ANALYSIS OF THE MANUSCRIPT

1. Make-up

An examination of the poems in the Arundel MS. shows that they form two groups, fairly differentiated both in content and handwriting. The one is made up of poems by the elder Harington and his contemporaries, with a basic, though not precise, order in arrangement, and written predominantly in Hand A, a clear, regular secretary, which occurs also in Harington MSS. Prose I and II. The second group is made up of poems by Sir John Harington and his contemporaries, or of later work by the older writers, entered into the Manuscript in a more casual order, and written most frequently in the distinctive and sophisticated hand of Sir John, but also in a number of other late Elizabethan hands, sometimes careless and indifferent in form.

The first group consists of poems by the elder John Harington, Sir Thomas Wyatt, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, Thomas, Lord Vaux, Sir John Cheke, Thomas Churchyard, Edmund Knevet, John Astley, Admiral Sir Thomas Seymour, Sir Thomas Smith, Sir George Blage, Sir William Cordall, John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, his brother Robert, later Earl of Leicester, Richard Edwards, and others. This group of poems, with which the Manuscript begins and ends, is the basis of the collection. The Arundel MS. seems to have been designed originally as an ordered anthology, with the overall plan: (1) poems of John Harington and others; (2) poems of Surrey, in the order: the lighter poems, the Psalms, the Ecclesiastes; (3) poems of Wyatt, in the general order: sonnets, epigrams, miscellaneous poems, satires, Psalms; (4) poems by miscellaneous authors, including again John Harington. In arranging the Manuscript, a number of leaves were left blank in various parts, as, for example, fols. 220v-223r. The compiler evidently followed the same plan used in MS. Prose I, a collection of state papers relating to the early part of Elizabeth's reign, where from one to ten leaves of the original paper are left blank between entries.1 Thus space was available for other material of a similar nature. Now in the MS. Prose I these blank pages were never used, but in the Arundel MS. most of them were. It is on these pages left blank that we find

---

1 See Hughey, pp. 400, 417, and p. 38 below.
entered more casually and in the varied hands later poems by con­
temporaries of the elder Harington and the poems of Sir John, his
friends, and fellow writers: Sir Philip Sidney, Edward de Vere, sev­
enteenth Earl of Oxford, Samuel Daniel, Sir Walter Ralegh, Henry
Constable, Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, Edmund Spenser, Sir
Edward Dyer, and others. It is necessary to keep in mind that the
elder Harington lived until 1582, when his son John was only
twenty-two years of age; therefore poems written up to the year
of his death might have been collected by the father, although they
might have been copied into the Manuscript by Sir John. This is
true, I think, of No. 66 and possibly of Nos. 68, 146-53. The un­
finished poems occur in this casual second group. The entries of Sir
John and his friends are in the nature of insertions in, or additions to,
a manuscript already planned but not filled. The former Harington
MS. No. I (Egerton MS. 2711) is a good illustration of a composite
volume which was in the making for well over a hundred years.
Many of the poems in that manuscript, as is well known, are in
Wyatt’s autograph, and, consequently, were written in the volume
before his death in 1542. But Nicholas Grimald and others added
some lines and revisions, and later Sir John Harington made use of
four leaves left blank, fols. 104r-107r, to copy his metrical para­
phrases of the seven Penitential Psalms. Some one else added Latin
aphorisms with translations, fol. 102r, and metrical versions of the
beginnings of Psalms 1 and 6, fol. 103r. Still another writer copied
French epigrams on fols. 110r-111v; and finally the Haringtons of
the Civil War period used the manuscript as a kind of notebook for
various and sundry memoranda. MS. Prose II was similarly used in
the Civil War period.

Although the Arundel MS., fortunately, was not taken as a note­
book by the seventeenth-century Haringtons, its make-up indicates
clearly that Sir John Harington and his contemporaries made use of
its blank pages for copying poems in the same way as in the Wyatt

2 In Hughey, pp. 414-16, 442-43, a double-page facsimile is given, showing Grimald’s
corrections of one poem and one stanza of “O restfull place: renewer of my smart,”
written completely in his hand. Muir, Sir Thomas Wyatt, p. 256, mistakenly attributes
to Miss Foxwell the discovery of Grimald’s corrections in Egerton 2711, and, p. 105,
he erroneously describes the stanza mentioned as written in “a later handwriting.” Miss
Foxwell, Poems, i, 65, thought the stanza was in “possibly the handwriting of John
Harington.” For further discussion of Grimald’s revisions, see below, pp. 44-45.

3 From a different source Thomas Park, N.d., ii, 403-06, prints paraphrases of Psalms
24 and 112 and a portion of 137 as “Psalmes putt into verse by Sir John Harington.”
Bodleian MS. Douce 361 contains a contemporary copy of Sir John’s metrical para­
phrases of the Psalms and another contemporary manuscript copy is owned by the
English Department Library of the Ohio State University. See below, p. 41, note 50.
MS., only to a greater extent. There is also the possibility that leaves were later inserted in the middle of the volume, where Nos. 176-256 (on thirty-one folios, 130-63, with 131 and 143 missing) constitute the large consecutive number of poems belonging to the second group. Although the numbering of the folios is contemporary, it is not all of one character.

2. Contents

Nos. 1-23, fols. 16r-27v. The first fifteen folios are missing, but fol. 15 is represented, as I have said, in Nott’s transcript, MS. Add. 28635. The three poems there written seem to accord with Nos. 1-23, which can be generally described as poems by John Harington and his contemporaries. Hand A, however, does not begin until No. 9 on fol. 18r, whence it continues through No. 23. The first two folios, 16 and 17, have several different secretary hands, which appear to be later than Hand A. Nos. 1, 2, 3, and the crossed-out version of No. 4 are written in a hand which occurs on a number of folios in MS. Prose II. Nos. 2 and 3 are John Harington’s compositions, and the heading for No. 2 seems to be written in his hand. A late secretary hand appears in No. 4 and recurs in No. 6. No. 5 seems to be in still another hand, although it has some similarity to that of No. 4. A late insertion in the hand of Ellina Harington, Sir John’s daughter, appears in Nos. 7 and 8 on fol. 17v, differing completely from the hand of the crossed-out versions on fol. 16r. Fols. 16 and 17 were evidently filled in somewhat later, even though in Nos. 2 and 3, and possibly in Nos. 1 and 4, we have poems by John Harington. No. 20 is another of Harington’s poems, and Nos. 15, 19, and 22 are attributed to him in the NA, as has been noted. On the basis of style Nos. 16, 17, 18, 21, and 23 seem to be of Harington’s composition, as do the three poems on fol. 15 of the transcript. Represented also in the section are Harington’s contemporaries, Edmund Knevet, a courtier in the reign of King Henry VIII, who is author of No. 10, and Sir Thomas Wyatt, to whom No. 6 is usually attributed. Its subscription, “To Smith of Camden,” I interpret to mean that the poem was to be sung to the tune of the ballad “Smith of Camden.” Other writers have not been identified, but the poetry

4 See above, p. 8.
5 No. 2 in the NA, 1769, p. 87, is signed, “J. H. 1567”; consequently it may be later than some of the other poems in this section.
6 See above, pp. 20-22.
7 For details see Notes on these poems.
is clearly that of the second and third quarters of the sixteenth century.

Nos. 24-63, fols. 27v-30r. This section is headed, apparently in John Harington's hand, "dyvers sentences." Nos. 24-26 are, I think, in Hand A, but those following, except No. 26a, which is in contemporary italic, seem to be in the hand of Nos. 4 and 6. Corrections occur in at least two hands, one of them Sir John's. No. 26 is a versification of a sentence in John Harington's translation of Cicero's *De Amicitia*, 1550 (sig. F3v), and No. 28 was said by Sir John to have been taught him as a child by his father.\(^8\) No. 35, however, is an early version of two lines in Sir John's translation of the *Orlando* (XXXI.2), and No. 56 is an early version of one of Sir John's epitaphs (ed. 1615, sig. D2v). Additions to the "dyvers sentences" were probably made over a period of years.

No. 64, fol. 31r. With this anonymous translation of Petrarch's forty-eighth canzone, somewhat in the manner of Wyatt's translation, No. 144, we return, but momentarily, to the poetry written in Hand A.

Nos. 65-71, fols. 31r-36r. Sir John's hand occurs in Nos. 65, 66, 67, 70, and possibly in Nos. 68 and 69. No. 71 is in another late sixteenth-century hand. Sidney is represented by Nos. 67 and 71, and Greville, it seems, by the worthless No. 69. Although No. 66 on the martyrdom of Edmund Campion is in Sir John's hand and could not have been written before late 1581, it nevertheless may have been collected by the elder Harington, who is said to have considered it the best poem he ever read.\(^9\) No. 68, ascribed to Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex, who died in 1576, but printed in *The Paradise of Dainty Devices* (Rollins, No. 98), with attribution to Francis Kinwelmarsh, is another of the poems which may have a similar derivation. These seven poems, written predominantly in Sir John's hand, occur between poems of the Tottel school in Hand A.

Nos. 72-90, fols. 37v-59r, with 38-48 wanting, and with 53 appearing twice. The handwriting is that of Hand A. Poems generally considered to be Surrey's begin with No. 74 on fol. 49v, and continue through No. 90, fol. 59r, but No. 85 is here ascribed to "Preston," probably to be identified as Thomas Preston, a member of the Royal Household, who in 1533 sent Thomas Cromwell a specimen of his


\(^9\) See p. 66, below.
"fashion of writing."" The question arises whether the AH MS. compiler intended his Surrey group to begin with No. 72, "Gyrrt in my giltlesse gowne," which was printed by Tottel as the work of an Uncertain Author (Rollins, No. 243), but was attributed to Surrey by Sir Richard Barckley in *A Discourse of the Felicitie of Man*, 1598 (p. 499). No. 73 likewise is among the Uncertain Authors (Rollins, No. 184). The eleven folios missing between Nos. 73 and 74 make impossible a positive answer regarding the compiler's grouping.

Nos. 91, 92, fol. 59. These two poems by Sir John Harington are an interpolation. Both are written in his hand on a half-page left blank between the last of Surrey's poems and more of the Uncertain Authors which appear to form the beginning of the Wyatt section.

Nos. 93-145, fols. 59v-105r, with 61, 62, 69-74, 79-96, 103, 104 wanting, and 67 and 99 appearing twice, written in Hand A. Despite the fact that Nos. 93-95 belong to Tottel's Uncertain Authors (Rollins, Nos. 219, 277, 247), they are here placed at the beginning of the Wyatt group, which follows. It is a reasonable conjecture that they were considered his by the compiler, as is true of No. 143, another Uncertain Author poem (Rollins, No. 172) in the Wyatt sequence. Whether they are Wyatt's is another matter. The AH compiler has in general placed Wyatt's poems in the order: sonnets, epigrams, miscellaneous poems, satires, and longer poems; but there are exceptions. Nos. 97 and 103 are epigrams among the sonnets, as is the satire No. 104. Nos. 119 and 120 are epigrams mistakenly run together as a sonnet. The fragment No. 145, the only religious poem in this Wyatt section, occurs nowhere else. The compiler probably considered it Wyatt's.

Nos. 146-53, fols. 105r-107v. Here on two and one-half folios left blank between poems by Wyatt is another interpolation. These "Certayne verses made by vncertayne autors wrytten out of Charleton his booke" are all in the same handwriting, an unidentified secretary, with ascriptions added in other hands. The identity of "Charleton" is uncertain, but he may have been John Charlton, whose translation of *The Casket of Jewels* by Cornelius Valerius was published in 1571, or Sir John Harington's contemporary and fellow at Cambridge, Richard Carleton, the composer, who in 1601 brought

---

10 *Letters and Papers, . . . of Henry VIII*, vol. vi, ed. James Gairdner (1882), p. 673. In the same letter Preston thanks Cromwell for securing for him a living and yearly pension. For further discussion, see the Note on No. 85.

11 The hand of Nos. 146-53 might possibly be Sir John's, but I think it is not.
out *Madrigals to Five Voyces*. Since Nos. 147 and 148, having to do with troubles connected with Mary Stuart in 1572, were written by Sir Henry Goodyere and Thomas Norton in that year, and No. 149 by Sir Edward Dyer is thought to belong to the same year, they could not have been written into the Arundel MS. before that time. Although No. 151, a stanza of a longer poem by Richard Hatfield, goes back probably to the reign of Henry VIII, it is nevertheless a late entry in the Arundel MS.

Nos. 154-69, fols. 108r-119v; in Hand A. Nos. 154-67 comprise Wyatt’s metrical paraphrases of the Penitential Psalms. Nott suggested that the fragment No. 169, not found elsewhere, was intended as a proem for No. 168, which paraphrases Psalm 37.

Eight folios, 120-27, are wanting between Nos. 169 and 170.

Nos. 170-75, fols. 128r-130r. Hand A appears in Nos. 170-74; poems by Thomas Churchyard (No. 171); Sir William Cordall (No. 172)—a contemporary of the elder Harington and Master of the Rolls under Mary and Elizabeth, but not known as a verse-maker; Lord Vaux (No. 173); and an anonymous writer with a poem (No. 174) of the same school. Nos. 173 and 174 are not found elsewhere. The unknown No. 175 is in another secretary hand, and should perhaps be classed with the next section, but in style and temper it belongs with the earlier verse. The heading, “Hennage,” doubtless refers to Sir Thomas Honeage, whom Sir John described as “an old courtier and a zealous Puritan” in 1592.

Nos. 176-236, fols. 130r-164r, with 131, 140, 154, 161 wanting. These poems constitute the large consecutive number of later entries, written in several different hands, between poems of the earlier period. In this division there are some subgroupings. No. 176 by Sidney is in an unidentified secretary hand; but Nos. 177 and 178, probably by the elder Harington, and No. 179, by Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, are in Sir John’s hand. Nos. 180-83 are “libels” in the taste of Sir John. His hand appears in the first five lines of No. 181, and perhaps in Nos. 182 and 183. Another hand, which occurs also in MS. Prose II, has written all of No. 180, a good many lines in the fragmentary No. 181, and most of No. 184, but the first

---

12 *D.N.B.; S.T.C. 4649*. Other possibilities for this Charlton are John Chardon, Bishop of Down and Connor, who died in 1601, and George Carleton, 1559-1628, Bishop of Chichester, also known as a poet.
13 Ralph M. Sargent, *At the Court of Queen Elizabeth; the Life and Lyrics of Sir Edward Dyer*, 1935, p. 207.
14 Nott, *Surrey and Wyatt*, ii, 580.
15 In *A Briefe View of the State of the Church*, quoted from NA, 1769, p. 24, section on “Doctor Still.”
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seven lines of the latter are in Sir John’s hand. Two unidentified hands occur in No. 185 by Spenser and the unknown No. 186. The first seven lines of No. 187 are in Sir John’s hand. A careless unidentified secretary then takes up the poem and continues in Nos. 188-94, 196, 198, and 199. All except the unknown No. 188 are popular late sixteenth-century poems, of which there are a number of copies. No. 197 by Sir John is curiously out of place and must represent an example of an even later filling in. No. 195 is in contemporary italics. Sir John’s hand reappears in No. 200 and begins the Constable sonnets from Diana, Nos. 201-21, which have an important heading indicating that they were addressed to Penelope, Lady Rich, in 1589. With line 5 of No. 203 another secretary hand, which occurs nowhere else in the Manuscript, takes up the Constable sonnets and continues to the end of the sequence. Sir John’s hand returns in his poem No. 222, and, with the exception of No. 224, which is in contemporary italics, continues through the first ten lines of No. 227. Perhaps more important than the text itself is Sir John’s heading for No. 223, the first sonnet in the Astrophel and Stella sequence, which states that Sidney’s sonnets were written to the Lady Rich. Likewise, Sir John’s title to No. 225 makes certain Ralegh’s authorship of this epitaph on Sidney. The rest of No. 227 and all of No. 228, an unknown poem, apparently addressed to Mary Herbert, Countess of Pembroke, are written in a hand which resembles Sir John’s and may conceivably be his. Certainly, No. 229 by Sidney and the hitherto unpublished Nos. 230-33 are written in Sir John’s hand, as is also No. 234, an interesting version of Daniel’s “Octavia to Antony.” The first seven lines of No. 235 by Ralegh are in Sir John’s writing, but the rest of the poem and its answering fragment, No. 236, are in the hand of No. 180. It is evident that Sir John started the copying of a good many poems which were completed by others.

Nos. 237-44, fols. 164r-168r, with 165 wanting. With the exception of No. 238, these poems by Richard Edwards (Nos. 239, 240), Thomas Churchyard (No. 241), and others of the same school are written in a hand which may be called B, somewhat similar to Hand A. It may be the same hand at a different period. No. 238 by Queen Elizabeth is in two late hands, of which the first, through line 4, may be that of Nos. 188-94, and the second that of Nos. 182-83.

Nos. 245-324, fols. 168r-225r, with 175, 189-91, 197-204 wanting. The greater part of fol. 220r, fols. 221rv, 222rv, and 223r are blank, but are the original paper. Nos. 245-324 comprise the final
group of miscellaneous poems belonging to the school of the elder Harington and his contemporaries. They are written for the greater part in Hand A, but Hand B seems to recur in Nos. 319-22, and still another hand of the same general character appears in Nos. 323 and 324. If No. 320 is to be accepted as a translation by Queen Elizabeth, it is evident that the initials “E.R.” would not have been so written until sometime after her accession in 1558. They could have been added, however, after the poem was copied. In connection with the *Nugae Antiquae*, mention has been made of No. 262 by John Harington, of the anonymous No. 278, and of No. 291 by Sir Thomas Seymour. There is some reason to believe that the unknown Nos. 246 and 247, addressed to Henry Stanley, Lord Strange, and his wife, Lady Margaret Clifford, and No. 274 are also by Harington, as may be others among the anonymous poems. Three additional poems by Wyatt, Nos. 310-12, appear in this section, and ten of the twenty of Tottel’s *Uncertain Authors* contained in the Manuscript: Nos. 245, 263, 265, 267, 292, 293, 297, 299, 300, 313. No. 299 is here definitely ascribed to Vaux, as is also No. 298, given by Tottel to Surrey. There are texts of published poems by Churchyard, Nos. 305 and 321; Edwards, No. 288; Robert Burdet, No. 264; and George Blage, No. 295. Especially interesting are the number of hitherto unpublished compositions, of which a good many are anonymous. Several poems are ascribed to writers whose names are not ordinarily associated with verse-making: John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, who died in 1554, No. 289; his brother Robert, later Earl of Leicester, No. 290; John Astley, to whom Roger Ascham addressed *A Report . . . of the Affairs and State of Germany* (1553), No. 296; Sir William Cordall, who has been mentioned previously, Nos. 307-08; Sir Thomas Smith, better known as a secretary of state under Edward VI and Elizabeth, No. 323. The distinguished humanist Sir John Cheke is represented by four unpublished poems, Nos. 282-85, with the ascriptions inserted in a hand very like that of the elder Harington. Thus a considerable body of new material from the older writers appears in this section.

The Manuscript closes with some scribbling, including four names, on the lower half of fol. 225. “Thomas Arundell” is written in a

16 See pp. 20-21 above.
17 For corresponding numbers in *TM*, see Chart, pp. 70-73.
18 No. 295 was printed by Nott, *Surrey and Wyatt*, vol. ii, “Memoirs,” p. xcvi, footnote, from the copy in the Arundel MS.
19 See p. 13 above.
20 See p. 32 above.
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neat, but large, contemporary italic, in an ink now faded and brown. This is the signature of Thomas, first Baron Arundell of Wardour, who was at Eton with Sir John Harington in 1571, when both boys were eleven years old. Their association is mentioned by Sir John in the Notes to Book XLV of his translation of the Orlando Furioso.²¹ The other writing, or scribbling, is in black ink. This consists first of a sentence in contemporary italic, “A man mai e manie frends retayn,” followed by, “Among mans,” written twice, with below, “standing,” in secretary. The names of Nicholas Hollowell and Ralph Horton occur both in italic and late secretary, with additional partial scribblings. William Horton’s name is in late secretary, smeared. Another bit of writing is illegible. These three signatures, if such they are, I have not identified. A Ralph Horton was living at Coole, Cheshire, in the early seventeenth century, but no William is named in that family.²² There were, however, several William Hortons living at the time when these names could have been written. The will of a William Horton of Ilford, Wiltshire, was proved in 1584; of another of Staunton, Worcestershire, in 1613.²³ Two William Hortons were living in Yorkshire, at Eland and at Barkisland, in the early seventeenth century.²⁴ Records I have examined of the Hollowell, or Halliwell, family show no Nicholas of the late sixteenth or early

²¹ On Thomas, first Baron Arundel of Wardour, 1560-1639, see the D.N.B. For some account of the Arundell and Harington family connections, see the Note on No. 262. According to A List of Eton Commensals, 1563-1647, ed. Sir Wasey Sterry, 1904, p. 19, John Harington and Thomas Arundell were at the same table in 1571. Sir John refers to Thomas Hoby and Thomas Arundell in connection with a task of translation, Orlando, 1591, p. 393. A letter by Thomas Arundell, written at Eton, “The xxix of December” to Mistress Penn is in Lansdowne MS. 107, No. 3. A letter from him to Sir Francis Walsingham, dated July 8, 1588, is in the State Papers Domestic, Elizabeth (S.P. 12), vol. 212, no. 21. The autograph of his grandfather, Thomas Arundell, beheaded in 1552, is in MS. Cotton Cleopatra E.IV, fol. 257, and in MS. Cotton Vespasian F.XII, fol. 153.


²³ 14 Watson and 22 Capell, respectively (Index of Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury . . . , vol. iv, ed. S. A. Smith and E. A. Fry; vol. v, ed. E. Stokes, The British Record Society, vols. xxv, xliii [1901, 1912]).
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The appearance on the page of the names of the two Hortons and Nicholas Hollowell suggests that they were written by youths who were scribbling in the old secretary and the newer italic for the fun of it. Very probably these three, like Thomas Arundell, were friends of Sir John Harington. They may be responsible for some of the copying of later poems, but the writing in the names is not sufficient to make this certain.

3. Origin

Comparison of Earlier Poems with Other MSS.:

Prose I and II, P, D, E; with Tottel's Miscellany and Other Miscellanies

If we grant that the Arundel MS. is a composite volume, with poems of the later entries extending well into the period of Sir John Harington's maturity, the question naturally arises as to the time of the beginnings of the Manuscript. When, in other words, was the copying of the earlier entries begun? Who was the compiler? Unfortunately, to neither of these questions is there a positive answer. Nevertheless, the circumstantial evidence, based primarily on further consideration of the Arundel MS. in relation to others in the Harington collection, points to the conclusion that the Manuscript was begun as such by the early years of Elizabeth's reign, and perhaps earlier. The collecting of the material and the revising of some of the texts, especially Wyatt's, undoubtedly extended back many years, possibly to the final period of Henry VIII's reign.

If Hand A were that of the elder Harington, our problem would be simpler; but it is not. If it could be shown that the ascription in contemporary italic "T. Seymour" for No. 291 was written by Sir Thomas himself, we could then be sure that a part of the Manuscript was under way before his death in 1549. The writing is very like

25 The Hollowell, or Halliwell, family seems to originate from Holliwell township in the parish of Dean, Lancashire, and from Hollowell, a parish in the diocese of Peterborough. Pedigree of the Hollowell family of Hampshire is in Harl. MS. 1544, fol. 173r; of Northamptonshire, in Harl. MS. 1553, fol. 246v; of London, in Harl. MS. 1463, fol. 53r. A Nicholas Halliwell was graduated B.A. at Cambridge in 1484 (Alumni Cantabrigienses, ed. John and J. A. Venn, I, ii [1922]).

26 It occurred to me that the Hortons and Nicholas Hollowell might also have been with Sir John at Eton, but Sir Wasey Sterry, answering my letter of inquiry, tells me that he has not come across their names in Eton records. Nor do I find that they attended Cambridge with Sir John.

27 For reference on Harington's handwriting, see p. 12 above.

28 Sir Thomas Seymour was executed March 20, 1548/9. A marginal note in pencil, perhaps Bishop Percy's, reads, "Lord Admirall Seymour written the week before he was beheaded."
one of Sir Thomas' official signatures in MS. Cotton Titus B 11, fol. 77r, a Privy Council order during the reign of Edward VI; but a close examination of the ascription reveals that it was first written "T.S." in rather heavy black ink, and that the "eymour" was added in lighter ink. The e is written over the period after the S. The "mour" looks exactly the same in the two, but the y of the AH MS. does not have the flourish of that on the Privy Council order. Seymour's writing, however, was not constant. His official signature in MS. Add. 19398, fol. 32r, dated 1544, is of the same general style as that in the Cotton MS., but two in MS. Add. 5753, fols. 48r and 137r, show marked differences. It is possible, then, that the ascription in the AH MS. was written by Seymour, with the rest of the surname added to the initials "T.S."; but we are hardly justified in accepting so doubtful a point in establishing evidence about the beginnings of the Arundel MS.29

Again, if it could be shown that the 1549 edition of Wyatt's Penitential Psalms was set up from the versions in the Arundel MS., we could set a superior limit for this portion of the Manuscript; but collation shows too many divergences in these texts to admit such a conclusion.

There are, however, other important factors. We shall be concerned with: (1) a more particular consideration of the handwriting, especially Hand A; (2) the nature of material in several other Harington MSS., its approximate dates and arrangements; (3) the evidence of textual collation, particularly that of Wyatt's poems; (4) certain suggestive features in the life and character of John Harington the elder.

I have said earlier that Hand A is a clear, regular secretary. It may be further described as showing more nearly characteristics of the simpler mid-sixteenth-century handwriting than of the more flourishing, or careless, late Elizabethan hands. Nevertheless, a hand such as this could, of course, continue to occur in the late sixteenth century. It is easily read, with most letters distinct, except that some capitals and minuscules, especially l and h, are frequently indistinguishable. There are few abbreviations and contractions and very little punctuation. Some punctuation, written in a different ink, has clearly been added, probably by another hand. Hand A noticeably uses ea frequently instead of e or ee. Erasures indicating revision and a few

29 Dr. W. W. Greg, who very kindly compared these examples of Seymour's signature with the ascription in the AH MS., agreed with me in this conclusion.
additional alterations, in this or other hands, are scattered through the lines written in Hand A. As is true of Sir John's handwriting, Hand A shows sometimes less care and precision than at other times.

Hand A figures prominently in Harington MSS. Prose I and II, and other less frequently used hands of the Arundel MS. occur also in both manuscripts. From this interrelation of handwriting it is apparent that these three manuscripts have a common background. The MS. Prose I, set up in the same way as was the Arundel MS. originally, with blank leaves intervening between sections, is a collection of state papers relating to Elizabeth's reign. The first three entries, fols. 1-78, having to do with the question of the Queen's marriage, 1560-70, are written entirely in Hand A. They were probably collected as a result of the elder Harington's Parliamentary career, 1559-63. The next three entries, which include Sir Philip Sidney's personal address to the Queen regarding her proposed marriage with Alencçon, are written in a handwriting resembling that of one of Sidney's poems in the Arundel MS., No. 176. The hand of the seventh and final entry in the MS. Prose I, concerning English policy toward the revolt of the Netherlands against Spain, may be the same hand which has entered poems 1-4 into the Arundel MS.

MS. Prose II is composed mainly of letters, written about 1540 to 1575, of which the greater number have nothing to do with the

---

30 See above pp. 12, 14, 27, 28; and Hughey, pp. 399-401. I have revised somewhat the opinion given in the reference just named. The two prose miscellanies were in the possession of Mr. John E. M. Harington when I examined them. They are now British Museum MSS. Add. 46366 and 46367, respectively, I and II.

31 The items so entered are: (1) Sir Thomas Smith's disputation on the marriage of the Queen, 1560, fols. 1r-48v; (2) the petition presented to the Queen by Sir Nicholas Bacon in 1566 on behalf of the House of Lords, fols. 49r-52v; (3) another discourse, not identified, on the "Queenes Maties estate," clearly of the same period, fols. 55r-78v.


33 These three entries in MS. Prose I are: (1) a petition to the Queen to take criminal proceedings against Mary Stuart, fols. 82r-95v; (2) Sidney's address, fols. 100r-106v; (3) a discourse entitled, "The emulation of good men is profitable for the commonwealthe," fols. 117r-119v. The writing of these items has some similarity to that of Francis Harington, Sir John's brother, as given in a memorandum made by him in 1609, MS. Add. 27632, fol. 41r. N. E. McClure, The Letters and Epigrams of Sir John Harington, p. 11, note 3, describes MS. Prose I as a volume kept by Sir John, reflecting his interests during the period of his study at Lincoln's Inn, which he entered in 1581. Some of the later entries may derive from Sir John. In Hughey, p. 400, I have said that I did not believe Sir John's hand occurred in MS. Prose I. Certainly, his mature hand does not appear, and presumably his handwriting in 1581 would not have differed a very great deal from the period of his work on the Orlando, about 1590-91, as seen in MS. Add. 18020.

34 Fols. 122r-126v.
Harington family. Many were evidently collected as good pieces of writing, edifying or stylistic, to form another miscellany. The important unit in the collection is made up of forty-one letters by the humanist and reformer Sir John Cheke to his wife, his mother, his nephew Peter Osborne (Keeper of the Privy Seal to Edward VI), Protector Somerset, King Edward VI, at the end of which are the words, "finis Mr Cheekes letters." There is a somewhat similar epistle from the learned Dr. Walter Haddon to his fellow humanist and reformer Thomas Wilson, giving much wholesome spiritual advice; and, among others, a letter from William first Baron Paget of Beaudesert, and Sir Philip Hoby to Protector Somerset, about 1549. The first twenty-one of Cheke's letters and translations from several of Seneca's Epistles are written in Hand A. The remaining twenty of Cheke's letters and a number of others, including the Paget-Hoby letter, appear to be written in the hand of Nos. 180, 181, and 184 in the Arundel MS. The Haddon-Wilson letter and one from "M. Samson to M. ff. Walsingham" seem to be in the same handwriting as Nos. 323 and 324 in the Arundel MS. Fragments of the two letters by Queen Elizabeth which furnished the copy for the NA are in the writing of Nos. 237, 239-44 in the Arundel MS.

Cheke, as has been noted, is represented in the Arundel MS. by Nos. 282-85, and Haddon is indirectly represented in No. 21, since his Latin version of the poem was published in his "Poemata" in 1567.

From this comparison and brief analysis it becomes evident that the collecting and arrangement of the prose, as well as the actual writing, have such elements in common with the Arundel MS. that the three manuscripts clearly have the same origin and continuing background. Certainly they were set up under the same direction, and they may have been begun within a close period of time, with

35 MS. Prose II, fols. 4r-23v, with fol. 15 wanting. A few letters are dated 1549, 1550, or 1554. MS. Prose II was used for the NA (see p. 19 above), which, in addition to the two of Cheke's letters still common to the manuscript, has seven more of his letters, of which one is addressed to John Harington, dated April 4, 1554, from Calais (NA, 1769, pp. 171-72). MS. Prose II, like the Arundel MS., has a good many leaves missing.

36 MS. Prose II, fols. 121r-124v, 66r, respectively.

37 MS. Prose II, fols. 4r-13v, 99r-104v.

38 MS. Prose II, fols. 126v-128v. Evidently Thomas Sampson, 1517?-1589, to Sir Francis Walsingham, 1530?-1590, before the latter was knighted in 1577.

39 For these letters in the NA, see p. 19 above.

the MS. Prose I begun last, about 1560-65. From this circumstance it seems quite probable that the date 1564, referred to as the date of one of the manuscripts used in the *Nugae*, was written somewhere on a page of the Arundel MS., relating to a portion of the contents.

This concern for the orderly preservation of material predating in its composition the time of Sir John Harington is also revealed in the second Harington poetry miscellany, MS. Add. 36529, the *P* MS. It is a part of the accumulative evidence to note that this manuscript is made up almost completely of English poetry composed before 1565, although it contains also a Latin poem written by Edmund Campion before 1569. Other poets represented are: Thomas Chaloner, Thomas Phaer, Wyatt, Surrey, John Harington, and Sir John Cheke. There are also twenty poems of unknown authorship, and their style indicates that they belong approximately to the mid-sixteenth century. Twenty-two poems in the *AH* MS. are common to the *P* MS.: No. 104, Wyatt; Nos. 74, 77, 80-84, 86-90, Surrey; Nos. 3, 20, John Harington; Nos. 282-85, Cheke; Nos. 4, 286, anonymous. Hand A does not occur in the *P* MS. A hand which does appear on a good many pages of *P* is somewhat similar to Hand A, but the *P* hand uses frequent abbreviations and contractions, contrary to the practice of Hand A, has dif-

---

41 See above, p. 21.
42 See above, pp. 8, 18-19; also Chart, pp. 70-73.
43 Fols. 69r-79v, entitled, "Nascentis Ecclesiae generatio prima, etc." It is a history of the Church in Latin hexameters, written from Oxford, which Campion left in 1569, and addressed to Anthony Browne, Viscount Montague. This poem is of interest in connection with No. 66 in the Arundel MS.
44 Thomas Chaloner, died 1565, translation from Ovid, *Heriodes*, Epistle XVII, fols. 5r-9v, which was printed from this manuscript by Park, *NA*, ii, 372-89. Thomas Phaer, died 1560, translation of Bks. I-III of Virgil's *Aeneid*, fols. 10r-29v, 36r-43v. According to the *Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the Years MDCCCC-MDCCCV*, 1907, p. 128, this appears to be an earlier version than that in Phaer's published work of 1558, where he states that he had completed the first three books by October 10, 1555.
45 MS. Add. 36529, fols. 30r-31v. Six more poems by Wyatt follow, fol. 32r, of which versions are printed in the *NA*. See above, pp. 22-23.
46 MS. Add. 36529, the major manuscript source for Surrey's poems, contains in all twenty-eight by him, grouped between fols. 50r and 66v, and ascribed to him. The poems common to the *AH* MS. occur on fols. 50r-5v, 52r-53r, 58r-67r. Three Surrey poems are common to the *P* MS. and the *NA*. See above, p. 22, note 51.
47 MS. Add. 36529, fols. 44v, 68r. A third Harington poem in the *P* MS., fol. 69r, written apparently in the handwriting of Nos. 323 and 324 of the *AH* MS., is a companion to No. 21 in the *AH* MS. A version of the *P* MS. poem is in the *NA*. See above, p. 24.
48 MS. Add. 36529, fols. 80r-81v, grouped together as in *AH* MS., but unascribed in *P*.
49 The same, fols. 46r, 81v. No. 286 follows the Cheke poems in both the *P* and *AH* MSS. Four anonymous poems in *P* are in *NA*. See above, p. 23.
different tricks in spelling, and is more ornate, with more striking capitals. A number of poems are copied in the hand of "ffrancis Haryngton," probably that of Sir John's daughter Frances, and others in the hand of his daughter Ellina. Both used the italic style. I have pointed out that Ellina's hand occurs in the AH MS. in Nos. 7 and 8. Sir John's hand appears only twice in the P MS., in the versions of Nos. 4 and 286.

The texts of the twenty-two poems common to the AH and P MSS. are very close. Nos. 4, 282-86 have no variants in P; No. 20 only two. The variants of No. 3 represent a middle stage between the AH reading and the final form given the stanza by Sir John in his Orlando Furioso. Since Sir John tells us that this stanza was translated by his father many years before the time of his own work, about 1590, it is fairly certain that the AH version represents the first stage as made by the elder Harington. The thirteen Surrey texts, some of which are in the hands of Francis and Ellina in P, are again close, but there are two significant types of variants. Those in Ellina's hand, i.e., the Ecclesiastes paraphrases, show corrections made to conform to readings as in the AH MS. For example:

No. 88, line 10:

AH and every pleasaut shouw revyves/ our wofull hartes agayne
uiues

P and euerly plesant showe re(joyce) e† wofull herts againe

Percy left a note on fol. 4r of MS. Add. 36529 as follows, "It exhibits in many pages the same Hand-Writing as in Dr. Harrington's MS. No. 2." See Hughey, p. 413. In 1948 the English Department Library of the Ohio State University purchased from Dobell an Elizabethan quarto manuscript volume, 231 pages, bound in contemporary vellum, of metrical versions of "King Davids Psalms," which my assistant, Mr. Karl E. Schmutzler, has identified as Sir John Harington's paraphrases (see p. 28, note 3 above). The volume is of interest here because the Psalms versions are written in a secretary hand which very closely resembles that just referred to in the P MS. On the second fly-leaf is the name "James Harington," also written in secretary. This could refer to Sir John's son James, but the old-fashioned character of the handwriting suggests that it might refer rather to Sir John's relative Sir James Harington, Bart. (died, 1613), of Merton, Oxfordshire, younger brother of John, first Baron Harington of Exton. For the pedigree of the Haringtons of Exton, see Brit. Mus. MS. Harl. 1094, fols. 151v-155v; for records of Sir John's children, see the pedigree given by F. J. Poynton in Miscellanea Genealogica et Heraldica, New Series, iv (1884), 191-93.

On fol. 29v of MS. Add. 36529 are the names "ffrancis Haryngton" and "Ellina Harington," with the latter repeated on fol. 82r. Frances was Sir John's eldest daughter and Ellina his third (see the pedigree by Poynton, reference in the preceding note). The handwriting of "ffrancis Haryngton" as here given is not the same as that written in 1609 by Sir John's brother, Francis (see p. 38, note 33), and I am therefore of the opinion that this is the handwriting of the daughter.

Book XIX, stanza 1. See the Note on No. 3.

For references, see Chart, pp. 70-73. Collations are fully given in the Notes.
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No. 89, line 13:

\begin{verbatim}
AH through sloothe and Carelesse folke/ whom ease so fatt doth see\n
P Throughe slouthe of carles folke, whom (each) so fatt dothe feade
\end{verbatim}

No. 89, line 54:

\begin{verbatim}
AH And symple faith the golden ghoost/ his mercye doth requyre

P and simple fayth the yolden (h)oost, his marcy doth requyre
\end{verbatim}

On the other hand, in the Psalms paraphrases, written in the hand of Francis in P, the variants in several places agree with the first readings in the AH MS., still visible under the emendation. For example:

No. 81, line 4:

\begin{verbatim}
AH so pearce thyne eares as in thie sight/ some favour it may fynde

P so perce thyne eares that in thy sight som favour it may fynde
\end{verbatim}

(In A H the “as” is written over an erasure, which was clearly “that.”)

No. 81, line 24:

\begin{verbatim}
AH nor suche setforth thie praise as dwell/  in the land of dispaire

P nor suche sett forth thy faith as dwell in the land of dispaire
\end{verbatim}

(In A H “praise” is written over an erasure, which was “faith.”)

The same type of variant is in No. 77, line 48, which in P is written in the hand described above as being similar to Hand A:

\begin{verbatim}
AH thos hidden trays I know/ and secreat snares of love

P the hidden traynes I know, & secret snares of love
\end{verbatim}

(In A H “thos” is written over “the” erased.)

No. 77 has two lines not in P, 31-32, and other variants which show clearly that it could not have been taken from P. The fragment No. 74, which gives only the closing six lines of Surrey’s poem “The sonne hath twyse brought forthe the tender grene,” complete in P, has in its second line (49 of the poem) another example of an emendation not in P:

\begin{verbatim}
AH print in your harte, some percell of good will

P prynt in yo’ hert some pcell of my will
\end{verbatim}

(The “good” of A H is written over an erasure.)

The text of No. 75 differs only slightly in the two manuscripts. In line 66 A H, in accord with its usual practice, reads “rightuous,” whereas P has “right wise.”
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Variants of the Surrey texts in the two manuscripts tend to point to a common original, a conclusion supported also by the fact that in the P MS. the poems are ascribed “H S,” but in the AH MS. no ascription to him appears.

As has been pointed out by Surrey’s editors, the manuscript versions of his poetry, taken principally from these two Harington volumes, usually present far better texts than those printed by Tottel, with a rhythm less wooden, and with better readings in sense; furthermore, they give us poems not found in the Miscellany. There are now only six Surrey poems common to the AH MS. and TM: Nos. 74, 76-78, 85, 298, and the two last are ascribed to Preston and Vaux in the Manuscript. No one of the six agrees exactly with the Tottel version, although No. 76 is very close. The others show marked variants. It is important to recognize that these two Harington MSS. do not necessarily give us Surrey’s poems as he wrote them. The versions are probably revised, as are most of the Wyatt texts in the AH MS., with some regularization in meter, though not nearly so much as in Tottel, with some modernization in language, and with some changes in diction and sense.

A comparison of the texts of the one Wyatt poem now common to P and AH, No. 104, the satire addressed to John Poyntz, again shows the close relationship between the two manuscripts, as these two versions agree a number of times against others, including the omission of the same lines. Nevertheless, there are differences which indicate use of other sources. The following lines will illustrate:

No. 104, line 10:

AH but trew it is that I haue ever ment
P but trew it is that I haue allwaies ment
(AH has the independent reading.)

No. 104, line 31:

AH and do my self hurt wheare my self I offer
P and do most hurt where my self I ofFre

In other sources the line runs (quoted from MS. Add. 17492):

and do most hurt where most hellp I ofFre

Line 36 in P was apparently copied from the AH MS. and corrected by another hand to agree with other versions:

AH and will not lyve wheare lybertie was lost

Nott, of course, is the only editor to use the AH MS. itself. F. M. Padelford used the transcript, MS. Add. 18635, for his edition, The Poems of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, 1920, revised, 1928.
A corrector of P has crossed out “will” and written “would.” Line 50, however, shows a correction in another hand in the AH MS., making it agree with other versions, while P is left with the independent first reading:

AH on others lustes to hang both (day and) night and day

Neither the AH MS. nor the P MS. incorporates the striking emendations of the Tottel version, clearly made for political reasons in Mary’s reign. In AH, with which other texts than Tottel agree, lines 92 and 93 run:

nor I am not wheare Chryste is geven in pray
for monye, poysen, and treason at Rome.

In Tottel they are neutralized as follows:

Nor I am not, where truth is geuen in pray,
For money, poysen, and treason: of some.

The AH MS. then continues with an independent reading:

a common plague vsed night and day,

which becomes in P:

a common place vsed night and day.

But in other versions we have “a common practise.”

Of more importance than MS. Add. 36529 in shedding light upon the compilation and textual significance of the earlier poems in the Arundel MS. is the former Harington MS. No. I (the Wyatt autograph volume, Egerton MS. 2711), which has already been mentioned a number of times in relation to the Arundel MS. The Egerton MS., or E, is presumed to have come into the possession of John Harington sometime after Wyatt’s death in 1542, but the exact time is not known. It was in all probability the beginning of the Harington collection of literary manuscripts. Although it is now imperfect, it contains one hundred and twenty of Wyatt’s poems, including a few fragments. A good many of these, in particular all the Psalms paraphrases and some of the satires, are written throughout in Wyatt’s hand with his revisions; and other poems in the hand of an amanuensis contain his revisions. In addition, alterations in the hand of Nicholas Grimald occur in ten poems at the beginning of

55 For Rollins’ number references to the poem in TM, see Chart, p. 71.
56 I have mentioned in my article, p. 424, that A. K. Foxwell in A Study of Sir Thomas Wyatt’s Poems, p. 20, states, without naming an authority, that Wyatt left the present Egerton MS. 2711 to John Harington. I find no record of such a bequest. As will be evident, however, the Egerton MS. was at hand for the making of the AH MS.
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the manuscript, fols. 4-11, with one stanza of “O restfull place: renewer of my smart” written completely in his hand. Grimald’s corrections have to do mainly with matters of form, spelling, and punctuation, with marked use of the colon and the doubling of vowels. Four of the poems with his corrections are common to the AH MS.: Nos. 99-101, 144. There are also in some of the Wyatt poems of the E MS. revisions made in other sixteenth-century hands. It is therefore clear that a certain amount of co-operative editing was being done on Wyatt’s poetry. Sixty poems in the AH MS., all attributed elsewhere to Wyatt, are common to the E MS.: Nos. 99-142, 144, 154-68. In other words, of poems thus far attributed to Wyatt, all but eight, Nos. 6, 96-98, 169, 310-12, occur also in the E MS. This bulk alone, which forms the ordered body of the Wyatt poetry in the AH MS., might lead us to suspect a close relationship in texts, emphasized by the fact that we know we are concerned with volumes designated I and II in the past. Of the sixty poems common, thirty-three were printed in Tottel’s Miscellany, 1557: Nos. 99, 101-07, 109, 110, 112-29, 135, 139-42, 144. The Penitential Psalms paraphrases, Nos. 154-67, were printed in 1549, and brought out by Thomas Raynald and John Harrington, a London bookseller and printer who died in 1550, not to be confused with the poet and collector John Harington of Stepney. Five poems by Wyatt not in the E MS. are also in TM: Nos. 96-98, 310, 311. Obviously, the question arises as to the relation of the AH MS. versions to the E versions and to the printed texts.

57 For the evidence on Grimald’s alterations in the E MS., see Hughey, pp. 414-16, 427-35, 442-43. See also p. 28, note 2, above.
58 Certaine psalmes chosen out of the psalter of Dauid commonlye called thee. vii. penytentiall psalmes, drawn into englyshe meter by Sir Thomas Wyat knyght, wherunto is added a prologue of ye auctore before every psalme, very pleasaunt & profettable to the godly reader. Imprinted at london in Paules Churchyarde, at the sygne of thee Starre, By Thomas Raynald. and Iohn Harryngton. Colophon, sig. E4*: “Cum Preuilegio ad imprimendum Solum. M.D.XLJX. The last day of December.”
59 Foxwell, in her Study of Sir Thomas Wyatt’s Poems, pp. 1, 21, says that the 1549 edition of Wyatt’s Psalms was brought out by “John Harrington, the father of the translator of the Orlando Furioso,” and that the copy was set up from the E MS. Collation shows that the printed text differs markedly both from E and AH, as will be evident. Rollins, TM, ii, 90, calls attention to the fact that William Hunnis’s Certaine Psalmer were printed for the bookseller John Harrington in 1550. See also E. Gordon Duff, A Century of the English Book Trade, 1905, p. 66; S.T.C. 2727. William Herbert in an addition to Joseph Ames’s Typographical Antiquities, iii (1790), 1309, states that Psalms of David, as Theo. Sternhold grome of the Kings Majesties Robes didde in his lifetime draw into English metre was printed “at London, by the wydowe of Jhon Harrington, MD.&L,” and dedicated to the King. Herbert says he has seen no other book printed by Harrington’s widow, and he surmises this one was begun before the death of her husband.
The most cursory examination of the texts makes it evident that the E MS. was at hand for the preparation of the Wyatt section of the AH MS., which in the sonnets and miscellaneous poems follows the E MS. closely, sometimes exactly, including the incorporation of revisions. This is not to say that spelling and punctuation are necessarily followed, although some of Grimald’s peculiar corrections are included. Wyatt’s corrections are almost always adopted. The epigrams, satires, and Psalms also give evidence of the E MS. revised as the basis, but the AH versions have more extra-deliberate alteration.\textsuperscript{60} In the AH MS. text of Wyatt’s poetry there is a certain amount of modernization of forms over those of the E MS. The AH text rarely uses such a form as “theven,” as in E, but “the heaven.” “Thone,” or “ton,” and “thother” may appear, but rarely. “Withouten” may become “without,” and “rightwisely,” “rightuously.” The “mine” of E tends to be changed to “my,” and “ye” to “you,” although both forms do occur in E and AH. Endings in “th” are usually spelled “eth,” but “eth” itself may be changed to “s” or “es.” Obviously some of these changes would have an effect on the rhythm, sometimes resulting in further revision of that kind. I have mentioned earlier the predominance of \textit{ea} in spelling. A good many instances of double vowels to indicate the long sound appear, in addition to those marked by Grimald.

Inasmuch as Wyatt’s Penitential Psalms paraphrases were brought out eight years before the secular poems which appeared in the \textit{Miscellany} in 1557, we may examine first the relationship of the AH MS. versions of the Psalms to those of the E MS. and the printed copy, which I shall refer to as \textit{PC}. As I have said, these paraphrases are written throughout in the E MS. in Wyatt’s hand, with a good many alterations by him, as if we had before us the actual first drafts of the compositions. There are also occasional revisions in another hand. From the collation it is evident that both the AH MS. and \textit{PC} give somewhat edited versions of the E texts, but that AH and \textit{PC} tend to diverge rather than to agree in their departures from E, although there are a few variants common to AH and \textit{PC}. In some lines each version differs. \textit{PC} is rather carelessly printed, and some of its variants are without doubt to be attributed to the compositor; others are evidently the fault of the copyist; while still others indicate deliberate change by an editor, but without a particular

\textsuperscript{60} Foxwell, \textit{Study}, p. 11, has noted this general relationship from the transcript, MS. Add. 28635; and I have mentioned it, Hughey, p. 427, where, in note 1, I have also pointed out that I do not always agree in my readings with Miss Foxwell.
principle, sometimes showing lack of understanding of the original, sometimes changing the rhythm, but not in any one direction. The _AH_ versions also have instances of copyist's errors, or of occasional changes of diction or sense; but the greatest number of independent variants in _AH_ have to do with metrical revision for the purpose of smoothing the rhythm of Wyatt's line, in the direction of a more regular pentameter.

The examples following illustrate readings in the main peculiar to _PC_ (corrections are Wyatt's unless otherwise stated).\(^{61}\)

No. 154, line 22: I say

_E_ Vrye (to go) y* was his Idolles make

_PC_ Vrye I saye that was hys Iewles make

( _AH_ agrees with _E_ corrected.)

Line 47:

_pall_

_E_ his (palle his) purpull his sceptre he lettes fall.

_PC_ Hys purple pauler, hys scepter he letteth fall

( _AH_ agrees with _E_ corrected.)

Line 69:

_E_ off stormy sighes/ his chere colored lyk clay

_PC_ Of stormye syghes, depe draughtes of hys decaye

( _AH_ agrees with _E_.)

No. 156, line 21: him

_E_ for who had sene so^knele w*in th grave

_PC_ For who had sene, so kneeling with in the graue

( _AH_ ffor whoe hathe sene so knele within a grave)

No. 165, line 16:

_E_ At such acompt? dred/ and not reuence

_PC_ At soche accompte, dede, and no reuerence

( _AH_ agrees with _E_.)

No. 165, line 11:

_ere_

_E_ thin (sellff) thrto/ here then my wofull plaint.

_PC_ Thyne eare sette therto heare the my wofull playnte

( _AH_ agrees with _E_ corrected.)

_PC_ appears here to attempt use of both readings in _E_, having _sette_ for _sellff_. Another example is:

\(^{61}\) For folio references on readings quoted, see Chart, pp. 70-73. I have not included in these illustrations variants from MS. Royal 17 A.XXII, another, probably later, sixteenth-century manuscript of Wyatt's Penitential Psalms. The collation shows that it does not derive from _AH_, and that it is closer to _E_ than to _PC_. Complete collations are given in the Notes.
No. 163, line 71: aboue

E The lord (y^t is) so Iust and mercifull

PC The Lorde that is above so iust and mercifull

AH The Lorde above so iuste and mercifull

If in the two lines just given PC attempts, though unsuccessfully, to give both of Wyatt’s readings, in the following line the alteration is omitted, while the AH MS. includes it.

No. 167, line 43: lord

E Thow for thy name^shalt revive my spryte/

PC Thow for thy name, shal reviue my spiryte

(AH agrees with E corrected.)

Two other lines in No. 167 are indicative of poor metrical alteration in PC.

No. 167, line 3:

E not by desert/ but for thyn own byhest

PC Not for my desert, but for thyne owne behest

(AH agrees with E.)

No. 167, line 26:

E like bareyne soyle for moystre off thy grace

PC Lyke bare soyle, for moyster of thy grace

(AH agrees with E.)

The difference in metrical revision in AH and PC is well illustrated in the following line:

No. 154, line 60:

E w’drawyng hým in to a dark Cave

PC Wythe drawynge hym selfe, into a darke caue

AH withdrawing hym into a darke depe cave

AH is usually independent in this type of change. Thus:

No. 154, line 68:

AH Afore his brest yfraughted with disease

(E: frawty’d; PC: frawted)

No. 161, line 42:

AH Sence that my faithe doth not as yet decaye

(E and PC omit “as.”)

No. 161, line 68:

AH Thow must o Lorde my lyppes at furst vnloose

(E and PC omit “at.”)
No. 159, line 62:   provokars
   E    And my (evell willers) herby do augmēt
   AH   And my provokes hearbye do moche awgment
(PC agrees with E corrected.)

In the following line the AH editor has incorporated part of Wyatt's first reading, clearly for metrical purposes:

No. 161, line 54:

E   spryte voy'dy'd  fylthye
   w^t  vpryght (spryte/ purged) from (all Vile) lust
   AH  with spryght vpright voyde from all filthie luste
   (PC agrees with E corrected.)

It will be evident from these examples that alterations of this kind can have been made only by someone with a definite theory about rhythm. In the aggregate these modifications are not indicative of sporadic variation on the part of a copyist. Neither, indeed, are most of the changes in diction, although they may indicate a failure to understand the meaning of the original, or a deliberate attempt to "improve" or modernize to a certain extent. Thus in the two following lines the reading in AH misses the point:

No. 161, line 43:

AH   And as y^e Iuyce to heale the leaper sore

The word "Iuyce" is written over an erased word, probably the "Iuyz" of E, not understood by the copyist, or the editor. PC prints "Iewes." Another example is:

No. 165, line 27:

AH  By this his relief to quenche of sleepe the thurst

Misled by "quenche," the AH editor has changed the "thrust" of E (and PC) to "thurst." In No. 156, line 28, "caught" is substituted for the "rowght" of E and PC, possibly for lack of understanding. In No. 159, line 19, the editor has changed Wyatt's "stepp," interpreted "stoupe" in PC, to "shrinck," a substitution which must have been regarded as an improvement; and the same might be said of "glister" for "luyster" in No. 158, line 21.

In the discussion thus far we have been concerned with distinctive characteristics of AH and PC in relation to the author's manuscript, and it is clear that the divergence of the two is marked. Examination of the complete collation makes this even more certain. There are a few instances of agreement between AH and PC against E. For example, in No. 154, line 1, both AH and PC read "subiectes hartes";
whereas $E$ has "subiect." In No. 154, line 8, they have "sparkled," as opposed to the "sparplid" of $E$. In No. 164, line 28, they read "god" instead of "good." That variants such as these have special significance may be doubtful, but in No. 167 two occur which cannot be dismissed. In line 16 "fforreyne Realmes" is plainly written in Hand $A$ over "ffor that in heins," first copied from Wyatt's line as written in $E$, but Wyatt's language here is dialectical; hence the change. But which text is responsible for the revision, $AH$ or $PC$? $PC$ likewise has the second reading. It is quite possible that "ffor that in heins" was erased after the $AH$ editor saw a copy of $PC$. This conclusion is even more probable, I think, in the next example, No. 167, line 37. $AH$, following $E$, was first written,

Mye foes to me, for I have me assinde,

but in another ink and hand, the word "bee," according with $PC$, is written over "me," which has not been erased.

From this examination it is evident that the $AH$ MS. versions of Wyatt's Penitential Psalms are edited texts, based on the $E$ MS., but "improved" in rhythm and diction, and that the $AH$ MS. shows little similarity with the peculiarities of the 1549 edition of the Psalms, which is also an edited version of the $E$ MS., but usually diverging from rather than paralleling the revisions in $AH$.

Before returning to a consideration of the relation of the $AH$ versions of Wyatt's secular poetry to $E$ and $TM$, something should be said about the other major manuscript source for this poetry, the former Devonshire MS., now MS. Add. 17492 in the British Museum, to be referred to as $D$. Although the $D$ MS. dates from the reign of Henry VIII, it is not a Harington MS.; consequently, there is a marked difference between it and the $E$ MS. in relation to the $AH$ MS. $D$ contains twenty-two poems common to $AH$, and of these twenty have been attributed to Wyatt, though not always in the original sources. Of the two non-Wyatt poems, Nos. 10 and 151, the latter in the $AH$ MS. is one of the selections from "Charleton his booke," consisting of one stanza only of a longer poem ascribed to Hatfield in $D$; whereas No. 10, ascribed to Knevet in $AH$, is unascribed in $D$, where it is carelessly written. Nos. 6 and 312, peculiar to $AH$ and $D$, have been attributed to Wyatt by modern editors. Although $AH$ and $D$ versions of No. 312 are

62 See p. 17 above.  
63 For folio references, see Chart, pp. 70-73.  
64 See pp. 31-32 above.  
65 Both, taken from $D$, are included by Nott, Surrey and Wyatt, ii, 227, 256, 583, 585. Foxwell, Wiat, i, 337-39, prints No. 6 from $D$, where, she says, it is ascribed to
similar, they are not identical, and No. 6 is three stanzas shorter in \textit{AH}, with the provocative notation, "To Smithe of Camden."\textsuperscript{66} There is little indication in the four poems just mentioned, which are not found elsewhere, of an immediate relation between \textit{D} and \textit{AH}, granted that there is probably an indirect one. This conclusion tends to be borne out by a study of the other poems common to the two manuscripts.


\begin{verbatim}
\textit{D} Was neuer yet fyle half so well fylyd  
\textit{E} Ther Was never ffyle half so well filed  
\textit{AH} Was never ffyle yet half so well yfyled
\end{verbatim}

Nevertheless, as the collation shows, No. 98, which agrees exactly with the version in the second edition of \textit{TM}, does not follow distinctive readings peculiar to \textit{D}, and it is in reality closer to the \textit{E} version, from which No. 108 is derived.

Both the \textit{D} and the \textit{AH} MSS. show in all Wyatt’s poems a definite and direct relation to the \textit{E MS.}, but it is not the same. The \textit{D} versions frequently give readings which coincide with lines in \textit{E} before they were revised by Wyatt. As for example,

No. 121, line 9:

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{AH} Yet as I gesse vnder disdaynfull brow
\end{verbatim}

"Disdaynfull" is Wyatt’s correction in the \textit{E MS.} from "that scornfull." In the \textit{D MS.}, it is "the scornfull."\textsuperscript{67} \textit{TM} accepts the

\textsuperscript{66} See p. 29 above.

\textsuperscript{67} Foxwell, \textit{Study}, pp. 12-13, calls attention to this relationship between \textit{E} and \textit{D}. 
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corrected reading. Again in No. 125, line 1, AH reads, according to Wyatt’s revision in E:

Whoe hath heard of suche crueltie before
But D has corrected “crultye” to “tyranny,” which is the first reading in E. The line in TM is a good example of typical adoption and change for metrical purposes:

What man hath hard such cruelty before.

In No. 127, line 7, AH and TM give Wyatt’s revised line:

AH Made her owne weapon doe her fynger bleede
But D has the first writing:

w^t hir owne wepon ded make her fing blede

In line 3, however, D accepts Wyatt’s revised “in” for “and.”

Although in some instances, as in the line just cited, and in most of No. 139, Wyatt’s changes are incorporated into the D text, we do not find in D evidence of the work of the other revisers. Consequently, we can with fair certainty assign the D versions to a date preceding the time of the co-operative editing of Wyatt’s manuscript. The AH MS., as I have said, does make use of many of these editorial revisions in E, as well as Wyatt’s own, as for example,

No. 100, line 4:

AH I am of them that furdest come behynde

The “furdest come” is an alteration by Grimald in E, from “farthest cometh.” In line 8 in E another hand has written “sins” over “sithens,” but the AH compiler has not taken that correction. Again, in No. 99 several of Grimald’s corrections are included both in the AH MS. and in TM. Thus,

No. 99, lines 5, 6: lernz

E She that mee lerneth too love, & suffer:
wylz

and will: that my trust, & lustes negligence

(Grimald’s corrections in italics.)

AH she that me learns to love and suffer

and wills that my trust, and lustes negligence

TM She that me learns to loue and to suffer

And willles that my trust and lustes negligence

(TM alters further.)

The epigram No. 103 in the E MS. is considerably revised both by Wyatt and by someone else, though not by Grimald. The AH compiler has carefully incorporated all these revisions, the non-
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Wyatt ones clearly pointing to concern with meter. It is interesting to find that these extra changes are not in the $TM$ text, although, as usual, $TM$ has some independent readings.

No. 103, lines 4, 5, 6:

$E$ that by no meanes (it may) be (a)mended?

the next way is this
then (to) revenge you/ (then) and (sure ye shall not myssse)
throughe
an other kyssse shall have my lyf(f)e endid

$AH$ that by no meanes the matter may be mendid
then revendge you and the next way is this
an other kisse shall haue my lif through endid

$TM$ That by no meanes, it may not be amended
Revenge you then, the rediest way is this
Another kisse my life it shall haue ended.

These readings not only serve to illustrate the close relationship that does exist between the $E$ and $AH$ MSS., though by no means always so exactly as this, but they also call attention to a divergence in the development of the $AH$ and $TM$ texts. Here it is clear that the $TM$ text derives not from $AH$ but from $E$ before it received extra revision. A study of the collations will show that there are other instances of $TM$'s reversion to the uncorrected $E$, of agreement with $E$ against independent readings in $AH$. There are also, of course, readings where $AH$ and $TM$ coincide against $E$, particularly in the satires, and many where $E$ and $AH$ agree against $TM$; or, obviously, where all three agree; or where they disagree.

By far the greatest number of variants from the $E$ MS. revised in the Wyatt sonnets and miscellaneous poems of the $AH$ MS. can be attributed to mistakes by the copyist or to slight changes in forms. Although some deliberate alteration in metrics occurs in these types, it is somewhat more pronounced in the epigrams, and still more so in the satires, where also appear the greatest number of sense changes.

I have already pointed out the way in which the $E$ text is followed in sonnets 99 and 100 and in epigram 103. The $E$ text is taken over exactly, except for spelling, in sonnets 106, 109, 111, 112, $^{69}$ 116, 117, 122, 124; in epigram 128; in miscellaneous poems 132 and 136.

$^{68}$ Foxwell, Study, p. 11, has noted from MS. Add. 28635, the transcript, this general relationship.

$^{69}$ No. 112 was first copied from $E$, and then, in a different ink, "life," line 6, was written over "light," and "sighes," line 8, over "sighes."
Such of these versions as are in TM differ, although sometimes slightly. A number of other Wyatt poems in AH vary from E only by an obvious copyist’s error or a modernization. Thus No. 105, line 10, “Sighing” for “sighting”; line 12, “a fall of” for “a farr of”; No. 118, line 12, “fall” for “fals”; No. 108, line 6, “pardons” for “pardond,” the d of E resembling a round s. No. 123 omits line 6. The copyist has left a blank in No. 135, line 29:

\[ \text{AH And you withe of crewelnes } \]
\[ \text{hir of } \]
\[ \text{E And you with } (\text{yo' owne}) \text{ cruelnes } \]

The difference between AH and E may rest upon slight changes in form: as “my” for “myn” in No. 114, lines 13 and 14, and in No. 121, line 6; “rightuouslye” for “rightwisely,” No. 114, line 10, where TM, with many other variants, keeps the E form; “without” for “withouten” in No. 131, line 13, which affects the meter; similarly, “heares” for “hereth” in No. 133, line 7, changes the meter. In several lines a word or syllable is omitted which destroys the iambic pattern, and inasmuch as such alteration is in general contrary to the practice of the AH editor, these omissions may be attributable to the copyist. Thus No. 115, line 10, “but daylye yet the yll dothe chaunge into worsse”; but E and TM have “the wors” (spelling, E). No. 129, line 2 reads, “when the bowle,” etc., but E and TM, “When that the bowle.” In the fragment No. 130, line 13 (line 21 of E), AH runs, “Yet wolde I please,” destroying the pattern of the poem, instead of “gladdely plese,” as in E and D; but in every other word AH agrees with E. Smacking somewhat more of the editorial flavor because of its parallelism is No. 107, line 14, “Plowithe in water and sowith in sand,” where E and TM have “in the sand.” No. 113, line 3, is even more indicative of editorial change: “the wearied mynd streight from the hart parteth,” instead of “departeth,” as in E and TM. Examination of the sonnet shows that the rhyme words are: “wasshith,” perceyuith,” and “playneth.” The AH editor may have dropped the “de” to obtain a more regular line leading to accent on the rhyme syllable “eth.” In the next example emendation rests upon pronunciation of “id.”

No. 127, line 5:

\[ \text{AH the blynde master whom I have servid (so) long } \]

The word “so” is crossed out in AH, although it is in both E and TM. Evidently, however, the “id” might or might not be pro-
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nounced. In No. 125, line 5, AH reads, “Had pricked my hart for
to encrease my sore,” but in E Wyatt has emended to “prykt,” which
is adopted by TM. The retention of “pricked” by AH is particularly
noticeable when other emendations in the E version are not accepted;
and, moreover, in line 8 “prycked” is clearly dissyllabic.

Although metrical revisions in AH are in general indicative of
cconcern in bringing Wyatt’s line more into accord with the iambic
pattern, and in some instances they agree with TM, there is, never­
theless, in AH evidence of greater awareness of the natural emphasis
of words, with more admission of substitutions, especially of two
short syllables. Differences in the rhythmic emendations of AH and
TM may be illustrated by the following:

No. 101, line 1:

AH Was I never of your love yet greevid
TM Yet was I neuer of your loue agreued
E Was I never, yet, of yo' love graved  [Grimald’s e]

No. 139, line 17:

AH Westwarde the Sonne from out the easte/ dothe scantlye
     shew his Light
E and D read “skant doth shew” and TM “scant shewes,” thus
producing a more regular iambic beat, but with less emphasis on
“scant.”

No. 139, line 39:

AH Tweene me and those shyning lightes/ that wonted for to cleare
E and D omit “for”; TM has “shene” for “shyning,” a change
which makes a regular iambic line by subordinating “shene.” In
No. 141, line 72, AH breaks the two strong syllables at the caesura,
but TM retains them:

AH It is but love, turne thow it to a laughter
E and TM omit “thow.” On the other hand, in No. 139, line 13,
both AH and TM emend at the caesura, though not identically:

AH This is the trust as yet/ that hath my life sustayned
E and D omit “that”; TM has “it.”

AH and TM sometimes agree in metrical alterations. In No. 126,
line 1, AH reads, “What needes theise threatening wordes and wasted
wynde,” which accords with TM against E, where it runs, “What
nedeth these threning wordes,” etc. AH and TM, of course, modern­
ize. The rest of the poem in AH follows E, but TM has some
independent readings. No. 142 has a number of lines showing exceptional agreement between \(AH\) and \(TM\), as in line 5, where \(AH\) runs, “she thought her self endured to greevous payne.” \(TM\) also has “greevous,” but \(E\) and \(D\) have “much.” Line 27 in \(AH\) reads, “she feedes on boylde meat, bake meat, and on roste,” agreeing with \(TM\) except in “boyle”; but \(E\) has, “she fedeth on boyled bacon meet and roost.”

One of the most noticeable alterations in \(AH\), affecting both form and sense, occurs in Nos. 119 and 120, which in \(E\) and \(TM\) are given as two epigrams, but in \(AH\) are mistakenly combined into a sonnet, with a change of sense in No. 120.

No. 120, lines 3-6:

\[
E \\
\text{it is myn aunswer god it wot} \\
\text{and eke the causer of my payn} \\
\text{a love rewardeth with disdain} \\
\text{yet is it loved what would ye more}
\]

\[
AH \\
yf is myne answere god it wott \\
and the cause of my Payne \\
A Love withe disdayne \\
yet is it Loved what wold ye more
\]

Thus \(AH\) puts “love” in apposition with “answere” and “cause,” depending on “yf.” This may be mistaken emendation, but it is not a mere copyist’s error. \(TM\) connects No. 120 with Anne Boleyn, so that we have change of another kind:

\[
TM \\
\text{It is mine Anna god it wot} \\
\text{The only causer of my pain:} \\
\text{My love that medeth with disdaine} \\
\text{Yet is it loued what will you more.}
\]

The \(AH\) editor’s compounding of the two epigrams into a sonnet appears to have something in common with the composite version of No. 98, discussed earlier.\(^7^0\)

The satire No. 141 gives examples of striking sense alterations according with \(TM\). Here are the lines clearly emended during Mary’s reign for political reasons.

No. 141, line 22:

\[
E \\
\text{So sackes of durt be fild vp in the cloyster}
\]

\[
AH \\
\text{So Sackes of durt be fild. The neat Courtyer}
\]

\[(TM \text{ agrees with } AH.)\]

\(^7^0\) See p. 51.
INTRODUCTION

No. 141, line 47:

E lerne at Kittson that in a long white cote
AH Learne at the Ladde, that in a long whyte cote
(TM agrees with AH.)

I have pointed out, however, that satire No. 104, which is placed oddly with the sonnets in AH, does not incorporate alterations made for political reasons as given in TM.\(^{71}\)

No. 139, line 49, offers an example of agreement with TM which can hardly be accidental: “Alas the cleare Cristall/ that bright transplendant glasse”; but E and D have “transparāt.” No. 140, line 20, has an example of misunderstanding common to AH and TM: “Against the same, devyding iust the grownd by lyne direct.” E has “round,” not “ground.”

The five Wyatt poems common to AH and TM but not in E again afford evidence of agreement and diversity. In No. 311 the variants are too marked to admit the supposition that either copy depended upon the other. No. 310 is much closer. No. 96 has only one variant; No. 97 agrees exactly except that the AH editor has crossed out “which” in line 2; and, as previously stated, No. 98 follows the version printed in the second edition of TM.\(^{72}\) Noting this agreement, G. F. Nott says: “This coincidence strengthens the conjecture advanced in the preface to the late edition of Tottel’s Songs and Sonnets; that the Harington MS. altered by the editor to reduce as much as possible the lines to the Iambic measurement of five equal feet, supplied the text for Tottel’s publication.”\(^{73}\)

Since Nott’s preface to his unpublished Songs and Sonnets is not now known to exist,\(^{74}\) we do not know how he developed this thesis. It is evident from the examples given, and even more from the complete collation, that the Wyatt texts in the AH MS. do in general show a position somewhat median between E and TM. The versions in TM, like those of AH, incorporate some of the added revisions of E, but others included by AH, e.g., in No. 103, TM omits. Furthermore, while TM also makes many additional changes for purposes of meter and neutralization of the sense, far more so than in the AH text, these additional revisions in AH and TM by no

\(^{71}\) See above, p. 44.
\(^{72}\) See above, p. 51. The only variant between the first and second editions is in line 7, where “lost” of the first, as in E, is changed to “last” in the second, agreeing with AH.
\(^{73}\) Surrey and Wyatt, ii, 537.
\(^{74}\) This preface is not contained in any of the British Museum partial copies of this work, nor in the Arundel Castle copy.
means necessarily agree, although they may do so, as in No. 98, and
the rhythmic revisions of Wyatt's poetry in AH point in a Tottel-
ward direction. This last characteristic is true also of the secular poems
and the Psalms paraphrases not in TM. I have called attention to the
fact that Tottel sometimes shows definite dependence upon E against
AH, and some readings in TM appear to have connection with D.
There are, however, too many peculiarly significant passages com-
mon to AH and TM for them to be regarded as accidental. In view
of the evidences of co-operative editing revealed by the pages of
the E MS., I think it reasonable to suppose that such common revis-
ing was continued. A certain amount of progressive continuity in
editorial principle is evident in E itself, in AH, and in TM. Further-
more, it seems worthy of note that the AH texts of Wyatt in them-
selves present a somewhat progressive development in revision, from
the sonnets common to E to the satires and Psalms. In other words,
the Tottel text may have emerged by a kind of evolutionary process,
representing the work of a school, or group, with the revisions of
the AH text contributing. I do not maintain that the versions of
Wyatt's poems in AH were necessarily copied into the Manuscript
before Tottel's publication, although they may have been; but it
seems evident that the AH versions do represent a median stage
between E and TM. If the AH MS. itself, altered further, served
as the basis for TM, there is no doubt that for Wyatt's poems some
readings were re-altered to conform with the E text. Unfortunately,
the author's manuscript is lacking for a check of the Surrey poems,\(^75\)
and the AH MS. has nothing of Grimald's, another point for con-
sideration.\(^76\) Unless we are to suppose that Grimald's poems did at
one time fill some of the missing leaves of the AH MS., it is certain
that another source must have supplied them for TM. It is a curious
fact that so large a poetry collection as the AH MS., especially
representative of mid-sixteenth-century verse, has nothing in it by
Nicholas Grimald. One is tempted to speculate that there may be
some connection in this omission and the dropping of so many of
Grimald's poems from the second edition of TM.

\(^75\) See above, p. 43.
\(^76\) As I have pointed out in my article, pp. 428-29, Nott seems to have had access
to manuscripts of Grimald's poems. In one of the British Museum partial copies of his
*Songs and Sonnets*, C.60.c.13, vol. ii, on fol. 114, 115, for numbers in the first quarto
of TM, corresponding to thirty of Grimald's poems, Nott gives the direction to see
manuscripts. He specifies that these poems were printed in the first quarto only. These
manuscripts are not now known. It may be that some of Grimald's poems were at one
time on some of the missing folios of the AH MS.
I have mentioned earlier that twenty poems of Tottel’s Uncertain Authors appear in the AH MS.: Nos. 15, 17, 18, 19, 72, 73, 93-95, 143, 245, 263, 265, 267, 292, 293, 297, 299, 300, 313.\textsuperscript{77} A comparison of the versions shows that only one in AH, No. 93, is identical with the copy in TM, although it is placed with the Wyatt group in AH, as are Nos. 94, 95, and 143, which are also very close to the TM text. Nos. 263, 293, and 300 likewise have few variants from TM, but the others differ quite considerably. Nos. 72, 265, and 267 have much longer versions in AH, the last having seventy-eight lines to the eight of TM, and No. 313 is one line longer in AH. No. 299, in AH ascribed “L vawse,” omits two lines given in TM.

I have referred to the same ascription for No. 298, also two lines short, printed as Surrey’s in TM.\textsuperscript{78} In addition to differences in length, these poems vary in a number of passages in AH and TM. No. 18, with a good many variants from TM, has a revision in line 21 which is evidently related to the printed copy:

No. 18, line 21:

\begin{verbatim}
AH one rychesse could not (please) at all
TM Whom riches could not raise at all
\end{verbatim}

The correction is in the hand of the poem. I do not know that it can be determined whether it was made to accord with the printed copy, or whether the revised reading in AH had an effect on TM, but one might suppose that in the former case, the AH editor would have changed “one” to “Whom.”

No. 245 in TM is addressed to “R,” contrary to AH.

No. 245, line 4:

\begin{verbatim}
AH of her for whome thow lyer art to blame
TM Of her for whom thou .R. art to blame.
\end{verbatim}

Line 23:

\begin{verbatim}
AH So strangled was the Rodapeiane mayde
TM So strangled was the R. so depe can auoyde,
\end{verbatim}

But, of course, the line in TM makes no sense, and was undoubtedly the fault of the printer. TM neutralizes the sense in

No. 265, line 25:

\begin{verbatim}
AH I saw wheare Atrapose did sytt/ the threede of lyfe to spynne
TM I saw eke vertue, how she sat the threde of life to spinne.
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{77} See above, p. 14.

\textsuperscript{78} No. 73 is a fragment in AH, caused by a missing folio. It is thirty-eight lines to the forty-two of TM.
This entire poem is markedly different in AH, as might be said of No. 15, where the first stanza has little in common with the first stanza in TM.

No. 15, lines 1-6:

AH Vnto my songe geue eare that wyll
and deeme my doinges as you please
for I shall tell yf you be still
what trade I toke to lyve in ease
and how those wayes that I wayd best
in fyne did fayle to myne vnrest

TM To this my songe geue eare, who list:
And mine intent iudge, as you wyll:
The tyme is cume, that I haue mist,
The thyng, wheron I hoped styl:
And from the top of all my trust,
Myshap hath throwen me in the dust.\(^79\)

Study of the texts of the twenty poems of the Uncertain Authors common to AH and TM leads to the same general conclusion that was reached regarding the poems of Wyatt and Surrey: that the AH MS. itself could not have furnished the copy for the printed Miscellany, but that both collections are a part of the same editorial movement. As with the poetry of Wyatt and Surrey, the AH MS. usually offers better texts for the poems of the Uncertain Authors than Tottel offers, and I think we can say that they give evidence, as, again, in the work of the two major poets, of being textually prior to Tottel. But with these contributions, as with those of Surrey, there is no means of checking authors’ manuscripts. This is true even of poems attributed to John Harington, since none is written in his hand in the AH MS. Fortunately, however, we do have Wyatt’s manuscript in E, and also the early D MS., containing so many of his poems; and, as we have seen, comparison of the Wyatt texts in AH with those in E, D, and TM leads to the conclusion that AH is later than E and D, though deriving directly from E, but that it seems to be textually earlier than TM.

The close relationship that does exist between the earlier poems in AH and TM is even more evident upon comparison with other miscellanies of the period. We might expect that Richard Edwards’ collection, The Paradise of Dainty Devices, formed before his death in 1566, and first published in 1576, would have many of the same poems as are in AH, but there are only five: No. 19, also in TM,

\(^79\) No. 15 is one of the poems printed in the NA in shortened form, ascribed to John Harington (see above, pp. 20-21). This first stanza is lacking in the NA.
attributed to D. Sand in *The Paradise*, unascribed in *AH*, but assigned to Harington in *NA*; No. 22, attributed to Vaux in *The Paradise*, unascribed in *AH*, but again assigned to Harington in *NA*; No. 68, attributed to Francis Kinwelmarsh in *The Paradise*, but to Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex, in *AH*; Nos. 239 and 240, both given to Edwards in *The Paradise*, unascribed in *AH*. The versions of these poems do not indicate direct connection between the collections, nor do the small number of poems common to the two. Thomas Proctor’s miscellany, *A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions*, 1578, has even less basis for comparison with *AH*. Only two *AH* poems, Nos. 251 and 292, the latter also in *TM*, were printed in *A Gallery*, and the copies of the poems are clearly independent. Clement Robinson’s collection, *A Handful of Pleasant Delights*, 1584, contains a version of No. 243 only, with the less polished copy in *AH* giving evidence of priority. Two *TM-AH* poems, Nos. 17 and 265, and No. 67 by Sidney were reprinted in Nicholas Breton’s collection *The Arbor of Amorous Devices*, 1597, and another, No. 76 by Surrey, in a very different version appeared in Breton’s earlier *Britton’s Bowre of Delights*, 1591. Several poems belonging to the period of Sir John Harington were published in the late sixteenth-century miscellanies. *Britton’s Bowre* includes also versions of No. 194, perhaps by Raleigh, and of No. 189, by De Vere. *The Phoenix Nest*, 1593, has versions of Nos. 194 and 225 by Raleigh, and of No. 193; *England’s Helicon*, 1600, of No. 196 by Sidney, and of No. 198 by Greville; *A Poetical Rhapsody*, 1602, of No. 185 by Spenser, of No. 190 by “incerto,” and of No. 205 by Constable. Several poems also appeared, sometimes in very different versions from those of *AH*, in the song books of the period.

The relationship of *AH* to the miscellanies after *TM*, though of some interest in regard to particular poems, throws no real light on

---

80 Ed. Rollins, Nos. 47, 17, 98, 7, 66, respectively.  
81 Compiled by Thomas Proctor; ed. Rollins, 1926, pp. 56, 47-48, respectively.  
82 Ed. Rollins, 1924, pp. 12-14. *A Handful* is now represented by the edition of 1584, but there was evidently an earlier edition, about 1566. See Rollins’ Introduction, p. xii.  
84 Facsimile edition, with Introduction by Rollins, of the copy in the Huntington Library, 1933, sigs. G2r-G4r, F2r, B4r-C1r, respectively.  
85 Compiled by R. S. (?) ; ed. Rollins, 1931, pp. 69-70, 8-10, 92-93, respectively.  
87 Compiled by Francis Davison; ed. Rollins, 2 vols., 1931-32, Nos. 173, 128, 174, respectively.  
88 See the Notes on Nos. 66, 67, 71, 187, 190-94, 198, 199, 201, 235, and 305.
the compilation of the Manuscript. The lack of parallelism with the other miscellanies only serves to emphasize the connection with TM, strengthening the opinion already considered that the AH collection was begun approximately near the date of TM, 1550-60. This opinion is supported also by the relation of AH to the two Harington Prose MSS., I and II, which by their contents seem to have been started during that period. As we have seen, the similarity in make-up between these two Harington MSS. and AH, the inter-relation of handwriting, the earlier contents of approximately the same period—this last illustrated also in the P MS.—these features lead to the conclusion that the manuscripts were begun as a planned collection by someone who had access to original material before the time of Sir John Harington. That this collector and compiler was the father, John of Stepney, is, I think, a reasonable supposition.