

EARLY MODERN LITERARY STUDIES



Collaborative Writing and Lyric Interchange in Philip Sidney's *Old Arcadia*

Margaret Simon

North Carolina State University

margaret_simon@ncsu.edu

By now the collaborative nature of much literary writing in the English Renaissance is well known. From texts with multiple compositional agents, to the often murkier relationship between writers and printers, to the practice of transcribing from print and manuscript texts and the variations this engenders, most Renaissance texts are the product of multiple material and metaphorical hands.¹ The Renaissance lyric particularly stands out in this context. The lyric is often defined for modern students as ‘the personal thoughts and emotions of a single, first-person speaker.’² In early modern lyric, the first-person pronoun can belie the many voices that contribute to the poem’s composition and the many hands which enable its manuscript transcription and circulation or print dissemination.³ Scholars have lately been training more attention on how authors represent lyric composition, how the collaborative nature of early modern

¹ Gary Taylor, ‘Macbeth and Middleton’, in *Macbeth: The Norton Critical Edition*, ed. by Robert Miola (New York: Norton, 2014), pp. 296–305 (p. 296). William Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), p. xii. ‘Corrupting Donne’ in Arthur Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press 1995). G.W. Pigman, ‘Textual Introduction’, in *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. xlv–lxv (pp. liv–lix).

² Ross Murfin and Surprya M. Ray, ‘Lyric’, in *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms*, 3rd edn (Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2009), pp. 276–77 (p. 276).

³ Arthur Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the Renaissance Lyric* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995), p. 10; Gillian Austen, *George Gascoigne*, *Studies in Renaissance Literature England*, v. 24 (Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 2008), p. 69; Ilona Bell, *Elizabethan Women and the Poetry of Courtship* (Cambridge [Eng.]: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 53–74; Arthur F. Marotti, ‘“Love Is Not Love”: Elizabethan Sonnet Sequences and the Social Order’, *ELH* 49.2 (1982), 396–428 (p. 398); Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass, ‘The Politics of *Astrophil and Stella*’, *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 24.1 (1984), 53–68 (p. 54).

textual production features within the period's fictional worlds. If early modern 'intellectual products were accordingly marked by contingency and the potential for change, visible at the level of presentation,'⁴ they are also visible at the level of representation. Recent work has offered insight into how authors understood the affordances and constraints of their literary exchanges and the material forms which result. Megan Heffernan, for example, argues that authors were able to use 'the poetics of organizing books,' the often horticultural metaphors that represent the poems' collected nature, to encourage readers to 'articulate a discursive form for the volume'.⁵ Heffernan traces a shift from Gascoigne's first volume, *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (1573), which plays with 'a larger idea of the book' to the more narrowly authorial revised text, *The Posies of George Gascoigne Esquire* (1575).⁶ By foregrounding the compositional warrants that underlie each volume and the conceptual shifts introduced by revision, such scholarship explores how the terms of lyric compilation offer imaginative possibilities for authorial self-representation. Within this field of practice, even single-author publications are rendered 'open, multiple, and heuristically volatile.'⁷

This methodology likewise speaks to how authors use fictional accounts to reflect on the collaborative nature of the period's literary production. Philip Sidney's revised *Arcadia* is well known as a collaborative text. Joel Davis notes that no fewer than eight people were involved in publishing the first editions.⁸ The terms of their revision offers different perspectives on editorial and authorial agency. Fulke Greville, who produced the 1590 edition in collaboration with Matthew Gwinne and perhaps John Florio, claims credit for positioning the eclogues in the revised first three books that constitute his volume, though Sukanta Chaudhuri has persuasively argued that these changes are authorial.⁹ For the 1593 edition, compiled by Mary Sidney Herbert and Hugh Sanford, the volume's paratexts downplay the collaborative nature of its production in order to

⁴ Jeffrey Todd Knight, *Bound to Read* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), p. 6.

⁵ Megan Heffernan, 'Gathered by Invention: Additive Forms and Inference in Gascoigne's Poesy', *Modern Language Quarterly: A Journal of Literary History* 76.4 (2015), 413–45 (p. 415).

⁶ *Ibid.*, 417.

⁷ Patricia Pender and Rosalind Smith, 'Early Modern Women's Material Texts: Production, Transmission, Reception', in *Material Cultures of Early Modern Women's Writing*, *Early Modern Literature in History* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), p. 2.

⁸ Joel Davis, 'Multiple Arcadias and the Literary Quarrel between Fulke Greville and the Countess of Pembroke', *Studies in Philology*, 101.4 (2004), 401–30 (p. 402).

⁹ The prefatory material to 1590 contends that the eclogues "have bene chosen and disposed as the overseer thought best." Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia*. London, 1590. Early English Books Online. Web. 2 October 2017. http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99846372. Doc. Image 5. Sukanta Chaudhuri, 'The Eclogues in Sidney's *New Arcadia*', *Review of English Studies*, new ser., 35 (1983), 185–202 (p. 192).

highlight it as Sidney's text.¹⁰ Though less pronounced, the unrevised *Arcadia* likewise emerged if not from direct collaboration, then from a collaborative environment of manuscript circulation. According to Sidney's own prefatory letter, it was written for and in the presence of his sister, Mary Sidney Herbert. Sidney Herbert was involved in its development (if not its writing) and at least nine authorial transcripts of the text circulated among friends.¹¹ The text itself is likewise interested in representing the social dynamics of literary transmission and considering the particular consequences of sequestering lyric poetry from its social world.

This essay offers a reappraisal of a prosimetric scene from the unrevised *Arcadia* which is substantially altered in the revised text, and whose depiction of collaborative lyric composition has been undervalued. Musidorus and Pamela, half of the heroic pairs that dominate the plot, escape into the woods together and express their love through inscribed and voiced collaborative poetic productions. The scene ends with a different capacity for lyric, as Pamela falls asleep and Musidorus, now the sole compositional agent, recites a poem and composes a prose blazon which almost inflames him to the point of raping Pamela. Contemporary scholars, though justly fascinated with the ethical, philosophical, and gendered implications of Musidorus's almost-rape, tend to downplay the larger scene's representation of collaborative compositional practices, subjectivities, and generic emphases that accompany Musidorus's move from co-creator to sexual aggressor.¹² The scene between Pamela and Musidorus emphasizes a shift in

¹⁰ Fulke Greville's title page to the three-book 1590 printing foregrounds that it is 'Written by Sir Philippe Sidnei.' The 1593 and 1598 full-length versions do likewise but note that the text has been 'augmented and ended'. Sanford and Sidney Herbert specify that their editing goes 'no further then the Authors own writings, or knowen determinations could direct', *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia. Written by Sir Philip Sidney Knight*, Early English Books Online, 1475-1640 / 471:01 (London: Imprinted [by R. Field] for William Ponsonbie, Anno Domini. 1598), p. 4. For insight into book format in the editions see Francis X. Connor, *Literary Folios and Ideas of the Book in Early Modern England* (Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014), pp. 43–7. For its editing as a means of promoting Sidney's exemplarity, see Hannay's chapter 'Sister vnto Astrofell' in *Philip's Phoenix* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990). For a useful overview of the many continuations the revised text inspired, see Natasha Simonova, 'Fan Fiction and the Author in the Early 17th Century: The Case of Sidney's *Arcadia*', *Transformative Works and Cultures*, 11 (2012), n.p.

¹¹ Hannay, p. 70.

¹² See Barbara Baines, *Representing Rape in the English Early Modern Period* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, c. 2003), p. 78. Anne Sussman, 'The Poetics of Sexual Violence' in *Renaissance Papers 1994* (The Southeastern Renaissance Conference, 1994), pp. 55–66 (pp. 64–5); Julianne Werlin, 'Providence and Perspective in Philip Sidney's *Old Arcadia*', *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 54.1 (2014), 25–40 (p. 30); Nancy Simpson-Younger, "'I Become a Vision": Seeing and the Reader in Sidney's *Old Arcadia*', *Sidney Journal* 30.2 (2012), 57–85. p. 71; Amy Greenstadt, *Rape and the Rise*

the social terms of lyric composition with implications for subject construction in Sidney's unrevised romance. Mary Ellen Lamb has summarized the link between subjectivities and their generic phenomenologies, claiming that 'Within any culture, the availability of specific discourses and the unavailability of others place restraints upon the kind of subject that can be constructed.'¹³ In representing the dynamics of lyric production in this scene, Sidney's text assesses not just what subjectivities given genres allow, but how modes of production shape the relationship between genre and subjectivity. This essay argues that the unrevised scene insists on the social phenomenology of lyric and its ability to constitute intersubjective agents. The scene scrutinizes the monologic lyric through shifts in lyric discourses and modes of poetic production and transmission.

Sidney's unrevised version of this scene reinforces the collaborative cultural writing practices from which it emerges. In so doing, it helps to develop a type of subjectivity that resists strong claims for early modern subjects as primarily constructed through agonistic external discourses of power.¹⁴ The scene better accords with Christopher Tilmouth's recent argument which productively breaks down any simple opposition between the fluid, emerging, and largely interpolated self of the Renaissance with the 'supposedly complete, autarkic' modern self, 'peculiarly adept at fortifying its interiority against incursions from without.'¹⁵ He looks to Renaissance drama to present evidence for 'the dialogic domain of intersubjectivity,' arguing that certain texts offer 'multiple agents engaging (with various degrees of equality) in a process of exchange and interchange, their competing perspectives, interests, awarenesses, and attachments penetrating and (re)shaping one another's consciousness and thereby producing selves born of intersubjectivity.'¹⁶ The scene also bears out Bruce Smith's incisive definition of phenomenology as the understanding that 'you cannot know anything apart from the way in which you come to know it.'¹⁷ For the encounter between Pamela and Musidorus, Smith's definition is useful in two primary ways. First, it draws attention, at

of the Author: Gendering Intention in Early Modern England (Farnham, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), pp. 32–4.

¹³ Mary Ellen Lamb, *Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), p. 4.

¹⁴ The 'governing conditions' Greenblatt ascribes to self-fashioning lean heavily on this external model, whereby interiority and selfhood are primarily fictions born of resistance. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), pp. 8–9, 257.

¹⁵ 'Passions and Intersubjectivity in Early Modern Literature' in *Passions and Subjectivity in Early Modern Culture*, ed. by Brian Cummings and Freya Sierhuis (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 13–32 (p. 16).

¹⁶ Ibid. pp. 16–17.

¹⁷ Bruce R. Smith, *Phenomenal Shakespeare* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), p. 180.

the level of plot, to the way the two share in the act of writing and composing as a phenomenal epistemology—the act of creating together in the form of lyric interchange develops their relationship. Second, it identifies the scene’s meta-literary strategy of having the reader ‘come to know’ these characters through subtle shifts in generic discourse made possible within the expansive space of romance. As a genre, romance has long been open to representing female voices and calling on female readers.¹⁸ The scenarios of both courtly and chivalric romance often offer female characters, if less frequently female authors, the right of response.¹⁹ The phenomenon of collaborative writing within romance, as Sidney represents it, can offer both his male and female characters intersubjective experience.²⁰ Intersubjectivity emerges when ‘one actively works at making sure that the Other and the Self are perceptually, conceptually, and practically coordinated around a particular task’.²¹ Sidney’s *Arcadia* uses fictional representations to argue a similar point, turning to collaborative textual creation as the very type of task that helps to constitute more fluid than fixed notions of the subject.

The scene that will become the focus of this essay begins as Pamela elopes with Musidorus after his promise to love her virtuously. The couple, before stopping to rest in a ‘fair, thick wood,’ engage in ‘delightful discourses’, ‘maintaining their hearts in that right harmony of affection which doth interchangeably deliver each to other the secret workings of their souls’.²² These interchanges continue to resound as they compose poems together on the barks of trees. Pamela initiates the first exchange as she ‘entrusted the treasure of her thoughts in these verses’:²³

Do not disdain, O straight upraised pine,
That wounding thee, my thoughts in thee I grave;
Since that my thoughts, as straight as straightness thine,

¹⁸ Helen Hackett, *Women and Romance Fiction in the English Renaissance* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 6–19.

¹⁹ See, for example George Gascoigne, ‘The Adventures of Master F.J.’ in *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, ed. by G. W. Pigman (Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 141–216 (p. 147); Thomas Lodge, *Rosalind*, ed. by Donald Beecher (Ottawa: Dovehouse Editions, 1997), pp. 165–8.

²⁰ Though beyond the scope of this essay, there are many earlier models for collaborative composition and its relationship to intersubjectivity. See, for example, Laurelle LeVert, ‘“Crucifye hem, Crucifye hem”: The Subject and Affective Response in Middle English Passion Narratives,’ *Essays in Medieval Studies: Proceedings of the Illinois Medieval Association*. 14 (2000), 73-90.

²¹ Alessandro Duranti, ‘Husserl, Intersubjectivity, and Anthropology’, *Anthropological Theory* 10.1–2 (2010), 16–35 (p. 17).

²² Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia (the Old Arcadia)*, ed. by Jean Robertson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), p. 197.

²³ *Ibid*, p. 198

No smaller wound—alas! far deeper have.

Deeper engraved, which salve nor time can save,
Giv'n to my heart by my fore-wounded ey'n
Thus cruel to myself, how canst thou crave
My inward hurt should spare thy outward rine?

Yet still, fair tree, lift up thy stately line,
Live long, and long witness my chosen smart,
Which barred desires (barred by myself) impart.

And in this growing bark grow verses mine.
My heart my word, my word hath giv'n my heart.
The giver giv'n from gift shall never part.

Musidorus responds in kind, making 'the trees as well bear the badges of his passions, as this song engraved in them did testify':²⁴

You goodly pines, which still with brave ascent
In nature's pride your heads to heav'nward heave,
Though you beside such graces earth hath lent,
Of some late grace a greater grace receive,

By her who was (O blessed you) content,
With her fair hand, your tender barks to cleave,
And so by you (O blessed you) hath sent
Such piercing words as no thoughts else conceive:

Yet yield your grant, a baser hand may leave
His thoughts in you, where so sweet thoughts were spent,
For how would you the mistress' thoughts bereave
Of waiting thoughts all to her service meant?

Nay higher thoughts (though thrall'd thoughts) I call
My thoughts than hers, who first your rine did rent,
Than hers, to whom my thoughts alonely thrall
Rising from low, are to the highest bent;

²⁴ Ibid, p. 199.

Where hers, whom worth makes highest over all,
Coming from her, cannot but downward fall.

Tree writing in romance is often depicted in contradictory terms. On the one hand, it is associated with solitary love laments.²⁵ On the other, for later writers, trees often acted as living cites for proxy amorous exchanges, a use presaged by this scene.²⁶ Sidney's scene exploits both of these potentials. In a version of the affective agency Tilmouth notes as a feature of intersubjectivity, Pamela displays the rhetoric of intimate confiding (she entrusts her thoughts to the tree, using it as witness to her 'inward hurt') to which Musidorus responds in kind. In this exchange, each party's virtuous claims are somewhat belied by their account of their writing as a type of interpenetration, as the 'upraised' trees both absorb and read back the feelings of the lovers. As a physical go-between for the lovers, the trees offer an erotic imaginary that reminds us that these textual transactions ultimately seek a different substrate – the lovers' own bodies – a fact which overmasters Musidorus later in the scene.

Within the *Arcadia* as a whole, Pamela and Musidorus's interactions stake out a social yet intimate space for lyric exchange, relative to the romance's other more public lyric displays. The eclogues, by contrast, generally use lyric in service of public competition, exemplifying more performative goals for collaborative poetry. These pastoral poems are between men (even when Pyrocles speaks in his female disguise as Cleophila, his collaborator, Musidorus, and his addressee, Philoclea, know him to be male).²⁷ While the subject is often love, the goal is frequently more agonistic, as the poets' 'last sport was one of them to provoke another to a more large expressing of his passions.'²⁸ Such affective outpourings, cast as performance for a judging audience, demonstrate Smith's claim for the relationship between phenomenology and epistemology, as the terms of

²⁵ Leah Knight, 'Writing on Early Modern Trees', *English Literary Renaissance* 41.3 (2011), 462–84 (p. 477).

²⁶ Aemelia Lanyer's 'The Description of Cooke-ham' depicts her avatar kissing a tree just kissed by Margaret Clifford. 'The Description of Cooke-ham' in *Salve Deus Rex Judeorum*, ed. by Susanne Woods (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1993), ll. 165-72. Ben Jonson's 'To Penshurst' famously depicts the tree honouring Sidney as a quasi-social site inscribed with the names of lovers (*Ben Jonson: The Complete Poems*, ed. by George Parfett [New Haven: Yale University Press 1982], ll. 12-15).

²⁷ Early modern women did participate in lyric competition. See Barbara K. Lewalski, 'Lucy, Countess of Bedford: Images of a Jacobean Courtier and Patroness', in *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 52–77. Sidney's own niece famously wrote a scathing riposte in verse to Edward Denny; see Mary Wroth, *The Poems of Lady Mary Wroth*, ed. by Josephine A. Roberts (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1983), pp. 34–5.

²⁸ *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (the Old Arcadia)*, p. 58.

the exchange reveal as much, perhaps more, about the poets' competitive natures as their inner passions. The first eclogues end with a dual poem by Dorus (the name Musidorus takes on when he is disguised as a shepherd) and Cleophila. While the cousins do speak of their plights in a masked way and show some mutual understanding, the exchange is designed primarily to reveal their love to, not inspire poetic collaboration from, Pamela and Philoclea.²⁹ As frequently, lyrics are produced and uttered in solitude, spillways for the excesses of emotion that propel the *Arcadia*'s plot. Philoclea and Pyrocles are particularly likely both to intone poems in solitude and to overhear each other doing so. In the Second Book, Philoclea, shocked at the extent of her own passion, revisits a poem vowing constancy and chastity she had inscribed on a marble stone in the woods. Though not written on a tree, the poem is a type of sylvan altar set 'among the few trees, so closed in the top together as they seemed a little chapel.'³⁰ The trees, though not her chosen substrate, participate in creating a solitary space for lyric composition. In the Third Book she sings 'like a solitary nightengale' a song which she had 'written to enwrap her secret and resolute woes.'³¹

Pamela and Musidorus's exchange has more in common with a third category: those social, but more intimate lyrics shared between Musidorus and Pyrocles, as when in the Third Book they perform revisions of each other's poems. Pyrocles offers a poem outlining love's misfortunes through a mercantile metaphor but ending in the lover's triumph as 'now success has got above annoys'. Musidorus ends fretting that 'love with care, and hope with fear do fight'.³² This process of shared composition culminates in mutual affection as Pyrocles (again, disguised as Cleophila) takes Musidorus in her arms and begs him to say more of his recent history with Pamela. The shared verse increases intersubjective understanding which leads to embodied (if not erotic) love between the cousins.

Pamela and Musidorus's episode of shared poetic creation participates in such intimate models for shared lyrics in the romance but changes them with its self-conscious shifts in lyric modes of production. Pamela's inscriptions include 'pretty knots which tied together the names of Musidorus and Pamela, sometimes intermixedly changing them to Pamedorus and Musimela'.³³ While humorously representing their shared affection, these carvings also present a phenomenology of shared subjectivity as each privileges the other's name by turn. The concept of 'interchange' is present here and in the first

²⁹ Ibid, pp. 81-2.

³⁰ Ibid, pp. 110-11.

³¹ Ibid, p. 229.

³² Ibid, pp. 170-71.

³³ Ibid, p. 198.

lines of the scene when they ‘interchangeably deliver each to other the secret workings of their souls’; it is also a concept Sidney uses in the narrative of the Eighth Song of his lyric sequence, *Astrophil and Stella*.³⁴ The lovers look tearfully into each other’s eyes ‘While their eyes by love directed, / Enterchangeably reflected’.³⁵ Their reciprocal gaze presages the emotional union put forth in the poem. The third-person nature of the poem’s narrative may mark the Eighth Song as a fiction within a fiction.³⁶ The ideal of interchange cannot be realized by the terms of the broader sequence. Yet Musidorus does not imagine his encounter with Pamela, it is part of the plot’s main narrative, making the scene’s intersubjective claims viable. These ‘pretty knots’ become further contextualized in the vocabulary of a verse miscellany, as Pamela inscribes trees ‘with twenty other flowers of her travailing fancies.’ Musidorus then answers by inscribing another poem on a tree. After this, Pamela constructs ‘a posy of the fair undergrowing flowers,’ literalizing her lyric practice which gathers and shares her poetic productions in the spirit of a printed collection.³⁷ Such period texts often foreground the flowers of rhetoric in their titles, such as *A Handefull of Pleasant Delites* (1584), Gascoigne’s collection *Posies* (1575) which is organized by ‘Flowers’ and ‘Weeds,’ and any of a number of printed collections that make use of the term ‘garland’ as a way to discuss their gathered and compiled nature.³⁸ Miscellanies are inherently social productions, as they bring together in often somewhat random fashion the works of many poets, sometimes attributed, sometimes not.³⁹ Thus, in this first exchange, Sidney intermingles the associations of solitary tree writing with the social dynamics of the lyric miscellany, complicating the terms of lyric inscription.

The scene then moves to voiced collaboration, as Pamela begins speaking a poem to which Musidorus responds, using the final line of her poem to begin his own. This linked structure recalls their melded names marked on the landscape, though it also shifts agency from Pamela to Musidorus. In their first exchange (quoted in full above),

³⁴ Ibid, pp. 198, 197.

³⁵ ‘Astrophil and Stella’, in *Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. by William A. Ringler (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), ‘Eighth Song’, l. 16.

³⁶ Margaret Simon, ‘Refraining Songs: The Dynamics of Form in Sidney’s *Astrophil and Stella*’, *Studies in Philology* 109.1 (2012), 86–102 (pp. 97–98).

³⁷ Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia (the Old Arcadia)*, p. 199.

³⁸ Poetic ‘garlands’ of the period range from poetry collections like Skelton’s early *A ryght delectable treatyse upon a goodly garlande or chapelet of laurell* (1523) to Drayton’s *Idea the sheapherds garland fashioned in nine eglogs* (1585). Later sixteenth and seventeenth century texts tend to apply the term to more strictly religious collections, as in Thomas Twyne’s *The garlande of godly flowers bewtifully adorned as most freshly they flourish in the gardeins of right faithfull Christian writers* (1574).

³⁹ Joshua Eckhardt and Daniel Starza Smith, ‘Introduction: The Emergence of the English Miscellany’, in *Manuscript Miscellanies in Early Modern England* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 1–16 (p. 13).

Pamela chooses both the poems' material manifestation and their content. In the second exchange, she likewise begins the poem, while he answers, inverting the 'expectation of [the lady's] answering response.'⁴⁰ Yet his response is, as Anne Sussman has noted, longer than Pamela's, initiating a shift away from Pamela as a lyric agent.⁴¹ While her beginning this exchange and him ending it has an element of balanced agency, the lyric that follows is voiced solely by Musidorus and is in fact used to lull Pamela to sleep, incapacitating her and making her the touchstone for a different type of lyric production. The combined names, shared substrates, and dialogue poems promote lyric productions as collaborative and social, but most intersubjective when the authors are equal agents, sharing their affection in verse.

The shift from intersubjective exchange to a hierarchy of subject and object, as Musidorus uses Pamela as the object of his poetry and a prose blazon, is the more surprising for its proximity to their previous exchange. By contrast, the 'Second Song' in *Astrophil and Stella*, though equally unsettling, is not particularly exceptional within a lyric sequence that offers little overt opportunity for the addressee, Stella, to respond. As he considers stealing a kiss (or more) from her as she sleeps, he does imagine her response: 'But o foole, thinke of the danger, / Of her just and high disdain.' He then laments at its fruition: 'Lowring beauty chastens me.'⁴² But her response is non-verbal, subtended to her beauty, and it is not an intervention – he still steals the kiss. As with all lyric ladies, Stella is an absent presence, a state literalized through her sleep which renders her body vulnerable even as she remains inaccessible. They are the typical 'poet lover and his distant beloved.'⁴³ The lyric 'I' is never overtly challenged, except by the speaker's own strategies (as when, in the final line of sonnet 45, he wishes himself a fiction: 'I am not I pitie the tale of me'). In the prose romance of the *Arcadia* the lyric 'I' is never quite so secure, subject to the social dynamics and polyglossia of a prose plot and, at the start of this scene, to the lyric address of the lady herself.

Early modern men and women collaborated to produce and exchange a variety of texts.⁴⁴ Nonetheless, women are often represented in a responsive position; Ilona Bell

⁴⁰ Bell, p. 53.

⁴¹ Sussman, p. 64.

⁴² Philip Sidney, *Astrophil and Stella*, 'Second Song', ll. 17-18, 26.

⁴³ Ronald Levaio, *Renaissance Minds and Their Fictions: Cusanus, Sidney, Shakespeare* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), p. 158.

⁴⁴ Marotti, *Manuscript, Print, and the Renaissance Lyric*, pp. 48–61; Jerome De Groot, 'John Denham and Lucy Hutchinson's Commonplace Book', *SEL Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 48.1 (2008), 147–63 (p. 152); Micheline White, 'Power Couples and Women Writers in Elizabethan England', in

puts particular emphasis on how the expectation of female response ‘cannot help but affect the way in which the poet/lover formulates his lyric persuasion.’⁴⁵ The prosimetric romance demands representation of such response more readily than the single-voiced lyric sequence, in which the response is generally only alluded to or implied (consider Stella’s ventriloquized and ambiguous refrain in the fourth song of *Astrophil and Stella*). As Pamela sleeps she loses the ability to respond. In this way, Sidney’s scene emphasizes the way genre, subjectivity, compositional practice, and even affective state are mutually dependent. As Pamela sleeps, Musidorus’s lyric rhetoric moves from response to regard. Pamela’s sleep is coterminous with Musidorus’s Petrarchan lyric, a conjunction of affect, genre, and subjectivity that reorients the scene’s portrayals of mutual affection, female authorship, and the capacity of women’s writing to inspire others, toward a more conventionally Petrarchan mode. Musidorus’s poem addresses any dream Pamela might have, asking to make himself a dream-avatar. He says ‘take my shape and play the lover’s part; / Kiss her from me, and say unto her sprite, / Till her eyes shine, I live in darkest night’.⁴⁶ Musidorus succumbs to the literary bad faith of the Petrarchan speaker.⁴⁷ He is in metaphorical ‘darkest night,’ ostensibly rendered blind and lost by his beloved’s absence. But she is shaped by his words and subjected to a kiss her waking self would likely not permit.

As a sort of dream vision indebted to poems like Sidney’s own sonnet 32 in *Astrophil and Stella*, Musidorus’s lyric lullaby seems in some ways less malevolent (in the sequence, *Astrophil and Morpheus* argue over who possesses Stella’s blazoned image). Musidorus’s poem is followed, however, by a prose blazon:

He thought her fair forehead was a field where all his fancies fought, and every hair of her head seemed a strong chain that tied him. Her fair lids (then hiding her fairer eyes) seemed unto him sweet boxes of mother of pearl, rich in themselves, but containing in them far richer jewels. Her cheeks, with their colour most delicately mixed, would have entertained his eyes sometime, but that the roses of her lips (whose separating was wont to be accompanied with most wise speeches) now by force drew his sight to mark how prettily they lay

Framing the Family: Narrative and Representation in the Medieval and Early Modern Periods (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005), pp. 119–38 (p. 123).

⁴⁵ Bell, p. 53.

⁴⁶ Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia (the Old Arcadia)*, p. 201. Should the line numbers be cited for poems within the larger prose text, here and throughout?

⁴⁷ Heather Dubrow, *Echoes of Desire: English Petrarchism and its Counterdiscourses* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), p. 36; Nancy Vickers, ‘Diana Described: Scattered Woman and Scattered Rhyme’, *Critical Inquiry* 8.2 (1981), 265–79 (p. 277). See also Hackett, p. 118.

one over the other, uniting their divided beauties, and through them the eye of his fancy delivered to his memory the lying (as in ambush) under her lips of those armed ranks, all armed in most pure white, and keeping the most precise order of military discipline.⁴⁸

While this blazon is not represented as a lyric, it strongly resonates in this period with Petrarchan verse. Despite efforts to ‘blaze’ Pamela’s beauty, amplifying it through sometimes heraldic rhetoric, the blazon is not voiced, or even shaped in verse. In embedding Musidorus’s blazon of Pamela in the prose plot, the blazon becomes even more removed from the social dynamics of many of the romance’s lyric moments. It is purely in Musidorus’s mind, an autoerotic pseudo-poem that draws attention to the dangers of errant lyric discourse.

Musidorus is well-versed in the social powers of blazon which he has already used to elope with Pamela. In order to get her guardian, Miso, out of the way he manufactured a story about her husband, Dametas, exchanging love poems with the shepherdess Charita. The hyperbolically affective terms of their exchange prefigures his own with Pamela. In fabricating this affair, Dorus imagines Dametas’s body as bellows animated by his lover: ‘But as if the shepherd that lay before her had been organs which were only to be blown by her breath, she had no sooner ended with the joining her sweet lips together but that he recorded to her music this rural poesy’. She has just completed reciting a poem which inspires his response, one made up of contrastingly rough-hewn comparisons of her hair to straw, her eyes to ‘fair ox’s eyes,’ and her skin to ‘cruds well pressed’.⁴⁹ The blazon overmasters Miso who is so furious that she pursues Dametas leaving Musidorus to accomplish his departure with Pamela. The recursive tendency of romance plots to include tellings and retellings of stories enables a sort of imagined oral remediation of manuscript exchange. Here Musidorus tactically presents a ruse of retelling through the inflaming rhetoric of blazon. Musidorus’s and Pamela’s less public, less tactical, but still collaborative shared poems shift the poetry of courtship from being ‘both fantastical and real, both cause and effect’, to being both cause and affect, as it were.⁵⁰ Musidorus and Pamela seek, initially, not acquiescence but mutuality. His later blazon of her resting body, no longer in a social context or with a reasoned strategic goal, demonstrates lyric discourse unbound in a double sense. It is fully internal to Musidorus, not materially ‘bound’ to any substrate or means of transmission, but also controlled neither by his own strategy nor by Pamela’s response.

⁴⁸ Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia (the Old Arcadia)*, p. 202.

⁴⁹ *Ibid*, p. 191.

⁵⁰ Bell, p. 20.

Through elements like the blazon, Petrarchan poetry often reifies the body's imperviousness, not to personified love (e.g. Cupid, who frequently sets up camp in the speaker's body/mind),⁵¹ but to other bodies, a fact exemplified by, among other things, the tendency for such poems to describe the beloved's body in terms of hard, impenetrable substances like sapphires, rubies, and pearls.⁵² On the other hand the blazon, particularly in Petrarch's own verse, often acts as a 'defensive displacement of the male viewer's own fear of loss of control and disintegration when confronted with the alarming and disturbing spectacle of female physicality.'⁵³ The blazon marks the moral distance between Musidorus's princely ideals and his carnal desires. But as much as the blazon applies a vocabulary to Pamela's beauty, it also reveals the limits of Musidorus's own self-knowledge. His pledge of virtuous love, the speech act that begins the scene, is here answered by an internal counter-monologue that sparks the following almost-action:

overmastered with the fury of delight, having all his senses partial against himself and inclined to his beloved adversary, he was bent to take advantage of the weakness of the watch, and see whether at that season he could win the bulwark before timely help might come.⁵⁴

As Musidorus is provoked by his own urging and urges, Sidney's plot intervenes, harnessing mythological allusion in service of the Arcadian social world with the arrival of 'clownish villains.' Their cries reverberate differently through the nested plots, ironically preserving Pamela's virtue even as they imperil her freedom.

As several scholars have noted, the gendered dynamics of his blazon and reaction are clear, as we see Musidorus 'madly in love with his own projection of feminine beauty, pieced together from the imaginary fragments of Pamela's body.'⁵⁵ Less well recognized is how the scene's structure and its heretofore unrecognized use of Ovidian

⁵¹ See Petrarch's Sonnet 140 and its reworkings by Thomas Wyatt and Henry Howard.

⁵² In the sequence's second song, Sidney's Astrophil calls the sleeping Stella his 'jewel'. 'Astrophil and Stella', ll. 1-2. See also the fifteenth sonnet of Edmund Spenser's *Amoretti*. *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser*, ed. William A. Oram et al. (New Haven: Yale University Press 1989), p. 609. Pamela S. Hammons discusses such objects' association with "severe, impenetrable chastity." *Gender, Sexuality, and Material Objects in English Renaissance Verse*, (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Pub. 2010), p. 105.

⁵³ Hackett, p. 118.

⁵⁴ Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (the Old Arcadia)*, p. 202.

⁵⁵ Lucian Ghita, "'I Can Neither Write Nor Be Silent': The Circulation of Women's Texts in Sidney's *Old Arcadia*", *Literature Compass* 3.2 (2006), 95-106 (p. 100).

allusion work against the narrator and reader's possible complicity in this fantasy. The increasingly hermetic modes of lyric production which structure this scene, from paired lively collaboration to internal monologue, counsel critique of the blazon. The scene also alludes to the story of Priapus and Lotis told in Ovid's *Fasti*, long recognized as an intertext for Sidney's Second Song.⁵⁶ Sidney shifts from a Petrarchan warrant for sole lyric agency to an Ovidian allusion more fully attuned to the risky metamorphic change made possible by less mutual forms of amorous interchange. If Petrarch's version of Ovidian transformation often seeks, as in Canzone 23, the reader's pity as the speaker struggles in solitude with his emotions, Ovid's own stories sometimes offer their subjects social derision. In the version of the story told in the *Metamorphoses* Lotis preserves her chastity by becoming the lotus flower.⁵⁷ In the *Fasti*, however, Lotis is saved in part by social opprobrium. Priapus tries to 'make his way on the happy road to his desires' by raising Lotis's skirt when she has fallen asleep after a feast.⁵⁸ He is interrupted by the braying of an ass who belongs to a lusty old man, Silenus, also at the celebration. The animal's action both reveals Priapus's own beastly nature in this moment and amplifies it. The bray ironically reasserts a moral framework upon the scene, interrupting and interpreting Priapus's near-transgression. That the donkey belongs to an old man also draws attention to Priapus's own advanced age relative to the nymph's. In similar ways, the 'clownish villains' of the *Arcadia*, bringing their own form of political upheaval, highlight Musidorus's ethical inversion before it can happen, affiliating him and his blazon, however temporarily, with the text's debased agents of misrule.⁵⁹

The Ovidian critique of Musidorus provided in this scene is focused on Musidorus's monologic poetics. In so doing, it implicitly privileges the combined verse and prose that start the scene as an analogue to what Tilmouth argues for in drama: the scene's prosimetric start casts lyric as social, intersubjective, and dialogic. The ass's bray, which humorously gives voice to Priapus's errant desire, also literally recalls Priapus to a social world that can mock his actions. If 'Ovid's figures showed the perils and pleasures that bodies produce in passionate contact with other bodies',⁶⁰ Sidney

⁵⁶Mary Chan, 'The Strife of Love in a Dream and Sidney's Second Song in *Astrophil and Stella*', *Sidney Newsletter* 3.1 (1982), 3–9.

⁵⁷ *The. Xv. Bookes of P. Ouidius Naso, Entytuled Metamorphosis, Translated Oute of Latin into English Meeter, by Arthur Golding Gentleman, a Worke Very Pleasaunt and Delectable. 1567*, trans. by Arthur Golding, Early English Books Online, 1475-1640 / 259:04 (Imprynted at London: By Willyam Seres, 1567), p. 116.

⁵⁸ Ovid, *Times and Reasons: A New Translation of Fasti*, trans. by Anne Wiseman and Peter Wiseman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), I. 432.

⁵⁹ Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (the Old Arcadia)*, p. 202.

⁶⁰ Goran V. Stanivukovic, 'Introduction', in *Ovid and the Renaissance Body*, ed. by Goran V. Stanivukovic (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), p. 7.

explores the consequences of anatomizing a lyric corpus in order to parse the perils and pleasures of its various discursive potentials.

Conclusion

The authorial and editorial revisions of the 1590, 1593, and 1598 volumes generally relinquish the scene's interest in the intersubjective possibilities of lyric collaboration and circulation. Ironically, the most collaborative versions of the *Arcadia* are also often the most dedicated to advancing Sidney as a singular and exceptional author. The 'heterogeneous agents' who created Sidney's texts produced editions which themselves constitute a 'dialogic series' that struggles to 'shape the ethos of Sir Philip Sidney.'⁶¹ This irony extends beyond the well-known editing, material features, and many continuations the revision inspired. At the level of the plot, revisions to this Pamela and Musidorus scene in particular move away from the intersubjective potentials of collaborative composition to the solitary production of lyric.

Musidorus's contemplated transgression and its Ovidian resonances are largely excised from the first printing of the revised *Arcadia*, which ends midway through the third book before the lovers elope. An unbidden embrace and attempted kiss does occur at the start of the third book, well before their departure. This scene reworks one from the *Old Arcadia* in which Musidorus kills a bear threatening Pamela and when she faints, he takes "the advantage to kiss and re-kiss her a hundred times." When she wakes she puts him from her "with great disdain."⁶² The revised Pamela is awake and able to rebuke Musidorus's actions immediately.⁶³ Mary Sidney Herbert and Hugh Sanford, perhaps following authorial corrections, restore a version of the elopement scene to the 1593 and 1598 printings.⁶⁴ While the revised scene is more moral, the discourses that shape Musidorus's actions are less scrutinized. In this version, Musidorus likewise blazons Pamela's beauty as she sleeps, but this blazon is not coupled with his lust. No longer is he prepared 'to take advantage of the weakness of the watch'.⁶⁵ If for Astrophil, 'Desire

⁶¹ Joel B. Davis, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia and the Invention of English Literature*, 1st ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 4.

⁶² *Old Arcadia* p. 52.

⁶³ Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia*. London, 1590.. p. 244.

⁶⁴ Jean Robertson contends that Sidney himself "is most likely to have started to redraft" Book III and that the revisions to Musidorus's actions are "not entirely a matter of greater maturity or sterner morality." She goes on to affirm Ringler's contention that the revisions also amend the flawed ending of the *Old Arcadia*. Jean Robertson, 'Textual Introduction', in *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), pp.xlii-lxxi (pp.lxi-lxii).

⁶⁵ Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (the Old Arcadia)*, p. 202.

still cries, give me some food',⁶⁶ Musidorus, in this revision, sates himself by breathing the sleeping Pamela's insubstantial breath: 'sucking the breath with such ioye, that he did determine in himselfe, there had ben no life to a *Camaeleons* if he might be suffered to enioye that foode'.⁶⁷ This sentence is carried over from the unrevised *Arcadia* and is swiftly followed by the arrival of the villains. Preserving and emphasizing this line, so clearly a reworking of Astrophil's lyric appetites, reminds the reader of the distance between the romance and its lyric relative. In taming the blazon, the revision tempers the strong contrast between Pamela's lively lyric agency and her later subjection to lyric objectification. Modes of production are less fully coupled to considerations of genre and subjectivity.

The fact that this scene is revised has seemed to mark its unrevised version as somehow lacking. It is a 'scophilic fantasy of sexual control',⁶⁸ its view of gender in need of rehabilitation. Viewed as a whole, however, the scene implicitly challenges the problematic conservatism of lyric. In juxtaposing Pamela's lyric agency, conveyed in terms familiar to both manuscript and print circulation, against Musidorus's hermetic, predatory blazon, Sidney elevates instead a social, intersubjective role for lyric contrasted with the moral errancy of the genre's monologic tendencies. By both inserting fully fledged lyrics and embedding troubling lyric elements within this scene, Sidney explores how the discourses of lyric interact with its composition and transmission to promote the forms of shared agency and collaboration such 'single voiced' poems can sometimes forestall. The unrevised scene offers a potent and unrecognized example of how the period's literature understood and represented the complex dynamics of its own production, and suggests how these dynamics might reveal as 'heuristically volatile' not just the period's texts, but the subjectivities they represent.

⁶⁶ Philip Sidney, 'Astrophil and Stella', 71, l. 14.

⁶⁷ Philip Sidney Sir, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia. Written by Sir Philip Sidney Knight. Now since the first edition augmented and ended.* London, 1593. Early English Books Online. Web. 2 October 2017. <http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:citation:99847133>. p. 180. .

⁶⁸ Ghita, p. 100.