



Provided by the author(s) and University of Galway in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite the published version when available.

Title	"The argument to the whole discourse" and other etiological tales in Turberville's epitaphes, epigrams, songs and sonets
Author(s)	Reid, Lindsay Ann
Publication Date	2020-01-31
Publication Information	Reid, Lindsay Ann. (2019). "The argument to the whole discourse" and other etiological tales in Turberville's epitaphes, epigrams, songs and sonets. In Arthur F. Marotti (Ed.), <i>New Ways of Looking at Old Texts, VI: Papers of the Renaissance English Text Society 2011-2016</i> (pp. 127-147). Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Arizona State University (ACMRS) in conjunction with Renaissance English Text Society.
Publisher	Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Arizona State University (ACMRS)
Link to publisher's version	https://www.acmrs.org/9780866986083/new-ways-of-looking-at-old-texts-vi/
Item record	http://hdl.handle.net/10379/15999

Downloaded 2024-04-18T01:55:45Z

Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.



*New Ways of
Looking at Old Texts, VI*

Papers of the
Renaissance English Text Society
2011–2016

Edited by
ARTHUR F. MAROTTI



Arizona Center for Medieval & Renaissance Studies
in conjunction with
Renaissance English Text Society
Tempe, Arizona
2019



Arizona Center
for Medieval &
Renaissance Studies

Published by ACMRS (Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies)
Tempe, Arizona

© 2019 Arizona Board of Regents for Arizona State University.
All Rights Reserved.

∞

This book is made to last. It is set in Adobe Minion Pro,
smyth-sewn and printed on acid-free paper to library specifications.
Printed in the United States of America

**“The Argument to the Whole Discourse”
and Other Etiological Tales in
Turberville’s Epitaphes, Epigrams,
Songs and Sonets**

LINDSAY ANN REID

Like the majority of his mid-Tudor contemporaries, George Turberville has long been *démodé*. Memorably condemned by C. S. Lewis as a poet “ruthlessly on the march along the hard shadeless road of poulter’s and four-teeners,” when he is remembered at all, it is most often as a translator of that great Elizabethan favorite Ovid.¹ Turberville’s rendition of the *Heroides*—the earliest full translation to have been printed in England—first appeared in ca. 1567 under the title *The Heroycall Epistles of the Learned Poet Publius Ouidius Naso*. Beyond this frequently reprinted work, however, Turberville was, in fact, quite prolific. His *oeuvre* encompasses a number of additional translations from Latin, Italian, and French sources, a didactic *Booke of Falconrie or Hawking*, and two collections of original English verse, including the work upon which this essay primarily focuses, *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets, with a Discourse of the Friendly Affections of Tymetes to Pyndara His Ladie*.² This auto-

¹ C. S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), 260.

² All references to Turberville’s *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* are drawn from *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets, with a Discourse of the Friendly Affections of Tymetes to Pyndara His Ladie* (1567; STC 24326). Subsequent citations of this work are parenthetical. In my transcriptions of this and other Renaissance materials, I have silently regularized capitalization, where appropriate, as well as uses of *l/s*. Turberville’s second collection of original verse was appended to the end of his *Tragicall Tales*, ca. 1587.

miscellany — penned just as Turberville was on the cusp of becoming “the most important professional poet in London” — seems to have enjoyed considerable popularity in the author’s own lifetime: first published ca. 1565 and reissued “Newly corrected with additions” in 1567, the collection proved vendible enough to warrant reprinting by 1570 (as well as to be plagiarized rather liberally by Timothy Kendall in his 1577 *Flowers of Epigrammes*).³

While the study of Tudor England’s printed anthologies and miscellanies has gained significant traction in recent years, much work remains to be done on the authorial and editorial design of these works. Though the presentation of lyrics within such volumes may initially strike a modern reader as “disorienting,” haphazard, or even non-existent, scholars including Paul A. Marquis have increasingly argued that we should reconsider them “not as random aggregations of unrelated verse but as carefully designed and orchestrated arrangements of public and private sentiments.”⁴ This essay posits *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* as a work that readily illustrates how lyric collections of this era can function as purposive rather than desultory works. Turberville’s auto-miscellany invites particular scrutiny not only for its thematic typicality, but also for its structural anomalies. On the one hand, *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* is very much a product of its time, evincing a palpable synergy with Turberville’s better-known, roughly contemporaneous translation of the *Heroides*, as well as a number of other literary works that featured prominently in both the bookstalls and the popular imagination of the 1560s: earlier humanist collections of epigrams and epitaphs, a range of Ovid’s non-Heroidean poetry, romances such as Geoffrey Chaucer’s *Troilus and Criseyde*, and Richard Tottel’s seminal *Songes and Sonettes*. Yet, on the other hand, *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* is unique among Tudor England’s earliest printed anthologies for the extent to which it foregrounds and artfully experiments with the tensions between lyric expression

³ Turberville’s popularity in this era was thus characterized by Hyder E. Rollins, “New Facts about George Turberville,” *Modern Philology* 15.9 (1918): 136. On Kendall’s plagiarism of Turberville’s work, see 130–32.

⁴ Paul A. Marquis, “Printing History and Editorial Design in the Elizabethan Version of Tottel’s *Songes and Sonettes*,” *Tottel’s ‘Songes and Sonettes’ in Context*, ed. Stephen Hamrick (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 19. The adjective “disorienting” has been used by Wendy Wall to describe miscellanies’ variations “in tone as well as genre”: *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 23–24. As a further point of contrast with Marquis’s position, one might consider Elizabeth Pomeroy’s forty-year-old assessment that “the compilers of most [Elizabethan] miscellanies” shared a sense of editorial “indifference” and “gave little thought to progression or shape in the volume as a whole”: *The Elizabethan Miscellanies: Their Development and Conventions* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), 35.

and narrative cohesion. Having appeared at an especially rich and transitional historical moment, this volume speaks to a variety of literary trends that were beginning to coalesce in the early Elizabethan era: it simultaneously presents as a miscellany, a proto-sonnet sequence, and an embryonic epistolary romance.⁵

The precise content and design of the first (ca. 1565) edition of *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* is now impossible to reconstruct, as is the collection’s exact date of original publication, since no copy is now known to exist. Two things are immediately apparent when reading the extant *second* edition of 1567, however. Firstly, this is a work dominated and defined by its love poetry. Although, as its title would indicate, *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* contains a multitude of epitaphs and epigrams, it is the songs and sonnets (expansive generic categories that encompass both epistolary and non-epistolary amatory lyrics) that here concern me, for it is these pieces — just under one hundred in total — that form the bulk and narrative backbone of the collection.⁶ These love poems, as Cathy Shrank has perceived, are heavily promoted in the work’s paratexts. The amatory lyrics are “the only genre mentioned in the prefatory matter,” and they are also prominently advertised on the title page, wherein contrasting font sizes mean that “visually much more attention is drawn” to the volume’s songs and sonnets than to its other content.⁷ Beyond this privileging of the discourses of love, the second notable feature of Turberville’s auto-miscellany is its cardinal interest in representing *occasion*. G. K. Hunter long ago suggested that *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* is “pervaded by . . . scene[s] of poetry-making,” and, more recently, Raphael Lyne has made the similar point that, like much other literature produced in the mid-Tudor period, this auto-miscellany is acutely concerned with depicting “the sociable origins of the poems” it contains.⁸ I here advance such lines of thought by exploring how Turberville’s fascination

⁵ Mary Thomas Crane makes the related claim that this auto-miscellany “combine[s] three models of authorship: humanist gathering, courtly self-expression, and a new, as yet un-theorized third possibility: that of fictional narrative”: *Framing Authority: Sayings, Self, and Society in Sixteenth-Century England* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 172.

⁶ It is difficult to definitively sort the amatory from the non-amatory in this collection, but William E. Sheidley has estimated that ninety (or approximately 55%) of the volume’s poems belong in this category: “George Turberville and the Problem of Passion,” *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 69.4 (1970): 634.

⁷ Cathy Shrank, “‘Matters of Love as of Discourse’: The English Sonnet, 1560–1580,” *Studies in Philology* 105.1 (2008): 33.

⁸ G. K. Hunter, “Drab and Golden Lyrics of the Renaissance,” *Forms of Lyric: Selected Papers from the English Institute*, ed. Reuben Brower (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970), 11; Raphael Lyne, “Writing Back to Ovid in the 1560s and 1570s,” *Translation and Literature* 13.2 (2004): 143.

with bibliogenesis manifests in the volume's organizational and hermeneutic strategies. This is a tangible fixation that is evident both on the micro-level of individually titled lyrics, as well as at the macro-level, where we find two more sustained etiological narratives — including, most prominently, the fiction that the bulk of *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* was written by “Tymetes” and, to a lesser extent, his inconstant beloved “Pyndara.” In what follows, I therefore seek to locate this volume's recurrent representations of amorous textual generation within the broader discursive contexts of mid-Tudor literary culture.

Turberville's most obvious generic model was Tottel's paradigmatic *Songes and Sonettes*, a multi-authored collection that had first been published around a decade earlier in 1557. Though Tottel's so-called *Miscellany* was still a relatively new work, it had been reprinted at least five times by the end of 1565, and its profound influence was already being felt. Matthew Zarnowiecki makes the emphatic point that “not only were [the] poems [of Tottel's *Miscellany*] copied and recopied” by the book's successors, “but its methodology, its mode of copying, was itself copied.”⁹ Turberville was one of those early copiers. “[B]olstered by the evocation of Tottel's established and successful format,” as Shrank puts it, he followed the lead of his friend Barnabe Googe — whose *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* was published in 1563 — in crafting an auto-miscellany of lyrics seemingly calculated via its derivative title and content to recall Tottel's earlier multi-authored work.¹⁰ And, although Turberville's preoccupation with bibliogenesis in *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* is far more explicit than anything in *Songes and Sonettes*, it nonetheless has roots in Tottel's prior editorial interventions.

As Arthur F. Marotti and others have noted, one of the most conspicuous innovations of Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes* was the miscellany's distinctive “practice of providing special titles” for its poetic contents.¹¹ It has often been observed that the headings in *Songes and Sonettes* (almost always written from a third-person vantage point) supply interpretative scaffolding for previously untitled lyrics, and they tend to place the miscellany's cast of character-authors in dramatic situations, “both reflect[ing] and help[ing] to focus the interest of sixteenth-century readers . . . on the circumstances — actual or fictional — occasioning the poem.”¹² Since such evocations of context in *Songes and Sonettes* typically have amatory underpinnings, Tottel's titles thus feel like the distant, miniaturized literary de-

⁹ Matthew Zarnowiecki, *Fair Copies: Reproducing English Lyric from Tottel to Shakespeare* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 5.

¹⁰ Shrank, “Matters of Love,” 54.

¹¹ Arthur F. Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the English Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 218.

¹² Anne Ferry, *The Title to the Poem* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 14.

scendants of the self-annotations in Dante Alighieri's *La Vita Nuova*: descriptions such as “Complaint that his ladie after she knew of his love kept her face alway hidden from him,” “A song written by the earle of Surrey to a ladie that refused to daunce with him,” “Of his love that pricked her finger with a nedle,” or “Complaint of a diying lover refused upon his ladies injust mistaking of his writing” provide etiological frameworks for each of the volume's collected poems.¹³ Turberville's auto-miscellany features a wide array of similarly narrative titles — in many cases “lengthier and more detailed,” as Jane Hedley remarks, than those of Tottel's earlier collection.¹⁴ As in *Songes and Sonettes*, the titles in *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* tend not only to blur our sense of the distinction between author and the poet-lover persona, but also to focalize readers' attention on the purported circumstances of each piece's composition: “To his Ladie, that by hap when he kissed hir and made hir lip bleed, controld him and tooke disdain” (C1v), “To a Gentlewoman that alwayes willed him to weare Rosemarie, (a Tree that is alwayes greene,) for hir sake, and in token of his good will to hir” (L7), “The Louer to a Friende that wrote him this sentence. *Yours assured to the death*” (G1), and the like.

Turberville also appears to have adapted from Tottel's *Miscellany* a further strategy of sequentially arranging these micro-level titles to achieve particular narrative effects. Though twentieth-century readers encountering *Songes and Sonettes* often found their search for its taxonomical principles perplexed by this miscellany's apparent *miscellaneity*, more recent scholarship has tended to emphasize that the Tottel's seminal collection does, indeed, seem to be clearly organized — in a way largely unprecedented by its manuscript counterparts — according to distinct authorial divisions. These internal divisions in *Songes and Sonettes* demarcate the Earl of Surrey's poetry from Thomas Wyatt's, and the poems of unidentified authors from those of named authors, and, relying on cumulative effect, Tottel's descriptive titles work together within each authorially defined section to create a sense of mounting narrative coherence. As in Tottel's earlier *Songes and Sonettes*, in *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* individual lyrics are mediated by a correlative titling strategy that infringes upon these poems' independence from one another. Ongoing interrelations between titles

¹³ References to *Songes and Sonettes* throughout this essay are keyed to the influential, revised, second edition of 1557, as edited by Paul A. Marquis, *Richard Tottel's Songes and Sonettes: The Elizabethan Version* (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2007), 10, 25–27, 53, 14–16. Subsequent citations are parenthetical and refer to page numbers in this modern edition.

¹⁴ Jane Hedley, *Power in Verse: Metaphor and Metonymy in the Renaissance Lyric* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1988), 64.

foster the impression that the collection's amatory pieces are a veritable paper trail — impassioned first-person scribbles and various billet-doux — relating to “the Friendly affections of Tymetes to Pyndara his Ladie,” as the work's subtitle puts it. Though the eponymous Tymetes and Pyndara are mentioned by name in less than a dozen of the collection's poems, a far greater number of its pieces speak to amatory themes and thus contribute to our sense of these characters' developing romance. As Hunter put it, these “love poems” in *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* are “strung along a thread of quasi-narrative,” and it is on this basis that John Erskine Hankins identified Turberville's auto-miscellany as England's first “definite poetic sequence in honor of a mistress, such as that of Petrarch in honor of Laura” (as well as, more implicitly, an important generic antecedent to the celebrated sonnet sequences of the later Elizabethan era).¹⁵

Beyond Turberville's micro-level narrative framing of individual lyrics with descriptive titles, the poetic content of *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* is further structured on the macro-level by what might best be described as two competing and interlocking accounts of the work's genesis. And, although these two macro-level rubrics are similarly concerned with broad questions of occasion and inscription, Turberville strayed from his immediate Tottelian model in constructing them. The first of these narratives is introduced in the collection's opening dedicatory letter, which provides Turberville not only with the opportunity to proclaim publicly an author-patron relationship, but also with a space wherein to begin delineating the fictive boundaries of the Tymetes and Pyndara narratives that feature so prominently within the work. Addressed to the then-teenaged Anne Dudley (née Russell), Countess of Warwick, Turberville's opening epistle implies that the two enjoyed a personal friendship. He is, after all, the countess's self-described “daily Orator” (*4v). Within this letter, Turberville refers to his previous publication of a “fond & slender treatise of Sonets” (*2) — which he self-deprecatingly characterizes as a collection of “rashe compiled toyes” (*4v) — and suggests that the countess's favorable reception of the first edition of *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* has now led him to “inlarg[e] this Booke” by “adding moe Sonets to those [he] wrote before” (*3, *2). This initial etiology is further fleshed out in the following address “To the Reader,” in which Turberville claims that these “vnripe seedes of [his] barraine braine” (*5) were created only for recreation — and *not* for emulation by would-be lovers: “Whatsoever I haue penned, I write not to this purpose, that any youthlie head shoulde folow or pursue such fraile affections, or taste of amorous bait: but by meere fiction of these

¹⁵ Hunter, “Drab and Golden,” 11; John Erskine Hankins, *The Life and Works of George Turberville* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1940), 82.

Fantasies, I woulde warne (if I myghte) all tender age to flee that fonde and filthie affection of poysoned & vnlawful loue” (*6-*6v).

This first of the auto-miscellany's stated *raisons d'être* — that it was an assemblage of amusing follies composed (and later expanded) as a means of currying favor with Turberville's noble friend and patroness — is further developed in the two poems that begin and end the collection. Poem 1, “In prayse of the Renowned *Ladie Anne, Ladie Cowntesse Warwick*,” and Poem 164, “Of the renowned Lady, Lady Anne Countesse Warwick,” function as a set of paeans, designed to flatter the countess. Poem 1 takes the form of a mythologically infused allegorical narrative recounting the creation of “this Cowntesse corse.” Attempting to sculpt from “Claye a featured face . . . / To match the courtly Dames of Greece,” Nature is assisted by a host of Olympian deities, who jointly forge “With one assent this Noble Dame” and dub her Pandora (A8-B1). The second poem of praise, found at the collection's end, is similarly concerned with glorifying Anne Dudley's origins, though its focus is instead upon her illustrious earthly lineage:

An Earle was your Sire a worthie Wight,
A Cowntesse gaue you Tet, a Noble Dame,
An Earle is your Féere, a *Mars* outright,
A Cowntesse eke your selfe of bruted fame-
A Brother Lorde, your Father Earles Sonne,
Thus doth your line in Lordes and Earles ronne.
(T7v)

Turberville's obsequious tributes to his patroness are also informed by his ongoing preoccupation with her imagined reception of his work. “Of the renowned Lady, Lady Anne Countesse Warwick” concludes with a plea that she “take with hande / This ragged rime, and with a courteous looke / And Cowntesse eie peruse this tryfling Booke” (T7v), and in the final poem of the collection, “The Authours Epiloge to his Booke,” Turberville's authorial persona instructs his anthropomorphized text to take note of the countess's reaction to its contents:

The countnance of this Noble Cowntesse marck
When she thy Verse with eie that Saphire like
Doth shine suruayes, let be thy onely carck
To note hir Lookes: and if she ought mislike
Say that thou shouldst haue hid it from hir sight
(T8)

This somewhat mechanical tale of patronage, flattery, and literary reception figured through the person of Anne Dudley is not the only macro-level account of the work's origins in *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets*, however. It is complicated by a second, even more prominent—and more overtly fictionalized—account of bibliogenesis within which Turberville additionally situates the anthology's contents: the previously mentioned tale of Tymetes and Pyndara. Of the various rubrics framing the lyrics of Turberville's collection, this is both the most conspicuous and the most evenly sustained hermeneutic, and, for that reason I turn my attention to the various facets of this narrative and its implications in the remainder of this essay.

In *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets*, Turberville appears not only to be responding to the success of Tottel's printed miscellany format; rather, he also seems to have been keen to exploit an emergent cultural interest in the narrative possibilities of epistles, as heralded by the 1555 publication of *The Image of Idleness*, a fictive multi-letter exchange in prose that has been hailed as the first epistolary novel in English.¹⁶ As Turberville's subtitle indicates, much of the collection's content is presented to readers as documentary evidence relating to Tymetes and Pyndara, whose "Ovidian wooing-story" is relayed in pseudo-epistolary fashion.¹⁷ This fact becomes all the more remarkable if we pause to consider not only that the publication of conceptually related works like Nicholas Breton's *A Poste with a Packet of Madde Letters* was still decades off, but also that Turberville was writing at a historical moment *before* the immensely saleable and influential vernacular letter-writing manuals such as William Fulwood's 1568 *Enimie of Idlennesse* were about to make their English *début*.

Tymetes and Pyndara, who receive no explicit mention in either of the work's opening epistles, are introduced to readers in Poem 2, which professes to be "The Argument to the *whole discourse and Treatise* following." According to this forty-line piece, "By sodaine sight of vnacquainted shape / Tymetes fell in loue with Pyndara." Fearing that he might offend the lady, Tymetes at first "couert kept his torments many a daye." Entirely unable to conceal his ardor, however, he happily

¹⁶ See Michael Flachmann, "The First English Epistolary Novel: *The Image of Idleness* (1555). Text, Introduction, and Notes," *Studies in Philology* 87.1 (1990): 1–74.

¹⁷ Arguing that this is a "pattern repeated endlessly in English fiction" of the era, Robert Adams Day defines the "Ovidian wooing-story" as "a tale of amorous intrigue" in which the male protagonist "sees and falls in love with the heroine, and lays siege to her affections by means of letters, presents, and go-betweens." He further notes that, while the lovers "usually meet and exchange vows, . . . complications . . . prevent the consummation of the affair": *Told in Letters: Epistolary Fiction Before Richardson* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966), 11.

found that she "seemde with friendly eie / To like with him that lyked" her. Yet the lady later proved to be "straunge and coye." Rather than simply "yeeld[ing] him grace," she instead kept "the doubtfull man" wavering "twixt dispaire and hope." And just when she seemed to Tymetes to finally be "atchiued," Pyndara traitorously married another. As the closing lines of Poem 2 emphasize, the series of lyrics that "here ensues" within *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* accordingly forms a sequential record of each "ioy or smart" experienced by Tymetes as he "euer dr[ew] / His present state with Pen" (B2-B2v).

As my discussions to this point would indicate, there are a surprising number of narrative layers at work in the paratexts of *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets*. Our introduction to Turberville in the work's prefatory materials establishes him as an exegetical narrator of sorts. Our implied author carefully disavows any connection between himself and the "fiction" (*6) of the brooding, first-person persona of Tymetes, who features so prominently in the lyrical sequence to come. The collection's lyrics are the products of his pen, yet Turberville himself draws careful lines discouraging—at least when taken at face value—a reading of the lyric "I" of the male-voiced amatory poems as autobiographical. Googe's 1563 *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* provides a useful basis for comparison since it is another Tottelian-inspired auto-miscellany that, as Shrank has remarked, "strive[s] to recreate the social milieu in which, and for which, [it was] produced."¹⁸ Like Turberville's *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets*, Googe's *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* shows a demonstrable interest in narrating its own origins. Googe's dedication evocatively figures the volume's content as "the nombred heapes of sundrye Frenshypps" and claims that "these tryfles" has previously been circulated among "a greate nombre of [his] famyliar acquaintance." Indeed, such friends pressed Googe "both dayly & hourelly" to publish these lyrics more widely, and one bold individual went so far as to commit an "all togyther vnpolysed" manuscript of *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* "to the handes of the Prynter" while Googe was conveniently out of town (an early instance of a formula that recurs with almost comic frequency later in the period).¹⁹ Though Googe's auto-miscellany shares with Turberville's *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* the impulse to account paratextually for its own origins and circuitous route to print, this framing narrative of friendship, patronage, and literary composition remains relatively uncomplicated in *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes*. The structure of Turberville's volume radically deviates from Googe's, then, through its incorporation of an additional narrative level wherein the bulk

¹⁸ Shrank, "Matters of Love," 40.

¹⁹ Barnabe Googe, *Eglogs, Epytaphes, and Sonettes* (1563; STC 12048), A5-A6v.

of its poems are posited as products of fictive personae operating within a defined story-world. And it is in this structural layering of bibliogenetic tales that we find the great novelty of Turberville's work.

In "The Argument to the *whole discourse*," Turberville repeatedly, even tediously, makes comparisons between Tymetes and Pyndara and Paris and Helen of classical mythology: Pyndara is even more beautiful than Helen; Tymetes' reticence to reveal his passion mirrors Paris' initial attempts to hide his own feelings; once Pyndara appears to warm to Tymetes' suit, this is like Helen's behavior; when Tymetes pleads with his pen, he follows the precedent of Paris; and Pyndara's ultimate change of heart supposedly follows Helen's. Such alleged parallels are further emphasized by the fact that every second line of the poem (with the exception of the final four) alternatively ends with either "Pyndara" or "Helena" (B2-B2v). The first few poems that succeed this argument substantiate our impression that the anthology will feature a sustained, documentary account of the events described in Poem 2 and that it will be patterned after the mythological affair of Paris and Helen. Indeed, Poem 3, a verse letter entitled "To a late acquainted Friende," seems to confirm the promises of the "Argument to the *whole discourse*" by again taking up the rhetoric of Pyndara-as-a-second-Helen. Tymetes announces:

What time I first displayde
mine eies vpon thy face,
(That doth allure eche lookers hart)
I did the *P.* imbrace.
And since that time I féele
within my breast such ioye,
As *Paris* neuer felt the like
when *Helen* was at *Troye*.
(A4v)

Further into the collection, however, thorny questions of plot quickly emerge. While a basic narrative arc *does* underpin the development of Tymetes and Pyndara's romance, this plotline likely fails to meet the specific expectations raised — at least for most modern readers — by Poem 2's classically charged "Argument to the *whole discourse*." We do not actually see portrayed, for instance, those early moments in the relationship wherein Tymetes allegedly attempted to hide his passion from Pyndara; little attention is given to the origins of their relationship. In the first poems, we instead see Tymetes declaring his newfound ardor, and, evidently needing little persuasion, Pyndara quickly returns his af-

fections. By Poem 23, Tymetes is already jealously admonishing "his Friende to be constant after choise made" (D3), and the fictive pair of lovers face their first period of separation when Tymetes departs in Poem 26. By the time that we reach Poem 57, Tymetes seems to have returned home and Pyndara now departed; later pieces clarify that she has relocated to London, where she appears to remain for the rest of the sequence. And by Poem 128, when "The forsaken Louer laments that his Ladie is matched with an other," Tymetes has conclusively lost Pyndara, though he continues to write several more poems of personal despair and (perhaps counterintuitively) of continued praise for his quondam beloved (Q4). In terms of basic plotline, the narrative resemblances between Tymetes' romantic plight and that of the legendary Paris evoked throughout "The Argument to the *whole discourse*" are slight. In fact, in the aforementioned Poem 128, Tymetes explicitly identifies with the Trojan prince's mythological *rival*, positing himself as an alter-Menelaus rather than continuing the anthology's opening associations between Tymetes and Paris (Q4). Though we do see ample description of the stage in Tymetes and Pyndara's relationship wherein "the Nymph began / To quite his loue as did faire *Helena*" (B2v), one is hard pressed to think of how the broader narrative of love and loss corresponds with the notoriously adulterous affair of the mythological Trojan duo. Indeed, as the sequence progresses, Tymetes and Pyndara come to sound far more like another unhappy set of literary Trojans, the Chaucerian Troilus and Criseyde.²⁰

Turberville cultivates an explicit Tymetes-as-Troilus analogy in several of the collection's lyrics.²¹ This conceit is first introduced in Poem 49, wherein Turberville's poetic persona attests that "*Troilus* halfe so true / vnto his *Creside* was / As I to hir, who for hir face / did *Troiane Creside* passe" (G8v). Criseyde makes another appearance swiftly thereafter in Poem 53, where she is cited alongside Helen as an *exemplum in malo*, particularly condemned for "hir lightnesse" in "le[aving] / a Troian for a *Gréeke*" (I4v). Falling roughly at the midpoint of the collection, Poems 58, 65, and 66 all elaborate upon a common analogy that Pyndara's departure for London mirrors Criseyde's departure for the Greek camp as portrayed in Book 5 of Chaucer's romance. And Tymetes' connections with

²⁰ On Turberville's allusions to *Troilus and Criseyde*, see Sheidley, "George Turberville," 639–42.

²¹ The idealized identification of Troilus as tragic poet-lover is ubiquitous in Tudor literature, and Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes* would have provided Turberville with models in this vein, including "The lover disceived by his love repenteth him of the true love he bare her" (183), "A comparison of his love wyth the faithful and painful love of Troylus to Creside" (155–57), and "Complaint of a dying lover refused upon his ladies unjust mistaking of his writing" (14–16).

the plaintive Troilus are again forcefully driven home as the sequence draws to a close. Having, by this point, largely dispensed with any pretense that Tymetes is to Paris as Pyndara is to Helen, “The Louer in vtter dispaire of his Ladies returne, in eche respect compares his estate with *Troylus*,” as the title of Poem 159 informs us. Identifying himself as “a *Troylus* outright,” Tymetes traces the various resemblances between his brief relationship with and subsequent abandonment by Pyndara and the fictive experiences of “King *Priams* worthie Sonne” who likewise “soong, / . . . out [his] Ladies vertues” before Criseyde “le[ft] a *Troian* for a *Greeke*” (T2-T3v).

What, then, are we to make of the uneasy relationship between the prefatory argument’s emphasis on Paris and Helen’s romance and its seemingly ill-fitting relationship with the Tymetes and Pyndara tale that unfolds in pseudo-epistolary fashion throughout the collection as a whole? What little scholarship exists on this work has often gotten mired in these apparent inconsistencies. Elizabeth Heale cites such discrepancies as evidence of Turberville’s “indifference to the precise details of how his narrative of betrayal and vanity is played out,” while William E. Sheidley advises that any reader “who attempts to trace the relations of Tymetes and Pyndara through the approximately ninety amatory poems in the collection” and therein “expect[s] to find an orderly series . . . fleshing out the skeletal story presented in the ‘Argument’” will be quickly confounded.²² Rather than simply dismissing “The Argument to the *whole discourse*” as a faulty hermeneutic, however, I want instead to propose that we may well be misreading the fuller implications of Poem 2 when we unsuccessfully attempt to map direct narrative correlations between Tymetes and Pyndara’s relationship and Paris and Helen’s. Turberville himself would have been well aware of the incongruences between these love stories: after all, Ovid’s *Heroides* 16 and 17 (a pair of verse epistles featuring a declaration of love in the voice of Paris and Helen’s righteous response), which he personally translated for *The Heroycall Epistles*, constituted one of Tudor England’s primary sources for the mythological lovers’ relationship. And I want to further suggest that re-reading the Tymetes and Pyndara sequence alongside Turberville’s roughly contemporary *Heroides* translation may help to clarify the nature of his prefatory assertions that the “*whole discourse*” of *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* is in some way indebted to the story of Paris and Helen. More particularly, when Turberville juxtaposes these sets of lovers, he is accentuating hermeneutic, rhetorical, and generic resemblances rather than more superficial parallels in plot.

²² Elizabeth Heale, *Autobiography and Authorship in Renaissance Verse: Chronicles of the Self* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 30; Sheidley, “George Turberville,” 634.

Lyne describes *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* as a collection brimming with “*Heroides*-like material” that “recur[s] in the form of complaint” as well as in the volume’s “epistolary dialogue” proper.²³ Turberville would no doubt have agreed with this assessment. Though Tottel’s earlier *Songes and Sonettes* contained a limited number of female-voiced lyrics, Ovid’s *Heroides* would have provided Turberville with a far more expansive and developed paradigm for the (at times) cross-gendered and metatextually infused epistolary discourse that features so prominently in his collection.²⁴ What is more, there is evidence to suggest that Turberville was working on his *Heroides* translation and the lyrics of *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* concurrently. That Henry Denham was the printer of both works is not without significance, and their interconnectedness is underscored in the paratexts to both volumes. Turberville’s prefatory matter in the earliest extant edition of *The Heroycall Epistles* promises his “friendly” readers that, in return for “well accepting this prouiso[n],” they will “be inuited to a better banquet in time at [his] hands.”²⁵ Shrank has remarked that Turberville’s use of “better” here “carr[ies] connotations of both moral and aesthetic superiority,” and I would note that this detail is particularly interesting, given that the “better banquet” promised to readers in his Ovidian translation is clearly a reference to the second edition of *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets*.²⁶ This claim is emphatically confirmed in the latter book’s prefatory materials, where Turberville declares: “Here have I . . . according to promise in my Translation [of Ovid’s *Heroides*], giuen thee a few Sonets” (*5). All of this suggests that Turberville was not only working on the two projects at once, but also that he saw them as being conceptually and aesthetically interrelated, with the amatory content of *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* grounded in and expanding upon the work that he had done for *The Heroycall Epistles*.

In addition to providing Turberville with rhetorically sophisticated models for fictive epistolary discourse, Ovid’s *Heroides* also seems to have partly inspired the previously remarked dual emphases on occasion and inscription that

²³ Lyne, “Writing Back,” 151.

²⁴ Female-voiced lyrics in Tottel’s *Songes and Sonettes* include “Complaint of the absence of her lover being upon the sea” (13–14; 17–18), “An answer in the behalfe of a woman of an uncertain aucthor” (24), “The complaint of a woman ravished, and also mortally wounded” (206), and — most significantly — a translation of the opening of *Heroides* 1 entitled “The beginning of the epistle of Penelope to Uliesses, made into verse,” a piece that may well have helped to inspire Turberville’s constellation of Ovidian epistolarity and the miscellany format (171).

²⁵ George Turberville, *The Heroycall Epistles of the Learned Poet Publius Ouidius Naso* (1567; STC 18940), π8- π8v. Subsequent citations of this work are parenthetical.

²⁶ Shrank, “Matters of Love,” 42.

pervade Turberville's auto-miscellany. Ovid's mythologically allusive letter collection is, after all, a work "in which the procedures of writing and story-telling are used not only as the form but also as material for the content."²⁷ Unsurprisingly, given the well-documented centrality of Ovid in Tudor humanist curricula, Turberville borrows rhetorical techniques from the *Heroides*—in which the epistolers frequently reference the writtleness of their own documents or allude to the material constraints under which they write—to establish an atmosphere of verisimilitude in his own collection.²⁸ If we turn, for example, to Poem 3, "To a late acquainted Friende," we find that, like so many of Ovid's fictive letters, this piece calls careful attention to its own pseudo-materiality, concluding with the epistoler's following admonition that his addressee:

. . .pervse
 This slender Verse, till leysure serue
 abroad to bring my Muse.
 For then you shall perceiue
 by that which you shall see,
 That you haue made your choise as well
 as I by choosing *P*.
 (A5v)

In these commands that the lector "pervse" the physical message to "perceiue" its meaning, we sense what both Linda S. Kauffman and Philip Hardie have identified as the "illusion of presence" that typifies Ovid's epistles, an illusion reinforced here as in the *Heroides* by the epistoler's reiterative references to acts of writing and transmission.²⁹

²⁷ Alessandro Barchiesi, "Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and Ovid's *Heroides*," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 95 (1993): 353–54.

²⁸ I have adopted William C. Dowling's terminology of "epistoler" and "lector," as defined in *The Epistolary Moment: The Poetics of the Eighteenth-Century Verse Epistle* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 12.

²⁹ Linda S. Kauffman, *Discourses of Desire: Gender, Genre, and Epistolary Fictions* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1986), 36; Philip Hardie, *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), esp. 106–42. Turberville would have also found a more limited number of examples of poems incorporating similar epistolary rhetoric in Tottel's *Songes and Sonettes*. One piece entitled "Complaint of the absence of his love," for instance, finishes with the epistoler imagining that, when his beloved has "red" his letter "and sene the grief" therein, she will tenderly place it "Betwene her brestes" (72–74). Furthermore, the juxtaposition of this verse epistle with a lyric entitled "The lover blameth his love for renting of the letter he sent her," which immediately follows (74), is loosely suggestive of the same

That Turberville is, furthermore, also interested in what Kaufmann describes as the related "illusion of reading a letter in the process of being written" as manifested in "[s]igns of physical pain" that allegedly "deface the pages of [the] letter" is evident in a number of *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets*'s lyrics, as well. Perhaps the most blatant instance occurs in the previously mentioned Poem 26. Tymetes opens this letter with the observation that, though he has a "good store" of "Pennes . . . / ne Paper did . . . want," his supply of "Inck was somewhat scant." Undeterred, he narrates his extraordinary decision, just moments before, to let loose "a clouen Conduite" from his own "middle finger" with the aid of a "pointed Pensill" (D6). The graphic specificity of this blood-as-ink imagery reads like an elaboration of—and possibly a parodic commentary upon—techniques often seen in Ovid's Heroidean letters, wherein, as Duncan F. Kennedy describes, bodily "fluids become the most potent trope of presence, and blots . . . are felt to carry a meaning that the letters they efface cannot aspire to."³⁰ Though her claims are slightly less hyperbolic, Ovid's suicidal epistoler Canace, for example, similarly opens her letter with a reference to its blood spattered nature (here in Turberville's own translation):

If any blots doe blinde, or blurre my lynes,
 The murder of their Maistresse makes y^e sann
 My right hande holdes the pen; the left a sworde,
 And in my carefull lappe the Paper lyes.
 (I2)

As classicist Laurel Fulkerson argues, though Ovid's *Heroides* are often described as a series of "more-or-less ineffectual letters written by abandoned women to the men who abandon them," such "characterization[s], while not wholly incorrect, [are] limited" in a variety of ways.³¹ Among them, our contemporary tendency to focus on the uniformly female voices represented in the so-called single epistles, or first fifteen pieces in Ovid's collection, glosses over the fact that the work also contains a number of double epistles in which heroes and heroines exchange letters: Paris and Helen are paired in *Heroides* 16 and 17; Leander and Hero in *Heroides* 18 and 19; and Acontius and Cydippe in *Heroides* 20 and 21. Describing

atmosphere of ongoing correspondence that Turberville develops more fully in *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets*.

³⁰ Duncan F. Kennedy, "Epistolarity: The *Heroides*," *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, ed. Philip Hardie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 224.

³¹ Laurel Fulkerson, *The Ovidian Heroine as Author: Reading, Writing, and Community in the 'Heroides'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 1.

the way that a sense of narrative emerges in these intratextual exchanges, Kennedy has written:

Ovid's paired epistles . . . clearly contain the potentiality for the kind of dramatic development that can be seen in the best epistolary novels, and Ovid pays careful attention to the purported time of composition and the motivation for the writing of the letters from the dramatic context. In the absence of an omniscient third-person narrator, we the readers must reconstruct for ourselves the dramatic context of the exchange from details mentioned in passing by the two correspondents.³²

Readers of Turberville's era would have been particularly attuned to the rhetoric of what Kennedy here calls the "dramatic development" and the establishment of "dramatic context" made possible through the pairing of letters, for Renaissance editions of the *Heroides*, including Turberville's own *Heroycall Epistles*, habitually included a handful of additional, pseudo-Ovidian, neo-Latin forgeries penned by the fifteenth-century humanist Angelo Sabino: a companion letter to *Heroides* 1, in which Ulysses replies to Penelope; a companion letter to *Heroides* 2, in which Demophoon replies to Phyllis; and a companion letter to *Heroides* 5, in which Paris replies to Oenone.³³ As they were known to Tudor readers, Ovid's mythological epistles were, then, even more discursive than they now appear in modern editions.³⁴

Turberville redeploys rhetorical techniques characteristic of the *Heroides* to create a multi-perspectival effect in *Epigrams, Songs and Sonets*. A reading of Turberville's own translation of *Heroides* 17, Helen's reply to Paris, is instructive.³⁵ The female epistoler begins by encoding a fictive act of transmission, documenting her reaction to receiving *Heroides* 16: the missive's opening lines indicate that, offended by the audacity of her houseguest, Helen thinks it "needefull" to respond to his romantic communiqué (i.e., *Heroides* 16), which has "rashly

³² Duncan F. Kennedy, "The Epistolary Mode and the First of Ovid's *Heroides*," *The Classical Quarterly* 34.2 (1984): 414.

³³ On Sabino's forgeries, see Lyne, "Writing Back," 145–46.

³⁴ The printed versions of Ovid's Latin *Heroides* available to Tudor readers were typically descended from Aldus Manutius's version (edited by Andrea Navagero). This Aldine text served as the basis for many later Renaissance editions, including those printed in London by Thomas Vautrollier and John Harrison.

³⁵ Somewhat confusingly for modern readers, Turberville's *Heroycall Epistles* presents the letters of Paris and Helen as *Heroides* 15 and 16 rather than *Heroides* 16 and 17 (as they are uniformly known in modern editions). I have, for clarity, consistently referred to these epistles by their modern numbers rather than those used in Turberville's sixteenth-century translation.

wrongde [her] sight" (N2). Suggestive verbal echoes of *Heroides* 16 permeate *Heroides* 17 as Helen methodically — if somewhat disingenuously — addresses Paris' prior arguments. When she advises, early on, "A rustick let me bee, / so I not passe the bounde / Of honest shame," for example, she is specifically responding to Paris' earlier comment "Too simple sure thou art, / a rustick might I say?" (N2v, M5v). Throughout her letter, Helen proceeds to systematically rebut the assertions and insinuations of *Heroides* 16, arguing that Paris' letter misrepresents the implications of her mother's rape by Jove and her own attempted rape by Theseus, among a multiplicity of other points.

Patently derivative strategies are at work in the epistolary responses supposedly penned by Tymetes' fictive correspondent Pyndara in Turberville's *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets*. In Poem 27, "Pyndaras aunswere to the Letter which Tymetes sent hir at the time of his departure," for instance, Pyndara opens with a description of herself "rashly ripl[ing] the Seale" of a letter (here posited as Tymetes' Poem 26) only to discover — with some horror — Tymetes' aforementioned "gorie scrole" penned "with Purple blood" rather than ink. After comically swooning and then herself suffering from a shock-induced nosebleed, Pyndara sets about answering her suitor in a letter that recycles his own alarming vocabulary of the "pointed Pensell," "dolefull Inck," and "clouen Conduit" that gave rise to the blood letter (D7–D8). Elsewhere, Turberville employs the same argumentative cross-referencing that typifies the double epistles of the *Heroides*. In Poem 29, for example, Pyndara responds to Tymetes' admonition of Poem 28 that she "not exchange a Fawcon for a Kite" (i.e. leave him for another) by archly retorting: "A Fawcon is full hard / amongst you men to finde, / For all your manners more agree / vnto the Kytish kinde" (E5v, E7). Perhaps this sense of mirroring is felt most keenly, however, in Poem 24, "Counsell returned by Pyndara to Tymetes, of Constancie." In this piece, *Pyndara* responds to *Tymetes*' demand of the previous poem that she "be constant after choise made" (D3). Whereas the sanctimonious epistoler of Poem 23 had cited the classical (and Chaucerian) precedents of Penelope, Cleopatra, and Lucretia as *exempla in bono*, in Poem 24's piquant answer Pyndara uses a series of *exempla in malo* to rebut the assumption that she needs to be guided towards constancy. Proposing that "we Women are / more trustie than you men," Pyndara responds both to Tymetes' sentiments and methodologies by producing her own arsenal of counter-*exempla* to illustrate that she has more cause to remind *him* to be constant than he her: Aeneas, Jason, and Theseus all (as depicted both in Ovid's *Heroides* and Chaucer's *Legend*

of *Good Women*) abandoned “their faithfull Friendes / that saude their doubtfull lyues / . . . and did disdaine / to take them to their wyues” (D3v–D4).³⁶

In considering the symmetries between Turberville’s *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* and *Heroycall Epistles*, it is also crucial to note that, in Renaissance editions, the Latin letters of the *Heroides* were paratextually anchored. Drawing on medieval exegetical traditions, such editions typically prefaced each epistle with a scene-setting blurb, positioning each missive at a particular point within the renowned narratives of Virgil, Homer, et al. that served as Ovid’s own primary intertextual referents.³⁷ Audiences of Turberville’s era were therefore not required, to again borrow Kennedy’s phrasing, to “reconstruct . . . the dramatic context of the exchange from details mentioned in passing by the two correspondents.” Resultantly, the epistles of the *Heroides* were vested with what might be described as an intensified sense of occasion, as readers found their attention paratextually drawn to the precise circumstances under — and also precise time-frames within — which famed heroes and heroines composed these pieces. This widespread feature of humanist Latin editions is one that Turberville adopted in his own translation. Each letter in *The Heroycall Epistles* is introduced by an original “Argument” in rhyming couplets that provides what Patricia B. Phillipy has called “the ground situation” for its genesis.³⁸ These poetic blurbs proactively answer crucial contextual questions about *where*, *when*, and *why* each fictive dispatch was composed by each mythological correspondent. Turberville’s translation of *Heroides* 16, for example, the letter of Paris to Helen, is prefaced with the milieu-establishing information that the Trojan has just been “receiued lyke a Roy / At *Menelaus* house” and, in his host’s absence, found “occasion to bewraye / His sute to *Helen*,” while the companion argument for *Heroides* 17 begins by describing what happened after “*Helen* had . . . perusde” *Heroides* 16 (L3, N1v). As Helen Moore perceives, “the addition of these framing narratives,” means that Turberville’s Ovidian translations in *The Heroycall Epistles* exhibit “a more than passing resemblance to mid-Elizabethan [vernacular] letter-collec-

³⁶ This exchange of Poems 23 and 24 is also reminiscent of a paired set of lyrics found in Tottel’s *Songes and Sonettes* entitled “Against women, either good or bad” and “An answer” (192), which similarly debate the meanings of Ovidian *exempla* (Penelope and Helen).

³⁷ The Latin *argumenta* typically found in Renaissance-era printed editions of Ovid’s Latin *Heroides* were originally composed by Guy Morillon and spread via the influential Aldine text.

³⁸ Patricia B. Phillipy, “Loytering in Love: Ovid’s *Heroides*, Hospitality, and Humanist Education in *The Taming of the Shrew*,” *Criticism* 40.1 (1998): 27.

tions and manuals such as *The Tresurie of Amadis of Fraunce* and *The English Secretorie*.³⁹

Moore has made the further argument that the letters of Ovid’s *Heroides* formed “the blueprint for the literary realization of amorous emotion in Elizabethan fiction: they are the primary source and model for many of its set pieces of epistolary and verbal rhetoric.”⁴⁰ And it would appear that Turberville himself, writing at the dawn of the Elizabethan era, manages to articulate a rather similar position about the possible role that the *Heroides* might play in the creation of new English genres. When we juxtapose the versified “Argument to the whole discourse” with the near-contemporaneous prefatory matter found at the start of each letter in *The Heroycall Epistles*, the extent of the former’s debt to the latter becomes clear. That Turberville’s initial outline of Pyndara and Tymetes’ “ground situation” is both modeled upon and designed to recall the *argumenta* framing Ovid’s *Heroides* in both humanist Latin editions and his own English translation is signaled not only by its placement in the sequence and its exegetical tenor, but also by the heavy-handed allusions that it makes to an eminent pair of Ovidian correspondents. If the new English characters of Pyndara and Tymetes were prefigured by these classical precedents, so too is “The Argument to the whole discourse” a novel vernacular re-conception of a pervasive and far-reaching commentary tradition.

I want to propose that, when Turberville makes these analogies between the Ovidian letters of Paris and Helen and the lyrics contained within his own collection, he is pointing to the *Heroides* as a direct model for this current project as much as — and perhaps more than — he is suggesting a strict congruence between the Tymetes/Pyndara and Paris/Helen plotlines. Put otherwise, it is the ways that *Heroides* 16 and 17 foster dialogic verisimilitude rather than the precise details of the budding-if-doomed romance represented within this epistolary exchange that leads Turberville to trumpet the affiliation. The answers to *why*, *when*, and *where* that are preemptively provided in Poem 2’s argument may lack the scholarly precision of the humanist *argumenta* framing Ovid’s Latin *Heroides*, but the very fact that Turberville has prefaced his lyric sequence with such a contextual hermeneutic is in itself remarkable as a developmental moment in the pre-history of English epistolary fiction.

If we, furthermore, consider the centrality of occasion to Turberville’s project, this also goes some way towards explaining how it is that the alleged Paris

³⁹ Helen Moore, “Elizabethan Fiction and Ovid’s *Heroides*,” *Translation and Literature* 9.1 (2000): 48.

⁴⁰ Moore, “Elizabethan Fiction,” 48.

and Helen story arc introduced in “The Argument to the *whole discourse*” morphs into what more closely resembles *Troilus and Criseyde* redux. No doubt, Turberville would have been familiar with the formally hybrid and metafictionally tinged sentimental romances of the prior century such as *Carcel de Amor*, *Arnalte y Lucenda*, or *De Duobus Amantibus* (all readily available in English translation by the 1560s), which embedded first person complaints and epistles into narrative frameworks, and he would have found in them certain analogues for his own project.⁴¹ Yet the most visible native English example of a romance imbued with such a documentary aesthetic in the 1560s would still have been *Troilus and Criseyde*. As Seth Lerer has shown, this late medieval romance provided “a model for early Tudor epistolarity,” and its influence is widely felt in the literature of the period.⁴² After all, in addition to a number of inset first-person lyrics—the most famous being Book 1’s famed “Canticus Troili”—Chaucer’s work also memorably features the well-known letter exchange of the paired “Litera Troili” and “Litera Criseydis” in Book 5.⁴³

I have, throughout this essay, sought to read Turberville’s *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* with the assumption that, in order to appreciate its intended effects, we must consider particulars of its historical context and literary genealogy. By way of conclusion, I would again reiterate my stance that this auto-miscellany is a carefully devised work that displays an exceptional self-consciousness about its own experimental, generically hybrid nature; within its pages, diverse rhetorical strategies and narrative framing devices make otherwise discontinuous amatory lyrics cohere into a more legible sequence. Furthermore, Turberville’s evident concern with occasion throughout this auto-miscellany—made manifest as he recurrently fictionalizes acts of inscription—accounts for his intertwined usage of Tottelian, Ovidian, and Chaucerian prototypes. His fascination with literary etiologies seems to have stemmed equally from all of these precursors, which provided models for those “variations on the theme of reply and the poetic network” that Lyne sees as fundamental to the identity of Turberville’s own anthology.⁴⁴ But as much as his work is rooted in established tradition, it also pushes new boundaries. Turberville’s practice of providing lyrics

⁴¹ For the ultimately Heroidean roots of such works, see Marina Scordilis Brownlee, *The Severed Word: Ovid’s ‘Heroides’ and the Novela Sentimental* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).

⁴² Seth Lerer, *Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII: Literary Culture and the Arts of Deceit* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 12.

⁴³ On the inset lyrics of *Troilus and Criseyde*, see Robert O. Payne, *The Key of Remembrance: A Study in Chaucer’s Poetic* (1963; Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977), 184–87.

⁴⁴ Lyne, “Writing Back,” 154.

with narrative frames clearly goes beyond what we find in the earlier titling or dedicatory strategies of his vernacular precursors Tottel and Googe, and he similarly stretches further than his immediate Ovidian epistolary model in that he attempts to create an ongoing exchange between characters that far exceeds a single instance of paired letters. Ultimately, this collection’s interest in fictionalizing literary genesis not only resonates with the near-contemporary exemplar of Isabella Whitney’s *Copy of a Letter*, but also anticipates future experiments in English romance: this includes not only George Gascoigne’s celebrated *Adventures of Master F.J.*, which cultivates a similar documentary aesthetic, but also the embedded lyrical and epistolary outpourings that would come to characterize both the Arcadian and Euphuistic romances of the later Elizabethan period.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ My argument here dovetails with that of R.S. White, “Functions of Poems and Songs in Elizabethan Romance and Romantic Comedy,” *English Studies* 68.5 (1987): 392–405.