuscript Breefe Discourse on naval preparedness and economic policy. On 7 October 1610, Gorges petitioned Robert Cecil for ‘a place of credit about the Prince’, saying he was ‘loathe styll to lyue Idlely, and as on masterless in ye worlde’ (Hatfield CP 128.156). He also wrote directly to Henry to offer his ‘domestic service’, misleadingly stating that he shunned ‘the mediation of great men; for that were to anticipate your own liking in the free election of your servants’ (BL MS Harley 7007, ff.440r-440v).

55 ‘Few narratives could have been more attractive to a thirteen-year-old boy or more surely have directed his attention to Ralegh in the Tower’ (Coote 1993, 333). Another potential intermediary between Ralegh and the Prince was Sir George Carew, who had lodgings in the Tower from 29 June 1608 as Master of the Ordnance.

56 Gorges was very interested in such things. Musket-arrows are enthusiastically recommended in his manuscript treatises (see Sandison 1934). At about the same time as he was presenting Henry with the crossbow, he was, according to his neighbour Alexander Prescott, threatening to use his own crossbow to shoot trespassing cattle (PRO STAC8/244/4).
Gorges is not, as far as I can tell, included in any official list of Henry’s officials.\textsuperscript{57} In the Summer of 1610, however, he boasted that he occupied ‘a place of Right good accomte and trust’ in the prince’s service (PRO STAC8/244/4).\textsuperscript{58} A letter from Gorges to Henry belonging to April the same year shows that Gorges had been successful in persuading the prince to let him perform services for him. Gorges starts by referring to a ‘deed’ he has persuaded the prince to perform:

For having once gained thereby a general applause of glory and love in the world by So worthy and virtuous a deed; when it is done, to second the same, I will be ready to acquaint your Highness with a matter, that shall bring unto your cofferes, for the better supporting of your princely state, twenty thousand pounds a year at the least, and to be effected with ease, without wrong to the public, and not needing to sollicit the parliament for the same: and this shall follow in its due time, when the other is effected. And, in the mean time, this may suffice for an answer to all, that shall go about to disgrace your bill in parliament, that it savours more of a well-policed Christian state, and of the government of a wise and giddy prince, rather, with mild and provident remedies, to prevent growing mischiefs, than afterwards to seek to weed them out with rigorous and bloody means, when they are already placed. (BL MS Harley 7007, f.357r)

It is clear from this letter that Gorges was active in devising money-making schemes for the Prince, and successful in getting Henry to look favourably on them. J.W. Williamson proposes that Gorges was behind the plan, rejected by the Attorney-General in October 1610, to obtain for Henry ‘a grant of all the forfeiture arising, or that ought to accrue, to his Majesty from Recusants; his Highness paying yearly to him one thousand pounds more than was answered for those forfeitures’. Perhaps Gorges’s references in the letter to Henry to the policing of a Christian state refer to this scheme.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{57} Strong has no grounds for saying that Gorges was ‘A [late] addition in 1611 to the Gentlemen of [Henry’s] Privy Chamber’ (1986, 41). If Gorges held an official post of this sort he would certainly have mentioned it in some of the lawsuits considered later in this section.

\textsuperscript{58} Williamson suggests that Gorges was one of two gentlemen whom Henry wanted to advance but about whom Cecil had reservations (1978, 143, n.16, citing Birch 1760, 134).

\textsuperscript{59} Gorges’s language suggests that the ‘bill in parliament’ he refers to later in the letter was also directed against recusants. Probably it was the bill which had been read in the Commons just two days before, recommending more stringent enforcement of the recusancy laws (‘An Explanation of the Statute of 23 Elizabeth, Cap.i, To Retain the queen’s Subjects in their due Obedience’). The issue of the bill was a proclamation, requiring, among other things, that the departure of all recusants from London. Of this letter, Sandison says cryptically ‘Ralegh’s figure seems to stand in the background’ (1928, 668, n.85).
Significantly, perhaps, the failure of the scheme to farm the recusancy fines was closely followed by a grant to Gorges and Sir Walter Cope60 of the right to set up a ‘Public Register for Private Commerce’. The public register was a very ambitious project that does not seem to have got off the ground. Its aim was to provide a means whereby buyers and sellers and lenders and borrowers across the country could be put in touch with each other. Offices keeping registers of items for sale and money for loan were to be set up in the chief towns of the kingdom. Cecil had apparently been instrumental in securing the grant for Gorges (SP14/62/ f.154r), though he did not respond immediately to Gorges’s request that the office be based in Britain’s Burse. (Cecil eventually agreed, though only after a base for the office had already been built at the Middle Temple.61)

A prospectus was printed in 1611 (Gorges 1611). This unusual step suggests that the new office had been the focus of public anxiety. The prospectus seeks to allay people’s fears. A translation of the project’s patent (PRO C66/1868/30) is followed by a preface written by Gorges ‘To the Unpartiall Reader’, which defends the probity of the scheme, Gorges’s brainchild (‘myne own poore conceit and labour, (ayming specialy at the aduancement of mutuall Commerce, the bond and sinewes of humane society)’ (C2v)), and ‘An Overture and Explanation of the purport and use of this Office’. Gorges

60 Cope was a prominent figure (see Chamberlain 1939, passim), who became Master of the Wards in 1613 and died £27, 000 in debt. Gorges had had dealings with Cope in 1598/9 over the transfer of Chelsea from Cecil to Lincoln (Hatfield CP 59.86). Gorges had the idea for the scheme; Cope, presumably, provided much of the financial backing. Cope’s involvement would have been instrumental in winning government support for the scheme.

61 In the Summer of 1611 Gorges and Cope built a brick building ‘adjoining the east side of Middle Temple Gate’, abutting the chambers of Antony Luther of the Middle Temple (Martin 1904, 4542) though neither Cope nor Gorges (pace HP) had ever been a member of the Inn. The site was announced in the second edition of the prospectus (Gorges 1612, E4v). The ‘new brick building’, put up during something of a ‘boom’ period for building at the Middle Temple (Bedwell 1909, 31-2), was demolished in 1629 after ‘Mrs. Jaggard’ complained that its chimney had fallen on her roof (Martin 1904, 2.696-97, 752). A cancel-slip
compares the new Office to a ‘publique Market’—like a market, it will bring conveniently together all the best things to be sold. He stresses its benefits (e.g. it will be useful for people who, living in remote shires, do not know a broker) and emphasises the privacy of its arrangements. In conclusion the success of the venture is entrusted to ‘the eternall guide of all things’ (F2v). Anxiety about the scheme must have persisted, for a second edition of the prospectus was published in 1612, adding five new paragraphs intended to meet the objections that the Register would be ‘a meanes to enter into Mens estates, and lay them open to euerie enuious Inquisition’ (Gorges 1612, E3r) and ‘that in this Register there lurkes some mysterie and policie of State, dragging after it a hidden inconuenience not yet seene’ (E3v). Gorges stresses that the scheme guarantees privacy for all participants and that there is no hidden agenda.  

The project responded to a recent shift in the institutional structure of early modern money-lending. 1611, the year in which Gorges’s and Cope’s project got under way, marks, according to Lawrence Stone, ‘a break in the line of really great professional money-lenders working in the private market’ (1965, 536). Increasingly, scriveners were starting to act as loan-brokers, ‘putting creditors in touch with debtors and thus tapping a far wider range of men and women with a surplus of money to invest’ (532). This new ‘bye-employment’ of the scriveners was the first stage of a process which paved the way for the banking projects of the later seventeenth century (Stone 1965, 536-7; Ashton 1960,  

announcing Britain’s Burse as the office’s new location was pasted over the earlier site announcement in some copies of the second edition. 
62 J.W. Williamson connects Prince Henry with this project (1978, 117). There is no evidence either that Henry was involved or that Gorges and Cope intended deviously to exploit the office to gather information of one kind or another (to use it to hunt out recusants, for example). A possible connection with Ralegh is implied by the involvement in the project of Charles Chewte (see note 65), who is included in a list of people allowed to attend Ralegh in the Tower in 1604 (HMC Salisbury 16.193).
12ff.). Gorges’s and Cope’s scheme seems to have been an attempt to usurp and institutionalise the scriveners’ activities, underpinning them with a structure of nation-wide branches comparable to that of a modern-day bank. It represents an attempt to impose order on a chaotic credit system then entirely dependent on the untrammelled ‘enterprise’, and thus self-interest, of individual brokers. Indeed, throughout the pamphlet reference is made to the risks borrowers face in depending on these ‘scriveners or/and brokers’. At the same time, the extended opportunities the register offered for buyers and sellers—its potential to be a paper ‘publique fair’ (Gorges 1612, E3r; 1611, C4r-C4v)—register the growth in retail demand during the early seventeenth century. The objections to which the 1612 edition responded seem to have killed the venture, though, as John Moore pointed out in a letter to William Trumbull:

we cannot endure to have our estates be discovered whether we be rich or poor, which is the reason that Sir Walter Cope’s new commerce, though in itself approvable, is so much contemned, albeit there is provision made that men may borrow other names at their pleasure. (HMC Downshire 2.239)

In the last years of Henry’s life Gorges was probably writing *Lycans Pharsalia* for the prince, a work only published, like Ralegh’s *History of the World*, with which it has affinities, after Henry’s death (see Chapter 6.1). One of the early texts of Ralegh’s treatise on the plan to marry Princess Elizabeth to a Prince of Savoy (a treatise composed in 1611...
at Henry’s command) is attributed to Gorges (BL MS Cotton Vitellius C.XVI ff.529r-38r (Beal 1980, RaW 628)). Clearly Gorges continued to work as an intermediary between Ralegh and the prince. An undated letter from Gorges to Thomas Hariot (BL MS Additional 6789, f.538r, reproduced in Gorges 1953, facing xxiv) testifies to Gorges’s connection with the group associated with Ralegh and the Earl of Northumberland in the Tower (cf. Shirley 1949a): the letter encloses an unidentified ‘discourse’, which Gorges asks Hariot to spend an hour or two reading: ‘Sir lett me entreate yow to calle Master Carleton and Master Warner, to bee Gossyps with yow; att thy Baptisme’. The discourse could be any of Gorges’s extant manuscript treatises (see Chapter 5). Gorges goes on to say, intriguingly, that Hariot has ‘power to command me in a farr greater matter’.

Prince Henry died in November 1612, just two years after Gorges had described him as ‘a braue younge Prince, likelie (by the grace of God) to see, and runn through manye stirringe tymes’ (Trinity College, Cambridge MS R. 7.23 (Prince Henry’s Copybooks 3), f.21r). Henry’s death was a devastating blow for Gorges. Ideologically out of step with those in favour at James’s court, Gorges must have felt isolated and unwanted. His long narrative elegy for Henry, The Olympian Catastrophe, looks back to Daphnaïda and The Faerie Queene, depicting Henry as the Arthurian hero of an interrupted royal tournament (see Chapter 4.3).

In 1614 Gorges’s translation, Lvcans Pharsalia, was published. Henry’s death meant that it (like Ralegh’s History, printed the same year), was unable to function as originally intended: anti-Jamesian elements that might have been acceptable in the context of an

rented the Middle Temple building after the public register office moved to Britain’s Burse (Martin 1904, 2.572).

⁶⁶ Gorges’s son Egremont (Davies 1914, 123) was presumably named in honour of Northumberland.
educative text for Henry now became potentially dangerous (see Chapter 6.1). Gorges’s oblique approach to this situation involved prefacing the book with a dedication to Lucy, Countess of Bedford supposedly written by his ten-year old son, Carew. Though the Lucan dedication is deliberately apolitical, the choice of the Countess of Bedford, one-time neighbour at Kew, as a potential patron firmly identifies Gorges as an anti-Spanish hawk (Norbrook 1994, 51-2). Gorges wrote an elegy for the Countess’s young brother, Prince Henry’s best friend, who died in the same year that Lucan’s Pharsalia appeared (Gorges 1953, poem 108).  

Two legacies cushioned Gorges’s life in his last years. In 1614 his nephew William died, leaving Gorges the family manor of Butshead (and inadvertently involving Gorges in a legal dispute with the occupants of the manor house (BL MS Additional 38170, ff.244r-244v)). In 1615 the death of the Earl of Lincoln meant that the Chelsea estate came to Gorges and his wife (Davies 1904, 38; Sandison 1928, 665). They lived in the Great House until 1619, when it was sold to Lionel Cranfield, the Gorgeses moving into the smaller house they had built nearby (Davies 1904, 38; 1914, 96; Sandison 1928, 667). During his last years, Gorges served as a JP for Surrey (Cockburn 1982, passim) and for Middlesex (Sandison 1928, 666).  

Ralegh was released from the Tower in March 1615/6. There is no evidence that Gorges was involved in any way with Ralegh’s final, disastrous Guiana expedition, though after Ralegh’s death Gorges incorporated some of the orders Ralegh had issued for the expedition into a tract on how best to fight a Spanish invasion (see Chapter 5.4).

---

67 This elegy is the last easily dateable poem in a group added, probably in a spirit of Stoical resignation, to Gorges’s manuscript of his shorter poetry, BL MS Egerton 3165 (see Chapter 3.2).
68 Though he was not yet a JP in May 1612 (PRO STAC8/244/4).
In the aftermath of Ralegh’s execution, Gorges was confined to his house on the basis of charges levelled against him by Sir Lewis Stukely, the cousin who had betrayed Ralegh to his death (Sandison 1928, 668-9). Gorges gives a few details in a letter to William Trumbull taken down by his French secretary on 12 January 1618/9: he had been, he says,

*commandé de me retirer en ma maison comme prisonnier, pour avoir un peu brusquement affronté et disgracié ce poltron Stukiye qui avoit pratiqué une grande vilenie contre moy pour m’attraper par quelque finesse que ie descouroy et euito: mais si tost que ie l’auoy estrillé pour cela, il s’en alla en poste vers le Roy qui pour lors estoit aux Champs, et se pleignit de moy avec beaucoup de mensonges: en telle façon que par le commandement de Sa Maiesté i’estoy confiné en ma maisq^ pretendant que i’auoy affronté le service et affaires du Roy^ respect de mon Cousin Monsieur Raleigh (BL MS Trumbull 10, f.l2r)

Called up before the Privy Council, Gorges exonerated himself: not only did he regain his liberty, he says, but ‘ie receuoy la, autant d’honneur et de grace que iamais ait esté attribuée à Gentilhomme qui soit’ (*ibid.*) to the disgrace of Stukely. James told Pembroke to tell Gorges he was in the right.

In March 1618/9 Gorges dedicated a manuscript treatise on the best way to defend England against a Spanish attack to the Duke of Buckingham, recently appointed Lord High Admiral. He may also have presented Buckingham with revised copies of his narrative account of the Islands Voyage and the notes on the sea-service (see Chapter 5.3-4).

The last fifteen or so years of Gorges’s life, when he was based in Kew and Chelsea, are marked by a series of acrimonious court cases. Gorges seems to have been acutely sensitive to any aspersions cast on his honour or status, and, according to his opponents, to have used violence to impose awareness of this honour and status on others.69 1615

---

69 Though he was also accused of violence not specifically linked to this issue. In 1609 Phillip Arnold, a waterman Gorges had hired to transport provisions from London to Kew, accused Gorges of assaulting him, ‘altogether forgettinge or at least neglectinge his ... place of Justice of peace and the oath which he had taken for the preservacion of yor Maiesties Peace’, when Arnold asked to be paid. Having first ‘entred into

52
saw a particularly vivid instance. In Star Chamber (PRO STAC8/20/10), Francis Beale claimed that Christopher Davies had bribed Gorges, a JP, to say that Beale had fathered Davies’s illegitimate child. All parties in this case were acutely anxious that their high social status be recognised. Central to Beale’s complaint against Gorges was Gorges’s behaviour at an initial examination. According to Beale, John Morris, an associate of Davies’s, had sneered at Beale, leading Beale to claim that Morris had no right to insult a superior. Morris retorted by giving Beale the lie direct. Rather than respond with the violence his wounded reputation demanded, Beale asked Gorges to bind over Morris for good behaviour, only to be outraged by Gorges’s response:

Sir Arthur...pubblicklie told the said Francis Beale that he had none of the bloud Royall in him and purposelie to incite and prouoke to some outragions course being then in hott blood newlie wounded as aforesaid the said Sr Arthur told the said Francis Beale that he the said Sr Arthur had been in the feild before Ten thousand of his enemies and shed his bloud where he thought the said Francis Beale would haue Rune away.

According to Beale, Gorges tried to force him to give up ‘anie Course of revenge against [Morris] by the sword for giving him the Lye’. Beale agreed to this, but only because he said Morris was not a fit adversary. Gorges’s evidence to the court casts doubt on Beale’s self-description, and stresses the gentlemanly appearance of Morris. He attempts to authorise his social status in terms very similar to those in the speech attributed to him in the magistrate’s court by Beale. Central to this self-authorisation is the brief period of rayling speeches’ Gorges, it was accused, beat Arnold with a ‘Cudgell or bastinado in his hand full of knobbs & knockes beeinge three Inches in Compasse’, drawing copious blood and confining Arnold to bed for a fortnight (PRO STAC8/244/4). In 1610, William Arden, accusing Gorges of punishing his horses for trespassing on Gorges’s land by cutting their tails off, said Gorges was ‘a man of a very vnrule spirit’ (ibid.) Prescott called Gorges ‘a man of very rough and intemperate behavior’ who had threatened to kill Prescott’s cattle with his crossbow (ibid.). Gorges’s defence against Arnold and Prescott was that they were the ringleaders of a group of Kew inhabitants bent on trespassing and causing havoc on Gorges’s land. It is worth remembering that accusations of violence and riot were commonplace in renaissance law-courts and not always to be taken at face value.
Gorges’s military service for the crown, which Gorges uses here to focus his social identity:

this defendant saithe that for anythings that concerned this defts reputation Hee ... did better understande it then Mr Beale could teach him, having often giuen sufficiente Testimony thereof in private by his Worde, at home in his owne Cuntrye and in publicke in forraigne Cuntries both by sea and land in ... his service to his Prince and Cuntrie by the adventure of his lief and losse of his bloodde in the face of his enemies more then euer Mr Beale had donne And for it, receaved in the feild the honor and title of a knight as the reward of Vertue and valor [...]

Gorges bases his social identity and standing in three arenas, moving outwards from the least to the most public: testimony to his reputation has been given ‘in private by his Worde’, in his service to his local community and in military service abroad. The third arena sets the seal on the other two. His wounding in the royal service (during the Islands Voyage) is the ultimate authorisation of his reputation. Gorges’s low opinion of Beale’s social status is coterminous with his assessment of Beale as a coward who, faced with the enemies Gorges encountered, ‘would have Run away’.

Gorges’s long-running dispute over trespass with Alexander Prescott, a Chelsea goldsmith, had similar elements. Bringing a case against Gorges in 1610, Prescott said that a servant of Gorges’s had threatened in public to kill any trespassing cattle of Prescott’s, and that he had done this at a time when Prescott was sitting as foreman of the homager jury of the manor court of Richmond. Prescott implied that Gorges had disrupted legal proceedings that came under the ultimate jurisdiction of Prince Henry as lord of the manor of Richmond. In his reply, Gorges does not deny sending his servant,

---

70 Morris laid claim to a higher social status than Beale, disputing Beale’s description of his father as a ‘handicraftsman’. He claimed that his father had been a learned German mathematician and stressed the noble status of mathematics in ancient Greece.

71 Gorges echoes Ralegh’s prefatory poem to Gorges’s Luvens Pharsalia, published the previous year (see Chapter 6.1.2).
and devotes his energy instead to questioning Prescott’s attempt ‘to laye some
ymputation of offence or neglecte to be Committed by this defendant towards the said
Noble Prince or his Offycer whereof this defendant himselfe is one in a place of Right
good accomte and trust’, arguing that ‘it is manifestly & generally well knowne how
much the said Prince his highnesse by his worthie particular Favours to this defendant
hath firmely oblidged this defendant to serue honor & loue him & Consequently to haue a
due respecte towards his Highnesse Officers which as this said defendant hath’. The court
Prescott mentions, Gorges argues, was held under the jurisdiction of Edward Gorges
(Gorges’s cousin) and not the prince—so Gorges has not insulted the prince in any way.
Later, Prescott says, Gorges burst into a meeting of the homager jury with a gang of
armed ruffians,\(^{73}\) ‘nether hauinge such due respect of the preservacion of yor highnes peace
as a good subiect ought to haue had nor such due regard of his duty to the said Noble
Prince as his Copieholder ought to haue had’, pulled Prescott’s beard, hit him in the
mouth and threatened to knock Prescott’s head and the wall together. Again, Gorges
defends himself by appealing to his honourable status. He says he temperately accused
Prescott’s cows of trespass and only got angry when Prescott gave him the lie, saying
‘You haue heard many words but not true ... which scorneful maner of lye beinge giuen to
this defendant by a man of soe base quallitie in a place soe publicke: this defendant did
houlde so greate a disgrace for him this defendant to pockett vp’. Playing down the
assault on Prescott—Gorges says he gently touched Prescott’s beard and then, when

\(^{72}\) Gorges’s use here of martial experience as the ultimate validation of his status is a clue to the seriousness
with which he must have taken the composition and presentation of his naval treatises. A major concern of
all of his treatises is the projection of Gorges as an experienced military figure (see Chapter 5).

\(^{73}\) Gorges claimed he was accompanied only by a page and coachman, and that the only weapon was his
‘little wearinge Rapyer fytt for a Gentleman of his profession to Carrye.’
Prescott gave him the lie again, flicked slightly with the back of his hand 'towards'
Prescott’s nose—Gorges says that he pointed out to Prescott that ‘a lye giuen and
reiterated in that manner had Cost many a man his liffe. And was vsually more deeply
revenged then this defendant had done.’ Prescott concludes that Gorges is

of such A contentious violent & turbulent spirite bearinge & boastinge himself of the greatnes of his
owne estate & the Countenannc he hath by beinge within your said verge & the multitude of his friends
that neither of your subjects or any other of your subjects beeing men of meane qualitie can live neere
vnto him without danger & oppression wronge or violence to be offered or made vnto him & ther
Cattle...

He points out that it is very difficult for poor people to get justice imposed on such a
grandee.74

Perhaps related to Gorges’s anxiety about status in this period of his career is his
problematic relationship with his sons. His will fulminates angrily against three of them.

These, he says,

I haue found to be very wastfull and carelesse of my comaundements whereby they haue the more
hindered themselves and displeased me with the neglect of their duties towards God ... [I pray that]
their ill example may be an admonition to their youngest brother [Henry] to follow better courses whom
also I beseech the Father of heaven to inspire with his grace in his young yeeres, that he may accordingly
proceede in vertue and piety in his elder yeeres (PRO PROB1/147)75

Gorges’s will includes a substantial list of property as well as a parting shot at King
James. Gorges says that he has ‘never received any manner of rewarde or preferment of
kinge James notwithstanding my loving and faithfull service’, having received instead

74 In his final reply, Gorges emphasises Prescott’s ‘meanness’ and ‘baseness’. Prescott’s claim echoes the
accusation made by the Earl of Lincoln and Henry Hickes later that Gorges ‘seldome goeth abroade where
he may bee arrested vnless yt bee to the Assizes ...’ and uses his status as a JP to evade arrest, being ‘so
furiously and desperately bent and allwaies Carrieth with him (in shewe to attend him) divers such desperate
and quarrellsome fellows his followers and servants that [no-one] dare to arrest him ... for daunger of their
lives’ (PRO STAC8/91/29). Gorges was involved in many other disputes. In October 1618 he brought a
case against a large number of men and women from Chelsea, accusing them of riotously trespassing on
some land of his with disputed common rights (PRO STAC5/160/18; C2/JAMESI/G2/16). In 1622,
Gorges and his wife alleged that Sir John Danvers was illegally occupying a ‘messuage and close’ which
should have come to them on the death of the Earl of Lincoln. They also alleged that Danvers had stolen
and hidden away all the relevant deeds and records (PRO C2/JAMESI/G3/12).
'many crosse; and detractions from his Maiestie to my great hinderaunce and
impoverishing in divers kindes although I farre better deserved, whereof I haue good
testimonyes remayning vnder his owne royall hand'.

In his will Gorges asked that his body

may be buried in my Ile in the Church of Chelsey where my friends shall thinke most fitt, And that there
be noe pompe nor ceremony vsed at my funerall but to be buried privately in the evening with ordinary
divine Christian service and only accompanied with myne owne children and servants or such frriendes
as of their own voluntary vouchsafe to accompany my body in that charitable office,will to be buried in
the evening.

The accent here is on privacy—one gets no sense reading this that Gorges seeks in death
to display his honourable status. Yet this impression is wrong. When selling the great
house at Chelsea Gorges had gone out of his way to retain the prestigious right of burial
in the More Chapel in Chelsea Old Church that ownership of the house had brought him
(Davies 1904, 5-6; 1914, 82). The location of his body, if nothing else, confirmed his
honourable status. Gorges died on 28 September 1625 and was buried in the More Chapel
on 10 October. The parish register records that in the same month twenty-two people died
of the plague (2.130), death uniting patrons, clients and vagabonds. The Countess of
Bedford observed that 1625 was a 'fatal' year—deadly 'to great persons as well as the
meaner' (Cornwallis 1842, 120).^76

^75 There is a desperate poignancy here in the name 'Henry'. Presumably this last hope of Gorges's was
named after the dead prince, from whom Gorges had expected so much.
^76 For Gorges's epitaph, with its mention of Gorges's translation of Lucan, and his memorial brass,
picturing Gorges, Elizabeth and their children kneeling, see Sandison 1928, 667, n.82; 1953, plate facing
title-page.
1. Letters and the Patronage System

Patronage relationships, unavoidable in early modern Europe,¹ were a major focus for anxiety in renaissance culture. The patronage tie centred on a continuous process of exchange: the patron provided the client with material help (money, jobs) in return for which the client offered the patron ill-defined ‘service’. Patron and client performed ritualistic moves, deploying ‘accepted conventions of solicitation and acknowledgement’ (MacCaffrey 1991, 21). Despite this, patronage texts deceptively emphasised the ‘voluntariness’ of the patronage tie (Lytle 1987). Clients glossed their offers of service by referring to their love and respect for their patrons’ nobility, glory and accomplishments, stressing that their service was ‘freely given’. A similar emphasis on individual acts of will informed texts produced by patrons. The relationship between a patron and a client was presented as voluntary though in reality, as Sharon Kettering points out, the ties were tight and demanding:

Polite references to the gracious, voluntary bestowal of patronage by a benevolent superior upon a worthy inferior for his valuable service were more complimentary and a more flattering portrayal of the giver and a greater honour for the recipient than the reality of an obligatory relationship. In fact, a patron was obliged to reward the loyal service of a client if he wanted to retain his service, and a client was obliged to repay a patron’s material generosity with loyal service if he wanted patronage in the future. The polite term ‘freely-given’ concealed the obligatory reciprocity of the patron-client exchange [which]

¹ ‘Patronage’, Linda Levy Peck says (1990, 3) ‘structured early modern society.’ As Robert C. Evans points out, to analyse an early modern man or woman’s patronage relations is to analyse a large part of his or her identity: ‘Patronage, or one’s place in the various interlocking patronage networks, went far towards defining not only one’s social status but also one’s self-esteem’ (1989, 23). Cf. Biagioli 1993, 16: ‘we should not think of patronage as an ‘option’...Patronage was a voluntary activity only in the narrow sense that by not engaging in it one would commit social suicide.’
helped to create the bond of trust and loyalty and at the same time accommodated the self-interest of the partners.²

In practice this meant that in most patronage relationships, the genuineness of the bond—the warmth of the patron towards the client and vice versa—was perpetually in doubt, and the relationship and its texts a site for anxiety.³ A further point of tension for the client was the likelihood that he would never be able to repay his debt to his patron and that he would accordingly be forced into 'a continuous display of affection, deference and obedience' (Landé 1977, xxvii).

There is evidence to suggest that the early modern period saw an increase in patronage tensions, as patrons tended to rely more and more on clients outside the ambit of their households, and the pressures of a developing proto-capitalism grew.⁴ Such developments accentuated the anxieties and indeterminacies at the basis of patron-client relationships.

In the renaissance the letter genre was the focus for the textualisation of patronage relationships. Manuscript letters were central to renaissance culture. They were the

---

³ In explicating the patronage structures of early modern France, Roland Mousnier attempted to distinguish between relationships based on self-interest and relationships based on genuine affection. A growing body of opinion now finds such distinctions untenable: see Kettering 1992; Lytle 1987; Neuschel 1989. The client's 'real' attitude to his or her patron could range from adulation to contempt and is very difficult to recover from clients' letters alone. Cf. John Chamberlain's irritation at Dudley Carleton's patron Sir Walter Cope, the 'ydle oracle of the Strand' (1.271): 'Though I hold him neither apt nor greatly able to do any frend he hath goode,yet must we sometimes hold a candle before the devill, and do as the people of Calicut, that worship him not so much for any help they looke for at his hands, as because he shold do them no harme' (Chamberlain 1939, 1.163; see also 1.237-8). Gorges's most extensive avowal of friendship for his major patron Robert Cecil comes in a letter of 1602/3: 'a frend yt I haue more cause to honor then your selfe, I know not whe[r] he dwels; for yf I thought no so, I doe and dare avoe, yt yf I affected not your person, I wolde neuar fawne on ye purple; for I have knowne others ryght powrefull; yt neyther for hoape nor feare, I euar flattred or followed.' Later in this same letter, written to apologise to Cecil for a clumsy attempt to present him with a New Year's gift, Gorges admits that in the past he has been unhappy with the relationship: 'I must truly confess, yt eyther owte o f lust discontent, or suiruw praesumptions, I haue sumtymes had mutynous concayts, but yet my harte and fayth neuar revolted (Chas:66e:CP 17.42).
⁴ 'As a social form the personal service of early Tudor England was in decay by the end of the sixteenth century but as a cultural form it was not' (Bray 1990, 13). For the commercialisation of patronage in the
commonest means of non-oral communication, used every day by the crown to signify its power and by private individuals to negotiate relationships of every kind. The educational curriculum dominant in English grammar schools, developed originally by Erasmus, accordingly gave letters a vital role. Epistolary composition formed a transition point between the two stages of a grammar school career, the ‘lower school’ lessons in grammar, and the ‘upper school’ lessons in rhetoric. The letter was the first extended rhetorical form most schoolboys were taught. For many it was also the last, as some schools chose not to make pupils compose orations. Arguably, the letter was the key renaissance genre. Within the letter genre, the client’s letter (in effect, the ‘petitionary letter’ (see section 2)) was, because of the centrality of the patronage system, particularly important.

One of the most important influences on renaissance letter writing was the medieval rhetoric of letter writing, the *ars dictaminis* (Murphy 1974; Constable 1976; Camargo 1991ab). The *ars*, practised largely by the secretaries of those in authority, had been centrally concerned with the mediation of hierarchical relationships through rhetorical norms. *Artes dictaminis* traditionally devoted much space to a letter’s two opening sections (the *salutatio* and the *captatio benevolentiae*) since it was considered crucial to

Jacobean period see Peck 1990. Peck stresses Buckingham’s corrosive effect on court patronage after 1614, though she also argues that the system was already in decay.

5 Baldwin 1944, 1.89-90, 99-101, 132-3, 155-62, 363, 402, 413. For accounts of the teaching of letter-writing in Elizabethan grammar-schools see 2.239-71; Clark 1948, 185f. Letter-writing manuals were important partly because, unlike the new Ramist rhetorics, they retained the categories of *dispositio* and *inventio*.

6 Educated Elizabethans would have been conditioned by their education to read texts through the prism of the epistolary form. Renaissance texts were thus read by a public for whom the paradigmatic communicative form was addressed to a single specified individual. Printed works of literature accordingly tend to guard their approach to the unknown purchaser with strategies intended to evoke the letter form and the comforting ghosts of specific addressees (Mack 1994; Marotti 1995, 209-324; Wall 1993). Henry Peacham, writing in 1622, says that epistles are often the most interesting parts of printed books (Peacham 1962, 66).
the success of a letter that the social status of both addressee and writer be precisely notated (Constable 1977). The renaissance’s dictaminal inheritance was tempered by the emergent ideal of the ‘familiar letter’, stimulated by Petrarch’s rediscovery of Cicero’s letters to Atticus. The ‘familiar letter’ was conceived of as a loosely structured text, free of strict rhetorical rules, inspired by selfless amicitia. Clearly, this was an ideal antithetical to the strictures of the ars dictaminis. In the renaissance its force made itself felt to writers of all types of letters. Matters were complicated by a third epistolographical model, which involved the application to letter writing of the full, recently rediscovered system of ancient rhetoric (Gerlo 1971; Monfasani 1988; Henderson 1983ab; 1988; 1991; 1992; 1993). Humanist epistolographies, such as Erasmus’s De conscribendis epistolis (Erasmus 1985) overlaid the ideal of the ‘familiar letter’ with elaborate rhetorical rules adapted from Quintilian. Ironically, it suddenly became possible to manufacture the unstudied eloquence of the ‘familiar letter’ (cf. Jardine 1996).

The renaissance letter writer was pulled in three directions by the epistolographical manuals he or she read. He or she was expected simultaneously to be a socially tactful dictator, a potent rhetor, and a Petrarchan/Ciceronian humanist stretching out the hand of amicitia to absent friends. The classical ideal of the ‘familiar letter’ was diametrically opposed to the view that letter writing demanded elaborate rhetorical rules and conventions and also, in its avoidance of the issue of status relationships, opposed to the old dictaminal concentration on the delineation of social hierarchies.

Juan Luis Vives says that a letter should be as free from artifice as ‘a tender young maiden’ (1405). Erasmus advises the cultivation of an ‘artless’ manner in letters: ‘whatever would not have escaped criticism in other forms of writing can be defended here ... variation and unevenness of style and subject-matter which would merit condemnation elsewhere here have a peculiar charm (1985, 20).
These tensions are strikingly homologous to those at the centre of renaissance patronage relations. The idealistic terms of clientage discourse—of voluntary, mutual dedication based ostensibly on the patron’s and client’s recognition of each other’s ethical worth—was analogous to the idealistic discourse of the Petrarchan ‘familiar’ letter. Meanwhile, in relation both to letter writing and to patronage, an idealistic discourse of friendship was underpinned by more rigid conceptions of social hierarchy and duty: for epistolography, the dictaminal tradition; for patronage discourse, hierarchical, quasi-‘feudal’ modes of social relation. These parallels are not accidental: letter writing and the patronage system, closely connected to each other, simultaneously registered important tensions in the nature of social relationships—tensions which inevitably play a part in Gorges’s letters.

2. Epistolary Structures

Most clients’ letters in the renaissance can be categorised as ‘petitionary letters’. The importance of the patronage system meant that, of all types of letter, the ‘petitionary’ or ‘petitory’ letter was central. Angel Day notes that

there is no one thing affoording matter more plentiful, or with vse more commonly frequented, then this Petitorie kinde, (Insomuche as whatsoeuer containeth any speciall or sole requeste in the substaunce thereof to bee accomplished is hereunder concluded) (1586, M4v)

adding the observation that ‘the method [of the petitory letter] is one of the most ordinaire of any sortes of Letters that are indited’ (M8v).

Most of Gorges’s extant letters—the bulk of which were written between 1593 and 1610 to Gorges’s patron, Sir Robert Cecil—use the strategies recommended by Erasmus

8 None of Cecil’s replies is extant.
for ‘indirect’ petitions—petitions, that is, in which there is an element of ‘shamefulness’ in making the request:

we shall use an indirect approach in making the request, first of all exaggerating the need that besets us, showing what a great weapon neediness is, how useless modesty is to a person in need, and that we are well aware of the shamelessness of making so large a request of a person for whom we have never done anything to deserve it. After that we shall gradually demonstrate in subtle ways that no slight hope is afforded by his singular kindness, which prompts him to give assistance even to unknown and undeserving persons because of the extraordinary goodness of his virtue, which is disposed to lighten all men’s miseries. This restrained manner commends the petitioner highly, just as presumption serves to estrange the other’s feelings. For no one willingly grants a kindness to one who expects it as if it were his due and who makes a demand rather than a request. (Erasmus 1985, 172-3)

Gorges is frequently less than modest (see section 4 for a gloss on this). In general, though, his letters fit Erasmus’s prescriptions. Certain themes keep cropping up: Gorges’s long service; his lack of reward; the preferment of less worthy men; the dire consequences if his request is not granted. In letters written to Cecil in Elizabeth’s reign Gorges consistently uses the phrase ‘her sacred person’ to allude to the Queen’s presence, the cynosure of all his petitions.

Gorges’s structuring of his letters was influenced by a number of factors. His practice varied, as one would expect, according to the nature of the relationship with his patron at the time of writing. Equally significant was the relationship between the letter in question and other components—letters to and from other people; formal written petitions;^audiences with the letter’s addressee and with other potential patrons—in whatever patronage negotiations were in train. It is worth bearing in mind that letters were always secondary, always subordinate to face to face contact between patron and client.10 The delivery of a letter was significant, too. On delivery, letters were often

---

9 For examples of formal petitions by Gorges see Hatfield CP Petitions 56; 119; Hatfield CP 187.123.
10 Though, as John Chamberlain pointed out, ‘great men love letters’ (1939, 1.237). See, e.g., Vives 1989, 36; Whigham 1981, 881, n.22. On occasion Gorges apologises in his letters for not appearing in person to plead his suit. See, e.g., Hatfield CP 50.30: ‘I knowe it woulde better beseeme me to wayte on your honnor my selfe, then to wryte; but that I am a bannished man from the Courte, and a strauenger to that parte of the
expanded on by servants, friends or even patrons of the writer.\textsuperscript{11} Behind renaissance clients' letters are complicated secret histories, involving elaborate, intersecting negotiations, oral and written, with a variety of patrons and associates.\textsuperscript{12}

At the heart of Gorges's patronage negotiations was his relationship with the monarch. Most of Gorges's letters to patrons ask them to intervene with the monarch on his behalf (e.g. Hatfield CP 61.55; 75.53; 78.61). Some of his letters to Cecil (e.g. 35.97; 45.25; 75.53; 182.47) make great play of Queen Elizabeth's favour, reporting that she has asked Gorges to seek his reward from Cecil.\textsuperscript{13} The existence of Gorges's private correspondence with Cecil is itself testimony to Gorges's (comparative) inwardness with the highest court circles. That Gorges was able to write directly to Cecil as a loving client was in itself a mark of status and success.\textsuperscript{14} Throughout his correspondence with Cecil, Gorges had to face the problem of how to reconcile the discourse of client-patron

---

\textsuperscript{11} The ideal messenger was someone close to the writer, ideally a friend or close personal servant whose presence could go some way towards compensating for the writer's absence (Allen 1972, 20, 126, 136-8; Starkey 1977). To Edward Stafford, his personal courier was as much his 'right hand' as a secretary (Allen 1972, 30). Cf. Chapter 1, note 5, for Gorges's uncle Sir Thomas Gorges's function as Queen Elizabeth's special messenger. When John Chamberlain found a letter left at his lodging without knowing how it had been delivered he felt that part of the message had been lost (Chamberlain 1939, 1.216). Letters written to one friend or patron were sometimes read out by their addressee and glossed (generally, the writer hoped, supportively) in the presence of another friend or patron. Cf. Chamberlain's attempts to get Sir Walter Cope to help Dudley Carleton by showing to Robert Cecil a letter written by Carleton to Cope. Chamberlain urges Cope to do more than simply 'shew a bare letter', saying he must 'second yt with some good affection' \textsuperscript{12}.

\textsuperscript{12} A vivid window onto this world is provided by the letters written to Robert Sidney by Rowland Whyte, Sidney's agent at court during his absence in the low countries (Collins 1746).

\textsuperscript{13} Gorges also uses Elizabeth in this way after her death, basing an appeal for favour to Cecil and the Earl of Suffolk (old servants of Elizabeth) on Gorges's service of the dead Queen (SP14/15/33, ff.54-54v). Cf. his reference to himself in a letter to Cecil of 1610 as 'one of ye outcasts of Queene Elyabeths auncyent and faythfull Servaunts; of whom ye Lordship hathe euar shewed a noble care, yf the faulte haue not byne in theme selues' (Hatfield CP 128.156).

\textsuperscript{14} Cf. Gorges's fear in 1598, at one of his low points, that he may 'bee enforced, euen with common sewters as one forsaken of all other meanes; to importune Her Maiestie with publique; and contynewall petitions' (Hatfield CP 61.55).
friendship (cf. Lytle 1987) within which he found himself writing with the starker reality of his client status.

Clients such as Gorges often sought help from more than one patron. One letter spells out the fact that Gorges is soliciting Cecil ‘amongst others my noble friends’ (Hatfield CP 46.59). Gorges addressed some letters jointly to Cecil and to other important court figures (61.55; 77.45; 188.12; 251.73; PRO SP14/15/33, ff.54r-55v). The idea was that these figures would work together for Gorges’s interests. In 1610 Gorges petitioned both Cecil (Hatfield CP 128.156) and Prince Henry (BL MS Harley 7007, ff.440r-440v) for a position in the prince’s household. To Henry, Gorges wrote that he shunned ‘the mediation of great men; for that were to anticipate your own liking in the free election of your servants’. In his letter to Cecil he managed simultaneously to seek Cecil’s mediation and deny that he was seeking it:

Although I wyll not importune your Lordship to deale for me by waye of mediation; yet I shall humbly praye your honorable fauour (yt it cumm in question;) so farfoorth as you shall think well bestowed, on a poore gentleman yt with many noble benefytts you haue faste bounde; to affoord yowr good worde.

Gorges also paid court to Cecil in association with other clients. In 1594, he wrote a letter on behalf of himself and his cousin Sir George Carew, seeking Cecil’s help for an unnamed suit (Hatfield CP 27.49). In 1606 his unsuccessful petition for the

---

15 For the court background to some of these letters see Chapter 1.2. These letters are all in the hands of professional scribes and are on the whole phrased more formally than letters written from Gorges to Cecil alone. A letter of 1604 (Hatfield CP 108.99) opens with lavish acknowledgement of Cecil’s past help, protesting that though Gorges may thank other patrons, gratitude is really only due to Cecil himself (‘Complement maye in discretion be attrubuted to others; but acknowledgement and gratytude onlye due to your Noble selfe’). Gorges goes on to mention a further suit being solicited for him by Sir Philip Herbert ‘because my healthe is now erased’ and in his conclusion manages to ask for Cecil’s support at the same time as saying that he does not want it: ‘To aduaunce my fortune thearin, I cannot be so stupyde, as yet doubtingly to emploie your favor; whearof I haue alreadye had so greate and comfortable assuraunce; but ought rather by my best endeavours to make your lordship knowe, yt I holde my selfe bounde to loue and honor yow to ye Laste daye of my lyfe.’
Lieutenantship of the Ordnance was contingent on Carew being appointed Master of the Ordnance (115.126).\footnote{Cf. Sir John Harington in 1604 to the Earl of Shrewsbury: ‘Your Lordship promist me to move my Lord Treasurer and my Lord of Northampton and my Lord Cecill on this behalf. I pray your Lordship let mee add my Lord Chauncellor, who may stryke the greatest stroke thearyn’ (Harington 1930, 112).}

In analysing Gorges’s letters I have found it useful to bear in mind the guidelines laid down by Angel Day in the 1586 edition of The English Secretorie. In an opening section on letters in general (B7v), Day lists the six key parts of a letter: \textit{exordium}, ‘a beginning or induction to the matter ... not alwayes after one sort or fashion, but in diuers maners’; \textit{narratio} or \textit{propositio} ‘eache seruinge to one effect, wherein is declared or proponed, in the one by playne termes, in the other by inference or comparisons, the very substaunce of the matter whatsoeuer to be handled’; the \textit{confirmatio}, ‘wherein are amplyfied or suggested manye reasons, for the agrauating or proofe of anye matter in question’; \textit{confutatio}, ‘whereby is diminished, disprooued or auoyded, whatsoeuer to be supposed, obiected or agrauated’; \textit{peroratio}, ‘in which after a breife recapitulation of that which hath beene urged, the occasions moouing affection are immediately concluded.’ Day points out that ‘These are not altogether at all tymes vsed, but some or the most of them as occasion serueth, eyther admitted or reiected: besides which, others also are sometimes remembred’ (B7v-B8r).\footnote{For Gorges, Carew and Ralegh working together see section 4.}

In the 1586 edition of The English Secretorie, Day marks in the margins the major parts of his model letters. In the section on ‘petitorie’ epistles (M1r-M8v), Day does not use \textit{confirmatio} or \textit{confutatio}. \textit{Exordium}, \textit{narratio}, \textit{propositio}, \textit{petitio} and \textit{peroratio} are all marked. Also marked, instead of \textit{confirmatio} and \textit{confutatio}, are parts of the letter not
mentioned in Day's opening discussion: 'Honestie of request'; 'Meane of performance'; 'Possibilitie'; 'Remuneration'. These are elements particular to the composition of petitionary letters. Day’s practice here is indebted to Erasmus. In *De conscribendis epistolis*, Erasmus begins his discussion of petitionary letters by quoting the four elements stated by Servius to be necessary to all requests:

First, that we show that our request lies within the power of the person to whom it is made; second, that we explain the justice of our request; next, that we indicate the method and manner in which our request can be fulfilled; and finally, that a reward will follow. (1985, 172).

Day gives six rules for the composition of petitionary letters, repeating the four given by Servius and Erasmus and adding two ways in which to appeal to the patron:

[Firstly] it is requisite that in the *Exordium* an endeavor be used therby to adhibite unto vs the good will, fauor, or good liking of him to whom we write. Next that therein we proceed according to our acquaintance with the party, his estate credit, or support whereby to pleasure vs. Thirdly that the cause we take upon vs to preferre, be lust, lawfull, and honest. Fourthly that it be in his habilitie, or power to counsell, aayne, protec, preferre or relieue vs. Fifthly, the order or meanes whereby the same may be wrought and accomplished. Sixly, our gratitude and remuneration, worthily tied to the thankful acknowledgement or requital of the same. (1586, M1v)

The parts of the petitionary epistle marked by Day—*exordium*, *narratio* (*propositio*); *petitio*, *peroratio*; honesty of request; possibility; means of performance; remuneration—are useful units with which to analyse Gorges's letters. Though Gorges is unlikely to have learnt letter-writing from Day’s manual, his letters share with *The English Secretorie* the aim of applying epistolographical rhetoric to the demands of the English renaissance patronage system. For this reason, Day is a better guide to Gorges’s practice than the Latin humanist texts Gorges is more likely to have actually read.²⁰

---

¹⁸ All letters contain salutations, farewells, subscriptions and superscriptions ('the outewarde direction' (B8r)).

¹⁹ Day also marks a few elements not restricted to the petitionary genre, e.g. 'Distributio' (M3v); 'Parenthesis' (M4r).

²⁰ For surveys of the use made by renaissance English epistolographies of the dictaminal and humanist traditions see Hornbeak 1934; Robertson 1942.
Day's first example of a petitionary letter (M2v-M3r) establishes a normative structure for the genre: an *exordium* and a *narratio cum propositione* (in which the background to the petition is laid out) prepare the way for a *petitio* which is then backed up by sections on 'Honestie of request', 'The meanes to performe the same' and 'Remuneration'.

Some patronage letters consist only of no more than a short *salutation/exordium* in praise of the patron and the subscription. Apart from simple acknowledgements of the client's status as the patron's client, they are contentless. The most basic of clients' letters, these texts perform a vital function by simply keeping the patronage tie going.

An example of this type of letter was written by Gorges to Cecil during the Islands Voyage of 1597:

```
Moste honorable and deare Sir/ I maye more easely troble yow; then satisfie my selfe; with the remembrance [of] my duty and devouted affection to your Honor: whoe euar lyuinge in my dearest and reverent thoughts: Muste be somtymes subiect to the incumber of my words; for that I doo rather desyre to incurr the concaye of folly then Ingratytude. Heare is no meanes nor occasion that I canne fynde to doo your honor any acceptable seruyce; And therfore wyll only resarue my selfe to be commaunded by yow att your good pleasure; prayinge God to prosper your dayes. with multiplyed happynes. (54.30)
```

On the whole, however, something approaching Day's standard order seems to have served as Gorges's template in the composition of his petitionary letters. Erasmus recommended flexibility in structuring letters, or, rather, the appearance of flexibility: 'in the end it is better for letters which seem at times to have no order at all, even when they are in fact carefully constructed, to conceal rather than reveal their order' (1985, 65).

The appearance of fluidity brings a letter closer to the unstructured, 'unaffected' ideal of

---

21 'The like order hereof is generally to be entertained through out all the residue of these Epistles' (M3r).
22 Whigham compares these letters to the modern use of the telephone conversation to 'check in' or 'keep in touch' (1981, 867). It is presumably letters of this type that Hoskins says 'go a-begging for some meaning and labor to be delivered of a great burthen of nothing' (1935, 4).
23 Writing here is significantly conceived of as a substitute for service. Interestingly, though the tenor of this letter is submissive, Gorges's language imagines a 'subject' Cecil encumbered by the client's rhetoric.
the familiar letter. Day’s model petitionary letters generally shift seamlessly from one part to the next, to fluid, if not artless, effect. Gorges’s letters, too, generally disguise the transitions between the different sections which make them up.\footnote{69}

The structure suggested by Day as standard (exordium; narratio; petitio; ‘Honestie of request’; ‘Meane of performance’; ‘Possibilitie’; ‘Remuneration’) has a logical rationale. The narratio provides a context for the petitio,\footnote{26} then, once the request has been made, it can be buttressed with supporting arguments derived from the topics of ‘Honestie of request’, ‘Meane of performance’, ‘Possibilitie’ and ‘Remuneration’. In Gorges’s letters, the ‘honesty’ of petitions usually turns out to inhere in the misery of Gorges’s condition: poverty, lack of reward, desperation. Frequently the narratio concentrates on elements in the progress of Gorges’s petitioning rather than in anything more substantively connected with the subject-matter of the petition (e.g. Hatfield CP 86.65; 108.99).

A letter written in November 1596 when, following the Queen’s anger at his second marriage, Gorges was facing prison, presents an interesting anomaly. Gorges’s bleak exordium casts him outside the patronage system as a man incapable of receiving or returning favour:

I being now plunged ouer the eares by that maistering disease of affection, which many wiser then my selfe haue fallen into Haue presumed amongst others my noble friends to craue such fauour of your Honor as welwillers commonly afoorde vnto the deed; that is to grace them with their good worde thoughge they cannot reclayme them into the worlde: whiche maner of proceding is the more worthy and

\footnote{Erasmus also advises that ‘On straightforward subjects we should follow the order dictated to us by our judgment, not by petty rules’ (1985, 65). Vives says that no rules need to be followed about the order of the parts of a letter (1989, 83).}

\footnote{The transitions from one section to another often occur in the middle of a sentence. One letter, an exception to this flexibility (78.61), reads unconvincingly as a result.}

\footnote{Erasmus says that in the narratio of a petitory letter ‘we shall adapt everything to persuasion and scatter the seeds, as it were, of the proofs’ (1985, 108).}
sinceere because they are courtesies conferred without hope of recompense; for the dead can yeald no thankes nor unfortunate men retourne gratuities. (46.59)\textsuperscript{27}

Appropriately, given this opening, Gorges presents no petitio. Instead, a narratio detailing Gorges’s court disappointments is followed by a long, confused passage in which Gorges seems simultaneously to defend his behaviour and admit that he has made a mistake.\textsuperscript{28} There is no petitio, it seems, because Gorges is unable to decide whether or not he is entitled to plead for anything from Cecil.

Gorges’s scribally prepared letters usually start with an exordium (e.g. 46.59; 75.53). However, he hardly ever uses a formal exordium in holograph letters. Presumably it was felt that holograph status carried with it a closeness to the letter-writer that meant the reader does not need to be eased into the letter.

Erasmus says that the exordium can be about anything so long as it prepares the addressee for the contents of the letter (1985, 75). Gorges usually concentrates in his exordia on himself. Many of Gorges’s exordia simply make some observation about the circumstances in which the letter was written, such as the necessity to use a secretary (e.g. 50.30). Most of Gorges’s exordia, though, highlight his pitiful state.\textsuperscript{29} The opening of a letter to Cecil and the Earl of Nottingham in 1600/1 is paradigmatic:

\begin{quote}
Lett the true and lamentable repoarte of my distressed estate, moue your iuste and Noble myndes in commiseration of me; That of all the poore gentlemen that euer serued her Maie^tie wrth duty and zeale; am the most vnfortunate, and misserable (77.45)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{27} In 1604, on a happier note, Gorges tells Cecil that ‘That which was to me desperate and deade, by your only fauour hathe receaued Lyfe and hoape’ (108.99). Images such as these are reminiscent of the opening of Ralegh’s Ocean to Cynthia (1951, poem XXIV).

\textsuperscript{28} It is perhaps significant that this passage contains one of the few pieces of obtrusive verbal patterning in Gorges’s letters: ‘If I haue done nothing but that whiche is honest and iustifiable, I hoape I shall receaue the measure of a good subiecte; Yf I haue ouershott my selfe in conyting an error; I thanke god I haue the harte of a man to suffer without dread whatsoever shall be inflycted’.

\textsuperscript{29} Here Gorges is in line with Erasmus’s suggestions for the indirect petitionary epistle, quoted at the beginning of this section (1985, 172-3).
Several of these *exordia* attempt to differentiate Gorges’s plight from that of other suitors: Gorges, these letters argue, is not in the position of a mere client—things have come to a worse pass. Twice Gorges says he is not looking for favour to a client but for justice to a subject (61.55; 75.53). The first of these two *exordia* opens with a list of common clientage strategies specifically in order to claim that Gorges’s ill fortune has transported him beyond the status of a client:

I doe see it often vsed, as a good help with ould Seruitors o f the Courte; when they seeke for preferment; eyther to pleade pouertye; to repeate theyre seruices; or to complaine o f smale rewards; from all, or anye of which; although I cannot exempt myne owne hapless condition; yet dare I not feed my hoaps with those ordinarie allegations; which other more fortunate men doe finde; as meanes sufficyent to induce comyseration; and comforte. But as one designed, to a more harde, and graceless destenye; am enforced to seeke my releife; in a farr inferyor kynde; fallinge from ye hoaped bountie o f a Prince; to a Seruaunte; euen vnto the strickt Justice of a Soueraigne; to a Subiecte. (61.55)

In these examples, Gorges is effectively deploying Day’s category of ‘Honesty’ in his *exordia*. The effect is arresting.\(^{30}\)

A radically different type of *exordium* occurs in the letter Gorges wrote to Cecil in 1610 seeking support in his suit for a place in Prince Henry’s household (128.156). Unusually for a letter with a formal opening, this is in Gorges’s holograph. In his brief, nervous *exordium*, Gorges focuses, uncharacteristically, not on himself but on the patron: ‘As I wolde not be troblesome, so wolde I not be to earless in my complements, to so reuerent a personage, and so noble a Patron[.]’ Gorges’s relationship with Cecil at this point was largely a thing of the past, so it is perhaps not surprising that the subject-matter of this little *exordium* should be the difficulty of writing an *exordium* for Cecil.

One of Gorges’s most extensive *exordia* comes at the start of a letter of 29 January 1605. This is because it is not so much a petitionary letter as a letter of advice. Gorges

\(^{30}\) Another example is Hatfield CP 46.59, quoted above. For the thinking behind this melancholy rhetoric see section 4.
works hard to try to justify his assumption of the position of Cecil’s advisor, trying hard
to avoid the imputation of presumptuousness:

It is neyther in my thought nor my abylye to giue aduyse to yt wysdome and Judgment; whose actions I
haue often with reuerence admeryed, and whose wordes I haue euer obserued to be balanced with
integrety and temperanca far from my [intent] is all such presumption; But as of a poore frende (yt so
protesteth hymselfe to your honor) I wyll wyshe the best; and so by consequence maye vppon reason
make bolde, as put your honor in mynde sumtymes of matters, yt eyther for ye greatnes of your more
serious affayres make be forgotten, or for the pryvasye of theyr owne natures neuere cum within ye
accompt of your cares. (190.34)

Having made his request, in conclusion Gorges is equally anxious:

I doo wyllingly submytt my opinion to your lordships wysdome and ame so farr from not yeldinge to
greater consideratyon as yt for thys which I haue written, I doo humbly, desyre to be enterpreted; as a
poore faithfull servante and wellwyllar to the state rather then as on that wyll presume to gyue aduyce,
much less peremptorely to gyue my censure in any state matters.31

Some of Gorges’s letters contain a narratio and almost nothing else. In these letters,
though there is no formal petitio it is implicit. By retailing news to Cecil, Gorges is
performing the part of a dutiful client: in return Cecil is expected to keep a weather eye
out for Gorges. (Examples include a letter telling Cecil about a violent row between Sir
John and Lady Kennedy (PRO SP14/48/7, ff.8r-9v) and letters in which Gorges is
negotiating for his father-in-law the Earl of Lincoln (Hatfield CP 67.10) and replying
angrily to his allegations (251.45).) In some cases, the letter is limited to narratio because
a petitio exists outside the letter: thus, a letter of March 1598/9 (68.76) consists mainly of
supplementary, ‘narrative’ details designed to back up a petition made in other
documents.

31 This is significantly a much-corrected passage. In another, roughly comparable, letter (185.72) Gorges
does not need to be so circumspect, for the advice he there offers Cecil follows naturally from the letter’s
narratio, in which Gorges retails to Cecil what a servant has told him about Jesuits’ hiding-places. Gorges’s
recommendations follow on seamlessly from the news he gives to Cecil: central to the letter is Gorges’s
function as news-bringer, not as advisor. Accordingly, Gorges is able to begin the letter with a simple
‘Maye it please yow to vnderstande’. (He is, though, worried about the possibility that he will appear to be a
dishonourable ‘enformer, especyally in cases that maye concerne mens lyues and fortunes’ and stresses that
his involvement, by way of his servant, is ‘by accydent’. He has not been trying to find people to inform on;
In the major variation on Day's basic structure for a petitionary letter (M5v-M6v), *petitio* precedes *narratio*. In some letters to Cecil Gorges makes no bones about making his petition at the very beginning. This is a strategy which generally bespeaks confidence in Cecil's support (e.g. in a letter asking Cecil to make out a warrant against Edmund Stansfield (180.49)). Letters by Gorges which contain a *petitio* without a *narratio* generally compensate by containing more on the topics of 'Honestie of request', 'Meane of performance', 'Possibilitie' and 'Remuneration' following the *petitio* (e.g. 35.97; 45.25). In one of these letters (250.90), Gorges, seeking Cecil's goodwill in advance of a formal petition, buttresses his *petitio* with lavish praise of Cecil, saying that as Cecil has been so kind to him in the past, he will be very grateful to Cecil whatever he decides.\(^\text{32}\) Here there is no *narratio* because there is nothing to narrate. Usually, letters lack a *narratio* because the patron already has sufficient access to information about the topic in hand, often in supporting documents (e.g. BL MS Harley 7007, ff.357r-357v).

3. Markers of Dignity

Erasmus (1985) privileges the genre of the familiar letter, downgrading epistolary practice that, continuing the tradition of the *ars dictaminis*, was geared to register the relative social positions of writer and addressee. Vernacular epistolographies, however, take on the whole a different view and make the marking of status a key theme. Fabri

---

he is simply doing his duty by passing on to Cecil what he thinks ought to be made known to someone in authority.)

\(^\text{32}\) This is disingenuous, of course. As Gorges says he will continue to do Cecil service, there is, whatever Gorges pretends, considerable pressure on Cecil to keep his side of the client-patron bargain and reward Gorges.
(1969) and Fulwood (1571) organise their texts around concepts of social hierarchy. Letters are classified in terms of the class of writer and addressee: they may be written from a superior to an inferior, from an inferior to a superior or from an equal to an equal. Day's *English Secretorie* is generally described inaccurately as a close paraphrase of Erasmus's *De conscribendis epistolis* (Hornbeak 1934, 17-29; Robertson 1942, 19-20). In fact, its consistent stress on the demarcation of social hierarchies makes it highly unlikely that Erasmus is its main source. It is easy to read these rules as responding to a need, in the face of increasing social mobility, to shore up class boundaries. Thus Frank Whigham argues that 'The clamor and desperation and oiliness of [Elizabethan clients'] letters reveal social conditions of pressure and anxiety' (866). Whigham locates the anxiety in an awareness of the fragility of social hierarchies, at a time when 'Many old, stale devices for registering status were being replaced by a more dynamic system of conspicuous expenditure, itself inherently anxiety-producing' and concludes that, faced with this situation, courtiers used their letters as an inexpensive means for signaling identity, status and integration...Each utterance of 'my lord' or 'dame' or 'sir' ratified not only the place of the superior but that of the speaker as enfranchised witness in a coherent social universe' (1981, 867).

Letters were written on bifolia 'closed, sealed and packed up after the finest fashion' (Fulwood 1571, A8v). The first element of a letter to come to an addressee's attention was the seal at the back—a key to the identity of the sender—and the 'superscription' or 'direction' written on the outside of the letter containing the name and address of the recipient. Wording delineated the sender's relationship to the recipient and had to be

---

33 Fulwood's text ultimately derives from Fabri (Guedet 1984).
34 Day was probably working from a vernacular adaptation of *De conscribendis epistolis* yet to be identified.
calculated carefully as, unlike the actual text of the letter, the superscription was vulnerable to the censure of 'prying and critical eyes' (Vives 1989, 73). Fulwood says that the superscription should contain

the name of [the recipient's] dignitie, Lordship, Office, Nobilitie, Science, or parentage: And if we write more than one, the chiefest and permanent dignities must be written first, then the consanguinitie: and afterwarde the mutable dignitie, as for example: To my Lord of such a place, my cousin, Maister of the Requestes of our soueraigne Lord the King. (1571, A8v)

Gorges's practice is in harmony with Fulwood's stipulations. His standard form for the superscription to his letters to Robert Cecil is 'To the Honorable Sir Robert Cecyll knight of hyr Maiestis. preuy Councell' (e.g. Hatfield CP 27.49; 31.66), a simple conjunction of permanent and mutable dignities, the former ('knight') coming first, as Fulwood recommends.

Gorges's subscriptions, most of which melt imperceptibly into the closing section (peroratio) of the letter in which they occur, clearly register Gorges's attempt to maintain a balance between friendliness and submissiveness in his relationship with Cecil. Nearly all the subscriptions combine, in some shape or form, 'affection' with 'duty' (e.g. 'Your Honors in all dutye and affection' (69.1); 'Your Honors in all dutye most affectionate' (55.54)), several of them adding new formulae to heighten the effect of friendship and/or submissiveness (e.g. 'Your honors dutifull and affectionate poore Kynsman to commaund' (32.83)). Opening addresses attempting a similar balance of attitudes towards the patron are few and far between (e.g. 'Moste honorable and deare Sir' (55.54)).

35 In section 4 a different explanation is given for this phenomenon.
36 For anecdotal evidence illustrating the importance of the wording of superscriptions see Collins 1746, 2.175.
37 The anxiety behind such formulations comes to the surface in a letter written by John Harington in 1603, which opens with the address 'Right honorable and, I hope [my italics], still my speciall good Lord' (Harington 1930, 105). In one letter (67.101), Gorges distinguishes Cecil the friend from Cecil the forbidding public servant. Gorges says he is sending the letter because he does not want 'to omitt a fytt
the whole, Gorges sticks to the standard ‘Most honored Sir’ (e.g. 55.54) and its variants, switching to an address of the form ‘Moste honored and my singuler good Lord’ on Cecil’s elevation to the peerage.

Another way in which renaissance letters registered the social relationship between a letter’s writer and its recipient was by means/the positioning of the words on the page (Braimmuller 1993; Gibson 1997). The more space that was left between various elements of the letter the higher the social status of the recipient. Throughout Gorges’s correspondence significant space is used (wherever paper-size allows) to register submissiveness to Cecil. Significance attaches to the gap between text and subscription, the left/right placing of the subscription and signature (placing in the extreme right-hand corner signifies the greatest respect) and the gap between the opening address to the recipient and text. Subscriptions and signatures in letters to correspondents closer than Cecil in social status to Gorges—Thomas Harlot (BL MS Additional 6789, ff.538r-538v); William Trumbull (BL MS Trumbull X, f.12r-12v); George Carew (Hatfield CP 19.130)—are placed relatively centrally.  

A significant element in renaissance letters was the choice of handwriting. A holograph letter, a step nearer the presence of its sender than a scribal letter, was interpreted as a mark of respect, goodwill and privacy (Vives 1989, 4-9). Letters copied by professional scribes, particularly when in italic script, were used when an effect of

opportune ye to doo seruyc e to so good and noble a frende as Master Secretar ye; Though to ye Master of the wardes I be made a straungre, by destyne butt not by deserte’. The letter was written in 1599, during the negotiations between Cecil and Lincoln over the sale of Chelsea to Lincoln. In the context of these negotiations, Gorges got on well with Cecil. However, they coincided with a difficult spell in Gorges’s wrangle with the Queen over the wardship of Ambrosia.  

The most radical deployment of significant space of which I am aware comes in a letter written by Raleigh to Anne of Denmark in 1611 or 1612 (PRO SP14/67/126). Raleigh’s signature is as tiny as can be,
formality was wanted. Gorges used scribal italic when composing his most elaborately structured petitionary letters at key crisis-points in his career (e.g. Hatfield CP 46.59; 75.53; 77.45; 85.160; 87.37; 87.38; 105.146; 108.98; 182.47; 188.12; 251.73). Most of Gorges’s other letters are in holograph, some simply because they were written off the cuff (e.g. 31.67; 33.58; 59.86; 121.56),\(^\text{39}\) the rest as a token of his goodwill toward Cecil and his personal investment in serving him and as a guarantee of the privacy of the letter.

Occasionally, Gorges apologises for using a scribe instead of writing himself. The reason is always illness (e.g. 78.61), with one significant exception, a letter written to Cecil in 1602/3 (97.48). In this lengthy holograph text, Gorges apologises effusively for sending Cecil a New Year’s gift of furnishing material. Cecil had been offended not just by the gift itself, with its overtones of bribery, but by the late hour of its delivery and by the fact that the letter accompanying it (91.20) was in the hand of Gorges’s secretary. In seeking to exculpate himself, Gorges refers back to the original letter’s protestation that the gift was not designed to win favour from Cecil:

I dyd ... presume to use my mans hande in wrytinge my letter, because owr seruinge creatures (who are apte to be tatlinge in all their Masteres matters) should ye better know how harshe and vnpleasinge it is to your humor to be thought pleased with presents

Gorges claims that he had been given the present by someone else, that it was unsuitable for his house, and that all he was trying to do was to get rid of it.\(^\text{40}\) The letter is vivid testimony to the potentially perilous nature of the balance between friendship and clientage Gorges continually tried to maintain in his letters to Cecil.

\(^{39}\) In these letters, Gorges generally apologises to Cecil for his ‘hasty scryblinge’ (Hatfield CP 31.67).
\(^{40}\) Gorges also mentions a hanging decorated with Cecil’s arms and suggests that Cecil barter for it with him to avoid incurring a debt of gratitude.
4. Clients' Melancholy

Renaissance epistolographies consistently advise letter-writers to avoid excessive self-pity in their letters. Juan Luis Vives says that petitions should be made not in such a way as to seem that we wish to display our misfortune to excess and almost cry out that we are worthy of pity giving the impression that we are too weak and helpless to bear our hardships ... For we are inclined by nature to take less pity on those who we see prostrate themselves in the face of adversity and lament their misfortune too much, as if it were something totally unmerited. (1989, 45)

Gorges's letters, and the letters of many other Elizabethan courtiers, including Ralegh, ignore these strictures. Self-pity is their dominant mode. The tone of Gorges's letters frequently verges on the suicidal. In a letter of July 1601, Gorges envisages himself 'destened to a life of contynewall pouertie, and dispaire, and onlie to serue as a marke to shewe howe much other men are blest': if his suit is not heeded, Gorges says, he 'will goe dye in myne owne poore home; yt am not able to liue in [the Queen's] service' (Hatfield CP 87.38). Gorges also stresses the fact that his misfortunes are unmerited: 'I see noe difference in condytion or rewarde;' he wrote in the wake of Essex's revolt, 'betwene my longe and loyall seruice; and ye late disloyaltie of most of those yt haue moste vnnaturallye rebelled; for they by hatefull treason haue but ruyned theyre estats; and I with vnspotted zeale haue aryued but to ye like measure' (182.47). Gorges also frequently harps on his past disappointments, cataloguing his disappointments. The excessiveness of such pleading is censured in the plainest terms by renaissance letter writing manuals.41

---

41 Modesty in making requests is to be desired ('In general, we must speak of ourselves modestly and reservedly and we shall minimize praise of ourselves' (Vives 1989, 67); 'Let there be in every petition a sense of modesty (for whoever makes a request puts himself in an inferior position)' (ibid., 41); cf. Erasmus 1985, 19), for arrogance is like poison (Vives 1989, 39-41). The letter should not 'make it appear that you are more concerned about the future than disappointed about the past' (Vives 1989, 61); reproach of the patron for negligence should be avoided (ibid., 63) as should presumption ('no one willingly grants a
This melancholic tone is central to Gorges's presentation of himself as a client. It is possible to read it as a means of responding to some of the tensions endemic to the renaissance client's letter.

The client's part in the patronage system was structured by two contradictory imperatives. He was required on the one hand to emphasise and demonstrate his abilities, presenting himself as competent for the task in hand and in control of his own destiny. At the same time, however, it was essential for him to register the superiority of his patron and to demonstrate that without the help of the patron he was powerless. In other words the client was required simultaneously to assert his power and his impotence. Every act of clientage required the client to negotiate this dilemma, which was closely related to the influence of rhetoric on renaissance writing. In the renaissance rhetorical power was closely associated with political/social power (Rebhorn 1995). The renaissance letter-writer was encouraged by humanist epistolographies to think of himself as a rhetorician and thus, by analogy, as a powerful figure, using the persuasive force of his rhetoric to lead his auditors after him in a golden chain. This model of rhetorical power, however, strikingly failed to match the interpersonal context of the client's letter, the rationale of which was to demonstrate the superior power of the addressee—to play down the power of the writer/rhetorician. Renaissance clients were faced with the problem of demonstrating their impotence and the power of their addressee by means of conventions of writing constructing the writer/rhetorician as all-powerful.

The pose of melancholy enabled renaissance clients like Gorges to construct a rhetoric of powerlessness. Melancholy's social cachet (Lyons 1971) meant that the pose of

kindness to one who expects it as if it were his due and who makes a demand rather than a request'

79
melancholy could act as a cultural safety-valve, a means by which clients could temporarily carve out positions of power for themselves. The pose of melancholy allowed a client to depict himself as irrational and disempowered—out of control—in a prestigious way. At the same time, it licensed a powerful, compelling language of extremes built on figures of repetition and excess. Literary melancholics could gloss their powerlessness by means of a language in complete control over its own symbols and imagery, wresting words to their limits.

Central to the pose of melancholy was the idea of the melancholic’s lack of artifice. Melancholy utterances were (apparently) spontaneous, uncalculating. It thus allowed the client to emphasise the genuineness of his feelings.

Hence, I think, the melancholic rhetoric underpinning the Elizabethan client’s letter. By using the discourse of melancholy, clients could respond to the cultural pressure on them to show that their regard for their patron was honest, natural, uncalculating and disinterested. Posing as a melancholic enabled the client to demonstrate the huge power of the patron and to establish the genuineness of his emotions. It also provided him with a compelling, powerful ‘anti-rhetorical’ rhetoric.42

These factors help explain the excessive melancholy of Gorges’s and Ralegh’s letters. In practice, the pose of melancholy often coincided with other markers designed to show that the client’s speech-acts were genuine and unpremeditated. The most significant of these was a species of *apostrophe*: the pretence that the client’s speech-act was not really

---

42 Whigham puts a different gloss on this phenomenon, reading clients’ letters as ‘weird phenomenological mixtures of arrogance and paranoia, each factor deriving from a desperate need for coherence, between the normative humanist expectations of the university and the murky and resistant realities of court life as lived.’ (1981, 21-2).
addressed to the patron at all, but, instead, addressed to a third person and then reported to or ‘overheard’ by the patron. This device gives the impression of naturalness, implying that a client’s praise of his patron is uncalculated and truly felt. Erasmus was aware of this:

we cannot help being kindly disposed towards those who we realize sincerely admire us without any flattery. So Isocrates cleverly pointed out that an excellent overture to the forming of a friendship is to praise a person in his absence before those we suspect will pass this on to others (Erasmus 1985, 182)

Gorges’s best-known letter is a vivid example of this strategy in action, a letter clearly intended to serve as a means by which Ralegh could make an apostrophic, ‘involuntary’ communication with the Queen. The letter is couched as a report intended for Robert Cecil. Gorges gives a vivid account of Ralegh’s melancholic behaviour when under house arrest for his marriage to Elizabeth Throckmorton:

Honorable Sir I cannot chuse but aduertyse you of a straunge Tragedye yt this d[ay] had lyke to haue fallen owte bewteene the Captayne of the Guarde, and the Lyuetennaunt of the Ordenaunce; If I had not by great chaunce cumen at[t] the very instant to haue turned it into a Commedye. For vppon the re[port] of hyr Maiestties beinge att Sir George Caryes; Sir W. Rawly hauing gazed an[d] syghed a longe tyme att his study wyndow; from whence he mygh[t] discerne the Barges and boates aboute ye blackfryars stayers; soodayn[ly] he brake owte in a greate distemper, and sware yt hys Enymyes hadd of purpose brought hyr Maietie thethar, to breake hys gaule [in] sounder with Tantalus Torment; that when shee wentt a way he myght see hys deathe before hys Eyes; with many such lyke conc[eyts.] And as a mann transported with passion; he sware to Sir George Care[w] that he wolde disguysse hymeselfe; and gett into a payer of Oares to Ease hys mynde butt with a syght o f the Queene; or els he protest[ed] his harte wolde breake. But the trusty laylor wold non of yt for displeasing the hygher powers, as he sayde which he more respect[ed] then the leading of hys humor; and so flatly refused to permitt hym[e.]

But in conclusion vppon this dissipute they fell flatt owt to collorygyougous wordes; with struying and struggling att ye doores, yt all[l] lamenes was forgotten; and in the fury of the conflyct, ye laylor [he] had hys newe perwigg torne of hys crowne./ And ye[he]re the battle ended not, for att laste they had gotten ow[te] theyr daggers; which when I sawe I played the styckler betwene them, and [so] purchased such a rapp on the knockles, yt I wysht bothe theyr [pates] broken; and so with much a doo, they stayed theyr brawl to see my bloodyed fyngers. Att the fyrste I ws ready to breake with laughinge; to see them too so scambel and brawlke lyke mad[e] menn, vntyle I saw the Iron walkinge; and then I dyd my best to apease the fury. As yet I cannot reconcile them by any perswasions for Sir Walter swears yt he shall hate hym for so restrayning hym from the syght of hym Maes[tis] whilst he lyues; for yt he knowes not (as he sayd) whethar euer he shall see hys agayne when shew is gon the progress. And Sir Georg, on hys syde swares yt he wolde drawe on hym hys Maesties displeasur by such lyberty. Thys they contynwe in mallyce and sn[ar]lyinge, but I ame sure all the smarte lyghted on me/ [I] cannot tell wheare I should more alowe of ye passionat lou[er] or the trusty laylor. But yt your selfe had seene it, as I dy[d] yow wold haue byne as hartely merry and uncalculated and sory; as Euar yow weare in all yr lyfe for so shorte a tym. I praye yu pardo[n] my hasty wrytten narratio; wch I acquaynt yu hoping [yow] wyll be the
peacemaker; butt good Sir lett nobody kno[we] thearof for I feare Sir W. Rawly; wyll shortly growe [to be] Orlando furioso; If the bryght Angelyca perseuer agaynst [hyme] a l[y]tt[le] lon[ger.]

Gorges attached a telling postscript to the letter on a separate scrap of paper, revealing his and Ralegh’s intended audience:

If yow lett the Queens Maiestie know hearof as yu think good be it, butt otherwyse good Sir keepe it secrett for theyr credytt; for they know not of my discourse which I could wyshe hyr Maiestie knewe .

The letter is designed to give Elizabeth an intriguing impression of Ralegh’s dedication to her, and simultaneously a good impression of Gorges. The force of Ralegh’s melancholy gains from being reported by a third party.

Ralegh’s own texts, pre-eminently his melancholic letters to Cecil, use similar strategies. The account of the Cadiz voyage Ralegh sent to Gorges (Lefranc 1966, 340-4) may have been a text of this type. Ralegh mentions ‘a greeious blowe in my legge, larded with meany splinters which I dayly pulle out’ (344), and ends his text, like Gorges’s letter to Cecil, with flattering references to Elizabeth: accordingly, Pierre Lefranc suggests that ‘Ralegh hoped some of this might be read to [Elizabeth] and perhaps arouse her pity: he was still out of favor at the time’ (338). More striking is Anna Beer’s theory that Ocean to Cynthia is a text of this type. Beer argues that Ralegh uses the fragmented melancholy voice of this poem as ‘a literary strategy’ (1992, 501) to win indulgence from Elizabeth, ‘the severity of his melancholy’ functioning as ‘a reflection of

42 Bodl. MS Ashmole 1729, f.177, following Sandison’s suggested reconstructions (in square brackets) of missing passages (1928, 657-8).

44 To explain the existence of the letter, Gorges works hard to give the impression that he is telling Cecil about the incident for its entertainment value and presents his patron with a highly coloured dramatic spectacle involving stock characters. Ironically, by doing this—painting himself as a concerned onlooker, Carew as a trusty royal servant and Ralegh as a lovelorn melancholic—he inadvertently exposes the stagey, artificial nature of the incident. The artificiality is stressed still further by the closing reference to Ariosto (an allusion, presumably, to the recent translation by John Harington). For more on this letter see Chapter 4.1.1.
her power' (503). Such strategies as this—exotic mixtures of power and impotence—are important to a range of texts connected to Gorges and Ralegh.45

45 A non-melancholy 'apostrophic' text by Gorges is a letter written to Sir George Carew in 1605, in which Gorges warns of the possibility that papists are hiding in large cellars in city houses owned by gentlemen or in churches run by 'knave' sextons (Hatfield CP 109.130). In the text of this letter Gorges says that his intention is that Carew should show the letter to Cecil, 'whose Noble and vygylant care is neuar idle both for our soveraygne and the publyque good.' (Gorges goes on to say that his house has not been searched because he is a gentleman, not a citizen; he observes that 'lentlemen are the cheafe actors in these tragycall determynations'. Part of the function of this letter is thus to mark out Gorges as a loyal gentleman, worthy of favour and reward.)
This chapter deals with all of Gorges’s English manuscript poetry with the exceptions of *The Olympian Catastrophe* and ‘A Pastorall unfynyshed’, both of which are considered in Chapter 4. Texts of all of the poems dealt with in this chapter can be found in BL MS Egerton 3165, Gorges’s ‘auto-anthology’, and have been printed from the Egerton manuscript in Sandison’s edition of Gorges’s verse (1953). The Gorges poems in MS Egerton form two distinct sections:

1. The bulk of the manuscript is given over to poetry composed during Gorges’s time at Elizabeth’s court or earlier. 102 poems fall into this category. In the first 104 folios of the book a professional scribe (Sandison’s ‘Scribe One’) copied in an elegant italic hand (Hand A) a sequence of 98 poems: poems 1-23 and 25-98 in Sandison’s edition together with one poem Sandison printed but left unnumbered (1953, 75 (‘poem 76a’)). The scribe copied one poem twice (poems 28 and 55), and probably copied poems 96-8 some time after the rest of the poems (see section 1.1). At some point, poem 24, a verse ‘answer’ to
poem 23, was added to Hand A’s work in a different, unidentified italic hand (Hand B). Either before or after this addition, Gorges himself added two new poems on the pages immediately following Hand A’s sequence (poems 99-100; ff.105v-106v\textsuperscript{5}). Probably several years later, he made extensive holograph corrections and additions (Hand C), both to the work of Hand A and to Hand B’s answer-poem. He also added two titles to the opening leaf of the book: ‘The Vanytyes of Sir/Arthur Gorges/Youthe’ (f.1r) and ‘Sir Arthur Gorges/his vannetyes and toyes of yowth’ (f.1v). As part of the revision process, one poem (poem 76a) was deleted completely and attributed to Thomas Churchyard. The poems in this section of the manuscript are marked with numerous crosses and circles in a variety of inks. The transcription and correction of this section of the manuscript is looked at in more detail in section 1.5 below.

2. At a much later date, on ff.107-113v of the manuscript, another scribe (Sandison’s ‘Scribe Two’), working in italic (Hand D), copied poems 101-111.\textsuperscript{6} One of these poems (109) belongs to November 1599 (Sandison 1953, 230); the others were probably all written by Gorges during James’s reign and were copied no earlier than 1614 (Sandison 1953, 229). There are no authorial corrections or additions to this part of the manuscript.\textsuperscript{7}

This section of the manuscript is looked at in more detail in section 2 below.

\textsuperscript{5} The poems are not numbered in the manuscript.
\textsuperscript{6} I refer, like Sandison, to the BL foliation; Gorges’s, added later (section 1.5), is inaccurate.
\textsuperscript{7} H.I. Bell, the first scholar to analyse the Egerton manuscript, mistakenly believed Hand D to be be Gorges’s holograph (1940, 90).

Following Hand D’s work are three texts (Sandison 1953, 231-2) apparently unconnected with Gorges’s ownership of the manuscript, copied ‘in a rough hand that looks considerably later than the manuscript proper’ (Sandison 1953, 231). The first two are pieces of crude doggerel. The third is part of an account of Ralegh’s execution which, according to Sandison (1953, 232) ‘agrees closely with the account in the Inner Temple MS. Petyt 538, 18, f.240.’ Sandison argues rather unconvincingly that ‘It is probably mere chance that this entry concerns Gorges’s cousin’ (1953, 232).
In what follows, I refer to the poems in the Egerton manuscript transcribed by Hand A and the two poems in Gorges’s holograph which follow Hand A’s work as the Vannetyes and Toyes.

1. The Vannetyes and Toyes: Structure and Objectives

Gorges’s initial intentions for his auto-anthology are uncertain. The manuscript gives no information about the motivations behind the transcription of the first block of poetry. The collection’s double title (f.1r, f.1v) was added to the manuscript probably more than a decade after Hand A’s work. It is possible that the sequence copied by Hand A originally had a different title, perhaps even a dedication, on flyleaves now lost. 

Most of Gorges’s Vannetyes and Toyes are love poems, composed most probably in the 1580s (see section 1.1). Gorges married Douglas Howard in 1584. Building on the fact that some poems in the Vannetyes and Toyes clearly refer to Douglas, Gorges’s editor, Helen E. Sandison (1953), emphasises the connections between Gorges’s wooing of Douglas and the contents of the Vannetyes and Toyes in general. Recently, Sandison’s position has been challenged by Steven W. May (1991). I argue in this chapter that the collection was conceived as a patronage text with Douglas as ‘patron’-dedicatee. If a dedication existed, it would, I think, have been either to or about Douglas.

8 Cf. Robert Sidney’s manuscript auto-anthology, BL MS Additional 58435, inscribed on its flyleaf ‘For the Countess of Pembroke’ (Sidney 1984, 127).
1.1. Date

A rough date of 1589 for the *Vannetyes and Toyes* transcription by Hand A is set by Briquet’s dating of the type of watermark found in the Egerton manuscript (see note 2). Further evidence shows that many of the *Vannetyes and Toyes* must have been written several years before 1589. A hiatus—possibly of some years’ duration—seems to have interrupted Hand A’s work following poem 95. As Sandison (1953, 222) points out,

> The scribe’s writing in 96 and 97 is smaller than usual, and apparently done at a different time, for a more elaborate *h*, only occasional in the earlier pages, is now habitual, persisting through 98, his last entry, where the writing is unusually large; his last three pieces, then—two laments for Sidney and the eclogue which was to appear later in *A Poetical Rhapsody* and was perhaps already in circulation—may have been separate from the body of the scribe’s copy. One notices the *abba* of 97’s quatrains, not used elsewhere in Gorges’s sonnets.

It seems likely that a gap intervened between the transcription of poems 96-8 and the transcription of the earlier *Vannetyes and Toyes*. The poems preceding poem 96 date, as will be shown below, from the early to mid-1580s. Sidney’s death in 1586 helps set a date for the transcription of poems 96-8, two of which (poems 96 and 97) are elegies for Sidney. These last three scribally copied poems might therefore have been transcribed several years after the earlier poems. The ‘*abba*’ quatrains of poem 97 presumably form a homage to Sidney’s use of this pattern in *Astrophil and Stella*. The eclogue (poem 98) has perhaps been included with the two elegies as a tribute to ‘the shepherd knight’.

Many poems in the *Vannetyes and Toyes* have been linked to Gorges’s wooing of Douglas Howard. If these poems were designed to woo Douglas before her marriage to Gorges, they must have been written between Whitsun 1584, the date when Gorges, according to his own testimony to Star Chamber (PRO STAC5 H20/3), first decided to woo Douglas, and September 1584, the date of their marriage (for further discussion see section 1.3). Sandison (1953) has suggested that poems 12, 25, 26, 29, 39, 40, 44, 48, 52,
52, 53, 57, 63, 66, 69, 89 and 95 belong to the period of the marriage. May (1991, 107-13) finds fewer links between Douglas and the poetry than Sandison but nevertheless accepts Sandison’s argument for Douglas’s relevance to poems 26, 29, 44, 48, 52, 53, 57, 63, 66 and 69. Connection with Douglas does not necessarily imply composition in 1584 (cf. section 1.4). Gorges might well have written love poems for her after their marriage and before her death in 1590. Other evidence, however, supports a date early in the 1580s—and thus close to the marriage—for the composition of the poems in the first section of the manuscript. May argues (1991, 110-1) that poems 38, 40, 93 and 94 refer to a love-affair with a noble lady which preceded Gorges’s connection with Douglas and that they thus antedate 1584. If May’s theory is correct, this lady might be the ‘Mistres asmuch to be respected as any mans Master’ mentioned in a letter written by Gorges in 1582 (May 1991, 109). ‘Of Mounsieur’, an elegy for Alençon cancelled by Gorges when revising the manuscript and attributed by him to Churchyard (Gorges 1953, 75; see section 1.5, no.4), must belong to shortly after 1584, the date of Alençon’s death. Poem 78 might have been written in connection with a fracas which took place between Gorges and a servant of Sir John Scudamour in 1582 (May 1991, 109). Poem 87 seems to refer to Gorges’s imprisonment in March 1580 (May 1991, 106, n.6).

Many of the Vannetyes and Toyes are translated from French sources. Of the French authors Gorges used, Desportes is the only one consistently to have revised his works. Desportes’s Premières Oeuvres was first published in 1573 and went through many editions.9 Five of Gorges’s sources (those for poems 10, 27, 34, 52 and 69) appear first in

---

9 Full details of Gorges’s French sources, with references to the modern editions of Desportes edited by Victor E. Graham, are given in section 1.2. At many points Graham’s apparatus is in error. For the purposes of this thesis I have made my own collations of Desportes on the basis of the early editions. Lavaud’s list of
the edition of 1577. The sources for poems 19 and 70 first appear in 1575 and 1576 respectively. Poem 3 translates two Desportes pieces which are next to each other only in editions published between 1576 and 1582. In translating the source for poem 69, Gorges used a text no later than 1585. Poem 17 must derive from a text no later than 1583. Gorges’s text of the sources for poems 1 and 6 must have antedated 1594 and 1599 respectively. Gorges’s translation ‘words’ at line 3 of poem 6 shows that he did not use the edition of 1582 with its reading ‘soupirs’. Further evidence can be assembled by looking at the revisions Desportes made to the order of his poetry. The source for poem 6 appears in all editions up to 1582 after Jean Passerat’s reply to the source for Ralegh’s ‘Like to a Hermite poore’. This is potentially significant, given the close poetic links between Ralegh and Gorges (see section 1.6) and the importance of ‘Like to a Hermite poore’ to the depiction of Gorges in Spenser’s Daphnaida (see Chapter 4.1.3). Similarly, ‘Rymes tierces’, the source for poem 22, appears in editions between 1577 and 1581 immediately after ‘Contr’Amour’, the source for Ralegh’s ‘Farewell false love’ (Gibson, forthcoming). ‘Rymes tierces’ follows on logically from ‘Contr’Amour’, so it seems likely that Gorges and Ralegh collaborated in translating two poems next to each other in the Premières Oeuvres.
It is, I think, reasonable to assume that all of Gorges’s translations from Desportes were made from the same edition. If this was the case, the edition Gorges used must have dated from between 1577 and 1581. It must thus have been one of the following five editions: 1577, 1578, 1579, 1580, 1581.\textsuperscript{11} Use of an edition of this vintage supports the view that Gorges’s translations were made in the early to mid-1580s.

It is possible that Gorges’s texts for some of his other translations from French came from manuscript sources or even by way of musical performance.\textsuperscript{12} However, the volume of Gorges’s translations from Desportes and Du Bellay renders it virtually certain that he worked from printed editions in both cases.

Sandison discovered that four of the \textit{Vannetyes and Toyes} (poems 35, 43, 44 and 94) are translated from French \textit{chansons} (1953, 194-5, 197-200, 219-21).\textsuperscript{13} Poem 35 is a partial translation of a \textit{chanson} found in \textit{Le nouveau recueil des chansons amoureuses} ... (Paris, 1589; the \textit{chanson} is printed in Sandison 1953, 194-5). Also found in \textit{Le nouveau recueil} is the source for poem 43. Poems 44 and 94 are translated from \textit{chansons} printed both in Tessier’s \textit{Premier livre} ... (1582, 1585; both \textit{chansons} are printed in Sandison 1953, 200, 219-20) and N. Bonfons’ \textit{Sommaire de tous les recueils des chansons} ... (1581-2 (poem 44); 1585 (poem 94)). The source for poem 44 is also printed in P. Bonnet’s \textit{Premier livre d’airs} (Paris, 1586). Meanwhile the source for poem 43 can be found in versions different from that used by Gorges in both Tessier’s \textit{Premier livre} ...

\textsuperscript{10} According to Sandison, they also occur side by side ‘in certain anthologies of French verse appearing in print in 1579 and years of the following decade’ (1953, 185).
\textsuperscript{11} Sandison argues for an edition between 1577 and 1583 (1953, xxxi).
\textsuperscript{12} Eight of the Desportes poems translated in the \textit{Vannetyes and Toyes} occur in sixteenth-century French songbooks (Verchaly 1954). The relevant poems are translated by Gorges as poems 1, 3, 7, 19, 22, 23, 32 and 34.
\textsuperscript{13} Absence of French songbooks from British libraries has meant that I have been unable to consult the originals of any of these \textit{chansons}. 
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(printed in Sandison 1953, 198-9) and in Bonnet’s *Premier livre d’airs*. The fact that three of Gorges’s *chanson* translations derive from texts associated with Tessier leads Sandison to suggest that Gorges’s composition of these poems resulted from contact with Tessier at the English court in the 1580s. Gorges could have come into contact with three of the four sources for his *chanson* translations (43, 44, 94) by way of Tessier. The fact that the text of the source for poem 43 in Tessier’s *Premier livre* ... differs from the one Gorges used need not invalidate this argument, for it is at least possible that Tessier performed or otherwise circulated a text of poem 43’s source close to that given in *Le nouveau recueil* and apparently followed by Gorges. If Gorges did come across these French *chansons* by way of Tessier, the date of translation was presumably in the early to mid 1580s. The publication of the source for poem 35 in 1589 thus does not mean that Gorges could not have seen a text of it before that year. Overall, the evidence shows that Gorges’s translations of *chansons* focus on *chansons* popular in the 1580s.

Variant texts of a number of the poems in the *Vannetyes and Toyes* are found in several manuscript and print sources. Sources relevant to the determination of the poems’ composition date are Cambridge University MS Dd. 5. 75. (*Cambridge*), BL MS Harley 7392 (2) (*Harley*) and Bodl. MS Rawlinson Poet. 85 (*Rawlinson*). *Cambridge* contains texts of poems 1, 8, 39, 72, 79 and 98, transcribed, its modern editor proposes, in the early 1590s (May 1988, xxxix-xl). *Harley* contains texts of poems 1, 25, 46 and 79, and was, according to L. G. Black, compiled early in the 1580s: ‘the lack of sonnets, the absence of poems associated with notable events of the late 1580s (such as Sidney’s

---

14 Sandison 1953, 198. Sandison’s case is weakened by her confusion of Guillaume Tessier (fl. c.1582), a composer with links to England, though not known to have visited the country, with Charles Tessier (fl. c.1600), who is known to have come to England. Cf. Sadie 1991, s.v.
death) suggest very strongly that the manuscript was largely complete by the middle
1580s' (1970, 54). Rawlinson contains texts of poems 1 and 46, transcribed some time
between 1586 and 1590 (Black 1970, 41-2).

All the evidence points to a composition date for Hand A’s first 95 poems in the early
to mid-1580s. The Sidney elegies (poems 96 and 97) were clearly written after this
period. The eclogue (poem 98) might also have been composed at this time.

1.2. Gorges and the ‘New Lyricism’

The poetry of the Vannetyes and Toyes is written in the tradition of Elizabethan court
‘new lyricism’. This type of poetry has only recently been identified, named and studied
In this section I will give a general account of the nature and antecedents of ‘new
lyricism’ before considering Gorges’s contribution to the tradition and in particular the
place in it of his translations of Desportes and Du Bellay.

Love poems had been written at the English court since at least the time of Chaucer
(Green 1980). There was, however, no continuous tradition of English court love poetry.
The Italianate work of Wyatt and Surrey in Henry VIII’s reign did not influence the
writings of Edwardian, Marian and early Elizabethan courtiers. In the early years of
Elizabeth’s reign, courtier poetry focused predominantly on religious and moral themes
(May 1991, 41-52). From about 1570, however, love poetry, influenced by Italian and
French models, began to be written again. Steven W. May calls this mini-renaissance

\[15 \text{ For discussion of variant texts see section 1.6.}
\[16 \text{ ‘Unlike courtier verse of the 1560s, the new lyricism modeled itself primarily upon post-classical}
continental authors, from Petrarch to the Pléiade’ (May 1991, 52).} \]
‘the new lyricism’ (52-68): he reports that ‘the shift in direction occurred suddenly during the period between roughly 1570 and 1575’ (52). The two key figures in this transformation were Sir Edward Dyer and Edward DeVere, 17th Earl of Oxford. An awareness of the nature of both Oxford’s and Dyer’s poetry is essential to an understanding of Gorges’s *Vannetyes and Toyes*.

In May’s view, the eight poems attributed to Oxford in *The Paradise of Dainty Devices* (1576 edition), ‘pieces that Oxford must have composed before 1575’ (the date of his departure on a continental tour) ‘create a dramatic break with everything known to have been written at the Elizabethan court up to that time’. Seven of these pieces are pithy, decorative love poems. Oxford’s later poems develop this strain. Two of Oxford’s poems have been traced to continental sources. ‘I am not as I seme to bee’ (May 1980, 28; 1991, 273-4) derives ultimately from Petrarch. ‘When werte thow borne desyre’ (33-4, May 1991, 277-8) adapts a poem by the Italian neo-Petrarchist Sassi which was also translated by Desportes (73-4). The use of continental source material fits well Oxford’s courtly image, for Oxford was notorious for introducing Italianate fashions into English court life. Since the sources of court manuscript poetry have been inadequately studied, I would be surprised if further research did not reveal that more of Oxford’s poems originated in French or Italian texts.

---

17 For the reliability of the attributions of these poems to Oxford see May 1980, 68-9.
18 There has been surprisingly little investigation into potential French and Italian sources for Elizabethan manuscript and miscellany poetry. The important work in this area undertaken earlier this century by Janet G. (Espiner) Scott, not yet superseded, concentrated on printed sonnet sequences. Scholars such as Hyder E. Rollins and Steven W. May, meanwhile, have tended to emphasise bibliographical problems at the expense of source study. Scott (1929) builds on earlier research by L. E. Kastner and Sidney Lee. Rollins describes his approach to source-study in his edition of *The Phoenix Nest* (1931, xl-xli): ‘It seems a safe generalization that the majority of the poems in the second half of The Phoenix Nest are either translations or adaptations of French or Italian. I have made no special hunt for sources ... but a merely casual glance through Petrarch, Desportes, and Ronsard has brought to light enough evidence to justify my generalization.’
Oxford was also an important literary patron.\(^{19}\) As May has shown (1980, 8-9), book dedications to Oxford include an unusually high proportion (47\%) of purely literary works. Two book dedications associate Oxford with the translation of continental lyric poetry. Thomas Watson’s *Hekatompathia* (1582; Klein 1984, 41-157), a collection of 100 18-line sonnet-like love poems, was dedicated to Oxford. Watson wrote that the poems had been read in manuscript by Oxford and that Oxford’s interest in them had led directly to publication (Klein 1984, 43). Two years later John Soowthern dedicated his *Pandora, The Musyque of the beautie, of his Mistress Diana* (Klein 1984, 159-89) to the Earl. *Pandora* is the first extensive English book of poems to be dominated by the influence of Desportes. Soowthern follows Desportes in addressing a mistress called Diana (Diane). These books seem to have functioned as publicity for continental neo-Petrarchism. *Hekatompathia* (1580) is explicit about its derivation from Italian neo-Petrarchism. Oxford’s interest in Italian courtiership theory and in Italian literature is shown by his interest in Bartholomew Clerke’s translation of Castiglione’s *Cortegiano*. Thomas Bedingfield was, like Gorges, a Gentleman Pensioner. His translation of Girolamo Cardano’s *Comfort*, published in 1573, is dedicated to Oxford and carries a commendatory letter and poem by the Earl (May 1980, 25, 67).

The ‘new lyricism’ of Oxford and his associates was interpreted by at least one contemporary as a revival of the courtly poetic pioneered by the Earl of Surrey in Henry

\(^{19}\) Exhaustive source identification is not a prime consideration either in May’s meticulous editorial work (1980; 1988) or in his seminal survey of *The Elizabethan Courtier Poets* (1991). Commentators have on the whole tended to play down the French influence on Elizabethan verse, exaggerating the influence of Italian texts. In the case of Thomas P. Roche’s work on *Petrarch and the English Sonnet Sequences* (1989) this results in serious misreading (Dubrow 1992). Anne Lake Prescott’s essay on *French Poets and the English Renaissance* (1978) makes little attempt to identify new sources.

Despite this several critics (eg. Van Dorsten 1981) seem to share the assumption that the only possible patron of ‘new poetry’ at this period was Sir Philip Sidney.
VIII's reign. George Puttenham uses similar language to link in parallel two moments in court literary history when groups of courtly makers 'sprong vp':

In the latter end of [Henry VIII's] raigne sprong vp a new company of courtly makers, of whom Sir Thomas Wyat th'elder & Henry Earle of Surrey were the two chieftaines...And in her Maiesties time that now is are sprong vp an other crew of Courtly makers Noble men and Gentlemen of her Maiesties owne seruauntes, who haue written excellently well as it would appeare if their doings could be found out and made publicke with the rest, of which number is first that noble Gentleman Edward Earle of Oxford. Thomas Lord of Bukhurst, when he was young, Henry Lord Paget, Sir Philip Sydney, Sir Walter Rawleigh, Master Edward Dyar, Maister Fulke Greuell, Gascon, Britton, Turberuille and a great many other learned Gentlemen... (Puttenham 1936, 60-1)

Like Surrey, Oxford was interested in continental Petrarchism. Links can be made between this aesthetic preference and Oxford's political and religious affiliations. During the 1570s Oxford was a prominent advocate of the French marriage and from about 1580 a crypto-Catholic. French marriage negotiations (Woudhuysen 1981, 1-32) had started in 1570 and focused initially on Charles IX's brother, Henry, Duke of Anjou, though attention switched quickly to Charles' and Henry's younger sibling, Francis, Duke of Alençon (Duke of Anjou from 1574). Having hung fire for several years, the negotiations entered a new phase in 1579. In January, Anjou's envoy Simier arrived in England and wooed Elizabeth with considerable panache, employing a range of tricks and devices which excited and scandalised the English court. Later in the year Anjou himself made an impromptu secret visit to England. May's 'new lyricism' has not to my knowledge been linked to the French marriage negotiations before, though such a link would seem to have much to recommend it. Significantly, the development of English 'new lyricism' coincided with the arrival of a new mode of poetry in France. The early 1570s in France

20 In identifying a school of court poets, William Webbe likewise placed Oxford at its head: 'I may not omitte the deserued commendations of many honourable and noble Lordes and Gentlemen in her Maiesties Courte, which in the rare deuises of Poetry haue beeene and yet are most excellent skylful, among whom the right honourable Earle of Oxford may challenge to himselfe the tytle of the most excellent among the reste.'(1588, 243)
were marked by a shift in French poetry towards Italian Petrarchist models. This new, ‘précieux’ style of poetry has been described by Gisele Mathieu-Castellani as ‘un nouvel italienisme’ (1975, 209-66). It found its major proponent in Philippe Desportes and centred on aristocratic circles. In the early 1570s Desportes was in high favour with Henry, Duke of Anjou, the first of Elizabeth’s two princely French suitors, eclipsing Ronsard’s more old-fashioned poetry. When Henry ascended the French throne in 1574 Desportes’ star rose higher still. Desportes’ poetry was first published in the *Premières Oeuvres* of 1573 but circulated before that date in manuscript. At Elizabeth’s court the movement towards a possible French marriage in the early 1570s would have authorised the writing of English poetry based on neo-Petrarchist French models. French ‘nouvel italienisme’ was largely produced within the salons of great ladies such as the Maréchale de Retz and Madeleine de l’Aubépine. Transplantation into the court of Elizabeth was thus a natural step. Texts of currently fashionable French poets such as Desportes would have been easily available from the many members of the various French entourages which visited England during the negotiations.

The possible links between Oxford, the French marriage and French ‘nouvel italienisme’ have important implications for Gorges’s part in the ‘new lyricism’. Together with Ralegh, Gorges appears in the late 1570s and early 1580s to have been closely

---

21 It is tempting to argue that the poems of the ‘new lyricism’, with their possible connections to the French match and French female-led salons, inaugurated the ‘cult of Elizabeth’, the practice of identifying Queen Elizabeth as a Petrarchan sonnet-lady. (For poems by Oxford possibly addressed to Elizabeth, see May 1991, 55.) The ‘cult’ is normally said to have started in the early 1580s. Influential early work by Frances A. Yates and Roy Strong is currently being subjected to revisionist scrutiny: see Berry 1989; Anglo 1992; Hackett 1995.

22 For a detailed study of the literary tastes of Alençon himself see Woudhuysen 1981. It is striking that two of Desportes’ patrons, Rambouillet and L’Aubépine came as envoys with Alençon to England in Summer 1578 (Woudhuysen 1981, 20), at about the same time that the text of Desportes used by Gorges (see section 1.1) was published. For a good survey of the culture of the French court in this period see Boucher 1981.
associated with Oxford and Catholic proponents of a French marriage. Of the courtiers in this 'Oxford group', some of whom were poets (Thomas, Lord Paget, Henry Noel, Philip Howard (see May 1991)), many were either Howards or related to the Howard family. Perhaps the Howard connection helps explain the importance of Surrey, a Howard forebear, to the new lyricism. Gorges probably met his first wife, Douglas Howard—for whom at least some of the *Vannetyes and Toyes* were written—through this Howard network. During the second Anjou (Alençon) courtship, Gorges and Ralegh consolidated Oxford's work by writing love poetry of their own, heavily influenced by French sources.

The work of these writers has affinities with Surrey not simply on account of its use of continental source material. William A. Sessions (1986) has emphasised Surrey's fashioning of a 'neo-classical', aristocratic poetic, geared to display its author's poise and control, pure and refined in its diction. This aristocratic, 'courtly' poetic was centred in a careful, elegant deployment of metrical regularity.

In Surrey's poetry the metrical line—the newly established English accentual iambic pentameter—is the fundamental unit both of sense and of rhythm. Surrey's poems tend to be made up out of an elegant sequence of self-contained rhythm/sense units. Often

---

23 Peck 1978. Gorges's and Ralegh's connection with Oxford is considered in more detail in Chapter 1.1.
24 Ralegh and Gorges were writing their early lyrics at the same time as Sir Philip Sidney. Ralegh's 'Like to a hermite poor' (1951, poem XI) is adapted from Desportes ('Je me veux rendre Hermite' (Desportes 1959b, 207; see Littledale 1903 and Rollins 1929)) as is 'Farewell false love' (poem V; Gibson forthcoming). Entertainments at the Elizabethan court at this time enacted a 'frenchified world of courtly compliment in honour of Elizabeth' (Strong 1977, 60).
25 This Surreyan poetic was disseminated to the later sixteenth century by means of *Tottel's Miscellany*.
26 I take the concept of the rhythm/sense unit from D.W. Harding (1946-7). Harding described Wyatt's poetry as 'pausing verse', arguing that it had been composed predominantly in short (generally phrasal) rhythmic and semantic/syntactic 'units'. In Wyatt such units generally occupy only parts of lines and thus exist in a state of productive tension with the expectations of syllable-stress metre. Because in Surrey's
Surrey makes the discreteness of his rhythm/sense units—their tendency to float free of his broader syntactic structures—into the subject-matter of his poetry. He frequently engineers a tension between a series of objects or thoughts arranged neatly in a sequence of rhythm/sense units and his poetic persona, the first-person perceiver of the phenomena of that sequence. The resulting interplay—often melancholy, always ultimately within the persona's control—between the poetry's persona and the world around him may aptly be described as 'aristocratic'.

The professional poets of the mid-century were heavily influenced by Surrey and built much of their poetry around sequences of Surreyan rhythm/sense units. The effect of their poems is very different from Surrey's, however. Writers such as George Turberville constructed long, rambling poems based on rigidly policed rhythm/sense units (usually half-lines, lines, couplets and stanzas) geared primarily to impress the print reader (Panofsky 1977). Surrey's courtly aesthetic—his use of rhythm/sense units to build elegant, classical structures—was left behind. Turberville's units do not dramatise the basic unit is much longer and always cast in the same (iambic) rhythm, the alluring tension so characteristic of Wyatt's metre is absent.

The objects described in Surrey's rhythm/sense units are generally differentiated from each other either temporally or spatially. Thus, 'The soote season' (Rollins 1965, poem 2) dramatises the contrast between the succession of symptoms of Spring—each assigned to a discrete rhythm/sense unit—and a mourning poetic voice. In many of Surrey's poems perceptions and/or thoughts arrive sequentially. The speaker of How no age is content with his own estate, & how the age of children is the happiest, if they had skills to understand it (Rollins, poem 33) is confronted in turn by visions of childhood, youth and old age. He discovers that each 'age' is unhappy with itself and envies the condition of one of the other ages. These even-handed musings are destabilised, though, when Surrey's persona suddenly realises that he is not exempt from the anxieties he has been observing and that years have confined him to the viewpoint of Old Age. As in 'The soote season', then, the relationship between perceiver and rhythm/sense unit is dramatised. The delicacy of this relationship is the focus for much of Surrey's poetry and at the centre of his 'aristocratic' style.

Douglas Peterson argues that this 'drab poetic' was built on 'a medieval theory of eloquence' (1967, 4), privileging stylistic embellishment. Mary Thomas Crane finds in writers such as Turberville 'the use of aphoristic fragments to constitute and control a middle-class subject able to move upward within the dying hierarchies of the early modern state' (1993, 4), linking it to anti-individualistic concepts of collective authorship.
perceptions; rather, they accumulate statements vaguely linked in potentially endless sequences. Turberville’s poetic persona is not a sensitive, melancholy courtier, but a boastful rhetor.

The ‘new lyricism’ represented in the work of writers such as Oxford, Ralegh and Gorges can be read as an attempt to get back to the practice of Surrey, its major precursor. To do this, these writers needed to engage with Surrey’s immediate legacy, the mid-century or ‘drab age’ writers such as Turberville and Gascoigne. Their aim seems to have been to purify the diction of these writers and abbreviate the length of their texts. One way to do this was to return to Surrey; another way was to look at recent continental Petrarchism.

As one might expect, ‘new lyrical’ poets tended to translate continental poems in such a way as to bring them closer to the ‘drab’ rhetoric of the mid-century poets. On the other hand, in composing their texts, they sought a concision of utterance and delicacy of phrasing which owed far more to the example of Surrey and to the study of French and Italian source material than to their immediate English precursors.

The rise of the ‘new lyricism’ was in part a reaction to the female-centredness of Elizabeth’s court. Elizabeth’s sex meant that male courtiers were automatically distanced from the royal presence, for the Privy Chamber was dominated by women (Wright 1987; Merton 1991). Gorges himself, as a Gentleman Pensioner, was confined to the frustrating limbo of a ‘displaced male Privy Chamber’ (Chapter 1.1). Immediate access to the Queen

---

29 In this context the term ‘drab’, coined by C.S. Lewis (1954) is in equal portions brilliantly apt and dangerously misleading, not least on account of its status as a counterweight to ‘golden’. ‘New lyrical’ writers are in effect simultaneously ‘drab’ and ‘golden’ and thus destabilise Lewis’s terms.

30 And thus to banish ‘drab’ locutions such as ‘graping’, ‘griesly’, and ‘carke’ and to use alliteration more sparingly.
was largely a female prerogative, so court ladies automatically became more powerful figures than before (Merton 1991, refuting Wright 1987); thus, love poetry, aimed not just at Elizabeth but at other court ladies too, could play a significant role in the battle to gain patronage at court. The refinement of ‘Oxfordian’ new lyricism would have been useful here.

At the same time Petrarchan love poetry provided courtiers with a means of confronting the marginality of their status and the tensions of the patronage system in general. Much recent criticism has emphasised the way in which the discourse of early modern court patronage negotiations overlapped with the discourse of Petrarchist love poetry (Marotti 1982; Jones and Stallybrass 1984; Barrell 1988; cf. Burrow 1981). Writing as a Petrarchist lover put the poet in a position similar to a client’s vis-à-vis a patron. The differences between the two positions allowed the poet to play over scenarios impossible in the relationship with a genuine (male or female) patron. In love poetry, the patron-figure could be abused and denigrated, split up into beautiful or contemptible fragments within the client/poet’s rhetorical control—as could the problematic desires of the client/lover. The new lyricism’s Surreyan use of rhythm/sense units allowed its writers to dramatise their struggle for control within hierarchical relationships. This is a constant theme in Gorges’s adaptation of his French sources—unsurprisingly, given the significance to Gorges’s wooing of Douglas Howard of her high social rank (cf. Chapter 4.1.1).

31 For the usefulness of ‘two or three prettie lines’ in gaining a great lady’s support in a suit, see Chamberlain 1939, 1.272. For the topic of male anxiety at the court’s female-centredness, see Berry 1989, passim. The locus classicus is Calidore’s encounter with the circle of maidens in The Faerie Queene, Book 6. A variation on the theme is the male heroes’ infiltration of Basilius’s female-dominated ‘court’ in Sidney’s Arcadia.
Gorges's major French sources were identified by Helen E. Sandison in 1953 for her edition of his poetry, and are given in tabular form below.\(^{32}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gorges</th>
<th>Desportes</th>
<th>Graham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1577/1578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>aabccb(^8) x 7</td>
<td>D2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>aabccb(^8) x 7</td>
<td>H.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>abab(^10) x 5</td>
<td>H.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>abab(^10) x 5</td>
<td>D1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>abab cdcd efef gghh(^10)</td>
<td>H.xliii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>abab(^6) x 12</td>
<td>D2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>abab cdcd efef gg(^10)</td>
<td>D2.xxiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>abab(^10) x 4</td>
<td>D1.xxxiii/xxxii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>abcb(^8) x 8</td>
<td>DA.27/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>abab cdcd efef ghgh ii(^10)</td>
<td>H.xxxiii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ababcc(^10) x 7</td>
<td>D1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{32}\) Desportes's poems are cited using page numbers in Graham's multi-volume edition (1959-61) and the following abbreviations for individual sequences: D1 (Les Amours de Diane: Premier Livre (Graham 1959a)); D2 (Les Amours de Diane: Second Livre (Graham 1959b)); DA (Diverses Amours et Autres Oeuvres Meslées (Graham 1963)); E (Élégies (Graham 1961)); H (Les Amours d'Hippolyte (Graham 1960)). The copytext of Graham's edition is the Premières Oeuvres of 1600, in which many of the poems listed below occur in contexts completely different from those they would have had in the edition(s) from which Gorges would have worked. I have therefore included in this table an indication by sonnet and song number of the placing of each poem in the Paris editions of 1577 and 1578, texts which preserve orders close to those Gorges would have known. (see discussion in section 1.1). I have used lower case letters to mark instances where Gorges has combined in a single poem two Desportes originals. 1b has same source as 32; 28 and 55 are variant texts of the same poem. Du Bellay's poems are cited from Chamard's multi-volume edition (1908-31) first by sequence and sonnet number then by volume and page number. Sequences and long poems are abbreviated as follows: A (Les Amours); AR (Les Antiquitez de Rome); DdA (Complainte de Didon à Enée, prise d'Ovide); JR (Divers Jeux Rustiques); O (L'Olive); P (Poesies Diverses); R (Les Regrets); RN (Sonnets a la Royne de Navarre); SD (Sur la Statue de Didon Prins d'Ausone). Rhyme schemes are given both for Gorges' poems and for his sources. Raised numbers indicate
27 abab\textsuperscript{10} x 4 & D2.lvi & D2.301 & abab\textsuperscript{12} x 4 \\
28 abab ccdc efef gg\textsuperscript{10} & D1.xlii/xl & D1.94 & abba abba ccd eed\textsuperscript{12} \\
30 abab\textsuperscript{10} x 4 & D2.xliii & D2.284 & abba abba ccd eed\textsuperscript{12} \\
31 abab\textsuperscript{10} x 4 & D2.li & D2.298 & abba abba ccd eed\textsuperscript{12} \\
32 aabccb\textsuperscript{8} x 10 & H.9 & H.59 & See 1b \\
34 abab\textsuperscript{10} x 7 & DA.21/22 & DA.84 & abab\textsuperscript{12} x 7 \\
51 abab\textsuperscript{10} x 4 & D1.iiii/ii & D1.75 & abba abba ccd eed\textsuperscript{12} \\
52 abab ccdc efef gg\textsuperscript{12} & D2.li & D2.313 & abba abba ccd eed\textsuperscript{12} \\
60 abab ccdc efef gg\textsuperscript{10} & H.xxxii & H.82 & abba abba ccd eed\textsuperscript{12} \\
69 abab ccdc efef gg\textsuperscript{10} & D1.xiii/xii & D1.52 & abba abba ccd eed\textsuperscript{10} \\
70 abab ccdc efef gg\textsuperscript{10} & D2.xvi & D2.209 & abba abba ccd eed\textsuperscript{12} \\

Gorges & Du Bellay & Chamard \\

11 abab\textsuperscript{12} x 4 & R.v & ii.55 & abba abba ccd eed\textsuperscript{10} \\
13 ababcc\textsuperscript{10} x 5 & O.liii & i.72 & abba abba ccd eed\textsuperscript{10} \\
20 abab\textsuperscript{10} x 4 & O.xci & i.104 & abba abba ccd eed\textsuperscript{10} \\
36 ababcdcddee\textsuperscript{10} x 2 & PD.xxv & v.391 & ababb (c)b(c)\textsuperscript{10} x 15 \\
42 aabccb\textsuperscript{8} x 11 & JR.xx & v.69 & aaa\textsuperscript{10}b\textsuperscript{6}aaa\textsuperscript{10}b\textsuperscript{6} x 26 \\
45 ababcc\textsuperscript{10} x 2 & R.lii & ii.92 & abba acca dde ffe\textsuperscript{12} \\
47 abab ccdc efef gg\textsuperscript{10} & R.clxviii & ii.186 & abba abba ccd eed\textsuperscript{12} \\
48 abab ccdc efef gg\textsuperscript{10} & R.li & ii.91 & abba abba ccd eed\textsuperscript{12} \\

the number of syllables, not stresses, per line. A letter in parentheses indicates a rhyme sound that is
On the whole, Gorges opts either to translate poems by his French sources with enumerative structures hospitable to ‘new lyrical’ rhythm/sense units, or in translating poems lacking such structures to reshape them until they do. In general, Gorges tends to simplify the structures—imagistic, logical and syntactic—of his French originals, creating identical in every stanza.

33 Hence, perhaps, Anne Lake Prescott’s gut feeling that the effect of Gorges’s translations ‘is to move Desportes back a few years ... Desportes is gently nudged back toward the Pléiade through selection and modification’ (1978, 80). Gorges’s rhythm/sense units slow the pace of the French originals. In poems based around lists of exempla, each exemplum is isolated in a rhythm/sense unit and thus seems isolated to the reader/auditor of the poem. In a poem by Desportes, exempla link back much more easily to the lover’s situation. In Pléiade poems by writers such as Du Bellay, the exempla tend to be more detached from the lover though for semantic and phonemic reasons rather than as a result of metrical isolation. Overall, Gorges’s translation technique brings Desportes and Du Bellay closer together. Poems by Du Bellay are given greater direct relevance to the situation of the lover, whilst poems by Desportes lose something of their swift movement, becoming less completely ‘coherent’. Du Bellay is modified in the direction of Desportes, and Desportes in the direction of Du Bellay.
the basic elements for Surreyan dramas of control. Poem 47, for example, steamrollers a syntactically complicated French poem into a simple list of attributes, allocating each attribute one line. Poem 59 completely changes the syntax of Du Bellay's original to allow its own argument to proceed in two-line units, as, to a less drastic extent, does poem 20. Poem 66 does the same thing more subtly—here Gorges indulges within his two-line units in plentiful inversion, a device which gives a stately effect in keeping with 'glory', the poem's subject-matter.34

In several cases (eg. poems 1, 32, 36, 42) long French poems are considerably cut down in size. In a few cases, Gorges alters the situation narrated in the poem, generally making it more conventional (eg. poems 19, 42). On the other hand, Gorges sometimes adds imagery to add point to an argument; sometimes he adjusts imagery and syntax found in his French original to make it clearer and more logical.35

34 Other poems whose structures Gorges simplifies include the sources for poems 27, 51, 52 and 69. Poem 19 translates a French original rhymed in 'abab' stanzas into 'abcb' stanzas. Gorges's omission of an 'a' rhyme here heightens the isolation of the two-line units which are the basic rhythm/sense units for both French and English poems. In another attempt to isolate rhythm/sense units, poem 10 translates alexandrines hemistich by hemistich into short ballad-type stanzas (abab^). Occasionally, such adaptation causes problems for Gorges. Poem 3 combines two poems by Desportes. Here Gorges's attempt to provide strong links between his rhythm/sense units fails: units refuse to enter into subordinating relationships and every line bulks as large in the reader's attention as every other line—most unfortunately, given the intrinsic beauty of Gorges's closing two lines: 'whose gentle harte was never fi*amde off Ise/althoughe her Breste resemble dryven snowe' (19-20). These lines are as good an example as any of the courtly elegance, artifice and concision aimed at by the new lyricism.

35 Thus, poems 68 and 88 both amplify the syntactic structures of their Du Bellay originals, interposing an extra quatrain following their sources' third quatrains. The extra quatrain in poem 68 allows Gorges to spread the poem's opening exclamations over two balanced lines each, whilst poem 88's extra lines give Gorges the space to expand and tighten up the terms of Du Bellay's allegory. Poem 31 swerves from Desportes in allocating a quatrain to each stanza, as does poem 18. Both of these poems are argumentative pieces: Gorges obviously needed extra space to do justice to their logical structures. Poem 5 is two lines longer than its Desportes source. In its source Desportes compares the fruitless expenditure of the lover's blood, sighs and flame with the power lion's blood, wind and rain have over diamond, oaks and marble. Gorges's poem deviates from Desportes by isolating the presence of each of these three potent elements in the lover within a single line: as a result, another two lines are needed. In adapting the source of poem 62, Gorges gets into a muddle, mainly because, very unusually in his poetry, quatrain divisions do not accord with sense divisions. Interestingly, Gorges's robust adjustments to Desportes' syntax often clarify expressions criticised in Malherbe's neo-classical commentary on Desportes (reprinted in Graham's edition (1959-63)).
One of Gorges’s most impressive works of translation is poem 70. Gorges cuts pretty
details out of his Desportes source in order to bring out more clearly the allegorical sense
of Desportes’s conceit. In the closing couplet, the potential for rhythm/sense units to
isolate dramatic, contingent events in the manner of Surrey is beautifully realised. Here
Desportes’ tercet seems rather long-winded—

Quand il eut achevé, luy-mesme en fut épris,
En devint idolatre, et soudain je fut pris,
A fin que de mon coeur il luy fist sacrifice. (lines 12-4)

—and Gorges’s Surreyan emphasis on event is more felicitous:

Thus havige choyselye donne his moost and beste
To garnyshe her with Bewties chyfe attyre
Love Felte hym selfe at laste with love posseste
And dyd so much his workemanshipp admyre
As that he dyd Idolatrye comytt
And tooke my hart and sacryficede ytt. (lines 11-6)

One of Gorges’s most common strategies when translating is to place a greater
emphasis than his French source on the situation of the client/poet. Often this involves
isolating the poet, in the manner of Surrey, from other elements in the poem. Poem 11 is a
good example. Its Du Bellay source consists of an isocolonic list of agents and actions:
‘Ceulx qui sont amoureux, leurs amours chanteront,/Ceulx qui ayment l’honneur,
chanteront de la gloire’ (lines 1-2). Du Bellay keeps this up for thirteen lines, his future
tenses lending the poem a sense of inevitability. The final line subjects the figure of the
poet himself to the same syntactic structure: his activity is as banal and inevitable as
everybody else’s: ‘Moy, qui suis malheureux, je plaindray mon malheur.’ (14). Gorges’s
translation engineers a much greater contrast between the speaker and the previous
agents. A jussive construction is introduced, to imply, as Du Bellay’s poem does not, an
impatient speaker waiting in the wings:
Lett those that lyve in love, lament the louers fitts
and such as riches crave devyse to kepe upp wealth
Let those that Knowledge seek to study frame their witts
and such as are diseased seke meanes to have their helth (lines 1-4)

Gorges, moreover, gives the figure of the poet two lines to languish in and the only future
tense in the poem. He distinguishes poetic activity still further by contrasting the
conjunction ‘But’ with the conjunction ‘and’ which has hitherto headed every other line:
‘But I that am opprest vith luckeles frowarde fate/will here alone bewaile, my haremes
and my mishapp’ (lines 11-2). Rhetorical power is carved out for the client/poet by means
of a heightening of his disempowered status. A similar adjustment is made by Gorges to
the source for poem 84. Having described its speaker’s grief, Du Bellay’s text concludes
with a list of people who, like its speaker, ‘sing’ while they are sad: ‘Ainsi le prisonnierz
maudissant sa prison’ (14). Gorges adds two mythic singers (the dying swan and ‘the
Byrde agaynst the sharp thorn’ (13)) to Du Bellay’s list of real people and, in a move
away from the French poem, returns explicitly to the speaker in his last line: ‘So synges
my sad muse that musyke doth scorne’ (14).

Du Bellay’s sonnet ‘Rendez à l’or cete couleur, qui dore’, the source of Gorges’s poem
20, ends in a mood of wistful bathos. The speaker has instructed that various qualities of
his mistress be ‘returned’ (‘Rendez ces mains au blanc yvoire encore’ (5)); yet Du Bellay
ends his poem without having explained to whom his poem is addressed. The addressee
could be Olive, the mistress; more probably, though, it is the poet himself—images of the
lady’s beauty are, of course, within his gift. Whilst Du Bellay ends his poem on an
eloquent diminuendo—

Rendez encor’ ce doux nom [‘Olive’] a son arbre,
Ou aux rochers rendez ce coeur de marbre,
Et aux lions cet’ humble felonnie. (12-4)
—Gorges’s ending characteristically turns to the lover’s situation, clarifying in doing so the identity of the poem’s addressee, and adding a power relation:

And let that harte off hardened flynty stone
returne unto the rocks from whence it came
And then (oh love) if thou wilt heare my monse
teach me withall how to foregett her name. (13-6)

The poet-lover is separated not only from the subject-matter of the poem but also from the possibility of control over poetic images of his lady’s beauty.36

Whilst Oxford’s love poems represent the ‘forward-looking’ tendency of the ‘new lyricism’ to make contact with continental Petrarchism, the poetry of his near contemporary, Edward Dyer, represents a different strand of activity, almost equally influential on Gorges’s practice.37 Dyer specialised in writing medium-length lover’s complaints—impassioned, hysterical pieces with obvious affinities to the work of ‘drab’ writers such as Churchyard, Turberville and Gascoigne. Dyer’s work tends to be more introverted and emotional than the work of these men, however, and accrues at times considerable emotive force: Puttenham praises ‘Maister Edward Dyar, for Elegie most sweete, solempe and of high conceit’ (1936, 63). Dyer’s most popular poem concludes with a pun on his name:

My song, yf any aske whose greivous case is suche,
Die er thou lette his name be knowen, his folie shoes to muche;
But best is the to hide and never com to light,
For on the earthe may none but I this accent sound aright (May 1991, 292, lines 77-80)

36 Some of the poems translated by Gorges explicitly isolate the poet from the rest of their subject-matter in the original French: presumably it was for this reason that Gorges chose to translate them. The prime example is the source for poem 1.

37 Dyer and Oxford seem to have been the first two Elizabethan courtiers to write love poetry. Dyer had been at court since the late 1560s. It is possible that his earliest poems date to that time. None of his poetry is definitely that early, though. Dyer’s earliest dateable poem belongs to 1575. Steven W. May concludes that ‘Dyer wrote nearly all, if not all of his extant poetry between the mid-1570s and 1590’ (1991, 288). Dyer’s poetry has recently been edited by May (1991, 287-316).
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Melancholy love complaints seem to have been known in Scotland during the renaissance as ‘Dyers’ (Shire 1969, 221). Dyer’s texts take to an extreme the isolation—emotional as well as metrical—of their speaker, picking up on an important aspect of Surrey’s poetry that is very influential on Gorges’s translation practice in the *Vannetyes and Toyes*. Such poems stage a drastically disempowered version of the male lover’s voice, generically related to the ‘female complaint’ of Ovid’s *Heroides*. The lover is presented as verging on madness, in a gambit related to the use of melancholy in clients’ letters (see Chapter 2.4). Surrey is behind the use of this ‘new lyrical’ genre, specifically his two poems of this form in *Tottel’s Miscellany*.

Several of Gorges’s poems are ‘Dyers’. In these texts (poems 12, 25, 26, 39, 40) Gorges juxtaposes reminiscences of Dyer (cf. May 1991, 105) with the influence of Turberville, exploring the depiction of extreme states of submission and dependence and the paradoxically potent rhetoric of melancholy.

1.3. Structural Theories

Steven W. May sees little coherence behind the order of poems in the *Vannetyes and Toyes*:

> the collection as a whole is amorphous to a degree surpassing that of Greville’s *Caelica*. As with *Caelica*, clusters of poems on the same theme crop up here and there, yet the ‘*Vannetyes and Toyes*’ form a miscellaneous collection rather than a sequence. Their entry ... does not follow the order of their composition, and their connection with Gorges’s courtship of his first wife, Lady Douglas Howard, has been somewhat exaggerated. (1991, 106)

May’s disagreement here is with Helen E. Sandison, who argues that many of the poems in the *Vannetyes and Toyes* are written about Douglas, and who suggests that the early

---

38 For accounts of this genre see Schmitz 1990; Kerrigan 1991. Two of the extracts from Gorges’s poem 25 quoted by Puttenham are attributed to Dyer (see Sandison 1953, 190).

39 For Turberville’s influence see section 1.4.
poems in the sequence are arranged chronologically (1953, xxviii-xxx). The importance of the work of Sandison and May makes it necessary to examine their theories about the composition of the *Vannetyes and Toyes* in some detail.

Sandison argues that three ‘groups’ of poems within the collection are particularly closely connected with Douglas Howard:

1. A group of ‘drab’ complaints, all in Hand A (poems 12; 25; 26; 39; 40; 89; 95)
2. A group of poems in Hand A marked with a ‘D’ either by Gorges or by the scribe of Hand A after or during the transcription of the manuscript (poems 29, 44, 48, 52, 53, 57, 63, 66, 69).
3. A group of poems at the end of the collection, some by Hand A, some in Gorges’s holograph (poems 93, 94, 95, 98, 99, 100).

The poem most definitely connected with Douglas Howard is poem 26. This poem forms the basis for Sandison’s posited group of ‘drab’ complaints. Its description of the beloved as of ‘lyons kinde’ (line 104) alludes to Douglas and the Howard coat of arms. Poem 26 is one of seven ‘drab’ complaints in the *Vannetyes and Toyes*, nearly all of which cannibalise verse by George Turberville (Sandison 1953, 187; 190; 191-2; 196; 215; 221), five of which (12; 25; 26; 39; 95) Sandison suggests were written with Douglas in mind (1953, 191-2). Sandison proposes that all seven pieces were written ‘near the marriage in 1584’ at a time when ‘Gorges was evidently practising his hand...on imitations of Turbervile’s short-lined complaints based on Ovid’ (1953, 191). Sandison identifies a number of links within this ‘group’ of complaints which she argues imply

---

40 In *Daphnaïda*, Daphne is allegorised by Alcyon as a lioness, and allusion is made in the dedication epistle to the Howard coat of arms. See Chapter 4.1.1.
composition for Douglas. In poem 26, line 204, Gorges promises to carve on trees his beloved’s ‘worthy name’, ‘a link with Douglas’ according to Sandison ‘only less explicit than the ‘lyons kinde’ of 104’ (1953, 192). The issue of Douglas’s great birth (and thus the ‘name’ of Howard) was a matter of great importance at the time of Gorges’s and Douglas’s marriage and is much emphasised in the dedication to Spenser’s elegy for Douglas, *Daphnaïda* (see Chapter 4.1.1). Poem 26 presses home the significance of the beloved’s status by referring to her as ‘worthy one’ (line 213). References to the loved one’s ‘worthy name’ occur also in poems 12 (line 55) and 39 (line 16), suggesting to Sandison that these two pieces must also refer to Douglas (1953, 187; 196). If one uses this argument to link poem 39 with Douglas, then the posy-like phrase, ‘more yours then myne owne’, in line 32 becomes significant:

Witness with me my hande  
that haste subscribe alone  
To her and to none els alyve  
more yours then myne owne (lines 29-32)

If poem 39 is about Douglas, the clear implication is that ‘more yours then myne owne’ was used as a posy by Gorges and Douglas. There is what looks like an oblique allusion to this posy at the end of poem 26, not noted by Sandison: ‘And yff I dye the losse ys yours/to loose that ys your owne’ (lines 215-6). Sandison links poem 25 to Douglas by arguing, persuasively, that it is a companion-piece to poem 26 (1953, 190): poem 25 promises a complaint given as poem 26. The other Turbervillian complaint Sandison links particularly closely to Douglas is poem 95. Her reason is the poem’s general similarity to poem 26 (1953, 221-2).

---

41 In section 1.4. below I argue for the importance of Turberville’s influence on the *Vannetyes and Toyes* as a whole.
Although Sandison identifies these Turberville-influenced complaints as a ‘group’ and proposes that they were all written at about the same time and that most of them were written for Douglas Howard, they do not fall together in the manuscript. Poem 12 is isolated from all of the others, which fall into three blocks of two poems each: 25 and 26; 39 and 40; 89 and 95. If these complaints did originally form a group, then the transcriber has spaced them out across the volume.

In Spenser’s *Daphnaida*, an elegy on the death of Douglas (described fully in Chapter 4) Gorges is allegorised as ‘Alcyon’ and Douglas is given the name ‘Daphne’. Nine poems marked with a ‘D’ (poems 29; 44; 48; 52; 53; 57; 63; 66; 69) form the second of Sandison’s proposed ‘groups’ of poems for Douglas Howard. Sandison proposes that the ‘D’ signifies ‘Douglas’ and/or ‘Daphne’. She suggests (1953, xxix) that ‘all these rather closely grouped D-poems ....were written for Douglas, or chosen as addresses to her, in years near 1584’, the date of Douglas’s and Gorges’s marriage. Only one, poem 44, actually uses the name ‘Daphne’. Poem 29 however, a sonnet in alexandrines emphasising the beloved’s superiority to the goddesses judged by Paris, is one of those pieces which emphasises the ‘name’ of the beloved (line 14). It also refers to the mistress’s ‘worthy mynd’ (line 4). Poem 44 is translated from a song by Guillaume Tessier (Sandison 1953, 200). It opens with an original frame-narrative placing the translation of Tessier’s complaint in the mouth of the shepherd Phylander. Phylander laments that he is not ‘sencles’ (line 6) like the laurel tree:

```
Safelye within thy Barke was Daphnae shrinde
To shunne the rage of Phoebus frindly fire
But wretched I no suche retrayte cann fynde
To shrowde my harte from force of my desire. (lines 9-12)
```
Sandison suggests that this reference to Daphne, present in the French source, connects the poem to Douglas Howard, the ‘Daphne’ of *Daphnïda* (1953, 200). As May points out, however (1991, 108), the poem explicitly fails to associate Daphne with the poet’s mistress—Daphne is instead invoked as a means of focusing on the pain of ‘Phylander’—and would thus seem unlikely to have been written for a lady nicknamed ‘Daphne’. Poem 48 is a sonnet translated from a poem from Du Bellay’s *Regrets*, in which the addressee (‘Mauny’ in the French original, ‘My deare’ in Gorges’s text) is counselled to bear up under the depredations of Fortune. Sandison points out that Gorges specifies Du Bellay’s ‘mauvaise fortune’ as ‘this fortune badde’ (line 1) and proposes that ‘Such a difficulty as Viscount Bindon’s violent opposition to the marriage in 1584 might be the occasion.’ (1953, 202). Poem 52 is an amatory sonnet translated from Desportes, with no obvious features linking it to Douglas. French and English texts both emphasise the lover’s exclusive fidelity to his mistress. May finds in this poem ‘a constant love in keeping with the intimate tone of poem 48’ (1991, 107), his implication being that such a tone links it to Gorges’s relationship with Douglas Howard. Poem 53 is an original sonnet, whose depiction of the lover is closely connected to Spenser’s depiction of Alcyon in *Daphnïda*. Sandison finds this poem reminiscent of Ralegh and detects ‘Considerable feeling ... through all the commonplaces’ (1953, 203). Poem 57, another sonnet, deploys a common type of inexpressibility topos, making no ascertainable reference to Douglas

---

42 May unaccountably nods here, stating that poem 48 is ‘an original English sonnet’ conveying ‘genuine, rhetorically unadorned or exaggerated sentiments’ and appearing ‘to be a sincere address to ‘My deare’- an otherwise trite commentary on inconstant fortune’ which ‘ends on a note of sincere and original insight suggesting that the poem was no pat exercise but was designed genuinely to comfort Lady Howard in the midst of adversity’ (1991, 107). In fact, the ending of Gorges’s poem is very close to Du Bellay’s French. 43 May’s observation here is weakened by his misidentification of poem 48 as an ‘original’ poem of Gorges’s. See previous note. 44 For Spenser’s use of the *Vannetyes and Toyes* in the composition of *Daphnïda* see Chapter 4.
Howard. The scribe’s transcription of the word ‘Finis’ following this poem suggests that in his copytext this poem was the last in a formal sequence of some sort. Poem 63 is an apparently original sonnet about the act of dreaming about the beloved. Poem 66 translates a poem by Du Bellay contrasting the lover’s pains with heroic deeds of war, featuring, Sandison suggests, ‘changes that suggest Spenser’, specifically a passage in *The Ruines of Time*: ‘Perhaps Gorges saw Spenser’s lines in circulation, or Spenser, seeing Gorges’s words in these Toyes in 1589, if not before, retained a memory of them’ (1953, 205). Poem 69, the last of the ‘D’ poems and another sonnet, is a translation of a poem by Desportes. Its reference in its opening line to ‘her prowde youthly mynde’ recalls the ‘worthy mind’ of other poems which may be linked to the theme of the ‘worthy name’ of Howard. Otherwise, though, there is no obvious link to Douglas.

Overall, there is no solid reason—other than the presence of the ‘D’s—to link any of these nine ‘D’ poems with Douglas Howard. Many other poems in the manuscript have equally close or closer connections to Douglas. May nevertheless accepts Sandison’s argument that ‘D’ signifies ‘Daphne’ and/or ‘Douglas’ and thus that the nine ‘D’ poems form a ‘group’ of poems written by Gorges for Douglas Howard (1991, 107). Sandison proposes that all nine of ‘these rather closely grouped D-poems (29, 44, 48, 52, 53, 57, 63, 66, 69) were written for Douglas, or chosen as addresses to her, in years near 1584’ (1953, xxix). The ‘D’ poems are not, though, grouped all together. Poem 29 is not very close to any other ‘D’ poem. The other ‘D’ poems fall into two ‘groups’: one of five (44, 48, 52, 53, 57) followed by another of three (63, 66, 69). It might be significant that it is poem 57—the final poem of the first of these ‘groups’—which uniquely in the manuscript is followed by a scribal ‘Finis’. Perhaps these ‘D’ poems originally existed in one or more
short sequences presented by Gorges to Douglas in a gathering or two. Certainly they would have made a decorative and elegant mini-sequence. All are in sonnet form except for 44, a pastoral song. The ‘D’ might identify the poems as part of a short sequence entitled *Daphne*, analogous to Desportes’ *Diane*, Du Bellay’s *L’Olive* and Gorges’s cousin Ralegh’s putative *Cynthia*. If Sandison and May are correct and the ‘D’ poems do form a group, then the aim of the scribe and Gorges in assembling the *Vannetyes and Toyes* seems to have been to disperse this group across the sequence as a whole. In other words, they seem to have treated this ‘group’ much as they treated the ‘group’ of Turbervillian complaints. A similar pattern of dispersal seems to have occurred, too: a single poem introduced early in the manuscript and separated from the rest of the group (poems 12 and 29) is in each case followed by a number of small bunches of poems near them. A further possibility, not considered either by May or Sandison, is that the ‘D’s were added shortly after transcription to mark poems that either Gorges or someone else wanted recopied.

The third of the major ‘groups’ of poems linked by Sandison with Douglas is a sequence of poems at the end of the *Vannetyes and Toyes*: poems 93, 94, 95, 98, 99 and 100 (Sandison 1953, xxix). Of these, the first four are in Hand A, and the last two have been added in Gorges’s holograph (for these, see section 1.5). Poem 93 is a poem attacking the poet’s hightborn mistress for stooping to a rich and unworthy lover in the poet’s absence. It is one of the poems to include a reference to the posy ‘more yours then myne owne’ (line 19) as well as an allusion to ‘the glory of thy name’ (line 22). The poem ends in bitterness:

Hadste thow pursude thy noble kinde  
   honor shoulde fyriste have wonne thy mynde
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Sandison argues that this poem might belong to about 1584, when Viscount Bindon was trying to match Douglas ‘for his pryvate gayne of money’...The occasion for the lover’s absence, search for a place of honour, is more definite than is common in poems of this type; Gorges, a newcomer at court in the early eighties, was with Ralegh zealously pursuing his fortune. (1953, 219)

Poem 94 is an adaptation of a song by Guillaume Tessier asserting the superiority of country lasses to court ladies. Significantly, Gorges names the country lass he praises as ‘my Daphnae’ (line 31), swerving here from the French text. This Daphne is linked later in the poem to the primrose (line 36), thus paralleling the Daphne of *Daphnaïda* (Sandison 1953, 221). Poem 95 is one of the short-lined Turbervillian complaints grouped together by Sandison and closely associated by her with Douglas Howard. It makes no obvious allusion to Douglas, however, and can only be linked with her by association with other Turbervillian complaints with closer Howard connections. Sandison suggests that ‘As 26, for all its conventionality, certainly refers at one point to Douglas, so 95 may have been brought to life by the thought of her’ (221). Poem 98, ‘An Ecloge betwen a Shephearde and a Heardman’, concerns a shepherd in love with Daphne. The ‘heardman’ argues in vain that Daphne is too noble for the shepherd. May is sceptical about the connection Sandison finds here with Douglas Howard. Pointing out that neither this poem nor the other ‘Daphne’ pastoral, poem 94, are marked with a ‘D’, May (1991, 108-9) raises the possibility that Spenser specially manufactured the equation between Douglas and ‘Daphne’ for *Daphnaïda* and that in her lifetime Gorges never thought of his first wife as ‘Daphne’. Poem 99 is the first of two holograph entries made by Gorges. Here Gorges refers to the necessity to ‘cloak my woe/In honor to preserve your name’, a
'hint of Douglas' according to Sandison (1953, 224). Poem 100, 'A Pastorall unfynyshed', appears to be the 'conceit of Eglantyne' referred to by Spenser in Colin Clouts come home againe (Chapter 4.2). In Gorges's poem, in what looks like an obvious reference to the death of Daphne, 'a sober Ladd' (line 4) plays a harp 'As on for loste love much dismayde' (line 6) and sings in praise of 'Eglantyne'. The poem breaks off unfinished with a poignant 'etc'. 'Eglantyne', it is clear, signifies Queen Elizabeth: Gorges seems to be depicting himself turning from devotion to Daphne/Douglas to royal panegyric.

I am not convinced that these six poems (93; 94; 95; 98; 99; 100) constitute a coherent, Douglas-related 'group'. Crucially, the 'group' contains two breaks in transcription. The first of these follows poem 95 (Sandison 1953, 222). The last two poems in the 'group' were copied in Gorges's holograph after another gap, probably of some years (section 1.1). These breaks in transcription strongly suggest that the 'group' as identified by Sandison cannot have been intended by Gorges as such when originally planning the Vannetyes and Toyes.

The means by which Sandison defines her complaints 'group' underpin most attempts to link other poems in the Vannetyes and Toyes to Douglas. Thus, the idea that 'more yours then myne owne' was a posy used by Gorges and Douglas might lead one to argue that poems 4, 6, 36, and 93 should be classified as Douglas poems. Poem 4 culminates in the lover's petition that the beloved 'save with speed the harte more yours then myne' (line 17). In a passage independent of its French analogue (Sandison 1953, 185), poem 6 echoes poem 39's reference to the act of writing a love posy: '... thy righte hand (which yf

45 Sandison 1962 (correcting Sandison 1953, 225-7); May 1991, 112-3. For 'A Pastorall unfynyshed' see
the truthe were known)/dyd ofte subscribe, more yours then myne owne’ (lines 17-8).

Lines 11-2 of poem 36, close to the wording of Gorges’s French source (Sandison 1953, 195), seem to be connected to the posy: ‘Shee whose owne I am so muche/as that myne owne to bee I have no mighte’. Meanwhile, chiding the beloved for admitting a rich but unworthy lover, line 19 of poem 93 recalls the formula: ‘Ingrate so much I was thine owne’. Two other poems include passages, not noted by Sandison, which echo the posy more indirectly: the opening four lines of poem 34, translated from Desportes (Sandison 1953, 193), describe an exchange of hearts, whilst 38, a poem addressed to ‘False Craessyde’ refers to ‘My harte that sometymes was your owne’ (line 9). Overall at least eight poems (poems 4; 6; 26; 34; 36; 38; 39; 93) can be linked to the posy, though not all of them need necessarily have been written for Douglas: Gorges could easily have used the posy in poems for more than one mistress (cf. Sandison 1953, 185).

It is not difficult to find poems which refer to the beloved’s great ‘name’ (Sandison 1953, 188). Sandison’s note to poem 29, line 13 (‘No mervaile thoughe my harte dysdaine, to thinke on other name.’) suggests that ‘the culminating accent on the lady’s name, useful as it is for rhyme, might have personal bearing’ (1953, 192). Poem 82 identifies the flowers embroidered on a lady’s garter as ‘eglantynes and lyllyes [the last word cancelled] for your name’ (line 8). Sandison fails to establish a connection between these flowers and the Howards (1953, 212-3; cf. May 1991, 112-3), though she persists in using the emphasis on the lady’s ‘name’ to link the poem to Douglas. In chiding the mistress for abandoning him for financial gain in poem 93, Gorges weaves together a
reference to the mistress’s worthy ‘name’ and an allusion to the ‘more yours then myne owne’ posy:

Ingrate so much I was thine owne
that all my care was to make knowne
Howe farr the rest thow dydste surpasse
for loe the glory of thy name
Which now to saye I blushe for shame
uppon my browe engraved was (lines 19-24)

Sandison places particular weight on these passages’ potential connection with Douglas, remarking of the words ‘her worthye name’ in poem 12, line 55 that

This phrase, however much an amorous convention, suggests Douglas as the lady, since Gorges uses it in 26..., a poem that identifies his love as a Howard, and in 39..., a poem strongly suggestive of her; her high birth loomed large in the controversy of 1584. (1953, 188-9)

In this connection the climactic wish in poem 20 to be allowed ‘to foregett her name’ (line 16), a swerve from Du Bellay’s French, may be significant. Overall, there are six poems in which a lady’s name ‘looms large’ (12; 20; 26; 29; 39; 82; 93). A related topos is the stress on the mistress’s ‘worthy mind’ which recurs in several poems in the Vanneteyes and Toyes. Poem 20, meanwhile, swerves significantly from its French source in attributing to the poet’s mistress a ‘mynde which honoreth all the reste’ given by Minerva. Du Bellay’s original refers only to ‘graces’ given by Venus.

On the whole, May is highly sceptical about Sandison’s attempts to link the Vanneteyes and Toyes with Gorges’s marriage to Douglas Howard. He concurs with Sandison’s suggestion that the poems marked ‘D’ are associated with Douglas, and finds likely connections to Douglas in two other poems, poems 26 and 94. (Poem 26 is the poem which refers to the beloved as ‘of lyon kinde’; poem 94 is the poem which alters Tessier to incorporate a reference to ‘Daphne’.) May concludes that ‘Gorges’s poems for or about

Other ‘groups’ can be discerned in the Vannetyes and Toyes. Poems 21, 23 and 56 are all pithy and all transcribed in Roman script. Sandison suggested that ‘all three came to [the scribe’s]...copy from a single group of epigram like verse’ (1953, 189). Again, if such is the case, it is notable that the process of transcribing the Vannetyes and Toyes would have involved splitting up the ‘single group’.

May argues for the existence of a group of poems (poems 38; 40; 93; 94) connected to a love-affair with a noble lady other than Douglas Howard:

Poems 38 and 40 deal with some ‘false Cresseid’ who deserted the poet for a rival. These lyrics are too bitter in tone to apply to Daphne, nor was there quite time enough to crowd so many romantic upheavals into Gorges’s courtship of his wife. His point of view in both poems is that his mistress, who scorned him as Cressida did Troilus, may find that her new love is a Diomede who will serve her in the same way. Poems 93 and 94 probably deal with the same failure in love. In the first of them Gorges rebukes a woman who, as in poem 40, turned to another man during the poet’s absence: ‘Whilste hope high Honnors place to have/estraungde fi-om me thy parson brave’ (lines 1-2). These lines suggest that he was engaged in some official mission at the time of his displacement by a wealthy rival. His mistress, herself of ‘noble kinde,’ has rejected him ‘Onely for clownishe muckes desyre’ (poem 93, lines 42, 46). Poem 46 emphasises the lady’s high estate by referring to ‘the glory of thy name,’ yet the poet rejects such court ladies, ‘attyred all in craft and guile,’ for a simple country lass—and here Gorges first names Daphne as the object of his love. Accordingly, Gorges may have pursued another heiress before courting Lady Howard, who caught him ‘on the rebound’ from a woman who was herself a fortune hunter. (May 1991, 110-1)

I argue in section 1.4 that such a strict autobiographical interpretation of these poems, though defensible, is not necessary, and that there were strong generic pressures compelling Gorges to write this sort of love poetry.

In general, it is clear that, while the groupings identified by May and Sandison have some logic to them, their status is ultimately doubtful. At most, May’s and Sandison’s arguments suggest that Gorges collected a number of different types of copytext for the scribe of Hand A, and that in compiling the manuscript the scribe dispersed the poems so
grouped throughout the text. A possible explanation for such a strategy is given in section 1.4.

1.4. Plan and Structure

May's summary account of the subject-matter of the *Vannetyes and Toyes* casts light on the assumptions underpinning both his and Sandison's analysis of Gorges's poems:

It seems [improbable] that these lyrics provide a coherent record of Gorges’s wooing of his first wife, that he consistently wrote about her as Daphne, or that he devised for himself a fictional identity as Alcyon. (107)

Both May and Sandison implicitly assume that for the Egerton poems to be linked to Gorges's wooing of Douglas they must 'provide a coherent record' of Gorges's and Douglas's historical relationship. Having demonstrated that the *Vannetyes and Toyes* do not provide 'a coherent record', May feels able to assert that there are few threads linking Douglas Howard to the sequence. May's further point—that Gorges did not 'consistently [write] about [Douglas] as Daphne, or [devise] for himself a fictional identity as Alcyon'—he takes to have established that the *Vannetyes and Toyes* should not be read as predominantly concerned with a fictionalisation of Gorges's relationship with Douglas.

Such a conclusion is not, however, necessary. I believe that the *Vannetyes and Toyes* should be read as a sequence deliberately put together to celebrate and commemorate Gorges's connection with Douglas Howard, sometime in the 1580s. The sequence could have been put together to mark the marriage; but there is no reason why it should not have been compiled later. The fact that a fair proportion of its poems were probably not originally written for Douglas and that as a whole it does not seem to provide 'a coherent record' of the courtship I do not find problematic. It is possible to argue that many of the
poems in the collection were not necessarily originally written with Douglas in mind yet to argue at the same time that these poems were nevertheless presented to her, and that the Egerton manuscript was compiled in the immediate context of Gorges’s and Douglas’s relationship.

Sandison and May provide the basic conceptual apparatus necessary to argue such a case. Sandison’s proposal that the nine poems marked with a ‘D’ ‘were written for Douglas, or chosen as addresses to her [my italics], in years near 1584’ (1953, xxix) hits the nail on the head, as does May’s comment about the despairing tone of Gorges’s Turbervillian complaints. May finds these poems ‘quite incompatible with Gorges’s successful wooing’ and suggests that ‘Perhaps Douglas asked her husband to compose these lover’s complaints for her just as Queen Anne made a similar request of King James’ (1991, 107).

It is possible to conceive of the Vannetyes and Toyes as a whole being put together for Douglas, in the same playful spirit in which James VI of Scotland’s poetry was composed for Anne of Denmark. If the poetry was assembled with this end in view, it need not have been composed very near to the wedding in 1584. Thus Sandison’s assumption that all poetry with links to Douglas must have been written in the years near the marriage is unnecessary. Also unnecessary, though by no means ruled out of court, is May’s argument that four of the poems refer to a love-affair predating Gorges’s meeting with Douglas (1991, 110-1).

46 Cf. the jokiness of ‘The Answer’ (poem 24), a poem on the topic of faith and betrayal added to the Egerton manuscript, possibly in Douglas’s hand (section 1.5, no.1). Cf. Duncan-Jones’s description of Astrophil and Stella as ‘a kind of literary charade in which both real-life participants knew exactly what was going on’ (1991, 246)
I do not think that Gorges wrote the lyrics of the *Vannetyes and Toyes* with precise intentions about ordering them into a sequence. It seems likely that the poems were written on a number of different occasions—some love poems having been composed for Douglas, some perhaps for other women—and that the compilation of the *Vannetyes and Toyes* involved finding a way of ordering such divergent material. The collection is not so much ‘amorphous’ (May 1991, 106) as experimental. It is a valuable witness to the ways in which a ‘new lyrical’ court poet of the early 1580s put together a sequence of love poems.

Perhaps Gorges’s assembly of the *Vannetyes and Toyes* was undertaken in a spirit similar to that in which Sir John Harington compiled a collection of poetry shortly before Christmas 1600. In a letter Harington explained to Lady Jane Rogers that in addition to his translation of Ariosto’s *Orlando Furioso*, he was sending her ‘as manie of the toyes as I have formerly written to you and your daughter, as I could collect out of my scattered papers’. Sending the poems signifies Harington’s intimacy with the two women. He sends his texts, he says,

> supposing (though you have seene some of them long since) yet now to revew them againe, and remember the kynde, and sometimes the unkynde occasions, on which some of them were written will not be unpleasant, and because there was spare roome, I have added a few others that were showed to our Soveraigne Lady, and some, that I durst never show any Ladie, but you two. And so wishing you to lock me up as safe in your love, as I know you will lay up this booke safe in your Chest I commend me to you. (Harington 1930, 86-7)\(^7\)

The passage is a useful gloss on some of the pleasures afforded by coterie manuscript verse. The recipients of Harington’s verse—and its main subject-matter—were also sent

---

\(^7\) A similar use of the word ‘toys’, more straightforwardly within a patronage relationship, was made by John Chamberlain and Dudley Carleton in 1602. Chamberlain says Walter Cope asked him ‘why I did not present Master Secretarie [Robert Cecil] with some toyes to kepe me in his remembraunce: I delivered him some of those pictures and verses you sent me, in your hand, which I presume Master Secretarie knowes: at
poems on other topics. The document as a whole was used by Harington as a means of cementing his friendship with the two women. Mutatis mutandis, this, I believe, brings us close to the motivations behind the compilation of the Vannetyes and Toyes.

The ordering of the Vannetyes and Toyes is influenced both by English and by French models. Just as the verbal texture of Gorges’s poetry represents a ‘new lyrical’ attempt to harmonise ‘drab’ English rhetoric with courtly French elegance, so the organisation of his sequence attempts to unite French concision with the dramatic structure characteristic of drab poetry books.

The key English influence on the Vannetyes and Toyes is George Turberville’s Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets (London 1567; reprinted in Turberville 1977). Gorges also reworks material from Turberville’s translation of Ovid’s Heroides (Ovid’s Heroycall Epistles (London, 1565)). The Vannetyes and Toyes should, I believe, be read as a rewriting of Turberville’s books in the ‘new lyrical’ continental style. In putting his sequence together, Gorges would, I think, have expected Douglas to have recognised its relationship both with Turberville’s text and with fashionable French poetry.48

Turberville’s Epitaphes was the first sequence of love poetry by a single author published in English to have anything approaching a narrative framework. Including also poems on other subjects, the book charts the love of Tymetes, the poet’s persona, for the lady Pyndara, who ends up married to another man. Turberville makes it obvious that Pyndara (a quirky spelling of ‘Pandora’) is a fictionalised representation of his patron and

---

48 Gorges’s use of Turberville is recorded in detail in Sandison’s edition (1953). Sandison differs from me in seeking to de-emphasise Gorges’s use of Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets (‘It is an index of
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the dedicatee of the book, Anne, Countess of Warwick, recently married to Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick (A8r-B1v). Critics have puzzled over the apparent lack of decorum which Turberville’s presentation of the Countess with a book in which he seems to depict himself as her wooer would seem to involve (Hanks 1929; Warkentin 1984). They have been equally puzzled by the structure of the book. A clear narrative progression can be extracted from the text—and, indeed, the text seems to ask to be read as a coherent narrative—yet only at the expense of the actual order of the poems. It has been suggested that for reasons unknown Turberville disordered the poetry following the publication of a lost first edition in which narrative coherence was maintained (Hanks 1929). Germaine Warkentin has suggested (1984) that the ‘incoherence’ of the collection is an attempt to replicate what was perceived in the renaissance as the ‘disordered’, ‘scattered’ state of Petrarch’s love poetry (Rime sparse). I do not think it is necessary to go back to Petrarch. The disorder of Turberville’s sequence can be linked to texts such as Du Bellay’s L’Olive. Turberville must have intended the Countess of Warwick to read the story of Tymetes and Pyndara as a flattering allegory of his patronage relationship with her. In distorting narrative chronology, he emphasised its fictional status, moving tentatively towards the ‘purer’, more ‘abstract’ sequences of love poetry currently being published on the continent, which gestured towards narrative and thematic structures without making them obvious.

Gorges’s Vannetyes and Toyes can be read as an attempt to take Turberville’s strategy further in a homage to Douglas Howard. The Vannetyes and Toyes are further removed from a coherent narrative than the Epitaphes. Even so, they embed enough features taken

Gorges’s poetic sensitiveness that he was stirred to close imitation of Turberville only by the semi-narrative
from Turberville’s account of the relationship between Tymetes and Pyndara to justify the description of them as a ‘rewriting’ of Turberville’s text. As May’s and Sandison’s researches reveal (see section 1.3), clues about the events apparently behind Gorges’s poems are scattered freely and unpredictably through his text. Just as Turberville commemorated his relationship with the Countess of Warwick in Epitaphes, so Gorges, less problematically, commemorated his relationship with his wife in the Vannetyes and Toyes. Gorges went further than Turberville in using continental methods of ‘scattering’ love poems through sequences to emphasise the fictional status of his composition.

There are several important historical links between Gorges, Douglas and Turberville. Turberville was a west country neighbour of Gorges and was probably acquainted with him (Sandison 1953, xvii, n.1). Turbervilles were involved in the stormy legal battles over Gorges’s and Douglas’s marriage. The nub of Douglas’s father’s complaint to Star Chamber in December 1584 was that without his knowledge the previous October Gorges ‘with Thomas Turbevile, John Fleire and others not yet known took away Douglas and married her’ (PRO STAC5 H20/3). The text of a later interrogatory requested by Howard goes further:

Whether dyd not you with fayer speches and by offeres of gyfts before the said maridge alluer and entyce the said dowglas to foresake her said father and mother and to betake her selfe vnto the said Gorges....Whether dyd not you at any tymes bestowe vppon hir any gyfts and other rewards thereby to wynne and drawe her good wyll towards her nowe husband and yf you so dyd whether was hit not in hope of a gayne to be had att the hande of the saide Gorges. (PRO STAC5 H29/11)

Turberville denied all charges, claiming no knowledge of the marriage and no involvement with it. There is a fine irony in these accusations, given the centrality of the epistles, not by ‘songs and sonets’ like those addressed to Pyndara’ (xlvi)).
work of Thomas Turberville’s relative George to Gorges’s poetic ‘wooing’ of Douglas.49

Additionally, there was a direct patronage relation between George Turberville and the Howards. Turberville’s translation of Ovid’s *Heroides, Heroycall Epistles* (London, 1565) had been dedicated to Douglas’s grandfather, Thomas Howard, first Viscount Bindon. Bindon, as Sandison points out, ‘till his death in 1582 championed [Douglas] and her mother against his son’ (1953, xvii, n.1), Henry Howard, Gorges’s great enemy. Equally significant is the link between the Gorgeses and the dedicatee of the *Epitaphes*, the Countess of Warwick. Gorges’s and Douglas’s child, a girl (b.1588), was named ‘Ambrosia’ after her godfather Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick, the husband of Turberville’s ‘Pyndara’ (Sandison 1953, xvii).50

One of the most important links between the *Vannetyes and Toyes* and Turberville’s *Epitaphes* is Gorges’s adaptation of Tymetes’s motto ‘My hart is yours’. Tymetes uses this motto (or ‘posy’) to mark the end of epistles and at one point composes a poem about the ring it is engraved on (D1v-D2r). Many poems in the *Vannetyes and Toyes* incorporate a more extreme version, ‘More yours than my own’. Consistently, Gorges integrates his posy into his poetry. In poem 39 the speaker recalls having used it in correspondence with the beloved:

Witness with me my hande
that haste subscribde alone
To her and to none els alyve
more yours then myne owne (29-32)

---

49 When Thomas Mewtas came to Dorset to rescue Douglas and her mother from the Viscount (see Chapter 1.1), both George and Thomas Turberville were present (BL MS Lansdowne 43, f.53r). ‘William Turberville’ took Gorges’s side in the pitched battle at Lulworth with Stansfield’s servants in 1599/1600 (PRO STAC5 S27/25; see Chapter 1.1). For the Turbervilles see Hankins 1929; Lloyd 1967, 126-48.
50 Gorges’s uncle Thomas had been present at Ambrose Dudley’s marriage to Anne Russell (Bradford 1936, 34).
Other occurrences come in poem 26, lines 215-6, poem 4, line 17, poem 6, lines 17-8, poem 36, lines 11-2, poem 93, line 19, poem 34, lines 1-4 and poem 38, line 9.

Behind both Gorges's and Turberville's poetry collections is the story of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*. Throughout the sixteenth century Troilus's complaints were cannibalised to provide the sources for numerous love lyrics. More importantly, the story of Troilus and Criseyde was used as a model for the narrative of a love affair (Southall 1954). This meant that early English sequences of love poetry had a strong tendency to depict a love affair in which the beloved lady proved faithless like Criseyde. In the Elizabethan miscellanies, poems berating faithless mistresses—many making specific allusion to Criseyde—are found alongside straightforward love laments. Turberville's sequence is explicit about its dependence on Chaucer's narrative. The scheme of the story which Turberville's sequence tells is given in 'The Argument to the whole discourse and Treatise following' (B2r-B2v). The hero, Turberville's poetic persona, Tymetes, woos and wins Pyndara, only for Pyndara to marry someone else (i.e. Ambrose Dudley). Towards the end of the book, a detailed comparison between Tymetes's situation and Troilus's is made in 'The Lover in utter dispair of his Ladies retume, in eche respect compares his estate with Troylus' (T2r). Throughout the book, attention is drawn to such parallels.

The Troilus and Criseyde story is an important presence in the *Vannetyes and Toyes*. Its influence is, I think, the reason why Gorges contains so many poems in his sequence which attack the poet's mistress for stooping to a rich rival (see section 1.3 above). Gorges's poem 38, 'False Craessyde have yow chaungde your mynde', is most explicit in
its invocation of the Troilus and Criseyde story, and uses a refrain in a manner reminiscent of Turberville's 'Argument to the whole discourse...'. In repudiating a false mistress, meanwhile, poem 40 incorporates an adapted version of the fourth stanza of 'False Craessyde' (poem 38). Gorges's poem 65 follows Turberville in its adaptation of lines from Troilus and Criseyde (Sandison 1953, 205). Gorges's use of imagery taken from falconry to criticise his beloved in poem 40 is strongly reminiscent of the Epitaphes (see, e.g., C5v-C7r). May and Sandison have suggested that these poems in Gorges's text must have had an occasional basis. Yet in writing them Gorges could simply have been working conventionally, playing on the reader's expectation that a sequence of love poems would gesture towards the Troilus and Criseyde story. Particular occasions may lie behind some of these poems; if so, it is possible that the occasions for the poems were less serious than the poems make out. We should be alert to the possibility that these betrayal poems were written in play—as part of a 'game of love'—rather than in deadly earnest.

The theme of betrayal is taken further in Gorges's poems 90 and 91, both in the voice of Dido. Poem 90 is a translation of Ovid's seventh Heroides epistle. Gorges follows Du Bellay's French translation very closely but also incorporates material from Turberville's version in his Heroycall Epistles (Sandison 1953, 215-7). It is followed by 'Dido's true Complainte', a version of a well-known epigram wrongly attributed in the renaissance to Ausonius (Sandison 1953, 218). Gorges's inclusion of it in the Vannetyes and Toyes nods in the direction of Turberville, for a translation of the same epigram occurs in the Epitaphes (O2r). However, Gorges's ultimate source is Du Bellay, whose translation of

51 Interestingly, Turberville's brother, Nicholas, very friendly with George, gave his first son the name
the epigram followed his translation of Dido’s epistle in his printed text. Lines from Turberville’s translation of *Heroides* 7 are used by Gorges in poem 25 (Sandison 1953, 190). Sandison (1953) has noted the extent to which Gorges’s long lovers’ complaints (poems 12, 25, 26, 39) adapt material from Turberville’s *Heroycall Epistles*.

Central to the love story in *Epitaphes* are the exchanges of letters Turberville provides between Pyndara and Tymetes. Constantly, the two arraign each other, affirming, as did their precursors Troilus and Criseyde, that when parted they will remain true to each other (D3r-D4v). In Gorges’s ‘new lyrical’ text there are no ‘drab’ exchanges of this kind. Gorges does engage with the theme, though, in poem 19, a dialogue translated from Desportes, in which mistress and lover wonder how they will behave when parted from each other. Poems 23 and 24, meanwhile, stage a brief dialogue between Gorges’s poetic persona (poem 23) and the voice of his mistress (poem 24). Poem 24 replies gamely to criticisms made in poem 23 of the mistress by criticising its author, ‘My trustie [servant]’ (line 1). (Poem 24 has been added to the manuscript in an italic hand different from Hand A, possibly by Douglas Gorges (see section 1.6, no.1)).

Turberville touches on many themes in the love poems of *Epitaphes* which feature in poems by Gorges (both original compositions or translations from French sources). Gorges’s poem 46, a poem translated from Ronsard on the subject of Jupiter’s metamorphoses, echoes a similar poem of Turberville’s (B4r). The last line of poem 9, ‘I had bestowed the golden shafte on yow’ (line 24) derives from a very similar line by Turberville (B4v). Poems composed by Gorges (poems 6, 7) in which the poet addresses various parts of his body also echo Turberville (B4v-B5r), as do Gorges’s two portrait

‘Troilus’. Troilus Turberville ended up as George’s heir (Lloyd 1967, 140).
sonnets (poems 70 and 72; cf. Epitaphes, B5v-B6 and R8r-S1r). Gorges’s translation of
Du Bellay’s Contre les Petrarquistes seems to have been prompted by a poem by
Turberville (E6r-E7v); similarly his translation of Desportes’s poem about dreaming
(poem 10) echoes the Epitaphes (F3r). The topos of Venus losing Cupid is used by both
writers (Gorges poem 9; Turberville, O8r-O8v; see also P1r-Pv and S3v). Both
Turberville and Gorges rework Surrey’s ‘The soote season’ (Turberville, P4v-P5; Gorges,
poem 1), Gorges using as intermediaries two French poems on related topics by
Desportes. Gorges’s prison sonnet (87), translated from Du Bellay, is anticipated in a
poem in the Epitaphes (Q7r).

When Gorges came to assemble the Vannetyes and Toyes he seems to have wanted to
work towards an ‘abstract’ overall structure, less dependent than Turberville’s on the
expectation of narrative coherence. In putting together his text, Gorges must have asked
his scribe to disperse various pre-existent groups of poems throughout the sequence. Such
a request would explain why all groupings of poems identified by May and Sandison (see
section 1.3) are dispersed.

In creating a structure more ‘abstract’ than the semi-coherent narrative structure of
Turberville’s Epitaphes Gorges would have been aware of other structural models, and
specifically, I think, of the structures of the printed collections of his major French
sources, Du Bellay and Desportes. In passing, Sandison characterises Hand A as ‘a
beautiful Italian lettering, almost like printing’ (1953, xxviii). ‘Printing’ here must mean,
in the context of lyric poetry, ‘continental printing’, for at this period most short English
verse to be published was printed in black letter. It is tempting to argue that the
appearance of Hand A’s work—italic lettering filling a portable quarto book—was
calculated to resemble the appearance of printed continental poetry books such as those written by the authors of Gorges’s major source material. The structure of Gorges’s collection was also, I think, influenced by his French models.

It is perhaps generally assumed that the standard form in which French Petrarchan writing was presented was the sonnet sequence. To an extent this is true: most of both Du Bellay’s and Desportes’ poems were published in sonnet sequences. Significantly, though, the editions of Du Bellay and Desportes Gorges would have known are not simply sonnet sequences. Rather, Du Bellay’s *L’Olive et autres oeuvres poetiques* (Paris, 1561) and Desportes’ *Premières Oeuvres* (1573 and later) are collected editions, in which sonnet sequences are juxtaposed with other types of poetry collection. In the *Vannetyes and Toyes*, Gorges seems to have been trying to assemble—by way of his rewriting of Turberville’s *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets*—a ‘collected edition’ of this type. Gorges’s ‘recueil’ juxtaposes three sequences, marking the beginning of each of them with a blank leaf. First comes a sequence (the ‘song sequence’) of 46, mainly stanzaic, love-poems (2-43). Many of these poems (1, 3, 5, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32 and 34) are translations from Desportes. All but five of Gorges’s Desportes translations are in this section. Du Bellay translations, meanwhile, are thin on the ground (11, 13, 20, 36, 42 and 45). In this song sequence Gorges intersperses song-like poems with several sonnets. His model seems to have been a collection such as Desportes’ *Diverses Amours*, in which songs and sonnets are freely interspersed. As in such French

---

52 The full title of Gorges’s collection—‘Sir Arthur Gorges his vannetyes and toyes of yowth’ (f.1v)—added at least a decade after Hand A’s transcription—recalls the title of Desportes’ *Premières Oeuvres*.
53 Here I am defining the *Vannetyes and Toyes* as originally conceived as comprising Hand A’s transcription of poems 1-95 only. Poems 96-8 were transcribed possibly several years later than poems 1-95 (see section 1.1).
precursors, there is no overarching narrative or thematic arrangement. Between editions Desportes frequently moved the positions of poems, both within and between sequences, highlighting the almost arbitrary arrangement of his texts (Graham 1966).

The second section in Hand A’s work is a block of sonnets and sonnet-like poems (44-66; the ‘sonnet sequence’). The song sequence is separated from the sonnet sequence by a blank verso (43v). Texts translated from Du Bellay predominate in the sonnet sequence. This is unsurprising given the historical importance and influence of Du Bellay’s sonnet sequence L’Olive. Desportes wrote sonnet sequences too, of course; yet his (Diane 1, Diane 2, etc.) generally included song-like texts as well as sonnets. L’Olive, with its concentration on the sonnet alone, sets the major precedent for Gorges’s sonnet sequence.

In putting together the sonnet sequence, Gorges’s scribe, presumably following instructions, worked in an unusual way. He seems to have started out with two distinct sets of sonnets and sonnet-like poems. The first set he copied onto the rectos of the sonnet sequence, leaving the intermediate versos blank. He then returned to the versos and copied onto them the second set of sonnets. It is possible that the two parallel sets of poems were originally two independently planned sequences, which Gorges directed the scribe to interweave. It is also possible that the first sonnet sequence to be transcribed, the recto sequence, was originally intended to stand alone.

The evidence for all this is in part bibliographical. Each poem in the sonnet sequence takes up a whole recto or verso. Sonnets on rectos are in black ink, clearly written, concluded by a rounded scribal paraph. Titles (most often ‘Sonnet’) are set parallel to first lines. On versos, the writing is marginally less neat, in browned ink, with flatter parahs. Titles on versos (generally ‘Sonnett’) tend to be at an angle to first lines, and are not
centred. Poems on rectos capitalise the first letter of every line (the exception is poem 61), whilst on most versos capitalisation occurs on alternate lines only. This contrast between rectos and versos is unique to the sonnet sequence, as a comparison with the layout of sonnets in the song sequence (eg. ff.25v and 26r) shows. There are two empty versos in the block (ff.51v and 65v). The angling of titles on versos suggests that they were added after the transcription of the actual text, perhaps one after another at a single sitting. That the only two sonnets not labelled as such (poems 52 and 63) are both on versos (ff.46v and 52v) supports this thesis. Two minor exceptions to the pattern I have described should be pointed out: the title on f.58r is slightly tilted and not central; the title on f.53v is central.54

Within the sonnet sequence, most of the poems translated from Du Bellay’s *Les Regrets* are placed on versos, viz. poems 48 (44v), 50 (45v) and 84 (63v). The exception is poem 47 (44r), a sonnet to the Queen which is out of place among the other *Regrets* poems. Likewise, most of the poems in the sonnet sequence deriving from Du Bellay’s *L’Olive* occur on rectos, viz. poems 57 (50r), 59 (51r), 66 (54r), 68 (55r), 74 (58r) and 88 (66r). There is again one exception, poem 82 (62v), radically different in form and content from the other *L’Olive* ‘sonnets’. The two sonnet sequences, recto and verso, interweaved by Gorges’s scribe are described below:

(a) The Recto Sequence. A sequence of 23 non-occasional love poems (8 of them English sonnets, the rest mostly poems of roughly sonnet length), centred around the translations

54 Space-marks, used throughout the text by Hand A to fill out short last lines, follow the title on ff.49r, 50v, 53v, 54v, 56v, 57v, 58v and 64r (the title ‘Philomela’).
from *L' Olive* listed above, initiated by two sonnets to the Queen (47 and 49). Below, I give a list of the recto poems:

47 (f.44r) ‘Prodigall was nature fruitfull and devyne’

49 (f.45r) ‘In that yow sway the Scepter and the Crowne’

51 (f.46r) ‘Whom love commaundes and holdes as humble thrall’

53 (f.47r) ‘Harde is the happ wherto my lyfe is Bownde’

55 (f.48r) ‘As I drawe neare with fearefull steppes to see’

57 (f.49r) ‘He that cann number by his skill or payne’

59 (f.50r) ‘Iff all my thoughtes were open unto yow’

61 (f.51r) ‘To the greate Macedon my fayre Queene I compare’

62 (f.52r) ‘Myghtye is death and mightie Shee lykewise’

64 (f.53r) ‘Your selfe the Sonne, and I the meltinge frost’

66 (f.54r) ‘That to revive which wronge of tyme might weare’

68 (f.55r) ‘My werye ghooste charged with to highe desyre’

70 (f.56r) ‘With his owne hande dyd love her feature frame’

72 (f.57r) ‘How durste a selye Paynter undertake’

74 (f.58r) ‘Neither amongste the Nimphes, in shady woodes’

76 (f.59r) ‘Iff this be love, to fyxe the Eyes onn grownde’

77 (f.60r) ‘Lyke as the Princely faulcon on the fyste feedynge’

79 (f.61r) ‘Her face Her tongue Her wytt’

81 (f.62r) ‘The fayrest scornynge to see my lybertye;’

83 (f.63r) ‘Who woulde more sweete Contentment crave’
The poems on rectos form a sequence of Petrarchan love poems. The sequence begins, with a nod to texts by Du Bellay such as his sequence *Sonnets à la Royne de Navarre*, with two poems to Queen Elizabeth, both translated from Du Bellay poems. Of the remaining seven recto sequence poems translated from du Bellay, six derive from *L’Olive* (57, 59, 62, 66, 68, 74, 88). The seventh, 62, is translated from *Les Amours*, a late sequence. Three poems have Desportes sources (51, 55 and 70).

(b) The Verso Sequence. A sequence comprising 20 pieces (9 English sonnets, the other poems in sonnet-like forms), possibly occasional poems translated from Du Bellay’s *Les Regrets* (48, 50 and 84) together with other poems circumstantially related to these pieces, an occasional poem translated from Du Bellay’s *L’Olive* (82), and other miscellaneous verse. The verso poems are listed below:

48 (f.44v) ‘My deare, take in good parte this fortune badde’

50 (f.45v) ‘Hadd not Pirythous to hell gone downe’

52 (f.46v) ‘Yff other love then yours do lodge within my Breste’

54 (f.47v) ‘How gravelye wise was that Senatours counsaile’

56 (f.48v) ‘That yeelds yow due prayse I am the meanest of manye’

As two of these poems, 68 and 88, translating two poems found together in *L’Olive* (Iv and Ivi), interpose an extra quatrains between the conventional sonnet’s third quatrains and its couplet, it seems likely that they
58 (f.49v) 'Vauntinge sometymes how I had bynn a thralle'
60 (f.50v) 'Whilste all on fyre victorius Rome blazed'

[There is no poem on f.51v.]

63 (f.52v) 'Full lytle knowes my deare and sweetest frynde'
65 (f.53v) 'Like to a lampe whose flaming lyghte is deade'
67 (f.54v) 'Itt gladdes the harte to see faire Phoebus ryse'
69 (f.55v) 'Nott the disdaynes of her prowde youthly mynde'
71 (f.56v) 'O love how my sweete Mistres in bewty all excellethe'
73 (f.57v) 'In that faire face of yours where joyes so ryffe doo shyne'
75 (f.58v) 'Erect thy flighte on ye with Eagles winges'
76a (f.59v)'On worthy Queen on mighty Realme on God above'
78 (f.60v) 'Wher leaste of all I dyd susspecte'
80 (f.61v) 'Decayde I fynde my favor and my fate'
82 (f.62v) 'To my unspotted fayth I may compare'
84 (f.63v) 'Waying the cares that cause me thus to crye'
86 (f.64v) 'My mynde desyrous off my Bodies wracke'

The verso sequence opens with two poems translated from Les Regrets. Poem 48 advises the poet’s ‘deare’ to take ‘this fortune badde’ ‘in good parte’ (line 1). Here Gorges, unlike Du Bellay, emphasises the allegorical female figure of ‘Fortune’. Poem 50 is an attack on a ‘false frynde’ (line 9), which also alters Du Bellay’s text to feminise and allegorise Fortune: ‘Si Fortune vers moi n’eust est, variable’ becomes ‘had fortune never bent her
browes on me’ (line 10).  The false friend topos also occurs in poem 78, where the friend is arraigned specifically for envy. The envy theme recurs in poem 80, a piece next to 78 in the verso sequence. There is only one poem in the verso sequence from L’Olive, poem 82. This is the only one of the translations from L’Olive which is less than 14 lines long. Its occasional nature, too—contemplation of a garter given the poet by his lady—sets it apart from the L’Olive poems in the recto sequence. Also in the verso sequence is Gorges’s only translation from Les Antiquitez de Rome, poem 54, a piece in experimental metre on the Roman civil war. Linked to poem 54 in theme and metre is poem 60, translated from Desportes’ Hippolyte, a comparison between the laughter of the poet’s lady and the laughter of Nero. Also in the verso sequence are an epigram in Roman script (poem 56), the elegy for Alençon cancelled by Gorges and attributed to Churchyard (poem 76a) and a portrait sonnet translated from Ronsard to which Gorges added a reference to Nicholas Hilliard (poem 75).

I have already suggested that the idea for a sonnet ‘sequence’ (at first perhaps planned for the rectos only) was inspired by the example of du Bellay’s L’Olive, a sequence uninterrupted by any forms other than a sonnet. The pressure of this example seems to have impelled most of Gorges’s L’Olive translations into the recto ‘sonnet sequence’, despite the fact that, by and large, they were not proper sonnets. This explains the presence of poems derived from L’Olive rhymed abab10 × 4 in the ‘sonnet sequence’ in the absence of poems in an identical scheme derived from Desportes’ Premières Oeuvres. Significantly, all the poems which translate Desportes pieces into regular sonnets are

56 In the ‘song sequence’, poem 45, also derived from Les Regrets, introduces the related notion of ‘fate’ into Du Bellay’s text: ‘Et le pleurer pouvait la tristesse arrester’ becomes ‘or weepinge could our frowarde fate amend’ (l.2).
found in the sonnet sequence, one on a recto (70r), the rest on versos. (One poem, 55 is also found copied out, in different orthography, amongst the ‘song sequence’ as 28).

In placing poems on versos, the scribe (or Gorges) seems to have tried to group the poems introduced on versos next to similar recto poems. Thus, poem 75, a portrait sonnet which refers to Hilliard by name, is inserted near a pair of less occasional portrait sonnets on rectos (70 and 72). Poem 84 with its Philomel image is put on the verso of folio 63, facing the poem ‘Philomela’ (poem 85). Poem 86, a sonnet which begins with a contrast between mind and body, is on a verso facing poem 87, a piece contrasting mental and bodily ‘prisons’.

The Vannetyes and Toyes as originally planned end with a short sequence of seven long poetic complaints. Poems 89 and 92 are lover’s complaints written in experimental long-line metres. Poem 90, which dominates this section, is Gorges’s translation of Ovid’s Heroides 7, ‘Dido to Aeneas’, Dido’s long complaint on being abandoned by Aeneas. Poem 91 translates an epigram attributed to Ausonius in which Dido vindicates herself to posterity, revealing that in reality she never even met Aeneas. Poems 93 and 94 are long love-poems. In a ‘collected works’ such as Du Bellay’s L’Olive et autres oeuvres poetiques, mixed material such as this was often placed between sequences. Gorges’s decision to place immediately after a block of sonnets a set of long poems dominated by the love complaint of an abandoned woman (poem 90), links the Vannetyes and Toyes to other Elizabethan sonnet sequences. Critics have noticed that several Elizabethan sonnet sequences are followed by ‘lover’s complaints’ in which abandoned women rail against their fickle lovers (Duncan-Jones 1983; Kerrigan 1991). This ‘lover’s complaint’
tradition is usually traced back to Daniel’s juxtaposition of his sonnet sequence Delia (1592) with the Complaint of Rosamond. Gorges’s practice in the Vannetyes and Toyes antedates Daniel and thus seems to stand at the start of the tradition. Possibly Daniel, who like Gorges had strong west country connections, knew the Vannetyes and Toyes: the fact that Gorges added to his source for poem 91 a narrative framework very similar to Daniel’s narrative framework for Rosamond is suggestive. Perhaps the shared structure indicates a shared response to the construction of French poetry books—like Gorges, Daniel translated several poems from texts by Du Bellay (Scott 1929).

The Vannetyes and Toyes then, integrate Turbervillian themes into an organisational structure seeking to emulate Gorges’s French sources. In taking this line of approach, Gorges might have been innovative. As Gorges’s collection is the only ‘new lyrical’ auto-anthology to survive, however, we cannot know whether or not this was the case. The structure of the Vannetyes and Toyes might have copied from sequences put together by writers such as Oxford or Ralegh to which Gorges had access. In any case, it is reasonable to assume that Gorges compiled the manuscript with Douglas in mind and expected her to recognise its up-to-date terms of reference.

Throughout, the Vannetyes and Toyes echo the works of Surrey, the guiding spirit of the ‘new lyricism’.

Surrey was Douglas Howard’s great-uncle. It is surely no accident, then, that the Vannetyes and Toyes open with ‘The gentle season’ (poem 1), a translation from Desportes the basic argument of which is identical to Surrey’s ‘The soote season’ (Rollins 1965, no. 2) and which quotes directly from ‘The soote season’ at line 4.

57 For possible connections between Gorges and Hilliard see Sandison 1953, 208.
1.5. Transcription, Revision, Addition

Hand A copied in italic a sequence of 98 poems (Gorges 1953, poems 1-23 and 25-98, as well as one poem unnumbered in Sandison’s edition (1953, 75 (‘poem 76a’))) into a bound volume,59 making numerous corrections currente calamo.60 When he made a mistake he generally patched it up by erasing some letters and adding others on top of the erasure, careting in missed-out words.61 The scribe’s ordering of the text is unrelated to the disposition of the gatherings (long poems generally overlap the ends of gatherings (e.g. poems 26; 35; 42; 90; 95)). Drypoint ruling guides the positioning of words on the page.62 The scribe copied one poem twice (poems 28 and 55) and probably copied poems 96-8 some time after copying the rest of his section (see section 1.1). Some of the scribe’s spellings reflect characteristic holograph spellings of Gorges (Sandison 1953, xlvii). ‘D’s possibly identifying poems related to Douglas Howard (see section 1.3), perhaps in Hand A, perhaps part of a later revision (nos. 2 and 3 below) mark some poems. None of these marks occur beyond Hand A’s text.

Changes of several different sorts were made to Hand A’s copy, the exact chronology of which is difficult to determine. Below, these different types of change are classified in numbered sections, with a few suggestions about dates.

59 Sandison 1953, 192, 196, 204, 205, 208, finds echoes in poems 26, 40, 61, 64 and 68 respectively.
59 F.23, the first page of a gathering, follows drypoint ruling on f.22. The writing is very cramped at the inner margin of f.10v.
60 Most of the scribe’s corrections materially affect the length of the line that they are in. Occasionally he left a gap for later correction or insertion (e.g. poem 1, line 1, at ‘gentell season’).
61 Most mistakes concern single letters, especially ‘o’ and ‘u’ (e.g. ff.29r; 36v; 53r; 95v). Terminal ‘e’s are erased in about twenty instances, presumably for metrical reasons (see Sandison 190-2).
62 Drypoint ruling on rectos generally determines the line arrangement of corresponding versos, especially when a single long poem is involved. Sometimes it is carried through to the next recto too (cf. note).
1. 'The Answer' (poem 24) was added to Hand A's text in an unidentified italic hand ('Hand B'), neither Gorges's holograph nor Hand A. In reply to poem 23, which casts aspersions on the mistress's 'waveringe mynd' (line 1), 'The Answer', written in the voice of the mistress, twits the faithless male author of poem 23:

... what to mee hee vows or saith
To twentie others hee hath sworne
what[originally 'Noe'] heart can then forgetfull bee
Of such a luyall Ladd as hee.

The most obvious, if romanticising, explanation—that the poem was added to the manuscript by Douglas Howard—may well be the right one.\(^\text{63}\) If it was, its transcription must antedate 1590, the year of Douglas's death. Transcription must in any case have antedated at least one stage of authorial revision (no. 3 below), as it carries a revision made in Gorges's holograph (line 5).

2. The *Vanneteyes and Toyes* are sprinkled with crosses and little circles, the significance of which is now obscure. It seems most likely that these signs mark poems to be copied for future manuscripts, for Gorges, and/or other people. Most of the crosses in the early part of Hand A's text mark the beginnings of poems (though the first two pages of poem 40 both have crosses). The poems 'selected' by crosses are 1; 6; 8; 9; 10; 12; 13; 15; 19; 22; 23; 25; 32; 34; 35; 39; 40; 42; 43; 44; 51; 52; 53; 56; 57; 58; 60; 61; 62; 63; 64; 67; 69; 70; 72; 74; 76; 77; 78; 79; 80; 82; 83; 85. Towards the end of Hand A's text (ff.67r-104v), crosses seem to mark sections of text rather than individual pieces. In poem 90 a cross occurs every sixty lines (except at line 360), presumably to help the scribe of a new 'fair copy' cast off copy. Little circles and groups of circles, sometimes accompanied by a
little cross, occur on some rectos at bottom right, on some versos at bottom left. Some of these marks appear on the same page as the big crosses. All of them appear either on the only page of single page poems or on the first page for longer poems: so it seems almost certain that they are intended to select poems for transcription. Poems thus selected are 4; 26; 28; 30; 33; 52; 53; 57; 58; 59; 63; 64; 68; 69; 72; 74; 75; 76. Oddly, both poems 28 and 55, two texts of the same poem, have been selected. All of the rings occur in the block of sonnets. None of these marks—crosses, circles and combinations of the two—occurs beyond the end of the first 97 poems copied by Hand A (see above), so it is possible that they were added before 1586.

3. Gorges made a large number of holograph revisions (Hand C) to the work of Hand A and to Hand B's answer-poem (no. 1 above). These holograph revisions use a number of different inks. Gorges probably revised the manuscript several times. However, it is difficult to distinguish between different stages of copying, as Gorges sometimes used more than one ink at a single sitting. While the scribe of Hand A tried hard to hide corrections, obsessively erasing and reforming, Gorges did not shrink from making bold inky deletions that broke up the body of the text. Gorges crossed out offending passages,

---

63 I know of no examples of Douglas's writing. For some other possibilities see Sandison 1953, xli.
64 It is easy to confuse these tiny marks with little circles caused by the damp, persistent through several folios.
65 Sandison's statement that the rings cluster round the 'D' poems is too sweeping (1953, xlvii).
66 In poem 91 the 'f' in a holograph addition in light brown ink ('for') takes up into its ascender some blue-grey ink from an earlier correction. In at least two cases a cancellation in brown is accompanied by additional matter in grey (ff. 58r; 39v).
wrote his corrections above them, placing a caret or two below each deletion. Most of the pieces corrected in this way come comparatively late in the manuscript.\footnote{The opening section has only three poems with definitely authorial corrections (35; 39; 41). Corrected poems in the sonnet sequence are on the whole on rectos (47; 49; 51; 53; 57; 61; 64; 68; 74; 79; 81). Only four are on versos (60; 65; 76a; 84).}

Some of Gorges’s annotations simply correct transcriptional errors (e.g. poem 64, line 6).\footnote{Not that he corrects all such errors: see poem 87, line 10.} Quite often Gorges’s revisions add clarity and point. In such cases, it is easy to imagine modern editors preferring the additions to the earlier, rejected versions.\footnote{In one instance a plain statement is turned into a rhetorical question (poem 24, line 5). Many images are added and existing imagery is made more vivid (poem 35, line 4; poem 39, line 44; poem 74, line 1; poem 65, line 1). In poem 47, line 6, ‘spotles minde’ becomes ‘minde reposde’, the new version introducing a new concept (repose) to the poem. Gorges cancels a couplet added by Hand A to the end of the first Sidney elegy (poem 96, lines 12-13) which clearly belongs to a different elegy for Sidney. The wording of poem 98, line 61 is changed to avoid too close an echo with line 67. Gorges also adds punctuation, particularly to poems at the end of the manuscript (poems 89-91).} Many other additions, however, are finicky: they seem no better or worse than the original readings.\footnote{In one instance Gorges’s revision is misguided, producing a text clearly worse than the original (Sandison 1953, 202-3; poem 49, line 1). Text is occasionally crossed out and not replaced (poem 82, line 7). In a particularly extensive revision, Gorges added to poem 98 four lines (lines 43-8) adapted from poem 94 (lines 25-6; 33-6) describing the simplicity of country ladies. On the whole, the poem gains from the addition, though its integration into poem 98 lacks skill. An addition to poem 91, \textit{Didos true Complainte}, may have biographical significance. Gorges adds material emphasising the theme of slander and envy (lines 85-8) that Sandison suggests might be connected with the opposition Gorges encountered to one or other of his marriages (1953, 218).}

As much of Gorges’s poetry turns on themes of power and submission, these themes loom large in his revisions. Poem 61, a comparison between the military/regal power of
Alexander the Great and the erotic/regal power of Queen Elizabeth, is, significantly, speckled with corrections. The means by which Alexander conquered the world, 'force and Fortune', metamorphose into 'Arms and Fortune' (line 6). 'Force' is cut, presumably, to point up Gorges's contrast between Alexander and Elizabeth, Elizabeth's instruments of rule being 'bewty and bountye'. Perhaps inadvertently, though, the change demonstrates the affinity between the two rulers: 'Force' need not be confined to Alexander because, in a general sense, 'Force' clearly belongs to Elizabeth as well. In the third stanza Gorges contrasts Alexander's cruel murders of his followers with Elizabeth's sonnet-lady mercilessness. In the first version the victims of Elizabeth's eyes are 'The yeldinge hartes of those that hir deare love have sought' (line 12). Gorges changed this to 'Their yeldinge hartes that hir praetious love have sought'. The word 'praetious' lacks some of the emotional charge of 'deare'; meanwhile, the change of 'The' to 'their' gives some power to the victims, now owners of their hearts, individuals who exist outside the poem. The poem's attitude to the Queen is distanced. Revising a passage about the Queen's limbs (line 15), Gorges replaces 'amydst theyr flowringe tyme' with 'triumphant over tyme'. The nature of the change suggests that it was made several years after the composition of the poem, when the Queen was noticeably older.\textsuperscript{71} (The revision also adds a further (questionable) power relation to the text.) One of Gorges's revisions to poem 74 replaces an image of power with images of death and presence: 'That of my harte may clayme the soveraygne righte' becomes 'Whose presenc wounds; but absence slayes outryght' (line 14).

\textsuperscript{70}Thus 'yeldes' becomes 'gyves' (poem 49, line 14); 'bend' 'yeald' (poem 79, line 23); 'checkinge' 'ebbing' (poem 64, line 8); 'heavy' 'sadd' (poem 91, line 28); 'spake' 'sayde' (poem 91, line 33).

\textsuperscript{71}Sandison (1953, 204) suggests that this change is metrically motivated.
At one stage of revision, Gorges added ‘Of the Q’ to two poems (47; 61) and ‘Q’ to one (48), identifying these poems as being about Elizabeth, presumably to help readers of future copies of the *Vannetyes and Toyes*. Perhaps it was at this point that he added ‘Of Mounsieur’ to poem 76a (no. 4 below). At some point he foliated the text, stopping at the end of Hand A’s text (poem 98, f.104r). More significant is the addition of two holograph titles: ‘The Vanytyes of Sir/Arthur Gorges/Youthe.’ (f.1r) and ‘Sir Arthur Gorges/his vannetyes and toyes of yowth’ (f.1v), which presumably coincided with one set of revisions to the text. This set of revisions must have postdated 1597, the date of Gorges’s knighthood.

4. At one stage of revision, Gorges added a title to poem 76a (Gorges 1953, 75), ‘Of Mounsieur’, identifying it as an elegy for the Duke of Alençon. Later, he crossed out the entire poem, adding an attribution to Churchyard. Perhaps the poem really is by Churchyard, and Gorges’s exclusion of it was simply motivated by the desire to ensure that all the *Vannetyes and Toyes* were his. An alternative explanation is that he made the attribution because he felt it was unwise to advertise his past support for Alençon. The most romantic explanation (though there is no evidence for it) is that the alteration was made for the benefit of Spenser, who must have read the *Vannetyes and Toyes* before the publication of *Daphnaida* (1591; see Chapter 4.1.3), and who had, before leaving England, been a vigorous opponent of the Alençon match. Just possibly, then, the crossing-out of poem 76a belongs to c.1590.
5. Gorges added poem 99 (f.105v) in holograph, immediately following Hand A’s text. This poem returns the *Vannetyes and Toyes* to the plight of the poet-lover, following a series of poems on other topics. It is possible that poem 99 was added after the transcription of ‘The Answer’ (no. 1 above) and before the excision of 76a (no. 4 above). If so, it would have brought the total number of poems in the manuscript to a round 100. If added after ‘The Answer’ and after the excision of 76a it would have ended the sequence on the appropriately ‘imperfect’ number of 99. Poem 99 is on the verso of the last leaf foliated by Gorges (no. 3 above), so it could have been transcribed either before or after the foliation.

6. Poem 100 was added in Gorges’s holograph some time after the addition of poem 99, on the page following, ‘pen-stroke, size of script, and format differing from those of 99’ (Sandison 1953, 124). It is on the recto following the end of Gorges’s foliation, so presumably its transcription postdates the stage of revision including the foliation. This poem, ‘A Pastorall unfynished’ (discussed in detail in Chapter 4.2), in which a grieving shepherd sings Queen Elizabeth’s praises, is mentioned in *Colin Clovts come home againe*. In *Colin Clovts come home againe* Spenser encourages Gorges to complete the poem. Gorges copied the first part of the poem into the Egerton manuscript, then, later, tried to finish it, eventually giving up, concluding his text with an ‘etc.’ He could have been responding directly to *Colin Clovts come home againe*, either shortly after its publication, in 1595, or shortly after its composition, in 1591.

---

72 The fact that in the manuscript the poems are unnumbered arguably makes this sort of speculation problematic.
‘A Pastorall unfynyshed’ stages the transfer of Gorges’s loyalty from the dead Douglas to the living Queen Elizabeth, and was presumably written for the Queen (Chapter 4.2). It is possible that Gorges intended it to stand at the end of a presentation copy of the Vannetyes and Toyes prepared for Elizabeth, dramatising the shift in his allegiance. The pastoral is written in the same unusual metre as the first poem in the sequence (poem 1)—tail-rhyme stanzas with four-stress lines—and—if completed—would have wrapped up the Vannetyes and Toyes very neatly. Perhaps Gorges’s addition of titles to the manuscript (no. 3 above) was part of this project. If the pastoral was added to the manuscript after the addition of ‘The Answer’ (no. 1 above) and before the excision of 76a (no. 4 above) it would have brought the collection to an end on the appropriately perfect number of 100.

1.6. Variant Texts

Eight of the Vannetyes and Toyes appear in early texts outside the Egerton manuscript (Egerton). The main sources for these early texts are: Additional (BL MS Additional 15117); Cambridge (Cambridge University Library MS Dd. 5.75); Harley (BL MS Harley 7392); Phoenix Nest (The Phoenix Nest (London, 1593; Rollins 1931); Rhapsody (A Poetical Rhapsody (London, 1602-21; Rollins 1931-2); Rawlinson (Bodl. MS Rawlinson Poet. 85). The following table uses the poem numbers in Gorges 1953:

---

73 For page and folio numbers see Sandison 1953.
There are many other texts of poem 79, some of them attributed to Ralegh (see Rollins 1931, 173f; 1931-2, 2.184f; Latham 1951, 159f; Sandison 1953, xxxix-xl; 209-12; Black 1970, 240; Doughtie 1970, 449-51; May 1988, 319-21). A correlative poem, it exists in many different forms: each copyist seems to have played his own variations on its basic structure. Its textual history is excessively complicated. Perhaps, as Latham (1951, 160) and Sandison (1953, xxxix-xl) suggest, it was written by Gorges and Ralegh as a joint effort.

Texts of one poem by Gorges are known to exist in more than one authorially sanctioned version. In *Egerton* there are revisions in Gorges’s holograph to poem 98. *Cambridge’s* and *Rhapsody’s* texts of the poem do not include Gorges’s revisions; *Additional’s* does. It is clearly possible that other variants between different texts of
Gorges’s poems represent revisions by Gorges. Other poets probably followed Gorges’s practice. As L.G. Black says,

The evidence that Gorges revised his poems after they had come into circulation does, I think, have some bearing on the curious textual state of many courtly lyrics preserved only in manuscript: a theory of occasional revision by the author would help to explain many otherwise puzzling variants ... Many variants found in the miscellany texts can be shown fairly conclusively to be corruptions; others are more surprising, and sometimes read like alternative readings leaving one wondering how such a ‘corruption’ could have arisen. (1970, 237)

In the absence of more revised texts like Egerton, however, it is difficult to work out which variants represent authorial revision and which are due to other factors. This is partly due to the nature of Gorges’s undoubted revisions to Egerton (see section 1.5, no. 3 above), which sometimes improve the text but often do not, and which frequently seem finicky and nugatory.74

Cambridge is the only source other than Egerton to include texts of poems 8, 39 and 72, and also includes poems 1, 79 and 98. The last two poems also occur in Rhapsody.

Three sources, Harley, Phoenix and Rawlinson, contain 46, a poem not in Cambridge, and all of these sources also include poem 1. Harley and Phoenix also contain poem 79.

In addition, Harley contains another poem not in Cambridge, poem 25.75 William Barley’s A New Booke of Tabliture (London, 1596), meanwhile, contains the title only of poem 25 (Doughtie 1970, 55) and a full text of poem 79 (ibid., 59-60; see Sandison 1953, 209). It is tempting to deduce from this that poems from Gorges’s Vannetyes and Toyes circulated in two main groups: one consisting of poems 1, 8, 39, 72, 79 and 98 (represented in full by Cambridge and in part by Rhapsody) and one consisting of poems 1, 25, 46 and 79 (represented in full by Harley, in part by Phoenix, Rawlinson and

---

74 This means that readings which seem clearly ‘worse’ than Egerton’s may nevertheless represent versions fixed upon by Gorges.

75 Extracts from this poem are quoted in Puttenham’s Arte of English Poesie (Sandison 1953, 190-1).
Barley). This hypothesis fits quite well with the pattern of variants in poem 1. Here Harley, Rawlinson and Phoenix all represent essentially the same type of text, as against Egerton and Cambridge. Here and Rawlinson are closer to each other than either is to Phoenix, though each text has unique readings.) The same kind of test cannot really be applied to poem 79, the only other poem common to poems from each group (Egerton, Harley and Barley’s Booke), given its extreme vulnerability to rewriting.

The Gorges texts in Harley, Rawlinson and Phoenix are not, by and large, attributed to Gorges. They occur in close association with poems by Ralegh. Two of the Gorges texts in Phoenix, poems 46 and 79, occur in a section of the anthology often referred to as ‘the Ralegh group’ (Hudson 1931; Latham 1951, xlv-liii; Lefranc 1968; Rudick 1971) but which might, as Sandison suggests, be more accurately called the ‘Ralegh-Gorges neighbourhood’ (1953, xxxvi). Michael Rudick has pointed out that of this ‘group’ only two poems, ‘Like truthles dreames, so are my ioyes expired’ (K3v; Latham 1951, no. XII) and ‘Calling to minde mine eie long went about’ (K4v; Latham no.IX), can be attributed to Ralegh with anything approaching confidence. The idea that these poems constitute a ‘group’ of some sort is worth holding onto, though. Several of the poems in the ‘group’—enticingly similar in rhetorical structure and wording to the undoubted work of Gorges and Ralegh—exist in no other texts. The initial attribution of ‘Praisd be Dianas faire

76 For a full collation see May 1988, 337-8.
77 See in particular line 24.
78 The only poem which is attributed to Gorges (as ‘G.O.R.’) is Harley’s text of poem 25. Harley attributes poem 1 to Sir Philip Sidney, poem 46 to ‘RA’ and poem 79 to ‘Raley’.
79 ‘Feede still thy selfe, thou fondling with beliefe’ (K1v-K2r; Latham no.XLII); ‘My first borne loue unhappily conceived’ (K2r-K2v; Latham no.XLIII); ‘The brainsicke race that wanton youth ensures’ (K2v; Latham no.XLV); ‘Those eies which set my fancie on a fire’ (K2v-K3r; Latham no.XLV); ‘Sought by the world, and hath the world disdain’d’ (K4v; Latham no.XLVII); ‘What else is hell, but losse of blissful heauen’ (L1r; Latham no.XLIX); ‘Who plucks thee down from hie desire poor hart? Love’ (L1v; Latham no.LIV). Another poem, ‘Those eies that holds the hand of euery hart’ (L1v-Lr; Latham no.LII) is attributed
and harmles light' (K3r; Latham no.X), to 'S.W.R' in *Englands Helicon* (London, 1600) was later covered over with a cancel slip marked 'Ignoto'. Rudick plausibly takes this to mean that the editor of *Englands Helicon* had found out that his initial attribution was wrong, and had tried to correct it. This explanation undermines slightly the argument for Ralegh’s authorship of the piece. At the same time, though, it shows that the poem was circulating as Ralegh’s or in the company of poems associated with Ralegh. Several poems in the ‘Ralegh group’ can be linked, with varying degrees of firmness, to Gorges. Two poems in the group are included in *Egerton*: ‘Hir face, Hir tong, Hir wit’ (K4r; Gorges’s poem 79) and ‘Would I were chaunged into that golden showre’ (Lr; Gorges’s poem 46). The inclusion of these two poems in *Egerton* is a strong argument for Gorges’s authorship. They circulated as the work of Ralegh—probably because anthologists encountered them in manuscripts associated with Ralegh.80 ‘A secret murder hath bene done of late’ (K3v; Latham no.XLVII), is in its only other text (Rawlinson) attributed to ‘Goss: ’ possibly shorthand for ‘Gorges’ (Sandison 1953, xxxvi, n.1). ‘Who list to heare the sum of sorrowes state’ (L2r; Latham no.LIII) is a short-lined version of Gorges’s poem 12 (see Sandison 1953, 187). The attribution of ‘Like to Hermite poore in place obscure’ (K3r-K3v; Latham no.XI) to Ralegh (Latham 1951, 104-8) lacks solid foundation, as Michael Rudick points out (1971). The poem is quoted in *Daphnaida* by Aleyon, Gorges’s persona—possibly with the implication that that it is by

---

to Nicholas Breton in *Brittons Bowre of Delights* (London, 1591). It is possible to argue on stylistic grounds that all these poems are the work of Ralegh and/or Gorges, though the absence of external evidence makes such evaluation practically worthless (cf. Rudick 1971). Black (1970, 220, 224) argues that Gorges intended *Egerton* to include all his shorter poem and that therefore none of these unattributed poems can be his. Sandison points out the wording of line 1 of ‘Those eies which set my fancie on a fire’ echoes Gorges’s *Egerton* poem 3, line 1 (1953, 185).

80 Poem 79 is attributed to ‘Raley’ in Harley and to ‘W.R.’ in *Le Prince d’Amour* (London, 1660; Sandison 1953, 209); poem 46 is attributed to RA in *Harley*. 
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Gorges (see Chapter 4.1.3). Line 20 of Gorges's poem 7 ('Where none but love shall know to fynd me oute') echoes line 4 of 'Like to Hermite poore in place obscure' ('Where none but Loue shall euer finde me out' (1951, 11)). Overall, nine poems in the 'group' of sixteen can be connected, in one way or another to Ralegh and/or Gorges. It is clear that Gorges's and Ralegh's poetry circulated together. Supporting evidence is provided by the fact that Gorges's poem 46 is grouped with Ralegh's 'Calling to minde mine eie long went about' (Latham no.IX) in both Phoenix and Harley (Black 1970, 221).

Rawlinson was probably compiled at Cambridge between about 1584 and 1590 by John Finett (Black 1970, 41). Harley was compiled by Coningsby at Oxford, and was probably largely complete by the mid-1580s (54; see section 1.1). Both Finett and Coningsby clearly had access to texts of recent court poetry. It is quite possible that their texts of Gorges's poems, and the texts in Phoenix, preserve authorially-sanctioned readings. In poem 1, Egerton's and Cambridge's versions of lines 20-4 are closer to Gorges's Desportes source than the versions in Harley, Phoenix and Rawlinson. If Harley, Phoenix and Rawlinson preserve authorial readings in this poem then they probably postdate Egerton's and Cambridge's versions. Sandison argues that Harley's readings in poem 25 are 'more-to-be-expected' (1953, 190) than Egerton's. Some of the

---

81 Lefranc (1968, 44-8) suggests, though without evidence, that two of the poems in the 'group' on the same theme, 'Those eies which set my fancie on a fire' and 'Those eies that holds the hand of euery hart', were written at the same time by Ralegh and Gorges, as an exercise. He also proposes that the first section of the 'Ralegh group' is by Ralegh, the second by Gorges. Lefranc's speculations about the 'Ralegh group' are undermined by his assumption that Ralegh and/or Gorges were involved with planning the structure of The Phoenix Nest. Walter Oakeshott suggests that Gorges's poem 46, a piece with erotic overtones, was written by Ralegh for Queen Elizabeth and caused offence. Gorges, Oakeshott argues, deliberately juxtaposed poem 46 with poem 47, a panegyric of Queen Elizabeth emphasising her chastity, 'as if ... saying, 'Here is Raleigh's disastrous poem, and here mine which smoothed things down' (1960, 167). There are no compelling reasons for accepting this theory.

82 For the Harley text see Wagner 1935, 469. There are several significant variants which could conceivably represent authorial revision.
variant readings in the different versions of poem 46\(^{83}\) could easily have been ordered by Gorges.

There are several other connections between Ralegh's and Gorges's poems. The reply to Marlowe's 'Come live with me' often attributed to Ralegh (Latham no.XVI) is in one late text attributed to 'Sir Arthur', a possible reference to Gorges (Doughtie 1985, 186). At a number of points, the language of Gorges's poetry recalls that of Ralegh's *Ocean to Cynthia* (eg. poems 1, 32; cf. also Latham 1951, xlviii). More specific links with *Ocean to Cynthia* inform poem 110, part of Hand D's text (see section 2). May (1991, 113) has suggested a link between Gorges's 'Pastorall unfynyshed' (see Chapter 4.2) and a lost version of *Ocean to Cynthia*. Two poems by Gorges emphasising (in swerves away from his French originals) the topic of 'Fortune' (poems 48 and 50) might be related to the identification commonly made between 'Fortune' and Ralegh (cf. May 1991, 119-20).

Ralegh's elegy for Sidney is constructed on a plan similar to that of Gorges's second Sidney elegy (poem 97; see May 1991, 115-6). The sonnets of the two men on the theme of imprisonment may also be related (May 1991, 127). Katherine Duncan-Jones (1970, 146) compares Gorges's 1599 *Verses sung to Queene Elizabeth by a Mairmead* (poem 109) to Ralegh's 'Prais'd be Dianas faire and harmles light'.

*Cambridge*\(^{84}\) was compiled by Henry Stanford (May 1988, viii-xxvii; Black 1973), a contemporary of Gorges's at Oxford (Black 1973, 235), and tutor from 1582 of William Paget, many years later an executor of Gorges's will. William was the son of Lord Thomas Paget, one of the 'Oxford group' of pro-French courtiers (see Chapter 1.1). In

---

\(^{83}\) For the readings of *Phoenix* and *Rawlinson* see Rollins 1932; for the text of Harley's version see *Hudson* 1931, 386.

\(^{84}\) Edited in May 1988.
1586/7 William became ward of Sir George Carey and went to live with the Careys on the Isle of Wight. Stanford probably moved with him. At about this time, Gorges seems to have been quite closely connected with the Careys: Sir George Carey was responsible for nominating Gorges as MP for Yarmouth, Isle of Wight in 1584; his brother Sir Robert Carey took part with Gorges in a court show in 1587; Lady Elizabeth Carey, wife of Sir George, was godmother to Gorges’s daughter Ambrosia, born in 1588 (Chapter 1.1). Stanford later became tutor for George Berkeley, grandson of Lady Carey, ‘a kinsman through the Howards not only to Douglas and Ambrosia and, more remotely, to Arthur himself, but also to the Gorges cousins at Wraxall’ (Sandison 1953, xxxvii-xxxviii). Stanford’s poetry, and that of his pupils, was influenced, like Gorges’s, by Turberville (Black 1973, 4; May 1988, xxii). Sandison suggested that Stanford copied his texts direct from *Egerton* (1953, xxxvii). Steven W. May has shown that this is unlikely (1988, 316-8), except in the case of poem 72 (May’s poem 199).\(^5\) The many connections between Stanford and Gorges need not mean that Stanford’s access to Gorges’s texts was authorised by Gorges: they simply show that both men were moving in overlapping circles of acquaintances. May suggests that Stanford’s source for his Gorges texts was Henry Carey, first Baron Hunsdon, father of Sir George and Sir Robert (1988, xlviii; cf. xvii-xviii). Gorges’s poems probably came to Stanford with no attribution (none of Stanford’s Gorges texts is attributed to anyone), in good texts from sources close to Gorges though not necessarily directly authorised by him.

*Cambridge’s* six Gorges texts are grouped together fairly closely in a section of court verse put together in the early 1590s (May 1988, xxxix) and occur in the following order:

\(^5\) Working on the basis of calculations about Stanford’s liability to error.
The text of poem 8 diverges at many points from *Egerton*, several times noticeably in error. The nature of its readings suggests that Stanford (or his sources) may have been copying down the poem from memory (quite likely, given the occasional nature of the poem). *Cambridge*’s text of poem 79, the correlative poem, is highly eccentric. Otherwise, *Cambridge*’s texts are close to *Egerton*’s, its text of poem 72 exceptionally close. Stanford’s texts antedate the holograph alterations made by Gorges to poems 39 and 98.

*Rhapsody*’s text of poem 98 also lacks Gorges’s holograph revisions. Both texts also fail to assign the last two lines of the eclogue to the herdsman (as *Egerton* correctly does). Perhaps *Cambridge* and *Rhapsody* preserve readings from an earlier version of the text, later revised by Gorges before transcription into *Egerton*. The many unique readings in *Rhapsody* look like modernisations, made in an attempt to create a smoother, blander text. *Additional*, a musical setting with an incomplete text of the poem (lacking, *inter alia*, the last two lines), incorporates Gorges’s holograph revisions. The incorporation of the corrections shows that following his corrections to his manuscript Gorges allowed his work to be recopied.

---

86 May gives collations for all of these poems.
87 E.g. singulars for plurals and *vice versa*; ‘I ye truthe in colours two’ for ‘In too collours I the truth’ (line 16); ‘truthe’ for ‘prooife’; rearrangement of the rhyme-scheme in lines 7-10.
88 For a collation see May 1988, 334-6. *Cambridge* and *Rhapsody* twice agree in error, though since *Cambridge* also has four unique errors May concludes that the texts are not ‘directly’ related.
89 E.g. ‘truest Turtles’ (line 49) becomes ‘truest Lasses’; ‘Yett thoughghe that’ (line 17) becomes ‘But, whereas’.
90 *Additional* and *Rhapsody* agree against all other texts in a couple of instances, probably accidentally (lines 10, 41).
2. Later Poetry

At the end of the manuscript are eleven poems transcribed together in an italic hand (Hand D). The transcriptions must have been made after 1614, for poem 108 is an elegy for the young Lord Harington, who died in 1614 (Sandison 1953, 229). (Poem 111 is probably later still—see below.) All but one of the pieces ponder Gorges's patronage relationships with royal or noble figures. Hand D's text was, I think, intended to gather together for the benefit of Gorges and his friends 'private' versions of a sequence of texts originally written, on a number of different occasions, for patrons. The transcription of these poems into the Egerton manuscript looks like a gesture of Stoic resignation. As memorials to doomed hopes the poems are apt companion-pieces for the lyrics Gorges had written for Douglas Howard and which they follow in the manuscript.

The first six poems are also found, with variants, in BL MS Royal 18 A XLVII, a manuscript presented by Gorges to the royal family on 1 January, 1609/10. The Royal manuscript opens with a piece addressed 'To the Kinges Maiestie' written on paper, and is followed by four poems (a second one to James, one to Anne of Denmark, two to Prince Henry) written on vellum and each illustrated by an illuminated crest or coat of arms. The collection closes with a final address to the King written on paper. Each of the four illustrated poems revolves around a conceit based on the addressee's arms. The poems come in the same order in the Egerton manuscript (ff.197r-9r), immediately
following Gorges’s ‘Pastorall unfynyshed’. Replacing the illuminated arms in the Egerton manuscript are explanatory titles.  

The impetus behind the assembly of the Royal manuscript must have been Henry’s imminent installation as Prince of Wales, as Sandison suggests (1953, 227). The manuscript was put together by the scribe of the sole manuscript of the prose *Breefe Discourse* dedicated to Henry by Gorges in 1610 (see Chapter 5.2). Both manuscripts use gilt illumination. Common to both, too, is Gorges’s conceit that the Prince of Wales’s three feathers belong respectively to Bellona, Minerva and Juno.

The poems in praise of James strike an uncomfortable note. Poem 101, ‘*An new Yeares guift to the Kings Majestie alluding to the time that hee Was proclaimed heere in England 24th March*’ introduces Gorges’s mini-anthology:

When Time our styled yeare did end,  
and change beganne your Raigne:  
Then Time reft vs a Soueraigne Blisse,  
Which change repay’d with gaine.  
Time now, by shortninge his owne time,  
Hath chaung’d the Aged yeare:  
Yet in my long borne zeale; Times chaunge  
Can make no chaunge appeare.  
But many, a blessed chaunge of Times;  
Heauens graunt, your Time may see.  
That Time chaunge not your Royall Race;  
Till Time no more shalbe (f.1r)

James is identified with Change, and Gorges’s zeal is said to be unchanging. There is an uneasiness about Gorges’s logic here, as if he is still living in Elizabeth’s reign and his

---

91 Following the form ‘*Verses of the Queenes Armes beinge the three Lyon of Denmarke*’ (poem 103). Both manuscripts give a title to the first poem. Egerton is alone in titling the last poem ‘*The Conclusion to the Kings Majestie*’ (poem 106).

92 Sandison also argues that some of the poems might have been written before 1609/10 and presented earlier in the reign. This suggestion is plausible in the case of the first poem, the theme of which is James’s accession. If the first versions of the reused poem(s) were presented, though, in copies now lost, to James and/ or Anne it seems odd that Gorges should have chosen later to present the same poem(s) twice to the same people.

93 This title is found only in the Egerton manuscript. The Royal manuscript title is ‘To the Kinges Majestie’
‘long borne zeale’—not explicitly linked in the poem to James—is for Elizabeth rather than for the new King.

The last poem in the set, 106, ‘The Conclusion to the Kings Majestie’, is similarly problematic. Here Gorges bases the value of his praise of James in its disinterestedness—he has not been rewarded by the King, so he cannot be considered a flatterer: his poetry is ‘not schoold by favors, guifts, or gaine’ (line 4). Again, Gorges stresses the long-lastingness of his devotion to James:

To sweet my tunes, I straine not flatteries stringe
But hould that temper in your Royall prayse
That long I did, before you were my Kinge.

The two texts diverge here. In the Royal manuscript, just one couplet follows, tinged with bitterness:

As one that vertue for it selfe regards:
And loves his Kinge more, than his Kings rewards

Gorges paints himself as a virtuous, isolated figure, echoing, as Sandison points out (1953, 229), Ralegh’s commendatory poem to his translation of Lucan (see Chapter 6.1.2). The Egerton text is arguably more disillusioned still. Replacing the Royal text’s couplet are a quatrain and a couplet. Everything is now in the past, and all that can be hoped for is favour from God. This echoes the fatalism of Ralegh’s Lucan poem even more strongly:

Soe did I vertue for it selfe regard
   With truth unstained, that hath the test indurd
Lovinge my Kinge without my Kings reward
   And yet such Zeale, through wrong lives still obscurde
But hope dyes not, dispaire it doth dispysye
For constant faith draws favour from the skyes. (lines 9-14)

For this reason I think the text in the Egerton manuscript is the later.94

94 Sandison, however, finds the Egerton version more hopeful and therefore thinks it is the earlier one.
In the first poem for Prince Henry (poem 104), the Egerton text includes a couplet not found in the Royal text: ‘Now tell mee noble France what wrong maye well withstand/A Crowned head, a prudent heart, a valiaunt hand.’ This addition concludes the poem neatly,\(^95\) adding a bellicose tone that would probably have been more acceptable to Henry than to James.\(^96\)

The Egerton manuscript, then, preserves texts of poems 104 and 106 marginally less guarded than those in the presentation volume—bitterer to James, more lavish in the praise of Prince Henry. The Egerton texts are, presumably, the ‘private’ versions, for circulation among Gorges’s friends, of the ‘public’ presentation poems in the Royal manuscript.\(^97\)

Elegies for Prince Henry (poem 107) and the young Lord Harington, neighbour of Gorges’s at Kew (poem 108; see Chapter 1.2), follow, both adapted from earlier poems by Gorges. The elegy for Henry reworks poem 84 from the *Vannetyes and Toyes*, itself a reworking into a love poem of a poem by Du Bellay addressed to a friend (Sandison 1953, 213). The theme is the speaker’s ability to sing when sorrowful: something relevant to any kind of sorrow—lack of professional success; erotic frustration; bereavement.\(^98\)

This elegy also occurs, as ‘To the Reader’, in *The Olympian Catastrophe*, Gorges’s long

---

\(^{95}\) Sandison (1953, 228) is wrong to say that this couplet would be better suited to the other Henry poem (poem 105), for poem 105 does not contain the Minerva/Bellona/Juno conceit to which the couplet clearly alludes.

\(^{96}\) The couplet is more explicit than poem 105, which is on the same theme. Henry’s supporters hoped that he would lead an invasion of Catholic France (Williamson 1978, 34-7; Birch 1760, 43).

\(^{97}\) There are other variants, the most extensive of which comes in poem 103, to Anne. The Egerton manuscript adds two lines, introducing an a reference to Britain as ‘Troye’ not present in the Royal text. The Egerton titles direct that the verses be set ‘over’ the illuminated arms, when in the Royal manuscript they are in fact written below the arms.

\(^{98}\) The poem lists a number of different figures in different situations who sing when sad (‘Soe sings sweet Philtome … So sings the Swart’ (lines 11-12)). Thus the poem’s argumentative structure itself invites its use and reuse in differing circumstances.
narrative elegy for Henry (Chapter 4.3). Hand D initially transcribed the first three lines in the form in which they appear in *The Olympian Catastrophe*—a proud statement of Gorges’s disinterestedness, disavowing any intention to flatter—only to cancel them and add a replacement (‘The change, made after line 4 was copied, was either ordered by Gorges (possibly dictating) or made by the scribe when he discovered a variant that he should have followed’ (Sandison 1953, 229)). The new text seems less aware of a ‘public’ audience, simply stating the poet’s grief at Henry’s death. As with the poems of 1609/10 to the royal family, then, Hand D’s text preserves a ‘private’ version of a presentation poem. The elegy for the young Lord Harington, who died in 1614, was presumably written for his sister the Countess of Bedford, mentioned in line 9. Recasting Gorges’s elegy for Sidney (poem 97), it also, in its second line, echoes Ralegh’s elegy on Sidney (Sandison 1953, 230). These echoes are not accidental. In the same year as Lord Harington died, Gorges’s translation of Lucan appeared (see Chapter 6.1), with a dedication to the Countess of Bedford purporting to have been written by Gorges’s ten-year-old son Carew, in which Lord Harington is explicitly compared to Sidney forebears:

> your Ladiship is an honourable louer and Patronesse of learning and the Muses, an instinct naturally ingrafted in your excellent spirit, by that worthy blood of the Sydneyses, wherewith you do so nearlye participate, and whose perfections did so eminently shine in that hopefull yong Lord your late brother, one of the mirrours of our Age (Lucan 1614, A3v)

Poem 108, then, seems to have been engineered deliberately to parallel the young Lord Harington with Sir Philip Sidney.\(^9^9\)

The two elegies are followed in the manuscript by the *Verses sung to Queene Elizabeth by a Mairmead as shee past upon the Thames to Sir Arthur Gorges house at*

\(^9^9\) Both of the elegies in Hand D’s text, unlike the other poems there, are followed by Gorges’s initials. Presumably the scribe was copying from copy linked to some kind of presentation.
This poem was written for an occasion in 1599, when, seeking the Queen’s help over his attempt to establish his rights over his daughter Ambrosia, Gorges presented Elizabeth with a large piece of jewellery (see Chapter 1.1). Its elegant ending is an early example of the theme of Stoic virtue, a dominant theme in Gorges’s later years, implicitly placing Gorges’s ‘virtue’ alongside Elizabeth’s:

When all things dyed; her Raigne began to growe
To prove shee is devyne.
Soe those in whose chast harts virtue survyvyes
Finish their fading yeares, but not their lives. (lines 17-20)

Poem 110 was perhaps originally intended to round off Hand D’s text. It certainly makes an appropriate valediction: in the night-time of age, the poet reviews the ‘spent hopes’ (line 5) of his life. This sonnet has excited much critical comment, for of all Gorges’s poems it is the one which echoes the undoubted work of Ralegh, specifically Ocean to Cynthia (Latham 1951, xlviii-l; Sandison 1953, 230-1) most strongly. Sandison (ibid.) hypothesises that it is an Elizabethan poem, originally intended by Gorges to conclude the Vannetyes and Toyes and that it ‘strayed’ into Hand D’s copy. Katherine Duncan-Jones, on the other hand, thinks it may have been written by Ralegh and transcribed ‘in the aftermath of Raleigh’s death’ (1970, 146).

It is hard to imagine the final Gorges poem in the manuscript, poem 111, circulating widely under Gorges’s name, for its anti-Jamesian bitterness is coruscating. The poem offers ‘deliberately ambiguous’ (Sandison 1953, 231) praise to James for not going to war against Spain. James is praised in extravagant terms for having restrained the English from raiding Spanish treasure, ‘repressing’ his people’s hands ‘from gaine of gould’ (line

---

100 Gorges’s name in the title shows that the scribe’s copy derived from a text intended for circulation.
4). Following a reference to Elizabeth’s naval triumphs (lines 5-8), the closing couplet argues, with obvious irony, that the strength of the English navy has rendered James’s pacifism all the more laudable: ‘For Spaine well knows thou needst not dread her weight,/Thy Neptune Howards name, speals Eightie Eight’ (lines 13-14). The argument of this poem echoes an equally uneasy passage in one of Gorges’s naval treatises, dedicated in 1618/19 to the then anti-Spanish Earl of Buckingham (BL MS Stowe 426, f.42r; see Chapter 5.4), newly appointed to succeed ‘Neptune Howard’ as Lord Admiral. It seems likely, as Sandison suggests, that the poem, a strikingly bitter conclusion to Hand D’s section, belongs to the period immediately before Howard’s resignation (1953, 231).

---

101 Poem 111, uniquely in this section of the manuscript, leaves most lines uncapsitalised and is not separated from its preceding poem by a blank verso.

102 There is a certain uneasiness here about the reference to Lord Admiral Howard, as under James his negligence was partially responsible for the decline of the navy. Gorges’s reference to Howard’s name may allude to the double ‘f’ in ‘Effingham’, similar in appearance in secreterry hand to ‘88’ (for the use of ‘eighty-eight’ to allude to 1588, see, e.g. Chamberlain 1939, 1.178).

103 The ironic references to greed for gold may be an allusion to Ralegh’s failed last voyage to Guiana.
4

GORGES MOURNING

The death of a renaissance client’s major patron generally came as a crushing blow, ushering in a period of anxiety and uncertainty (Biagioli 1993, 30). For poet-clients, the composition of an elegy was an important way of coming to terms with this disturbing situation and of redirecting the course of their career.¹ As was common in the renaissance, Gorges’s career was structured by the deaths of a sequence of patrons. The deaths of two of these, his first wife Douglas Howard and Prince Henry, were marked by poems presenting Gorges in the pose of a mourner. Douglas’s death prompted Spenser’s long elegy, Daphnaida, in which Gorges is depicted in the character of the mourning shepherd Alcyon. Gorges himself composed ‘A pastorall unfynyshed’, a short poem depicting a shepherd trying to recover from the death of his lover. In Colin Clovts Come home againe Spenser alluded to ‘A pastorall unfynyshed’, encouraging him to finish it. Much later, Gorges redeployed lines from Daphnaida as well as some of his own previously written poetry in his elegy for Prince Henry, The Olympian Catastrophe.

A client’s elegy was generically similar to a client’s letter. As both types of text were called into being by the absence of the patron and designed to display deep emotional attachment to him or her, they shared strategies.² The difference between the two genres was equally important, though. Since the patron memorialised in a client’s elegy was

¹ Arthur Marotti has emphasised the importance of the elegy in the analysis of patron-client relations (1995, 129-30).
² Guillén argues that the genre of the letter is fundamentally elegiac, since both letters and elegies ‘confront or suppress an absence’ (1986, 88).
permanently lost, the discourse of patron-client attachment could not lead to a closer relationship between the original patron and client. Instead, it functioned as a commemoration of the closeness of the lost patronage relationship, the client-poet’s grief signifying the strength of his dedication to the patron. If the patron had been a prestigious figure, the elegy reflected particularly well on the client. Often, a client’s elegy would be directed to a potential future patron, presenting him through the representation of the client’s grief with an enactment of the client’s skills in patronage discourse. Sometimes the client-poet depicted a third party’s grief at the patron’s death—another potential patron, perhaps, or an ally of the poet’s. Strategies of this sort are central to the poems analysed in this chapter.

1. Daphnaida

Spenser’s *Daphnaida* (Spenser 1912, 527-34) is cast in the form of a *chanson d’aventure*. Walking out one Autumn evening, a sorrowful narrator encounters the melancholy figure of Alcyon, a grieving shepherd. Asked why he is sad, Alcyon, at first hostile to the narrator’s probing, spins an elaborate story about the death of a white lioness (lines 99-167). The narrator is baffled. He asks for a clearer explanation. Sighing, Alcyon abandons his allegory and resorts to direct statement. ‘Daphne thou knewest (quoth he)/ She now is dead’ (lines 183-4). Alcyon embarks on an elaborate and hysterical complaint against everything in the universe (lines 197-539), recalling along the way the attempt of the dying Daphne to console him with the thought that she will be in heaven and her charge to him to look after their daughter Ambrosia (lines 267-92).
Alcyon staggers off at the end of the poem, leaving the narrator alone and in doubt about what will happen next:

...without taking leave, he forth did goe
With staggering pace and dismal looks dismay
As if that death he in the face had seen;
Or hellish hags had met upon the way:
But what of him became I cannot see. (lines 561-7)

_Daphnaida_ was first published, by itself, in 1591, with a title-page and a dedication to Helena, Lady Marquis of Northampton, that made it obvious that Alcyon was intended to stand for Arthur Gorges, the Lady Marquis’s nephew, and that Daphne was a representation of Douglas Howard, Gorges’s recently deceased wife. The link to Gorges, then, is clear. Yet exactly what Spenser was trying to do in _Daphnaida_ has been a focus for disagreement between critics. The key problem has been the poem’s apparent breach of generic decorum. Unlike the protagonists of most pastoral elegy, Alcyon does not finish the poem reconciled to the loss of his loved one. He retains the bitterness against the universe which elegy conventionally works through and supersedes. Until recently, critics, assuming that Spenser had vainly intended Alcyon’s lament to be read sympathetically, generally considered _Daphnaida_ a grotesque authorial miscalculation, an embarrassing failure to obey generic rules. In the last two decades most critics have been more indulgent to Spenser, on the whole accompanying praise of the poem with an ironic interpretation of Alcyon’s lament—Spenser, it is argued, intended the reader to be

---

^3_Daphnaida. An Elegie vpon the death of the noble and vertuous Douglas Howard, Daughter and heire of Henry Lord Howard, Viscount Byndon, and wife of Arthure Gorges Esquier. Dedicated to the Right honorable the Lady Helena, Marquesse of Northampton._

^4 Thus Alcyon’s behaviour is classifiable in Freudian terms as ‘melancholia’ rather than ‘mourning’ (cf. Martin 1987, 87). For a subtle account of elegiac convention see Sacks 1985.

^5 See, for example, Lewis 1954, 369-70 and Berlin 1966, as well as most of the comments in the notes of the Spenser _Variorum_ (Spenser 1932-57). Erskine’s judgement is typical: ‘The dirge is not a strict elegy according to the Greek model, such as the elegy in the Shepherds Calendar. The order of themes is apparently haphazard, and there is no note of consolation whatever’ (429).
unsympathetic to Alcyon’s excessive grieving. The major proponent of the ironic reading, William A. Oram, interprets *Daphnaida* as ‘a warning against grieving too much’ (1981, 141) addressed directly to Gorges. Alcyon, in Oram’s reading, is Spenser’s nightmare vision of what Gorges might become if he succumbs to excessive grief (155-6). Like Oram, Harris and Steffen (1978) argue that *Daphnaida* counsels proportion in grief, Alcyon functioning as ‘an instructional example, a personification of excessive, blasphemous grief whose very extremity forces the poet’s audience to recall the tenets of proportion’ (20). For A. Leigh DeNeef (1982, 41-50), Alcyon is a literalising poet, disapproved of by Spenser, whose fatal mistake is to use literary conventions to distort experience, ‘assuming that the poetic conventions are literal records of his own emotional situation and his own experiential situation’ (49). G.W. Pigman III stresses the selfishness of Alcyon’s grief and its incommensurability with classical elegiac norms—qualities which make it a ‘counterexample to moderation’ (75): ‘The example of stubborn, self-centered, destructive grief stands as a warning to Spenser as well as to his bereaved friend, Arthur Gorges. Spenser does not recoil with horror from Alcyon because he realizes the temptation to yield to despair himself’ (76).

---

6 There are two important exceptions to this critical tendency. Ellen Martin (1987, 81-99) reads *Daphnaida* as an exploration of the productive psychological and poetic effects of loss. Røstvig (1963, 82-7) argues that Alcyon’s realisation at the arithmetical centre of his lament (lines 365-71) that life should not be valued too highly and his decision to do penance involve a growth in spiritual stature. The poem is, for Røstvig, centrally concerned with ‘the spiritual illumination which induces a desire for penance and remission of sins’ (85); the importance of penitence as a theme is confirmed by the structural importance to the poem of the number seven, ‘the Old Testament number of lament and penitence’ (85; the poem is written in seven-line stanzas, Alcyon’s complaint being made up of seven sections of seven stanzas each, twenty-eight stanzas preceding it, four following it). Convincingly rebutting Røstvig, Oram (1981, 146-7) points out that Alcyon’s penance is devoted to Daphne not God and that it is not informed by a proper awareness of Alcyon’s own sinfulness: ‘He hates the world intensely because he still values its gifts so highly and has been so disappointed’ (147). Alcyon should really be penitent for his sinfully excessive devotion to Daphne.

7 In a similar move, Oram suggests that the poem was written soon after the death of Spenser’s first wife and ‘represents a road not taken, a mode of behaviour Spenser felt it necessary to suppress in himself’ (1981, 154). Pigman also emphasises the selfishness of Alcyon’s love for Daphne, pointing out that whilst
1.1. *Daphnaïda* and the Howards

There is nothing in the prefatory material of *Daphnaïda* to support the ironic reading—no implication in the dedicatory letter to the Lady Marquis that the purpose of the poem is to advise her nephew against unmannerly grief—and nothing in the text of the poem either. In trying to work out what Spenser might have been trying to do in the poem, it is perhaps best to follow Helen E. Sandison’s lead (1928, 650-1) and look first at the immediate historical background of its publication. *Daphnaïda* appeared in January 1590/1, at a crucial stage in the dispute between Gorges and the Howard family over the status and rights of his and Douglas Howard’s daughter, Ambrosia. Douglas died on 13 August 1590, leaving the two-year-old Ambrosia heir to extensive Howard lands and a ward of the crown. Just five days later, Gorges ‘procured a certificate under the hande of diverse woemen of Ambrosias birth: written by Philips Scrivener by charing crosse’ (DRO D10/L8), presumably in response to aspersions cast on his daughter’s legitimacy. On 17 November Gorges exhibited a bill in Chancery defending Ambrosia’s status as his and Douglas’s child (PRO C3/225/41). Douglas’s hostile father, Henry Howard, who had opposed Gorges’s marriage to Douglas on the grounds of Gorges’s low social status (PRO STAC5 H20/3) died on 1 December 1590. The heir to the Bindon title, Thomas Alcyon’s statement that the purpose of Daphne’s death is to torture him is at the arithmetical centre of his embedded lament Daphne’s description of her joy in heaven is at the arithmetical centre of the poem (78-9). Some external support for the ironic reading is provided by a passage in *Colin Cloutes Come home againe* in which Colin urges Alcyon to stop mourning Daphne (see section 2 below).

---

8 Some external support for the ironic reading is provided by a passage in *Colin Cloutes Come home againe* in which Colin urges Alcyon to stop mourning Daphne (see section 2 below).

9 *Daphnaïda*’s title-page is dated ‘1591’, its dedication to the Lady Marquis ‘first of Ianuarie. 1591’ (Spenser 1912, 528). Sandison argues that ‘1591’ here is 1591 new style and not 1591/2, pointing out that in *Colin Cloutes Come home againe*, which tries to cheer up the still-grieving Alcyon (lines 384-91, quoted in section 1.4.), the dedication to Ralegh is dated 27 December 1591. Sandison suggests that ‘it is practically inconceivable that Spenser would present Gorges, through his aunt, with a lament picturing the black depth of grief, five days after dedicating to Gorges’s cousin and intimate an appeal that he abandon woe for mirth and poesy’ (1928, 650). Perhaps, as Renwick suggests (1929, 175), *Daphnaïda*’s likely status
Howard, Henry's brother, promptly intruded on Ambrosia's property, defending his action with the claim that Ambrosia was 'a forged or changed childe; and yt so by triall he would proue her' (BL MS Lansdowne 43, f.59r). Thomas Howard brought his first case against Gorges in the Easter term of 1591 in the Court of Wards (DRO D10/L8). 

*Daphnaida* appeared, then, at just the point when Thomas Howard was publicly casting aspersions on Ambrosia, when the courts were in recess and when further litigation could be expected. The only case to have taken place was Gorges's pre-emptive strike against rumours fostered presumably by someone in the Howard camp. The new year, ushered in by Spenser's new year's gift to the Marchioness (Renwick 1929, 175), could be expected to bring wearisome challenges from Henry Howard's successor. The Gorges party would have been on the defensive, keen, above all, to combat the insidious rumours which were being spread. *Daphnaida* in this context looks like a propaganda weapon engineered by Spenser and the Gorgeses to counterbalance the slanderous rumours circulating at court.

The Lady Marquis and her husband, Gorges's uncle, Sir Thomas Gorges, were important allies of Gorges during his legal battles with the Howards (see Chapter 1.1). As the highest-ranking women in England after the Queen, the Lady Marquis was an important potential patron for Spenser. The fact that the first three books of *The Faerie Queene* had been recently published perhaps gave Spenser's intervention in the dispute particular force. The dedication makes it clear that *Daphnaida* is dedicated to the Marchioness and written out of friendship for Gorges: the Lady Marquis is the author's

---

as a New Year's gift for the Lady Marquis made it seem sensible to put '1591' rather than '1590' on the titlepage.  

10 For a more detailed narrative of events see Chapter 1.  

11 Her high status means that Spenser's reference to her in *Colin Clouts Come home againe* is not gratuitous, *pace* DeNeef 1982, 42.
patron, Gorges his friend and equal. Presumably, Spenser would have been put in touch with the Gorgeses through Ralegh (May 1991, 108). In producing a text serving Gorges’s interests in his legal dispute with the Howards, Spenser would have been performing a useful service for the Lady Marquis. Daphnaïda implicitly argues the Gorges case, in an attempt to scotch the Howards’ allegations.

Many years ago, Helen E. Sandison drew attention to two of the means by which Daphnaïda served Gorges’s purposes in his dispute with the Howards. She pointed out that Daphne’s description of Ambrosia as a ‘pledge’ of the love between Alcyon and herself (lines 288-9) implicitly rebuts Bindon’s slanders, constituting ‘a bold challenge to the Viscount’s party’ (1928, 651), whilst Spenser’s dedicatory epistle stresses Gorges’s aristocratic connections in defiance of the Howards’ feeling that Douglas had married beneath herself (1953, xviii). This reading can taken further. Below, I look briefly at the poem’s attitude to the Howards before examining how the Gorges-Howard legal context can help explain the radical intemperance of Alcyon’s grieving.

In the dedicatory epistle (Spenser 1912, 528) Spenser emphasises Gorges’s right to Ambrosia’s inheritance by praising the Gorges family. Spenser explains that he has dedicated the poem to the Lady Marquis in deference to the ties that bind her to the deceased Douglas Howard. Douglas was, Spenser says, ‘by match neere allied, and in

---

12 Gorges is wrongly identified as Spenser’s patron by Ellen Martin (1987, 88). Oram (1981, 151) stresses the relatively narrow social gap between Gorges and Spenser, pointing out that the word ‘goodwill’, which occurs in Daphnaïda’s dedication (‘the particular good will which I beare unto ... Master Arthur Gorges, a louver of lerning and vertue’ (Spenser 1912, 528)) ‘appears in only one other dedication ... addressed to the Lady Carey who was, after all, kin’. It is perhaps significant that Alcyon is only a ‘shepherd’s swain’ and not actually a shepherd (Bernard 1989, 221, n.32).

13 Though Gorges’s connections with the Careys (Chapter 1.1), Spenser’s patrons, may also be significant.

14 In effect Spenser presents himself in the poem performing the valuable function of a sympathetic and tactful ‘secretary’, ripe for preferment. For similar strategies in other texts by Spenser see Rambuss 1993. Kay interprets Daphnaïda as a servant’s ministration of consolation to a patron (1990, 52).
affection greatly deuoted vnto your Ladiship’. Next Spenser explains the double occasion of the poem’s composition: first, ‘the great good fame’ he had heard of Douglas, second, ‘the particular goodwill which I beare vnto her husband Master Arthur Gorges’. Four reasons are given for Spenser’s ‘goodwill’: Gorges’s status as ‘a lover of learning and vertue’, his relationship to the Lady Marquis, the antiquity and patriotism of the house of Gorges and the Gorges family’s descent from the Howards. Spenser concludes hoping that ‘no due honour [will be] done to the white Lyon [the heraldic badge of the Howards] but will be most gratefull to your Ladiship, whose husband and children do so neerely participate with the bloud of that noble family’. The dedication identifies and entangles Gorgeses with Howards. The reader is told that Daphnaïda was occasioned partly by the fame of Douglas Howard and partly by the fact that her husband Arthur Gorges was related to the Howards anyway; meanwhile the reader is assured that the poem was dedicated to the Lady Marquis in part because she had married into the Gorges family, and thus is linked through them to the house of Howard. Every effort is made to stress that the aim of Daphnaïda is to glorify the Howard family. In being written for the Gorges family, it is implied, Daphnaïda is equally being written for the Howards. The dedication is pretty clearly designed to replace, and thus exclude, Douglas’s Howard relatives, to replace the Howard family with a Gorges family imbued vicariously with Howard power and status. The dedication is designed to obfuscate the fact that the poem, said to do ‘honour to the white Lyon’, is not in fact dedicated to a member of the Howard family and that the Gorges family’s only solid link to the Howards is through Douglas, who is dead. This emphasis on relationships between Gorgeses and Howards should,
think, be seen as a strategy directed against the Viscount’s case, to emphasise the right of Ambrosia to Howard land.¹⁵

In the allegorical account Alcyon gives of the wooing and death of Daphne (lines 99-168), the antagonism of Daphne/Douglas’s family is similarly elided. The only opposition Alcyon has to overcome is the innate savagery of his ‘faire young Lionesse’ (line 107); no other lion is in sight. Perhaps the lioness should be read as a representation not simply of Douglas/Daphne but more generally as an allegory of the connection between the Gorgeses and the Howards that Douglas’s marriage to Gorges brought about, a figure of the status Gorges accrued as a result of his marriage. It is significant that this is the only part of the poem to refer implicitly or explicitly to Douglas’s family, for despite its stress on the antiquity of the lioness’s lineage and her high status as one of ‘the race, that all wild beastes do feare’ (line 123), Alcyon’s allegory of himself as lion-tamer makes him superior to and in control of the captured lion.¹⁶ The Bindon antagonists are belittled by simply being ignored.

It is clear that Alcyon would have been regarded in the renaissance as a selfish, intemperate mourner: there is little doubt of the sinfulness of his behaviour. Although he repudiates the sensual world and aspires to a penitential, ascetic lifestyle, from a Calvinist perspective his attitude remains fundamentally sinful because he places ultimate value in the enthroned Daphne instead of in God:

¹⁵ An additional element in the dedicatory epistle is the implicit parallel it makes between Douglas and Helena, each a wealthy heiress linked through marriage with the Gorgeses. The Lady Marquis owed her high status at court—she was the highest-ranking woman after the Queen—to the rank of her first husband, William Parr, Marquis of Northampton and to the abeyance of the Howard Dukedom of Norfolk following the disgrace and execution of the last Duke in 1572.

¹⁶ In reality, of course, Douglas was far from being lion-like and independent—she was a twelve year old girl living with her mother, in danger of being married off against her will by a demented father (PRO STAC5 H20/3).
And she my love that was, my Saint that is,
When she beholds from her celestial throne,
(In which she joyeth in etemal blis)
My bitter penance, will my case bemone,
And pitie me that living thus doe die:
For heavenly spirits have compassion
On mortall men, and rue their miserie. (lines 379-85)  

Alcyon’s behaviour has parallels with that of several other figures in Spenser’s poetry, despairing, suicidal sinners overly attached to the things of this world. Alcyon’s attitude to penitence, meanwhile, looks like a parody of Roman Catholic doctrine, whilst his

---

17 ‘We are enjoined to love God with all our heart, with all our soul, with all our strength. Since all the faculties of our soul ought thus to be engrossed with the love of God, it is certain that the commandment is not fulfilled by those who receive the smallest desire with their heart, or admit into their minds any thought whatever which may lead them away from the love of God to vanity’ (Calvin, 1961, 1.517).

18 Daphnaída’s depressed tone fits in well with the theory of several critics (e.g. Cain 1978) that Spenser found his 1590-1 visit to London a disheartening experience—the poetry Spenser published after the appearance of part one of *The Faerie Queene* and before the appearance of part two is, as Cheney says, ‘dominated by a sense of time’s urgency, of darkening shadows’ (1983, 37). Daphnaída has particular affinities with *Complaints* (1591), in the preface to which the printer explains that in Spenser’s absence from England he has gathered scattered poems, ‘being all complaints and meditations of the world’s vanitie...To which effect I understand that he besides wrote sundrie others...being all dedicated to Ladies; so as it may seeme he ment them all to one volume’ (Spenser 1912, 470). Like these poems Daphnaída is a ‘complaint of the world’s vanity’ dedicated to a lady. Alcyon has affinities, meanwhile, with the first two visionaries, Petrarch and Du Bellay, in Jan Van Der Noodt’s *Theatre for Worldlings* (London, 1568), for which Spenser supplied translations, revised versions appearing in *Complaints*. Van Der Noodt had been a client of the Lady Marquis’s husband, the Marquis of Northampton (Van Dorsten 1970, 75-85). Petrarch and Du Bellay, are, Carl J. Rasmussen (1980) argues, depicted as sinners, who, though aware of the vanity of worldly things, have failed to turn to God. The visions of earthly vanity described by Petrarch in the aftermath of Laura’s death are the products not of love of God but of love of Laura—thus, Petrarch’s melancholy should be read as ‘sinful despair’ (Rasmussen 1980, 11). Du Bellay, too, is presented as unable to transcend his despair at earthly decay whilst the third visionary, St. John, is able through faith to perceive the divine plan. It is perhaps significant that connections can be made between Alcyon/Gorges and Petrarch and Du Bellay. Petrarch, like Alcyon/Gorges, mourns the death of a woman whose name associates her with the laurel, whilst Alcyon’s complaint has been compared to the *Rime in morte di madonna Laura* (Renwick 1929, 173). Many of the love poems written by Gorges before Douglas Howard’s death were translated from Du Bellay. Links can also be made between Daphnaída and *The Shepheardes Calender* (Oram 1981, 145). Stressing Alcyon’s ‘impatient’ unwillingness to submit to God’s designs, Oram links him with Despair in *The Faerie Queene* (1981, 143).

19 Spenser’s treatment of penitence in *The Faerie Queene* 1.10, close to Calvin’s account, conceives of it as the necessary product of faith. For Calvin and Spenser God’s freely given grace must necessarily precede any penitent action—it is impossible to be a penitent without already being elect. Roman Catholic penitence, on the other hand, considers man able to effect his own salvation by performing specified tasks: a process culminating in ‘satisfaction’—the act, literally, of having ‘done enough’. Alcyon’s approach to penitence involves ignorance of the divine gift of Grace, a crude view of God as primarily a judge, and the reliance on a ‘Saynte’ as a mediator (lines 379-85). Alcyon’s use of the word ‘satisfide’ (line 386) alludes to the Catholic doctrine of satisfaction, and indeed, his attitude throughout implies that he believes that
appearance in pilgrim's clothes (lines 40-2) and references to pilgrimage (lines 372-8, 533-8) are ironic. Why, though, should Gorges have been depicted this way at the time of the dispute over Ambrosia's legitimacy? Excessive, sinful melancholy was ethically problematic, yet paradoxically also something it was advantageous to be seen indulging in. It was deployed in clients' letters to signify the genuineness of the client's emotional attachment to his or her patron (see Chapter 2.4). By demonstrating that his emotions had outrun the limits of acceptability the melancholy client sought to establish the genuineness of his patronage tie. In Daphnaïda, the immoral excess of Alcyon's grief helps establish the closeness of Gorges's relationship with his wife, implicitly establishing Ambrosia's legitimacy and confirming Gorges's status as Douglas's de facto heir.

The selfishness of Alcyon's grief is an important element in Daphnaïda's strategy. The most notorious element of Alcyon's complaint is the passage in which he remembers Daphne's dying words. Alcyon takes no notice of Daphne's injunction to cherish penitential actions can by themselves achieve results. For Calvin, such confidence in the power of human action fatally compromised God's absolute superiority over man. The assertion that Daphne will be able to see and empathize with Alcyon's penance contradicts Calvin's statement that saints 'do not...lose their quiescence so as to be distracted with earthly cares: far less are they, therefore, to be invoked by us' (1961, 2.122). The identification of Daphne as a saint would not in itself necessarily have been considered idolatrous for, as Hackett notes, the doctrine that true believers such as martyrs 'would be crowned as saints in Heaven stayed important for Protestants' (1995, 34).

Cf. the comparison of life to a pilgrimage in A Theatre for Worldlings: 'This time of our pilgrimage is granted of God to learne to knowe him, to serue and honor him, to laude and magnifie his name, to put oure whole confidence in hym, to leade our life accordyng to hys blessed will, and to seeke our whole felicitie and blessednesse only in hym' (D8r).
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The connection between mourning and inheritance has remained a close one throughout history. Most interesting for any reader of the elegy is the fact that in Greece the right to mourn was from earliest times legally connected to the right to inherit...Furthermore, the ancient law prevented anyone from inheriting unless he mourned...the heir apparent must demonstrate a greater strength or proximity to the dead than any rival may claim; but he must also wrest his inheritance from the dead. More than a mere ingestion, some act of alteration or surpassal must be made, some device whereby the legacy may be seen to have entered a new successor' (Sacks 1985, 37). By giving Gorges/Alcyon a complaint to speak Daphnaïda meanwhile puts Gorges in the position of plaintiff, implying that he—not Thomas Howard—is the injured party.
Ambrosia (lines 288-94)—whom he never otherwise mentions—and immediately launches into a description of the agonising effect of Daphne’s last words as sense impressions, oblivious to their meaning (lines 295-301). In reality, of course, Gorges was in 1590/1 all too aware of his responsibilities vis-à-vis Ambrosia, having painstakingly assembled a large cast of midwives and female relatives to testify that Douglas had borne a child. On the issue of Ambrosia’s parentage rested a vast income, sufficient to set Gorges up for life. In *Daphnaida* Spenser allows no space for the accusation that Ambrosia was a ‘forged childe’: by making Gorges guilty of forgetting the welfare of his child in his grief for his wife, he absolves him from more immediately damaging accusations. The reader of the poem (e.g. Oram 1981, 149) is encouraged to take the side of Daphne, to want Alcyon to care for Ambrosia, taking for granted his status as her father. Spenser’s text effectively substitutes for harsh, litigious reality the image of Ambrosia as heavenly grace—given to Gorges without his knowledge. Daphne’s behaviour, meanwhile, emphasises her ‘natural’, maternal care for her own child. Here Spenser pre-empts the accusation later made by ‘Mr.Wey’, one of Thomas Howard’s informants, ‘that he on a tyme having the child called Ambrosia, in his armes, broght it to Mrs Douglas, but she made no share of ioye or gave any worde to him or the child, as if she had not cared for it, or as if it had ben none of hers’ (DRO D10/L8).

*Daphnaida* was presumably directed at a limited London/court readership, readers whose sympathy for Gorges might be advantageous in the pending court case, with the aim of building up a climate at court favourable to Gorges’s interests, its approach to this audience mediated through Spenser’s dedicatory epistle to the Marchioness of Northampton. Spenser presents the Lady Marquis, a sympathetic patron, with the image
of an excessively melancholy Gorges, uninterested in any type of further advancement, as a means of bringing Gorges’s plight to the attention of an influential wider audience. A very similar strategy is used in Gorges’s letter of 1595 to Robert Cecil (Bodl. MS Ashmole 1729, f.177; see Chapter 2.4): Gorges presents Cecil with the image of a frenziedly melancholy Ralegh, hoping that Cecil will pass on the letter to the Queen. The parallel is quite close. In both texts a narrator encounters a melancholy, hysterical lover and presents an account of the meeting to an important court figure. Both texts end uncertain about lover’s fate, waiting to see what the patron can do about the situation. Central to each is the remembered encounter between lover and beloved: Ralegh’s memories of the Queen, Alcyon’s memories of Daphne. Each lover takes an extreme course of action as a result of his beloved’s absence: Alcyon determines to live in caves and despise the world until he can join Daphne by dying; Ralegh desperately plans to escape from prison to catch a glimpse of the Queen and fights Sir George Carew when he does not get his way. In each case there is a further audience: in the letter, the Queen; in Daphnaïda the audience of the printed pamphlet—and in each case the depiction of the melancholy man is intended to win favour for him from the secondary audience. In both cases the madness of the lover’s melancholy is intended to authorise the genuineness of his passion, as is the fact that both lovers have been ‘overheard’—neither Ralegh nor Alcyon, the reader is given to understand, has intended that his plight be brought to anyone’s attention.23

22 ‘But what of him became I cannot weene’ (line 567); ‘I feare Sr W. Rawly; wyll shortly growe [to be] Orlando furioso; If the bryght Angelyca perseuer agaynst [hyme] a l[y]tt[le] lon[ger]’ (Sandison 1928, 658).
23 There are differences too. The secondary audience in Ralegh’s case but not in Gorges’s is the beloved whose absence he mourns. In each case the lover’s complaint studiously ignores a major point at issue, stressing instead an honourable object of excessive emotion. Ralegh’s failure to mention Elizabeth
1.2. Disrupted Pastoral

Parallels for the themes and arguments of Alcyon’s hysterical lament can be found in contemporary drama. What is particularly unusual in Daphnaïda is their appearance in Alcyon’s lament in the context of a pastoral elegy. Generically, Daphnaïda is a pastoral elegy disrupted by excessive grief. The components of Alcyon’s complaint—nature, animals, shepherds—belong naturally in a controlled elegy such as Colin’s elegy for Dido in ‘November’ from The Shepheardes Calender. The unusual focus on imperfectly resolved grief in Daphnaïda derives from the poem’s major literary influence, Chaucer’s Book of the Duchess. Spenser disruptively plots the subjectivism of this poem onto a pastoral framework. Alcyon is a shepherd who elects to grieve completely outside the pastoral community. Spenser highlights Alcyon/Gorges’s self-imposed exile from society and his lack of interest in other people’s opinion of him. This strategy simultaneously stresses the depth and genuineness of Alcyon/Gorges’ link to Daphne/Douglas and puts pressure on Alcyon’s pastoral community—the English court—to do its best to mend his grief.

Throckmorton is intended to signify his greater devotion to the Queen just as Alcyon’s failure to take cognizance of Ambrosia stresses his devotion to Daphne. However, whilst Ralegh’s silence marginalises the significance of his wife to him, Alcyon’s has, because of its juxtaposition with Daphne’s injunction to him to look after Ambrosia, paradoxically the opposite effect of stressing the centrality of his daughter. Another difference is that Alcyon’s frenzied fidelity to his absent patron can have no conceivable utility, much as he tries to convince himself that if he is good Daphne will arrange for him to die (lines 379-92).

Clemen’s description of the genre of the dramatic lament (1961, 211-52) includes many elements—the apostrophe to Fortune; the invocation to the gods; the inexpressibility topos; rhetorical questioning; the idea that the speaker’s grief is unique; the appeal to others for sympathy—found in Daphnaïda. Oram briefly compares Alcyon to the ‘overreachers of Elizabethan drama’, mentioning, too, affinities with pastoral love complaint (1981, 144-5; 1989, 487).

Pastoral elegy, of which Spenser’s ‘November’ (Spenser 1912, 460-3) is a paradigmatic instance, sometimes uses a vision of the beloved to help the mourner to realise that the loved one is in heaven and need not be mourned. Colin’s elegy for Dido in ‘November’ ends with his confident vision of Dido in the Elysian fields (lines 175-202). In Daphnaïda, Alcyon projects onto this pastoral convention two very different visions of lost beloveds from The Book of the Duchess (Alcyone’s vision of Ceyx and the man in black’s vision of White27), producing a distorted version of the climax of ‘November’.

The core of Alcyon’s complaint, his memory of Daphne on her deathbed (lines 253-94) and the following eight stanzas (lines 295-357), is made up of bits and pieces taken from ‘November’ and The Book of the Duchess. Like the man in black, unlike the ‘professional’ Colin (Kay 1990, 31), Alcyon is a mourning widower, who enters into dialogue with the poem’s narrator. His vision of his beloved, is, like the man in black’s, based on the memory of her when alive. Its focus on the moment of the beloved’s death, however, has more in common with Colin’s elegy and Alcyone’s vision of Ceyx than with the man in black’s potent recreation of the living White. The name ‘Alcyon’ is an

---

26 Chaucer 1987, 329-46. Daphnaïda’s use of The Book of the Duchess was first pointed out by Nadal (1908). Most critics who have compared the two poems (e.g. Berlin 1966; Harris and Steffen 1978; Oram 1983) argue that Chaucer’s poem is consolatory while Spenser’s is not.

27 Like Daphnaïda, The Book of the Duchess has a narrator who encounters a grieving husband—Chaucer’s in a dream, Spenser’s in a Winter landscape. In Chaucer’s poem, though, that encounter is preceded by the image of another mourner whose story Chaucer’s narrator reads before going to sleep, Alcyone, widow of the drowned King Ceyx. The Book of the Duchess engineers a parallel between its two mourners’ coming to awareness of the reality of their loved one’s death. Alcyone, uncertain of Ceyx’s fate, is confronted with her dead husband’s animated body telling her not to mourn (lines 195-211). The mourner inside the dream, the man in black, comes gradually, by means of an elaborate dialogue with Chaucer’s narrator, to an awareness of the reality of his beloved’s death. The blazon through which the man in black reconstructs the memory of his dead love White (lines 848-1041) parallels Alcyon’s vision of Ceyx: memory of the beloved in both cases eases the pain of loss. Neither Alcyone nor the man in black transcends their grief by means of the vision of the lost beloved. Alcyone’s Ovidian speech and metamorphosis are, significantly, omitted by Chaucer, whilst there is no time at the end of the poem, as the narrator’s dream ends, for the man in black to think about his response to his memorial reconstruction of White. In each case, something positive seems to
obvious link to Chaucer's Alcyone. Both Alcyon and Alcyone complain bitterly after the vision of the dead lover. Alcyone's complaint, present in Chaucer's Ovidian source, is omitted in *The Book of the Duchess*—Alcyon's complaint in *Daphnaiida* makes good the omission. In general, Alcyon's encounter with Daphne is, like its analogues in *The Book of the Duchess*, charged with personal emotion and a vivid sense of physical presence. Like all three of its analogues it is positioned in close proximity to a complaint. However, whilst the complaints of the man in black and Colin *precede* the moment in which the death of the beloved is fully faced, and Alcyone's complaint is entirely absent from the text, Alcyon's complaint surrounds and is nurtured by the vision of Daphne. There is no hint of the consolation that, implicit in the elaborately-terraced strategies of *The Book of the Duchess*, is such a key feature of 'November'.

The centre of Alcyon's complaint is a tragic reshaping of the elegiac structure of the last part of 'November'. Both poems cover roughly the same ground, though in a different order and with different emphases. The basic pattern is straightforward:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'November'</th>
<th>Daphnaiida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree image</td>
<td>Tree image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lines 83-92)</td>
<td>(lines 239-45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory of Dido alive</td>
<td>Memory of Daphne's deathbed; failed consolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lines 93-112)</td>
<td>(lines 251-92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mourning; pathetic fallacy</td>
<td>Memory of Daphne alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lines 113-52)</td>
<td>(295-315)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory of dead Dido; successful consolation</td>
<td>Mourning; pathetic fallacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lines 153-201)</td>
<td>(lines 316-54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

have been achieved through the reappearance of the beloved, though exactly what its significance is remains mysterious. For the debate among Chaucer critics see Chaucer 1987, 966-76.

28 The effect is heightened by the pastoral context of Alcyon's lament, which builds in the generic expectation of consolation. The primary function of Ceyx's appearance to Alcyone is to inform her of his death. In *Daphnaiida*, though, the entire point of Daphne's speech is to tell Alcyone not to be sorry for her death and to devote his life to the care of Ambrosia.
Colin’s first memory of Dido as a living woman entertaining the shepherds ‘With cakes and cracknells and such country chere’ (line 96) leads into an account of how all the shepherds and all nature mourn her (lines 113-52). His song is rooted in an awareness of the pastoral community as a whole, whose sorrow at Dido’s death he tries to banish by means of his vision of her in the Elysian fields (lines 153-201). Alcyon’s first memory of Daphne is of a dying woman offering him consolation for her death (lines 251-92). Failing to be consoled, he only then remembers her in her prime, among the other shepherds and shepherdesses (295-315). Aggressively commanding nature and the shepherds to mourn Daphne (lines 316-54), he proceeds in the rest of his complaint to a denunciation of everything in the universe, alienating himself in extremis from the pastoral community.

The means by which Alcyon suddenly remembers Daphne’s activity in the pastoral community are crucial. Remembering her on her deathbed he contrasts first her words (lines 295-301), then her face (lines 302-308), with her words and demeanour at the time of their courtship (‘How happie was I then, and wretched now?’ (line 308)). It is at this point that he suddenly remembers Daphne dancing and singing in public:

```
How happie was I, when I saw her leade
The Shepheards daughters dauncing in a rownd?
How trimly would she trace and softly tread
The tender grasse with rosie garland crownd?
And when she list aduance her heauenly voyce,
Both Nymphs and Muses nigh she made astownd,
And flocks and shepheards caused to reioyce. (lines 309-15)
```

This is an important moment in the poem, for it is Alcyon’s bitter reaction to Daphne’s absence from the pastoral community (‘But now ye Shepheard lasses, who shall lead/Your wandering troupes, or sing your virelayes?’(lines 316-7)) that prompts in him the rage against the universe that engulfs the rest of his complaint and confirms him in his
self-imposed alienation from society.\textsuperscript{29} There is a significant gap in the text here. Whilst Alcyon openly considers the state of Daphne’s words and face during her final illness, the description of Daphne dancing stands alone; it is not contrasted by Alcyon with the stillness of her dying body or the weakness of her limbs. Behind Alcyon’s extreme grief at this point is, I think, brute historical fact. Douglas Howard, it seems, had been paralysed for some years before her death, a circumstance Thomas Howard tried to exploit in his lawsuit by arguing that Douglas had been physically incapable of bearing a child. In 1591 Douglas’s mother gave evidence about the condition of her daughter’s limbs:

\begin{quote}
Lady frances howard reported that her daughter Dowglas went nere two yeres wth a tympanye & often during that tyyme was trobled wth a most grievous ache, which withered all her lower partes from the girdle downe that she could not move her self but where her legges were laid they continued till they were removed by others: & so borne to & fro her bedd: And her sinewes so shroonk, that her heeles were shroonke neere vp to her buttocks, which could not be drawne out untill she dyed. (DRO D10/L8).
\end{quote}

It is from this horrifying sight, I think—this suppressed vision of Daphne at the heart of the poem’s clientage strategies—that Alcyon recoils between lines 308 and 309 of \textit{Daphnaïda}.\textsuperscript{30}

\subsection*{1.3. \textit{Daphnaïda} and Gorges’s \textit{Vannetyes and Toyes}}

In constructing the figure of Alcyon, Spenser used Gorges’s poetry. Much of Alcyon’s complaint can be linked to passages in the \textit{Vannetyes and Toyes}, Gorges’s manuscript ‘auto-anthology’ (Chapter 3.1). The name ‘Daphne’ is used, though infrequently, in

\textsuperscript{29} Alcyon’s immediate response is to curse the pastoral setting vacated by Daphne: ‘Let Bagpipe neuer more be heard to shrill/That may allure the senses to delight ... Let birds be silent on the naked spray,/And shady woods resound with dreadful yells’ (lines 323-4; 330-1).

\textsuperscript{30} An obvious contrast can be made with the way in which Colin in ‘November’ openly confronts Dido’s dead body and from that confrontation wins consolation (lines 158-66). It is also perhaps worth
Gorges's poetry, though whether Gorges consistently used this name to stand for Douglas is doubtful—Steven W. May has recently argued that the Douglas-Daphne equation is tantamount to a Spenserian invention. The name 'Alcyon', meanwhile, though not ever used by Gorges himself, argues knowledge of the *Vannetyes and Toyes*. Alcyone's story in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* closely parallels the stories of the *Heroides*, a key source for Gorges's longer lyrics (see Chapter 3.1.4). As much of Gorges's male-voice poetry cannibalises female-voiced complaint, Spenser's choice of a name for Gorges that is the masculine form of the name of an archetypal female Ovidian complainant is entirely appropriate. The intemperance of Alycon's rhetoric, meanwhile, seems to owe something to Gorges's poetry in the *Vannetyes and Toyes*. Alcyon's monotonous lists—

I hate to speake, my voice is spent with crying:
I hate to heare, lowd plaintes haue duld mine eares:
I hate to tast, for food withholds my dying: (lines 413-5)

—have affinities with similarly iterative 'drab' structures in the *Vannetyes and Toyes* (e.g. poems 12, 20, 39). Alcyon's resolution to hide himself away in grief is reminiscent of several of Gorges's poems, most particularly poems 1 and 53. In poem 1 the speaker, like Alycon dressed in black (line 10), hides in 'some sollytarye walke' (line 27) where he prays to the gods for death (lines 37-42). In poem 53 (suggested as a source for *Daphnaïda* by May 1991, 108) the lover's description of himself sounds like a description of Alcyon: 'Uppon my shoulders hanges the moorenynge Blacke/My feltred lockes doo overshadye my face' (lines 9-10). Spenser's 'She fell away in her first ages remembering the importance attached by Elizabethan preachers at funerals to the physical presence, the 'spectacle', of the corpse (Tromly 1983, 299-300).

31 'Spenser expanded the fictional personae of Gorges's lyrics beyond anything which can be reasonably be inferred about the author's own intentions for the characterization of either himself or his wife' (May 1991, 109). Some of the *Vannetyes and Toyes* are marked with a 'D', possibly as a means of identifying poems written for Douglas/Daphne for the benefit of Spenser or some other reader. See Chapter 3.1.3.
spring,/Whil'st yet her leafe was greene' (lines 239-40) echoes poem 1’s ‘whose leafe
doeth fall amydste his sprynge’ (line 12; see Sandison 1953, 184). The wish to die,
pervasive in Alcyon’s complaint, is a major theme in Gorges’s lyrics (e.g. poems 12, 25,
26, 86). Gorges sometimes, like Alcyon, looks forward with pleasure to his death, linking
it to the will of his beloved and spiritual progress (e.g. poem 41, lines 11-4; poem 1, lines
40-2). Both Gorges and Alcyon call their beloved a ‘saint’ (poem 52, line 7; Daphnaïda,
lines 379-85). Both Spenser and Gorges link Douglas Howard to the ‘lion’ of the Howard
family arms (poem 26, line 104; Daphnaïda, dedication (Spenser 1912, 528) and lines
106-82). Both praise the ‘worthy’ or ‘noble’ mind of the beloved (poem 29, line 4;
Daphnaïda, line 216). Both associate the loved one with the primrose (poem 94, line 36;
poem 98, line 48; Daphnaïda, line 233 (see Sandison 1953, 221)). Gorges is, in one of his
poems, addressed, like Alcyon—as if in a vision—by his beloved and told not to despair
(poem 10; Daphnaïda, lines 260-94). Two of Gorges’s poems, moreover, like
Daphnaïda, have a pastoral framework (poems 44, 98), one of them featuring ‘Daphnae’
(poem 44, line 10).

Intriguingly, Daphnaïda also echoes poetry attributed to Ralegh. Lines 372-8
paraphrase Ralegh’s ‘Like to hermite poor’ (Littledale 1903; Rollins 1929). One
possibility is that Spenser read Gorges’s poems in a manuscript also containing Ralegh’s
work and mistakenly thought ‘Like to hermite poor’ was by Gorges; another possibility is
that the allusion simply registers Ralegh’s and Gorges’s community of interests.
Alternatively, the poem, whose attribution to Ralegh, is not particularly secure (Rudick
1971), may be by Gorges (cf. Chapter 3.1.6).
In *Colin Clovts Come home againe*, Colin mentions Alcyon,\(^\text{32}\) ‘bent to mourn’, ‘Whose gentle spright for *Daphnes* death doth tourn/Sweet layes of loue to endlesse plaints of pittie’ (Spenser 1912, 540, lines 384, 386-7). For *Daphnaïda*, Spenser reshapes the material of Gorges’s love lyrics into elegy, thus himself ‘turning’ Gorges/Alcyon’s ‘Sweet layes of loue to endlesse plaints of pittie’. It is possible, though, that this process was initiated by Gorges, and that it is to Gorges’s rewriting of his own lyrics as an elegy or elegies for Douglas (now lost) that Colin refers. (Gorges certainly rewrote love lyric as elegy later in his career (see section 3 below.) The most important sources for Alcyon’s lament may therefore be no longer extant.

2. ‘A pastorall unfynyshed’

In *Colin Clovts Come home againe*, Spenser revisits Gorges’s bereavement. Colin’s roll-call of poets at Cynthia’s court includes Alcyon:

\begin{verbatim}
And there is sad Alcyon bent to monme, Though fit to frame an everlasting dittie, Whose gentle spright for Daphnes death doth tourn Sweet layes of loue to endless plaints of pittie, Ah pensive boy pursue that braue conceipt, In thy sweet Eglantine of meriflure, Lift vp thy notes vnto their wonted height, That may thy muse and mates to mirth allure. (lines 384-391)\(^\text{33}\)
\end{verbatim}

Spenser had depicted Gorges/Alcyon in *Daphnaïda* as adapting his love poetry to serve an elegiac purpose—here he asks him to redirect his poetic energy and complete a different type of text. The piece Spenser refers to, embodying the ‘braue conceipt’ of ‘sweet Eglantine of meriflure’, is ‘A pastorall unfynyshed’ (Sandison 1953, poem 100), a

---

\(^{32}\) Quoted more fully in section 2 below.
poem copied by Gorges himself into BL MS Egerton 3165—his ‘auto-anthology’—as a pendant to the Vanmetyes and Toyes. In this incomplete poem Gorges presents the reader with the image of a mourning shepherd who manages to redirect his devotion from his ‘loste love’ (line 6) to ‘Eglantine of Meriflure’, a figure for Queen Elizabeth.\[^{34}\] The poem embeds within a brief narrative preface the song of ‘a sober Ladd’:

*Dianas darlinges in a rownde*  
sate twyninge garlonds on the grownde  
whylst in the mydst of them there playde  
on Evory harpe a sober Ladd,  
with noates full sweete and lookes full sadd,  
As on for loste love much dismayde

*He seemde to bee summ Jollye swayne*  
by his attyre of floras trayne  
his roabe was woven Jessamyne,  
a chapylett uppon hys heade  
Composde of roses whyte and redd  
And in the topp an Eglantyne.

*Of flowres he sange the sundry kyndes*  
the Prymrose and the sweet woodbynds  
the marygold that loves the Sunn  
the paynted Paunce the Eyes delyght  
The violet that cheares the spryghts  
The Hyacinth so woe begunn.

*But when of Eglantyne he spake*  
his strynges mellodiously he strake  
The Albion flowre so fayer so pure  
whose Excellen[c] dothe well declare  
Whatt worthy braunch thys blossom bare  
She woonnes in plesaunte Meryfleur

*Greate flora Sommers Soveraygne queene*  
to make hyr glory to us seene  
from paradys dyd fetch this flowre  
It fyrst was planted in that place  
and after grafte in humane race  
But styll enspyred with heavenly powre.

---

\[^{33}\] Later on the Lady Marquis is allegorised as ‘Mansilia’, ‘the paterne of true womanhead,/And onely mirror of feminitie:/Worthie next after Cynthia to tread,/As she is next her in nobilitie’ (lines 512-15). For the name ‘Mansilia’ see Sandison 1927.

\[^{34}\] ‘Meriflure’ was a tower, rebuilt by Henry VIII, in Greenwich park (Sandison 1962). Sandison originally proposed (1953, 225-7) that Gorges started writing ‘A pastorall unfynyshed’ in praise of Douglas when she was still alive, a view later retracted (1962). For Queen Elizabeth and the eglantine see Strong 1977, 68-71.
Then hyr hye lynage lowde he rynges
deryyved from the Dardane kynges
descendinge to the conqueringe lyne
wheare stately stryff he doothe recyte
betweene the redd rose and the whyte
apeasde in thys brave Eglantyne.

etc

'A pastorall unfynyshed' was probably written after 1 January 1590/1 (the date of the dedication of *Daphnaïda*) and before Spenser returned to Ireland later the same year. (Spenser dated the dedication of *Colin Clovts Come home againe* 27 December 1591 'From my house at Kilcolman' (Spenser 1912, 536.).) ‘A pastorall unfynyshed’ clearly takes its cue from *Daphnaïda* (see below) and must antedate in some shape or form Spenser’s reference to it in *Colin Clovts Come home againe*. Its central aim, it is clear, was to stage the transfer of Alcyon/Gorges’s allegiance from Daphne/Douglas to Queen Elizabeth. The poem’s ultimate audience, presumably, would have been the Queen herself, Gorges assuming in her a knowledge of *Daphnaïda*’s melancholy ‘Alcyon’. The poem’s context must have been an improvement of some sort in Gorges’s situation, probably in his legal tussle with the Howards—one possibility is that the pastoral was written shortly after October 6, 1591, the date on which Ambrosia was established by inquisition to be Douglas’s true heir (BL MS Lansdowne. 43, f.59, cited in Sandison 1928, 651).38

The text of the poem in the Egerton manuscript looks like a transcription up to and including ‘the’ in line 32. The last few lines, however, seem to have been added at the

---

35 Gorges started to write ‘Troyan’ here, but only got as far as the first two letters before substituting ‘Dardane’ (Croft 1973, 17-18).
36 Changed by Gorges from ‘cyvyll’, presumably in an attempt to make civil war more respectable.
37 Steven W. May reads the pastoral as presenting the reader with a depiction of Gorges at court: ‘Dianas darlings’ (line 1) represent Elizabeth’s maids of honour (1991, 82) whilst the sober lad ‘is the pastoral equivalent of Gorges on duty in the Presence Chamber’ among them (1991, 112).
time of composition (Sandison 1953, 225) and the word 'unfynyshed' was added to the title some time after the first transcription (Sandison 1953, 124). It seems likely that Gorges wrote lines 1-31 and the first part of line 32 some time after reading *Daphnaïda*, then transcribed them into the Egerton manuscript as a poignant sequel to the poems he had used to woo 'Daphne'. It is possible that he intended the poem to bring the *Vannetyes and Toyes* sequence to a happy conclusion (see Chapter 3.1.5, no.6). The addition of the final four and a bit lines show that Gorges intended at the time of transcription to complete the poem. Having failed—a second time—to perfect his 'braue conceipt', Gorges presumably then added the word 'unfynyshed' to the title (Sandison 1953, 225).

Spenser could have seen the poem at any stage, though it is tempting to assume that he saw it just after its initial transcription in the Egerton manuscript and that Gorges’s last attempt to finish it was made just after reading *Colin Clovts Come home againe*.

‘A pastorall unfynyshed’ is, in effect, a reply to *Daphnaïda*. Eglantine’s celebrant is clearly Alcyon: ‘summ Jolly swaine’ (line 7) echoes the description of Alcyon in *Daphnaïda*, line 54 as ‘the jollie Shepheard swaine’, whilst the reference to the sober lad’s ‘noates full sweete and lookees full sadd’ (line 5) looks like a response to Colin’s injunction to Alycon in *Colin Clovts Come home againe* to ‘Lift vp thy notes vnto their wonted height’ (line 390). Gorges’s poem confronts Alcyon’s grief-stricken memory of Daphne’s dancing and singing in *Daphnaïda*, the focus of his melancholy (see section 1.2, above):

> How happie was I, when I saw her leade

38 This would mean that Spenser returned later to Ireland than is generally thought. The date of Spenser's return to Ireland is uncertain (Smith and de Selincourt 1912, xxxi, n.1).

39 Sandison's suggestion that Spenser echoes Gorges here, rather than *vice versa* (1953, 226), is the result of a theory about the composition of the pastoral later withdrawn (Sandison 1962). See note 34 above.
The Shepheards daughters in a rownd?
How trimly would she trace and softly tread
The tender grasse with rosie garland crownd?
And when she list aduance her heavenly voyce,
Both Nymphs and Muses nigh she made astownd,
And flockes and shepheards to reioyce.

But now ye Shepheard lasses, who shall lead
Your wandring troupes, or sing your virelayes?
Or who shall dight your bowres, sith she is dead
That was the Lady of your holy dayes?
Lett now your blisse be turned into bale,
And into plaints conuert your ioyous playes,
And with the same fill euery hill and dale. (lines 309-322)

Gorges approached his rewriting of these lines by way of Spenser’s ‘Aprill’ from The Shepheardes Calender (Spenser 1912, 431-5). In ‘Aprill’, Hobbinol, lamenting the vain love for Rosalind that has sapped Colin Clout’s poetic energy, sings a ‘laye’ made by Colin before the crisis in praise of ‘fayre Eliza, Queen of shepheardes all’ (line 34):

See, where she sits vpon the grassie greene,
(O seemely si^ t)
Yclad in Scarlot like a mayden Queene,
And Ermines white.
Vpon her head a Cremosin coronet,
With Damaske roses and Daffodillies set:
    Bayleaves betweene,
And primroses greene
Embellish the sweete Violet. (lines 55-63)

Colin’s song in ‘Aprill’ serves as a pattern for the embedded song in Gorges’s pastoral. Both are ‘sung’ by a shepherd in praise of the Queen. However, in Gorges’s poem it is the singer and not the object of his song who is crowned with a rosy coronet. Gorges is placing himself (or ‘Alcyon’) in the position previously occupied by ‘Daphne’: he wears ‘a rosie garland’, and sings ‘virelayes’ at the head of a group of maidens, just as she did. The poem provides an upbeat answer to Alcyon’s bitter question, ‘But now ye Shepheard lasses, who shall lead/Your wandring troupes, or sing your virelayes?’ (lines 316-7). The transition in ‘Aprill’ from ‘loste love’ to royal panegyric is, meanwhile, relocated in real
time, as a genuine, chronological progression. (Colin's song, though coming at the end of
the eclogue, is temporally prior to the dialogue of Thenot and Hobbinoll.) Colin moves
from worthwhile praise of Eliza to profitless agonising over his mistress, whilst
Alcyon/Gorges/ the 'sober Ladd' moves in the opposite direction, away from profitless
grief at the loss of his beloved towards royal panegyric. Whilst 'Aprill' laments the
failure of Colin's poetic gift, Gorges's pastoral celebrates, or aims to celebrate, the
rebudding of Alcyon's.

The 'song' starts mournfully as the 'sober Ladd', 'with...lookes full sadd', 'much
dismayde' for 'lost love' (lines 4-6), recalls flowers—primrose, woodbine and violet
(lines 13-18)—closely associated with Gorges's lost 'Daphne' (Gorges 1953, poem 94,
lines 35-6; poem 98, lines 47-8). The tone changes however when in the fourth stanza he
turns his attention to the eglantine, who 'woonnes in plesaunte Meryfleur' (line 24). The
eglantine clearly stands for Queen Elizabeth (Sandison 1962; note 34 above). As the song
switches its attention from the dead 'Daphne' to the living 'Eliza', its gloom lifts ('his
stringes mellodiously he strake' (line 20)). Stanza five amplifies the praise of Elizabeth
using Spenser's account of the origins of the rose (The Faerie Queene (Spenser 1912),
3.5.52):

Eternall God in his almighty powre,
To make ensample of his heauenly grace,
In Paradize whilome did plant this flowre,
Whence he it fetcht out of her natiue place,
And did in stocke of earthly flesh enrace.
That mortall men her glory should admire:
In gentle Ladies brest, and bounteous race
Of woman kind it fairest flowre doth spire,
And beareth fruit of honour and all chast desire.
Spenser's lines follow the description of Timias's involuntary love for Belphoebe. Belphoebe spared no pains in applying restoratives to Timias's wounds, yet refused to give him the rose of her chastity:

that sweet Cordiall, which can restore  
A loue-sick hart, she did to him enuy;  
To him, and to all th'vnworthy world forlore  
She did enuy that soueraigne salue, in secret store.

That dainty Rose, the daughter of her Mome,  
More deare then life she tendered, whose flowre  
The girland of her honour did adome: (3.5.50.6-51.3)

The rose here stands for Belphoebe's, and thus implicitly, Queen Elizabeth's, maidenhead, denied to her plaintful suitor, Timias. As Timias is very often glossed by critics as a representation of Ralegh, it is tempting to argue that Gorges intends an allusion here—perhaps something in the nature of a private joke—to the nature of Ralegh's relationship with Elizabeth. Perhaps, even, it was these lines which led Colin Clout to speak of the poem as something that would provoke 'mirth'. It is significant, anyway, that it is at this point that the pastoral begins to run out of steam. When, in the next stanza, Gorges attempts to move beyond the quotation from Spenser and frame his own panegyric for Elizabeth, his inspiration quickly dries up. He begins to link the red and white roses in the singer's garland to the roses of York and Lancaster (lines 34-5), translating pastoral into state propaganda, but the poem then comes to an abrupt halt.

The poem's opening strategy is skillful: Gorges eases the transition from one patron-figure to another by limiting his reference to the first patron-figure, his 'lost love' Daphne, to a list of flowers associated with her. This allows the 'sober Ladd' to move

---

40 Sandison argues that this stanza was added to an earlier draft of the poem lacking it, suggesting that 'the shift to detached platonic sentiment and then back to shepherd song is too abrupt to allow any other explanation' (1953, 225).
seamlessly into praise of a flower associated with the second patron and thence into a more detailed panegyric of Elizabeth, without having to confront the memory of his 'loste love' in any detail. Yet, having cleverly set up the structure of his poem, Gorges fails, for reasons unknown (incompetence? grief? boredom?) to carry it through. Significantly, though, the change of direction represented by ‘A pastorall unfynyshed’ persists through Gorges’s later poetry, nearly all of which is dedicated overtly, like ‘Eglantine of Meriflure’ to the praise of royal or noble persons.⁴¹

2. The Olympian Catastrophe

More than twenty years after the publication of Daphnaida, Gorges’s grief at the death of a patron-figure formed the basis of another long poem. Prince Henry’s death in 1612 left Gorges in a precarious situation, without an obvious patron to turn to (Chapter 1.2). Like many other writers (Wilson 1946, 144-68), Gorges wrote an elegy for Henry, in which he attempted to come to terms with his loss and his need for a new patron. Gorges’s poem, however, The Olympian Catastrophe, differs from the other elegies for Henry in being a Spenserian chivalric narrative. In it, Gorges simultaneously addresses the problematic situation facing him in the wake of Henry’s death and looks back to Daphnaida.⁴²

The Olympian Catastrophe, unpublished until the twentieth century (Gorges 1925), exists in only one manuscript, Huntington Library MS Ellesmere 1130, a scribal copy

---

⁴¹ See Chapter 3.2 for Gorges’s later short poetry and section 3 below for The Olympian Catastrophe.
⁴² The most enthusiastic recent reader of The Olympian Catastrophe is Dennis Kay (1990, 144-8), who concludes that ‘Gorges’s longest and most ambitious original work is more than a repository of elegiac commonplaces: it is a fitting culmination to his eclectic and serious-minded career’ (148).
with a heavy sprinkling of corrections, some in Gorges’s hand. The poem is set at the Olympian games, the stage for the glorious exploits of a young prince, evidently Henry. Framing the account of the games is a quarrel between three goddesses, Bellona, Minerva and Juno. Each claims ownership of the Prince of Wales’s triple plume, Bellona asserting it to be ‘the badge of Mart’ (line 26), Minerva claiming that ‘the quills weare instruments of art’ (line 28), Juno arguing that arts and arms both owe homage to the crown, bestowed by her. On the first day of the games, Henry wins the prize for running at the ring (lines 165-7). That night in his dreams an old man shows him the underworld. The prince and his attendants discuss dreams and omens, including a rainbow seen that night by a squire (lines 217-318). On the second day of the games the prince fights two opponents, the first honourable and worthy, the second a proud knight with ‘Without Compare’ written on his breast. ‘Without Compare’ is brought close to death, but loses everyone’s sympathy when he is revealed to be the Prince of Antioch, a ‘hellhownd’ Turk (line 582). The fighting at barriers takes place without the Prince. Night falls again and the argument between the three goddesses rages. In pique, Minerva goes to take back her quills, only to bump into Atropos (‘Atrops’), whose wrists are stained with blood. Henry’s thread has been cut. Juno blames the goddesses’ quarrel for the catastrophe which has taken place and rails against Atropos. Atropos’s answer—that the Prince’s death has at least prevented him from being a bad king—fails to satisfy Juno. Gorges describes the reaction of England to the princes’s death, quoting Princess Elizabeth’s lament, before the reader is returned to the three goddesses, who decide to remove their quills, plume and crown from mortal eyes. At the last moment, they choose instead to bestow them on Prince Charles ‘To grace

43 I have not been able to see this manuscript and have worked from Sandison’s text (1953, 135-82).
therewith a second Charlemayne’ (line 1122). Juno begs Jove to grant Charles a long life, but Jove declares himself unable to alter his ‘unchangeable decree’ (l. 1165).

Gorges’s intentions for the Ellesmere manuscript are obscure. Its careful preparation has been taken to suggest that it was originally meant to be a presentation manuscript. The corrections which were made to it, however, many of them very untidy, involving excisions and paste-ons, led Sandison to argue that scribal and authorial intentions for the manuscript changed over time:

[The scribe] at first believed that he was producing a fair copy, as some of his meticulous self-correction proves; but soon he knew better. He and his master must have gone through the transcript together at least once, the scribe perhaps following oral orders given at the moment, the author contributing his inextensive changes, and a few pencilled signals at a spelling now corrected or a metrically deficient line; one wonders whether the revising hand ... was disabled for anything beyond brief and easy entries. Between them, the two finally produced a manuscript ready only for a fresh copy, or for printing (Sandison 1953, 1)

Harold Love convincingly argues that the Ellesmere text was intended from the first as ‘an authorially supervised master copy’ (1993, 48), designed to be used in the preparation of multiple copies of the poem. Love points out that late-seventeenth-century scriptorium master-copies, like The Olympian Catastrophe, were revised using excisions and paste-ons, and argues that ‘The only conceivable use for such a manuscript would be as an exemplar for others’ (49). Love’s view is supported by the fact that Trinity College, Cambridge MS R. 7.23* (Prince Henry’s Copybooks 3), presented by Gorges to Henry in 1610, has a clean, uncorrected text, as does National Maritime Museum MS LEC/8, a manuscript originally in the collection at Petworth House, inscribed ‘Given by Sir Arthur Gorges’. BL MS Stowe 426, meanwhile, is a heavily corrected scribal copy, presumably
used, like the Ellesmere manuscript, as ‘an exemplar for others’. BL MS Egerton 3165, the manuscript preserving Gorges’s personal collection of his shorter poetry, seems to have fulfilled a similar function in its later life (see Chapter 3.1.5).

*The Olympian Catastrophe* is preceded by dedicatory poems to Anne of Denmark and to Elizabeth, Countess Palatine, both of them, according to Sandison, added to the manuscript after the initial transcription. As first copied, *The Olympian Catastrophe* itself was preceded by just one poem, ‘To the Reader’ (Gorges 1953, 138), copied on the first recto to follow the original title-page. That title-page was, however, at some point pasted to the verso of an immediately preceding flyleaf. The poem to Anne was then transcribed on the recto of the flyleaf and, at a later stage, the poem to Elizabeth was copied on the verso of the original (now pasted-down) title-page, facing ‘To the Reader’. A new title-page was made out of a second, preceding flyleaf (Sandison 1953, li-lii). The preliminaries of *The Olympian Catastrophe*, then, if Sandison’s analysis is accurate, went through three stages:

1. ‘To the Reader’
2. Poem to Anne; ‘To the Reader’
3. Poem to Anne; poem to Elizabeth; ‘To the Reader’

The narrative is followed by three poems: ‘The Author to his Muse’; ‘Sonet To his Entombed Bodye’ and ‘The Lamentation of Richmond’ (Gorges 1953, 181-2). The third of these seems to have been added at a later stage (Sandison 1953, 239), possibly coevaly with the addition of the poems either to Elizabeth or Anne.

---

44 For more on these three manuscripts see Chapter 5. The Ellesmere manuscript used to be in the Bridgewater library. Sandison suggests (1953, xlix) that it reached Lord Chancellor Ellesmere through his wife, aunt by marriage to Gorges’s daughter Elizabeth.
The obvious explanation for all this is that Gorges revised the poem’s dedicatory strategy for different copyists. Perhaps two of the copies made were presented to Anne and Elizabeth respectively, Anne’s copy including just the poem to her, Elizabeth’s including both dedicatory poems. The final ‘Lamentation for Richmond’, a poem adapted from one of Gorges’s *Vannetyes and Toyes* (Gorges 1953, poem 65), was perhaps added at the same time as the poem to Elizabeth, to commemorate Elizabeth’s, Henry’s and Gorges’s connections with Richmond and Kew. A late dedication to Elizabeth is perhaps confirmed by the odd fact that Elizabeth is described as a virgin in the narrative of *The Olympian Catastrophe* yet feted as a married woman in the dedicatory poem (Sandison 1953, 237).

Gorges’s original intention for the ‘publication’ of his poem seems, then, not to have involved a dedication to a living patron. The title-page make it clear that the poem’s patron is dead: the poem is, it says, ‘*Dedicated to the worthy memory of the most Heroical Lord Henry, late illustrious Prince of Wales. &c.*’ (Gorges 1953, 136). Without a dedication the poem could have circulated in published form (either printed or manuscript) to Gorges’s advantage, depicting him as an insider struck dumb by Henry’s death and not ready to seek further patronage, a rough duplication of Spenser’s strategy in constructing the figure of Alcyon for *Daphnaida* (see section 1.1). In both cases, the bereaved client is presented as being so wrapped up in grief at the loss of his old patron

---

45 See Chapter 1.2. Sandison thinks that the poem is out of place, and that it was originally written to commemorate Queen Elizabeth’s death at Richmond (1953, 238-9). Gorges started living at Kew in about 1602, so he would have been nearby at the time of Queen Elizabeth’s death (the manor of Richmond, of which Kew was a part, had been granted to his uncle Sir Thomas Gorges in 1597). Gorges may well have adapted the poem to Richmond to commemorate Elizabeth’s death. It is suitable for Henry, too, though, for Henry had been granted the manor on Sir Thomas’s death in 1610, and often went there to visit his sister Elizabeth, chief mourner of *The Olympian Catastrophe* and a neighbour of Gorges in Kew.
that he is unable to think of a new one. ‘To the Reader’ states outright that Gorges does not seek to gain anything by his writing:

No praise for Poesie do I affect
Nor flatteries hoped meed doth me encite
Such base borne thoughts, as servile I reject
Sorrow doth dictate, what my zeale doth write (Gorges 1953, 138, lines 1-4)47

Later, The Olympian Catastrophe presents Gorges as struck into incapacity by Henry’s death. His muse is ‘fainting’ and can only dictate ‘bleedinge layes’ (line 9). ‘To the Reader’ promises that The Olympian Catastrophe will be the last poem Gorges writes (‘Which Antheam sunge, my Muse for ever sleepes’ (line 14)). At only one moment in the poem does Gorges mention his own grief at any length. Here, significantly, he stresses the difficulty he finds in finding the right words to ‘name’ England’s plight (line 1026):

My Muse did want her selfe my sence was nume.
My heart grew faint, my quicker power grew slow,
Myne eyes weare dimme, my tongue was taken dumbe,
My inke no longer from my penn would flowe,
For inke, tongue, eyes, power, hart, senc, muse, apawld,
Became thick dumbe dymme, slow, faint nume, and stald. (lines 1027-32)

‘The Author to his Muse’ (The Olympian Catastrophe, lines 1183-94), with its attack on ignorant readers, meanwhile very clearly positions The Olympian Catastrophe as a text open to public scrutiny. The aim of the ‘publication’ of The Olympian Catastrophe seems to have been to publicise Gorges’s grief to potential future patrons. Gorges’s self-presentation as someone temporarily outside the patronage system has a family resemblance to the strategies of two other ‘post-Henrician’ texts, the revised Islands Voyage and Sea-Service (Chapter 5.3) and Lvcans Pharsalia (Chapter 6.1.2).

46 This is the text of the revised title-page, which Sandison says ‘almost exactly reproduces the earlier one’ (1953, 135).
47 When this poem was revised in the Egerton manuscript collection of Gorges’s poetry, these lines were altered to refer simply to Gorges’s excessive grief (poem 107; Chapter 3.2). Cf. Kay’s comment (1990,
At the centre of The Olympian Catastrophe's strategies is a rewriting of the two poems in which Douglas Howard's death had been mourned twenty years before (see sections 1-2 above). Significantly, though, Gorges does not approach this project by the most obvious route. He does not himself occupy the role of Alycon written for him by Spenser and deployed in both Daphnaïda and ‘A Pastorall unfynyshed’. The point of The Olympian Catastrophe is to demonstrate its author’s incapacity for first-person lament. Gorges casts himself roughly in the role of Spenser’s narrator in Daphnaïda—an insider, intimate with the lives of great ones, tactful, sympathetic, unintrusive. The focus for Gorges’s and the reader’s sympathies in the poem is Princess Elizabeth, whose complaint (lines 1063-88) interpolates many reminiscences of Alycon’s complaint in Daphnaïda. Sandison suggests convincingly (1953, 237) that the manner in which the two texts are connected—Elizabeth echoes, successively, lines 491-7, 470-6, 392f, 243-4, 240f. and 211—shows that Gorges knew Alcyon’s lament by heart. Gorges aligns Elizabeth, his future patron (Chapter 6.1), with himself, giving her his words to grieve with. It is significant that Elizabeth’s lament does not contain the most reprehensible, selfish elements of Alcyon’s speech—she lacks Alcyon’s misanthropy and suicidal impulses.

The pain of loss in Daphnaïda is, I suggested in section 1.2, at its most acute when Alcyon remembers Daphne’s public appearance at court entertainments, leading the shepherds’ daughters ‘dauncing in a rownd ... with rosie garland crownd’ (lines 310, 312), and contrasts it with the dead Douglas’s withered limbs. In ‘A Pastorall unfynyshed’ (Gorges 1953, poem 100; section 2) Gorges writes himself (as Alcyon, the ‘sober Ladd’, line 4) into the position of the dancing Daphne, crowned with a rosy

---

142) on the use elegies for Henry make of ‘the developing vogue for self-conscious, often self-proclaimed
garland, singing the praises of Queen Elizabeth. Praise of the monarch, the pastoral tries to tell the reader, has now replaced personal grief. The Olympian Catastrophe returns to the abortive happy ending of ‘A Pastorall unfynyshed’ and unravels it, restaging Daphnaïda’s tragic juxtaposition between a court entertainment and the death of the patron at the centre of that entertainment.

The Olympian Catastrophe consists almost entirely of the unstated comparison between the courtly performance of Henry at the height of his powers and his dead body. The presence of Spenser’s poem in the text perhaps partly explains the odd way in which The Olympian Catastrophe shies away from the moment and the means of Henry’s death. At one moment the prince is dazzling everyone with his behaviour at the tilt; the next moment he is said to be, inexplicably, dead. No details are given: the prince’s death seems to exist in complete isolation from the events of his life which the poem has been chronicling.

Essentially, the entertainment described in The Olympian Catastrophe is the same as the entertainment mentioned in Daphnaïda and rewritten in ‘A Pastorall unfynyshed’. Henry is identified with both the dancing Daphne and the attempts of the ‘sober Ladd’ of Gorges’s unfinished pastoral to lance his grief by turning to royal panegyric. The prince first appears when the running at the ring is described. Gorges builds up to his appearance with a description of the troop of youths with lances on their way to set up the competition, which very closely echoes the opening of ‘A Pastorall unfynyshed’:

\[\text{sincerity}\].

48 It is possible, as Sandison suggests (1953, liv-lv), that parts of The Olympian Catastrophe preserve poetry written for an earlier entertainment, for Henry or/and for Queen Elizabeth. The poem’s bumpy narrative structure leads Sandison to propose that ‘The chivalric core may be of Spenser’s lifetime’ whilst ‘The framework of Olympian rivalry may have originated near 1610’ (liv), close to Henry’s investiture.
These seemd to bee fresh youthes of Flora's traine:
For with them they a gold bright garland bare
Contriv'd in flowers of pure enamels staine
So fyn, that art with nature did compare:
This as a prize to honor him they bringe,
That fayrest dooth and oftest take the ringe. (lines 121-6)

The maids of honour of Elizabeth’s court, amongst whom Alcyon sings (see section 2) have been replaced by the promising young men of Henry’s court. Gorges gives a description of the prince’s appearance which culminates in another passage rewritten from ‘A Pastorall unfynyshed’:

And yet all this his byrth no whitt bewrays,
But that which on his browne-curled locks he wore
Of Roses redd and white two wreathed sprays,
(Types of the Crowne-competitors of yore)
And both of these he had together Twynde:
Because in him both titles were combynde.

This made him knowne great Britaines Prince to be
A ryght Plantagynet of Royall race ... (lines 145-52)

Elsewhere in the poem, Gorges uses The Faerie Queene to build up his picture of Henry: the long passage describing Henry’s arming is adapted, as Sandison points out (lines 337-72), from Spenser’s description of Arthur at his first appearance in the poem (1.7.29f.). The context of Spenser’s description of Arthur helps explain Gorges’s programme in The Olympian Catastrophe. At this point in The Faerie Queene, Redcrosse is imprisoned by Orgoglio, the giant of pride. Arthur enters the poem to rescue Redcrosse from pride. The link Gorges makes between Henry and Spenser’s Arthur associates the prince with the defeat of pride. This is entirely appropriate, for this description of Henry’s arming opens Gorges’s account of the second day of the tournament, in which

---

49 Sandison (1953, 234-8) points out other Spenserian echoes at lines 189ff., 239-35, 392, 395, 458, 985-6, 1032 and 1183-94.
50 Henry is linked at this point to Redcrosse/St. George too, for he has ‘St. George his crosse enameld on his brest’ (354). For Henry and St. George see Williamson 1978, 28.
Henry defeats the Prince of Antioch, a victory which represents not just ‘the triumph of Christian chivalry over pagan deceitfulness’ (Kay 1990, 146) but also, and perhaps more importantly, Henry’s victory over the vice of ambitious pride. Antioch is throughout described as embodying excessive pride (he has ‘A proudswolne harte, that Christians held in skorne’ (line 585)), in marked contrast to Henry, whose modesty and lack of pompous pride Gorges goes out of his way to stress (e.g. lines 463-8). The Prince’s wry comment after knocking ‘Without Compare’ off his horse—‘So prid will have a fall’ (line 564)—sums it all up. Elsewhere in his writings for Henry, Gorges stresses the necessity for the prince to avoid ambitious pride (see Chapters 5 and 6.1.1), so it would make sense for Gorges to highlight the theme in *The Olympian Catastrophe*. 

In building up his description of Henry’s doomed entertainment, Gorges alludes, I think, to two real entertainments planned for Henry, both of which were, in different ways, disrupted and rendered imperfect. He also breaks down his own previous praise of Henry.

Essentially *The Olympian Catastrophe* is a masque-like court entertainment gone wrong. Many of the key elements of entertainments for Henry and poetic tributes to him are there, as Sandison points out (1953, lv-lvi). Its setting at a tournament recognises Henry’s passionate enthusiasm for warfare and chivalric festivals (Mulryne 1989; Strong

---

51 Perhaps this episode was originally intended to be the core of an entertainment and/or poem in praise of the living Henry. The episode can also be linked to many anti-Turkish elements in texts associated with Henry, as Sandison says (1953, 236).

52 Documented further in Sandison 1953, 233-7. Strong finds that *The Olympian Catastrophe* ‘reads like a handbook to the ideas and attitudes that motivated those who made up the Prince’s household during the years 1610-1612’ (1986, 41). A couple of extra details can be added. The poem’s solar imagery (lines 337-9; 358; 462; 853-8; 865-8) picks up on a major theme in tributes to Henry (see, e.g., Chapman’s *Memorable Masque*, ‘saturated ... with solar attributes’ (Strong 1986, 78)). Horse-racing was a great enthusiasm of Henry’s (Strong 1986, 63-6; Cornwallis 1641, C4r) and one of his riding-schools was at the monastery of
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The framework Gorges uses, the debate between Bellona, Minerva and Juno, is based on a conceit Gorges used to praise Henry during the Prince's lifetime. It occurs in a poem included in the set of heraldic conceits Gorges presented to the royal family in 1609/10 (Sandison 1953, poem 104; see Chapter 3.2) and also in Latin versesprefacing Gorges's *A Breefe Discourse*, presented to Henry the same year (see Chapter 5.2).

The *Olympian Catastrophe* has affinities with Chesters *Triumph In Honour of Her Prince* (London, 1610), which commemorates an event which had taken place on St. George's day that year. Like the *Olympian Catastrophe*, Chesters *Triumph* features horse-racing for the prize of bells and running at the ring. Wreaths were bestowed 'after the order of the Olimpian sportes, whereof these were an imitation' (Nichols 1828, 295). As in the *Olympian Catastrophe*, there is a strong anti-Turkish colouring, and in both texts Henry is explicitly linked with St. George. Henry was not present at this entertainment (Bergeron 1971, 92). The *Olympian Catastrophe* can be read as a rewriting of the absence of Henry from Chesters *Triumph* for, while Henry is present in the *Olympian Catastrophe's* masque, this presence is illusory: the masque is fictional and the occasion for its composition is the prince's death.

The *Olympian Catastrophe* also seems to be related to the *Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn*, one of the masques written for the marriage of Princess Elizabeth Sheen, Richmond Palace (Strong 1986, 65), near Gorges's home in Kew. Gorges gives the Prince a 'Turkey horse' (line 136; cf. line 110), reflecting Henry's enthusiasm for Barbary horses (Strong 1986, 66).

53 Henry was particularly interested in the French *tournoi à theme* (Strong 1986, 139-40), a genre which brought together fighting and allegory.

54 Christopher Brooke's *A funerall Elegie on the Prince* (1613) uses a similar idea, thinking of Mars and Minerva 'at iarre' (Nichols 1828, 181) for Henry's heart. Brooke also links Henry to Bellona (183), as well as to the Olympian games (184-5). Strong reproduces Inigo Jones's design for an *impresa* shield, possibly...
and Frederick, Elector Palatine. This masque, written by Francis Beaumont and organised by Bacon, opens with a contention between Iris and Mercury, emissaries respectively of Juno and Jove, over the right to celebrate the wedding. Iris gives way to Mercury, who announces that Jove’s will is to renew ‘the Olympian games/Which long have slept’ (Beaumont 1967, lines 268-269). Jupiter’s priests and the Olympian Knights are revealed, ready to start their games. However, no games take place, and the masque ends in a dance. Roy Strong suggests that the plan for Beaumont’s masque changed following Henry’s death:

what ended up as a masque may have begun as a device for a combat at the barriers, more in keeping with the Prince’s tastes and also with what the Inns had taken to court at an earlier date. Indeed, Beaumont’s highly militaristic masque of Olympian Knights would make far more sense with fighting at the barriers for the Olympic Games than a tame round of choreographed dances (Strong 1986, 180).56

The Olympian Catastrophe can be read as an attempt to stage this unstaged entertainment.

The reader is presented with the martial games absent from The Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray’s Inn. Significantly, too, Henry is central. In the course of the Olympian games, there is no reference to his father and nobody of higher status than the Prince watches Henry’s triumphs. In real life this would have been difficult. Strong points out that from 1610 on, reflecting James’s anxiety at Henry’s popularity, ‘every source points to the prince’s perpetual frustration in any attempt to present himself alone as the focus of public spectacle’ (1986, 153). The Olympian Catastrophe’s entertainment is wish-fulfilment, though: instead of actually being staged, its games form the basis of a fictional

for Henry (1986, plate 70), featuring two figures identified by Strong as Chivalry and Minerva which could equally well represent Bellona and Minerva.

55 Sandison lists other ‘Olympian’ texts connected with Henry (1953, 233).

56 None of the performed entertainments of 1613 ‘celebrates the match in quite the way that it was seen by the Prince’s party, as a militant, pan-Protestant European alliance to curb Habsburg power’ (Strong 1986, 177). For details of an aborted militantly Protestant masque see Strong 1986, 180-2; Norbrook 1986.
‘masque’ that acts as a memorial for Henry’s death. Henry is central to *The Olympian Catastrophe* precisely because he is dead.

*The Olympian Catastrophe* is haunted by this theme. Court entertainments existed in part to confirm authority—to use devices such as gods and goddesses to underwrite the monarch’s power. *The Olympian Catastrophe*, by contrast, stages a ‘masque’ in which such authority is consistently destabilised: it demonstrates the futility of earthly power and of the patronage texts, like masques, which make myths about it, presenting a mythicised view of Henry’s qualities and simultaneously undermining the validity of such mythicising.\(^{57}\)

In *The Olympian Catastrophe* a sequence of apparently powerful figures lose standing, one by one. At the end of the poem all that is left is Jove’s highly questionable, unanswerable will. Henry could have been given much more authority in *The Olympian Catastrophe* than he is accorded. In *Daphnaida*, the lost love, Daphne, is arguably in the position of greatest authority. On her deathbed she tells Alcyon about her desire for death and explains that she longs for the joys of heaven. The intemperate Alcyon’s refusal to pay attention to the meaning of her words only emphasises her speech’s centrality. In *The Olympian Catastrophe*, by contrast, Henry is in nothing like Daphne’s position. His view of the after-life is shrouded in doubt.\(^{58}\) The parallel to Daphne’s speech in *The Olympian Catastrophe*.

---

\(^{57}\) J.R. Mulryne (1989) reads Henry’s death as casting a shadow over the polite fictions of mythicising court panegyric. Kay finds that ‘the image of the rules of art as chains, fetters, aggravating constrictions’ is a common feature of the elegies for Henry (1990, 142). Cf. J.W. Williamson’s analysis of the ‘myth’ of Henry—Williamson concludes that ‘Henry’s mind was as mythologized as was his image among the Scots and the English; he believed fervently that the symbols were made flesh in him, that in him the hand of God had made incarnate His truth and justice’ (1978, 32). In *The Olympian Catastrophe* it is perhaps significant that the Prince expresses his hostility to poetry: as for Poetrye,/(Sith the best Poet is but the best lyer)/Their fictions I reck not’ (lines 278-80). Cf. the attack made on Jacobean neoclassical art in Gerald M. MacLean’s reading of the commendatory poems to Gorges’ translation of Lucan (1990, 39-41; see Chapter 6.1.2).

\(^{58}\) This is a function of the plot, of course: Henry, unlike Daphne, doesn’t know he’s about to die.
Catastrophe is Henry’s dream on the first night. He dreams that he is guided through the underworld by an old man, who tells him he is destined to go there soon (lines 211-40). Gorges nods here not so much towards Daphnaida as towards its source, Chaucer’s Book of the Duchess (Chaucer 1987, 329-46) and the visit to Morpheus at the beginning of the poem (lines 153f.), as well as to Chaucer’s other dream visions. The whole episode is surrounded by doubt and uncertainty. The Prince’s telling of his dream leads to an unresolved discussion among his attendants about the reliability of dreams (lines 247f.). The last word on the topic goes to a knight whose conclusion suggests that such visions should be completely ignored (lines 283-93). A squire then mentions the nocturnal rainbow he has seen, precipitating a second debate, parallel to the first, about the significance of rainbows.59

Equally lacking in authority are the goddesses who seem at first to be completely in control of events. When Gorges first used the Bellona-Minerva-Juno conceit, before Henry’s death, he resolved the conflict in favour of Juno. Ultimately, the most important thing about Henry, he had argued, was his royal status. In a poem for Henry of 1609/10, Bellona’s and Minerva’s claims, reported in indirect speech, are capped by a conclusive statement in direct speech by Juno: ‘Nay then quoth Juno, stay, this Crowne hee houlds of mee/ Therefore shall Arts, and Arms but his attendants bee’ (Gorges 1953, poem 104, lines 5-6). When Gorges rewrote this poem at the opening of The Olympian Catastrophe to set up the Bellona-Minerva-Juno dispute the major change he made was to deny Juno

59 At this point an attendant clearly intended to signify Gorges himself describes the nocturnal rainbow mentioned in Gorges’s narrative of the Islands Voyage (Purchas 1905-7, 66). A rainbow seen at night over the dying Henry’s room had caused much alarm (Sandison 1953, 234-5).
the privilege of direct speech. The claims of all three goddesses are reported in indirect speech, and none of them predominates (lines 25-30).

Royal authority within the conceit is thus removed. The process goes a stage further as the poem develops. The goddesses have no say in the death of Henry and are outraged at Atropos’s ‘presumptuous’ cutting of his thread. At the centre of the poem is the clash between the goddesses and Atropos. It is made clear that the power of the goddesses is fatally circumscribed. Juno complains to Jove about Atropos’s power, asking that ‘Atrops may (by thy resist-lesse law)/From crossinge our designes stand more in awe’ (lines 1145-6).

Yet the poem makes it clear that the arbitrary power of which Juno complains is ultimately Jove’s: Jove is the final authority. Atropos’s defence is that she was only doing Jove’s bidding (‘theres a Supreme power, whom wee obay:/Besides whose sacred heastes wee dare not go’ (lines 819-20)). Jove’s explanation of Henry’s death closely echoes Atropos’s. Atropos scandalises the goddesses by arguing that Henry’s death has won him ‘a crown, devoyd of jealous feare’ (line 832). Jove himself, at the end of the poem, says ‘I tooke him ... to give him heere his meed,/For earthes base pompe, his vertue did exceed’ (lines 1175-6). Elsewhere Atropos gives a powerful description of Jove’s tyranny:

Tis not for us with him to hold dispute.
His doomes are lawes, his heasts without controll.
Wee dare not question whither they do sute
With reason, who all reason doth enroll
Within his breast, we are but Instruments,
That some doe please, and others discontents. (lines 823-8)

These antagonisms—tension between a king and a queen; the king’s mysterious involvement in the death of a prince—hint at a dark subtext. Rumours circulated at the
time of Henry's death that James had had Henry poisoned.\textsuperscript{60} Perhaps, then, it is not accidental that the Gorges's elegy makes Jove, in court masques a figure for King James, problematically responsible for the prince's death.

\textsuperscript{60} Strong (1986) is sceptical about these rumours, which are taken seriously by Williamson (1978).
Manuscript Treatises

In his epistolography Erasmus distinguishes carefully between books and letters:

there is an important difference between a book and a letter, in that the latter must be adapted as far as possible to the immediate occasion, and to contemporary topics and individuals, whereas a book, intended as it is for general consumption, must be contrived to please all men of learning and good will. (1985, 14)

Gorges’s manuscript treatises are, in Erasmus’s sense, more like ‘letters’ than books. They were all written within the context of Gorges’s patronage relationships, as texts for patrons or potential patrons to read, and thus had to adapt to the shifting needs and interests of particular patrons and of Gorges himself. Gorges constantly recycles material: arguments and examples framed for one patron are redeployed for other patrons in different contexts. All Gorges’s treatises were written in James’s reign. They present the reader with the image of Gorges as a virtuous Elizabethan warrior, a brave teller of truth in a fallen world. Virtuous service is a constant theme. Gorges’s strategies of self-presentation are generally constructed around discussion of the ethics of service and reward and often involve a contrast, implicit or explicit, between James’s and Elizabeth’s treatment of clients. Gorges struggles to find an authoritative voice for himself in his necessarily submissive client’s status.

1 Though Sea-Service, in its original form, was an Elizabethan text composed by Ralegh (see section 1 below).
I know of four prose treatises written by Gorges. In this chapter they are identified by
the following abbreviated titles:

1. *Islands Voyage*
   Gorges's very long, 'quiet but masterly' (Gorges 1944, 60) narrative account of the
   Islands Voyage of 1597.

2. *Sea-Service*
   A concise set of proposals, subdivided under thematic headings, on how to improve the
   management of the navy, originally written by Ralegh in Elizabeth's reign, revised in
   James's reign by Gorges and/or Ralegh.

3. *Seafight*
   A rambling treatise discussing the best way to defend England by sea, followed by a set
   of maritime orders, some adapted from orders written by Ralegh.

4. *A Breefe Discourse*
   A short mercantilist treatise advocating naval and military preparedness and a reduction
   in the consumption of luxury goods.

The relationship between different texts of these treatises is quite complicated. In the
list that follows, manuscripts known to have been prepared under Gorges's direct
supervision are marked with asterisks. Manuscripts I have not been able to see are
enclosed in square brackets.

*Islands Voyage*


---

2 I am omitting from consideration two long prose texts with agendas more precise than the word 'treatise'
implies, both of which are described in Chapter 1.2: Gorges's 'Public Register' prospectus (Gorges 1611;
1612) and his manuscript proposal for an office to seal fustians (Hatfield CP 114.22).
SP15 PRO SP15/36/94. Attributed to Gorges. Imperfect. The title indicates that the manuscript originally contained Sea-Service too.

Trumbull BL MS Trumbull 22. Attributed to Gorges. The title indicates that the manuscript originally contained Sea-Service too.

Islands Voyage and Sea-Service


Sea-Service

1650 Ralegh 1650, A6r-D4v. Attributed to Ralegh.


[Finch] Copy in a folio volume of tracts attributed to Ralegh; 17th century. Formerly among the Finch MSS at Burley-on-the-Hill, Rutland, this MS recorded in HMC, 7th Report (1879), Appendix, p.516. Unlocated (not with the Finch MSS in the Leicestershire
Record Office and possibly destroyed in a fire in 1908’ (Beal 1981, RaW 691).

**Folger**

**Harley**

**Petyt**

**Wales**

**[Woburn]**

**Seafight**

**Maritime**

**SP14**
PRO SP14/17/1405. Attributed to Gorges.

**Stowe**
BL MS Stowe 426. A scribal copy corrected in Gorges’s holograph.
Sea-Service and Seafight


A Breefe Discourse

*Breefe Discourse Trinity College, Cambridge MS R. 7.23* (Prince Henry’s Copybooks 3). A presentation manuscript prepared under Gorges’s supervision.

In the rest of the chapter I suggest a chronology for these treatises which is given below in schematic form.

1597-8: Ralegh composes the first version of Sea-Service for Queen Elizabeth (a text similar to Folger). See section 1.

1607 Gorges, probably with Ralegh’s help, presents Islands Voyage (in a text similar to 1625) together with a revised version of Sea-Service (similar to Harley) to Prince Henry. Later, or possibly simultaneously, the text of the 1607 Sea-Service is circulated independently, attributed both to Gorges (Harley) and to Ralegh (1650, Additional and Petyt). See section 1.

1610 Gorges presents Henry with A Breefe Discourse. See section 2.

c.1615-9 Gorges revises Islands Voyage and Sea-Service (producing a text similar to Ballard, Leconfield and SP15) for manuscript and possibly also print publication, adding a dedication to ‘England’. Leconfield, a copy of this text, was perhaps given to the Earl of Northumberland. There were probably at least two separate stages of revision. See section 3.
1618/9 Gorges supervises the production of *Stowe*, a scribal text of *Seafight*, making hundreds of holograph corrections. A fair copy of the text (now lost) is presented to the Duke of Buckingham. Further copies are made on the basis of *Stowe*’s text for presentation to other influential people. *Maritime*, one of these copies, was presented by Gorges to someone, perhaps the Earl of Northumberland. See section 4.

**Later Copies** Many non-authorial alterations were made to the texts of *Islands Voyage*, *Sea-Service* and *Seafight*. *Trumbull* represents a non-authorial revision of *Islands Voyage*, made on the basis of a form of the treatise antedating the revisions incorporated in *Ballard*, *Leconfield* and *SP15*. *Wales* is a non-authorial revision of *Sea-Service*. *Lansdowne* brings together heavily revised, non-authorial versions of *Sea-Service* and *Seafight*. *Ballard* and *SP14* were probably produced together. Written by the same scribe, they contain good texts of, respectively, the authorially-revised version of *Islands Voyage* and *Sea-Service* and the *Stowe* form of *Seafight*. For brief accounts of *Trumbull*, *Wales* and *Lansdowne* see section 5.

In the discussion which follows, *Islands Voyage* is cited from Purchas 1905-7, *Sea-Service* is cited from 1650 and *Seafight* is cited from *Stowe*. The extant texts of these treatises differ from each other in literally thousands of instances. Below, I have tried to identify the stages in their textual history at which Gorges made major revisions. Gorges was a fussy reviser of his own work, as a glance at *Stowe*, a scribal manuscript corrected in his holograph, shows (see section 4). In *Stowe*, Gorges makes hundreds of tiny stylistic alterations (often going on to alter his own alterations). Minor stylistic variation between
one text and another, then, might well represent authorial revision of a sort impossible to distinguish from non-authorial revision. It is likely that Gorges’s manuscript texts went through more stages of revision than are recorded in this chapter—more stages, probably, than it will ever be possible to record. At the same time, though, the unique readings of three manuscripts, *Wales, Lansdowne* and *Trumbull*, should, I think, be excluded from the chronology of authorial revisions. All of these manuscripts, discussed briefly in section 5, represent alterations to Gorges’s texts made, probably after Gorges’s lifetime, by people other than the author.3

1. 1607: Presenting *Islands Voyage* and *Sea-Service* to Prince Henry

1625 preserves the earliest known form of the text of *Islands Voyage*. In his note Purchas says that his copy-text was

> written A.D. 1607. and dedicated to ... Prince Henry; the epistle to him and the Preface I have omitted in regard of our long volume. I have not added a word of mine, but the Title and Marginall Notes; nor defalked any of the Authors ... He also added Notes touching the Navie Royall, which are worthy the noting, but perhaps not to be permitted to every vulgar and notelesse eye. (34)

The ‘Notes’ Purchas refers to must have been a text of *Sea-Service*. Sandison hypothesises that *Islands Voyage* was originally written in about 1604, shortly after Ralegh’s imprisonment, ‘as a document for the defense’, and that it is to be identified with an unspecifed manuscript sent by Gorges on 12 March 1604/5 to Robert Cecil for approval before publication (1928, 670). *Islands Voyage* is certainly strenuous in its partisanship for Ralegh and vividly demonstrates the fundamentally anti-Spanish

---

3 In saying this I am not discounting the possibility that some of the variants separating other, more ‘authoritative’ texts of Gorges’s treatises are also non-authorial. The point is simply that in these three manuscripts probable ‘non-authorial’ revisions are extremely extensive.
character of Ralegh’s career. There is no real evidence, though, that it was written before
1607.

*Sea-Service* is another matter. It was written by Ralegh during Elizabeth’s reign
(Gossett 1986-7). *Folger* is the only manuscript to preserve the Elizabethan text, under
the title ‘Especial Notes concerninge her Maiesties Nauie and Sea-Seruice’. Ralegh’s
preface explains that he has written the treatise for the Queen as a result of his recent
experience of sea-service in the Islands Voyage, ‘having gotten the practise and
confirmation, of some knowledge, which in former lornyes I had observed’ (f.l61r).
Gossett links the text to Ralegh’s involvement with a parliamentary bill of January
1597/8 for the maintenance of the navy and to Ralegh’s wish to present himself to
Elizabeth as ‘a sober administrator’ (1987, 17). The treatise addresses a range of
problems thrown up by the Islands Voyage: corrupt officers, the best place to dock the
fleet, overgunning, victualling, faulty sheathing of ships—all highly topical issues in
1597/8 (Gossett 1986-7, 18-20).

Purchas’s note in 1625 makes it clear that in 1607 a text of *Sea-Service* was appended
to the 1625 form of *Islands Voyage*, the whole package being dedicated to Prince Henry.4
The subject-matter, naval warfare against Spain, would have appealed strongly to the
prince, with his passionate interest in the navy, at its peak at this period (Gossett 1986-7,
20-1). One assumes that Henry would have known about Ralegh’s involvement in the
composition of *Sea-Service*, though there is no evidence that Gorges mentioned it
anywhere in the original manuscript. Possibly, explicit mention of Ralegh was felt to be

---

4 Purchas does not give the manuscript’s original title. Presumably it was close to the title of the revised
version represented by *Ballard* and *Leconfield* (see section 3). Purchas calls Gorges’s work ‘A larger
Relation of the said Iland Voyage’ (34), appending it to Essex’s official report to the Queen.
unwise (Gossett 1986-7, 24). The timing of the presentation is significant. Henry’s interest in naval matters was at its height, following his unannounced inspection of the fleet at Chatham in 1606 (Strong 1986, 57). In 1607 pressure was being exerted by the shipwright George Waymouth and others for an inquiry into the running of the Navy. Complaints centred on the two areas dwelt upon at greatest length by the 1607 text of Sea-Service: the ineffective manufacture of the King’s ships and the the quality of men preferred to high rank in the service.

In its 1607 form (1625) Islands Voyage presents Henry with plenty to think about. The text is a memorial to a reign in which the Spanish threat was taken seriously and brings vividly before the reader the bravery and resolution of Ralegh, Gorges and others. It establishes Gorges as experienced in sea-service, ready, like Henry, to think about how the navy might be better run.

Islands Voyage was, Gorges says, put together on the basis of notes scribbled aboard ship (Sandison 1940, 243). Presumably these notes form the core of Gorges’s narrative. For Henry, Gorges added lengthy generalising and moralising passages, picking out key lessons. The text starts in schoolbook fashion with an elaborate account of the human

---

5 During the voyage Gorges wrote a long account of the action for Sir Thomas Gorges, no longer extant (mentioned in Hatfield CP 49.102).

6 Cf. Gorges’s practice in Lycans Pharsalia (Chapter 6.1.1). Purchas’s full title for Islands Voyage describes these passages as ‘Marine and Martiall Discourses added according to the Occurrences’. In his note he recommends them to the reader’s attention: ‘The Discourses I have usually put in another letter, to distinguish them from the History; the one the Eyes observations, the other the Minds, and both worthy both thine eyes and minds best observation’ (34). (Sandison explains this enthusiasm by suggesting that Purchas knew of Ralegh’s involvement in the project (1940, 245).) There are also decorative, touristic vignettes, including vivid descriptions of a night-time rainbow (66) and a burning carrack (‘you might have seene the very shape ... of a ship so perfectly in fire, as no Painter could have halfe so well resembled it’ (115)) and the report of a silly conversation about navigation between Gorges and a Spanish prisoner (29).
and physical geography of the Azores, based on printed sources such as Ortelius (34-6).\footnote{7} Gorges squeezes out from his experience of the voyage as many practical tips for Henry as he can, stressing, \textit{inter alia}, the dangers of passing by other ships in the Azores without noticing them (65), the ease with which the Azores may be taken (76), the cowardliness of soldiers from garrison towns (85) and the usefulness of issuing orders after putting to sea (41-2). Problems in the English navy considered more analytically in \textit{Sea-Service} are highlighted as events on the voyage give rise to them: the inadvisability of overcharging ships with ordnance (42); the abuses of brewers and victuallers (44, 48); the dangers of greedy captains (126f.).

Throughout his narrative, Gorges is careful to defend Ralegh against the charge levelled against him by supporters of Essex that he irresponsibly sought glory for himself at the expense of the best interests of the voyage. Gorges provides a meticulously detailed narrative account of Ralegh’s actions, carefully justifying them at every point.\footnote{8} He goes further than this, however, displacing the accusations made of Ralegh onto Essex, whose deludedly vainglorious behaviour forms the major focus of Gorges’s treatise. Gorges’s critique of Essex fits in neatly with the concerns of other texts written by Ralegh and Gorges for Henry.\footnote{9} Gorges’s narrative encourages prudent heroism, advising against reckless dashes for glory.\footnote{10} Essex is described as ‘a man that did affect nothing so much
in the world as much as fame, and to be reputed matchlesse for magnanimitie, and undertaking, and could hardly indure that any that should obscure his glory in that kinde’ (92). He is criticised, early in the voyage, for sailing near enough to the shore of Spain to cause the enemy to light warning beacons, an incident that provokes Gorges into a digression on foolish ‘braving humours’ (37); later he is taken to task for twice refusing to wear armour (37, 109). Clearly, part of the treatise’s aim is to prevent Henry turning into Essex when he grows up:

This therefore may stand for a Maxime and Caveat, to all great and wise Commanders, that to whom a King or State commits the trust and direction of an Army: It bridles him in the free use of his owne courage, or from expressing (upon every temptation) his particular valour. For that forward humour of daring, is to be used in younger yeeres, before they arrive to these places of dignitie or command; and then ever after, counsell should command their courage, alwayes wrapping their heads in the Furre of the Foxe, and their Armes seldome in the Lyon skin, setting aside all respects of braving as vaine glory ... (102-8)

Gorges’s most extensive attack on over-boldness is reserved for the hollow bravery of Essex’s land captains before Tercera. Gorges glosses this episode with a long sequence of examples from modern history, including an elaborate attack on Sir Richard Grenville’s irresponsible bravery on board the Revenge (103f.). Gorges’s scorn for the unbearable pride of the Spaniard—‘where they conquer or command, no people so proud, and insolent, and when they are mastered ... no Nation of the world so base, or fuller of servile crouching, and observing’ (83)—is related to his critique of over-boldness. Over-reliance on the heroic self and an obliviousness to other people’s requirements; an improper refusal to act responsibly within hierarchical relationships—these seem to be the common threads. Gorges bitterly attacks selfishness at the public expense—

Maskers then Souldiers’. In its Jacobean context the word ‘Maskers’ echoes uncomfortably here. Gorges holds up Henri of Navarre, a hero of Henry’s (Strong 1986, 72-3) as a model of serious heroism (45). For Gorges’s criticism of lavish dress cf. A Breefe Discourse (section 2 below).

In fact, adverse winds meant that Essex could not help doing this (Wernham 1994, 171).
demonstrated in the self-interestedness of those followers of Essex who chose to loot Villa Franca rather than attack the strategically more important St. Michael’s (116)\(^\text{13}\) and by the greed of captains who illegally sold booty belonging to the Queen (126f.). Throughout, Essex is depicted as wrongly deploying his power as a patron, favouring flatterers above the truly deserving as a result of his fatal desire for fame. Essex himself is depicted as weak but well-meaning—Gorges stresses Essex’s ‘moderation and bountie’, describing him as a man ‘indued with many good gifts, though at the last he failed in the use of them’ (69)—and the full force of Gorges’s critique is reserved for his manipulative followers. Gorges observes, too, that Essex was friendlier to Ralegh than many of his followers would have liked:

For albeit the Earle had many doubts and jealousies buzd into his eares against [Ralegh], yet I have often observed, that both in his greatest actions of service, and in his times of chiefest recreations, he would ever accept of his counsell and company, before many others that thought themselves more in his favour. (69-70)

Gorges’s critique of Essex is problematic, for Essex’s behaviour and ideals seem at times very close to those of Ralegh and Gorges. In several passages Gorges criticises foolhardy courage in himself and Ralegh at the same time as obvious pride in his own bravery implicitly endorses it. Gorges comes out of such episodes rather well—simultaneously brave and prudent—though they undermine the force of his critique of Essex. In a key episode, Ralegh alone volunteers for a perilous reconnoitring mission. Gorges goes with him. He makes it clear that he does not approve of a senior commanding officer putting himself in danger in this way:

when I saw him resolved, I told him that I would out of the love of a kinsman ... and also out of an honest regard, take such part as he did, from whom I had received many kinde favours, and accompany

\(^{12}\) Perhaps, with Ralegh’s approval, as a deliberate corrective to Ralegh’s *Revenge* pamphlet of 1591.

\(^{13}\) *Ballard’s* sidenote here reads ‘Priuate profitt hindreth the publick seruice.’ Gorges’s belief that it would have been quite easy to take St. Michael’s was, apparently, misplaced (Wernham 1994, 181).
him, but not out of any great desire I had to goe about a weeke of worke that consisted of much danger, and little honour in the performance. (87)

Cunningly, Gorges here ratifies his own foolhardy bravery by interpreting it as virtuous service. Ironically, he goes on to report how his action did in the end win him ‘honour’: ‘I say truely, and so afterwards it was much spoken of, that there was not any one more of quality, that did accompany him in that businesse’ (88). When, in the same episode, Ralegh tells Gorges to take off his prominent red scarf, Gorges refuses, pointing out that Ralegh’s white scarf is just as easy to spot. Again, Gorges disapproves of his own behaviour; though, as before, he is clearly proud of it as well. Similar ambivalences play around Gorges’s admiring account of how his cousin and associate Sir George Carew, his ship in trouble, refused help from the Earl of Southampton, ‘having a more tender care of the losse of his Honour, then of the hazard of his life’ (51). Gorges’s account of Carew’s heroism seems designed entirely as panegyric; yet for Gorges to be consistent, Carew should logically be censured, like Essex.

Such themes link Islands Voyage to Gorges’s and Ralegh’s attempt, through texts like Lvcans Pharsalia and The History of the World, to reformulate heroism for Henry. The tension between Ralegh and Essex makes Gorges’s narrative a drama of clashing egos comparable to Lvcans Pharsalia. At the same time, Islands Voyage makes it clear that the voyage it describes could have been much better organised, and that when Henry is king he will be able, with the help of Gorges and others, to make sure that similar enterprises will prosper.

---

14 Extensive material in honour of Carew reflects the closeness of Gorges, Ralegh and Carew in the years leading up to 1607. See Chapter 1.2. Perhaps Gorges was trying to win favour from Henry for Carew.

15 For more on this see section 6.
One of the key reasons for the failure of the voyage (along with poor weather) is, in Gorges’s account, Essex’s susceptibility to the wrong sort of follower. Through his narrative, Gorges establishes himself as the right sort of follower, brave in action, loyal to his superior officer. The nature of his writing in the treatise, too, is clearly intended to demonstrate his worth. As in Lycans Pharsalia (see Chapter 6.1) he depicts himself as a brave truth-teller regardless of the consequences. His most extensive attack on Essex is followed by extravagant praise of the truthfulness of ancient historians and of their defiance of tyrants (92-3). The narrative ends with Gorges’s account of how he, unlike most other captains, scrupulously oversaw the unlading of the booty, paying more attention to ensuring that the Queen got her due than to openings for private gain.16 In the final sentence, Gorges contrasts the honourable service he insists he offers with the venality of others (implicitly, James’s favourites):

this generall neglect of truth and merit thoughout the world, is the cause, that so few doe apply to follow ... sincere and unprofitable courses: especially, seeing how many doe daily, by fraud and flatterie, finde shorter and smoother wayes to Honours, wealth, and preferment: Even beyond all measure and expectation.(129)

Four of the extant texts of Sea-Service preserve what looks like the version of the treatise dedicated with Islands Voyage to Henry in 1607. Sandison argues that 1650, the only one to be printed, was set up from a text of Purchas’s 1607 ‘Notes’:

There, significantly, the word ‘Notes’ lingers in the title, though in the post-1612 forms [Ballard; SP14; Lansdowne] its place is taken by the more elaborate ‘Observations and Overtures’. There—and there alone among these 1650 essays—appear the familiar sidenotes; examination shows them to be quite in the Purchas manner and tone, and once ‘Nota’, reminiscent of Hakluyt and Purchas, appears. (1940, 246)

The opening sentence of 1650—‘Having formerly (most excellent Prince) discoursed of a Maritimall voyage, and the passages and incidents therein, I thinke it not impertinent nor

16 Gorges argues that captains of a higher social status should be employed, who are not in need of money to
differing from my purpose, to second the same with some necessary relations concerning the Royall Navy ...' (A6r)—proves that its text of *Sea-Service* was originally intended to follow a text of *Islands Voyage* dedicated to the prince, presumably, as Sandison argues, a text of the type represented by 1625.

Three manuscripts preserve texts of *Sea-Service* very close to 1650's, all of them opening with the brief address to Henry: *Additional*, *Petyt* and *Harley.* Of these, *Additional* and *Petyt* are hardly distinguishable substantively from 1650. The third, *Harley*, a rather slipshod piece of copying, is probably closer than 1650, *Additional* or *Petyt* to the original form of the lost 1607 *Sea-Service* appended to *Islands Voyage*. It is the only text of the 1607 *Sea-Service* to attribute the treatise to Gorges and it has a unique title: ‘Observaciones and notes concerning the Royall Navie and Sea Service by Sir Arthur Gorge Dedicated to the Prince Henry’. The title of 1650, *Additional* and *Petyt*, ‘Excellent Observations and Notes, concerning the Royal Navy and Seaservice’ (supplemented in *Additional* and *Petyt* by the addition of ‘Dedicated to the most noble and illustrious Henry Prince of Wales’) shares the word ‘Excellent’ with the title of *Wales*, a variant text of the 1607 *Sea-Service* which, like 1650, *Additional* and *Petyt*, ascribes the treatise to Ralegh (‘Excellent and true obseruaciones Concerning the Royall Nauye and Sea Servuice. Written By sir Walter Rawleigh knight and by him dedicated To the most noble and Illustrious Henry Prince of Wales’). All these texts, none of them accompanying a text of *Islands* support themselves (126f.). Cf. the post-1612 revision of *Sea-Service* (section 3 below).

17 An examination of *Woburn* might change the picture. Beal (1980, RaW 685, 685, 688) assigns *Additional* to c.1640 and both *Petyt* and *Harley* to the early-mid seventeenth century. *Petyt*, uniquely, contains a list of topic-headings.

18 *Wales*, I think, represents a non-authorial revision made on the basis of a copy of the 1607 text. See section 5.
Voyage, obviously derive from a version of Sea-Service meant to follow Islands Voyage as they all include the tell-tale opening sentence. It seems that the 1607 text of Sea-Service got detached from Islands Voyage and was at the same time attributed to Ralegh.\textsuperscript{19} It was probably an admirer of Ralegh who added the adjective ‘Excellent’, perhaps the editor of 1650 (in which case, Additional, Petyt and Wales would all derive from 1650 or the manuscript behind it). That Harley contains a comparatively early form of the 1607 text is more conclusively shown by the fact that it is the only one of the four texts of the 1607 Sea-Service to agree at any point with Folger against the other three.\textsuperscript{20} Moreover, agreement between Ballard, a manuscript which incorporates post-1612 authorial revisions (see section 3) and Folger and Harley against 1650, Additional and Petyt shows that Harley is closer to the manuscript Gorges used as the basis for those revisions than any other text of the 1607 Sea-Service.\textsuperscript{21}

The few differences between different texts of the 1607 version are minor, involving no more than stylistic tinkering.

The 1607 Sea-Service works well as a pendant to the 1607 Islands Voyage. Some of the problems discussed in Islands Voyage, as well as others of importance to the royal navy are looked at more analytically in the 1607 Sea-Service, which differs in many respects from the text of Sea-Service found in Folger. Suzanne Gossett has glossed the immediate context of the revision, which she argues was made by Ralegh (1986-7, 21-2).

\textsuperscript{19} Perhaps Ralegh had revised it for presentation to Henry alongside Islands Voyage and retained the copy he used as a basis for his revision, that ‘Raleghan’ copy then serving as copy-text for later copies.
\textsuperscript{20} E.g. in omitting ‘Vice-Admiral’ from the list of officers (A7r) and in the reading ‘to these offices’ (A7v).
\textsuperscript{21} E.g. at A8r, where 1650, Additional and Petyt read ‘eate out’, Folger has ‘suppresse’ and Ballard and Harley have ‘suppresse and eate out’. (Wales has ‘eat’ but lacks ‘out’ through damage.) Other examples of this pattern include a surprising copying error common to Folger, Harley and Ballard, viz. ‘Famouth’ for ‘Falmouth’ (B6r).
Corruption in the administration of the navy was a burning issue. A commission of investigation started its work in May 1608. Sea-Service makes sense read in this context, as a contribution to a widespread debate on the best way to run the navy.

The most notable alteration is the addition of a long section on the construction of ships, very close to the text of a ‘letter’ from Ralegh to Henry on the subject (known only in its printed form (Remains of Sir Walter Ralegh (London, 1656-7), reprinted in Edwards 1868, 2.330-2)). Gossett assumes that the revision of Sea-Service could not have taken place before the composition of the letter, usually dated as 1608, and that therefore Gorges’s coupling of Sea-Service and Islands Voyage must have been made ‘sometime between 1609 and 1612’ (1986-7, 22). Purchas’s copy-text for 1625, however, bore the date ‘1607’, reflecting Gorges’s habit of putting the date of presentation of his manuscripts on title-pages (Sandison 1940, 242). All known texts of the ‘1607’ Sea-Service, meanwhile, open with a sentence clearly implying that their text was meant to be appended to a copy of Islands Voyage, and all of them contain the material shared with Ralegh’s letter. Perhaps when presented to Henry (in 1607) Sea-Service did not include the material on ship-building. Later, when further copies of the text were being circulated, Gorges and Ralegh might have thought it a good idea to incorporate the ship-building material. (This second version of the ‘1607’ text, made in or after 1608, would presumably not have been intended for Henry, who would already have read Ralegh’s letter.) There are other possible explanations, of course. On the whole, it seems safest to

---

22 It is worth remembering that Ralegh’s letter exists only in printed form, undated, and so may not actually ever have been sent as a letter at all. (It could be a fictional letter, made up out of text excerpted from Sea-Service (for fictionalised letters in the renaissance see Braunmuller 1981; 1983).) Charles Firth was the first to suggest the 1608 date, arguing that the letter was written in response to a request for advice from Henry made shortly before the laying of the keel of the Prince Royal in October that year (Wilson 1946, 88, n.28).
stick with Purchas and assume that *Islands Voyage* and *Sea-Service* were first presented to Henry in 1607, as a unit.\(^{23}\)

Gossett (1986-7, 22-4) indicates several other major alterations the 1607 version makes to the 1597 text. Much more emphasis is placed on the preferment of unworthy men, a topic closely related to the work of the commission. Meanwhile, ‘In the section on harbors, various small changes indicate Ralegh’s recognition that the Dutch and French are an increasing threat’ (Gossett 1986-7, 23): Spain is no longer the only potential enemy.\(^{24}\) The Elizabethan version of the treatise ended with a rousing peroration in praise of England’s naval strength, Ralegh serenely confident in the power of Elizabeth’s ‘absolute will’ to put everything right. The revised version instead addresses the objection that the subject-matter of the treatise is irrelevant in peace-time. Stressing the need to be prepared for another war with Spain, Ralegh/Gorges ends placing his faith not in Elizabeth, but in God’s grace (D4v; James, significantly, is not mentioned at all). An addition early in the treatise which helps stress the need for the disinterested appointment of naval personnel, ‘and vertue truly regarded for it selfe’ (A8r), echoes phrases in Ralegh’s dedication to the 1597 text.\(^{25}\)

Ralegh may have been primarily responsible for the revision, as Gossett argues. However, if Gorges was responsible for the presentation of *Islands Voyage* and *Sea-Service* to Henry, as I think he was, his practice elsewhere (e.g. in the revision of *Stowe*...
and of BL MS Egerton 3165 (see Chapter 3.1.5) suggests that he would probably have made revisions to the text before making the presentation. Some elements in the revision are reminiscent of Gorges. At several points, personal touches in his manner ('To which I answer this' (B6r) to replace 'yet notwithstanding'; 'But certaine it is' (B7r); '(in my poore opinion)' (B7r)) are added; and there is a stylistic flabbiness about some of the revisions more reminiscent of Gorges’s prose than Ralegh’s ('they' becomes 'the whole Navy throughout' (C3v)).

2. 1610: Presenting A Breefe Discourse to Prince Henry

Gorges’s presentation of A Breefe Discourse to Henry in 1610 formed part of his campaign for preferment to Henry’s newly-established court (see Chapter 1.2). It is a more personal piece of work than Islands Voyage. Though there is a separate dedicatory epistle, the text as a whole reads like an extended letter, frequently lapsing into direct address to Henry. This personal quality is reflected in the absence of variant texts. Its sole text is the scribal presentation manuscript given by Gorges to Henry. The dedication is signed by Gorges. Unlike the naval tracts, A Breefe Discourse exists first and last within Gorges’s patronage relationship with the prince. The dedicatory epistle (ff.2r-2v), signed by Gorges, stresses the value of the advice of private individuals—he who lives in the valley can see the position of the mountain better than he who lives on top of it.

The manuscript is in a scribal italic hand also found in Gorges’s correspondence of this period (e.g. PRO SP14/62/40 (22 March 1610)). The title-page (flr), picking some letters out with gilt, reads ‘A Breefe Discourse tendinge to the wealthe and strength of

26 Folios in the manuscript are unnumbered.
this Kingedome of Great Brittayne. Written to the Highe and Illustrious Lorde Henrie Prince of Wales, By Sir Arthur Gorges Knight Fides fortibus, Fraus formidolosis’. As was his practice with books presented to him Henry had it bound in vellum decorated with his arms (Wilks 1987, 69). Pasted on the inside cover (there is no flyleaf) above Latin couplets is an illumination of the Prince of Wales’s feathers. The verses’ conceit on the feathers is duplicated in *The Olympian Catastrophe*, Gorges’s elegy on Henry’s death (see Chapter 4.3). 27

*A Breefe Discourse* is about the proper use of peace. The first section looks at the best way to build up the nation’s wealth, whilst the second section considers how best to keep England defended. Gorges’s constant themes are the need to be prepared for war, and the need to employ the right kind of people. Ultimately, the subject of the treatise is the subject of all Gorges’s treatises—the value to patrons of Gorges’s virtuous service.

In the first section of *A Breefe Discourse*, Gorges, voicing contemporary mercantilist orthodoxy, stresses the importance of exporting more than is imported. Much of this first section tallies with James’s policy of encouraging trade (ff.4v-5r). Gorges stresses the importance of exporting ‘our triffles, and slightest home bred commodities aswell: as those of greatest use and accompt’ (f.5r). Quickly, though, Gorges’s argument zooms in on the topic of virtuous service—in a characteristic move, he focuses his discussion on the issue of good and bad servants. 28 He identifies two things Henry can do immediately to help the balance of trade. The first, completely uncontroversial, is to encourage

---

27 Marginalia in an unidentified reader’s hand in the first part of the treatise, on economics, mark Gorges’s partitioning of his argument. At some points words of marginalia have been cut out.

28 The treatise itself begins with a long comparison between good and bad servants: ‘Hee, that faithfullie honoreth his prince, wilbe euer more apt to put hym in mynde of his profitt: then of his pleasure: The one beinge the fruits of fidelitie: and the other but the froth of flatterie’ (f.3r).
aduenturinge marchaunts [and] thos, that seeke out new trads’ (f.6v). The second thing Gorges recommends Henry to do is to discourage the purchase of foreign luxury goods by rooting out ‘extreame excess, and pride of Apparell’ (f.7r) among his household. Arguing for the enforcement of sumptuary laws to restrict expenditure in this area (f.7v), Gorges moves into an open attack on the sale of knighthoods (‘I remember ye report not longe synce made of one that hauinge lost 300li att dice: sware, that hee had lost that daye his gaines for three knighthoods’ (f.7v)) which leads him to the conclusion that true service is not rewarded nowadays. James seems to be to blame for this:

What a number are there, both of English, and Scotts, on whome the Kinge, your father hath bestowed greate, and bountifull gultis; that cann shewe no other testimonie thereof, nor are thereby enabled to doe hym better seruice: then to seeke protections to saue them from arests, or els are readie dailie to begg new suites? (ff.8r-8v)

James’s practice is contrasted with that of Elizabeth, whose restraint in rewarding her servants, Gorges says, meant that everyone was kept ‘in an appetite to frugaletie, and in hope of more by theire desertes, and seruice’ (f.9r). The benefits of this policy were shown, according to Gorges, in 1588, when Elizabeth’s servants were happy to bear the cost of defending ‘theire Prince, and countrie’ (ibid.). Gorges takes an apocalyptic view of the current situation:

I feare it (but I praye God my feare be vaine) that this kingdome cannot longe contynewe in this violent excesse: without producinge some greeuous effects. (ibid.)

The message is essentially the same as that of Islands Voyage: Henry should model himself on Elizabeth rather than on his father. There is also the shadow of an allusion to Ralegh’s Guiana project (‘Wee haue no mynes of gouled, nor siluer, and when the poole

29 In March 1610/11 Henry announced (influenced by Gorges?) that he had decided that his household should wear Italian dress, more modest than the French (Strong 1986, 12-3).
is once vnlaed; the dewes of goulde, and siluer must falle from heauen, to replenish itt againe’ (f.9v)).

The second section, on how to build up the military strength of the kingdom, is, like the first section, centred on the theme of virtuous service. Gorges starts by highlighting the plight of Elizabethan veterans, a favourite topic (‘They haue all followed hazard and perill: to finde pouertie, and neglect’ (f.13v)).

He stresses the need for military preparedness in peace-time: ‘euerie prudent prince ought to prouide in such sorte for all alterations; as if his enemies weare to daye, and to morrowe, and euerie daye within sight of lande’ (f.14r). Gorges is cautious in his approach to the topic of naval reform, in marked contrast to his and Ralegh’s openness in *Sea-Service*, presented to Henry two years earlier. The shift is a reflection of the feeble result of the inquiry of 1608/9 into abuses in naval administration. The shipwright Phineas Pett, a favourite of Henry’s, correctly accused of corruption, had been exonerated (Strong 1986, 57-60; Gossett 1986-7, 21-2). Gorges’s caution is understandable:

> Of the state of our Nauye manie complaintes haue latelie bynn made, but howe justlie I knowe not, but this I knowe, yt the castinge of your princelie eye on itt putts the more care, and diligence into theire hartes that are the ouerseers, and officeres thereof. (f.14r)

Gorges simply recommends that the prince act as a responsible patron to the principal naval officers. Instead of further recommendations, he offers a defence of the English defence strategy of 1588, explaining in particular the inadvisability of boarding large Spanish ships (f.15v), the importance of letting a defeated enemy escape (ff.16r-17r) and

---

30 Gorges’s interests in the problems of veterans dates back to at least 1593, when, as MP for Dorset he sat, together with Ralegh (Sandison 1928, 656), on a parliamentary committee for the relief of maimed veterans (HP).

31 The prince seems to have acted on Gorges’s suggestion, paying a surprise visit to Chatham in April 1611 (Strong 1986, 59).
the difficulty of mounting an invasion by sea (ff. 17v-18r). Part of the function of this excursus is doubtless to heighten Henry’s awareness of the Spanish threat, not otherwise directly specified. Returning to the topic of the veterans, Gorges steers his argument back round to the theme of virtuous service. Again he stresses his ignorance of naval administration, adding, however, that, in his opinion,

if there bee any doubt to bee made, itt maye rise from hence: that wee see sometymes such officers chosen, and designed to those martiall places: as are mearelie ignoraunt in the service ... hauinge neuer bynn experienced, nor trayned therein: but chosen eyther for fauour, or for other respectes ... (ff. 18v-19r)

Gorges re-emphasises the importance of military preparedness in peace-time, stressing the ease with which war can break out. The English should seek to emulate the martial exercises of the Romans, and only men experienced in military service (like Gorges) should be put in charge of forts (ff. 21v-22r). The treatise ends by focusing on Henry’s power to achieve great things. Gorges is anxious that Henry fulfils his potential (f. 23v). He ends by stating his determination to ‘liue and constantly dye’ with ‘a harte more faithfull: then fortunate’ in Henry’s service (f. 24r).

*A Breefe Discourse* returns obsessively to the theme of desert and service. Gorges takes advantage of the generational difference between himself and Henry to use the treatise as an opportunity to temporarily occupy the place of a patron, deciding on the qualities of different clients, and clearly positioning himself as a virtuous servant who

---

32 Gorges seems to have revised this section at ff. 14v-15r, in a passage about the Armada of 1588. Just before writing on versos, the scribe scored lines across many of the openings in the book to maintain an identical number of lines of text on facing pages. Something must have disrupted the ‘cast off’ text at facing pages ff. 14v-15r, for this opening is the only one in the book where there is no relationship between the rule of the two facing pages—f. 14v has 26 congested lines of text, f. 15r 21 wide-spaced lines. Gorges probably revised this passage, perhaps adding text to f. 14v, and taking it away from f. 15r after ‘casting off’ his scribe’s copy-text and before transcription.

33 In the first section of the treatise Gorges had already dwelt on Spain’s ominous prosperity, likely, he says, to ‘raise their purses ... to the ambition of their mindes; and then howe they will emplhoye it God knowes’ (f. 11v).
'chooseth his Master more by instigation of loue, then for hope of benefitt’ and therefore
‘is always proud most trustie, and diligent’ (f.3r).

3. Presenting Islands Voyage and Sea-Service to England

At some point after Henry’s death, Gorges revised Islands Voyage and Sea-Service. Full
texts of the revised versions of both treatises exist in Ballard. SP15 is a fragmentary text
of the revised version of Islands Voyage, which probably originally also contained a text
of Sea-Service. Leconfield, currently unlocated, contains, according to Sandison (1940,
243-4) a text of Islands Voyage very close to SP15. It too probably originally also
contained a text of Sea-Service. The evidence suggests that these sources all reflect a
revision of Islands Voyage and Sea-Service made by Gorges after Henry’s death and
designed for print or manuscript publication. The date of this presentation is not known. It
might be related to the presentation of Seaflight to the Duke of Buckingham in 1618/9 (see
section 4). Certainly, some aspects of Gorges’s revision both of Islands Voyage and of
Sea-Service can be explained as attempts to make his text more palatable to followers of
Buckingham c.1615-9. Other elements, however, imply an earlier date. It is probable that
more than one stage of revision is included in Ballard’s unique readings. Examination of
Leconfield would probably clarify the picture. As Sandison, who was able to see
Leconfield, says,

   further copies were made of the Voyage, and Notes, with some revisions designed for this eye or for
   that, as Raleigh and Gorges plied their suits, especially after 1612, for the restoration not only of their
   own fortunes, but also of English naval prestige. (1940, 245)

Raleigh could, of course, have been involved with the pre-1618 revision only.

   The dedication in Ballard (transcribed in Sandison 1940, 248) is to England. Gorges
   makes it clear that his text is a memorial to the time of Elizabeth, a period notable for the
coincidence of ‘Martiall renowne and glorie’ with ‘Maesticall calme and peace’ (Sandison 1940, 248). The contrast with James’s reign is obvious, though unstated. Gorges stresses the fact that he seeks no reward for his work. The dedication seeks to detach the text it introduces from the patronage system:

Vouch[s]afe therefore to receaue from the hand of one of thy loyall and loueinge Children this offeringe of Zeale and deuotion proceedinge from the free and sincere disposition of that minde which neither expecteth nor desireth any other returne or gratuitie then that Seauen foote of earth, which thou at last bestowest on those whom thou hast brought into the worlds light, inclosinge them in thy fruitfull wombe, when all other friends and fortunes doe forsake them &c:/. (Sandison 1940, 248)

In the Preface which follows, Gorges seems to be addressing a fairly large readership. He stresses his devotion to truth, explaining that this means that he does not need to ‘defend the creditt of this small pamphlett with anie superfluous apologie’ (249). He advertises the fact that the text has not been dedicated to a potential patron:

Neither doe I by the dedication thereof to any great personage seeke to insinuate myselfe into publique opinion or grace well knowinge the worke to bee of noe such meritt, and my frostbitten fortunes allreadie to much distasted[,] now to relish those Sunnshininge fancies[,] Only the preserved memorie of these fore passed actions, I leaue to the honour of my Countrie and the Glorie of an excellent Queene who now resting in the graue can neither retume for the same thanks nor reward, you therefore may free me from all imputacion of flatterie. (249)

Gorges says that his aim is to apply lessons from the past to the present situation—or, rather, to encourage others to act:

I presume not to make this slender ... taske of mine worthie anie other regard in obseruacion, then by the bouldnes of myne adventure, with soe weake forces to stirr vp men of greater faculties and skill beeing Actors themselues yppon the like occasions to affoord a little leasure and labour for the honour of the Age, wherein they liue, and allsoe for the benefitt of posteritie wherein they may be remembred when they are dead. (Sandison 1940, 250)

He also stresses the importance of eye-witness history, of which Islands Voyage is an example.

All this strongly suggests that Gorges intended the Ballard/Leconfield/SP15 text of Islands Voyage and Sea-Service to be published, in either print or manuscript form. The strategy of publishing a text without an authorial dedication to a great person is strongly
reminiscent of the melancholic strategies of *The Olympian Catastrophe* (1613) and *Lycans Pharsalia* (1614). It seems likely, then, that this second version of *Islands Voyage* and *Sea-Service* belongs, in one incarnation, to roughly the same, ‘post-Henrician’, period as those texts. *Ballard* is a copy made no earlier than 1634.\(^\text{34}\) I do not know the whereabouts of *Leconfield*, almost certainly a much earlier copy, quite probably made under Gorges’s supervision. *Leconfield* was originally in the collection at Petworth House, so it may well have been a gift from Gorges to the Earl of Northumberland, Raleigh’s crony in the Tower.\(^\text{35}\) *SP15* is an imperfect copy. According to Sandison *SP15* and *Leconfield* ‘are ... nearly identical’ (243-4). *SP15* differs at several points from *Ballard*.\(^\text{36}\)

It is tempting to try to link the revision to the presentation of a copy of *Seafight* to Lord High Admiral Buckingham in 1618/9 (see section 4). Features of the post-1612 revision suggest that one stage of it might have been composed within Buckingham’s patronage grouping, at about the same time as the *Stowe* text of *Seafight*. Buckingham’s rise was orchestrated by an anti-Howard faction. Perhaps it is significant that at two points the revised text of *Islands Voyage* plays down praise of Howards. A reference to the wisdom of Howard of Effingham’s tactics in the Armada campaign of 1588 (107) is cut.

\(^\text{34}\) It is in the same volume as a naval treatise dated 1634.

\(^\text{35}\) Sandison (1940, 243-4) makes this suggestion, though she thinks the recipient is more likely to have been Lord Admiral Howard. This is unlikely if, as I think it does, this revision of *Islands Voyage* and *Sea-Service* reflects Gorges’s attachment to the anti-Howard, pro-Buckingham faction (see below). An undated letter from Gorges to Thomas Hariot (BL MS Additional 6789, f. 538r; Sandison 1953, plate facing xxiv) asking Hariot to look over a ‘discourse’ for Gorges might be connected with the presentation of either *Islands Voyage* and *Sea-Service* or *Seafight* to Hariot’s employer Northumberland.

\(^\text{36}\) *Ballard* and the fragmentary *SP15* by and large agree against other witnesses. In a few instances, *SP15* differs from all other texts, in some of which it clearly preserves a superior reading. For example, ‘we left him to his best excuse, and our apparent innocencie’ (70, found in all texts other than *SP15*) is incoherent. *SP15* alone makes sense of the passage by adding ‘our selves to’ after ‘and’. There are also differences in the use of sidenotes, both *Ballard* and *SP15* having some unique sidenotes.
Meanwhile in the list of personnel at the beginning of the narrative a revision is made in the description of Lord Thomas Howard (36-7): 'a Nobleman much honoured and beloved, and of great experience in Sea service' becomes 'a Nobleman of good experience in Seaservice but infortunate in some of his imployments'. This could be a reference to Howard's disgrace on corruption charges in 1618-9; equally, though, it could refer to the rumours circulating in 1615 about Howard's involvement in the Overbury murder. In a related move, Gorges tones down his hostility to Essex:37 'clemency' is added to a list of his qualities (69), and 1625's observation that Essex 'failed' in the 'use' of his virtues (69) is altered—Ballard and SP15 say the Earl 'was traduced' in the 'right use' of them 'by ill councell'. Added to the account of Essex's death (116) in Ballard alone (SP15's text having come to an end) is the statement that Gorges was in attendance, 'a teary eye witnes'.

There are other important alterations. Praise of Sir John Norris is tempered by an addition which recognises that Norris was, on occasion, too daring 'and susteyned thereby great losse' (106 (Ballard only, SP15 imperfect)). The detailed account of Sir George Carew's adventures after getting separated from the fleet is cut (55-6). Many of the additions are clear improvements—the addition of Pompey, for example, to a list of classical heroes soberly analysed by ancient historians.38 The complicated sequence of examples of over-boldness in 1625 (103ff.; Ballard only) is slimmed down and made more logical.

37 One of Buckingham's key supporters, the Earl of Southampton, had rebelled with Essex in 1601.
38 This addition presumably reflects Gorges's increasing interest in Lucan. Perhaps he was preparing his translation of the Pharsalia for press at the same time as revising Islands Voyage.
The revised text includes hundreds of sidenotes, evidently of Gorges’s composition, completely unrelated to the notes added by Purchas for 1625. Sandison puts forward a rather complicated explanation for this state of affairs: ‘Gorges may have got wind of [Purchas’s] insertion of notes in the 1607 copy—may even have seen them—and may have taken up the idea, though preferring to compose his own notes’ (1940, 245). This seems very unlikely. Sandison is wrong to say that ‘none of [Gorges’s] other writing employs’ sidenotes (ibid.), for many sidenotes appear in Lycans Pharsalia (1614; see Chapter 6.1), quite obviously of Gorges’s composition. One stage of Gorges’s revision of Islands Voyage and Sea-Service probably belongs to roughly the same period as the Lucan translation (see above), so it is logical that sidenotes should be used in both texts.\(^{39}\)

In the absence of Leconfield, Ballard is the only manuscript to preserve Gorges’s post-1612 revision of Sea-Service.\(^{41}\) Ballard derives from a text related to Harley (see above, section 1). Gorges makes several major alterations to the treatise. One very important addition made by Ballard places considerable stress on the role of the Lord High Admiral. This probably belongs to a period after Buckingham’s appointment to this post, and strongly suggests that at one stage it was hoped to present him with a copy of Sea-Service.\(^{42}\) A section is added (just before the conclusion) on the Vice-Admirals of the maritime shires, the chief ministers and agents, Gorges says, of the Lord High Admiral,

\(^{39}\) See, e.g. Ballard’s sidenote to 122 (SP15 is imperfect at this point): ‘Myne answere to my prisoners objection’. Other sidenotes consistently use the second person plural. The general tone strongly reflects Gorges’s attitude and interests, e.g. ‘A demaund brauely answered’ (89); ‘A place ill & disgracefully lost’ (117; Ballard only (SP15 imperfect)).

\(^{40}\) The existence of these sidenotes might support the idea that Gorges intended his post-1612 revision of the two naval texts for print publication. No other manuscript prepared under Gorges’s supervision contains sidenotes.

\(^{41}\) Lansdowne, a later, non-authorial revision based on a text like Ballard’s, consistently agreeing with Ballard against all other texts, is briefly described in section 5.

\(^{42}\) It seems unlikely that Gorges should seek to offer instruction on his duties to the experienced Howard.
men who ease the burden of his 'highe and waightie office'. The problem is, of course, that the wrong sort of men have been chosen. Ensuring that better men are chosen in future is something that would redound greatly to the credit of the Lord High Admiral. Gorges admits that technically the appointment of the Vice-Admirals of the maritime shires is within the gift of the Vice-Admiral of England. However, he insists that the Lord High Admiral also has authority in this area.

There is also evidence, however, implying a date earlier than Buckingham’s appointment. This chimes in with the idea that one stage of the revision, involving, perhaps, the decision not to write a dedication to a patron, belongs to a period quite soon after Henry’s death. After describing the sinking of the *Mary Rose*, Gorges points out the relationship between her captain and his friend Sir George Carew, ‘the now Lord Carew, Master of the Ordinance’ (B3v). As Carew left this job in 1617, this reading must represent a ‘left-over’ pre-1618/9 state of the text.

*Ballard*’s revisions often clarify and/or supplement the arguments of the 1607 version. A passage is added to explain that old oakum is used even when the King has provided money for new oakum (C3v). Among other things, Gorges gives more details about the advantages of a forecastle cookroom (C7r), recommends musket arrows, his favourite weapon (D1v), explains the function of the painted portholes on easterling hulks (C2v) and highlights the fact that the *Mary Rose*’s portholes were open when she sunk (B3v). A third way to make a ship strong is added to the two listed in the 1607 text (‘truth of the Workeman, and the care of the Officers’ (B2v)), *viz.* money: the ship should be built ‘without too much sparing for cost’. At the opening of the treatise Gorges adds a modest
disclaimer, stressing that he is not trying to usurp anyone who is more expert in these matters (A7r).

A constant theme, as ever, is virtuous service and its opposite. A long self-serving passage is added at the end of the section on captains. Building on his experience at the end of the Islands Voyage (see section 1), Gorges suggests that men of good birth should be made captains. Such men (like Gorges himself, presumably) are, he says, more keenly aware of their reputation than men of ‘an inferior and obscure calling’, and so will try harder. ‘Base’ captains will be more likely to be greedy for booty to which they are not entitled. The addition of the section on the Vice-Admirals of the maritime shires raises the possibility that Gorges felt that he should be appointed to such a position. Certainly, the revised version stresses Gorges’s experience: there is added emphasis on the author as an eyewitness of naval problems (C4v). At the end of the text, meanwhile, when Gorges anticipates objections to his presumption in advising on naval matters (D2v), he describes his critic as ‘some vnexperienced man’, automatically establishing his own superiority without having to worry about the substance of the accusation.

4. 1618/9: Presenting Seafight to Buckingham

The final manuscript treatise by Gorges is Seafight. The Stowe text of Seafight is a scribal copy incorporating thousands of corrections in Gorges’s holograph. The title-page is dated 1 March 1618/9. Stowe includes a unique dedication, dated 16 March 1618/9, to

43 ‘Observations & Overtures for a Seafight upon our owne Coasts, and what kynd of order and disciplyne is fittest to bee used in Martialling and directing our Nauies to [replacing cancelled ‘for our’] advantage, agains the [‘huge’ cancelled] praeparations of such Spanish Armadas or others [these last two words caret in] as shall at anie tyme come to assayle and invade vs. The first of March 1618’ (f.1r). As elsewhere in the treatise, corrections here are in Gorges’s holograph. Following the dedication is another title (f.6r) lacking ‘to best aduantage’, with ‘or others’ caret in again, and lacking the date.
the Duke of Buckingham, just recently installed as Lord High Admiral. The other texts of
*Seafight, SP14, Maritime* and *Lansdowne*, all preserve Stowe’s corrected readings.

Following *Seafight* in *Stowe* is a set of naval orders. The first sixteen of these are
sailing orders, designed for the most part to keep the fleet together, and may date back to
as early as 1579 (Sandison 1934, 344). To these orders Gorges appended new, mainly
‘fighting’, orders adapted from orders issued by Ralegh in 1617 for the Guiana voyage.
He eliminated details specific to the Guiana expedition and added an order on the use of
musket arrows (a favourite hobby-horse). The other texts of *Seafight* all follow Stowe’s
arrangement of these orders.

Sandison suggests that *Seafight* took shape in its *Stowe* version ‘about 1610-12,
though it looked back to Elizabethan days on the one hand, and yet was rather neatly
applicable to the new Spanish ‘alarms’ of 1619’ (1934, 325). It is certainly tempting to
argue that *Seafight*, an extraordinarily old-fashioned and retrospective text, was
composed before 1618/9. As all known sources reproduce Stowe’s corrections, however,
this argument has no solid supporting evidence.

Shortly before his death, Ralegh said that he had started to write a treatise for Prince
Henry on the art of war by sea, and that he had hoped to finish it and to present it to
Buckingham to honour his appointment as Lord High Admiral. Gorges’s *Seafight* can be

---

44 For a detailed account of how Gorges and his scribe mixed together these two sets of orders for *Stowe* see
Sandison 1934, 325-6. The orders are printed by Sandison, 328-9. For discussion of the Elizabethan
elements in Gorges’s orders see also Corbett 1905, 27-45; Hannay 1913. Sandison 1934 provides a
definitive chronology. Texts of Ralegh’s original form of orders are listed by Beal 1980, RaW 701-4.

45 Gorges’s use of Lucan in *Seafight* is perhaps relevant here. He mentions an episode occurring in Book 2
of the *Pharsalia* in which Brutus discusses Caesar and Pompey with Cato. The uncorrected text of *Stowe*
says that Brutus’s conversation was with ‘a frende of his’ and is corrected by Gorges’s holograph to ‘Cato
his vncle’ (f.19v). If it is assumed that *Seafight* was written at the same time as it was prepared for
presentation to Buckingham, viz. 1618/9—four years after Gorges’s translation—such a basic mistake seems
read as an attempt to partially make good this loss (Sandison 1934, 326-7). Fragmentary plans exist for Ralegh’s discourse (Lefranc 1968, 596-602), showing that it would have been on a far grander scale than *Seafight*. Still, it seems likely that Gorges’s conception for *Seafight*, involving a wholesale plundering of Ralegh’s Guiana orders, must have been at some level as a tribute to his cousin.

Presumably a fair copy was taken from *Stowe* and given to Buckingham. It is probably in connection with this treatise that Gorges upbraided Buckingham in July 1619 (Sandison 1934, 327, n.3). Sandison is doubtful about the form *Stowe*’s text ultimately took: ‘Whether a fair and elaborate copy of Stowe went to [Buckingham], or a printed pamphlet, of which no copies have survived, or whether the whole plan fell through, there seems to be no way of knowing’ (ibid.). In the dedication Gorges refers to the text as ‘theis pryvate manuscript’ (*Stowe*, f. 5r)\(^{46}\) and says that he hopes that it will not get in the way of the efforts of anyone else to advise Buckingham about naval matters. This would seem to suggest that the *Stowe* text of *Seafight* was planned as a one-off presentation to the Lord Admiral, whether or not the plan was carried out.

There is no evidence that, following the transcription of *Stowe*, *Seafight* underwent any further authorial revision for presentation to anyone else. The other texts of *Seafight* closely follow the corrected form of *Stowe*.\(^{47}\) Many agreements in error between *Maritime* odd. Perhaps Gorges’s scribe wrote out a fair version of a text of *Seafight* written many years before for Gorges to revise.

\(^{46}\) This reading is a holograph correction of Gorges’s, substituted for the original reading ‘labors’.

\(^{47}\) One example out of hundreds, taken at random: *Maritime* and *SP14* both read ‘wynd may’ (f.9r), reflecting Gorges’s excision of ‘of them’ from ‘wynd of them, may’, the original version.
and *SP14* show that both ultimately derive from the same transcript of *Stowe*.\(^{48}\) *Maritime* preserves more of *Stowe’s* readings than *SP14*.\(^{49}\)

*Maritime*, once at Petworth House, is inscribed ‘Given by Sir Arthur Gorges’. It has no dedication. Perhaps the recipient was the Earl of Northumberland.\(^{50}\) Probably following the presentation of *Seafight* to Buckingham, other manuscript copies without the dedication were circulated to interested parties.

*Stowe* is the only text of *Seafight* to include the dedication to Buckingham. In it, Gorges stresses the value of a navy—successor in terms of ‘Martiall force’ (f.2v) to the chariots of the ancient Britons and the bows of Crécy. He begins to praise English naval achievements only to correct himself in a mock tactful dig at Jacobean foreign policy (‘The particulers whereof I will forbeare to repeat to avoid the distast of these our peaceable seasons’ (f.3r)). At this point in the dedication Gorges originally included a long passage on the maltreatment of veterans, men who with their toyles, the hazard of their liues, and the losse of their blood made our nation and Seaforces soe famous, reduced our mightiest and proud enimyes to seeke peace at our hands, endured the heat of the daye, and underwent the burthen of those Warrs; are now cast asyde, as of litle vse, by reason of the Calme wherein wee liue, and are onely looked on in behoulding how manie others enioye the comfortable rewardes and fruits of their forepassed labors and daungers (ff.3r-3v)

\(^{48}\) E.g. ‘fight’ for ‘light’ (f.13v). *Lansdowne*, a later text revised by someone other than Gorges (see section 5), at times agrees with *SP14* against *Maritime* and *Stowe* (see note below) and less frequently with *Maritime* against *SP14* and *Stowe*. At one point, where *Stowe* alters ‘as long as our Fleet’ to ‘nor durst attempt so long as our Fleet’ (f.11r) *Lansdowne* reads ‘durst attempt, so our fleet’. *Lansdowne* here derives from a misreading of *Stowe*, for in the latter ‘nor durst attempt so’ is written just above the two words omitted by *Lansdowne*, ‘long as’. No other text shares *Lansdowne’s* error here, so clearly *SP14* and *Maritime* ultimately derive from a transcript of *Stowe* different from that on which *Lansdowne* is based.

\(^{49}\) E.g. ‘not well observing’ (f.13v) as against ‘not observing’ (*SP14* and *Lansdowne*); ‘the broadsyde’ (f.14r) as against ‘their broadsydes’ (*SP14* and *Lansdowne*).

\(^{50}\) Sandison thinks a more likely recipient would have been Lord Admiral Howard (1940, 244). This is highly unlikely, I think: *Maritime* incorporates *Stowe’s* revisions, so it must have been put together after Buckingham’s appointment as Lord High Admiral and thus also after Howard’s removal from the post in disgrace. A presentation of a naval text to Howard after 1618-9 would have been tactless.
This is the nub of the treatise, for Gorges clearly thinks of his situation as analogous to that of the veterans: like them, he sees himself as a martially experienced servant of Elizabeth, spurned under the new dispensation, doomed to see worthless men prosper.\textsuperscript{51} This passage sits uncomfortably in the dedication—it reads like an awkward addition and, indeed, is prefaced by an apologetic ‘But yet withall under pardon I may this truly saye’ (f.3r). Revising the text, Gorges significantly cut the entire section, preferring, one assumes, to argue his case more obliquely. The centrality of the theme of desert is demonstrated again at the end of the dedication. Gorges expresses his hope that Buckingham will act in his new appointment ‘to the glorie of God, the honnor of his Maiestie and the service of the State’ (f.4r). The next sentence, significantly much fiddled around with by Gorges’s correcting hand (though without much of a shift in meaning (f.4r)) makes it clear that all Gorges means by this is that he hopes Buckingham will appoint good officers.

\textit{Seafight} is remarkable for its backward-lookingness\textsuperscript{52} and for its overt anti-Spanish stance. Gorges was responding to a moment in history when there was potential for Jacobean foreign policy to shift in an anti-Spanish direction and when Buckingham was perceived as sympathetic to the anti-Spanish cause. Gorges obviously felt that in this context his presentation of himself as a veteran of the Armada campaign would be advantageous and that emphasis on the glorious days of Elizabeth would be well-received.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{51} Cf. the passage on veterans in \textit{A Breefe Discourse} (section 2).
\textsuperscript{52} Gorges’s naval examples—Drake (f.13v); Frobisher (f.15r); Henry VIII (f.25r); the 1588 Armada (f.10v)—all antedate 1590.
\textsuperscript{53} A related topical feature of the treatise is Gorges’s vehement argument that James hold to his alliance with the Dutch (f.25v-27v).
*Seafight* does not have a logical argumentative structure. It is, rather, a jumble of suggestions about naval defence, mixed up with sometimes puzzling *exempla* and digressions. The treatise starts with a comparison between the Spanish and English navies, stressing the importance of keeping the fleet together, a problem during the Islands Voyage. Gorges next debates the advisability of the Admiral’s using a slow ship. The idea is that a slow ship guarantees that when danger strikes an Admiral will stay with the rest of his fleet. Gorges makes the obvious point that an Admiral in a fast ship who stays with his fleet shows more bravery than one in the same situation in a ship with no chance of getting away. As in *Islands Voyage*, Gorges here deals with the topic of individual ‘bravado’, though here he casts no shadow of disapproval over it. He uses as an example the heroic death of ‘the braue Lord Talbott’ who refused to leave his father’s side, an act ‘which makes his fame still liue’ (f.8r).

More and more topics, very loosely connected to one another, are heaped up: the need for unity among the defence forces; the need to get the weather gauge of the enemy and pound them with cannon; the right time to use musket arrows; the scarcity of ports big enough to harbour Spanish ships. Arguments against boarding are illustrated by a long defence of the strategy used to defeat the Armada of 1588, after which Gorges returns to the more or less arbitrary accumulation of relevant observations: the advisability of letting a defeated enemy escape (illustrated again by the Armada); the need for ships to carry lights in the night; why it is a bad idea to fire at an enemy that is out of range. Gorges eventually settles on his favourite topic, the need to employ experienced personnnel, ‘menn that are most lykelye to geue sound directions, and especially such as haue made a tryall of their experience and valour’ (f.15r). At this point, Gorges’s treatise unravels.
Gorges says that it is impossible to make recommendations about the details of fighting a sea battle because so much depends on shifting circumstance—all that one can do is choose reliable commanders. Perhaps this is what is behind *Seafight’s* incoherence: ultimately, the best way to defend England against Spain is to employ the right people to do it—*Seafight’s raison d’être* is illusory.\(^{54}\)

Gorges continues to assemble material, however. He briefly considers the dangers that would be posed by the enemy in a calm before moving on to look at the best way to respond to an imminent landing. The advantages of the defenders are stressed. Gorges points out reassuringly that England’s naval defences have improved since the Roman, Danish, Saxon and Norman invasions. Consideration of England’s military strength tempts Gorges into a section in praise of James I’s pacifism that is hard to take at face value. Gorges warns the Spanish not to break the treaty with England. He points out how tempting it must have been for James to fight Spain when it was in such a weak position. James’s wise neutrality is glossed with a peculiarly chosen *exemplum*: Brutus’s announcement to Cato that he has decided to support neither Caesar nor Pompey but to ‘take in hand for the Romane libertie’ (f.19v) whichever of the two is victorious. In view of the commonplace identification between James and Roman emperors, the deployment of Brutus and ‘Romane libertie’ here as counters with which to praise James is startling.\(^{55}\) Significantly, this is a passage that underwent extensive holograph revision. Gorges added to *Stowe’s* first version an attempt to express and contain the subversive effect of Brutus’s involvement in Julius Caesar’s assassination, ending the anecdote with the holograph explanation that

\(^{54}\) And, of course, the best sea-commander of all, Ralegh, is dead. See section 6.1.2.
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Albehit afterwards (perswaded by his vnkle) hee syded with Pompey as Cato dyd, at ye battayle of Pharsalia, and yet afterwards [these last two words cancelled and replaced by ‘in the end’] performed hys vowe vppon the conqueror, though more treacherously then well beseemed a Roman of hys valor and virtu (ff.19v-20r).

In the end Gorges cancelled this revision. Tyrannicide is no longer explicitly in the text— but then neither is Gorges’s explicit condemnation of it.  

Gorges presses home at this stage one of his key topics: the need, in peace-time, to be well prepared for war. Mention of the need to keep a good store of powder leads into an account of the powder and shot shortage during the Armada campaign of 1588, which Gorges proceeds to use, rather irrelevantly, to rebut the allegation that the Spanish were beaten by the weather. He goes on to stress the importance of winning the first battle in a campaign and then returns to the theme of virtuous service, arguing that the captains appointed to be in charge of coastal forts should be experienced and well qualified.  

Gorges points out how difficult it is to tell where the Spanish fleet will be at any one moment. He then looks back at Henry VIII’s readiness for naval action. In Henry VIII’s day, of course, the Netherlands were on the enemy side. This prompts Gorges to argue strongly that England should continue to be the ally of the Dutch. The treatise comes to an end with a long anecdote (discussed in section 6) intended to show that the advice of ‘private’ men without naval rank (like Gorges) can be valuable.

Gorges made thousands of corrections to Stowe, crossing out and/or caretting in words in pretty well every sentence in the treatise. The vast majority are fiddly points of style.  

55 Particularly since in Lucan the decision is more Cato’s than Brutus’s.  
56 Cf. Gorges’s approach to Rome and republicanism in Lvcans Pharsalia (Chapter 6.1).  
57 Repeating an argument made in A Breefe Discourse.  
58 E.g. changes from ‘manie’ to ‘divers’; ‘large’ to ‘manye’ (both f.6v); ‘carefull’ to ‘tender and careflill’ (f.27v); ‘would’ to ‘wyll’ (f.24r); ‘manie examples’ to ‘sundrie praesydents’ (f.27r). Gorges piles correction on correction: ‘ruin or overthrow’ is corrected to ‘decay [or] overthrow’ which is then further corrected to ‘overthrow or decay’ (f.26r).
Gorges makes several very extensive revisions to his text, all of which mark points of major thematic pressure. A few corrections unconvincingly attempt to show that Gorges is not exclusively concerned with the threat of a Spanish invasion: 'or others’ thus qualifies the title’s reference to Spanish armadas (ff.1r, 6r; see above). Gorges’s anxiety that faith be kept with the Dutch leads him to add an extra reason to back up his argument ('because we haue bynn their founders and protectors’ (f.26r)) and a rousing conclusion: ‘The late former tymes shewed boathe our wysdom and force in gayning such interest in the Lowe countreyes; lett not vs therfor by error lose it now ... ’ (f.27r). Gorges recasts his half-hearted praise of James’s peace with Spain to stress James’s agency (f.42r). Gorges’s most extensive revision is of his first passage about the defeat of the Armada (ff.10v-13v). Gorges made some minor corrections to this section before deciding to replace it completely. A new, scribally prepared version was pasted over the old text and revised in turn in Gorges’s holograph. The main concern of the first draft is to dispute the view that the Armada was defeated by the weather. The pasted-on replacement cuts all this material, adding instead an extra justification for not boarding the Spanish vessels.  

5. Non-Authorial Revisions

Three manuscripts preserve non-authorial revisions of these treatises. Trumbull is a late, non-authorial version of Islands Voyage.  

Where variants separate 1625 and

---

59 *Viz.* the fact that the Duke of Parma was waiting in the wings meant that it was inadvisable to risk all by boarding the Spanish ships. Defence of the strategy of the Armada campaign is also the focus for revision in *A Breefe Discourse* (see section 2).

60 Thousands of variants distinguish it from all other texts of Islands Voyage in an entirely predictable and uniform pattern that is stylistic rather than substantive. All points of most interest to Gorges—details of the accusations against Ralegh; digressions on topics such as ambition or naval strategy; anecdotes; names and details lovingly preserved to record heroism or treachery for posterity—are ruthlessly cut, and Gorges’s narrative voice is consistently depersonalised (in the most extreme example 'my selfe' becomes 'Sir Arthur Gorges' (38)). Hundreds of phrases are simplified and modernised, cutting redundant words. I can find no
Ballard/SP15, Trumbull agrees in practically all instances (i.e. several hundred) with 1625. Trumbull's unauthorised alterations, then, seem to have been made to a 1607 text, bypassing the Ballard/SP15 revision. Wales is an imperfect text of the 1607 revision of Sea-Service, with several unique readings which do not look authorial.

Lansdowne, unlike any other source, brings together texts of Sea-Service and Seafight. It is, as Sandison says, an 'unauthoritative copy, made by someone who freely tampers with the material before him' (1934, 323) and incorporates thousands of unique readings, none of them clearly authorial. One index of its unreliability is its ascription of Seafight to 'William Gorges'. Its text of Seafight incorporates the revisions to Stowe, whilst its text of Sea-Service derives from a text of the revised, post-1612 form represented by Ballard. Lansdowne includes a far higher proportion of unique readings than either Trumbull or Wales, nearly all of them completely lacking any sort of justification. (Hundreds of times, Lansdowne swaps around the other texts' word order (so that, for example, 'safe, and good' (B6r) becomes 'good & safe').) One of the reviser's aims seems to have been to modernise the texts. Most of his/her revision, though, seems to have been designed

---

Footnotes:
61 Interestingly, Trumbull contains a preface very similar to Ballard's—possibly evidence that 1625 originally had a preface of this type too. Trumbull cuts the passage found in Ballard in which Gorges explains why he has not dedicated the treatise to anyone (Sandison 1940, 249; see section 2), as would have to be the case if Trumbull's preface is of 1607. Given the consistently savage way in which Trumbull cuts Gorges's text, though, it is not really possible to deduce anything about how the original 1607 preface would have differed from Ballard's.
62 Many of Wales's unique readings seem thoughtless and pointless, e.g. the substitution of 'Army' for 'Navy' (D2v). None add anything of substance to the text. Modernisation is a major impulse (e.g. 'no lesse behooveful' (A8r) becomes 'very proper and necessary').
63 Sandison explains this by suggesting that the copyist noticed that the author of the treatise mentioned that his father was called Sir William Gorges and then 'thoughtlessly or deliberately assuming that the son was also William Gorges ... set it down as fact on his title-page' (1934, 323-4). Another possibility is that Lansdowne's copy derives from texts once in the possession of a later William Gorges (e.g. Captain William Gorges (1606-59), fourth son of Sir Edward Gorges of Wraxall).
simply to make them longer, for hundreds of redundant extra words are added. At a couple of points, Lansdowne makes what look like substantive revisions. Though it is impossible to tell for sure, these could possibly represent authorial revision. Lansdowne could derive from texts which included authorial revisions absent from the copy-texts of the other manuscripts. Gorges’s habit of revising revisions (see section 4) means that, confusingly, this is quite likely.

6. The Theme of Desert: Two Versions of an Anecdote

Two versions of the same anecdote are told by Gorges in Islands Voyage (52-4) and Seaflght (ff.28r-30r) respectively. The anecdote centres on the themes of desert and boldness, two of the key issues of Gorges’s manuscript treatises, and the differences between the two versions are revealing.

In both versions, the basic story is the same: a pirate prisoner saves the royal ship that has captured him by advising the captain to sail over a sandbank with as much force as possible. However, the details of the anecdote in each case are different, as is its immediate context in Gorges’s text. In Islands Voyage, the anecdote follows a long account of Sir George Carew’s brave resolution in distress. Carew’s ship had got separated from the rest of the fleet and Carew bravely refused to accept help from the Earl of Southampton’s ship: he

\[\text{\footnotesize 64}^{\text{Footnote}}\] Thus ‘in Conscience’ (A7r) becomes ‘in point of conscience’; ‘six things are principally required’ (B2r) becomes ‘sixe qualities are principally look’d to, and regarded’; appropriately, ‘needlesse charge’ (D2v) becomes ‘needlesse and unnecessary Chardge’ (D2v).

\[\text{\footnotesize 65}^{\text{Footnote}}\] There are two key examples: a little digression about the wholesomeness of merchant ships in Sea-Service (C4v), and an amplified version of the anecdote about Talbot in Seaflght (f.8r). There are also occasional personalising touches in Gorges’s style (‘in my poore Opinion’ (C8v)).
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would not forsake the Ship, but made election rather, to run the fortune of the rest of his company, then to provide for the particular safetie of himselfe, and some other Captaines, and Gentleman [sic] of good qualitie, whereof hee had store. (51)

Gorges adds a comparison between Carew’s behaviour and the parallel heroism of the Earl of Lincoln in Elizabeth’s reign. All this seems to contradict Gorges’s frequent recommendations elsewhere in Islands Voyage that such excessive, incautious bravery should be avoided as counter-productive (see section 1 above). Gorges’s problem is that he wants to praise Carew, a close associate at the time of the 1607 version of Islands Voyage (see note 14), but that the type of martial behaviour that is conventionally seen as most glamorous and praiseworthy is of a type Gorges censures elsewhere. Gorges uses the pirate anecdote at this point to smoothe over this tension and redirect the reader’s attention. The reader expects another example of boldly heroic behaviour parallel to Carew’s and Lincoln’s, but this is not exactly what s/he gets. Though the pirate’s advice is certainly bold, it is not gratuitously so (as Carew’s heroism is) and the focus of the anecdote is on the theme of desert. Gorges says that the event took place at the time of Desmond’s rebellion in Munster, when Gorges’s father, Sir William, was Vice-admiral in the Dreadnought under the command of Sir John Perrott. The pirate, named Derivall, gave his advice about the sandbank to Perrott, on condition that he be pardoned back in England. Perrott gave his word, but was unable to keep it. Gorges finds a double moral: service should be recognised, the state remembering that ‘verteue deserves no lesse to bee cherished, then vice to be chastised’, and an Admiral should be allowed ‘to make good his word for any thing, that concernes the advancement of the service, wherewith hee is
put in trust' (54). Gorges has effectively used the anecdote to shift from one theme to another—from the theme of boldness to the theme of desert. The story of Carew’s reckless heroism is followed by an account of Derivall’s more obviously praiseworthy boldness. The Derivall story then ends up focusing not on the theme of boldness at all, but on the scandal of Derivall’s lack of reward. All this enables Gorges, when, following the anecdote, he returns to his narrative of Carew’s exploits, to justify his praise of Carew. The implication can be made that Carew, unlike Derivall, is being given his due: ‘small is the reward of those that so resolutely engage, and expose their lives for the service of their Prince and Countrey, if they should not bee allowed the comfort of honourable memory’ (54). The Derivall anecdote obliquely allows Gorges to validate Carew’s over-boldness.

The same anecdote is deployed to different, more straightforward, effect in Seaflght. It comes at the end of the treatise, underpinning Gorges’s attempt to justify his decision, as a ‘private’ man with no official naval position, to write on naval and state affairs. The anecdote takes up a lot of space at the climax of the text. This is unsurprising—its function is, after all, to win the text a hearing. The anecdote, an example of an outsider of low status giving valuable service, fits this context very well.

Gorges makes several significant changes. He now says that the event took place after an expedition looking for the traitor Thomas Stukely, recently invested ‘Marquis of

---

66 The post-1612 revision (Ballard and SP15) further emphasises the point about the power of commanders, adding an extra clause after ‘wherewith’: ‘for in such cases authoritie [SP15 adds ‘and power’ here] must not be separated’.

67 Derivall’s lack of recognition, of course, has nothing to do with his advice to Sir John Perrott—it is entirely due to his piracy, which takes place outside the text. Thus it cannot really be compared at all to the issue of Carew’s desert. See below. The Ballard and SP15 texts of Islands Voyage try to more respectable by saying that the former was ‘an expert Pilott for the Narrowe Seas’ (52).
Ireland’ by the Pope (1577). Gorges says that he himself was present—and there is, accordingly, an immediacy in this version of the anecdote not present in *Islands Voyage* (the pirate suddenly comes ‘running to my father’ (f.45v)). Gorges’s father, Sir William, in this version takes Sir John Perrott’s place, promising immunity to the pirate, here unnamed. The most crucial alteration is Gorges’s failure to say what happened to the pirate on returning to England. The reader encountering the anecdote for the first time assumes that Sir William was able to keep his word, and Gorges can sign off neatly: ‘By this Narration it is seene, how necessary, & profitable sometimes is the counsell, & advise of a poore man’ (*ibid.*).68

The nightmare version of the anecdote, *Islands Voyage*’s, is probably the factual one. Sir William Gorges did not go to Ireland during the Stukely campaign, but did serve there in 1579 under Sir John Perrott (Glasgow 1971, 180). *Seafight* does not tell the reader what the pirate’s fate was. It seems likely, then, that *Islands Voyage*’s bleak ending is the true one. Whether or not Gorges himself was present remains uncertain.

In the *Islands Voyage* version, Gorges is able to face up to the bleakness of the pirate’s fate because in it he momentarily occupies the position of the conferrer of reward: as a writer, Gorges is in the position of Carew’s ‘patron’, bestowing praise as reward for Carew’s brave service.

Clearly Gorges could not have used the full, bleak version of the anecdote in *Seafight*, for that would have undermined the moral he was trying to illustrate. The *Islands Voyage* version shows that the advice of poorly regarded people can be valuable, but it also shows that it often goes unrewarded. By using a revised version of the pirate anecdote at this

---

68 The pirate’s request for reward is not in the unrevised text of *Stowe* but is Gorges’s later addition (f.29v).
point in *Seafight* rather than a different *exemplum* Gorges covertly builds into his appeal for patronage the expectation of failure, the anxiety that his reward will be like Derivall's.\(^69\) An unsettling element in all this is the fact that Derivall's reward is not exactly unmerited. There is a solid reason—the pirate’s former life—to justify the lack of recognition the pirate’s good service receives. Derivall, simultaneously a daring free agent not beholden to patrons\(^70\) and a good servant to the crown, is an ideal focus for anxieties about one’s behaviour in the patronage system. Independence leads to death.\(^71\)

*Stowe’s* text of *Seafight* was prepared for presentation to Buckingham in March 1618/9 in association with a reworked text of Ralegh’s orders for the Guiana voyage. Ralegh, recently executed, is nowhere mentioned, though Sandison (1934) argues that many readers would have recognised his presence both in the orders and in the general spirit of the treatise. Perhaps Ralegh is present, too, at the very end of *Seafight*, in the occluded unhappy ending of Gorges’s pirate anecdote. Ralegh, like Derivall, did worthy service only to be rewarded with execution for a previous ‘offence’. The end of *Seafight* covertly confronts the fear that Gorges will suffer a parallel fate—his service unrewarded, his independence punished. Covert invocation of Ralegh helps explain the most puzzling feature of *Seafight’s* version of the anecdote, Gorges’s decision to shift it from its real context, 1579, and relocate it in the context of the search for Thomas Stukely in 1577.

---

\(^69\) It is significant that Gorges’s father is in the position of the disempowered, unwillinglytreacherous patron in the censored, *Seafight* version of the anecdote and not in the bleak, full *Islands Voyage* one. Gorges himself is present only in *Seafight*. It is as if the direct relevance of the story to Gorges himself can only be faced if betrayal by the father/patron is struck from the text.

\(^70\) Though the pirate occupies the archetypal position of ‘other’, it is surely significant that Ralegh’s privateering, in which Gorges might well have been involved, often verged on piracy (e.g. Coote 1993, 73-4). The ‘other’ of piracy is closer to Gorges’s conception of himself than at first appears.

\(^71\) Gorges’s use of the pirate anecdote in *Seafight* has a buried stoicism reminiscent of Ralegh’s depiction of Gorges in his prefatory poem to *Lycans Pharsalia* (‘Change not, to change thy fortune is too late’—see Chapter 6.1.).
Could it be that Gorges’s use of the name Stukely here, just a few months after Ralegh’s execution, is meant to make the reader think of Sir Lewis Stukely, the man responsible for betraying Ralegh to his death?\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{72} For Gorges’s antagonism to Stukely (6 January 1618/9) see Chapter 1.2.
Towards the end of his life Gorges worked on translations of Lucan and Bacon, texts which were printed in Gorges's lifetime with his agreement. In the first section of this chapter I argue that Gorges's translation of Lucan's *De bello civili* (*Pharsalia*) was originally conceived within the limits of Gorges's patronage relationship with Prince Henry but was fatally undermined by Henry's death before its publication. The second section analyses Gorges's translations of Bacon's *Essays* into French and Bacon's *De sapientia veterum* into English. I argue that Bacon conceived of these two works as closely related texts and encouraged their joint publication in a number of languages as a means of advancing his European reputation and extending his patronage contacts in preparation for the publication of the *Novum organum*.

1. *Lucans Pharsalia*

Although Lucan was an important author in the renaissance grammar-school syllabus (Baldwin 1944, 1.103, 196-7), Gorges's *Lucans Pharsalia* (1614)\(^1\) was the first complete English translation of *De bello civili*.\(^2\) Marlowe's version of the first book had appeared posthumously in 1600. Gorges's translation is very different from Marlowe's. Marlowe used a heavily annotated edition of Lucan, working into his translation material from its

---

1 *Lucans Pharsalia: containing The Ciuill Warres betweene Caesar and Pompey. Written In Latine Heroicall Verse by M. Annaeus Lucanvs. Translated into English verse by Sir Arthur Gorges knight. Whereunto is annexed the life of the Authour, collected out of diuers Authors. Fides fortibus fraus formidolosis.*

2 The preferred modern title; renaissance readers knew the text as *Pharsalia*. 
glosses (Gill 1973; Burrow 1988, 228). Gorges, on the other hand, worked from a copy of a Lyon edition of 1561, a sparsely annotated text which included only simple sidenotes. Whilst Marlowe’s translation is a vivid, skilful scholarly production (Gill 1973; 1987; Shapiro 1988), Gorges’s translation is very much the work of an amateur, rough-hewn and crude, peppered with misreadings. The contrast is unsurprising. It is likely that Gorges’s translation was conceived of pragmatically as a useful text to present to his patron Prince Henry. Gorges’s aim would have been to produce not a scholarly version of Lucan’s poem but a text that Henry would find helpful in considering questions of political and martial behaviour and policy. Lucan’s *Pharsalia* was published in 1614, two

---

3 *M. Anni Lucani de bello civili libri decem, Nunc recens post omnium editiones sedulo recogniti, ac scholiis illustrati Lygaduni apud haered. Seb. Gryphii, M.D.LXI.* That Gorges probably used this edition is shown by close parallels in paragraph division (no other Latin text that I have seen, for example, parallels Gorges’s paragraph break at 1.30) and in the wording of sidenotes (e.g. ‘Tages the first inuenter of Auguring’ (E4v) from ‘Tages auspicianae artis inuentor’ (B5r); ‘A detestation of warre’ (O2r) from ‘Belli detestatio’ (F4v)). In his translation Gorges makes sporadic references to other classical texts and to commentators (e.g., H6v; 202v; 2P4v), only turning to these authorities when puzzled by something in Lucan. He also turned to other sources when compiling his life of Lucan (B1r-B3v) and for his translation of Sulpitius’s arguments to each book. Latin quotations in this chapter use Lucan 1928, a text which does not differ substantively from the Lyon edition in any of the passages I have chosen to quote.

4 Thus, for example, ‘templa’ meaning ‘sky’ (1.155) is mistranslated as ‘temples’ (C2r) and ‘ardenti servilia bella sub Aetna’ (1.43), a reference to the ‘slave wars’ of 36 BC, is taken to involve a comparison between Etna’s ‘sparkling forges’ and the battle of Actium (B3r-B5v). Gorges’s translation has a naïve, unsophisticated quality that is occasionally quite effective. It is written in regular tetrameter couplets, each line generally forming a discrete rhythm/sense unit (see Chapter 3.1.1), often a relative clause, with solid syntactic links to neighbouring lines. Gorges’s preference for clausal structures and finite verbs means that the number of grammatical subjects is multiplied and that statements which in Latin read as clear descriptions of complex states of affairs become lumpy sequences of events. Connected with this is Gorges’s fondness for personifications (‘bruma’ (1.17) becomes ‘Hyems’, with ‘ycie hands’ (B4v); ‘ponto’ (3.633) becomes ‘in midst of Thetis lappe’ (L6r)). The effect is often vivid, though the success or failure of Gorges’s approach depends on the ability of the sense of the original Latin to withstand a sequential approach in which each new line reacts immediately upon the preceding line, and is reacted upon in turn by the line following. Occasionally, Gorges is obliged to heap up a sequence of awkward adverbial qualifications improperly subordinated; elsewhere, his linkage of units breaks down and he has to start again with a new main clause. On the whole Lucan’s Latin is bludgeoned into the simplest English possible. Gorges’s use of a short metre, coupled with his penchant for clausal sense units, means that few of his words have more than two syllables. He resorts to a host of unusual monosyllabic words which give the poem an earthy, archaic feel (‘prank’, ‘trend’, ‘ming’), meanwhile placing words with fairly specific meanings in contexts asking for more general terms (thus, ships ‘seize’ the shore). Gorges is also fond of adding images to the original. Modern opinion of Gorges’s ‘dogged’ (Burrow 1993, 188) translation has been variable: Katherine Duncan-Jones (1983, 163) considers it to be ‘a most distinguished translation, now
years after Henry’s death. Some of its unusual features can be explained if it is thought of
as a text composed in two stages: first as an abortive client’s offering to Henry (to be
presented either as a printed book or in manuscript); secondly as a revised, printed text,
exposed for the first time to the public gaze in 1614. The absence of Henry in 1614, in
this reading, made it difficult for Gorges to work out how he was to present his text
publicly, and forced him into unusual stratagems.

It is at first sight surprising that it took so long for the Pharsalia to be translated, for
Lucan’s influence on sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century English literature was
widespread (e.g. Blissett 1956; Ingledew 1962; LaBranche 1963; Jones 1977, 273-7;
Ronan 1988ab; Burrow 1993, 180-99). Recent critics (MacLean 1990, 26-44; Norbrook
1994) put a political gloss on the delay. The Pharsalia is an obviously republican poem,
Lucan the ‘one leading Roman poet who could become a focus for republican loyalties’
(Norbrook 1994, 46). Throughout the Pharsalia, Lucan is sympathetic to Pompey and the
republican cause and hostile to Julius Caesar and the Caesars in general (Dilke 1972a, 62-
9). The poem has no obvious ‘hero’ but, rather, three candidates for that role: Caesar,
Pompey and Cato, the Stoic saint who takes over the republican cause after Pompey’s
death. The absence of the gods means that the poem’s focus is consistently on the morally
problematic choices made by the three major protagonists. Renaissance literature took an
interestingly ambivalent view of Julius Caesar (Blissett 1956; Miola 1985); and a major
source for this view was Lucan, who combined vehement hostility to Caesar with a
compelling presentation of him as an ambitious, dynamic, charismatic military genius. By

strangely forgotten’; Roma Gill finds it ‘easy enough reading which quickly degenerates into jingle’ (1973,
401).
contrast, Lucan’s Pompey is on the right side but weak and his Cato admirable but politically ineffective.

Almost as problematic as the text’s republicanism was Lucan’s career, ‘the resonant paradigm of a politically active poet who, though a senator who was highly successful at the imperial ‘court’, changed allegiances and conspired to kill his emperor and sponsor’ (MacLean 1990, 26). Lucan began his career as a favourite of Nero’s; he ended it as a participant in the Pisonian conspiracy. He was associated with a Stoic ideology nostalgic for the Roman republic. The Pharsalia’s republicanism is uneasily juxtaposed with gaudy flattery of Nero. Most critics now argue that Lucan began his poem loyal to Nero, but completed it hostile to him, writing at least some of it after he had joined the conspiracy (Ahl 1976, 41-54; Braund 1992, xiv-xvi). It is not surprising that renaissance writers were reluctant to confront directly through wholesale translation the Pharsalia’s open republicanism and its awkward status as the work of a traitor. Two ‘drab’ poems stage their authors’ failure to translate Lucan: Barnabe Googe says that he was inspired by Melpomene to translate Lucan, only for Calliope to persuade him out of it (1989, 127), whilst George Turberville says he had started work on a translation but was told to stop by Melpomene (1977, 334-44).^5

Renaissance debate about the Pharsalia focused obsessively on its generic status as history and/or poetry (Hulse 1981, 198-205; MacLean 1990, 26-34), perhaps in an anxious ‘suppression or strategic displacement’ of the text’s republicanism (MacLean 1990, 34). In another ‘strategic displacement’, the poem was sometimes read as a general demonstration of the evils of civil war, a strategy enabling it to be used to buttress any
legitimate authority, monarchical or republican (Norbrook 1994, 50). Despite these attempts to muzzle it, though, the radicalism of the Pharsalia persisted as a disruptive force in renaissance culture.⁵ Annabel Patterson (1984, 14) singles out Lucan, together with Virgil and Tacitus, as an author emblematic in the renaissance of the problems inherent in the relationship between writers and political authority. A major source for Patterson’s analysis of how renaissance writers got round the problem of a censored press is Frederick M. Ahl’s analysis of the plight of ‘The Man of Letters in a Totalitarian Society’ in his monograph on Lucan (1976, 25-35). Ahl argues that writers hostile to Nero protected themselves by means of ambiguity:

Provided that the criticism is not direct and outspoken, but follows, at least superficially, the official ideology and propaganda of the regime, the writer has a good chance of emerging unscathed...There must have existed, then, between poet and emperor, an uneasy truce. The emperor realized the ambivalence of the poet, and the poet was careful not to go so far as to reveal his antipathy openly. Literary ambiguity was the poet’s means of achieving a kind of freedom of speech, despite all obstacles. (1976, 30-2)

Patterson’s argument is that ‘functional ambiguity’ (1984, 18) of this sort was common in the renaissance. In the period in which Lucan’s Pharsalia appeared a ‘Neostoic’ tradition had emerged of using texts of classical history, particularly Tacitus, as the vehicle for potentially oppositional political statements, rooted in the sorts of strategies Patterson and Ahl describe (Patterson 1984, 49-58; Salmon 1989; Smuts 1994; Norbrook 1994; Sharpe and Lake 1994b). Renaissance ‘Neostoicism’ concentrated in particular on the works of Tacitus and Seneca, Lucan’s uncle. J.H. Salmon argues that ‘the entry of Tacitean politics into English Neostoicism was accomplished by those who inherited the tradition of the

⁵ Perhaps Gorges’s Lucan should, then, be read in part as a besting of Turberville, the major precursor of Gorges’s Vannetyes and Toyes (Chapter 3.1.4).

⁶ For an arresting radical reading of Lucan see Quint 1993, 131-57. For a survey of political uses made of Lucan during the English civil war see, in addition to Norbrook 1994, Smith 1994, 203-12. Norbrook
Sidney circle, first in Essex’s retinue, and then in the household of Prince Henry’ (1989, 207) and that the opposition of James I meant that in England in particular ‘Tacitean Neostoicism became a vehicle for discontent in Jacobean court circles’ (1989, 224).

1.1. Henry’s Lucan

At the time of the publication of Lucan’s Pharsalia, Gorges was certainly alienated from much of Jacobean government policy and it is, unsurprisingly, not hard to find oppositional elements in the text. Yet it is hard to envisage Gorges embarking on such a piece of work—as an oppositional and/or ‘functionally ambiguous’ text exposed in the public domain—outside his patronage relationship with Prince Henry. A ‘Henrician’ context helps explain the nature of the mixture of oppositional and conservative elements in Gorges’ translation.7

Several factors make it likely that Gorges originally wrote Lucan’s Pharsalia for Henry. Translating (and then printing) Lucan’s ten books must have been a lengthy process, so it is almost certain that Gorges would have been working on them before Henry’s death in 1612. At that date, when Henry was his major patron, it is hard to envisage Gorges being involved in a major project not centred around his patronage relationship with the prince. Rich in material on strategy and tactics, rousing speeches, descriptions of battles and analyses of heroic virtue and leadership, the Pharsalia would have appealed strongly to Henry’s martial interests and his related enthusiasm for the study of history (Strong 1986, 50) suggests that Gorges’s translation was published to take advantage of interest in the republican Grotius’s edition of 1614. Grotius’s edition had no direct influence on Gorges’s work, as far as I can tell.

7 Cf. the obviously anti-Jamesian elements in Gorges’s manuscript A Breefe Discourse, dedicated to Henry (Chapter 6.2). Gorges cites Tacitus in his Seafight treatise, alongside Lucan (BL MS Stowe 426, f.41v).
145-8). The figure of Caesar was, moreover, strongly associated with Henry (Soellner 1985, 137). In Basilicon Doron James had recommended to Henry the study of historians in general and the study of Caesar in particular, arguing that ‘of all the Ethnicke Emperours, or great Captaines that euer was, he hath farthest excelled, both in his practise, and in his precepts in martiall affaires’ (1944-50, 1.151). Clement Edmondes’ dedication to Henry of the 1604 volume of his commentaries on Caesar explains that he returned to his unfinished translation of Caesar after having read the passage on Caesar in Basilicon Doron (Edmondes 1604, B3r). In 1609 Edmondes’ commentary on Caesar’s Civil Wars appeared, making liberal use of Lucan, accompanied by a commendatory poem by Joshuah Sylvester identifying Henry as ‘a CAESAR of our owne’ (Edmondes 1609, A3r). The title-page engraving shows Caesar and Pompey facing each other across an archway surmounted by a portrait of Prince Henry. Chapman’s Caesar and Pompey, a relatively even-handed dramatisation of the civil war, possibly written at about the same time as Gorges’s translation of Lucan, was, Rolf Soellner has suggested (1985), originally composed for Prince Henry. Henry was, then, being presented with texts associated with Caesar. The texts by Edmondes and Chapman both cover the same events as Lucan, and both involve the juxtaposition of Caesar’s good and bad qualities with the

---

8 The subject-matter of the Pharsalia also obviously forms part of ‘the lawe and studdie of state’ recommended to Prince Henry by Gorges in 1610—‘the knowledge of the meanes by which dominions are founded, conserved, and amplified’, a study ‘not vnproper for your Highnes’, ‘that lawe: supported by vertruous projects, and heroycall deedes, that frames Trophies to renowne, stepps to the Heauens, and settles in prosperitie the Royall Throane’ (Trinity College, Cambridge MS R. 7.23* (Prince Henry’s Copy books 3), f.24r).


10 Not an uncommon view in the renaissance: it was, for example, Philip Sidney’s opinion too (recorded by Gabriel Harvey, quoted in Jardine and Grafton 1990, 54).

11 Arguments have been made for both c.1605 and c.1612. See Soellner 1985, 136.
good and bad qualities of Pompey and Cato. Perhaps the sort of issues raised by the events of the civil war were being actively discussed at Henry’s court, and Chapman’s, Edmondes’ and Gorges’s texts were designed to feed that discussion.

Henry’s court would have been an ideal arena for the discussion of such topics. It would have been possible for writer-clients presenting Henry (a young prince under instruction) with accounts of Pompey, Cato and Caesar to argue that he should emulate some of these figures’ actions and avoid others. The conventional identification of Henry with Caesar need not have prevented his clients from criticising some of Caesar’s actions. Edmondes asks, even-handedly,

> Was it Pompeis Ambition, or Caesars high Thoughts, that bereft the State of libertie, with the losse of so many Romaines? It were besides the scope of these discourses, to lay an imputation vpon either of those Worthies; the one beeing chiefe Assistant to the Empire, when she put off her Consularie Government,and the other sitting sole at the helm, directing a course to fetch in many Caesars. Onely this I may truely say with Tacitus; That Ciuil wars were neuer set on foote by justifiable courses. (1609 (Commentary on the Ciuil Warres), B1v-B2r)

Discussion of the faults and virtues of Caesar and Pompey in utrumque partem would have been facilitated by the dependence of the Pharsalia on elaborately wrought, sententiae-laden declamation (either in Lucan’s own voice or in the voices of his characters), a feature which constantly holds up the narrative and makes it difficult for the inattentive reader to get an overall picture of what is happening (Ahl 1976; Braund 1992, xvii-xviii, xx, xxxiii-xxxv, xlix-l). This quality of the poem was recognised by Ben Jonson, who judged that ‘Lucan, taken in parts was good divided, read altogether merited not the name of a poet’ (1975, 462; cf. 478). Because of it, political, military and moral

---

12 An anonymous play on the same topic, The Tragedy of Caesar and Pompey, had been published c.1606-7. Many critics have discussed the ambivalences of Chapman’s treatment of his three main protagonists, e.g. Kistler 1979; Ide 1985; Soellner 1985. For the direct influence of Lucan on the play see Ingledew 1962.

13 Set-piece discussions of historical topics certainly occurred at Henry’s court, as his biographer W.H. records (cited by Strong (1986, 145)).
lessons are automatically ready for piecemeal application, in speech-making or in action, in isolation from the rest of the poem (cf. LaBranche 1963). Writing on Caesar and Pompey, Richard S. Ide points out that

the humanist conception of history could...pull in the opposite direction from coherent characterization, toward lessons that were situational, political and ethical examples that might be used to flesh out a rhetorical argument. (Ide 1985, 256)

Gorges’s translation emphasises this quality in Lucan, exaggerating it. Many sententiae (including whole speeches by Cato) are marked, in a departure from the practice of Gorges’s Latin edition. Some of these marked sententiae are sententiae in Gorges’s translation only, having had more specific reference in Lucan’s Latin (e.g. ‘And those most soundly take their ease,/Whom lowly pouerty can please’ (S4), adapting 5.505-6). Gorges’s sidenotes, meanwhile, frequently mint entirely original sententiae (‘True valor increaseth with mis-fortune’ (L5v); ‘The remembrance of former felicities is grievous in aduersitie’ (2E1v); ‘Opportunity in martiall affaires once lost is hardly recouered’ (2Q2v)).

Gorges’s translation is parallel to the work of the professional ‘readers’ recently identified by Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, ‘scholar-secretaries employed for ‘reading’—providing interpretations of textual material on pragmatic political themes’ for their employers, ‘facilitators easing the difficult negotiations between modern needs and ancient texts’ (1990, 34, 35). Gorges’s approach to Lucan, with its emphasis on martial utility and lack of interest in detailed scholarly minutiae is similar to Gabriel Harvey’s professional ‘reading’ of Livy for Philip Sidney (Jardine and Grafton 1990, 36-7). Like Henry himself, Gorges shared Harvey’s view of Roman history as primarily ‘a treasury of military devices to be imitated and heroic battles to be savoured’ (Jardine and Grafton
His narrative of the *Islands Voyage* contains a ringing passage contrasting with weak-minded contemporary practice the manner of going to war ‘of those worthy Romans, that by their wisdome and valour made themselves famous, and Lords over the World, whose glorious examples we doe more willingly read then follow’:

They going a warfare departed Rome in obedience and strictnesse of Martiall discipline, in sobrietie of diet and attire, fitted with Armes, like men that knew that Iron and Steele were mastring mettalls over Gold and Silver, and having achieved and performed their enterprises, returned then home in triumph, in glory, and in pride, shining in the spoyles and riches of their vanquished Enemies, and adorned with as much sumptuousnesse as thy could get, braving therein their conquered Foes, and setting to the shew of the world the fruits of their Valour and Travailes. (Purchas 1905-7, 45-6)

Gorges’s Lucan would have presented Henry with a commonplace-book of military, political and moral wisdom held together in an exciting narrative framework, clearly designed to furnish the prince with a storehouse of *exempla* and *sententiae* to ponder and to deploy in speech and action.

The annotation in the Latin edition Gorges used has a rhetorical bias. Many of its sidenotes simply register Lucan’s use of specific tropes. Though extensively indebted to the Latin annotation (see note 2, above), Gorges’s sidenotes largely omit this technical rhetorical material, focusing attention instead on potentially useful elements of martial lore. The making of speeches to troops—and thus rhetoric generally considered—is an important theme in Gorges’s annotation, though, and would have been of great interest to Henry. Gorges scrupulously annotates Caesar’s, Pompey’s and Cato’s speeches to their troops, registering the speeches’ strengths and weaknesses and noting the troops’ reactions. Cato’s long speech in Book 9 is marked as an extended *sententia*. Gorges adds

---

14 Cf., too, Henry Savile’s approach to Tacitus (Smuts 1994, 27). Tacitus was recommended to Prince Henry as ‘a writer of admirable sagacity’ (*ibid.*, 34). On Tacitus and Henry’s circle see Salmon 1990. Edmondes’s *Observations* on Caesar constantly stress ancient literature’s applicability to modern warfare. An essay demonstrating the value of ‘reading and discourse’ in the making of a soldier opens Edmondes 1609 (A1r-A4r). The full title of Edmondes 1604 is *Observations Upon Caesars Commentaries setting*
to the account of how Crassus kept peace between Caesar and Pompey a reference to its rhetorical basis in ‘perswasiue powerfull words’ (C1r).

At several points Gorges compares moments in Lucan’s narrative to recent military history: the Spaniards’ use of a ‘stockado’ before Antwerp (H6r); the sinking of the Mary Rose in Henry VIII’s reign (L6v). Implicit reference is made in some sidenotes to Gorges’s experience on the Islands Voyage (e.g. T1r). Military topics highlighted in added sidenotes include the treatment of veteran soldiers (D2v); the importance of armies in preventing idleness (K5v); ‘The cruelty of fire in a sea-fight’ (M1v; 2Q4r); the way in which ‘Confused fighting in Troopes; obscures particular valour’ (O4v); the Roman practice of ‘fighting in an orbe...in extremity’ (P6v); the use of the ‘systron’ as a weapon of war (2O4r). Gorges is full of admiration for the courage and dedication of Caesar’s men (M5) and the affection (O5r) and awe (R6r; V6r) with which they regarded their general. He also approves of the Romans’ thirst for ‘future fame’ (O5r) and honour (2L4v) and individual heroism such as ‘The resolution of Vulteius’ (O5v). He adds several sidenotes to draw attention to the bravery of the Massilians in Book 3. Throughout, he vigorously notes moments of ‘pagan’ foolishness which disqualify parts of the text from contemporary application (O4v; P1v; Q4v; R5v).

Rolf Soellner argues that Chapman in Caesar and Pompey ‘sought to encourage [Henry’s] energy and enthusiasm but also to purify them and to steer him away from thoughts of conquest and military glory’ (1985, 144). Lycans Pharsalia lends itself to a similar if less extreme interpretation. If, like Chapman’s play in Soellner’s reading, it was written for Henry, it would have presented the prince with an only partially admirable forth the Practise of ye Art militarie in the time of the Romaine Empire for the better direction of our
Julius Caesar—a figure to be imitated in some respects and avoided in others, whose bravery and tactical skill are to be emulated but whose amorality and recklessness are to be shunned. Gorges was keen to promote the prince’s sense of himself as a military hero in the making, but he was careful in the texts he wrote for Henry to emphasise the virtues of prudence and circumspection—the Islands Voyage narrative, the Observations on the Sea-Service and the Breefe Discourse are all centrally concerned with evolving a model of prudent heroism (see Chapter 5). The approach of Gorges in these texts seems to share aims with a series of texts written for Henry by other writers in which prudence and moderation in martial and political affairs is recommended—in particular three of the masques for Henry, Daniel’s Tethys’ Festival and Jonson’s Prince Henry’s Barriers and Oberon, each of which approaches Henry’s anti-Habsburg militarism soberly and prudently in a clear attempt to tone down Henry’s martial enthusiasms. A similar approach was taken by Ralegh in The History of the World, written for Henry but published after his death in the same year as Lycans Pharsalia. Ralegh’s History highlights for dispraise the theme of egotistical, overarching ambition so central to the Pharsalia’s critique of Caesar. Together, Ralegh’s and Gorges’s texts would have offered Henry a strong warning against the perils of unchecked ambition, while nevertheless

moderne Warrs.

15 Roy Strong (1986, 141-51; 155-7; 160-74) argues that these masques attempt the impossible task of celebrating simultaneously the incompatible ideals of Henry and his father.

16 Gorges highlights the importance of this theme by mistranslating ‘stimulos dedit aemula virtus’ (1.120) as ‘Where vertue emulates it iarres’ (C1v). Cf. the observation à propos of the rivalry between Ralegh and Essex in Gorges’s account of the Islands Voyage, written for Henry in 1607 (Chapter 5.1) that ‘this impotent humor of induring rivalry, and other mens praises, is very incident to men in high places, especially if they be of great courage, or tickled with Ambition’ (Purchas 1905-7, 93). The tag from Lucan is used, coincidentally, by James Cleland in his 1607 description of the friendly rivalry between young men at Henry’s court (quoted in Wilson 1946, 52). For the theme of ambition in Ralegh’s History see, e.g., Williamson 1978, 87-90.
encouraging him in his militaristic outlook.\(^{17}\) The closeness of the association between
Gorges and Ralegh, indeed, makes it likely that *Lucans Pharsalia* was from the first
conceived of as a pendant to the *History*.\(^{18}\) The *History*’s narrative comes to an end in
168 BC. In his conclusion, Ralegh says:

By this which we have alreadie set downe, is seene the beginning and end of the three first Monarchies
of the world; whereof the Founders and Erectours thought, that they could neuer haue ended. That of
*Rome* which made the fourth, was also at this time almost at the highest. We haue left it flourishing in
the middle of the field; hauing rooted vp, or cut down, all that kept it from the eyes and admiration of
the world. But after some continuance, it shall begin to lose the beauty it had; the stormes of ambition
shall beat her great boughes and branches one against another; her leaues shall fall off, her limbs wither,
and a rabble of barbarous Nations enter the field, and cut her downe. (Ralegh 1614, 6T4r)

Gorges’s Lucan can be read as a sobering continuation of the *History*, a dissection of
some of these Roman ‘storms of ambition’. Gorges’s account of the Islands Voyage of
1597, put together for Prince Henry in 1607 (just before Ralegh is said to have started
planning the *History*), also seems designed to demonstrate to the young prince the
dangers of ambition (see Chapter 5.1). Publication details, meanwhile, link *Lucans
Pharsalia* to Ralegh and the *History of the World*.\(^{19}\)

---

\(^{17}\) The *History* shares the martial bias of *Lucans Pharsalia* to such an extent that ‘at times Book V reads like
a training manual for Henry on how to deal with Spain’ (Salas 1996, 199).

\(^{18}\) Cf. May 1989, 104: ‘It was perhaps not mere coincidence that Sir Arthur Gorges chose to translate
Lucan’s *Pharsalia*, and to publish it in the same year that Ralegh’s *History* came from the press.’

\(^{19}\) *Lucans Pharsalia* was entered in the Stationers’ Register to Walter Burre on 27 May 1614 and was
printed in one edition of three issues (all 1614), under the imprints of Edward Blount, Walter Burre and
Thomas Thorpe (STC 16884; 16885; 16885a; pace Norbrook (1994, 333, n.17), there are three issues
because the book was published jointly by three publishers, not because it was particularly popular). Burre,
effectively the book’s copyright holder, was probably the publisher who established contact with Gorges
and put up most of the capital. His other major publication of 1614, undertaken without a syndicate, was
Ralegh’s *History of the World*, in press since 1611, so it seems probable that Gorges was put in touch with
Burre by Ralegh. (Ralegh might have been put in touch with Burre through Jonson, whose work Burre had
published (STC 14755; 14759; 14766; 14773).) In 1614, Burre’s two regular printers, William Stansby and
Nicholas Okes, were working on *The History of the World* and *Lucans Pharsalia* respectively. Thorpe and
Blount were close professional associates—Thorpe had been apprenticed to Blount and had collaborated
closely with him on the publication of texts by Marlowe. George Eld and Valentine Sims, Thorpe’s regular
printers, printed extensively for Blount. The names of Burre, Thorpe and Blount are, strikingly, found
together in only one other publishing venture, Marlowe’s translation of Lucan’s first book (1600; STC
16883; Marlowe 1987). This text was entered to John Wolfe in 1593 but never published under Wolfe’s
name. The 1600 edition was published by Thorpe to be sold by Burre. A dedicatory letter from Thorpe to
Blount refers to the latter’s ‘old right’ in the text. In 1614 Burre clearly believed that Blount and Thorpe
Though the rhetorical structure of the *Pharsalia* and its emphasis on martial affairs made it an ideal text with which to present Henry, Gorges must have found Lucan’s depiction of Caesar problematic. In translating the poem for Henry a difficult balance would have had to have been struck between Lucan’s almost demonic Caesar and the figure admired by Henry’s father and Gorges himself and commonly linked by panegyrist s to the prince. To make Lucan a text that could carry the double message of Gorges’s other texts for Henry some doctoring of Lucan’s presentation of Caesar would have been necessary. This is why, I think, Gorges’s Caesar is a more balanced, ambivalent figure than Lucan’s. Gorges consistently plays down the evil of Lucan’s Julius Caesar and accentuates his heroism. Thus, for example, translating the first of Lucan’s major attacks on Caesar, Gorges censors the suggestion that Caesar ‘rejoices’ (‘gaudet’ (2.439)) in slaughter, toning down ‘Caesar in arma furens nisi sanguine fuso/Gaudet habere vias’ (439-40) into ‘Caesar in Armes with furies sway/Not without bloud will shape his way’ (G6r). Unflattering adjectives applied by Lucan to Caesar are regularly doctored. The ‘unjust (‘iniqui’ (7.40)) victor’s weapons’ become simply ‘the hand/Of him that doth the victor stand’ (2A2r). At 7.503 the blades of the swords of Caesar’s soldiers are ‘guilty’ only in the Latin text, Gorges having omitted Lucan’s ‘nocens’ (202r). Later, Gorges manages to detach ‘furor’ and ‘rabies’ from Caesar: ‘Hic furor, hic rabies, hic sunt tua crimina, Caesar’ (7.551) becomes the more neutral ‘Here rage and furie now exceeds/Here Caesar are thy hainous deeds’ (2C3v). At 7.386, Gorges omits the ‘fear of tyranny’ animating Pompey’s army: ‘metus hos regni, spes excitat illos’ thus becomes

could still claim to possess a right in any English translation of Lucan. For Okes see Blayney 1982; for Blount, Lee 1895; for Thorpe, Duncan-Jones 1983. It is perhaps significant that Blount supplied books to Prince Henry (Wilks 1987, 68).
‘Feare doth one side to courage straine,/The others hope to rule and raigne’ (2B5r). Latin sidenotes hostile to Caesar are suppressed, and Caesar is described as ‘noble’ (5.301) and ‘manly’ (2B1v; 7.248-9), in departures from Lucan’s text. Gorges amplifies Caesar’s boldness by wrongly stating that his reputation was not as great as Pompey’s (C2, mistranslating 1.143). At numerous other points in the text he emphasises Caesar’s courage and nobility. At 7.701-2 (‘Quo pectore Romam/Intrabit factus campis felicior istis?’), for example, he doctors Lucan’s text to present the reader with the image of an implausibly compassionate Caesar:

Thinke what remorse will straine his breast
When he shall enter Rome, opprest
With griefe, for her deare people lost,
Gain’d to Pharsalia at her cost. (2D1r)

In a key episode of Book 1, meanwhile, he mollifies the impact of Caesar’s wicked defiance on crossing the Rubicon (1.225-7) by making it into part of a rallying speech to his troops. Gorges’s sidenotes about Caesar’s deeds add complimentary adjectives such as ‘mercifull’ (2b3v) and ‘pious’ (2B3) not found in the Latin sidenotes they translate. In the storm in Book 5 (5.654-71), Gorges’s added sidenotes play down Caesar’s foolhardiness and highlight his bravery. Where Gorges registers hostility to Caesar in sidenotes it is generally clearly marked as being Lucan’s own opinion only (‘The Authors bitternesse in taxing Caesar’ (2H1v); ‘The Authors loue to Pompeys merit’ (2I1r)). Bias towards Caesar is accompanied in Gorges’s translation by bias against Pompey, so that,

---

20 For example, ‘Caesaris impietatem, imprudentiamque taxat’ (d3v; note to 3.73). ‘Caesarem metuebant ciuitates, non amabant’ (ibid.; note to 3.78) is toned down into ‘Caesar not applauded by the Citties, as he past towards Rome.’ (14r).

21 An apparent exception to this bias, Gorges’s translation of 2.319f., may be the result of error. Cato says that Pompey will if victorious make himself master of the world, and that his job, in supporting Pompey, will be to temper this ambition. Gorges mistranslates this quite spectacularly, making Cato say that Pompey does not seek world domination (‘If Pompey giue the ouerthrow/He is of minde too iust and
for example, at 1.131-3 Gorges adds a sidenote censuring Pompey’s courting of the people as ‘popular affectation’ (C1v).

These alterations to Lucan would have allowed Gorges to have put a ‘safe’ gloss on his text, as an even-handed account of Caesar’s virtues and failings for Henry to consider in planning his career. Making Lucan’s Caesar into a more admirable figure would have made other elements of Gorges’s translation discussed in the following section—elements particularly unpalatable to James, though interesting to Henry—easier to present to the prince. As a text dedicated to Henry, a young prince interested in learning about martial affairs, Lucan’s Pharsalia need not have been viewed as an oppositional text; in Patterson’s phrase, it could have been ‘functionally ambiguous’. It is easy to imagine the sort of dedicatory epistle Gorges would have written for it. After Henry’s death, however, things were very different. Lucan’s Pharsalia, like Ralegh’s History must suddenly have seemed a much more dangerous book. Charles G. Salas’s assessment of Ralegh’s situation—‘Ralegh had been using history like a sword and Henry had been his shield’ (1996, 198-9)—is equally applicable to Gorges’s.22

1.2. James’s Lucan

Ralegh’s History, called in for being ‘too saucy in censoring princes’ (Chamberlain 1939, 1.568), has long been read as hostile to James (Lefranc 1968, 320-9; May 1989, 90-3; Salas 1996). Charles G. Salas interprets the History’s anti-Roman version of the Punic meeke/Supreme command alone to seeke’ (G3r)). His intention could conceivably have been to make even more striking Lucan’s contrast between a dynamic, amoral Caesar and a moral but weak Pompey.

22 Cf. Tennenhouse 1981, 249-53. Lucan’s Pharsalia also echoes material in Ralegh’s fragmentary A Discourse of the Original and Fundamental Cause of ... War, much of which concentrates on ambition in great men as a cause of civil war. May assigns this text to 1614 (1989, 106-9).
Wars as ‘a campaign (based on parallels) against Rome, against James, and against James’s ministry’ (1996, 196), pointing out that ‘criticism of ancient Rome ... was likely to be suspect in the eyes of Jacobean’ (197-8). Jacobean iconography frequently depicted James as a Roman emperor (Goldberg 1983, 33-4; Parry 1981; Salas 1996, 197). Against this background Lucan’s republicanism, his hostility to Julius Caesar and his involvement in the Pisonian conspiracy against Nero must have been problematic.

Malcolm Smuts points out that James was closely associated by panegyrists with Augustus, ‘who had healed the wounds of civil war and presided over a golden age of peace, prosperity and cultural brilliance’ and that conservative Jacobean thought considered ‘strong, stable royal government’ the ideal answer to civil war. In 1623, Edmund Bolton argued in *Nero Caesar or Monarchy Depraved* ‘that monarchy was such an effective form of government that it benefited the Empire even during the reign of vicious tyrants’ (Smuts 1994, 39):

> That sacred monarchy could preserve the people of Rome from final ruin, notwithstanding all the profanations, blasphemies and scandals of tyrannous excesses, wherewith Nero defiled and defamed it, is the wonder which no other form of government could perform.

Many years earlier James had ‘translated a section of Lucan in order to affirm the independence of the king’s authority’ (MacLean 1990, 41), adapting from Caesar’s self-assertive speech to the mutineers at 5.335-40 the argument that rulers do not need to depend on their nobles (MacLean 1990, 37-8).

*Lucans Pharsalia* allows Gorges considerable scope for ambiguous invocations of Jacobean monarchy. Gorges follows tradition in believing that the first part of the poem was written as a patronage text for Nero—his note to Lucan’s praise of Nero at 1.45 observes that ‘It should seem that this was written in the beginning of *Neroes* reign,
which was most excellently gourned for the first 5 yeares, with singular Iustice & temperance’ (B5v). Only a few lines later on, though (1.53-5), he glosses Lucan’s hyperbolic vision of the deified Nero as too heavy for the heavens as ‘meere Ironicall flattery’ (ibid.). His note to 1.60f., Lucan’s anticipation of a Neronian peace—‘In this he teacheth NERO how he should gouerne, by an Imagination of what is’—suggests that he imagined Lucan as combining panegyric and instruction in quasi-Jonsonian manner.

At many points in Lvcans Pharsalia Gorges distorts the Latin original in apparent attacks on the Jacobean status quo. In a couple of passages, Gorges comes close to identifying contemporary England with the plight of corrupt Rome. First person plural forms are added to the Latin. Lucan’s text,

Non tu, Pyrrhe ferox, nec tantis cladibus auctor
Poenus erit; nulli penitus descendere ferro
Contigit: alta sedent civilis volnere dextrae. (1.30-3),

becomes

This dismal state wherein she [Hesperia] stands,
Proceedes not yet from fierce Pyrrhus hands;
Nor yet could Hannibals despight
Inflict on vs this wretched plight,
No forraine foes could so preuaile,
Our settled state to rent and quake:
Th’audacious sword worn by thy side,
Hath hewen in thee these gashes wide. (B5r)

Gorges adds a first person plural construction again later in the same book, describing the decay of Rome (1.160ff):

O this was it when conquering Fates
Had made us Lords of mighty states,
And cloyd vs with abundant treasure,
We steep’t our thoughts in pride & pleasure.
Then Luxurie the state surpriz’d,
And vertuous manners grew disguis’d:
For Avarice (that rauening gull,
Who more she hath, the lesse is full)

23 Cf. here the Latin sidenote: ‘Hoc nugamento Nerone- magis rodere, quam commendae voluit’ (a4r).
24 In The Olympian Catastrophe (Gorges 1953), Nero is singled out as the archetypal tyrant (lines 937-48).
To stately mansions drawes their mindes,  
And Gluttony new dainties findes; 
The moderate dyet not regarded,  
Our appetite must now bee larded,  
So men from manly humors fall,  
And grow effeminate withall (C3r)

The attack on luxury echoes similar critiques of English society in Gorges’s prose works (see Chapter 5). Much of Gorges’s translation at this point—references to the laws’ loss of ‘sacred freedome’, clashes between consuls and tribunes, the prevalence of bribery and ‘Vsuryes moth-eating trade’—would have had troubling contemporary resonances:

Then Faction vshers on this warre,  
The Senate with the people iarre.  
Force doth authorize their decrees,  
The lawes their sacred freedome leese,  
Consuls with Tribunes now contest,  
Pruiate repsects their censures wrest,  
All suffrages are bought and priz’d,  
The Consulships are Marchandiz’d,  
And Bribery (the Cities bane)  
Did Campus Martius so prophane,  
That her braue Palmes (the victors hire)  
The purses vertue did acquire.  
Then Vsuryes moth-eating trade  
So rife is growne, and lawlesse made,  
That Debters, at the payment day,  
To Creditors became a pray.  
So Banque-rupts (wanting meanes to liue)  
Their hope to warre and spoyle did giue. (C3r; 1.178-82)

The sidenote Gorges adds at this point highlights the text’s contemporary pertinence: ‘Honors bought and sold, and not conferred by merit’ (C3r). Later, the translation of ‘Nobilitas cum plebe’ (2.101) as ‘Both Lords and Commons’ (F3v) brings Lucan’s Rome closer still to Jacobean England.

Other passages link Rome to Jacobean England in a slightly more positive way. In Lucan, the fearful people of Ariminum see Caesar ‘celsus’ (1.245; ‘towering’) as his armies invade. Gorges’s translation—‘Mounted vpon a Throne of State’ (C5)—momentarily conjures up the picture of an enthroned James. Lucan’s praise of peace is
frequently amplified by Gorges, in implicit homage to James’s view of himself as *rex pacificus*. ‘Multum Roma tamen debet civilibus armis/Quod tibi res acta est’ (1.44) thus becomes ‘And yet thou *Rome* shalt be in debt/Vnsto these wrackes, that did beget/This happy peace, wherein we liue,/And to our toyles an end did giue’ (B5v). To Lucan’s optimistic anticipation of a universal peace presided over by Nero (1.60-2), Gorges adds a hope for ‘Trades increase’ (B5v), duly registering one of the most important elements in James’s pacifism. In a similar move, Gorges expands on Lucan’s praise of national unity, introducing an italicised *sententia*: ‘*Diuided Kingdomes staggring stand,*/One Scepter fits one soueraigne hand’ (B6v). Lucan’s praise of Nero translates into implicit praise of James: does this mean James is/will be like Nero? On the whole, Gorges’s implicit references to Jacobean England give an uneasy effect. In these passages Gorges echoes the use of Roman history made by oppositional Jacobean writers. As Malcolm Smuts points out, the links made by Roman imperial writers between peace, ‘luxury, corruption and the decline of old Roman virtues’ were increasingly deployed in the years following 1604 as ‘the long Jacobean peace became widely associated with growing luxury and vice’ (Smuts 1994, 37).

Such passages, bringing Lucan’s text close to the Jacobean present, sit uneasily with Gorges’s straightforward translation of key republican passages. Several passages make it clear that Gorges was aware of Lucan’s republican bias. He faithfully renders Lucan’s republican apostrophe to non-Romans (7.449-51)—

```plaintext
Ye Meads, and Arabes are blest,
With all the nations of the East,
That have been vsde perpetually
Vnto the rule of Tyranny.
```

25 Gorges stresses the importance of trade in his *Breefe Discourse*, written for Henry in 1610 (Chapter 5. 2).
For now mongst those of any age,
That kings haue held in vassalage,
Our destenie is to be last,
And seruile shame our glory blast.
There are no Gods to be obaid;
The world is but by blind chance swaid: (2B6v)

—and is equally unflinching at 10.526-9 when confronting Lucan’s anger at Pompey’s murder:

The tyrants selfe of worth is not,
Nor all his Realme to cleare that blot.
And till the Senatorean state
On Caesars bowels venge their hate
Pompeys reuenge will be in date. (2Q5)

Translating Lucan’s anticipation of the death of Caesar (7.451), he pointedly adds the word ‘Tyrants’ (‘What must this worke be brought to fine/By Cassius hand? And must he quell/The Tyrants head that so doth swell?’ (2C1r)) and a little later adds a sidenote registering Lucan’s ‘derision’ (2C1r) of the belief in imperial deification. Gorges is also consistently friendly to Brutus: the Latin note to 2.234, ‘Bruti constantia’ (c2r) is expanded to ‘Brutus constancy and courage’ (F6v), whilst Gorges sticks close to a laudatory apostrophe to Brutus which includes a bitter evocation of Caesar’s pride (7.588-95):

Thou glory of the Empires state,
Chiefe hope of Senatorian fate,
Last of that race that banish’t Kings,
Whose name throughout all ages rings;
O do not here (with too great spright)
Against thy foes expresse thy might ...
He is not yet come to his haitgh;
Nor to that supreme humane pride
That will all honour ouer-stride. (2C4v)

Moments such as this allow space for republican sympathies, which Gorges does not go out of his way to condemn. Gorges’s translation has been read as a critique of Jacobean absolutism (MacLean 1990, 39-41; Norbrook 1994, 51-4). Colin Burrow resists the
tendency to make Gorges into a closet republican, arguing that ‘the fear of tyrannical injustice and its consequences, not love of the Republic, underlies Gorges’s translation’ (1988, 189). Convincing as this assessment is, David Norbrook (1994, 51-4) is surely right to emphasise the ease with which *Lycans Pharsalia* can be read as a republican text.

*Lycans Pharsalia* is deliberately, ‘functionally’, ambiguous. Is Gorges Lucan to James’s Nero? How much of what Lucan writes does Gorges endorse, and seek to apply to Jacobean society? Gorges deliberately leaves these questions unanswered by refusing to deploy the usual bibliographical preliminaries. Katherine Duncan-Jones says that *Lycans Pharsalia* is ‘finely printed...self-evidently a ‘quality’ production’ (1983, 163). Yet in comparison with other folio volumes published at the same time by the same publishers, there are some surprising omissions. There is no author’s dedication, and at no point, either in the preliminaries or in the main text, does Gorges explain why he undertook the translation or what he thinks about Lucan or any of the issues his text raises. The life of Lucan that precedes the translation (B1v-B3v) glosses Nero’s antagonism towards Lucan as personal rivalry, avoiding broader political elements. The book also, unlike most of the other folios printed by its publishers at around the same time lacks an emblematic titlepage: Gorges—or, perhaps the publisher—again seems to have shied away from a direct account of what the book is trying to do.26

Gerald M. MacLean’s argument (1990, 39-41) for the radicalism of *Lycans Pharsalia* is based entirely on the three commendatory poems by W.R., S.S. and T.W. These poems are linked by the common theme of ‘truth’. Lucan’s act of composition and Gorges’s act

---

26 Leah S. Marcus argues that the absence of elaborate iconography from the title-page of the Shakespeare first folio performs a related, aestheticising, function (1988, 2-25). John Florio’s *Quean Anna’s new world*
of translation are classified as rare examples of truth-telling behaviour, good deeds in a naughty world. Gorges is closely identified with Lucan. The poem by W.R., usually identified as Ralegh (Latham 1951, 147; Sandison 1928, 660), makes the act of writing/ translating the *Pharsalia* into a defiance of the patronage system. Ralegh casts Gorges as a latter-day Lucan, disappointed in life and out of key with the time and counsels a Stoic endurance. The time for action, he states quite categorically, is past. Gorges has been a virtuous man: that ought to be enough to satisfy him. The only test left is the encounter with death. Gorges expresses his virtue, his independence from the need to flatter the great, by simply, like Lucan, telling it as it is. Stoicism is deployed as a way to escape the patronage system, a way of vindicating failure as a client and rewriting the failed client’s sense of self:

Had Lucan hid the truth to please the time,  
He had been too vnworthy of thy Penne:  
Who neuer sought, nor euer car'd to clime  
By flattery, or seeking worthlesse men.  
For this thou hast been bruis'd: but yet those scarres  
Do beautifie no lesse, then those wounds do  
Receiu'd in iust, and in religious warres;  
Though thou hast bled by both, and beart them too.  
Change not, to change thy fortune tis too late.  
Who with a manly faith resolues to dye,  
May promise to himselfe a lasting state,  
Though not so great, yet free from infamy.  
Such was thy Lucan, whom so to translate  
Nature thy Muse (like LVCANS) did create (A4v)

Ralegh is using Lucan here as a model for writers out of sympathy with the time and the time’s power structures. The apparent subject-matter is Gorges’s virtuous behaviour, yet the poem clearly implies hostility to ‘worthlesse men’ favoured by King James above

---

of words (Blount, 1611), Aaron Rathbone’s *The Surveyor* (Burre, 1616) and Sir Roger Dallington’s *Aphorismes Civill and militarie* (Blount, 1613) all have elaborate title-pages.  
27 Ralegh’s poem was imitated during the civil war by Mildmay Fane (Smith 1994, 204; 388, n.4).
Gorges. None of this explicitly suggests republicanism, though there is space for republicanism within its argument. The political content of Gorges’s virtue is evaded: instead, Ralegh grounds his demonstration of Gorges’s worth in physical bravery: participation in ‘iust, and religious wars’; the resolve to die.

The other commendatory poems make similar points. S.S. contrasts the truthfulness of Lucan with the fabling of Homer and Virgil, in what MacLean construes as an ‘attack on the ‘poetizing’ of Jacobean neoclassicism’:

‘Therefore how farre from Fable Truth is set,/So farre aboue all feigners LUCAN shines’ (A5r). T.W. gives the theme of truth a political edge:

LVCAN, that first in the Imperiall tongue
(In naked truth of acted history)
The civill wounds made for an Empire song;
Hath checkt precedent, taught succeeding Poesy,
That flatteries and fictions may delight,
May please a Tyrant, wrong a rightfull King,
May please an Orphan Judgment, wrong the right,
Enuelp Truth, proclaime an vntrue thing.
Lucan, that first hath shrowne the force of verse,
Relating onely what was scene, felt, donne,
Of Conqu’rors triumphs, of the Conqu’reds herse,
All as it left, all as it first begunne.
Not like the Trojan Theamers, fit for schooles,
Fabling of this and that in Heauen, Earth, Hell,
Sober to mad-men, turning wise to foones,
Gods to be Neat-heards, men in starres to dwell,
Hath match’t the faith, that History requires:
Hath match’t best History in choyce of phrase:
Hath taught, that History in nought aspires
Aboue the truth of deeds, it selfe to raise.
This Lucan for his truth a Truch-man gains
As true to him, as he to truth remains. (A6r)

Flattery of tyrants is linked with a fanciful way of writing, in contrast to which Lucan (and Gorges) offers ‘Truth’. MacLean argues that T.W.’s poem is ‘directed against

---

28 He echoes Gorges’s own description of his unchanging virtue in two poems written c.1609 (1953, poems 101 and 106; see Chapter 3.2, above). May argues that for a commendatory poem to a literary text, Ralegh’s poem ‘is unusual in its neglect of the work itself’ (1989, 104).
James’s attempt to legitimate his reign by recourse to a classicizing style that permits exaggeration and fable’ (1990, 40).

Gorges himself makes no statement in 

_Quintus Pharsalia_

on the themes of these commendatory poems. However, elsewhere in his writings he associates Roman history with the brave telling of truth. In one version of the preface to his Jacobean account of the _Islands Voyage_, he draws attention to (in the words of his sidenote) ‘The faithfull manner of the Roman histories in their Relations’:

> hee that hath read and obserued the Ancient manner and method of the most famous and truthfull Histories of the most glorious Empire that euer was shall plainlie find and see that they did euer, as carefully and exactly sett downe in their stories their owne defaults their Cowardize, their disgraces and ouerthrowes, as their pollicies their valowr their victories and triumphs ...

(Sandison 1940, 250)

Gorges makes his attitude clear in his narrative account of the _Islands Voyage_, dedicated in 1607 to Prince Henry. Justifying an attack on the Earl of Essex he aligns himself with truth-telling ancient historians, defying tyranny:

> The which (I protest) I doe not speake, either out of any neglect of one that is dead, or to picke a thanke of any that lives, but simply out of a resolution to write an unpartiall truth, or else to be silent. For those spirits that base flattery, or servile fear doth transport in fashioning their Histories, are of all others to be reputed the unworthiest, and most pernicious in a well-pollicied Common wealth. For wee see that those Heathens, which have written the stories of Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Alexander, Hannibal, Scipio, Caesar, and of all other those great Kings and renouned Heroes, do as well taxe them for their vices, as glorifie them for their vertues: For, who lives without fault? And so sincerly & boldly do they follow the truth in their writings, as that they are therby freed from malice, or revenge, because they are free from all partialitie; or if any spleen arise, yet it is secret; for the prosecution of such sinceritie, is reputed meere impietie in all sorts, and flat Tyrannie in Princes. (Purchas 1905-7, 92-3)

When Gorges came to revise the _Islands Voyage_ after Prince Henry’s death (Bodl. MS Ballard 52; see Chapter 5.3), he added ‘Pompey’ to the list of heroes after ‘Caesar’.

These parallels strongly suggest that Gorges encouraged the authors of the commendatory poems to stress the theme of virtuous truth-telling in a debased world.

---

29 More overtly this poem, together with T.W.’s, discussed later, looks like an attack on Chapman’s Homer (then appearing volume by volume), a translation undertaken for Prince Henry.
This stance empowers Gorges’s act of translation in the absence of Prince Henry, the patron who would otherwise have given it meaning. The writers of the commendatory poems, like Spenser in *Daphnaïda* (see Chapter 4.1), construct Gorges—to his advantage—as a figure temporarily outside the patronage system.\(^{31}\)

The odd form of the dedication of *Lvcan’s Pharsalia* stresses the fact that Gorges’s translation has lost its value as a patronage text. Instead of an authorial dedication there is an unusual dedication to Lucy, Countess of Bedford, ‘the most important and most powerful patroness of the Jacobean court, except for Queen Anne herself’ (Lewalski 1993, 97) purporting to have been written by the translator’s young son, Carew:

The least good documents, which we learn in our youth, may in some part of our lives seem to us to use. I remember this sentence in my *Pueriles, Voluntas, vbi desunt vires, est laudanda*: Where power is wanting the good will is to be accepted. Which I presume will be my warrant in presenting your Ladyship with this Poeme, which by chance I did see in my father’s study, amongst many other of his manuscripts. And because it lay idly there, I desired him to give it me. Who then asking what I would do with it, I told him that I would present it to my Lady my Mistresse. Which humor of mine he seemed very well to like: but he answered, that it was not faire enough written for her reading. Whereunto I replied, that if I might have it, I would amend that fault, and get it printed by the helpe of my Schoole-maister, and in that sort offer it.[…] Whereto my father said, that he liked so well of my devotion to so noble a mistresse, as that he would freely give it me. The which now (as mine owne) I do humbly recommend to your honourable acceptance, as some testimony of my devoted zeal, untill yeares, and ability shall second my indeuors with parts more answerable to my desire. And in the meanse I will perswade myselfe that this poore present is the more aptly offered, knowing that the reading of Heroicall actions do as properly belong to noble and vertuous Ladies, as the acting of them to worthy and valorous Knights. Besides that, your Ladyship is an honourable louter and Patronesse of learning and the Muses, an instinct naturally ingrafted in your excellent spirit, by that worthy blood of the Sydneyes, wherewith you do so nearely participate, and whose perfections did so eminently shine in that hopefull yong Lord your late brother, one of the mirrours of our Age. Now if this may but receiue your honourable applause, as some pledge of my Deuotion, I will neuer thinke that I need to be ashamed to flutter with my Fathers feathers. (A3r-A4r)

The dedication is a way of presenting the translation to a patron without explicitly broaching any tricky political topics—though, as David Norbrook points out, the choice of the Countess of Bedford and the mention of the Sidneys firmly locates Gorges as part

\(^{30}\) A further commendatory poem, by A.I. (A5v) like the other poems links Gorges closely to Lucan, stressing the ‘modesty’ with which Gorges presents Lucan to the public.\(^{31}\) Cf. the parallel practice in the dedication to the post-1612 text of *Islands Voyage* and *Sea-Service* (Chapter 5.3) and in *The Olympian Catastrophe* (Chapter 4.3).
of the Protestant ‘war-party’ (1994, 51-2; cf. Salmon 1989, 208; Lewalski 1993, 95-123). At the same time, it provides Gorges with a means of confronting, through Carew, the ineffectiveness and marginality of his text. Carew first saw the translation, he says, lying ‘idly’ on his father’s desk, doing nothing. Carew proceeds to deploy Lvcans Pharsalia within his patronage relationship with the Countess of Bedford. Yet this is a use of Gorges’s text that is blind to its content. There is an implicit contrast between Carew and another boy, the original intended reader of Lvcans Pharsalia, Prince Henry. Unable to attend to the sententiae of Lucan/Gorges and, as a powerful prince, to translate them into virtuous action, Carew instead deploys a sententia from his schoolbook that emphasises his lack of power: ‘Where power is wanting the good will is to be accepted’.32 Significantly Carew’s patron is female, and thus by definition unable to put Lucan’s precepts into action. The Countess is limited to reading: ‘the reading of Heroicall actions do as properly belong to noble and vertuous Ladies, as the acting of them to worthy and valorous Knights’.33 Significant too is the brief allusion to the Countess’s brother, Prince Henry’s best friend, whose death not long after the Prince’s had been commemorated by Gorges with a sonnet (Gorges 1953, poem 108). The dedication publicises Gorges’s self-imposed, virtuous exclusion from the patronage system, offering as the only replacement for Gorges’s clientage relationship with Prince Henry a child’s game.

32 Closely associated in the school curriculum with the schoolbook Carew refers to here, the Sententiae pueriles, was a collection of sententious Disticha ascribed to Cato the Censor (for which see Crane 1993). There might therefore be a submerged allusion here to Cato of Utica, the Pharsalia’s Stoic hero, great-grandson of the elder Cato: Carew looks to the elder Cato instead of to Lucan’s hero.

33 Cf. A Breefe Discourse (Trinity College, Cambridge MS R. 7.23* (Prince Henry’s Copybooks 3)), f.3v: ‘the praise of vertue consists in action, and not in words. And as the Italian saith deeds are masculine; but words are feminine’.
1.3. Acoreus’s Speech

Gorges’s most extensive addition to Lucan’s text comes in Book 8, bringing together some of the major themes of the translation. It is, in effect, the ideological core of Lucan’s *Pharsalia*.

In Book 8, the court of the young King Ptolemy debate whether or not to help the fleeing Pompey. Lucan reports that the aged courtier Acoreus recommends that Ptolemy support Pompey. Pothinus, another courtier, advises the opposite course of action. Lucan gives Pothinus’s speech, a gleefully cynical performance, arguing that the law of the jungle makes it necessary to act amorally and that Pompey must die (8.483-535; ‘exeat aula/qui vult esse pius’ (lines 493-4)), but he does not include Acoreus’s speech. Gorges rectifies this omission, giving over more than a hundred lines to his own idea of what the virtuous Acoreus might have said (‘Here it seems the Authour was defectiue by iniury of time and Achoreus speech lost, which the translator supplied, as pertinent’ (2G2r)).

One of the things Gorges is doing by giving Acoreus a voice is implicitly lending support to Lucan’s sympathetic portrayal of the republican Pompey: Pompey should be supported, not Caesar. At one point Acoreus says that Ptolemy should not count on Rome’s continued support for imperial rule:

... *Rome* doth Monarchie disdaine,
And her braue spirits that still liu’d free,
To vassallage will not agree. (2G2v)

This is the closest Gorges comes to the advocacy of republican rule. Yet the speech is not completely hostile to Caesar—one of Acoreus’s arguments is that treacherous behaviour will be frowned on by Caesar, who will in such a case ‘condemne thy mind/As most

---

34 Gorges’s addition is looked at briefly by Colin Burrow (1993, 188-9)
disloyall and vnkind' (2Gv). Caesar’s nobility is stressed at length. Acoreus’s key argument is that amorality in government leads to rebellion. If princes do not keep faith, how are subjects to behave?

All Kings by Ceremonies stand,
By lawes they rule with powerfull hand.
But if those lawes they vioalate, [sic]
They weaken then their owne estate. (2G2r)

As Gorges’s sidenote here says, ‘Order and iustice [are] the support of regall power’ (ibid.). A king’s lawlessness invites violent opposition from overmighty subjects:

When Kings themselves lawlesse grow,
They hazard then to ouerthrow
Their owne estate; and teach that mind
That is ambitiously enclind,
How to aspire by fraud or might,
To reawe away their soueraignes right. (2g2r)

Through Acoreus, Gorges here seems to be expressing his extreme disquiet at the amorality of James’s reign. The next sentence makes it clear that this feeling of disquiet is based on his own lack of reward from James: ‘He that no good deserts obserues,/The like at others hands deserues’ (ibid.). Gorges’s pique at his lack of reward at James’s court has opened up a space in which Gorges can seem to flirt with republicanism.

Just as Gorges was a virtuous elderly advisor to Prince Henry, so Acoreus is a virtuous elderly advisor to the young King Ptolemy. Acoreus’s advice to Ptolemy can be read as parallel to Gorges’s advice to Henry. It is, then, striking that his advice should be rejected. Ptolemy sides with the vicious Pothinus. There are echoes here of the anxiety Gorges expresses elsewhere in his writing that Henry fulfil his potential. Atropos in The Olympian Catastrophe (Gorges 1953) justifies Henry’s death by arguing that, had he lived, Henry might have gone to the bad and significantly compares Henry to Nero:

... had I parted Nero’s twyne in twayne,
In his Quinquennium: when the confluence
Of Prince-beseeminge vertues grac’t his raigne,
And heald possession of his purer sence:
    He never had a hell-hatcht monster beene
    Accounted, for his nature-thwarting sinne.

He had not liv’d to be the scorne of men,
The scourge of Rome, the worlds enflamed brand:
    He had not beene the first of all the tenn,
    That tortor’d those that for the truth did stand:
    He had not had the divells imagery
    Stampt in his soule, with seale of tyranye. (lines 937-48)

Addressing Henry in *A Breefe Discourse* (Trinity College, Cambridge MS R. 7.23*)

(Prince Henry’s Copybooks 3)), Gorges issues an anxious warning:

... by howe much the more the pregnancye and forewardnes o f your younge yeares hath raysed an extraordinaire expectation in the worlde o f your riper age: by soo much the more your Highnes is to bee tender, and carefull: that your vertues maye alwayes march arme wrth your fame: that you maye euer bee the same Paragon Prince, which you seem to bee, and are ... Soe shall your Highnes, by the renowne of your first actions eyther conquer ye worlds loue, and opinion, or fayle o f itt ... (ff.23r-23v)

A similar anxiety informs Acoreus’s speech:

Be well aduised and stand in awe,
The worlds defame on thee to draw
    In thy yong yeares, for such a staine
    Will all thy life on thee remaine.
The vessell alwayes holdeth fast
    The sent whereof it first did tast. (2G2r)

Gorges’s sidenote here reads ‘Young yeares are apt to be distalned [sic] with ill manners & euer to retain the tast therof’ (*ibid.*). At the ideological core of the translation, then,

Gorges confronts the possibility that his project will be useless. Acoreus’s speech to Ptolemy stages in little Gorges’s original intentions for *Lycans Pharsalia*, writing into them the acute awareness of the possibility of failure.

**2. Bacon Translations**

In 1620 translations by Gorges of two works by Bacon were published: a French version of the *Essays* and an English version of *De sapientia veterum, The Wisedome of the Ancients*. H.R. Kynaston-Snell suggests that Gorges’s *Essays Moraux* were ‘le travail
d'un dilettante', 'une edition à tirade limité pour être distribué parmi [des] intimes' (1939, 75-6). This is misleading, I think. The aims of Gorges’s Bacon translations are more serious than Kynaston-Snell recognised. The texts are dedicated respectively to Frederick, Count Palatine and to his wife Princess Elizabeth, Prince Henry’s sister. Frederick and Elizabeth represented the Protestant hope after the death of Henry. Elizabeth’s connection with the Countess of Bedford links the books with Gorges’s other translation, Lvcans Pharsalia, which is dedicated to the Countess of Bedford.\(^\text{35}\)

Both have links with the Stoicism of Lvcans Pharsalia. Gorges’s dedication to the Essays describes Bacon as ‘un sage & docte Seneque de nostre temps’ ‘qui pour ses discours excellens, & moralités prudens, peut estre dignement leu, & medité des plus Grands, & Magnanimes Princes du Monde’ (Bacon 1619a, A4r); The Wisedome of the Ancients, meanwhile, opens with a comparison between Cassandra and Cato of Utica,

who as from a watchtower discovered afar off, and as an Oracle long foretold, the approaching ruine of his Countrey, and the ploutted tyrannie houering ouer the State, both in the just conspiracie, and as it was prosecuted in the ciuill contention between Cesar and Pompey, and did no good the while, but rather harmed the commonwealth, and hastened on his contreys bane. (Bacon 1620, A2r-A2v)

Bacon continues in the same vein, reading Typhon as ‘a Rebell’ and the cyclops as a king’s wicked servants. Both De sapientia and the Essays are informed by a Tacitean interest in power politics that fits well with Gorges’s interest in Lucan. The sobering lessons of the Pharsalia are extended by Gorges to Prince Henry’s ideological successors, Elizabeth and Frederick. (The Essays had been revised some time before 1610 for presentation to Prince Henry, as a showpiece designed to clarify Bacon’s qualifications as a counsellor (Kiernan 1985, lxxiii)).

\(^{35}\) For Elizabeth’s later enthusiasm for Bacon’s works see Bacon 1857-74, 14.535.
That Gorges’s links with Bacon appear at the same time as the rise of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham (who was closely associated with Bacon) is not coincidental. In the period immediately preceding the translations Buckingham and Bacon were associated with an aggressive, anti-Spanish foreign policy highly agreeable to Gorges (Bacon 1857-74, 14.22f; cf. 7.37). In March 1618/9, Gorges celebrated Buckingham’s appointment as Lord Admiral by compiling a treatise on how best to fight a Spanish invasion, prefaced by a patriotic dedication to Buckingham (BL MS Stowe 426; see Chapter 4.3). Bacon’s account-book for July 1618 carries an entry recording the payment of 10s ‘To Sir Arthur Gorges’s man that brought your Lop. a book’ (Bacon 1857-74, 13.332), probably a present intended to commemorate Bacon’s creation as Baron Verulam of Verulam on 12 July, possibly one of the translations.  

Bacon may have been encouraged to approve of Gorges as a prospective translator after reading his vigorous Lvcans Pharsalia (see section 1 above) since in translations of his own work he seems to have favoured a robust approach. For the first, abortive, Latin translation of The Advancement of Learning, Bacon had ‘desired not so much neat and polite, as clear, masculine and apt expression’ (Bacon 1857-74, 10.302). Gorges’s Bacon

36 There are a number of ways in which Bacon could have come to know of Gorges. Gorges’s mother-in-law by his first marriage was related to Thomas Meautys, Bacon’s secretary (Sandison 1928, 674). A memorandum drawn up by Bacon in 1612 concerning financial projects unmistakably alludes to Gorges’s ‘Public Register’ patent of the same year (Bacon 1857-74, 11.325). Bacon’s plan to befriend the imprisoned Ralegh in 1607/8 ‘and therefore Haryott, themselves being already inclined to experiments’ (11.63) might have brought him into contact with Gorges, as might his interest in Prince Henry as a source of patronage (Kiernan 1985, xxi-iv). In 1613 Bacon was credited with ‘setting forth, ordering and furnishing’ Francis Beaumont’s Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray’s Inn for the marriage of Princess Elizabeth and the Elector Palatine (1613; Beaumont 1967), an entertainment possibly linked with Gorges’s Olympian Catastrophe (11.343; see Chapter 5.3). For Bacon’s connection with Tacitean Neostoicism, a possible link to Gorges’s Pharsalia translation, see Salmon 1989, 212-3.
translations are certainly neither ‘neat’ nor ‘polite’, though their ‘masculine’ pithiness is not uniformly ‘clear ... and apt’. 37

Critics occasionally note the structural and rhetorical parallels between the Essays and De sapientia veterum. Both texts are composed of short pieces on discrete topics and appear more populist—less ‘scientific’—than the bulk of Bacon’s published output. Douglas Bush reads De sapientia veterum as ‘a twin volume to the Essays’ on the basis of the two works’ shared ‘interest in allegorical mythology’ and their deployment of the ‘short discourse’ form (Bush 1945, 188). Lisa Jardine (1974) uses both texts (separately) as examples of the ‘magistral’ method used by Bacon to address lay audiences, contrasting their strategies with those of the ‘initiative method’ Bacon recommends for use in texts aimed at fellow-scientists—‘initiative’ texts appeal to and invite the participation of the (scientific) reader’s reason; ‘magistral’ texts use rhetoric to teach and persuade. 38

Less remarked upon has been the long-lasting publishing convention of linking the two works. Between 1617 and 1620 the Essays and De sapientia veterum were printed as companion volumes in a number of different languages (see below). The association persisted in the authoritative posthumous edition of 1638, Operum Moralium et

37 In the Essays, Gorges’s French slavishly follows Bacon’s word order (‘Celuy qui a femme & enfans, a donné hostages à fortune’ (‘Of Marriage and Single Life’)) and is consistently archaic and unidiomatic (outdated usages include the omission of articles after ‘De’ (titles follow the form ‘De Religion’, etc.); the use of ‘en’ for ‘dans’; excessive use of ‘es’ (=en + ‘des’); the omission of subjects (eg. ‘De la advient semblablement’ (‘Of Empire’)). Kynaston-Snell finds Gorges’s Essays ‘serré et compact’ (1939, 73) in comparison to the loose and inaccurate translation by Jean Baudoin. Gorges’s English in The Wisedome of the Ancients tends, like his poetry, to highlight syntactic divisions between clauses (on this see Chapter 1.1.3 and note 3 in section 1 above). There are many syntactic awkwardnesses and occasional moments of incoherence. Gorges’s few alterations to Bacon’s text largely involve the addition of imagery and/or ethical charge to the original.
Civilium—in which a revised text of De sapientia was printed alongside the Latin translation of the Essays—and can be traced through a host of seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth century editions. Gorges’s coupling of these two works is by no means unique. The evidence suggests, in fact, that Gorges’s translations form part of a calculated plan, orchestrated by Bacon himself with the help of the printer John Bill, to bring Bacon’s works before a wider continental readership and to win patronage from European nobility.

The ‘magistral’ status of the Essays and De sapientia—their attractive, punchy form—made them ideal texts to present to potential patrons, a perfect way of guaranteeing a friendly reception for later, more ‘scientific’ works. The short discourse form, meanwhile, cuts both ways. On the one hand, Bacon imposes his views on his powerful readers, ‘magister’ of the ‘magistral’ method. At the same time, though, the jewelled concision of each essay/myth exposition seems calculated to appeal to an aristocratic reader. Excluding compositions connected with his legal career, they were Bacon’s only works to be printed between two texts of a completely different, much more ‘scientific’, kind, The Advancement of Learning (1605) and the Novum Organum (1620). (Their palatable form perhaps represents a reaction to James’s puzzled reception of The Advancement of Learning.)

---

38 See Chapter 10 for De sapientia veterum, Chapter 11 for the Essays. A diametrically opposed reading of the strategy of the Essays is given by Fish 1972, 78-155. For the background to Bacon’s mythography in De sapientia veterum see Lemmi 1933; Rossi 1968; Garner 1970.
39 There were editions coupling the texts in 1658 (Gibson 1950, no. 97), 1668, 1673, 1680, 1681 (Gibson 1950, no.98), 1696, 1701, 1706, 1718, 1836 and 1856.
40 That Bacon intended a handmaidenly role for these texts surfaces in some remarks made in the dedication of his Considerations touching a holy war (1622): ‘As for my Essays, and some other particulars of that nature, I count them but as the recreations of my other studies, and in that sort purpose to continue them; though I am not ignorant that those kind of writings would, with less pain and embracement
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Three factors made a translation project particularly feasible between 1617 and 1619: Sir Tobie Matthew's visit to London, the appointment of John Bill as King's printer, and Bacon's promotion to high office. Sir Tobie Matthew, Bacon's best friend, arrived in London in July 1617. Matthew had, during years of exile in Italy, helped keep Bacon abreast of the researches of Galileo (Bacon 1857-74, 14.35-6). His appearance in London, under special dispensation from the Crown (13.214-6), represented an opportunity for him to help strengthen the link he had already begun to establish between Bacon and the Continent. John Bill became King's printer with his associate Bonham Norton in the same month as Matthew arrived in England. Bill was the most important English publisher in the import/export market. Every year he went to the Frankfurt book fair where he advertised his Latin books (the only English publisher regularly to do so in this period). He published a London edition of the official Frankfurt catalogue from Spring 1617 onwards (e.g. Bill 1617, 1618, 1619; see STC 11328f.). Bill was also a continental buyer for individual clients, including Thomas Bodley (Hampshire 1983, 158-67). He was also employed as 'a sort of secret service agent abroad' (Greg 1967, 257-8). In 1630 he drew up a petition in which he listed 'many services in printing for ye advancement of o' religion & honor of y e Nation' which he had undertaken. Amongst these was the printing and distribution abroad of government propaganda at the royal command. This side of Bill's activities suggests the possibility that the dissemination of the Bacon translations abroad was undertaken on the specific command of Bacon in his official capacity first as Lord Keeper, then as Lord Chancellor, offices to which Bacon was appointed in (perhaps), yield more lustre and reputation, to my name than those other which I have in hand.' (Bacon 1857-74, 14.374).
respectively 1616/7 (Bacon 1857-74, 13.151) and 1617/8 (13.287). Perhaps significantly, Bill’s first Frankfurt catalogue appeared in London at about this time (Bill 1617). 41

Bacon’s writings betray much anxiety about the need to translate his works into Latin, 42 so he might equally have realised the value of a continental holding operation such as the translation of the Essays and De sapientia. He was always keen to extend his European reputation. In 1608, he had written in his notebook of his resolution to set about ‘The finishing of the aphorisms, Clavis interpretationis, And then setting forth ye book. qu. to begynne first in france to print it; yf hear then wt dedication of advantage to ye woorke.’ (Bacon 1857-74, 11.64). 43

The use of Matthew and Gorges as go-betweens may have been associated with this, the aim being to stress the aristocratic, courtly nature of these texts—gifts offered casually by courtiers, in a spirit of sprezzatura, to important sponsors that allowed Bacon to be promoted without his being seen to promote himself.

In 1617 Bill brought out a reprint of De sapientia veterum (Gibson 1950, no. 86). This first stage of the project must have been geared to display Bacon’s scientific position in persuasive form to the European audience, just as the 1609 edition of De sapientia had

---

41 He also delivered books to Bacon: Bacon’s account-book for August 1618 records a payment ‘to Mr. Bill’s man for bringing books to Gor[hambury] by yr. Lp. order’ (Bacon 1857-74, 13.331). During this period Bill was facing competition in the more popular titles of his import/export business from the newly-established Latin Stock, so he might have chosen to concentrate more on private clients (Pollard and Ehrman 1965, 86-7). In several lawsuits after 1617, Robert Barker, King’s Printer until July 1617, challenged Bill’s and Norton’s assumption of the office of King’s Printer. Norton’s claim was dismissed, but Bill was held to have been a bona fide purchaser, so for a short period after May 1619 Bill was in partnership with Barker (Plomer 1901). Was Bill favoured because of his ‘secret service’ work overseas and/or his publication of Bacon? Strikingly, one of the largest bribes Bacon is alleged to have accepted was tendered by Robert Barker in connection with a later instalment of the same wrangle (Willoughby 1852).
42 The aim was to create a community of scientific workers engaged in co-operative research. Bacon wrote in connection with the projected Latin translation of The Advancement of Learning ‘since I have only taken upon me to ring a bell to call other wits together ... it cannot but be consonant to my desire, to have that bell heard as far as can be ...’ (Bacon 1857-74. 10.301).
43 For Bacon and French literature see Hovey 1991.
displayed it to English academics. Bill next published two Italian translations binding together *De sapientia* and the *Essays*, one or both made, apparently, by Sir William Cavendish (Kiernan 1985, lxxxix, n.82), with Sir Tobie Matthew performing an editorial role. The need for a second translation might have been pointed out by Matthew after he had discovered inadequacies in the first. Both translations were dedicated by Matthew to Cosimo II de Medici, Grand Duke of Tuscany, the patron of Galileo. Matthew’s preface to the second translation makes the purpose of the enterprise clear. His praise of Bacon stresses the insignificance of the *Essays* and *De sapientia* in comparison with Bacon’s major project:

> li trattati che van con questa, son stati composti da lui molti anni sono, come per passa tempo, e facendo piu ogni altra cosa, che affaticarsi molto inquel che faceua...(Bacon 1618, *2-2v*)

A translation of *The Advancement of Learning* is promised—‘un libro raro, ch’egli ha composto in Inglese Del Progresso delle Scienze, che sera come spero tradotto con il tempo in differenti lingue’ (*3r*).

The Italian translations of the *Essays* are based mainly on John Jaggard’s 1613 edition of Bacon’s 1612 revision. Material offensive to Catholics is excised. This meant that

---

44 For details on these translations see Pellegrini 1942; Crino 1957; 1959; Reynolds 1890. The Italian translations of the *Essays* and *De sapientia* appear under title-pages of 1617 and 1618 (Gibson 1950, nos. 33 (STC 1153) and 35 (STC 1154) respectively). (A 1618 reissue of 1153, 1153a (Gibson 1950, no. 34), consists of the sheets of 1153 and the preliminaries of 1154 (Kiernan 1985, lxxxviii, n.80; Gibson 1950, nos. 35-7).) 1153 and 1154 differ in many points of verbal expression; also, as discussed below, 1153 alone includes a translation of ‘Of Seditions and Troubles’. Numerous editions printed in Italy followed, starting with a Florentine edition of 1619 based on the text of 1154 (Crino 1957, 1959; Gibson 1950, nos. 38-43). The translation certainly raised Bacon’s profile in Italy. Cf. Pellegrini 1942, 112: ‘il numero delle ristampe, assai considerevole, in un breve giro di anni, è una prova dell’interesse suscitato fra noi dall’opera letteraria di Bacone’. The unusualness of this translation project is highlighted by John L. Lievsay: ‘This is an extraordinary moment in the history of Italian texts in England, for it marks the first time that a work of English literature (as distinct from propaganda) had been translated into Italian, printed in England, and exported to an Italy already entering upon an era of cultural eclipse’ (1969, 28)

45 Editions of the original text of Bacon’s *Essays* were printed in 1597, 1598, 1606 and 1612 (Kiernan, lxv–lxvi). A reordered, greatly augmented text, c.1610–12, forms British Library MS. Harley 5106 and was originally dedicated to Prince Henry (Kiernan, lxxi-lxxvii). In 1612 a text similar to that of the manuscript
two essays, ‘Of Religion’ and ‘Of Death’, were cut altogether. Passages were cut from two other essays, ‘Of Superstition’ and ‘Of Faction’. These two essays appear in the Italian translations at the end of the text—perhaps their inclusion was a last-minute decision. Remarkably, the second of the two Italian translations (STC 1154) also includes, at the end, a text of ‘Of Seditions and Troubles’, an essay included in the 1610 manuscript prepared by Bacon for Prince Henry but in no English printed edition until 1625. This strongly suggests that Bacon authorised the translations. Interestingly, the first Italian translation (1617 (STC 1153), reissued in 1618 (1153a)), despite advertising ‘Of Seditions and Troubles’ in its table of contents, does not include a text of it.

Matthew had planned a companion Spanish translation in February 1618/19, but had had to shelve the project (Kieman 1985, lxxxix, n.82). In Paris, Jean Baudoin, a prolific translator, was sufficiently impressed by the Italian texts to translate them into French. His dedication of the Essays to the Maréchal of France picks up Matthew’s reference to The Advancement of Learning, which is due to appear, Baudoin says, ‘en diuerses langues’ (Bacon 1619b, a1v). Baudoin seems to have made his translations, on his own initiative, on the basis of the Italian texts. His translation of the Essays follows precisely the essay order of the second Italian translation.46

but with the essays arranged in a different order—omitting ‘Of Seditions and Troubles’ and ‘Of Honour and Reputation’—and including six new essays (possibly absent from the manuscript only on account of physical deterioration) was printed by John Beale (Gibson 1950, no. 6; STC 1141). In the same year John Jaggard printed a second edition combining the sheets of his 1612 text with a new setting of the essays introduced by Beale’s text (Gibson 1950, no. 7; STC 1141.5). Jaggard printed a resetting of Beale’s edition tout court in 1613, adding to it from his own 1612 edition one essay (‘Of Honour and Reputation’) which had been omitted by Beale. Two paginary reprints of Jaggard’s 1613 edition which imitate its title-page are thought to be piracies by John Beale printed respectively c. 1615-18 (Gibson 1950, no. 9; STC 1143) and c.1615 and 1624 (Gibson 1950, no. 10; STC 1144). An Edinburgh edition set from Jaggard’s 1613 edition was printed by Andrew Hart in 1614 (Gibson 1950, no. 11; STC 1145; Kieman, pl.lxxvii-lxxxv). 46 However, Kynaston-Snell argues Baudoin only looked occasionally at the Italian versions (1939, 85-92). For the bibliographical details of Baudoin’s translation of the Essays see Gibson 1950, nos.44-5; for his
In 1619, Gorges’s two translations appeared, the *Essays* in French, dedicated to Frederick, Elector Palatine, *The Wisedome of the Ancients* dedicated to Elizabeth.\(^{47}\) As in the Italian translation, contact is made between Bacon and European nobility through the medium of a mutual English acquaintance, for Gorges had been a neighbour of Elizabeth’s when she had lived at Kew (see Chapter 1.2).\(^{48}\) The *Essays* were translated into French for the benefit of Frederick, who could not read English, and communicated with his wife in French. (There is extant a letter of Bacon’s to Frederick written in French (Bacon 1857-74, 14.22).)\(^{49}\) In addition to its value as a means of improving contact with German intellectuals, the dedications to the rulers of the Palatinate were politically tactful. In 1619 Frederick was trying to win support for the Bohemian rebels from King James, his father-in-law. James was unwilling to help, so Bacon, with other government ministers, was faced with the task of gently fending off Frederick’s petitions (Bacon 1857-74, 14.22). Gorges’s dedications might thus have been a politic way of assuring translation of *De sapientia* see Gibson 1950, no.99. Both texts were published in 1619 in Paris by François Julliot.\(^{47}\) *The Wisedome of the Ancients* (*The wisedome of the ancients, written in Latine By the right Honourable Sir FRANCIS BACON Knight, Baron of Verulam and Lord Chancelor of England. Done into English by Sir Arthur Gorges Knight. Scutum inuincibile fides ...* (STC 1130)) appears under three title-pages, two dated 1619 (Gibson 1950, nos. 95 and 94 (STC 1130-1)) and one of ‘1622’, corrected by pen in both extant copies to ‘1620’ (Gibson 1950, no.96 (STC 1132)). 1132 is a variant issue of 1131. None of the many variants distinguishing 1130 from 1131/2 looks authorial. Bodl. MS Rawlinson D. 1119, an early seventeenth century transcription of Gorges’s translation (Beal 1980, 1.49) follows the preliminaries and text of 1131-2, changing the paragraphing, correcting a few errors and introducing new mistakes. For later editions of Gorges’s translation, see Gibson 1950. Gorges’s translation follows the Latin 1609/17 text independently of either the French or Italian versions. His paragraph divisions differ both from the other translations and the Latin original. Uniquely among the editions, he provides references for some of Bacon’s quotations (eg. A12r, D4r, E3r, F8v, G3v). There is just one edition of Gorges’s translation of the *Essays* (*Essays moraux, dv tres-honorable seignevr François Bacon chevalier, baron de Verulam, & grand chancelier d’Angleterre. Traduits en François par le Sieur Arthvr Gorges Chevalier Anglois. Scutum inuincibile Fides ...* (Gibson, no.45; STC 1152)); it appeared in 1619, with two variant title-pages.\(^{48}\) And Gorges’s wife, Lady Elizabeth Gorges, went to visit Elizabeth in 1621 in the Hague (APC 39.211).\(^{49}\) In 1618/9 Gorges employed a French secretary (BL MS Trumbull 10, f.12r), perhaps in connection with this project.

---

\(^{47}\) *The Wisedome of the Ancients* (*The wisedome of the ancients, written in Latine By the right Honourable Sir FRANCIS BACON Knight, Baron of Verulam and Lord Chancelor of England. Done into English by Sir Arthur Gorges Knight. Scutum inuincibile fides ...* (STC 1130)) appears under three title-pages, two dated 1619 (Gibson 1950, nos. 95 and 94 (STC 1130-1)) and one of ‘1622’, corrected by pen in both extant copies to ‘1620’ (Gibson 1950, no.96 (STC 1132)). 1132 is a variant issue of 1131. None of the many variants distinguishing 1130 from 1131/2 looks authorial. Bodl. MS Rawlinson D. 1119, an early seventeenth century transcription of Gorges’s translation (Beal 1980, 1.49) follows the preliminaries and text of 1131-2, changing the paragraphing, correcting a few errors and introducing new mistakes. For later editions of Gorges’s translation, see Gibson 1950. Gorges’s translation follows the Latin 1609/17 text independently of either the French or Italian versions. His paragraph divisions differ both from the other translations and the Latin original. Uniquely among the editions, he provides references for some of Bacon’s quotations (eg. A12r, D4r, E3r, F8v, G3v). There is just one edition of Gorges’s translation of the *Essays* (*Essays moraux, dv tres-honorable seignevr François Bacon chevalier, baron de Verulam, & grand chancelier d’Angleterre. Traduits en François par le Sieur Arthvr Gorges Chevalier Anglois. Scutum inuincibile Fides ...* (Gibson, no.45; STC 1152)); it appeared in 1619, with two variant title-pages.

\(^{48}\) And Gorges’s wife, Lady Elizabeth Gorges, went to visit Elizabeth in 1621 in the Hague (APC 39.211).

\(^{49}\) In 1618/9 Gorges employed a French secretary (BL MS Trumbull 10, f.12r), perhaps in connection with this project.
Frederick of Bacon’s tacit support. Gorges is unspecific in his praise of Elizabeth and Frederick. The dedication to Frederick, though incidentally praising his ‘vertus heroiques’, is mainly devoted to Frederick’s stewardship of Elizabeth (A3r-A3v). No inkling of support for Frederick’s triumphalist Protestantism is given, as it would almost certainly have been had Gorges been dedicating a work of his own to the Elector. The case is the same in the dedication of The Wisedome of the Ancients to Elizabeth, which stresses Gorges’s humble position rather than the political circumstances of Frederick.

For the Essays, Gorges, like the Italian translator(s), followed a text of the type represented by Jaggard’s edition of 1613. The essays cut in the Italian translation are present in Gorges’s translation (as one would expect given its dedication to the Protestant Frederick) and the two essays partially cut in the Italian versions, ‘Of Superstition’ and ‘Of Faction’, occur in Gorges’s text in the same positions as they do in Jaggard’s text. ‘Of Seditions and Troubles’ (an essay which cites both Tacitus and Lucan) is listed in the

50 Frances Yates (1972) hypothesised that Bacon was in touch with the ‘Rosicrucian’ Palatinate writers Robert Fludd and Michael Maier, and that Rosicrucian ideas informed Bacon’s philosophical projects in general. At first sight some of the details of Gorges’s Bacon translations seem to support this view. The dedications to the Elector Palatine and his wife establish a solid connection between Bacon and the Palatinate at just the time of the Rosicrucian excitement; Gorges’s sympathies with Ralegh and Prince Henry establish him as a potential supporter of Frederick’s Protestant crusade; and the translation program as a whole shows Bacon reaching out to Europe, seeking the goodwill of a continental public. John Bill’s trips to Frankfurt and elsewhere on the continent might plausibly have involved the purchase of Rosicrucian books for Bacon, for he could certainly have bought Rosicrucian texts at the Frankfurt fair (the Pia admonitio of the Rosicrucian brothers was for sale in Autumn and Spring 1618 (Bill 161 Sab)). Bill’s interest in alchemical literature is demonstrated by his publication of the work of Thomas Draxe (e.g. STC 7179). He also published Sarpi’s History of the Council of Trent in several languages (STC 21760f.) and the works of De Dominis, the Protestant convert (STC 6994f.). Yates aligns these last two authors, representative of a ‘liberal Italian tradition’, with the Rosicrucians’ political ambitions (1972, 131). Her mention of Galileo as a member of ‘Sarpi’s circle’ (1972, 131) of Italian liberals brings us back to Bill’s Bacon translations and the dedication of the Italian texts to Cosimo II de Medici, Galileo’s patron and a ruler of wavering political allegiance. None of these links means that Bacon was sympathetic to Rosicrucian ideas, though; and it is salutary to note that Bill’s dissemination of the texts by Sarpi and De Dominis was authorised by his employer King James, damned by Yates as Rosicrucianism’s greatest enemy (1972, 123-4). As Brian Vickers says, ‘There is no evidence that Bacon knew of the Rosicrucians’ (1979, 20).
Bill took copies of the Italian and French translations to Frankfurt. No books printed in English were sold at the Frankfurt fair, so *The Wisedome of the Ancients* was probably only sold in England. The dissemination of the other texts was, in effect, double. Each book was on one level an individual petition on Bacon’s behalf to a European grandee, delivered perhaps in person by John Bill. Simultaneously, though, Bill’s trips to Frankfurt ensured it a distribution among a more general reading (and academic) public. For the Frankfurt fair of Spring 1618 (Bill 1618a, F2r) Bill advertised an edition of the Italian translation with the title-page of the first translation (STC 1153) but set in 12mo (1153 is in 8mo) which is otherwise unknown. An edition which could be either 1154 or 1153a is included in Bill’s Frankfurt catalogue for Autumn 1618 (Bill 1618b, D4r). Gorges’s French version of the *Essays* is included in Bill’s Frankfurt catalogue for Spring 1619 (Bill 1619a, I1r). Two other editions of Gorges’s translation, neither of them registered in Gibson’s Bacon bibliography (1950; 1959), are included in later Frankfurt catalogues. Both are listed as having been published by foreign publishers, *viz.* Belleros of Amsterdam (Bill 1619b, C3r) and Isaac Mesnier of Paris (Bill 1620, M2v).

The highpoint of Bill’s work for Bacon was his publication of the *Novum Organum* in 1620 (Gibson 1950, nos. 103a-b). Bacon must have wanted to continue to publish with Bill to ensure access to a continental market. Yet with his fall from office in 1621 he lost any power he might have had over Bill, and for everything else he published used other publishers.
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