

## **The manuscript miscellany in early Stuart England : a study of British Library Manuscript Additional 22601 and related texts**

Reardon, Maria Louise

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://qmro.qmul.ac.uk/jspui/handle/123456789/1617>

Information about this research object was correct at the time of download; we occasionally make corrections to records, please therefore check the published record when citing. For more information contact [scholarlycommunications@qmul.ac.uk](mailto:scholarlycommunications@qmul.ac.uk)

The Manuscript Miscellany in Early Stuart England:  
A Study of British Library Manuscript Additional 22601 and Related Texts

In two volumes

Volume One

By Maria Louise Reardon



Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English at  
Queen Mary, University Of London  
2007

## Declaration

I, Maria Louise REARDON, testify that this thesis is entirely my own work.

*Maria Reardon.*  
~

## Abstract

This thesis is an intensive study of a manuscript miscellany dating from the early years of the reign of James VI and I: British Library Manuscript Additional 22601. Compiled by someone who had close links to the court, but who was also likely to have been associated with the Inns of Court and possibly with the south-west of England, the miscellany contains verse (including that of King James) and prose in a wide range of genres, with a particular interest in the political culture of the period. My thesis provides a description of the manuscript's contents as a whole and then goes on to focus on texts from three specific genres: the letter, political prose, and poetry. Studying these individually and in their immediate context, it goes on to trace their appearance in a number of other contemporary miscellanies held in British and North American archives.

The two primary contentions of the thesis are (1) that manuscript miscellanies need to be treated as coherent wholes, whose arrangement to some extent determines the meaning of the texts they contain and (2) that in the process of transmission from one manuscript to another texts and their meanings are significantly modified. The act of transcription is thus also an act of interpretation. Building on work by Peter Beal, Mary Hobbs, Harold Love, Henry Woudhuysen and others, the thesis aims to expand our understanding both of the culture of scribal publication and of the ways in which that culture engaged with the political, religious and literary life of the nation.

# CONTENTS

## Volume One:

<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	.....	<b>5</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	.....	<b>6</b>
<b>Transcription note</b>	.....	<b>7</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	.....	<b>8</b>
<b>Chapter one</b>	British Library Manuscript Additional 22601: a description. ....	<b>15</b>
<b>Chapter two</b>	The manuscript circulation of a letter exchange between Mathew Hutton, Archbishop of York, and Robert Cecil, Lord Cranborne. ....	<b>57</b>
<b>Chapter three</b>	The transmission of political prose in the manuscript miscellany. ....	<b>106</b>
<b>Chapter four</b>	The manuscript miscellany and the transmission of poetry. ....	<b>164</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	.....	<b>224</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	.....	<b>227</b>

## Volume Two

<b>Appendix A</b>	Contents list of British Library Manuscript Additional 22601 .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Appendix B</b>	Transcription of British Library Manuscript Additional 22601. ....	<b>8</b>
<b>Appendix C</b>	Transcription of 'The poore mans petition to the Kinges highnes' from Downing College, Cambridge, MS Wickstede Thesaurus. ....	<b>166</b>

Abbreviations

AS	All Souls College, University of Oxford
Beinecke	Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscript Library, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut (all references are to manuscripts in the Osborn collection)
BL	British Library, London
Bod.	Bodleian Library, University of Oxford
Brotherton	Brotherton Library, University of Leeds
Chetham's	Chetham's Library, Manchester
CUL	Cambridge University Library
Exeter	Exeter Cathedral Library, Exeter (all references are to Dean and Chapter MS 3527)
Folger	Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington DC
Harvard	Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Huntington	Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, California
NRA	National Records and Archives, London
STC	A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, eds, <i>A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland &amp; Ireland, And of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640</i> , second edition revised by W. A. Jackson, F. S. Ferguson, and Katherine F. Pantzer, 3 volumes (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976-1991)
Talbot Papers	Lambeth Palace Library, London

## Acknowledgements

My greatest intellectual debt in writing this thesis is to David Colclough who supported my interest in manuscript studies whilst studying for my Masters Degree at Queen Mary, University of London and encouraged me to push my research further. His enthusiasm, friendship, encouragement and unwavering confidence in my ability has been endless as has his support and patience, which has surely been tested to the limit by now. Within the Department of English and Drama I also owe thanks to Julia Boffey, Warren Boutcher, Patricia Brewerton, Graham Rees, and Maria Wakely for their support, advice and suggestions as well as to Michèle Barrett, Markman Ellis, Morag Shiach and Patricia Hamilton.

I have benefited from discussions with numerous scholars and owe immense gratitude to so many, but would especially like to thank Peter Beal, Joshua Eckhardt, Gabriel Heaton, Arnold Hunt, Eric Linqvist, Randall McLeod and Henry Woudhuysen.

Thanks to the librarians, archivists and library staff who have granted me access to their collections or otherwise facilitated research for this thesis, to several of whom I would like to express especial gratitude. I would like to thank all the staff in the Manuscripts Room at the British Library, but especially Zoe Stansell and Elaine Fordes who showed me the ropes as a manuscripts beginner, and over the years the staff there who have accepted my sometimes unconventional requests as a matter of course, provided computer repairs and humour, as well as exemplary knowledge and advice. To Dr Norma Aubertin-Potter at the Codrington Library, All Souls College, University of Oxford, Dr Karen Lubarr and Jill Young at the Maitland Robinson Library at Downing College, University of Cambridge, for whose hospitality and exceptional generosity with their collections I will always be thankful, and to Michael Morrogh at Shrewsbury School. I am grateful to those at the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, and the Folger Shakespeare Library for their unrelenting patience whilst I searched what must have seemed at the time their entire manuscript collection on a hunch, but especially to Diane Ducharme, Catherine Schindler, and June Can at the Beinecke. Lastly, I want to thank all the staff at the Folger Shakespeare Library, whose kindness and support in all manner of ways made my time there both productive and enjoyable, especially Dr Heather Wolfe, Dr Georgianna Ziegler, Betsy Walsh, Luellen DeHaven, and Nicole Murray.

I owe thanks for financial assistance to the Arts and Humanities Research Council who provided funding for this project and both the AHRC and Department of English and Drama at Queen Mary, who generously provided grants towards travel to overseas libraries.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends, who possibly know as much about British Library Manuscript Additional 22601 as I do, for their support and good humour, especially my father Eric, brother Don, Jane and Theresa; most of all, though, to Shaun for everything.

## Transcription Note

In transcribing texts from manuscript I have used the following conventions:

- I have not altered the spelling or punctuation of the original text.
- Contractions have been silently expanded, the missing letter(s) have been underlined and the superior letters have remained in superscript.
- - / ~ A straight or wavy line, a tilde or tittle, over a letter, or a backward sweeping line over the last letter(s) especially over minims, may either stand for the missing letter(s), or indicate the need to supply the double 'm.' If this tilde appears above 'con' or 'ton' at the end of a word, it always indicates the omission of an 'i.' If the reason for the tilde is unclear, or if it crosses a double 'l' it may be otiose. In these transcriptions, however, I have replaced and underlined the missing letter(s) where known.
- ~ If the word ending, missing letter(s) or reason for the tilde is unclear, I have inserted a hyphen in superscript
- Where the scribe has replaced a letter with an apostrophe (for elision), the apostrophe has been retained in these transcriptions in order to preserve the tone of the text.
- | To indicate line endings. No line endings are shown at the end of a folio.
- End of line filler marks have not been indicated in the transcription
- ~ To indicate where a word is incomplete because it has run off the page
- < > To indicate a deleted or erased word which has not been replaced by the scribe
- [ ] To indicate conjectural reconstructions of the text by the transcriber
- ← / → A left or right arrow indicates words that are written either in the left or right margin.
- // - // Where a word(s) is illegible in the text it will be indicated in these transcriptions with double diagonal lines surrounding hyphen(s) indicating the number of missing words.
- / - / Where a word(s) is unclear in the text it will be indicated in these transcriptions surrounded by single diagonal lines .
- Words crossed through in the text have been struck through in these transcriptions and corrections made by the scribe have been inserted in accordance with the manuscript text.
- \* To indicate a scribal mark on the page
- ^ ^ To indicate a word which has been omitted and written above the line, or elsewhere on the page. In these transcriptions the word has been written in superscript between the symbols.
- Single letters which have been omitted in the original document have been included in superscript in the same place as on the original text
- Ø To indicate damage to the page.
- Verse stanzas have not been separated in these transcriptions. Where a verse runs onto another folio the new folio number has been indicated but no line space has been left. A line space has been left between folios containing prose and between verse which has been undivided by the scribe
- The folio number is supplied alongside the first entry on that folio, whether it is the first line of the piece or the title.
- Where the title or introduction for a piece of writing is on the previous folio to the work itself, it is supplied as in the manuscript in these transcriptions. For clarity, the title or introduction has also been transcribed onto the head of the page containing the work – in this case it is surrounded by round brackets ( ) to indicate that it was not placed there by the original scribe.

All transcriptions remain true to the original text and therefore include scribal errors.

Where reference is made to texts from MS 22601 that have been copied into other manuscripts their spelling has been regularized to that in MS 22601.



## Introduction

This thesis is an intensive study of British Library Manuscript Additional 22601 – a manuscript miscellany of the early seventeenth century – and miscellanies related to it socially and textually.<sup>1</sup> The importance of this manuscript derives from its contents and their relationship to each other, and also from the fact that it was compiled at a pivotal point in English history: the first years of the reign of James I. My aim in the thesis will be to examine the miscellany's contents and their arrangement before tracing the dissemination of selected texts to other collections. One basic contention of my argument is that when a text is placed in a different environment its meaning may be altered due to the influence of the other material being read alongside it; likewise, the presence of a particular text in a collection affects the ways in which we read what surrounds it. The transcription of a text, and its placement in a specific section of a miscellany leads us to ask several key questions: what was the compiler's intention in collecting it? Why has it been placed where it has? What is the effect of reading it in the context it has been assigned? Addressing these questions can help us to understand the social, as well as internal, meanings of texts, to develop our understanding of manuscript culture, and to map the networks – social, textual, and political – of those who exchanged the works that I discuss.

As has been increasingly recognised in recent scholarship, the compilation of manuscript miscellanies was a vital part of the literary and political culture of the early seventeenth century.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, this practice was not (as was often previously assumed) the preserve of the aristocratic class. Many of those with some education would collect and share material with networks of friends or associates, either by copying separates individually or by one member copying a piece for the whole group.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hereafter referred to as MS 22601.

<sup>2</sup> See especially Peter Beal, "Notions in Garrison": The Seventeenth Century Commonplace Book', in *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1985-1991, MRTS 107*, ed. by W. Speed Hill (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Text Society, 1993); David Colclough, "The Muses Recreation": John Hoskyns and the Manuscript Culture of the Seventeenth Century', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61 (2000), 369-400; Colclough, *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Mary Hobbs, 'Early Seventeenth-Century Verse Miscellanies and Their Value for Textual Editors', *English Manuscript Studies*, 1 (1989), 182-210; Hobbs, *Early Seventeenth-Century Verse Miscellany Manuscripts* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992); Harold Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal publication in seventeenth-century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998); Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995); Andrew McRae, *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); H.R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

Although miscellanies are usually associated with the collection of verse, by definition they contain a wide range of texts from different genres – as will become evident from the contents of MS 22601 and throughout this thesis. The literary acquaintances of the men (and some, although rather fewer women) who compiled them would include those in their geographical region, professional colleagues or personal friends; it would also stand to reason that members of these groups might not necessarily share the same literary taste but that they would have shared interests stemming from their backgrounds. Stephen Powle, for instance, one of the Six Clerks at the Court of Chancery, copied a text of professional interest, ‘Problemes of Judges Habetts’, into his miscellany and noted that he had sent it to a fellow Six Clerk, John Clapham.<sup>3</sup> Although Clapham and other collectors would have access to texts specific to certain networks, these associations would only be reflected in their miscellanies if they chose to include those communal texts. The texts in the miscellany would, therefore, be chosen from a wider base but the compilation would ultimately remain unique to its compiler. Whether he included some of his own compositions, collected material which was given to him, or copied his favourite works from printed sources, the whole document would act as an indication of what was in circulation at the time, of the compiler’s personal interests and attitudes, and as a monitor of the political, literary and religious persuasions of his social circle and, potentially, of the population at large.

Although, as Harold Love has argued, texts are usually passed within ‘scribal communities’,<sup>4</sup> it is not always possible to determine the identity or the owner or compiler of a manuscript miscellany or to establish where he or she received each piece of work from. Entries into these books were often not attributed to an author, and even when they were, the information was often unreliable. The name attached may be that of the copyist, of the donor, or even of someone who the compiler thought or wished had written it to raise the prestige of his collection. It is only through corroborating this evidence with other sources that its accuracy can be determined. One important feature of manuscript culture was that many pieces of writing remained anonymous, either through the choice of the author, or because circulation in the safer handwritten form made anonymity practical for sensitive texts. John Watson, the vicar of Mildenhall between 1661 and his death in 1673, is one of the few compilers who has assisted us

---

<sup>3</sup> Jason Scott-Warren, ‘Reconstructing manuscript networks: The textual transactions of Sir Stephen Powle’, in *Communities in Early Modern England*, ed. by Alexandra Shepard and Phil Withington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp.18-37 (p.23).

<sup>4</sup> Love, *Culture and Commerce*, pp.179-180.

with these details. He was presented with an album in 1667 in which he entered material dated as early as the 1640s as well as contemporary material, recording the donor and date of reception, but not where he received it or to whom he passed it.

Love contends that miscellanies have usually been treated simply as quarries for texts of individual writers and as of sources for evidence in dating them.<sup>5</sup> Modern editors might mine the miscellanies of the period in their search for an authoritative version of an author's text (or for significant variants), but in removing a text from its context and reorganising it according to modern editing conventions the text and miscellany are being put to a use that would not have been recognised by the original compiler. I have found no indication that early modern compilers were especially concerned with the authority of a text; rather, they were likely to personalise a text by adapting it, or by adding a title. Compilers were responsible, however, for editing their manuscripts by selecting and placing texts, and even organising their collections by genre or another method – unless we presume that the compilation of a miscellany was to some degree a random grouping of texts, which is rarely the case. Even if this were the case then the collection would comprise those texts with which the compiler had contact, and those which were in circulation at that time.

Another key aspect of my argument here is, therefore, that a manuscript miscellany should be viewed as a whole, and the texts it contains read in this context. If a miscellany is studied as a collection of unrelated material or if individual works in it are examined in isolation, the intentions of the original compiler are obscured, and the meanings lent to texts by their alignment with others ignored. Furthermore, I suggest that in order to grasp the intention of the compiler, we need to pay close attention to the order in which the contents are arranged. The research of Mary Hobbs, Arthur Marotti and David Veith has shown that a text is influenced by the miscellany in which it is copied and Harold Love agrees that it is important to consider how the context provided by the miscellany would have influenced the individual contents within the book, as well as how the texts were read.<sup>6</sup> Every individual text in a miscellany thus affects the overall tone of that miscellany.

---

<sup>5</sup> Love, *Culture and Commerce*, p.5

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p.5; Hobbs, 'Early Seventeenth-Century Verse Miscellanies', Hobbs, *Verse Miscellany Manuscripts*; Marotti, *Manuscript*; David M. Vieth, *Attribution in Restoration poetry: A study of Rochester's 'Poems' of 1680* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), cited in Love, *Culture and Commerce*, pp.4-5.

Texts are vulnerable to change according to the conditions of their production and reception – where they are placed, or read at a particular time. The way in which the conditions of production shape the text has been referred to as ‘social editing’ by Steven May. This can take two forms: the first is when a text is circulated and revisions are purposefully made to it – at the point when the new owner makes it his or her own. The second is when it is recontextualized. This can be when the meaning and implication of a text changes because of where it is placed – when it is placed in new surroundings or read in different circumstances from those originally intended and new layers of meaning and understanding are attached to it.<sup>7</sup> Arthur Marotti also argues that manuscripts preserve or invent social occasions for poems that in print have a more general meaning, and that when they move away from their original environment they are ‘recoded and recontextualized’, thus losing their sense of social environment.<sup>8</sup> A miscellany is therefore a collection of texts which have been decontextualized from their original, or former, environment and recontextualized by their transcriber into an order which now becomes their textual environment. The combination of texts and their placement in the new environment can, in turn, participate in an ongoing discussion of social issues; in the case of my manuscript, offering a unique history of the political situation during the early Stuart years.

Until relatively recently (and sometimes even now) editors tended to disregard the manuscript copies of some verse as ‘corrupt’ if they found variations from copies which they examined and deemed ‘authoritative’. In her edition of Donne’s *Divine Poems*, Helen Gardner even stated that ‘an editor would be rash to adopt a reading from [these miscellanies] without some external evidence of reliability’.<sup>9</sup> Mary Hobbs, however, has argued that although some manuscripts are ‘careless’, they should not be discounted, even if a more authoritative version is in existence. She believes that these ‘mistakes’ or ‘corruptions’ reveal much about authorship, revision and the nature of textual transmission,<sup>10</sup> and has shown specifically how verse miscellanies display links

---

<sup>7</sup> Steven May, ‘Renaissance Manuscript Anthologies: Editing the Social Editors’, *English Manuscript Studies*, 11 (2002), 203-216 (pp.204-207).

<sup>8</sup> Marotti, *Manuscript*, p.10. For an example of this in manuscript see my discussion of James I’s poems in chapter four below.

<sup>9</sup> John Donne, *The Divine Poems*, ed. by Helen Gardner, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), p.lxxxii. Randall McLeod is currently pursuing a contrasting approach in his project of reproducing in photographic facsimile every known copy of Donne’s ‘Elegie: To His Mistris Going to Bed’.

<sup>10</sup> Hobbs, ‘Early Seventeenth-Century Verse Miscellanies’, p.183.

between groups of Oxford scholars, thus developing our knowledge of the communities that were formed as a result of texts being shared.<sup>11</sup>

Peter Beal, meanwhile, has shed further light on the distrust shown towards miscellanies by editors, arguing that they are often regarded as unreliable

in view of their apparent remoteness from the author and the intermingling or 'contamination' of textual traditions which they represent. Editors [...] have treated miscellanies (simply by virtue of the fact that they are miscellanies) with greater suspicion than manuscripts devoted almost exclusively to a single author as if exclusiveness denoted some form of pedigree.

Anticipating Hobbs's argument, he emphasised the short-sightedness of such attitudes, asserting that

Miscellanies can, however, throw extensive light on the assumptions involved in the collecting of verse in this period, on the way contemporaries interpreted texts and on the nature and provenance of sources.<sup>12</sup>

My work in this thesis builds on research by scholars such as Hobbs, Marotti, Andrew McRae and Jason Scott-Warren in attending to the material and social facets of manuscript culture and focussing on manuscripts as publication events rather than as purely personal artefacts.<sup>13</sup> It aims to develop our understanding of the ways in which compiling a miscellany could be a social and political act. Scholars have examined individual texts in MS 22601, but the manuscript as a whole has been largely neglected. I have found that by studying the circulation of either a single text or a set of texts and the documents it is copied with, it has been possible to make links between various manuscripts. In this thesis I have traced texts from my primary manuscript to other miscellanies and in doing so have found groups of texts which are often copied together. I have used all the evidence that the manuscripts offer to determine ownership, where possible, and subsequently analysed what the contents and their arrangement can tell us about the social and political circumstances surrounding the collection and its owner.

As I have stated, MS 22601 has not received extensive discussion: it has not been mined for definitive versions of texts written by poets sought after by twenty-first century

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., pp.185-195.

<sup>12</sup> Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts, volume 1: 1450-1625* (London: Mansell, 1980), I, 248-249.

<sup>13</sup> McRae, *Literature*; McRae, 'The Literary Culture of Early Stuart Libelling', *Modern Philology*, 97:3 (2000), 364-392.

editors, nor does it contain the work of a single poet.<sup>14</sup> Its importance lies in its diverse range of material and what this can tell us about the reaction to events in the early years of James's reign: letters and political prose share the miscellany with verse (which predominates in this manuscript) – some of which is also overtly political. One of the most interesting facets of this collection is that many of the poems have an underlying meaning at variance with their explicit statements; a meaning which can only be discovered when we further investigate the characters involved and the connections between them – authors such as Sir John Davies, or figures discussed in the verse such as Sir Walter Raleigh and the Earl of Essex. Political comment is also found couched in courtly vocabulary, or becomes evident when we examine the placement of a text in the collection. It is significant, for instance, that Sir John Davies is the author of two royal entertainments, as well as some of the verse in the miscellany. Davies wrote one of these entertainments, 'A lottery proposed before supper' (fol. 49<sup>r</sup>), for presentation to Elizabeth I, at Harefield, on her last progress through the country in 1602. The text and occasion on which it was presented marked a turning point in Davies' fortunes after his expulsion from the Middle Temple in 1598: James knighted him in 1603. The collection also displays a cultural interest in Sir Walter Raleigh, and includes lampoons ridiculing him as well as examples of his own writing. Raleigh, unlike Davies, did not survive the transition of monarchy and was arraigned for treason in 1603.

Chapter one contains a physical description of MS 22601 and an account of its contents; this is followed by chapters discussing selected letters, prose and poetry from the miscellany. Chapter two focusses on the opening items in this manuscript: an exchange of letters between Mathew Hutton, Archbishop of York, and Robert Cecil, Lord Cranborne. The ecclesiastical and political issues contained in this correspondence lay the foundations, and act as a springboard, for the other texts in the manuscript. This apparently private correspondence, I demonstrate, was clearly designed for a wider audience, and this is evinced by its transcription in this collection and elsewhere.

Political prose was ideal for manuscript circulation; unlike verse it was usually too long to be disseminated orally and its sensitive content often meant that it remained anonymous. In chapter three I trace the manuscript circulation of two political texts, 'The poore mans Peticion to the Kinge' and 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' of a loyall subiect to his

---

<sup>14</sup> MS 22601 is not even mentioned in the recent edition of King James VI and I, *Selected Writings*, ed. by Neil Rhodes, Jennifer Richards and Joseph Marshall (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003).

Soueraigne drawne from an obseruation of the peoples speaches’, and identify groups of miscellanies and compilers which are linked through these works.<sup>15</sup> Using the ‘Petition’ and the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ as ‘hinge’ texts I ask whether these texts travel consistently with the same material and what impact they had on each other, as well as what they can tell us about the political climate of the time. I consider the function of this political material in the miscellanies and show how the texts have been manipulated to suit the purpose of the individual compiler, also asking how far they might have affected government policy and public opinion.

Chapter four is dedicated to the poetry in MS 22601 and consists of three main sections: poetry which I have found only in our manuscript, poetry with limited circulation – that of King James I – and texts written by or about Sir Walter Raleigh. I consider the poems in their immediate context and, in the case of those that circulated more widely, analyse how they were altered textually. In both cases I consider how the poems ask to be read in MS 22601, and in the latter how their meaning shifts when they are read in other contexts.

Appendices to the thesis provide a full list of the contents of MS 22601, a transcription of the whole manuscript, and a transcription of the version of the ‘Poore mans petition’ found in Downing College, Cambridge, MS Wickstede Thesaurus.

---

<sup>15</sup> Hereafter these texts will be referred to as the ‘Petition’ and the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’.

## Chapter 1

### British Library Manuscript Additional 22601: a description

#### 1. The Manuscript

This chapter will be devoted to a technical description of the manuscript at the centre of this thesis, followed by a list of its contents with a commentary.

##### *MS 22601*

Fols 107. Paper. Watermarks: fols 8, 11, 16, 19, 24, 25, 27, 30, 37, 38, 39, 49, 50, 51, 62, 63, 64, 65, 72, 74, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 90, 92, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99. Good condition, some conservation work evident at fols 80 and 81 and to several worn leaves. Binding size 150mm x 120mm. Page 140mm x 95mm containing approximately 30 lines of secretary hand or 28 lines of italic on fully written page. Twentieth-century binding of half morocco with gold lettering on the spine.

Collation: 1<sup>7</sup> (+1), 2-9<sup>8</sup>, 10<sup>26</sup> (-2), 11<sup>6</sup>, 12<sup>4</sup>. Catchword on 38<sup>v</sup>; five ascriptions: Mathew Ebor,<sup>1</sup> Giles Codrington, Sr Thomas Areskine of Gogar Knighte, Shake Singleton, and Richard Pixley.

Written shortly after June 1606 by one compiler in several hands: close written secretary, and variations on a single italic hand.

History: The manuscript was in the possession of William Andrews, a Bristol bookseller in early 1845; it was purchased by Dr Philip Bliss later that year and on his death was sold via Sotheby's and then bought on commission for the British Museum by Mr William Boone, the agent at auction sales, for the Museum in 1858.

MS 22601 is a small volume with 107 folios as well as three waste sheets at the front and three at the rear. Most of the manuscript is gathered in eights and fours which seems to suggest a duodecimo arrangement, but the gatherings are far too irregular to meaningfully describe the manuscript in this way. The book is made of paper with watermarks on several folios. I have not been able to identify any of the watermarks unequivocally – none are complete and several are obscured by page guards – but I have described them below, and where possible tried to match them against recognised watermarks.<sup>2</sup> Most of the watermarks are in the top left of the leaf, but there are two instances where the whole gathering has been turned over so that the watermark is in the bottom left of the page. The guards have obscured some watermarks whilst others are more clearly visible.

---

<sup>1</sup> The official title of Hutton as Archbishop; Mathew Ebor is Mathew of York (Eborum = of York).

<sup>2</sup> C.M. Briquet, *Les filigranes: Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier, des leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu'en 1600*, reprinted from 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 4 vols (New York: Hacker, 1985); Edward Heawood, *Watermarks* (Hilversum, Holland: The Paper Publications Society, 1950); W.A. Churchill, *Watermarks in Paper in Holland, England, France, etc. in the XVII and XVIII Centuries* (Amsterdam: Hertzberger & Co., 1935).



## (a) Paper and Watermarks

The first gathering (fols 1-7) contains no watermarks. The second (fols 8-15) has two watermarks, on the first and fourth folios of the gathering: the first has the appearance of the base of a pot whilst the second is a part mark of the same pot on its side. Again, the third gathering (fols 16-23) has two similar watermarks to those in the second gathering, on the first and fourth folios. The watermark on folio 16, however, is slightly larger at 25mm and on comparison with other marks in this miscellany it is distinguishable as part of a decorative letter P. The fourth gathering (fols 24-31) contains four watermarks on the first, second, fourth, and seventh folios. These all appear to be various parts of decorative letters P, and O, except for that on folio 24 which is an upright and complete P of 30mm with two half inner circles in the top of the letter. In the fifth gathering (fols 32-39) are three watermarks on the sixth, seventh, and eighth folios. These marks are all 15mm; the first is a full circle, or O, the second a part O, or reverse C tucked into the guard, and the third is a flower, again obscured by the guard. There are no watermarks on the sixth gathering (fols 40-47). The seventh gathering (fols 48-55) contains three watermarks, on the second, third, and fourth folios. That on the second folio, although only part shown, is identifiable as a letter P on its side; the third is clearly the same as that on folio 24 (a 30mm decorative P with two inner circles), and on the fourth folio is a half O, or reverse C, tucked into the spine as on folio 25. The eighth gathering (fols 56-63) has two watermarks on the seventh and eighth folios; on the seventh folio is an upright vase with the initials P O on top, and on the eighth folio is a similar vase with flowers set on it. The whole of the ninth gathering has been reversed so that the mould side is the recto of the page, the grooves on several of the folios are obvious, and the watermarks on the first and second folios remain next to the left spine, but have been turned over. The watermark on the first folio is recognisable as the leg of a P with an arch next to it, and the second is either an upturned vase or flower. Likewise, the tenth gathering (fols 72-97) has twelve watermarks, all at or close to the bottom of the folio and it appears to have been turned. Three of these are part Os (fols 72, 74, 81), four of these are part or whole letter Ps (fols 82, 86, 90, 92), and five of these are parts of a vase and flowers (fols 84, 85, 94, 95, 96). The eleventh gathering (fols 98-103) has two watermarks on the first and second folios: the first is the base of a vase, and the second is the letter O. There are no watermarks on the twelfth gathering (fols 104-107).

Measurement of the chain and wire marks indicates that there are four different stocks of paper used within the manuscript. I measured the distance between the chain mark in

the centre of each folio and then the wire marks 15mm above and below the centre point (30mm total) and divided this by 3 to give an average measurement for 10mm of wire marks to indicate the density of the paper.<sup>3</sup> The results are in the order of letter to indicate paper stock, number of gathering, corresponding folio numbers, chain measurement, and wire marks. A [1] 1-7=25mm [10]; B [2] 8-15=25mm [12]; B [3] 16-23=25mm [12]; B [4] 24-31=25mm [12]; B [5] 32-39=25mm [12]; A [6] 40-47=25mm [10]; B [7] 48-55=25mm [12]; C [8] 56-63=23mm [10]; D [9] 64-71=25mm [14]; D [10] 72-97=25mm [14]; C [11] 98-103=2.cm [10]; C [12] 104-107=23mm [10]. Tranchefiles are visible in the following gatherings: 6: on folios 42, 43, 46, and 47; 8: on folios 59 and 60; 9: on folios 67, 68, and 69; 11: on folio 103; and 12: on folio 104.

### (b) Condition and binding

The manuscript is in good condition; it was conserved and rebound in 1981. There is evidence of conservation to several damaged page corners as well as to holes in the paper. Further to this, folios 80 and 81 appear substantially thicker than the rest of the manuscript and on closer examination under a cold light there are signs that the pages have been laminated for preservation.<sup>4</sup> The manuscript is bound in half morocco and the gold lettering on the spine announces it as a collection of 'Ancient MS Poems | British Library | Add. | MS | 22601'. I believe that the manuscript would have been in its original calf binding (as listed in the manuscripts catalogue at fol. 2) on its arrival at the British Museum in 1858 and there is no evidence that it was bound or altered in anyway between 1858 and 1981.<sup>5</sup>

The binding is 150mm by 120mm and 20mm deep and the page size is 140mm by 95mm. The pages are on guards and these are not included in the page size. The pages were set on guards at the time of rebinding, but the original gatherings remain.

---

<sup>3</sup> David L. Vander Meulen, 'The Identification of Paper without Watermarks: The Example of Pope's *Dunciad*', *Studies in Bibliography*, 37 (1984), 58-81 (p.68); see also Allan Stevenson, 'Chain-Indentations in Paper as Evidence', *Studies in Bibliography*, 6 (1953), 181-195; Allan Stevenson, 'Paper as Bibliographical Evidence', *The Library*, fifth series, 17:3 (September 1962), 197-212; David L. Gants, 'Patterns of Paper use in the *Workes of Beniamin Ionson* (William Stansby, 1616)', *Studies in Bibliography*, 51 (1998), 127-153; David L. Gants, 'Identifying and tracking paper stocks in Early Modern London', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 94, no. 4 (December 2000), 531-540.

<sup>4</sup> The instructions on the binding order were to deacidify, repair as necessary, guard and bind in half morocco. This would have been the standard treatment at the time for a volume that was structurally unsound, with acidic paper.

<sup>5</sup> No evidence of the previous appearance of the book, prior to 1981, nor a physical description is available. Old bindings are normally retained if they are of significance but in this case, the binding has not been kept. For this information, and that in footnote 4, I am grateful to Rachel Stockdale, Head of Manuscripts Cataloguing and Collection Management at the Department of Manuscripts, British Library.

### (c) Hands

Fully written leaves of the manuscript have approximately thirty lines of secretary hand, with the letters 2mm high, or twenty-eight lines of italic, with letters of 3mm in height. This, however, is very general, and it is outside the scope of this study to define the size of the writing more accurately.

The manuscript is written in several hands but all belong to one compiler. The letters at the beginning, for instance, are written in secretary hand and the titles, which were written at the same time, are in italic. The early folios (until fol. 8<sup>v</sup>) follow in secretary hand and then the text is written in a neat, but fairly non-descript italic hand until folio 73<sup>r</sup> where the handwriting begins to deteriorate. It is a curious coincidence that it is at this point, until folio 75<sup>v</sup>, that the poetry is bawdy and yet there are too many similarities in the hand for it to be written by a different person (unless, of course, the compiler's hand has been imitated by another person). It is possible that this portion was copied in a hurry from another person by the compiler, or even (less plausibly) that the compiler himself altered his hand to suit the low tone of the poetry he was copying. I have been unable conclusively to determine the compiler of this manuscript, although I have compared examples of the hand of Sir Thomas Areskine, written between 1603 and 1627 (contained in BL MSS Add. 46381, fol. 141<sup>r</sup>, 12503, fol. 9<sup>r</sup>, 15903, fol. 73<sup>r</sup> and Sloane 3827, fols 72<sup>r</sup>, 91<sup>r</sup>, 108<sup>r</sup>) with assistance from the Librarians in the Department of Manuscripts at the British Library, with the writing in sections of this collection and found striking similarities.<sup>6</sup>

Different inks are evident throughout: some are pale (although not necessarily worn); for instance, 'Water thy complaints' (fol. 63<sup>v</sup>) is in pale ink and the first stanza of 'Watt I wot well' (fol. 64<sup>r</sup>), which follows it, is in a dark ink whilst the rest of the poem is pale, suggesting that it has been written at different times, with different writing materials or that the final verses of 'Watt I wot well' were not available at the time of its initial copying.

### (d) Gatherings

There are twelve gatherings in the manuscript: eight gatherings of eight, one gathering of six, one gathering of seven, one of twenty-six, and one of four leaves. The page

---

<sup>6</sup> The first of these examples was written in 1603 from Areskine to Sir John Harington; see also chapter four, p.180.

numbers are in a modern hand and are likely to have been added by a librarian at the time of the manuscript's acquisition by the British Museum; they have been written around the text to cause least disruption and several are in areas free of text part way down the folio. Although the first gathering contains folios 1-7 it was originally made up of six leaves. An additional leaf has been inserted as folio 2, at the time of its acquisition by the British Museum, onto which the catalogue description of this and the previous manuscript at auction has been attached; the folded edge of folio 2 is visible between folios 6<sup>v</sup> and 7<sup>r</sup>. The following eight gatherings are of eight leaves, followed by one of twenty-six. This quire is stitched along the centre between folios 85<sup>v</sup> and 86<sup>r</sup> and there are fourteen folios at the beginning of the gathering and only twelve after the stitched 'centre'. There is no evidence that additional folios have been added to the section prior to 85<sup>v</sup>: the text does not appear to have been interrupted, there is no evidence of additions, and the page numbers remain consecutive. The loose folio edges of folios 80 and 81 are visible between folios 89<sup>v</sup> and 90<sup>r</sup> and the text does not run on at this point; in addition, 'A Dirge' starts on folio 90<sup>r</sup>, indicating that this is a likely point for folios to have been removed. On the evidence available I would suggest that two folios have been removed prior to folio 90<sup>r</sup>. It is apparent that these pages would have been removed prior to the pagination of the manuscript, and therefore prior to its acquisition by the British Museum.<sup>7</sup> It is possible, of course, that these two extra folios were never in existence and that the loose edges emerging before folio 90<sup>r</sup> are the remnants of the conservation treatment applied to folios 80 and 81. Alternatively, it is not impossible that the manuscript was paginated as late as 1981 when it was rebound and that folios might have been lost or irreparably damaged at that time. One quire of six and then one of four follows this long gathering.

#### (e) Ownership and provenance

Extensive research has been unable to establish the identity of either the compiler or the early owners of this manuscript. In addition, much of its history and provenance remains obscure. Here, I present all the evidence I have been able to amass of its connection to named individuals and of its passage to its final and current home at the British Library. Five ascriptions are written in the volume: the letter from the Archbishop of York, Mathew Hutton, has 'Mathew Ebor' written on folio 4<sup>r</sup>;<sup>8</sup> 'Giles

---

<sup>7</sup> The manuscript was paginated after its acquisition by the B.M. (see above) and there is no evidence that it was bound between 1858 and 1981. The folios were placed on guards at the time of its rebinding in 1981.

<sup>8</sup> See footnote 1.

Codrinton' is written at the end of 'The Counsell of a frend hearinge a purpose of marriage by another' on folio 9<sup>r</sup>; 'S<sup>r</sup> Thomas Areskine of Gogar Knighte', is written at the end of 'If he who lakes y<sup>e</sup> sight of both his eies' on folio 36<sup>v</sup>; 'Shake Singleton's name is written after 'A proper new Ballad of y<sup>e</sup> Countess would be a notorious woman' on folio 48<sup>v</sup>; and the name 'Richard Pixley' is written upside down at the foot of folio 52<sup>r</sup> after 'To you faire Dames'. There are also two acrostic poems spelling 'Stephen Radford' (fols 52<sup>v</sup> and 60<sup>r</sup>); and two spelling 'Prudence Bulmer' (fols 81<sup>v</sup> and 82<sup>r</sup>); and 'ensueth the lett<sup>re</sup> of Si<sup>r</sup> Walter Rawleigh to the Kinge after his Arraignmen<sup>t</sup>' is written on the folio prior to the actual letter (fol. 17<sup>v</sup>). The only instance of a catchword in the manuscript, other than the announcement of Raleigh's letter, is 'for thy' which is written at the bottom of folio 38<sup>v</sup> and repeated on folio 39<sup>r</sup>, in the poem 'O thou prodigious monster'.

All available space is used in MS 22601, which causes the pattern of ascriptions to appear before the text they refer to on some occasions and not at the end, as might be expected. In support of this, 'ensueth the lett<sup>re</sup> of Si<sup>r</sup> Walter Rawleigh to the Kinge after his Arraignmen<sup>t</sup>' is written at the end of the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' (fol. 17<sup>r</sup>) but undoubtedly (as 'ensueth' suggests) introduces his letter on the next folio (fol. 17<sup>v</sup>). Likewise, at the foot of 'A funerall Dirge vpon the death of Bard flowe<sup>r</sup>dew' (fol. 90<sup>v</sup>) is written 'Sonetta prima vpon the death of one Maste<sup>r</sup> Skeuington of Leiceste<sup>r</sup>shi<sup>re</sup> who died in the Flowe<sup>r</sup> of his Age', which would appear from the title to have links with the poem above it. Upon examining the poems that follow, however, it is apparent that it belongs to 'Yee brimfull Cesternes' (fol. 91<sup>r</sup>) on the following recto; 'Sonnetta Secunda' at the foot of this page refers to 'In anncient times' (fol. 91<sup>v</sup>), 'Sonetta Tertia' to 'Soule rake to th' death' (fol. 91<sup>v</sup>) and 'Sonetta 4' to 'Ill tutor'd thou' (fol. 92<sup>r</sup>).

'Giles Codrinton' is written underneath 'The Counsell of a frend' (fol. 9<sup>v</sup>), indicating authorship due to its immediate proximity. The authorship of 'A proper new Ballad of y<sup>e</sup> Countess' (fol. 43<sup>v</sup>) is ambiguous. It has written at the foot of the text, 'by me Shake Singleton, And dare to be sold at the signe of The Shippe called y<sup>e</sup> quittance' and under this is a short epigram. It would appear apparent that Singleton wrote both the ballad and the epigram until the final lines of the ballad are noted: 'write when you dare weel write againe, and write aswell as youe. And so good Singleton go hang, if thou wilt not adue', suggesting that the ballad writer was goading Singleton, and that the epigram is his reply.

The manuscript has ‘of Andrews Bristol 1845 at the enormous price of 6.6.0’, written on folio 1<sup>r</sup>; in the centre of the leaf is written ‘Purchd at D Bliss sale, 21 augt 1858. 1 lot 189’. A description from William Andrews’ catalogue is at folio 2<sup>r</sup>, headed ‘Bristol’ and ‘Manuscripts’. Attempts to discover who Andrews bought the manuscript from have proved futile and it is likely that his only catalogue for 1845 was dissected and inserted in the manuscript.<sup>9</sup> The lot prior to MS 22601, Lot 57, is described as ‘a curious manuscript, in folio’ written by ‘W M Spurrel, Philomathematicus and Astrologer of Bath’ and containing scientific material, maps, historical texts and those relating to local events. The description ends with the information that ‘this important and valuable manuscript was purchased by ‘W.A.’ at the ‘late Mr Moody’s sale of Books at Cheltenham, by whom it was highly prized; £4.14S.6d’. Lot 58, the manuscript at the centre of this thesis, is described as ‘ancient manuscript poems, Ballads, Letters, Plays and Sonnetts, in English’, which the catalogue description, as well as the flyleaf inscription, states was sold for £6.6S, making it worth more than the ‘important and valuable manuscript’ sold in the previous lot. It is probable that ‘W.A.’ is Andrews of Bristol and that he bought Lot 57 and sold MS 22601 at the same auction in 1845.<sup>10</sup>

William Andrews is likely to have come from a line of booksellers working in the Devon and Sussex regions of England. William Andrews, born in Chichester in 1802, is recorded as being the second child of William Andrews, a printer of that city. A printer named Andrews is shown to be in business at the same address by 1755 and is on record as being from Exeter, and there is a strong possibility that this is young Andrews’ grandfather.<sup>11</sup> A William Andrews, however, is shown as a printer in Exeter and Plymouth in 1763, and at Chichester in 1770: this may be the grandfather or, alternatively, a relative, but in both instances the Andrews lineage leads back to the West Country.<sup>12</sup> The father of young Andrews disappears from the Chichester records after his son’s birth ‘having latterly taken to book dealing following bankruptcy’.<sup>13</sup> It is

---

<sup>9</sup> A collection of books, in all departments of literature and in various languages, now on sale by William Andrews, 7 Corn St Bristol, catalogues for 1839, 1840, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1848 and 1850.

<sup>10</sup> Andrews commonly used his initials in his catalogues.

<sup>11</sup> James Britten, ‘Andrews, William’ rev. D.E.Allen, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/532>, accessed 11 Jan 2007).

<sup>12</sup> Henry Plomer, ‘A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at work in England Scotland and Ireland from 1726 to 1775’, in *Dictionaries of the Printers and Booksellers who were at work in England 1557-1775*, ed. by H.R. Plomer, G.H. Bushnell, E.R. McC. Dix (London: Bibliographical Society, 1977), pp.1-273 (p.6).

<sup>13</sup> Andrews (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/532>, accessed 11 Jan 2007).

plausible, then, that Andrews of Bristol is the missing father.<sup>14</sup> William Andrews is shown as being a dealer in new and second-hand books and manuscripts at 7 Corn Street, where he employed an apprentice named Wilson Andrews, indicating that as there is no trace of his wife, Jane Crawford, he may have started a new family in that city.<sup>15</sup> Andrews appears to have conducted business on quite a large scale for a provincial dealer and his trade catalogues are a witness to his success. At the end of *William Andrews's catalogue of books containing a selection from upwards of Twenty Thousand volumes in all Departments of Literature, and in various languages now on sale at No. 7, Corn Street, Bristol*, published in or shortly after 1840, is a note that there are four more catalogues of this kind containing 'selections from several important and valuable collections, including an entire Theological Library'. This was the library of the Rev John Wood Duppa, Rector of Pudglestone, Hertfordshire.<sup>16</sup> He also supplied many manuscripts to Sir Thomas Phillipps.<sup>17</sup>

It is known that MS 22601 was in Andrews' possession in 1845: James Orchard Halliwell printed several texts from MS 22601 in 'Poetical Miscellanies from a manuscript collection of the time of James I'. In his preface, written on 22 February 1845, he says that the texts have been 'selected from a much larger collection [...] which has recently come into the possession of Mr Andrews, a well-known bookseller at Bristol', and from whom he had made use of the manuscript for the Percy Society publication.<sup>18</sup> In his edition of the poems of James VI and I James Craigie refers to Halliwell's book and, seemingly being unable to locate the source of the poems, merges his own comments with those of Halliwell's above, continuing that 'nothing further has ever been heard of that MS and it now seems to have irretrievably disappeared, for all efforts to trace it have so far been unsuccessful'; and so MS 22601 became known as

---

<sup>14</sup> Circumstantial evidence links Andrews to both Chichester and Bristol: the catalogue referred to above is part of a collection donated to the West Sussex Record Office by a local donor who is related to the Wagner family, whose papers, as well as those of George Strahan, are amongst the collection. Both had connections with the Sussex area.

<sup>15</sup> (<http://www.bbti.bham.ac.uk>); see also *Hunt & Co.'s City of Bristol, Clifton and Hotwells Directory* (London: Hunt, 1848), p.51; *Mathews's Annual Bristol and Clifton Directory, and Almanac, 1850* (Bristol: Mathews, 1850), p.64. Andrews lived close to his shop at 11 Catherine Place, Cheltenham Road, Bristol.

<sup>16</sup> West Sussex Record Office, Chichester, MS Add. 10085.

<sup>17</sup> A.N.L. Munby, *The Formation of the Phillipps Library from 1841-1872* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), p.8.

<sup>18</sup> James Orchard Halliwell, 'Poetical Miscellanies from a manuscript collection of the time of James I', in *Early English Poetry, Ballads, and Popular Literature of the Middle Ages* (London: Percy Society, 1845), XV, p.v.

the 'lost Halliwell manuscript'.<sup>19</sup> Curtis Perry, in his article on James's poetry, reinforces the notion that the manuscript was at one time lost by quoting Craigie's version of Halliwell's statement before missing part of the manuscript's history by saying that the British Museum bought it 'of Andrews'.<sup>20</sup>

The manuscript did not stay in the possession of Andrews for very long: he sold it in the same year to 'D Bliss'. The Reverend Philip Bliss was a prolific collector of manuscripts and early books and on his death in 1858 Messrs. S. Leigh Sotheby & John Wilkinson handled the sale of his collection on Saturday 21 August.<sup>21</sup> Our manuscript was sold to one Mr Boone at quite a loss, for £3.6s, and arrived at the British Museum later in August. The Boones, William and Thomas, had been dealers of rare books and manuscripts since 1814, following their father into the business. They moved their premises from the Strand to New Bond Street in 1830, where they traded until William's retirement in 1860. William was particularly highly esteemed in his knowledge of rare books and was appointed buyer for the British Museum in 1849, but also continued in the family business. Although it would have been customary to sell to the British Museum through an intermediary book dealer at this time, such as the Boones, MS 22601 was purchased in William's official capacity as Museum buyer.<sup>22</sup>

If we cannot trace its entire history, perhaps we can at least connect our manuscript to a specific region. Although it has connections with the royal court (the presence of James I's poems alone indicates this), through both internal and external evidence the manuscript also displays links – textual and personal – with Devon and the surrounding regions. There are, in fact, indications of social and familial links in Devon and that the manuscript could possibly have stayed in this area until its re-emergence in the nineteenth century. Several texts refer to Devon ('A proper new Ballad of y<sup>e</sup> Countess', to Exeter (fol. 43<sup>v</sup>); 'To all malcontents giue this in y<sup>e</sup> Deuils stable', to Barnstaple (fol. 61<sup>r</sup>)), while 'A Dirge' (fol. 90<sup>r</sup>) and 'A funerall Dirge vpon the death of Bard flowe<sup>r</sup>dew' (fol. 90<sup>r</sup>) both refer to the sudden demise from 'Gaoll sickness' of Judge

---

<sup>19</sup> *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, ed. by James Craigie, 2 vols (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1955-1958), II, 273-274.

<sup>20</sup> Curtis Perry, 'Royal Authorship and Problems of Manuscript Attribution in the Poems of King James VI and I', *Notes and Queries*, 46 (244) no. 2, June (1999), 243-246 (p.244).

<sup>21</sup> For further information on Bliss see, Major Whittle and Rev. W. Guest, eds, *P. P. Bliss: His Life and Life-Work* (London: Morgan and Scott, 1877).

<sup>22</sup> Munby, *Phillipps Library*, p.4; George Smith and Frank Benger, *The Oldest London Bookshop* (London: Ellis, 1928), p.61.



Edward Flowerdew whilst presiding over the Exeter Assizes on 31 March 1586.<sup>23</sup> The miscellany contains poems about Sir Walter Raleigh, a Devon man ('Water thy plaints', 'Watt I wot well', and 'Wilye watt') and one written by him ('To A. Vaua').<sup>24</sup> 'Pallas hath sett a Crowne on Prudence head' (fol. 81<sup>v</sup>) and 'Pleasure is gone from rate conceyt of Prudence' (fol. 81<sup>v</sup>) are acrostic poems to Prudence Bulmer, daughter of Sir Bevis Bulmer, courtier and mining projector, who on the discovery of a silver-rich mine in Coombe Martin, Devon in 1587 gained half the lease, making a large profit.<sup>25</sup> As early as 1586 the curate of Barnstaple, John Farmer, was concerned about 'such tumults and frivolous opinions' caused by the strengthening puritan movement in Devon.<sup>26</sup> In this manuscript not only is Barnstaple's reputation for puritanism documented in 'To all malcontents' but the miscellany begins with Mathew Hutton's views, which are very much in line with those of the godly controversialists who were connected with the region. Although William Cotton, the reluctant Bishop of Exeter (1598-1621), stated that his aim was to rid his diocese of the 'popish faction' as well as the 'peevish' both he and his wife had puritan sympathies and he exercised favouritism in matters of subscription. The Devon and Cornwall regions were notoriously devoid of Catholics whereas the puritans were seen as a much greater problem.<sup>27</sup> In 1600 Cotton complained of the 'rattle-headed preachers' in his diocese, amongst whom were the hierarchy of West Country puritans, Melanchthon Jewel and John Travers. Edmund Snape's arrival in Exeter, and his licence to preach, did not improve that year for Cotton. Snape was to become the hinge between the West Country puritans and the Northampton sect in the aftermath of the Hampton Court conference but his

---

<sup>23</sup> Philip Wyot, 'The Diary of Philip Wyot, Town Clerk of Barnstaple from 1586-1608', in *Sketches of the literary history of Barnstaple*, ed. by John Roberts Chanter (Barnstaple: Arnold, 1866), pp.89-119 (p.91).

<sup>24</sup> Mark Nicholls and Penry Williams, 'Raleigh, Sir Walter (1554-1618)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23039>, accessed 10 March 2005).

<sup>25</sup> Wyot, p.102, Wyot mentions the arrival of a ship called the Prudence of Barnstaple, bringing 'much pillage from takeying of Cales' on 8 August 1596. The Prudence was one of the Armada fleet in 1588, the year after Bulmer's projection in Devon, and it is a possibility that the ship may have been named after his daughter bearing testimony to his success there; see also Todd Gray, Margery Rowe and Audrey Erskine, eds, 'North Devon Maritime Enterprise 1560-1640', in *Tudor and Stuart Devon: The common estate and government* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1992), pp.119-140 (p.127); and M.M. Oppenheim, *The Maritime History of Devon* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1968), p.50 for further information on 'The Prudence'. Leslie Owen Tyson, 'Bulmer, Sir Bevis', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/49453>, accessed 11 Jan 2007).

<sup>26</sup> Ian Gowers, 'Puritanism in the County of Devon between 1570 and 1641', Unpublished University of Exeter MA Thesis, 1970, cited in Todd Gray, *The Lost Chronicle of Barnstaple 1586-1611* (Exeter: Devonshire Association, 1988), p.42.

<sup>27</sup> Mary Wolffe, 'Cotton, William', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.Oxforddnb.com/view/article/6431>, accessed 22 Jan 2007).

employment in the meantime at St Saviours, Southwark, was possibly as a result of his friendship with Sir Christopher Yelverton.<sup>28</sup>

Links also exist between MS 22601 and others with puritan tendencies: it is apparent that Yelverton was aware of this manuscript and had most likely seen it. This and his own collection share many texts, and several of Yelverton's copies show signs of acknowledgement of those in MS 22601.<sup>29</sup> Unsurprisingly, Exeter MS 3527 contains petitions from non-conformists of London and Northamptonshire, but it also shares the 'Peticion' and 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' with MS 22601, as well as a letter from Raleigh, another Devonian, to the king. The collection also begins with the address of fellow Middle Templar and Member of Parliament for Barnstaple in 1601, Richard Martyn's address to King James on his entry to London in 1603.<sup>30</sup>

(f) Date of contents and compilation

The earliest known pieces in the manuscript are the poems on the death of Edward Flowerdew in March 1586 and the latest is an entertainment before James I at Greenwich in 1606. The volume also contains letters from prominent members of the Elizabethan and Jacobean era, poetry and entertainments by John Davies, political prose and many anonymous poems.

The physical state of the manuscript can illuminate its contents, so before discussing them in detail it is worth asking what this information can tell us about MS 22601 as a miscellany. The relatively small size of the manuscript means that while it is not particularly portable, it could be transported easily to show texts to, or copy them from, others. Although the beginning of the miscellany is neat, however, it is not consistently of a quality that would be expected if the compiler wished to parade his book before his contemporaries; I suggest, therefore, it was intended primarily for personal use. This is further corroborated by the arrangement of the manuscript: the texts are not arranged chronologically but I would argue that the compiler has arranged them in a particular order to impart significance which will become evident as I examine the contents in the second part of this chapter. As I show below, the fact that the texts are not arranged chronologically but have been transcribed in a deliberate sequence indicates that the

---

<sup>28</sup> Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London: Cape, 1967), pp.441-443; see also chapter three for Yelverton and his connection with MS 22601.

<sup>29</sup> AS MS Y155.

<sup>30</sup> See chapter three.

compiler had access to them, or that they were in his possession in order for the miscellany to be copied over a short period of time in late 1606, or shortly after.

The watermarks and paper stock can indicate whether the book was bound before compilation. In this case the evidence shows that it was, and that we can therefore examine individual texts in the context and the order that the original compiler intended in order to gain an understanding of his reading of the text, and the collection. I have shown that there are four different paper stocks in the miscellany, but that there may be two different watermarks, and that as part marks only are predominant it is not possible to be certain whether they are parts of a whole, or different marks entirely. The same watermark(s) are evident throughout the collection, and although they often appear on seemingly different paper, this can be explained by the paper being laid on two halves of a twin mould (whereby the watermark would be similar but the chain and wire marks would leave a slightly different indentation).<sup>31</sup>

Several of the gatherings are joined to gatherings of the same paper, and in others the text runs on, indicating that the leaves were originally cognate. For instance, in the first gathering 'Amor Quid' is divided between the first and second gathering; the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' continue from the second to third gathering and the paper is from the same stock; the third gathering ends with 'In praise of Peace wi<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Spaine' and the fourth begins with the king's poems, but the paper is of the same stock; the king's poems are divided between the fourth and fifth gathering and the paper is the same; the paper between the fifth and sixth gathering is different but 'I y<sup>i</sup> once liu'd in Englands glorious Court' is divided between the two; likewise, the paper changes between the sixth and seventh gatherings but 'A proper new Ballad' runs on; neither the paper nor the text runs on between the seventh and eighth gatherings but there is continuity between the texts, as both have acrostic poems on S.R. or Stephen Radford ('S.R. in defence of Loue', fol. 52<sup>v</sup>; and 'Soare I will not', fol. 60<sup>r</sup>); a similar pattern is observed where neither text nor paper are continuous between the eighth and ninth gatherings, but again 'Water thy plaints', the anti-Raleigh lampoon, is on one side of the divide and 'Watt I wot well' is on the other; the paper is of the same stock between the ninth and tenth gathering although the text is not continuous; neither text nor paper are the same between the tenth and eleventh gathering but the last gathering returns to the pattern where the paper and the text are continuous.

---

<sup>31</sup> See Allan H. Stevenson, 'Watermarks are twins', *Studies in Bibliography*, 4 (1951-1952), 57-91.

Similar watermarks to that in MS 22601 are in All Souls MS Y155, Downing College, MS Wickstede Thesaurus, and Chetham's MS Mun. A4.15. Robert Krueger has established that these manuscripts all have in common the work of Sir John Davies;<sup>32</sup> as well as Davies, however, they also contain work by John Hoskyns, and other texts of importance to those with an interest in the political questions of the period. The 'Wickstede Thesaurus', for instance, shares both the 'Petition' and Davies' 'Trenchers' with MS 22601 and the twenty-four maxims (beginning 'Loue no man but thy selfe'), in our manuscript are answered by 'An Encounter to certaine wicked and blasphemous propositions beginning thus: Loue none but thy selfe made by some most wicked Atheist'.<sup>33</sup>

As well as enabling us to date and identify texts and collections, physical evidence can tell us that these manuscript compilers were not working alone or in isolation; rather, they were working in collaboration with each other. That these and other manuscripts contain similar texts, therefore, is not surprising; they were compiled over a similar time span, between the last decade of the sixteenth century and 1630, and utilising texts from early in Elizabeth I's reign onwards – in other words, they were working from a similar pool of texts.

## 2. The Contents

A commentary on the individual texts in MS 22601 will follow. Several items will be discussed at length in the following chapters of this thesis, so in order to avoid repetition those texts will be marked with an asterisk when they are introduced. Folio 1<sup>r</sup> serves as a flyleaf and shows that Philip Bliss purchased the volume 'of Andrews Bristol' in 1845 and that it was sold at Bliss's sale on 21 August 1858. The verso of this leaf is blank and Andrews' catalogue announces the sale of this and one other manuscript and is attached to a leaf and numbered folio 2<sup>r</sup> and 2<sup>v</sup>.

'The Archbishopp of yorkes lettre to my Lord Cranborne'\* (fol. 3<sup>r</sup>) and 'My Lord Cranbornes Aunsw<sup>er</sup> to the Lord Archbishopp'\* (fol. 4<sup>r</sup>), make up a letter exchange between Mathew Hutton and Robert Cecil, and are the opening items in the

---

<sup>32</sup> *The Poems of Sir John Davies*, ed. by Robert Krueger (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), pp.436, 439, 445. Hereafter this edition will be referred to as 'Krueger'.

<sup>33</sup> AS MS Y155, fol. 196<sup>f</sup>. Hereafter, this will be referred to as the 'Maxims'.

manuscript.<sup>34</sup> Hutton's letter is dated 18 December 1604, followed by Cecil's later reply which is undated in the manuscript.<sup>35</sup> The collection begins therefore with a conflict of views regarding King James and monarchical policy just nine months into his reign.

'O yes, o yes, o yes' (fol. 7<sup>r</sup>) is the latest text in the miscellany. It forms part of a traditional tilt performed before King James and his brother-in-law, Christian IV of Denmark, at Greenwich in June 1606. I have examined the entertainment in several miscellanies of the early Stuart years, where it has been given various headings: 'The coppie of a challenge proclaimed by sounde of trumpet before y<sup>e</sup> court gate at Greenewitche';<sup>36</sup> 'A humorous proclamation to all honorable men at armes and knights adventurers';<sup>37</sup> and 'Order of the entertainment at Greenwich'.<sup>38</sup> There is also a copy of the same entertainment in All Souls, MS Y155, which has been headed 'Challenge to tilt & turnary'.<sup>39</sup> In this copy the names of 'Linnis, Arrundel, Pembroke and Montgomery' are not written at the end of the text as in MS 22601. There are several textual connections between the two manuscripts which will be discussed in later chapters, but a further link can be found through the above text. Written to the side of the title in the Yelverton miscellany is 'O yes, o yes, o yes', suggesting that the compiler of this collection had seen MS 22601 at some stage after copying the text into his own collection. In addition, the flower watermark on this leaf is the same as that which appears with the pot watermark in the primary manuscript. The entertainment has been accredited to William Drummond of Hawthornden in the Calendar of State Papers for 1 June 1606, but I have found no evidence to support either this or alternative authorship.<sup>40</sup> The entertainment is printed in full by John Nichols in *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> I have also examined the letters in the following collections: Hutton: BL MSS Add. 12497, fol. 203<sup>r</sup>, 38492, fol. 93<sup>r</sup>, Egerton 2877, fol. 167<sup>v</sup>, Lansdowne 89, fol. 28<sup>r</sup>, Stowe 156, fol. 50<sup>r</sup>; Folger MS V.a.321, fol. 38<sup>v</sup>; NRA SP Dom.14/10/64; Cecil: CUL MSS Add. 335, fol. 53<sup>r</sup>, E.iii.57, fol. 4<sup>r</sup>; Folger MS V.b.303, fol. 227<sup>r</sup>; NRA SP Dom. 14/10/66; Both: AS Y155, fols 177<sup>v</sup>, 178<sup>v</sup>; BL MSS Add. 30662, fols 67<sup>v</sup>, 69<sup>r</sup>, 34395, fols 46<sup>v</sup>, 47<sup>v</sup>, 38139, fols 181<sup>r</sup>, 194<sup>r</sup>, Harleian 677, fols 45<sup>r</sup>, 46<sup>r</sup>; CUL MS E.e.5.23, fols 470<sup>v</sup>, 471<sup>v</sup>; Bod. MS Ashmole 781, fols 104<sup>r</sup>, 105<sup>r</sup>; Talbot Papers, vol. K, fols 236<sup>r</sup>, 257<sup>r</sup>

<sup>35</sup> See chapter two, footnote 4.

<sup>36</sup> BL MS Add. 38139, fol. 266<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>37</sup> BL MS Add. 34218, fol. 83<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>38</sup> BL MS Egerton. 2877, fol. 162<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>39</sup> AS MS Y155, fol. 248<sup>r</sup> (the Yelverton manuscript).

<sup>40</sup> *The Poetical Works of William Drummond of Hawthornden with "A Cypresse Grove"*, ed. by L. Kastner, 2 vols (London and Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1913).

<sup>41</sup> John Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 4 vols (London: Nichols, 1828), II, 49.

Like ‘O yes, o yes, o yes’, ‘Amor Quid’\* (fol. 7<sup>v</sup>) relates to the courtly tradition of poetry and entertainment.<sup>42</sup> Michael Rudick suggests that it belongs to the motif verse tradition of the time, which includes ‘Now what is loue I pray thee tell’, which both he and Peter Beal doubtfully ascribe to Raleigh.<sup>43</sup> I have found no other instances of the poem in manuscript or print; however, the sixth of J. Payne Collier’s *Seven Poetical Miscellanies, England’s Parnassus*, prints a poem very similar in style and language to ‘Amor Quid’ which begins ‘Love is a sowre delight, a sugred grieve, | A living death, an everdying life’, which Collier identifies as Thomas Watson’s ‘sonnet 18’ in *The Ekatomπαοια*. There are certainly similarities between the poems but ‘Amor Quid’ is an imitation of Watson’s poem rather than a copy, and (to reinforce the point of Rudick’s motif tradition) later in *The Ekatomπαοια* is a Latin poem entitled ‘Quid Amor’.<sup>44</sup>

‘The Poore Soule sate sighinge by a sickamore tree’ (fol. 8<sup>i</sup>) is a hitherto unacknowledged copy of the ‘Willow Song’, sung by Desdemona, and first printed in Act IV of the 1623 Folio edition of Shakespeare’s *Othello*. As the play was written and performed in the same year as James’s accession to the English throne, the choice of song and its position in this miscellany might be topical. The song mourns lost love but the play also presents the struggle of Christianity against Islam, which had spilled over from the Elizabethan to the Jacobean age, and comparisons might therefore be made between the play and the religious divisions which awaited James in his new kingdom. The question of how the private or personal life of a leader impacts onto his public role at a time when questions of kingship were foremost in the minds of subjects also makes the choice topical. However, a direct connection with *Othello* cannot, unfortunately, be proved.

The ‘Willow Song’ was in circulation by the early years of the seventeenth century but had been altered and adapted by its early collectors to form several similar versions. The earliest extant version of the song is recorded in the 1583 manuscript lute book of Thomas Dallis, a Cambridge music teacher (John Cutts argues that the ‘Willow Song’

<sup>42</sup> Printed in Halliwell, p.19 with the title, ‘What is Love?’

<sup>43</sup> *The Poems of Sir Walter Raleigh, A Historical Edition*, ed. by Michael Rudick (Tempe, Arizona: Renaissance English Text Society, 1999), pp.xxxii-xxxiii, 140-141; hereafter this edition will be referred to as ‘Rudick’; see also Beal, *Index*, II, 413.

<sup>44</sup> J. Payne Collier, ed., *England’s Parnassus: or The choyssest Flowers of our Moderne Poets* (London, 1867), p.206; Thomas H. Watson, *The Ekatomπαοια or Passionate Centurie of Loue* (London, 1581), Sonnet XVIII, on p.32, ‘Quid Amor’ on p.113.

in *Othello* and in Dallis are different).<sup>45</sup> A longer version is preserved in a manuscript volume of English madrigals and psalms, however, to which several dates have been assigned: 1600, '1616 or earlier', 1614-1616, and the 1630s; another version is printed in Percy's *Reliques*, which Honigmann says is taken from an 'old ballad'.<sup>46</sup> The *Othello*, 'Percy', and 'English Madrigal' texts do not have the same variants but share similarities with the 'Willow Song' in our manuscript, the most significant being that our manuscript has nineteen lines and is copied as a poem, whereas eight of the fifteen lines in the *Othello* version are refrains and stage directions. In our manuscript, and the 'Madrigal' text, the 'poore soule' is 'sighinge' and is male throughout whereas Desdemona's is 'singing' and the female pronoun is used in the song. In our manuscript and the 'Percy' copy, 'the cold streames ran by him his eies wept apace', but in *Othello*, 'the fresh streames ran by her and murmured her moans'; the second part of the line echoes 'made tame by his mones' in line seven of this manuscript. Likewise, 'wi<sup>th</sup> salt water furrowes he drownes his face', becomes 'her salt teares fell from her, and softned the stones'; again the second part of the line echoing 'his true teares fell from him, & softned the stone' in our manuscript. Desdemona says 'let no body blame him, his scorne I approue' before realising, 'that's not next'. Her next line is then 'I call'd my loue false Loue: but what said he then', but this order is reversed in the manuscript copy: 'who speakes of a false loue, mine falser than shee' and 'let no bodie chide hir, hir scornes I approue'. Cutts believes that *Othello* is modelled on the more complete madrigal version, and although this is likely (there are more lines to choose from) I suggest that the copies in circulation borrowed lines from each other.<sup>47</sup> It is possible that the compiler of our miscellany recollected the song from an early performance of *Othello*, but it is more likely that it was copied and altered for the miscellany from several sources. (The song in both the Quarto and Folio text is referred to as 'an old thing', and it is possible that the audience knew it).<sup>48</sup> This, in turn, is to

---

<sup>45</sup> Trinity College, Dublin MS D.iii, 30, see John P. Cutts, 'A Reconsideration of the Willow Song', in *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 10:1 (Spring, 1957), 14-24 (p.14); F.W. Sternfeld, *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963), p.32, *Othello*, ed. by E.A.J. Honigmann (Surrey: The Arden Shakespeare, 1997), p.340, both agree that the Dallis manuscript is a likely source for Shakespeare's 'Willow Song'.

<sup>46</sup> BL MS Add. 15117, fol. 18<sup>r</sup>; 1600 by Peter J. Seng, 'The Earliest known Music for Desdemona's "Willow Song"', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 9:3 (Summer 1958), 419-420 (p.419), 1614-1616, in *Othello, the Moor of Venice*, ed. by Michael Neill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), p.451, 1616 or earlier by Sternfeld, p.32, and the manuscript book is dated 1630s in the BL MS catalogue. See Sternfeld, pp.23-52 for further discussion. Thomas Percy, ed., *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, 3 vols (London: Nisbet & Co., 1858), I, 158, Honigmann, p.339. Having examined BL MS Add 15117, it is possible that the items in it were composed as early as 1600, but that the manuscript was not compiled until the later dates suggested.

<sup>47</sup> Cutts, p.17.

<sup>48</sup> Sternfeld, p.29.

accept that the song was actually in the version of the play that was performed in 1604: although the ‘Willow Song’ appeared in the First Folio of 1623, it was not present in the first Quarto (1622).<sup>49</sup> As the song was available in the early years of the seventeenth century, the manuscript evidence does support the argument that the ‘Willow Song’ would have appeared in early versions of the play.

Following Desdemona’s song is a poem written in the courtly love tradition: ‘One time oh happy time for euer blest’\* (fol. 8<sup>v</sup>). Another traditional theme is that of ‘The Counsell of a frend hearinge a purpose of marriage by another’\* (fol. 9<sup>r</sup>), printed in Collier’s section on ‘Marriage’ in *England’s Parnassus*<sup>50</sup> – a theme which re-emerges in ‘How a man may chuse a Good wife from a Bad’ by Thomas Heywood.<sup>51</sup>

‘Souldio<sup>rs</sup> are like y<sup>e</sup> Armou<sup>r</sup> y<sup>t</sup> they weare’\* (fol. 9<sup>v</sup>), ‘Tho tyme hath byn my purse well lyn’d’\* (fol. 10<sup>r</sup>) and ‘The moone doth change’\* (fol. 10<sup>r</sup>)<sup>52</sup> end this particular section of poetry in a cynical vein. Four longer prose texts follow this: the ‘Peticion’\* (fol. 10<sup>v</sup>), the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’\* (fol. 12<sup>r</sup>), ‘The lett<sup>re</sup> of Si<sup>r</sup> Walter Rawleigh to the kinge after his Arraignmen<sup>t</sup>’\* (fol. 17<sup>v</sup>), and the ‘Maxims’\* (fol. 18<sup>v</sup>).<sup>53</sup> Raleigh’s letters were common in the manuscript miscellanies of the period and long after his death, and this particular one is found in the following collections:<sup>54</sup> Bodleian MSS Ashmole 781 (p.92); English History c.272 (p.44); BL MSS Add. 34631 (fol. 63<sup>r</sup>); Add. 44848 (fol. 166<sup>v</sup>); Lansdowne 157 (fol. 155<sup>r</sup>);<sup>55</sup> Cambridge University MS E.e.5.23 (fol. 427<sup>v</sup>); Exeter MS 3527 (fol. 12<sup>v</sup>); Folger MS X.d.241 (p.a); and Huntington EL.102 (fol. 132<sup>r</sup>). The ‘Maxims’\* (fol. 18<sup>v</sup>), however, are rare: I have found them in only two other collections: BL MS Add. 34599 (fol. 7<sup>r</sup>) and Folger MS V.a.321 (fol. 14<sup>v</sup>). The phrase

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., p.25.

<sup>50</sup> Collier, *England’s Parnassus*, p.233; also printed in Halliwell, p.10.

<sup>51</sup> Beal, *Index*, II, 220; the Heywood poem is in Bod. MS Eng. Poet. d.3.fol. 86.

<sup>52</sup> Also printed in Halliwell, p.20.

<sup>53</sup> I have also examined copies of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ in the following manuscript miscellanies: AS MS Y155, fol. 15<sup>r</sup>; Beinecke MSS, fb.9, fol. 42<sup>r</sup>, fb.236, fol. 103<sup>r</sup>; Bod. MSS Add. D.109, fol. 148<sup>r</sup>, Eng. Hist. c.272, p.62; BL MSS: Add. 4160, fol. 161<sup>r</sup>, Add. 22591, fol. 54<sup>r</sup>, 29546, fol. 73<sup>r</sup>, Cotton Faustina, CII 12, fol. 61<sup>r</sup>, Egerton, 2877, fol. 180<sup>v</sup>, Harleian, 35, fol. 460<sup>r</sup>, 677, fol. 33<sup>r</sup>, 3787, fol. 163<sup>r</sup>, 5191, fol. 3<sup>r</sup>, Stowe, 145, fol. 34<sup>v</sup>; CUL MS Add. 335, fol. 59<sup>v</sup>; Exeter MS 3527, fol. 24<sup>r</sup>; Folger MS V.a.321, fol. 77<sup>r</sup>; NRA SP14: state papers James I, and the ‘Peticion’ in: AS MS Y155, fol. 5<sup>r</sup>; Beinecke MS fb.9, fol. 46<sup>r</sup>; BL MSS Add. 29607, fol. 17<sup>r</sup>, Harleian 1925, fol. 1<sup>v</sup>, 3787, fol. 181<sup>r</sup>; Downing College, MS Wickstede Thesaurus, fol. 28<sup>r</sup>; Exeter MS 3527, fol. 3<sup>r</sup>; North Yorkshire County Record Office, ZAZ 1286/9101; Shrewsbury School, ‘Dr Taylor MS’, fol. 229<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>54</sup> Also printed in Edward Edwards, *The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh together with his Letters*, 2 vols (London: Macmillan, 1868), II, 296-297; *The Letters of Sir Walter Raleigh*, ed. by Agnes Latham and Joyce Youings (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1999), pp.258-260.

<sup>55</sup> The letter is commonly dated 17 November 1603, this one, however, is endorsed ‘A copy of the letter written by Sir Walter Raleigh to the Kings Majesty, 21 Januarii, 1603’ in the hand of Sir Julius Caesar.



written at the end of the 'Maxims', 'subditorum virtutes regibus formidolosae', commenting on the terrible virtues of the king's subjects, aptly provides the link to the next poem.

The verso of the leaf containing these principles is dedicated to three more maxims (fol. 20<sup>v</sup>). At the head of the folio is a four-line rhyme, which is worth citing in full, as it sets the scene for the two remaining maxims:

Because that worde & faithe  
in no degree doth stande.  
Therefore the wise man saith  
take writinge of their hand.

The author then provides twelve examples of people who are not as they are expected to be, 'Duodecim destructiones', which develop his lack of faith in mankind as suggested in the opening clause. This text continues the theme set in the 'Maxims':

Rex sine sapientiae  
Episcopus sine Doctrinae  
Dominus sine Consillio  
Populus sine Lege  
Judex sine Justicia  
Diues sine Elimosina  
Religiosus sine Castitate  
Adolescens sine Obedientia  
Seruus sine Timore  
Miles sine Probitate  
Pauper a Superbus  
Senex Luxuriosus<sup>56</sup>

Culpa conscius reprehenditur pallet | Studit ac tacet.

The Conscience beinge accused of a fault | waxeth pale, doth studie & like wise | holdeth his peace.

The next three texts are poems that offer advice about, and satire on, the transience of superficial or worldly goods and also link with the maxims preceding them. 'The happie life is that whi<sup>ch</sup> all desire' (fol. 21<sup>r</sup>) consists of eight stanzas of six lines in an ABABCC rhyme pattern and is divided into two distinct parts.<sup>57</sup> The poem starts by saying that not everyone has a happy life and asks what it is. If it is riches, or power, then these things are hard to retain; if it is 'bewty, strength & praise of finest witt' then

---

<sup>56</sup> A king without wisdom, A bishop without learning, A lord without counsel, A people without law, A judge without justice, A rich man without alms, A priest (or religious man) without chastity, A young man without obedience, A servant without fear, A soldier without honesty, A proud pauper, A dissolute old man.

<sup>57</sup> Also printed in Halliwell, p.29

these attributes often prove the downfall of the owner. The first part ends with the suggestion that the key to happiness is ‘worthines of minde’. The second, rather than offering advice to the ordinary man, addresses the ‘mightiest Kinges & monarchs of y<sup>e</sup> earth’ and turns to the virtues of good kingship. It recognises that it is not an easy task to balance happy subjects with good rule but recommends that the king exercises a virtuous government free from corruption: ‘the meane to keepe theis subiects still in awe | is reason pure, the ground & life of lawe’.

‘Fie fye desire why seekst thou to intice’ (fol. 22<sup>r</sup>) has the same rhyme pattern as ‘The happie life’, but has just six stanzas; the language and sentiment are similar to that of ‘Amor Quid’. Both poems mix pain with love but the poets cynically conclude that it is better not to love. The former refers to love as ‘sweete but swallow bitter gall’ whilst in the latter it is ‘bitter sweete, a pleasant sowre’ and ‘sugred poyson mixt wi<sup>th</sup> gall’. The following poem, ‘Why art thou prowde, thou Peacock of y<sup>i</sup> plumes?’ (fol. 22<sup>v</sup>) has the same rhyme pattern and is in seven stanzas. Its moralistic tone is similar to that of the two previous poems, but it warns that beauty and virtue do not mix and that beauty will fade with age.

These poems are politicised by their proximity to overtly political texts: on one side of them are the ‘Maxims’, the ‘Peticion’ and the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’, and the text following is ‘In praise of Peace wi<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Spaine’\* (fol. 23<sup>v</sup>), a song praising the king for bringing peace to England.<sup>58</sup> At first reading they appear to ask for no more than a simple, well governed life, but when they are considered alongside these other texts their meaning becomes more specific: they are commenting on life at court and the desire for good governance and the target of their sentiment, therefore, is King James. Likewise, I argue that the proximity of these poems to several folios of poems collaboratively written by King James is no coincidence: ‘Ballade .1.’\* (fol. 24<sup>r</sup>); ‘A Dreame .2.’\* (fols 25<sup>r</sup> and 26<sup>v</sup>);<sup>59</sup> ‘A Ballad .3.’\* (fol. 25<sup>v</sup>); ‘A Ballade .4.’\* (fol. 30<sup>v</sup>); ‘Passionado .5.’\* (fol. 31<sup>v</sup>); ‘A Sonnett’\* (fol. 33<sup>v</sup>); ‘.2.’\* (fol. 34<sup>r</sup>); ‘.3.’\* (fol. 34<sup>r</sup>); ‘.4.’\* (fol. 34<sup>v</sup>); ‘.5.’\* (fol. 35<sup>r</sup>); ‘.6.’\* (fol. 35<sup>r</sup>); ‘.7.’\* (fol. 35<sup>v</sup>); ‘.8.’\* (fol. 36<sup>r</sup>); and ‘.9.’\* (fol. 36<sup>r</sup>).<sup>60</sup> I argue

<sup>58</sup> ‘In praise of Peace wi<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Spaine’ is printed in Halliwell, p.31.

<sup>59</sup> Also printed in Halliwell, p.20.

<sup>60</sup> The following are printed as a sequence in this order in Halliwell, pp.32-37: ‘A Sonnett’; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; and 9. At the end is written ‘Finis, Sir Thomas Areskine of Gogar, Knighte’. It is notable that the compiler has attributed the sonnets to Areskine but not ‘A Dreame’.

that the compiler's motive has been to make implicit the suggestion that James endorses the opinions of those texts surrounding his poems.<sup>61</sup>

These poems are grouped together but it appears that the compiler has mistakenly only copied the first sixteen lines of 'A Dreame .2.' before copying 'A Ballad .3.', which ends midway down folio 26<sup>r</sup>. It would have made matters worse to start 'A Ballade. 4.' at that point and so he filled the gap with a shorter poem before continuing 'A Dreame .2.' on folio 26<sup>v</sup> and marking his error on folios 25<sup>r</sup> and 26<sup>v</sup> with a finger guiding the reader to the rest of the text. A sonnet, 'A Gentlewoman y<sup>t</sup> married a yonge Gent who after forsooke whereupon she tooke hir needle in whi<sup>ch</sup> she was excelent & wo<sup>k</sup>ed vpon hir Sampler thus' (fol. 26<sup>r</sup>) is squeezed into the gap and returns to the theme of the gulf between appearance and reality in 'The Counsell of a frend', and hinted at in 'Amor Quid'; but this poem is written from a woman's perspective.<sup>62</sup> A lady is sewing a sampler in four colours to describe the 'change constant thinge' of her lover's affection; she says she will not use plain stitches because that would be to complain and then reflects 'how men haue tongues of hony, harts of rue', and that there is no correlation between their heart and their tongue, 'men have made 'y<sup>m</sup> twain'. Needlework has become a replacement for her lover by the final couplet.<sup>63</sup>

'O thou prodigious monster moste accurst'\* (fol. 37<sup>r</sup>) follows the poems linked with the king and is on the folio following the ascription to 'S<sup>r</sup> Thomas Areskine of Gogar Knighte'.<sup>64</sup> Unlike 'A Gentlewoman', 'O thou prodigious monster' is politically motivated. Although it is directly responding to an attack on Elizabeth I after her demise it also serves to warn James 'that flatters cannott be Princes frend'. I have found no other copies of this poem in print or manuscript and the only evidence of its date is that its content suggests that it was written early in James's reign. If this were so, he would not yet have gained his reputation for favouritism, but his entourage of Scottish followers was commented on from the moment of his accession to the throne, so its warning against flatterers would still have been topical. The poem is longer than the

<sup>61</sup> These poems are also copied in BL MS Add. 24195, fols 4<sup>r</sup>-24<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>62</sup> 'A Gentlewoman' is printed in Halliwell, p.11.

<sup>63</sup> On the connection between reading and sewing see Suzanne Trill, Kate Chedgzoy and Melanie Osborne, eds, *Lay by your needles ladies, take the pen: Writing women in England, 1500-1700* (London: Arnold, 1997); the archetypal weaver of texts for Renaissance readers would have been Penelope: see also Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, 'The needle and the pen: needlework and the appropriation of printed texts', in *Renaissance Clothing and the materials of memory*, ed. by Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp.134-171.

<sup>64</sup> Printed in Halliwell, p.1. See chapter four for a discussion of attribution in this miscellany and of Areskine's role in the manuscript's poetry.

earlier ones in this manuscript at sixteen stanzas, but has the same rhyme pattern. The poem is marked in two places with a pointing finger: the first at the line ‘the Duties both of Seruannt & of frend’, after the author has said that she has remained loyal to the queen’s memory (the following line goes on to say ‘whi<sup>ch</sup> she professed, when y<sup>ou</sup> here didst raigne’, indicating a female author). The second finger points to two rows of numbers and letters written at the foot of the folio that appear to be a tally or code, but for which I can find no meaning: 19. 8 9 8 3 5 (8 4 7 6 7) s 5 / Sr T 1 2 3 11 7 c k 5<sup>3</sup>.

‘I y<sup>t</sup> once liu’d in Englands glorious Court’\* (fol. 39<sup>r</sup>) is about the hypocrisy and corruption at the royal court and aptly follows ‘O thou prodigious monster’. Like that poem and ‘A Gentlewoman’, it is written from a woman’s perspective. Connections between this poem and ‘To A. Vaua.’, to which I return below, are evident. The author is a young lady at the royal court who has been seduced by a courtier who has dishonoured her and against whom she now plots revenge. The poem returns to the theme of betrayed youth treated in ‘Fie fye desire’, but on this occasion it is the female who has been disappointed: the miscellany is using different sides of the same question to illustrate the theme of the many areas of court life. Arthur Marotti has remarked that the fragility of female reputation and honour was a constant theme in the literature of the time, but in this collection a balance has been struck between the dishonoured female who can only seek ‘sweete reuenge’ (fol. 39<sup>v</sup>) and the gentleman who can choose to say ‘farewell’ to ‘y<sup>e</sup> Crocodile wi<sup>th</sup> fained teares’ to ‘learne another loue’ (fols 22<sup>r</sup> and 22<sup>v</sup>).<sup>65</sup>

The compiler has copied all twelve of Sir John Davies’ ‘Trenchers’\* (fol. 40<sup>r</sup>) into this miscellany, as has the compiler of Downing College, MS Wickstede Thesaurus.<sup>66</sup> Davies wrote the verses at the request of Sir Michael Hicks for Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, to whom he was secretary, as a new year’s gift in 1605.<sup>67</sup> Their satirical

<sup>65</sup> Arthur Marotti, ‘Folger MSS V.a.89 and V.a.345: Reading Lyric Poetry in Manuscript’, in *The Reader Revealed*, ed. by Sabrina Baron Alcorn, Elizabeth Walsh and Susan Scola (Washington, DC: Folger Shakespeare Library, 2001), pp.44-57 (p.47).

<sup>66</sup> Downing College, MS Wickstede Thesaurus, fol. 25<sup>v</sup>; ‘Trenchers’, ‘Dialogue’, and a ‘Lottery’, were printed in the second edition of Francis Davison, *A Poeticall Rapsodie* (London, 1608), whilst MS 22601 was in the process of compilation; see also Hyder Edward Rollins, *A Poetical Rhapsody, 1602-1621*, 2 vols (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1931). Edward Doughtie, *Lyrics from English Airs 1596-1622* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), pp.596-597; Marotti, *Manuscript*, p.3. Trenchers were thin wooden discs about 6” in diameter which were painted and inscribed with a verse on the underside. Fruit or cheese would be served on the plain side and then the verse read aloud.

<sup>67</sup> The title of the trenchers in MS Wickstede Thesaurus shows that they were written for Sackville: ‘Verses giuen to the Lord Treasurer vpon New yeares day vpon a dosen of Trenchers by Mr Davis’, fol. 25<sup>v</sup>; a letter copied into BL MS Lansdowne, 88, Plut. LXXV D., no. 2. from Davies to Sackville’s

content would have been close to the mark as a gift for Sackville, who may have recognised some of his own dealings in the poems. His father was known as ‘fill-sack’ whilst in the post of royal treasurer, and Sackville himself attracted libels such as ‘Heere lyes a lord that Wenching thought no sinne’; it is likely that he was one of the ‘rich treasurers’ and ‘wary keepers’ referred to in ‘England men say of late is bankrupte growne’ (fol. 60<sup>v</sup>).<sup>68</sup> Several other miscellanies have chosen certain poems from the series of trenchers: St John’s College MS U 26 (James 548), a verse miscellany compiled in the second quarter of the seventeenth century by John Cruso of Gonville and Caius College, has ‘The Courtier’, ‘The Diuine’, ‘The Souldior’, ‘The Wyfe’, ‘The Widowe’, and ‘The Mayde’ (pp.32, 35); National Library of Wales, Sotheby MS B2 has copied ‘The Courtier’, ‘The Diuine’, ‘The Souldior’, and ‘The Mayde’ (fols 148-149)<sup>69</sup>; Bodleian MS Rawl. Poet. 84 has ‘The Diuine’, ‘The Souldior’, ‘The Lawyer’, and ‘The Mayde’ (fols 44<sup>v</sup>-43<sup>v</sup> reversed); BL MS Add. 22602, a mid-seventeenth-century miscellany has ‘The Diuine’ (fol. 36<sup>v</sup>) (headed ‘A parson to his sweete heart’); Harvard MS Eng. 686 (fol. 86<sup>v</sup>) has copied ‘The Diuine’ again, headed ‘A parson to his mistris’, in a collection with New College and Inns of Court connections from the 1630s; and Bodleian MS Eng. Poet. d.152 (fol. 103<sup>v</sup>) has copied just lines one and two from ‘The Wyfe’.<sup>70</sup> Underneath the folio containing ‘The Batchelour’ and ‘The married man’ (fol. 42<sup>r</sup>) are two columns of numbers: the arithmetic is dubious, but their position certainly suggests that the compiler is weighing up the financial cost of the single life against marriage: it isn’t clear which prevailed.

‘Thinges hard to winn wi<sup>th</sup>  $\wedge$  ease  $\wedge$  makes loue incited | and fauou<sup>rs</sup> wonn wi<sup>th</sup> ease are hardly quited’ (fol. 43<sup>r</sup>) is a short proverbial rhyme that has been written at the foot of the folio underneath ‘The Mayde’. It is written in a secretary hand, unlike the texts surrounding it which are in italic, and has the appearance of being squashed in as an afterthought at a later date than the texts before and after it. It is possible that the compiler wished to contradict the maid’s view that she would not ‘mocke and play’ and risk driving a suitor away, whereas he would rather court a lady who was hard to win.

---

secretary, Sir Michael Hicks: he says that he has enclosed the ‘cobwebb of my invention’ promised before Christmas at the request of Hicks – referring to the trenchers. He admits the trenchers are ‘light & trifling’ but states that he would be glad of any occasion to be made known to ‘that noble gentl.’. The letter is signed Chancery Lane, 20 January, 1600. See Krueger, pp.414, 415; *The complete poems of Sir John Davies*, ed. by Rev. Alexander B. Grosart, 2 vols (London Chatto and Windus, 1876), I, cxviii.

<sup>68</sup> BL MS Harleian 3991, fol. 126<sup>v</sup> and V&A MS Dyce 25, F.39, fol. 68<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>69</sup> Beal, *Index*, I, 220; see also E.H. Fellowes, revised and enlarged by Frederick W. Sternfeld, and David Greer, *English Madrigal Verse 1588-1632* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), p.620.

<sup>70</sup> Beal, *Index*, I, 220.

‘A proper new Ballad of y<sup>e</sup> Countess would be a notorious woman out of Italy, and of a Pandress or promoter of Loue amonge the Augustine nunnes Translated out of Cornish or Deuonshire into true Suffolk And is to be sunge to the tune of Lighte of Loue, or Vptailles all, as you can deuide’ (fol. 43<sup>v</sup>) is the full title given to ‘Mat’s Ballad’ which describes itself as a ‘lible’. It is likely that the ballad is loosely based on a local scandal involving folk in East London, Exeter and Suffolk. ‘Mat’ is identified as the author of the ballad when the lewd Dutchwoman in the nunnery, or brothel, speaks to him. He writes ‘she y<sup>t</sup> railes of other folks | doth seldomme keepe good name’, but she asks him

if thou wilt be mat singleton  
and raile in rascall ryme.  
As he hath done in sundry songes  
and Ballads in his tyme.

She then tells him that others ‘raile aswell as he’ and that it would ‘make y<sup>e</sup> Readers sport’ to hear a libel about him. She goes on to tell a bawdy tale about Singleton, telling him that he is a ‘knaue & foole’ and warning him that

he will haue his eares or nostrils cut  
for cuttinge in his ballet  
orels his mouthe must seared be  
for lumpus in the pallet.

These are some of the punishments meted out to libellers in this period. The woman who turns Singleton’s ballad against him is standing up for the ‘Westerne ladds’ against Singleton’s ‘Suffolk weessells’ and ends by daring him to write again: ‘And so good Singleton go hang | if thou wilt not adue’. Written underneath, by way of further insult to Singleton, is ‘by me Shake Singleton. And dare to be sold at the signe of The shipp called ye quittance,’ followed by:

O let not pass one less shame  
vnto the first beginner  
for she hath byn and she wilbe  
a fallinge pleasant sinner.  
fire newe and y<sup>e</sup> first mintage.

‘A lottery proposed before supper at y<sup>e</sup> Lord Chief Justice his house in y<sup>e</sup> first entrance: to hir Maiestie, Ladies, Gentlewomen & Straungers’ (fol. 49<sup>r</sup>) is the second of the Davies entertainments in the manuscript.<sup>71</sup> It was written for Sir Thomas Egerton, Lord Keeper, and his wife, Lady Derby, to entertain Elizabeth I when she visited Harefield from 31 July to 2 August 1602, as part of what was to be the last progress she made before her death. The ‘Lottery’ is part of a longer entertainment where at the queen’s

---

<sup>71</sup> Also printed in Halliwell, p.5; see also chapter four, p.165.

entry into the house the figures of 'place' and 'time' perform a dialogue, before a mariner appears with a box under his arm, signifying the riches taken from the Portuguese carrick, and sings to 'Cinthia, queene of seaes and landes'. The mariner then turns to the distinguished gathering of ladies to 'deuide' his 'bootie amongst them' and invites them to try their luck at fortune's wheel where they each take a 'lot' beginning with the queen. Krueger suggests that the 'Lottery' copied into MS 22601 is the earliest version of this entertainment.<sup>72</sup> It only includes thirty-eight lots with the name of the lady, her prize, and a two-line verse.

The Lord President of the North, Edmund Sheffield, sent a copy of the complete entertainment to Mathew Hutton, Archbishop of York. Hutton replied to Sheffield that he was glad to hear that it was to the 'good likinge and best contentment' of the queen and likened Time and Place to the 'wise and happie government' of Elizabeth who 'bothe time and place themselves have bene much graced'.<sup>73</sup> Not everyone enjoyed the 'Lottery' as much as the queen, however: John Chamberlain wrote to Dudley Carleton on 23 December 1602: 'you like the Lord Kepers devises so yll, that I cared not to get master secretaries that were not much better, saving a pretty dialogue of John Davies twixt a maide, a widow and a wife, which I do not think but master Saunders hath seen'. Chamberlain is referring to 'A Dialogue betwene the Mayde, the Wife, & the Widow for the defence of their Estates', which will be discussed below.<sup>74</sup>

The most complete version of the entertainment is copied in the papers of the Newdegate family of Arbury Hall, Nuneaton, which are preserved in the Record Office at Warwick (CR/136/B2455),<sup>75</sup> but other copies exist in Folger MS X.d.172 (fol. 4<sup>v</sup>), papers originating from Sir Edward Conway, Viscount Conway, which contains one other lot not found in MS 22601 and omits five which are included in that manuscript.<sup>76</sup> John Manningham's diary lists some of the lots and ladies present (BL MS Harleian 5353, fol. 95<sup>f</sup>); the songbook compiled by Giles Earles has copied only the mariner's song (BL MS Add. 24665, fol. 19<sup>v</sup>); Beinecke MS fb.9, a volume of state papers, has a

<sup>72</sup> Krueger, p.409.

<sup>73</sup> 'A copye of my Lord Archbishop's letter unto the Lord President', in *The Correspondence of Dr Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York*, ed. by J. Raine (London: The Publications of the Surtees Society, 1843), p.167.

<sup>74</sup> *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. by Norman Egbert McClure, 2 vols (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1939), I, 177-178.

<sup>75</sup> Also printed in *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, ed. by R. Warwick Bond, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902); see also Beal, *Index*, I, 233.

<sup>76</sup> The version printed in Francis Davison's *Poeticall Rhapsodie*, 1602, was copied from this manuscript; see also Krueger, p.409.

copy of the dialogue between Time and Place (fol. 40<sup>r</sup>) and a manuscript amongst the papers of the Talbot family has copied only the farewell speech of Place ‘delivered to her Majesty at her departure from Harville the Lord Keepers house Aug 1602’ (Talbot Papers, vol. K, fol. 43<sup>r</sup>).<sup>77</sup>

I believe that it is likely that the compiler of MS 22601 has chosen to include only the lots in this entertainment rather than the whole performance, choosing to present the women surrounding the court, his contemporaries, rather than centring his attention on the queen. The queen remains at the head of the entertainment as a mark of respect as she takes the first lot and then the ladies and maids take no preference. This is in contrast to a ‘Dialogue’, where the focus is on the queen and the women take a strict hierarchical order – that is, with the ‘mayde’ in the dominant position.

‘To you faire Dames whose fauou<sup>r</sup> doth now flourish’ (fol. 51<sup>v</sup>) starts by toasting the lives of women but is another warning that ‘when wealth when pomp when bewty shall y<sup>m</sup> leaue’ all that will be left is virtue. It advises women to look to the lives of Helen and Cressida, and to apply themselves to the good life, ‘for vice brings plagues, and vertue happie end’.

‘S.R. in Defence of loue’ (fol. 52<sup>v</sup>) is an acrostic poem spelling ‘Stephen Radford’, about whom, despite considerable effort, I have been unable to discover anything.<sup>78</sup> The poem is written in two seven line stanzas with an ABABBCC rhyme scheme, and in it the poet notes that even those who have no other skills can fall in love, and that it is only those who have loved who can criticise it. ‘In Defence of loue’ is divided from another acrostic poem by Stephen Radford, ‘Soare I will not, in flighte the grounde ile see’ (fol. 60<sup>v</sup>), by seven poems which will be discussed below. This group of poems is of a similar style, as well as content – courtly and advisory – and they are likely to have come from the same source or author. In the poet’s denial of ambition above his station in ‘Soare I will not’ he alludes to the fall of Icarus and recognises that to scorne ‘fortunes angrie frowne’ could be to court danger in political circles: the poet is content with his life and refuses to play the games for courtly advancement.

---

<sup>77</sup> See also Beal, *Index*, I, 234.

<sup>78</sup> Also printed in Halliwell, p.12.



‘Sweet mistres mine bewties chiefe generall’ (fol. 52<sup>v</sup>) follows ‘S.R. in Defence of loue’ and is a poem in the courtly love tradition, where the lover carries his mistress’s colours as a soldier in her army but also as a warrior on the tiltyard. Likewise, the speaker of ‘I flatter not when you y<sup>e</sup> sonne I call’ (fol. 54<sup>f</sup>) places his lover’s beauty above that of the sun. The tone of contentment in ‘I feare not death, feare is more paine’ (fol. 55<sup>v</sup>) is similar to that in ‘Soare I will not’. The moral in this poem, however, is that to fear is worse than the actual outcome of fear. I have found no other instances of this poem in manuscript or print, but the sentiment is shared by a poem in Philip Sidney’s *Arcadia*: ‘Feare is more paine then is the paine it feares’.<sup>79</sup> The next poem, ‘I will not soare aloft the skye’ (fol. 56<sup>f</sup>) also has similarities in language, and content to ‘Soare I will not’: the poet has taken caution from Icarus and will neither fly so high that he could fall, or so low that he becomes ‘a marke for base contempt’ but instead chooses to live in the middle ground. ‘Councell whi<sup>ch</sup> afterward is soughte’ (fol. 56<sup>f</sup>) is a four-line proverbial poem which offers the kind of cautionary advice that the writer of ‘I will not soare aloft’ and ‘Soare I will not’ may well have suggested: that is, to seek counsel before matters have progressed too far. Margaret Crum identifies two manuscripts containing the text in the Bodleian Library: the first, MS e. mus. 63 (fol. 146<sup>v</sup>) has copied it three times and the second, Rawl. D.649, states that it has been ‘copied by Wiman Ramsey’ about 1595 (fol. 28).<sup>80</sup> ‘Tho loues and would his suite should proue’ (fol. 56<sup>v</sup>) is a twenty-seven stanza poem which attempts to return to the courtly theme in ‘I flatter not’ and ‘Sweet mistris’ but soon descends into misogynistic and pornographic verse, in which sex is given freely after courtship, and in which rape is recommended because although women use ‘reiecting words’ their ‘alluringe iestures do say yea’; this says the poet, is further illustrated by the story of Helen, Menelaus and Paris. ‘When as a fearfull Horseman backs’ (fol. 59<sup>v</sup>) is the last in the group sandwiched between the two Stephen Radford acrostic poems. Hunting and military themes are used to illustrate the poet’s advice that you become vulnerable if you are afraid. Written at the end of ‘Soare I will not, in flighte the grounde ile see’ is a four-line love poem:

If all the Earthe were paper white  
and all the sea were incke.  
Twere not inough for me to write

---

<sup>79</sup> Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia* (London, 1598), p.445; see also Collier, *England’s Parnassus*, p.104; M.P. Tilley, *A Dictionary of proverbs in England in sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950) lists several instances expressing this sentiment at the time of the manuscript’s transcription.

<sup>80</sup> *First Line Index of English Poetry, 1500-1800 in the manuscripts of the Bodleian Library*, ed. by Margaret Crum, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), I, 178.

as my poore hart do thinke' (fol. 60<sup>r</sup>).<sup>81</sup>

The poem is self-explanatory but its playfulness appears out of place before the texts it precedes. The poem is anonymous in both this and the only other manuscript in which I have found it: Folger MS V.a.339 (fol. 224a).

Two poems by John Harington follow this: 'England men say of late is bankrupte growne'\* (fol. 60<sup>v</sup>)<sup>82</sup> and 'When doome of death by judgemen<sup>ts</sup> force appoin<sup>ted</sup>' (fol. 60<sup>v</sup>).<sup>83</sup> Neither of these poems was available in print during the manuscript's transcription: the first was published in the nineteenth century, and the second in 1615.<sup>84</sup>

The unrest reflected in the first of these poems in anticipation of Elizabeth's death is further highlighted in the second, even though it refers to events fifteen years earlier.

'When doome of death' does not so much lament the death of Mary Queen of Scots as express horror that an anointed monarch was executed. Although the speaker recognises that Mary was justly dealt with by the law, reason tells him that it a treasonable offence to kill a queen. The poem is copied into miscellanies of the early Stuart period as an item of interest, and to provoke questions about leadership. It is also used to bolster collections sympathetic to the established church (as an anti-Catholic text, but also as one which questions the morality of executing a monarch, regardless of their religion), as well as those with Catholic connections: Emmanuel College, Cambridge, MS1 3.28. (James 80), and BL MS Add. 10309, the collection of the Catholic gentlewoman Margaret Bellasys from Yorkshire, for instance.<sup>85</sup> Its proximity to 'England men say of late' in this collection, however, suggests that the potential for civil unrest at the beginning of a new reign is recognised; the author hopes that England will never be so divided again – the wish is for peace.

'To all malcontents giue this in y<sup>e</sup> Deuils stable' (fol. 61<sup>r</sup>) is an eight-line poem which immediately follows 'When doome of death'.<sup>86</sup> The poem is addressed to 'Ye Babes of Barum' (Barnstaple) and suggests that the notoriously puritan Church needs to exercise

<sup>81</sup> Also printed in Halliwell, p.12.

<sup>82</sup> Beal, *Index*, II, 135; printed in Halliwell p.37; I have also examined copies in: Bod. MSS Ashmole 781, p.134; Eng. Poet. f.10, fol. 97<sup>r</sup>, Malone 23, p.121, Rawl. Poet. 212, fol. 87<sup>v</sup>, Sancroft 53, p.57; Corpus Christi CCC, 327, fol. 24<sup>r</sup>; BL MSS Add. 10309, fol 120<sup>r</sup>, 39829, fol. 93<sup>r</sup>, Folger MS V.a.249, p.186.

<sup>83</sup> Copies of the poem can be found in: Bod. MS Eng. Poet. e.14, fol. 100<sup>r</sup>; Rawl. Poet. 212, fol. 87<sup>v</sup>; BL MS Add. 10309, fol. 148<sup>v</sup>; Emmanuel College, Cambridge, MS I 3.28 (James 80), fol. 56<sup>r</sup>; University of Texas MS file/(Herrick, R)/works B, p.63; Folger MSS, V.a.103, I, fol. 2<sup>v</sup>, V.a.249, p.148, V.a.319, fol. 21<sup>r</sup>, V.a.322, p.35, V.a.345, p.103 see Beal, *Index*, II, 152; also printed in Halliwell, p.38.

<sup>84</sup> Beal, *Index*, II, 121.

<sup>85</sup> Margaret Sena, 'William Blundell and the networks of Catholic dissent in post-Reformation England', in Shepard and Withington, *Communities*, pp.63-64.

<sup>86</sup> Also printed in Halliwell, p.38.

succour, or failing that, authority in Barum over the laity or the ministry there. Its inclusion in this manuscript (and particularly in this context) suggests that it is offered as a warning to those who step outside the established religion of the country.<sup>87</sup>

The next poem, ‘Concerninge his suit & attendance at y<sup>e</sup> Courte’ (fol. 61<sup>v</sup>) is another of the group of poems in this collection which discuss the problems of the courtier trying to gain the attention of the monarch – in this poem, Elizabeth. The speaker laments the time and effort wasted in playing the political game in order to be heard, only to be disappointed at every hurdle; he summarises his lament in a Latin phrase attached to the end of the poem: ‘Pereunt nil pariunt Anni Vertes’ (the turning years perish and bear no fruit). ‘The thundringe God whose all embracing power’ (fol. 62<sup>f</sup>) seemingly answers the previous poem. The poet acknowledges the early golden days of the earth when man served God alone, but in the ‘rusty Iron age’ he wants recognition for his service. ‘Patience’ however is overseeing his actions and has fled to heaven. He considers his ‘labour lost’ and ends by establishing that no matter how devout, ‘if nought but Aire he purchase he may starue’.

It seems appropriate that following ‘The thundringe God’, are three libels against Sir Walter Raleigh: ‘Wilye watt’\* (fol. 63<sup>f</sup>), ‘Water thy plaints wi<sup>th</sup> grace diuine’\*(fol. 63<sup>v</sup>), and ‘Watt I wot well thy ouerweenninge witt’\* (fol. 64<sup>f</sup>).<sup>88</sup> Raleigh had been one of the Queen’s ‘peers’ who had filtered suitors from her presence in ‘Concerninge his suit’ but had also seen the other side of the fence as he was shunned from James’s presence in the Jacobean era. As if to form an anthology of texts portraying the trials of court life, ‘A Dialogue betwene the Mayde, the Wife, & the Widow for the defence of their Estates’ (fol. 66<sup>f</sup>) by Sir John Davies follows the anti-Raleigh texts. After his disgrace and dismissal from the Middle Temple, Davies used his literary skills to woo those with

<sup>87</sup> For further discussion of Barnstaple, see pp.23-24.

<sup>88</sup> All three libels are printed in Halliwell: ‘Wilye watt’, p.13; ‘Water thy plaints’, p.14; ‘Watt I wot well’, p.15. I have not found ‘Wilye watt’ in any other collection; ‘Water thy plaints’ is also copied in: Bod. MS Ashmole 781, p.163 and Brotherton MS Lt.q.9, fol. 17<sup>r</sup>; I have found the full version of ‘Watt I wot well’ in the following manuscripts: AS MS Y155, fol. 181<sup>v</sup>; Bod. MS Don. C.54, fol. 9<sup>v</sup>; Folger MS X.d.241, fol. 1<sup>v</sup>. The following manuscripts reverse stanzas four and five of MS 22601: AS MS Y155; Bod. MSS, Don. c.54, Eng. History, c.272, p.46; BL MSS Add. 38139, fol. 192<sup>v</sup>, Harleian 3910, fol. 14<sup>f</sup>, Stowe, 952, fol. 84<sup>f</sup>; Folger MS V.a.339, fol.211<sup>v</sup>. The poem has been copied in BL MS Harleian 6947, fol. 212<sup>r</sup> but the page has been cut after the end of stanza sixteen; the top of the next line is still evident but stanzas 17-19 have been removed and the remainder of the page, commencing at stanza twenty, has been stuck to the folio. Stanzas four and five have also been reversed. Folger MS V.a.345, discussed in chapter four, has only six of the twenty-one stanzas.

power to restore him to favour. This entertainment, amongst others, was written after his pardon, largely effected by Lord Keeper Egerton.<sup>89</sup>

A 'Dialogue' is the third of Sir John Davies' entertainments contained in this miscellany; it was copied into numerous miscellanies of the early Stuart years, including BL MS Harleian 286 (fol. 248<sup>r</sup>)<sup>90</sup> and Christopher Yelverton's manuscript, which contains a reversed version of the text in this miscellany.<sup>91</sup> Krueger has suggested that the rarity of some of Davies' texts in Yelverton's manuscript and the professional connection between the men makes the author the likely source for the Davies texts there. Although a 'Dialogue' is not rare, it is likely that it was supplied by the author: the connection between Yelverton's manuscript and this one indicate a common link between the compilers, and in addition to this, Krueger suggests that MS 22601 was copied from Davies' rough drafts, which were possibly copied out of order, thereby accounting for the 'eccentric sequence' of the speeches.<sup>92</sup> The entertainment was written for Sir Robert Cecil's entertainment of Elizabeth at his new house, Salisbury House, in the Strand, on 6 December 1602. Chamberlain referred to it as a 'pretty dialogue' and remarked on its future printing, and it is certain that Davies' entertainment was inspired by Samuel Rowland's 'Tis Merrie when Gossips meete', which contains a 'Conference between widdow, wife and mayde', and which was entered in the Stationers' Register on 15 September 1602.<sup>93</sup>

In the 'Lottery' the women are given names as well as matrimonial titles, which demand that privilege and prerogative are adhered to, and the queen takes the superior role. The 'Dialogue', however, is a conversation between the maid, the widow and the wife, where there are no names, only matrimonial positions of status; the victor is not, therefore, a foregone conclusion. Likewise, the 'Lottery' is a presentation, whereas a 'Dialogue' would normally take the form of a discussion. When performed before the

---

<sup>89</sup> The entertainment, also known as 'The contention', was referred to by John Manningham, in *The Diary of John Manningham of the Middle Temple 1602-1603*, ed. by Robert Parker Sorlien (Hanover, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 1976), p.150, see also Krueger, p.413; for Davies' 'troubles' see Krueger, pp.xxxv-xliii.

<sup>90</sup> See Beal, *Index*, I, 233.

<sup>91</sup> AS MS Y155, fol. 118<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>92</sup> Krueger, pp.412-414.

<sup>93</sup> Samuel Rowlands, 'Tis Merrie when Gossips meete' (London, 1602), in *The Complete works of Samuel Rowlands, 1598-1628*, 3 vols (Glasgow: Hunterian Club, 1880), I, (23 leaves); Sir John Davies, 'Dialogue', was printed in Francis Davison's *Poeticall Rhapsodie*, also in 1602; see also Krueger, pp.412-414.

queen there could only be one victor – the usually less significant rank of maid would have to be promoted to win this argument.

Anne Vavasour was low in the order of precedence in Davies' 'Lottery', so in this context it seems a bold move by the compiler to allocate Elizabeth's disgraced maid of honour the same rank as her mistress. Yet a poem dedicated to the scandal surrounding Anne Vavasour, attributed to Walter Raleigh, is copied into the collection after Davies' 'Dialogue'. 'To A. Vava.\*' (fol. 71<sup>r</sup>), offers cautionary advice to a mistress at the royal court, and its position in this collection suggests that as well as maintaining a personal reputation, court ladies should not compete with the queen or draw attention to themselves, or away from her.<sup>94</sup> Below this poem is copied 'Constant wiues are comforts to mens liues'\* (fol. 71<sup>v</sup>), thereby countering the balance and celebrating the status of wife.

The first eighteen lines of 'Scorne not the least', and lines seven to twelve of 'Time goe by turnes', by Robert Southwell have been conflated to form one poem, beginning 'Where words are weake & foes incounter stronge' (fol. 71<sup>v</sup>) in this collection.<sup>95</sup> The first three stanzas argue that everything on the earth has its place and that while these things cannot always be perfect, or as they should be, God is the guiding force. The concluding stanza (the second stanza of 'Time goe by turnes') summarises by saying that the 'sea of fortune' does not simply flow; it ebbs and flows, so that all creatures have a chance to reap the reward, offering a sense of comfort. Brown suggests that these may be exercises in the style of popular anthologies, but that they may also have 'hidden relevance' for persecuted English Catholics. As the texts were not published during Southwell's lifetime, however, we cannot be sure of his plans for them.<sup>96</sup> Likewise, the compiler may have copied them either from other manuscript versions or from the printed text.

---

<sup>94</sup> The poem was first printed in *Le Prince d'Amour, or the Prince of Love with a collection of Several Ingenious Poems and Songs By the Wits of the Age* (London: Leake, 1660), sig. K3<sup>r</sup>; also copied in Bod. MS Rawl. Poet. 85, fol. 116<sup>r</sup>; see Beal, *Index*, II, 378; printed in Rudick, pp.27-28

<sup>95</sup> Beal *Index*, II, 512, 514; *The Poems of Robert Southwell*, S.J. ed. by James H. McDonald and Nancy Pollard Brown (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp.69, 152 ('Scorne not the least'), pp.57, 146 ('Time goe by turnes'). Hereafter this edition will be referred to as 'Brown'. See also: 'Scorne not', BL MSS Add. 10422, fol. 47<sup>v</sup>, Harleian, 6910, fol. 126v, 6921, fol. 42<sup>r</sup>; Bod. MS Eng. Poet. e.113, fol. 50<sup>v</sup>; 'Time goes', BL MSS Add. 10422, fol. 38<sup>v</sup>, Harleian 6910, fol. 124<sup>r</sup>, 6921, fol. 35<sup>v</sup>, Bod. MS Eng. Poet. e.113, fol. 41<sup>v</sup>; see footnote 98 below. See also St Robert Southwell, *Collected Poems*, ed. by Peter Davidson and Anne Sweeney (Manchester: Carcanet, 2007).

<sup>96</sup> Brown, p.lxxix.

Southwell wrote his poetry while a Catholic priest on the English mission between July 1586 and his arrest in June 1592.<sup>97</sup> There are no other versions similar to that in MS 22601 extant, and both poems appear separately in manuscript as well as in the first edition of *Southwell's St. Peters Complaynt*, which was printed shortly after his execution in February 1595.<sup>98</sup> Alison Shell contends that *St. Peter's Complaynt* became a best seller in the publishing mainstream after Southwell's execution, and texts about or by prominent people were extremely collectable after their death – Raleigh's texts were highly prized, as was Chidioc Tichborne's 'My prime of youth'.<sup>99</sup>

The compiler of MS 22601 would, I suggest, have known that these poems were the work of a Catholic martyr, and the reason for their inclusion might simply be that he wished to gather knowledge of current affairs. It seems apparent, however, that he did not want a 'Catholic' poem in his collection. We cannot know for certain why the compiler of this miscellany arranged the two poems as he did, but his formulation avoids the Catholic doctrine of damnation alluded to in the original concluding stanza of 'Scorne not the least' and ends the poem with hope, rather than admonition. The compiler might simply have preferred this arrangement, but in light of the dominant puritan opinion throughout the rest of the compilation, it is possible that he was attempting to avoid the whiff of Catholicism. Alternatively, he might have recontextualised the stanzas to the extent that the poems were not recognisable, and that either he no longer believed the final version to be Southwell's, or he thought that by making these alterations he had protestantized the poems, either by rearranging their contents or by making them remote from their Catholic author. I would argue that the appeal of Southwell's texts for the compiler of this miscellany derives from their newsworthiness rather than their religious content. The miscellany has subtly gathered Catholic and puritan texts, but still occupies the middle ground; but it also illustrates ecclesiastical confusion.<sup>100</sup> A balance of views is apparent throughout the manuscript: Southwell, during his imprisonment, pointed out in a letter dated 6 April 1593 to Cecil

---

<sup>97</sup> Brown, p.xxiii.

<sup>98</sup> *Southwell's St. Peter's Complaynt with other poems* (London, 1595), 'Scorne not the least', sig. G1<sup>r</sup>, 'Time goe by turnes', sig. F3<sup>r</sup>; both poems are copied in Stonyhurst College, MS A.v.27; Bod. MS Eng. Poet. e.113; BL MS Add. 10422; Harl 6910, 6921; see footnote 95 above.

<sup>99</sup> Alison Shell, 'What is a Catholic Poem? Explicitness and censorship in Tudor and Stuart verse', in *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England*, ed. by Andrew Hadfield (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), p.96; *Letters of John Holles*, ed. by P.R. Seddon, 3 vols (Nottingham: Thoroton Society, 1986) no. 314; see Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney*, p.158, footnote 24; see also chapter three.

<sup>100</sup> Southwell's own view was that the 'variety of religions, hath abolished almost all religion': that the uncertainty has driven people away from any religion at all. Robert Southwell, *An Epistle of Comfort* (London, 1587), fol. 85<sup>r</sup>.

(who was at that time a privy councillor), that he had so far ‘abstained to stain [his] hands in Catholic blood’, and as there is no trace of a reply from Cecil, we can only speculate about his reaction. In his letter to Hutton at the beginning of this compilation, however, leniency towards Catholics of ‘moderate spirites’ is again acknowledged by Cecil.<sup>101</sup> There was, then, a clear division between Cecil’s personal and public conscience. His public duty insisted that the king’s ‘godlie and iust lawes’ should be ‘dulie executed’, whereas his private persona allowed peaceful recusants, some of whom were close to the centre of power, to practice Catholicism untroubled.<sup>102</sup>

‘Nowe is y<sup>e</sup> time that pleasure buildes hir  $\wedge$  bower  $\wedge$ ’ (fol. 72<sup>r</sup>) is a courtly love poem which corroborates the notion in the poem before it that fortune offers equal chances to everyone. ‘I neede not reede my passions shew  $\wedge$  my  $\wedge$  paine’ (fol. 72<sup>r</sup>) is written in two six-line stanzas rhymed ABABCC, and the author relies on internal rhythm to build on the sense of hopelessness in the pursuit of his love. The ever changing condition of love noted in this poem is also addressed, and is likened to the moving state of nature, in ‘The harmles lambe y<sup>e</sup> crafty foxe deuoureth’ (fol. 72<sup>v</sup>), which is written in four six-line stanzas and, like the previous poem, has an ABABCC rhyme scheme.

The style changes slightly in ‘Comme sweete thoughte returne againe’ (fol. 73<sup>r</sup>), in which the first three stanzas are a love poem with the poet pleading with the ‘sweete thoughte’ to return to him. In the fourth and last stanza, however, the poet’s grief is ‘well abated’ and his ‘reasons soone shalbe dilated laid late betwixt my mist<sup>res</sup> thies’.

‘Faine wi<sup>th</sup> a looke y<sup>t</sup> lock my hart in mirthe’ (fol. 73<sup>v</sup>) is a battle between love and the pain it causes, and is written in the courtly style: the lover has only ever had one love and asks that his heart ‘receiues his death by none but hir alone’.<sup>103</sup> The content is in complete contrast to the poem that follows it: ‘Pleas’d wi<sup>th</sup> a kiss, a kiss did please me’\* (fol. 74<sup>r</sup>) which follows the same style as the poetry surrounding it but has a mildly pornographic content. ‘In thought not sight though eies long time  $\wedge$  had  $\wedge$  watched’ (fol. 75<sup>r</sup>)\* is of a decidedly pornographic nature and consists of a voyeuristic sexual fantasy. It has four six-line stanzas in which words are picked up from one line and cascade down through the stanza. Time is laid against the seasons in the third stanza: ‘Autume

<sup>101</sup> Folger MS V.a.421, fols 54-61; Brown, pp. 77-85.

<sup>102</sup> Pauline Croft referred to correspondence between Southwell and Cecil in an unpublished paper presented at the Institute of Historical Research on 12 February 2007.

<sup>103</sup> Also printed in Halliwell, p.39.

ended a moneth before y<sup>e</sup> springe, | & winter ripe y<sup>t</sup> Sommer forth did bringe' and a finger points to the first of these lines. Underneath the poem another finger points to the words: 'Autume January Februarie May'.

In 'Cease thy plaints since she doth cease' (fol. 75<sup>v</sup>) the lover dies by Cupid's dart because the 'coyness' of his lover has been too cruel for him to take. In 'Hearing songs of sorrowes monings' (fol. 76<sup>r</sup>) the pain of departed love is described in terms of misery.<sup>104</sup>

'Driuen to extremes I thought my selfe accurst' (fol. 76<sup>v</sup>) has four six-lines stanzas in which the poet laments his lost love. He likens his misery to that of the thieves who died on the crosses alongside Jesus, who he thinks would have re-found happiness in heaven after their deaths: like them, death might release him.

'The sweetest kiss y<sup>t</sup> euer creature gained'\* (fol. 77<sup>r</sup>) is followed by a bawdy rather than pornographic poem: 'Late it was & lately done' (fol. 77<sup>v</sup>). This poem is written in fourteen four-line stanzas. It is written in catalectic trochaic tetrameter with an ABAB rhyme scheme, which allows it to 'bounce' along and adds to the poem's humorous tone. The poet plays his lute by a sleeping lady, 'an earthly saint', but his 'fancies fitts' overcome him and he cannot resist touching her naked breasts. The reader is asked to picture her, because a painting is more beautiful than the living person. The poet, however, only has a painting of the lady in his memory and this will make her more beautiful to him with time. The image of the painting continues as the poem ends by leaving 'you all to muse of y<sup>e</sup> parts y<sup>t</sup> be vnnamed'.

Six poems which are closely connected in both content and style follow 'Late it was & lately done'. The poems all describe an unobtainable or lost love and lament this condition to various extremes. 'Is it a life daily to be tormented' (fol. 78<sup>v</sup>) and 'Amidst my thoughts I thought on times <sup>were</sup> <sup>^</sup> past' (fol. 79<sup>r</sup>) both consist of three six-line stanzas: in the first the lover has been caught in a snare but once he has been hooked the love is unrequited; in the next poem the lady holds the lover's happiness in her hands and refuses to release him. 'Amidst my thoughts', by contrast, has a happy ending: the lover was restored as he was close to dying by love descending from a cloud.

---

<sup>104</sup> Also printed in Halliwell, p.40.



The next four poems in the group have two stanzas of six lines each and are a continuation of the theme. ‘Mountaines let slide their stormes & showe<sup>s</sup> taken’ (fol. 79<sup>r</sup>) uses nature imagery to illustrate the point that the natural world just accepts without question; why, it then asks, can’t love do the same? In ‘Do not leaue of thy comely daunce’ (fol. 79<sup>v</sup>) the poet pictures his lover as a heavenly object and tries to win a kiss from her, which he sees as a religious blessing. ‘The lofty trees whose brannches make sweete shades’ (fol. 79<sup>v</sup>) uses both material objects and nature to illustrate the point that love must have an object and cannot exist in isolation. ‘If y<sup>t</sup> I liue I cannot liue but loue’ (fol. 80<sup>r</sup>) returns to the repetition of the words ‘liue’ and ‘loue’ in every line to reinforce the concept that the two go hand in hand and cannot be separated. The group is concluded by a seventh poem which aptly begins ‘Nowe at last leaue of lamenting’ (fol. 80<sup>r</sup>).<sup>105</sup> The first two stanzas, of four lines, tell the lover that his woe is in vain and has lasted too long. The last stanza of six lines tells him that fortune has granted his wish – death – and that there is nothing to lament.

The lover in ‘Tell me now or tell me not’ (fol. 80<sup>v</sup>) believes that he is being rejected by his lady because of what others have said to her. The poem describes the way that gossip was able to travel in an environment such as the court, and is evocative of the court scandal to which Anne Vavasour was subject and about which Sir Walter Raleigh warned her in ‘To A. Vaua.’.

‘Pallas hath sett a Crowne on Prudence <sup>head</sup>’ (fol. 81<sup>v</sup>) and ‘Pleasure is gone from rare conceyt of Prudence’ (fol. 81<sup>v</sup>) are two acrostic poems to Prudence Bulmer. The first celebrates her attributes and beauty whilst comparing her to the gods. Its last line suggests that she was the focus of gossip, or ‘lyinge tongues’. The second poem, written directly below the first, tells that there was, however, truth in the ‘tongues of sharpest witts’ and that Prudence had been dishonoured, and that ‘Envy’ was rejoicing ‘to heare Sweet Prudence lamentacion’. Prudence was the daughter of Sir Bevis Bulmer, a courtier at both the Elizabethan and Jacobean courts and a mining projector in the north of England. Records show that Prudence married John Beeston of London on 13 February 1595.<sup>106</sup> John Chamberlain, however, writes that Sir Patric Murrey, ‘at first coming in of the King married a daughter of Sir Bevis Bulmer that was a widow to

<sup>105</sup> Also printed in Halliwell, p.41.

<sup>106</sup> Geo. J. Armytage, ed., *Allegations for Marriage Licences issued by the Bishop of London, 1520 to 1610*, 2 vols (London: Publications of the Harleian Society, 1887), I, 228.

a nephew of Sir George Beeston.<sup>107</sup> It is likely that Prudence's husband was the Cheshire recusant George Beeston, who was knighted in July 1588 and died in October 1601, and that Prudence then married Murrey in 1603, and that she had presumably died by the time of Murrey's marriage to Lady Vere in September 1613.<sup>108</sup>

'My loue is full of pleasure' (fol. 82<sup>r</sup>) ponders on the physical beauty of his lover. In the poem following it, 'Blessed soule why art thou sad' (fol. 82<sup>v</sup>), the lady is cajoled into banishing grief and enjoying the pleasures on offer to them both. In 'More sweete contentmen<sup>t</sup> haue I had wi<sup>th</sup> thee' (fol. 84<sup>r</sup>) the lover tells that he enjoys all aspects of his 'secreat friends' company, but theirs is a clandestine relationship which must be based on discretion. Although theirs is a sexual relationship, he seems unwilling to admit that they are any more than friends, writing 'frend' in the right hand margin after the poem. The story is continued in 'Tell me wherein I do slack' (fol. 85<sup>r</sup>), where the lover is accused of breaking the laws of friendship. The poem is ambiguous, and has the impression of a one-sided conversation. The 'care' that the lover 'heedfully regarded' in 'More sweete contentmen<sup>t</sup>' has been misplaced and he wishes 'y<sup>t</sup> women had y<sup>e</sup> sence to discerne of thinges discreetly', as his lady refuses to listen to reason, only believing that she had been disgraced. The suggestion is that the lover has been having an affair and that his lady has found out. Likewise, it is also possible that the conversation implied in 'Tell me wherein' is with the object of his secret liaison; they have fallen out and now he accuses her of being indiscreet. The discussion continues in 'Can you spend my time to muse' (fol. 85<sup>v</sup>), but the lover decides that his friendship is unrequited and that where there is suspicion and doubt there is no room for friendship – so the poem sequence ends, with his farewell.

'O fy desire why dost thou still intise' (fol. 86<sup>v</sup>) is followed by 'Oh sweete desire y<sup>t</sup> sweetly dost intice' (fol. 86<sup>v</sup>): both are sonnets written in iambic pentameter with an ABAB rhyme scheme in three quatrains ending with a rhyming couplet. The speaker in the first of these is reprimanding 'desire' for allowing him to court a lover that he disdains, but he still tries to 'pearse hir hart' and in the third stanza he falls asleep and dreams, but the last line ends unresolved and the couplet tells the reader that the speaker does not know us well enough to share that dream. The speaker in the second sonnet

<sup>107</sup> Chamberlain, I, 476.

<sup>108</sup> William Arthur Shaw, *The Knights of England*, 2 vols (London: Heraldry Today, 1971), II, 86; Chamberlain, I, 133; *HMC Salisbury (Cecil)*, IV, 240, October 1592. Quotations from texts in *HMC* volumes are from the original manuscripts; however, I have supplied references to *HMC* volumes for ease of reference.



welcomes 'desire' and claims he will never disdain his love as long as this condition will not cause him pain. The lady says that her heart has been wounded by him but lays down to rest and her dream, as in the first sonnet, is not to be shared with the reader.

The next four poems are all written in three six-lines stanzas, in which the scene is set in the first stanza, a test is set in the second and in the third the speaker either has to wait, has lost his love, the matter is left unresolved, or her kiss revives him as he is dying of love for her. 'The fresh grene bay y<sup>t</sup> neuer loose hir coollo<sup>f</sup>' (fol. 87<sup>r</sup>) is a love poem in which the speaker says that nature, like his love, will never lose its hue. She is out of his reach but he knows that he will win her even if it takes so long that he is out of his 'pleasant bloominge prime'. The love in the first stanza of 'Like to y<sup>e</sup> luory straun<sup>g</sup>e now thou beholdest' (fol. 87<sup>v</sup>) is both mutual and constant, but by the second stanza they have parted. In the third the poet says that he lives in 'secreat trust', indicating that theirs was a surreptitious affair, thereby tarnishing the initial ideal of pure love which had been set up earlier in the poem. A chance meeting is described between a lover and his mistress in the first stanza of 'What luck had we to meete so well togethe<sup>r</sup>' (fol. 87<sup>v</sup>); in the second he uses a kiss as a gauge to test her love for him and consoles himself in the last stanza by reasoning that if she loves him as she has said, then he should not doubt her, otherwise he has wasted his time. The lady at the centre of 'I sate & thought vponn my best belou'd' (fol. 88<sup>r</sup>) is above all other flowers, and it is her kiss that revived the speaker of the poem as he was dying. 'And beinge fild with pleasant Oyle' (fol. 88<sup>v</sup>) and 'Where sapphire signes runs round about' (fol. 89<sup>r</sup>) are of a similar form. In the first poem, the lover is compared to a candle made of rush; the image of straw as ordinary and useful is reversed as his lover is described as being above all traditional forms of beauty: this rush should not be used as a bed or as floor covering, instead it deserves its own bed. In the second, the poet conjures two signs of beauty – precious gems and flowers – which are substitutes for his lover. The earthquake is a metaphor for his being awoken from a dream, or his realisation that he can never attain that wonder, but he finds that the fantasy is in fact real.

'A Dirge' (fol. 90<sup>r</sup>) begins a series of six funereal poems. It becomes apparent, however, that it concerns the 'flowe<sup>r</sup>dew' that the next poem is seemingly dedicated to. Gaol fever had 'stay'd y<sup>e</sup> circuite' of Judge Edward Flowerdew whilst on the Western circuit in Exeter (fol. 90<sup>r</sup>). The whole course of the deceased's passing is described in the first stanza and then the second and third describe how God had called his soul to

the Holy Ghost, and argues that those left behind should not mourn him because although he is lost to them and the earth, 'highest heau'ns hath won'. The second poem begins at the foot of this folio and has the heading, 'A funerall Dirge vpon the death of Bard flowe'dew' (fol. 90<sup>r</sup>) (the titles in this manuscript are written on the previous folio to the text in several places).<sup>109</sup> The poem is divided into four stanzas of six lines: the first places the deceased above all living things, referring to 'his body fram'd out of a mine of golde' and is a likely allusion to King Henry VIII. The next three stanzas celebrate the life and death of 'This Soueraigne Queene' and the references to 'non suche', the palace built by Elizabeth's father, Henry VIII, make her the most likely subject of this lament.

At the end of this poem is written 'Sonetta prima vpon the death of one Maste<sup>r</sup> Skeuington of Leiceste<sup>r</sup>shi<sup>re</sup> who died in the Flowe<sup>r</sup> of his Age': the 'Sonetta', which prefers to use the sounds of nature to voice its lament, commences on the following folio (fol. 91<sup>r</sup>). The lament is highly impersonal and tells us nothing about 'Skeuington' other than that he is 'of Leiceste<sup>r</sup>shi<sup>re</sup>': a link has been created between these poems by stating that he died in the flower of his age. William Skeffington of Leicestershire is likely to be the deceased – he was fellow-commoner of Jesus College, Cambridge in 1594-5, admitted to Grays Inn on 7 November 1595, knighted in 1603 and died at the age of 25 in 1605.<sup>110</sup>

The next heading, 'Sonnetta Secunda' is written at the foot of folio 91<sup>r</sup>, and the poem begins on folio 91<sup>v</sup>. The poem says that tradition has dictated that sorrows are carved on a tree, but the speaker does not wish to share his grief with an inanimate object. Although a name will be carved on a headstone, it is in time that he will become immortal. 'Sonetta Tertia' (fol. 91<sup>v</sup>) begins at the end of 'Secunda'. This begins by blaming Erebus, the gloom of the underworld, for the death of the deceased and wishes that 'Caron' the ferryman might lose him on the River Cocitus, or that he might die by 'ebon dart'. The speaker does not invoke the 'heavens' in the poem and tells the 'vnskilfull Gardiner', death, that he has left the weeds and taken the rose. He continues to use mythological figures to recount the untimely death of the poem's subject, and it is in the last stanza that it becomes apparent that the deceased is a young child who has

<sup>109</sup> See pp.20, 23-24 above.

<sup>110</sup> J.A. Venn, ed., *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, 4 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927), IV, 84; Joseph Foster, *The Register of admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521-1889, together with the register of marriages in Gray's Inn chapel, 1695-1754*, 2 vols (London, 1889), p.88.

never seen his first winter. The fertile goddess Pomona has replaced the deceased in the poem but has been beaten by Erebus. ‘Sonetta 4’ (fol. 92<sup>r</sup>) ends this series of poems by saying, enough talk about ‘cruell death’: it is inevitable and will happen to you too – this conclusion is similar to the way that ‘Nowe at last leaue of lamentinge’ concluded the group of poems about lost love. The final ‘Sonetta’ asks a recurring question of the age: ‘what is life’? The answer is balanced: it is a journey, but also a ‘comick tragedye’, and a ‘prison full of cares’. God and nature are brought together in this poem, the poet announcing that the world is our stage and men are the actors, but that it is nature that gives us our destiny, not God: nature provides us with ‘a vearse’, and once we have acted our scene we may die. Death, however, is not the end, as our heirs will live on.

‘A vale to vanity & y<sup>e</sup> pleasu<sup>res</sup> of this worlde’\* (fol. 93<sup>r</sup>), asks for help in shunning worldly pleasures whilst bidding farewell to a corrupt world and ends with the advice, ‘sub soles vanitas | multa latent quae non patent’, describing the underlying dangers to morality outlined in these three poems. The first is a biblical reference to ‘vanity under the sun’<sup>111</sup> while the second, ‘many things are hidden which are not exposed’, is a warning that if the speaker does partake in dubious practices he will be discovered.<sup>112</sup>

‘O monstrous worlde to see thy fickle course’ (fol. 93<sup>v</sup>) follows, with a discussion of how man’s life and fortune are affected by the changing world. The speaker in the poem wishes that God had given him the ability to not react to the ways of the world, and this theme is answered in the next poem, ‘A minde that’s free is worth a myne of golde’ (fol. 94<sup>r</sup>). The poem is written in two six-line stanzas; the first stanza is explained in its first line, and the second describes how the speaker will not succumb to the pressures of other people, and that his heart and mind will remain free.

‘Strange newes now harke y<sup>e</sup> world begins to burne’ (fol. 94<sup>v</sup>) uses mythology to comment on the decaying state of the world. It recounts the myth of Phaeton, describing how he lost control of the dawn goddess’s chariot and was heading on a collision course towards the earth: the earth is consumed in flames and the dead are returned to life.

---

<sup>111</sup> Ecclesiastes 1.

<sup>112</sup> ‘Multa latent quae non patent’ is quoted in Robert Greene, *A Notable Discovery of Cozenage* (London, 1591), p.177, where it is central to the rogue literature of exposing hidden practices; see Linda Woodbridge, ‘Impostors, Monsters, and Spies: What Rogue Literature Can Tell us about Early Modern Subjectivity’, *Early Modern Literary Studies*, Special Issue 9 (January 2002): 4.1-11 URL:<http://purl.oclc.org/emls/si-09/woodimpo.htm>.

Four poems which appear to form a sequence follow this: 'Oh deer harte where hast thou bene' (fol. 95<sup>r</sup>); 'Grone no more oh heauy hart' (fol. 96<sup>r</sup>); 'Why art thou sad my soule' (fol. 96<sup>v</sup>) and 'In my body rest my harte' (fol. 97<sup>r</sup>). In the first of these, two estranged lovers meet; the man declares his love and before they part he asks that his lover remain honourable. 'Grone no more' shows the lover in despair and being warned not to listen to 'strange reports'. In the third of the sequence, he is still sad but recognises that his lover was not worth the pain and that he would be better without her. At the end of the poem, he reprimands himself for his 'uniust of reports of slannder'. His conclusion is reached in 'In my body rest my hart' as he decides that death can be his only release.

'All alone my loue was playinge'\* (fol. 98<sup>r</sup>) is followed by 'I haue  $\wedge$  I know  $\wedge$  not what it was' (fol. 99<sup>v</sup>), a flippant poem describing the nature of love. 'A ringle through my hart is rily fastned' (fol. 100<sup>r</sup>) is a poem of unrequited love: the lady has captured her lover's heart, but the love is not returned. She is happy to see him sad, and he is happy to 'see hir ioye in gladnes'. The next poem in the collection is 'No no but no & euer no' (fol. 100<sup>v</sup>), another light poem in fourteen quatrains in which the lady will not succumb to her lover's advances, and although she loves him her answer is always 'no'.

'Jane Fustian is a prety gentle lininge' (fol. 101<sup>v</sup>) is a six-line poem in which the lady's name signifies plainness, fustian being a coarse cloth made of cotton and flax, and the name 'Jane' being renowned as plain. The poet's thoughts are focussed on what is beneath the lady's dress and he views the fustian as a barrier to his fantasy.

'O loue moste great & wondrous is thy mighte' (fol. 102<sup>r</sup>) and 'My loue is faire and chearly' (fol. 102<sup>v</sup>) both praise the wonders of love, the first in more general terms than the second, which describes the beauty of a lady.

Variations on 'Discriptio Amoris'\* (fol. 102<sup>v</sup>) appeared in print, but questions relating to the meaning of love and life were common to poetry of this period, as the following two texts also testify. The second of these, 'Now what is loue' (fol. 104<sup>r</sup>) even has the title, 'A description of love'.<sup>113</sup> Although the poem which follows 'Discriptio Amoris', 'O Loue great wonders & sundry victories' (fol. 103<sup>r</sup>), gives three acts which are eternalised by men it is love on which it focuses. The poem consists of ten six-line

---

<sup>113</sup> See chapter four, pp.166-168.

stanzas, but after the first six are the headings '1. generalis Amor' and '.2. particularis'; the first and last stanzas in this section are a general description of love, whilst the second and third are 'respected loue' and 'reiected loue'.

The last two poems in the collection travelled to other manuscripts. 'Now what is loue I pray thee tell'\* (fol. 104<sup>r</sup>) also appeared in several printed versions at the time of the manuscript's transcription.<sup>114</sup> The second has been given the title 'Experience & examples dailie proue that my man can be well aduised & loue' (fol. 106<sup>r</sup>), this is contradicted by the maxim written towards the right margin: 'Nemin datur amare simul et sapere' (it is given to no-one to love and be wise). John Hoskyns, the author of this poem, had a reputation for satiric and often caustic poetry. It is likely that he wrote this poem around 1600, when he was an inner Barrister at the Middle Temple. The poem is divided into two parts: Hoskyns' section of the poem to Lady Jacob and her answer. The only indication to mark a division in this miscellany is that Lady Jacob's answer appears on the verso of the main poem. Hoskyns' biographer, Baird Whitlock, considers the poem to be weak, and imagines that it was written in jest at a dinner party at a lady's request. He also argues that this poem gives us some idea of the openness in conversation between the sexes during the Elizabethan years.<sup>115</sup> Although Hoskyns' poem to the lady is discourteous, she is equally impolite and if this openness was not considered to be unusual, neither might some of the other verse in this miscellany, which appears either bawdy or mildly pornographic to the modern reader.<sup>116</sup> The poem was first printed in *Wit and Drollery Jovial Poems*, where a division has been made between Hoskyns' section and the reply, and given the headings: 'A mock song' and 'The Answer'.<sup>117</sup> It also circulated widely and can be found in the following collections: BL MSS Add. 25303 (fol. 70<sup>v</sup>); Add. 24665 (fol. 81<sup>v</sup>); Bodleian MSS Ashmole 36-37 (fol. 145<sup>v</sup>); Eng. Poet. e.97 (p.164); Eng. Poet. f.9 (p.19); Jones 58 (in the margins of fols 50<sup>v</sup>, 59-65); Malone 19 (p.105); Rawl. Poet. 26 (fol.5); Rawl. Poet 142 (fol. 39<sup>v</sup>); Rawl. Poet. 172 (fol. 14<sup>v</sup>); Rawl. Poet. 199 (p.75); Tanner 465 (fol. 84);

---

<sup>114</sup> See chapter four, footnote 13 for further discussion; the title of this poem was 'Shepherd, what's love' and printed in *The Phoenix Nest* (1593), and *England's Helicon* (1600), a version is also in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood*, ed. by R.H. Shepherd, 6 vols (London: John Pearson, 1874), V, 161-257 (V, 180), entitled "'Valerius Song" from the "The Rape of Lucrece"' (1608). Versions are also printed in Doughtie, *Lyrics*, pp.156-157 and J. William Hebel and Hoyt H. Hudson, eds, *Poetry of the English Renaissance, 1509-1660* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1929), p.135; variations on the poem can also be found in Folger V.a. 399, fol. 10<sup>r</sup>; Christ Church, Oxford MS Mus. 439 p.35; Rosenbach MS 186.

<sup>115</sup> Baird W. Whitlock. *John Hoskyns, serjeant-at-law* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1982), pp.109-110.

<sup>116</sup> See further, Marotti, *Manuscript*, pp.76-82.

<sup>117</sup> *Wit and Drollery Jovial Poems* (London, 1682), pp.297, 299.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford, MS 328 (fol. 91<sup>v</sup>); Folger MSS V.a.124 (attributed to Donne) (fol. 36); V.a.162 (attributed to Poulton of New College) (fol. 39); and Huntington MS HM 904 (fol. 185).<sup>118</sup>

### 3. Conclusion

An examination of its physical make-up and of its contents shows that the manuscript was bound before writing and that the contents were organised in the particular order in which I have described them. The non-chronological arrangement of its contents suggests further that it was not compiled over an extended period of time. Furthermore, coherence is noticeable between the contents in the miscellany, corroborating my earlier suggestion that it was compiled by one person, or at the direction of one person. For instance, between the two acrostic poems on Stephen Radford is a group of poems about ambition and courtly advice; between 'Is it a life daily to be tormented' and 'Nowe at last leaue of lamenting' is a group of poems bewailing lost love, with the last of these acting as a 'final word' on the matter; this also occurs between 'A Dirge' and 'Sonetta 4', a group of funereal poems, the last of which pragmatically concludes that death is inevitable. Likewise, organisation is evident in the placing of the prose towards the beginning of the collection, with the poetry (especially the less political poetry) towards the end.

Krueger argues that the inclusion of petitions, a letter to the king, royal entertainments by Davies, the tournament before the king and James' own poems, in MS 22601 suggest that it was written by or for someone at the royal court.<sup>119</sup> There are, however, indications that it might have Inns of Court connections. It contains poems by Davies and Hoskyns, both lawyers and roommates at the Middle Temple, as well as by Raleigh, also of Middle Temple, Flowerdew of the Inner Temple and Skeffington of Grays Inn. Characteristics of several of Davies texts which are in Christopher Yelverton's manuscript suggest that Yelverton, also a lawyer, received them directly from Davies for his miscellany.<sup>120</sup> Connections between 'O yes, o yes, o yes' and this manuscript which I have discussed above, also show a link between these two men and their collections, as do shared texts such as the: 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>', the 'Peticion', and the answers to the 'Maxims' in MS 22601, which appear in the Yelverton collection and, to

---

<sup>118</sup> I would like to thank David Colclough for this information; see also Colclough "The Muses Recreation", and Louise Brown Osborn, ed., *The life, letters and writings of John Hoskyns, 1566-1638* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937).

<sup>119</sup> Krueger, p.435.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, p.436.



a lesser extent, the shared watermark evidence in the paper. In addition to this, Hoskyns' work was not printed in his lifetime, and so to find one of his texts in MS 22601 is an indication of either legal or parliamentary links. Work by Davies and Hoskyns is also to be found in Chetham MS Mun. A4.15, whose compiler is likely to have been connected to the Inns of Court and which also shares watermark evidence with MS 22601 and the Yelverton manuscript. No single opinion persists throughout the miscellany but this is far from unusual in manuscript miscellanies of the period – almost by definition, they juxtapose texts drawn from across the ideological spectrum. For instance, we have seen that rare texts by the king suggest that the compiler was close to James, but there is also a strong puritan inclination shown in the texts collected, the characters described, and the bias towards the Devon area. I argue that it is a personal compilation, however, which reflects the compiler's range of interest in text, culture and politics over a twenty-year time span. Having described the miscellany, I will now move on in the following chapters to discuss selected texts contained in it, looking in turn at letters, political prose and poetry.

## Chapter 2

### The manuscript circulation of a letter exchange between Mathew Hutton, Archbishop of York, and Robert Cecil, Lord Cranborne

#### 1. Epistolary culture in the early seventeenth century

Credentiall Letters, States, and Kingdoms tie,  
And Monarchs knit in lignes of Amitie;  
They are those golden Links that do enchain  
Whole Nations, though discinded by the Main;  
They are the soul of Trade, they make Commerce,  
Expan'd it self throughout the Univer.  
Letters may more than History inclose,  
The choicest learning, both for Vers and Prose;  
They knowledg can unto our souls display,  
By a more gentle, and familiar way,  
The highest points of State and Policy,  
The most severe parts of Philosophy  
May be their subject, and their Themes enrich  
As well as privat businesses, in which  
Frends use to correspond, and Kindred greet.  
Merchants negotiat, the whole World meet.<sup>1</sup>

Any researcher who has made an unexpected archival discovery can easily imagine Francesco Petrarch's euphoria when he uncovered a manuscript of Cicero's 'familiar letters' to Atticus, Quintus, and Brutus, as he worked in the Cathedral Library of Verona in 1345. Petrarch was, reportedly, moved to tears at his discovery, but it was also the catalyst that motivated him to write, and to form collections of his own letters.<sup>2</sup> The re-emergence of the Latin familiar letter from the archives and the influence of Petrarch's own collections promoted the re-fashioning of epistolary techniques and trends. The new style was plain, unornamented, and deemed appropriate for communicating with all degrees of society, while still remaining conversational and intimate – a balance which was not on offer in the elevated and formal style which had previously reigned.

Three hundred years after Petrarch's discovery, the historian and political writer James Howell, published *Epistolae Ho Elianae*, a compendium of letters which he dedicated to Charles I. The introductory poem to the first edition of *Familiar Letters*, 'To the Knowing Reader' (quoted above), offers certain commonplaces about the role of the letter during the seventeenth century – the title is a further indication that Howell was

---

<sup>1</sup> James Howel, *Epistolae Ho Elianae, Familiar letters domestic & forren partly historical, political, philosophical* (London, 1645), sigs Aiii<sup>v</sup>-Aiv<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Alan Stewart and Heather Wolfe, *Letterwriting in Renaissance England* (Washington, D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library, 2004), p.21.

addressing both the poem and the volume's contents to those familiar with the letter-writing conventions of the age. The convention of publishing the familiar letter in print was well established by Howell's time, and his readers would undoubtedly have recognised that the letters had been modified for patronage, or for public consumption, just as Petrarch's collections had been centuries before.<sup>3</sup>

This chapter will focus on a particularly fascinating exchange of correspondence between Mathew Hutton, Archbishop of York, and Robert Cecil, Lord Cranborne, written in December 1604 and February 1605<sup>4</sup> – an exchange which found its way into the miscellany at the centre of this thesis.<sup>5</sup> Hutton and Cecil were also responsible for disseminating their own letters, and it is clear, I will argue, that Mathew Hutton wanted to influence wider public opinion by putting his own arguments into circulation. The importance of these texts is evident from their widespread transmission into personal collections; it is also striking that they occupy the opening folios of MS 22601. It is notable that none of the many copies of these letters that I have examined have deteriorated in transmission; a likely indication that they were transmitted from sources or within networks close to their origin.

I will examine the letters in the context of MS 22601 and in the epistolary culture of the period, and then as they appear in the miscellanies of men who, like Petrarch and Howell, collected letters. The different purposes for which the letters have been used in their wider dissemination will tell us much about their significance to the literary and political culture of the early years of the seventeenth century. Arthur Marotti attests that the miscellany retains a sense of the social environment of the verse it collects, and much has been written on the value of considering verse in the context of its transmission and collection; this chapter will show how this concept applies equally to the letter.<sup>6</sup>

When a researcher opens a manuscript miscellany and finds a set of correspondence written over 400 years ago, one of her initial thoughts is how these letters relate to the

---

<sup>3</sup> Howell, sig. Aiii<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Cecil's letter is dated Whitehall 3 February 1604[5] in BL MS Add. 34395, fol. 47<sup>v</sup> (a letter book belonging to the Williams family of Huntingdon containing texts from the last decade of the sixteenth and the early years of the seventeenth centuries, several of which indicate sympathy towards Catholics; see footnote 69), although it is undated in MS 22601.

<sup>5</sup> MS 22601, fols 3<sup>r</sup>, 4<sup>r</sup>. Further references to this manuscript in parts 1 and 2 will be supplied parenthetically within the text

<sup>6</sup> Marotti, *Manuscript*, especially chapters one and three; see also May, 'Editing the Social Editors'.

social, political and textual culture of that time. The early modern compiler might similarly have wondered what Hutton and Cecil were talking about (and might even have known less about events at Westminster in 1604-5 than the historian does); but his reading would have been directed by the way he received the texts. He is likely, for instance, to have received a text from someone he already knew, professionally, socially, or geographically. The manuscript scholar Harold Love has argued that texts are rarely passed at random in this period, and describes the effect of their exchange as ‘defining communities of the like-minded’.<sup>7</sup>

These compilers collected and evaluated Hutton and Cecil’s letters, and appropriated them for their own purposes. What the letters were actually taken to mean therefore varied according to the type of collection within which, and the texts alongside which, they were placed: they would be evaluated according to the cultural situation of their reader or collector as they moved from network to network. One of the questions central to this chapter is why these letters were collected, or, what purposes they were appropriated for. Before answering this, however, it is necessary briefly to consider the place and significance of the letter in early modern culture and society.

Treatises on the art of letter-writing had been in circulation for around 300 years before Petrarch’s discovery at Verona. Alberic, a Benedictine monk of Monte Cassino, left the *Dictaminum radii* (Rays of the epistolary arts) and the *Breviarium de dictamine* (Epistolary breviary), which appear to set the standards of letter-writing as a specific art and were based on the ancient rhetorical styles of humble, middling and grandiose.<sup>8</sup> Adelbert of Samaria’s modifications a century later were centred on the status of individual types – inferior, middle and sublime. The rediscovery of Cicero’s familiar letters was the catalyst for the replacement of the traditional formularies of the *ars dictaminis* (which advocated formalised language and modes of address, excessive politeness, and occasionally the use of *cursus*, a form of stilted prose rhythm often employed in official correspondence) with a plain, simple and unaffected style. Erasmus secured the status of the familiar letter when he added it to the previously established persuasive, encomiastic, and judicial letters in *De conscribendis epistolis* (1498 and 1522) and interpreted the familiar letter as a conversation between friends,

---

<sup>7</sup> Love, *Culture and Commerce*, pp.179-191.

<sup>8</sup> Roger Chartier, Alain Boureau and Cecile Dauphin, *Correspondence: Models of Letter-Writing from the Middle Ages to the Nineteenth Century*, trans. by Christopher Woodall (Cambridge: Polity, 1991), pp.37-39.

warning that ostentatious display should not be used where there is least need of it.<sup>9</sup> Through the texts of Erasmus and other continental humanists the role of the familiar letter was elevated in England and woven into the lives of those who participated in the culture of letter writing. It became a key part of the humanist education programme, with the *De conscribendis epistolis* or similar texts appearing on grammar-school syllabi.<sup>10</sup>

Cultural changes in early modern England provided two central roles for the familiar letter: communication and social preferment. Expansion of trade and geographical diversity required a simpler and more practical form of communication for the purpose of sharing information with personal and business acquaintances. These cultural changes also accelerated a goal-oriented, or what Linda Levy Peck terms a patronage-structured, society.<sup>11</sup> Social advancement relied on the friendships and professional alliances which were created by and dependant on the growing epistolary culture. Consequently, the importance of social signals required the writer to follow an epistolary protocol which adhered to accepted conventions.<sup>12</sup> As the use of the vernacular increased, the cultural forms of the Latin letter were absorbed into the English language and transferred into manuals written by, amongst others, William Fulwood in *The Enemie of Idlenesse* (1568) and Angel Day in *The English Secreterie* (1599). These texts aimed to meet the needs of the growing mercantile class of the late sixteenth century and became the standard texts for both goal-oriented and communicative letters.<sup>13</sup>

The vast quantity of letters scattered throughout the manuscript miscellanies and commonplace books of the early seventeenth century is evidence of the frequency with which correspondence escaped the bounds of addressee and author. Whilst some correspondence was meant to remain private, letters were also sent or manipulated with

---

<sup>9</sup> Desiderius Erasmus, 'De Conscribendis Epistolis', in *Collected Works of Erasmus, 25: Literary and educational writings, 3*, ed. by J.K. Sowards (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), p.20.

<sup>10</sup> See Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), chapter one.

<sup>11</sup> Linda Levy Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London: Routledge, 1993), p.3.

<sup>12</sup> Stewart and Wolfe, p.35.

<sup>13</sup> Schneider, *The Culture of Epistolarity*, pp.18, 19, 41; Jean Robertson, *The Art of Letter Writing: An essay on the handbooks published in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (London: University Press of Liverpool, 1942), p.15.

a planned objective in mind, and were not always routes to the truth.<sup>14</sup> When a letter was circulated beyond its original route it also left its intended context, but unlike other texts, it was usually already part of a social exchange – a letter sent, and a reply received. Examination of a letter's content and study of its surroundings will provide us with much information and possibly, but not always, the identities of its author and recipient.

We cannot view the early modern letter against modern conventions: we presume, for instance, that numerous unknown persons might see an official or business letter, as we assume that personal communications would remain private. The distinction between public and private correspondence was not so clear during the early seventeenth century, and a personal letter might also be passed from person to person (and sometimes even adapted). Judith Rice Henderson has observed that one modern assumption of a letter is that since it records the present it preserves our reactions to experiences and opinions as they occur, and that we therefore trust its accuracy over other historical documents or memoirs.<sup>15</sup> Was this also the case for the early modern correspondent? It is evident from the numerous extant miscellanies and letter-books of the early seventeenth century that letters were treated with less historical or biographical respect than we allow them. Editing was carried out as letters were carefully selected, had paragraphs, names and dates added, altered or deleted, and their owners' commentaries included.<sup>16</sup>

We can speculate about how the early modern correspondent viewed the letter when we examine some of the reasons for its collection. Fritz Levy attributes the commonplace-book habit to educational practices: schoolboys would learn how to make an argument and arrange their reading by topic and as adults they continued to collect exempla, news, ideas and rhetorical devices with the same techniques.<sup>17</sup> Consciousness of domestic and foreign events had prompted the literate classes to seek out letters and other material to satisfy their appetite for current affairs; other collections may be a

---

<sup>14</sup> Judith Rice Henderson, 'On Reading the Rhetoric of the Renaissance Letter', in *Renaissance-Rhetorik*, ed. by Henrich F. Plett (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), pp.143-162 (p.146).

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p.146.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p.143.

<sup>17</sup> F.J. Levy, 'How information spread among the gentry, 1550-1640', *The Journal of British Studies*, 21:2 (Spring 1982), 11-34 (p.11). See also R.R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954), pp.88, 270-275; Peter Beal, "'Notions in Garrison'" pp.131-147; Mary Thomas Crane, *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).

reflection of current affairs but were not necessarily compatible with the beliefs of the compiler. John Rous, a Suffolk clergyman, included verse libels in his diary, but noted ‘I hate these following railing rimes’ but transcribed them ‘for president of the times’.<sup>18</sup> Many collections contain texts and letters that represent public opinion or are considered to be newsworthy. Compilers also obtained texts for ideological purposes: Nicholas Throckmorton-Carew, for instance, was a patron of puritan ministers whose collection of prayers and meditations reflected his interests, whilst Gilbert Freville’s commonplace book shows distinct puritan sympathies.<sup>19</sup> Julius Caesar’s collection of papers relates to government matters from the reigns of both Elizabeth and James I, whilst others are a reflection of the compiler’s personal interests or acquaintances.<sup>20</sup> A compiler may, of course, have collected a letter simply because he knew its author, or to flaunt his access to higher social circles – imperative to advancement in an age when reputation was paramount. It would have been highly flattering to a letter’s author to find that his letters have been kept. Mathew Hutton writes to Robert Cecil that ‘I have [...] showed with gladness to my friends divers of your short, pithy and kind letters to me, which I keep (as worthy to be kept) among others from her Majesty, from your worthy father, and some other honourable friends’.<sup>21</sup> In this way Hutton is both parading a list of elite correspondents before Cecil and flattering him by implying that his letters are worthy to be collected and that he is one of the elite group who are being flaunted by Hutton to others. It may also be the case that Hutton wished to suggest to Cecil, under the guise of deference, that their correspondence was not private and that he had access to and possibly assistance from men in high places.

Contemporaries might also use a letter as a tool for public life: either to shore up their beliefs or to use the ideas or style as a point of reference for their own speeches and writing. Similarly, a compiler might collect his own letters for such purposes. Having considered some of the reasons why an epistolary text may find its way into the manuscript miscellany, this chapter will now focus on the letter exchange between Mathew Hutton and Robert Cecil and its context in our primary manuscript.

---

<sup>18</sup> *The Diary of John Rous* (London, 1856), p.109, cited in Thomas Cogswell, ‘Underground verse and the transformation of early Stuart political culture’, in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. by Susan Amussen and Mark Kishlansky (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp.177-300 (p.284).

<sup>19</sup> BL MSS Add. 29607 (Throckmorton-Carew); Egerton 2877 (Freville).

<sup>20</sup> BL MS Add. 12497 (Caesar).

<sup>21</sup> *HMC Salisbury (Cecil)*, XII, 170.

## 2. MS 22601: an exchange of letters

James's accession had been the first time in English history where there had been a peaceful and successful accession of a new dynasty to the throne, and it was especially unusual because this time England was to have a foreign monarch.<sup>22</sup> There had been growing dissatisfaction in England during the last decade of Elizabeth's reign: war debt, high food prices as a result of poor harvests which were exacerbated by the rapid rise in population, and the advancing years of the queen highlighted concern over the fact that she had not named a successor. As a result of the Earl of Essex's revolt aimed at removing his enemies from court in February 1601, and his subsequent arrest, James lost his chief ally in his quest for succession to the English throne. After Essex's downfall James recognised a widening rift between the people and the state;<sup>23</sup> this discontent was reflected in Richard Martyn's speech welcoming James to London in 1603. In it, a reference to James as the 'faithful Physition' implies that England is in need of healing, and further pleas to an 'uncorrupted Kinge' on behalf of 'the hopes and desires of his best subjects', that they be delivered from legal, ecclesiastical and court corruption is an (albeit implicit) indictment of the previous ruler.<sup>24</sup> Whilst all hope appeared to be directed towards James in Martyn's address, many people were sceptical about the new regime, and others mourned the passing of Elizabeth's reign; these views were all reflected in the texts that appeared in the manuscript miscellanies of these years.

One week after being consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, Richard Bancroft was ordered by the Privy Council to proceed against members of the clergy who still refused to conform. He wrote a circular letter to Hutton as well as to his other Bishops, on 10 December 1604 asking them to keep matters in their diocese under control, as well as quoting the Lords' letter verbatim.<sup>25</sup> Hutton's letter to Cecil on 18 December was instigated by this order of Council; he told Cecil that the demands from the Lords were twofold: 'that y<sup>e</sup> Puritans be proceeded against, acordinge vnto y<sup>e</sup> lawe, except they conforme them selues etc. Secondlie that good care be had vnto greedie Patrons. that none be admitted in their places but suche as are conformable & otherwise worthie for their vertue & learninge' (fol. 3<sup>r</sup>). The Order of Council and Hutton's answer to it are

---

<sup>22</sup> Linda Levy Peck, *Northampton: Patronage and Policy at the Court of James I* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1982), p.21.

<sup>23</sup> Pauline Croft, 'Robert Cecil and the Early Jacobean Court', in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. by Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp.134-147 (p.134).

<sup>24</sup> AS MS Y155, fol. 8<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>25</sup> David Wilkins, *Concilia Magae Britanniae*, 4 vols (London: Gosling, 1737), IV, 408-409.



of interest because they show the clergy being criticized for simultaneously allowing nonconformists to preach and Catholic numbers to rise, thereby highlighting ecclesiastical problems as well as passing what could have appeared to be conflicting messages to puritans and Catholics.

Hutton's letter addresses these two points. Hutton believed that the progress of popery should be stopped, but he did not actively persecute Catholics. Equally, though, he opposed Presbyterian forms of puritanism and in the opening lines of his letter expressed the desire that a similar order had been proclaimed against the Catholics. Hutton argues that whilst the puritans were being persecuted the Catholic powers, knowing they were not under scrutiny, were becoming stronger. His letter expresses the fear that Catholic beliefs diverged from Protestantism in 'manie substanciall pointes of Religion' (fol. 3<sup>v</sup>) and that their allegiance was to the Pope, whereas puritans remained loyal to the king.

Hutton condescendingly reminds Cecil that his father, Lord Burghley, was a 'worthie instrument to banishe supersticjōn', and advises him to 'ymitate him in this service especiallie'. After delivering this glancing blow to Cecil by referring favourably to the previous reign, Hutton criticizes the new regime by turning his attention to the king's conduct: he wishes for 'lesse wastinge of Treasure of the Realme and more moderacjōn in the lawefull exercise of huntinge bothe that poore mens come maie be y<sup>e</sup> lesse spoiled, & othe<sup>r</sup> his maies<sup>ties</sup> subiectes more spared' (fols 3<sup>v</sup>-4<sup>r</sup>).

In his reply, Cecil immediately attempts to diminish the importance of both Hutton and his letter: he refers to the letter as a 'receipt' to the Council's order, which does not require a reply from himself, and then implies further that neither Hutton nor his ideas have credibility by placing him firmly in the Elizabethan era. Cecil suggests that Hutton's failure to grasp modern religious policy and his desire that the king exercise some restraint in his habits are traits of advancing years. The letter is divided between a defence of ecclesiastical policy and of the king's expenditure and recreational pursuits. The king would hunt across arable land, which caused damage to crops and inconvenience to residents as well as being a drain on the nation's wealth. In addition, many puritans found hunting an offensively frivolous pastime. It is apparent from

Chamberlain's letter to Winwood<sup>26</sup> that James was content to delegate 'kingship' to his ministers, whilst adopting the role of renaissance courtier. Active sport, and hunting particularly, due to its resemblance to warfare, was thought to be a 'suitable pursuit' for a prince.<sup>27</sup> On 25 July 1604 James issued a prohibition to the inhabitants near Theobalds from passing through the park because he was fearful that they would disturb the game and so hinder his sport.<sup>28</sup> Similarly in November of that year 'all millers were commanded to stay their watercourses at the time of hunting otter'.<sup>29</sup>

Whilst the king was hunting he was away from London and Parliament for lengthy periods of time. Chamberlain wrote to Ralph Winwood on 26 January 1605 that the king hurried away from the Christmas celebrations

two dayes after Twelfetide, where and thereabout he hath continued ever since, and findes such felicitie in that hunting life, that he hath written to the counsaile, that yt is the only meanes to maintain his health, (which being the health and welfare of us all) he desires them to undertake the charge and burden of affaires, and foresee that he be not interrupted nor troubled with too much business.<sup>30</sup>

G. P. V. Akrigg suggests that James did have problems with his health, but it cannot be ascertained whether he spent so much time in these activities because he enjoyed them and therefore they kept him in good health or whether he partook of hunting because he was of a sickly nature.<sup>31</sup> I suggest that the former explanation is more likely and Chamberlain was cynically drawing attention to the blackmail being worked on the nation – in order to have a fit and healthy king, his habits must also be accepted. Cecil explains that whilst he is not 'disposed to suche manlike & actiue recreation', he does support the king's activities. As to criticisms of the king's 'wastinge of the Treasure of the Realme' and spoiling the people's corn as he rode across their fields, Cecil states that the nation should be grateful that they have a healthy king who would be likely to live long, and that already none of the succession problems existed that had dogged Elizabeth's reign. It is clear, however, that Cecil is fending off Hutton's attack on him as well as defending his own position in the new regime.

Gary Schneider suggests that letters of the early modern period were sociotexts: that multiple parties participated in stages of their composition, transmission and

---

<sup>26</sup> Chamberlain, I, 201.

<sup>27</sup> Baldesar Castiglione, *The Courtier*, trans. by George Bull (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1976), p.63.

<sup>28</sup> *CSP Domestic, 1603-1610*, p.138.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p.166.

<sup>30</sup> Chamberlain, I, 201.

<sup>31</sup> *Letters of James VI and I*, ed. by G.P.V. Akrigg (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), p.13.

reception.<sup>32</sup> Such a letter is one in which Archbishop Grindal tells Hutton that ‘whatsoever I write unto you in this letter [...] is not to be imparted to any creature, unlesse you your self first have a good lykinge of the motion herein by me made’.<sup>33</sup> The implication here is that if Hutton agrees with the content he can pass it on, possibly with his own comments. The difficulty with the exchange of letters at the centre of this chapter is that each participant has different ideas: Hutton is on the side of the sociotext – Cecil is not. Hutton circulated his letter before, or at the same time as, it was sent.<sup>34</sup> It was passed amongst the clergy in the North of England: the vicar of Blith, John Chadwyck, sent it to John Craven, Chaplain to the Earl of Shrewsbury with a covering letter telling him that ‘I do hear therbe dyverse in Yorkesshre that be ministers whi<sup>ch</sup> knowe the contentes of y<sup>r</sup>’.<sup>35</sup> By these means the letter passed from ecclesiastical to courtly networks. It is familiar and advisory, and its reliability is enhanced by the fact that it does not contain any indication that it was intended for public consumption. Cecil’s reaction to its wider dissemination is an indication that he had considered Hutton’s letter to be personal, and although Hutton did not ultimately sway ecclesiastical policy, Cecil suspected him of purposefully disseminating the letter in order to do so. Cecil’s reference to Hutton’s ‘frendlie caveat’ implies that he considered it a personal missive rather than an official one, but he pointedly blames ‘vnsecrete clarkes’ (fol. 6<sup>v</sup>) for its dissemination rather than Hutton. Cecil wrote to Lord Sheffield, the Lord President of the North, that

I account my self hardly dealt wi<sup>th</sup> by some in those partes, who have sought to make some vse to my prejudice of  $\wedge$  by publishing  $\wedge$  a letter written to mee by my Lord Bishop of York. To think that the good and reverend prelate could have any designe to scandale mee and glorifie himselfe I would be verie loth.<sup>36</sup>

In this way Cecil is pushing the blame onto an unnamed ‘some’ and denying that he blames Hutton while implying that there is a chance he is responsible. Cecil then enclosed a copy of his reply, possibly before it had been sent, expressing the concern that ‘peradventure false copies may be delivered by some of his’, and reasoning that his side of the tale should also be made public. Although he was ostensibly defending himself against misrepresentation, it is telling that he was now guilty of doing that of which he accused Hutton. It is clear that the king did hear of these grievances, as Cecil also sent a copy of his and Hutton’s letter to the Earl of Worcester, who brought it to the

<sup>32</sup> Schneider, p.22.

<sup>33</sup> Hutton, *Correspondence*, p.68, letter dated 26 May 1582.

<sup>34</sup> See p.62 above, Hutton had shown previous correspondence from Cecil to others.

<sup>35</sup> Talbot papers, vol. K, fol. 237<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>36</sup> *HMC Salisbury (Cecil)*, XVII, 61-62. Cranborne to Sheffield, February 1604-5. It is apparent that Hutton’s letter had been widely circulated in the North of England.

king's attention.<sup>37</sup> James praised Cecil's reply,<sup>38</sup> and made both Lord Sheffield and Hutton aware – by sending a joint letter – that the contents of Hutton's letter had been noted and that the correspondence was in the open.<sup>39</sup> There is no definitive evidence of what effect these letters had on public affairs, but Hutton and Cecil certainly succeeded in opening their debate to a much wider audience than those to whom they had written directly.

Hutton's letter resembles to some extent the grievances that were presented to MPs, noblemen, and even the king, in this period. But it was expected that a grievance would be passed directly from its source to the intended recipient. When a puritan petition was delivered to Archbishop Whitgift, he complained 'that they did not onely deliver their objections to me wh<sup>i</sup><sup>ch</sup> had bene tollerable; but they also gave out diverse and sundrie coppies abroade to others contrarie to their dutie to the manifest breache of the law, by Acte of parliament established, to the advancement of their owne glorie'.<sup>40</sup> As in the case of Whitgift's petition, once the exchange between Hutton and Cecil passed into general circulation it became an appeal to the public over the heads of both the monarch and of the church: the implication could be that the state was unable to govern itself.

Hutton's and Cecil's letters were, then, at least to some extent an appeal to the public; but how would contemporaries have responded to them? By looking at the way that people engaged in the compilation of manuscript miscellanies or commonplace books dealt with these texts we can begin to reach an answer. None of the miscellanies that I have examined comment directly on the letter exchange. As I noted above, the king reported back to Cecil in a presumably personal letter addressed 'to my littill Cankerid Beagill', that he had 'sene the bishope of Yorkis letter so mucche talkid of' and that he was 'throchlie pleased with youre ansoure, & speciallie concerning my hunting ye haue ansourid it according to my hairtis desyre, for a skornefull ansourles ansoure became best such a senceles proposition'.<sup>41</sup> Worcester then informed Cecil that he 'aquaynted his maiestie w<sup>i</sup><sup>th</sup> your letter whoe red euey word, both of yours and the Lordes, and liketh exceedingly of all in your proceedings', and that he 'sawe him not so well pleased w<sup>i</sup><sup>th</sup> letters in my lyfe'.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>37</sup> *HMC Salisbury (Cecil)*, XVII, 70.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.75-76.

<sup>39</sup> NRA SP14/12/87, fols 197<sup>r</sup>-199<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>40</sup> BL MS Lansdowne 42, fol. 185<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>41</sup> *HMC Salisbury (Cecil)*, XVII, 75-76.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*

To some extent it would not have been of any consequence to Hutton whether he received a reply from Cecil himself: his text was as much an 'open letter' as it was a piece of correspondence. It is clear that Hutton wanted to influence public opinion by putting his own arguments into circulation and once they had been circulated there was little need for a reply. Writing an 'open letter' like this was a means by which an Archbishop could become involved in debate on all manner of issues, outside his usual forum of the pulpit.

The number of extant copies of Hutton and Cecil's letters in the miscellanies of the period is testimony as to how far their debate had spread. It is evident, however, that these letters have a specific purpose in the collections I have examined and I will go on to show that it is not always the case that the miscellany compiler agrees with sentiments expressed in the texts he collects. What was it that made these letters so popular among contemporary readers? I suggest that the answer lies partly in the fact that they were so malleable, and could be read in several different contexts: as a record of a dispute between two significant figures in the early years of James's reign on matters of toleration, ecclesiastical government, the relative powers of the king and the church and the governance of the king (subjects that were of concern to ordinary people), or collected individually to take the side of one of them, or as contributions to much longer disputes over the state of the nation. As is so often the case, the placement of these texts in any given manuscript further illuminates the purpose they are intended to serve.

In the manuscripts I have examined Hutton and Cecil's letters occasionally appear together as a narrative, along with texts on related issues; sometimes, by contrast, the compiler has either only had access to, or chosen to include, one or the other. Although they do not always travel as a set they are often included in miscellanies that discuss the issues of puritanism and of hunting: two of the central concerns of James' early reign (he was excessively fond of hunting, and much less so of puritans).<sup>43</sup> Miscellanies of this early period of the seventeenth century were often concerned with the question of what kind of ruler James was going to be, and the letters served to give an insight into the kinds of problems to which he needed to react.

---

<sup>43</sup> B.W. Quintrell, 'The Royal Hunt and the Puritans, 1604-1605', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31 (1980), 41-58 (p.53).

The letters often appeared in similar manuscript miscellanies and alongside similar texts: more specifically, texts that were involved in the debate over religious conformity and about how these matters affected the future of the nation more broadly. James was hunting in the area of the Lincolnshire diocese at the time Hutton wrote his letter to Cecil, in which he suggested that the king's hunting should be moderated.<sup>44</sup> The king had left for this particular hunting trip in mid November, as the period of grace given to ministers to conform was nearing its expiry date of 30 November. Royston was James' favourite hunting territory (and where he was converting the 'Old Greyhound Inn' into a lodge).<sup>45</sup> I can find no evidence to suggest that it is any more than coincidence that this area also happened to be a hotbed of non-conformity; it is not a coincidence, however, that the non-conforming ministers of these regions chose to deliver their petitions whilst he was amongst them. The protesters did not have much leeway to petition the king before the deadline at the end of the month on behalf of those ministers who would not be conforming, and yet it is apparent that they were aware of his habits; on 20 November 1604 'two hundred yeomen' about Royston presented a petition to James. Indeed, as with the letter to Cecil, it is likely that the Royston petition was being written whilst James was in the field. The experiences of Arthur Hildersham, vicar of Ashby de la Zouche, and John Burgesse, rector of Waddesden, who were cited on 3 October 1604 for 'not wearinge the surplisse and not conforminge themselves to the use of the Ceremonies of the Churche in the celebracion of divine service and administracion of the sacramentes',<sup>46</sup> were widely transmitted to miscellanies along with our letters, as were comments on Catholicism and material relating to characters who had influenced the politics of the nation as well as to the question of crown expenditure raised by Hutton.

These texts are, of course, only two examples of the vast amount of writing which surrounds the letters in the many manuscript collections of the period in which they appear. It is necessary now to turn to these collections in detail and examine the letters in the contexts in which their early modern collectors placed them, beginning with MS 22601.

---

<sup>44</sup> Quintrell, pp.43-44; C.W. Foster, *The State of the Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I as illustrated by documents relating to The Diocese of Lincoln*, 23 vols (Lincoln: Lincoln Record Society, 1926), I, xiv.

<sup>45</sup> Quintrell, p.43; see also p.74 below.

<sup>46</sup> Burgesse was rector of Waddesden, 3<sup>rd</sup> part. He was responsible along with two other ministers for the parish, and so his deprivation would not therefore be so harsh; Foster, pp.lxviii, 363.

One of the striking features of this letter exchange, particularly as it occupies the opening folios of the miscellany, is that it presents opposing views on matters of church and government from James's leading councillors in these matters. Further research shows that this letter exchange acts as an introduction to and an account of the contents in the manuscript. Mathew Hutton, as Archbishop of York, was in one of the most powerful ecclesiastical positions in the country, and he sets out the grievances of non-conformist church members throughout the nation. His criticism is levelled at injustices which he believes will lead to Catholics becoming more open in their faith, to the detriment of the established church. There was a fine line, if any, dividing ecclesiastical and state matters in this period, and Hutton had previously been warned about crossing the line. In his letter to Cecil, Hutton merges the difficulties of the church with those of the state and purposefully, in doing so, criticises Cecil and the king. Cecil understands his underlying criticism of the politics of the new reign, of the nation's finances as well as of the king, and takes the opportunity in his defence to promote James as well as his own ambition.

As I have outlined in chapter one above, the presence in our miscellany of texts relating to the court, as well as poems written by James, with an extremely limited circulation, indicate that the compiler was close to the king; it was well known, however, that James disliked puritans and so the bias towards Devon, a puritan region (apparent in the characters and texts in the miscellany), suggests that its compiler may have been of a 'godly' frame of mind. Above all, the compiler is asking questions in the miscellany about what the future will hold. I argue, therefore, that although the compiler is likely to have been close to James, he might not necessarily have shared all his views (specifically those on religion, as revealed most clearly after the Hampton Court conference), and his choice of texts reflects his displeasure with the ecclesiastical position of the government on church matters. If this collection did not contain James's poems, the neutrality gained by the inclusion of Cecil's letter would certainly be lost and the 'godly' inclination, combined with Hutton's letter, would outweigh Cecil's defence. The rest of this chapter will consider the place of these letters, individually and as a pair, in four further manuscript collections.

### 2.1. British Library Manuscript Additional 34392 (Lewkenor manuscript)

Sir Edward Lewkenor of Denham, Suffolk (1542-1605) was the owner of BL MS Add. 38492. His great granddaughter, Mary, married Horatio Townshend in 1649 and the

collection was acquired by the British Museum along with the Townshend family papers in 1911. This miscellany is a compilation of separate texts that have been written by various people (between 1584 and 1605) and gathered together by Lewkenor. There are clear links between the texts in the miscellany and it is evident that it was intended to form a collection. The individual texts were bound after they had been written: the paper is from different stock and of various sizes and each item is copied onto a separate leaf, with no new entries on the verso. Moreover, several of these are documents sent to Lewkenor from their authors, which again would explain the blank versos and folios that could not have been sensibly filled.<sup>47</sup> In this way, Lewkenor's miscellany differs from the others that will be discussed in this chapter. It is highly likely that Lewkenor arranged these texts in a particular order before the book was bound, as my discussion will go on to show, but as there is no conclusive evidence to confirm that he placed the texts in the order in which we now find them we can only consider his miscellany as a whole – that is, the significance this group of texts has when read together.

The most obvious question, then, is how we can be sure that Lewkenor was the compiler. There are three documents written in his hand, but as the collection as a whole contains miscellaneous hands this does not tell us much.<sup>48</sup> There are, however, indications of family ties scattered throughout the collection: letters addressed to Lewkenor;<sup>49</sup> a list of books borrowed from him which would have no value other than the personal;<sup>50</sup> a marginal annotation in his hand;<sup>51</sup> inscriptions on the fly leaves of two letters (both are missing): 'to mi veri loueing and welbeloued husband sur Edward Lewkenor att Mustres Quarles in Rumforde geue thes with spede', which refers to a report of the second day of the Hampton Court Conference, and 'to my very loving wyfe mystris Susan Lewkenor at Denham Halle yeve these' attached to notes of the *Apocrypha*.<sup>52</sup> The majority of the remaining texts relate to ecclesiastical matters of two clear time spans: the mid 1580s and the first two years of James I's reign.

---

<sup>47</sup> The treatise in favour of toleration from William Bedell, fol. 18<sup>r</sup> and a letter from 'Robert Pricke' the minister for Denham, Suffolk to whom Lewkenor was patron, fol. 68<sup>r</sup>, for instance.

<sup>48</sup> 'Necessarie causes toe vs of humiliation at this pa<sup>l</sup>liament', fol. 98<sup>r</sup>; a note of reforms demanded by the puritans followed by six prelates and six puritans including 'Mr Egerton and Mr Galloway, fol. 99<sup>r</sup>;' and a summary of 'Mr Rogers sermon preched at Bury the 10 Dec. 1599, fol. 104<sup>r</sup>.'

<sup>49</sup> BL MS Add. 38492, fols 47<sup>v</sup>, 68<sup>r</sup>, 91<sup>r</sup>, 100<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., fol. 102<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., fol. 5<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>52</sup> BL MS Add. 38492, fol. 103<sup>r</sup>.



Lewkenor was a Justice of the Peace for Suffolk and Member of Parliament for Maldon, Suffolk, having previously represented Tamworth, New Shoreham, and Newport (Cornwall).<sup>53</sup> He was influential in his support of ‘godly’ ministers, both in his home region as well as other militant counties, and in promoting the puritan cause in parliament.<sup>54</sup> There was an added impetus in the puritan campaign for reform surrounding the parliament of 1584-1585, and again in anticipation of James’s accession and in the early years of his reign. The first surge can be partly explained by the death of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund Grindal, and his replacement by the anti-puritan John Whitgift; the second, by the desire of the puritans to place their case before, and possibly influence, the new king at the start of the new era – this would have been especially important to them in the light of the leniency that Catholics were anticipating from James. The most creditable puritan ministers in every region were sent to London with documentation to petition their cause at the start of parliament in November 1584.<sup>55</sup> Lewkenor amassed a selection of papers that might have been used for such purposes in the Elizabethan and Jacobean campaigns. His collection illustrates his business, personal and religious interests, and he may have used or referred to the texts in his possession as he took part in religious debates in the House of Commons, or kept them as a record of his contribution to ecclesiastical matters. The miscellany contains puritan surveys, or statistics, of Essex, Suffolk and Sussex to which he was sponsor, for instance.<sup>56</sup> The latest items in the miscellany are Hutton’s letter, which is dated 18 December 1604, and John Butler’s letter dated 1604-5. Lewkenor died of smallpox in October 1605, and I suggest that he was responsible for the binding of the manuscript in the early part of this year. It is possible, of course, that Lewkenor only had access to Hutton’s letter: we do not have a date for Butler’s letter, and as Cecil’s reply was written in February 1605, the manuscript may already have been bound. It seems apparent from Lewkenor’s involvement with the subject matter in the texts that the documents were used and kept in his possession, and then bound as a collection before his death. It is unlikely that Lewkenor had kept, or had access only to documents from the two time spans mentioned, and this further indicates that it was intended to be a collection; that he chose particular documents and collated them (probably in this order) for binding.

---

<sup>53</sup> John William Bridgen, ‘Lewkenor, Sir Edward (1542-1605)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/74412>, accessed 31 July 2006).

<sup>54</sup> Collinson, pp.278, 280.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p.279.

<sup>56</sup> Lewkenor (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/74412>, accessed 31 July 2006).

Forty out of the sixty-five items in the manuscript relate to the first two years of James's reign. The texts which date from Elizabeth's reign, such as 'A brotherlye caveat to the godlye zealous and wyse gentlmen of the parlament house', exhorting them to renewed efforts for church reform, pose similar questions which bubble over into the next reign.<sup>57</sup> The overall impression gained from the manuscript is that the new reign had given an increased impetus to those desirous of religious reform.

The manuscript opens with an address presented to convocation on 2 May 1604 by Stephen Egerton, a Church of England clergyman of the parish of St Ann, Blackfriars.<sup>58</sup> The address asks for further reform regarding ministers, preaching, ceremonies, and particularly the Book of Common Prayer. Thus, although the first text in the collection belongs to James's reign, its content is an echo of the early years of Elizabeth's. Elizabeth too wanted to remove signs of the Catholic system established by Mary, but there were elements within the church who wished for more rapid and extreme reform than was granted. Radicals were still pressing for change and it is likely that, like Egerton a generation later, they were hopeful for more success at convocation. This was not to be. Among articles debated and defeated before convocation, which met at the same time as Elizabeth's second parliament in 1563, were the abolition of Saints' days, the omission of the sign of the cross in baptism, and removal of organs from the church.<sup>59</sup> After their defeat, the godly decided to work through the House of Commons rather than convocation.<sup>60</sup> Egerton's address is also the culmination of a series of events described by texts in the miscellany; an indication that Lewkenor not only wanted to record recent reformist action but to use the example of history and of petitioning government.

Examination of the manuscript indicates that Egerton is the key factor in many of the works and he is in a prominent role at the beginning of the collection. Egerton had attracted the unwelcome attention of Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of London, for his non-conformist practices in 1598 and in the aftermath of the Essex rebellion when Bancroft had decreed that only official sermons should be preached throughout London, Egerton failed to meet his approval. On Cecil's advice that he should offer Bancroft a

---

<sup>57</sup> BL MS Add. 38492, fol. 37<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>58</sup> BL MS Add. 38492, fol. 1<sup>r</sup>. Further references to this manuscript in part 2.1 will be supplied parenthetically within the text.

<sup>59</sup> G.W. Prothero, *Select Statutes and other Constitutional Documents illustrative of the reigns of Elizabeth and James*, fourth edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), p.191.

<sup>60</sup> J.E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments 1559-1581* (London: Cape, 1953), pp.89-90.

satisfactory account of himself he gained freedom from Bancroft's intervention throughout the rest of his episcopate, as well as the protection of Cecil.<sup>61</sup>

'An easy way to redress y<sup>e</sup> abuses in y<sup>e</sup> Episcopa<sup>ll</sup> governmen<sup>t</sup> wi<sup>th</sup>out change of lawes established' suggests following the example of Henry VIII, who appointed a commission of thirty-two persons to examine the constitutions and canons (fol. 5<sup>r</sup>). An annotation has been made in the margin in Lewkenor's hand, warning that 'the putting of this matter on foot as the case now stands may impart some danger'. This illustrates how Lewkenor put texts in his possession to practical use by reading and then debating with them.

Following this is 'The true copy of y<sup>e</sup> petition y<sup>t</sup> about 200 yeomen of Essex and other parishes about Royston exhibited to his maies<sup>tie</sup> on Tuesday y<sup>e</sup> 20<sup>th</sup> of November' (fol. 6<sup>r</sup>). Both Egerton and Arthur Hildersham<sup>62</sup> were organisers of puritan agitation; they had been involved in the presentation of the Millenary petition and prepared instructions for puritan delegates attending the Hampton Court Conference, from which they were excluded; they were also prominent amongst the organisers of the petition presented to the king at Royston.

The king's hunting schedule took him into one of the staunchest puritan regions of the country, where he would ride northward from Royston to Hinchingbrooke, near Huntingdon, to the home of Sir Oliver Cromwell where he was a regular guest. Although the distances between Royston, Huntingdon and other areas of religious tension to the north of London were considerable, and especially so to the early seventeenth-century traveller, they were within the jurisdiction of two Bishops: Bishop Thomas Dove of Peterborough and Bishop William Chaderton of Lincoln. Peterborough covered Northamptonshire and Rutland whilst Lincoln diocese governed the counties of Lincoln, Leicester, Bedford, Buckingham, Huntingdon, and part of Hertford.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>61</sup> *HMC Salisbury (Cecil)*, XI, 154-155 letter from Bancroft to Cecil, 2 April 1601; XI, 157-158 letter from Stephen Egerton to Cecil, 4 April; XI, 161 Cecil's reply 8 April; see also Thomas Birch, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, 2 vols (London: Millar, 1754), II, 464 and Collinson, pp.446-447.

<sup>62</sup> Arthur Hildersham, a non-conforming clergyman, was presented with his living at Ashby-de-la-Zouch in 1593 by Henry Hastings, 3<sup>rd</sup> Earl of Huntingdon, a puritan sympathiser and member of the Leicestershire gentry. Bryan D. Spinks, 'Hildersham, Arthur (1563-1632)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13256>, accessed 8 Aug 2006).

<sup>63</sup> See further W.J. Sheils, *The Puritans in the Diocese of Peterborough 1558-1610* (Northampton: Northamptonshire Record Society, 1979); see also p.69 above.

Lewkenor's copy of the petition offers further proof of the connections between this part of the country and those puritans operating there. It states that 'one of y<sup>e</sup> cheefest of them, viz. M<sup>r</sup> Hildersham stuard. To S<sup>r</sup> Francis Barington, ys bound over thereupon to appeare before y<sup>e</sup> Counsayle when he shalbe called, some 3 other at y<sup>e</sup> first stayed were after dismissed' (fol. 6<sup>r</sup>). The king was disconcerted to find that Richard Hildersham, the cousin of Arthur, was one of the Royston petitioners. In a letter to Cecil shortly after its presentation he refers to the anonymity of the 'puritans catholic peition', which 'neither names county, parish, nor pastor'. He goes on to demand, however, that the 'knave that was the framer of the petition and drawer of them together' should be punished and expresses his concern that 'he is so near of king to Emmanuel as I shall mistrust that race the more while I live'.<sup>64</sup> It might have been expected then, that he would have been further aggrieved when thirty-two divines, led by John Burgess and including Arthur Hildersham, called on him on 1 December shortly after the presentation of the Royston petition, whilst he was still at the home of his host, Oliver Cromwell. Having had no action taken against them when they appeared before Chaderton the previous day, their intention now was to present the king with their reasons for not conforming.<sup>65</sup>

I suggest that the king would have been as aware that the puritans would locate him as they were sure of finding him and, furthermore, that rather than viewing his foray into their territory as troublesome, he welcomed the opportunity to discuss matters of theology with them. He was, after all, staying at the home of Sir Oliver Cromwell. Cromwell was the uncle of the future Lord Protector of England and the brother of Lady Barrington, a patron of clergy in her own right but married to Lord Francis Barrington of Hatfield Broad Oak, Essex, where Richard Hildersham was his estate steward. Barrington was knighted by James at Theobalds on 7 May and re-elected to Parliament in March 1604 with the backing of his landlord, and fellow puritan, Sir Robert Rich.<sup>66</sup> He was one of the organisers of the Royston petition as well as a member of the

---

<sup>64</sup> James I, *Letters*, p.236; *HMC Salisbury (Cecil)*, XVI, 362-364; Quintrell, p.45. Emmanuel College, Cambridge was the traditional puritan stronghold.

<sup>65</sup> Quintrell, p.47; Foster, p.lxxi. This group of men from the Lincoln diocese published early the following year, 'An abridgement of that Booke which the Ministers of Lincoln Diocess delivered to his Maiestie upon the first of December last 1605. Being the first part of an Apologie for themselves and their Brethren that refuse the subscription, and conformitie which is required' (London, 1605).

<sup>66</sup> Lewkenor (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/74412>, accessed 31 July 2006); Lewkenor was related through his mother's side to the Rich family.

committee in the 1604 parliament which was responsible for drafting the 'Apology of the Commons'.<sup>67</sup>

The puritan impetus for church reform diminished in the last years of Elizabeth's reign and the 'Apology' was one of the early petitions drawn up by puritans who now pinned their hopes for church reform within parliament on James.<sup>68</sup> James's expedition into the most militant area of puritanism in the country is an indication that both sides considered these issues open to discussion. This is evident from the diverse miscellany of Cromwell (Sir Oliver referred to his family name as 'Williams, alias Cromwell'), Lewkenor's neighbour and the king's host. This miscellany contains texts which highlight a general threat to Christianity as well as an inclination towards Catholic sympathy.<sup>69</sup> It is significant that not only was the king a guest at Hinchbrooke but that the family had puritan connections. Cromwell's great grandfather Morgan Williams married the sister of Henry VIII's minister, Thomas Cromwell, and the Williams family were the beneficiaries of much confiscated church land; in gratitude, Richard Williams changed his name to Cromwell. Among the collection is included a letter from the Sultan of Turkey to the Emperor Rudolph II in which Ahmed I refers to himself as 'destroyer & persecutor of the Christians' and threatens that 'thee wee shall slea & put in Oyle';<sup>70</sup> 'Extracts from a papisticall booke called the Virgin Mary's life';<sup>71</sup> a letter from Robert Southwell, the Jesuit, to his father guiding him towards a religious life,<sup>72</sup> the letter to William Parker, Lord Monteagle warning him and other Catholics in parliament of the impending gunpowder plot<sup>73</sup> as well as the letter exchange between Hutton and Cecil.<sup>74</sup>

Radical puritans had been excluded from the Hampton Court Conference and were never going to believe that concessions made there had gone far enough in their favour, even though they had issued their colleagues with demands. Tellingly, Lewkenor has copied at the head of a lengthy document of matters decided there, a descriptive and

---

<sup>67</sup> Andrew Thrush, 'Barrington, Sir Francis, first baronet (c.1560–1628)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/article/70627>, accessed 5 September 2006).

<sup>68</sup> See pp.72-73 above; the 'Apology' was written in the name of the Commons but did not pass through the House; Conrad Russell, *The Crisis of Parliaments* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp.269-270.

<sup>69</sup> BL MS Add. 34395 contains texts dated between 1589-1630.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 49<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 52<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 36<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 46<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, fols 46<sup>v</sup>, 47<sup>v</sup>.

accusatory title: 'The matters reformed in the new common booke according to the intendment of the conference; the matters not reformed, whereof pretence was made that they should be reformed; Errors and inconvenience further added in the new booke' (fol. 12<sup>r</sup>), which passes some of the blame onto delegates representing them at the conference. Yet the suggestion in his title that 'pretence was made' levels the accusation at the government rather than the delegates, who are said to be at fault in the actual text. Lewkenor had pressed for matters of reform in parliament and it is likely that he sympathised with the delegates who had fought their cause less than successfully.

William Bedell, fellow of Emanuel College, Cambridge, addressed convocation before its meeting on 20 March 1604 and expressed views similar to those of Egerton outlined earlier in this miscellany.<sup>75</sup> At Emmanuel Bedell was influenced by his friends, Laurence Chaderton, master of Emmanuel from 1584 until his resignation in 1602, and William Perkins, fellow of Christ's College. He left Emmanuel to join the ministry of St Mary, at Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk in 1602, where it is likely that his religious orientation caused him to cross paths with Edward Lewkenor. 'Treatise in favour of toleration with regard to ceremonies' appears to be in the hand of Bedell, indicating a personal connection between the two men. Furthermore, Bedell contributed to a volume of elegies on Lewkenor and his wife after their deaths (fol. 18r).<sup>76</sup> Shortly after Bedell's address, chronologically and in the manuscript, on 5 May 1604, is a record of parliamentary debate where Lewkenor is listed as one of the disputants when support was being counted for the six articles of religion (fol. 31<sup>r</sup>).

Lewkenor has preserved Edmund Snape's petition to parliament against William Cotton's sentence of inhibition (fol. 36<sup>r</sup>).<sup>77</sup> Snape was a militant preacher, well known amongst the puritans represented in this miscellany, as well as to Lewkenor. After what Snape believed to be an irregular inhibition by Cotton he carried on preaching, and was subsequently suspended; a third breach forced the Chancellor of the Diocese to make the inhibition official in May 1603.<sup>78</sup> The petition, which was also sent to the

---

<sup>75</sup> See p.73 and footnote 61.

<sup>76</sup> The elegies are in a volume entitled *Threnodia in obitum D. Edovardi Lewkenor, Equitis et C. Susannae conjugis charissimae. Funerall verses upon the death of the right worshipfull Sir Edward Lewkenor, knight, and madame Susan his lady with deaths Apologie and a rejoinder to the same* (London, 1606), cited in *Athenae Cantabrigienses, 1586-1609*, ed. by Charles Henry Cooper and Thompson Cooper, 3 vols (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1858-1913), II, 411.

<sup>77</sup> For Snape and Cotton see chapter one.

<sup>78</sup> Collinson, p.442.

Archbishop's Court of Audience and to the Privy Council, complains of the injudiciousness of the inhibition and the hardship which would be suffered by his dependants. It is testimony to the number of puritan sympathisers in Parliament that Cotton was required to allow Snape to preach anywhere outside the City of Exeter.<sup>79</sup> Snape might truly have believed the inhibitions and suspension to be unjust: he held little regard for the Bishops, considering Episcopal ordination to be a 'thing merely civil', and understood his ministerial authority to come from his godly ministers. He asked his congregation at St Peters, Northampton, in 1589, what they would say if 'we devise a way whereby to shake off all the Antichristian yoke and government of bishops and will jointly together erect the Discipline and government'.<sup>80</sup>

The credibility of the Millenary petition lay in its gathering of 'more than a thousand' names, but the document attracted criticism from the University of Cambridge and the vice-chancellor and Doctors of Oxford (as well as of the king) as it contained no signatures.<sup>81</sup> In order to rectify this the Northamptonshire puritans devised a plan for drawing up petitions to the king in various parts of the country which two of their number presented to Parliament. 'Advices tending, to reformation' states that 'it is thought fitt by some of credit and neere to his Maiestie, that both noblemen, gentlemen and ministers (everie sort of themselves) complaine of corruptions, and desire reformation in severall petitions signed with as many hands of everie worte as may be procured'; Yelverton, as 'principal wether of the flock', was procured by Cartwright to assist in the collection of signatures (fol. 62<sup>r</sup>).<sup>82</sup> Babbage suggests that those of 'some credit' were two men from James's entourage: Patrick Galloway, his Scottish chaplain, and Lewis Pickering, a Northamptonshire gentleman. Pickering was a graduate of Emmanuel College, Cambridge and had been one of the courtiers who had ridden north in 1603 to gain the king's attention; he was also the author of the libel, 'The Lamentation of Dickie for the Death of Jockie' left on the hearse of Archbishop Whitgift in March 1604.<sup>83</sup> The 'Advices' ends with the request that this 'passe from

<sup>79</sup> City of Exeter Muniments, Act Book V. fol. 502; *HMC City of Exeter MSS*, p.40; NRA SP 12/282/49; BL MS Sloane 271, fol. 24<sup>r</sup>; cited in Collinson, p.442.

<sup>80</sup> Patrick Collinson, 'Snape, Edmund (c.1565–1608)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25973>, accessed 16 March 2007); Collinson, p.390.

<sup>81</sup> Collinson, p.450; see p.75 above.

<sup>82</sup> Also BL MS Sloane 271, fols 20<sup>v</sup>-22<sup>r</sup>; Collinson, pp.452-453.

<sup>83</sup> S.B. Babbage, *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft* (London: S.P.C.K., 1962), pp.48, 49; Colclough, *Freedom of Speech*, p.218; Collinson, pp.450, 452; R.G. Usher, *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, 2 vols (London and New York: Appleton, 1910), I, 294. For the libel see Alastair Bellany, 'Libels in Action: Ritual, Subversion and the English Literary Underground, 1603-42', in *The Politics of the Excluded 1500-1850*, ed. by Tim Harris (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp.99-124; Alastair Bellany,

one faythfull brother to another with all speede and heede'. Action was being taken all over the puritan districts of the country: Samuel Norden had been placed in his living in Sussex by Lewkenor and was responsible for drafting the petition in that county, and a draft of the petition to the king from the knights and gentry of Suffolk was collected by Lewkenor (fol. 71<sup>r</sup>). Information gathering was also taking place on both sides: prior to the Hampton Court Conference Archbishop Whitgift had asked his bishops to compile statistics of beneficed clergy and preachers, whilst Lewkenor was responsible for the surveys of the ministries in Essex (fol. 89<sup>r</sup>), Suffolk (fol. 90<sup>r</sup>) and Sussex (fol. 91<sup>r</sup>) – a copy of these is addressed to 'his verie good cosin Mr Edward Leukenour' (fol. 92<sup>r</sup>).

After these statistics is Hutton's letter to Cecil, followed by a letter to the king from 'J.B.', who 'although he is a family man' has resigned his living rather than subscribe and pleads for leniency towards nonconforming ministers, as 'to subscribe and yet to denie to subscribe to the same articles apeares so manifeste a faulte eyther of inconstancie [...] Howe can I justifie my selfe' (fol. 94<sup>r</sup>)? It is likely that 'J.B.' is John Butler, Lewkenor's fellow-burgess for Maldon, Essex; rather than John Burgess of Waddesden, as Burgess did not resign but was deprived of his living.<sup>84</sup> He asks the king to remember that good men differ in lighter matters and that they are entitled to their opinion. His statement not only echoes Hutton's letter but also reiterates the king's sentiments that he would offer moderation to nonconformists 'as I do equally love and honour the learned and grave men of either of these opinions'.<sup>85</sup> Lewkenor has collected John Jegon, the Bishop of Norwich's bid to his clergy and churchwardens to display the Ten Commandments and the Royal Arms in a notification that asks for an affirmation of loyalty to both the crown and church (fol. 95<sup>r</sup>). A petition from the Justices of the Peace for Lancashire asking for 'indulgence to nonconformists' follows this (fol. 96<sup>r</sup>). Although this was sent after the king's letter to Hutton of 29 October 1603, which offered toleration to certain members of the Lancashire clergy, the letter from the king is not included – the miscellany petitions the king, therefore, but does not include answers.

---

'A Poem on the Archbishop's Hearse: Puritanism, Libel, and Sedition after the Hampton Court Conference', *Journal of British Studies*, 34 (April 1995), 137-164.

<sup>84</sup> Collinson, p.311.

<sup>85</sup> Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I', in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, ed. by Kenneth Fincham (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), pp.23-49 (p.25).



No one character is central to this miscellany; rather, the texts are interconnected both by shared acquaintances and by their occupation with the question of church reform. Lewkenor was loyal to both monarchs and his miscellany illustrates loyalty to the church and to the crown. The viewpoint presented in this miscellany, then, is that puritanism is aligned with the crown and is, in fact, the national religion. At the time of the earlier texts represented in the collection, the threat to England, and Elizabeth I, was from Catholicism; denunciation of Catholics by puritans emphasised the danger and attracted conventional protestants to the reformist's cause. The Babington Plot further highlighted the notion that the safety of the queen was dependent on quashing the Catholic threat, and so the puritans were able to gain the upper hand.<sup>86</sup>

What place, then, does Hutton's letter have in a collection where the emphasis is on loyalty to the church and crown (fol. 93<sup>v</sup>)? It is probable that Lewkenor chose to transcribe only Hutton's letter as it was close to his own religious and personal views; both were Elizabethan men, living only two and three years respectively into James's reign. Also the local interest aspect cannot be ruled out: Hutton criticized the king's hunting, and Lewkenor lived close to the king's hunting territory. Both Hutton and Lewkenor's strength of allegiance to the crown is expressed in their opposition to the current state of religion, which they believe is detrimental to the nation: they believe, as I have stated above, that they are of the established religion.

We cannot assume that the proximity of Hutton's letter to 'J.B.'s' resignation or John Jegon's text is any more than coincidence, but connections can certainly be made between Hutton and Jegon. Both prelates were committed to royal supremacy and actively attempted to elevate the purity of the church: Jegon signed orders for the 'present suppressing of the multitude and iniquity of apparitors in my several jurisdictions', and was determined to clear his diocese of 'bribery and extortion'<sup>87</sup> whilst Hutton campaigned against Catholicism and believed that unnecessary conformity would be harmful to the church. Hutton has been described by Peter Lake as a 'Puritan Bishop' for the evangelical world-view that he shared with godly Protestants,<sup>88</sup> but it is clear that neither he nor Jegon wished for extremity in religion. I have stated above that the puritans gained strength during the 1580s as a result of the

---

<sup>86</sup> G.R. Elton, *England under the Tudors* (London: Methuen, 1977), p.310; Russell, pp.240-242; Collinson, p.309.

<sup>87</sup> Collinson, p.451.

<sup>88</sup> Peter Lake, 'Matthew Hutton - A Puritan Bishop?' *History*, 64 (1979), 182-204 (p.200).

perceived Catholic danger, but Hutton expresses the fear in his letter that the situation has reversed: Catholic hopes of James's leniency have caused the 'papistes & recusants' to gain the strength that the puritans had previously possessed.

It is also likely that Lewkenor wished to emphasize ecclesiastical hypocrisy: Jegen schemed for the election of his younger brother, Thomas, to the vacant Mastership at Norwich against the wishes of Archbishop Whitgift. Signs of nepotism were evident again as Hutton turned away a lay preacher offered by the queen, seemingly taking the high moral ground by accepting 'two godly preachers' for the sake of 'this unlearned country' – one of these learned men was his nephew.<sup>89</sup> One of the grievances expressed in the Millenary Petition was with regard to pluralities: non-conformists petitioned that double beneficed men 'bee not suffred to hold some two some three benefices'.<sup>90</sup> Hutton held benefices at York and Settrington as well as Southwell in Nottinghamshire, and on this matter he would have been in opposition to nonconformists such as Egerton, Barrington and Hildersham.<sup>91</sup>

Lewkenor's miscellany shows that on matters of ecclesiastical policy he and Hutton were of the same point of view. In MS 22601, Cecil's reply lends neutrality to the miscellany, without which the 'godly' aspect would prevail as it has in this collection. Lewkenor's miscellany is a collection of working papers which have subsequently been formed into a collection, and have been put to practical use: to an extent they illustrate the political and religious arguments that a godly MP could make in parliament. As a result, the collection is an accurate gauge of Lewkenor's ideas, rather than a record of events. As MS 22601 is a collection of texts explaining the compiler's understanding of the political and cultural situation the texts, both individually and as part of a collection, have a different purpose to those in Lewkenor's miscellany. In MS 22601, Hutton's letter seems to be compatible with the compiler's religious position, but it has been mellowed by Cecil's defence of religion and the new regime, as well as by the inclusion of James's poetry and other material. Hutton and both compilers display a certain amount of wariness towards the new regime, as well as ecclesiastical displeasure, but the texts in Lewkenor's collection directly ask for reform.

---

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., p.194.

<sup>90</sup> Babbage, pp.44-45.

<sup>91</sup> Lake, 'Puritan Bishop', p.193.

## 2.2. British Library Manuscript Harleian 677 (Harleian manuscript)

The Harleian manuscript, which contains Hutton's letter and Cecil's reply, is an anonymous miscellany, and as a result of this must be read in a quite different way to the Lewkenor manuscript. Here we have to rely on physical and internal evidence to attempt to explain why these texts have been gathered together and to assess what they tell us about the period. The miscellany uses texts reaching back to the middle of the sixteenth, and into the first sixteen years of the seventeenth century. The majority of the seventeenth-century texts were written in the first four years of James's reign, but the date of the latest text is 1616. The texts debate similar issues and I would suggest that they have been chosen, and possibly placed in the order we find them (non-chronologically), to illustrate the tensions that surrounded both James' predilection for hunting and his management of the church. Indeed, it seems that the compiler has attempted to show the vulnerability of the nation as a direct result of James's rule. The miscellany includes texts with a Catholic, as well as with a puritan bias; together, they imply that England is under threat from domestic as well as foreign enemies, be they Protestant factions or Catholic insurgents.

In common with many from this period, this manuscript contains material on the Earl of Essex, who was an enormously popular subject in miscellanies both before and after his spectacular fall in 1601. As a result of an altercation with the queen Essex was placed under house arrest and all four of the items about him are letters relating to that time:<sup>92</sup> a letter to one of his closest followers, the Earl of Southampton;<sup>93</sup> a letter informing the queen of his decision to withdraw from court following her disfavour (fol. 114<sup>v</sup>); and 'A letter of the lord keeper Egerton to the Earle of Essex being committed at his returne from Ireland' and Essex's reply, in which Essex refuses Egerton's advice to 'submit' (fols 109<sup>v</sup> and 111<sup>v</sup>). He argues that to do so would be to 'ruinate' his honour, but dangerously, raises the issue of monarchical power, asking Egerton, 'what, cannot princes err? Cannot subjects receive wrong? Is an earthly power or authority infinite?' A.R. Braunmuller suggests that the dates in Folger MS V.a.321, 15 and 18 October, are incorrect (other sources place Essex back in court circles by the dates on the letters) and that the 'ear boxing' incident, which provoked the letters, most likely happened in July

---

<sup>92</sup> The altercation after which he was placed under house arrest has been linked both to the queen's choice of Lord Deputy for Ireland, as well as to him storming into her chamber on his unexpected return from Ireland.

<sup>93</sup> BL MS Harleian 677, fol. 39<sup>r</sup>. Further references to this manuscript in part 2.2 will be supplied parenthetically within the text.

or August 1599.<sup>94</sup> The letter from Egerton in this collection states that it was written on Essex's return from Ireland, but as Essex was in Egerton's custody within days of his return, it seems unlikely that he would have written to him. It is possible that Egerton wrote his letter for his own ends after the matter had been settled: asking Essex to 'submit' would have the effect of distancing himself from Essex's motives and would also provoke an abandoned response from Essex. If this were the case it had the desired effect – Sir Francis Bacon objected to Essex's suggestion that the queen might be at fault and used his reply against him at his first trial on 5 June 1600.<sup>95</sup> Many collections use the example of Essex after his downfall to question how James would deal with problems, such as the dangers of favouritism, that lingered from the old reign. Whilst Essex was still depicted as a Protestant hero, keen to defend the nation in Ireland and against the Spanish and Catholics, in this collection as in others of the period, it could also be argued that the material about him here is used to represent an internal threat to the country.

'The coppie of a letter from the Lorde of Leicester to y<sup>e</sup> bishopp of Peterborrowe' in which Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester and Essex's step-uncle, asks Edmund Scambler to reinstate the non-conformist minister Arthur Wake as Master of St John Hospital, Northampton highlights Leicester's religious sympathies as he shows his concern that the 'notorious' puritan town of Northampton, has a 'sufficient preacher' (fol. 37<sup>r</sup>). Leicester, like Lewkenor in the previous manuscript, was close to the centre of power and yet he openly opposed the orders of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and of the queen in pursuit of his desire for further reform. Archbishops Whitgift and Bancroft believed that Leicester's Presbyterian position was based on financial motives, and after his death he was portrayed in Thomas Nashe's *Pierce Penilesse* as a bear scheming to fatten himself on ecclesiastical honey.<sup>96</sup> If Leicester's motives were dishonest, he had managed to fool those in the puritan borough of Maldon, (represented in parliament by Sir Edward Lewkenor), who appointed him as recorder, as well as many other puritans, who regarded him as their patron.<sup>97</sup> The miscellany also shares the 'Petition exhibited by the people neere adjacent unto the towne of Roiston, November 1604', and 'An

<sup>94</sup> The letters are dated 15 and 18 October by Walter Bouchier Devereux, *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex*, 2 vols (London: Murray, 1853), I, 498-502.

<sup>95</sup> A.R. Braunmuller, *A Seventeenth-century letter-book* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1983), pp.417, 418.

<sup>96</sup> Thomas Nashe, 'Pierce Penilesse His supplication to the Divell', in *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. by Ronald B. McKerrow, 5 vols (Oxford: Blackwell, 1958), I, 137-245 (I, 221-226).

<sup>97</sup> *The Letters of Thomas Wood, Puritan, 1566-1577*, ed. by Patrick Collinson (London: Athlone Press, 1960), pp.xxii-xxxvi.

address of John Burgess a puritanical minister of the king' with the Lewkenor miscellany (fols 44<sup>r</sup> and 48<sup>v</sup>).

Essex's threat to the nation was martial, but Catholicism had been a source of unease to Elizabeth throughout her reign, and had the potential to haunt the next in the guise of James's mother, Mary Queen of Scots (executed in 1587), as well as in James' apparent desire to offer some toleration to Catholics (a desire seen off for good by the Gunpowder Plot). The 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' (dated September 1603) focuses on the risks involved in becoming allies with a Catholic nation. Cecil's role as politician and advisor to James was central to the issues addressed in this text – the French, Cecil argued, were capable of emerging as a powerful threat against England, as were the Spanish, but at least the Low Countries are 'y<sup>e</sup> only yokefellows (as it were) of you<sup>r</sup> Religion' (fol. 33<sup>r</sup>).<sup>98</sup>

Although puritanism is not affiliated with the crown here in the same way as it is in Lewkenor's miscellany, this manuscript does show that Catholicism has crept into ecclesiastical and political circles, and is also lying dormant amongst numbers of the population and therefore constitutes a similar threat. Burgess, in his letter to the king, reiterates Hutton's argument, and that expressed more widely in Lewkenor's collection: that puritans differed only in minor points of worship but loved his 'maiestie and the present state', whereas Catholics were 'opposite and contrarie in verie manie substantial pointes of Religion'. He goes further than Hutton, linking the potential downfall of the nation with the resurgence of Catholicism, proclaiming that 'the very boyes & girles laughe at ou<sup>r</sup> most graue & reuerente ministers, whome befor they looked on wi<sup>th</sup> fear & reuerence' (fol. 49<sup>v</sup>).

'An idle libel of some papist in doggrel rhyme to the heretical parson of Enborne', left by Catholics towards the end of Elizabeth's reign (1601-2) in the newly ransacked church, is a warning that Catholic factions were as active in the country as the puritans (fol. 50<sup>v</sup>). Fulke Greville's miscellany carries a fuller title: 'A copie of verses made by sondry papists of Somers<sup>et</sup>shire who entered into y<sup>e</sup> church of Enbourne in that countie & rent & scattered y<sup>e</sup>  $\wedge$  service Bookes & tare  $\wedge$  church Bible & register Booke & directed

---

<sup>98</sup> Christopher Durston, *James I* (London: Routledge, 1998), p.4.

those verses to the parson lauing them behind them'.<sup>99</sup> The Enbourne libel might be viewed as much as a Catholic triumph as a cause for concern. Those who left the libel turned the tables on traditional views by addressing it to 'y<sup>e</sup> hereticall parson of Enbounne'. Their defence was that:

Thou saiest idolatry and vain superstition,  
yet we know it is holie church tradition,  
the service Booke here scattered all,  
is not divine but hereticall,  
so is the Bible of false translation,  
to cutt it and mangle it is no damnation.

More noteworthy are 'Verses written by a favorer of the Queen of Scots', which resurrects the concern that there are still supporters of the king's mother, or those who 'favour' Catholicism amongst the population (fol. 104<sup>r</sup>), as well as a letter Mathew Hutton wrote to the recognised Catholic Earl of Northampton in January 1605. As in his letter to Cecil, Hutton argues that the financial difficulties in the church and the nation, are 'by reason of the excessiue wasting of the treasure of this kingdome, whi<sup>ch</sup> y<sup>f</sup> it should continew, England is like to be the poorest kingdome in Europe'. In this letter religious differences are seemingly put aside, but these comments read alongside those in his letter to Cecil suggest that there is treachery amongst sources close to the king. Howard was not only a Catholic, but as close to James as it was possible to be and Hutton's insinuation that Catholics were not loyal to the king or state is a damning assertion.<sup>100</sup>

To find our letter exchange among texts about Catholicism and about the financial state of the nation gives an impression of profound concern about the new monarch and about where the nation is heading, on the part of people who were often a long way from the centres of power. As I have suggested above, the material in the collection might simply be read as providing a balanced view. After all, the inclusion of Leicester's letter (an apparently committed puritan), and Hutton's letter to Howard (an established Catholic), illustrate the king's toleration to men from both religious extremes in his government. These texts, rather than asking for sides to be taken, could

---

<sup>99</sup> BL MS Egerton 2877, fol. 183<sup>r</sup>. The title refers to Enborne, Somerset, and although Pauline Croft suggests that it refers to Newbury, Berkshire, I have found no evidence to confirm this; Pauline Croft, 'Libels, Popular Literacy and Public Opinion in Early Modern England', *Historical Research*, 68 (1995), 266-285 (p.281).

<sup>100</sup> Howard had a key role, along with Cecil, in James's accession to the throne; Pauline Croft, 'Howard, Henry, earl of Northampton (1540-1614)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13906>, accessed 20 March 2007).

be read as asking for compromise. It could also be argued that the letters together offer a complete case: Hutton attacks the ecclesiastical system and court regime, whilst Cecil defends it – the reader is left to decide who has the strongest argument.

The position of the letter exchange, copied together between the Royston petition and Burgess's letter to the king, asks for a particular reading to be applied to these letters, and to their purpose in this miscellany; that is, that they should be read in association with the texts that surround them. In this case they would be understood as tracts relating to reform and expressing displeasure with the Stuart court. This then raises questions as to the relevance of Cecil's letter, both in the miscellany and in this position. In its position following Hutton's, Cecil's letter provides balance in his defence of Hutton's criticism. In the wider context of the miscellany, he is the defender of the nation against internal political and religious wrangling, and in turn from the Catholic threat from Spain. It is common to find texts about Cecil and the Earl of Essex in the same miscellanies; Essex is usually venerated at the expense of Cecil. In the Harleian manuscript, however, the suggestion of danger to England from religious factions and from Catholic infiltration have the effect of casting Essex as a threat, so the tables are turned. Essex was not keen to participate in the Irish Campaign in 1599, but Cecil's advice to the queen had secured his passage, and his accelerated disgrace. Cecil later defended Essex's friend and co-conspirator, the Earl of Southampton, in their trial after the unsuccessful revolt two years later, arguing that Southampton was the weaker party and had been influenced by Essex.<sup>101</sup>

The letters in this miscellany and in MS 22601 attempt to explain the political and cultural situation at the end of the Elizabethan and into the Stuart reign by using a combination of old and new texts. When Cecil's letter was used in MS 22601 to defend the 'state's' position he was also taking care to ingratiate himself in the favour of the new king at a time when his own status was precarious. In 1616, however, when the Harleian manuscript was compiled, the characters and the events had become of more historical interest, and new threats to the country were emerging which this miscellany attempted to explain by using examples from the past. Cecil struggled with the burden of the king's increasing expenditure and financial deficits until his death in 1612. The marriage of James's daughter Elizabeth, and the funeral of his son Prince Henry in 1613

---

<sup>101</sup> Park Honan, 'Wriothesley, Henry, third earl of Southampton (1573–1624)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30073>, accessed 20 March 2007).

increased his financial difficulties, whilst Robert Carr, his favourite, who had also been on the receiving end of much wealth from the crown, was beginning an affair which would cause a sexual scandal that would reflect on the morality of the court. The 1614 parliament had put a strain on the nature of the English constitution and had dissolved after only a few weeks, partly due to disagreements regarding impositions.<sup>102</sup> Sir Edward Coke had argued that the law placed restrictions on the king's right to legislate or levy taxes without the consent of his subjects, but in 1616 he was dismissed.<sup>103</sup> I doubt that it is a coincidence that 'Witty speeches collected out of a letter sent to Edward Cooke after he was Lord Chiefe Justice' is copied into this miscellany (fol. 31<sup>r</sup>).<sup>104</sup> The text, although unasccribed in this collection, has formerly been attributed to Sir Francis Bacon, and it accuses Coke of failings in his position as a judge as well as mismanagement in the Overbury murder trial the previous year.<sup>105</sup> In sum, the purpose of the letters in this miscellany is, in combination with the other material, to illustrate that there will always be threats to the country of a similar nature, but with a strong parliament and arena for debate they will be overcome.

### 2.3. Cambridge University Library Manuscript Additional 335 (Cambridge Collection)

John Eyton Bickersteth Mayor presented the Cambridge Collection to Cambridge University Library sometime during the three years that he held the post of University Librarian (1864-1867). Mayor was a scholar of St John's College, Cambridge and had been an assistant tutor and lecturer there prior to his appointment as University Librarian. He was a writer, publishing classical, historical, and texts on historical figures; he was also an avid book collector, particularly of classical and biographical books. It is likely that this manuscript formed part of the immense library that Mayor owned.<sup>106</sup>

Nothing is known of the compilers of this miscellany: it is written in several hands in Latin and English and includes documents from the middle of the sixteenth century to the late seventeenth century, including Cecil's letter to Hutton. The miscellany is composed of material that suggests an interest in the condition of the nation: questions

<sup>102</sup> See Alastair Bellany, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Russell, pp.280-282.

<sup>103</sup> J.P. Sommerville, *Royalists and Patriots: Politics and Ideology in England, 1603-1640*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (London: Longman, 1999), pp.82, 96.

<sup>104</sup> For further discussion see p.92.

<sup>105</sup> *The Cambridge Portfolio*, ed. by Rev. J.J. Smith, 2 vols (London: Parker, 1840), I, 225. Bellany, *Court Scandal*, pp.76, 77, 181-212.

<sup>106</sup> St John's College Library, (GBR/0275), Notebooks of John Eyton Bickersteth Mayor.



of monarchy and loyalty to the crown, ecclesiastical and civil law, and foreign policy. It is also concerned with the subject of counsel; a field in which Cecil held a pivotal role as statesman and politician but also as the right hand man to both the king and his predecessor. There is no evidence to suggest that the collection was not arranged in the order we now find it, but as it appears to have been compiled over many years and by different compilers it is more likely that the collection has been added to. More recently, the miscellany was valued as an early modern reference text by Mayor, a nineteenth-century historian, but we can only speculate as to its attraction for its contemporary readership.<sup>107</sup>

Cecil's letter, although widely disseminated, is rarely found in collections without the Archbishop of York's letter.<sup>108</sup> As we have already seen, in his reply Cecil reversed the points raised in Hutton's letter to bolster his defence of religion and the habits of the king. Without Hutton's letter Cecil's is defending points that are not criticised in this miscellany – there is only the defence without the attack. It is important to examine the effect that the inclusion of one side of the correspondence has in a miscellany, but equally important to note that we do not know whether the compiler of the Cambridge Collection had access to Hutton's letter and chose to include only Cecil's (the reverse of the case of the Lewkenor miscellany), or only possessed Cecil's reply. If he only had Cecil's letter, it is likely that he would be aware that it was not written in isolation but did not regard it as a problem to place what we may consider 'half the story' in his collection.

The old and new reigns are represented in the Cambridge Collection: James's speech to the Scottish Parliament at Edinburgh on 19 June, 1617, which significantly, was his birthday, is on the same folio as an account of the death of his mother, 'The Scottish Queenes Death'.<sup>109</sup> James's speech primarily discusses unity in religious practices in England and Scotland which, he knew, would be necessary before there could be a union of crowns. His trip to Scotland was intended to familiarise the Scots with the English religion. Eventually he hoped to introduce the Five Articles to the kirk, but

---

<sup>107</sup> The manuscript is of 'working' quality, rather than as a presentation, or valuable book.

<sup>108</sup> It is also found alone in a collection of papers relating principally to the See of Norwich, CUL MS E.e. iii.57 and Folger, MS v.b.303, fols 227<sup>r</sup> and 228<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>109</sup> CUL MS Add. 335, fols 29<sup>v</sup>, 29<sup>r</sup>. Further references to this manuscript in part 2.3 will be supplied parenthetically within the text.

knew that this would have to be done gradually.<sup>110</sup> Since his accession James had come to like the ways of the Church of England; he stated in 1616 that the Anglican Church was 'most pure, and neerest the primitiue and Apostolicall Church in Doctrine and Discipline, and is sureliest founded vpon the word of God, of any Church in Christendom'.<sup>111</sup> In order to demonstrate the practices of the Church south of the border he ordered that an organ be installed in the chapel so that sung services could be conducted. It was noted that 'upon Saturday Seventeen of May [1617] the English service, singing of Quiristers, and playing on Organs, and surplices were first heard and seen in the Chappel Royal'.<sup>112</sup> The Scots were horrified; their churches were traditionally very bare. When the bishops told James to show restraint after he had carpenters making wooden statues of apostles, he replied that such images were not idolatrous, as in the Catholic faith, but rather served as 'ornament and decoration of the place where we should sit'.<sup>113</sup> In this way the question of unity between the nations is emphasised by a seemingly straightforward lineage between mother and son; James is firmly located in his homeland on the date of his birth, following the account of her death.

'Sr Thomas Egerton the Lord Chancelor's Speech in the King's Bench upon the Removeall of Sr Edward Cook, the Lord Cheif Justice, upon Receiving in Sr Henry Mountague', in 1616, and the reply from Sir Henry Montague, the incoming Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench who replaced Coke, follow James's speech (fols 31<sup>r</sup> and 32<sup>v</sup>). The speeches are patriotic but also argue that the justice system is the backbone of the nation. Both pay homage to the 'wisdome and judgement' of the king as the leader of 'Great Britane'. The language of the law would have provided them with the means to flatter the king but recognising these qualities in particular would have placed Montague in high esteem with the king, and he was prudent enough to realise that his political advancement depended on his ability to retain a lower profile than Coke.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> Roger Lockyer, *The Early Stuarts: A Political History of England 1603-1642* (London: Longman, 1989), p.324. The five articles were that communicants should kneel when they received the sacraments; that these could be administered in private houses if sickness or other causes made it appropriate; that baptism should also be permitted in private, under similar conditions; that bishops should revive the practice of confirmation for children; and that Easter, Christmas and a number of other feast days should be included in the kirk's calendar and formally celebrated.

<sup>111</sup> King James VI & I, *Political Writings*, ed. by Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p.210, cited in Lockyer, p.323.

<sup>112</sup> David Calderwood, *The True History of the Church of Scotland from the Beginning of the Reformation unto the End of the Reigne of James VI* (1678), p.674.

<sup>113</sup> Samuel R. Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War 1603-1642*, 10 vols (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1901), III, 224.

<sup>114</sup> Lockyer, p.16.

The use of the title, 'Great Britane', was, of course, another form of flattery; it was first adopted by James, and was an acknowledgement of his plans for union with Scotland. Concern for their careers, and wisdom, no doubt, prevented either man from drawing attention to the direct contradiction: that the moment the name 'Great Britany' came into being there would be 'an utter extinction of all the laws now in force',<sup>115</sup> making their flattery all the more conspicuous as union of the nations would threaten their own positions. The Lord Chancellor informs Montague that a man should follow good examples when governing and that he had the best example to follow in that of his grandfather.<sup>116</sup>

Queen Elizabeth's Golden Speech to Parliament on 30 November 1601 was frequently copied into Jacobean manuscript miscellanies, perhaps most often as a means of expressing dissatisfaction with the current reign whilst glorifying the past (fol. 39<sup>r</sup>).<sup>117</sup> Its situation in this collection, however, is ambiguous: it may be a criticism of the new reign or alternatively, it may be an indication of hope for the future. The collection is predominantly anti-Spanish, and James' hopes for a united kingdom and his ties to Mary Queen of Scots and indirectly to Catholicism do suggest that the Golden Speech is elevating the past. A speech made by the deceased Queen read alongside James's wishes for a united kingdom might also imply a new beginning rather than a sense of grievance and it is not until the rest of the manuscript is considered that we can determine the effect of any one text.

Cecil's defence of religion in his reply to Hutton is strengthened by the compiler's choice of texts regarding religious issues. Hutton's opinion 'touching certaine matters lyke to be caled in question before the King's most Excellent Maiestie' typically asks for provision for godly ministers, but he uncharacteristically relinquishes that charge to the 'grave men of state' (fol. 64<sup>r</sup>).<sup>118</sup> In his letter to Cecil he comments that 'as I confesse I am not to deale in state matters', before doing just that, indicating that he has been warned previously about his interference – choosing to ignore it in his letter to

<sup>115</sup> Cecil wrote this in a letter to Earl of Mar dated 28 April 1604, cited in Francis Bacon, *The works of Francis Bacon*, ed. by James Spedding, 14 vols (London: Longman, Green, Longmans & Roberts, 1857-1874), X, 200.

<sup>116</sup> BL MS Stowe 156, fol. 46<sup>v</sup>; Montague was Sir Henry Montagu, first Earl of Manchester. His grandfather was Sir Edward Montagu (1480s-1557), chief justice of the King's Bench. Brian Quintrell, 'Montagu, Henry, first earl of Manchester (c.1564-1642)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19020>, accessed 4 Sept 2006).

<sup>117</sup> For further discussion see chapter three, p.141.

<sup>118</sup> John Strype, *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift*, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822), III, 312; MS 22601, fol. 3<sup>v</sup>.

Cecil, but unwillingly heeding it in this text. Cecil also had an unlikely advocate in the dissenting preacher John Burgess: in a sermon before the king at Whitehall on 19 June 1604 (fol. 72<sup>f</sup>) Burgess undertook to advise the king on religious matters and consequently found himself committed to the Tower. Hutton had escaped a similar fate at in the 1590s at Whitehall after warning Elizabeth that ‘the uncertainty of Succession gave hopes to Forreiners to attempt fresh invasions and breed feares in many of her subjects of a new conquest’, and that ‘the expectations and presages of all writers went Northward, naming without any circumlocution, Scotland’.<sup>119</sup> Burgess, however, petitioned James (fol. 70<sup>f</sup>) and the Privy Council (fol. 69<sup>f</sup>) and after personal conference with the king conformed, returned to his previous diocese, and became a defender of the established church.<sup>120</sup>

The circumstances surrounding ‘Richard Weston’s Indictment’ and the Overbury trial might possibly have invited contemporaries to link the news of corruption, poisoning, and patronage with the Jacobean court (fol. 67<sup>f</sup>). We enter the Overbury affair at the point in which it reaches the courtroom, and so the public domain. Richard Weston, one of Overbury’s wardens at the Tower, was on trial for administering a fatal dose of poison. The account recalls that ‘my Lord of Somersett’ sent the poison in a letter to Weston and describes Weston’s execution at Tyburn on 23 October 1615. Sir Edward Coke presided over Weston’s trial and reinforced inherent popish conspiracy fears throughout the Overbury trial; these, along with suspicions of recusancy amongst the murderers, transmitted images of a corrupt court and by implication a corrupt, and popish, monarch, to the nation. Bellany contends that a connection between sinful behaviour and the presence of popery was widely presumed.<sup>121</sup> The report further highlights the corruption at James’s court by drawing in the Earl of Somerset and Sir Walter Raleigh, two previous royal favourites. It relates that upon Somerset’s committal to the Tower on 6 November Raleigh, also a prisoner, took his leave from another knight telling him ‘I understand my sonn & heire is come to see me’ (fol. 67<sup>v</sup>). Raleigh had been given the estate of Sherborne as a gift by Elizabeth but the lands had been forfeited on his downfall and given to Carr (‘sonn & heire’ because he ‘inherited’ his land) who ignored Raleigh’s pleas to refuse the estate from the king. The account of this meeting shows that Carr had profited at the expense of Raleigh when he fell, but that his power

<sup>119</sup> Sir John Harington, ‘A Briefe View of the State of the Church of England’, in *Nugae Antiquae*, 3 vols (London: Cadell, 1792), I, 1-249 (p.219); Lake, ‘Puritan Bishop’, pp.191-192.

<sup>120</sup> Jeremy Collier, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, 9 vols (London: Straker, 1840), VII, 312.

<sup>121</sup> Bellany, *Court Scandal*, p.143.

was only transient as he suffered the same fate. The actual events of the trial are outside the scope of this study, but its effects were far reaching: feuds between elite families were highlighted; prominent members of all systems of government were drawn into the scandal, but most importantly it diminished the ideal of court virtue and morality.<sup>122</sup>

‘A copy of a lettre sent to Sir Edward Cooke in Michelmas tearme, 1616, without name’, possibly written to him in the interval between his suspension and eventual discharge from office, follows Burgess’s sermon (fol. 78<sup>f</sup>). The letter is signed ‘ignoto’ in this collection but it has been suggested that the author was Francis Bacon.<sup>123</sup> In it, Coke is admonished for his conduct as a lawyer (‘all other artes which wee see you doe indirectly not without touch of vaine glory, having noe respecte to the end’) and told that with his ‘yearly living of 1000 l’ he can give but little back.<sup>124</sup> It has been suggested that Coke’s career was tied to ‘machinations of Court factions’ and that Bacon was behind his dismissal in 1616, whilst his return was due to the influence of George Villiers, later Duke of Buckingham.<sup>125</sup> Bacon and Coke were old adversaries, although Bacon had admitted that he admired Coke’s work, stating that ‘had it not been for Sir Edward Coke’s *Reports* the law by this time had been almost like a ship without ballast’.<sup>126</sup> Coke believed that the monarch should not intervene in the execution of the law and this belief was behind Coke’s discharge from office.<sup>127</sup> Coke had repeatedly questioned what he saw as the king’s interference in the law of the land and in 1616, on the king’s orders, the Attorney General, Francis Bacon, wrote to Coke telling him to instruct his judges not to make a decision on a commendam case without the king’s input. Fearing monarchical intervention again Coke rallied his colleagues to make a statement reiterating the fact that they swore when they took office to do justice without delay.<sup>128</sup> This provoked the anger of the king, and Coke was shortly after summoned before the Privy Council to answer charges of negligence in office.<sup>129</sup> There were also

---

<sup>122</sup> Pauline Croft, *King James* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Peck, *Northampton*; for a full discussion of the Overbury affair see Bellany, *Court Scandal*.

<sup>123</sup> *The Cambridge Portfolio*, I, 225; see p.87.

<sup>124</sup> See Lisa Jardine and Alan Stewart, *Hostage to Fortune: the troubled life of Francis Bacon* (London: Gollancz, 1998), especially chapter thirteen, for a discussion of relations between Coke and Bacon.

<sup>125</sup> Sommerville, *Politics and Ideology*, p.82.

<sup>126</sup> Jardine and Stewart, p.389.

<sup>127</sup> Lockyer, pp.18-22; J.H. Baker, ‘The Common Lawyers and the Chancery: 1616’, in *The Legal Profession and the Common Law: Historical Essays* (London: Hambledon 1986), pp.205-229 (p.206).

<sup>128</sup> Lockyer, p.20.

<sup>129</sup> In England, the common law provided the frame of government and was based on tradition and custom, James believed that kings could withdraw any case from court and judge it themselves, Coke opposed the royal prerogative; King James VI and I, *Political Writings*, pp. 62-84; Lockyer, pp.7,18; R.G. Usher, ‘James I and Sir Edward Coke’, *English Historical Review*, 18 (1903), 664-675; Johann P. Sommerville, ‘Jacobean Political Thought and the Controversy over the Oath of Allegiance, (unpublished

suggestions, however, that Coke's fall from grace was connected to scandal that he may have discovered connected to the royal court during the course of the Overbury investigation: John Chamberlain wondered whether he had 'dived farther into secrets than there was need'.<sup>130</sup>

'The Articles of the Matrimoniall Agreement betwixt the most excellent Prince of Wales and the most excellent Infanta' (fol. 56<sup>r</sup>) and 'A discourse to prove that a Conjunction by Alliance of England and Spaine, is the most safe, honourable, and profitable course for both the monarchies, especially for Spaine?' (fol. 57<sup>v</sup>) are followed by the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' (fol. 59<sup>v</sup>). These texts all make anti-Catholic claims, thereby heightening the sense of petition towards the king with regard to his policy. The articles concerning the proposed marriage linking Spain and England, and the discourse on the alliance between the two nations appear innocuous: the former simply holds up the articles for debate, whilst the latter puts forward the notion that the discourse will prove the claims. It ends, however, by opposing the debate with the observation that the advantage of this deal would be to Spain – the question mark at the end then protects the text's author by seemingly passing the subject back for debate. The 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' appear to offer a solution by insisting that England does not become allied with Catholic countries.

In the Cambridge Collection Cecil's letter (fol. 53<sup>r</sup>) is placed between the abbreviated trial notes of several of the Bye and Main plot conspirators, including Griffin Markham and Sir Walter Raleigh (fol. 50<sup>r</sup>), and 'The Earle of Castlehaven's declaration of faith and speech at his death' (fol. 54<sup>r</sup>), and it is Cecil that is the link between these texts rather than his letter, as I will argue below. Sir Griffin Markham, the main organiser of the Bye Plot, was a Catholic, but he was also a remnant of the Essex faction, and had served with him in the Irish campaign of 1599.<sup>131</sup> Markham, like many Catholics, was hoping for more success after James's accession; likewise, those in political circles who had been sidelined during Elizabeth's reign hoped for preferment under James – when this was not forthcoming their disillusionment led to revenge.

---

doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 1981); Sommerville, *Politics and Ideology*, pp.81-104; Louis A. Knafla, *Law and Politics in Jacobean England: The Tracts of Lord Chancellor Ellesmere* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977) p.125.

<sup>130</sup> Bellany, *Court Scandal*, p. 209; Chamberlain, II, 14.

<sup>131</sup> Mark Nicholls, 'Markham, Sir Griffin (b. c.1565, d. in or after 1644)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18066>, accessed 22 March 2007).

Cecil, mainly through ambition, had played a crucial part in the downfall of Sir Walter Raleigh and of the Earl of Essex, but there would have been many people in the nation who would have made their own minds up about Raleigh's guilt. Cecil had acquired a letter at the time of Essex's death which stated that Raleigh and Cobham had set in motion plans to place the King of Spain's daughter on the throne after Elizabeth. Cecil had informed James that this pair had the opportunity to allow a Spanish invasion, as Raleigh controlled the southwest of England from his estates in Devon, and Cobham was Warden of the Cinque Ports, with control over the southeast coastline.<sup>132</sup> Essex had been a favourite of James and they had corresponded with regard to his accession to the English throne until Essex's downfall, which James had been led to believe was partly the fault of Raleigh. It was at this point that Cecil and Henry Howard took over. They set about poisoning James's mind against Raleigh, Cobham and other possible obstacles to their ambitions for position in the new court.<sup>133</sup> Raleigh was an anti-Spanish hero to those steeped in the Elizabethan age, and a standard to those concerned with the future of Jacobean politics. His father-in-law was Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, a patron of puritan ministers and vehement anti-Catholic (Raleigh was married to his daughter, Elizabeth), and he had lived as a patriotic Protestant.<sup>134</sup> Raleigh had also fought against the Spanish and been a favourite of the previous Queen; and yet this still did not save him from Edward Coke's charges at his trial of having 'an English face, but a Spanish heart'.<sup>135</sup> Coke had been one of Raleigh's prime accusers at his trial and in a letter Raleigh told his wife that 'all my services, hazards, and expenses for my country – plantings, discoveries, fights, councils, and whatsoever else – malice hath now covered over. I am now made an enemy and traitor by the word of an unworthy man [Coke]. He hath proclaimed me to be a partaker of his vain imaginations'.<sup>136</sup>

In 'The Earle of Castlehaven's declaration of faith and speech at his death', Mervin Touchet, second earl of Castlehaven, affirmed both his loyalty to the Church of England and to the king's right to try him at his execution for sodomy and rape in 1631, although it is likely that he had converted to Catholicism in the 1620s. As at Raleigh's trial, there were questions of innocence which stretched further afield than the defendant, as well as

---

<sup>132</sup> Steven May, *Sir Walter Raleigh* (Boston: Twayne, 1989), p.19.

<sup>133</sup> Peck, *Northampton*, p.19.

<sup>134</sup> Stanford Lehmberg, 'Throckmorton, Sir Nicholas (1515/16–1571)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27394>, accessed 22 March 2007).

<sup>135</sup> E. Edwards, *The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh together with his Letters*, 2 vols (London: Macmillan, 1868), I, 391.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 383.

‘contemporary suspicions of suborned evidence’, and counter-allegations of corruption and conspiracy, that were not investigated by the crown.<sup>137</sup> The last item in the miscellany is ‘A briefe Relation of the Araidment of the Earles of Essex and Southampton, the 19<sup>th</sup> Febr. 1600’ (fol. 85<sup>r</sup>).

The inclusion of Raleigh’s trial notes and his meeting with Carr, along with reports of the downfalls of Coke and Essex, illustrate that these men have fallen foul of the new regime, but also that one-time favourites, or even powerful men like Castlehaven and Carr were susceptible to the vicissitudes of court politics. Coke abhorred the sycophants at court and believed in a ‘vocal and unrestricted Parliament’;<sup>138</sup> Raleigh, as we have seen, was accused of having a ‘Spanish heart’ in 1603 having fought the Spanish and popery, but by the next decade, when he was on trial for pro-Spanish tendencies, there were active concerns that James was contemplating allying the nation with Spain. An implication emerges from all this that honest voices are being shunted aside as the king aids corruption at court, especially when read alongside texts hoping for allegiance through marriage with Spain, the king’s wishes for union with Scotland and his speech there, as well as an account of his Catholic mother’s death and Raleigh’s trial notes.

This manuscript shares several texts with other miscellanies that contain the letter exchange between Hutton and Cecil, many of which are interested in religious issues, as would be expected especially with the inclusion of Hutton’s letter. There are exceptions: Julius Caesar has copied only Hutton’s letter into his collection of personal papers; papers which appear preoccupied with expenditure, debts and what the compiler and others (including the king) are spending, such as ‘Guifts to the Scottish men since the Kings coming’<sup>139</sup> and a report, which precedes Hutton’s letter, on the costs of entertaining the Queen when she visited Caesar’s house at Micham in Surrey in 1598.<sup>140</sup> It is clear in this case that the interest in Hutton’s letter was his criticism of the king’s extravagance.

---

<sup>137</sup> Cynthia B. Herrup, ‘Touchet, Mervin, second earl of Castlehaven (1593–1631)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/66794>, accessed 28 August 2006); Bellany, *Court Scandal*, pp.261, 262.

<sup>138</sup> Knafla, pp.58-64.

<sup>139</sup> BL MS Add. 12497, fol. 107<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 237<sup>r</sup>. The material is dated between the 1560s and the 1620s.



The question of the compiler's intentions for Cecil's letter in this collection cannot be answered with any certainty. A seventeenth-century reader would face the same difficulties as the modern reader, but they would first need to decide whether or not Cecil was one of the sycophants at the court, or whether his was honest counsel to the king and government. Even though Cecil's letter mainly addresses Hutton's ecclesiastical concerns, these become subservient to other political issues in the context of the miscellany. Cecil himself, rather than the letter, is the link between the Bye and Main plot trial notes, the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' and those texts between them, and Cecil, rather than his letter, has the role of councillor in this miscellany: whether honest or sycophantic has to be decided by the reader of the collection.

The texts surrounding Cecil's letter illustrate the differences in the political and religious situation of the nation and of the court. Catholics believed that James's leniency and toleration fell short of their expectations, whilst the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' resisted allegiance with Catholics. Cecil's own views were in accordance with the clauses in the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>', and yet his official position meant that he had to convey the king's wish to accommodate Catholics with 'moderate spirites' (fol. 53<sup>r</sup>). In his governmental role Cecil stood for justice and the security of the realm, and the miscellany contains texts where alleged conspirators are brought to trial, and yet the report of Markham's trial says that he made 'many men sory for him, and my Lord Cecill weepe abundantly' (fol. 50<sup>v</sup>).<sup>141</sup>

That the Cambridge Collection positions itself as, ultimately, loyal to the king is partly due to the inclusion of Cecil's letter. He has the position of intermediary; the content of his letter does not directly participate in the debate surrounding foreign policy, corruption at court or conspiracy against the king, but his presence amongst such texts suggests a voice of governance. Although no single opinion exists in this collection it highlights the negative side of James's court (Castlehaven was brought to justice under Charles I) but is also anti-Catholic. The texts in MS 22601 have puritan inclinations and express displeasure with policies in James's court; the Cambridge Collection has the appearance of expressing displeasure more stridently, but as the collection has been compiled over many years we cannot say that it belongs to a particular compiler.

---

<sup>141</sup> See also BL MS Egerton 2877, fol. 175<sup>v</sup>.

#### 2.4. British Library Manuscript Additional 38139 (The Manwood Miscellany)

Sir Peter Manwood, the compiler of BL MS Add. 38139, has copied both Hutton's and Cecil's letters into his manuscript miscellany. He has not placed them next to each other, which indicates either that he was interested in their individual content, that he did not consider it important to read them as a conventional exchange of opinion or, more simply, that they did not come into his possession at the same time.

Manwood was a lawyer and a Member of Parliament for Kent and Devon between 1588 and 1621 as well as a patron of learned men. He was also an antiquary who held a vast library of manuscripts and printed books and enjoyed a lavish lifestyle. Manwood was granted a licence in 1598 to travel beyond seas 'for his increase in good knowledge and learning'.<sup>142</sup> His miscellany is a compilation of state papers, covering the reigns of both Elizabeth and James, documents relating to his duties, and texts that appear to reflect his political interests. It also includes texts which might have been put to practical use by Manwood, both in his professional life, and as patron to local scholars at his home in Hackington in Kent. The miscellany has been used for a similar purpose to that of Sir Edward Lewkenor, who as stated above, referred to and engaged with his collection in a professional capacity; several texts have been annotated by Manwood, noting 'examined' or 'examined by me'. It is possible that after examination, these texts were collected for later use to imitate in the same way advocated by Angel Day in his handbook, where model letters are catalogued for use on stated occasions.<sup>143</sup> Likewise, Manwood may have collected texts such as collections relating to the topography of Canterbury<sup>144</sup> (Manwood's nearest city), or lists of knighthoods or promotions at court (fols 178<sup>r</sup>, 197<sup>r</sup>, 244<sup>r</sup> for instance) for their potential newsworthiness or informative value. Manwood's miscellany also includes religious texts: texts that defend the beliefs of James's bishops and warn the king of the dangers of Catholicism. The composition of the miscellany suggests that these indicate Manwood's loyalty to king and nation, and belief in the importance of institution and tradition. In my discussion of this manuscript I will show that Manwood has categorised Hutton's and Cecil's letters as

---

<sup>142</sup> Louis A. Knafla, 'Manwood, Sir Peter (1571–1625)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18013>, accessed 22 March 2007).

<sup>143</sup> Angel Day, *The English Secretary or Methode of writing of Epistles and Letters* (London, 1599; facsimile with introduction by Robert O. Evans, Gainesville, FL: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1967), sigs B2<sup>v</sup>-B3<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>144</sup> BL MS Add. 38139, fol. 195<sup>v</sup>. Further references to this manuscript in part 2.4 will be supplied parenthetically within the text.

patriotic tracts that are concerned with the welfare of the nation and defend the king (fols 181<sup>r</sup> and 194<sup>r</sup>).

Documents in the miscellany date from seven years before Manwood was born, in 1571, to seven years before his death in 1625, and although the collection is not compiled chronologically it is clear that its contents were arranged in their present order and probably at one time.<sup>145</sup> It is written in Manwood's hand throughout (a distinctive secretary hand), and there are several annotations in the same hand, noting their examination or commenting on the text. These annotations are in slightly darker ink, suggesting that they were made at a later date.

The presence of a series of mnemonic verses written in Latin on the succession of English sovereigns is indicative of the compiler's pride in his pedigree and his nation: they recognise a lineage of which James is a part, but show that his countrymen are infiltrators (fol. 202<sup>r</sup>). These verses assert the heritage of the nation, and James's claim to the throne as the great-grandson of Margaret Tudor. They also corroborate Manwood's stance against the union with Scotland, which is apparent from other texts in the manuscript. Although Manwood opposed the union his loyalty to the crown was not in question. This may appear contradictory, but it is necessary to make distinctions between loyalty to the institution of monarchy, to England, and to James. It goes without saying that James might not consider those in opposition to his views on union with Scotland as loyal, but Manwood's concern was with the preservation of the nation he served, and of which he considered himself a loyal subject. James's accession speech to Parliament establishes his authority in the land, and this is further affirmed by the inclusion of an entertainment before the king and court, 'O yes, o yes, o yes' (fol. 266<sup>v</sup>) which was copied into many other miscellanies, including MS 22601.<sup>146</sup>

Manwood has included in his miscellany copious amounts of notes of debates about the proposed union (fol. 27<sup>v</sup>), lists of objections 'against the change of the name of y<sup>e</sup> stile of England & Scotland into the name or stile of great Brittain to be moued or deliuered' (fol. 35<sup>r</sup>)<sup>147</sup> and Francis Bacon's report of the objections to union, against

---

<sup>145</sup> Several texts continue to the next folio, pagination is consistent with the order of the texts and the hand is closely written with few blank spaces.

<sup>146</sup> See chapter one, p.28.

<sup>147</sup> Also in Bod. MS Eng. Poet. c.50, pp.113-114.

which Manwood's annotation records his own concerns about the union (fol. 37<sup>r</sup>),<sup>148</sup> as well as documents such as the king's letter to the Commons dated 1 May 1604 (fol. 36<sup>r</sup>), 'An act for the instilinge our Souereigne Lord Kinge James Kinge of Britaine' (fol. 32<sup>r</sup>) and 'The diuine prouidence in ye misticall and reall vnyon of England and Scotland both by nature and other coherences with motiues for reconcilinge by differences as may now seeme to hinder the same' (fol. 42<sup>r</sup>) – a treatise in favour of the union. Manwood has copied items from both sides of a much-debated aspect of current affairs into his miscellany and states his opinion in annotations on several of the texts. These annotations then form part of the text, and become part of the material with which Manwood, and any other readers of the miscellany, would engage.

The miscellany contains a treatise addressed to Queen Elizabeth appealing for her to continue war with Spain and ally with the United Provinces (fol. 220<sup>v</sup>), and a letter from 'J A' to Robert Cecil advocating friendship with Holland and Zealand (fol. 46<sup>r</sup>). Instructions to John Kemp, Archbishop of York, in 1439 regarding peace with France are included, and these are followed by a statement of reasons why Henry VI should not accept the peace terms (fol. 262<sup>v</sup>), as well as the articles of the peace treaty with Spain, which are provided in Latin as well as in English, with a postscript written at the foot of the English version reminding Manwood that this was 'translated by Mr Knolles for mee' (fol. 84<sup>r</sup>). Richard Knolles was a historian and translator, as well as headmaster of the Grammar School at Sandwich founded by Roger Manwood, Peter's father.<sup>149</sup> A text on the proclamation of peace with Spain and the Archdukes has been annotated at the end in Manwood's hand, offering his observations on the reactions of the people to this news: 'wherevnto the people made noe maner of signe of ioy their way, or in any soeuer, as I have hearde them say which weare presente att itt' (fol. 70<sup>r</sup>).

John Burgess, the town preacher from Ipswich, who became a prolific campaigner during James's early years, wrote to Whitgift complaining about the way that nonconformist preachers were being treated.<sup>150</sup> Manwood has copied Burgess's resignation from office onto the same folio, rather than a reply from Whitgift, for

---

<sup>148</sup> A lengthy annotation is at the end of the text and expresses his concern at how union will affect English law.

<sup>149</sup> Christine Woodhead, 'Knolles, Richard (late 1540s-1610)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15752>, accessed 6 March 2007).

<sup>150</sup> John Burgess of Ipswich wrote this letter in 1602; although nothing more is known of him, it is possible that it is the same man who Patrick Collinson has identified as John Butler, in BL MS Add. 38492; see also pp.69, 75, 79, 84, 91-92. It is unlikely that it is John Burgess of Waddesden for the reasons cited above.

instance (fol. 19<sup>v</sup>). It might be inferred by contemporaries that implicit in Manwood's transcription of these two documents is the desire to show that there can be no deviation from the religion that has been established by the monarch. This point is strengthened by the inclusion of Archbishop Bancroft's letter. Bancroft was sent a letter from the Privy Council on 10 December 1604, shortly before Hutton received his letter from Cecil, informing him that the period of leniency towards nonconformists was over and action should be taken against them. He quotes the letter in full to his bishops before adding a postscript which is a clear declaration of his position. He tells them that 'you<sup>r</sup> lordship hauing perused this lettre cannot but greatly reioice at his Maies<sup>tyes</sup> constant resolucion and most honorable inclinacion of their Lordships and I doubt not but that yo<sup>u</sup> will wi<sup>th</sup> all care, faith and diligence accomplishe the effect thereof'.<sup>151</sup>

If further proof were required that Manwood was in support of the national religion it would be the folio containing two lampoons on Whitgift which appear to have caused Manwood great offence (fol. 58<sup>v</sup>). The first begins 'The prelates pope the canonistes trope', the only complete copy of which survives in this miscellany.<sup>152</sup> The second of the poems is on a proposal to substitute another name for preaching, which begins, 'Six of the greatest sexe and purest sect'; both have been crossed through individually and then the whole folio has been struck through. Manwood has written alongside the first of these, 'A lewd writing made of y<sup>e</sup> most wourthest & exsellentest man that ever governed y<sup>e</sup> church'. A reader might infer that Manwood would have realised the danger in collecting such material even if it were opposed to his own opinion, but that as a supporter of Whitgift he wished to keep them as 'president of the times', as John Rous had preserved his 'railing rimes'.<sup>153</sup> It is significant that the verso side of the folio has been left blank – perhaps he had left open the option to remove the leaf. Pauline Croft has suggested that Manwood 'relished' the libel and only crossed it out on hearing that Lewis Pickering, its author, was punished in the Star Chamber.<sup>154</sup> It is curious that he has merely crossed it through, however, especially as he would easily have been able to remove the leaf. Many compilers, as I have shown, collected an eclectic range of

---

<sup>151</sup> Wilkins, IV, 408, 409.

<sup>152</sup> The lampoon entitled 'The Lamentation of Dickie for the Death of his Brother Jockie', was pinned in contempt to the funeral hearse of Archbishop Whitgift (Dickie), Jockie being Bancroft who replaced him. See Bellany, 'A Poem on the Archbishop's Hearse', pp.137-164; 'Early Stuart Libels: an edition of poetry from manuscript sources', ed. by Alastair Bellany and Andrew McRae, *Early Modern Literary Studies* Text Series I (2005) <http://purl.oclc.org/emls/texts/libels> [accessed 21 March 2007].

<sup>153</sup> *The Diary of John Rous*, p.109, cited in Cogswell, 'Underground verse', p.284.

<sup>154</sup> Croft, 'Libels, Popular Literacy', pp.266-285, pp.280-281.

material which did not always express their opinion, and it doesn't seem likely that a line through this libel would have saved Manwood from Pickering's fate.<sup>155</sup>

Although Hutton and Manwood share an aversion to Catholics, their religious beliefs are not totally compatible. Manwood has copied into his miscellany several anti-Catholic tracts: 'A briefe summe of al the parishes, impropracions, preachers, communicantes, & recusants...within the seuerall dioceses of both the prouinces of Canterbury and York' (fol. 254<sup>v</sup>), 'A warning against the dangers of popish treachery' (fol. 266<sup>f</sup>) and 'Proiects touchinge Recusants su<sup>b</sup>mitted to further consideracion and articles agreed vpon for the framinge of an Act of Parliament for the better preuentinge of all popishe practizes against the kinges maiestie and her estate and for the better preseruacion of y<sup>e</sup> kinges maies<sup>ties</sup> subiects' (fol. 255<sup>v</sup>). These texts highlight the political concerns over Catholicism – the concern, shared by Hutton, that Catholics present a danger which goes beyond religious differences, and that they are similar to a foreign force who have their own leader, the Pope.

Methods of defence against Catholicism circulated: political polemic such as that of Coke's equated Catholicism and corruption, while anti-Spanish texts like those of Thomas Scott declared that the sovereign's spouse was a threat: 'Princes are married to the commonwealth; & the wife hath power of the husbands body, as he the husband of hers. The commonwealth then hath power of the Prince in this point'.<sup>156</sup> Anne of Denmark would have been considered a threat because of her wifely status, her true foreignness, and that which she inherited as a result of her Catholicism. She is represented in this miscellany by reference to her coronation (fol. 205<sup>f</sup>), the management of her court (fol. 104<sup>v</sup>), and the establishment of wages which she pays to members of her household (fol. 186<sup>f</sup>). James's integrity is under scrutiny in this context as Anne, his wife was Catholic, putting him at odds not only with Scott's views on

---

<sup>155</sup> Post 1605 the copying of a libel was regarded as publication and therefore a felony. In Coke's report *de Libellis famosis*, based on the case of Attorney General V. Pickering, he stated in Star Chamber that libel should not be used to complain of real injustice or corruption, and also that a slight against a magistrate or official was directed also at the king who had appointed him: if a libel is 'against a magistrate, or other publick person, it is a greater offence; for it concerns not only the breach of the peace, but also the scandal of the government, for what greater scandal of government can there be than to have corrupt or wicked magistrates to be appointed and constituted by the King to govern his subjects under him'; Sir Edward Coke, 'The Case de Libellis famosis, or of Scandalous Libels', in *The Reports of Sir Edward Coke*, 7 vols (London: Rivington, 1777), V, 125-126.

<sup>156</sup> Thomas Scott, *Vox Regis*, 1624; see also Peter Lake, 'Anti-popery: the Structure of a Prejudice', in *Conflict in Early Stuart England*, ed. by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London: Longman, 1989), pp.72-106.

mixed religion in marriage but with his own advice to his son in *Basilicon Doron* that 'I would rather have you to Marie one that were fully of your owne Religion'.<sup>157</sup>

This miscellany, like many others of the period, also contains the universal threat to Christians from the Sultan of Turkey, which is addressed to Emperor Rudolph II (fol. 64<sup>r</sup>).<sup>158</sup> As I have suggested, Catholics were popularly associated with all that was bad in early modern England. Peter Lake argues that for educated Protestant English people, Catholicism was an anti-religion, based on illusion and trickery.<sup>159</sup> Catholicism was viewed amongst many English Protestants as being inherently foreign and associated it with the paganism of the East, and so on the same side as Islam and therefore the Turks.

The texts copied between the two letters mainly concern government appointments and matters relating to Manwood's duties, covering both reigns. A commission to Lord Chancellor Ellesmere to receive surrenders of leases of crown lands (fol. 189<sup>r</sup>) detracts from the religious focus, but it is in line with Manwood's official interests as Sheriff and commissioner of sewers.<sup>160</sup> The text preceding Hutton's letter is a commission to Ellesmere to settle with persons in possession of land or area in the royal forests (fol. 179<sup>r</sup>). In addition, this manuscript, like many of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, contains more than one piece on Raleigh,<sup>161</sup> an Elizabethan craving for recognition in the new reign, as well as the exchange of letters between Lord Keeper Egerton and the Earl of Essex.

It is one of these Raleigh texts that separates Hutton's letter from Cecil's. The lampoon, 'Watt I wot well' (fol. 192<sup>v</sup>) has been attributed to Thomas Rogers, who by 1605 was secretary to Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton.<sup>162</sup> Howard was not only a Catholic, and an acquaintance of Cecil's, but one of Raleigh's enemies. Peck asserts that Cecil and Howard sought to establish a new patronage relationship with the king that relied upon convincing James that Cecil provided the only means to the throne. Howard set about warning the king against other courtiers, including Raleigh.<sup>163</sup> Therefore, a poem

<sup>157</sup> James VI and I, 'Basilicon Doron', in *Political Writings*, p. 40.

<sup>158</sup> See also the Cromwell manuscript above.

<sup>159</sup> Lake, 'Anti-Popery', pp.72, 75, 82.

<sup>160</sup> Manwood (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18013>, accessed 22 March 2007).

<sup>161</sup> BL MS Add. 38139, fol. 45<sup>r</sup>, Raleigh to king 1618; fol. 192<sup>v</sup>, Watt I wot well; fol. 204<sup>r</sup>, trial notes.

<sup>162</sup> For further discussion on 'Watt I wot well' see chapter four; H.R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p.101.

<sup>163</sup> Peck, *Northampton*, pp.19-21.

about Raleigh, by a secretary who was presumably in support of Howard, adds depth to the hypothesis that this verse was to be read as a political statement in this collection. 'Watt I wot well' is hostile to Raleigh: he is criticised for his ambition and haughty attitude, as well as his responsibility for the demise of Essex.<sup>164</sup> In this way, Manwood has categorised Essex's questioning of monarchical power as loyalty to England, in contrast to the rebelliousness with which Raleigh is charged in the poem, and then further contrasted his heroism with Raleigh's treachery.

This miscellany follows the style of the majority of collections of this period and portrays Essex as the Protestant hero. Here, rather than presenting danger to the English political system and to the crown, he is displaying loyalty to the country by standing by his belief in debate.<sup>165</sup> Manwood displayed this same loyalty to England in his opposition to union with Scotland. It is apparent that Manwood's allegiance is to Essex and not Raleigh, but as Cecil had helped bring about the downfall of Essex as well as Raleigh, we need to ask what this organisation of material in the miscellany tells us, if anything, about Manwood's opinion of Cecil, or indeed, about why he wished to copy Hutton and Cecil's letters into his miscellany at all.

Cecil's letter has been separated from Hutton's, and this distance requires each text to be read as an independent document, but still within the context of the miscellany. If Cecil's letter followed Hutton's it would insist on being read as one narrative; comments made in the letters would receive their context from each other. Cecil's letter would answer and defend the issues made by Hutton. One might presume that Manwood realised that the two letters were a set; Cecil acknowledges receipt of Hutton's letter, but as is the case in most extant copies of Cecil's letter, it is undated, unlike Hutton's. Contemporaries, therefore, might not necessarily make the connection between the two. I would argue that Manwood's choice of texts show that he agreed with Hutton, but respected Cecil's office.

In the context of this collection, Hutton's letter reads as one of a loyal subject petitioning for the good of his country. Several of the items, including Hutton's letter, are undoubtedly anti-Catholic when read in isolation, but when read in the context of the miscellany the implication is that loyalty to the crown and anti-Catholicism go hand-

---

<sup>164</sup> May, *Raleigh*, p.17; see also chapter four.

<sup>165</sup> See pp.82-84, 86, 94 above.



in-hand. Marotti has argued that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries English nationalism was gradually being defined in relation to a Protestant identity and that a language of anti-Catholicism was being used to reinforce English national characteristics.<sup>166</sup> Hutton's letter then falls into this genre of defence of the nation as well as religion. It is in the context of this burgeoning sense of English identity that men like Manwood, who are loyal to the crown, cannot reconcile themselves to union with Scotland.

Manwood's collection is one that advocates service to the crown and loyalty; Cecil was a dutiful servant to both Elizabeth and James. He was instrumental in Raleigh's downfall and it is significant that Raleigh's trial notes (fol. 204<sup>r</sup>) and his letter to the king the night before he died (fol. 45<sup>r</sup>) are copied into this collection. It is Cecil who acts as the hinge drawing together the political matter in the miscellany, although the content of both his and Hutton's letters in their defence of the nation cannot be entirely dismissed.

### 3. Conclusion

Hutton's letter questions the notion of religious unity: it is the duty of the monarch to authorise patterns of religion and therefore to step outside or to cast doubt on this is to risk a disjointed nation. By its very nature a miscellany will contain a variety of texts, some of which may contradict the meaning of others in the same collection, or will seem to do so because of different readings brought to the miscellany by the compiler or the reader. A miscellany invites the reader to reflect or debate all manner of questions contained therein, and on the surface, Hutton's letter is no different. It is when his position as a senior prelate is taken into consideration that his views portray disillusionment.

I have already discussed the wider dissemination of these letters, but when examining them in isolation or in another context or collection it is important to ask whether Hutton or Cecil were talking to a wider audience and, if so, whether they had a particular motive or audience in mind. If Hutton considered his as an 'open' letter, which it appears he did, then to veer away from the established church would have been a bold move. It is also apparent that he was advocating clergy control: that the social hierarchy, as well as the king should take 'advice of the word of God and the best

---

<sup>166</sup> Arthur Marotti, *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern Texts* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1999), pp.xiii, ix.

learned in the same'. This might be for altruistic reasons, but more likely in order to maintain his own power within the church and also within the mechanisms of politics with which he had influence during the previous reign.<sup>167</sup> The letters also convey tension in the relationship between sender and recipient. Cecil claims that both letters will be disseminated through no fault of his own and draws a line between the public and private sections by telling Hutton that 'my ende beinge nowe in serious thinges to shewe yo<sup>u</sup> in priuate what I am to yo<sup>u</sup> aswell as to my selfe'. He elevates his own superiority by refusing to become involved in bickering, condescendingly suggesting that it would be 'impertinent to spende anie time in discourse of y<sup>e</sup>, least men that see the passages betweene vs maie thinke y<sup>e</sup> you & I do bothe of vs forgett our accomptes for other tallentes whi<sup>ch</sup> we haue in keeping'.<sup>168</sup>

The question of audience raises many questions about the culture in which these letters were written, as the comments by Cecil in his reply show that they were turned into something more public. It is unlikely that any of the compilers whose manuscripts have been discussed in this chapter actually influenced the outcome of the points made in Hutton's letter and yet they formed a wider audience for the letters. There are two final conclusions that can be taken from the circulation of these letters: firstly, that figures such as Hutton and Cecil were sufficiently aware of a 'public' to attempt to mould its opinion; and secondly, that those who read and collected their texts were perfectly capable of putting them into contexts their writers might never have imagined.

---

<sup>167</sup> Lake, 'Puritan Bishop', pp.188-189; see further Strype, *Whitgift*, I, 614, Letter from Hutton to Whitgift, 10 October 1589, III, 224-228 (p.226).

<sup>168</sup> MS 22601, fol. 6<sup>v</sup>.

### Chapter 3

#### The Transmission of Political Prose in the Manuscript Miscellany

##### 1. Addressing grievances in early Jacobean England

I assure you, I can very well smell betweene a Petition that mooues from a generall Grieuance, or such a one as comes from the spleene of some particular person, either against Ecclesiasticall gouernment in generall, or the person of any one Noble man, or Commissioner in particular.<sup>1</sup>

In this chapter I consider the two important items of political prose contained in MS 22601 (in addition to the letter exchange discussed in chapter 2 above): the ‘Petition’ and the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’. Both of these texts were composed and transcribed in the period immediately following James I’s accession to the English throne, and I will here provide an analysis of their origins and context, their place in MS 22601, and their wider dissemination. Both texts participate in a broader culture of offering counsel to the monarch, and draw on (as well as sometimes rejecting) conventions associated with forms such as the petition and the ‘pasquil’. It will therefore be important, before I turn to the texts themselves, to consider the place of these forms of advice in early Jacobean England.

One of the topics on James I’s agenda in his speech to the Houses of Lords and Commons at Whitehall on Wednesday 21 March 1609/10 concerned ‘that which the people are to mooue vnto the King’: those matters which his subjects wished to bring to his attention, and ‘the thing which you [his Ministers] call grieuances’.<sup>2</sup> In his speech the king made it absolutely clear that although he was willing to accept grievances and petitions, he was only prepared to do so on his own terms. The matter of grievances was referred to the Lower House, whose members were advised to show restraint in the manner and number of petitions they collected: only those which they considered contained issues worthy of change, and not so many that it gave the impression that there were many issues to complain about within the government. Furthermore, petitions to the king should not meddle with ancient rights or with settled laws and, most tellingly, James asserted that, ‘I must not be taught my Office’.<sup>3</sup> His underlying

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘A Speech to the Lords and Commons of the Parliament at White-Hall, on Wednesday the XXI of March. Anno 1609’, in Sommerville, *Political Writings*, p.192.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p.180.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p.191.

annoyance at being offered advice in the form of petitions was hardly disguised as he told the Commons:

I haue reason to thanke you of the Lower house, I meane for your fire work, wherein I confesse you did Honour to me, and right to your selues: for hauing one afternoone found many Grieuances closely presented in papers, and so all thrust vp in a sacke together, (rather like *Pasquils*, then any lawfull Complaints) farre against your owne Orders, and diuers of them proceeding from grudging and murmuring spirits; you, vpon the hearing read two or three of the first lines of diuers of them, were not content with a publique consent to condemne them, and to discharge any further reading of them, but you also made a publique bonfire of them.

The king additionally expressed his concern that the lower house might become ‘a place for *Pasquils*’ and decreed that all grievances should be passed openly and not ‘obscurely or in the darke’.<sup>4</sup> *Pasquils* were verses which took their name from the anonymous satires that were attached to the statue of Pasquino in Rome. Through the work of Thomas Elyot in the 1530s the term became synonymous with ‘an honest and frank-speaking counsellor, concerned to ensure the welfare of the country before his own advancement or his prince’s comfort’.<sup>5</sup> James’s speech made it clear that he did not care to be advised through such unofficial media.

Like *pasquils* (and sometimes synonymous with them), *libels* were also used as an unofficial means of passing a grievance to the king or his government. William Hudson defined several kinds of *libel*, as

Either by scoffing at the person of another in rhyme or prose, or by personating him, thereby to make him ridiculous; or by setting up horns at his gate, or picturing or describing him; or by writing of some base or defamatory letter, and publishing the same to others, or some scurvy love-letter to himself, whereby it is not likely but he should be provoked to break the peace.<sup>6</sup>

Who were the authors of these *pasquils* and *libels*, and what did they hope to achieve? Many were posted anonymously in public places that related somehow to the complaint in the *libel* itself. James had been unfavourably compared to Elizabeth I throughout his reign, and many manuscript miscellanies, as well as other texts in circulation, display a sense of nostalgia for the queen’s reign. ‘The Coppie of a Libell put into the hand of Queene Elizabeths statue in Westminster by an unknowne person Anno domini <1619> 1621. ultimo Martii. 1623’, or *The Commons Petition* was a plea to the previous

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., pp.189-190.

<sup>5</sup> Colclough, *Freedom of Speech*, p.207.

<sup>6</sup> William Hudson, ‘Treatise of the Court of Star Chamber’, in *Collectanea Juridica. Consisting of tracts relative to the law and constitution of England*, ed. by Francis Hargrave, 2 vols (London: Brooke, 1791), II, 1-240 (II, 100), cited in McRae, *Literature*, p.26.

monarch made sixteen years into the Stuart reign.<sup>7</sup> Why was it necessary to resort to these unorthodox methods in order to be heard? The answer concerns the difficulty facing one of the king's ordinary subjects who wished to offer counsel, and the mechanisms by which the king could hear of his subjects' grievances. The 'Petition' and the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' are two important and neglected political texts whose dissemination can tell us much about how these concerns were addressed in early Stuart England. Before turning to them, however, I want to begin with a more general discussion of the ways in which such texts circulated in manuscript in the early seventeenth century.

The manuscript verse miscellany is, as I have already discussed, by its nature heterogeneous in its contents. How the various texts in a miscellany work together and the impact they have on each other in a collection will be the central questions in this chapter, particularly in relation to these two relatively lengthy political texts. Libels, which appeared in many collections in different forms, as I will discuss, could be written in either prose or rhyme (as William Hudson noted), and both appeared in collections and were disseminated in separates around the city and court. Francis Bacon suggested that the verse libel was 'sometimes contrived into pleasant pasquils and satires to move sport';<sup>8</sup> it was usually witty, reliant on rhyme and easier to recite than the prose libel, which was generally too long for oral dissemination. It was also less likely to be read as serious political comment; a text containing similar sentiments but written in prose might have more potential to be viewed as representative of widespread opinion. The miscellanies of the period contained texts circulated and collected by courtiers, lawyers and those in other professions; in addition, there are texts originating in the universities as well as those that were orally disseminated on the streets by illiterate or semi-literate citizens. The manuscript miscellany, then, crossed social boundaries and provided a link between those who did not have direct access to the king or government to press their grievances, and those who may either have had the opportunity to counsel the king or to recognise unease amongst his subjects. Indeed, as I will discuss in chapter four, verse written by the king himself also circulated among the miscellanies and, in MS 22601, appears alongside petitions which question James's kingship.

---

<sup>7</sup> Marotti, *Manuscript*, pp.85-86.

<sup>8</sup> Francis Bacon, 'Certain observations made upon a Libel Published this Present Year, 1592', in Bacon, VIII, 148.

Some texts, though, were unequivocally oppositional, giving the compiler cause to attach a disclaimer to the text, as Christopher Yelverton did against his copy of the 'Petition' in All Souls MS Y155, or to disassociate himself from the text as John Ferreure did when he sent a set of Machiavellian maxims entitled 'Certain Newe Conclusions' to Sir Henry Spelman, with the following waiver: 'I besech you impute not the profanenesse of the vnknowne Author as a blemish to the guiltlesse writers reputation'.<sup>9</sup>

The most obvious reason to write a petition would be to publish a point of view and, possibly, to alter the opinion of those who might oppose it. A petition is usually oppositional by its nature, thus usually relegating it to unofficial spheres of publication. Nonetheless, these spheres had to offer the possibility of such a petition reaching those with the power to take action. Authors of petitions hoped, it seems, both to speak to a relatively wide audience and to provoke individuals. By 'publishing' in manuscript, an author could remain anonymous and have a wider readership without being subject to the laws of censorship.

It may be the case that the compiler of a miscellany wished primarily to engage with the political debates and current affairs of the day and was not himself actively striving for reform. He could also do this by transcribing a printed text into his miscellany, but a printed text may have been regarded as more 'closed' and with less flexibility than a text (sometimes the same text) in manuscript. Manuscript texts almost invite the participation of their transcribers, it seems, whereas printed texts at least aspire to having the authority of being in their final form.

As I have already pointed out, a compiler of a manuscript miscellany was most likely to receive a text from someone he already knew, professionally, socially, or geographically. This means that the chances increase dramatically that he would take possession of material which directly interested him: there is a degree of pre-selection at work.<sup>10</sup> It makes sense, in other words, that the political sympathies of an individual would be determined and affected by those of the wider social groups or institutions with which he was associated.

---

<sup>9</sup> BL MS Add. 34599, fol. 7<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> See chapter two, pp.58-59.

It is possible, then, that contemporaries would know what circles of people would be likely to read a text in circulation in manuscript even though once it had been copied it was no longer in their control. The full reasons for resorting to informal methods to gain a voice in current affairs or to fight injustice are clear, but among them might be that the composers of these political texts would surmise that those in government office would read them and pass the information on to the king. How was the king to hear of the concerns of his people? He would rely on his ministers to supply him with information, or he could hear of problems via other officials – as we have seen in the case of Archbishop Hutton. It is evident that many petitions did come to his attention in this way. On 25 February 1604 the Earl of Worcester passed a letter from Lord Cranborne, along with an attached petition, to the king. Worcester then wrote back to Cranborne, telling him that the king had seen his letter and as ‘for the petition, he sayd he had seen y<sup>t</sup> before in wrytten hand but neuer in print, he prayed hartely that you may take the printer, for then he assurethe himselfe he shalbe sharply punished’.<sup>11</sup> This illustrates how a petition may come to the notice of the king, although it is curious that he did not think the manuscript version that originally came to his attention was worthy of action. This particular text came to the king’s direct notice but others may have reached circles in which the king also moved.

How, then, was a citizen to pass a grievance through his superiors to the monarch when there were conventions governing the form of such protests? A grievance in a petition was not expected to criticise existing laws or to indicate discontent with the government.<sup>12</sup> Such discontent was, however, precisely what many would have wanted to articulate, and so writers of petitions found themselves in a double bind. Although allowed to present petitions, they were constrained in what those petitions could request. The ‘Petition’ is thus perhaps best viewed as what its contemporary readers would have seen it as: a form of libel, and against the law, whether or not it was posted anonymously. It had little hope of success, moreover: the king, as we have seen, did not like open criticism, and nor did he like information being passed ‘obscurely or in the darke’.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> *HMC Salisbury (Cecil)*, XVII, 70.

<sup>12</sup> David Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2000), p.97.

<sup>13</sup> Sommerville, *Political Writings*, pp.189-190.

The problem of how to bring grievances to the attention of the king was, then, twofold: firstly, it ran the risk of being considered illegal, and secondly, James objected to being told how to rule. As a new ruler, and as one from a different country, there would certainly be changes from the old regime, none more so than on matters relating to religious reform. I have shown in chapter two how the king was not opposed to certain aspects of reform, but was angered that he was disturbed whilst hunting. Lord Thomas Howard was one who knew how to avoid the king's wrath, and told John Harington before Harington petitioned James that 'the roan jennet whereon the king rideth every day must not be forgotten to be praised, and the good furniture above all, what lost a man much notice the other day'. He then explained that a nobleman had placed a suit with the king whilst he was mounting the horse; the king heeded and read the petition but when no answer was given to the nobleman after a second visit to court, Howard pressed the matter with him. James's reply was 'shall a king give heed to a dirty paper, when a beggar noteth not his gilt stirrups'.<sup>14</sup> The nobleman failed in his suit. The author of the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' corroborates the suggestion that James was not opposed to petitions as such, but notes that the king 'doth receiue infinite number of Peticions; and the poore foolishe people think y<sup>e</sup> Kinge hath leisure to <sup>in</sup>attend euery poore mans buisines'; he advises him to rid his hands 'of suche importunacies'.<sup>15</sup>

As the nobility learnt to pander to James's flattery, so they also knew of the implications involved in the wrong choice of words when petitioning the king. In 1605 several Leicestershire gentry with puritan sympathies were warned against proceeding with a petition regarding nonconformity. Later that year the Privy Council questioned Sir Francis Hastings for his part in a Northamptonshire puritan petition which was held to be 'seditious, malicious, factious', and neither local nor sufficiently deferential. The petition stated that a 'thousand are discontented'. Hastings, a Somerset Member of Parliament, argued that the thousand were not 'discontented' but 'grieved' and in 1647 nearly identical words were used to defend a petition dismissed by Parliament.<sup>16</sup> A grievance did not, therefore, have the same disruptive political connotations as a discontentment, which implied more long-lasting dissatisfaction with the regime.

---

<sup>14</sup> Lord Somers, *A collection of Scarce and valuable tracts on the most interesting and entertaining subjects: but chiefly such as relate to the History and Constitution of these Kingdoms* (London: Cadell and Davies, 1809), p.144.

<sup>15</sup> MS 22601, fol. 12<sup>v</sup>. Further references to this manuscript in parts 1 to 3.1 inclusively will be supplied parenthetically within the text.

<sup>16</sup> *HMC Salisbury (Cecil)*, XVII, 165-166.



It is apparent from Lord Hastings' comment (and others which followed), that free speech and the right to petition revolved around the conventions of rhetoric and were subject to the whims of the king. David Zaret points out the discrepancies in early modern society, whereby grievances were expressed by petition and yet politics and the broader social culture were steeped in patronage and deference.<sup>17</sup> Petitions were a means by which citizens could pass political messages to the government and, at the same time, publish their grievances to a wider number of people. Although there were conventions regarding their content and form these were not concrete, and were open to manipulation and interpretation (rather like the politics of patronage). Political matters were generally prohibited from public discussion, for instance, but petitioners were exempt from these 'secrecy norms'.<sup>18</sup> The restrictions, however, were not defined and the line between a petition or a grievance, written or otherwise, that had breached either secrecy norms or other conventions was very fine and was often determined by precedents previously set – as in the case of Lord Hastings' distinction between grievance and discontent.

While the regulation that a petition should not criticise existing laws or show discontent with the government was, in many cases, inherently contrary to the purpose of a grievance, other rules concerning the rhetoric of the petition gave guidelines for mimicking decorum while offering frank counsel. The grievance, it was stated, should be directly experienced and delivered from a local source to a central authority, and it should emphasise the 'deferential, juridical and spontaneous attributes of the grievance'.<sup>19</sup>

## 2. Political prose in the manuscript miscellany

Having briefly described the culture of offering counsel to the monarch in the early Stuart years and the means by which ordinary subjects could be heard by those in power, I will now turn to the texts themselves. What kind of texts, then, are the 'Aduertismen'<sup>15</sup> and the 'Peticion', and how do they connect to the culture of grievances in the early years of James's reign? In this section I will consider their content and purpose in isolation before examining them in the context of other documents.

---

<sup>17</sup> Zaret, p.90.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., p.15.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p.90.

## 2.1. The ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ and the ‘Peticion’: the texts

Despite the peacefulness of James’ accession, many people were sceptical about the new king, and discussions of how best to rule the nation circulated in manuscript miscellanies and commonplace books of the period. One such text, the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’, recognises the ‘infinite number of Peticions’ the king receives, and expresses contempt for those petitioners who believe he has time to deal with all of them. Many petitions, however, appear to have grasped the chance to influence the policy of James in the early days of his reign. Richard Martyn’s open criticism of the old reign in his welcome address to James when he reached the City of London flatters James by contrasting it to the promise of better days ahead.<sup>20</sup> The ‘Peticion’ mostly addresses lingering Elizabethan problems for which the new reign undoubtedly seemed an ideal time for reform, and suggests that now is the time to quash old habits before they become re-established; but it also has one eye on the future. The ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ are openly critical of James: concerns deriving from his reputation, and relating to injustices in the nation that the petitioner believed had arisen since James’s accession, are addressed. Both texts make it clear to James what is expected of him. Several, including Richard Martyn’s address, openly criticised the old reign, thereby implying that the people looked to the future with hope. Criticism of Elizabeth is implicit in the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ and the ‘Peticion’, but in both cases the petitioner is also suggesting that matters need to improve under the new king.<sup>21</sup>

Although the copy of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ in MS 22601 is dated September 1603, internal textual evidence allows scope for it to have been composed at any time between James’s arrival in England in April 1603 and late August 1604, at the conclusion of the Treaty of London, and of peace with Spain.<sup>22</sup> The ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ addresses both domestic and foreign matters: it expresses the popular militant Protestant support for allegiance with the Low Countries and detachment from the French and Spaniards, and portrays a clear understanding of the anxiety which surrounded the new English court as James tried to integrate the Scottish into it. As with the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’, the dating of the ‘Peticion’ is dubious, but its content suggests that it was written after the king’s entry to England. The ‘Dr Taylor’ Manuscript corroborates this: in this chronological

---

<sup>20</sup> *A speach delivered, to the kings most excellent Majestie in the name of the sheriffes of London and Middlesex. By Maister Richard Martin of the Middle Temple* (London, 1603), sig. B1<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>21</sup> Martyn is discussed on pp.142-143 below.

<sup>22</sup> J. D. Mackie, “‘A loyall subiectes Advertisement’ as to the unpopularity of James I’s government in England 1603-4”, *Scottish Historical Review*, 23:89 (1926), 1-17.

Chronicle of Shrewsbury the 'Petition' is placed between a document discussing the poor weather for the end of March and beginning of April and a proclamation dated 27 May 1603.<sup>23</sup> The 'Petition' is mainly concerned with domestic matters that would directly affect the lives of the people, and has the tone of an appeal to the new king, in contrast with the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>'.

The 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' and the 'Petition' use rhetorical strategies which appear to adhere to the guidelines of decorum, but which in fact have the effect of undermining it. Both texts are advisory documents, and this status is made still more evident by their inclusion in manuscript miscellanies of a similar nature to MS 22601 where they take on this role. Both texts are divided into various numbered clauses, although the first number on the copy of the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' in MS 22601 appears to have been added either at a later stage or as an afterthought, indicating that the compiler of this miscellany may have originally perceived the text as a prose narrative rather than a formal petition.

The language of the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' is both humble and manipulative. Its title claims that it is from a 'loyall subiect' but 'drawne from an obseruation of the peoples speaches' and most of the clauses commence with 'It is said'. This distances the author from the speaker, and from any blame, allowing him the freedom to be more critical whilst giving the impression that the advice is for the good of the king and nation. By allowing this distance it also implies that the advice is from a greater proportion of the population, and with this comes the implication of lurking social unrest and of the formation of political factions. The cocktail of flattery and criticism is strengthened by the use of such phrases as 'gratious soueraigne' (fol. 13<sup>v</sup>) and 'right noble kinge' (fol. 14<sup>v</sup>) which, in the context of the grievances outlined, rather than offering their literal humility, begin to sound overly humble, implying a sense of underlying disillusionment and dissent in the ranks of the common people.

The indirect manner of the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' is carried over into the communication of grievances. It follows the style that I have previously shown to be at work in Mathew Hutton's letter to Robert Cecil, in which he deflects the blame from the king for problems in the nation, when it is apparent that the king is ultimately held to be at fault

---

<sup>23</sup> Shrewsbury School, 'Dr Taylor MS', fol. 229<sup>v</sup>.

– the mention of his name in the same context making it absolutely clear. One of the complaints in the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ is that some of the commoners of London ‘haue put out hir [Elizabeth’s] name, where it was engrauen & painted vnder the armes of y<sup>e</sup> kingdomme’, before going onto say that ‘surely theis slaunders be the deuises of y<sup>e</sup> Papistes, arguinge thereby at the defamation of the gossell, it will proue therefore your maies<sup>tie</sup> trulie magnaminous to prouide for y<sup>e</sup> preservation of hir famous memorie by all meanes’ (fol. 16<sup>r</sup>). Like Hutton’s letter to Cecil, this attempts to inform the king of widely held displeasure without either accusing or confronting him. There is also a reflection of Lord Thomas Howard’s advice to John Harington that to counsel the king successfully some flattery is required.

These rhetorical tactics are used to convey information to the king which the author of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ is aware that he would rather not hear. The author undermines his own nationality, if we accept that an Englishman wrote the document, and flatters the king before directly criticising him.<sup>24</sup> For instance, on both occasions in the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ where Scottish domination at court is mentioned various faults of Englishmen are acknowledged before the king is reminded that ‘y<sup>e</sup> kingdome and people of England made you grea’t’ (fol. 14<sup>v</sup>), and ‘let therefore y<sup>e</sup> admirable man<sup>er</sup> of you<sup>r</sup> maies<sup>ties</sup> cominge to so opulent a Kingdome be euer before you<sup>r</sup> eies’ (fol. 16<sup>v</sup>). The flattery is withdrawn as the king is reminded that he is a foreigner who has inherited and been allowed this greatness by those people who are at risk of his neglect. David Zaret suggests that ‘rhetoric in petitions restricted expression of grievance so that it did not invoke or imply “popular will” as a source of authority’.<sup>25</sup> The reverse effect is apparent in the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ (which is not surprising, as the content is overtly opinionated); the ‘Peticion’, however, has a confidential, non-threatening note which detracts from its immediate force, though it may be intended to render it more acceptable.

The ‘Peticion’ is shorter and blunter than the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’, but still too long to be orally disseminated and delivered by memory. Unlike the latter text, though, it is directed straight to its intended recipient in a humble but forthright manner. Each clause in most of the extant copies of the ‘Peticion’ starts ‘Good Kinge’, before making

<sup>24</sup> One copy of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ (Bod. MS Add. D.109, no 69, fol. 148<sup>r</sup>) refers to ‘our countrymen’ as opposed to ‘your countrymen’, implying that the author is Scottish.

<sup>25</sup> Zaret, p.90.

a request. The clauses are short and apparently unbiased, asking for ‘uniformity in true Religion without disturbance of Papist or puritan’ (fol. 10<sup>v</sup>). This petitioner has remained neutral about his political beliefs, unlike the author of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’, whose views that ‘the Pope euen y<sup>e</sup> fire brand of ~~sedition~~<sup>dissention</sup>’ clearly mark him as anti-Catholic (fol. 12<sup>v</sup>). The ‘Peticion’ asks for fairness and for justice and honesty in return, but the final clause tells James, ‘loue vs & we will loue thee, and will spend our harts bloods for thee’ (fol. 11<sup>v</sup>). The concealed threat is that if the king should disappoint the nation in these aspects that he cannot expect support from his subjects, and even as they have petitioned diplomatically this time, their future civility cannot be guaranteed. The text is a warning to the monarch.

The content of these petitionary texts is bound by the need to be deferential and legal and to give the impression of spontaneity, as well as avoiding direct criticism. By remaining remote from the source of authority and invoking ‘popular will’, however, the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ is able to directly criticise policy, and it clearly breaches the accepted conventions of petitioning. Peace was one of James’s priorities on his accession, yet the first clause of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ expresses militant Protestant support for allegiance with the Low Countries and detachment from the French and the Spaniards, arguing that ‘if y<sup>e</sup> Spaniard preuaile against theis poore forsaken men, his forces by Sea are more then trebled; peace will quickly enriche him, wealth will add to his pride; his pride will increase his hatred to you<sup>r</sup> Religion & people’ (fol. 12<sup>f</sup>). This does not appeal to the king; rather, it makes demands which were against current policy and which deliberately eschew the deference expected by the etiquette of petitioning. Cecil was suspicious of the French and the Spanish. The French were capable of emerging as a powerful nation and a threat against England, as were the Spanish. If the Spanish remained at war with the Dutch, however, it would drain their financial and military resources, making it more difficult for them to turn their attention to England. By contrast to the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’, the ‘Peticion’ does not confront government policy and refers only to the welfare of the soldiers who fight the battles.

While the ‘Peticion’ appeals for a settled nation whilst still remaining critical, the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ shows discontent with James’s attempts to integrate the English and Scottish courts. The ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ repeats the accusation that James wanted his closest acquaintances and countrymen in his ‘neerest employment’, but acknowledges that the xenophobic attitudes he had faced in the question of the union were unlikely to

cause him to surround himself with Englishmen in his private spaces. It also recognises the jealousy or ‘foolish gros clawinge’ (fol. 14<sup>v</sup>) of many Englishmen who believed that their previous position in court should allow them entry to the royal presence and who felt displaced by Scots of a lower station. Ultimately, though, the author argues that the government should consist ‘chiefly’ of ‘home-borne men’. The ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’, although in favour of the union, suggests that the tensions between the English and Scots at court could filter down and affect the chances of uniting the countries; furthermore, if these factions are unable to agree within the confines of the court then it is hard to believe that a wider union is possible. If, however, ‘we could forget all difference of nations’, it would be possible to ‘repaire <sup>the</sup> <sup>the</sup> almoste decayed name of great Britayne’ (fol. 17<sup>r</sup>).

While the issue of James’s Scottish followers taking the advantage at court is thus slyly identified as being at the root of the problem, the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ makes it clear that further problems of counsel stem from this. It asks James ‘not to follow the opinion of Rehoboam’s yonge Counsellors’ (fol. 13<sup>v</sup>) – it is possible that the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ had come to James’s attention by the time he reassured Parliament on 19 March 1603[4] that he had no intention of ‘encreasing their burdens with Rehoboam’, emphasising that he did not wish to discard the administrators of the previous regime.<sup>26</sup> While the text expresses a general concern that newcomers, being ‘ignorant of our lawes & customes’, will infiltrate the justice system, it is likely that this complaint is founded on the case of the promotion of Edward Bruce, Lord Kinloss, to Master of the Rolls on 18 May 1603, as many of the judicial offices remained (as James’s speech had indicated) in the hands of Elizabethan lawyers. The legal careers of Edward Coke, Sir John Popham, Sir Thomas Fleming and Thomas Egerton shows that there was a chain of promotion that had traditionally been followed, and whilst Kinloss was well qualified, he had leapt to the top of the chain.<sup>27</sup> Furthermore, the concern of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ is with the potential power bestowed on the Master of the Rolls: in 1563 the office of Lord Keeper was declared equivalent to that of Lord Chancellor and the Master of the Rolls had acted as his deputy. Thomas Egerton was made Master of the Rolls in 1594; he retained this position when he became Lord Keeper in 1596, contrary to usual practice, but the suggestion in the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ is that Kinloss had usurped him.

---

<sup>26</sup> Sommerville, *Political Writings*, p.139.

<sup>27</sup> Mackie, pp.15-16.

Without serious alteration to the law, unity between England and Scotland would not be possible: English common law provided the frame of government and was based on tradition and custom, in contrast to Scottish law. It seems apparent from his knowledge of politics that the author of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ was aware that union of the nations would mean, as Robert Cecil stated on 28 April 1604, that the moment the name ‘Great Britany’ came into being there would be ‘an utter extinction of all the laws now in force’.<sup>28</sup> The ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ thus expresses concern that James would alter the manner of government and the ‘common lawes & customes of England’, thereby making an indirect criticism of his desire for union. The difficult balancing act attempted by the author of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ is most apparent when he directly addresses the issue of petitioning. Seemingly undermining his own position, he calls for James to ‘rid’ himself of ‘suche importunacies’ and send petitioners to the ‘ordinary Courts of iustice ordeyned for the endinge of all differences’. If then, the petitioner does not feel he has been treated fairly, the king should intervene and make an example of him if the accusation has been unjust. While this method would protect the magistrate from malicious allegations and the common people from corruption, it would also demolish the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ itself. Here our petitioner is caught in a Catch-22 situation: perhaps he wants to suggest that his petition is not like others he condemns; or perhaps he wants to present it as the last in this form. Whatever the case, one has the sense that the balance between flattery and criticism can no longer be sustained.

Criticism of both previous and current legal arrangements runs as a thread throughout the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’. Corruption in public office was an issue carried over from the old reign, and one which was unlikely to disappear as officials struggled to prove themselves to a new monarch. As well as suggesting that people are given offices in justice for which they are unfit, being ‘ignorant of our lawes & customes’ (fol. 13<sup>v</sup>; see above), it also argues that a lawyer could do harm to more people than a military officer who had made a mistake. This warning extends further than simple concern over corruption in the legal system to apply to all public offices: James was known to be proud of his judiciary and would be unlikely to tolerate corruption in those quarters (the fall of Bacon in 1621 may be a case in point). Those who held offices allowing access to the king or Privy Council, however, were in a position to accept money above the accepted administration fee. Sir Anthony Ashley was suspended as a clerk on the Elizabethan Privy Council for exacting exorbitant fees from petitioners appearing before

---

<sup>28</sup> Bacon, X, 200.

the council. He was reappointed on James's accession but by 1609 was in prison for carrying on in his old ways.<sup>29</sup>

Underlying the 'Petition' is a sense of the domestic grievances which affect the life of the common man, and the fiscal and judicial system are at the bottom of most complaints within it. Direct criticism is aimed at Lord Treasurer Thomas Sackville, Baron Buckhurst, who succeeded William Cecil, Baron Burghley in the post in 1599;<sup>30</sup> Robert Cecil, Burghley's son and Master of the Court of Wards; officers of the remembrancers in the Exchequer, Thomas Fanshawe and his son Thomas, who succeeded his father in 1601<sup>31</sup> and John Osborne, who succeeded his father Peter as Lord Treasurer's remembrancer in 1578;<sup>32</sup> 'Roper' is likely to be William Roper, Chief Clerk of the King's Bench,<sup>33</sup> and 'Milles' either Francis Milles, Clerk of the Privy Seal or Thomas Milles, Customs Official, whose dispensation was renewed under James and who later wrote several texts defending 'the honest reputation of Her Majesty's Customs'.<sup>34</sup>

In both these petitions the phrasing suggests a formality and reverence that is contradicted by the critical contents. This has a twofold effect: on the one hand, the language attempts to disguise and soften the grievances, while on the other, because language and content contradict one another, an aura of unreliability is lent to their apparent deference. As the 'Petition' deals in generalities and refrains from prescribing solutions to the king, however, it does retain some degree of deference. For example, while the 'Petition' suggests that the king 'let good Preachers be well provided for' (fol. 10<sup>v</sup>), the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' criticises James for a 'kinde of kingly negligence' for not making the public appearances which Elizabeth did, and recommend that his 'maies<sup>tie</sup> must in somme sorte therefore satisfy their iealous affections, or els the poore Rascalls so farre as they dare wilbe angrie with you' (fol. 15<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>29</sup> Robert Folkestone Williams, ed., *The Court and Times of James the First*, 2 vols (London: Colburn, 1849) I, 90.

<sup>30</sup> Rivkah Zim, 'Sackville, Thomas, first Baron Buckhurst and first earl of Dorset (c.1536–1608)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24450>, accessed 13 April 2007).

<sup>31</sup> Sybil M. Jack, 'Fanshawe, Sir Thomas (1580–1631)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/66613>, accessed 13 April 2007).

<sup>32</sup> J.G. Elzinga, 'Osborne, Peter (1521–1592)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20880>, accessed 13 April 2007).

<sup>33</sup> Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'Roper, William (1495–1578)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24074>, accessed 13 April 2007).

<sup>34</sup> John Whyman, 'Milles, Thomas (c.1550–1626?)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/18753>, accessed 2 April 2007).



## 2.2. The ‘Petition’ and ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’: a reading

How seriously the content of these texts was taken by contemporary readers would depend upon a number of factors, among which would be their origin, authorship (known or presumed) and the manner of their dissemination. If a text was regarded by its transcriber as an independent and anonymous libel, its place and purpose in a miscellany might be quite different than if it were thought to be part of an entertainment, for example. When the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ was printed in *The Somers Tracts* the editor remarked that a previous editor had termed it ‘A libel against several proceedings of state’, and said that he was ‘at a loss to discover the reason of so harsh a censure. It does not seem to have been printed, and so could hardly be designed, under colour of giving advice to the sovereign, to point out subjects of complaint to the people’.<sup>35</sup> The distinction made here was not, however, one that people in the seventeenth century would have understood. A text would not need to be printed in order to be deemed (or presented as) a ‘libel’. Moreover, as I will go on to show, this text was widely disseminated (or, as Love would say, ‘published’) in manuscript form in miscellanies of the early seventeenth century. I have, in fact, found no evidence concerning its composition or presentation that would suggest it should be categorized as anything other than what contemporaries would have called it: a libel.<sup>36</sup>

The possibilities for the ‘Petition’ are, by contrast, more various: it may be a straightforward petition to the new monarch, a libel, part of an entertainment, or even an event staged by politicians. There were certainly many witnesses to James’s southbound journey to London who recorded events for their own reasons; the young Lady Anne Clifford recorded events in her diary,<sup>37</sup> while Robert Cecil wrote to Thomas Parry, the English Ambassador to France in Paris, that

wee are now so Ø<sup>38</sup> unexpectedly made the spectakle of happines and felicity, in enjoying so quietly and peaceably of such a Prince, whome, with Salomon, we

<sup>35</sup> Somers, p.144.

<sup>36</sup> Mackie deduces that the ‘loyall subiecte’ was Lord Henry Howard (or 1<sup>st</sup> Earl of Northampton as he became in 1603), on the basis of his anti-Spanish position, his closeness to James (allowing him to be this blunt) and the phrase from Ovid’s ‘Ovidi Nasonis remedia amoris’, ‘Principiis obsta sero medicina paratur’ (resist the first elements – of passion – its too late when you resort to medicine), which appears in the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ (MS 22601, fol. 12<sup>v</sup>) and which Howard used in an undated letter (between December 1601 and April 1602) to James, quoted in *The Secret Correspondence of Sir Robert Cecil with King James VI of Scotland*, ed. by David Dalrymple (Edinburgh: Millar, 1766), p. 60; cited in Mackie, p.7; see also Gabriel Heaton, “‘The Poor Man’s Petition’: Anthony Atkinson and the Politics of Libel”, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 69:1 (2006), 105-120 (pp.110-111).

<sup>37</sup> Lady Anne Clifford, *The Diary of Lady Anne Clifford with an introductory note by V. Sackville-West* (London: Heinemann, 1923), pp.4-12.

<sup>38</sup> The letter was damaged around the edges by the fire at Cotton’s Library 23 October 1731; there are possibly two words missing. Cotton’s library had moved from Cotton House to Essex House in the

very justly call, a wise and vnderstanding Prince, and one by whose long experience in kingly Gouvernement, and all Princely vertues, wee may justly promise our selfs all future happyness,

before relating the facts of the journey, in the knowledge that the French authorities might have had access to the letter.<sup>39</sup> In addition, the events when the king reached Theobalds on 3 May were recorded by Thomas Millington and John Savile.<sup>40</sup> Millington and Savile's accounts of the king's visit to Cecil's home are very similar: Millington records Lord Egerton's speech to the king, which highlights the entertainment aspect of the welcome, whereas Savile chooses to omit this and to include the presentation of the 'Petition'.

All eyewitnesses will have a different account of what they believe they saw at the same event, but these two accounts also show that those around the king had their own reasons for recording the occasion. John Savile dedicated his book to Sir George Savile, and he clearly wishes the reader to believe that it is a simple narrative of events. He records that there were two others with him and that they each stood watch at different points to provide a joint account; they also had a man in the court that led to the Hall to describe encounters between the king and the nobility. As part of the narrative, the reader is told of Savile's intention to publish his 'small remembrance'; these are all tactics which add to the apparent 'truthfulness' of his text.<sup>41</sup>

One of the most interesting details of the king's arrival concerns the way in which English ceremonial formality clashes with the seemingly carefree attitude of the king. Savile's account is meticulous in its detail even in this respect: we are told how the different ranks of nobility ride in formation but that 'his Magestie [was] riding not continually betweixt the same two, but sometimes one sometimes another, as seemed best to his highnesse'. The king's lack of ceremony is corroborated by Savile's remark that those around him were 'obseruing no place of superioritie, all bare-headed'. This may have surprised Cecil, as well as other nobles who had entertained Elizabeth and

---

Strand in 1722 due to deterioration of the room; it moved to Ashburnham House in Little Dean's Yard, Westminster, in 1730 due to the risk of fire at Essex House, and it was here that 200 of Cotton's 950 manuscripts were damaged when a chimney caught fire in the room below that in which they were housed; see Colin G.C. Tite, *The Manuscript Library of Sir Robert Cotton* (London: British Library, 1994), pp.37-39.

<sup>39</sup> Robert Cecil to Thomas Parry, 27 April 1603, BL MS Cotton Caligula E x, fol. 217<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>40</sup> Thomas Millington, *True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Maiestie* (London, 1603); John Savile, *King James his entertainment at Theobalds: with his welcome to London, together with a salutorie Poem* (London, 1603).

<sup>41</sup> Savile, sigs Bi<sup>r</sup>-Bi<sup>v</sup>.

who would have been used to dignified and formal performances based on strict protocol. When the king reached the court 'hee had not gone ten princely paces, but there was deliuered him a petition by a yong gentleman, his Magestie returning him this gracious answeare that he should bee heard and haue justice'.<sup>42</sup>

There has been a dispute about authorship and the manner of presentation of the 'Petition'. James Sutton suggests that the dating of the 'Petition' in the manuscript copy in Exeter Cathedral Library points towards it being a form of Cecilian performance.<sup>43</sup> This text is entitled 'The poore mens peticijon to the kinge at Theobalds the 17 of Aprill, 1603'. Sutton's theory is that it was written under the patronage of the Cecil household, sixteen days prior to the king's reaching Cecil's home, and he supports his argument that it was a sanctioned Cecilian performance rather than a spontaneous greeting by pointing to the fact that several copies of the text have survived. The author, he believes, is someone close to the court, due to their detailed knowledge of current affairs and their wish to discredit Sir Walter Raleigh and Lord Lennox. Sutton believes that the 'poore man' is fictive and further suggests that if the 'Petition' were not staged then a poor man would not have been able to approach the king on a formal occasion in this manner.

Gabriel Heaton, however, has argued against Sutton's suggestion that the presentation of the 'Petition' was part of a 'Cecilian Agenda' on the grounds that Cecil would not further his case by attacking the late-Elizabethan administration of which he had been a central part. He also finds fault in Sutton's notion that it was acceptable for a poor man to address the king with 'politic ideas which would be impolitic if spoken by the elevated host' arguing that it was the councillor, not the outsider, whose advice was most likely to be heeded by James.<sup>44</sup> Heaton argues that the manner of the presentation described by Savile suggests that Cecil did not have total control over events on his estate, and that a 'poor man' would have been able to approach the king in this way: as no reaction to this presentation has been recorded – we only have Savile's account that James accepted the 'Petition' graciously – this remains inconclusive.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., sig. Bi<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>43</sup> James M. Sutton, 'The "House of Cecil"/The Cecils' Houses' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1995).

<sup>44</sup> Heaton, pp.110-111; Heaton's article presents information arrived at independently as well as drawing on my own research.

<sup>45</sup> Heaton, p.111.

As I have pointed out, there are several possibilities for the ‘Petition’ and whilst I would argue that it is a libel, the arguments in favour of it being an entertainment or staged political event are enticing and worth discussing at this point. Although Sutton’s theory that the ‘Petition’ was a sanctioned Cecilian performance is possible, it does not do away with the possibility that someone with a weaker, or even no, connection to the court could have composed the ‘Petition’ in advance of James’s arrival at Theobalds; 17 April could have been the date that anyone wrote the text. Whether this was the case or not, there is no reason that a text would ‘disappear’ because it was not part of a staged event or entertainment, or was not written by someone with Theobalds connections. Copies could easily have been made and circulated prior to its presentation. Sutton’s evidence, therefore, is inconclusive: the ‘Petition’ could have been written as an entertainment or narrative with or without Cecil’s sanction, or composed as a separate petition.

The bluntness of the ‘Petition’ matches the haphazard entry of the king, but there is a more striking similarity between the language used in it and that of Savile’s narrative. Savile refers to the ‘ragged regiment’ being provided for at supper time as well as the ‘poore maimed & distressed souldiers which repaired thether for maintenance’, whose ‘thankfulness is not altogether vnknowne to my selfe’,<sup>46</sup> while the ‘Petition’ requests that the ‘poore souldiors be payd their wages while they be imployed and well prouided for when they are maihmed’.<sup>47</sup> This invites the question of whether the text was designed as a straightforward petition or whether the ‘Petition’ was in fact part of Savile’s narrative (sanctioned by Cecil, or not).

It is worth exploring then, the idea that Cecil was the choreographer of the event – both as host and to orchestrate his own political agenda. As Theobalds was to be the stage for the king’s welcome, Cecil, the host, was the most likely candidate to present an entertainment in his honour. Interesting comparisons can be made between the welcome entertainments presented to Elizabeth along the route of her progresses and as she approached the great houses in which she was to lodge and the presentation of the ‘Petition’ to James on his entry to the home of the nation’s most powerful statesman.<sup>48</sup> When Elizabeth approached Lord Egerton’s House at Harefield in May 1602, ‘At the entrye into the howse place & tyme p<sup>r</sup>esentes Tyme with yellowe haire & a greene

---

<sup>46</sup> Savile, sig. Bi<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>47</sup> MS 22601, fol. 10<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>48</sup> Nichols, *Progresses*, III, 586.

roobe & an hower glasses stopte not running & his winges clipt place in a pretie colored robe like the bricks of the howse'.<sup>49</sup> Here, Time and Place are personified and time is suspended while the visitor is asked to enjoy the pleasures of her stay at the house.

In contrast to this, when the king reached Theobalds he was handed a petition supposedly written by a 'poore man'; he was expected to read his own 'entertainment', which was handed to him by a 'yong gentleman'. It is tempting to question whether a narrative was composed whereby a petition was handed to the king, and that the fictive 'poore man' was intended to be Cecil. I would argue that the term 'poore man' refers to the suitor's circumstances (for which he is petitioning) as well as being a self-deprecating term for someone of more elevated standing; his age, however, may be factual. Elizabethan entertainments were tailored to a prescribed image and weighted with meaning symbolic to the prestige of the Queen. In the Harefield entertainment previously discussed, for instance, the masquer is a mariner and the allusion is to the riches plundered from the Catholic 'carrick' by the fleet of Sir Richard Levison and Sir William Morrison in March 1602, where the Portuguese reported a loss of one million ducats.<sup>50</sup> Likewise, in a 'Dialogue' (fol. 66'), which was acted before the Queen at the London home of Robert Cecil in 1602,<sup>51</sup> the image of the Virgin Queen is cultivated through the myth of Astrea.<sup>52</sup>

In this way, the vivid memory of those lavish entertainments might be recalled to Cecil and his contemporaries and the appearance of a 'poore man' would be poignant given their current plight – but particularly pertinent to the political position of Cecil himself.<sup>53</sup> To present their grievances in the form of an 'entertainment', therefore – a recognised convention in the presence of a monarch – was a way of passing a petition to the king in a subtle manner. The public bravado of Cecil regarding the new reign is apparent in the private letter he wrote to Sir Thomas Parry on 27 April, 1603, but in personal correspondence to his friend John Harington written on 29 May he wrote, 'I

---

<sup>49</sup> The 'Lottery', MS 22601, fol. 49<sup>r</sup>; Beinecke MS fb.9 fol. 40<sup>r</sup>. A copy of this entertainment was enclosed in a letter to Archbishop Hutton from Lord Burghley, the Lord President, on 30 August 1602. Hutton's letter is quoted Hutton, *Correspondence* p.167. A copy of the 'Petition' is also preserved amongst Hutton's papers in the North Yorkshire County Record Office, close to his family home of Richmond, Yorkshire. The folds in the document and outer endorsement suggest that it was sent to Hutton with an accompanying letter, which I have been unable to trace.

<sup>50</sup> Grosart, *Davies*, I, cxi-cxii; see chapter one.

<sup>51</sup> Krueger, p.xliii.

<sup>52</sup> See further Frances Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial theme in the sixteenth century* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), pp.59-69.

<sup>53</sup> Scaramelli, the Venetian Ambassador, believed that Cecil's position was precarious and that Kinloss was the man who mattered in the new government: *CSP Venetian*, X, 10, 18, 21, 33, 34, 46, 47, 49.

am pushed from the shore of comforte, and know not where the wyndes and waves of a Court will bear me; I know it bringeth little comforte on earthe; and he is, I reckon, no wise man that looketh this waye to Heaven'. Significantly, he goes on to warn Harington that it is not worth his coming to London as the king has 'scante roome to sit himself, he hath so many friends as they chuse to be called, and Heaven prove they lye not in the ende. In trouble, hurrying, feigning, suing, and suchlike matters, I nowe reste'.<sup>54</sup> Cecil is fearful about what the new reign will hold for him, and anxious that he might be ousted by those whom he saw vying for the king's attention.

As we have seen, James' gracious acceptance of the 'Petition' was not unusual; but his promise that the petitioner should 'bee heard and haue justice' without further consideration surely was.<sup>55</sup> This corroborates the theory that the 'Petition' was either part of an entertainment, or an event choreographed by Cecil for political means. Heaton has argued against it being part of a Cecilian agenda on the grounds that Theobalds' security was inadequate, and would allow an uninvited suitor to present the 'Petition', whereas Sutton is convinced that such a person could gain access. Alternatively, Cecil may have staged the event, and even if an actor presented the text to the king, it might reflect his views, as it occurred within his home. This might partly explain the king's statement, and willingness to listen; Cecil was, after all, his chief councillor and not an outsider.<sup>56</sup>

The clauses in the 'Petition', apart from numbers 12-15 inclusive, which I will discuss later in this chapter, set out the problems that James might be expected to face in the first months of his reign. Cecil, in his current position, would know that it would be his task to make sure the king was successful in dealing with such problems; if he were not, then Cecil too could be expendable. James's smooth accession was due in part to Cecil's assistance and from their correspondence during the last years of Elizabeth's reign it is likely that James would have been aware that the problems besetting England (and which were under fire in the 'Petition') were not due to Cecil, even though he was a key part of the administration.<sup>57</sup> He would also have been aware of Cecil's skill in managing the country. At the same time he might have been concerned that his own

---

<sup>54</sup> Harington, 'Sir R. Cecil to Sir J. Haryngton, 1603', in *Nugae Antiquae*, II, 263-265 (II, 264-265).

<sup>55</sup> See the presentation of the Royston petition in chapter two, as well as James' reaction to the clergy, chapter two, p.75.

<sup>56</sup> See Heaton, p.122 above.

<sup>57</sup> See John Bruce, ed., *Correspondence of King James VI of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and others in England during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London: Camden Society, 1861).

style of monarchy might not be compatible to Cecil's, making the latter's position in James's government vulnerable. The 'Petition' would set out an agenda to provide a smooth path for the king and his counsellor: a set of ground rules to avoid unnecessary tension. Cecil would have an advantage if the king were 'petitioned' at an early stage. This all suggests that the voice of the 'Petition' could be that of Cecil. Whether he was the protagonist of the 'Petition' or not, he was a shrewd politician who had learned the art of manipulation, but had also learnt enough of James to know that flattery rather than criticism was the way forward. It is also likely that those final two clauses which clumsily aim to set the king against Raleigh and Lennox might have been composed by someone close to the court as Sutton has suggested; but equally, their author may have been anyone who either knew of their reputation or had dealings with them. This did not necessarily have to be connected to Cecil, although he had the motive and means to pass a 'libellous' petition in the form of a conventional and customary entertainment.

The suggestion that the 'Petition' was part of a Cecilian agenda cannot be discounted, then, but the archival evidence insists that it should in any case be defined as a libel. The rivalry of court politics meant that there were many courtiers who had grievances to bear as they clambered for advancement and attempted to take revenge on those who had crossed them. The king was the recipient of many petitions and Cecil is by no means the only candidate for the originator of the 'Petition'. Anthony Atkinson wrote in a letter to James from prison, dated 20 April 1603, of corruption in public office and suggested that if the 'certaine pernicious Catterpillers', the unscrupulous officials were brought to reform his 'Reuenewes may be increased'. The language in the letter is similar to that in the 'Petition', as it complains of the 'unconscionable Lawyer, Attornies, and other wicked persons', who have become rich by 'wronging the poore Commons'.<sup>58</sup> The letter was presented to the king by the author's son, Thomas Atkinson, probably at Theobalds, as he made his way to London; if the 'Petition' was presented along with the letter, this would account for Savile's description that it was presented by a 'yong gentleman'.<sup>59</sup> Anthony Atkinson had previously been involved in libelling Thomas Sackville, Lord Treasurer Buckhurst, for corruption in office and so it is possible that he was the petitioner on this occasion. In a letter to Sir Julius Caesar, dated 16 June 1603, Lord Buckhurst mentions that 'thes lewd fellows Atkinson, Wilkinson & their adherents having bene long close prisoners' are to be examined about

---

<sup>58</sup> BL MS Royal 17 C. IV, fols 1<sup>r/v</sup>.

<sup>59</sup> BL MS Lansdowne, 160, fols 232<sup>r/v</sup>.

publication of a 'scandalous boke against the whole state', and 'who was the maker writer and publisher of that Libell comonly cald the pore mens peticon'.<sup>60</sup> He goes on to suggest that 'it best that you make it your first work of all to view & peruse old atkinsones writings wherein it may be that you may find some copie of the libel & then it wilbe aparant against him'.<sup>61</sup> It appears as though Caesar did make this matter his 'first work' as John Chamberlain wrote to Dudley Carleton on the 27 June that 'Atkinson, Wilkinson, Elson and Cawly the accusers of the Lord Treasurer' were punished. There is no reference to this punishment being for the presentation of the 'Peticion', but it strongly suggests that Atkinson was implicated and that the instigators of the 'Peticion' were widely known.<sup>62</sup>

The 'Peticion' is a warning as well as a critical appeal to the king. There is no way of confirming the date on which it was written, but evidence suggests that it might have been as early as 17 April 1603.<sup>63</sup> If the supposition remains that it was presented on 3 May 1603 at Theobalds, this means that it was composed sixteen days prior to its presentation, and we can assume that the occasion for this had already been arranged. It is clear, therefore, that the 'Peticion' was premeditated; but this also implies that it was factional. It is impractical to suppose that a petition of any length could be spontaneous, but the government's main worry was that a group behind any petition could become strong enough to make a viable protest. Some of the rhetorical and petitionary techniques I have discussed highlight how a petition could have its desired effect. We can see past these techniques, but it is less clear that contemporary readers would have done so. My analyses of the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' and the 'Peticion' indicate that both have lost the impact which it appears that their authors intended, but we know little about how the king reacted to them.

To return to my earlier discussion of the definitions of what denotes a libel, it should be clear that according to contemporary categorisations, both the 'Peticion' and the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' are 'libels'. Behind their traditional rhetoric are various unambiguous criticisms of the king and his countrymen, as well as of his governing powers. I previously asked what the point would be of penning a protest if it were unlikely to be

---

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., fol. 232<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., fol. 232<sup>v</sup>; Caesar's endorsement of this letter confirms that it arrived with a book; this book is in fact the lengthy letter sent to James from Atkinson and preserved as BL MS Royal 17 C.IV.

<sup>62</sup> Chamberlain, I, 154.

<sup>63</sup> Exeter MS 3527.



read by those in authority, or to receive a response. One of the reasons, I suggested, was that a miscellany compiler might wish to enter into discussion or debate on current affairs. But why would they risk the punishment attendant on collecting and circulating libellous texts?<sup>64</sup>

In early modern England, proclamations to the populace were the prerogative of the monarch, although citizens issued libels or critical petitions that were disseminated or posted in public places and challenged the authority of the crown.<sup>65</sup> Discussion of parliamentary proceedings outside parliament was considered to be in breach of parliamentary privilege. The existence of a widespread interest in texts concerning the state of the nation is evinced by the way in which texts circulated in manuscript miscellanies many years after they were composed. Sir Philip Sidney's letter to Queen Elizabeth against her proposed marriage to François, Duc d'Alençon, for instance, circulated in the manuscript collections of those with an interest in supporting either side on its composition in 1579 and the years after, and then there was a loss of interest towards the end of the reign. It reappeared, however, in collections during the Stuart reign as late as 1641, mainly in manuscripts which consider later inter-faith allegiances, or offer comment in times of conflict in the nation.<sup>66</sup> The case of Sidney's letter is a good example of the way in which apparently personal communications were disseminated more widely in order to influence opinion (as we have seen in the case of the letter exchange analysed in chapter two). Such publication flew in the face of official expectations for the presentation of grievances, which were supposed to be passed from their source directly to the intended recipient. The puritan petition given to Archbishop Whitgift (discussed in chapter two) is an example.<sup>67</sup>

### 2.3. The 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' and the 'Peticion' as part of a set

Just as texts were recycled and put to different uses in manuscript miscellanies many years after their original circulation (as I have shown was the case with Sidney's letter), so certain texts, particularly political texts, often travelled together to different

<sup>64</sup> See Bellany, 'Libels in Action', p.110 for the punishment of seditious libellers.

<sup>65</sup> Zaret, p.51.

<sup>66</sup> An example of an early copy of the letter is in the collection of John Harington of Stepney, c.1580, BL MS Add. 46366, fols 100<sup>r</sup>-106<sup>r</sup>, a later copy is in Christopher Yelverton's collection, c.1625-1630, AS MS Y155, fols 306<sup>r</sup>-312<sup>v</sup>. For a full list of manuscripts in which this letter is copied see Peter Beal, *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp.274-280.

<sup>67</sup> See the widely disseminated puritan petition given to Whitgift, chapter two, p.67.

miscellanies (as I have discussed in chapter one). When a group of texts moves from collection to collection we can assume that the compilers who shared these texts had assessed them and agreed that they belonged together. The particular importance of the ‘Petition’, in this regard, is that it is always the non-variable text in the collections I have examined: it gathers around itself a range of other texts, but remains a constant presence in five manuscripts.

This section of the chapter will therefore concentrate on the circulation of the ‘Petition’, treating it as what could be called a ‘hinge text’ which accommodates other texts around it. I have found that other political writing which was widely circulated and popular in manuscript miscellanies of the early seventeenth-century (such as the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’) is not found consistently with the same material. I will establish what else the manuscripts containing the ‘Petition’ had in common, other than the inclusion of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’. Why do some works of a political nature survive and circulate alone and others, like the ‘Petition’, move in the same groups consistently? It is clearly not the case that the ‘Petition’ relies on other texts for its meaning – it is a significant text and of political importance when considered in isolation. Although the same compilers may have had an interest in collecting both of these works for their miscellanies, they may not have moved in the same circles to gain access to them. I have found that there are fewer extant copies of the ‘Petition’, and its circulation seems not to have been as widespread as that of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’. The evidence from the manuscript miscellanies I have examined to date points towards the fact that the ‘Petition’ came into the possession of a particular coterie, was categorized and shared with friends or colleagues, and then remained with a fairly fixed set of texts either because they were circulated together almost by accident and became known as a set or, more plausibly, because there were strong ties of interest which attracted these compilers to the same works. The investigation of the travels of one rather rare text will, I suggest, highlight communities of readers who had similar interests and who were likely to collect the same material.

We now need to establish what the texts are which form a group around the ‘Petition’. Why are these texts attracted to the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ and to certain other texts, and what effect do they have on each other? Whilst tracing the circulation of the ‘Petition’ I have discovered that it is frequently found in the same manuscript miscellanies as two other kinds of political text: firstly, material that looks back to the political situation of the

Elizabethan years, and secondly, contemporary writing which both welcomes and looks with interest to the arrival of the new monarch, often using examples from a former age to illustrate problems in the present.

Certain dominant characters from Elizabeth's reign appear persistently in the miscellanies containing the 'Petition' and the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' in the early Stuart years. Sir Walter Raleigh and the Earl of Essex personified both the splendour of the glorious Elizabethan years and the problems of over-mighty favourites. Raleigh's letters, written immediately after his arraignment and during his time in prison, as well as pieces written by and about him, are commonly found in these miscellanies. Similarly, texts featuring the Earl of Essex are part of this set, although it is noticeable that one item in particular, Lord Egerton's letter to Essex, is invariably in the same compilations as the 'Petition'. Although Essex and Raleigh had become enemies, their fortunes were grouped together by miscellany compilers who were interested in how James would deal with relics lingering from the old reign and with the problem of overbearing royal favourites, and whether he would be receptive to counsel from his subjects. Even after his death, Essex was used as an example by contemporaries to compare the situation of a royal favourite screening the Queen's presence with that of the foreign king progressing through the nation with his Scottish entourage. Meanwhile, Raleigh was one of the many Elizabethan courtiers who were vying for position in the favour of the new monarch at Theobalds.

The church was in a reasonably settled state by the end of Elizabeth's reign, but the advent of an 'untested' monarch brought new worries as well as a flurry of material directly concerning doctrine and also religious policy. Religious debates triggered anxiety about England's place in the world, and over which nations would be allied with England if it moved closer to Catholicism or to puritanism; compilations containing the 'Petition' and the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' were involved in these debates. Likewise, widespread curiosity about James and his court was addressed by records of the courtly tilts and entertainments and the persons present – rather in the way that popular media today offer insights into the lives of celebrities. These courtly entertainments also acted as a link between Elizabeth's and James's reigns, and were a source of comparison of the lifestyles of the two, as well as describing characters both at court and surrounding it (including Raleigh and Essex).

There are two collections containing the ‘Petition’ which do not fit into the categories described above, neither sharing the same types of work nor featuring the ‘Petition’ as a ‘hinge’ text in their collections.<sup>68</sup> I will discuss these before moving onto those that do conform to my model. Nicholas Throckmorton-Carew, who was Raleigh’s father-in-law, copied the ‘Petition’ into his collection of religious meditations and prayers.<sup>69</sup> Throckmorton was the younger son of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton of Warwick, and a known patron of puritan ministers. The second miscellany is in the Holmes family collection.<sup>70</sup> Here the ‘Petition’ has been copied amongst heraldic material dating from the fourteenth century to the early Stuart years, including a list of the knighthoods bestowed at Theobalds as the king progressed towards London in May 1603. This miscellany also contains verse by Thomas Chaloner, a favourite of Robert Cecil, who rode north to accompany the king into England; Chaloner was to become one of the king’s favourites. In these instances the ‘Petition’ seems to have arrived in the miscellanies as an individual text which has been collected purely from personal interest – in the case of Throckmorton because of his religious interests, and in that of Holmes due to his interest in current affairs at the start of a new reign and his links with Cecil. Both men had connections in government circles and possibly had access to this text through these means.

### 3. The circulation of the ‘Petition’

It is tempting to consider the ‘Petition’ and the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ as a pair and to accept them both as inseparable hinge texts, particularly when examining MS 22601 and the Humphreys manuscript (discussed in 3.3. below) where the texts are next to each other; even in the other collections, these two texts are in close proximity to each other. The Wickstede Thesaurus Manuscript is an exception, and makes it clear that the ‘Petition’ (there entitled ‘The poore mans petition to the Kinges highness’) alone is the non-variable text.<sup>71</sup> The ‘Petition’ is copied amongst texts of national interest as in the other

---

<sup>68</sup> See footnote 71.

<sup>69</sup> BL MS Add. 29607, fol. 17<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>70</sup> BL MS Harleian 1925, fol. 1<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>71</sup> Downing College, MS Wickstede Thesaurus fol. 28<sup>r</sup>; other than the ‘Petition’ this manuscript contains texts with which the ‘Petition’ is usually found. It is an interesting example, as the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ has not been copied. The manuscript was compiled by John Wickstede, Mayor of Cambridge, 1613, between the late sixteenth century and the 1630s. It was acquired by John Bowtell (1753-1813), a bookbinder, collector and antiquarian and bequeathed to Downing College after his death. The manuscript is in two parts, the first containing copies of charters and documents relating to the town and University mainly from the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the second containing some works relating to Cambridge but mainly being concerned with national affairs, including the Lord Keeper’s letter to the Earl of Essex and his answer, Sir Walter Raleigh’s letter to Robert Carre, tracts and speeches to parliament, the letter to Lord Monteaule warning him about the gunpowder plot, as well as verses by John

manuscripts, but there is no copy of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ in this manuscript, aiding the supposition that it is best to consider the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ as one of the supporting texts and not as a hinge along with the ‘Petición’.

As I have argued in my introduction, despite the rise of ‘social editing’ and the work of Arthur Marotti, Peter Beal and Harold Love, texts found in manuscript miscellanies are still too frequently treated in isolation. The ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ and the ‘Petición’ have been examined as single documents and the individual circumstances of their circulation have been considered but, to reiterate one of the main points of this thesis, we can develop our understanding of such texts considerably by examining the context in which they were copied. Although I have examined the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ in many miscellanies, and the ‘Petición’ in rather fewer, this section will concentrate on just five miscellanies to which both of these texts have travelled: MS 22601; All Souls MS Y155; Beinecke MS fb.9; BL MS Harleian 3787 and Exeter MS 3527. I will now move on to discuss the place of the ‘Petición’ and the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ in these manuscripts.

### 3.1. MS 22601

The ‘Petición’, like any work in a manuscript miscellany, can acquire different meanings or significance depending on the texts with which it is associated. Before we consider the place of the ‘Petición’ and the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ in this miscellany it is important to consider what the effect is of encountering them together. This question is still more important when they are placed next to each other, as in MS 22601 and the Humphreys manuscript. Although in the manuscripts under scrutiny in this chapter both texts appear, and with similar companions, when the ‘Petición’ and ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ are placed next to each other the issues they raise are reinforced and the tone of complaint intensified. The forthright and more aggressive tone of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ contrasts with the reasoned and respectful one of the ‘Petición’, but as they both make demands of the king, the effect of their juxtaposition reinforces their meaning and even, to some extent, turns them into one longer text. The ‘Petición’ broaches domestic matters gently: the king is asked to ‘looke to thy Takers & Officers of thy house, and to their exceeding fees’ (fol. 11<sup>r</sup>), so that his own allowance is not affected. In a comparable clause, the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ tells the king that he should take more care over through whom and for what reason he spends the nation’s money, which, it argues, could be

---

Davies and ‘The Senses’. The copy of the ‘Petición’ has some significant variants from those previously examined and a transcript is supplied at Appendix C.

better used to reduce the heavy subsidies with which the people had long been burdened, as his ‘coffers are not sayd to be so full as y<sup>t</sup> they neede emptyinge’ (fol. 13<sup>v</sup>).

In MS 22601 the ‘Peticion’, which is immediately followed by the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’, has been placed towards the beginning of the miscellany, along with most of the longer texts in this collection. The opposing views set out in the letter exchange, however, have already indicated that there are various possible readings of what is to follow: the ‘Peticion’ and ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ are preceded by a tilt entertainment at Greenwich, presented to the king and his brother-in-law, the King of Denmark, setting a scene of civil, courtly behaviour, and several love poems with a bitter twist; they are followed by ‘The lett<sup>re</sup> of Si<sup>r</sup> Walter Rawleigh to the kinge after his Arraignmen<sup>t</sup>’ (fol. 17<sup>v</sup>).

The tilt at Greenwich was collected in several miscellanies of the first half of the seventeenth century containing texts of current affairs, as well as those which criticise the king. It is possible that contemporaries reading the entertainment, or indeed, being present at its performance, might make connections between the drunken entertainment held in honour of the Danish monarch at Theobalds on this same visit to England, and the tilt. John Harington described the events at Theobalds in a letter to Master Secretary Barlow, reporting the debauchery of the occasion and complaining that he had never seen such a lack of good order, sobriety and discretion in the days of the old Queen. He concluded that the manners were such that watching the royal party hawking and hunting made him ‘devise the beasts were pursuing the sober creation, and not man in quest of exercise or food’.<sup>72</sup> In this way the description of a seemingly innocent entertainment has the ability to be viewed as a criticism of James.

One very popular text in the manuscript collections of James’s early years was ‘The lett<sup>re</sup> of S<sup>r</sup> Walter Rawleigh to the kinge after his Arraignmen<sup>t</sup>’, written after Raleigh’s arrest for his supposed part in the Bye plot. This text follows the ‘Peticion’ and the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ in MS 22601. The reason for placing this letter in the manuscript, and particularly in this position, might have been as unclear to contemporaries as it is to the modern researcher. The ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ finishes two thirds of the way down folio 17<sup>v</sup> but instead of introducing the next piece on the same page as the work, the compiler has written ‘ensueth the lett<sup>re</sup> of Si<sup>r</sup> Walter Rawleigh to the kinge after his Arraignment’ at

---

<sup>72</sup> Harington, ‘Sir John Harington to Mr Secretary Barlow, 1606’, in *Nugae Antiquae*, II, 126-131 (II, 127-130).

the bottom of the page underneath the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ and started the letter on folio 17<sup>v</sup>. In this miscellany all the available space has been used for text, and although, as I have discussed in the introduction, this makes the placing of names erratic and the attributions unreliable, it shows that the compiler intended Raleigh’s letter to follow the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’. In December 1603 Raleigh had written to the king from the Tower thanking him for sparing his life. Raleigh’s letter in this miscellany is in answer to the king’s reply and his language is that of a dead man. It states that ‘I am nowe but the same earth & duste of which I was made’ and concludes, ‘this beinge the first lett<sup>re</sup>, whi<sup>ch</sup> you<sup>r</sup> maiestie receiued from a dead man’. In it Raleigh professes his innocence of the charges laid against him for participating in the pro-Spanish activity in 1603, but accepts his fate as the will of the king. Raleigh had been accused of ‘inciting’ Lord Cobham to ‘deprive the king of his crown and dignity; to subvert the government, and alter the true religion established in England; and to levy war against the king’.<sup>73</sup> Cobham was disenchanted with the organisation of the new court and had started negotiations to raise Arabella Stuart, James’s cousin, to the throne. When the case came to the attention of the Privy Council, Cobham retracted his own evidence and accused Raleigh instead. Raleigh maintained his innocence, admitting that he was ‘lost for hearinge a vaine man, for hearinge only, and neuer belieuing or acceptinge’ (fol. 17<sup>v</sup>).

Raleigh had fought against the Spanish and had been a favourite of the former Queen; he was as close to Elizabeth as the unpopular favourites of James were to the new monarch. To many people he was the archetypal Protestant hero. When read alongside the anti-Spanish, Protestant opinions in the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’, the letter could be seen, therefore, as an implicit criticism of the king for imprisoning Raleigh. Alternatively, the inclusion of the letter could suggest that the compiler was presenting a balanced view of political events, simply collecting a news item, or even criticising Raleigh himself. Raleigh’s success in the previous reign was a source of considerable envy, and his harsh fall was the subject of many texts found in contemporary miscellanies. The placement of his letter alongside the ‘Petition’ and ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ might indicate that the compiler was in favour of the new court, against Raleigh, and thus sympathetic to the sentiments of Cecil’s letter rather than those of Hutton’s (which, as we have seen, was strongly in favour of the old reign and what it stood for). The ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ could also be read as a damning commentary on Raleigh. It criticises favouritism in the court, and he was certainly a recipient of this in Elizabeth’s reign. Because these texts were

---

<sup>73</sup>Edwards, *Raleigh*, I, 383.

written so early in James's reign, and because they deal with the grievances that were still smouldering from the previous one, they draw attention to the perceived differences between the courts of Elizabeth I and James I over a short space of time. The accusation of favouritism at court applied to both monarchs, but for Raleigh it proved fatal in the new reign.

The political context of Raleigh's letter is apparent when viewed alongside the 'Petition' and 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>', but this is further reinforced by the presence of three poems which mock him and celebrate his downfall. These poems will be discussed at length in chapter four, but it is appropriate to mention the longest of them, 'Watt I wot well' (fol. 64<sup>r</sup>), at this point. The poem is hostile to Raleigh and praises the Earl of Essex for his rapport with the commoners, contrasting this with Raleigh's rejection of their 'gentle salutations' (fol. 65<sup>r</sup>). Essex is seen as the instigator of revenge against Raleigh, bringing about his downfall. Taken on its own, therefore, the letter from Raleigh could be read in a number of ways. The placement of it along with the 'Petition', however, puts it into a specific political context. The inclusion of the poems on Raleigh, particularly 'Watt I wot well', turns the emphasis of the miscellany against Raleigh, again, and he is mocked in one of the final clauses of the 'Petition': 'make not Si<sup>r</sup> W R Erle of Pancridge' (fol. 11<sup>v</sup>).<sup>74</sup>

Sir Edward Coke accused Raleigh of Machiavellian policy at his trial. He had suggested that Raleigh would confer with no one but Cobham in his negotiations to place Arabella Stuart on the throne, as he believed that a single witness would not be able to convict him.<sup>75</sup> In one of the poems in MS 22601 Raleigh is described as a 'mischieuous machiauell' (fol. 63<sup>r</sup>) because of his hounding of Essex, his pro-Spanish sympathies and his ambition.<sup>76</sup> Although Cecil is placed as defender of the state at the beginning of the miscellany, and we assume therefore, that he is on the side of the king in the 'Petition', his ambition and that of Raleigh and Essex is similar to the advice given in the 'Maxims'.

---

<sup>74</sup> The last two clauses in the 'Petition' refer to the 'Duke of Shorditche' and the 'Erle of Pancridge' (Pancras); archers were given the names of mock nobles in archery contests: 'A remembrance of the worthy show and shooting by the Duke of Shoreditch and his Associates the worshipful Citizens of London' cited in Centre for Metropolitan History, 'Newington Butts', *The Environs of London: volume 1: County of Surrey* (1792), pp.389-398 (<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/45386>, accessed: 25 May 2007)..

<sup>75</sup> Edwards, *Raleigh*, I, 393.

<sup>76</sup> 'Wilye Watt', discussed in chapter four.



The 'Maxims' (fol. 18<sup>v</sup>) are made up of a series of short clauses, Machiavellian and self-serving, celebrating private interest above public service, and their audience would have been politicians and those moving in court circles. They advocate doing wrong as long as the blame falls elsewhere, switching allegiances and using people to suit the circumstances. It is significant, therefore, that the compiler has chosen to place them immediately after Raleigh's letter to the king. This arrangement may have been chosen deliberately to question Raleigh's sincerity and to express the compiler's attitude towards the hypocrisy of those in power. I have found these maxims only in two other manuscripts, and one manuscript containing their 'answers' (which will be discussed in the section below on the Yelverton manuscript).<sup>77</sup> The first of those to contain the 'Maxims' is Folger MS V.a.321, the letter book of John Conybeare (1579-1594), where they have the title 'Certein Principles, or Instructions: from a greate man of this Land to his best beloved Sonne'.<sup>78</sup> The second copy, entitled 'Certayne newe conclusions' was enclosed with a letter sent from John Ferreur to Sir Henry Spelman on 25 October 1600; both the letter and 'Maxims' are preserved in BL MS Add. 34599.<sup>79</sup> The 'Maxims' are a satirical or perhaps comical version of the advice to sons or daughters literature prevalent at the time, one of which, the letter of advice from Lord Burghley to Robert Cecil 'before 31 August 1589', shares the volume with 'Certein newe Principles'.<sup>80</sup> The 'Maxims' are an alternative form of advisory document to the 'Petition'. They conclude with the phrase 'subditorum virtutes regibus formidolosae', referring perhaps to the terrible virtues of the king's subjects, and it is likely that contemporaries might have read them as a form of apology for the criticism in the 'Petition' and 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>', especially when the Latin tag is taken into consideration.

There are initial similarities between the 'Petition' and the 'Maxims'; both, for example, are written in short straightforward numbered clauses. However, these similarities are then outweighed by differences. One is addressed to the king; the other to one of his politicians or courtiers; the 'Petition' asks for justice and honesty from the king, ending with 'loue vs & we will loue thee, and will spend our harts bloods for thee'

<sup>77</sup> The only place that I am aware of these 'responses' being acknowledged is Krueger, p.445.

<sup>78</sup> See A.R. Braunmuller's edition of this manuscript, p.106, also chapter two above, footnote 95. The manuscript contains texts of a similar political nature to those in this study as well as the compiler's personal letters.

<sup>79</sup> BL MS Add. 34599, fol. 7<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>80</sup> Folger MS V.a.321, fol. 56<sup>v</sup>; advice literature is discussed in S. Lee Ustick, 'Advice to a son: A type of seventeenth-century conduct book', *Studies in Philology*, 29 (1932), 409-41; Agnes M.C. Latham, 'Sir Walter Raleigh's Instructions to his son', in *Elizabethan and Jacobean Studies, presented to Frank Percy Wilson*, ed. by H. Davis and H. Gardner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), pp.199-218; see further Nicholas Breton, *The vncasing of Machivils Instructions to his son* (1613, STC 17170 and 3704.3).

(fol. 11<sup>v</sup>), whilst the ‘Maxims’ warn that it is wise to disregard others and that one should ‘Loue no man but thy selfe, or if any man do it for thy selfe’ (fol. 18<sup>v</sup>). A.R. Braunmuller argues that in Folger MS V.a.321, where the ‘Maxims’ follow texts on the Earl of Essex, the ‘Maxims’ may be irrelevant to what precedes them or they may be an attack or post-mortem on Essex.<sup>81</sup> Although we cannot know the intentions of the compiler for certain, it appears likely that the ‘Maxims’ did function as a comment on Raleigh in MS 22601, and that as these texts follow each other, one piece impacts on and adds meaning to those surrounding it. The ideas in the ‘Maxims’ provide an alternative view of Raleigh to that presented in his letter.

Another complicating factor in establishing how contemporaries would have read the ‘Petition’ in MS 22601 is that we also find in the first section of this compilation a song entitled ‘In praise of Peace wi<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Spaine’, separated from the ‘Maxims’ by courtly love verse, similar to that which is copied before the ‘Petition’, and immediately preceding a selection of James’s poetry. The song glorifies James, ‘that makes this league of vnity’, whilst disparaging the more militant policies of Elizabeth’s reign:

where hatred Battell, sword & warre  
in former Raigne bare swinge & sway  
our peacefull Kinge to end y<sup>t</sup> iarr.

This song has a rousing chorus (‘sound organs cornets cherefull voice | for happy Peace lett all reioyce’) and remains respectful; the final verse even prays

that subiects loue may neuer cease  
so shall we liue in quiet rest  
& Kinge & Subiects both be blest. (fol. 23<sup>v</sup>)

This, along with the song’s optimistic and hopeful tone and admiration for the king (reinforced by the proximity of verses written by James), allow the ‘Petition’ to be read as pro-Spanish – a view which is, however, not entirely warranted as it remains neutral about the issues in the song.

An examination of other texts in the miscellany does not give a clearer answer to whether the ‘Petition’ is included merely as an item of interest or as an indictment of the new government. They rather reflect opposing views suggestive of a nation in flux. ‘O thou prodigious monster’ (discussed in chapter four) laments the passing of Elizabeth I and condemns those who forget her so quickly in order to woo the new monarch. It is critical of those who appeared to be her friends, flattering and

---

<sup>81</sup> Braunmuller, p.28; Folger MS V.a. 321, fol. 14<sup>r</sup>.

worshipping her and those in power while they furthered their own means, but deserting her memory after her demise. It warns that ‘suche misery on Princes lyues attend y<sup>t</sup> whilst they liue y<sup>ei</sup> cannot know their frend’ (fol. 38<sup>r</sup>). It highlights Elizabeth’s mistakes, but also serves as a caveat to those in political circles. The poem’s author proclaims in stanza thirteen:

yet one there is which on thee did attend  
 whose minde immaculate doth well retaine  
 The Duties both of Seruant & of frend  
 Whi<sup>ch</sup> she professed, when y<sup>ou</sup> here didst raigne,

thereby validating the final lines of the poem: ‘God Graunt he y<sup>t</sup> succeedes may well peruse h[ir] / and free himselfe of suche as did abuse hir’ (fol. 38<sup>v</sup>). A hand is drawn from the margin pointing to both these sections, indicating that the king should be warned to choose his friends carefully and beware flatterers. It is ironic that in the following years, these concerns would cause such disillusionment with the monarchy. Since Raleigh’s name was on the folio preceding his letter, it seems reasonable to assume that the compiler wanted the inscription, ‘Si<sup>r</sup> Thomas Areskine of Gogar, Knighte’, to be attached to ‘O thou prodigious monster’. The attribution is at the bottom of folio 36<sup>v</sup>, at the end of a section of James’s poems, and ‘O thou prodigious monster’ commences on folio 37<sup>r</sup>. It is unlikely, however, that Areskine wrote the poem. The language in stanza thirteen above indicates that its author was either a woman or one using this identity as a cover due to its inflammatory nature. Areskine, however, may have supplied the poem to the compiler as a warning to James; and either he or the compiler (most likely the latter) accentuated this warning by drawing attention to the poignant phrases marked with a pointing finger. James was highly security-conscious and so Areskine, as James’s Captain of the Guard, would benefit if James believed that he required this security. His prominent position at court, and the fact that he was in James’s confidence, was likely to place him in opposition to Cecil, who may have been one of the flatterers referred to in the poem.

Sir John Davies’s ‘Trenchers’ (fol. 40<sup>r</sup>) offer advice to the categories of people whom the ‘Maxims’ teach their readers to deceive. The ‘Petition’ asks that ‘good Preachers be well prouided for, and without any bribery comme to their liuinges’ (fol. 10<sup>v</sup>), and the ‘Trencher’s’ ‘Diuine’ says that he will not ‘followe Princes Courtes nor worldly maisters serue’, or ‘growe riche and fatt while my poore flock doth starue’ (fol. 40<sup>v</sup>) – there is, of course, an implication that these practices are in fact commonplace, and that

the speaker has too much information about malpractices to be totally innocent of them. The irony of the 'Trenchers' could make the 'Petition' and other texts in support of James appear sycophantic: the courtier of the 'Trenchers' insincerely claims that he has not learned how to be a deceitful hypocrite whilst at court; the implication to contemporary readers might be that the speaker of the 'Petition' is just that, and that the sentiments offered in the 'Maxims' show the way to advance at court.

My suggestion in chapter one that the compiler of MS 22601 was close to the king, but not necessarily in agreement with his policies, is corroborated by the advisory, rather than critical, approach taken in the 'Petition'. Likewise, the oppositional political views of the texts in the miscellany are a reflection of his decision to collect material relevant to current affairs and to offer no single opinion. On the other hand, we know that our compiler most likely had puritan inclinations and these are not evident in the 'Petition'. If, as I have argued, however, it is one of several texts offering different perspectives on the early years of James's reign, what effect does it have on the overall reading of the miscellany? It does not attempt to sway the reader in any particular direction, but does highlight problems which were inherited from Elizabeth's reign and which had the potential to continue in James's. When these issues are viewed against texts such as Raleigh's letter, the 'Trenchers' and the 'Maxims', the 'Petition' appears to assume an insincere edge. It is possible that contemporaries might view the clauses of the 'Petition' and wonder how change is possible: individual characters such as Elizabeth and Raleigh might change, but the basic conduct at court remains the same. Viewed thus, the 'Petition' invites the question of why things should be any different in this reign, since court politics have not changed.

### 3.2. All Souls Manuscript Yelverton 155 (Yelverton Manuscript)

An initial study of MS 22601 revealed that the texts were mainly related to questions about how court matters affected politics. This information led to the examination of several manuscript miscellanies which contained similar documents, and in which I found the 'Petition' to be the pivotal text.

An important manuscript in this group is the Yelverton manuscript, containing papers from the collection of Christopher Yelverton. Yelverton was born in 1536 in Norfolk into a family of lawyers. He entered Gray's Inn in 1552 and eventually went on to

become a judge and a member of parliament. Contemporary diarists, including John Manningham, a fellow lawyer, noted that although he was a staunch puritan he was not averse to enjoying himself in the company of gentlewomen into his seventies and liked nothing better than ribald anecdotes and risqué conversation.<sup>82</sup> The collection entered the library of a London book collector, Narcissus Luttrell, possibly in 1679, as this date is entered on the flyleaf in his hand. The manuscript was deposited at the Codrington Library, All Souls College, Oxford in 1786 as a gift from Luttrell Wynne, a fellow of the college, heir to the Luttrell collections and the grandson of Narcissus' sister Dorothy. On 4 May 1936 and 19 February 1957 Sotheby's sold other sections of Wynne's inheritance to Professor James Osborn, a Luttrell scholar who later donated them to the Beinecke Library at Yale.<sup>83</sup>

It is important when examining a manuscript that we consider whether it was originally compiled as a collection and if it was placed in that order by its compiler. Although the Yelverton manuscript was compiled mainly from the papers of Christopher Yelverton there are texts in it by, and relating to, his son Henry, and his wife Margaret, including a copy of a letter written to 'good mist<sup>res</sup> Yelverton' from Thomas Cartwright, commiserating over the sickness of her son. Several of these texts are personal items of no newsworthy value.<sup>84</sup> Christopher died in 1612, and it was probably Henry who was responsible for the collation and binding of the manuscript during the 1620s and early 1630s; there are indications that it stayed within the family until its acquisition by Narcissus Luttrell. There is, however, clear evidence that a large proportion of the papers in the manuscript were kept together by Yelverton, and can therefore be discussed as a 'collection'. We can confirm this by the inclusion of several texts which generally appeared with the 'Petition', but in particular by the presence of the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' and the answers to the 'Maxims' – 'An Encounter to certaine wicked and blasphemous propositions beginning thus: Loue none but they selfe, made by some most wicked Atheist'. Furthermore, Sir John Davies' works, some of them rare, are scattered throughout the manuscript, which would indicate that they were disseminated to the same source – Yelverton. That he and Davies were acquainted makes it credible

---

<sup>82</sup> Manningham, p.77; 'Yelverton, Sir Christopher (1536/7–1612)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30213>, accessed 25 May 2007).

<sup>83</sup> Stephen Parks, *The Luttrell File: Narcissus Luttrell's Dates on contemporary pamphlets 1678-1730* (New Haven: The Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, 1999), p.13

<sup>84</sup> AS MS Y155, fol. 111<sup>r</sup>; Patrick Collinson, 'Cartwright, Thomas (1534/5-1603)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4820>, accessed 24 May 2007). Further references to this manuscript in part 3.2 are supplied parenthetically within the text.

that the poet passed the texts directly to Yelverton. The collection has been rebound, probably during the mid nineteenth century; it appears, however, that the leaves were replaced in their original order, as they agree with an alphabetical index on folio 396<sup>r</sup>. It seems that a mistake has occurred in the pagination – possibly when it was rebound, as the problem has been resolved in the index; following folio 74, for instance, is 74a. One hand has been used to copy the main text and the ink is the same colour throughout, although there are personal explanatory titles and notes written in a later hand. The texts do not follow one another chronologically, and yet the book is well laid out with few cramped texts and gaps, indicating that it was most likely copied, largely at one time by the same person.

The ‘Petition’ (fol. 5<sup>v</sup>) and the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ (fol. 15<sup>v</sup>) are copied towards the beginning of Yelverton’s manuscript. There are many similarities between this miscellany and MS 22601, but although these texts are similarly proximate in the Yelverton manuscript, here the reader is not invited to consider them as a pair. Their separation by other texts highlights the ‘Petition’’s status as the ‘hinge’ text and leads the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ to be read as an independent political text to be read in conjunction with and supporting the ‘Petition’ in the group of manuscripts under discussion in this chapter.

The initial texts are assertions of monarchical power, the first of which is the celebrated speech that became known as the ‘Queen’s Golden Speech’ to Parliament on 30 November 1601 (fol. 1<sup>v</sup>).<sup>85</sup> It was copied into many manuscripts throughout the seventeenth century as an example of royal benevolence and willingness to redress public grievances. In it Elizabeth states that she ‘never was any greedy scraping grasper, no<sup>r</sup> a straight fast holdinge prince, nor yet a waster, my harte was never sett on any worldly goodes, but onely for my subiectes good’ (fol. 1<sup>r</sup>). In the case of royal grants of monopolies, she told parliament that she would not tolerate any that would be oppressive to her people. It is striking that this text which was directed towards Elizabeth’s subjects was still valued by miscellany compilers into James’s reign, its meaning having been transferred to James’s subjects, but also for its historical interest. It is not clear whether Yelverton collected this document when it was actually delivered or at a later date, but his inclusion of it in this manuscript appears retrospectively to

---

<sup>85</sup> Printed in *Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), pp.335-344.

glorify the Elizabethan reign (even though Elizabeth suffered criticism during her final years) by its implied comparison with James's, in order to highlight the perceived grievances of the Jacobean years.

'The States to the Duke of Alba' is found on the recto of the 'Petition'. The Duke of Alba, Ferdinand de Toledo, was sent to the Netherlands by Philip II in 1567 to purge the territories of religious and political dissatisfaction (fol. 5<sup>r</sup>). His approach was so aggressive that the Council of Troubles, which he established to solve the problem, became known as the 'Council of Blood'.<sup>86</sup> The Queen refers to the Duke in a speech given on 19 December 1601, also copied in this manuscript (fol. 2<sup>v</sup>), where she tells Parliament that she never strove for war but that there was less chance for moderation at the coming of Alba.

The texts do not follow one another chronologically, but nonetheless the first folios of the manuscript show how a diverse group of texts from an earlier age are linked by the themes they discuss, especially in their comparisons between good and bad rule. The next text, however, leaps into the Jacobean age: in closely-written script, squeezed onto the verso of 'The States to the Duke of Alba' is the 'Petition' (fol. 5<sup>r</sup>), another advisory text which appears appropriate in this section, but this time one with a menacing tone of expectation (fol. 5<sup>v</sup>). Then follow two more explicitly positive Jacobean items. The first is a letter that must have been familiar to James as he formed his new court; in it Francis Bacon declares his devotion to James, praises him, and describes his worth (fol. 6<sup>r</sup>).<sup>87</sup> The next is a more traditional welcome, entitled 'The speech of mr marten an vtter barrester of the midle temple to the kinge: 7<sup>o</sup> maij, 1603' (fol. 7<sup>r</sup>). Richard Martyn was a gifted orator and barrister of the Middle Temple, and he and Sir John Davies had been close friends until a disagreement in late 1597 or early 1598 incited Davies to beat Martyn with his bastinado on 9 February in the Hall of the Middle Temple before absconding.<sup>88</sup>

Martyn's speech was cleverly spun, probably by Cecil, and its purpose was twofold: to flatter the king, and to demonstrate to his subjects that he would listen to their

---

<sup>86</sup> Marcus, *Elizabeth I*, p.350.

<sup>87</sup> In the letter Bacon offers his service to the new King; he starts by honouring Elizabeth and recalling the memory of his father, as a token of service and loyalty, before praising James's virtues. The letter is printed in Bacon, X, 62-63.

<sup>88</sup> Manningham, p.7; see also p.113 above.

grievances. The privy councillors had the advantage of knowing that James would bow to flattery. They had also contrived that he would solve his first grievance immediately, gaining the early admiration of the population: prior to the king's entry to London, Cecil had drafted a proclamation announcing the suspension of monopolies.<sup>89</sup> Martyn's speech opens by mourning Elizabeth and praising James's princely and 'eminent virtues' (fol. 7<sup>v</sup>). The speech then becomes noticeably sterner; it tells the king that England is looking for 'an admirable goodnes, a particuler redresse' (fol. 7<sup>v</sup>) under 'an uncorrupted kinge' (fol. 8<sup>r</sup>). It goes on to censure heavy taxation, greedy lawyers and the sale of benefices, and asks for reform in the church and in the monopolies system, covering problems that were also set out in the 'Petition', and which had beset Elizabeth's reign (fol. 8<sup>r</sup>). As should by now be clear, one of the questions raised by the material collected in these miscellanies is how the new king would deal with the difficulties he had inherited. The welcome speech makes it apparent that his subjects – and his courtiers – were asking for reassurance that there would be change. As Elizabeth aged it would have been clear that any changes would only last as long as she did; the accession of a new ruler meant an opportunity to make their voices heard, and to mould decisions that might last James's lifetime. This was an ideal opportunity for Cecil and the Privy Council to demonstrate the king's willingness to listen to and act on the grievances of his subjects, so after Martyn's denunciation of monopolies came the announcement to suspend them. Another text in the manuscript showing the early benevolence of the king is 'The kinges l<sup>e</sup>ttre for the deliverie of the Erle of Southampton'; James ordered Southampton's release from the Tower whilst he was still in Scotland (fol. 106<sup>r</sup>).<sup>90</sup> This act, however, also had political implications: Southampton was one of the followers of the Earl of Essex and had been incarcerated in the Tower since Essex's ill-fated revolt. James's actions in support of the remnants of the Essex faction potentially placed him in opposition to those members of Elizabeth's government against whom Essex had revolted, including Cecil, as well as to the memory of the queen herself.

Following these public texts comes one that would normally be classed as more private: a prayer by Elizabeth. When such a text 'accidentally' becomes public, however, the reader might have a sense that they are seeing the secret side of the monarch; the secret side presented here is, unsurprisingly, a positive and virtuous one. The original version

---

<sup>89</sup> Croft, *King James*, p.50.

<sup>90</sup> Peck, *Mental World*, p.135.



of ‘Her maies<sup>ties</sup> prayer’ was written on the eve of the Cadiz expedition in May 1596 (fol. 10<sup>r</sup>). Walter Bouchier Devereux states that a messenger was sent with a farewell letter from the Queen to Essex and a dispatch from Cecil containing her private meditation or prayer for the expedition.<sup>91</sup> Leah Marcus suggests that the prayer was sent by the Queen with her farewell letter,<sup>92</sup> and Thomas Birch noted that that the Queen composed a prayer to be used daily in each of her ships. However, this was a private prayer of which Cecil procured a copy and sent it to Essex.<sup>93</sup> Elizabeth prays to God as the ‘omnipotent maker and guider of all worldes masse’, as one who can see into all souls (but particularly hers) and can see that although the English are going to do battle with the Spanish ‘noe malice of revenge nor quittance if iniury nor desire of bludshed not greediness of lucre hath’ driven them to it. It is understood that the omnipotent God is on the side of the English and the Protestants, however, as she asks Him for victory ‘with the least loss of Englishe bloude’(fol. 10<sup>r</sup>).

Much of Christopher Yelverton’s career was during Elizabeth’s reign so it is to be expected that many texts relating to Elizabeth or the old reign feature in the miscellany. Several of these texts, though, merge the person with the office and thus become more generally applicable. ‘Reasons offered against Queen Elizabeths marriage w<sup>i</sup><sup>th</sup> ye Duke of Anjou’ and ‘Earl of Essex his conspiracy against Queen Elizabeth’ for instance, are most definitely public documents, both in their circulation history and in that their outcome would affect the political structure of the nation – yet the former particularly touches matters very personal to the queen (fols 306<sup>r</sup> and 312<sup>v</sup>).

Other texts transcribed in Yelverton’s manuscript include Lord Egerton’s letter to the Earl of Essex and his reply (fols 64<sup>v</sup> and 66<sup>v</sup>), in this case preceded by Essex’s ‘silly bees’ poem about political disfavour (fol. 63<sup>r</sup>) and six items relating to Raleigh: a letter to Robert Carr entitled, ‘S<sup>r</sup> Walter Rawleighs letter to one who had begged his estate’ (fol. 353<sup>r</sup>); a letter Raleigh wrote the night before his death in the gatehouse, titled, ‘A prayer’ (fol. 144<sup>v</sup>); the letter Raleigh wrote in 1603, ‘S<sup>i</sup><sup>r</sup> Walter Rawleigh to his wife’ (fol. 100<sup>v</sup>); a short ‘Account of ye triall of sr Walter Rawleigh’ (fol. 293<sup>r</sup>), as well as two poems, ‘The Lye’ – above which the compiler has inserted, ‘Satyr on all thinges’

---

<sup>91</sup> Devereux, *Earls of Essex*, I, 345.

<sup>92</sup> Marcus, *Elizabeth I*, p.425.

<sup>93</sup> Birch, *Memoirs*, II, 18.

(fol. 18<sup>v</sup>)<sup>94</sup> – and ‘Watt I wott well’, below the title of which is inscribed a heading: ‘On Sir Walter Rawleigh’ (fol. 181<sup>v</sup>). There are copies of the letter exchange between Hutton and Cecil (fols 177<sup>v</sup> and 178<sup>v</sup>), of items debating the merits of the Oath of Allegiance, including a work by a major Catholic theologian (‘Cardinall Bellarminus, lettre to M<sup>r</sup> Blackwell’ (fol. 327<sup>v</sup>) of 28 September 1607 in which he takes issue with Blackwell’s decision and reasoning in taking the Oath) as well as the warning letter to Lord Monteagle regarding the gunpowder plot (fol. 261<sup>v</sup>) (unusually, this copy lists the ingredients and other implements stored for the assault on Parliament). A poem mocking puritans (fol. 180<sup>v</sup>) is copied immediately after Cecil’s reply to Hutton and ‘Reasons for peace with Spain’ (fol. 80<sup>r</sup>). The targets of ‘On a fart’ (fol. 240<sup>v</sup>), and ‘England’s Knell’ (fol. 239<sup>r</sup>) are dependant on the circumstances of their copying: the former might be read as being critical of parliament, or of the Lords, whilst the latter satirises the Scots, the king and all English institutions, including Yelverton’s own profession – both may also be jokes reserved for an exclusive professional audience.<sup>95</sup> Yelverton’s connections with courtly circles are evinced by the inclusion of entertainments such as the tilt before James at Greenwich in 1606 (fol. 248<sup>r</sup>) and before the King and Queen Anne at Theobalds in 1607, when Cecil handed over his house to them (fol. 319<sup>r</sup>).<sup>96</sup> His connections with legal and parliamentary circles are also represented: ‘A Dialogue’ was performed before the Queen at Cecil’s Strand house on 6 December 1602 (fol. 118<sup>r</sup>). Manningham remarked that there were ‘sundry devises; at hir entraunce, three women, a maid, a widdowe, and a wife, eache commending their owne states, but the virgin preferred’.<sup>97</sup> As I noted above, it is apparent that Sir John Davies had connections with Yelverton, as the manuscript contains poems which are rarely found in other manuscript compilations, and which bear similarities to poems in Davies’ holograph and in the Leweston Fitzjames manuscript, Bodleian Add. B.97.<sup>98</sup> Amongst personal documents relating to Yelverton’s career, such as ‘The serjeantes ringe for the quene when I preceeded seriante’ (fol. 68<sup>v</sup>), is a prayer he wrote for the

<sup>94</sup> Further references to ‘The Lye’ will be regularized to this spelling throughout the rest of this thesis, unless it has a different spelling in the manuscript under discussion.

<sup>95</sup> The fart was Henry Ludlow’s response to the chief messenger from the Upper House; see further Michelle O’Callaghan, *The Shepherds Nation: Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture, 1612-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), pp.76-77; McRae, *Literature*, pp.40, 108; ‘Early Stuart Libels’, p.cli.

<sup>96</sup> Before this folio is a handwritten note stating ‘this is a first draft of the Entertainment of King James and Queen Anne at Theobalds written by Ben Jonson when Lord Salisbury handed the house over on May 22 1607’. The final form of the text is in the folio of Jonson’s *Workes* (London, 1616), pp.887-890; another copy of the first draft is in BM Add MS 32218, ff.23<sup>v</sup>. This is signed by P. Timpson, Librarian at All Souls, 24 June, 1940.

<sup>97</sup> Manningham, pp.150-151.

<sup>98</sup> Krueger, pp.412, 445. Krueger argues that Yelverton received most of his copies of Davies’s work directly from the author.

opening of the House of Commons in 1597 entitled, ‘When I was speaker of the parliamen<sup>t</sup> A°39 and presented to the Archbishops of Canturburie to have his allowance whoe stracke out the worde that hereafter followe to be stricken out’ (fol. 62<sup>r</sup>). The words which the Archbishop struck out were part of the prayer which is still in use to this day, but the comments against it link this text directly to Yelverton.

Is it a coincidence that the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ precede one of the Raleigh texts in this manuscript, and what effect does this have on a reading of the ‘Petition’? We can only guess at why a contemporary would prefer to arrange texts in a particular order, but it is intriguing to note that just as the compiler of MS 22601 placed ‘The lett<sup>re</sup> of S<sup>r</sup> Walter Rawleigh to the kinge after his Arraignmen<sup>t</sup>’ after the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’, Yelverton placed ‘A satyr on all thinges’, or ‘The Lye’ (fol. 18<sup>v</sup>), after the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’. The ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ occupies only a small part of the recto of the folio and ‘The Lye’ is transcribed on the verso, thereby leaving a considerable blank space in contrast to the rest of the collection. From this we can deduce that the juxtaposition of these texts is probably intentional, and that Yelverton perceived a link between them.

I have shown how some texts were applicable to the Elizabethan and Jacobean eras, but it is also the case that some texts can be used to back up different views. One compiler may have an entirely different purpose for a text from that of his acquaintances, but it is surely not coincidental that it is a Raleigh text that follows the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’. Texts about Raleigh which have circulated from MS 22601 will be discussed at length in chapter four, but it is necessary to ask at this point what it is about Raleigh that makes texts about him so popular in compilations which centre around the ‘Petition’. Texts about Raleigh offer various readings: he is treated both with sympathy and aversion in the miscellanies (collections from the time of his imprisonment in 1603 are harsher than later ones, which tend to use him as an example to glorify the past); likewise, the ambiguity of the texts themselves allows multiple readings and so offers a higher chance of manuscript publication – the texts can be moulded to suit the compiler’s point of view.

It is the choice of Raleigh text that follows the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ which is interesting. It was the gravest form of insult to contemporaries to tell them that they lied so what does this say about the texts surrounding the poem, particularly the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’? ‘The Lye’ describes Raleigh’s disillusionment with the institutions from which he was

banished after his exclusion from court due to his secret marriage to Elizabeth Throckmorton, and is a farewell to his life there. Yelverton's positioning of this poem might therefore reflect his own disillusionment with the institutions described in the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>'.

In the same way that 'The Lye' appears to answer the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>', the king replies to Richard Martyn's oration in 'The kinges letter to the Citie of London', delivered in March 1603 (fol. 108a<sup>v</sup>). In this way it appears as though a political statement is presented and then answered, suggesting an interest in political discussion.

Another indication of the way in which the significance of a text can alter according to its position in a manuscript and the compiler's intention can be seen in the case of a rare political satire known as 'England's Knell' (fol. 239<sup>f</sup>).<sup>99</sup> The knell is for the demise of England's institutions, which are allowed to decline while the monarch pursues his sport:

The king he hawkes, and hunts;  
The Lords they gather Coyne;  
The Judges doo as they weere wont;  
The Lawyers they purloyne.  
The Clergy lyes a dyeing;  
The Commons toll the Bell;  
The Scotts gott all by lying,  
And this is Englands knell.

In Bodleian MS Malone 23 this is placed in a section devoted to events in 1628, with a particular interest in the assassination of the Duke of Buckingham. In this position the poem blends in with its surrounding texts, and 'Englands Knell' becomes one of the political statements towards the end of this manuscript. In the second half of Yelverton's manuscript, however, it is surrounded by comical ditties such as that on the serving man (fol. 242<sup>v</sup>), an entertainment entitled 'Challenge to tilt & turnary' (fol. 248<sup>f</sup>) which has acknowledged the title given in MS 22601 – 'O yes, o yes, o yes' – and 'On a fart' (fol. 240<sup>v</sup>). In the Yelverton manuscript, therefore, the poem is one of a number of miscellaneous texts with no specific context to aid their interpretation, whereas in the Bodleian manuscript the reader is being asked to read it specifically in the context of the events of 1628. In this way it is the content of 'Englands Knell' which is prominent in the Yelverton manuscript, presenting political dissatisfaction and

<sup>99</sup> Marotti, *Manuscript*, pp.85-86; Marotti states that this satire is found in no other Bodleian or British Library manuscript other than Bodleian MS. Malone 23; I have consulted copies in AS MS Y155, fol. 239<sup>f</sup> and Beinecke MS b.356, fol. 135<sup>v</sup>.

disillusionment towards the end of the collection in contrast to the optimism hinted at in the beginning of the manuscript and particularly in the 'Petition'.<sup>100</sup>

I have suggested previously that Elizabeth's speeches were copied as exemplars of royal willingness to redress public grievances. Many of the promised reforms did not in fact materialise in her reign, yet they were held up as an ideal. The 'Petition' was delivered in the first days of James's reign, and the concerns in it were ones inherited from Elizabeth's years, so at the beginning of the manuscript is a set of problems posed by Elizabeth and then solved by James. While the issues denounced in Martyn's speech were immediately cured, however, other texts in the collection then go on to show a sense of disillusionment, and this is reflected in the 'Petition'. The hopes that the king's decisions could be influenced and even that he could be moulded to some extent, raised when the text is read in isolation, disappear as it is read alongside other texts in the collection.

### 3.3. Beinecke Manuscript Osborn fb.9 (Humphreys Manuscript)

The Yelverton manuscript and the Humphreys Manuscript were both part of Narcissus Luttrell's vast collection of books and manuscripts. Whilst the Yelverton manuscript remains at All Souls, the Humphreys was one of those sold to Professor James Osborn and later donated to the Beinecke Library at Yale.<sup>101</sup> It is one among Osborn's collection at Yale which contains the 'Petition', although there is no sign that Narcissus Luttrell, who originally led me to this manuscript, was a former owner of the compilation. The Humphreys manuscript, as well as the last two collections in this group, looks back to the years of Elizabeth and forward into James's reign, and all contain similar texts.

As with most of the miscellanies examined here, we can only guess at the compiler's motives in collecting and placing the texts as he did; there are no internal clues offering suggestions and only a few dates. Items in the manuscript relate to events from the 1570s to 1606; they are not organised chronologically, but are linked to a common theme: that of loyalty to the monarch and, through this, to a group of characters at court. The leaves are sewn together with leather cord and the manuscript is wrapped in its

---

<sup>100</sup> Ted-Larry Pebworth discusses how one poem has been appropriated for individual purposes in 'Sir Henry Wotton's "Dazel'd Thus, with Height of Place" and the Appropriation of Political Poetry in the Earlier Seventeenth Century', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 71 (1977), 151-169.

<sup>101</sup> See pp.139-140 above.

original binding (paper covered with parchment). There were originally two leather ties on the front and rear, but the latter are missing. The contents are tidily placed, but not neatly written, in one secretary hand throughout and it is almost certain that the contents were arranged in this order by their original compiler.

The name 'John Humphreys' is written in the centre of the first leaf of the manuscript. I have found no clues leading to a definite identification of him, but there are indications that he was the provost marshal at Brill when the soldiers on the Queen's payroll in the Low Countries were being reduced to strengthen the Irish forces.<sup>102</sup> If this were the same Humphreys, it would follow that he may have had an interest in military matters and in Essex's Irish campaign and rebellion, as well as in the related issues of welfare and policy addressed in the 'Petition' and the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>';<sup>103</sup> he would also have moved in the same professional circles as other figures in this manuscript.

The manuscript is mainly concerned with conspiracy, particularly that surrounding Elizabeth. The 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' and the 'Petition' are the last items in the manuscript, and it is only with these texts in the final leaves that it is evident that the content has entered the Stuart years. More than half of the manuscript is directly devoted to the Earl of Essex, and the remainder of the collection revolves around a tight band of men with court connections. I will now turn to some of the texts that share the miscellany with the 'Petition'.

The conspiracy against Elizabeth was martial as well as religious; both were a threat to her rule and the issues involved merged; the first item in the manuscript is a reflection of this. This is the 'Arraignement of Robert Earle of Essex' at Westminster on 9 February 1601; amongst those presiding on the 'Queenes Counsaile' was Christopher Yelverton (fol. 1<sup>r</sup>). This is followed by 'The Confession of Sir Charles Danvers at his execution on Tower hill ye 14 March 1600 [i.e., 1600/01]' (fol. 19<sup>r</sup>); 'The Confession of Sir xofer [Christopher] Blunte at his execution' on the same date (fol. 20<sup>r</sup>); 'A collection of the speaches in the Starre Chamber touching of the Traiterous conspiracy of the Earle of Essex' (fol. 22<sup>r</sup>); 'The Lord Keepers letter to the Earle of Essex' and his reply (fols

<sup>102</sup> *CSP Domestic, 1598-1601*, p.244; *Acts of the Privy Council of England, 1542-1631*, ed. by John Roche Dasent, 46 vols (London: HMSO, 1890-1964), XXIX, 137, 440.

<sup>103</sup> Beinecke MS fb.9, fols 46<sup>r</sup>, 42<sup>r</sup>. Further references to this manuscript in part 3.3 will be supplied parenthetically within the text.

23<sup>v</sup> and 24<sup>v</sup>) and ‘Queene Elizabeths lettre: or prayer for the prosperous successe of the Earle of Essex at Calse’ (fol. 33<sup>r</sup>). Danvers and Blunte were both implicated in the Essex conspiracy: Danvers had turned his attention to Essex after his military career had been blocked when the Queen refused to send him to Ireland after he was nominated Colonel,<sup>104</sup> and Blunte had married Lettice Knollys, Leicester’s widow and Essex’s mother, and assisted his stepson in his failed attempt to seize the court.<sup>105</sup>

Essex’s threat was martial, but Elizabeth’s reign had been threatened by Catholicism. In this manuscript there are a number of texts that treat the issue of the Catholic threat: ‘The Queene of Scottes letter to Anthonye Babington’ (fol. 27<sup>r</sup>); his reply (fol. 27<sup>r</sup>); ‘Verse made in Scotland 20 yeares past & nowe come to paste’ (fol. 27<sup>v</sup>); ‘Anthony Babington’s Leter to her Maies<sup>tie</sup> Queen Elizabeth after his arraignment’ (fol. 28<sup>r</sup>); ‘The Queenes lettre to Sir Amyas Paulet’ (fol. 28<sup>r</sup>); ‘To her most excellent majes<sup>tye</sup>’ from Francis Throckmorton asking for forgiveness after his death sentence for implication in catholic treason (fol. 29<sup>r</sup>); the Catholic Chidiok Tichborne’s prison poem ‘My prime of youth is but a frost of cares’ (fol. 30<sup>r</sup>); an account of the execution of Mary Queen of Scots (fol. 37<sup>r</sup>) and the pleas of a suitor to court claiming that he has been wrongly accused of being a lover of papists (fol. 39<sup>r</sup>). All of these texts treat religious opposition to the current regime, as well as revealing the attacks on the political stability of the nation from an ‘enemy within’.

‘The ambassadors oration of Powlande’ (fol. 31<sup>r</sup>) is illustrative of the obstacles put in the way of foreign forces by the queen. In this text, dated July 1577, Elizabeth is accused of mistreating the Polish merchants due to their bonds with the Spanish. Her reply, which was originally delivered in Latin but appears in this manuscript in an English translation, accuses the ambassador of ignorance and his king of not knowing how to manage foreign affairs, as well as contemptuously forgiving him for being chosen by right of election rather than right of blood (fol. 31<sup>v</sup>).<sup>106</sup> The Queen tells the ambassador ‘that when hostility interposeth herself between princes, it is lawful for either party to cease on withers provisions for war from whence soeuer deriued and to

<sup>104</sup> Paul E. J. Hammer, ‘Danvers, Sir Charles (c.1568–1601)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7132>, accessed 10 March 2005).

<sup>105</sup> Paul E. J. Hammer, ‘Blount, Sir Christopher (1555/6–1601)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2685>, accessed 10 March 2005).

<sup>106</sup> Elizabeth’s rebuke to the Polish Ambassador appears in many miscellanies of the early seventeenth-century, including Folger MSS V.a.321 and V.b.214; BL MS Harleian 6798; see also Marcus, *Elizabeth I*, pp.332-335.

forsee that they be not conuerted to their owne hurts' (fol. 33<sup>r</sup>). This exchange is placed between Tichborne's poem and the Queen's prayer, although the blank verso of her reply might indicate that another item was designed to separate the two texts. It does not obviously fit in with the manuscript's concern with conspiracy, but as well as highlighting Elizabeth's authority, it offers the implicit message that the Crown will not assist those who could turn against it: religious and martial force were equally dangerous.

Essex, Danvers, and Blunte were all professional soldiers and official defenders of the state; in his confession Danvers asked that the country might be defended from its enemies, especially Spain (fol. 19<sup>r</sup>). Whilst travelling through Italy in 1593, however, he was attracted by Catholicism, and in Rome he allegedly 'kyst the Pope's toos'.<sup>107</sup> On his return to England he was arrested and spent two weeks in the Marshalsea prison before convincing the authorities of his loyalty to Elizabeth. Christopher Blunte had a Catholic upbringing; after matriculating from Hart Hall, Oxford (a notorious shelter for Roman Catholics in the University), he went to the Catholic College at Douai instead of taking his degree. When the college was forced to leave Douai in 1576, he went with Francis Throckmorton to Paris and became involved with supporters of Mary Queen of Scots; Sir Amyas Paulet, the English Ambassador at the time, warned him about these connections. He later profited from having a foot in both camps by arranging that Mary's communications from prison were exposed to the authorities, which indirectly led to the detection of the Babington plot.<sup>108</sup> Although Danvers and Blunte had Catholic tendencies, their actions described above suggest that they recognised where the line had to be drawn: Spain remained the enemy and their Catholicism would not encroach on their loyalty to England. The manuscript thus reminds us how inseparable religion and politics were in this period. Throckmorton was also involved in a Catholic conspiracy in 1583 whereby the duke of Guise was to lead an invasion of England, release Mary and secure a degree of toleration for English Catholics. The plot was foiled and he was executed in 1580.<sup>109</sup> Amyas Paulet was Mary's last jailor; when the French and Scots were urging Elizabeth not to carry out the death sentence against Mary, Elizabeth suggested to Paulet that he should privately put Mary to death under his oath under the Bond of Association. His refusal meant that he was guilty of perjury, but

<sup>107</sup> Lambeth Palace Library, Bacon Papers, MS 649, fol. 431<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>108</sup> Blount (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2685>, accessed 10 March 2005).

<sup>109</sup> Alison Plowden, 'Throckmorton, Francis (1554–1584)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* ([www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27390](http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27390), accessed 11 April 2007).



Elizabeth later thanked him for his judgement, and the letter is included in this compilation (fol. 28<sup>r</sup>).<sup>110</sup> Robert Cecil is another link between the texts in these manuscripts. He was close to the Queen, related to Danvers by marriage, and sent copies of Elizabeth's answer to the Polish Ambassador and allegedly her private prayer written for Essex to him in Calais. His speech in the Star Chamber focuses on the relationship between Essex and the Queen and describes her personal hurt at Essex's betrayal (fol. 22<sup>v</sup>).

In addition, the later texts in the collection display an interest in matters at court: 'The coppie of a lettre wrytte<sup>n</sup> Willia<sup>m</sup> Dodington esqui<sup>r</sup> had in his pocket when he threw him selfe downe vpon st Pulchers church London', signed at the bottom by 'the unhappie William Dodington' (fol. 36<sup>r</sup>),<sup>111</sup> is followed by the account of Mary Queen of Scots' death; the suitor to court accused of Popery; the 'Lottery'; (fol. 40<sup>r</sup>); and, finally, the 'Aduertisment<sup>is</sup>' and the 'Petition'. William Doddington hurled himself from the tower of St Sepulchre's Church in Newgate on 10 April 1600, the day before he was due to stand at the Star Chamber. He said he had been perjured and was unable to stand the slander, 'which caused me to chuse rather to die with infamie, than to liue with infamie & Tormente'.<sup>112</sup> Doddington had matriculated at St John's College, Cambridge in 1545 and was nominated the next year as a fellow or scholar of Trinity College, where he took his degree and went on to become a lawyer and to marry Francis Walsingham's sister, Christine.<sup>113</sup> There was interest in the incident at court: only two days after Doddington's suicide Rowland Whyte, employed by Sir Robert Sidney to relate court matters, wrote to him from Baynards Castle that 'Dodington, rich Dodington, yesterday morning went up to St Sepulches steeple and threw himself over the battlement, and broke his neck. There was found a paper sealed about him, with the superscription, "Lord, save my sowle, and I will praise thy name"'.<sup>114</sup> The story of his death became anecdotal: Francis Bacon referred to it in conversation with the Queen the following year when discussing the Earl of Essex, commenting that 'if I do break my neck, I shall do it in a manner as Master Dorrington did it, which walked on the battlements of the

---

<sup>110</sup> Russell, p.241.

<sup>111</sup> His tale is also copied into manuscripts relating to Cambridge matters, including Downing College MS Wickstede Thesaurus, fol. 28<sup>r</sup>; BL MSS Lansdowne 99, fol. 88<sup>r</sup>; Add. 5815, fol. 138<sup>v</sup> and 5821, fol. 209<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>112</sup> BL MS Add. 5821, fol. 209<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>113</sup> Charles Angell Bradford, *William Dodington: A Tragedy of St Sepulchre's, Holborn, in 1600* (London, 1933), p.125.

<sup>114</sup> Arthur Collins, ed., *Letters and Memorials of State, in the Reigns of Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth, King James, King Charles the First, Part of the Reign of King Charles the Second, and Oliver's Usurpation*, 2 vols (London: Osborne, 1746), II, 187.

church many days, and took a view and survey where he should fall'.<sup>115</sup> It appears that Doddington was known at court, most likely through his personal and professional connections, but it is possible that the high degree of interest in his death was due to the financial difficulties which were to result in his appearance at the Star Chamber. Anthony Higgins, apprentice to the London stationer Thomas Purfoote, had circulated a broadside setting out the details of Doddington's death, but the ballad was not registered and does not appear to be extant. The Privy Council met at Greenwich Palace on 4 May 1600 and issued a warrant to suppress the 'scurrilous rag'. The Acts of the Privy Council on 4 May 1600 contain a warrant to the master and wardens of the Stationers' Company which refers to 'a certaine pamphlette or ballade towching the death of William Doddington', which 'wee thinke it verie unmeete to be published'. Copies of the pamphlet were to be seized and delivered to Dr Stanhope, a Chancery lawyer,<sup>116</sup> further indicating that Doddington's name was to be protected.

Although the contents of this manuscript are not arranged chronologically, the compiler does appear to have grouped certain texts together; in the case of the Essex material the order of events dictates the order in which the texts appear. A distinction has also been made between Elizabethan and Jacobean texts (although 'A suitor to court wishes to be seen by the soueraigne' is located between the account of Mary's death and the 'Lottery' ('Her maies<sup>tie</sup> entertainment')). We cannot know for certain what the compiler's own interpretation of the texts was, but the pledge of loyalty to the monarch and the denunciation of Catholicism in the suitor's text suggest that its content had been categorised and distinguished as useful to bolster the pro-royal concerns in the manuscript. The suitor made his plea to the monarch later than January 1606 (fol. 39<sup>r</sup>), but I would argue that the compiler of this manuscript has decided to focus on the content of this text rather than its date.

What picture do the contents of this manuscript portray? It is one of monarchy under threat – overtly in the Essex coup, and more subtly in Tichborne's verse – and of thwarted conspiracy, in the Catholic plot. Devotion to Elizabeth, however, is also evident: there is no sign that the compiler sympathised with Elizabeth's enemies. There is a cluster of texts between the Essex material and 'The ambassadors oration of Powlande' which is related to the Catholic conspiracies, but 'Verses made in Scotland

---

<sup>115</sup> Bacon, X, 157-158.

<sup>116</sup> APC, vol. XXX AD 1599-1600, p.289.

20 yeares past & nowe come to paste', which are undated, link the political and religious concerns of the texts in the collection. These prophetic verses are copied between Babington's reply to Mary Queen of Scots during her imprisonment and his letter to Elizabeth after his arraignment, and refer to the unstable state of Scotland and the foiled Catholic conspiracy, lamenting the condition of the 'poore scot'. I would argue that the title was given to the 'Verses' at the time they were copied into the Humphreys manuscript; in the context of this miscellany it serves as a warning to James that although Mary has been executed the Catholic threat is still apparent.

The 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' and the 'Peticion' are copied as a pair in this manuscript, with the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' first (as in MS 22601). Neither text, however, is dated (something that is not unusual in this manuscript), making the texts more general in their application. The copy of the 'Peticion' in this collection does not contain the offensive clauses which fix the date, and if it were not for the direct address to the king it would be applicable to either reign – the 'Peticion' and 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' petition for issues which were relevant to James and Elizabeth. However, because these two texts are linked, and the contents of the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' place it securely in the Jacobean era, both texts have become associated with reform in the new reign. Likewise, the sentiment of the suitor to the court can also be applied to either reign – but the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' and the 'Peticion' are separated from this and the rest of the manuscript. The compiler has thus created a division between the Elizabethan years and the Jacobean with the effect (and possibly the intention) of reflecting dissatisfaction with the Stuart monarch.

In MS 22601 the meaning of the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' merged with that of the 'Peticion' because they were copied as a set. How, then, is the Humphreys manuscript different if the same applies here? The texts surrounding the set in MS 22601 alter their reading, whereas in Humphreys the texts are set aside at the end of the manuscript. Significantly, the section of the 'Lottery' that is copied into this collection starts with the entry of Time, and Place remarks 'well come good tyme Tyme,' and 'fare well tyme are you not gonn doe you stay' (fol. 40<sup>r</sup>) – further marking the end of one reign and the beginning of another.

#### 3.4. Exeter Cathedral Manuscript, Dean and Chapter 3527 (Exeter Manuscript)

The Reverend Canon Howell of Exeter received a letter from his colleague, Mr R. Polwhele, at nearby Newleigh Vicarage, on 2 December 1823 with a request on behalf of

Mr John Nichols, editor of *The Gentleman's Magazine*. Howell was asked to copy 'Richard Martyn's speech' and the 'Petition' from a particular manuscript in the Cathedral Library for Nichols, who wished to illustrate the progresses of King James I – these copies were destined for Nichols' *Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*.<sup>117</sup> Nichols claimed that 'the following singular production, whether the same I cannot determine, I have obtained', and printed the 'Petition' from the Exeter Cathedral library manuscript.<sup>118</sup> Nichols's desire to print the 'Petition' is an indication of its revived significance in illustrating the demands that were placed on James at his entry into England.

The manuscript was rebound in the nineteenth century, when it is likely that the title *A collection of state papers in the time of James I* was assigned to it by librarians. The library catalogue, printed in 1697, lists it as 'Speeches, petitions and letters belonging to the first year of James I', and from this it is clear that the manuscript has resided in Exeter Cathedral since the late seventeenth century; I have been unable, however, to clarify the first eighty years of its history.<sup>119</sup> It is written in one secretary hand throughout and the pagination matches this hand, indicating that the contents are in their original order. The 'Petition'<sup>120</sup> is towards the beginning of the miscellany, preceded only by Richard Martyn's 'Speech delivered to the Kinge at his neere approach to London' (fol. 1<sup>r</sup>), whilst the 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' is towards the end of the compilation (fol. 24<sup>r</sup>). It is tempting to suggest that the compiler arranged the contents thematically: the 'Petition' was written, and possibly presented, prior to Martyn's address, which as I have discussed, discreetly sets out the subjects' hopes for the new king and is followed in the Exeter manuscript by 'The Catholiques supplicacion to the Kinge' (fol. 3<sup>v</sup>), a petition from his 'maies<sup>tes</sup> most devoted servantes the Catholiques of England'. We can only speculate about the compiler's methods of organisation, and as the manuscript consists of similar material collected over a short time span it is possible that there was no planned arrangement. There are no wasted spaces in the book, and it appears to have been written largely at one time; if the 'Petition' and 'Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>' were viewed as a set they would certainly have been placed together as a pair.

---

<sup>117</sup> Nichols, *Progresses*, I, 127.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 127.

<sup>119</sup> Edward Bernard, *Catalogi Librorum Manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae* (Oxford, 1697), p.351<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>120</sup> Exeter MS 3527, fol. 3<sup>r</sup>. Further references to this manuscript in part 3.4 will be supplied parenthetically within the text.

The earliest text is the letter sent in 1599 from the Lord Keeper to Essex and his answer, which is copied into all the manuscripts under discussion in this chapter that contain the ‘Petición’ and the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’, other than MS 22601. The latest text copied is ‘His maies<sup>ties</sup> speech in the parliament howse’, delivered on Saturday 9 November 1605. James begins by telling Parliament that the purpose of this speech was originally to thank them and congratulate them for accepting him as their monarch, but thanks are now due instead for the ‘miraculous deliuerie he hath at this time granted to me, and to you all, and consequently to the whole body of this estate’ at the hands of those plotting to destroy the Houses of Parliament (fol. 21<sup>r</sup>).<sup>121</sup>

The manuscript is a collection of items of interest in the early years of James’s reign: the majority of the texts in the miscellany are petitions and pieces of advice to the king on issues raised in the ‘Petición’ and ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’: fiscal and legal questions and foreign and domestic policy, including matters surrounding the union of Scotland and England.

As we have seen, the collection opens with Richard Martyn’s address to the king on his arrival in London on 7 May 1603 (the copy of the ‘Petición’ in MS 22601 also bears this date); it is followed by the ‘Petición’, and then the Catholics’ petition. ‘Obiections against the changing of the name or stile of England and Scotland into the name or stile of great Britaine’ (fol. 11<sup>r</sup>) are followed by a copy of Sir Walter Raleigh’s letter to the king after his arraignment, which is also copied into MS 22601. Another letter to the king, from a prisoner in the Fleet Prison this time, declaring his innocence, follows Raleigh’s letter. No name has been ascribed to the letter but ‘Mr Burgess’ is written in the margin in the same hand as the text – this prisoner was incarcerated for preaching seditious sermons so it is plausible, considering other texts in the miscellany, that it refers to John Burgess of Waddesden, one of the Royston petitioners involved with the Northamptonshire puritan group.<sup>122</sup> Following a letter to the king from the ‘Inhabitants about the Cittie’ wishing James well in his reign, but also pressing their concerns and reminding James of the numbers there who were threatened with deprivation (fol. 15<sup>r</sup>) is ‘The Petición of the Gentlemen of Northamptonshire’ (fol. 15<sup>v</sup>) and ‘The humble petición of 22 preachers in London and the suberbs thereof, 18 January 1604’ (fol. 16<sup>v</sup>), both concerning matters of subscription.

<sup>121</sup> ‘A Speech in the Parliament House’, Somerville, *Political Writings*, p.147.

<sup>122</sup> See chapter two, pp. 69, 75, 79, 84, 91-92.

‘The coppie of the kinges letter to the Parliament in the nether howse of Commons 1 May 1604’ (fol. 10<sup>v</sup>) and ‘His maies<sup>ties</sup> speech in the parliament howse’, delivered on Saturday 9 November 1605, represent the king’s voice in the miscellany. His address on 1 May 1604 was instigated by the continuing opposition of the English Parliament to his proposed title of King of Great Britain, as well as to his plans to unite England and Scotland.<sup>123</sup> James had himself proclaimed King of Great Britain on 24 October 1604, without the approval of Parliament.<sup>124</sup> His gratitude in his speech after the gunpowder plot was dispensed with after the first folio, and his address turned once again to the matter of union. James mirrors the content of the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’, which follows this speech, in his acknowledgement of England as the greater of the two nations and of its Parliament as the ‘fittest place for a king to be in’ (fol. 22<sup>r</sup>).

The last item in the miscellany appears to be a resolution to a problem of both foreign and religious policy: ‘Articles of peace between England and Spain, 19 Aug 1604’ (fol. 28<sup>v</sup>). Peace between England and Spain, however, was a matter of dispute in this collection and others of the early Stuart years. More than a year after the peace treaty Catholics were to make an attempt on the life of James and on his Parliament and so James, unsurprisingly, states in his speech after the plot that those who through error had dabbled in Catholicism could be loyal subjects, but those that really knew the true meaning of popery could not (fol. 22<sup>r</sup>). The inclusion of the peace articles appears to suggest that the compiler is commenting that James had been warned.

The Lord Keeper’s letter to the Earl Marshall and Essex’s answer appear incongruous in this collection. Together they have become standard advisory texts or exemplars (in a similar way to the Queen’s speeches previously discussed), and are used to bolster other advisory texts, particularly the ‘Peticion’ and the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’. What is important with regard to their placement in this collection is that the Lord Keeper advises Essex that ‘he that is a stander by seeth more than he that playeth the game and for the most part any man in his own cause standeth in his own light, and seeth not so clearly as he should’ (fol. 18<sup>v</sup>) – the inference possibly being that the king is too close to the issues to make sound judgements on them. This suggests that we could consider the letter alongside the petitions to the king; all imply that the king should treat the complaints of

---

<sup>123</sup> James I, *Letters*, p.225.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, p.225.

his subjects seriously – a sentiment with which, I would argue, the compiler of the Exeter manuscript would agree.

### 3.5. British Library Manuscript Harleian 3787 (Sancroft Manuscript)

William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1678-1690, was the last compiler of Harleian 3787. The eclectic range of contents from the middle of the sixteenth-century as well as the variety of hands, ink, and insertions, suggest that this compilation had several previous owners, all of whom made contributions to it. It is likely that the collection was built throughout the seventeenth century, although it was rebound in the nineteenth, and that the contents were originally placed as they are in the manuscript, with individual texts or even groups of texts being arranged in a particular order by each contributor. I will in this section, however, concentrate on the group of texts surrounding the ‘Petition’.<sup>125</sup>

There are texts in the Sancroft manuscript which are often copied together in other collections, and the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ is one of these (fol. 163<sup>r</sup>). In this manuscript it is the first of the texts which are in the same group as the ‘Petition’ and follows a vehemently anti-Catholic, and anti-Spanish text, which mirrors its opinion: Thomas Scott’s, ‘Vox Populi or newes from Spayne translated according to y<sup>e</sup> Spanish coppye which may serue to forwarne both England and y<sup>e</sup> United Provinces how farr to trust y<sup>e</sup> Spanish pretense’ (fol. 141<sup>r</sup>) (printed in 1620).

Likewise, as we have seen above, ‘The Lord Kepers letter to the Lord of Essex 1599’ and Essex’s reply (fols. 177<sup>r</sup> and 178<sup>r</sup>) are often copied together in manuscripts of the period and found in collections with the ‘Petition’. These letters follow Sir Thomas Wentworth’s speech to Parliament on 22 March 1627, in which he criticises the practice of billeting soldiers with ordinary householders who were expected to pay for their board and lodging (fol. 176<sup>r</sup>). This related group also includes the account of the execution of the Earl of Essex (fol. 179<sup>r</sup>); ‘The names of the Traytors & conspirators supposed to be of this laste rebellion’ (fol. 180<sup>r</sup>); the ‘Petition’ (fol. 181<sup>r</sup>); ‘A speech found in Sir Walter Rawley’s pocket after his execution written by him in the gatehouse the night before his death’ (fol. 182<sup>r</sup>) and the letter Raleigh presumed would be the last

---

<sup>125</sup> BL MS Harleian 3787, fol. 181<sup>r</sup>. Further references to this manuscript in part 3.5 will be supplied parenthetically within the text.

to his wife (fol. 183<sup>v</sup>). Although the manuscript contains multiple hands it is striking that the ‘Peticion’, ‘The names of the Traytors’ and the account of Essex’s execution are all written in the same hand, and the paper of all three items retain fold lines as though they have been wrapped together in a letter. None of them have further markings indicating their origin, but this does indicate that they were viewed as being in some way connected by the person who sent them to our compiler. This might suggest that this person counted Essex as one of the ‘traytors’, but the link between Essex and the petition might hold various meanings, and it is only the connection between the actual documents and the content which leads to this conclusion. Two letters written by Raleigh, who was commonly condemned as a traitor in the miscellanies of the period, follow the ‘Peticion’, the penultimate line of the ‘Peticion’ asking: ‘good kinge make not Si<sup>r</sup> Walltar Rawleye lorde of pankredge for he is a of~’ – it is possible that although Raleigh would not have been on the list of traitors connected with the Essex revolt, the compiler, and possibly contemporary readers, would have inferred that he was being cast here as a traitor. Alternatively, these texts, along with the anti-Spanish texts mentioned above might imply criticism of a regime in which two Protestant heroes could be executed for offences which many in the population would view as serving their country.

#### 4. Conclusion

Why is the ‘Peticion’ the linking text or hinge in these manuscripts? We can attempt to answer this by considering what these manuscripts have in common other than a shared set of texts. They could be linked by ownership, or the route that the ‘Peticion’ took on its way to that particular collection, but this information is not always available. When a text is appropriated for a different collection it is not only read differently, as I have discussed above, but it can be physically altered for the purpose of the new owner.

To illustrate this I want to reflect on the links between the Yelverton manuscript and MS 22601. I have found only one copy of the ‘Peticion’ with seventeen clauses and that is the one found in the latter;<sup>126</sup> the others, including that in the Yelverton manuscript, have thirteen, and it is this oddity that provides the connection between them. The ‘Peticion’'s clauses begin ‘Good Kinge’, except numbers 12-15 in MS 22601, which omit this prefix. These clauses are the most insulting: they accuse the

---

<sup>126</sup> MS 22601 has seventeen clauses as well as a final clause: ‘good kinge loue vs & we will loue thee, and will spend ou<sup>r</sup> harts bloods for thee’; other copies omit clauses 12-15 as listed in this miscellany.



treasury of corruption and usury, attack the wardship system, and refer to Robert Cecil as ‘Crookback’ – particularly damning if the ‘Petition’ was presented to the king at Robert Cecil’s home (and an argument against it being written by Cecil). The altered phrasing of clauses 12-15 (and the fact that this is the only version altered in this way) leads me to believe that these have been inserted in this manuscript rather than deleted from the other copies. I had expected to find seventeen clauses in the Yelverton copy because of similarities in the contents, links between the contents of MS 22601 and Christopher Yelverton, as well as similar watermarks in the manuscripts (all of which are discussed above). Due to Christopher Yelverton’s status and his friendship with Cecil it probably would not have been prudent to include them. He has written at the end of his copy of the ‘Petition’, however, that ‘there be more againste the greatest officers of the exchequor, starre chamber, and Courte of Wardes, which are here omitted’.<sup>127</sup> This is an indication that Yelverton viewed a copy of the ‘full’ version; this would possibly have been the one found in MS 22601, but we can only say for certain that Yelverton saw seventeen clauses in the ‘Petition’ at this point, and that there was likely to have been collaboration between the two compilers. There appears to be no explanation for a dating discrepancy between the two copies: the ‘Petition’ in MS 22601 is dated 7 May; there is no date on Yelverton’s copy, but Richard Martyn’s speech is dated 7 May. The seventh was a Saturday, and the date that the king reached London, making Yelverton’s date correct and further corroborating the suggestion that Yelverton copied certain texts from MS 22601’s compiler. I have discussed how the meaning of a politically contentious text can be altered by the context in which it is transcribed, but in this case Yelverton has manipulated the ‘Petition’ by choosing to distance himself from the extra clauses. However, his comments are a personal reminder that they exist, and strongly suggest the tone of the missing information.

In the same way that the physical manipulation of a text points towards collaboration with another compiler, so can the inclusion of remarks made about texts, and of items which answer another directly. In addition to the connections mentioned, MS 22601 contains the series of ‘Maxims’ discussed above, another text rarely found in manuscript, and one which advocates deceit and treachery.<sup>128</sup> Copied into the Yelverton manuscript is ‘An Encounter to certaine wicked and blasphemous propositions beginning thus: Loue none but they selfe, made by some most wicked Atheist’, which

---

<sup>127</sup> AS MS Y155, fol. 5<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>128</sup> See footnotes 78, 80 and pp. 109, 135-140 above.

consists of the answers, clause by clause, to the ‘Maxims’. It appears that this ‘wicked atheist’ may be the compiler of MS 22601 (whom I have yet to identify). The original ‘Maxims’ were, as I have suggested above, a satire on the advice literature to sons and daughters of the period and, more particularly, an attack on Cecil who had received such an advisory letter from his father, Lord Burghley, in the summer of 1589<sup>129</sup> and who was the target of the extra clauses in the ‘Petition’. These traditional texts offered advice on manners and morals. Walter Raleigh prepared instructions to his son when he was in the Tower and unable to help him personally,<sup>130</sup> and James Stanley, 7<sup>th</sup> Earl of Derby borrowed sections from Burghley when advising his own son.<sup>131</sup> The genre also attracted satirical replies such as the ‘Maxims’, or ‘Certayne newe conclusions’, as well as Nicholas Breton’s *Uncasing of Machivil’s Instructions to his sonne*.<sup>132</sup> The attack on Cecil is made more evident in the ‘Maxims’ by the clause which advises, ‘by no meanes take bribes you<sup>r</sup> selfe, let that be donne by somme trustie man. The Offices of the Crowne of the wardes, of the Lawe, & of the Church, will bringe in a reasonable haruest’ – this specifically refers to the office of the Wards, which was held by Burghley and then Cecil.<sup>133</sup>

The manuscripts held together by the ‘Petition’ can be linked by author, as well as by compatibility of texts. The Yelverton manuscript and MS 22601 both contain some of the lesser-disseminated works of Sir John Davies. A ‘Dialogue’, which is copied into Yelverton’s collection, was possibly a scribal copy that had been revised after its initial performance and received directly from the author.<sup>134</sup> Likewise, MS 22601 contains an unrevised version of a ‘Lottery’ and of a ‘Dialogue’, which Krueger argues was copied from Davies’ rough drafts of the work.<sup>135</sup> It is apparent, then, that Davies supplied both compilers with his texts, and we can surmise that this is indicative of a close acquaintanceship; that he and Yelverton were lawyers is known but there are still many unanswered questions about the compiler of MS 22601.

---

<sup>129</sup> Copied into Folger MS V.a.321, fol. 56<sup>v</sup> and BL MS Stowe 143, fol. 100<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>130</sup> Sir Walter Raleigh, *Instructions to his Sonne* (London, 1632).

<sup>131</sup> Louis B. Wright, ed., *Advice to a son: Precepts of Lord Burghley, Sir Walter Raleigh, and Francis Osborne* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962), p.xviii.

<sup>132</sup> Breton, *Machivils instructions*.

<sup>133</sup> MS 22601, fol.19<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>134</sup> Krueger, p.412.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, p.412.

We can only speculate on the reasons why a compiler would want a copy of the 'Petition', but at the very least the collection of such material indicates an interest in political debate. The potential force of such political criticism is evident in the early years of the seventeenth century, however, when we consider how much effort went into finding the author of the 'Petition'. Lord Buckhurst's letter to Sir Julius Caesar indicates his certainty that Anthony Atkinson was the libeller, while other evidence points towards Atkinson and his cohorts (even if we take into account that Buckhurst had an axe to grind with Atkinson).<sup>136</sup> By the middle of the nineteenth century, however, when John Nichols sought a copy for his *Progresses*, its value was no longer political but historical.

The circulation of grievances in manuscript was not only an attempt to sway the opinion of government or the monarchy; it was also about the very act of making critical statements, and of taking a stand on political issues. It was a way of making a view known and taking part in political debate, rather than necessarily hoping that a petition would have an effect. James wanted to foster his reputation as a king who listened to the grievances of his subjects, and his councillors knew that it was also important that he was seen to take action. Richard Martyn's welcome speech to the king exploits this knowledge, telling the king:

The wearied Commons shall be worne as a rich ring on your Royal finger, which your Majesty with a watchful eye will still graciously looke upon. For we have now a King that will heare with his owne eares, see with his own eyes, and be ever jealous of any great trust, which (being afterwards become necessary) may be abused to an unlymited power.<sup>137</sup>

This both flatters the king by suggesting that he is known to listen, whilst giving him counsel; at the same time it raises an issue with the public, who are then rewarded with an immediate solution – the suspension of monopolies. In other words, the presentation of grievances could act in the same way as the traditional 'mirror to princes' literature was supposed to. Yet, as we have seen, not all such texts were as concerned as Martyn was to observe the rules of decorum when offering advice to the monarch. In the case of Martyn's welcome speech, the king and government appeared to welcome sharp counsel from unofficial advisers and to act as though they were taking notice of grievances, when in fact it was just a rhetorical ploy. There is no evidence to indicate that James listened to this kind of advice. His speech at Whitehall on Wednesday 21

---

<sup>136</sup> BL MS Lansdowne 160, fol. 232<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>137</sup> Nichols, *Progresses*, I, 131.

March 1609 demonstrates that acceptance of grievances was subject to his volition, and was, on the whole, treated as a public relations exercise; he did not want so many grievances that it appeared as though there were problems at court, or to be told how to rule.

There is a surprising range of responses surrounding the 'Petition'; responses that might be read as either supportive of the crown or hostile to it. It is especially intriguing when the sheer variety of texts in a miscellany prevents us from firmly establishing what position its compiler is taking. What is apparent is that the 'Petition' attracted, and tended to travel with, the same texts to other manuscripts, indicating that contemporaries viewed it as one of the group of political texts discussed in this chapter. That the 'Petition' is the pivotal text in this group further suggests its importance: the other texts were supporting it. The manuscript compilers whose texts I have examined here demonstrate the way in which prose travelled together in groups; in my next chapter I will turn to verse, and will show how it circulates across a wider range of manuscripts and often has a quite different purpose.

## Chapter 4

### The manuscript miscellany and the transmission of poetry

#### 1. Introduction

Some may perchance account my time mispent  
 And mee unwise to write such things as these  
 But let them know my deed Ile ne're repent  
 Twas not for profit but my self to please.<sup>1</sup>

With these lines in verse the compiler of Folger MS V.a.345 responds to anticipated critics of his collection. The sometimes complementary, sometimes conflicting, motives of 'profit' and 'pleasure' are ones that we have also encountered in MS 22601, and in this chapter an examination of the poetry collected in that manuscript will further illuminate the degree to which public and private use frequently mingled in the same pages.

I will chart the circulation of a selection of the poetry in MS 22601 and consider how the poems were used or read in different environments and contexts by their new readers. The poems can be separated into three categories, providing an insight into three sorts of manuscript publication and transmission: those that did not circulate and appear to be unique to this miscellany; those with a limited circulation; and those that travelled extensively.

MS 22601, like many early modern collections, contains such a wide range of poetry that it is not immediately clear why such items were gathered in the same volume. The 'non-circulating' poems can be divided into motif poems (those which adhere closely to convention and often appear so similar to others following the same pattern that they become difficult to differentiate); love and courtly poetry; bawdy poetry; and political poems. The manuscript contains several poems that have extremely restricted circulation, only travelling as a unit to one other manuscript. These are especially important as their royal author, James VI and I, wrote them before his accession to the English throne. The final category is formed by its concentration on a single person – Sir Walter Raleigh. Poems about and by him travelled extensively both during his

---

<sup>1</sup> Folger MS Va. 345, p.vi. This Christ Church, Oxford, based manuscript will be discussed at length later in the chapter. These are the opening lines of 'Ad Lectoram', the last of three prefatory poems announcing the miscellany.

lifetime and long after his demise. The purpose of this chapter is to consider several of the poems in their immediate context in MS 22601 and, for those that circulated, to analyse how they are altered, both textually and in the way they are read, when they appear in other manuscripts. In chapter one I discussed how some poems in MS 22601 did circulate to varying degrees, and it is worth mentioning these before I move onto the other groups of poems in the miscellany.

## 2. Poems that circulated

One hundred and eighteen of the one hundred and twenty-three texts in this miscellany are poems or entertainments and of these only twelve appear in other collections.<sup>2</sup> For a miscellany with close connections to the royal court it is not surprising to find that three entertainments have been included: one before King James and his brother-in-law, Christian IV of Denmark, at Greenwich on 6 June 1606 ('O yes, o yes, o yes');<sup>3</sup> and two before Elizabeth (the 'Lottery', at Harefield in Spring 1602 (fol. 49<sup>r</sup>),<sup>4</sup> and a 'Dialogue' (fol. 66<sup>r</sup>)). Also included is a set of twelve 'Trenchers' (fol. 40<sup>r</sup>) by Sir John Davies, which were often copied separately into the miscellanies of the period. One miscellany belonging to the Lloyd family of Llwydiarth, Wales (Sotheby MS B2), notes that they represent 'the twelve degrees of persons' and were also called 'The XII wonders of the world' and 'set and composed for the viol de Gambo, lute, and the voyce in 1611'.<sup>5</sup> 'The Poore Soule sate sighinge by a sickamore tree' (fol. 8<sup>r</sup>) is a version of the 'Willow Song' from Shakespeare's *Othello*.<sup>6</sup> There are two short proverbial rhymes ('If all the Earthe were paper white' (fol. 60<sup>r</sup>), and 'Councell whi<sup>ch</sup> afterward is soughte' (fol. 56<sup>r</sup>)), which, along with a longer poem about the disgraced maid of honour, Anne Vavasour ('To A. Vaua.' (fol. 71<sup>r</sup>)) attributed to Sir Walter Raleigh, have only circulated to one other manuscript.<sup>7</sup> In contrast, two poems by John Harington circulated widely. They

---

<sup>2</sup> This does not include the poems by James and by or about Raleigh discussed later in the chapter. I have made an extensive search of numerous manuscript collections in English libraries as well as in the Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscript Library, Yale University, and the Folger Shakespeare Library. I have also used Beal's *Index*; Crum, *First-line Index*; the handwritten first-line index of the British Library, and other English library catalogues, including those of Oxford and Cambridge University Libraries, as well as the catalogues of American libraries, including the Beinecke, and Folger libraries. I am grateful to Peter Beal and to Joshua Eckhardt for checking the first lines of MS 22601 against their records and to Heather Wolfe at the Folger Shakespeare Library, Gayle Richardson at the Huntington Library, and Diane Ducharme at Yale University Libraries for the same.

<sup>3</sup> MS 22601, fol. 7<sup>r</sup>. Further references to this manuscript in parts 1 to 5.2 will be supplied parenthetically within the text.

<sup>4</sup> For further discussion see chapter one.

<sup>5</sup> Beal, *Index*, I, 220; this miscellany is National Library of Wales, Sotheby MS B2, pp.148-149. Fellowes, *Madrigal Verse*, p.620.

<sup>6</sup> For further discussion see chapter one.

<sup>7</sup> See pp.171-172, 194-195 below.

both look to the Stuart years with hope: ‘England men say of late is bankrupte grow<sup>ne</sup>’ (fol. 60<sup>v</sup>)<sup>8</sup> refers to the corruption at the end of Elizabeth’s reign as factions grew and individuals were keen to secure their own future, while ‘When doome of death by judgemen<sup>ts</sup> force appoin<sup>ted</sup>’ (fol. 60<sup>v</sup>) is an epigram on the death of Mary Queen of Scots, James’s mother. The final poem to leave this collection is also the last in the manuscript: ‘Expe<sup>ri</sup>ence & examples dailie proue that my man can be well aduised & loue’ (‘Loue whose power & might | none euer yet with stoude’) (fol. 106<sup>r</sup>). This is John Hoskyns’ mock love-poem to the Lady Jacob, which was popular in the miscellanies of the early seventeenth century.<sup>9</sup>

### 3. Poetry unique to MS 22601

It should not be surprising to find poetry that was not circulated in a personal miscellany like this one. The manuscript system endorsed the appropriation of texts, and was responsible for breeding poets and it is likely, therefore, that a compiler would compose several of the poems in his collection. Manuscript miscellanies, as Peter Beal has argued, represented the pleasurable rather than the useful aspects of the commonplace book mentality and it stands to reason that they would consist at least in large part of that which was of interest or enjoyment to their compilers.<sup>10</sup> The compiler would be free to alter poetry that came into his possession, and the urge to personalise a text frequently superseded concerns over ‘accuracy’. It is in this climate that what I shall refer to as the ‘motif poem’ came into being.

#### 3.1. Motif Poems

One of the most striking things found when browsing through manuscript miscellanies of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries is the similarity between the poems in these collections. In this section I will consider several poems in MS 22601 that strongly resemble more widely circulated poems, either because of imitation, exposure to the same subjects, or alteration.

In his *Art Poetique francoys* of 1548, Thomas Sebillet distinguishes between a description and a definition of love, and uses Mellin de Saint-Gelais’ poem *Description*

---

<sup>8</sup> See pp.202-203 below.

<sup>9</sup> See chapter one, p.54.

<sup>10</sup> Beal, “Notions in Garrison”, p.133.

*d'Amour* as an example of the later.<sup>11</sup> Richard E. Quaintance, Jr. has argued that about one third of Robert Greene's 'Sonetto' in *Menophon*, which begins 'What thing is Loue?', is translated from the *Description d'Amour* by Saint-Gelais.<sup>12</sup> It is this model that poets emulated and used to compose poems such as 'Amor Quid' (fol. 7<sup>v</sup>), 'Discriptio Amoris' (fol. 102<sup>v</sup>) and 'Now what is loue I pray thee tell' (fol. 104<sup>f</sup>),<sup>13</sup> which must be described as motif poems: conventional words to describe the condition of love are used and, in line with Saint-Gelais' poem, the poet seems to ask himself the question 'what is love'? 'Amor Quid' is written in twelve rhyming couplets and is based on a series of contrasts ('bitter sweete a pleasant sowre | sugred poison mixt wi<sup>th</sup> gall' and so on) where the pain far outweighs the pleasure; the poem works on the premise that 'love is blind'.

The 'love' in 'Now what is loue' is more realistic. The poet recognises the high and low points – 'it is a fountaine and a well | where pleasure & repentance dwell' – as well as the downright ordinary: 'it is a finger in a ringe | it is a moppinge toothles thinge'. Rather than question the constancy of love, however, he recognises that the first flames will diminish and that a deeper kind of love will remain. The poem is written in six-line stanzas in iambic tetrameter, which, along with its rhyming couplets, make it easily memorisable (not unlike 'Amor Quid'). Another thing that these poems have in common is that the poet appears to be thinking of love in the past, as one who has been hurt by the experience.

Similarities to 'Discriptio Amoris' are evident in an extract from George Peele's lost pastoral 'The Hunting of Cupid', 'What thing is love'.<sup>14</sup> 'Discriptio Amoris' is comprised of six lines with a memorable ABABCC rhyming scheme; unlike the previous two motif poems in this section, it is a damning indictment of love. It starts with the question 'What thing is loue?', the answer being given on the same line: 'a Tirant of y<sup>e</sup> minde', giving the impression that the poet's mind is made up. Seemingly belonging to these lines on the same folio are two short proverbial poems: 'Amantis &

<sup>11</sup> Frank Kermode, 'Definitions of Love', *RES*, N.S. 7 (1956), 183-185 (p.183).

<sup>12</sup> Mellin de Saint-Gelais, *Oeuvres poetiques* (Lyon, 1547); Richard E. Quaintance, Jr., 'The French source of Robert Greene's "What thing is Love"', *Notes and Queries*, 208 (1963), 295-96 (p.295).

<sup>13</sup> Beal, *Index*, II, 413, and Michael Rudick both have reservations about this poem's attribution to Raleigh; for further discussion see Rudick, pp.xxxii-xxxiii, 140-141; see also chapter one, pp.53-54.

<sup>14</sup> Hebel, pp.385, 386; a variation of George Peele's lyric set to music by John Bartlet from his 1606 *Book of Aires* is printed in Fellowes, *Madrigal Verse*, p.361; *The works of George Peele*, ed. by Alexander Dyce, 2 vols (London: Pickering, 1828), p.175.



amentis discriminens' ('how to distinguish between a lover and a fool') and 'Alteri in Seruiens' ('the other as a slave').

'The Counsell of a frend hearinge a purpose of marriage by another' (fol. 9<sup>v</sup>) is an excellent example of how poetry is appropriated and manipulated by a miscellany compiler for his own purpose. It also requires the modern reader to ask whether we now have one poem or two different ones when it has been altered. In MS 22601 this poem is attributed to Giles Codrington but the first stanza is the third stanza of the 'Contents of schedule of Sir John of Burdeaux to his sonnes' in Thomas Lodge's *Rosalynd*.<sup>15</sup> The first stanza is resigned to the notion that you cannot have an attractive and pleasant wife, but a second stanza has been added to Lodge's lines, which starts 'my choice is made' and outlines just these qualities. 'The Counsell' treats themes that are found in many miscellanies which were connected with groups of young men, and that are the subject of playground conversation in modern times. The fascination of this particular poem is that the alteration made to it is by way of an answer or extension to the existing theme, and the language indicates that its author had just copied or read 'Amor Quid' (which is highly likely, as it is two folios prior to this text in the manuscript): the former understands love as 'hony mixt wi<sup>th</sup> bitter gall' whilst instead of honey, the later finds it to be 'sugred poyson mixt wi<sup>th</sup> gall'.

A similar pattern is evident in 'The moone doth change yet not so strange' (fol. 10<sup>f</sup>): the common theme is that women are fickle creatures. This idea is to be found in numerous manuscripts; in 'The moone' we are told that 'womens mindes, change as the windes', while the Earl of Essex asserts that a man should 'change thy minde since she doth change',<sup>16</sup> and the Earl of Oxford wishes that 'woemen coulde be fayre and yet not fonde, | or that there love were firme, not fickll still'.<sup>17</sup> The proliferation of love poetry in the manuscript collections is thought unsurprising by Arthur Marotti due to the youthfulness of the majority of collectors of verse, many of whom were from similar professional and academic environments:<sup>18</sup> the combination of the discovery of youth and shared experience in these institutions consequently produced poems in which these experiences were debated.

<sup>15</sup> Thomas Lodge, *Rosalynd: Euphues Golden Legacie* (London, 1609), sigs B1<sup>v</sup>-B2<sup>f</sup>; a version is also attributed to D. Lodge, in Collier, *England's Parnassus*, p.233.

<sup>16</sup> Steven W. May, *The Elizabethan Courtier Poets: The poems and their contexts* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991), p.252.

<sup>17</sup> May, *Courtier*, p.284.

<sup>18</sup> Marotti, *Manuscript*, pp.75-76.

The theme and style of 'The Five Senses', a libel against King James, has been taken and formed into another poem entitled 'A vale to vanity & y<sup>e</sup> pleasu<sup>res</sup> of this worlde' (fol. 93<sup>v</sup>). 'The Five Senses' is written in the form of a prayer for the welfare of the king whilst depicting each of the bodily senses as susceptible to corruption.<sup>19</sup> The stanzas are sub-titled in Latin, as are those of 'The Five Senses', and the similarities are apparent in the final lines of both:

On God therefore wi<sup>th</sup> hart on knees I call  
to keepe mine Eares, Eies, nose, tonge hands & all  
That eache of them may shunn to heare, to see,  
to smell, to taste, to touche, where pleasures bee. (MS 22601, fol. 93<sup>v</sup>)

And just God I humblie pray  
that thou wilt take the Filme away  
that keeps my Soueraignes eyes from vieweing  
the things that wilbe our undoeing  
then lett him Heare good God the sounds  
aswell of Men, as of his hounds  
Give him a Taste and tymely too  
of what his subiects undergoe  
Give him a Feelinge of there woes  
and noe doubt his royall nose  
will quickly Smell those rascals forth. (Folger MS V.a.345, p.59)

The predominance of these motif poems, and the continual repetition of commonplaces, themes, and even phrases, is yet another indication of the extent to which manuscript miscellanies of this period both derived from and shored up a common culture. Mary Hobbs argues that many of those who were compiling manuscript miscellanies during the early seventeenth century were either related or known to each other and were a product of the 'uniform contemporary system of classical education' which would have featured Latin exercises on set themes.<sup>20</sup> The poetry copied into MS 22601 and other miscellanies of the period suggests that these poets reverted back to the habits of their schooldays: they wrote poetry on the same themes as their educational exercises, and their poems are smattered with Latin phrases and titles, as in 'Discriptio Amoris'.

In the same way that education influenced these miscellany compilers so could affiliation to an institution. Shared interests as men spent time in professional surroundings with a specialised language or routine, for example, influenced their writing and speech. Texts and ideas could also be exchanged and copied, or lines of poetry borrowed, with the inevitable outcome that they became increasingly hard to

<sup>19</sup> See also chapter one, p.52; on 'The Five Senses' see McRae, *Literature*, pp. 75-82.

<sup>20</sup> Hobbs, *Verse Miscellany Manuscripts*, p.30.

distinguish, as were their authors. It is especially difficult to identify authors in manuscript culture as the signature or initials following a poem were not always accurate; equally, since these men swapped texts within relatively tight circles, no more than initials were necessary to identify themselves. Hobbs has highlighted one particular case of a whole poem being ‘borrowed’ for a different purpose and reason. The Catholic Chidiock Tichborne’s prison poem ‘My prime of youth is but a frost of cares’, written just before his death in 1586, was recycled in Daniel Leare’s miscellany and altered to commemorate the death of Mr Fishborne, a puritan benefactor to the city of London, who died in 1625 – ‘Tichborne’ simply being changed to ‘Fishborne’.<sup>21</sup>

### 3.2. Love Poetry

Literary conventions and traditions profoundly influenced the love poetry of the age: poets frequently used the language of the medieval traditions of pursuit and romance as well as emulating a model to describe love. Many love poems could also be described as motif poems. These conventions became so entrenched in the culture that a code existed which set this genre aside from all other poetry of these years. Love poetry in particular throughout the Tudor years deployed a Petrarchan, courtly vocabulary. The royal court was the centre of government and of patronage and the influence of its culture, therefore, found its way into the writing of those throughout the nation. Elizabeth became the focus for this courtly poetry on her accession. ‘Desire’ was personified in the poetry of the Earl of Oxford as early as 1576,<sup>22</sup> and the entertainments presented to the Queen are a striking example of how she became the lady to be worshipped – both as an object of love and as a monarch capable of bestowing favour and advancement.<sup>23</sup>

These courtly conventions are apparent in many of the poems in this miscellany. That these poems appear not to have circulated is an indication of how well established and common these traditions were: the author (who may also be the compiler of the miscellany) clearly wrote for personal pleasure and kept his poems close. ‘One time oh

---

<sup>21</sup> Daniel Leare’s miscellany is BL MS Add. 30982, cited in Hobbs, ‘Early seventeenth-century verse miscellanies’, pp.198-199.

<sup>22</sup> May, *Courtier*, p.53; Richard Edwards, *The Paradise of Dainty Devices, 1576-1606*, ed. by Hyder Edward Rollins (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927). Oxford’s poems were published in the 1576 *Paradise of Dainty Devices* and were possibly circulating before Leicester entertained Elizabeth at Kenilworth the previous summer.

<sup>23</sup> The Earl of Leicester’s entertainments at Kenilworth in July 1575 presented the character of desire in a forest of lovers; Leicester was a competitor for the favour of the Queen at this time. See also Catherine Bates, *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

happy time for euer blest' (fol. 8<sup>v</sup>) is one example. The poem has twenty-six lines, divided in this collection into two stanzas of eighteen and eight lines each, with a regular rhyme scheme (ABABCDCDEFEGHGH II and ABCDCDEE). The content fits the mould of the courtly tradition: the suitor is happy to hear the lady's voice at her window as she is going to bed; he believes he is unworthy of her; she appears at the window; he falls on bended knee and begs pardon for his great offence, which 'she so gracious, pardon gaue to me | & thus to hir I did my suite commence'.

Arthur Marotti has argued that in Elizabethan England the unmarried, female monarch 'specifically encouraged the use of an amorous vocabulary by her courtiers to express ambition and its vicissitudes'.<sup>24</sup> This is apparent in the poems of many of her courtiers, including the Earl of Essex and Sir Walter Raleigh (the latter of whom will be discussed at length below). As I have stated above, the majority of poems in this collection did not circulate, and would not therefore fit into Marotti's category: it would be strange to pen a poem designed to make a political impact if it were not to be seen by those who mattered (although it does not always follow that because a poem has not been widely preserved that it did not reach its intended recipient). Early modern authors, however, did not always write for an audience – they may even have written such texts as practice – but the presence of these poems are proof of how deeply inculcated this habit was. Marotti's point is corroborated to some extent by the inclusion in this miscellany of 'To A Vaua.' (fol. 71<sup>r</sup>), a poem written about Anne Vavasour, Elizabeth's maid of honour, who caused scandal at the court over her affair and child with the Earl of Oxford. This poem did not circulate widely but illustrates how comment on the court and its system of favourites can be enclosed with a love poem: it was a way of softening a blunt statement or shielding more serious matters. The poem is a reference to what will become of those who cause displeasure at court – it explains that many desire to have things which are unattainable, but if they attain them they will pay with their reputation. That the poem is addressed to Anne Vavasour and written by Sir Walter Raleigh is poignant: Raleigh too was dismissed from court after his marriage to Elizabeth Throckmorton without the consent or approval of the Queen.

Steven May has argued that the courtly love tradition was adaptable to Elizabeth's court: courtliness had to be redefined and 'tailored' to suit the circumstances of a

---

<sup>24</sup> Marotti, "Love is Not Love": Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order', *English Literary History*, 49 (1982), 346-428 (p.399).

‘maiden queen who was likewise head of the national, Protestant church’.<sup>25</sup> Whilst courtiers did not stop expressing their desire for favour through amorous discourse after James’s accession, the pretended point of their desire, from unmarried female monarch to James, young and with a wife and family, necessarily altered the character of this type of verse. It is apparent that as Elizabeth aged, and her reign came to an end, courtiers were only striving for favour and not courtship. It was less acceptable, however, for James to openly encourage flirtatious poetry. The significance of ‘To A Vaua.’ would be quite different against the background of the Jacobean court; the context in which it appears in this miscellany. Implicit in the poem is the sexual jealousy for which Elizabeth had Raleigh rejected from court: it was now an historical document, or a general criticism of the court at large.

### 3.3. Bawdy lyrics

There is no evidence to suggest that courtly poetry came to a halt with the demise of Elizabeth and, as I have shown, it is found in manuscript collections throughout the first half of the seventeenth century. I now wish to examine some poems that have reversed the courtly conventions, as well as poems that would emanate from an all-male environment. ‘Pleas’d wi<sup>th</sup> a kiss, a kiss did please me’ (fol. 74<sup>r</sup>) forms the watershed of the miscellany. It is where a clear division can be observed between plain love poetry and a ‘lowering’ of style towards bawdy. The poem has five six-line stanzas with an easily remembered ABABCC rhyme scheme based on repeated words. The suitor starts by saying that a kiss would make him happy but the poem descends into sexual banter between him and his lover.

‘The sweetest kiss y<sup>t</sup> euer creature gained’ (fol. 77<sup>r</sup>) and ‘All alone my loue was playinge’ (fol. 98<sup>r</sup>) become more sexually explicit. In both of these poems the suitor fantasizes about the lady and acts as a voyeur before approaching her; neither of the ladies are willing but the suitor is confident that he can win them over. The object of the first poet’s desire is offended but then submits to the fantasy. The second suitor spies on the lady as she undresses and bathes, but being unable to contain himself he springs out of his hiding places, runs to her and ‘downe I kneeld & kiss hir bare’ (fol. 99<sup>r</sup>).

---

<sup>25</sup> May, *Courtier*, p.41.

These three examples of bawdy poetry in MS 22601 parody the conventions of courtly love. The first starts with a common premise – that of being rewarded with a kiss – but the repetition of ‘kiss’, and variations of ‘sweete’, and ‘faire’ overload the sentiment to the point that it has become absurd: ‘Pleas’d wi<sup>th</sup> a kiss, a kiss did please me | Deare kiss <sup>^</sup> <sup>^</sup> <sup>sweet</sup> <sup>^</sup> sweete kiss, from fairest sweetest faire | fairest dearest & sweetest ease me’. The suitor gains the ‘sweetest kiss y<sup>t</sup> euer creature gained’ and is seemingly about to embark on a typical courtly poem but sinks to bawdy as his lady ‘wondred how [he] durst approche | to press so nye & kiss hir in the coche’ (fol. 77<sup>r</sup>). ‘All alone my loue was playinge’ (fol. 98<sup>r</sup>) evokes the Gods in a pastoral setting. The suitor watches as ‘Phaebus tun’d his siluer lute | playinge in a lawrell shade’ and sees Apollo and Phillis making ‘heau’nly musick’. Common cultural themes have been parodied and corrupted.

Courtly poetry, as I have suggested, was directed at Elizabeth, in the form of both verse and entertainment, by those wishing to court royal favour. To parody this type of verse, therefore, is to mock both these courtiers and, perhaps, the Elizabethan court more generally. At work here is a sense of rivalry between men acquainted through courtly or professional circles. Likewise, poems such as ‘Constant wiues are comforts to mens liues’ (fol. 71<sup>r</sup>), and ‘If y<sup>t</sup> I liue I cannot liue but loue’ (fol. 80<sup>r</sup>), are concerned with matter more typically suited to male conversation. ‘Constant wiues’ is a short epigram listing the qualities that would make a good wife; that is, to be a good companion, and ‘faithfull & chaste, sober milde louinge, trustie | nurse to weak age, and pleasure to y<sup>e</sup> lustie’. The latter poem is written in two six-line stanzas with heavy alliteration relying on the repetition of ‘live’ and ‘love’: the sentiment is that you cannot live with love, and you cannot live without it. The content of these poems contrasts with their style: the reader might expect to find a courtly poem but finds instead one that mocks the convention. Similarly, the final group of poems in the miscellany – the political and topical verse – is often in conflict with its context.

#### 3.4. Political and topical poems

I have already discussed the way that seemingly innocent poetry can cloak double meanings. In this section I will look at poems where the meaning is altered according to their context; for this purpose I will be looking at political poetry and poetry with a topical subject matter. When the context of a poem is examined, it must be remembered

that to include a text in a miscellany is a deliberate act. When the song, ‘In praise of Peace wi<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Spaine’ (fol. 23<sup>v</sup>) is read, the obvious conclusion, beyond the title, is that the compiler was in agreement with the said peace. The poem regrets the ‘hatred Battell, sword & warre | in former Raigne’ and thanks James for the peace that he has brought to the nation. The poem is overtly political, especially if viewed in isolation. But while the poem might have been transcribed because the compiler agreed with its sentiments, he might equally have collected it for its newsworthiness or even because he was actually *opposed* to its political viewpoint.<sup>26</sup>

‘Souldio<sup>rs</sup> are like y<sup>e</sup> Armou<sup>r</sup> y<sup>t</sup> they weare’ (fol. 9<sup>v</sup>), ‘Tho tyme hath byn my purse well lyn’d wi<sup>th</sup>in’ (fol. 10<sup>r</sup>) and ‘Concerninge his suit & attendance at y<sup>e</sup> Courte’ (fol. 61<sup>v</sup>) contain grievances, and yet we must presume that these complaints were never aired publicly, as the poems have not circulated to other collections, nor is there any evidence to suggest an intended recipient for them. ‘Souldio<sup>rs</sup>’ and ‘Tho tyme’ share the same folio in this collection. I suggest that the former enjoyed restricted – if any – circulation because of the blatant attack on James and his policy that it contains. The soldier, it says, starts in fine form but then ‘somme throwne by somme bang’d against y<sup>e</sup> walls | thus after warres souldio<sup>rs</sup> to ruines falls’. This poem, though, is not opposed to war *per se*. It glorifies the ‘braue minded worne & contrymen’ whilst criticising the leaders. It is a direct criticism of James and his policy:

Courageous Caesar made his Campes his Courtes  
his Captaines kings, inferio<sup>r</sup> Leaders Lordes  
To gaine a Country was his huntinge shores  
And as the Huntsman to his houndes afordes  
the Intrales of the beast y<sup>t</sup> he hath slaine.  
& what he gained rewarded Souldio<sup>rs</sup> paine. (fol. 9<sup>v</sup>)

In the author’s view, preferment should be on merit, and the rewards gained by the commander’s victories should filter down to the soldiers. The poet then appears to commit the ultimate crime by contemplating a time when men who are capable are made rulers (‘Well tyme may comme y<sup>t</sup> Souldio<sup>rs</sup> may be kinges’) above the monarch. He qualifies this – rather unconvincingly – by saying that he means kingship is only ‘in conceite’, because ‘to aspire to Crownes we know it dange<sup>r</sup> bringes’.

‘Tho tyme hath byn my purse well lyn’d wi<sup>th</sup>in’ expresses a similar theme to the poem above. While the soldier is left ‘frendless’, the speaker of this poem is one whose many friends desert him when his wealth is gone. Both poems are indictments of the court, as

<sup>26</sup> This will be discussed further in section four of this chapter.

is ‘Concerninge his suit & attendance at y<sup>e</sup> Courte’ (fol. 61<sup>v</sup>). This poem is the tale of a petitioner at James’s court who is left miserable as he has ‘waite[d] many yeres’ for his suit to be heard. The speakers of these poems are on the outside of the court and their plight accentuates what it means to be part of the accepted elite or on the margins of it.

A very striking aspect of the poetry in this miscellany is that it appears to have been roughly organised into genres. As I have already shown, the prose is at the beginning of the collection, but the political poetry that I have discussed above is also situated between the male-oriented texts, such as ‘Counsell of a frend’ and ‘The moone doth change’, and a folio before the following texts: the ‘Peticion’; the ‘Aduertismen<sup>ts</sup>’ and ‘S<sup>r</sup> Walter Rawleigh to the kinge after his Arraignmen<sup>t</sup>’. The bawdy poetry is towards the back of the miscellany. This may be an organisational choice, or it may simply be that the compiler had run out of ‘better’ quality material – it is evident that most of the texts which have circulated to other collections are towards the beginning of the collection, suggesting that the compiler was involved with a coterie or other group at this time.<sup>27</sup> There is, indeed, a suggestion of institutionalism or ‘clubbiness’ throughout the poems that I have considered in this miscellany: a search for the best kind of life, the Latin titles suggestive of a university affiliation, a scepticism regarding love and involvement in political and current affairs.

#### 4. King James as poet

In this section of the chapter I will consider the extremely restricted circulation of fourteen poems in MS 22601 which I believe were written by James VI and I.<sup>28</sup> In this manuscript fifteen poems appear as a unit,<sup>29</sup> and of the fourteen of James’s poems, thirteen are also found in *All the kings short Poesis*, where they are written into a section of the manuscript entitled ‘Amatoria’.<sup>30</sup> MS 22601 is the earlier of these two manuscripts but it does not necessarily follow that the poems in *Poesis* were copied from this manuscript.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>27</sup> The manuscript’s provenance is discussed in chapter one.

<sup>28</sup> For further discussion of the attribution and ownership of these poems see pp.179-181 below.

<sup>29</sup> I will argue that only fourteen of these can be attributed to James, the additional poem (‘A gentlewoman y<sup>e</sup> married a yonge gent’) being an interpolation by the manuscript’s compiler.

<sup>30</sup> BL MS Add. 24195, fols 2<sup>r</sup>-30<sup>v</sup>, *All the kings short Poesis* (referred to from this point as *Poesis*), is a collection of poems unpublished until the twentieth century and includes ‘Amatoria’, ‘Miscellanea’, and ‘Fragmenta’. Eight additional poems are in ‘Amatoria’ which are not in MS 22601; see ‘All the kings short poesis that ar not printed’, in Craigie, *Poems*, II, 65-98 (68, 69, 70, 90-98); MS 22601 has one poem which has not been copied into *Poesis* (‘O haples hap, o luckless fortune blinde’). One poem in MS 22601 can also be found in Bod. MS 165, fol. 46 (‘Passioinade 5’).

<sup>31</sup> The authority of the poems will be discussed later in this section.



Early in his Scottish reign James was acclaimed by poets from both sides of the border as a poet, rather than a king. James Doelman asserts that by addressing James as a poet they could elevate their own vocation.<sup>32</sup> This elevation hardly seemed necessary, though, as James I of Scotland was one of the early Scottish poets,<sup>33</sup> his own mother, Mary Queen of Scots, wrote poetry, as did his father, Lord Darnley, and Darnley's mother the Countess of Lennox. James had in his possession a manuscript in his mother's hand of her verses on 'The Institution of a Prince' which was bound in a cover adorned with her own needlework.<sup>34</sup> James became the leader of a group of poets at his Edinburgh court from an early age: this group came to be known as the 'Castalian band'. Much has been written about several of these poets, who include Alexander Montgomerie, William Alexander, William Fowler (who was later Anne of Denmark's secretary), and Alexander Hume, and yet as Kevin Sharpe has noted, James's own verse 'has received no historical and little critical evaluation'.<sup>35</sup>

Courtier verse in Elizabethan England had taken its example from the classical authors (as had that of most European countries), but had struggled to apply classical poetics to the vernacular.<sup>36</sup> By 1584, when James contributed to the discussion on poetic principles, a modified style of Petrarchan poetry was prevalent in England, and *Ane schort treatise, conteining some revlis and cautelis to be obseruit and eschewit in Scottis Poesie* made it clear that James's vision for Scottish poetry was that there should be a clear division between his vernacular and the English style. He tells the 'docile reader' that his *Revlis* were written for two reasons: to use the best that the ancients had produced to modern advantage, and because no one had written in Scots.<sup>37</sup> His comments show that he was keen to strengthen Scotland's place on the cultural and political map both in the production of progressive works and works in his native

---

<sup>32</sup> An example is Thomas Greene, *A Poets Vision, and a Princes Glorie* (1603), sig. C1<sup>r</sup>, cited in James Doelman, 'The Accession of King James I and English Religious Poetry', *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 34:1 (Winter 1994), 19-40 (p.20).

<sup>33</sup> James I of Scotland was author of *The King's Quair*.

<sup>34</sup> G.P.V. Akrigg, 'The Literary Achievement of King James I', *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 44 (1975), 115-129 (p.116).

<sup>35</sup> Kevin Sharpe, 'The King's Writ: Royal Authors and Royal Authority in Early Modern England', in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), pp.117-138 (p.127). For further discussion of James's poetry see Ronald D. S. Jack, 'James VI and Renaissance Poetic Theory', *English*, 16 (1967), 208-211; 'Poetry under King James VI' in *The History of Scottish Literature, vol. 1: Origins to 1660*, ed. by R.D.S. Jack (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988), 125-140; Helena Mennie Shire, *Song, Dance and Poetry of the Court of Scotland under King James VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969); Kevin Sharpe, 'Private Conscience and Public Duty in the writings of King James VI and I', in *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth Century England*, ed. by J. Morrill, P. Slack and D. Woolf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp.77-100.

<sup>36</sup> Jack, 'Poetic Theory', p.208.

<sup>37</sup> James VI, 'The Essayes of a Prentise, in the Divine Arte of Poesie', in Craigie, *Poems*, I, 67.

language. Kevin Sharpe's comments might be partly answered by suggesting that James's poetry, because of its vernacular bias and different rules, had made it an 'alternative' form of poetry. Further to this, Morna Fleming states that 'perhaps the most persuasive reason for James involving himself actively in poetry was that he had seen its power used as a weapon against his mother Mary and he was determined to ensure that the poetry produced during his reign was to his own design';<sup>38</sup> the message was that Scottish poetry had 'purpose', whereas that of the Elizabethan court, although sometimes fraught with encoded political significance, was 'pleasurable'.<sup>39</sup>

James has certainly not received the kind of modern critical or editorial attention that other poets have received. He was recognised as a great poet during his lifetime, as a 'homer to himselfe, a golden spurre to nobility', although it would probably be wise to regard such references with caution.<sup>40</sup> His *Workes*, 1616 (actually published in 1617), contained two sonnets (on the defeat of the Spanish Armada, at the end of *Ane Meditation* on 1 Chronicles 15, 25-29, and that at the beginning of *Basilikon Doron*), and it was just these and two other poems that were known to his mid-eighteenth century biographer Dr William Harris.<sup>41</sup> Horace Walpole claimed 'a small collection of his poetry, under the title "His Majesty's poetical Exercises at Vacant hours"' in 1758 and, the following year, some additional poems to those named by Harris. Akrigg has noted that *Essayes of a Prentise* and *Poeticall Exercises* 'do not contain much of the best of his poetry'; if, therefore, the only poetry by which James was known was believed to be 'sub-standard' he might not have been worthy of either historical or critical evaluation. More recently, discoveries include several of James's poems in Bodleian MS 165 by Sir Robert Rait in 1901, followed by A.F. Westcott's *New Poems by James I* in 1911<sup>42</sup> and Craigie's editions of James's poetry in 1955 and 1958; the

---

<sup>38</sup> Morna Fleming, 'The Amatoria of James VI: Loving by the Reulis', in *Royal Subjects: Essays on the writings of James VI and I*, ed. by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002), pp.128-148 (p.125); for further discussion of the poetic attacks on Mary see Sandra Bell, 'Kingcraft and Poetry: James VI's Cultural Policy', in *Reading Monarchs Writing: The poetry of Henry VIII, Mary Stuart, Elizabeth I and James VII*, ed. by Peter C. Herman (Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), pp.155-177 (pp.159-160).

<sup>39</sup> The *Revlis* stipulates that a poet must avoid 'materis of commoun weill, or vther sic graue sene subiectis' because 'they are to graue materis for a Poet to mell in' and yet by pressing for his own design of poetry James's 'revlis' became both a poetical and a political treatise: Craigie, *Poems*, I, 79.

<sup>40</sup> Gabriel Harvey, *Pierces Supererogation* (London, 1593), and further references from contemporaries, quoted in Craigie, *Poems*, I, 274.

<sup>41</sup> Dr William Harris, *The Life and Writings of James I* (London, 1753), p.138, cited in Craigie, *Poems*, I, lxii. The two other poems are: an epitaph on Sir John Maitland, from John Spottiswoode's *History of the Church of Scotland* (London, 1655) and one on Sir Philip Sidney which he found in the article on Sidney in Jeremy Collier's *Great Biographical Dictionary* (1688).

<sup>42</sup> *New Poems by James I of England*, ed. by A.F. Westcott (New York: Columbia University Press, 1911).

most modern edition of his poetry is to be found in *King James VI and I: Selected Writings* (which does not mention the inclusion of James's poems in MS 22601).<sup>43</sup>

English critics have traditionally been concerned with the 'renaissance' of Scottish literature under James. The editors of his most recent edition, however, have drawn attention to the interest since the 1980s and 90s in the 'topoi of power and sexuality in relation to James I'.<sup>44</sup> Kevin Sharpe has argued that 'speaking, writing, discursive performances, not only reflect social relationships, and structures of authority'; they also represent 'acts of authority',<sup>45</sup> whilst Jonathan Goldberg believes that James's poetry is an attempt to shape the reader's moral vision to agree with the king's will.<sup>46</sup> By setting out the *Revlis* of poetry James provided the link between poetry, politics and kingship and defined his role. This will be further illustrated in the manuscript poetry under consideration in this chapter. Whilst these critics have focussed on monarchical self-representation and poetry as a way of establishing the king's authority, however, my concern is with the poetry and its circulation. I am going to turn my attention now to the poems, unpublished in James's lifetime, that form part of the 'Amatoria', and examine their place in MS 22601 and *Poesis*.

#### 4.1. The Manuscripts

As the focus of this dissertation, MS 22601 requires no further introduction, but before describing the individual poems in this primary manuscript, I will introduce BL MS Additional 24195: the manuscript containing *Poesis*. The manuscript retains its original white vellum binding, marked on both sides with a gold ornament and the following inscription: DO /MINE /SALVVM /FAC /REGE /M. The inner front cover tells us that it was in the possession of Mr Wright on 'dec. 15. [17]89', when he presented it as a gift to 'd. Tenison' for his Library, and that it was purchased at the sale of Archbishop Tenison's manuscripts on 1 July 1861 by the British Museum.<sup>47</sup> The name 'Charles' has been written twice on the back cover and Thomas Carey's signature is on the flyleaf

<sup>43</sup> *King James VI and I: Selected Writings*, ed. by Rhodes, Richards and Marshall; see chapter one, footnote 14.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

<sup>45</sup> Sharpe, 'The King's writ', p.117.

<sup>46</sup> Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne and their contemporaries* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989), p.127.

<sup>47</sup> Craigie, *Poems*, II, xxxvii, states that Mr Wright was the Rev. Abraham Wright, Rector of Oakham in Rutland; Tenison was vicar of St Martin's in the Fields, later becoming Archbishop of Canterbury. Tenison's library was the first free library of its kind in London, which he had recently established in the parish: E. Carpenter, *Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury: his life and times* (London: S.P.C.K., 1948), pp.23-29. In 1861 it was sold for £2,900 to the British Museum.

at the front, along with those of James Leviston and John Craig.<sup>48</sup> The manuscript consists of eighty-four numbered and nine unnumbered folios. It is made up of two parts: the first, occupying the first sixty-one folios, is a collection of King James's poems entitled *All the kings short poesie that ar not printed* (fol. 2<sup>r</sup>) and the second consists of eleven prose texts on varied subjects. The poems in the first part are classed under the headings 'Amatoria', 'Miscellanea' and 'Fragmenta'. It is those in 'Amatoria' with which this chapter is concerned. Westcott believed that all the poems in 'Amatoria' were an expression of James's impatience as he awaited Anne's arrival from Denmark prior to their marriage, before finally going to collect her himself in Autumn 1589.<sup>49</sup> Internal evidence suggests that the manuscript was copied between 1616 and 1618,<sup>50</sup> and Craigie suggests that the preparation of this manuscript may have been connected with the publication of the *Workes* in 1616 and that an additional volume containing James's poems may have been intended. 'Amatoria' is written in the hands of Prince Charles and Thomas Carey and corrections to the text are in James's holograph. The poems that are copied into MS 22601 (fols 24<sup>r</sup>-36<sup>v</sup>), and which appear in *Poesie*, are copied at the beginning of that collection following a title page and index pages for 'Amatoria' and 'Miscellanea'.<sup>51</sup>

#### 4.2. The Poems

My examination of the poems in MS 22601 will be in the order in which they appear in that manuscript, including 'O haples hap, o luckless fortune blinde' which is not copied into *Poesie*, and I will consider the variants and similarities between these poems as they appear in their new environment.<sup>52</sup> Before I do this however, it is appropriate to discuss the attribution of these poems as they appear in both collections. Curtis Perry argues that the poems in MS 22601 that both Craigie and Westcott previously ascribed to James, are attributed to Thomas Areskine in a manuscript he refers to as the 'lost

---

<sup>48</sup> Carey and Leviston were Grooms of the Chamber to Prince Charles, and Craig was the royal doctor.

<sup>49</sup> Westcott, p.71.

<sup>50</sup> 'A Sonet against the could that was in January 1616', fol. 43<sup>v</sup>, was written about the extreme cold of that winter, and yet 'King James on the blazeing starr: Octo: 28: 1618' has not been copied even though it was popular in the miscellanies of the period, for example: Bod. MSS Rawl. Poet. 84, Ashmole 38, Eng. Poet. e.14; Folger MSS V.a.162, V.a.345; BL MSS Add. 3910, Add. 30982; Harleian 791, Harleian 1221, Harleian 6038.

<sup>51</sup> See footnote 30.

<sup>52</sup> Curtis Perry, 'Royal Authorship and Problems of Manuscript Attribution in the Poems of King James VI and I', *Notes and Queries*, 46 (244), no 2 (June 1999), 243-246. Perry points out that the poems in MS 22601 have been 'recombined into different units' and that several of the individual poems attributed to Areskine (all of those in MS 22601) become stanzas in longer poems attributed to James (those in *Poesie*). I will discuss attribution below.

Halliwell' manuscript.<sup>53</sup> J.O. Halliwell printed selected texts from MS 22601, where he attributes the poems previously ascribed to James to Thomas Areskine due to the ascription 'Si<sup>r</sup> Thomas Areskine of Gogar Knighte', which is written on the folio containing the last poem.<sup>54</sup>

Several hands were involved in the compilation of MS 22601, and there is a strong possibility that Thomas Areskine was responsible for copying the section of poems attributed to James (or to Areskine) in this collection.<sup>55</sup> It is clear why Halliwell attributed the poems to Areskine, then, but a detailed study of the manuscript reveals that the attributions (if this is what they are), as in manuscript culture generally, are unreliable. I cannot discount unequivocally that Areskine's name was intended to refer to either the poem, or the group of poems above it, but if we were to adhere to the pattern of attributions discussed earlier and Areskine's name is intended to refer to the text following, then he is being claimed as the author of 'O thou prodigious monster' (fol. 37<sup>r</sup>).<sup>56</sup>

There are certainly close connections between Areskine and the king. He was born in the same year as James, and was his childhood, and lifelong, friend. They were both taught by George Buchanan, and it was Areskine who replaced Raleigh as Captain of the Guard on James's accession to the throne. Perry's argument is that the poems should not be considered as solely either James's or Areskine's but were a collaborative effort. In a coterie environment such as James had in Scotland this would be quite possible, or even expected, as would the imitation of poems (as I have shown in section one).

Perry has identified a similar sequence of Petrarchan sonnets composed collaboratively by the Scottish poets Robert Ayton, William Alexander, and Alexander Craig when all three were students at St Andrews in the 1580s.<sup>57</sup> It is extremely likely that 'O haples hap' was either a collaborative effort between James and William Drummond or that James was simply imitating the work of his coterie.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Perry, pp.243-246

<sup>54</sup> Halliwell, pp.32-37.

<sup>55</sup> See chapter one, p.18.

<sup>56</sup> See chapter one, p.20 for further explanation.

<sup>57</sup> Mary Jane Wittstock Scott, 'Robert Ayton: Scottish Metaphysical', *Scottish Literary Journal*, 2:1 (1975), 5-16, cited in Perry, p.245.

<sup>58</sup> For 'O haples hap' see *The Poetical Works of William Drummond, with 'A Cypresse Grove'*, ed. by L.E. Kastner, 2 vols (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1913), I, 90.

Alternatively, although poems were compiled in volumes they still circulated, in a very close circle in this case, and it is feasible that MS 22601 was copied by someone who had access to James's papers at the royal court in Scotland or in England. Also, it was often the case in manuscript circles that rather than the name of the author being attached to a text it was the name of the person who had supplied the texts to the compiler. Areskine remains the likely candidate in any scenario for either collaboration in writing, copying or supplying the texts. Perry's theory that the poems were written by Areskine in Scotland, and copied as his in this manuscript and then 'corrected and amended' by the king in *Poesis* is also possible, although it does seem unlikely if the poems were either solely James's or a collaborative effort that he would have copied the poems from MS 22601 back into *Poesis*. The pattern of amendments and corrections in MS 22601 is too inconsistent to choose definitively between these alternatives. The miscellany includes several amendments that James has made in *Poesis*, but does not incorporate them all and it is clear that there was collaboration between the two sets of poems, which in turn indicates a link between MS 22601 and the royal court or peripheral circles.

'Ballade .1.' ('While as a stately fleetinge Castell faire', fol. 24<sup>f</sup>) has been given a title in *Poesis*: 'A complaint of his mistress absence from Court'.<sup>59</sup> The only other difference is textual, but is one that draws attention to the question of which was the authoritative text, MS 22601 or *Poesis*. In stanza seven of MS 22601 and the uncorrected text of *Poesis*, the 'comely bewty' of the mistress 'stain'd our princely traine' but 'stain'd' has been struck through and in James's hand is written the far more flattering 'graced'. Does this mean that MS 22601 was copied before the amendments were made to *Poesis*, or alternatively could it be that *Poesis* was copied from MS 22601 and that the word 'graced' was simply more to James's liking?

The poet takes some time to remember his mistress, seeming to have a preference for the natural world over either naming or describing his lady. The lover describes a ship at sea in perfect conditions but the travellers are subject to the whims of fortune and the coming storm signifies his mistress's absence. The poet says that his 'crime' is like Apollo removing the sun from the sky, and thus his lady from his presence. He laments the absence of the court's 'chifest flowre' and the sun is still equated with his lady as he

---

<sup>59</sup> MS 24195, fol. 14<sup>f</sup>; first in MS 22601, eighth in *Poesis*.

pleads to the clouds not to push the sun away. James has shown his preference for alliteration in the first line, and the poem is in the Troilus verse (rhyme royal) recommended in *Revlis* as the ‘kynde of verse’ suitable for ‘tragicall materis, complaintis, or testamentis’.<sup>60</sup>

‘A Dreame.2.’ (fols 25<sup>r</sup> and 26<sup>v</sup>) follows ‘Ballade.1.’ in this miscellany as well as in *Poesis*; here the mistress has been elevated to (or identified as) Lady Glammes (‘A dreame on his Mistris my Ladie Glammes’).<sup>61</sup> Westcott has identified the subject of this and the previous poem as Lady Anne Murray, the daughter of Sir John Murray, a childhood companion of the king who became one of his Masters of the Household. He refers to a letter from Sir John Carey to Burghley dated 10 May 1595 in which the forthcoming marriage is mentioned and ‘Mistris Ann Murrey’ is called ‘the Kinges mistris’. The king is also linked to Lady Euphemia Glamis, one of the seven daughters of the 5<sup>th</sup> Earl of Morton in another letter from Carey to Lord Burghley.<sup>62</sup>

The poem is a dream vision. The poet is granted a vision of his loved one, in which she places a tablet and an amethyst around his neck; on awaking he finds that they are still there and realises that the dream was in fact true, so he calls on the gods and asks ‘what could the meanninge proue’. The amethyst was traditionally a love gem and this one is in the ‘forme of hart’, but the dreamer refuses to bow down to love – as does the poet.<sup>63</sup> Fleming argues that the poet is asserting traditional Scottish manliness in refusing to be ‘enslaved to love’; it is only Cupid who can shoot through this armour.<sup>64</sup> James adheres to his *Revlis* once again by invoking his own classical training in the shape of the many classical and mythological references he deploys.<sup>65</sup>

Westcott argues that the titles of this and the previous poem were added at a later date, presumably at the time of the manuscript’s compilation.<sup>66</sup> The title of ‘A complaint of his mistressis absence from Court’ (‘A Ballade.1.’) was, I suggest, written after the

<sup>60</sup> Craigie, *Poems*, I, 76, 81.

<sup>61</sup> MS 24195, fol. 16<sup>v</sup>; second in MS 22601, ninth in *Poesis*.

<sup>62</sup> *Calendar of Border Papers*, II, 31; Westcott, pp.78-79. William Douglas, 5<sup>th</sup> Earl of Morton’s daughter, Eupheme, married Sir Thomas Lyon, Master of Glamis, in 1586; they had one daughter. There is no evidence to support either mother or daughter being the mistress in the poem. Rob Macpherson, ‘Lyon, Sir Thomas, of Auldbar, master of Glamis (c.1546–1608)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17286>, accessed 25 April 2007).

<sup>63</sup> For further discussion of the qualities of the amethyst see Fleming, p.135.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p.136.

<sup>65</sup> Craigie, *Poems*, I, 78-79.

<sup>66</sup> Westcott, p.79.

compilation of the manuscript: the space for the title is cramped and has the appearance of an afterthought. I would argue that the title is in a rougher, and more casual version of the hand that transcribed the poem below, most likely that of Prince Charles.<sup>67</sup> The amendment to it, however, is in James's hand and he has altered 'Mistris' to the more Scottish 'Mistressis'. Likewise, I believe that 'A Dreame on his Mistris Ladie Glammes' ('A Dreame.2.') was written above the text in the same hand. In MS 22601, therefore, the mistress never becomes Lady Glammis: she remains anonymous, leaving the poem in an open condition and seemingly impersonal. There may, of course, be more practical reasons: that 'Lady Glamis' was no longer James's mistress in 1603, for instance, or that it would have been unchivalrous to name the lady if she had married.<sup>68</sup> This is corroborated in the style of the titles. 'Ballade .1.' has no named object of desire – a ballad hints at remote narration and verse based on folklore or legend – in comparison with 'his mistressis', which suggests a personal relationship. In the same way it is likely that the compiler of MS 22601 chose to leave these poems open, so that they could apply to whoever the reader desired.

As in 'A complaint of his mistressis absence from Court', alterations have been made to the text of 'A Dreame on his Ladie Glammes'. In the line 'as absence breeds thee noyis',<sup>69</sup> it appears that James has made several attempts to choose the perfect word: 'woes' has been written above 'noyis', which has been struck through, as have 'woise' and 'woesi'. Likewise, 'Loe here she is who makes thee tredd' has been corrected in the hand of Prince Charles to the less romantic 'trade' in place of 'tredd'. The text of MS 22601 has incorporated the correction to 'woes' but has not included Prince Charles's amendment to 'trade'.

'A Ballad.3.' begins on the verso of the first sixteen lines of 'A Dreame 2';<sup>70</sup> it finishes on folio 26<sup>r</sup>, where 'A Gentlewoman y<sup>t</sup> married a yonge Gent who after forsooke whereupon she tooke hir needle', a short ballad, has been squeezed onto the end of the folio. Prince Charles has written the title 'Constant Loue in all conditions' above the text in *Poesis*, but it is not apparent in whose hand 'breathe' is corrected in the second

---

<sup>67</sup> It is the same hand as that of the indexes and 'Two sonnets to her Maies<sup>tie</sup>', which has been identified as that of Prince Charles.

<sup>68</sup> For further discussion on the lady's identity see Westcott, pp.78-80.

<sup>69</sup> Annoyance.

<sup>70</sup> At the end of fol. 25<sup>r</sup>, after this part of 'A Dreame', a hand has been drawn with the first finger pointing off the right side of the folio. 'A Dreame' then continues on fol. 26<sup>v</sup>.



line for 'bearde', although I would argue that Charles was responsible for this too.<sup>71</sup> MS 22601 originally missed the word 'Saturne' in the first line, an easy eyeskip error if the text were being copied. It is apparent in this case that if the compiler used *Poesis* as his copy text he did so before the corrections were made, as MS 22601 has retained the original 'breath' rather than its correction 'bearde'.

If James has remained as true to his *Revlis* as he had done so far then we are to read this poem as one of 'heich & graue subiectis', as it has been written in the suitable 'Ballat Royal' rhyme. The poem returns to the wintry scene which James had described in *Essayes of a Prentice* (sonnet 6), where he refers to 'saturne olde, | Whose hoarie haire owercovering earth, makes flie'.<sup>72</sup> Here love is suppressed in the natural world but the poet contends with the outward cold to maintain 'the course of constant loue'.

'A Ballade.4.' is next in the sequence in MS 22601 and is not included in *Poesis*.<sup>73</sup> The poem starts 'O haples hap, o luckless fortune blinde', and is written in two stanzas. The first stanza has a regular ABABCDCD rhythm whilst the second is irregular; a chorus follows each stanza. The poet believes that he has a life that is worse than death since Cupid's 'golden dart' condemned him to a love that was to be denied him. Although 'O haples hap' (fols 31<sup>r</sup>-31<sup>v</sup>) appears to be unique to this miscellany, the theme is common to several Petrarchan sonnets of the Elizabethan and early Stuart years and particular similarities are to be found in William Drummond's 'What haplesse hap had I now to bee borne' and Thomas Wyatt's 'Epigram 24', 'The fructe of all the servise that I serve | Dispaire doth repe, such hapless hap have I'.<sup>74</sup> Drummond laments the demise of a past 'golden age' and prays to be taken from this world as he recalls the corruption and lack of virtues in the present time. Like the speaker in Drummond's 'What haplesse hap', Wyatt's poem states that devotion to service has brought him only despair, that 'Tantalus ane I and yn worse payne'; likewise, the speaker in MS 22601 compares his 'wofull case' to that of Tantalus. I would argue that 'A Ballade.4.' was intended to be part of this sequence of poems (other than 'A Gentlewoman' which is clearly an 'outsider'); it is written in the same hand and is of a similar style to the others in this group.

<sup>71</sup> MS 24195, fol. 10<sup>r</sup>; third in 22601, sixth in *Poesis*.

<sup>72</sup> Craigie, *Poems*, I, 11.

<sup>73</sup> Fourth in MS 22601, not included in *Poesis*.

<sup>74</sup> Peter Beal attributes 'What haples hap' to William Drummond; see Beal, *Index*, II, 23. It is one of six sonnets entitled 'Urania, or Spiritual Poems'.

The sixth poem in this group in MS 22601 is entitled 'Passionado.5.'; again, the title bestowed on it by James and Prince Charles is more exotic, and possibly suggests that the poem was written after the marriage of James and Anne, or that the title was added at a later date. In *Poesis* James wrote the original title ('A Dier<sup>75</sup> on her Maies<sup>tie</sup>') and the text of the poem.<sup>76</sup> Prince Charles has struck through 'on her Maies<sup>tie</sup>' and written underneath 'at her Maies<sup>ties</sup> desyer'.<sup>77</sup> Several other amendments have been made throughout the text which are suggestive of a debate between James and Charles: where the text of *Poesis* says 'nor raging Roland for his loue ~~who~~<sup>that</sup> ledd so madd a life → or that →', the first 'that' has been written in by James and 'who' crossed out, and the final 'or that' written in the right hand margin by Charles seems to suggest that James made his amendment after Charles had made his recommendation, crossing out the 'who' and adding 'that'. In this particular case MS 22601 has 'that', in agreement with the corrected version of *Poesis*; James's amendments have also been copied into MS 22601 in line 21, but there are three instances in this poem where his amendments in *Poesis* have not been copied into MS 22601: line 11 retains 'can', instead of James's 'may'; line 24 retains 'a' and not James's 'one'. This collaboration on the textual amendments appears to suggest that James and Charles were preparing the poems for a 'final' edition for posterity, either as an additional volume of *Workes*, thus corroborating Westcott's theory, or as a family volume.

'Passionado.5.' is a conventional lament, and Steven May points out that it is an imitation of Sir Edward Dyer's well-circulated poem, 'Bewayling his exile he singeth thus', which begins, 'He that his mirthe hathe lost'.<sup>78</sup> The poet bewails his unrequited love, but does not welcome death because it best becomes his misery to waste away. Unlike in the courtly model, however, the lover recognises that this lady is not worth his pain and the final lines are a reaction against the Petrarchan ideal and the misogynistic forms which are found in James's poems as a result. He states that he would be 'happie' if he were martyred for 'sume sweete Sainct' that were 'good and faire' and wishes the man well who might find a mate who does not change, but although 'in vertue sume excell', some 'ou'matche the greatest Diuell in hell'. Curiously, though, the poem does end with the ambiguous profession of love: 'for true and honest constant

<sup>75</sup> A 'Dier' is a complaint or problem.

<sup>76</sup> MS 24195, fol. 10<sup>v</sup>; fifth in MS 22601, seventh in *Poesis*.

<sup>77</sup> This is the only poem in the collection in MS 22601 that is to be found in another manuscript, Bod. MS 165 (see footnote 30 above).

<sup>78</sup> May, *Courtier Poets*, pp.66-67, 290-294.

loue, this patient here does lye'. One can see why Prince Charles might wish this poem to be read by his mother, or written at her desire, rather than be thought to be about her.

After the copy of this poem in *Poesis* an explanation has been written in James's hand: 'The sonnett watt is here | quhiche interprettis all the | mater'<sup>79</sup> – this is the end of the folio and what does follow is 'A Complaint of his Mistresis absence from Court'.<sup>80</sup> The numbers on the folios are in a contemporary hand in *Poesis*, and the numbering includes an inserted leaf, much smaller and of different paper stock to the rest of the book; this leaf contains 'My muse hath made a wilfull lye I grant', which also follows 'Passionado.5.' in MS 22601 ('A Sonnett'). Why this should be an insertion is partly explained by the content of the sonnet. The poet confesses that he 'sange of sorrowes neuer felt by me' (we can only assume that these were the sorrows sung of in 'A Dier at her Maiesties desyer' ('Passionado.5.')), and asks how so loud a lie could be excused. The unambiguous reference to the previous poem as well as the point that he lied at her desire and wrote the poem by her order is found in the lines: 'O yes I did it euen at hir desire'.

The longer poems in this group ('Ballade.1. '; 'A Dreame.2. '; 'A Ballad.3. '; 'A Ballade.4. ' and 'Passionado.5. ') are placed together in MS 22601 and on folios 33<sup>v</sup> to 36<sup>v</sup> are nine individual sonnets: 'A sonnett' ('My muse hath made a wilfull lye I grant'), then numbers 2 to 9 rather than titles.<sup>81</sup> Perry and Craigie both included 'My muse' as the final stanza of 'A Dier', and although it is clear that it was designed to follow this poem, its placement in the manuscript, the reference to it as an individual sonnet and the clear division of ideas do not support their arguments. In addition to this, the indexes in *Poesis* state that 'If mourninge might amend' is 'with the Sonnet'<sup>82</sup> and 'with the Sonnet – My muse hath made'<sup>83</sup> indicating that it was not a stanza of the longer poem.

The following two sonnets in MS 22601, '.2.' and '.3.' (fols 34<sup>r</sup> and 34<sup>v</sup>), have been joined together in *Poesis* and given the title, 'Two Sonnets to her Maies<sup>tie</sup>' to show the

<sup>79</sup> MS 24195, fol. 12<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., fol. 14<sup>r</sup>

<sup>81</sup> The sonnets in MS 22601 are listed with the corresponding number in Craigie, *Poems*, II, 65-89, in brackets: 1. A Sonnett (7); sonnet 2 (4); sonnet 3 (4); sonnet 4 (second stanza of 1); sonnets 5 to 9 are part of a 6 stanza sequence: sonnet 5 (stanza 4); sonnet 6 (stanza 2); sonnet 7 (stanza 5); sonnet 8 (stanza 6); sonnet 9 (stanza 3).

<sup>82</sup> MS 24195, fol.2<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., fol. 82<sup>v</sup>.

difference of Stiles'. The vanity of the poet is apparent in both, as are the Petrarchan principles that are alluded to in the title: the poems are about the writer and also a chance for him to show his rhetorical skills in persuading the lady of his love. The poet in the first sonnet is clearly writing under duress, harping back to her request to write in the previous poems, with the excuse that 'Castalias flouds dried vp in mee'.<sup>84</sup> In the second he tells her that he will not deny her request, but that it is her name and status which wake the muse so that the poet can begin to write. It is the suggestion of James's voyage to Denmark to escort Anne to England alongside the allusion to rank which convert a seemingly amorous poem into an impersonal one. The title has been added later in Prince Charles's hand, most likely at the time it was being edited, and he is responsible for copying the text of these poems as well. The amendments to the text made by James have not been included in MS 22601.

'O cruell Cupid' (fol. 34<sup>v</sup>) follows '.2.' ('Suppose madam') and '.3.' ('But what madam') in MS 22601 and is headed '.4.'. In *Poesis*, it is on the verso of 'A complaint against the contrary wyndes', which ends at the bottom of the folio with a knotted flourish. 'O cruell Cupid' or '.4.' is copied over the whole of the verso and has no connection with the poem on the recto. It seems clear, therefore, that it was intended as a separate sonnet and not as the second stanza of 'Contrary wyndes' as suggested by Craigie.

Sonnets '.5.' to '.9.' use the same imagery as '.4.' ('O cruell Cupid'): that of the heat of love which destroys the lover. In *Poesis* six sonnets have been included as one poem: 'The cheuiott hills'; 'As man, a man am I' (6); 'If he that lackes the light' (9); 'Comme fruitctfull thoughts' (5); 'Although that crooked crawling Vulcan lie' (7) and 'O womans witt that wauers with the winde' (8). The poems have been rearranged and the compiler of MS 22601 has not included the first in James's sequence.<sup>85</sup>

I have shown in previous chapters how the meaning of prose texts can be modified by the other items that they share a manuscript with, and in the case of individual poems this process is no different.<sup>86</sup> The sequence of poems gathered together by attribution, especially when a numerical order has been assigned to them by the compiler, as in the

---

<sup>84</sup> Castalia: a spring on Mount Parnassus sacred to the muses.

<sup>85</sup> The number allocated to the sonnets in MS 22601 is supplied in parenthesis within the text.

<sup>86</sup> This process is also evident in the rearrangement of stanzas of 'Watt I wot well' in Bod. MS Rawl. Poet. 172 discussed below.

case of James's poems in both collections, offers us an insight into the importance the compiler placed on the individual poems, the sequence and their place within the manuscript as a whole. We cannot know for certain what narrative, if any, the compilers of *Poesis* or MS 22601 wished to construct but I will now consider what the placement of these poems can tell us.

The order of the poems in MS 22601 is an inverted mirror of that in *Poesis*. The longer poems which open this sequence in MS 22601, 'A Ballade.1.', 'A Dreame.2.', 'A Ballad.3.' and 'Passionado.5.'(including 'My muse'), are at the end of the sequence in *Poesis*; after these longer poems follow the nine sonnets. The first four of the sonnets in MS 22601 have been recycled earlier in the manuscript, as I have shown, which leaves sonnets five to nine which have been incorporated into *Poesis* in a different order.

A constant theme is evident in *Poesis*. We are told that the writer's muse 'interpretis' the previous poem, and 'Two Sonnets to her Maies<sup>tie</sup>' are joined. In MS 22601, these links are more apparent as these sonnets form the first three of the sequence. In this case the compiler reverses the conventional structure of love lyrics with his confession that his previous words of desire were untrue; sonnets '.2.' and '.3.' then parade his rhetorical skills, showing the lady how he was able to persuade her. Although the other sonnets have no particular connection, the unamorous 'O womans witt' and 'If he who lakes y<sup>e</sup> sight' seem a fitting end to the section of sonnets. By this stage the absence in 'O womans witt' is welcome. The lover is constant only in inconstancy and as stable as a 'weathercock' (fol. 36<sup>r</sup>) and the relief felt at the end of the poem carries into that which follows it.

The poems in *Poesis* that mention the Queen and describe the desire to breach the distance which separates the lovers are not included in MS 22601. Although the poems remain prescriptive, focussing more on imaginary figures and the gods, the references to the 'Queene' and 'her maies<sup>tie</sup>' fit the provenance of the book, whereas the compiler of MS 22601 has chosen certain poems from an arranged collection and rearranged them according to length, following them with the sonnets, which are (as we have seen) in an apparently contrived order. The poet describes how the amorous 'Passionado.5.' had been written at the lady's desire, before seemingly using rhetorical devices again to persuade her of his love (possibly a futile task, and more to do with writing to a

prescribed formula, having previously told her of his methods, although he continues to woo her through the sequence). Alternatively, of course, the arrangement of poems might be more about the organisational methods of the manuscript's compiler. In this way, poems have been removed from their context, and rearranged in a sequence according to the motives of the compiler, and further to this they have been taken out of a location which marks them as being relevant to the monarch – they have now become love lyrics about an anonymous lady and do not add to the historical understanding of James's marriage.

Two principles guiding the style of James's poetry were his literary background and his gender. It seems apparent that he wished to break away from English Elizabethan conventions of poetry in the style of his love poetry in 'Amatoria' as well as in his belief that although English is 'lykest to our language', 'we differ from thame in sindrie reulis of Poesie'.<sup>87</sup> It is ironic, then, that on James's accession those Scottish courtier poets who travelled to the English court with him imitated the Petrarchan style of poetry which had been displaced for the Scottish rules under James. Secondly, James was writing poetry for his betrothed, much of it apparently from a sense of poetic duty. He wrote verse in the common language that he advocated in the *Revlis*, which gave it a practical and dispassionate edge. Elizabeth I, by contrast, as an unmarried female, was able to court the flirtatious and passionate Petrarchan style of poetry in which she was desired and admired for her chastity.

The audience of James's poetry must be taken into consideration when its poetic style is analysed. James's 'Amatoria' poems were copied into a manuscript book either for his personal use or to be seen by those close to him. While MS 22601 had practical, descriptive titles (perhaps as a record for the compiler), *Poesis* was initially copied with no titles, just flourishes to indicate the end of a text. The titles in the manuscript were clearly added after the poems had been copied – although several titles are in the same hand as the text, the writing is often cramped or in an awkward position on the page. Why, though, would the compiler place titles on texts in a personal miscellany? Likewise, in such a small volume, there seems little practical value in an index – this volume has two.<sup>88</sup> These editing tools, along with the corrections made by the king,

---

<sup>87</sup> Craigie, *Poems*, I, 67.

<sup>88</sup> MS 24195, fols 2<sup>v</sup>, 82<sup>v</sup>; an index would be of assistance to the compiler in large miscellanies such as Folger MS V.a.345, discussed below.

Prince Charles, and possibly one other scribe indicate that the volume was most likely being prepared, as Westcott has suggested, for printing. Editing surrounding the choice of title is apparent in 'A Dier at her Maies<sup>ties</sup> desyer' where there is evidence of careful consideration about how the relationship between the king and queen should be represented to the public.<sup>89</sup> Publishing would transform the miscellany from a personal keepsake into a literary artefact and an historical record.

'Miscellanea' and 'Fragmenta' were subjected to the same editing processes as I have described in relation to 'Amatoria', but following the poems in these subsequent sections are eleven miscellaneous prose pieces (including letters to and from the king) which were not edited by James or Prince Charles and it is unlikely, therefore, that they were considered for printing. It is apparent, however, that they have paid careful attention to the order of the poems in their book and the impact that the collection as a whole would have on the reader of the miscellany as well as of the printed book. In 'Miscellanea' for instance are 'A Sonnet painting out the perfect Poet';<sup>90</sup> 'A Sonnet to the reader prefixed to the treatise of the arte of poesie';<sup>91</sup> and 'number 28',<sup>92</sup> which is a continuation of this theme; here a leaf has been cut out of the book and '29' is still visible on the stub. It is clear that the numbers on the folios have been added after this amendment was made because they take the missing leaf into consideration.

The position of 'Amatoria' at the beginning of the collection marks it out as being the most important part of the book. In MS 22601 the 'Amatoria' poems are found towards the front of the book, following several prose pieces and four short poems. All of the poems are together (with the exception of 'A gentlewoman', which is copied between 'A Ballad.3.' and the continuation of 'A Dreame'), and they are between 'In praise of Peace wi<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Spaine' (fol. 23<sup>v</sup>) and 'O thou prodigious monster' (fols 37<sup>r</sup>-39<sup>r</sup>).

If the compiler was connected to the court, as I have suggested, then it is likely that he would have been aware that the poems originated from either the king or his immediate circle, as would a court insider when reading the collection. In this case the poems would provide a section in the miscellany which is overtly court-centred, or a

---

<sup>89</sup> See p.185 above.

<sup>90</sup> MS 24195, fol. 40<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., fol. 41<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., fol. 41<sup>v</sup>.

collectable group of poems with the added prestige of royal connection. The modern reader with no prior knowledge of MS 22601, however, or a contemporary reader outside the king's circle, might possibly view these amatory poems as conspicuous in the miscellany because of their serious nature, their prominence being lessened by the ascription to Sir Thomas Areskine.

It is significant that 'In praise of Peace wi<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Spaine' (fol. 23<sup>v</sup>) immediately precedes James's verse. As I have mentioned above, James was in favour of peace with Spain, although this was often in conflict with the popular political and religious inclinations of the nation.<sup>93</sup> The poem is a short ditty with a chorus, indicating that it would have been sung and/or that it was written to a pre-existing ballad tune. It does not praise the Spanish or the idea of any union with them, only the idea of bringing peace to the nation in place of the years of war under Elizabeth. It has a weary tone, pressing thanks and admiration on the king.<sup>94</sup>

In contrast with the criticisms of the previous reign offered in 'In praise of Peace wi<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Spaine', 'O thou prodigious monster' has echoes of the Lord Keeper's condemnation of the critics of Elizabeth's Irish policy at a Star Chamber discussion in 1599, in which he declared they were notorious defamers, 'some wicked and traitorous persons (monsters of men) that without regarde of dutie or conscience, and without feare of God, or man, cease not in the abundance of their malice, to traduce her maiestie'.<sup>95</sup> The poem is a virulent attack on those who wooed Elizabeth not for love, but for political advancement and 'did shew y<sup>e</sup>ir mindes' after her death by turning their attention to James. Although the poem denounces the flatterers in Elizabeth's court it also serves as a warning for the new king, and a finger points out to him the text's warning that while true counsellors were to be found, he should choose with care, since 'flatterers cannott be Princes friend'.

---

<sup>93</sup> Thomas Cogswell, *The blessed revolution: English politics and the coming of war, 1621-1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); W.B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

<sup>94</sup> For further discussion of 'In praise of Peace wi<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> Spaine' see chapter three.

<sup>95</sup> NRA SP12/273, fols 60<sup>v</sup>-61<sup>r</sup>; for further discussion of 'O thou prodigious monster' see chapter three. 'When you awake, dull Brittons', BL MS Harleian. 3910, is a libel against the libellers of Francis Bacon after his impeachment; it refers to the corrupt men of power as the 'monster multitude' and calls for the 'monster overgrowne' to be thrown at justice's feet.



Joseph Hall's poem for James's accession recognised the corruption in the previous court and welcomed a reign free from 'filth, excesse and seruile flattery'.<sup>96</sup> James himself instructed his son of the duties with which a monarch is burdened and told him that he should strive to be a pattern of virtue; these views are mirrored in 'O thou prodigious monster'.<sup>97</sup> The poem is more likely to have been written by one of Elizabeth's courtiers than one of James's, and yet as one of James's oldest friends and his bodyguard Areskine might well have shared its sentiments, if he was not in fact the author. The warning in this poem, in the context of the miscellany, is directed towards 'the king' as a public person, not as the author of the poems with which it shares space. One might argue that the placement of Areskine's name at the end of James's poems and the beginning of 'O thou prodigious monster' suggests that he was guarding the king textually, as well as offering advice to him in the poem.

The texts either side of James's poems shed a different light on them from that offered in *Poesis*. They return frequently to the corrupt and corrupting nature of the royal court and the political system. Betrayal and revenge go hand in hand in 'If y<sup>t</sup> once liu'd in Englands glorious Court' (fols 39<sup>r</sup>-39<sup>v</sup>) as the poet dreams of retrieving his lost honour. A series of twelve 'Trenchers' by Sir John Davies (fols 40<sup>r</sup>-43<sup>r</sup>), written whilst he was trying to regain lost favour in legal and court circles, and which tellingly begins with 'The Courtier', follows 'Englands glorious Court'.<sup>98</sup> In this series of short rhymes the poet illustrates the potential failings of eleven other callings, including 'The Diuine', 'The lawyer', 'The merchaunt' and 'The married man', whilst denying that members of these professions (as well as the poet) are guilty of such practices. The courtier, for instance, has never learned

Superiors to adore  
 inferiors to despise  
 to fly from them that fall  
 to follow them y<sup>t</sup> rise. (fol. 40<sup>r</sup>)

Between Raleigh's letter to the king after his arraignment and James's poems are twenty-four 'Maxims' offering further, Machiavellian, advice to the successful courtier: 'whatsoeuer yo<sup>u</sup> do against him, pretende the Princes good & commonweath by this slie course you shall sooner cutt his throate'; 'be not ouerfonde of vertue it hath hurte many

---

<sup>96</sup> Joseph Hall, 'The Kings Prophecie: or Weeping Ioy', in *The Collected Poems of Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter and Norwich*, ed. by A. Davenport (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1949), p.118.

<sup>97</sup> James VI and I, 'Basilicon Doron', in *Political Writings*, p.34.

<sup>98</sup> See p.165 above.

of hir doatinge louers'; 'By no meanes take bribes you<sup>r</sup> selfe let that be donne by somme trustie man'.<sup>99</sup>

How would James's contemporaries have read his texts in this miscellany? Whether the king would have been seen to be endorsing texts in close proximity to his poems is dependant on the arrangement of the individual texts by the manuscript's compiler and, of course, on the reader's knowledge that James was their author. We cannot know for certain how his texts would have been received, but we can assume that the royal word was a mark of favour, and that the texts would only have been available in elite circles at the time this manuscript was being compiled.<sup>100</sup> Likewise, the presence of so many of James's texts, and their rarity, is an indication of the compiler's proximity to royal circles. Historians have often used James's writings in order to analyse aspects of his life, and there is no evidence to suggest that contemporaries did not do the same, thereby potentially making judgements of the king and court based on the content of his amatory poems. The inclusion of these poems in the miscellany suggests that they were either about him or his court. Alternatively, given the predominance of anti-court material in the miscellany, James's poems could have been taken as further evidence of courtly dissipation, with love taking precedence over policy. This, then, could make the miscellany seem to offer a more sceptical assessment of the king in view of his statements in *Basilicon Doron* that virtue should radiate from the king to his subjects.<sup>101</sup>

### 5. Sir Walter Raleigh in Verse

So far in this chapter I have discussed poetry that appears not to have circulated at all and that which has extremely limited circulation; I am going to turn my attention now to the contrasting case of Sir Walter Raleigh. Work written by or about Raleigh circulated extensively in manuscript miscellanies throughout his successful days as a courtier and soldier at Elizabeth's court, through his fall from grace and his execution, as well as posthumously. Miscellany compilers used these texts to bolster political or religious views in other texts in their collections, both oppositional and otherwise, and as an example (positive or negative) of what could happen to a prominent courtier.

---

<sup>99</sup> For further discussion of the 'Maxims' see chapter three.

<sup>100</sup> Kevin Sharpe, 'Reading James Writing: the subjects of royal writings in Jacobean Britain', in *Royal Subjects*, p.18.

<sup>101</sup> James VI and I, 'Basilicon Doron', pp.138-149, 166-167,169-170.

The poetry that I will examine in this chapter was written during the early years of James's reign, and includes a poem written by Raleigh which was turned against him ('Water thy plaints wi<sup>th</sup> grace divine', fol. 63<sup>v</sup>) and two anti-Raleigh libels ('Wilye watt', fol. 63<sup>r</sup>, and 'Watt I wot well thy ouerweening witt', fol. 64<sup>r</sup>). I will examine 'Water thy plaints' in Bodleian MS Ashmole 781, and 'Watt I wot well' in Folger MS V.a.345 and Bodleian MS Rawlinson Poetry 172. I have not found 'Wilye watt' in any manuscript other than MS 22601, and 'Water thy plaints' is extant in only two other known collections.<sup>102</sup> 'Watt I wot well', however, is common to many miscellanies throughout the first half of the seventeenth century. These three poems have been copied as a set in MS 22601, so we need to ask how the compiler of this miscellany wished to present Raleigh.

Raleigh established his status at court and his place in Elizabeth's favour between 1582 and 1586, but the Accession Day tilts on 17 November 1586 introduced his first real rival to the court.<sup>103</sup> Robert Devereux, second earl of Essex, had just returned from campaigning in the Low Countries and with the assistance of his uncle, the Earl of Leicester, very soon contested with Raleigh for the Queen's attention.<sup>104</sup>

Raleigh's poems circulated extensively amongst elite coterie during Elizabeth's reign; one of these, 'Nowe what is loue I pray thee tell' (fol. 104<sup>r</sup>), can be found in our miscellany.<sup>105</sup> Another also found in this collection, and which was probably written during Raleigh's early years at court when he was closely acquainted with the Earl of Oxford, is 'To A. Vaua.' (fol. 71<sup>r</sup>).<sup>106</sup> Raleigh sympathises with Anne over her illicit affair with the Earl of Oxford, warning her that once her reputation has been damaged, 'farewell the rest thy happie daies are don'. Further to preserving her personal reputation, the poem is an indication of the close connections within the royal court and of the way in which public position, reputation, and ability to impress the Queen go hand-in-hand. The affair ruined Oxford's chances of advancement at court, and although Anne's reputation was marred, she went on to survive several more lovers. At

---

<sup>102</sup> See chapter one, footnote 88, for other copies of these three poems.

<sup>103</sup> May, *Courtier*, p.119.

<sup>104</sup> May states that Raleigh and Essex were not the only favourites; Hatton, Heneage, and Leicester were still in favour: *Courtier*, p.121.

<sup>105</sup> See p.167 above.

<sup>106</sup> Steven W. May, 'Vavasour, Anne (fl. 1580–1621)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/68083>, accessed 10 Nov 2006). This poem is attributed to W.R. in *Le Prince de Amour*, where it is known as 'Manie desire but few or none deserue'. The lady in the poem was identified as Anne Vavasour, a gentlewoman of Elizabeth's bedchamber in this manuscript and in Bod. MS Rawl. Poet. 85. Anne was Oxford's mistress and bore his child in 1581.

this point in his upward climb Raleigh could have had no idea that his downfall would be greatly accelerated after courting the displeasure of the Queen after his own clandestine marriage to the pregnant Elizabeth Throckmorton in 1591. The ease with which Elizabeth's courtiers could fall from grace is apparent here, and in the poems written about Essex and Raleigh after they too fell from power: the Queen outliving the former and the latter not surviving the change of monarch.

What did contemporaries think of Raleigh? Much of the poetry written about him was produced between the beginning of James's reign and Raleigh's execution in 1618. These years also coincided with a lull in his poetic output and an increase in prose, including petitions for his reputation and protestations of his innocence. He spent most of these years in prison, and it is at this time that our miscellany was compiled. Rudick has argued that Raleigh's low circulation and attribution levels during his years of imprisonment are also due to the small number of extant miscellanies from the period, suggesting that it was not such an attractive proposition to have a convicted traitor gracing your compilation.<sup>107</sup> The libels therefore became multi-functional and ensured that Raleigh remained in the public eye both whilst he was out of circulation and after his death.

Raleigh had been the victim of jealous courtiers and political wrangling, yet he was revered as a national hero after his death. Some critics reconciled the man and the author; David Lloyd, for instance, acclaimed him as 'a great Soldier, and yet an excellent Courtier: an accomplished Gallant, yet a bookish man; a man that seemed born for any thing he undertook' whereas others could only understand the man through the poetry.<sup>108</sup> We have no real idea of what Raleigh himself thought of his poetic works: they were not placed in any order for either his contemporaries or the modern editor. That he circulated his political prose, letters and poems indicates that he had an agenda; to use his writing as a political tool: whilst a courtier to maintain the pleasure of the queen for his own advancement, and to present his case as he fell from favour in both reigns. In this way he was presenting a public image of himself. This collection offers a glimpse of the courtly image of Raleigh in the old reign but it is with his profile during the early Stuart years that I am concerned here. The circulation of these poems can tell us something about Raleigh's public image and how his contemporaries had chosen to

---

<sup>107</sup> Rudick, p.li.

<sup>108</sup> Rudick, p.xvii.

fashion that image. Before I introduce the manuscripts and the poems, it is worth mentioning that Raleigh's reputation is still under debate. On 5 November 1995, the headline 'Raleigh was a traitor: official', appeared in *The Sunday Times* – the following week, *The Sunday Telegraph* contested the allegation.<sup>109</sup>

### 5.1. Raleigh's poems in MS 22601

'Wilye watt' (fol. 63<sup>r</sup>), 'Water thy plaints' (fol. 63<sup>v</sup>), and 'Watt I wot well' (fol. 64<sup>r</sup>) have been copied together just over mid-way through this miscellany and as I have stated above, the collection also includes 'The lett<sup>r</sup>e of Si<sup>r</sup> Walter Rawleigh to the kinge after his Arraignmen<sup>t</sup>', 'To A. Vaua.', and 'Now what is loue I pray thee tell'. I will briefly examine the poems and their place in this context, where they support each other and the other Raleigh texts in the collection, before considering the place of 'Water thy plaints' in Bodleian MS Ashmole 781, and 'Watt I wot well' in Bodleian MS Rawlinson Poetry 172 and Folger MS V.a.345 in order to interpret the effect that the different contexts have on the poems.

When six items relating to a single person are found in one miscellany, one of the most pressing questions must be, 'why?' Arthur Marotti argues that poems that occur frequently in manuscript collections fall into three categories: model epitaphs and elegies, general cultural beliefs or moral truisms and poems celebrating the lifestyle and shared values of a social or intellectual group.<sup>110</sup> The Raleigh material in this manuscript, as well as other texts by Raleigh discussed in this chapter, fit into all three categories, and so his work clearly served a number of functions. It could be argued in this case that as a flexible and prolific author he had a higher chance of circulation and collection and, therefore, manuscript publication than other, less dynamic, authors. The content of many of his texts is ambiguous, which as well as offering various readings allows the collector and author to be more politically specific without redress. Raleigh's letter after his arraignment, for instance, might either be collected as an example of *contemptus mundi*, or in opposition to his arrest: only the compiler would know for sure. In the same way that there are variant readings of these ambiguous texts there are also variant 'writings', enabling the compiler to adapt a text to suit his own purposes. 'Watt I wot well', for instance, has different connotations depending on how much of the text is copied, just as much as if the text is adapted or altered. The lampoon consists

<sup>109</sup> Cited in Anna Beer, *Sir Walter Raleigh and his Readers in the Seventeenth Century: Speaking to the People* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), p.2.

<sup>110</sup> Marotti, *Manuscript*, pp.129-131.

of 125 lines, but often only the first 96 are copied into miscellanies (including MS 22601), thus highlighting the poem's political aspects by removing stanzas concerned with religion (specifically, atheism).

The anti-Raleigh lampoon 'Wilye watt' consists of six stanzas of four lines, with an AAAB rhyme scheme and a recurrent chorus simply stating 'mischieuous matchiuell'. The poem mocks Raleigh's 'skaunce [disdainful looks] and pride' whilst celebrating his fall from eminence and arrest for treason in July 1603. The magnitude of his fall is emphasized by reference to his prosecution and by the poet's satisfaction that he now cowers in 'towne & Citie', where he was once revered. Raleigh's losses at the beginning of James's reign are listed:

Lordshipp is flagg'd and fled  
 Captain shipp newly sped  
 Dried is the Hogsheads hed.

'Lordshipp' is likely to refer to the loss of lands; Raleigh lost the 'Captain shipp' of the Guard to Thomas Areskine, and he also lost his monopoly to license winesellers and wine imports (the 'Hogsheads hed'). The poem blames Raleigh for his part in Essex's downfall, which is attributed to a desire for revenge. In treating the rivalry between Essex and Raleigh the poem does not entirely take the side of Essex, however, pointing out that 'Essex for vengeance cries' and Raleigh is a 'damnable fiend of hell, mischieuous matchiuell': neither party is the favourite in this poem. Essex usurped Raleigh in Elizabeth's favour, and they remained enemies until Raleigh 'attended Essex's execution with glee'<sup>111</sup> in February 1601.

Raleigh's success in the previous reign was the source of envy, and his harsh fall was the subject of poetry and libels in many miscellanies, many writers rejoicing at his disgrace as he had supposedly done at Essex's. Some even turned Raleigh's own texts against him. 'Water thy plants with grace diuine', attributed to 'Sir Wa: Raleigh' in another collection, has only eight lines.<sup>112</sup> In MS 22601, however, is copied an anonymous libel, 'Water thy plaints wi<sup>th</sup> grace diuine', which extends and uses Raleigh's poem to attack him, even imitating Raleigh's pun on his surname to show the misery of his current position and the extent to which he has fallen since writing the original eight-

<sup>111</sup> Peck, *Northampton*, p.21. Raleigh, in his speech at the scaffold, denied drinking wine and smoking tobacco in celebration as was alleged: Folger MS X.d.241, p.d.

<sup>112</sup> Bod. MS Ashmole 781, p.163. Crum, II, 1014. Variations between different versions of this poem will be discussed below.

line poem: 'A man well knowne vnto you all | whose state you see doth stand Rawlie' (fol. 63<sup>v</sup>). Like the previous poem it shifts between Elizabeth's era, when Raleigh and his group had been investigated for their suspected atheism, and James's early years when Coke revived the suspicion at his treason trial. It implies that Raleigh climbed too high and beyond his ability, but the final lines hold 'a warninge' to those vying for a place in the esteem of the new king, to remember that political power earned through favouritism is transitory.<sup>113</sup>

'Watt I wot well' (fol. 64<sup>f</sup>) has similarities to the previous poems in its recognition of Raleigh's ambition. It is more forthright than the other poems as it makes a direct reference to his desire to 'manage the affaires for Englands Crowne'. The poem makes the point that he may have been 'Immortall Cinthia's sometime deare delight' (fol. 64<sup>v</sup>), but now he is out in the wilderness as she has gone, and also because his one time friends would jeopardise their own position if they associated with him. The poet recognises that Raleigh has been thought of as 'wise and wittie' and that he could pity him if his crime were not treason. The suggestion appears to be that he would still warrant admiration if only he had remained true to the monarch. The poem returns to the idea that as Elizabeth's favourite Raleigh was protected and the common people suffered his lack of humility because of this, but now the situation has changed.

'Watt I wot well' is hostile to Raleigh himself, rather than to the previous age. In this poem Essex is praised for his rapport with the commoners ('they will cease yet to lament his death'), whereas Raleigh would reject their 'gentle salutations' (fol. 65<sup>f</sup>). The suggestion in 'Wilye watt' that 'Essex for vengeance cries' (fol. 63<sup>f</sup>) is repeated but taken a step further. The poem states that 'the Heauens accordinge to thy merite, | in his behalfe do acte this Tragedie' (fol. 65<sup>f</sup>), implying that Raleigh's misfortune is due to his treatment of Essex. Raleigh is seen as the playwright of a tragedy in which he also plays a part, along with his co-conspirators Henry Brooke, Lord Cobham, his brother, George Brooke and Lord Thomas Grey of Wilton. The poem states that 'Essex was made y<sup>e</sup> prologue to the playe' suggesting that he took the part of 'revenge' or the chorus and directed the action against Raleigh and that although the play was not acted, Raleigh's

---

<sup>113</sup> Poems on the fickleness of fortune include Sir Henry Wotton's 'Dazel'd Thus, with Height of Place' (see May, *Courtier*, p.370) and Stanley Ferdinando, Lord Strange's 'Of his unhappie state of life' (see David Norbrook and H. R. Woudhuysen, eds, *The Penguin Book of Renaissance Verse 1509-1659* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1993), p.146).

life is still at the discretion of the king. The implication of Raleigh writing a play with a heathen God in the character of 'revenge' is summed up in the poet's observation that he is beyond salvation because 'little hope remains when faith is fled'. The tone of nostalgia present in 'Watt I wot well' in particular is one that runs through the whole miscellany. The connotations are of a golden age that is passed. Essex is praised and Raleigh was 'like Midas, surfettinge wi<sup>th</sup> golde', but the underlying allusion is to the riches that Raleigh collected as a favourite of Elizabeth and as the holder of lucrative patents and monopolies.

Raleigh's sentiments in his letter to the king are also echoed in the poem: in the former Raleigh tells James that 'whither I dy or liue your maies<sup>ties</sup> true and louinge seruaunt I will die or liue' (fol. 18<sup>r</sup>). The poet appears to answer his letter by reasoning that Raleigh's life is in the hands of the king, and if the king did pardon him would no doubt a 'faithfull subiect proue' and 'recouer to thyselve thy soueraignes loue' (fol. 65<sup>v</sup>), but the implication is that this is irrelevant as Raleigh had intended to murder the monarch, and should be concerned for his life.

Folger MS X.d. 241 is a loose fragment of a commonplace book copied after 1635. Amongst the few texts contained in it are two letters from Raleigh to the king<sup>114</sup> and a full version of 'Watt I wot well' signed by Thomas Rogers.<sup>115</sup> After Rogers matriculated from Oxford he entered New Inn and then Middle Temple where, like many lawyers, he turned to London society and penmanship.<sup>116</sup> As might be expected, similarities can be found between *Celestiall Elegies* and 'Watt I wot well': Leicester's omen of death as 'piggs followed me as I road in my coach' (line 1865) can be compared with 'Essex angrie spirite' (stanza 7), as can 'Cynthia whome my spirit doth adore, | vp to her spheare coelestiall hauing fled' (2108-2109) and 'where is Cinthia now whose golden thred | mighte leade thee from this laborinth of errors, | She to hir soliar celestiall back is fled'. Furthermore there are similarities between the three libels against Raleigh in MS 22601. It is possible that Rogers is the author of all three libels in MS 22601, having 'replied' to Raleigh's poem 'Water thy plaints'; alternatively, the

<sup>114</sup> (1) after his arraignment in 1603; (2) on his failed trip to Guiana.

<sup>115</sup> Folger MS X.d.241, fol. 3<sup>r</sup>. This version contains 125 lines. See below for further discussion.

<sup>116</sup> Franklin B. Williams Jr., *Thomas Rogers Leicester's Ghost* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), p.xvi. Rogers' works include: *Tullius* (1592, STC 24042), *Celestiall Elegies* (1598, STC 21225) and *A Prosopopeia of the Earle of Leicester's Ghoast*, 1605, BL MS Add. 12132 (a libel on another Elizabethan favourite, Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester).



compiler may have copied the style of Rogers' 'Watt I wot well' and written 'Wilye watt' and 'Water thy plaints'. This would partly answer the question of why 'Wilye watt' and the libellous version of 'Water thy plaints' did not circulate further while 'Watt I wot well' circulated widely – someone had claimed responsibility for it. Alternatively, it might be that 'Wilye watt' and 'Water thy plaints' were imitations of libels which were on the manuscript circuit at this time and were simply grouped with 'Watt I wot well'.

Do the texts on Raleigh, then, have any affect on the collection as a whole? The answer to this will be more apparent when the poems are viewed in other collections. In MS 22601 a political edge is noticeable due to the placement of the texts and the alterations that have been made to them. For instance, the last five stanzas of 'Watt I wot well' are often not copied into miscellanies and, other than the last stanza (a prayer for King James), are a tract on atheism. The overall meaning of the poem is altered by the compiler if they are removed, as here, thereby manipulating the miscellany to suit his own attitudes, as well as the politics and purpose of the volume. The compiler's interest seems to be in politics rather than religion.

Raleigh's letter is not overtly political, but it takes another meaning from the context in which it is situated. As an isolated item it gains the same sympathy to which the poet in 'Watt I wot well' is nearly tempted when he asks

leave, dread soueraigne Lord, to pittie  
so rare a witt should be so ill employed.  
Yea suche a witt as I could praise in reason  
for any point exceptinge only treason.

Raleigh eloquently professes his innocence and loyalty to the king. He was the archetypal hero, although not the most popular of courtiers, and the inclusion of his letter in the miscellany without the further evidence of the three poems would have been favourable for him. Raleigh was an anti-Spanish hero to those steeped in the Elizabethan age, and a standard to those concerned with the future of Jacobean politics. His persona, as well as his texts, is ambiguous. The choice of Raleigh text was, though, not imperative: he was a figurehead to highlight the good and bad of either age. In some miscellanies his texts might mark political dissatisfaction and disillusionment with the Jacobean years; alternatively, they might cast him as a relic of corrupt Elizabethan times. Each of the texts written by or about Raleigh in our miscellany are malleable

enough to fit into all three of Marotti's categories: model epitaphs and elegies, general cultural beliefs or moral truisms and poems celebrating the lifestyle and shared values of a social or intellectual group. The presence of three anti-Raleigh poems together, reinforced by the 'Petition' with its negative clause against Raleigh, as well as several texts by Sir John Davies, a Middle Templar with Raleigh, and two by Sir John Harington, both of whom wrote poetry against him,<sup>117</sup> diminishes the possibility of any ambiguity in the miscellany towards Raleigh and strongly suggests that the bias of the collection is against him.

### 5.2. Bodleian manuscript Ashmole 781 (Ashmole Manuscript)

The catalogue of the Ashmolean Manuscripts includes this collection amongst 'miscellanies, Religious, Political, and Poetical; chiefly by Persons of quality'. It is a small quarto, of 85 paper leaves in a single closely written hand. The seventeenth-century calf binding has been preserved, although the manuscript was rebacked in the nineteenth or twentieth century. Several pages are nearly illegible due to fading ink and from paper damage due to the corrosive quality of the ink, but the seventeenth century ink pagination corresponds with the table of contents at the back of the volume.<sup>118</sup> The compiler of the miscellany remains unknown, but we do know that it was written between 1620 and 1631, the latest item being the last in the collection: 'Verses made upon a paire of slippers sent for a new-yeares guifte, 1631'.<sup>119</sup> Despite this, many of the texts it contains date to the late Elizabethan and early Stuart years.

The Ashmole manuscript shares several texts with MS 22601, as well as some that have travelled to other miscellanies from MS 22601. Letters such as those between Mathew Hutton and Robert Cecil discussed above, texts and poetry about or by Raleigh and

---

<sup>117</sup> Harington and Davies both wrote 'Paulus' epigrams in which Raleigh has been identified as Paulus: *The letters and epigrams of Sir John Harington*, ed. by Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1930), pp.51, 157-314, Epigrams 22, 56, 61, 79, 110, 122, 134, 168, 213, 315, 329, 386, 410; Krueger, p.148, epigram 41; see also Carolyn Bishop, 'Raleigh satirized by Harington and Davies', *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 23:89 (February 1972), 52-56; Joshua Michael Eckhardt, 'The Politics of anti-courtly love poetry: gender, sexuality, and religion in early seventeenth-century manuscript verse miscellanies' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Illinois, 2005), pp.42-43.

<sup>118</sup> Bod. MS Ashmole 781, pp.167-168; although the page numbers correspond, several short texts are not included in the index. Further references to this manuscript in part 5.2 will be supplied parenthetically within the text.

<sup>119</sup> The catalogue states that this article, which bears a date, was written some time after the rest of the manuscript and neither it, nor any of the six foregoing articles, is entered in the index. The text was written much later than the other texts, which were written prior to 1620, and although it is possible that it was added to the collection some time after the rest of the manuscript it does not have the appearance of being 'squeezed in': the index follows, and as several other texts are not included the evidence towards it having been copied later is inconclusive.

Essex, as well as speeches by the king and prominent members of his parliament are common in miscellanies of the first half of the seventeenth century and so it should not be surprising to find them in both miscellanies. These miscellanies, although transcribed fourteen years apart, were a reflection of the political, cultural and social attitudes that were prevalent at the time of their particular conception. The purpose of this section, however, is to examine the place of one text, 'Water thy complaints', in such a miscellany and to show that it does not necessarily follow that when the same texts are collected the compilers are presenting the same political position or building the same debate from their texts.

As I have mentioned, Hutton's and Cecil's letters appear in the Ashmole manuscript; they are found together in the first half of the miscellany (pp.104 and 105), in close proximity to several texts relating to the Earl of Essex and Sir Walter Raleigh. 'England men say of late is bankrupte growne' (here entitled 'Epigram on the remedy of England's poverty') ascribed to 'Si<sup>r</sup> Joh<sup>n</sup> Harrington' (p.134) appears to have been strategically placed immediately after the Earl of Essex's 'buzzing bees complaint' about political disfavour, 'It was a tyme when sillie bees could speake' (p.132).<sup>120</sup> Harrington had served in the Irish campaign of 1599 with Essex and been one of his followers until opting for self-preservation and distancing himself as Essex fell from grace. Harrington copied this poem at the end of his *Tract on the Succession of the Crown*, in December 1602.<sup>121</sup> The poem is indicative of the political wrangling that took place as Elizabeth's days came to an end and it anticipates James's accession, hoping that 'somme new Officer [will] mende old disorder | yes, ou<sup>r</sup> good Steward [i.e., Stuart / steward] may sett all in order' (p.134). Those in positions of authority realised that their days of power might too be coming to a close and some factions, including those of Harrington and Essex, accused them of corruption as they 'feathered their nests' in anticipation of power falling elsewhere, and as counter accusations were made against Essex.

Although 'England men say' was written by one of Essex's faction, its views could be applied equally to the rivals Essex and Raleigh: both were former favourites of Elizabeth, and scrambling for recognition under James on his accession; they were

---

<sup>120</sup> The poem is attributed to Essex in this miscellany, but May, *Courtier*, pp.266-267, suggests that it may have been written about Essex by Henry Cuffe, his secretary.

<sup>121</sup> John Harrington, *Tract on the Succession of the Crown, 1602*, ed. by Clements R. Markham (London: Roxburghe Club, 1880).

ambitious, Protestant, military heroes who were deserted by those who had attached themselves to them for political gain and financial reward.<sup>122</sup> Its proximity to the ‘buzzing bees complaint’ is ambiguous: Essex was executed for treason at a time that Harington deemed as corrupt; ‘England men say’ therefore bolsters the notion that Essex was a martyr who died in a corrupt political arena. However, Harington had deserted Essex, and presumably his views, before he died, which might suggest that Essex was part of that regime, or equally that if Essex was a martyr, then Harington was not - that *he* was corrupt. His return a year later to greet the arrival of the Stuarts in ‘England men say’ does demonstrate that he hopes that they ‘may sett all in order’, and I would argue that Harington had been loyal to Elizabeth but became disillusioned during her last years.

The execution of Mary Queen of Scots is reported in many different ways and accounts of it are common in the miscellanies of the late sixteenth through to the mid seventeenth centuries. MS 22601 condemns the execution of an anointed queen in ‘When doome of death’ (fol. 60<sup>v</sup>), but stops short of direct accusation:

the Axe y<sup>t</sup> should haue done y<sup>e</sup> execution  
shund to cutt of a head that had byn Crownd

and prays that

in this noble Ile a queene  
wi<sup>th</sup>out a head may neuer more be seene.<sup>123</sup>

The potential risk of taking a position in relation to Mary’s execution is avoided in the Ashmole manuscript by the inclusion of two letters: ‘A true declaration of the execution of Mary the late Queene of Scotts’ by R. Wingfield, a witness to the execution, in a letter to ‘Lord Burleigh’ dated 11 February 1586 (p.26), and ‘The coppie of Anthony Babington’s letter’ to Queen Elizabeth from prison where he was committed for high treason (p.73), and ‘My prime of youth is but a froste of cares’, written by the recusant Chidioc Tichborne from prison before his execution later in the same year as the death of the Catholic Queen (p.138).<sup>124</sup> There are three items relating indirectly to the Overbury affair, the first of which is ‘Si<sup>r</sup> Gervas Ellovis leivetenant of the Tower, his appollogie touching his knowledge of Si<sup>r</sup> Thomas Overburie his death’, in which he professes his innocence of involvement in Overbury’s murder but admits that he kept

<sup>122</sup> Raleigh’s desertion is narrated in ‘Watt I wot well’; see above for further discussion.

<sup>123</sup> MS 22601, fol. 60<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>124</sup> See chapter three.

silent over the part played by Carr and Howard (p.51).<sup>125</sup> Tellingly, this follows 'A letter of advise to the Lord Cooke 1616', possibly written to Edward Coke in the interval between his suspension and eventual discharge from office (p.43).<sup>126</sup> Carr wrote two letters which follow each other in the first half of the miscellany, the first to Nicholas Overbury after the death of his son (p.115), and the second to the Earl of Northampton, defending himself against accusations that had been circulating about his motives (p.116). Also in close proximity to these texts are James's early act of benevolence in delivering the Earl of Southampton and Sir Henry Neville from the Tower before he left Scotland (p.86);<sup>127</sup> his address to the 'Citty of London giving thanks for the readiness of the citizens in proclaiming him King' (p.87); several items relating to the unity of England and Scotland (pp.19 and 87) and the 'Papists petition to the Kinge', declaring their fidelity and anticipating 'sinister informations' (p.89).

As these texts were common among miscellanies concerned with the political situation throughout James's reign and as we know nothing more about the Ashmole manuscript's compilers we have to speculate about the motives for their transcription here. A strikingly oppositional perspective is apparent in this collection; many of its speakers, as should be clear, are responding to adversity or petitioning for alternative action, both directly and indirectly. 'Mr Hoskins Dreame', for instance, is an allegorical poem in which his wife pleads for Hoskyns after his imprisonment in 1614 for outspokenness in parliament. The poem asks:

What if my Husband once have err'd?  
Men (more to blame) are more preferr'd.  
He that offends not, doth not live:  
He err'd but once, once (king) forgive. (p.130)

Hoskyns had a reputation as a frank speaker, which had followed him through New College and into law and politics, and yet on this occasion his wife is left to do the talking.<sup>128</sup> By letting his wife plead his case and setting the poem in a dream he has distanced himself from any further offence – rather as the letters relating to Mary Queen of Scots could be seen as simply relating another person's views. In both of these cases both the content and the person are potentially provocative whilst seemingly innocent.

---

<sup>125</sup> For further discussion of Elwes see Bellany, *Court Scandal*, pp.221-229.

<sup>126</sup> See chapter two, pp.87, 89, 91-95, 101.

<sup>127</sup> See chapter three, p.143.

<sup>128</sup> Colclough, *Freedom of Speech*, pp.222, 238-249.

The old and new reigns are intertwined in the manuscript, but there are several strands which link them together, as I have shown. Although the cast of characters changed, the question of monarchical favourites was a permanent fixture and Robert Carr, the Earl of Essex and Walter Raleigh all co-exist in this collection to give us some indication of the compiler's views. As I have argued above, the person was often of more significance than the text and this is the case with Essex and Raleigh: there are nine items directly relating to Essex and fourteen to Raleigh.<sup>129</sup> Marotti contends that the political events that became the focus of the largest number of texts in Elizabethan manuscript collections were those concerning the conspiracy, treason, trial and execution of Essex.<sup>130</sup> In the collections I have examined which are connected with MS 22601, however, Raleigh is just as popular – both men were at the pinnacle of power and suffered spectacular and very public falls, capturing the imagination of writers but also offering an insight into courtly and political life, or a gauge of what was good and bad about the old reign, and even a code book of how not to act.

Essex's correspondence with Lord Keeper Egerton after his house arrest and before his final rebellion and downfall (and desertion by Egerton) (pp.78 and 81)<sup>131</sup> is followed by two letters to the Queen 'upon his commaund to goe for Ireland' (pp.82-83). 'Happy were he could finish forth his fate' is not part of the letter, as in many manuscript collections, but is attributed to Essex.<sup>132</sup> The connection between the poem and the letter is apparent, however, as it is signed 'your Maiestie's exiled servant' in this section of the manuscript. Robert Cecil was implicated in the order for Essex to be sent to Ireland (and, it is widely believed, in the knowledge that his failure there would secure his fall from power); Essex describes his unhappiness at his command in his poem to the Queen. The compiler appears to be building a picture of Essex's downfall, but what does the chronological reversal of these texts suggest about the compiler's point of view, particularly about Essex? In this arrangement we have Essex telling us that he is a loyal and dutiful soldier and that he would be better serving his country than living 'a private kind of life'; he opposes the Queen, even suggesting that she may be wrong,

---

<sup>129</sup> See chapter three for further discussion of royal favourites.

<sup>130</sup> Marotti, *Manuscript*, p.95.

<sup>131</sup> See chapter two, pp.82-83.

<sup>132</sup> The poem is also copied in: Bod. MSS Tanner 76, fol. 92<sup>v</sup>, Rawl. C.744, fol. 29<sup>v</sup>; Chetham MS mun. A4.15 and Beinecke MS b.197, p.213; it is anonymous in Bod. MS Malone 19, p.177; it is part of the letter in the following collections: BL MSS Harleian 1576, fol. 226<sup>v</sup>, Harleian 35, fol. 338, Add. 9828, fol. 7; Bod. MS Tanner 304, fol 59<sup>v</sup>. The Earl's original letter survives and the poem is not included as part of it (BL MS Loan 23 (1), fol. 128<sup>v</sup>; E. Doughtie 'The Earl of Essex and Occasions for contemplative verse', *English Literary Review*, 9 (1979), 355-363).

before the texts in which he contradicts himself by expressing his wish not to go to Ireland. If the texts were copied in chronological order, Essex would be painted in a more positive way; that is, to show his displeasure at the command, followed by the unsuccessful aftermath. Furthermore, if these texts were placed alongside Essex's 'buzzing bees complaint' and Harington's 'England men say', I suggest that they would diminish the ambiguity surrounding Essex and that he would be shown as part of the corrupt regime described in Harington's poem. The compiler, therefore, does not wish to condemn him, and in order to avoid this has allowed a gap in the manuscript between these texts. This supposition is corroborated by the texts following those of his downfall: an epigram in praise of Essex and expressing sadness at his execution – 'When noble Essex, Blunt, and Danvers dyde' (p.83) – Lady Rich's letter to the Queen on behalf of her brother (p.84), poignantly followed by the freedom of the Earl of Southampton and Nevile from the Tower.

Raleigh's ruin is, by contrast, treated in chronological order and unlike Essex he has not been spared by the compilation of the miscellany; the texts on Raleigh begin four items after Essex's disgrace and apparently by design, follow the 'Papists petition to the Kinge', which is signed 'your Maies<sup>ties</sup> most devoted servants the Catholikes of England' (p.89). The arrangement offers the first glimpse of the anti-Raleigh tone of the manuscript and raises the question of his religion. In the trial notes which are copied in this section, Raleigh is accused by Coke of plotting pro-Catholic activity (p.101). He is traced through the letter to the king before his trial and after his condemnation (p.92); through a letter to his wife the night before his expected execution in November 1603 (p.94); a letter to 'Si<sup>r</sup> Robert Carre' in 1608 (p.96); letters to his wife during his Guiana voyage in 1617 (p.97), from St Christopher's in March 1618 (p.99), and on his return from Guiana (p.100), and finally, 'Carey Raleigh's petition to his Maies<sup>ties</sup> for his father' prior to the proceedings of his trial on 28 October 1618 (p.101).

The focus of these Raleigh texts is on his downfall, but also on the mutability of fortune: they catalogue his loss of reputation and freedom, his family, his estate, and finally his life. In his letter to Carr Raleigh tells him that he has his life ahead of him and that his fortune is assured in the king's favour, and if he contributes to his downfall he should 'cut downe the tree, pity the fruit'.<sup>133</sup> Bellany suggests that Raleigh adopts the pathetic

---

<sup>133</sup> See Rudick, p.lxvii for further connections between Raleigh and Carr.

persona of fallen greatness in the letter, but it was not long before Carr too became a fallen favourite.<sup>134</sup> The implication in Raleigh's 'adopted' persona is that he is aware that the post of monarch's favourite is only temporary, and is based on favour and fortune – neither of which could be relied upon.

Midway through the miscellany there is a reversion to Raleigh's glorious days in the courtly Elizabethan poem 'Callinge to minde myne eie went long about' (p.138). In the last seventeen folios of the collection there are four poems about Raleigh. 'Heere heedlesse headlesse matchlesse Raleigh lyes' is headed as an epitaph, and yet the closest to praise it reaches is that he died for the wrong reason, but 'his right for wrong payes the deserts of crime' (p.151). In 'Annother on his death' things do improve for Raleigh as the poet appears to be on his side, suggesting that Raleigh is the victim of spite, malice and envy and arguing that if he were alive to answer these slurs he would 'strike the first two blind the other dombe' (p.151). The penultimate items in the collection are attacks on Raleigh in answer to his own poem 'The Lye', written while he was banished from court: 'Courts scorne, states disgracinge' and 'Court's commender, state's maintainer' (p.164).<sup>135</sup>

What place, then, does 'Water thy plants' ('Water thy plaints') have in this collection? The four-line poem (eight lines in MS 22601) is the first stanza of the version of 'Water thy plaints' in MS 22601. It is attributed to Raleigh in the Ashmole manuscript and is his denunciation of atheism. In the last five folios of a miscellany which is predominantly anti-Raleigh, he has been given the opportunity to redeem himself. This becomes more apparent when texts surrounding 'Water thy plaints' are examined: 'Verses on the fewness of faithful friends' (p.162) and 'When faith faileth in preists sawes' (p.162) precede it, while 'In obitum literatissimi sanctissimique viri magistri Gulielmi Perkins', is above it on the same page (p.163) and following it on the same folio, signed 'W. Perkins' is: 'Hee that will live when he is dead, must dye whilst hee is

---

<sup>134</sup> Rumours of a curse against those who took Sherborne lands from the church were known to contemporaries. The lands were given to Protector Somerset in Edward VI's reign; after his downfall and execution the lands were reclaimed by the church and given to Raleigh, Carr, Prince Henry and then 'lastly the Earl of Somerset' – 'whose fall is much feared too'; see NRA SP 14/82/131; Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991), p.118, cited in Bellamy, *Court Scandal*, p.171, footnote 161.

<sup>135</sup> See pp.211-213 for discussion of 'The Lye'.



alive, namely to his sinnes'<sup>136</sup> – thereby reflecting the last two lines of 'Water thy plaints':

Rawe is the reason that doth lye within an Atheist head  
which saith the soule of man doth dye, when that the boddies dead. (p.163)

I have found only one copy of the twenty-line lampoon version of 'Water thy plaints', and that is in MS 22601. Yet the Ashmole copy and the only other copy I have found differ slightly: Brotherton MS Lt.q.9 ends 'when that his corps are dead' - the Brotherton version therefore corresponds more closely with MS 22601.<sup>137</sup> It would seem logical that the lampoon version was written in imitation after exposure to the 'true', or Raleigh-attributed, four-line version but this cannot be the case as both manuscripts were copied much later than MS 22601. I argue in this case that MS 22601 contains the original version, which has been cut short by later compilers who did not wish to lampoon Raleigh, or by those who had not seen the longer version in our manuscript.

My description of the Ashmole manuscript has not shown it to be favourable to Raleigh, but it could be argued that those texts written against him, rather than reflecting the opinion of the compiler, have been transcribed as a record of current political feeling (we might remember John Rous' comment quoted earlier).<sup>138</sup> That the final twelve lines have been removed, and that the poem is situated amongst texts concerning salvation, suggests that the compiler's interest might not have been in the fall of an Elizabethan hero, and that he did not intend a personal attack on Raleigh. MS 22601, however, is a court-based manuscript written whilst Raleigh was still alive and whilst events were still developing: many of his enemies and friends were still at court or in royal circles but it would have been politically unwise vociferously to defend him. Later miscellanies such as the Ashmole manuscript were distanced from Raleigh's contemporaries, and from events, making it possible for their compilers to use Raleigh as a model to identify a situation with hindsight and without emotion.

---

<sup>136</sup> An obituary on William Perkins, who converted from being a wild and sinful student at Cambridge to the most celebrated Calvinist preacher of the age; Michael Jenkins, 'Perkins, William (1558–1602)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21973>, accessed 31 May 2007).

<sup>137</sup> University of Leeds, Brotherton MS Lt.q.9, fol. 17<sup>r</sup>: a commonplace book, c.1640-1650, containing verse in English and Latin, culinary and medical recipes, sermons and meditations, accounts, legal documents and other prose material; some autograph and mainly in a single hand.

<sup>138</sup> Chapter two, p.62.

The benefit of hindsight available to the Ashmole compiler is evident, I suggest, in his choice of texts. It is worth reiterating that while we cannot know the compiler's motives we do know from the available evidence which texts were in circulation at the same time. Why would this compiler include the material on the Overbury affair alongside that from so much earlier in the reign – old news, even? Alastair Bellany has argued that Raleigh's letter in which he pleads with Carr to refuse the king's gift of Sherborne, his family home, was deliberately leaked (possibly by Raleigh) shortly after it was written, and that by the 1620s it was one of a number of his letters that were being commercially transcribed and circulated by the 'feathery scribe'.<sup>139</sup> The texts on Raleigh, then, and particularly his letter to Carr, could be recycled to bolster opposition to Carr; but even the Overbury affair would have been old news by the time the Ashmole manuscript was compiled. I contend, then, that the compiler combined the material in this manuscript as a means of comparing the different reigns and as a tool for political analysis. This is only possible because the time restraints are fluid in manuscript culture: the actual content or event was often secondary, if significant at all, compared to the broader circumstances that they illustrated. For instance, that Raleigh's letter to Carr was written in 1608, and that the Overbury affair was five years later was irrelevant; the letter acted as a character witness. In this way we can see how 'Water thy plaints' has been read and used very differently in different miscellanies. Here, it has been copied without the support of 'Wilye watt' and 'Watt I wot well' as well and is being read against items from the beginning and the end of James's reign.

### 5.3. Bodleian Manuscript Rawlinson Poetry 172 (Rawlinson manuscript)

One of the most important considerations when investigating a text in a miscellany is whether the contents were gathered as a 'collection', or whether it is an arrangement of loose papers. The Rawlinson manuscript is the latter – the texts were written between the late sixteenth and early eighteenth centuries on various paper stocks. The first folio is a folded verse epistle of moral instruction from Robert Blakwell to his daughter Ellinor, and throughout the manuscript folds are evident in items that have been sent and collated at a later date. It may appear, therefore, that I would be pursuing a pointless task in tracing 'Watt I wot well' to this collection with the purpose of examining it in its new context, but there is in fact a clear relationship between many of the texts, several

---

<sup>139</sup> Bellany, *Court Scandal*, p. 96: on the 'feathery scribe' see further Beal, *In Praise of Scribes*, pp.58-108.

of which appear together in miscellanies in this study.<sup>140</sup> Furthermore, I suggest that these texts were gathered specifically for this collection, although not necessarily arranged in this order, by a series of compilers. ‘Watt I wot well’ will lead me to a group of texts that will offer an explanation of why these texts, and particularly this one, have been compiled in the Rawlinson manuscript.

Political comment and personal items, as well as some amorous and widely circulated poetry, share this manuscript. ‘The Parliament Fart’ circulated widely in the manuscript miscellanies throughout the seventeenth century and as David Colclough has argued, it might be read as an insider’s joke for parliamentarians, or a satirical remark against the Lords, or a criticism of parliament depending on the circumstances of its copying and its local context (fol. 8<sup>r</sup>).<sup>141</sup> ‘The Parliament sitts with a synod of witts’ (fol. 79<sup>v</sup>) is less flexible; like ‘The Parliament Fart’ it aims criticism at named persons, but its subject matter – James’s religious and foreign policy – is not criticised light-heartedly. That these two texts share a miscellany is an early indication that the intent is parliamentary criticism rather than a witty jest. The collapse of the Spanish Match was a relief to those English Protestants who were already suspicious of James’s religious inclinations, and certainly of the Duke of Buckingham, who had travelled to Spain with Prince Charles. They believed that the Spanish match would herald the country’s conversion to Catholicism.<sup>142</sup>

In the same section of the manuscript as ‘The Parliament sitts’ is an account of the execution of Mary Queen of Scots, serving perhaps as a reminder of the Catholic threat that seemed to be reviving in the early seventeenth century (fol. 75<sup>r</sup>). In the front section is copied Raleigh’s ‘What is life a play of passion’, entitled ‘Mans life compared to a stage play’ (fol. 8<sup>r</sup>) and sharing a folio with ‘The Parliament Fart’ and Tichborne’s ‘My prime of youth is but a frost of cares’ (fol. 7<sup>r</sup>).<sup>143</sup> Early in the collection there is a tone of resignation to the forces of power. Raleigh’s poem, like Tichborne’s, was written in prison and although the poems were written under different monarchs and

<sup>140</sup> Bod. MS Rawl. Poet. 172, fol. 14<sup>r</sup>. Further references to this manuscript in part 5.3 will be supplied parenthetically within the text

<sup>141</sup> The fart was Henry Ludlow’s response to the chief messenger from the Upper House: Colclough, *Freedom of Speech*, pp. 242-243; see further Michelle O’Callaghan, ‘Performing Politics: The circulation of the “Parliament Fart”’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 69:1 (2006), 121-138.

<sup>142</sup> See further Thomas Cogswell, ‘England and the Spanish Match’, in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642*, ed. by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London: Longman, 1989), pp.107-133.

<sup>143</sup> See above for further discussion.

seventeen years apart, the implication of both is that life has been pre-destined. Tichborne 'sawe the world, and yet I was not seene' and in a reversal of expectations there is nothing after 'his life is done', whereas Raleigh describes 'times short tragedye' but recognises heaven, and life after death.<sup>144</sup>

Several texts are grouped together in the first half of the manuscript dedicated to Raleigh and Essex, and although many different compilers oversaw the compilation of this manuscript this group of poems seems to have been copied together and by the same person, shortly after Raleigh's initial prison term. The first is headed 'Dr Latworthe lye to all estates', and is Raleigh's poem 'The Lye' (fol. 12<sup>v</sup>). In another Bodleian miscellany probably started at St John's College and compiled between 1580 and the early Jacobean years, a copy of 'The Lye' is entitled 'W R farewell made by D: Lat'; here each stanza is copied with a reply attributed to 'Lateware'.<sup>145</sup> Rudick asserts that the poem began its anonymous manuscript circulation in the 1590s, and that one miscellany has been dated 1595.<sup>146</sup> Raleigh had been excluded from court three years earlier in 1592 after lying about his marriage to Elizabeth Throckmorton, and the poem is an expression of his disillusionment with and resentment at the systems of power to which he no longer had access. 'The Lye' is written in columns on the verso of the leaf and untidily written to the side of this is a short ditty headed 'London's Lie' (fol. 12<sup>v</sup>). On the right side of the opened manuscript are three answer poems to 'The Lye' (fol. 13<sup>r</sup>), giving the impression that the compiler or copyist wished them all to be viewed together.

The answer poems form an extended attack on Raleigh, and it is therefore clear that those in courtly circles knew the identity of 'The Lye's' anonymous author. 'The aunswer to the lie by Lord of Essex' which begins 'Go eccho of the minde', disputes the content of Raleigh's poem, saying that 'so rawe a lye' must descend from Italy, alluding to the cunning scheming associated with the works of Machiavelli. Raleigh's plotting against Essex caused him to be accused of Machiavellian policy at his trial and, as we have see, he was called a 'mischieuos machiauell' in that other anti-Raleigh libel,

<sup>144</sup> Michael Rudick, 'The poems of Sir Walter Raleigh' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1970), p.45, cited in May, *Raleigh*, pp.70-71.

<sup>145</sup> The manuscript is Bod. MS Rawl. Poet. 212, a collection of verse and prose with Oxford connections. Richard Lateware (1560-1601), clergyman and fellow of an Oxford College, was chaplain to Charles Blount, Lord Mountjoy, a partisan of Essex and his sister's long-term lover. See also Woudhuysen, p.170.

<sup>146</sup> Huntington MS HM 198, fol. 1<sup>r</sup>, cited in Rudick, pp.xliii-xliv.

‘Wilye watt’.<sup>147</sup> Andrew McRae argues that although ‘Go eccho of the minde’ has been attributed to Essex, the case for his authorship is weak;<sup>148</sup> Bodleian MS Rawlinson Poetry 212 evinces the uncertainty in its heading: ‘Another answere made by an unknowne author’.<sup>149</sup> Following this in Rawlinson is ‘An other answere by Si<sup>r</sup> Walter Raleigh’, which Bodleian Rawlinson Poetry 212 has headed ‘Another answeare thought to bee made by R. Essex’,<sup>150</sup> which starts ‘Courts scorne, states disgracing’, and attacks both Raleigh and the content of ‘The Lye’ stanza by stanza. ‘A replie’ follows this, beginning, ‘Courts commender’, which reverses each of the charges made in ‘Courts scorne’ this is headed ‘In reproofe of this made by the first’ in Rawlinson Poetry 212;<sup>151</sup> these two poems are also treated as a pair in the Ashmole manuscript.<sup>152</sup>

It is possible that the compiler of the Rawlinson manuscript has copied ‘The Lye’ from ‘W R farewell’ in Rawlinson poetry 212, and as Dr Lateware was the only name in the title other than initials, he has mistakenly believed him to be its author and transcribed it as such. Alternatively, it is entirely possible that, as the poem was originally circulated anonymously, it was reasonable to assume that Lateware was the author. Rudick has argued that the allusions to Raleigh in the following poem, ‘Go eccho of the minde’, did not cause the compiler of Rawlinson to revise his attribution to Lateware.<sup>153</sup> Again, he may not have been in possession of ‘Go eccho’ at the same time as ‘W R farewell’ and to alter it at a later date would have been to change the original record or historical link. ‘Court’s scorne’ is referred to by the compiler as an answer by Raleigh, which would mean that the compiler believed Lateware to be the author of ‘The Lye’ or that Raleigh, or someone taking the part of Raleigh, is answering the poem. Titles and texts were interchangeable and recycled in the culture of manuscript miscellanies and therefore cannot be classed as firm evidence of attribution or meaning. What remains, however, is evidence of the collecting habits of a particular compiler; and although the attributions are dubious they begin to show how contemporaries made connections between Raleigh and Essex and perceived the factional divisions at court, as the followers of Essex are linked with poems against his rival.

<sup>147</sup> MS 22601, fol. 63<sup>v</sup>; see above for further discussion.

<sup>148</sup> ‘Early Stuart Libels’, A6.

<sup>149</sup> Bod. MS Rawl. Poet. 212, fol. 90<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>150</sup> Also copied in Bod. MSS Ashmole 781, p.164, Rawl. Poet. 212, fol. 91<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>151</sup> MS Rawl. Poet. 212, fol. 91<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>152</sup> MS Ashmole 781, p.164.

<sup>153</sup> Rudick, p.xlv.

Ironically, it was with the assistance of Robert Cecil and the Earl of Essex that Raleigh recovered his position at court in May 1597; but during the naval expedition to the Azores that summer relations soured, and it was shortly after this that the first libels against Raleigh were circulated and recognised by collectors such as the compiler of the Rawlinson manuscript to be connected with the rivalry between the two men. I would suggest, then, that the libels in this manuscript were written after the summer of 1597 and before Raleigh's prison term in the Jacobean period began.

'My Lord of Essex his bee' (the 'buzzing bees complaint' (fol. 13<sup>v</sup>)), a poem of complaint written by either Essex or his secretary Henry Cuffe, is on the verso of the answers to 'The Lye', further strengthening the argument that rivalry and political wrangling at the Elizabethan court was widely recognised. 'Watt I wot well' then has the last word in the poetical dispute and finalises the contest against Raleigh and is firmly in the pro-Essex camp (fol. 14<sup>r</sup>). 'Watt I wot well', however, is not a complaint but a libel: although it acknowledges Raleigh as the victor in the rivalry of the last poems, it compares him unfavourably with Essex and blames the latter for his downfall. I have shown connections between the three 'Raleigh' poems in MS 22601 above, but there are striking comparisons between Raleigh's denunciation of religion in 'Watt I wot well', and 'The Lye': in the first, Raleigh is the personification of religion as 'faith' which has fled; in 'The Lye' Raleigh accuses the church of hypocrisy and says that faith has 'fledd the cittye'. Likewise, the image of a tragedy being acted alludes to heaven watching the characters in 'What is life', except that in this case Raleigh is the playwright who was able to orchestrate Essex's downfall but not that of the nation, as the scheme to replace the king was the tragedy that 'was plotted but not acted'.

In the Rawlinson manuscript the poem has been manipulated deliberately, and apparently with a set agenda. The first three stanzas remain in the same order as in MS 22601: Raleigh's 'ambitious humours' have brought about his fall and friends have distanced themselves from him. Stanza four in MS 22601 acknowledges that he was

counted passinge wise and wittie  
 hadst thou hast grace high treason to avoyed  
 then giue me leaue, dread soueraigne Lord to pittie  
 so rare a witt should be so ill employed  
 yea suche a witt as I could praise in reason  
 for any point exceptinge only treason.<sup>154</sup>

<sup>154</sup> MS 22601, fol. 64<sup>r</sup>.

The Rawlinson miscellany skips over the points sympathetic to Raleigh in favour of Essex and has moved stanzas ten to fifteen (in MS 22601) as a group, to follow stanza three.<sup>155</sup> The final stanza in this group that has been moved forward is the one which warns that if Raleigh is pardoned no doubt he will wangle his way back into favour, and ‘when thy handes seeke bloud beware y<sup>i</sup> head’. The poem then resumes with stanzas five and four. It is at this point in the poem that Raleigh is praised and the poet is almost sympathetic, but at this late stage the damage has been done.

The poem was rearranged, I believe, for its inclusion in this miscellany, and in consequence its tone has been quite changed. The version in MS 22601, after setting the scene acknowledges that Raleigh is ‘Hated of all, but pittied of none’, but recognises the pity in the fall of a ‘sommetime worthy knighte’. In this version, the poet has promoted the stanzas in which Essex rather than Raleigh is praised, and where Raleigh’s treason is referred to. They also imply that Essex’s death was due to Raleigh, and not to his own actions. On the evidence of this poem alone, the miscellany is anti-Raleigh, and this is confirmed by the variations on ‘The Lye’.

#### 5.4. Folger Shakespeare Library Manuscript V.a.345 (Folger manuscript)

There is no doubt that this verse miscellany was copied as a collection, unlike the Rawlinson manuscript. It is a collaborative student anthology of 337 pages connected with Christ Church, Oxford, containing many different hands, and seems to have belonged to ‘D Doughe’.<sup>156</sup> The initial appearance of the book indicates that it was intended to be a neat copy designed to be shown around or left where others could read it. It is ruled to provide deep margins on the top, bottom, and both sides, and at the end of the manuscript are four blank pages with ruling and no text. The original numbering begins after the first six pages and continues to p.244; the next page is blank and then there is a section of medical receipts and other prose items before the anthology resumes at p.245.

The contents of the manuscript are highly miscellaneous and although the texts suggest that the collection was written during the 1620s, there are also items dating from Elizabeth’s reign. The structure of this miscellany, in comparison to the Rawlinson

---

<sup>155</sup> See pp.196-197.

<sup>156</sup> This manuscript has been discussed by Marotti, ‘Folger MSS V.a.89 and V.a.345’, in *The Reader Revealed*, and Marotti, *Manuscript*, pp. 32,142, 155-158, 159, 172-173, 327-328; Colclough, *Freedom of Speech*, pp. 245-246. See also Hobbs, *Verse Miscellany Manuscripts*, for further discussion of miscellanies with Christ Church and other college connections.

manuscript, would lend quite a different meaning to those texts it contains. The Folger collection was written several years after Raleigh's death and towards, or even after, the death of the monarch who instigated his downfall. Likewise, by this time Raleigh's contemporaries and enemies would not have been in positions of power, or even alive, allowing a different perspective on Raleigh and the work written about him. My focus in this section will be to consider the place of 'Watt I wot well' in this context.<sup>157</sup>

It is not unusual to find material of local interest in a manuscript miscellany, and this collection contains texts relating to the Oxford hierarchy: the conviction for embezzlement and royal pardon of John Clavell, purser of Brasenose College (p.25), 'On Dr Corbets Marriage' (p.297), and a poem on the death of the earl of Pembroke's chaplain, Mr John Smith of Magdalen College (p.283). It also contains poetry by members of the institution: Richard Corbet, Dean of Christ Church, William Strode, Brian Duppa, and Henry King. Poetry and prose of interest to the compiler that was in circulation in manuscript has also been copied into the miscellany. It includes several poems attributed to John Donne (pp.7, 80, 88, 131, 146, 237), John Earle's 'Characters' (p.184),<sup>158</sup> bawdy verse such as 'A virtuous Lady sitting in a muse' by John Harington (p.29), which attracted answer poems, many of which lowered the tone further, as well as misogynistic material which would be expected in a 'homosocial' environment.<sup>159</sup> These items were common in the manuscripts of the early seventeenth century, although not copied together as in this collection; they are a well-rounded representation of items of interest to students. An interest in political comment and current affairs is shown by the compilers of the Folger manuscript in texts such as the satirical epigrams and libels on prominent figures such as Lady Rich, Thomas Overbury, Robert Cecil, Francis Bacon and Buckingham, as well as guarded criticism of King James. The material, however, remains neutral towards many of the characters.

'The Pope's Pater Noster' (p.37), 'A Papist Creed' (p.37), 'In fisherie' (p.43), 'The Blazon' (p.97) and 'On Church who beat a fencer at all weapons' (p.149) are amongst the anti-Catholic items in the collection, and Chidiok Tichborne's imprisonment poem

---

<sup>157</sup> Folger MS V.a.345, p.177. Further references to this manuscript in part 5.4 will be supplied parenthetically within the text

<sup>158</sup> Later published in John Earle, *Micro-cosmographie, or, a peece of the world discovered; in essays and characters* (London, 1628).

<sup>159</sup> As Mary Hobbs has stated, most of the miscellanies are interspersed with scurrility and mild pornography but it is often at schoolboy level – hardly surprising, as undergraduates commonly matriculated between the ages of 13 and 16; Hobbs, *Verse Miscellany Manuscripts*, p.28.



is in proximity to the anti-Scottish poems in the miscellany (p.284). It also contains 'An Answer to the song against blackcoats' which refers to an anti-Catholic ballad about clerical lechery (p.157) and 'Goe to y<sup>e</sup> sons of Antichrist' (p.42). These poems are typical of the anti-Catholic feeling rife throughout James's reign and, as I will go on to show, they make the crucial link between politics and religion which had reached a peak at the time of events written about in 'Goe to y<sup>e</sup> sons of Antichrist'. The poem is about the collapse of a room at Blackfriars in October 1623, which killed hundreds of people who had come to pray with a Jesuit preacher. Prince Charles and the Duke of Buckingham had been in Spain since February that year in pursuit of Charles's Spanish marriage, returning in October prior to the Blackfriars incident, although it is likely that the poem was written before their return. Anti-Catholic feeling in England had risen as James's foreign policy seemed to drift towards accommodation with Spain: the linked threats of a Catholic queen, or the conversion of the future monarch and the easing of persecution of English Catholics as part of the negotiations with Spain alarmed many godly Englishmen and women.

The timing of the incident at Blackfriars, as well as the context in which the poem was used, would affect its meaning. It might be viewed as a text of celebration – celebrating Charles's return home without a Catholic bride and thus freedom from the Catholic threat. Andrew McRae describes how in the 1620s, and especially after the failed Spanish match, anti-papist discourse was used as a means of defining the unity of the early Stuart church; texts such as this would serve that purpose.<sup>160</sup> Likewise, the poem might have been written as an omen of troubled times ahead, especially as it was likely to have been written before Charles and Buckingham returned to England. Its significance in this miscellany however, remains ambiguous. It is supported by various other anti-Catholic texts, but its view is balanced by 'You men of Britaine, wherefore gaze y<sup>ee</sup> so' (p.143), as well as several texts concerning the opposite threat, that of puritanism.<sup>161</sup>

The author of 'You men of Britaine', is generally accepted to be King James; its title in Bodleian manuscript Rawlinson Poetry 84 is 'King James on the blazeing starr: Octo:

<sup>160</sup> McRae, *Literature*, p.195.

<sup>161</sup> Printed in Craigie, *Poems*, II, 172, see also II, 255.

28:1618'.<sup>162</sup> The 1618 comet caused widespread prophecy that the 'match with spaine hath causd this starr' or 'their Prince my Minion | will shortly chang, or which is worse religion'. James was concerned that such rash talk about divine intervention against the Spanish match could cause political instability, and the poem mocks gossips and newsmongers. The comet appeared at the beginning of the Spanish match discussions, and its purpose in this miscellany seems to defend the alliance. Anti-puritan poems ('Six of the weaker sexe but purer sect', p.43, and 'A zealous sister with one of her society', p.47) are also included in the miscellany.<sup>163</sup>

Robert Cecil's death triggered a wave of poems, three of which are transcribed in this miscellany. 'Heere lies Hobbinoll' (p.110) is often attributed to Raleigh, and uses the form of a pastoral to accuse Cecil of fiscal corruption and sexual deviancy,<sup>164</sup> while 'O Ladies, ladies howle & cry' (p.36) refers to his rumoured adulterous affairs and death from syphilis, as well as his part in Essex's downfall.<sup>165</sup> 'Antidotum Caecilanum' (p.107), written by Corbet, meanwhile, redresses the balance with excessive praise for Cecil and an attack on his libellers. Sir Francis Bacon receives the same treatment in this collection with three libels against him: 'Upon Sir F. Ba.' ('Within this sty heer now doth ly' p.25), which was probably written during his lifetime, 'Heer is Francis Verulam Lord Chancelour God save him' (p.127), another epitaph (but this time linking his political demise with his death), 'Great Verulam is very lame', by Hoskyns (p.127) (which suggests that Bacon's fall was due to the Duke of Buckingham and makes reference to sexual relationships with his servants) and 'When you awake, dull Brittons, and behould' (p.127) which, in the manner of the anti-libel on Cecil, attacks the libellers and supports Bacon after his impeachment.<sup>166</sup>

The king is mourned in 'All that haue eyes now wake and weepe' (p.16), and yet this is contradicted with 'When Scotland was Scotland and England it selfe' (p.287). This is

<sup>162</sup> Bod. MS Rawl. Poet. 84, fol. 74'. In BL MS Harleian 3910, fol. 29' (another collection with Christ Church connections and containing similar material) it follows 'On the death of Quene Anne 2 of March 1618' which begins 'I chide no blazing starr yt did forfoe'.

<sup>163</sup> A puritan poem imitating this called, 'Six of the greatest sexe and purest sect' is copied in BL MS Add. 38139 underneath 'The prelates pope the canonistes trope'; the later was entitled 'The Lamentation of Dickie for the Death of his Brother Jockie', and pinned in contempt to the funeral hearse of Archbishop Whitgift (Dickie), Jockie being Bancroft, who replaced him. See Bellany, 'A Poem on the Archbishop's Hearse'.

<sup>164</sup> For further discussion see Pauline Croft, 'The Reputation of Robert Cecil: Libels, Political Opinion, and Popular Awareness in the Early Seventeenth Century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6:1 (1991), 43-69; McRae, *Literature*, p.35.

<sup>165</sup> See Croft, 'Reputation', pp.58, 61.

<sup>166</sup> See also Jardine and Stewart, pp. 464-465.

only an insult to James as a fellow-Scotsman, as he had been king of England for ten years before the likely composition date of the poem, and its chief focus is on the elevation of the ‘coarse Scots’ within the English royal court.<sup>167</sup>

The charges made in the libels that I have discussed epitomize the accusations that were made against the Stuart state: Robert Carr had been consistently in the firing line for those wishing to point the finger. ‘When Scotland was Scotland and England it selfe’ (p.287) moves from the lowly Scots taking English money, lands and living (which could not have failed to draw the minds of contemporaries to the king’s gift of Raleigh’s home, Sherborne, to his favourite Carr) to ‘Thy beginne to get our fayre wives’, alluding to the marriage of Carr to Frances Howard. Alastair Bellany has argued that some of the resentment against Carr stemmed from the fact that he was a Scot as much as from his humble origins.<sup>168</sup>

The Folger manuscript includes the widely circulated and bawdy libel against Howard, ‘On the Lady Carr’ (‘Essex bird hath flowen hir cage’ p.290), which recognises her nobility as the wife of Robert Devereux, third Earl of Essex, but also suggests that she has lowered her standards by going to Court to ‘ly with a Page’. These texts, in conjunction with the commendatory epitaph on Thomas Overbury,<sup>169</sup> begin to indicate the manuscript’s concern with corruption at the royal court; this is strengthened by the presence of ‘Of the five senses by James Johnson’ (p.59)<sup>170</sup> and ‘I that my countrey did betray’, a libel against the Duke of Buckingham (p.315).

The ‘five senses’ – seeing, hearing, tasting, feeling and smelling – are those of the king’s body and hence areas of potential corruption both of the king and, as a result, of the nation as a whole. Bellany argues that the poem could be read as a ‘loyal prayer’ for

---

<sup>167</sup> Andrew McRae suggests that the allusions to the marriage of Robert Carr with Frances Howard and the first elevations of Scotsmen to English earldoms late in 1613 date this poem: ‘Early Stuart Libels’, E6.

<sup>168</sup> Bellany, *Court Scandal*, p.170

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, p.106.

<sup>170</sup> Andrew McRae states that some conjecture remains about the authorship and date of this poem but it was most likely written by William Drummond in 1623: McRae, *Literature*, p.75; see also Bellany, *Court Scandal*, pp.258-260, who argues that it has been mistakenly assigned both to Drummond and to Alexander Gill – see C.F Main, ‘Ben Jonson and an Unknown Poet on the King’s Senses’, *Modern Language Notes*, 74 (1959), 389-393, responding to Allan H. Gilbert, ‘Jonson and Drummond or Gil on the King’s Senses’, *Modern Language Notes*, 62:1(1947), 35-37. See p.169 above for similarity to a poem in MS 22601; for further discussion of ‘The Five Senses’ see Paul Hammond, *Figuring Sex between Men from Shakespeare to Rochester* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), pp.141-143; McRae, *Literature*, pp.75-82.

the king's protection, but that it is also evocative of sins that the court had already succumbed.<sup>171</sup> James, however, liked the poem so much that he obtained a copy, and believed that its author wished good things for him. As with 'Goe to y<sup>e</sup> sons of Antichrist', the 1623 circulation of 'The Five Senses' is important as it reflects the widespread concern (and even hatred) that James's pro-Spanish policies had caused. The people's anxieties found a focus in the Duke of Buckingham. The poem refers to his sexual influence over the king as a factor that 'may prove the ruine of a lande'; it makes a link between the Duke's power and allowing 'Spanish treatise that may wound our Countries peace' and 'the daingerous fig of Spaine', or Catholicism, to infiltrate the English court.

Buckingham's Catholic mother, Mary Beaumont, Countess of Buckingham, was possibly the primary reason that his religious loyalty was questioned, and as the Spanish Match reached its climax she too became the catalyst for anti-Spanish feeling evinced by the libels in circulation in 1623 and the last years of James reign.<sup>172</sup> The fact that James's policies were believed to depend heavily on his favourite's influence, and that Buckingham was Charles's escort to Spain, did not help his cause. 'I that my countrey did betray' mirrors the idea in 'The Five Senses' that Buckingham 'undid that King that let mee sway' and suggests in addition he was an agent for the Spanish state, 'The Romist Frend, the Gospells Foe'.

The danger of the monarch's being open to persuasion and corruption from a favourite is a concern that runs consistently throughout this particular manuscript. I have mentioned in the first section of this chapter how poetry was a bargaining tool for courtiers before Elizabeth, but the ground rules for Raleigh were set as he presented himself before the new king at Theobalds in the early days of James's reign. Raleigh showed his enthusiasm for the anti-Spanish campaign and offered his military support. James was less than impressed, and it soon became apparent how different the wooing strategies for the old and new monarchs would be. It is tempting to imagine that it would have been unlikely that Carr and Buckingham would have become Elizabethan royal favourites any more than the military hero from the previous age was able to survive in the Jacobean era. The favourites from the old and new eras clash in this miscellany, however, and although James's favourites come out of it in a poor light, the

<sup>171</sup> Bellany, *Court Scandal*, p.258.

<sup>172</sup> 'Heauen blesse king James our joy' is such an attack on Mary Beaumont, Beinecke MS b.197, p.187; see also Cogswell, *The blessed revolution*, pp.47-48.

criticism is aimed at all those who have been undeservedly rewarded or have benefited from their position or status.

I have discussed how Carr was rewarded by the king, both as favourite, and as benefactor to Raleigh's estate, but the miscellany also contains an eight-line poem on the tomb ('Enough for three'), that was built in honour of Christopher Hatton, a one-time favourite of Elizabeth. A comparison could be made between the treatment proffered to favourites at the expense of those more deserving of it. Although the poem states that 'Sir Frauncis and Sir Phillip [Walsingham and Sidney] have noe Tombe', comparisons in the later age could easily be made between Raleigh and Carr.<sup>173</sup>

How has a positive image of Raleigh been reflected in this manuscript? Those who contributed to his downfall are criticised, as is the system that both he and the Elizabethan regime were opposed to (the Spanish alliance and the threat of Catholicism), whilst Raleigh remains immune from the attacks on royal favourites. The miscellany does not include references to his direct rivalry with Essex, although a veiled attack on the Essex camp is made through the inclusion of 'Here lyes the Lady Penelope Rich', a libel on the Earl of Essex's sister who conducted a long and adulterous affair with Charles Blount, Earl of Devonshire (p.28).

Four of Raleigh's poems which were widely circulated throughout other miscellanies of the early seventeenth century have been copied into the Folger manuscript: 'What is our life' (p.14); 'Even such is time' (p.32); 'In obitum Robert Cecillii' (p.110)<sup>174</sup> and 'Goe soule the bodies guest' (usually called 'The Lye' (p.176)). As we have seen, the last of these was Raleigh's farewell to court after his dismissal from Elizabeth's presence, and although the poem was initially circulated anonymously its author became apparent very soon; it is clear that the compiler of this manuscript knew Raleigh to be the author, as it is followed by 'Watt I wot well' (p.177).

The Folger manuscript is the only miscellany that I have found in which this anti-Raleigh libel is used in his favour. In the Rawlinson manuscript the stanzas have been manipulated to highlight different aspects of the libel but it remains negative, whereas

<sup>173</sup> See Colclough, *Freedom of Speech*, pp.240, 246.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, p.110.

the compiler of this collection has only used the first six stanzas of the libel. In several places throughout the manuscript, texts have been either squeezed into the available space or else written in double columns. 'Watt I wot well' is surrounded by enough space for the compiler to have included more of the poem if he had wished to do so, and I believe that he has made a decision to use only these stanzas.<sup>175</sup>

Similarities can be found between 'Watt I wot well', where Raleigh is described 'like Phaeton y<sup>t</sup> did presume to sitt | in Phoebus chaire to guide y<sup>e</sup> golden ball', and the description of James as Phoebus in 'The Five Senses' resigning his throne to 'younge Phaeton', or Buckingham. The first six stanzas of 'Watt I wot well' are a lament for a 'sommetime worthy knighte' who succumbed to ambition and whose position in the monarch's favour exposed him to jealousy. In stanza five the poet skims over the charge of treason to focus on one who is 'wise and wittie', and 'so rare a witt'. The last stanza copied restores Raleigh to his former glory by wishing that he had remained loyal to the king 'as to the Quene thou euermore was true' and suggests that if this had happened 'my muse thy praise might vncontrolled singe'. There are several mythological allusions throughout the first six stanzas, which have the effect of elevating their subject in a manner not possible in the portion of the poem that is not included, as the emphasis there is on idolizing Essex at the expense of Raleigh.

Raleigh had spent most of the Jacobean years before his death out of the public eye, in prison. This manuscript was compiled after his death and nearer to the reports that were circulating of his heroic end on the scaffold than to those of his treason, which were the purpose of his inclusion in many of the earlier miscellanies. John Chamberlain recorded of Raleigh that 'he spake and behaued himself so, without any shew of feare of affectation that he moved much commiseration, and all that saw him confesse that his end was omnibus numeris absolutus, and as far as man can discerne every way perfect'.<sup>176</sup> His manner of death partly explains why he became an idol of the Elizabethan era and was used as a standard to highlight all that was wrong with the Stuarts during troubled times and in miscellanies such as this one.

Many poets of this period arrange their work into collections even in manuscripts, but Raleigh and many of the poets in section one of this chapter did not – although Raleigh

<sup>175</sup> Stanzas four and five have been reversed in this copy.

<sup>176</sup> Chamberlain, II, 177

did circulate his work freely, which indicates that he wished it to be read. When an author contextualizes his own work the modern reader, as well as the early compiler, is given an insight into their interpretation of it. In manuscript culture the interpretation of either the author or another compiler becomes almost redundant, as the miscellany is a collection built to suit the individual meaning of its owner. As texts travel to miscellanies by means of ‘compiler publication’ rather than ‘author publication’ they are to some extent made the compiler’s own.<sup>177</sup> Although Arthur Marotti argues that it is unusual to find a miscellany that has a mixed perspective on the work it contains, I have found considerable evidence of just this in the manuscripts that I have examined for this study.<sup>178</sup> The Folger manuscript, for instance, contains texts in support of and opposition to prominent people of the period, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine the political view of its compiler. Within the collection, however, it can be possible to determine its position on a set text, or series of texts, as with those concerning Raleigh.

We have seen how the arrangement of the Raleigh texts within the manuscripts above, and also within ‘Watt I wot well’, can make a clear difference to the overall reading of a manuscript. In the case of this text the compiler can choose how much of it to include in order to highlight the religious or political focus of his collection, or to rearrange the text to focus on a different aspect. Writing by or about Raleigh is especially malleable, as I have suggested above, and it is for this reason that his work can be used to illustrate several situations: court and personal rivalry and politics, religious circumstances, and relations with Spain, to name the most obvious. His texts ‘bend’ to alter the meaning of those that surround them. For instance, had ‘Watt I wot well’ not been placed with the Essex material at the beginning of the Rawlinson manuscript, Essex would have been shown in a far worse light; likewise, the presence of the shortened, and pro-Raleigh version of this poem in the Folger manuscript reinforces its anti-Spanish tone. In other words, to remove the Raleigh texts from these manuscripts would alter the way they demand to be read.

## 6. Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed poetry that appears not to have circulated beyond MS 22601, that which has extremely limited circulation, and texts about Raleigh which were

---

<sup>177</sup> See the discussion of ‘user publication’ in Love, pp.79-83.

<sup>178</sup> Marotti, *Manuscript*, pp. 87,108.

common in the collections of his own lifetime and for several decades after. Whilst some of these poems are overtly political (either because of their subject or their author), others take on a political significance due to the texts they share the collection with or to their placement within the collection. Many of the poems have an underlying meaning at variance with their explicit statements; a meaning that can only be discovered when further investigation is made into the characters involved and the connections between them – authors such as Essex, Raleigh, Cecil, and Davies. Political comment is also found couched in courtly vocabulary. What does it mean, for instance, that our manuscript contains a large number of James's poems, especially ones with such limited circulation, or that three libels against Raleigh are copied together in the same collection? If the compiler of MS 22601 had only one of James's poems, there would be no absolute link to the royal court, or reason to suppose that its compiler was close to court circles; similarly, if only one of the Raleigh libels had been copied, it could be argued that it was simply a text in circulation and therefore worthy of collection; in this case, however, it is clear that the compiler's intention was to criticise Raleigh. Although I have separated the poems in MS 22601 into three general groups, overlapping is evident. For instance, 'Passionado.5.', which is attributed to James, has been recognised as an imitation of Dyer's poem, and while I have concentrated on libels against Raleigh, he was also responsible for much love poetry, particularly during Elizabeth's reign. The compilers of these miscellanies are ruthless in their historical use of texts: the immediate context of a work is easily disregarded as material is used to bolster their ideas or positions, regardless of the date of its composition. As we have seen, the Raleigh material shares collections with that on the Overbury affair and the Spanish Match. Tracing the movement of poetical texts found in MS 22601, then, demonstrates once again the extent to which appropriation and recontextualisation can determine our interpretation of a single work or a group of works, as well as reminding us how important it is to consider miscellanies, at least to some extent, as 'works' in their own right.



## Conclusion

The analysis that I have carried out in this thesis is based on the premise that the compilers of the miscellanies that I have examined chose to edit their miscellanies in a particular way over four hundred years ago. Peter Beal believes that the miscellany was associated with the commonplace book mentality, but that while the former was directed towards pleasure, the latter was directed towards utility. He argues that no individual text found in either a miscellany or commonplace book ‘can safely be viewed as an independent entity, divorced from the collection in which it occurs’.<sup>1</sup> In other words, a miscellany is an important document in itself, and each component of it is also of great significance. I have suggested that it is necessary to examine each text in isolation and then in the context in which it was originally set, and shown what is to be gained through such an approach. Harold Love has described two strategies for reading manuscript miscellanies – centrifugally and centripetally.<sup>2</sup> I would argue that, rather than being attractive alternatives these strategies must always be used in conjunction with one another. If a miscellany were studied as a collection of unrelated material the intentions of the compiler would be altered and the value of it as a historical artefact would be lost.

In this thesis I have considered the contents of MS 22601 individually and as part of that collection; that is, the meanings of the individual texts in isolation, with no outside influences, and their meanings as they become clearer, or are altered, when the whole collection (and what we know about the texts and their circumstances) is examined. A typical case study is that of ‘A Dirge’ (fol. 90<sup>r</sup>). In isolation ‘A Dirge’ can be read as a typical funeral lament; however, internal clues suggest that its subject was a Judge and, although he is not mentioned in that poem, on delving further we find that Judge Edward Flowerdew died of ‘Gaoll sickness’ in Exeter in 1586. When the text is read alongside the following poem, ‘A funerall Dirge vpon the death of Bard flowe<sup>r</sup>dew’ (fol. 90<sup>r</sup>) its subject becomes clear. Furthermore, the presence of other texts relating to the south-west of England, as well as the textual evidence connecting our miscellany to a nineteenth-century book dealer from the area all suggest links to the Devon region.

When a text is found in a different miscellany its meaning in isolation (its internal meaning, perhaps) remains the same, but its contextual, or social meaning may be quite

---

<sup>1</sup> Beal, “Notions in Garrison”, p.133.

<sup>2</sup> Love, *Culture and Commerce*, p.230.

different, as the content and origins of the miscellany provide a new framework within which to read it. In this way a text is recontextualized, either through physical alterations or simply by its new environment. In the first case a compiler, or the intermediary from whom it was received, might make alterations to a text. Several instances of this have emerged from this thesis: MS 22601 contains the only version of the 'Petition' (fol. 10<sup>v</sup>) with the offensive clauses, and the only conflated version of Robert Southwell's poems (fol. 71<sup>v</sup>) that I have found; the version of 'Watt I wot well' (fol. 64<sup>r</sup>) in MS 22601 has been lengthened, shortened and had its stanzas rearranged on its dissemination to other collections. In the second case of recontextualization, new layers of meaning become attached to the work, either perceived by the modern reader (taken from such information as we have – biographical, textual, or other internal evidence such as attributions or annotations), or by the use to which the compiler has put a text – whether it is in a poetical miscellany or alongside political or other matter which alters or inflects the range of readings available to us and to early modern readers.

It is not often in manuscript culture that we are able to say with certainty that a text is the 'original' or first version written by its author: even when we have a holograph authorial copy we can never be entirely sure which amendments to it represent 'final' choices (or whether these were the best choices). It is difficult, therefore, to find the beginning of the trail or to make assumptions about how a text has altered if we are not aware of its original state or to judge if a text is 'corrupt' or the intended version. An example of this is 'Water thy plaints' (fol. 63<sup>v</sup>), which is discussed at length in chapter four.<sup>3</sup>

Ultimately, manuscript studies have to rely on a certain amount of guesswork or supposition, and we must make the best use of the evidence with which we are presented. But even if we cannot always know conclusively what meaning a text was intended to have in a miscellany we *can* begin to put together likely scenarios – scenarios which simply do not appear if the miscellany is treated only as a source.

Manuscript miscellanies of this period – and MS 22601 in particular – comment on contemporary society through their contents. They also provide insights into that society in a quite different way to that offered by 'official' documents, or even by

---

<sup>3</sup> Chapter four, pp.197-198, 207-208.

printed texts. Focussing on a single miscellany and working outwards from it, therefore, allows us not just to observe the collecting habits of one person but to make hypotheses about broader sets of attitudes and their dissemination. The compiler is an eyewitness to events: he does not need to provide a direct commentary on the work in the miscellany; his selection and organisation of the book do this for him.

The main objective of this thesis has been to trace the dissemination of texts from MS 22601 and to examine these texts in their new environment. Although it was hugely tempting to then follow the trail of texts that were now situated alongside those disseminated from MS 22601, this would have been an almost endless task and one that would have exceeded the limits of this study. Much work therefore remains to be done: only by constructing as many individual case studies as possible of manuscript miscellanies can we begin to understand their full importance, and to map the intellectual terrain of which they were a part. This thesis is intended as a contribution to that larger project.

## Bibliography

### MANUSCRIPTS

#### Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales

Sotheby MS B2 Miscellany belonging to the Lloyd family of Llwydiarth, Wales

#### Cambridge, Cambridge University Library

Additional 335 Political miscellany

E. III.57 Collection of prose belonging to the See of Norwich

E.e. V.23 Miscellany in verse and prose

#### Cambridge, Downing College

“Wickstede Thesaurus” Miscellany compiled by John Wickstede, Mayor of Cambridge

#### Cambridge, Emmanuel College

I. 3. 28 (James 80) Miscellany in verse and prose

#### Cambridge, St John’s College

GBR/0275 Manuscript notebooks of John Eyton Bickersteth Mayor

U. 26 (James 548) Poetical miscellany compiled by John Cruso

#### Chichester, West Sussex Record Office

Additional 10085 William Andrews’ sales catalogue

#### Dublin, Trinity College

D. iii, 30 Manuscript lute book of John Dallis

#### Exeter, Devon Record Office

City of Exeter Muniments, Act Book V

#### Exeter, Exeter Cathedral

Dean & Chapter 3527 Political Miscellany

#### Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge Massachusetts

Eng 686 Verse miscellany

#### Lancashire, Stonyhurst College

A.v.27 Collection of poetry and prose by Robert Southwell

#### Leeds, Brotherton Library, University of Leeds

Brotherton Lt.q.9 Commonplace book compiled by Joseph Tempest

#### London, British Library

Additional 4160 Papers relating to Sir Julius Caesar

5815 Miscellany relating to Cambridge, sixteenth-seventeenth century

5821 Miscellany relating to Cambridge, seventeenth-eighteenth century

6917 Peter Calfe’s Miscellany

6918 Peter Calfe’s Miscellany

9828 Seventeenth-century letter book

10309 Poetical miscellany formerly belonging to Margaret Bellasys

- 10422 Poems, letters, and prose of Robert Southwell  
 12132 Contains *A Prosopopeia of the Earle of Leicester's Ghoast*  
 12497 Julius Caesar's papers  
 12503 Julius Caesar's papers  
 15117 Musical miscellany  
 22591 Miscellany in verse and prose  
 22601 Miscellany in verse and prose  
 22602 Miscellany in verse and prose  
 24195 Volume of James I's poems  
 24665 Giles Earle's songbook  
 25303 Miscellany in verse and prose  
 29546 Collection of ecclesiastical papers  
 29607 Nicholas Throckmorton-Carew's commonplace book  
 30662 Papers relating to English affairs – written in French  
 30982 Daniel Leare's miscellany  
 32218 Musical miscellany  
 33207 Papers and correspondence of Mathew Hutton  
 34218 Letter book of Sir Francis Fane  
 34395 Letter book of the Williams family of Huntingdon  
 34599 Sir Henry Spelman's miscellany  
 34631 Collection relating to Sir Walter Raleigh  
 38139 Sir Peter Manwood's miscellany  
 38492 Townshend family miscellany  
 39829 Papers and correspondence of Sir Thomas Tresham, recusant  
 44848 Collection of historical papers  
 46366 Papers of John Harington of Stepney  
 46381 John Harington's miscellany  
 52585 Richard Waferer's commonplace book
- Cotton Caligula E.X State papers  
 Faustina CII State papers  
 Titus CVI Papers of Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton
- Egerton 2877 Sir Gilbert Freville's commonplace book
- Harleian 35 State papers  
 286 State papers  
 677 Miscellany in verse and prose  
 791 Political miscellany  
 1221 Miscellany in verse and prose  
 1576 State papers  
 1925 Randle Holme's miscellany  
 3787 Miscellany in verse and prose  
 3910 Poetical miscellany  
 3991 Collection of songs and poems  
 5191 Miscellany in verse and prose  
 5353 John Manningham's diary  
 6038 Poetical miscellany  
 6798 State papers: English and foreign matters  
 6910 Poetical miscellany  
 6921 Collection of poems by Robert Southwell  
 6947 Poetical miscellany
- Lansdowne 42 Lord Burghley's miscellany  
 88 Michael Hick's papers  
 89 Michael Hick's papers

	99	Lord Burghley's miscellany
	158	Historical collection of papers
	983	Bishop Kennett's miscellany
Loan	23 (1)	Papers of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> Earls of Essex
Royal	17C.IV	Address to James I from Anthonie Atkinson
Sloane	271	Ecclesiastical miscellany
	3827	Papers relating to Lord Falkland
Stowe	143	State papers
	145	Miscellany in verse and prose
	156	State papers and political tracts
	160	State papers
	952	Poetical miscellany
	962	Miscellany in verse and prose

London, Lambeth Palace Library

Bacon Papers 649  
Talbot Papers K

London, National Archives

State Papers Domestic SP 12 Elizabeth  
State Papers Domestic SP 14 James

London, Victoria and Albert Museum

Dyce 25, F. 39 Poetical miscellany

Manchester, Chetham's Library

MS Mun. A4.15 (formerly 8012) Miscellany in verse and prose

New Haven, Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscript Library

Osborn	77	Papers relating to Narcissus Luttrell's collection
	b.32	Commonplace book of John Holles
	b.54	Miscellany in verse and prose
	b.197	Poetical commonplace book of Tobias Alston
	b.321	Narcissus Luttrell's commonplace book
	b.356	Miscellany in verse and prose later belonging to Alex Popam
	fb. 9	John Humphreys' commonplace book
	fb. 58	Narcissus Luttrell's commonplace book
	fb. 60	Political miscellany
	fb. 107	Narcissus Luttrell's poetical miscellany
	fb. 155	John Brown's political miscellany
	fb. 236	Political and religious miscellany

Northallerton, North Yorkshire County Record Office

ZAZ 1286/9101 Papers of Archbishop Mathew Hutton and his son Timothy

Oxford, Bodleian Library

Additional	B.97	Leweston Fittzjames's miscellany
	D.109	Miscellany in verse and prose
Ashmole	36-37	Verse miscellany
	38	Verse miscellany
	781	Miscellany in verse and prose
Donation	c.54	Richard Roberts' collection

English Poetry	c.50	Poetical miscellany once owned by Peter Daniell
	c.97	Miscellany in verse and prose
	d.3	Commonplace book of Sir Edward Pudsey
	d.152	Poetical miscellany once owned by Peter Le Neve
	e.14	Poetical miscellany
	e.97	Poetical and dramatic miscellany
	e.113	Collection relating to Robert Southwell
	f.9	Poetical miscellany, chiefly of works by John Donne
	f.10	Verse miscellany once owned by Simon Sloper
English History	c.272	Historical documents compiled by Henry Spelman
Jones	58	Poetical miscellany
Malone	19	Miscellany in verse and prose
	23	Poetical miscellany
Musaeo	e.63	Alchemical miscellany
Rawlinson	C.744	Miscellany in verse and prose
	D.649	Miscellany in verse and prose
Rawlinson Poetry	26	Verse miscellany compiled by Robert Cooke
	84	Poetical miscellany
	85	Miscellany possibly belonging to John Finett
	142	Miscellany once owned by William Bloys
	172	Composite collection of verse and prose
	199	Poetical miscellany
	212	Poetical miscellany
Sancroft	53	Archbishop Sancroft's miscellany
Tanner	76	Political miscellany
	304	Political miscellany
	465	Poetical miscellany

Oxford, Christ Church College

MUS 439 Songbook

Oxford, Codrington Library, All Souls College

Y155 Miscellany in verse and prose compiled from the papers of Sir Christopher Yelverton

Oxford, Corpus Christi College

CCC 327 Poetical miscellany later owned by William Fulman  
 CCC 328 Poetical miscellany

Philadelphia, Rosenbach Foundation

1083.15 (formerly Rosenbach 186) Poetical miscellany

San Marino, Henry E. Huntington Library

EL 102 Miscellany in verse and prose  
 HM 198 Poetical miscellany  
 904 Poetical miscellany of Constance Aston Fowler

Shrewsbury School

"Dr Taylor MS" An Elizabethan Town Chronicle for Shrewsbury

Texas, University of Texas, Austin

MS File/(Herrick, R.) Works B Miscellany owned and partly compiled by Robert Herrick

Warwick, Warwickshire County Record Office

CR/136/B2455 Papers of the Newdegate family of Arbury Hall

Washington, DC, Folger Shakespeare Library

- J.a. 2 Miscellany of poetical and dramatic works  
 V.a. 103 Poetical miscellany  
 124 Richard Archard's miscellany  
 162 Poetical miscellany  
 249 Miscellany in verse and prose  
 319 Poetical miscellany  
 321 Letter book of John Conybeare  
 322 Poetical miscellany  
 339 Miscellany later owned by Joseph Hall  
 345 Poetical miscellany  
 421 Volume of works by Robert Southwell  
 V.b. 210 Miscellany in verse and prose  
 214 Commonplace book of religious and state affairs  
 303 Miscellany in verse and prose  
 X.d. 172 Papers originating from Sir Edward Conway  
 241 Historical collection

## PRIMARY SOURCES

*Acts of the Privy Council of England, new series: 1542-1631*, ed. by John Roche Dasent, 46 volumes (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1890-1964)

Anon., *An Abridgement of that Booke which the Ministers of Lincoln Diocess delivered to his Maiestie upon the first of December last 1605. Being the first part of an Apologie for themselves and their Brethren that refuse the subscription, and conformitie which is required* (London, 1605)

Anon., *England's Helicon* (London, 1600)

Anon., *Le Prince d'Amour, or the Prince of Love with a collection of Several Ingenious Poems and Songs By the Wits of the Age* (London, 1660)

Anon., *Wit and Drollery Jovial Poems* (London, 1682)

Arber, Edward, ed., *English Garner in Gatherings from our History and Literature*, 8 volumes (London: E. Arber, 1877)

Armytage, Geo. J., ed., *Allegations for Marriage Licences issued by the Bishop of London, 1520 to 1610 (1611 to 1828). Extracted by Col. Joseph Lemuel Chester*, 2 volumes (London: Harleian Society, 1887)



- Bacon, Francis, *The works of Francis Bacon*, ed. by James Spedding, R. L. Ellis, and D. D. Heath, 14 volumes (London: Longman, Green, Longmans & Roberts, 1857-1874)
- 'Certain observations made upon a Libel Published this Present Year, 1592', in *The works of Francis Bacon*, VIII, 146-208
- Beal, Peter, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts, volume 1: 1450-1625* (London: Mansell, 1980)
- Bedell, William, *Threnodia in obitum D. Edovardi Lewkenor, Equitis et C. Susannae conjugis charissimae. Funerall verses upon the death of the right worshipfull Sir Edward Lewkenor, knight, and madame Susan his lady with deaths Apologie and a rejoinder to the same* (London, 1606)
- Bellany, Alastair, and Andrew McRae, eds, 'Early Stuart Libels: An edition of poetry from manuscript sources', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, Text Series I (2005), <http://purl.oclc.org/emls/texts/libels>
- Bernard, Edward, ed., *Catalogi Librorum Manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae in unum collecti, cum indice alphabetico* (Oxford, 1697)
- Birch, Thomas, *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, from the year 1581 till her death*, 2 volumes (London: A. Millar, 1754)
- Braunmuller, A. R., *A Seventeenth-century letter-book: A facsimile edition of Folger MS. V.a. 321* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1983)
- Breton, Nicholas, *The vncasing of Machivils Instuitions to his son* (1613, STC 17170 and 3704.3)
- *The Arbor of Amorous Devices 1597, By Nicholas Breton and others with an introduction by Hyder Edward Rollins* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936)
- Briquet, C. M., *Les filigranes: Dictionnaire historique des marques du papier, des leur apparition vers 1282 jusqu'en 1600*, 4 volumes (New York: Hacker, 1985)
- Bruce, John, ed., *Correspondence of King James VI of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and others in England during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London: Camden Society, 1861)
- Calderwood, David, *The True History of the Church of Scotland, from the Beginning of the Reformation unto the End of the Reigne of James VI* (n.p., 1678)
- Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury. K.G.*, ed. by M. S. Giuseppi (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1938)
- Calendar of Letters and Papers relating to the Affairs of the Borders of England and Scotland*, ed. by Joseph Bain, volume 2, 1595-1603 (1896), 2 volumes (Edinburgh, H M General Register House, 1894-1896)

- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1598-1601*, ed. by Mary Anne Everett Green (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1869)
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I.*, ed. by Mary Anne Everett Green, 4 volumes (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1857), volume I, 1603-1610 (1857)
- Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, relating to English Affairs, existing within archives and collections of Venice, and in other libraries of Northern Italy*, ed. by Horatio F. Brown and others, 38 volumes (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1864-1947), volume X, 1603-1607 (1900)
- Calendar of the Shrewsbury and Talbot Papers in Lambeth Palace Library and the College of Arms*, ed. by G. R. Batho (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1970)
- Castiglione, Baldesar, *The Book of the Courtier*, trans. by G. Bull (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967)
- Cecil, Sir Robert, *The Secret Correspondence of Sir Robert Cecil with King James VI of Scotland*, ed. by David Dalrymple (Edinburgh, 1766)
- Centre for Metropolitan History, 'Newington Butts', in *The Environs of London: volume 1: County of Surrey (1792)*, pp. 389-398 (<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/45386>)
- Chamberlain, John, *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. by Norman Egbert McClure, 2 volumes (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Association, 1939)
- Churchill, William Algernon, *Watermarks in Paper in Holland, England, France, etc, in the XVII and XVIII centuries, and their interconnection* (Amsterdam: M. Hertzberger & Co., 1935)
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius, *Cicero: On the ideal orator*, trans. by James M. May and Jakob Wisse (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)
- *Cicero: Letters to Friends*, ed. and trans. by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, 3 volumes (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001)
- Clifford, Lady Anne, *The Diary of Lady Anne Clifford with an introductory note by V. Sackville-West* (London: Heinemann, 1923)
- Coke, Sir Edward, 'The Case de Libellis famosis, or of Scandalous Libels', in The fifth part of the reports of Sir Edward Coke (Yiii<sup>f</sup>-Yiv<sup>f</sup>), *The Reports of Sir Edward Coke, in English, in Thirteen parts complete; with references to all the Ancient and Modern Books of the Law*, ed. by George Wilson, 7 volumes (London: Rivington and Sons, 1777), III, 125-126
- Collier, Jeremy, *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain chiefly of England: from the first planting of Christianity, to the end of the reign of King Charles the Second. With a brief account of the affairs of religion in Ireland, etc.*, 9 volumes (London: William Straker, 1940)

- *The great historical, geographical, genealogical and poetical dictionary being a curious miscellany of sacred and prophane history, collected from the best historians, chronologers, and lexicographers; especially out of Lewis Morery, the second edition revised, corrected and enlarged to the year 1688 by Jeremy Collier*, 2 volumes (London, 1701)
- Collier, J. P., ed., *England's Parnassus: or The choyssest Flowers of our Moderne Poets, with their Poeticall comparisons, Descriptions of Bewties, Personages, Castles, Pallaces, Mountaines, Groues, Seas, Springs, Rivers, &C.* (London, 1867)
- Collins, Arthur, ed., *Letters and Memorials of State* (London: T. Osborne, 1746)
- Cooper, Charles Henry, and Thompson Cooper, eds, *Athenae Cantabrigienses, 1586-1609*, 3 volumes (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1858-1913)
- Crum, Margaret, ed., *First Line Index of English Poetry, 1500-1800 in the manuscripts of the Bodleian Library*, 2 volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)
- Cutts, John, *Seventeenth Century songs and lyrics. Collected and edited from the original music manuscripts* (Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1959)
- Davies, Sir John, *The complete poems of Sir John Davies*, ed. by Rev. Alexander B. Grosart, 2 volumes (London: Chatto and Windus, 1876)
- *The Poems of Sir John Davies*, ed. by Robert Krueger (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975)
- Davison, Francis, *A Poeticall Rapsodie* (London, 1608)
- Day, Angel, *The English Secretary, or Methode of writing of Epistles and Letters: with a declaration of such Tropes, Figures, and Schemes as either usually or for ornament sake are therein required. Also the parts and office of a Secretarie, Deuided into two bookes* (London: P. s. for C. Burbie, 1599; facsimile with introduction by Robert O. Evans, Gainesville, FL: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1967)
- de Saint-Gelais, Mellin, *Oeuvres poetiques* (Lyon, 1547)
- Devereux, Walter Burchier, *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex*, 2 volumes (London: Murray, 1853)
- Donne, John, *The Divine Poems*, ed. by Helen Gardner, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978)
- Doughtie, Edward, *Lyrics from English Airs 1596-1622* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970)
- Drummond, William, *The Poetical Works of William Drummond of Hawthornden with "A Cypress Grove"*, ed. by L. Kastner, 2 volumes (London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1913)

- Earle, John, *Micro-cosmographie, or, a peece of the world discovered; in essays and characters* (London, 1628)
- Edwards, E., *The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh together with his Letters*, 2 volumes (London: Macmillan, 1868)
- Edwards, Richard, *The Paradise of Dainty Devices, 1576-1606*, ed. by Hyder Edward Rollins (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927)
- Elizabeth I: Collected Works*, ed. by Leah S. Marcus, Janel Mueller, and Mary Beth Rose (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002)
- Erasmus, Desiderius, 'De Conscribendis Epistolis', in *Collected Works of Erasmus, 25: Literary and educational writings, 3*, ed. by J. K. Sowards (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985)
- Evans, Joan, *English Posies and Posy Rings: A Catalogue* (London: Oxford University Press, 1931)
- Farmer, Norman K., Jr, 'Poems from a Seventeenth-Century Manuscript with the Hand of Robert Herrick', *The Texas Quarterly*, 16:4 (Winter, 1973), supplement
- Fellowes, E. H., *English Madrigal Verse 1588-1632*, rev. by Frederick W. Sternfeld and David Greer (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967)
- Foster, C. W., *The State of the Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I as illustrated by documents relating to The Diocese of Lincoln*, 23 volumes (Lincoln: Lincoln Record Society, 1926)
- Foster, Joseph, ed., *Alumni oxonienses: The members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714: their parentage, birthplace, and year of birth, with a record of their degrees. Being the matriculation register of the University, alphabetically arranged, revised and annotated, by Joseph Foster*, 4 volumes (Oxford: Parker and Co., 1891-1892)
- *Alumni Oxonienses: The members of the University of Oxford, 1715-1886: their parentage, birthplace, and year of birth, with a record of their degrees. Being the Matriculation Register of the University, alphabetically arranged, revised and annotated by J Foster*, 4 volumes (Oxford: Parker and Co., 1888)
- *The Register of admissions to Gray's Inn, 1521-1889, together with the register of marriages in Gray's Inn chapel, 1695-1754*, 2 volumes (London, 1889)
- Fulwood, William, *The Enimie of Idlenesse: teaching the maner and stile howe to endite, compose, and write all sorts of Epistles and Letters* (London, 1568)
- Gray, Todd, *The Lost Chronicle of Barnstaple 1586-1611* (Exeter: Devonshire Association, 1988)
- Greene, Robert, *A Notable Discovery of Cozenage* (London, 1591)
- Greene, Thomas, *A Poets Vision, and a Princes Glorie* (1603)

- Grosart, Alexander B., ed., *The Dr Farmer Chetham MS*, 2 volumes, Camden Society, old series no. 89 (Manchester: Chetham Society, 1873)
- Hall, Joseph, 'The Kings Prophecie: or Weeping Ioy. Expressed in a Poeme, to the Honor of Englands too great Solemnities', in *The Collected Poems of Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter and Norwich*, ed. by A. Davenport (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1949), pp. 107-122
- Halliwell, James Orchard, 'Poetical Miscellanies from a manuscript collection of the time of James I', in *Early English Poetry, Ballads, and Popular Literature of the Middle Ages* (London: Percy Society, 1845)
- Hanna, John, ed., *The Courtly Poets from Raleigh to Montrose* (London: Bell & Daldy, 1870)
- Harington, Sir John, 'A Briefe View of the State of the Church of England, as it stood in Queen Elizabeths and King James his Reigne, to the Yeere 1608', in *Nugae Antiquae: Being a Miscellaneous Collection of Original Papers in Prose and Verse: Written in the Reigns of Henry VIII, Queen Mary, Elizabeth, King James &C.*, 3 volumes (London, 1792), I, 1-249
- 'Sir John Harington to Mr Secretary Barlow, 1606', in *Nugae Antiquae*, II, 126-131
- 'Sir R. Cecil to Sir J. Haryngton, 1603, with Houshold Rules and Ordinances for Servantes', in *Nugae Antiquae*, II, 263-265
- *Tract on the Succession of the Crown, 1602*, ed. by Clements R. Markham (London: Roxburghe Club, 1880)
- *The letters and epigrams of Sir John Harington*, ed. by Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1930)
- Harvey, Gabriel, *Pierces Supererogation, or a new Prayse of the old Asse. A Preparative to certaine larger Discourses, intituled Nashes S. Fame. (Errours escaped in the printing; with certaine additions to be inserted. The answer to letters and sonnets commendatory)* (London, 1593)
- Harris, Dr William, *An historical and critical account of the life and writings of James the First, king of Great Britain; after the manner of Mr. Bayle* (London, 1753)
- Heawood, Edward, *Watermarks: mainly of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries* (Hilversum, Holland: Paper Publications Society, 1950)
- Hebel, J. William and Hoyt H. Hudson, eds, *Poetry of the English Renaissance, 1509-1660, selected from early editions and manuscripts* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1929)
- Heywood, Thomas, 'The Rape of Lucrece', in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Heywood, now first collected with illustrative notes and a memoir of the author in six volumes*, ed. by R. H. Shepherd (London: Pearson, 1874), V, 161-257
- Historical Manuscripts Commission 73, Report on the records of the City of Exeter*, ed. by James Hamilton Wylie (London: HMSO, 1916)

- Holles, John, *Letters of John Holles*, ed. by P. R. Seddon, 3 volumes (Nottingham: Thoroton Society, 1986)
- Howel, James, *Epistolae Ho Elianae, Familiar letters domestic & forren partly historical political, philosophical* (London, 1645)
- Hunt & Co.'s City of Bristol, Clifton and Hotwells Directory, including Ashton, Bedminster, Brislington, Pill, Keynsham, and Stapleton, A Descriptive Account of each place, the names and addresses of the Commercial and Private residents* (London: E. Hunt and Co., 1848)
- Hudson, William, 'Treatise of the Court of Star Chamber', in *Collectanea Juridica. Consisting of Tracts Relative to the law and constitution of England*, ed. by Francis Hargrave, 2 volumes (London: E. and R. Brooke, 1791), II, 1-240
- Hutton, Mathew, *The Correspondence of Dr Matthew Hutton, Archbishop of York*, ed. by J. Raine (London: Surtees Society, 1843)
- James I, *Letters of King James VI & I*, ed. by G. P. V. Akrigg (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984)
- *New Poems by James I of England from a hitherto unpublished manuscript (Add. 24195) in the British Museum*, ed. by Allan F. Westcott (New York: Columbia University Press, 1911)
- *The Poems of James VI of Scotland (volume one: The Essayes of a Prentise and Poeticall Exercises at Vacant Houres)*, ed. by James Craigie, Scottish Text Society, 2 volumes (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1955)
- *The Poems of James VI of Scotland (volume two: Unpublished and Uncollected Poems)*, ed. by James Craigie, Scottish Text Society, 2 volumes (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1958)
- *Minor Prose Works of King James VI and I: Daemonologie, The True Lawe of Free Monarchies, A Counterblaste to Tobacco, A Declaration of Sports*, ed. by James Craigie (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1982)
- 'Basilicon Doron', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, ed. by Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 1-61
- 'A Speech to the Lords and Commons of the Parliament at White-Hall, on Wednesday the XXI of March. Anno 1609', in *King James VI and I: Political Writings*, pp. 179-203
- *King James VI and I: Selected Writings*, ed. by Neil Rhodes, Jennifer Richards and Joseph Marshall (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003)
- Jorgens, Elise Bickford, ed., *English Songs 1600-1675 British Library Manuscripts, Facsimilies of twenty-six manuscripts and an edition of the texts edited with an introduction by Elise Bickford Jorgens* (New York: Garland, 1986)
- Jonson, Ben, *The Workes of Beniamin Jonson* (London, 1616)

- Larkin, James F. and Paul L. Hughes, eds, *Stuart Royal Proclamations, volume 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I 1603-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973)
- Latham, Agnes M. C., 'Sir Walter Raleigh's Instructions to his son', in *Elizabethan and Jacobean Studies, presented to Frank Percy Wilson*, ed. by H. Davis and H. Gardner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), pp. 199-218
- Lathbury, Rev. Thomas, *A History of the Convocation of the Church of England from the earliest period to the year 1742*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (London: J. Leslie, 1853)
- Lincoln's Inn, *The Records of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn, volume 1: Admissions from A.D. 1420 to A.D. 1799* (London: Lincoln's Inn, 1896)
- Lodge, Edmund, *Illustrations of British history, biography, and manners, in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, & James I, with numerous notes and observations by Edmund Lodge*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, 3 volumes (London: J. Chidley, 1838)
- Lodge, Thomas, *Rosalynd: Euphues Golden Legacie. Found after his death in his Cell at Silexedra. Bequeathed to Philautus Sonnes, nursed up with their father in England. Fetcht from the Canaries* (London, 1609)
- Lyly, John, *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, ed. by R. Warwick Bond, 3 volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902)
- Machiavelli, Niccolo, *Machiavils Advice to his son newly translated out of Italian into English verse by R. L. Esq. [Sir Roger L'Estrange?] [Abridged from 'The Uncasing of Machivil's Instructions to his Sonne']* (London, 1681)
- Manningham, John, *The Diary of John Manningham of the Middle Temple 1602-1603*, ed. by Robert Parker Sorlien (Hanover: New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 1976)
- Martin, Richard, *A Speach delivered, to the kings most excellent Majestie in the name of the sheriffes of London and Middlesex. By Maister Richard Martin of the Middle Temple* (London, 1603)
- Mathews's Annual Bristol and Clifton Directory, and Almanack; 1850*, 52<sup>nd</sup> edition (Bristol: Mathews, 1850)
- Millington, Thomas, *True Narration of the Entertainment of his Royall Maiestie [James I], from the time of his departure from Edenbrough; till his receiving at London* (London, 1603)
- Milward, Peter, *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1977)
- Nashe, Thomas, 'Pierce Penilessse His supplication to the Divill', in *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. by R. B. McKerrow, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, rev. by F. P. Wilson, 5 volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), I, 137-245
- Nichols, John, *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First*, 4 volumes (London: Nichols, 1828)

- Norbrook, David and H. R. Woudhuysen, eds, *The Penguin Book of Renaissance Verse 1509-1659*, revised edition (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1993)
- Osborn, Louise Brown, *The life, letters and writings of John Hoskyns* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937)
- Osborne, Frances, 'Secret History of the Court of James the First', in *Historical Memoirs on the Reigns of Elizabeth, and King James*, 2 volumes (Edinburgh: James Ballantyne and Co., 1811), pp. 1-297
- Peele, George, *The Works of George Peele, now first collected, with some account of his writings*, ed. by Alexander Dyce, 2 volumes (London: Pickering, 1828)
- Percy, Thomas, ed., *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, 3 volumes (London: James Nisbet & Co., 1858)
- Prothero, G. W., *Select Statutes and other Constitutional Documents illustrative of the reigns of Elizabeth and James*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913)
- Raleigh, Sir Walter, *The Poems of Sir Walter Raleigh*, ed. by Agnes Latham (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1951)
- *The Poems of Sir Walter Raleigh, A Historical Edition*, ed. by Michael Rudick (Tempe, Arizona: Renaissance English Text Society, 1999)
- Raleigh, Sir Walter, *Instructions to his Sonne* (London: Benjamin Fisher, 1632)
- Ringler, William A. Jnr., *Bibliography and Index of English Verse in Manuscript, 1501-1558, prepared and completed by Michael Rudick and Susan J. Ringler* (London: Mansell, 1992)
- Rogers, Thomas, *Tullius* (1592, STC 24042)
- *Celestiall Elegies* (1598, STC 21225)
- Rollins, Hyder Edward, ed., *Old English Ballads, 1553-1625, chiefly from manuscripts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920)
- *A Poetical Rhapsody, 1602-1621*, 2 volumes (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1931)
- Rowlands, Samuel, 'Tis merrie when gossips meete', in *The Complete works of Samuel Rowlands, 1598-1628*, 3 volumes (Glasgow: Hunterian Club, 1880), I (23 leaves)
- Rous, John, *The Diary of John Rous* (London, 1856)
- S., R., *The Phoenix Nest. Built vp with the most rare and refined workes of Noble men, woorthy Knights, gallant Gentlemen, Masters of Arts, and braue Schollers. Full of varietie, excellent inuention, and singular delight. Neuer before this time published. Set foorth by R. S. of the Inner Temple Gentleman* (London, 1593)



- Savile, John, *King James his entertainment at Theobalds: with his welcome to London, together with a salutarorie Poeme* (London, 1603)
- Scott, Thomas, *Robert Earle of Essex his Ghost, Sent from Elizian: To the Nobilitie, Gentry, and Communalitie of England* ('Paradise', 1624)
- *Sir Walter Rawleigh's Ghost, or Englands Forewarner* (Utrecht, 1626)
- *Vox Populi or News from Spayne* (n.p., 1620)
- Sebillet, Thomas, *Art poetique Francoise pour l'instruction des jeunes studieux by T. Sebillet, avec le quintil Horatian sur la defense et illustration de la langue Francoise by C. Fontaine* (Lyon, 1556)
- Shakespeare, William, *Othello*, ed. by E. A. J. Honigmann (Surrey: The Arden Shakespeare, 1997)
- *Othello, the Moor of Venice*, ed. by Michael Neill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006)
- Sidney, Sir Philip, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia* (London, 1598)
- Smith, Rev. J. J., ed., *The Cambridge Portfolio*, 2 volumes (London: Parker, 1840)
- Somers, Lord, *A collection of Scarce and valuable tracts on the most interesting and entertaining subjects: but chiefly such as relate to the History and Constitution of these Kingdoms* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1809)
- Southwell, Robert, *An Epistle of Comfort* (London, 1587)
- *Southwell's St. Peter's Complaynt with other poems* (London, 1595)
- *The Poems of Robert Southwell, S. J.*, ed. by James H. McDonald and Nancy Pollard Brown (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967)
- *Collected Poems*, ed. by Peter Davidson and Anne Sweeney (Manchester: Carcanet, 2007)
- *Two letters and short rules of a good life*, ed. by Nancy Pollard Brown (Washington, DC: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1973)
- Spottiswoode, John, *The History of the Church of Scotland, beginning the year of our Lord 203, and continued to the end of the reign of King James VI., etc. (The author's life.)* (London, 1655)
- Tanner, J. R., *Constitutional Documents of the Reign of James I A.D. 1603-1625, with an historical commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930)
- Venn, John, ed., *Alumni Cantabrigienses, a biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge from the earliest times to 1900*, 4 volumes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922)
- Watson, Thomas, *The Ekatomπαιοια or Passionate Centurie of Loue* (London, 1581)

- Whitgift, John, *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift, D. D., the third and last Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. by John Strype, 3 volumes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822)
- Wilkins, David, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae Ad anno MDXLVI, Ad anno MDCCXVII*, 4 volumes (London, 1737)
- Williams, Franklin B. Jnr., *Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books before 1641* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1962)
- Williams, Franklin B., *Thomas Rogers' Leicester's Ghost* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972)
- Williams, Robert Folkestone, ed., *The Court and Times of James the First*, 2 volumes (London: H. Colburn, 1849)
- Wood, Thomas, *The Letters of Thomas Wood, Puritan, 1566-1577*, ed. by Patrick Collinson (London: Athlone, 1969)
- Wright, Louis, B., ed., *Advice to a son: Precepts of Lord Burghley, Sir Walter Raleigh, and Francis Osborne* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1962)
- Wyot, Philip, 'The Diary of Philip Wyot (1586-1608)', in *Sketches of the Literary History of Barnstaple to which is appended the diary of Philip Wyot, town clerk of Barnstaple (1586-1608)* (Barnstaple: E. J. Arnold, 1866), pp. 89-119

## SECONDARY WORKS

- Alcorn, Sabrina Baron, Elizabeth Walsh and Susan Scola, eds, *The Reader Revealed* (Washington, DC: Folger Shakespeare Library, 2001)
- Akrigg, G. P. V., 'The Literary Achievement of King James I', *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 44 (1975), 115-129
- Atherton, Ian, 'The Itch Grown a Disease: Manuscript Transmission of News in the Seventeenth Century', in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain*, ed. by Joad Raymond (London: Frank Cass, 1999), pp. 39-65
- Babbage, S. B., *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft* (London: S.P.C.K., 1962)
- Baker, John Hamilton, 'The Common Lawyers and the Chancery: 1616', in *The Legal Profession and the Common Law: Historical Essays* (London: Hambledon, 1986), pp. 205-229
- ed., *An Introduction to English Legal History*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition (London: Butterworths, 2002)
- Baldwin, T. W., *William Shakspeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*, 2 volumes (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1944)

- Bates, Catherine, *The Rhetoric of Courtship in Elizabethan Language and Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)
- Bawcutt, Priscilla, 'James VI's Castalian Band: A Modern Myth', *Scottish Historical Review*, 80 (2001), 251-259
- 'Scottish Manuscript Miscellanies from the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Century', *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*, 12 (2005), 46-73
- Beal, Peter, "'Notions in Garrison': The Seventeenth Century Commonplace Book", in *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1985-1991*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 107, ed. by W. Speed Hill (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Text Society, 1993), pp. 131-147
- *In Praise of Scribes: Manuscripts and their Makers in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)
- Beer, Anna, *Sir Walter Raleigh and his Readers in the Seventeenth Century: Speaking to the People* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997)
- Bell, Sandra, 'Kingcraft and Poetry: James VI's Cultural Policy', in *Reading Monarchs Writing: The poetry of Henry VIII, Mary Stuart, Elizabeth I and James VI*, ed. by Peter Herman (Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2002), pp. 155-177
- Bellany, A., 'Libels in Action: Ritual, Subversion, and the English Literary Underground, 1603-1642', in *The Politics of the Excluded, c. 1500-1850*, ed. by Tim Harris (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 99-124
- 'A Poem on the Archbishop's Hearse: Puritanism, Libel, and Sedition after the Hampton Court Conference', *Journal of British Studies*, 34 (April 1995), 137-164
- *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- "'Raylinge Rymes and Vaunting Verse": Libellous Politics in Early Stuart England, 1603-1628', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), pp. 285-310
- Bergeron, David M., *King James and Letters of Homoerotic Desire* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1999)
- Birrell, T. A., *English Monarchs and their books: From Henry VII to Charles II*, Panizzi Lectures 1986 (London: British Library, 1987)
- Bishop, Carolyn, 'Raleigh satirized by Harington and Davies', *Review of English Studies*, 23:89 (February 1972), 52-56
- Bolgar, R. R., *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954)

- Borland, Lois, 'Montgomerie and the French Poets of the Early Sixteenth Century', *Modern Philology*, 11:1 (July 1913), 127-134
- Bradford, Charles Angell, *William Dodington: A Tragedy of St Sepulchres's, Holborn, in 1600*, reprinted from the 'Transactions of the London & Middlesex Archaeological Society', New Series (London, 1933)
- Brown, Nancy Pollard, 'Paperchase: The Dissemination of Catholic Texts in Elizabethan England', *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*, 1 (1989), 120-143
- Bryson, Anna, *From courtesy to civility: Changing codes of conduct in early modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)
- Carpenter, E., *Thomas Tenison, Archbishop of Canterbury: His life and times* (London: S.P.C.K., 1948)
- Chartier, Roger, Alain Boureau and Cecile Dauphin, *Correspondence: Models of Letter-Writing from the Middle Ages to the Nineteenth Century*, trans. by Christopher Woodall (Cambridge: Polity, 1991)
- Cogswell, Thomas, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)
- 'England and the Spanish Match', in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642*, ed. by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London: Longman, 1989), pp. 107-133
- 'Underground verse and the transformation of early Stuart political culture', in *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern England*, ed. by Susan Amussen and Mark Kishlansky (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), pp. 277-300
- Colclough, David, "'The Muses Recreation': John Hoskyns and the Manuscript Culture of the Seventeenth Century,' *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61 (2000), 369-400
- *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- Collinson, Patrick, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1967)
- Crane, Mary, *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993)
- Croft, Pauline, 'The Reputation of Robert Cecil: Libels, Political Opinion, and Popular Awareness in the Early Seventeenth Century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6:1 (1991), 43-69
- 'Libels, Popular Literacy and Public Opinion in Early Modern England', *Historical Research*, 68 (1995), 266-285
- ed., *Patronage, Culture and Power: The early Cecils* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002)

- *King James* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)
- 'Robert Cecil and the Early Jacobean Court', in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. by Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 134-147
- Cuddy, Neil 'The Revival of the Entourage: The Bedchamber of James I, 1603-1625', in *The English Court from the Wars of Roses to the Civil War*, ed. by David Starkey (London: Longman, 1987), pp. 173-225
- Cust, Richard, 'News and Politics in Early Seventeenth Century England', *Past and Present*, 112 (August 1986), 60-90
- Cust, Richard and Ann Hughes, eds, *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603-1642* (London and New York: Longman, 1989)
- Cutts, John, 'A Reconsideration of the Willow Song', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 10:1 (Spring, 1957), 14-24
- Daybell, James, ed., *Early Modern Women's Letter Writing, 1450-1700* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001)
- Doelman, James 'The Accession of King James I and English Religious Poetry', *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 34:1 (Winter 1994), 19-40
- Doughtie, Edward, 'The Earl of Essex and Occasions for contemplative verse', *English Literary Review*, 9 (1979), 355-363
- 'John Ramsey's Manuscript as a Personal and Family Document', in *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1985-1991*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 107, ed. by W. Speed Hill (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Text Society, 1993), pp. 281-288
- 'Unpublished Elizabethan Verse in a Huntington Manuscript', *English Literary Renaissance*, 34:1 (Winter 2004), 22-41
- Durston, Christopher, *James I* (London: Routledge, 1998)
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth L., *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 2 volumes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979)
- Elton, G. R., *England under the Tudors* (London: Methuen, 1977)
- Ezell, Margaret J. M., *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999)
- Febvre, Lucien and Henri-Jean Martin, *The Coming of the Book: The impact of Printing 1450-1800*, trans. by David Gerard (London: Verso, 2000)
- Fincham, Kenneth and Peter Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I', in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, ed. by Kenneth Finch (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), pp. 23-49

- 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', *Journal of British Studies*, 24 (1985), 169-207
- Fleming, Morna R., 'The Amatoria of James VI: Loving by the *Reulis*', in *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I*, ed. by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002), pp. 124-148
- Fox, Adam, 'Ballads, Libels and Popular Ridicule in Jacobean England', *Past and Present*, 145 (November 1994), 47-83
- *Oral and Literate Culture in England 1500-1700* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000)
- Gants, David L., 'Patters of Paper use in the *Workes of Beniamin Ionson* (William Stansby, 1616)', *Studies in Bibliography*, 51 (1998), 127-153
- 'Identifying and tracking paper stocks in Early Modern London', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 94:4 (December 2000), 531-540
- Gardiner, Samuel, R., *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642*, 10 volumes (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1884)
- Gilbert, Allan H., 'Jonson and Drummond or Gil on the King's Senses', *Modern Language Notes*, 62:1 (1947), 35-37
- Gibson, Jonathan, 'Letters', in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. by Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), pp. 615-619
- Goldberg, Jonathan, *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, and Donne and their contemporaries* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989)
- *Writing matter: From the hands of the English Renaissance* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990)
- Gray, Todd, Margery Rowe and Audrey Erskine, eds, *Tudor and Stuart Devon: The common estate and government* (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 1992)
- Greetham, D. C., *Textual Scholarship: An introduction* (New York: Garland, 1994)
- Hadfield, Andrew, ed., *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001)
- Hammond, Paul, *Figuring sex between men from Shakespeare to Rochester* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002)
- Hart, E. F., 'The Answer-Poem of the Early Seventeenth Century', *Review of English Studies*, 7:25 (January 1956), 19-29
- Heaton, Gabriel, "'The Poor Man's Petition': Anthony Atkinson and the Politics of Libel", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 69:1 (2006), 105-120

- Henderson, Judith Rice, 'On Reading the Rhetoric of the Renaissance Letter', in *Renaissance-Rhetorik*, ed. by Henrich F. Plett (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), pp. 143-162
- Herman, Peter C., 'Authorship and the Royal "I": King James VI/I and the Politics of Monarchic Verse', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 54:4 [2] (Winter 2001), 1495-1530
- Hobbs, Mary, *Early Seventeenth Century Verse Miscellany Manuscripts* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1992)
- 'Early Seventeenth-Century verse miscellanies and their Value for Textual Editors', *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*, 1 (1989), 182-210
- Jack, Ronald D. S., 'James VI and Renaissance Poetic Theory', *English*, 16 (1967), 208-211
- 'Petrarch in English and Scottish Renaissance Literature', *Modern Language Review*, 71 (1976), 801-811
- 'Poetry under King James VI', in *The History of Scottish Literature, volume 1, origins to 1660*, ed. by R. D. S. Jack (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988), pp. 125-140
- Jardine, Lisa, and Alan Stewart, *Hostage to Fortune: The troubled life of Francis Bacon* (London: Gollancz, 1998)
- Jensen, J. Vernon, 'The Staff of the Jacobean Privy Council', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 40 (1976-1977), 11-44
- Jones, Ann Rosalind, and Peter Stallybrass, 'The needle and the pen: Needlework and the appropriation of printed texts', in *Renaissance Clothing and the Materials of Memory*, ed. by Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 134-171
- Kaplan, M. Lindsay, *The Culture of Slander in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- Kermode, Frank, 'Definitions of Love', *Review of English Studies*, 7 (1956), 183-185
- Knafla, Louis A., *Law and Politics in Jacobean England: The tracts of Lord Chancellor Ellesmere* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977)
- Lake, Peter, 'Matthew Hutton – A Puritan Bishop?' *History*, 64 (1979), 182-204
- 'Anti-popery: The Structure of a Prejudice', in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642*, ed. by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London: Longman, 1989), pp. 72-106
- Levy, F. J., 'How information spread among the gentry, 1550-1640', *The Journal of British Studies*, 21:2 (Spring 1982), 11-34

- Lockyer, Roger, *The Early Stuarts: A Political History of England 1603-1642* (London: Longman, 1989)
- Love, Harold, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts: Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998)
- Mack, Peter, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- Mackie, J. D., "A loyall subiectes Advertisement" as to the unpopularity of James I's government in England 1603-4', *Scottish Historical Review*, 23:89 (1926), 1-17
- Main, C. F., 'Ben Jonson and an Unknown Poet on the King's Senses', *Modern Language Notes*, 74 (1959), 389-393
- Marotti, Arthur F., "Love is Not Love": Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order', *English Literary History*, 49 (1982), 346-428
- *Manuscript, Print and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995)
- ed., *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999)
- 'Folger MSS V.a.89 and V.a.345: Reading Lyric Poetry in Manuscript', in *The Reader Revealed*, ed. by Sabrina Baron Alcorn, Elizabeth Walsh and Susan Scola (Washington, DC: Folger Shakespeare Library, 2001), pp. 45-57
- May, Steven W., 'Companion Poems in the Raleigh Canon', *English Literary Renaissance*, 13:3 (Autumn 1983), 260-273
- *Sir Walter Raleigh* (Boston: Twayne, 1989)
- *The Elizabethan Courtier Poets: The poems and their contexts* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991)
- 'Manuscript Circulation at the Elizabethan Court', in *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1985-1991*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 107, ed. by W. Speed Hill (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Text Society, 1993), pp. 273-280
- 'Renaissance Manuscript Anthologies: Editing the Social Editors', *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*, 11 (2002), 203-216
- McKitterick, David, *Print, manuscript and the search for order, 1450-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)
- McRae, Andrew, 'The Literary Culture of Early Stuart Libelling', *Modern Philology*, 97:3 (2000), 364-392



- 'The Verse Libel: Popular Satire in Early Modern England', in *Subversion and Scurrility: The Politics of Popular Discourse in Europe from 1500 to the Present*, ed. by Dermot Cavanagh and Tim Kirk (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), pp. 58-73
- *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)
- Miller, R. H., 'Unpublished Poems by Sir John Harington', *English Literary Renaissance*, 14:2 (Spring 1984), 148-158
- Moss, Ann, *Printed Commonplace Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)
- Munby, A. N. L., *The Formation of the Phillipps Library from 1841-1872* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956)
- Neale, J. E., *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments 1559-1581*, 2 volumes (London: Jonathan Cape, 1953-1957)
- Notestein, Wallace, *The House of Commons 1604-1610* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971)
- O'Callaghan, Michelle, *'The Shepherds Nation': Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture, 1612-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000)
- 'Performing Politics: The circulation of the "Parliament Fart"', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 69:1 (2006), 121-138
- Oppenheim, M. M., *The Maritime History of Devon* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1968)
- Parks, Stephen, *The Luttrell File: Narcissus Luttrell's Dates on contemporary pamphlets 1678-1730* (New Haven: The Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, 1999)
- Patterson, W. B., *King James VI and I and the reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)
- Pebworth, Ted-Larry, 'Sir Henry Wotton's "Dazel'd Thus, with Height of Place" and the Appropriation of Political Poetry in the Earlier Seventeenth Century', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 71 (1977), 151-169
- Peck, Linda Levy, *Northampton: Patronage and Policy at the Court of James I* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982)
- *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London: Routledge, 1993)
- ed., *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)

- Peltonen, Markku, 'Bacon's Political Philosophy', in *The Cambridge Companion to Bacon*, ed. by Markku Peltonen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 283-310
- Perry, Curtis, *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
- 'Royal Authorship and Problems of Manuscript Attribution in the Poems of King James VI and I', *Notes and Queries*, 46 (244): 2, June (1999), 243-246
- Plett, Henrich F., ed., *Renaissance-Rhetorik* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993)
- Plomer, H. R., G. H. Bushnell and E. R. McC.Dix, eds, *Dictionaries of the Printers and Booksellers who were at work in England 1557-1775* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1977)
- Prest, Wilfred R., *The inns of court under Elizabeth I and the early Stuarts, 1590-1640* (London: Longman, 1972)
- Quaintance, Richard F. Jr., 'The French source of Robert Greene's "What thing is Love"', *Notes and Queries*, 208 (1963), 295-296
- Quintrell, B. W., 'The Royal Hunt and the Puritans, 1604-1605', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31:1 (January 1980), 41-58
- Robertson, Jean, *The Art of Letter Writing: An essay on the handbooks published in England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (London: University Press of Liverpool, 1942)
- Rollins, Hyder Edward, 'An Analytical Index to the Ballad Entries (1557-1709) in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London', *Studies in Philology*, 21 (1924), 1-324
- Russell, Conrad, *The Crisis of Parliaments* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971)
- Saunders, J. W., 'The Stigma of Print: A Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry', *Essays in Criticism*, 1 (1951), 139-164
- Schneider, Gary, *The Culture of Epistolarity: Vernacular letters and letter writing in Early Modern England, 1500-1700* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2005)
- Scott-Warren, Jason, 'Reconstructing manuscript networks: The textual transactions of Sir Stephen Powle', in *Communities in Early Modern England: Networks, place, rhetoric*, ed. by Alexandra Shepard and Phil Withington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 18-37
- Scott, Mary Jane Wittstock, 'Robert Ayton: Scottish Metaphysical', *Scottish Literary Journal: A Review of Studies in Scottish Language and Literature*, 2:1 (1975), 5-16
- Schwartz, Marc L., 'James I and the Historians: Towards a Reconsideration', *Journal of British Studies*, 13 (1973-1974), 114-134

- Sena, Margaret, 'William Blundell and the networks of Catholic dissent in post-Reformation England', in *Communities in Early Modern England: Networks, place, rhetoric*, ed. by Alexandra Shepard and Phil Withington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), pp. 54-75
- Seng, Peter, 'The Earliest known music for Desdemona's "Willow Song"', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 9:3 (Summer 1958), 419-420
- Sharpe, Kevin, *Sir Robert Cotton, 1586-1631: History and politics in early modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979)
- *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992)
- 'The King's Writ: Royal Authors and Royal Authority in Early Modern England', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), pp. 117-138
- 'Private Conscience and Public Duty in the writings of King James VI and I', in *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth Century England*, ed. by J. Morrill, P. Slack and D. Woolf (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 77-100
- *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000)
- 'Reading James Writing: The subjects of royal writings in Jacobean Britain', in *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I*, ed. by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002), pp. 15-36
- Shaw, William Arthur, *The Knights of England: A complete record from the earliest time to the present day of the knights of all orders in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of knights bachelors*, 2 volumes (London: Heraldry Today, 1971)
- Sheils, W. J., *The Puritans in the Diocese of Peterborough 1558-1610* (Northampton: Northamptonshire Record Society, 1979)
- Shell, Alison, 'What is a Catholic Poem? Explicitness and censorship in Tudor and Stuart Verse', in *Literature and censorship in Renaissance England*, ed. by Andrew Hadfield (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 95-110
- Shepard, Alexandra, and Phil Withington, eds, *Communities in Early Modern England: Networks, place, rhetoric* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000)
- Shire, Helena Mennie, *Song, Dance and Poetry of the Court of Scotland under King James VI* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969)
- Smith, George, and Frank Benger, *The Oldest London Bookshop* (London: Ellis, 1928)
- Sommerville, J. P., 'James I and the Divine Right of Kings: English Politics and Continental Theory', in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. by Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 55-70

- *Royalists and Patriots: Politics and Ideology in England 1603-1640*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (London: Longman, 1999)
- Sternfeld, F. W., *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963)
- Stevenson, Allan, 'Chain-Indentations in Paper as Evidence', *Studies in Bibliography*, 6 (1953), 181-195
- 'Paper as Bibliographical Evidence', *The Library*, fifth series, 17:3 (September 1962), 197-212
- 'Watermarks are twins', *Studies in Bibliography*, 4 (1951-1952), 57-91
- Stewart, Alan, and Heather Wolfe, *Letter Writing in Renaissance England* (Washington, DC: Folger Shakespeare Library, 2004)
- Sullivan, Ernest W. II, 'The Renaissance Manuscript Verse Miscellany: Private Party, Private Text', in *New Ways of Looking at Old Texts: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society, 1985-1991*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 107, ed. by W. Speed Hill (New York: Medieval and Renaissance Text Society, 1993), pp. 289-297
- Tannenbaum, Samuel, 'Unfamiliar versions of some Elizabethan Poems', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 45:3 (September 1930), 809-821
- Thomas, Keith, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in popular beliefs in sixteenth and seventeenth-century England* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991)
- Tilley, M. P., *A Dictionary of proverbs in England in sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950)
- Tite, Colin G. C., *The Manuscript Library of Sir Robert Cotton* (London: British Library, 1994)
- Trill, Suzanne, Kate Chedgzoy and Melanie Osborne, eds, *Lay by your needles ladies, take the pen: Writing women in England, 1500-1700* (London: Arnold, 1997)
- Usher, R. G., 'James I and Sir Edward Coke', *English Historical Review*, 18 (1903), 664-675
- *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, 2 volumes (London: D. Appleton, 1910)
- Ustick, S. Lee, 'Advice to a son: A type of seventeenth-century conduct book', *Studies in Philology*, 29 (1932), 409-441
- Vander Meulen, David L., 'The Identification of Paper without Watermarks: The Example of Pope's *Dunciad*', *Studies in Bibliography*, 37 (1984), 58-81
- Vieth, David M., *Attribution in Restoration poetry: A study of Rochester's 'Poems' of 1680* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963)

- Whitlock, Baird W., *John Hoskyns, Serjeant-at-Law* (Washington, DC: University Press of America)
- Whittle, Major, and Rev. W. Guest, eds, *P. P. Bliss: His Life and Life-Work* (London: Morgan and Scott, 1877)
- Wormald, Jenny, 'Gunpowder, Treason, and Scots', *Journal of British Studies*, 24:2 (April 1985), 141-168
- Woodbridge, Linda, 'Impostors, Monsters, and Spies: What Rogue Literature Can Tell us about Early Modern Subjectivity', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, Special Issue 9 (January 2002), 4.1-11, <http://purl.oclc.org/emls/si-09/woodimpo.htm>
- Woudhuysen, H. R., *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)
- Yates, Frances, *Astraea: The Imperial theme in the sixteenth century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975)
- Zaret, David, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England*, Princeton Studies in Cultural Sociology (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000)

#### UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS

- Eckhardt, Joshua Michael, 'The Politics of anti-courtly love poetry: Gender, sexuality, and religion in early seventeenth-century manuscript verse miscellanies' (University of Illinois, 2005)
- Gowers, Ian, 'Puritanism in the County of Devon between 1570 and 1641' (University of Exeter MA Thesis, 1970)
- Rudick, Michael, 'The poems of Sir Walter Raleigh' (University of Chicago, 1970)
- Sanderson, James L., 'An Edition of an Early Seventeenth-Century Manuscript Collection of Poems (Rosenbach MS 186 [1083/15])' (University of Pennsylvania, 1960)
- Sommerville, Johann P., 'Jacobean Political Thought and the Controversy over the Oath of Allegiance' (University of Cambridge, 1981)
- Sutton, James, 'The "House of Cecil"/The Cecils' Houses' (Yale University, 1995)

