

*Spenser's Dutch Uncles: The Family of Love
and the Four Translations of A Theatre
for Worldlings*

Stewart Mottram

A Theatre for Worldlings is a milestone work in more ways than one.¹ Commonly regarded as the first English emblem book, it is “always to be remembered as containing the first printed verse of Edmund Spenser.”² Yet Spenser’s contribution to *A Theatre* has overshadowed critical interest in the remainder of the volume, with its seemingly eclectic collection of poems, prose commentary, and woodcut illustrations. This chapter responds by restoring Spenser’s verse translations to the commentary they were originally intended to illustrate, reading poems and prose together within the broader context of the community by whom, and for whom, *A Theatre* was first produced. *A Theatre* announces itself as a product of London’s Flemish community, and it is to Flemish exiles that Jan van der Noot addresses his lengthy prose commentary on Spenser’s translations, as his references to “our natiue cou[n]tre[y] of low *Germanie*” make clear (sig. H2v).³ In this case study of a text produced by a collaborative community of poets, printers, illustrators, and translators, I explore a particularly fruitful instance of how the sixteenth-century book trade helped “translate” ideologies across texts and translations. *A Theatre for Worldlings*, printed in London by Henry Bynneman in 1569, was an English translation of a volume that had originally appeared in Dutch and French formats from the London press of John Day the previous year, and the volume would go on to appear in German translation in a Cologne edition of 1572. By reading the English *Theatre* alongside its companion translations, this chapter undertakes a comparative exploration of the four *Theatre* translations in relation to their investment in the mystical teachings of the Family of Love, focusing on the emblematic language of the poems and illustrations, the theological content of the commentary, and the context of each volume’s production in the printing houses of London and Cologne. I then move in conclusion to suggest some of the ways these Familist resonances may have influenced

Spenser's later poetry, focusing on *The Ruines of Time* (1591), and exploring how far its treatment of ruin was shaped by van der Noot's own response to this theme in the four *Theatre* volumes.

Spenser was seventeen when *A Theatre* saw print around May 1569, and while some find his translations "reasonably accurate if not altogether elegant," others have admired the precocity of Spenser's blank-verse sonnets, which for Grosart signal a new chapter "in the story of our national literature."⁴ These claims about the impact of Spenser's youthful translations on English poetry sit alongside critical interest in *A Theatre's* influence on Spenser's own authorial career. In particular, the eleven sonnets Spenser translated from the "Song" of Du Bellay's *Les Antiquitez de Rome* (1558) have been regarded as pivotal in shaping the landscape of his later poetry.⁵ Du Bellay's influence is most prominent in *Complaints* (1591), in which Spenser reworks his schoolboy translations from the "Song" into a complete sequence of fifteen sonnets, *The Visions of Bellay*; translates the remainder of the collection in which the "Song" appears – the thirty-two sonnets of *Les Antiquitez* – as *Ruines of Rome: by Bellay*; and offers what Hassan Melehy calls "a productive imitation" of both *Les Antiquitez* and the "Song" within the opening poem of *Complaints*, *The Ruines of Time*.⁶ But there is a flipside to approaching *A Theatre* as the spark that fired Spenser's interest in Du Bellay, for such an approach risks reading Spenser's *Theatre* sonnets in isolation from the volume in which they originally appeared. At 214 pages, it is van der Noot's prose commentary that dominates *A Theatre*, and van der Noot makes clear that the sonnets were intended only to amplify the message of the commentary – "to sette the vanitie and inconstancie of worldly and transitorie thyngs, the liuelier before your eyes" (sig. F2v). Most critics today take the opposite approach, sidelining the commentary in their focus on Spenser's verse translations.⁷ As Satterthwaite puts it, "the prose need not concern us because it clearly does not concern Spenser."⁸ But an earlier generation of critics argued that van der Noot's commentary did indeed "concern Spenser" – in 1945, Judson claimed that "too little weight has been given to the effect of this zealous pamphlet on the plastic mind of Spenser."⁹ For all his and W. J. B. Pienaar's pioneering work on Spenser and van der Noot, however, no study since the mid-twentieth century has taken the *Theatre* commentary seriously as a plausible influence on Spenser's later poetry.¹⁰

Critics assume that Spenser's translations were a "paid job" for which he was recommended by his headmaster, Richard Mulcaster, whose contacts with Flemish intellectuals in England and abroad are well documented.¹¹ But Spenser may have been more intimate with van der Noot and London's Flemish community than such readings suggest.¹² The poet probably spent

his childhood in East Smithfield, which contained one of the largest Franco-Flemish populations of any area of London in this period, and he studied under Mulcaster at the Merchant Taylors' School in Suffolk Lane, close by a Huguenot church, Flemish meeting place, and the steelyard of the Hanseatic League.¹³ The cosmopolitan demographic of Spenser's schoolboy London; his opportunity to forge links, via Mulcaster, with Flemish exiles; and his connections with the *Theatre* printer Henry Bynneman, who as well as printing *Het Bosken* for van der Noot in 1571 would go on to publish the Spenser-Harvey letters in 1580, all combine to make Spenser's youthful contact with London's Flemish community a distinct probability.¹⁴ Andrew Hadfield argues that Spenser must surely have known van der Noot, while Pienaar suggests Spenser completed his *Theatre* translations under van der Noot's direct supervision.¹⁵

Such links give grist to Judson's claim that van der Noot's commentary may have wielded more influence on Spenser than previous scholarship allows. Judson notes the "ardent Calvinism" of van der Noot's commentary and explores its influence on *The Faerie Queene*.¹⁶ More recently, Rasmussen's combined analysis of *A Theatre's* poetry and prose has also identified within both a "Protestant poetics" with roots in Calvinism.¹⁷ In what follows, I echo Judson's remarks on van der Noot's significance for Spenser's later poetry, but I do so in departure from his and Rasmussen's emphasis on the Calvinist accent of the commentary. By exploring the English commentary alongside those in the Dutch, French, and particularly the German *Theatre* translations, this chapter reveals nuances and revisions across these translations that work to identify the commentary and its author with the Family of Love. The case for van der Noot's association with the Family of Love has in the past rested on the largely biographical evidence of his series of conversions from Catholicism to Calvinism and back again, a characteristically Familist response to the religious uncertainties of the mid-sixteenth century.¹⁸ The Familist resonances of the *Theatre* commentary have been largely overlooked, despite the suggestiveness of van Dorsten's research in this area.¹⁹ Yet a comparative reading of all four *Theatre* translations can help uncover evidence of Familist belief in the writings as much as the records of van der Noot's life, and recognition of Familist undercurrents in *A Theatre* are of potential significance for our appreciation of its influence on the themes of vanity and ruin within Spenser's later poetry.

These themes, of course, were as large a concern for Du Bellay as for van der Noot. In Rome's ruins, Du Bellay read a lesson in "mondaine inconstance," and his response in *Les Antiquitez* was to attempt to rebuild Rome's rhetorical splendors in the language and literature of Renaissance France.²⁰

Du Bellay's aim was to enrich French vernacular poetry through judicious imitation of Greek and Roman, as well as modern Italian verse form and style, and Spenser pays homage to his achievement in his "Envoy" to the *Ruines of Rome*, where he praises Du Bellay as France's "first garland of free Poësie."²¹ Like Mulcaster, Spenser appears to have been an admirer of Du Bellay's Pléiade manifesto, *La Deffence, et illustration de la langue Francoyse* (1549), but Spenser's poetry also points to the influence of van der Noot.²² In Rome's ruins, van der Noot saw only the futility of human endeavor, ancient and modern, and far from seeking to rebuild Rome in the vernacular, in his own sonnets and commentary van der Noot looked beyond earthly cities toward the spiritual refuge of the city of God.

That the *Theatre* poems were printed in Dutch, French, English, and German may on face value imply van der Noot's support for the Pléiadist project of writing poetry in the vernacular.²³ But the character of these verse translations suggests otherwise, for their largely literal reworking of the original French poems departs from the Pléiadist spirit of imitation but not slavish translation, implying that with these translations van der Noot was concerned more with accuracy than eloquence. In *La Deffence*, Du Bellay discourages verse translations of any kind, arguing that a translation is as unable to express "le naif" – the nativeness – of the original language as a painting to represent the soul through its depiction of the body.²⁴ Translations perform useful functions as a means to disseminate knowledge, Du Bellay writes, but only in vain can they attempt to improve the eloquence of one language through translation of another, since "chacune langue a je ne çay quoy propre seulement à elle."²⁵

Du Bellay preached a doctrine of emulation not translation, but this message the Dutch, English, and German translations of the original French poems in *Le Theatre* seem purposefully to disregard. Spenser's English sonnets, Hadfield writes, are "straightforward and accurate" translations from the French; Satterthwaite notes that in the eleven sonnets Spenser translated from Du Bellay, only four of the total 155 lines deviate substantially from the original French word order.²⁶ Spenser's sonnets are not without innovation, not least his decision to replace the original French rhyme schemes with unrhymed English pentameter. But Spenser's decision to use blank verse may itself have been fuelled by his aim to adhere closely to the original French. Spenser would have found it considerably more difficult to match the rhyme scheme, as well as the syntax and structure of his exemplars, and his later, rhymed revisions of Du Bellay's sonnets in *Complaints* are indeed far freer in form.²⁷

Equally derivative is the Dutch translation of *Le Theatre's* French verse, presumably the work of van der Noot. His translations have been branded

“unremarkable,” and in the case of the “Epigrams,” Pienaar notes instances of their “too literal collation” of Marot’s French with the wording of Petrarch’s original Italian verse.²⁸ Printed in Cologne in 1572, the German translation, *Theatrum*, names its translator on the title page as one Balthasar Froe.²⁹ No other translator is identified in the volume, and it was presumably Froe who translated both poems and prose out of the “Brabandisch” – the Dutch – *Het Theatre*. Neither Froe nor Spenser was an established poet at the time of the *Theatre* publications, and in calling on their services as verse translators, van der Noot turned to a network of friends and fellow exiles whose skills in versifying were amateur at best. In so doing, van der Noot could not have hoped to win for his *Theatre* volumes the “garland of free Poësie” that Spenser would later award Du Bellay in *Ruines of Rome*. None of the *Theatre* translations displays that “free” assimilation of borrowed style that Du Bellay encourages in *La Deffence*. Rather, they appear much more slavishly bound to the syntax and structure of their originals, and their literal accuracy is achieved at the expense of greater fluency of expression. The line “The worke did shewe it selfe not wrought by man” in Spenser’s fourth Du Bellay sonnet, for example, adheres more closely to Du Bellay’s “L’ouvrage ne monstroit un artifice humain” than its more fluent, but less accurate, revision in *Complaints*: “No worke it seem’d of earthly craftsmans wit.”³⁰

Such accurate, if awkward, constructions cannot, surely, be put down to Spenser’s “youth, haste, and inexperience” alone.³¹ Similar constructions occur in van der Noot’s Dutch verse translations, and they together point to an abiding concern with communicating the message of their French originals, even if at the cost of concealing the literary potential of their languages of translation. Yet while van der Noot chose amateurs for his translations, he placed a premium on the visual appearance of his *Theatre* volumes, each of which is attractively printed with headpieces and fleurons, as well as the illustrations. Scholars have seen little merit in the “loose, fuzzy style” of the engravings for the Dutch and French *Theatre* volumes, probably the work of van der Noot’s fellow Flemish exile in London, Lucas de Heere of Ghent.³² But whatever their value as art, the twenty copperplates later copied as woodcuts for the English and German volumes would have been costly items to commission and print.³³ The use of ornament in the German edition is particularly pronounced, with each page enclosed in woodcut borders of various designs, some of which bear miniature emblematic and heraldic devices, others arabesque fleurons. Also of note is the careful use of typeface in each edition, the Dutch and French volumes printed in roman and italic, the German in black letter, and the English blending roman typeface for its dedicatory letter, italic for the poems, and

black letter for the commentary. Steven Galbraith argues that there is every reason to interpret the typeface and ornamentation of *A Theatre* as the product of careful choice by Bynneman, van der Noot, or both.³⁴

This attentiveness to the visual appearance of each *Theatre* volume points to their purposeful production as *emblemata*, and it is this that helps explain van der Noot's dismissive attitude, in his translations, toward the literary value of northern European vernaculars. Emblems were closely related to the humanist understanding of hieroglyphic in this period, and hieroglyphic was considered a language superior to all others, ancient as well as modern.³⁵ In his *Hieroglyphica*, a Latin encyclopedia of hieroglyphs printed in 1556 and subsequently translated into French and Italian, Valeriano describes hieroglyphic as an esoteric language devised in Egypt for purposes of passing on "les secrets de nature" from one generation to the next.³⁶ According to Valeriano, Pythagoras and Plato had been party to this secret language, as had Moses, David, and Christ himself. Writing of inscriptions carved on sepulchers in the Etruscan language, Leon Battista Alberti laments that these were in his day indecipherable because Etruscan was a language ancient and obsolete. Of all languages, he writes, only hieroglyphic remained impervious to decay.³⁷ These qualities were transferred in the Renaissance from hieroglyph to emblem – for hieroglyphs, as Francis Bacon would later write, are "continued impresses and emblems," insofar as each hieroglyph functions semantically as an emblem linked, or "continued," in sentences with others.³⁸ Renaissance emblematists, from Alciatus onwards, drew directly on the hieroglyphs recorded in the fifth-century *Hieroglyphs of Horapollo*, printed in Greek in 1505 and Latin in 1517, and they later plundered the ever-more compendious editions of Valeriano's *Hieroglyphica* that capitalized on popular interest in the subject across Europe.³⁹

As the first emblem book in English, *A Theatre* and its companion volumes are products of this esoteric tradition, and their use of emblem seems designed to create tension between the form of their "visions" and the content they express. The sixteen illustrated sonnets Spenser translated from Marot and Du Bellay may, as van der Noot writes, bespeak "the vanitie and inconstancie of worldly and transitorie thyngs" (sig. F2v), but, printed as emblems, their message of mutability is conveyed in a language considered far more enduring than their subject matter. This conflict between medium and message is particularly notable in *A Theatre's* third Du Bellay sonnet, which in Spenser's translation describes the speaker's vision of an obelisk supporting an urn containing "the ashes of a mightie Emperour" (l. 8).⁴⁰



8 Woodcut of an obelisk with hieroglyphs, from Jan van der Noot's *A Theatre for Worldlings* (sig.C2r). Reproduced by permission of the British Library.

A “sodaine tempest” destroys the monument (l. 13), and both the obelisk and its ruin are represented in the accompanying woodcut, which departs from the sonnet’s description insofar as it depicts the obelisk engraved with hieroglyphs (Figure 8). With its hieroglyphs, palm trees, and pyramids, the

woodcut appears to illustrate a scene from ancient Egypt, but the sonnet's position in Du Bellay's "Songe" suggests a Roman context for the obelisk, for as Prescott writes, all fifteen sonnets in the "Songe" "are in effect emblems of Rome's fall thickly veiled in occult symbolism."⁴¹ In *De re aedificatoria*, Alberti notes with approval the Roman practice of carving in hieroglyphs the "deeds of their most famous men," and he urges readers to avoid the fate of the Etruscans by preserving their own histories in hieroglyphic form.⁴²

So where the wording of Du Bellay's sonnet laments the downfall of Roman civilization, in the hieroglyphs he etched onto this obelisk in *A Theatre*, Lucas de Heere seems to hint, with Alberti, at the means by which a civilization can outlast the ruins of time. In the face of Rome's ruins, Du Bellay seeks refuge in French language and literature, but in *A Theatre* his visionary sonnets are wrested from their original context and arranged emblematically alongside de Heere's illustrations. In this new context their original significance shifts in light of the illustrations, so that their visions of ruin no longer point toward the new potential of modern European vernacular but instead look beyond language toward the esoteric symbolism of hieroglyphic. *A Theatre* may showcase Du Bellay's poetry, but within it van der Noot shows little interest in Du Bellay's vernacularist agenda, his use of emblem pointing to a more enduring medium than French, Dutch, English, or German for the expression of divine wisdom.

The printer John Day was a natural choice for the Dutch and French *Theatre* editions. Day's business had benefited from foreign printing expertise since the late 1540s, and in 1549 Day moved his business to Aldersgate, at the heart of one of only two communities in London where immigrants and refugees numbered more than 20 percent of the adult male population.⁴³ In this year, he listed four Flemish employees at his new address, and he subsequently forged close ties with the newly founded Dutch church at Austin Friars.⁴⁴ Day capitalized on these connections when the Dutch church was reestablished in 1560, printing Jan Laski's *Catechismus* and editions of Jan Utenhove's Dutch Catechism and Psalter for the Austin Friars community in 1561 and 1566, and in 1569 issuing a Dutch translation of Gonsalvius Montanus's *Sanctae Inquisitionis Hispanicae*.⁴⁵ But the Flemish community also left a more lasting legacy on Day's career with the printing of *Actes and Monuments* in 1563. Pettegree argues that the fifty woodcuts for this ambitious work – "the best illustrated book of the Elizabethan age"⁴⁶ – were probably cut by Flemish artists, and Day would certainly have drawn on foreign expertise for the considerable technical demands of the book's layout and production.⁴⁷ As "the foremost English

printer of Elizabeth's reign," Day could easily meet van der Noot's demands for Franco-Flemish compositors and for the technical resources of a printing house adept at high-end illustrated work.⁴⁸

Van der Noot may have turned to Bynneman for the English *Theatre* because of Day's commitments in 1568–69 with the second edition of *Actes and Monuments*, but Bynneman also had Flemish connections of his own.⁴⁹ Alongside *A Theatre*, in 1568–69 Bynneman printed two Dutch Protestant texts attacking the Roman Church, Pierre Viret's *De cautelen . . . met het canon*, and Denakol's *Den Sack met die stucken*. In the same period, he printed an English translation of Antonio del Corro's *An Epistle to the pastoures of the Flemish Church in Antwerp*, a text that, like the *Theatre*, was written with a Flemish Protestant readership in mind.⁵⁰ *A Theatre* sits comfortably alongside these titles, for van der Noot is certainly quick to confess his Calvinist faith in *A Theatre*. In his epistle to Elizabeth I, he praises Frederick, the Calvinist Elector Palatine, for his "feruent zeale and true feare of God" (sig. A7r). Recently, however, critics have begun to question the robustness of these Calvinist convictions, with van Dorsten claiming van der Noot for the Family of Love.⁵¹ From its foundation in Emden in 1540, the Family of Love spread its message of peace and non-partisanship outwards across northern Europe and into southeast England in subsequent decades.⁵² Familists offered a neat solution to the religious conflicts of their day because they argued for the absolute irrelevance of all established churches, Catholic and Protestant alike. Guided by the printed teachings of their founder, Hendrik Niclaes, Familists sought salvation in peace and love, through the practice of which they believed humankind could be perfected in preparation for the New Jerusalem on earth.

Although Familism dismissed the beliefs and practices of the visible Church, it did not discourage its members from outwardly conforming to either Catholicism or Calvinism, arguing that it was better to attend church services than risk persecution by the powers that be. Van Dorsten writes that many Flemish Familists accordingly "converted" to Calvinism under Margaret of Parma's tolerant regency in the Low Countries and that, when the tide turned against toleration under the Duke of Alba, these same "Calvinists" were forced into exile in England.⁵³ Van der Noot, we know, was one such Calvinist refugee, and his reconversion to Catholicism upon leaving England in 1571 makes his profession of Calvinism seem all the more suspect.⁵⁴ So too does the coincidence of van der Noot's residence in the Familist centers of Antwerp and Cologne. His native Antwerp was home to Hendrik Niclaes's eldest son, Frans Hendricks, and to the printing house of Christophe Plantin, who worked as printer for Niclaes, and whose business

was at the center of a circle of known Familists including the map maker Abraham Ortelius.⁵⁵ Van der Noot's decision to settle in Cologne in 1571 is also suggestive, for Nicolaes had himself moved to that city four years previously, where he continued to revise and write new Familist texts until his death in or around 1580. It was while in Cologne that van der Noot published the German *Theatre* translation, *Theatrum*, in 1572, and he was still in Cologne in 1576 when his Olympia epic, *Das Buch Extasis*, saw print.⁵⁶

Cologne was a Catholic city, and van der Noot's "reconversion" to the Roman faith is reflected in the layout of *Theatrum*, and also of *Het Bosken*, printed in London before his departure for mainland Europe in 1571. Waterschoot notes significant differences among the preliminaries of all three extant copies of *Het Bosken* and concludes that each is a bespoke edition targeted at specific members of Rhineland's Catholic nobility.⁵⁷ Particularly noteworthy is the insertion of the Dutch *Theatre* poems and engravings between the preliminaries and poems of the Folger Library copy of *Het Bosken*.⁵⁸ Stripped of their accompanying Calvinist commentary, van der Noot evidently considered that his *Theatre* poems were benign enough on their own to appear in a volume intended for a Catholic readership in the Rhineland. The *Theatre* poems, as we have seen, are close translations of verse in the European Catholic mainstream, and, like the poems, the iconography of their illustrations is inoffensive and entirely in keeping with the universalism of *emblemata*. Lucas Cranach's engravings for Luther's *September Testament* (1522) exemplify typically Protestant representations of the Apocalypse, in which the whore of Babylon is depicted with papal tiara, and the Fall of Babylon is illustrated by a city recognizable as early modern Rome.⁵⁹ But de Heere rejects this Protestant tradition in his engravings for van der Noot's four apocalyptic sonnets in the *Theatre* volumes. His illustration for van der Noot's second sonnet depicts the whore of Babylon and the seven-headed beast with open crowns, while Babylon appears as a non-descript cluster of buildings in the background.⁶⁰ Van der Noot's four accompanying apocalyptic sonnets are similarly benign, offering only a close paraphrase of the Book of Revelation: his identification of the whore of Babylon with "that false and hypocritical religion" of Rome is in the *Theatre* volumes confined to the commentary that follows.⁶¹

Het Bosken prints the *Theatre* poems unaccompanied by the commentary. In *Theatrum*, van der Noot keeps his commentary but excises from it all contentious material relating to the Roman Church. Of the 214 pages of commentary in the English *Theatre*, only the text printed on 63 of those pages is reproduced in translation in *Theatrum*, and this with minor textual

variations. This text corresponds to the beginning and ending sections of the English commentary (sigs. D7r-F7v and Q3v-S1v) and includes van der Noot's opening discussion of *contemptus mundi* in classical and Christian literature, his commentary on Petrarch's "Epigrams" and Du Bellay's sonnets, and his closing discussion of charity and peace. What is missing from *Theatrum*, then, is the large central section of the English commentary devoted to the interpretation of van der Noot's four apocalyptic sonnets, and in its place the author offers a short, sanitized account of their meaning, spanning a mere seventeen pages in *Theatrum* (sigs. L1v-M1v). This new account occasionally echoes passages from the excised sections of the English commentary, but, throughout, van der Noot is careful never to identify the apocalyptic beast or whore of Babylon with the Roman Church. In the English commentary, the beast embodies "Monkes, friers, prebendaries, priests, indulgences, bulles, Nonnes, and the reste of all such diuelyshe sectes." In *Theatrum*, these references are reworked into non-partisan condemnations of "des Teufels" and "die falsch Religion."⁶² Van der Noot not only reworks his commentary; in *Theatrum*, he also revises the ordering of the Dutch, French, and English volumes, interspersing sections of commentary among the "Epigrams," "Sonets," and van der Noot's own verse contributions.

Airbrushed of its Calvinist content, the Cologne edition exposes the original commentary's anti-Roman accent as a vocal but superficial tirade, though this was certainly not the case with the commentary's opening and closing passages: their retention in all four *Theatre* translations points rather to the sincerity of van der Noot's commitment to the ideas expressed therein. These retained passages make interesting reading as evidence of van der Noot's Familist tendencies, for in all four *Theatre* translations the commentary's concluding section echoes Familist teachings on time-serving and the true Christian life. Van der Noot concludes his English commentary by calling on readers to "haue peace wyth all men" whatsoever their creed, for "brotherly loue" transcends "what faith so euer we boast our selues to haue."⁶³ This emphasis on charity over church doctrine leads naturally into van der Noot's advice that readers "frame your selfe according to the time," a Nicodemite statement of such apparent significance that it alone is capitalized in the French translation of the commentary: "ACCOMMODEZ VOVS SELON LE TEMPS."⁶⁴ Elsewhere in his commentary's concluding section, van der Noot echoes the tone as well as the teachings of Familist writings. His call on the faithful to take up "the whole armour of God" may well borrow a metaphor from Niclaes's *Terra pacis*, in which the pilgrim dons the "Armour of the vpright warlyke

Souldiours of Iesu Christ.”⁶⁵ Like the land of “many maner-of-walkings” through which Niclaes’s pilgrim must pass, in his commentary van der Noot, too, sees life as a pilgrimage through which we learn to “walk in loue eue[n] as Christ hath loued vs, and hath giuen him self for vs.”⁶⁶

Terra pacis describes a spiritual pilgrimage from the city of Ignorance to the land of Peace. In its preface, Niclaes declares he will “open [his] Mouth in Similitudes, [and] reueale and witness the Riches of the spirituall heauenly Goodes, as Parables” (sig. *3r). Christ had used parables to speak to the masses but be heard by the few, and it is for these same reasons, we are told, that Niclaes sets out to speak symbolically in *Terra pacis*. In *Hieroglyphica*, Valeriano relates Christ’s parables to the “diuine couerture” of Egyptian hieroglyphs. “Noz lettres saintes,” Valeriano writes, “ont grande affinité auec cete maniere d’enseigner par marques hieroglyphiques ou figures significatifs.”⁶⁷ Like hieroglyphic, Scripture encodes a secret language that only the initiated can discern from the letters on the page. Thus, upon hearing Christ’s parables, Valeriano continues, “les Apostres se sont detournés du commun language des hommes à fin de discerner les choses diuines d’entre les autres escritures.”⁶⁸ Faith allowed the apostles to read between the lines, and, as a self-declared prophet, Niclaes writes that he, too, has privileged access to divine mysteries beneath the language of Scripture. For to “the Familie of the Loue of *Iesu Christ*,” he writes:

it is geuen to vnderstande the Misterye of the heauenly Kingdom. But to those that are thear-without, it is not geeuen to vnderstande thesame. For-that-cause, all spirituall Vnderstandings, do chaunce vnto them, by Similitudes, Figures, and Parables.⁶⁹

The *Theatre* volumes also evoke the riddling language of Renaissance hieroglyphic, the “occult symbolism” of their illustrated poems pointing toward divine mysteries masked by the phenomenal world.⁷⁰ The goal of *Terra pacis* is “the holy Citee of Peace, the new *Ierusalem*” (sig. *5r), and the pilgrim who seeks this must learn first to forsake “Vanitee or Foolishnes” (sig. Drv), guided by the cross of suffering and the compass called “the-forsaking-of-himself-for-the-good-lyfes-sake” (sig. B4r). The same message is conveyed emblematically in the *Theatre* poems and illustrations, which point, as van der Noot elaborates in his commentary, from “vanitie and inconstancie” toward his vision of the New Jerusalem in the final sonnet of the sequence.⁷¹ This vision in turn inspires the commentary’s concluding section on peace and love as pathways to the New Jerusalem, and, like Niclaes, van der Noot here emphasizes the importance of self-denial – “the-forsaking-of-himself” – as a guide or compass on the road toward spiritual

regeneration. In his commentary, van der Noot speaks of “casting off[f] the old ma[n], which is corrupt,” and of putting “on the new man, which after god, is created.”⁷² This echoes the language of *Terra pacis*, in which pilgrims to the land of peace praise “the Kingdom of the new man, puer, | That out of God doth ryse.”⁷³

Like Niclaes, van der Noot speaks in emblems, a language of “spirituall Vnderstandings” discernable from the languages of this world. Du Bellay speaks in his sonnet “Au Roy” of rebuilding Rome in the “couleurs poëtiques” (l. 4) of Renaissance France, but van der Noot teaches the vanity of all such endeavor: his *Theatre* volumes describe a trajectory away from worldly cities and toward the city of God, and they do so in the spiritual language of emblem most appropriate to their aims. Of course, the emblematic and esoteric were by no means exclusive properties of the Family of Love in this period, and resemblances between the medium and message of *Terra pacis* and the *Theatre* volumes do not in themselves identify these volumes as Familist texts. But a Familist context for the *Theatre* translations does help identify a market for these volumes and a motivation for their publication. That the Dutch and French *Theatre* translations were purportedly aimed at Flemish Calvinist refugees in London is clear from references in van der Noot’s commentary to the papist persecution of Protestants in “our natiue cou[n]tre of low *Germanie*.”⁷⁴ Yet it is among members of this same “Calvinist” community that Van Dorsten suggests we search for the Familists of 1560s London, and certainly the Dutch Church at Austin Friars was dogged in this period by the activities of suspected Familists amongst their ranks.⁷⁵ The Family of Love was also gaining roots in English native soil in the late 1560s, leading to the publication of Niclaes’s English translations in the 1570s and to Elizabeth I’s proclamation against Familism in October 1580.⁷⁶ The English *Theatre* may or may not have been aimed at this homegrown Familist community, but the suggestion at least helps explain van der Noot’s motivations for translating the volume into English, motivations that cannot otherwise be glossed sufficiently by its dedication to Elizabeth I, given that this same dedication had already appeared in the French edition the previous year.⁷⁷

The printer Henry Bynneman may himself have had connections with Familism, for he is one of only two London printers in this period to adopt a *charitas* device, which appears on the title page of the Spenser-Harvey letters that Bynneman printed in 1580.⁷⁸ The “Familist” printers Thomas Basson and Christophe Plantin used similar devices, and it is suggestive that the only other London printer to adopt a *charitas* device in this period was Bynneman’s fellow *Theatre* printer, John Day.⁷⁹ We must exercise caution

before extrapolating personal beliefs from the evidence of a printer's professional career. Both Bynneman and Day inherited their *charitas* devices from earlier printers, Reyner Wolfe and Thomas Gibson respectively, and their use in subsequent publications may have served interests entirely unconnected with Familism.⁸⁰ Yet in the case of Bynneman, the themes of the Spenser-Harvey volume in which his tree of charity device appears are by no means incompatible with the Familist themes of the *Theatre* translations, and this points to other correspondences between *A Theatre* and the concerns of Spenser's later work. Spenser and Harvey's *Three Proper, and wittie, familiar Letters*, published in June 1580, is today best known for its conversation about English quantitative verse, the subject of two of their three "familiar letters," as well as of the "two other, very commendable letters" that follow.⁸¹ Yet the title page draws attention to a second notable theme, "the Earthquake in Aprill last," the subject of the lengthy second letter, which occupies more than a third of the total volume. The *Familiar Letters* clearly capitalizes on popular interest in the earthquake, for in April 1580 Bynneman had printed Golding's *A discourse upon the earthquake*, and in the same month had entered into the Stationers' Register Thomas Churchyard's *A warning for the wise . . . Written of the late Earthquake*, on behalf of his former apprentice, Nicholas Ling.⁸²

In this second letter, Harvey writes that earthquakes "are terrible signes, and, as it were certaine manacing forerunners, and forewarners of the great latter day" that "threaten to this, and that Citie, vtter ruine and destruction," although he notes that not every earthquake should be seen as a token of apocalyptic doom (sig. C1v).⁸³ The subject sits uncomfortably with the other major topic of the *Letters*, "our English reformed Versifying" (sig. A1r), for where earthquakes "ruinate and ouerthrowe, and destroy," Spenser and Harvey seek rather to reform and rebuild English poetry through the studious imitation of classical meters (sig. C3r). Earthquakes prognosticate "cruell imminent warres" and other "dreadfull and particular Incidentes" to each "Realme or Kingdome" (sig. C2r), but it is rather to win "the kingdome of oure owne Language" that Spenser sets out to reform English pronunciation, the better to fit the prescribed metrical patterns of classical verse (sig. A3v). Such reforms are discussed in the shadow, as it were, of Harvey's discourse on the destructiveness of earthquakes, so while the *Familiar Letters* celebrates the makings of an English literary Renaissance, its focus on ruin also gestures toward the futility of such an endeavor. In his epilogue to *The Shepheardes Calender*, published six months prior to *Letters* in December 1579, Spenser had alluded to the timelessness of his poetry, "that steele in strength, and time in durance shall outweare."⁸⁴ But the seasonality of the *Calender* also implies

decay, and in the December eclogue Colin Clout's poetry molders with the change of season, his boughs "both bare and barrein," his fruit "rotted" and "harvest wast."⁸⁵ The *Calender* may seek to outlast time's ruins, but Spenser's optimism in the epilogue is nevertheless eroded by misgivings elsewhere in the volume. These doubts threaten the timelessness of the *Calender* just as surely as discussion of earthquakes overshadows debates over "our English reformed Versifying" in *Letters*.

Spenser returns to these doubts about the timelessness of poetry in *The Ruines of Time*, published in the volume *Complaints* (1591). In its focus on the Romano-British ruins of Verulamium, *Ruines* has been likened to Du Bellay's meditations on the ruins of Rome, and Spenser's poem has passages clearly based on sections of Du Bellay's "Songe," as both Ferguson and Melehy assert.⁸⁶ In her reverence for Rome's former "pride in pompous shew," Spenser's speaker, Verlame, certainly echoes the tone of Du Bellay's "sainte horreur" for "l'antique orgueil" of Rome.⁸⁷ And, like Du Bellay, who opens *Les Antiquitez* by summoning Rome's "Divins Esprits" from "les abysmes" of the underworld, in *Ruines* Verlame also clings to hope in the Orphic powers of poetry, its ability to resurrect the spirits of the great and good.⁸⁸ As did Orpheus with Eurydice, so all poets, Verlame asserts, are able to break:

The seven fold yron gates of grislie Hell,
 . . .
 and thence the soules to bring awaie
 Out of dread darkenesse, to eternall day,
 And them immortall make, which els would die
 In foule forgetfulnesse, and nameles lie.⁸⁹

Indeed Verlame is here even more optimistic than Du Bellay about the abilities of poetry to immortalize and endure. *Les Antiquitez* is a lament for injurious time, but it is also, as Prescott suggests, a "powerfully ritualistic" sequence that attempts in poetry to reawaken "le demon Romain."⁹⁰ Yet as Coldiron notes, Du Bellay's optimism in the powers of poetry "noticeably diminishes" over the course of *Les Antiquitez*.⁹¹ While Verlame resolutely claims that "wise wordes taught in numbers for to runne, | Recorded by the Muses, live for ay," the final sonnet of *Les Antiquitez* sees Du Bellay "in the grip of doubt" over the abilities of his paper monuments to outlast the "marbre et porphyre" of Rome's ruins.⁹²

Writing of Spenser's methods of translating *Les Antiquitez* in his *Ruines of Rome*, Coldiron argues that Spenser is more optimistic than Du Bellay about poetry's ability to outlast time, but, however true this may be of

Spenser's attitude toward poetry in *Ruines of Rome*, there is little evidence to suggest Spenser agrees with his speaker Verlame's optimistic assessment of poetry in *Ruines of Time*.⁹³ In this poem, Verlame's monologue has the effect, not of reconciling the poem's narrator to the immortalities of verse, but of provoking his "inward sorrow" and "senceless sad affright."⁹⁴ Spenser's narrator confesses himself daunted by "her doubtfull speach, | Whose meaning much I labored foorth to wreste" (ll. 485–86), and his reaction prompts the poem's concluding series of emblematic visions – six "sad spectacles" and six "heavenly signe[s]" – which combine to teach the narrator that "Ne other comfort in this world can be, | But hope of heaven, and heart to God inclinde."⁹⁵ Like readers of the *Theatre*, Spenser's narrator is by a sequence of visions taught to flee this world and put his faith in the next. The "Envoy" that concludes *Ruines* completes this process, for while Spenser here looks heavenward, his poem, by contrast, has become but "broken verse," another ruin symbolic "of sinfull worlds desire."⁹⁶

Poetry for Verlame, as for Du Bellay, has Orphic potential, but in his "Envoy" to *Ruines of Time* Spenser rejects these, poetry's immortalizing powers. Melehy is among several recent critics to recognize the poem's movement heavenwards, "towards an immortality that surmounts earthly vanity" – the poem is an "imaginative journey," Ferguson writes, "from Rome to a reformed England."⁹⁷ Carl Rasmussen agrees, arguing that the poem's ending returns readers to the realms of Calvinist orthodoxy in its two closing prayers in the "Envoy" to Philip Sidney and his sister, Mary Herbert.⁹⁸ But in fact there is nothing especially Protestant about Spenser's language in the "Envoy": his prayer that Mary Herbert turn "unto heaven" (l. 685) is conventional enough to accommodate any number of Christian perspectives, and for Spenser there was a more immediate source for the poem's spiritual trajectory in the arrangement of the sonnets in *A Theatre*. Recent criticism has likened *Ruines of Time* to the structure of *Les Antiquitez* in that it ends with "sad spectacles" that mirror, in their preoccupation with worldly vanity, the visionary sequence of Du Bellay's "Songe."⁹⁹ But the overall arrangement of Spenser's two sequences of visions in *Ruines* is in fact far closer to the organization of *A Theatre*, in that Spenser, like van der Noot, patterns his visions deliberately, so that "sad spectacles" are answered by the spiritual consolations of "heavenly signe[s]." Du Bellay's sonnets end in the "Songe" – and in *A Theatre* – with his vision of the fall of "great Typhæus sister" Rhea, "one of the patron goddesses of Rome."¹⁰⁰ But in *A Theatre*, Rome's fall is answered over the page by van der Noot's four apocalyptic sonnets, and this same arrangement we see also in *Ruines*,

where Spenser responds to Verlame's "piteous plaint" with mystical visions that point to "hope of heaven, and heart to God inclinde."¹⁰¹

Spenser's lifelong interest in ruins may well have been inspired by his youthful translations of Du Bellay, as Coldiron suggests, but Spenser's manipulation of the vanity theme in *Ruines of Time* nevertheless signposts the influence, not only of Du Bellay, but of Du Bellay as his sonnets were reinterpreted by van der Noot.¹⁰² Like van der Noot, Spenser chooses the certainties of the afterlife over the structures of "broken verse," and in the "strange sights" and "spectacles" of his closing visions in *Ruines of Time* he echoes the emblematic language of *A Theatre*, articulating the mysteries of heaven through the mystical symbolism of "heavenly signe[s]."¹⁰³ Spenser did not have to be a Familist to move from faith in poetry toward faith in a reality beyond the theater of this world, but the coincidences between his and van der Noot's respective approaches to Du Bellay's Roman ruins certainly suggest that Spenser was more familiar with the aims of the author of *A Theatre* than previous scholarship allows. Spenser, then, did not only translate Du Bellay's sonnets for van der Noot. Rather, his translations contributed to van der Noot's broader project to use the technologies and resources of an international book trade to "translate" Familist themes through the medium of print. These are themes to which Spenser returns, and in his later work he allows the Familist resonances of *A Theatre* to erode his faith in English poetry's ability to outlast the ruins of time.

Notes

1. Noot 1569.
2. Plomer 1908: 234. For the *Theatre* as the first English emblem book, see Judson 1945: 22; Bath 1994: 282–85.
3. *A Theatre* purposefully advertises the Flemish origins of all named contributors: van der Noot speaks of Brabant as "myne owne naturall Countrey" in his dedication to Elizabeth I (Noot 1569: A3^r), while the poets who contribute commendatory verses – M. Rabilae and Gerardus Goossenius – are also identified as "Poete Brabant" (A2^{r-v}). The translator of the English commentary, Theodore Roest, may have been the Dierick Roest cited in records of the Dutch Church in London for 1569. See Forster 1967: 27–34.
4. Ferguson 1984: 30. Ferguson's judgment echoes that of Anne Lake Prescott, for whom Spenser's translations are written in "passable if not first-rate English" (Prescott 1978: 46). For Grosart, see Pienaar 1926: 44, citing Grosart 1882: I, appendix.
5. See Prescott 1978: 43; and Coldiron 2002. Coldiron cites *Shepherd's Calendar*, *Amoretti*, and *Faerie Queene* as examples of works "significantly shaped" by Spenser's early translations from Du Bellay (42–43).

6. Melehy 2005: 159. For Du Bellay's influence on *Complaints*, see the foundational studies by Satterthwaite 1960: 66–75, 93–103, and Prescott 1978: 47–52, who also notes parallels between Spenser's *Tears of the Muses* (also in *Complaints*) and Du Bellay's *La musagnoeomachie*, as well as those between the "Songe" and *Ruines of Time*. More recent criticism has turned from these similarities toward what Coldiron calls the "shifts and gaps" that separate Du Bellay's sonnets from Spenser's translations and adaptations (Coldiron 2002: 55). Coldiron discusses Spenser's departures from *Les Antiquitez in Ruines of Rome*, while Melehy builds on Ferguson's conclusions, in "Afflatus of Ruin," to approach *Ruines of Time* as an English protestant reworking of *Les Antiquitez*, one that offers in place of Du Bellay's "wished-for earthly immortality" a vision of "the divine eternity conferred by God" (Melehy 2005: 166; cp. Ferguson 1984: 39).
7. An important exception is Rasmussen 1980's combined analysis of the poems and commentary.
8. Satterthwaite 1960: 25.
9. Judson 1945: 23.
10. See, for example, Tom McFaul's recent assessment: "As van der Noot's ideas and images are mostly very common for his time . . . one must be careful not to exaggerate his direct influence on Spenser" (McFaul 2010: 149).
11. William Barker, "Mulcaster, Richard (1531/2–1611)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
12. Satterthwaite 1960: 26–7; Forster 1967: 33–34; van Dorsten 1970: 79.
13. See Hadfield 2012: 22–25. I am grateful to Professor Hadfield for allowing me to read this material in advance of publication.
14. Noot [1571?]. For identification of Bynneman as *Het Bosken's* printer, see Waterschoot 1992.
15. Hadfield 2012: 40–41; Pienaar 1926: 38.
16. Judson 1945: 20–23, 20.
17. Rasmussen 1980: 4–8.
18. Van Dorsten 1970: 28–29.
19. Van Dorsten 1970: 78.
20. *Le Premier Livre des Antiquitez de Rome*, sonnet 3.12, in Du Bellay 2006: 250.
21. Spenser, *Ruines of Rome* l. 449 in Oram et al. 1989: 381–405. *Les Antiquitez*, Richard Helgerson argues, is in many ways exemplary of Du Bellay's ambitions, as espoused in *La Deffence* (1549), to create a "free Poësie" that emulates classical models, even as it emancipates vernacular literature from the "cultural dominance" of antiquity (Du Bellay 2006: 34–35). But, as we shall see below, *Les Antiquitez* also expresses considerable misgivings about Du Bellay's project to rebuild Rome in French vernacular verse.
22. For the influence of *La Deffence* on Mulcaster's own defense of vernacular literature in *The First Part of the Elementarie* (1582), see Renwick 1922; Prescott 1978: 65–66; Du Bellay 2006: 35–36; and Hadfield 2012: 38. Spenser is likely to have been initially introduced to the ideas in *La Deffence* via Mulcaster, but E. K.'s dedicatory epistle to, and commentary on, *The Shepherdes*

- Calender* may echo Du Bellay's treatise directly, as Helgerson asserts (Du Bellay 2006: 34). However as Hadfield notes (2012: 281), there are also important differences between Du Bellay's and Spenser's approaches – in *Shepherd's Calender* – to cultural imitation.
23. Prescott (1978: 45) cites van der Noot's verse experiments "in various languages" as evidence of his closeness "in spirit to Du Bellay and the Pléiade."
 24. Du Bellay 2006: 317–417, 335.
 25. "inasmuch as each language has an indescribable something that belongs to it alone" (Du Bellay 2006: 334). For Du Bellay's attitude toward verse translations, see Coldiron 2002: 41–42.
 26. Hadfield 2012: 42; Satterthwaite 1960: 256–58.
 27. Van Dorsten 1970: 81–83. For further discussion of why Spenser may have chosen to produce blank verse translations of Du Bellay's sonnets, see Prescott 1978: 46; and McFaul 2010: 153–54.
 28. Van Dorsten 1970: 77; Pienaar 1926: 41.
 29. Noot 1572.
 30. Noot 1569: C2^v; cp. *Un Songe ou Vision*, 4.9 in Du Bellay 2006: 282; Spenser, *Visions of Bellay*, l. 51, in Oram et al. 1989: 441–50.
 31. Satterthwaite 1960: 31.
 32. Friedland 1956: 108. The copperplates are unsigned in the Dutch and French *Theatre* editions. Friedland 1956: 117–20 argues for their attribution to de Heere.
 33. Evenden 2004: 66; Galbraith 2008: 30.
 34. See Galbraith 2008: 28–32.
 35. Daly 1979: 11–21; Bath 1994: 51–52.
 36. Bolzani 1556 (further Latin editions followed in 1567, 1575, and 1602). This and other quotations from *Hieroglyphica* are from the first French translation, Bolzani 1576: **4^v.
 37. Alberti 1988: 256.
 38. II.xvi.3 in Bacon 1957: 167, cited in Bath 1994: 51.
 39. Daly 1979: 51–52.
 40. Noot 1569: Cr^v.
 41. Prescott 1978: 44.
 42. Alberti 1988: 257.
 43. The other was Spenser's childhood home of East Smithfield, discussed above. See Pettegree 1987: 21. For Day's move to Aldersgate, see Oastler 1975: 7; and Evenden 2008: 16–17.
 44. Evenden 2008: 17ff.
 45. Leaver 1991: 246–47, 263–71.
 46. King 2001: 70.
 47. Andrew Pettegree, "Day, John (1521/2–1584)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; Evenden 2004: 76–77.
 48. Oastler 1975: 1.
 49. That Day's presses were occupied with the *Actes* in 1568–69 receives support from the slight number of volumes Day issued in those years. Only seven titles

- appeared from Day's presses in 1568 (the Dutch and French *Theatre* editions amongst them), and of the thirteen printed in 1569, most are slim volumes of sermons and polemics. By contrast, Day printed twenty-three titles in addition to the *Actes* in 1570, including other weighty volumes like Euclid's *Elements*.
50. *An Epistle* was printed in 1569 and *De cautelen* on November 19, 1568. *Den Sack* belongs either to 1568 or 1569. See Van Dorsten 1970: 77, n. 33.
 51. Van Dorsten 1970: 77–80.
 52. For a history of Familism, see Hamilton 1981. For Familism in England, see Marsh 1994.
 53. Van Dorsten 1970: 32. For Parma and Alba, see Parker 1985: 68–117.
 54. For the date of van der Noot's departure from England, see Waterschoot 1992: 42, *et passim*.
 55. Hamilton 1981: 65–82. Plantin may himself have been a Familist, as van Dorsten 1970: 28 and Hamilton 1981: 65–70 suggest. For a more cautious approach, see Blouw 1993.
 56. Zaalberg 1956.
 57. Waterschoot 1992: 29–30.
 58. Folger Shakespeare Library, HH.HN.62764. The copy (STC (2nd edition) 18601) is identified incorrectly in STC as an edition of the Dutch *Theatre* translation *Het theatre oft Toon-neel* (London: John Day, 1568).
 59. See Chastel 1983: 67–77 (plates 41b, 42, 44a).
 60. Noot 1569: D4^r.
 61. Noot 1569: K8^v.
 62. Noot 1569: K1^v; Noot 1572: L1^v.
 63. Noot 1569: N2^v-3^r, Q8^{r-v}.
 64. Noot 1569: Q8^r; Noot 1568: N4^v.
 65. Noot 1569: R3^r; Niclaes [1575?]: B5^r. This was a translation, probably by Christopher Vittels, of the original Dutch edition of *Terra pacis*, printed in Deventer *ca.* 1553–55.
 66. Niclaes [1575?]: B6^r; Noot 1569: Q6^r.
 67. "Our holy scriptures have a great affinity with this style of teaching by hieroglyphs or ciphers" (author's translation) (Bolzani 1576: **5^r).
 68. "The apostles turned away from the common language of man, sifting sacred writing from everyday speech" (author's translation) (Bolzani 1576: **5^r).
 69. Niclaes [1575?]: *3^r.
 70. Prescott 1978: 44.
 71. Rasmussen 1980: 8 also notes the "spiritual journey" of the *Theatre* sonnets "from vanity to faith," although he argues that their patterning is consistent with Calvinism.
 72. Noot 1569: q5^v.
 73. Niclaes [1575?]: E5^r.
 74. Noot 1569: H2^v.
 75. Van Dorsten 1970: 27–37.
 76. Marsh 1994: 77–106. For the text of the proclamation, see Hughes and Larkin 1969: II, 474–75.

77. Noot 1568: A4^f.
78. Van Dorsten 1970: 29–30; McKerrow 1913: no. 97.
79. McKerrow 1913: no. 83. The device, “Christus Horum Charitas,” appears in Day’s Dutch translation of Gonsalvius’s *Sanctae Inquisitionis Hispanicae* (1569).
80. For Wolfe, Gibson, and the transfer of their *charitas* devices, see McKerrow 1913: 33–34, 28.
81. Spenser 1580. The appended two letters have a separate title page (sig. G2^v), although page numbering is continuous throughout. For the *Familiar Letters* and quantitative verse, see Helgerson 1992: 1–18; also Hadfield 2012: 106–10.
82. Eccles 1957: 92.
83. For discussion, see Hadfield 2012: 149, who detects a note of parody in Harvey’s pious tone.
84. Epilogue to *The Shepherdes Calender*, l. 2, in Oram et al. 1989: 213.
85. Epilogue, l. 3; “December,” ll. 105, 107, 108 in Oram et al. 1989: 203–12.
86. Ferguson 1984: 34; Melehy 2005: 164–67.
87. Spenser, *Ruines of Time*, ll. 43–4, 82, in Oram et al. 1989: 225–61; *Premier Livre*, 1.13; 27.2, in Du Bellay 2006: 248–49; 274–75.
88. *Premier Livre*, 1.1; 1.7, in Du Bellay 2006: 248–49.
89. *Ruines*, ll. 372–78, in Oram et al. 1989: 248.
90. Prescott 1978: 48; *Premier Livre*, 27.12, in Du Bellay 2006: 274–75.
91. Coldiron 2002: 48–50, 48.
92. *Ruines*, ll. 402–03, in Oram et al. 1989: 249; Coldiron 2002: 49; *Premier Livre*, 32.7, in Du Bellay 2006: 278–79.
93. Coldiron 2002: 47, *passim*.
94. *Ruines*, ll. 472, 475, in Oram et al. 1989: 252. The significance of the narrator’s reaction has been variously interpreted. For Ferguson 1984: 36–37, he is rendered speechless by Verlame’s “rhetorical abundance,” which stifles the emergence of the poet’s own Protestant voice at this point in the poem. For Rasmussen 1981, it is rather Verlame’s dubious attachment to the world that troubles the narrator, and it is the work of the poem’s Protestant ending to turn his “inward sorrow” into spiritual contemplation. For a more positive appraisal of the narrator’s reaction, see Prendergast 2008: 190.
95. *Ruines*, ll. 576, 601, 584–85, in Oram et al. 1989: 257, 258, 257.
96. *Ruines*, ll. 678, 686, in Oram et al. 1989: 261.
97. Melehy 2005: 176; Ferguson 1984: 38.
98. Rasmussen 1981.
99. See Melehy 2005: 179, who writes that Spenser’s first series of six visions in the *Ruines of Time* “are clearly composed in imitation of the verses of both Petrarch and Du Bellay that Spenser renders as their *Visions*.”
100. Noot 1569: D1^v; cp. *Un Songe ou Vision*, 15.4, in Du Bellay 2006: 294–95; Renwick 1928: 259, cited in Oram et al. 1989: 450.
101. *Ruines*, ll. 470, 585, in Oram et al. 1989: 252, 257.
102. Coldiron 2002: 42–43.
103. *Ruines*, ll. 489, 576, in Oram et al. 1989: 253, 257.