The *Mirror for Magistrates*, 1559-1610: Transmission, Appropriation and the Poetics of Historiography

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English Literature

Harriet Archer

Christ Church
University of Oxford

Trinity Term 2012

Abstract

The *Mirror for Magistrates*, the collection of *de casibus* complaint poems compiled by William Baldwin in the 1550s and expanded and revised between 1559 and 1610, was central to the development of imaginative literature in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century. Additions by John Higgins, Thomas Blenerhasset and Richard Niccols extended the Mirror's scope, shifted its focus, and prolonged its popularity; in particular, the 1587 edition of the original text with Higgins's ancient British and Roman complaint collections profoundly influenced the work of Spenser and Shakespeare. However, while there has been a recent resurgence of critical interest in the editions of 1559 and its 1563 'Second Part', the later additions are still largely neglected and disparaged, and the transmission of the original text beyond 1563 has never been fully explored.

Without an understanding of this transmission and expansion, the importance of the *Mirror* to sixteenth-century intellectual culture is dramatically distorted. Higgins, Blenerhasset and Niccols's contributions are invaluable witnesses to how verse history was conceptualised, written and read across the period, and to the way in which the *Mirror* tradition was repeatedly reinterpreted and redeployed in response to changing contemporary concerns. The *Mirror* corpus encompasses topical allegory, nationalist polemic, and historiographical scepticism. What has not been recognised is the complex interaction of these themes right across the *Mirror*'s history.

This thesis provides a comprehensive reassessment of the *Mirror*'s expansion, transmission, and appropriation between 1559 and 1610, focusing in particular on Higgins, Blenerhasset, and Niccols's work. By comparing editions and tracing editorial revisions, the changing contexts and attitudes which shaped the early texts' development are explored. Higgins, Blenerhasset, and Niccols's contributions are analysed against this backdrop for the first time here, both within their own literary and historiographical contexts, and in dialogue with the early editions. A broad reading of the themes and concerns of these recensions, rather than the limited approach which has characterised previous scholarship, takes account of their depth and variety, and provides a new understanding of the extent of the *Mirror*'s influence and ubiquity in early modern literary culture.

Acknowledgements

> Crepe forthe my boke vnder the proteccion
> Of suche as haue bothe learnyng and eloquence.
> Humbly submyttyng to the correccion
> Of worthy writers of virtuous excellence.[1]

I have incurred many debts of gratitude over the course of writing this thesis, and it is a pleasure to be able to thank friends and colleagues for their assistance here. I am especially grateful to Paulina Kewes for her supervision and guidance. Scott Lucas, Mike Pincombe, Jennifer Richards, Bart van Es, Rhodri Lewis, and David Scott Kastan have provided feedback on sections of this thesis, and I owe them a great deal for their suggestions but also their support of my project in its early stages. A number of scholars have been generous enough to share unpublished work with me, including Scott, Mike and Jenny; in addition, I would like to thank Philip Schwyzer, Richard McCabe, William Kerwin and Joanne Diaz, Andrew King, Rob Carson, Kavita Mudan Finn, and Freyja Cox Jensen. I am also very grateful to the delegates not listed here of the Holinshed Workshop, held at Jesus College, Oxford in January 2009, and of 'Fame and Fortune: The *Mirror for Magistrates*, 1559-1946', at Magdalen College, Oxford, in September 2012. A more general debt of gratitude is owed to David Norbrook, Emma Smith and James McBain, who have given me invaluable advice and encouragement.

For financial support, I am indebted to the Arts and Humanities Research Council, who funded two years of my graduate study, and to Christ Church, Oxford, home from home for five years, for an academic scholarship, Dixon Prize and DPhil grant. The staff of the Bodleian Library, the Christ Church library, the Yale Manuscripts and Archives Room, the Oxford English Faculty and Library, and the British Library all deserve respect and thanks for their assistance, and their fortitude in increasingly difficult circumstances.

As an undergraduate, I was fortunate enough to be taught by Christopher Butler, Peter Conrad, Mishtooni Bose, Peter McDonald, Alexandra Harris, and Sophie Ratcliffe, a dream-team for whom I am more thankful than they can possibly appreciate. Their examples, and those of my Masters course tutors Sharon Achinstein and Katherine Duncan-Jones, have spurred me on throughout my postgraduate studies. My undergraduate students at Jesus College, the Queen's College, Christ Church, Regent's Park and Lady Margaret Hall have kept me sane, as well as on my toes.

For coffee and camaraderie, I am grateful to fellow early modernists Sophie Butler, Tim Smith-Laing, Rachel McPherson, and Simon May, and to Simon Davies and Alexander Jarosev for their long-distance support at some vital moments. Paul Gledhill, Martin Ash, Rob Shaw and Kerrith Davies have answered questions on everything from medieval hagiography to 1960s garage rock with endless wisdom and patience.

My greatest debt is to my parents, whose practical, intellectual and emotional generosity never ceases to inspire me. This thesis is for Jack, 'husband, friend'.

[1] George Cavendish, 'Metrical Visions', in A. S. G. Edwards (ed.), (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1980), 'Thauctor to hys boke', f.148v.

Contents

Acknowledgements i

Contents iii

List of Abbreviations v

Introduction 1

Chapter One 9

The Late Medieval Complaints, 1559-1610: Transmission 9

The *Mirror*'s Expansion 11

Suppression and Rebranding, 1554-59 13

The 'Second Part' (1563) 27

Ferrers's *Mirror*? A Historiographical Overhaul 34

Commercial Expansion, 1574-75: The *Mirror* and Thomas Marshe 37

1578: An Anomalous Edition 41

John Higgins and the 1587 Edition 53

Niccols's 1610 Edition: A new *Mirror* for a new age? 66

Conclusion 76

Chapter Two 79

John Higgins's Ancient British *Mirror*, 1574-5 79

Critical Reception 82

The Paratext 89

The Dream Frame 98

The Complaints 110

Conclusion 121

Chapter Three 123

Thomas Blenerhasset's *Second Part of the Mirror for Magistrates* (1578). 123

Critical Reception 126

The Paratext 132

The Prose Frame 148

The Complaints 174

Conclusion 195

Chapter Four 199

The Mirour for Magistrates (1587) 199

Revisions 202
Additions to the Ancient British Collection 209
Higgins's Roman Complaints 213
Fratricide and Civil War 225
Conclusion 229
Chapter Five 231
A Broken Mirror? Richard Niccols's *Mirror for Magistrates* (1610) 231
Critical Reception 234
The 1610 *Mirror* in Context 237
Revisions 247
A Winter Nights Vision 249
Polemic to panegyric? 268
Conclusion 291
General Conclusion 293
Works Cited 301
Primary Texts 301
Secondary Texts 309

List of Abbreviations

Primary Texts

Quotations from the *Mirror* are followed by a reference in parentheses in the main body of the text, using the following abbreviations.

1559	*A Myrroure for Magistrates Wherein May be Seen by Example of Other, with Howe Greuous Plages Vices are Punished: and Howe Frayle and Vnstable Worldly Prosperitie is Founde, Even of Those, Whom Fortune Seemeth Most Highly to Fauour* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1559).
1563	*A Myrrour for Magistrates Wherein May be Seen by Example of Other, with Howe Greuous Plages Vices are Punished: and Howe Frayle and Vnstable Worldly Prosperity is Founde, Even of Those Whom Fortune Seemeth Most Highly to Fauour* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1563).
1571	*A Myrrour for Magistrates Wherein May be Seene by Examples Passed in this Realme, with Howe Greuous Plagues, Vyces are Punished in Great Princes and Magistrates, and How Frayle and Vnstable Worldly Prosperity is Founde, where Fortune Seemeth Moste Highly to Fauour* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1571).
1574F	Higgins, John, *The First Parte of the Mirour for Magistrates Containing the Falles of the First Infortunate Princes of this Lande: from the Comming of Brute to the Incarnation of Our Sauiour and Redemer Iesu Christe* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1574).
1574L	*The Last Parte of the Mirour for Magistrates Wherein May be Seene by Examples Passed in this Realme, with Howe Greuous Plagues, Vices are Punished in Great Princes and Magistrates, and Howe Frayle and Vnstable Worldly Prosperitie is Founde, where Fortune Seemeth moste Highly to Fauour* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1574).
1575F	Higgins, John, *The First Parte of the Mirour for Magistrates Contayning the Falles of the First Infortunate Princes of this Lande: from the Comming of Brute to the Incarnation of Our Sauiour and Redemer Iesu Christe* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1575).
1575L	*The Last Parte of the Mirour for Magistrates Wherein May be Seene by Examples Passed in this Realme, with Howe Greuous Plagues, Vices are Punished in Gseat Princes and Magistrates, and Howe Frayle and Vnstable Worldly Prosperitie is Founde, where Fortune Seemeth Moste Highly to Fauour* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1575).

1578S	Blenerhasset, Thomas, *The Seconde Part of the Mirrour for Magistrates Conteining the Falles of the Infortunate Princes of this Lande, from the Conquest of Caesar, vnto the Commyng of Duke William the Conquerour* (Richard Webster, 1578).
1578L	*The Last Part of the Mirour for Magistrates Wherein May be Seene by Examples Passed in this Realme, with Howe Greenous Plagues, Vyces are Punished in Great Princes &Magistrats, and How Frayle and Vnstable Worldly Prosperity is Founde, Where Fortune Seemeth Most Highly to Fauour* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1578).
1587	*The Mirour for Magistrates Wherein May bee Seene, by Examples Passed in this Realme, with How Greeuous Plagues Vices are Punished in Great Princes and Magistrates, and How Fraile and Vnstable Worldly Prosperity is Found, where Fortune Seemeth Most Highly to Fauour: Newly Imprinted, and with the Addition of Diuers Tragedies Enlarged* (London: Henry Marshe, 1587).
1610	*A Mirour for Magistrates Being a True Chronicle Historie of the Vntimely Falles of such Vnfortunate Princes and Men of Note, as haue Happened since the First Entrance of Brute into this Iland, vntill this our Latter Age* (London: Felix Kynston, 1610).

Online Resources

EEBO	*Early English Books Online* (eebo.chadwyck.com)
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (www.oxforddnb.com)
OED	*Oxford English Dictionary* (www.oed.com)
USTC	*Universal Short Title Catalogue* (www.ustc.ac.uk)

Introduction

Give me that glass, and therein I will read.[1]

The *Mirror for Magistrates* is a collection of historical verse complaints. It was commissioned by the printer John Wayland to extend John Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*, to tell the tragic stories of English rulers from the death of Edward III to the reign of Mary I. William Baldwin, Wayland's assistant, compiled the collection from a series of manuscripts, read aloud by members of the group of poets he gathered to assist him in completing the commission. The collection opens with Thomas Sackville's Induction, and is divided into three books, the first containing complaints from the period 1377-1483, the second 1483-1485, and the third 1485-1554. The principal aim of this collection is to promote virtuous behaviour, and the exercise of justice by the English ruling class.

Or at least, that is the book described to us by the prose frame interspersed between verse tragedies, which narrates their recitation and immediate reception by the fictional poets' collective. It is not, however, the book printed by Thomas Marshe under the title *A Myrroure for Magistrates* in 1559, in which this account appears, and it is certainly not the *The Mirour for Magistrates* printed in 1587 by his son, Henry. It is not even the text called *A Memorial of suche Princes as Since the Tyme of King Richard the Seconde, have been Unfortunate in the Realme of England*, printed by John Wayland in 1554 and then suppressed, from which the *Mirror* was to emerge – so far as we can tell from the fragment that survives. From the very first, the *Mirror* as we have it draws attention to the slippery nature of textual authority, destabilising our faith in written records through its multi-layered fictions of transmission. As the collection of complaint poems expands across the second half of the sixteenth century, its engagement with the

[1] William Shakespeare, *Richard II*, 4.I.266.

transmission of texts shifts, along with its authors' approaches to historiography, its public function, and its personnel. Critics are inclined to focus on 'Baldwin's *Mirror*', the collection of late medieval characters' complaints printed in the editions of 1559 and 1563.[2] Scholarship has largely overlooked the substantial revisions made to these editions in the 1570s, not to mention the later appropriations of the corpus by John Higgins, Thomas Blenerhasset, and Richard Niccols. But each of these contributors re-reads the *Mirror* for new contexts, and shapes the text to conform to their own understanding of its significance. Our appreciation of the *Mirror*, its extraordinary popularity and profound impact on early modern literary culture, is unacceptably distorted if we do not take these later publications into account.

This study is about the transmission of textual histories. It explores the appropriation and development of the *Mirror for Magistrates*, looking in particular at how its authors conceive of and represent ways of reading and writing about the past. By examining the *Mirror*'s persistent engagement with history as textual, and its sustained interrogation of what that might mean both personally and nationally, I seek to provide a comprehensive reassessment of the *Mirror* texts, resituating each publication within the evolving landscape of sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century conversations about poetry and historiography. Just as significant, though, is the new interpretation which emerges of the texts' relation to each other. The *Mirror* is read not as a canonical hypotext followed by a series of inferior derivatives, but as an expanding body of work which is repeatedly reimagined and recast. Furthermore, I advance a model whereby each addition responds in new ways to the questions posed by the central collection, rather than adumbrating a pattern of purely linear development.

---

[2] In particular, Scott Lucas, *A Mirror for Magistrates and the Politics of the English Reformation* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2009).

Critical discussion of the transmission of the late medieval complaints between 1563 and 1610 is limited,[3] and the rare treatments of the whole span of the *Mirror*'s development, notably Paul Budra's, wrongly posit inexorable decline.[4] This assumption of the *Mirror*'s deterioration over time, and the binary division of its transmission history into phases either side of Baldwin's death, are mutually supporting fallacies which have become entrenched in conventional readings of the text. Lily B. Campbell's editions have helped to bolster these interpretations by separating 'Baldwin's' *Mirror for Magistrates* (1938) from the later *Parts Added* (1946) by Higgins and Blenerhasset, and leaving out altogether Niccols's editorial transformation of the *Mirror* corpus and his own collection of complaints, *A Winter Nights Vision* (1610).[5] Having said this, Campbell's collation of the expanding group of late medieval complaints in the first of these volumes offered an invitation to read this primary collection's transmission diachronically, which virtually no critic has taken up. Campbell did improve on the 1815 edition prepared by Joseph Haslewood, which flattened and distorted the work's transmission by using the 1587 edition as its base text.[6] However, Campbell's *Mirror* has had a lasting and detrimental impact on readings of the collection as a whole.[7]

Spanning some fifty years, the *Mirror* acts as a crucial witness to Tudor and early Stuart perspectives on the role of national history in political and intellectual culture, engaging with contemporary questions about the loss of textual records, the possibilities

---

[3] Lucas, for example, only delineates the *Mirror*'s transmission between 1554 and 1563, in *Politics*, pp. 237-248.

[4] Paul Budra, *A Mirror for Magistrates and the De Casibus Tradition* (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press, 2000), p. 22, and *passim*. Cf. Dermot Cavanagh, 'Review of Paul Budra, a Mirror for Magistrates *and the* De Casibus *Tradition*', *Early Modern Literary Studies,* 7.2 (September 2001), 1-7, where it is suggested that '[p]erhaps the sense of a progressive dissolution of the work's merit is also a little over-drawn'.

[5] Lily B. Campbell (ed.), *The Mirror for Magistrates* (Huntington Library Publications, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938), p. 20.

[6] Joseph Haslewood (ed.), *Mirror for Magistrates*, vol. 1 (London, 1815), p. xxix.

[7] Cf. Sherri Geller, 'Editing under the Influence of the Standard Textual Hierarchy: Misrepresenting *A Mirror for Magistrates* in the Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Editions', *Textual Cultures,* 2.1 (2007), 43-77, at 45.

of imaginative historiography, the local charge of historical *exempla* and the ethics of the language in which they are re-expressed. The continuity that inheres in the collection's rolling appropriation of *de casibus* complaint form masks the diversity of authors, genres and contexts, as well as strategies of reading and rewriting, which shape the *Mirror*'s development. But this continuity also speaks to the collection's endurance across very different political and cultural eras as a medium through which successive generations were moved to participate in historiographical process.

Higgins, Blenerhasset and Niccols all foreground the materiality of their encounters with their hypotexts, so the original late medieval work and the later recensions are bound together by authorial awareness of the *Mirror*'s textuality. In the Induction to his ancient British complaints, Higgins describes his visit to the printer's shop, where '[a]t length by hap, I found a book…The Mirroure namde' (1574F, f. 1r), and Niccols also uses the Induction to *A Winter Nights Vision* to narrate his experience of reading 'A Mirrour hight for Magistrates…[i]n which by painfull pens, the fals of Princes written were' (1610, p. 557). Blenerhasset acknowledges and then subverts his debt to textual precursors, citing the physical impracticalities of material texts; since, as a soldier, he 'could not beare about with me a librari', he contented himself with four books including 'the vnperfect *Mirrour for Magistrates*' which 'made nothing to [his] purpose' (1578S, sig. *4r).

Rather than being simply of bibliographical interest, then, textual transmission should be central to any study of the *Mirror*'s historiographical techniques and modes of representation. The interpretation of transmission is not only a means of understanding how the work was received and built upon in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but a fundamental concern of the texts themselves. Underneath and in tension with their political and historiographical functions, the late medieval complaints and their prose

links are a collection of texts about transmission.[8] They repeatedly interrogate modes of literary re-presentation and rehearsal, questioning both the oral, through mistrust of rumour and report, and the written, by foregrounding historiographical discrepancies. Elizabeth L. Eisenstein suggests that when 'the reproduction of written materials began to move from the copyist's desk to the printer's workshop', this shift had especial significance for historical scholarhip;[9] William Baldwin and his co-authors demonstrate the role of the historian bridging the categories of manuscript and print, but they are sceptical about the transmission of text in either form.

Not only the inscribed authors and compilers, but also the historical figures whose falls are retold are constantly concerned with how their utterances will be heard and read, and whether it is possible to transmit oral and written texts reliably or safely.[10] Report and reputation are central to the complaints' depictions of these figures' downfalls as well as their 'current' concerns. Baldwin did respond to the contemporary ruling class's interest in the preservation and propagation of their good name.[11] But in addition to the exploitation of this concern to make a moral point and induce obedience, Baldwin ties it to an interrogation of textuality and transmission, illustrating the precarious nature of written or spoken 'fame'.[12] Sherri Geller has demonstrated that the prose frame, as well as the complaints, 'thematizes the indistinguishability of truth and lies in accounts of history,

---

[8] Cf. Jennifer Richards, 'Transforming *A Mirror for Magistrates*', in Margaret Healy and Tom Healy (eds.), *Renaissance Transformations: The Making of English Writing, 1500-1650* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 48-63, p. 48. Richards states that the *Mirror* 'is not only about transformation but…was itself in transformation'.

[9] Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), vol. 1, p. 3.

[10] Cf. Sherri Geller, 'What History Really Teaches: Historical Pyrrhonism in William Baldwin's *A Mirror for Magistrates*', in Peter C. Herman (ed.), *Opening the Borders: Inclusivity in Early Modern Studies* (University of Delaware Press, 1999), 150-84.

[11] See Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 30.

[12] Cf. the inheritance of concern with fame from Boccaccio in Mike Pincombe's conference paper, '*The Mirror for Magistrates*: Fame and Blame', *Fame and Fortune: The Mirror for Magistrates, 1559-1946* (Magdalen College, Oxford, 2012).

undermining its own claim to veracity'.[13] But the 1559 *Mirror* goes further even than that, throwing spoken and written texts of and about the past and present into doubt. In particular, it destabilizes the process of transmission after the fact, and the manipulation of truth by multiple varying accounts. It is not just lies which concern the speakers of the complaints, but subsequent misrepresentation.

In fact, the authors of the *Mirror* might agree that '[a]s soon as a book has a reader it has been changed'.[14] This study is interested in how their book was read, and what it became. Fundamental to this project is D. F. McKenzie and Jerome McGann's 'sociology of texts', in particular the assumption that 'new readers of course make new texts, and that their new meanings are a function of their new forms'.[15] I also espouse their broad conception of responsibility for a text's production, and awareness of the historicity and variability of multiple iterations. More often, though, I take my lead from the *Mirror* texts themselves, which frequently engage with precisely McKenzie and McGann's concerns, and interrogate questions of intentionality, textual transmission and production, and the social construction and misconstruction of meaning: the span of the *Mirror*'s development explored here literalises the claim that '[e]very society rewrites its past, every reader rewrites its texts'.[16] Especially significant to this study is McKenzie's suggestion that the form of a text is 'less an embodiment of past meaning than a pretext for present meaning'.[17] The relationship between past and present meaning becomes crucial, particularly to the compendious *Mirror* editions of 1587 and 1610, which construct their new functions by eliding past significance with present understanding. It is

[13] Geller, 'Historical Pyrrhonism', p. 157.
[14] Stephen Orgel, 'Marginal Maternity: Reading Lady Anne Clifford's *A Mirror for Magistrates*', in Douglas A. Brooks (ed.), *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 267-89, p. 285.
[15] D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 29.
[16] Ibid., p. 25.
[17] Ibid., p. 33.

central to my new reading of the *Mirror* corpus that the separate editions are written and read as products of changing circumstances, but that their form is constantly self-reflexive.

A series of recent articles, following Grafton and Jardine's influential study,[18] have considered Renaissance reading and its products, asking how particular texts were read, by certain individuals.[19] Our understanding of the *Mirror* profits from these investigations, since it was a work designed to be 'studied for action' from its inception at the Inns of Court, as well as unfolding out of a tradition of commonplacing; both angles underpinned by the humanist education of the *Mirror* authors and their readers. The complaints are melting-pots of *sententiae* and *exempla*, while each complaint is also an *exemplum* writ large. But I want to suggest, too, that the action the *Mirror* prompts is further reading, and sceptical reading and writing. McGann's conception of a text 'not as an object but as an action' is helpful here;[20] textuality is the real action of the *Mirror* corpus.[21]

The chapters below offer snapshots of moments in the collection's expansion, to trace the evolution of its engagement with textual transmission, and what it meant to appropriate the *Mirror* form as the century progressed. Each chapter charts the expansion of the *Mirror* against contemporary changes to poetic and historiographical trends, and the shifting allegiances, literary and political, of the social and print communities of

---

[18] Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine, '"Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy', *Past & Present,* 11, 129 (1990), 30-78.
[19] See, for example, Freyja Cox Jensen, 'Reading Florus in Early Modern England', *Renaissance Studies,* 23, 5 (2009), 659-77; Julie Crawford, 'Reconsidering Early Modern Women's Reading, or, How Margaret Hoby Read Her De Mornay', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 73, 2 (2010), 193-223; Cathy Shrank, '"This Fatall Medea," "This Clytemnestra": Reading and the Detection of Mary Queen of Scots', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 73, 3 (523-41; Paulina Kewes, 'Henry Savile's Tacitus and the Politics of Roman History in Late Elizabethan England', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 74, 1 (2011), 515-51; and more generally, Fred Schurink, 'Manuscript Commonplace Books, Literature, and Reading in Early Modern England', *Huntington Library* Quarterly, 73, 3 (2010), 453-69.
[20] Jerome J. McGann, *The Textual Condition* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991), p. 177.
[21] Cf. Sandra Logan, *Text/Events in Early Modern England: Poetics of History* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007).

which the *Mirror*'s development was a part. At the heart of this approach is McGann's 'double helix of a work's reception history and its production history'.[22] This model works to illuminate both the 'sociology' of the *Mirror* corpus and, within that, the relationship of the *Mirror*'s transmission to its own representation of transmission. Beginning with the 1559 edition of late medieval figures' complaints overseen by William Baldwin, this study follows the extension of the corpus through the addition of ancient British and Saxon 'prequels' to the corpus by John Higgins and Thomas Blenerhasset in the 1570s, to the monumental compilation of the *First* and *Last* parts of the *Mirror* in 1587, and Richard Niccols's heavily revised and enlarged edition, printed in 1610. The thesis takes a predominantly chronological approach to the *Mirror*'s development and expansion through the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods; 'predominantly', because a lateral comparison of the different contributors' writing is also essential to an interpretation of the body of work as a whole. The *Mirror* is capacious, allusive and contradictory; there will always be more to uncover. But this diverse group of poets, all framing their writing as reading and their reading as conversation, suggest a way into the maze.

[22] McGann, *The Textual Condition*, p. 17.

Chapter One

The Late Medieval Complaints, 1559-1610: Transmission

The transmission of the *Mirror for Magistrates* is notoriously complicated. Critics are quick to observe that the texts' history 'is one of the most confused, controversial, and error-filled subjects in all of Tudor literary studies'.[1] And yet, even the most radical account of this slippery, unconventional work reinforces the common separation of its history into two distinct phases.[2] We still talk about 'Baldwin's *Mirror*' (1559-1563), and the 'post-Baldwin' editions (1571-1610), if the latter group is addressed at all.

Why define a work which is now variously celebrated for its polyvocality, collaborative composition, and fictive narratives of authorship, by its association – or not – with one individual?[3] Certainly, the paratextual material and prose frame describe how William Baldwin oversaw and coordinated the composition and collection of the *Mirror* complaints in 1559 and 1563; his death in 1563 prevented his further involvement.[4] But the collection of complaints in the voices of late medieval figures, and the accompanying prose frame, is reproduced (give or take editorial alterations and interpolations) in six editions between 1571 and 1610, as part of or alongside 'post-Baldwin' versions. Leaving aside the later collections, the group of late medieval complaints first printed in this form in 1559 has its own intricate transmission history, emerging out of the 1554 text of the suppressed *Memorial of suche Princes*, then extended and modified by each successive editor. This chapter aims to delineate in greater detail the transmission of what is

[1] Lucas, *Politics*, p. 237.
[2] Geller, 'Editing under the Influence', at 43, n.1.
[3] Mike Pincombe suggests that 'perhaps the time has come to abandon the cherished phrase "Baldwin's *Mirror*", since '[i]t implies that Baldwin was the author of the *Mirror* named after him', when he only wrote parts of it; in Mike Pincombe, 'A Structural Analysis of Two Poems by George Ferrers and William Baldwin from the 1559 *Mirror for Magistrates*', (Unpublished, 2010).
[4] See John N. King, 'Baldwin, William (*d.* in or before 1563)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1171, accessed 8 Sept 2012].

frequently referred to collectively as 'Baldwin's *Mirror*', in order to challenge the oversimplification of this nomenclature.

The 1559 edition was very unusual among mid-sixteenth-century imaginative historiography in drawing on episodes and characters from the late medieval period,[5] a period which is, in fact, an ideal foil for the texts' engagement with the transmission of historical narrative. It is recent enough to speak to contemporary interest in nationhood and the origins of the current regnal line, and to provide extensive extant written accounts. But it is also distant, in great part as a result of the Reformation and its destruction of textual evidence as well as of confessional continuity, such that full, definitive records of the period had become tantalisingly elusive, and communal memory was clouded by ideological distortion. While the *Mirror* exhibits many inheritances from the literature of the period it describes,[6] it resonates with contemporary anxieties about the instability of the textual past, and raises concerns regarding future textual distortion of the present, doubtless stemming in part from the censorship of the *Mirror*'s own precursor, *A Memorial*, in 1554.

It is crucial, therefore, to read the late medieval collection with an eye to transmission, both of, and within, the text. How do the successive authors and editors frame their approaches to reading and writing? What do the revisions to the text of 1559 reveal about these approaches when put into practice? And where should this analysis direct a new reading of the later additions?

---

[5] Other examples include *Godet's Chronicle* (1560), a series of woodcut portaits of British rulers accompanied by brief descriptions, in prose from Noah to King Harold, and in verse from William the Conqueror to Elizabeth I. George Cavendish's manuscript *Metrical Visions* arguably treats historical material just later than the late medieval period; Cavendish and his work's relationship with the *Mirror* will be discussed below. Sir David Lindsay composed *de casibus* complaints on contemporary figures, such as his *Tragedy of Cardinal Beaton* (1547), on the fall of David Beaton, the Archbishop of St. Andrews (1494-1546), and the fictional but contemporary *Complaynte and Testament of a Popiniay* (1538). See also A. S. G. Edwards, 'A Verse Chronicle of the House of Percy', *Studies in Philology,* 105, 2 (2008), 226-44.

[6] Not least its deliberate formal debt to Lydgate as an extension of his *Fall of Princes*, echoing the *Fall*'s *de casibus* complaint structure and framing narrative of composition; although the *Mirror*'s ostensible genealogical descent from the *Fall* belies its relatively small impact on the *Mirror*'s style.

The *Mirror*'s Expansion

Aside from the imperfect collation notes provided by Haslewood and Campbell's editions, no account describes in detail the transmission and expansion of the late medieval group of *Mirror* complaints between 1559 and 1610. Lucas's analysis concludes with the edition of 1563. The few studies which do address the whole range of the *Mirror*'s development focus instead on the additions by later contributors, rather than their editorial roles, and present smooth trajectories of deterioration or completion. Budra suggests that the *Mirror*'s development is defined by 'the declining abilities of successive authors';[7] 'later editions', he claims, 'suffered as they evolved away from [the *Mirror*'s original] authority and agenda'.[8] Jessica Winston, by contrast, argues that the *Mirror*'s primary purpose was augmented rather than diminished by the way in which it developed during Elizabeth's reign. She states,

> We should...read the evolving shape and audience of the *Mirror* quite differently than Budra does: the *Mirror*'s evolution indicates that it gradually realized the very project that Baldwin and his fellow authors began.[9]

These contradictory interpretations, however, leave little room for fluctuation or complexity in the *Mirror*'s fortunes across its six decades of expansion. They also fail to address specifically the transmission of the 1559 text, as distinct from the later additions to the *Mirror* corpus.

A new account of the late medieval complaints' transmission should overcome this sort of teleological narrative, while keeping the entire range of editions in sight as Budra and Winston do. Is it possible to group editions of the *Mirror* into a series of developmental phases, while avoiding the reductive impact of the 'Baldwin'/ 'post-Baldwin' division? Winston successfully deploys this tactic in her assessment of Tudor

---

[7] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 37.
[8] Ibid., p. 38.
[9] Jessica Winston, '*A Mirror for Magistrates* and Public Political Discourse in Elizabethan England', *Studies in Philology,* 4, (Fall 2004), 281-400, p. 400.

translations of Seneca,[10] and her approach demonstrates the benefits of situating textual transmission synchronically within the broader intellectual culture of the editors, translators and printers involved.[11] To do so may help to explain how and why editorial changes and interpolations to the *Mirror* occur, by exploring the groups of contributors involved at different stages of the texts' development.

The transmission of the late medieval material falls into four phases if divided by editor. Baldwin oversaw the 1559 and 1563 editions (as well as the suppressed version of 1554); no new editor is named between 1571 and 1578; while Higgins emerges as an alternative amanuensis in the narrative which frames the new late medieval complaints added in 1587; and Niccols takes charge of the 1610 revisions. But while the latter two phases are unproblematic, the first two are both fraught with internal contradictions, as we shall see. Alternatively, the works could be grouped by printer. Elizabeth Human observes that the fiction of 'the printer [as] the begetter of the text' is one which pervades the *Mirror* corpus, and reflects the real generative role of printers, witnessed by John Wayland's original commissioning an extension to Lydgate's *Fall*.[12] Thomas Marshe printed the majority of *Mirror* editions. Wayland and Felix Kyngston, respectively, printed the outlying editions of the text – the suppressed Marian *Memorial* and Niccols's expanded Jacobean edition – while the Elizabethan editions were printed by Marshe and his son Henry. This strategy would replicate Campbell's attitude towards Niccols's edition as an anomalous addition.[13] If we reposition Marshe at the centre of the *Mirror*'s development, Winston's reading of its Elizabethan transmission as a smooth process of

[10] Jessica Winston, 'Seneca in Early Elizabethan England', *Renaissance Quarterly,* 59, 1 (2006), 29-58, at 30-31.
[11] See also, for example, McGann, *The Textual Condition*, p. 15.
[12] Elizabeth M. A. Human, 'House of *Mirrors*: Textual Variation and *the Mirror for Magistrates*', *Literature Compass,* 5, 4 (May 2008), 772-90, at 779; see also Mark Breitenberg, 'Reading Elizabethan Iconicity: *Gorboduc* and the Semiotics of Reform', *English Literary Renaissance,* 18, 2 (1988), 194-217, at 204.
[13] Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 20.

improvement can be more easily understood and integrated into its history, and reconciled with the diverse group of contributors and conflicting personalities who complicate it. It is difficult, though, to see Thomas Marshe as the principal shaping influence between 1559 and 1578. The revisions are not cumulative or consistent during this period, and the changes to the edition of 1578 in particular suggest a new, different set of aesthetic and cultural concerns. In fact, both the 1587 and 1610 *Mirror*s were printed by Marshe's heirs: Kyngston inherited some of Thomas Marshe's printing materials, and perhaps the rights to the *Mirror* itself, via his stepfather Thomas Orwin.[14] Vital though the printer's role is throughout the *Mirror*'s development, it is not enough to interpret this development through the printer's input (or output) alone.

Whether scholars use the phrase 'Baldwin's *Mirror*' to refer to the editions of 1559 and 1563, or to the late medieval complaints reproduced by Campbell in 1938, these groupings lend themselves to an artificially antagonistic relationship with subsequent editions and later recensions. Rather than pitting the early against the late for the sake of interpretative convenience, or grouping the texts by the involvement of particular individuals, a more nuanced approach to the expansion of the collection is called for. To do justice to the complexity of the *Mirror*'s transmission history, and of the development and expansion of the late medieval collection in particular, the editions need to be treated as individual yet interconnected stages in the process of transmission.

Suppression and Rebranding, 1554-59

The earliest of the *Mirror*'s extant manifestations, *A Myrroure for Magistrates* (1559), is itself the product of a long history of textual transmission and appropriation. It is, of course, based on the previously prepared *Memorial of suche Princes as since the tyme of*

[14] See H. G. Aldis et al., in R. B. McKerrow (ed.), *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640* (London: Blades, East & Blandes for the Bibliographical Society, 1910).

King Richard the seconde, have been unfortunate in the Realme of England, commissioned by the Catholic printer John Wayland in 1553. Wayland's project had been conceived as an extension of John Lydgate's work, the *Fall of Princes* (1494), itself a translation and expansion of Giovanni Boccaccio's *De casibus illustrium virorum*, via the French version of Laurent de Premierfait (1365-1418), *Des cas des nobles homes et femmes* (1409). In translating Laurent's French version of Boccaccio's Latin, Lydgate himself made plain the licence afforded to the 'artificer', who may

> …chaunge and turne bi good discrecioun
> Shappis, formys, and newli hem deuyse,
> Make and vnmake in many sondry wyse[.][15]

Wayland reprinted the text as *The Fall of Prynces* in 1554, with the subtitle, 'wherunto is added the fall of al such as since that time were notable in Englande: diligently collected out of the chronicles'. The *Memorial* should have provided that additional material, but Mary I's Lord Chancellor, Stephen Gardiner, ordered that it be suppressed, and a new title page for Wayland's edition of the *Fall* was printed with the reference to a continuation excised.[16]

As Lucas notes, it is not known exactly why Gardiner chose to suppress the *Memorial*,[17] but the reputations of the authors involved in its composition may have been enough to attract his attention, and raise suspicions. On Mary's accession in 1553, in the light of her vehement opposition to her predecessor Edward VI's evangelical Protestant beliefs, the printer Edward Whitchurch retired from his profession and his business was taken on by Wayland. Whitchurch had enjoyed 'an illustrious career in evangelical publishing', printing the first editions of the *Great Bible* of 1539 and the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* with Edward VI's printer, Thomas Berthelet; he was moreover 'a

[15] Henry Bergen (ed.), *Lydgate's Fall of Princes* (Early English Text Society, London: Oxford University Press, 1924), Book I, Prologue, p. 1.
[16] For a detailed discussion of the text's suppression see Lucas, *Politics*, from p. 20.
[17] Ibid., pp. 20-21.

consistent advocate of evangelical reform'.[18] That his employee, William Baldwin, shared his confessional position seems to have gone unnoticed or unheeded by Wayland when he took over Whitchurch's shop and its staff in 1554.[19] Baldwin and his collaborators on the *Memorial*, including George Ferrers and Thomas Chaloner, had been 'committed to the ends of the evangelical governments of King Edward VI…and each had reason to fear for the future' under Mary.[20] Their faith alone should not have been enough to have the text suppressed – not, at least, until June 1555, when 'Mary prohibited and ordered burnt "any works by any protestants"'.[21]

R. W. Maslen claims that 'as a printer's assistant [Baldwin] knew that publication at the wrong time and place would be an act of Socratic self-destruction',[22] but Baldwin's shrewdly selective approach failed him on this occasion. The belated printing in 1560 of Baldwin's *The Funerals of King Edward the Sixth* (*c*. 1553), 'which blames Edward's premature death on the deep-seated corruption of the English ruling classes',[23] as well as the posthumous publication of the satire *Beware the Cat* in 1570, seem to demonstrate Baldwin's wariness of the censor, but the *Memorial*, composed ostensibly at Wayland's request, must have offered an enticing opportunity to release latently seditious material under the protection of a reputable printer, appended to a monumental, pre-Reformation work.

[18] See Alec Ryrie, 'Whitchurch, Edward (*d.* 1562)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29233, accessed 8 Sept 2012].
[19] Peter Berek notes, 'That Wayland, who seemed to function well under Mary, turned for help to the Protestant satirist Baldwin is a useful reminder of the fluidity of associations and affiliations in the 1550s'. In Berek, 'Tragedy and Title Pages: Nationalism, Protestantism, and Print', *Modern Philology,* 106, 1 (2008), 1-24, at 7.
[20] Lucas, *Politics*, p. 36.
[21] Cyndia Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 28.
[22] R. W. Maslen, 'William Baldwin and the Tudor Imagination', in Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 291-306, p. 305.
[23] Ibid., p. 294.

Having 'risked official disfavor and even personal retribution in order to release *A Memorial of suche Princes*' under Mary I,[24] Baldwin and his fellow contributors to the project found themselves on relatively safer ground when the revised version, *A Myrroure for Magistrates*, was printed in 1559. Changing the name of the *Memorial* may not have been necessary, but was probably prudent. As Lucas notes, 'the Elizabethan practice of reactive, post-publication censorship did not allow authors of such works freedom from anxiety about the ultimate fate of their writings', and Baldwin and his collaborators could not be sure how sympathetic Elizabeth and her government would be towards their previously suppressed material.[25] Amongst the changes to legislation around free speech and printing brought in on Elizabeth's accession, a number of Marian policies were retained.[26] But, as Peter Berek argues, 'early modern title pages can be construed as a kind of preface. They shape expectations and help to define a potential audience'.[27] The opportunity for politic 'rebranding' was seized and exploited to maximum effect, radically altering the ways in which readers might approach the contents.

Lucas suggests that the new title might have been inspired by the second stanza of the complaint of Gloucester, in which 'Humfrey urges Baldwin to make his life "a mirror for Magistrates all"', unless the phrase was added to the complaint after 1559.[28] While the complaint may have prompted the choice, there is more at stake in the new title. To change 'memorial' to 'mirror', and 'prince' to 'magistrate', suggests a shift in the perceived purpose of the collection, as well, perhaps, as commercial preference for catchy alliteration over stuffy obsequy. As 'memorial' is replaced with 'mirror' the title evokes

---

[24] Lucas, *Politics*, p. 22.
[25] Scott Lucas, 'Diggon Davie and Davy Dicar: Edmund Spenser, Thomas Churchyard, and the Poetics of Public Protest', *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual,* 16, (2002), 151-66, at 152.
[26] See Clegg, *Elizabethan Censorship*, p. 30.
[27] Berek, 'Tragedy and Title Pages: Nationalism, Protestantism, and Print', at 2. Lucas discusses the implications of the *Memorial* title page at length in Lucas, *Politics*, pp. 51-66. See also Ceri Sullivan, 'Disposable Elements? Indications of Genre in Early Modern Titles', *The Modern Language Review,* 102, 3 (2007), 641-53.
[28] Lucas, *Politics*, p. 241, n. 9.

perception rather than remembrance, and suggests immediacy as well as judgement and self-awareness, while invoking the long tradition of the *speculum principis*. If Lucas is right that the *Memorial* was suppressed because of the links drawn between the present and historical 'good dukes' Gloucester and Somerset,[29] the sticky ends met by its unfortunate characters would have been deserved (from Baldwin's perspective) only when read ironically. Budra suggests that the fall of Robert Tresilian alludes to the 'recent trial of Sir Nicholas Throckmorton for Protestant sedition',[30] another analogue punished for falling foul of an oppressive regime, rather than inherent wickedness. For such 'princes', a memorial would actually be fitting, and the concept of remembrance would carry satirical weight. However, as their topical relevance faded, and the ostensible purpose of the text (cautionary tales for the political elite) was brought to the fore, the mirror trope distanced the work from its earlier seditious potential by directing the reader's gaze back at their own image instead of towards likely targets. At the same time, this modification broadened the scope of the metaphor's reach – encompassing the living as well as the dead – and proved a runaway commercial success.

Herbert Grabes's break-down of the kinds of works given mirror-titles before the *Mirror for Magistrates*'s publication helps to illuminate the purpose of the change from 'memorial' to 'mirror', in that it delineates the range of generic implications inherent in the term with which Baldwin chose to introduce his work. The classification system includes 'factually informative mirrors', 'exemplary texts bearing mirror-titles' which may be either exemplary or admonitory, 'the prognostic mirror', and 'fantastic mirrors'.[31] Essentially, the term is often a fairly arbitrary title, but one which brings with it a wealth of associations. As we shall see, our *Mirror* draws on this rich semantic heritage without

[29] See ibid., Ch. 2, pp. 67-105.
[30] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 23.
[31] Herbert Grabes, *The Mutable Glass: Mirror-Imagery in Titles and Texts of the Middle Ages and English Renaissance*, trans. Gordon Collier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 38-63.

ever restricting itself to a single category; this contingency of transmission becomes central to the text's reception and meaning.

Unlike the change from 'memorial' to 'mirror', which goes some way to indicate a shift in genre, the move from 'princes' to 'magistrates' demonstrates a difference of focus, and not just rank. The princes of the *Memorial* are its characters, while the magistrates of the *Mirror*'s title are its readers as well as its subject matter. To a degree, then, the main focus implied by the title projects outwards to the readers; but because it is a 'mirror', its readership is also, by extension, its *dramatis personae*. The *Mirror* employs the term 'magistrate' in its broadest sense, which the *OED* defines as '[a] civil officer charged with the administration of the law, a member of the executive government…In this general sense the magistrate may be the sovereign or any subordinate officer with executive power within the state'.[32] This broad meaning is heightened and idealized by Thomas Norton's 1561 translation of Calvin's *Institutio Christianae Religionis* (1559), in which the magistrate is described as 'the father of the contree, and (as the Poete calleth hym) the pastor of the people, the keeper of peace, the protector of righteousnesse, the reuenger of innocence'.[33] Such a definition provides an impossible template; the *Mirror*'s task is to record and correct deviations from it.[34]

It would be easy to over-estimate the democratizing power behind the designation of all readers of and characters within the *Mirror* as 'magistrates', considering that the shift in focus from princes to the reader has only been accomplished by a change of title, rather than any substantial alteration of the content. But the range of estates represented

---

[32] 'Magistrate, *n.*', 1a, *OED* Online. March 2013. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/112219?rskey=n9Nsnm&result=1&isAdvanced=false (accessed April 22, 2013).

[33] John Calvin, *The Institution of the Christian Religion*, trans. Thomas Norton (London: Reinolde Wolfe and Richard Harrison, 1561), 4.20, f. 168v.

[34] See Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 52 for more on the significance of Calvinism to the *Mirror*.

by the choice of speakers is certainly broader than that of Lydgate's *Fall*,[35] and the prose frame allows eloquence to stand in for social status.[36] The 1559 *Mirror* contained the complaints of Robert Tresilian, Chief Justice of England; 'the two Rogers, surnamed Mortimers'; Thomas of Woodstock, duke of Gloucester; Lord Mowbray; Richard II; Owen Glendower; Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland; Richard, duke of Cambridge;[37] Thomas Montacute, earl of Salisbury; James I of Scotland; William de la Pole, duke of Suffolk; Jack Cade; Richard Plantagenet, duke of York; Lord Clifford; John Tiptoft, earl of Worcester; Richard Neville, earl of Warwick; Henry VI; George Plantagenet, duke of Clarence; and Edward IV. These complaints roughly encompass the period 1377-1483. Based on the extant *Memorial* table of contents, only Duke Humphrey's complaint is missing from the original scheme.

What else can be discovered about the transmission of the *Memorial* text? Only two pages from the original *Memorial* survived its suppression by Gardiner. Such is the scant evidence from which we must begin to piece together the story of the *Mirror*'s transmission, although Scott Lucas constructs a detailed narrative of the text's Marian composition and transmission from evidence within Baldwin's fictive prose frame.[38] Lucas describes the first edition of the *Mirror* as 'the lightly edited 1559 version of *A Memorial of suche Princes*'.[39] However, Pincombe notes that while '[i]t is often said that the 1559 *Mirror* is only a 'lightly edited' version of the old *Memorial*…since only one leaf of text survives from the original text, we cannot be sure of that'.[40] What can we be sure of by reading that surviving leaf?

---

[35] Although Lydgate includes a higher proportion of women.
[36] See, for example, the response to Jack Cade's complaint: 'What so ever he was by byrth, I warraunt hym a gentylman by his learnyng' (1559, f. 47r).
[37] Erroneously listed in the contents as earl of Cambridge from 1559-1563.
[38] Lucas, *Politics*, pp. 237-248.
[39] Ibid., p. 21.
[40] Mike Pincombe, 'William Baldwin and *A Mirror for Magistrates*', *Renaissance Studies*, (2011), 1-16, at 10.

One of the two extant excerpts from the *Memorial* that we have, the first page of Owen Glendower's complaint and its accompanying prose, actually supports the assumptions gleaned from the new title when it is compared to the guise in which it appears in the 1559 *Mirror*. Certainly, if the same degree of revision as appears in this prose link was sustained throughout the work, it would be inappropriate to describe the new *Mirror* as 'lightly edited', especially since the revisions reveal ideological and cultural differences in addition to the inevitable changes to orthography and scansion. For example, 'so eloquent' becomes 'so wofull', shifting the focus slightly from the practice of rhetoric to its affective power, and enacting this shift by abandoning Latin etymology for Old English. 'What Princes' becomes 'What Piers', while 'make men good' is replaced by 'make vs good', both of which substitutions develop the theme of communality and equitability, as against the exclusive or discrete. Finally, 'lamenteth his infortune' changes to 'lament his folly'.[41] This reflects the loss of latent sympathy for the historical figures depicted, as their topical significance fades, and their personal agency increases.

Other than this brief analysis, however, it is difficult to establish in what ways the *Memorial* differed from the 1559 *Mirror*, and impossible to know whether any substantial excisions were made. It does appear from the extant *Memorial* table of contents that we have, by 1578, complaints in the voices of all of the intended figures, even if they are not transmitted in their original form. Pincombe suggests that the names of the contributors 'who remain nameless in the *Mirror* were…given frankly in the *Memorial*', and that this excision 'shows Baldwin once again playing the role of the censor by refusing to name names'.[42] R. W. Maslen goes so far as to say that Baldwin erases himself from his writing, too, through his play with the idea of authorship, 'an erasure he may have

[41] See Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, collation notes, pp. 120-24.
[42] Pincombe, 'William Baldwin and *A Mirror for Magistrates*', at 10.

considered prudent in an age of religious conflict, when you never quite knew what faction might control the English government at any given time'.[43] Names do creep back into the text over the course of its later sixteenth-century transmission. Does this imply that as confidence grew, and Baldwin's death left him exempt from risk, the late medieval complaints began to approach the form of their original incarnations? The 1578 version of the Glendower prose link complicates this suggestion. In 1559, the prose link begins 'Whan he had ended this so wofull a tragedy' (1559, f. 18v), maintaining, as Pincombe notes, anonymity for the speaker. The *Memorial* version begins 'Whan master Chaloner had ended this so eloquent a tragedy', but in 1578 we are told that it was 'Maister Ferrers' who finished speaking (1578L, f. 24r). Either a mistake is being corrected, or the fact of attribution is more significant than to which poet the complaint is attributed. Perhaps the *Mirror* is revised in the spirit of the *Memorial* even without exactly replicating it. The 1578 edition was the first to include all of the complaints listed in the *Memorial*'s contents page, so in that sense it is the closest to the suppressed edition's shape. The short, equivocal 1559 edition does seem, by contrast, a cautious publication.

Nevertheless, the identity of those involved in the project may well have been an open secret, given the environment in which the *Memorial-Mirror* was initially written and read. Budra writes that the authors 'hoped that their audience would be learned',[44] but the first editions' real audience was more assuredly educated than his diction suggests. Winston has emphatically located the *Mirror*'s composition and reception within the Inns of Court and their circles,[45] and the text is imbued with a specifically legal discourse. The collection is immediately directed towards the legal community by the opening complaint, that of Justice Tresilian. Marshe's output also connected the work with posthumously reprinted legal texts by Sir Anthony Fitzherbert, a judge (d. 1538), and the

[43] Maslen, 'William Baldwin and the Tudor Imagination', p. 292.
[44] Budra, *De Casibus*, see pp. 29-30.
[45] See, in particular, Winston, 'Seneca in Early Elizabethan England'.

justice Sir Thomas Littleton (d. 1481), as well as the anonymous work *Institutions, or Princypal Groundes of the Lawes and Statutes of England* (1555).

While the prefaces explain that by magistrates Baldwin and his colleagues mean all men in office, or all those with the power to dispense justice, this could be a strategy to cover their antipathy to a specific group of actual magistrates; 'potential loyalty to Rome did not in itself then disqualify a man as a J.P.',[46] a trend which cannot have pleased Baldwin and his circle. But a university education, or membership of the Inns of Court were also not prerequisites for the position of J.P. in mid-sixteenth-century England,[47] and despite the broadening of the text's scope and appeal, the learned, urban elites of London and the Inns probably remained its primary market. The *Mirror* is full of humour derived from the authors' classical learning and legal training: Lord Clifford, for example, asks Baldwin to 'write my wretched fall,| The brief whereof I briefly vtter shall' (1559, f. 62v), punning on legal terminology, while Richard, earl of Warwick and one of the Nevilles, ancient enemies of the Percy family, declares himself 'a *per se* of my age' (1559, f. 69r). Poor George Plantagenet, the duke of Clarence, drowned in a butt of malmsey wine, assures Baldwin he is telling the truth because 'I can not lye, *In vino veritas*' (1559, f. 77r); following Richard, earl of Cambridge's complaint, 'belike, quoth one, this Rychard was but a litle man…for our Cronicles speake very litle of him' (1559, f. 29v). Equivalence and correspondences as means of interpreting the world are fundamental to the authors' readings of the tragedies, and place them within a distinct intellectual tradition, but here the effect is comic,[48] and designed to appeal to a close audience who would also get the joke. Budra suggests that 'Baldwin and his collaborators were themselves roughly analogous to the magistrates in their endeavours', such that 'the

---

[46] J. H. Gleason, *The Justices of the Peace in England 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 69.
[47] Ibid., p. 83.
[48] The poets' incongruous sense of humour is also noted in Pincombe, 'William Baldwin and *A Mirror for Magistrates*' at 12, and Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank, 'Doing Away with the Drab Age: Research Opportunities in Mid-Tudor Literature (1530-1580)', *Literature Compass,* 7, 3 (2010), 160-76.

magistrate might see himself reflected in history (the ghosts) or historiography (the authors), in record or the interpretation of record'.[49] But the authors and readers of the 1559 text are more than analogous. They belong to the same social group, are 'the same people', even as the 'ghosts' and 'authors' Budra places in opposition are actually members of the same group reading and reciting to one another.[50]

The association of the *Mirror* with the Inns appears to have become something of a truism by the 1570s. When Richard Robinson came to write his own collection of *de casibus* complaints, the *Rewarde of Wickednesse* (1574), which apes the *Mirror*'s style and subject matter, he suggested that the gentlemen of the Inns might be better suited to the writing of historical tragedies than he is. His account attempts to deflect the responsibility of writing:

> Commit it to some other man, that hath much better skill,
> […]
> Your Honours have in Th'innes of Court, a sort of Gentleman,
> That fine would fit your whole intents, with stately stile to Pen.[51]

There is a sharp, sidelong humour in the dissonance between the Inns and Robinson's project, which points to a degree of knowingness, if not quite mockery. Robinson's modest appeal to readers here foregrounds the writing, rather than printing, of his collection, as though anticipating the circulation among a small group of friends and patrons who would also appreciate this wry allusion.

The subject of manuscript circulation is peculiarly absent from the text of the *Mirror*, and from its recorded history. Baldwin figures the *Mirror*'s composition as a combination of manuscripts read aloud and then collected, and oral communication recorded by a secretary. The *Mirror*'s circulation in print creates and publicises the

---

[49] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 35.
[50] Cf. Geller, 'Historical Pyrrhonism', p. 162.
[51] Richard Robinson, in Allyna E. Ward (ed.), *The Rewarde of Wickednesse* (London: The Modern Humanities Research Association, 2009), p. 171.

fictional activity of a form of coterie, rendering a private exchange of texts and ideas public in a deconstructed form. The complaints themselves demonstrate the confusion of textual forms from which the work is constructed, where theatre is parallel to the written word (‘As one on a stage attendyng a playe’/ ‘as an olde booke sayth’, 1559, f. 9r-v), and pageants, proverbs and prophecies rub up against one another. The historical characters play on the ambiguities of a bookish discourse: an ‘appeal’ can be a request or a document; life is ‘abridged’; faults are ‘published’. The coalescence in the prose frame of fictional coterie and public distribution anticipates the paratextual narrative about how Blenerhasset’s *Second Part* (1578) came to be printed, in which a private literary exchange between friends falls into the hands of a printer.[52] In addition, it approaches the notion of a community of authors connected through printed accounts of their literary interaction, which Michelle O’Callaghan has argued characterised the ‘Jacobean Spenserians’ to whom Richard Niccols was affiliated.[53]

The print community represented in the 1559 *Mirror* is augmented by the disembodied presence of John Skelton (d. 1529), one of the few named poets to ‘contribute’ to this edition. By incorporating the tragedy of Edward IV, attributed to Skelton by a member of the group, the reader’s impression of the text’s composition and transmission is destabilised; Skelton is as present to us as any other contributor to the collection, but his ‘collaboration’ is involuntary. In this way, Baldwin’s first *Mirror* already exhibits the readiness to excerpt and appropriate, which is shared by the later editions more often associated with miscellanies or compendia. Moreover, the possibility of corruption, in the course of oral and material transmission between Skelton and Baldwin is also foregrounded. The editor of the 1578 text saw and attempted to rectify this instability: in 1559, Skelton’s complaint is recited aloud, from memory ‘so farre as I

[52] See Ch. 3, below.
[53] Michelle O’Callaghan, *The “Shepheards Nation”: Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture, 1612-1625* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. 3-5.

remember' (1559, f. 83r), but in 1578 the speaker explains that the complaint, 'the true copy wherof as hee wrote the same I haue here readye to be red' (1578L, f. 100r).[54] The revision reveals how important textual transmission was to those involved in producing and extending the *Mirror* corpus throughout its history, whether they revelled in its risks or tried to curb them. Edward IV's bilingual complaint is an appropriate foil for this volatility, as it gestures towards the chaotic echo chamber of Skelton's oeuvre.

Skelton wrote a Latin *Speculum Principis*, completed in 1501 and revised for presentation to Henry VIII between 1509 and 1512.[55] Although slight, this work shows Skelton appropriating the mirror for princes tradition with a mixture of pomp and irreverence, while his elaborately decorated presentation manuscript treads the line between public and private counsel. However, it is not Skelton's mirror which is most significant to the *Mirror for Magistrates*'s genesis and transmission. Rather, Baldwin and his colleagues' interaction with Skelton's work fits a broader pattern of post-Reformation reception; among those whom Jane Griffiths identifies at the culmination of posthumous praise for Skelton are the major *Mirror* author Thomas Churchyard, who contributed a prefatory encomium to Stow's 1568 edition of Skelton's works, and Robinson, whose *Reward of Wickednesse* borrowed heavily from the *Mirror*'s style, structure and subject matter.[56] Griffiths notes that 'the afterlife of the Skeltonic is decidedly Protestant', even if 'many of the Skeltonic protests are more subtle than this might imply'.[57] Aside from the general esteem for Skelton of Churchyard and Robinson, Baldwin in particular seems to co-opt Skelton's multivocal protest in *Speke Parott* for Protestant purposes, appearing to draw on the shrill caveat 'ware the cat, Parot, ware the fals cat!' in the title of his own

[54] Ironically, the 1578 editor also makes changes to the text of Skelton's complaint; even this interpolated concern for textual authority is a fiction.
[55] *The Latin Writings of John Skelton*, ed. David R. Carlson, p. 107.
[56] Jane Griffiths, *John Skelton and Poetic Authority: Defining the Liberty to Speak* (Oxford English Monographs; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), p. 158.
[57] Ibid., p. 161.

satire of clerical authority and corruption.[58] Skelton's influence is more pervasive in the *Mirror* corpus than his own dalliance with the *speculum* genre or the attributed complaint suggest. Even if he did not write Edward IV's tragedy, it is fitting that his name should appear in the narrative of the text's composition. Baldwin's early *Mirror* does, I think, quite clearly take its lead from Skeltonic protest; Collyn Clout's 'scrupulous care to dissociate himself' from potentially seditious utterances,[59] for example, anticipates exactly the techniques used by Baldwin in the *Mirror*.

Like Skelton, the *Mirror* contributor Thomas Sackville's affinity with the *Mirror*'s concerns and themes is demonstrated substantially through his work outside of the *Mirror* tradition. Sackville and Thomas Norton's co-authorship of *Gorboduc* (1561) returned to the relationship between unjust rule and civil discord. Sackville's best known verse, the Induction to his complaint of Buckingham, has far less in common with the earlier *Mirror* material and *Gorboduc* than those texts have with each other. But the addition of Sackville's Induction in 1563 redefined the *Mirror*. Not only that, but it shaped the *Mirror*'s reception, inspiring the dream frame devices in reinterpretations by Higgins and Niccols, as well as providing often the sole representative of the collection in modern anthologies of Renaissance poetry.[60] It was also well-known independently of its *Mirror* context,[61] and disproportionately influential in Shakespeare's poetry and drama.[62] For this reason among others, the 1563 edition is probably the most influential for the

[58] John Skelton, 'Speke Parott', in John Scattergood (ed.), *The Complete English Poems* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1983), 230-46, p. 233, l. 99.
[59] Griffiths, *John Skelton and Poetic Authority*, p. 163.
[60] See, for example, Gordon Braden (ed.), *Sixteenth-Century Poetry: An Annotated Anthology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005); Derek Pearsall (ed.), *Chaucer to Spenser: An Anthology of Writings in English, 1375-1575* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999); Betty S. Travitsky and Anne Lake Prescott (eds.), *Male & Female Voices in Early Modern England: An Anthology of Renaissance Writing* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).
[61] See Orgel, 'Marginal Maternity', p. 274.
[62] As shown by Meredith Anne Skura in her conference paper, 'The *Mirror*'s Children', *Fame and Fortune: The Mirror for Magistrates, 1559-1946* (Magdalen College, Oxford, 2012).

future transmission of the late medieval complaints, and for the development of the *Mirror* corpus as a whole.

The 'Second Part' (1563)

Not only has Sackville's Induction proved the most popular excerpt from the *Mirror* in subsequent years; it was also highly favoured by Baldwin's fictive collaborators in the 1563 prose frame. One argues that the piece, 'in my iudgement is so wel penned, that I woulde not haue any verse therof left out of our volume' (1563, f. 138r), and when they have heard the Induction and the complaint which follows it, they conclude that '[t]he tragedy excelleth: the inue*n*cion also of the induction, and the discriptions are notable' (f. 138r). Why do Baldwin and his colleagues approve so heartily of these poems?

Campbell tells us that Sackville was 'of surpassing eminence among the group with whom he was associated in the *Mirror*',[63] and perhaps Sackville's absence from the prose frame's debate evinces his apparent superiority: Baldwin claims to have spoken to him about his work, but he does not take part. Sackville's contributions, moreover, are not merely better written, but differently written, drawing on vernacular traditions in English and Italian poetry which mark his verses out as distinctly literary. Budra notes, for example, that 'Sackville took the list of allegorical characters loitering around the gates of hell from Vergil', but replaced the Sibyl with Sorrow, 'who may owe something to the character of Sorrow in Chaucer's translation of *The Romaunt of the Rose*'.[64] Sackville's allusion to classic medieval dream visions also sets Baldwin's own dream, first recounted in the edition of 1559, within a serious intellectual context and reframes Baldwin's lapse of concentration as a legitimate literary trope. Finally, the implication that a poet to be reckoned with is now a part of the group sets up the inclusion in 1563 of the tragedy of

[63] Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 35.
[64] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 53.

Collingbourne, another poet, whose complaint is used to explore the limits of poetic freedom. In this way the 1563 *Second Part* extends the *Mirror*'s discussion of textual transmission from historical source material to imaginative literature, before exploring the threat posed by misinterpretation. The collection also dramatizes the susceptibility of manuscript circulation to abuse. Sackville's Induction is intended as an introduction, self-evidently and as per Baldwin's explanation, but Baldwin places it in the collection according to its role in the narrative of compilation, not according to its role in the compilation itself. A picture emerges of a putative *Mirror* as it would be when complete, and we must remind ourselves that the *Mirror for Magistrates* to which the inscribed Baldwin refers is in fact a fictional text.

The 1563 edition was allegedly compiled at the encouragement of Henry Stafford (d. 1563),[65] despite the fact that by this time Baldwin had 'bene called to an other trade of lyfe', that is, taken orders.[66] The new edition contained, in addition to the 1559 material, a 'Second Part' in which a group of tragedies retold the machinations of Richard III's rise to power and subsequent fall, through the complaints of Anthony Woodville, Lord Rivers and Scales; Lord Hastings; Henry, duke of Buckingham, preceded by Sackville's Induction; the poet Collingbourne; Richard Plantagenet, duke of Gloucester; and Shore's wife, Jane. Two more complaints follow, 'to occupye the tyme whyle we be nowe together' (1563, f. 156r): Edmund, duke of Somerset, killed at the first Battle of St Albans (1455), and the tragedy of 'the Blacksmith', Michael Joseph, recounting the Cornish Rebellion of 1497. Baldwin's persona claims that this piece will eventually be placed in a 'third part' of the *Mirror*, which would narrate falls which occurred between Henry VII's reign and the present day.

---

[65] See C. S. L. Davies, 'Stafford, Henry, tenth Baron Stafford (1501–1563)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2006 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26205, accessed 8 Sept 2012]; the 1559 dedication also cites Stafford's assistance in the *Mirror*'s publication (p. 66).

[66] Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 66 n.

Given this blurring of real and fictive texts, it becomes difficult to trust Baldwin's claims about the composition of the 'Second Part'. The assertion in the amended dedication that 'I haue nowe also set furth an other parte, conteyning as litle of myne owne, as the fyrst part doth of other mens' supports the suspicion that his representation of the complaints' authorship in the 1559 prose frame was fictive,[67] while we may trust that the named poets, like Churchyard and Sackville, really did write the 1563 pieces ascribed to them. We have a little insight into the composition of Sackville's *Mirror* poems: MS 364 at St John's College, Cambridge contains the Induction, and the complaint of Buckingham, along with 'additional stanzas, parts of stanzas, and suggestions which seem to relate to Sackville's work on the *Mirror*'.[68] A note reminds Sackville to 'Loke in the prolouge of Bochas fol. lxiiii',[69] and is followed by fragments which allude to the Prologue to Book III of Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*;[70] one of the contributors at least kept their erstwhile hypotext in mind.

The prose links of the 'Second Part' seem more intent on the idea of equivalence. Treated humorously in 1559, the 'Second Part' contains more, and more serious, references to this means of interpreting the world. The complaint of the Blacksmith, for example, is apparently included unedited, because

> The Author him selfe…hath desired me that it maye passe in suche rude sorte as you haue heard it: for he obserueth therein a double *decorum* both of the Smith, and of him selfe: for he thinketh it not mete for the Smyth to speke, nor for himself to write in any exacte kynde of meter. (1563, f. 179r)

---

[67] Ibid., p. 66 n. See also Geller, 'Historical Pyrrhonism', p. 156.
[68] Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 544. Campbell collates these two poems with the printed versions in Appendix C. See also Marguerite Hearsey, 'The MS Of Sackville's Contribution to the *Mirror for Magistrates*', *The Review of English Studies,* 8, 31 (1932), 282-90, and Marguerite Hearsey (ed.), *The Complaint of Henry, Duke of Buckingham, Including the Induction: Or, Thomas Sackville's Contribution to the Mirror for Magistrates* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936).
[69] Hearsey (ed.), *The Complaint of Henry, Duke of Buckingham*, p. 91.
[70] Giovanni Boccaccio, *The Tragedies, Gathered by Ihon Bochas, of All Such Princes as Fell from Theyr Estates Throughe the Mutability of Fortune since the Creacion of Adam, Vntil His Time Wherin May Be Seen What Vices Bring Menne to Destruccion, Wyth Notable Warninges Howe the Like May Be Auoyded*, trans. John Lydgate (London: John Wayland, 1554), f. 64r. Cf. Hearsey (ed.), *The Complaint of Henry, Duke of Buckingham*, pp. 123-5.

This is presented as an ideal of decorous textuality; the authors aspire to poetic appropriateness to counterbalance the threats posed by the process of transmission.

The strength of the text's connection to Inns of Court, the legal profession, and the associated classical learning is unchanged. A newly incorporated complaint of Lord Hastings by 'Maister Dolman', for example, was most likely written by the John Dolman whose translation of *Those fyue Questions, which Mark Tullye Cicero, disputed in his Manor Tusculum* was printed in 1561 by Thomas Marshe.[71] While Campbell condemns Dolman's poetry, she claims that his complaint is remarkable because 'in learning and in thoughtful philosophizing on the rewards of evil-doing, it is second only to Sackville's tragedy', and it contains a discussion of Chaucer's *Nuns Priests Tale* which is 'more extensive and detailed than any other of its date'.[72] The prose link following Hastings's complaint famously affirms its readership's status as something akin to Jonathan Culler's 'competent reader';[73] although the complaint is 'very darke, and hard to be vnderstood', '[c]onsidering also that it is written for the learned (for such all Magistrates are or should be) it can not be to hard, so long as it is sound and learnedly wrytten' (1563, f. 114v). In this way, the 'Second Part' retains the intellectual elitism of the 1559 edition, despite Ferrers's inclusive mission statement.

Sackville, too, was associated with the Anglo Saxon antiquary, William Fleetwood, a member of Clifford's Inn and the Middle Temple,[74] who notes in his *Itinerarium ad Windsor* how he and Sackville customarily converse 'sometymes of parleamente matters, sometymes of chronicles and historyes, but chiefelye of the

---

[71] Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 45.
[72] Ibid., p. 46.
[73] See Jonathan Culler, *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1975).
[74] See J. D. Alsop, 'William Fleetwood and Elizabethan Historical Scholarship', *The Sixteenth Century Journal,* 25, 1 (Spring 1994), 155-76, at 156.

antiquityes of this realme of England'.[75] Fleetwood is known to have been sceptical regarding written historical records,[76] adding to the circle of Inns members whose work questioned the trustworthiness of textual transmission. This trend found expression in Thomas Newton's edition of *Seneca his Tenne Tragedies*, printed by Marshe in 1581 but arising from the Inns' resurrection of Senecan drama in the late 1550s and 1560s, in parallel with the expansion of the *Mirror*.[77] Jasper Heywood asked the reader in the 1559 preface to his translation of *Troas* to consider 'how hard a thing it is for mee to touch at ful in all poynts the authors mynd, (beyng in many places verye harde and doubtfull, and the worke much corrupt by the default of evil printed Bookes)';[78] 'this worke seemed unto mee in some places unperfite, whether left so of the Author, or parte of it loste, as tyme devoureth all thinges, I wot not'.[79] Alexander Nevile, like Fleetwood an associate of Matthew Parker, writes that his *Oedipus* is 'from his Author in word and verse somewhat transformed, though in Sense litle altered: and yet oftentimes rudely encreased with mine owne simple invention: more rashly (I confesse) than wisely'.[80] Nevile's *Oedipus* (1563) and its preface in particular forge close lexical links with the early editions of the *Mirror*.[81] As Winston has noted, Nevile describes Oedipus himself as a 'mirror meet' for princes.[82] Additionally, he states in the 'Preface to the Reader' that 'Myne only entent was to exhorte men to embrace Vertue and shun Vyce',[83] a formulation similar to that deployed in the *Mirror* prose link preceding Richard II's complaint, seemingly to deflect

---

[75] Ibid., at 175.
[76] Ibid., at 167-8.
[77] See Winston, 'Seneca in Early Elizabethan England'. Winston developed the connection between the *Mirror* and Senecan tragedy in her paper on the *Mirror*'s reception at 'Fame and Fortune: The *Mirror for Magistrates*, 1559-1946' (Magdalen College, Oxford, September 2012).
[78] Thomas Newton (ed.), *Seneca His Tenne Tragedies, Translated into English*, ed. Charles Whibley 2 vols. (The Tudor Translations, Second Series, 2; London: Constable and Co., 1927), pp. 3-4.
[79] Ibid., p. 4.
[80] Ibid., 1., p. 190.
[81] Nevile's *De furoribus Norfolciensium Ketto duce* (London: Henry Bynneman, 1575) also demonstrates his common interest in popular rebellion.
[82] Seneca, *The Lamentable Tragedie of Oedipus the Sonne of Laius Kyng of Thebes*, trans. Alexander Nevile (London: Thomas Colwell, 1563), sig. D2v.
[83] Newton (ed.), *Tenne Tragedies*, p. 191.

attention from corrupt historical records. A disagreement between chronicle sources 'is more harde to desise, than nedefull to our purpose, which minde onely to diswade from vices and exalte vertue' (1559, f. 16r).[84]

The 1563 'Second Part' introduced the first female voice to the collection. The complaint of Shore's wife, Edward IV's mistress, is also the first contribution by Thomas Churchyard to the *Mirror*. It became one of the most popular and frequently excerpted tragedies, and the definitive account of Jane Shore's fashionable narrative.[85] Richard Danson Brown suggests that Jane Shore's story and its transmission history became intertwined in the sixteenth century, as she became '(to borrow a metaphor from Drayton's Rosamond) a sexualized 'scribled paper' which Elizabethan writers reinscribed at will'.[86]

Shore's complaint went on to undergo a divergent transmission history, reprinted in the subsequent *Mirror* editions and 'much augmented' in the compilation, *Churchyard's Challenge* (1593). Churchyard told his dedicatee Lady Mount Eagle and Compton that, 'because Rosimond is so excellently sette forth…I haue somewhat beautified my Shores wife'.[87] Demonstrating the self-perpetuating agency of the complaint genre in the late Elizabethan period, Churchyard tries to prove himself by augmenting his poem in Pygmalion-esque terms, playing on Shore's gender in his choice of trope. He added new stanzas 'of a lyrical kind, in the style of Spenser and his imitators'.[88] Churchyard means 'beautified' literally; the newly enlarged Shore claims,

[84] Cf. Pincombe, 'William Baldwin and *a Mirror for Magistrates*', at 12.
[85] Richard Danson Brown, '"A Talkatiue Wench (Whose Words a World Hath Delighted in)": Mistress Shore and Elizabethan Complaint', *The Review of English Studies,* 49, 196 (November 1998), 395-415, at 400.
[86] Ibid., at 396.
[87] Churchyard, *Churchyard's Challenge* (1593), Dedication, p. 116. Samuel Daniel's *Complaint of Rosamund* was first printed in 1592.
[88] Barbara Brown, 'Sir Thomas More and Thomas Churchyard's "Shore's Wife"', *The Yearbook of English Studies,* 2, (1972), 41-48, p. 47.

My beautie blasd, like torch or twinckling starre,
A liuely lamp, that lends darke world some light,
Faire *Phoebus* beames, scarse reacheth halfe so farre:
As did the rayes, of my rare beautie bright,
As summers day, exceedes blacke winters night,
So *Shores* wiues face, made foule *Browneta* blush:
As pearle staynes pitch, or gold surmounts a rush.

The Damaske rose, or *Rosamond* the faire,
That Henry held, as deere as Iewells be,
Who was kept close, in cage from open ayre:
For beauties boast, could scarse compare with me.[89]

Here, Churchyard has Shore engage, through *The Complaint of Rosamund*, with both external historical precedent and the poem's literary context, telescoping the transmission of her story, and building on the sense of a gendered text whose beauty may be compared to others.

The final framing prose passage refers to a tantalising plethora of complaints which Baldwin has chosen not to include. It requests new contributions for the collection, clearing a path for the contributions of Higgins, Blenerhasset and Niccols, despite its author's doubtful sincerity. The fictive narrative of the text's composition has confused critics and contributors alike, but it proved hugely successful with readers, whose interest sustained its expansion over nearly five subsequent decades. The most active of these was the 1570s, which saw four new editions of the late medieval complaints, as well as the continuations by Higgins and Blenerhasset. It was in this period that the collection's emphasis began to be seriously modified by its transmission, as editors and contributors enacted the bowdlerization that earlier editions had theorized.

[89] Thomas Churchyard, *Churchyards Challenge* (London: John Wolfe, 1593), p. 129.

Ferrers's *Mirror*? A Historiographical Overhaul

The collection of late medieval complaints was reprinted four times during the 1570s, with two new tragedies added in 1578. The editions of 1571 and 1574 (and the reissue of 1575) reproduce only the complaints printed in 1563, but 1571 brought substantial modifications to that text. Budra claims that these 'Baldwin editions' 'emphasize the political and the historical over the tragic and the empathetic', like Collingbourne's complaint.[90] But the alterations cannot have been Baldwin's, as he had died in 1563. Who took control of the *Mirror* project, and continued to promote it after Baldwin's death?

Pincombe suggests that it was George Ferrers who 'edited and extensively revised' the 1571 edition.[91] This edition saw the widespread correction and augmentation of historical detail, for which Ferrers's sections of the earlier texts are notable. Besides, says Pincombe, 'who else would take the trouble to rewrite so much of "Baldwin's *Mirror*"?' It could not have been Higgins, who 'treated the 'master-text' with great reverence – quite unlike the commandeering reviser of 1571'.[92] We cannot go so far as to call this edition 'Ferrers's *Mirror*'. Despite the appropriation and adaptation of the text by its anonymous editor, the fiction of Baldwin's presence as coordinator and secretary is maintained in the late medieval complaints throughout the 1570s. But sweeping and lasting changes are made to the text, frequently carried right through to the edition of 1587.

Campbell notes minimal changes to the structure and layout of the 1571 edition. There are no new complaints added, but the preface to the 1563 'Second Part' is omitted, and some of the complaints are re-ordered: the tragedy of the Duke of Somerset is placed between those of Jack Cade and Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York, while the complaint

[90] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 55.
[91] Pincombe, 'Structural Analysis', p. 8.
[92] Ibid., p. 9. The text of the 1587 *Mirror* arguably does derive from that of 1574, though, which takes on the 1571 revisions.

of Jane Shore is placed last in the volume.[93] These changes improve the chronology of the sequence, in keeping with the greater emphasis on historical accuracy across the edition's revisions, and begin the metamorphosis of Baldwin's fiction into a historical compendium. The prose links' interrogation of textual transmission is stifled somewhat, too, in the process. The link which had connected the tragedy of Shore's wife and Edmund, duke of Somerset in 1563 is excised; gone is Baldwin's proposal that,

> …to occupye the tyme whyle we be nowe together, I wyl reade vnto you Edmund the Duke of Somerset, which must be placed in the fyrst parte: and than the blacke Smyth, which must serve for [the] thyrde volume. (1563, f. 156r-v)

This extraordinary fiction had constructed a meta-*Mirror*, imagining the compilation not of the book we are reading but of an external text which is somehow both real and not. In excising this detail, Ferrers begins the shift towards a more straight-faced *Mirror* which is finally fully realised in Niccols's edition where all prose and verse links are removed. Similarly, his textual alterations set a precedent for later editors.

These alterations frequently change the tragedies' sense, not merely their spelling or scansion as we might expect. This suggests that the text was deliberately revised, rather than simply inaccurately copied. The majority of textual variants which are retained throughout the subsequent four editions are introduced at this point; while the 1571 text is frequently overlooked as there are no new complaints added, it is in fact a vital stage in the *Mirror*'s transmission history. A new device is introduced for the title page of this edition which is also used for the title pages of all of the subsequent versions, such that this text also defines the *Mirror* 'brand' henceforward. This decision would have been made in conjunction with, if not by, Marshe, who had been involved with the project throughout its Elizabethan development. Since a radical overhaul of the text coincided with the institution of a new title page, it might be safe to assume that Marshe was party

[93] Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 15.

to the reframing of the 1571 *Mirror*. As will become clear, Marshe played a significant part in shaping the text's expansion and evolution later. Did his role in the collection's generic drift begin here?

Although most of the textual alterations are minor, a number of them work to sharpen the collection's political terminology. In particular, references to unjust rulers become tighter, perhaps owing to increased confidence in the *Mirror*'s contemporary acceptability. In the complaint of the poet Collingbourne, for example, 'The kyng him selfe' is replaced with 'The tyrant prince', and 'That with the lewde save this no order was' becomes 'That among tyrants this is and euer was'. The final line of the complaint, which remained fairly cryptic in the 1563 edition, is altered from a coy warning 'So shall their freedome save them from extreames', to the more overt hope that their 'fredome vnto no harme redound' (1571, f. 145r). It is notable that these particular alterations were all retained throughout all of the subsequent editions.

In line with this greater confidence and specificity, it is in 1571 that initials are included after some of the complaints. It is unclear in the 1559 prose frame exactly who is supposed to have written what, particularly since Baldwin does not name all of his collaborators. In the 'Second Part' we are told that tragedies have been written by Dolman, Sackville and Churchyard, but many of the additions remain anonymous, as Baldwin reads them aloud from manuscripts he has collected. Furthermore, Baldwin's companions in this second fictional meeting remain predominantly anonymous too. The 1571 inclusion of initials attributes specific complaints to specific authors; the use of initials rather than full names could hint either at residual anxiety, or authorial modesty. Official attribution, which Geller argues would have been so dangerous under Mary that Baldwin constructed the fictive narrative of composition to avoid it,[94] inscribes a

[94] Geller, 'Historical Pyrrhonism', at 154-157.

heightened sense of individual authorial agency and accountability, and nudges the appearance of the text towards that of a poetic anthology or miscellany.

Further to the inclusion of authors' initials, dates were added to the complaints' titles as part of the revisions in 1571. This gave the reader greater factual precision, and increased the text's value as a historiographical resource; a significant departure from the earlier editions which emphasised historical ambiguity, and aimed to be morally rather than factually educative. So what was it that motivated this divergent augmentation of the late medieval material, and what kind of agenda did it advance?

Commercial Expansion, 1574-75: The *Mirror* and Thomas Marshe

Thomas Marshe plays a crucial role in the transmission of the *Mirror*, since as its printer he facilitates it. He responded to popular demand and continued to print the collection, in a total of six editions across his career. But Marshe also makes it difficult for critics who wish to separate 'Baldwin's *Mirror*' from its later recensions, as he printed the late medieval complaints three times in the 1570s in conjunction with Higgins's *First Part*, the 'prequel' which begins its sequence of *de casibus* complaints with the foundation of Britain by Brutus. It is therefore Marshe who orchestrates the shifting emphasis of the *Mirror*, and solidifies its change in function, from topical admonishment to encyclopaedic history. Assessing Marshe's output, and imagining the range of texts he printed for sale side by side, it becomes possible to see more clearly the role the *Mirror for Magistrates* played within a largely cohesive and complementary network of cultural production.

Budra observes that 'Marshe had had an eclectic early career. He printed everything, from psalters to cookbooks. Later he would have success in history and tragedy…But he is probably best known to students of Renaissance literature as the

printer of *Seneca His Tenne Tragedies* (1581)'.[95] Actually, though, this account downplays Marshe's involvement in printing and reprinting what modern scholars would consider mainstays of sixteenth-century intellectual culture, from Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Boke Named the Gouernour* (1557), *The Firste Volum of Syr Iohn Froissart* (1563), and Stow's *Summarie of Englyshe Chronicles* (1565), to translations of Horace (1567) and Ovid (1572), collected works of Skelton (1568) and John Heywood (1577), and Roger Ascham's *Toxophilus* (1571). Marshe also printed Baldwin's *Funeralles of King Edward the Sixt* (1560), and the expanded version of Nicholas Udall's *Flowers or Eloquent Phrases of the Latine Speech* (1575), compiled by John Higgins.

Higgins's *First Part of the Mirror* was first printed in 1574, and then again in 1575 with minimal textual alterations and one new tragedy added.[96] It contained an Induction in which Higgins's first person persona reads the *Mirror*, before falling asleep and being guided by Morpheus into a hall where ancient British figures, 'Destainde with woade…And wylde', tell him 'Their names, and lyues: their haps, and haples days' (1574F, f. 3r). Echoing an aphorism expounded by Blacksmith in 1563 when he observes that 'as the greatest heads, the grayest heyres, and best clarkes haue not most witte, so the greatest Bookes, titles and Tomes containe not most mater' (1574F, *5v), Higgins's aim is to remedy this shortfall using 'mine owne simple inuention'. Perhaps in keeping with the sense that 'the range of learning required by a good magistrate was quite extensive, and was not reflected by the formal syllabus of the universities',[97] Higgins's history was expansive but unpretentious.

[95] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 11.
[96] See Ch. 2, below.
[97] Jan Broadway, *"No Historie So Meete": Gentry Culture and the Development of Local History in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England*, eds Ann Hughes, Anthony Milton, and Peter Lake (Politics, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain; Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2006), p. 187.

Budra states that 'the *Mirror* was of a kind with … Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* and Holinshed's *Chronicles*', in that it was 'a patriotic and political work that passed through the hands of multiple editors and contributors over a long printing history', a 'complex literary endeavour…indicative of mid-sixteenth-century print culture and suggestive of early modern understanding of text'.[98] The *Mirror*'s place among the great historiographical monuments of the sixteenth century could partially to be owed to Marshe, and his son and assign Henry, for their part in the text's expansion, but Marshe's other publications demonstrate the proliferation of a similar commercial strategy. In 1575, he also printed *The First Tome of the Palace of Pleasure* by William Painter and Thomas Churchyard's *Firste Parte of Churchyardes Chippes* – tempting prospective buyers with the suggestion of continuations must have been a profitable venture. Marshe's output is also packed with summaries, abbreviations and epitomes of historiographical and theological works. Could Marshe have conceived of the *Mirror* in this way, as it evolved from 'a collection of cautionary tales into a dictionary of national (and fervently nationalist) biography'?[99]

The alteration of the title of the late medieval *Mirror* to accommodate the new Higgins material made its subjection to Marshe's project overt: the 1574 edition and 1575 reissue were dubbed the *Last Part of the Mirror for Magistrates*, apparently rejecting the notion of future sequels. These first and last parts were presumably sold as a pair,[100] doubling Marshe's profit and approaching the vision Higgins had for his comprehensive history of Britain.

---

[98] Budra, *De Casibus*, pp. xii-xiii.
[99] Philip Schwyzer, 'Higgins, John (*b. c.*1544, *d.* in or before 1620)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2010 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13233, accessed 8 Sept 2012].
[100] See Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 17.

As Jennifer Richards observes, 'Higgins is not the outsider that scholars would have us believe'.[101] He was associated with Churchyard and Thomas Newton, both of whom had works printed by Marshe, and were admirers of Higgins's other work.[102] However, Higgins and Churchyard were not contemporaries by any means, and did not share the background of Edward VI's court that Baldwin and Ferrers had in common. Higgins therefore did not come to the *Mirror* with the same ambitions and expectations as his predecessors. Higgins also differs from Baldwin in that Higgins was the sole contributor to his *First Part*, with complete authorial control over the inductions which frame the complaints within a fully imaginative dream vision structure, rather than the 'pseudo-nonfiction' scenario of Baldwin's text. He exerted sufficient agency within the *Mirror* project to break away from the framework set up by Baldwin and his collaborators, while extending their work in the direction Ferrers's revisions had gestured.

Across the 1570s, the *Mirror* saw expansion for commercial reasons, as well as revision for ideological ones. Higgins's *First Part* and Marshe's commercial involvement are essential to this history, and to the course the revisions of the late medieval material took during this decade. But the clear logic behind the 1574-5 editions of the late medieval complaints, to be released in parallel with Higgins's continuation, makes the *Mirror* printed in 1578 all the more mystifying. The extensive revision in 1571 was nothing to the dramatic alterations put into print seven years later, and then subsequently ignored by Higgins and Henry Marshe when they came to compile the final sixteenth-century edition. Another, it seems, different anonymous editor was to put their stamp on *Mirror*, and potentially redirect the course of its transmission history once again.

---

[101] Richards, 'Transforming', p. 25.
[102] Schwyzer, 'Higgins, John (*b. c.*1544, *d.* in or before 1620)', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13233, accessed 8 Sept 2012].

1578: An Anomalous Edition

In 1578, then, the late medieval complaints were reprinted, including two new additions: the tragedies of Eleanor Cobham, duchess of Gloucester, and Humphrey Plantagenet, duke of Gloucester. The history of these two complaints is among the most complex and significant of any in the collection. Existing analyses only touch on disparate aspects of this history, clouding the picture further, so here I will attempt to sketch out the facts so far as they can be reconstructed, and offer a new analysis of the pair of complaints and how they work together. Additionally, a very large number of textual alterations are introduced in the 1578 edition, which are not retained in 1587. Along with the inclusion of Eleanor and Humphrey's complaints in a cancel, this suggests that there were strong, and perhaps contradictory editorial forces at work on this particular text. The new material itself engages directly with the subject of textual transmission, rendering this edition one of the most self-reflexive and difficult of the *Mirror* canon.

It is thought that this edition, like that of 1574, was printed in conjunction with Higgins's *First Part*, but although it was printed by Marshe it does not seem to fit with his programme of commercial expansion. Why isn't the 1574 text simply reproduced, but with the two additional complaints? Was the expanded and heavily edited 1578 *Mirror* a separate, anomalous enterprise?

The addition of Eleanor and Humphrey's complaints completes the late medieval collection for the first time; for the first time the edition's list of titles matches its content; the collection now ostensibly fits the original plan. However, Campbell suggests that the whole text was edited 'with an enthusiasm for change which is hard to explain…It seems very doubtful whether the text was derived from the immediately preceding texts'.[103] She does not go on to speculate about the text's derivation; Pincombe suggests that, again,

[103] Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 18.

Ferrers might be behind the anonymous alterations,[104] although this is both supported and belied by aspects of the 1571 and 1578 texts. This edition returned to the 1559 or 1563 text, deliberately bypassing a number of the 1571 alterations to Ferrers's complaint of Tresilian.[105] It makes sense that either he revised his own complaint in 1571, or corrected the 1571 revisions in 1578 to return to an original text, but not that he did both.

The revisions in 1578 are not spread consistently through the whole work. Instead, there are some identifiable trends, and a number of revision-heavy complaints. In terms of actual content, the 1578 revisions push for greater specificity and precision, inserting or clarifying details where, in particular, the prose frame was vague. Instead of 'a battayle', for example, the 1578 text specifies 'a battaile at Towton in Yorkeshire' (1578L, f. 81v). Substantial passages are added to the links preceding Tresilian and Richard Plantagenet's tragedies, which provide additional historical information, while smaller interpolations to the prose preceding the Mortimers' complaint reveal a desire for accuracy which verges on pedantry, adding 'Earle of March, and heyre apparaunt of Englande' to 'Roger Mortimer' and clarifying 'the last' as 'the earle Mortimer called Roger' (1578L, f. 4r). One counter-example occurs in the prose linking George, Duke of Clarence and King Edward IV's complaints, which sets out when the fictional writers' collective will meet again. In 1559, Baldwin suggests, 'Let vs therefore for this time leave with him. And this daye seuen nights hence, if your business will so suffer, let vs all mete here together agayne' (1559, f. 82v). This fiction persists until 1578, when the editor replaces it with the vaguer proposal that 'some other day when your leasure will beste serue let vs mete here altogether agayne'. The replacement of 'business' with 'leasure' arguably raises the social status of the *Mirror*'s compilers, removing the suggestion of professional authorship.

[104] Pincombe, 'Structural Analysis', p. 9.
[105] See Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 31.

Complaints which are particularly thoroughly revised in 1578 include those of the Mortimers, and Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York.[106] These conform to the trends observed, as precise details are added, and the discourse is given an aristocratic gloss. Fortune gains a (sophisticated and continental?) ‘triumphall Arch’ (1578L, f. 4v);[107] ‘fortunate estate’ becomes ‘pompe and highe estate’ (1578L, f. 7r); ‘matchles men’ are replaced by ‘knights peerelesse’ (1578L, f. 77v). The 1578 editor also amplifies the blame apportioned, particularly in the Duke of York’s complaint, where the behaviour of men that had been mere ‘folly’ renders them ‘Beastes most brute’ (1578L, f. 77v), and actions that were ‘voyde of cause’ are now ‘traytourlike’ (1578L, f. 78r). Increased emphasis on his son, the earl of Rutland, heightens the verse’s affective power. The title clarifies Rutland’s role as ‘an Infant cruelly murdered’, and this theme persists as the editor replaces ‘my sonne’ with ‘this poore Boy, whom by the hand I led’ (f. 77v), ‘my childe’ with ‘my poore infant’ (f. 79r), and ‘the infant wept’ with ‘the pore child with tears did mercy craue’ (f. 79r).

What revisions to the two complaints have most in common, though, is a greater emphasis on the theme of succession and inheritance, as in the revisions to the prose links. The following couplet in the Mortimers’ complaint is replaced with more overt comments on succession:

> Throughe theyr deserte so called of euery wight,
> Tyll death them tooke, and left me in theyr right. (1559, f. 5v)

is altered such that its implications are spelt out, as follows:

> After whose Death I onely stood in plight,
> To be next heyre vnto the crowne by right. (1578L, f. 5v)

[106] By contrast, there are hardly any new revisions to be found in the complaints of Richard, Earl of Warwick, Henry VI, and Collingbourne.
[107] See Anthony Miller, *Roman Triumphs and Early Modern Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 2-3.

Later, Richard II's death is not significant because it is caused by his 'dissolute lyfe', but because he has 'none heire after him to reigne'. These changes could have been prompted by a surge in awareness of a growing succession crisis in England, whereby questions of legitimate succession would be of general interest. The augmented emphasis on the Mortimers' right to the crown, however, may have had to do with the claim of Mary Stuart, a descendent of the Mortimer family.

A minor change to Baldwin's Dedication pertains to anxieties about authorial control, and the agency of the text itself. The former versions asked that 'God graunt [the *Mirror*] may attayne' its 'chiefest ende' (1559, sig. ¶3v), that is, to move magistrates to amend their actions. But in 1578 'Baldwin' hopes that 'God graunt it may talke according to the maner of the makers' (1578L, sig. 3r). Like Richard Robinson's *Rewarde of Wickednesse* (1574), which claims in the 'The Booke to the Author' that 'As the aucthour hath commanded mee, I shall declare at large', the *Mirror* is invested with the power to speak, and not necessarily as its authors would like. In Lord Hastings's complaint, we are warned,

> Forth irreturnable flyeth the spoken word,
> …
> Without retourne, and unreceiued, hit hangs,
> And at the takers mercie, or rigour, stands (1578L, f. 126r).

This 1578 revision demonstrates awareness that the written word can be equally unstable.

To complicate matters further, the transmission history of the newly added complaints is also uncertain. Paul Budra and Scott Lucas agree that the narrative retold by these two complaints appeared, perhaps as just one tragedy, in the 1550s *Memorial of suche Princes*, and that it was the most contentious material to be found there. Lucas suggests that since 'Gloucester was announced in the 1559 *Mirror* text and appeared in its table of contents…but did not appear in the collection itself', 'this may have been the

specific tragedy that Gardiner found so intolerable'.[108] Therefore, for both critics, the delay before the complaints' publication in 1578, instead of being printed in 1559 with the majority of the original complaints, stands to reason. Budra and Lucas do, however, have very different ideas about why these tragedies maintained their political risk under a different regime, over twenty years after they were originally thought to be seditious. This may be because Budra and Lucas address one complaint in particular, and in Budra's case, this one complaint is used to answer questions about the suppression of both. Furthermore, the complaints they choose to treat in detail are different.

Budra argues that Humphrey and Eleanor's tragedies were suppressed until 1578 because they 'were still too politically sensitive to print'.[109] Budra does not, however, explain why this complaint became safe to print in the 1570s – Elizabeth, after all, had replaced her sister two decades before – or why it should remain interesting, when the appeal of its topicality must have faded. Cobham's complaint, says Budra, 'seems to have been written as an analogy of the experiences of Elizbeth [I] and Dr John Dee in 1555 and 1556. The author of this particular tale, Baldwin's friend George Ferrers, actually served as a Privy Council informant against the young Elizabeth'.[110] In addition, Campbell suggests that Elizabeth and her mother, Anne Boleyn, are elided in the person of Eleanor.[111] Why would Elizabeth approve of this now – indeed, is it likely that she would ever greet an account of witchcraft and public humiliation with sympathy if it were overtly linked to her early life? And would Mary have had problems with such a representation? Budra does not describe the circumstances of the complaint's omission from the 1559 text. Was it a formal, legal requirement, like the suppression of the whole work in the 1550s? Or did Baldwin and Ferrers lose their nerve?

[108] Lucas, *Politics*, p. 21.
[109] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 11.
[110] Ibid., p. 11.
[111] See Lily B. Campbell, 'Humphrey Duke of Gloucester and Elianor Cobham His Wife in the *Mirror for Magistrates*', *The Huntington Library Bulletin*, 5 (1934), 119-55, at 144.

Scott Lucas does not focus on Eleanor's complaint, which in fact, he implies, might not have existed as a single entity in the *Memorial*.[112] Instead, he explores the complaint of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester as the prompt for Gardiner's suppression of the 1550s *Memorial* in the first place.[113] The complaint is central to Lucas's thesis, despite the fact that his analysis of the *Mirror* only actually extends up to 1563.[114] The 'Gloucester' of Lucas's argument is therefore that of the phantom suppressed edition, while the *Mirror* printed in 1578 does not officially feature in his assessment.

Both Campbell and Lucas see Humphrey's complaint, whether real or imagined, as playing on the resonances of Humphrey's story with that of Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset (d. 1552). For one thing, says Campbell, readers and writers of history during the reign of Edward VI turned back 'to the reigns of those kings of England, who, like their young King Edward, had ruled as minors. Most often…they found precedents in the reign of Henry VI'.[115] Aside from the topical political resonances of Humphrey's story, explored originally by Campbell and later by Lucas,[116] the narrative was familiar and popular in the sixteenth century for broader reasons. Samuel M. Pratt has called Humphrey a 'mythic figure',[117] a 'highly literate humanist',[118] whose life captured the early modern imagination because of its 'sensationalism and historical importance'.[119] In particular, it was 'atte commaundement of the worthi prynce Humfrey duk of Gloucestre' that Lydgate was to translate Boccaccio's *De casibus*.[120] In terms of his agency in the production of Lydgate's work, Jennifer Summit suggests that Humphrey's role was 'less

[112] The title of Duke Humphrey's complaint in the 1559 table of contents seems to elide the two in 'Good duke Humfrey murdered, and Elianor Cobham his wife banished'.
[113] Lucas, *Politics*, p. 21.
[114] Ibid.
[115] Campbell, 'Humphrey and Elianor', at 120.
[116] Ibid.; Lucas, *Politics*, especially pp. 90-105.
[117] Samuel M. Pratt, 'Shakespeare and Humphrey Duke of Gloucester: A Study in Myth', *Shakespeare Quarterly,* 16, 2 (1965), 201-16, at 201.
[118] Ibid., at 203.
[119] Ibid., at 203.
[120] Bergen (ed.), *Lydgate's Fall of Princes*, Prologue, Book I, p. 1.

of distant patron than of collaborator'.[121] Therefore, the *Mirror* is indebted to Humphrey for its inception, (perhaps even for its model of joint authorship?), while his complaint may be to blame for its unsuccessful first outing as the *Memorial*.

Humphrey's complaint was a 'long-promised tragedy',[122] which had featured in the tables of contents of 1559 and 1571 without ever appearing in full. By contrast, the complaint of Eleanor Cobham was indexed in the edition of 1571 after Humphrey's where, like his, it did not appear, but not indexed in 1559 or 1578. Instead, the complaint was introduced in a cancel in the 1578 edition.[123]

Is it, then, a mistake to think of these two complaints as a pair? They were very likely composed at different times and for different reasons, albeit by the same author: George Ferrers. However, since they were, finally, printed for the first time together, we cannot ignore the ways in which they interact within the text as we have it. Their appearance together would also, of course, have been how contemporary readers of the *Mirror* would have first accessed the complaints, although they may have been circulated in manuscript around the circle of contributors – they may even have existed in printed form, given the exactness of their eventual arrangement within the edition's other content. The relationship between the complaints, and the relationship between Eleanor and Humphrey which they portray, both hinge on textual transmission.

In the edition of 1571, where Eleanor's complaint is indexed for the first time, it is placed after Humphrey's, which supports the idea that Humphrey's was composed first. So the 1578 text reverses the order in which the complaints were to have appeared in 1571. But its prose links match up to the order in which the complaints are placed, from which we may deduce that they were written after the edition of 1571 was planned. With

[121] Jennifer Summit, *Memory's Library: Medieval Books in Early Modern England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), p. 29.
[122] Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 17.
[123] Ibid., see pp. 17-18 for fuller detail.

this in mind, one wonders whether the complaint of Eleanor, as we receive it in the 1578 edition, is in fact the same text that was intended for the edition of 1571. Unfortunately, we will never be able to answer these questions based on the material currently available, but it is important to note that the prose link used to introduce Eleanor Cobham's complaint must have been composed after 1571, and therefore that the process of the *Mirror*'s composition was still 'active' during the 1570s.

This variant prose link shows the pseudo-nonfictional contributors worrying over questions about order: the order in which the subsequent complaints ought to be presented, and the historical order of events. Ferrers admits that

> …whether of them is fyrst to be placed in the order of our boke, I somewhat stande in doute. For albeit the sayde Dukes death happened before the deceasse of the Duches, yet was her fall first, which fynally was cause of ouerthrow to both. (1578L, 39v)

These matters of order also raise the question of hierarchy, and the appropriate order of rank. Despite concluding that since 'the cause doth alwaies go before theeffect and sequel of any thing', the main reason for placing Cobham's complaint first seems in the end to be that 'al thys whyle we haue not hard the complaint of any Lady or other woman'. Thus the intricacies of chronology, cause and effect are in fact put aside, and the relationship between Humphrey and Eleanor's complaints – if not one of contradiction then at least one of uneasy correspondences – is set up by the inconsistencies within the prose link. The order of these two complaints is problematic, as Ferrers acknowledges, and crucial, which is less clearly put across, because it has the capacity to play havoc with our interpretation of the events and the characters' relationship. The prose link throws us off the scent here, in that the emphasis on understanding the order of actual events belies the potential distortion of events by narrative.

The complaints themselves also deal with transmission and its faults in detail. Firstly, it is impossible to ignore the unreliability of the accounts as set against each other;

Shakespeare and Drayton also exploit the relationship of Eleanor and Humphrey to create pairs of divergent accounts. Campbell has written extensively in her Introduction and in an independent article on the additions to the 1578 *Mirror*,[124] but her assessment of Cobham's complaint and its 'curious' perspective at odds with that of her husband should be reconsidered. Campbell notes that Eleanor Cobham's complaint, 'part of the tragedy rehearsed by her husband', disagrees with Humphrey's version of events, and concludes that 'these tragedies were not written to mirror the same contemporary situation…they may have been, and probably were, written at different times'.[125] The assumption that this discordance must have arisen by accident, leading to the conclusion that the tragedies were written at different times, is now outmoded: it is a commonplace of modern *Mirror* criticism that the complaints frequently contradict one another. A reassessment is called for, of these complaints and how they relate to one another within the *Mirror*'s transmission history.

Dame Eleanor's complaint was almost certainly written with Duke Humphrey's in mind (if we assume, as is most plausible, that Duke Humphrey's complaint was composed first). An uncharitable reading might argue that the author, Ferrers, had such a limited range of imagery on which to draw, that the complaints could not help but have language in common. However, recurrences of certain tropes in Eleanor's complaint seem to answer those in Humphrey's, such that the pair of tragedies, read together, create an atmosphere of marital reciprocity and balance, in tension with Eleanor's revisionist difference of perspective.

Eleanor's complaint does reinterpret the events of Humphrey's life, which strikes the reader as realistic, given the way in which her fall precedes Humphrey's but her death post-dates it. But because her account is placed first, and the framing narrative

[124] Campbell, 'Humphrey and Elianor'.
[125] Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 18.

foregrounds her impressive learning in the prose link that follows, the reader is inclined to believe her presentation of events over Humphrey's, and even judge Humphrey to be wrong or short-sighted when his perspective differs. Where Humphrey's complaint employs standard *de casibus* tropes – magistrates should 'beware of vnhap', 'Whilst Fortune false doth lul them in her lap| Drowned in dreames of brittle blessednesse' (1578L, f. 40r) – Eleanor's poem interrogates these tropes from the inside, evoking the experience of Fortune's dizzying highs before the inevitable fall: 'My state and place aduanced next the Queene| Whereby me thought I felt no ground, but swam' (1578L, sig. f ¶2v).

Eleanor's witchcraft is the subject of conflicting accounts across the pair of complaints, which leads Campbell to assert that the two tragedies 'could not have been written by George Ferrers to serve a common purpose in mirroring the present through the agency of the past, for the past is here being made to teach very widely differing lessons'.[126] Ferrers and his collaborators do not comment on Eleanor's witchcraft in the prose links. Instead, her vitriolic attack on Cardinal Beaufort is eventually defended, as her depiction of the 'Bastard preest' who paid the pope for his office seems to convince the (staunchly Protestant) contributors and outweigh condemnation of her own superstitious practices. Pratt suggests that it was John Foxe who initially homed in on agents of the Catholic Church as 'the cause of Humphrey's undoing', while stressing 'the role of Humphrey as a learned man and as a patron of learning',[127] and it is very plausible that it is Foxe's amplification of the account which inspired Eleanor's local anti-Catholicism.

Eleanor's tirade against Beaufort draws the particular attention of the other contributors in the prose link following Eleanor's complaint. They question whether

[126] Campbell, 'Humphrey and Elianor', at 126.
[127] Pratt, 'A Study in Myth', at 210-11.

medieval women's education would have been sufficient to provide Eleanor with the learning she displays, and conclude that she may have learnt from her husband. Budra observes that while some of this commentary 'is in line with the Renaissance perception of women as emotionally labile', the treatment of Cobham's cause 'is unique in the collection' because she is excused based on the justness of her complaints.[128] Eleanor's guilt is almost tempered by her masculine erudition, accurately anticipating Anna Trapnel's experiences on trial for witchcraft in the seventeenth century. In Trapnel's *Report and Plea* (1654), she describes how, having heard her speak 'the rude multitude' asserted her innocence: they say 'Sure this woman is no witch, for she speaks many good words, which the witches could not'.[129]

In addition to the impact Eleanor's language has on the transmission and interpretation of her complaint, we hear directly from her an anxiety (reflected later by Shakespeare's Cleopatra and others) about how her story will be remembered and retold. This concern is doubly affecting since Eleanor's punishment has been her public disgrace, whereby the law enacts the premature mangling of her reputation. Eleanor claims that, rather than her death having 'set al thinges at rest', since then 'myne enemies made a Iest| In minstrels ryme myne honour to deface' (1578L, sig. f ¶4v). As Cleopatra's disgrace will be played out on the stage, where she will witness 'Some squeaking Cleopatra boy my greatness| I'th'posture of a whore',[130] Eleanor is also mocked in her own medium, as 'A song was made in manner of a laye| Which old wyues sing of me vnto this day' (1578L, sig. f ¶4v).

The threat and reality of public disgrace run throughout the *Mirror*, but as a formalised punishment it is visited on the two female characters in particular, Eleanor and

[128] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 65.
[129] Cited in Hilary Hinds, 'Anna Trapnel, *Anna Trapnel's Report and Plea*', in Anita Pacheco (ed.), *A Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing* (Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture; Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 177-88, p. 184, *Report and Plea* p. 28a.
[130] William Shakespeare, *Anthony and Cleopatra*, 5.2.219-20.

Jane Shore. The influence of language is demonstrated to be as fickle as fortune in Shore's complaint, as her own deceptive claims are successfully disseminated before her fall. 'I tempered so my tounge to please [Edward IV's] eare,| That what I sayd was currant every where' (1563, f. 159v); as the king's mistress, 'Yf I but spake, who durst my wordes denye?' Budra casts Eleanor's complaint as '[t]he one tragedy that depicted an actively political woman',[131] and is subsequently ignored, whereas the complaint of Jane Shore 'became the narrative paradigm into which all subsequent portrayals of women were made to fit in this tradition, or to be defined as being in opposition to'.[132] Perhaps this is because, as Budra points out, the complaint of Eleanor Cobham would have begun the 'tradition of representing historical English women in *de casibus* tragedy', had it not been delayed 'at the last moment'.[133] It is unclear, however, whether Cobham's complaint existed as early as 1559; its first appearance as a separate entry in the *Mirror*'s table of contents in 1571 would still have followed Shore's. In addition, the interpolation of Humphrey and Eleanor's complaints in a cancel suggests that their complaints were not as widely disseminated as Shore's, which was a mainstay of the late medieval collection from 1563 and printed independently elsewhere. All in all the 1578 text, particularly with its complex additions, took up a somewhat extrinsic stance in relation to the main stream of the *Mirror* tradition.

At a far greater remove lay Thomas Blenerhasset's *Second Part of the Mirror for Magistrates*, printed in 1578. Blenerhasset's work began roughly where Higgins's ancient British material had left off, and concluded at the Norman Conquest. The text slotted in between Higgins's *First Part* and the late medieval part which had by now been renamed the 'last', but had no connection to the community of authors, or their printer Marshe, which had sustained the *Mirror*'s expansion. Despite epistemological doubts and

[131] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 67.
[132] Ibid., p. 66.
[133] Ibid., p. 63.

paratextual fictions to rival Baldwin's, Blenerhasset's *Second Part* had no official claim to integration into the *Mirror* corpus, but this was to be secured by its own exploitation of the collection's bewildering textual history.

John Higgins and the 1587 Edition

In 1587, the collection of late medieval complaints expanded again with the insertion of four new tragedies. The complaint of Sir Nicholas Burdet, a tragedy of King James IV, an account of the Battle of Brampton or Flodden Field, and the complaint of Cardinal Wolsey were added to the early corpus, following on from the complaint of Michael Joseph, the Blacksmith.[134] According to the accompanying prose link, Raphael Holinshed commissioned the complaint of Burdet, which was then written by Higgins, while the Scottish verses adapt poems found in the British Museum Harleian MS 2252.[135] The edition collated all of the *Mirror* material previously printed by Thomas Marshe, including Higgins's *First Part of the Mirror for Magistrates* (1575). The volume also contained Higgins's new collection of tragedies voiced by additional ancient British and Roman characters, from the legendary British king Iago to Aurelius Antonius Bassianus Caracalla, Roman emperor from AD 198-217.

The whole compilation, printed by Thomas Marshe's son and assign Henry, took on the title *The Mirour for Magistrates*. Its appearance mimicked that of the older Marshe's editions, to the extent that Henry still used Thomas's 'TM' device on the title page. Crucially, however, the prose frame's font size was reduced to match the text of the complaints, evening out their respective weight and eroding the prose frame's primacy. The attempt by 'atypical typography…to deter readers from considering the frame a supplement' was therefore quashed at this stage in the text's transmission, although the

[134] Jane Shore's complaint was moved to follow the tragedy of Brampton; see Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 372.
[135] See ibid., p. 19 and Appendix D, pp. 548-554.

prose was not actually rendered subordinate to the verse until Campbell's edition reduced the font's size further in 1938.[136]

In addition to the combination of material from separate editions, the late medieval complaints are rearranged in 1587, so that Jane Shore's tragedy, added in 1563, follows the new Scottish tragedies, and precedes that of Wolsey – allowing Thomas Churchyard's contributions to be read consecutively. Similarly, Higgins's new complaint of the ancient British Iago is integrated into the ancient British material printed as the *First Part* in 1574-5. This rearrangement and filling out of previously printed sections of national history contributes to the sense that Higgins aimed for a comprehensive range of British rulers, although the collection was still highly selective and far from complete.

Besides its compilation from several sources, and the reordering of the complaints, the text was also newly revised throughout in the 1587 edition, although this revision is not advertised on the title page. Higgins's epistle which opens the 1587 edition of the *Mirror* has led to the assumption that he edited the whole volume, since after Baldwin's death in 1563 the position of *Mirror* editor or coordinator was left vacant.[137] Higgins certainly writes himself into the same role as the Baldwin did (even if neither of them actually collaborated with colleagues to this extent in reality). In the complaint of Burdet, for example, the speaker addresses Higgins by name as a new mediating figure. Meanwhile, Churchyard's Wolsey claims that the author of his complaint 'preferred my tragedy to the Printer', cutting out the possibility of collaborative composition, and ignoring his place in a larger compilation – despite a reference to Baldwin's life and death (1587, f. 265r).

Many of the editorial changes simply alter orthography or improve scansion, as before; there are very few textual changes found in the 1587 *Mirror* which alter the

[136] Cf. Geller, 'Historical Pyrrhonism', p. 154.
[137] Although Pincombe makes a plausible argument that George Ferrers stepped into the breach, as discussed above.

meaning of the verse. The lack of definite ideological shift in the single-word changes made means that they provide little evidence of who made them – most are presumably incidental changes of spelling by the compositor. It is only the prose link before Jane Shore's complaint that is supplanted with a new passage. It is therefore difficult to identify any momentous change of editorial intention within the late medieval section, beyond what can be observed in the new complaints themselves.

So what do the additions tell us? Some details of the late medieval complaints added in 1587 resonate with contemporary concerns. If we accept Scott Lucas's thesis that anxiety over the status of the political poet under Elizabeth prompted the additions to the 1563 *Mirror*, we should forgive Higgins his inferior political urgency in, for example, Burdet's complaint in 1587 when the legislation Baldwin and Sackville dreaded had not really taken effect. David Dean comments that '[i]n October [of 1584] a proclamation suppressed all books 'defacing of true religion' and slandering the government' but adds that '[f]reedom of the press was...considered somewhat of a virtue by MPs; a 1584-5 measure limiting the right to print to members of the Stationers' Company and licensing all books was "very much misliked"'.[138] Dean suggests that bills attempting to legislate against freedom of the press frequently targeted specific texts: when we consider that these included such works as William Allen's *True, Sincere and Modest Defence of English Catholiques* (1584), the *Mirror* appears even less likely to attract negative attention.[139] Thomas Newton's verses to the Reader, which were inserted before Higgins's verse induction in the 1587 text, state that,

> ...bookes, that now theyr faces dare to show,
> Must mettald bee with Nature and with Skill[.] (1587, sig. ¶2v)

[138] David Dean, *Law-Making and Society in Late Elizabethan England: The Parliament of England, 1584-1601* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 71-2.
[139] Ibid., pp. 71-2.

It is possible to read an implication of political risk into the use of 'dare', but in the context of the verse, Newton seems more likely to mean aesthetic rather than polemical confidence, augmenting his praise of Higgins's edition by suggesting that the market is a cruel and frightening environment for less accomplished writers and editors. Furthermore, Lawrence D. Green, anticipating Jennifer Richards,[140] has argued that Higgins's Burdet 'tries to appeal to the reader's emotions rather than promote an intellectual understanding of why events occur'; 'Burdet's notion of honor is a communal one in which the audience is invited to share',[141] speaking to a broader patriotism and pathos.

Burdet's ghost does, however, also make a strong case against a futile and wasteful war:

> It hurtes the Publique weale, decayes the state:
> It reaves the years too soone of longer lyfe:
> It freates the breste with ruste of baend debate[.] (1587, f. 252v).

This final line conveys the idea of a structure destroyed from within, creating an allusion to civil conflict on which Burdet does not comment overtly. Such an allusion would be pertinent to Higgins's contemporary political environment, since by 1587 the succession was the subject of heightening national tension, leading to fears of civil war if a suitable heir was not identified. The suggestion of internal corruption and 'ruste' transfers Burdet's warning to contemporary officials against wars abroad back inwards to reflect the potential destruction caused by a divided nation.

In so doing, Burdet's complaint accesses the on-going contemporary dialogue about rebellion, and the legitimacy of attempts to supplant a ruler, and comes to a balanced and forward-looking position. This issue is not the central concern of the complaint, unlike many of the earlier late medieval tragedies. However, the speaker

[140] On the affective force of Higgins's *Mirror* see Richards, 'Transforming', from p. 49.
[141] Lawrence D. Green, 'Modes of Perception in the *Mirror for Magistrates*', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 44, 2 (1981), 117-33, at 123-4.

suggests that while militant rebellion does not benefit the commonwealth – 'They found it was not for their owne or publique weale,| To rise against theire Lorde and Regent in araye' – members of a community who serve that community should have the right to voice their grievances:

> For if when as wee werde, for Prince and publique weale,
> We might to ech for both haue time and place to speake,
> Then why not now, yf wee to both appeale?
> Sith both well knowe our dealeings were not weake.
> Wee clayme as ryghte, in trueth our myndes to breake,
> Rather eke wee thinke to speake wee franchizde ar,
> Because wee serude for peace and dyde in Prince his war. (1587, f. 244r)

It is useful to consider this stanza in the light of T. E. Hartley's observation that, '[d]espite the absence of direct responsibility through an extended franchise, there was nevertheless a notion that members of Elizabeth's Commons spoke for others, as well as themselves, and that 'others' included all sections of the population'.[142] Or rather, perhaps it is useful to consider Hartley's observation in the light of Higgins's stanza, as Higgins seems to imply a greater degree of interaction between government and the wider public than Hartley allows. The 1587 text as a whole, including the new complaints, also seems more actively engaged with the discourse of the common weal than Baldwin's original. The edition's revisions place greater emphasis on the peace and prosperity of the nation, appealing to a sense of patriotism as well as morality and justice.

The unreliability of textual sources, a theme of the late medieval corpus into which Sir Nicholas Burdet's complaint is interpolated, complicates his vision for an ideal historiography. The prose link between the two Scottish complaints seems not to acknowledge the treacheries of textual transmission; the speaker claims, it appears

[142] T. E. Hartley, *Elizabeth's Parliaments: Queen, Lords and Commons 1559-1601* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1992), p. 15.

without concern, that ‘I haue altered the verse, which we call *Intercalaris*,[143] because the rest else would not haue beene well liked: but of the history I haue not changed one word’ (1587, f. 255v). The victory at Flodden, which ‘had helped to restore the Tudor myth and to revive the English reputation across Europe’,[144] was an odd choice of addition following the 1586 Treaty of Berwick, a ‘Treaty of peace and friendship’ between Elizabeth and James VI.[145] However, the prose link suggests that it would ‘pleasure not only such as write our historyes, but also encourage our Countreymen well, to the like loyall seruice of their Prince, and especially those who should finde therein of their parents or auncestours to haue bene praysed for valure’ (1587, f. 255v). It seems, then, that no attempt is made to sympathise with the Scots here, or in either complaint.[146]

James IV was thought to have been used as a figure for James VI in the late 1580s, and Robert Greene’s play *The Scottish History of James the Fourth* (printed in 1598, but probably first performed in 1590).[147] The Induction to the play tells the audience explicitly that ‘In the year 1520 was in Scotland a king, overruled with parasites, misled by lust, and many circumstances too long to trattle on now, much like our court of Scotland this day’,[148] although Norman Sanders notes that ‘the historical elements of the play are of minimal importance dramatically and are factually quite inaccurate’.[149] Had

[143] Puttenham writes that Latin *versus intercalaris* is the same as the Greek *epimone*, the repetition of a phrase or refrain (*Arte of English Poesie* (1589)), although it is noted that this definition of the Greek term is inaccurate by La Rue Van Hook, ‘Greek Rhetorical Terminology in Puttenham’s the *Arte of English Poesie*’, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* 45, (1914), 111-28, at 119. The repetition of a refrain features in a number of *Mirror* complaints, including the preceding one of James IV of Scotland (‘*Misere mei Deus* & *salua* mee’).
[144] Catherine G. Canino and Nancy A. Gutierrez, ‘“Trouth Ought to Be Rescude;/ Trouth Should Nat Be Subdude”: Skelton and the Tudor Myth’, in David R. Carlson (ed.), *John Skelton and Early Modern Culture: Papers Honoring Robert S. Kinsman* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies; Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2008), 167-88, p. 177.
[145] See Markham John Thorpe (ed.), *Calendar of the State Papers, Relating to Scotland, Preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty’s Public Record Office* 2 vols. (1; London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1858), p. 529.
[146] Cf. Green, ‘Modes of Perception in the *Mirror for Magistrates*’, at 122.
[147] Norman Sanders (ed.), *The Scottish History of James the Fourth, by Robert Greene (1598)* (The Revels Plays, London: Methuen & Co, 1970), p. xxix.
[148] Ibid., p. 11, ll. 106-109.
[149] Ibid., p. xxxvii.

Higgins and Marshe wished to provide a fuller Scottish component to their history, they could have looked to the satirical complaint ballads of Robert Sempill, who had employed the form earlier in the century.[150] Ulpian Fulwell had also composed a pair of *Mirror*-style complaints of James IV and his son James V, printed in his *Flower of Fame* (1575). But the prose link which connects the two Scottish complaints emphasises that they are not current, and foregrounds the antiquarian interests and practices of the pseudo-nonfictional group who discuss them. One notes,

> it seems by the copy, that it was pende aboue fifty yeares agone, or euen shortly after the death of the sayd King: for I found therewith, in an olde hand, the copyes of the sayd King *Iames* letters sent vnto King *Henry* at *Turwin*, and the Kings aunsweres & letters sent to him againe, with this lamentation ensuing them.
> (1587, f. 255v)

The concern for equivalence and appropriateness persists in the new late medieval prose links, and actually furnishes the author with the opportunity to vilify the Scots: King James IV 'is very rude', but the better for it, 'for if hee should bee otherwise, it would not well beseeme his person, nor the place whence he comes'.

A further seam of revisions made in the 1587 edition deploys the discourse of theatrical performance, perhaps following the construction of the Theatre (1576) and the Curtain (1577), and anticipating the contemporary opening of the Rose (1587).[151] If anything, the *Mirror*'s fluctuating generic status shifts away from the dramatic or performative with the addition of Higgins's *First Part*, particularly when the ancient British and Roman complaints are included in 1587 without prose or verse links to provide a narrative of aural reception. But this shift is belied by the picture which emerges from individual alterations to the late medieval material. In the prose link before the tragedy of Richard II 'thinke thervppon' is changed to 'looke therevpon' in the 1587

[150] See Tricia A. McElroy, 'Imagining the "Scottis Natioun": Populism and Propaganda in Scottish Satirical Broadsides', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language,* 49, 4 (2007), 319-39 at 324; Shrank, 'Reading and the Detection of Mary Queen of Scots', at 526 and *passim*.
[151] See Charlotte Scott, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Book* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 17.

edition, which emphasises the physical theatricality which Churchyard's 1587 prose links also bring out. This theatricality emerges more overtly in Thomas Newton's introductory verse in which he states, 'Certes this worlde a Stage may well bee calde,| Whereon is playde the parte of eu'ry wight', while Burdet asserts in his complaint that he deserves 'full well on stage [to] supply the place a while' (1587, f. 244v). Churchyard's Wolsey also employs the trope, asking,

> Shall I looke on, when states step on the stage,
> And play theyr parts, before the peoples face? (1587, f. 265v)

As Patrick Collinson observes, theatrical metaphors are common to many kinds of imaginative historiographical sixteenth-century writing;[152] here they draw out a latent theme of the earlier *Mirror*s, building on, for example, Churchyard's first 'cunningly 'staged' poetic complaint' of Jane Shore,[153] which indeed is only overtly 'staged' by the new prose link added in 1587.

Substantial space is given to the exploration of historiography within the 1587 additions to the late medieval section; the complaints and prose links once more engage with the transmission of narratives about the past. Burdet, for example, claims that there are many stories about the battles he witnessed,

> Although (God wot) the writers wanted poyntes of scill,
> Of whom to speake a while, degresse agayne I will,
> And partely shewe what one hee oughte to bee,
> Which takes on him to write an Historie. (1587, f. 249v)

He is less concerned, however, with the vagaries of and discrepancies between existing historiographers than with setting out the ideal technique. Burdet takes three stanzas, in what we might assume to be an approximation of Higgins's theoretical beliefs if not his own practice, to explain how British national history should be written:

---

[152] Patrick Collinson, *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Politics, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011) ix, 316 p., pp. 233-4.
[153] Brown, '"A Talkative Wench"', at 401.

A chronicler should well in diuers tongues bee seene,
And eke in all the artes hee oughte to haue a sighte,
Whereby hee myght the truth of diuers actions deeme,
And both supply the wants, correct that is not right:
Hee should haue eloquence, and full and fitly write,
Not mangle stories, snatching here and there:
Nor gloaze to make a volume greate appeare.

Hee should bee of such countenance and wit,
As should giue witnes to the Histories hee writes,
Hee should bee able well his reasons so to knit,
As should continue well the matter hee resytes:
Hee should not prayse, disprayse, for fauour or dispytes,
But should so place each thing in order due,
As myght approue the stories to bee true.

But this may haps the time may seeke at length redresse,
And then such stories nowe and noble acts as dye,
May come agayne to lighte (at least defaced lesse)
Yf from the Britaynes first antiquities they try.
In greate defects yf they the trueth supply:
Then shall the readers fuller stories finde,
And haue wherby to recreate the minde. (1587, ff. 249v-250r)

Higgins's 1574 vision for the *Mirror* and the growing contemporary recourse to antiquarianism come through in Burdet's claim that 'Britaynes first antiquities' should be examined for a fuller and truer picture of history. In contrast to Baldwin's earlier 'interventionary poetics',[154] Higgins's treatise in Burdet's complaint functions as his poetics for history. As the second edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles* was also printed in 1587, and instalments of English and Roman chronicles being produced by the likes of John Stow and Richard Rainolde had been printed by Thomas Marshe, the *Mirror for Magistrates* was beginning to shadow the publication patterns of sweeping histories, while still hinting at topical significance.

Churchyard's prose link which introduces Cardinal Wolsey's complaint takes on the voice of Wolsey, rather than a pseudo-nonfictional editorial figure: Richards describes

[154] Lucas, *Politics*, p. 210.

Thomas Churchyard's preface to Cardinal Wolsey's complaint in the 1587 edition as 'the most daring adaptation of the prose frame yet'.[155] Unlike Baldwin's original prose links, this passage makes no mention of collaborative composition and editing, but rather connects the contributors directly to the printer and, crucially, excludes not just Baldwin (now long dead) but also Higgins from the project. Campbell suggests that the both of Churchyard's links were 'designed to fight Churchyard's battle against Baldwin'.[156] Churchyard does seem to enjoy that idea that Baldwin is no longer able to contribute to, or interfere with, the compilation of the *Mirror*. Campbell is unable to identify a cause for the grudge between Churchyard and Baldwin,[157] and it is even harder to fathom if Baldwin was indeed the 'Western Wyll' who leapt to the defence of *Dauy Dycars Dreame*.[158] The original prose link which followed the complaint of Jane Shore in 1563 claimed that the piece 'was so well liked, that all together exhorted me instantly, to procure Maister Churchyarde to vndertake and to penne as manye moe of the remainder as might by any meanes be attaynted at his handes' (1563, f. 156r). This link was excised after 1563, so perhaps Churchyard resented the suppression of Baldwin's praise. Or could it be that the praise was a little too fulsome? If the prose frame is misleading, and the group of writers never really met together to recite and discuss their work, such effusive admiration and in particular the promise of future involvement could almost be interpreted as a joke at the poet's expense, especially a poet as ostentatiously hard up and desperate for preferment as Churchyard was.

The *de casibus* tragedy of Sir Simon Burley, printed in *The First Part of Churchyards Chippes* (1575 and 1578) and subsequently as part of *Churchyard's Challenge* (1593) in which Jane Shore's complaint was reprinted and enlarged, does little

[155] Richards, 'Transforming', p. 20.
[156] Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 19 and p. 42.
[157] Ibid., p. 43.
[158] Alternatively this could have been William Waterman, translator of *The Fardle of Facions* (1555) by Johannes Boemus (ca. 1485-1535), see Maslen, 'William Baldwin and the Tudor Imagination', p. 293.

to shed more light on the bad blood between Baldwin and Churchyard, but it certainly serves to revisit the old grievance. Burley begins his complaint, unaccompanied by a prose or verse introduction, by asking

> Am I of blood, or yet of birth so base,
> O *Baldwin* now, that thou forgetst my name:
> Or doth thy penne, want cunning for that case·
> Or is thy skill, or senses fallen lame,
> Or dost thou feare, to blase abroade my fame:
> O shew some cause, wherefore I sit in shade,
> And why is thus, my Tragedie vnmade.
> Who thinkes great scorne, in silence still to sleepe,
> And on whose fall, a world may waile and weepe.[159]

The idea of being left out of the *Mirror* was something of a trope by 1575: Ulpian Fulwell's short *de casibus* verse history of James IV of Scotland, 'informe of the Mirror for Magestrates',[160] opens by asking,

> AMong the rest, whom rewfull fate hath rest,
> whose shrouding sheetes hath wrapt their woful lyues
> why haue not I a place among the*m* left,
> whose fall eche tong with dayly talke reuyues.[161]

Later, in William Wyrley's *The True Vse of Armorie Shewed by Historie* (1592), Lord Chandos would claim in his *de casibus* complaint,

> When first that woorthy golden booke began
> For Magistrates bright mirror cleare indeed,
> Through which eternall praise the Authors wan,
> Streight I beleeud as truly as my Creed
> My hard mishap so happely would speed,
> As that some one of those rare learned men
> My blis and bale would haue vouchsaft to pen.[162]

---

[159] Churchyard, *Challenge*, p. 25.
[160] Ulpian Fulwell, *The Flower of Fame Containing the Bright Renowne, & Moste Fortunate Raigne of King Henry the VIII* (London: William Hoskins, 1575), f. 22r.
[161] Ibid., f. 22v.
[162] William Wyrley, *The True Vse of Armorie Shewed by Historie, and Plainly Proued by Example: The Necessitie Therof Also Discouered: With the Maner of Differings in Ancient Time, the Lawfulnes of Honorable Funerals and Moniments: With Other Matters of Antiquitie, Incident to the Aduauncing of Banners, Ensignes, and Marks of Noblenesse and Cheualrie* (London: I. Iackson for Gabriell Cawood, 1592), p. 31.

However, Burley's attack on Baldwin is particularly personal. The tirade continues for a further four stanzas, and accuses Baldwin of snobbery, embarrassment, cowardice, ineptitude, forgetfulness and sloth.

Churchyard, though, seems no better disposed towards Higgins in his *Mirror*. Was Higgins less instrumental in the compilation of the 1587 edition than has been supposed, or did Churchyard's antipathy to Baldwin's role in the transmission of the text extend to him, too? Churchyard himself takes the place of the inscribed Baldwin and Higgins, who act as amanuenses: the speaker, Wolsey, refers to '*Churchyard* (the noter thereof)' (1587, f. 265v). Higgins is also absent from Churchyard's new prose link for Jane Shore, which removes the setting still further away from Baldwin's conceit of companionable reading and writing when Churchyard's first person narrator, 'a talkatiue wench', states, 'and so step I on the stage in my shrowdeing sheete' (1587, f. 259r). The imagery of performance, and the intimation that Jane Shore's sheet, which denotes both her public penance and her death, is a costume, allows a link to be traced between the 1563 edition, and the theatricality enhanced by revisions to the 1587 compilation, in which Churchyard's second complaint first appears. The time it took for the second prose and tragedy to be added to the late medieval collection, twenty four years after Baldwin suggested Churchyard should complete as many of the remaining complaints as he could, belies the two prose and verse pairings' common ground. Having said this, they approach the treatment of Fortune's fickleness very differently, and the complaint of Wolsey, a 'rags-to-riches' 'adventure story',[163] remains an anomaly within the *Mirror*'s transmission history.

Perhaps the most startling addition to the 1587 *Mirror* is the final stanza of this complaint. The complaint itself, while notably more accomplished than some of the

[163] Green, 'Modes of Perception in the *Mirror for Magistrates*', at 125.

others in the collection, fits well with their pattern – at least as far as it is possible to generalise. Wolsey describes his successes, his moral failing, pride, and the unfortunate end to which this failing leads him. The final stanza, however, rather than appealing to the reader to learn from his errors, asks,

> But what of that? the best is wee are gone,
> And worst of all, when wee our tales haue tolde,
> Our open plagues, will warning bee to none,
> Men are by hap, and courage made so bolde:
> They thinke all is, theyr owne, they haue in holde.
> Well, let them say, and thinke what thing they please.
> This weltring world, both flowes and ebs like seas. (1587, f. 272v)

And so ends the 1587 edition, without any concluding prose link or epilogue. The message of this stanza ironically picks up the lexis of the subtitle of the work which sets out to show, we remember, ‘by examples passed in this realme, with how greeuous plagues vices are punished’. It would be a mistake to interpret Wolsey’s voice as Churchyard’s, but to end not only the complaint but the whole book with such bitterness and indifference to the use to which the text is put seems characteristically provocative. Is the conclusion a challenge to the reader, a piece of early modern ‘reverse psychology’?[164] Or is the *Mirror* offering a proto-Spenserian reflection on mutability?

Churchyard’s Wolsey is also an anomalous figure not least because he is the first Henrician Englishman to tell his story as part of the *Mirror*. This could threaten to disallow the category ‘late medieval complaints’ as an appropriate alternative to ‘Baldwin’s *Mirror*’, unless we accept the Reformation as a fitting marker of the end of the Middle Ages.[165] The inclusion of Henrician figures in this collection of complaints is very revealing about late sixteenth-century attitudes towards the delineation of period or era, and perhaps provides evidence that the heartfelt Protestant agenda which drove

[164] Cf. Ibid., at 133.
[165] See Greg Walker, ‘Epilogue: When Did “The Medieval” End? Retrospection, Foresight, and the End(s) of the English Middle Ages’, in Walker and Elaine M. Treharne (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Baldwin and Ferrers was still running through the project nearly thirty years after Elizabeth I's accession.

The inclusion of Churchyard's complaint of Wolsey in the central *Mirror* collection bears strong parallels with the inclusion of Drayton's complaint of Cromwell in the edition of 1610. Additionally, these two interpolations reflect the reproduction of 'Skelton''s Edward IV at the end of the very first collection of late medieval work. All three instances strengthen our sense of the *Mirror* as a compendious, multi-authored compilation, brought to prominence in Higgins's 1587 edition (particularly when contextualised within Higgins's wider oeuvre), but actually belied by the first edition of the *Mirror*. They also anticipate the later sixteenth-century appetite for single complaints, which will invert this appropriative tendency, and *extrapolate* characters and material from the *Mirror* corpus. The final early modern edition of the *Mirror* came at the cusp of this reversal.

Niccols's 1610 Edition: A new *Mirror* for a new age?

Richard Niccols's edition represents the final stage in the *Mirror*'s early modern transmission history, under the 'Mirror' title, at any rate. It was to include yet another dramatic and controversial reinterpretation of the late medieval material's form and function, through both editorial alterations, and the text's publication in proximity to new, divergent work. While modern scholarship has been largely dismissive of Niccols's Jacobean text, the reinvigoration of the late medieval material for a new cultural setting raises further important questions about its transmission, not to mention its endurance so far beyond its original context.

The edition collated almost all of the late medieval complaints with Higgins and Blenerhasset's collections of prequels. The prose and verse links were removed, and the tragedies arranged roughly in chronological order. Niccols added his own collection of

new complaints, separately, under the title *A Winter Nights Vision*, as well as the retrospective panegyric, *Englands Eliza*. Certain poems from the late medieval section are removed, such as the 1563 complaint of Richard III, replaced in *A Winter Nights Vision* by Niccols's own new composition, while the complaint of Cromwell, by Michael Drayton, was added following Churchyard's Wolsey.

In her introductory survey of the *Mirror*'s transmission, Campbell ends her description with the text of 1587. 'The 1587 edition', she argues, 'was the last of the editions of the *Mirror* to follow the original plan. The editions of 1609-10, arranged by Richard Niccols, cannot be integrated in the tradition. Niccols played Colley Cibber to the *Mirror*'.[166] Likewise, Haslewood seems to discount Niccols's edition (even though he does include it in his collation of the rest of the *Mirror*) when he declares that the 1587 text, 'being the last printed by either of the original editors, may be characterised, and has now been adopted, as the STANDARD EDITION'.[167] Niccols effects changes to the *Mirror* corpus in two distinct ways, by what he does to the existing material, and what he adds.[168] Later chapters will address Niccols's own contributions to the text and how they shift the emphasis of the whole. But it is high time his 'arrangement' of the earlier material was explored, whether it is faithful to an original plan or not. As Pursglove notes, and as we have seen above, 'To declare, as Miss Campbell implicitly does, that at one particular point in time [the *Mirror*'s] process of organic growth was over, and that no more contributions were permissible, is merely arbitrary'.[169] Moreover, the printer Felix Kyngston actually ties Niccols's *Mirror* more firmly to the tradition as a whole. R. B. McKerrow, for example, notes that in 1591, a substantial proportion of Thomas Marshe's

[166] Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 20. See also Green, 'Modes of Perception in the *Mirror for Magistrates*', at 122.
[167] Haslewood (ed.), *Mirror for Magistrates*, p. xxix.
[168] Cf. Glyn Pursglove (ed.), *Richard Niccols: Selected Poems*, eds. James Hogg and Holger Klein (Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Elizabethan and Renaissance Studies, New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), p. 17.
[169] Ibid., p. 16.

copyrights and devices were transferred to Thomas Orwin, then in turn passed on to Kyngston, Orwin's successor and step-son.[170]

Niccols amends rhyme and metre, as well as removing the prose links, which Human suggests 'makes the text far more like a chronicle history than it previously was'.[171] His edition has been widely condemned for these alterations.[172] While Haslewood describes the plan to collect all the Elizabethan *Mirror* material together as 'laudable', he claims that the corpus is 'destroyed' by Niccols's 'total want of respect for the original text, in addition to a false taste in remodelling it to please his own ear and fancy'.[173] It is not the purpose of this chapter to recuperate Niccols's edition as a perfect scion of the earlier texts. Instead, I want to show that Niccols's appropriation and rearrangement of the late medieval material followed naturally from a new interpretation of that material provoked by a new context.

Niccols's removal of the prose and verse links from the early *Mirror*s is a major source of antipathy towards his editorial intervention. This is partly because recent scholarship has elevated the significance of these links, particularly the 1559-63 prose links, above that of the complaints themselves. If the *Mirror* is valuable primarily for its famed polyvocality, how can it remain valuable once this polyvocality has disappeared? But Niccols's rearrangement creates an elegant triple dream vision structure, which tells its own story about his aesthetic priorities, and moulds a remarkably coherent whole from the disparate collection.

Ordering the existing complaints more or less chronologically, Niccols's edition divides the tragedies into three sequences, and approaches the putative *Mirror* of

---

[170] R. B. McKerrow, *Printers' & Publishers' Devices in England & Scotland, 1485-1640* (London: The Chiswick Press for the Bibliographical Society, 1913), pp. 177-8.
[171] Human, 'House of *Mirrors*', at 781.
[172] See G. D. Willcock, 'Parts Added to the *Mirror for Magistrates* [Review]', *The Modern Language Review,* 43, 1 (Jan. 1948), 104-5, at 104; Haslewood (ed.), *Mirror for Magistrates*, 1: p. xxx. Cf. Pursglove (ed.), *Selected Poems*, p. 17.
[173] Haslewood (ed.), *Mirror for Magistrates*, pp. xxix-xxx.

Baldwin's prose frame.[174] First, we are presented with Higgins and Blenerhasset's ancient and medieval material, prefaced by Higgins's Induction; then Baldwin and his fellow contributors' late medieval and Tudor complaints, with Sackville's Induction taking its allegedly intended place at the beginning; and finally Niccols's *Winter Nights Vision*, which opens with Niccols's own Induction after Sackville and Higgins's model. This reorganisation clearly evinces Niccols's admiration for Sackville's style and approach, also demonstrated by his eulogistic statement, explaining the position of Sackville's 'golden Preface' (1610, sig. A4v). Despite attempts by modern critics to distance the *Mirror* corpus from Niccols's edition, the centrality of Sackville's contribution to the structure of both Higgins's *First Part* and Niccols's reordered collection demonstrates the extent to which the later custodians of the corpus took its previous manifestations to heart. Sackville and Higgins are structurally definitive figures for Niccols. This may be predominantly an aesthetic decision, but we should not forget the potential 'uses of the visionary to convey controversial content',[175] an oppositional tradition to which the *Mirror* refers from its outset.

Niccols's admiration of Sackville led him to add – or did not prevent him from adding – four stanzas to Sackville's description of the underworld in the Induction. These were, notes Pursglove, unwittingly described by Thomas Warton (in the *History of English Poetry* (1778-81)) as 'too beautiful to have been relished by his contemporaries, or equalled by his successors', thinking Niccols's work was Sackville's.[176] Haslewood explains this mistake by arguing that Niccols 'so closely imitated his author',[177] which raises further questions about Niccols's editorial practice alongside the nature of poetic authority and collaboration more broadly, as it almost suggests that Niccols's

[174] See Introduction, above.
[175] Scott Lucas, 'Comment: The Visionary Genre and the Rise of the "Literary": Books under Suspicion and Early Modern England', *The Journal of British Studies,* 46, 4 (2007), 762-65, at 762.
[176] Cited in Pursglove (ed.), *Selected Poems*, p. 23, *History of English Poetry* (1870), p. 777.
[177] Haslewood (ed.), *Mirror for Magistrates*, p. 330, n. 1.

augmentation of Sackville's Induction is a successful forgery. Through this substitution, Niccols replaces one stanza on the suffering of the innocent dead – 'babes', 'maydes vnwed' and 'the guiltles slayne' – with four stanzas which describe the landscape in more detail, as well as the pain of those who have experienced 'hastned' or 'vntimely' deaths. In doing so he shifts the emphasis from absent crimes to undeserved or arbitrary punishments, arguably rendering the passage more pertinent to the text as a whole. The speaker sees 'A troope of men the most in armes';

> Some headlesse were, some body, face and hands,
> With shamefull wounds despoil'd in euery part.
> Some strangled, some that dide in captiue bands,
> Some smothred, drown'd, some stricken through the hart
> With fatall steele[.] (1610, p. 270)

This is, essentially, the cast of characters presented in the *Mirror*. In this way Niccols transforms Sackville's Induction from an independent literary set piece into a more apposite introduction to the collection – which was, as Niccols saw it, the poem's original function.

Notwithstanding Haslewood's claim that Niccols remodels the *Mirror* 'to please his own ear and fancy',[178] Niccols himself insists that it was done 'not taking a poeticall licence to fashion all things after mine owne fancie, but limiting my selfe within the bounds of an historicall writer' (1610, 'To the Reader'). However, Niccols is no historian, and despite the assertion that 'the storie in some places false and corrupted' has been 'made historically true', his alterations generally work towards literary improvement. Additionally, his approach to his source texts demonstrates a strong degree of critical engagement with the work as literature. Niccols must have consulted the 1587 edition, since he includes material added there for the first time, but he did not follow it exactly, as some complaints are removed and some added from Blenerhasset's *Second Part*

[178] Ibid., p. xxx.

(1578). Most of the time, Niccols's version of the late medieval complaints follows the text of the 1578 *Last Part*, except where revisions in 1587 have improved the scansion. It is possible to argue, then, that Niccols compared the two texts before preparing his own, specifically to effect metrical improvements.

The complaint of Lord Hastings features, according to Pursglove, 'One of [Niccols's] more extensive revisions', to what Campbell called 'probably the worst poetry in the *Mirror*'.[179] Haslewood's annotations record a marginal note to a 1610 copy which also describes the complaint's style as 'evidently the worst in the collection, and in this edition much alter'd from the three former publications of it'.[180] Campbell does not explain what it is about Dolman's complaint that offends, although the assessment of his co-writers from 1563 that it is 'very learnedly penned', and 'very darke, and hard to be vnderstood' (1563, f. 114v), might refer to its knotty syntax, and delight in lexical play. The tragedy opens 'Hastynges I am, whose hastned death…', and the gleeful juxtaposition of two homonyms in the phrase 'present present to thee' (1563, f. 100r) momentarily baffles the reader. It is unsurprising that even before Niccols's revisions the text was heavily edited in the 1570s, but heartening that the editors retained the young Dolman's puns while clarifying the sense: 'present present' becomes 'My selfe here present do present to thee'. The 'extensive revisions' by Niccols which Pursglove identifies predominantly take the form of improved scansion, or tidier, clearer expression. 'Mought' is amended a number of times to 'might', while the couplet

> See here of nobles new the diuers sourse?
> Some vertue rays'th[1587/ rayseth 1563-78], some clymbe by sluttish sorts

is edited to provide greater syntactic clarity, full rhyme and proto-Popean concision:

> See here the difference of a noble minde,
> Some vertue raiseth, some by vice haue climde. (1610, p. 412)

179 See Pursglove (ed.), *Selected Poems*, pp. 18-20, and Campbell (ed.), *Mirror*, p. 45.
180 Haslewood (ed.), *Mirror for Magistrates*, p. 306 n. 5.

Niccols also replaces 'waltsome murder' with 'wicked murder', again showing a preference for a less characterful lexis. In fact, Niccols is guilty of more than merely dampening colourful diction here, as this alteration detracts from a significant aspect of the complaint's history. The 'waltsome murder' of the original recalls the claim that 'Mordre is so wlatsom and abhomynable| to God...he ne wol suffre it heled be' in Chaucer's 'Nun's Priest's Tale',[181] the tale on which Dolman draws in Hastings's complaint to explore the potential importance of prophetic dreams. Either Niccols did not pick up on the allusion, or perhaps he sought to quash it; either way, his decision to replace the term does conceal a facet of the text's transmission history, further unifying his edition.

Niccols's revisions to Hastings' complaint also tweak its ideological stance. In the stanza which describes courtiers' 'wicked means' to social advancement, Niccols edits 'flattery or violence' by removing 'violence' altogether (1610, p. 412). This at once improves the scansion and places greater emphasis on the wickedness of flattery, a major concern which emerges from *A Winter Nights Vision*, and across Niccols's oeuvre. Perhaps Niccols pays Hastings such attention because this complaint in particular shares sentiments which had become, by 1610, 'Spenserian'. Hastings describes himself as a tiger, 'all for peace vnmeete', then claims that

> A souldier's handes must oft be dyde with goare,
> Least starke with rest, they finewd wax and hoare:
> Peace could I win by war, but peace not vse:
> Few dayes enioy hee, who warlike peace doth choose. (1610, p. 417)

The late medieval tragedies generally do not propound this stance; instead they frequently denounce conflict and promote civil stability. However, Niccols's own complaints commend martial qualities and rulers who exercise them, and here he alters 'enioy' in the

[181] *The Canterbury Tales*, in Larry D. Benson (ed.), *The Riverside Chaucer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 'The Nun's Priest's Tale', ll. 3053-55.

final line to 'liue', amplifying the threat of Hastings's assertion, and aligning it even more closely with his own distrust of 'idle' peace. As an exponent of the Jacobean Spenserian opposition to James I's regime, commonly characterised by sloth, indulgence and corruption in contrast to Elizabeth's example, Niccols used his revisions as well as his own collection of complaints to promote an oppositional Spenserian discourse.[182]

Niccols's excision of Higgins's two Scottish complaints constitutes the flipside of edits which might participate in his oppositional project. Adapted, allegedly, from copies of James IV's letters, the 'Lamentation of King Iames the fourth' and 'The bataile of Brampton, or Floddon fielde' were added to the late medieval collection in 1587 but not ever reprinted as part of the *Mirror.* Were these complaints removed out of respect for the new Stuart king? Or does Niccols take the opportunity, amid the enthusiastic reception of a putative union with Scotland, to obliterate the Scottish material from his English history? Henry Weber, when attempting to date a ballad account of Flodden, suggests the former explanation, noting that

> '[a]fter the accession of James to the throne of England, the battle would not have been a subject of popular celebration. A remarkable instance of the deference paid to this monarch on this score, occurs in the history of the Mirrour of Magistrates. Two poems on the subject of Floddon [sic] Field and the death of James IV., which had been introduced into the edition of 1587, and which, in point of merit, are certainly not inferior to the generality of the legends in that collection, were omitted in the edition of 1610'.[183]

But the ideologically loaded imagery of *A Winter Nights Vision*, and the satires deemed too seditious to print during Niccols's lifetime, tell a different story about his 'deference' to James.

While removing the Scottish complaints from the late medieval section, and omitting Blenerhasset's Guidericus and Alurede from that on ancient and early medieval

---

[182] See Ch. 5, below, for further exploration of Niccols's role in this oppositional movement.
[183] Henry Weber (ed.), 'The Battle of Floddon' (Edinburgh: Ballantyne & Co., 1808), cited in Charles A. Federer (ed.), *The Ballad of Flodden Field, a Poem of the Xvith Century* (Manchester: Henry Gray, Antiquarian & Topographical Publisher, 1884), p. 133.

Britain,[184] Niccols appropriates Michael Drayton's complaint of Thomas Cromwell for his collection. This complaint had originally been printed by Niccols's printer Felix Kyngston, as *The Legend of Great Cromwell* (1607) and subsequently *The Historie of the Life and Death of the Lord Cromwell* (1609). Drayton demonstrated his Spenserian credentials in *Idea: the Shepheards Garland* (1593), and his affinity with the *Mirror* tradition through complaints like *Peirs Gaveston, Earle of Cornwall* (1593) and *Matilda: the Faire and Chaste Daughter of the Lord Robert Fitzwater* (1594), and the pair of complaints by Eleanor Cobham and Duke Humphrey in *Englands Heroicall Epistles* (1597). He and Niccols had shared interests: they both wrote a complaint of Robert, Duke of Normandy, and used bird allegory to satirize court corruption in Drayton's *Owle* (1604) and Niccols's *Cuckow* (1607). In short, he was an obvious candidate to contribute to a new *Mirror.* Drayton's work is very much entangled with the collection's transmission: the dream vision opening of the *Tragicall Legend of Robert, Duke of Normandy*, for example, seems to have been plundered by Niccols for his Induction to *A Winter Nights Vision*, and itself draws on the model of previous *Mirror* frame narratives.

Like Churchyard's complaint of Wolsey – also depicting a Henrician character, printed elsewhere, and placed at the end of the late medieval segment – Drayton's Cromwell tells his story from youth, rather than extracting the relevant biographical section as many of the other *Mirror* tragedies do. In this way both diverge from the model which lent itself so effortlessly to dramatic tragedy, and Churchyard's might be seen as an early example of a genre which was flourishing by the time Drayton's was written, predominantly thanks to Drayton's earlier works. Additionally, of course, the figures Cromwell and Wolsey interact in both complaints, an intersection of which Drayton must have been aware. While not composed together or even for the *Mirror* collection, unlike

[184] See Ch. 5, below, for further discussion of why Niccols chose to omit these.

the complementary set of tragedies treating, for example, Richard III's rise and fall, the complaints of Wolsey and Cromwell overlap and therefore integrate seamlessly as a pair into the late medieval and Tudor material, particularly without Churchyard's anomalous prose link. Drayton's complaint instantly engages with the *Mirror*'s anxieties about transmission and reputation, when it opens to reveal Cromwell

> Wak'd, and trembling betwixt rage and dread
> With the loud slander (by the impious time)
> That of my actions euery where is spread[.] (1610, p. 520)

The two themes collide again when Cromwell rebukes time and reputation, asking,

> To thy report, O, who shall euer trust,
> Triumphant arches building vnto those
> Allow'd the longest memorie to haue,
> That were the most vnworthie of a graue? (1610, p. 524)

Ultimately, Cromwell concludes that attempting to rise 'By flattring princes with a seruill tong,| And being soothers to their tyrannies' (1610, p. 546) is the cause of his downfall. It is fitting, then, that Cromwell's arrest is staged in the 'counsell chamber', and he is tried by parliament as speech finally defeats him.

The appropriation of a complaint by the rising star of the genre could not revitalise the *Mirror* corpus sufficiently for its transmission to be sustained. Single, long complaints proliferated, re-treading the ground the *Mirror* had popularised, which was also echoed on the stage as the vogue for historical drama raged on. The unwieldy 1610 edition was crowded out of the market. In 1620, the transmission of the 'Mirror' was closed off when Niccols's text was renamed *The Fall of Unfortunate Princes*, by a new title page added to rejuvenate unsold copies. Coming full circle, the title's allusion to Lydgate represented a final early modern reading of the texts which had sought to subvert Lydgate's example.

Conclusion

The late medieval material's textual history reveals the centrality of oral and written transmission to our understanding of the text, and to the text's own engagement with the creation and manipulation of meaning. By analysing the individual stages of the collection's transmission, it is possible to establish a new narrative which describes a series of valid interpretative interactions between authors and texts. This narrative makes it clear that the seeds of the later recensions are sown throughout the early material. Rather than a despoliation of the 'original' text, these recensions may be reframed as interpretations and extensions of existing ideas.

The late medieval characters and their inscribed authors are very aware of the possibility that their stories may be being misread and misappropriated from 1559 onwards. Budra and others have argued that this is exactly what happened, as successive *Mirror*s distorted the collection's purpose. It is impossible to know what further plans Baldwin had for the *Mirror*, and whether or not he meant what he said about expanding it, since a literal reading of the prose frame has been all but discredited. It seems likely that he did not intend to add more material aside, perhaps, from the complaints of Humphrey and Eleanor; if they survived in manuscript, surely they would have been accompanied by the rest of the collection, had it existed. Higgins's decision (perhaps with Marshe's backing) to extend the collection is very probably a misreading of Baldwin's wishes, falling into the pseudo-nonfictional frame's hermeneutic trap. However, this is not to say that Higgins's work is not a legitimate response to Baldwin's legacy, particularly having seen the stage already set for a greater historical focus in the revisions of 1571.

Blenerhasset's *Second Part of the Mirror for Magistrates* took its lead from early editions of the *Mirror* too, and not, as scholarship has predominantly argued, from Higgins's work. When Blenerhasset's prequel is read in the light the late medieval

section's interrogation of textual reliability, the logic and lineage of Blenerhasset's new take on the tradition emerges clearly. Finally, Niccols's edition tells us much that is crucial to our understanding of the text and its reception. Not only does Niccols's edition endorse the collation of Higgins and Blenerhassets additions with the earlier texts. It also confirms the *Mirror*'s cultural importance, as Niccols's project deployed the epitome of great Elizabethan poetry against a new political regime. Niccols's part in the *Mirror*'s transmission history is the ultimate compliment, and assurance of the text's impact on early modern poetics.

Chapter Two

John Higgins's Ancient British *Mirror*, 1574-5

In the 1570s, John Higgins set about completing the *Mirror*. Aspiring to a comprehensive record of national history, Higgins began again with its misty origins, retelling the mythical foundation of Britain, and pursuing the narrative through the complaints of legendary figures up to the Roman invasion. Baldwin and his collaborators' concerns regarding unreliable textual transmission re-emerged as anxieties over the loss of historical sources, and with them of Britain's collective memory. Characterised in twentieth-century scholarship as staid and stolid, and criticised for its diversion from Baldwin's project, Higgins's work has been dismissed as an inferior sequel in the history of the *Mirror*'s expansion. But Higgins made bold and sweeping changes which built on the hints laid down by the 1571 edition, reimagining the text's scope and focus through his own work before taking on a wholesale appropriation and revision of the entire collection.

The *Mirror* had been printed in evolving editions three times before Higgins became part of its complicated production history. Higgins composed his own set of sixteen complaints which were printed by Thomas Marshe in 1574, and in 1575 with one additional complaint, as *The First Parte of the Mirour for Magistrates.* The 1574 edition contains, after Higgins's Dedication, 'Higgins to the Reader' and the Induction, the tragedies of Albanact (Brutus's son), Humber, Locrinus, Elstride, Sabrine, Madan, Manlius, Mempricius, Bladud, Cordila, Morgan, Forrex, Porrex, Kimarus, Morindus, and Nennius, who is supposed to have died of a head wound sustained in single combat with Julius Caesar in 54 BC. Higgins draws on Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* (1136), having lost, he says, a manuscript of that text, and another 'old

Chronicle in a kind of Englishe Verse, beginning at *Brute*' (1574F, sig. *5v), which he does not name.[1] Each complaint is preceded by a short authorial Induction in verse (except for that of Albanact, where the general Induction stands in for a specific one). The tragedy of Irenglas was added a year later, followed by three concluding stanzas in which Higgins promises he will 'Againe retourne, to Printers presse...' with a 'Seconde parte' (1575F, f. 81r), as Baldwin had done. Thomas Blenerhasset, of course, pre-empted Higgins's efforts – his *Seconde Part of the Mirour for Magistrates* was printed in 1578 – and no 'second part' by Higgins was ever released. Given Blenerhasset's disruption of Higgins's plan, we cannot be sure to what extent the edition printed in 1587 represented a culmination of Higgins's ambitions for the collection, although it has been held up as definitive by Joseph Haslewood.[2] In this edition, Higgins added a further eight ancient British laments, and revised three of those already printed. He also presented a new set of Roman complaints, following on from his account of the Roman invasion of Britain which had concluded the 1574 narrative.

Higgins, 'sober, scholarly, and ambitious',[3] was around thirty years old when he made his first contribution to the *Mirror* collection. He is believed to have studied at Oxford, and claims to have taught grammar for two years before revising Richard Huloet's *Abecedarium* (1552), an English-Latin lexicon, printed by Thomas Marshe in 1572 as *Huloets Dictionarie*.[4] Prefatory verses by Higgins enumerate the contents and uses of *The Foure Bookes of Flauius Vegetius Renatus* (1572), translated into English

---

[1] This manuscript could be Hardyng's chronicle; see Lily B. Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added to the Mirror for Magistrates by John Higgins and Thomas Blenerhasset* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1946), p. 26.
[2] Haslewood (ed.), *Mirror for Magistrates*, p. xxix.
[3] Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 4.
[4] See Schwyzer, 'Higgins, John (*b. c.*1544, *d.* in or before 1620)', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13233, accessed 8 Sept 2012]; much of our information on Higgins's life actually comes from his own summary in the *First Part*, in the verse link which follows Mempricius's complaint. It is unlikely that Higgins wanders too far from the truth here, except perhaps in his claim to have written numerous other works not named in the poem, but readings should retain a degree of caution.

from Latin by John Sadler, and again printed by Marshe; Campbell suggests that this is the first outing for Higgins's poetry in print.[5] Higgins was vicar of Winsham in Somerset, where he lived at least between 1574 and 1602.[6] He produced an expanded edition of Nicholas Udall's *Flowers, or, Eloquent Phrases of the Latine Speech, Gathered out of the Sixe Comedies of Terence*, also printed by Marshe in 1575 and 1581, and translated *The Nomenclator, or, Remembrancer of Adrianus Junius* (1585) out of 'Latine, Greeke, French and other forrein tongues'.[7] His final known work was *An Answere to Master William Perkins, Concerning Christs Descension into Hell* (1602),[8] which included a wilful rejection of suggestions that scripture might be accidentally corrupted, ('did al these [words] therefore creepe in by neglige*n*ce? I thinke not'),[9] and took the bold form of a dialogue between Higgins and the famous theologian Perkins.

Higgins's whole oeuvre demonstrates a desire to fix knowledge – language, history, scriptural interpretation – as secure textual records, and to augment or complete the work of others (Huloet, Udall, Baldwin). While too young to have fraternised with Baldwin and Ferrers at Edward VI's court, Higgins was demonstrably a part of the intellectual milieu within which editions of the *Mirror* were written and read; his works were variously endorsed by Thomas Churchyard and Thomas Newton.[10] By contrast, for example, Anthony Munday's *Mirrour of Mutabilitie* (1579), which he claimed in the

[5] Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 23.
[6] Schwyzer's entry in the *ODNB* suggests that we know only that Higgins 'was still dwelling [in Winsham] in 1585 when he wrote the dedication to *The Nomenclator*'. Additionally, though, his dedication to the nobility of the 1587 *Mirror* is dated 'At Winceham the vii. Day of December. 1586', while the address 'To the Christian Reader' which prefaces *An answere to master William Perkins, concerning Christs descension into Hell* places Higgins 'At Winsam the 22. Of Iune. 1602', sig. A2v.
[7] The Latin original, *Nomenclator, omnium rerum propria nomina variis linguis explicata indicans*, by Hadrianus Junius (or Adriaen de Jonghe) the Dutch physician and scholar, was first printed in Antwerp in 1567, and reprinted some dozen times up to 1620.
[8] Campbell states that this may have been 'the work of another of the same name, and I do not know of any evidence that bears on the matter…The title of the book…certainly bears no mark of the interests of the young man with whom we are concerned', Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 25. However, the dedication clearly connects the text with Higgins's work, placing its composition 'At Winsam' as noted above.
[9] John Higgins, *An Answere to Master William Perkins, Concerning Christs Descension into Hell* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, printer to the University, 1602), p. 2.
[10] Churchyard wrote a commendatory poem prefixed to *Huloets Dictionarie*; Newton did the same for the 1587 *Mirror*, and praised Higgins's *Flowers of Terence* in his *Encomia* (1589), p. 128.

subtitle was the 'Principall Part of the Mirrour for Magistrates', was introduced with commendatory verses by a raft of supporters unconnected with the original *Mirror* project.[11] But in addition to some degree of official endorsement, Higgins brought with him ambitions to educate and codify which extended beyond the late medieval *Mirror*'s wry moralising. And he was ready to exploit the ostensible fixity of print to achieve these goals. As Churchyard wrote in his commendation of *Huloet's Dictionarie*, Higgins proffered 'a schole of rules' by mobilizing a modern partnership, the 'Scholers penne and Printers shoppe'.[12]

Higgins is generally thought to have joined the *Mirror* authors principally in pursuit of fame, and financial gain, but, alongside ambition, this coherent agenda is displayed throughout his work. While there are clear motivations which underpin and unite Higgins's oeuvre at large, though, generalisations about his contribution to the *Mirror* have been reductive, as they smooth out the important differences between the 1574-5 *First Part*, and his 1587 edition of the whole Marshe corpus. Where his ancient British complaints are characterised by impulses towards compilation and completion, for example, the Roman collection added in 1587 reveals more about Higgins as a classical scholar and politically engaged citizen. Higgins is central to the *Mirror*'s history, as a reader, editor, and proponent of the form in his own right. Why, then, has Higgins not been central to the *Mirror*'s reception?

Critical Reception

Higgins's work has received only scant and reluctant critical attention to date. Elizabeth Human surveys the extant criticism and decries its negativity, but retains a note of

[11] These were Claudius Hollyband, Thomas Procter, E. K./ Edward Knight, Mathew Wighthand, William Hall, Thomas Spigurnel, and one T. N., probably Thomas Nowell with whom Munday travelled to Europe in 1578 (see David M. Bergeron, 'Munday, Anthony (*bap.* 1560, *d.*1633)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2007 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19531, accessed 8 Sept 2012]) rather than a Norton or Newton.
[12] Cited in Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 22.

scepticism; it is bad scholarly practice if we 'simply ignore the later editions', even though they are 'unable to reproduce [Baldwin's] tight organization'.[13] Long before Human took this stance, E. M. W. Tillyard also saw the study of Higgins's text as a painful but necessary part of understanding wider Elizabethan culture. Tillyard asks why, when they had access to historical commonplaces in the chronicles, did the Elizabethans look instead to 'the execrable verse of Warner or Higgins or Blenerhasset?' In order to understand, Tillyard implies, we must persevere with these texts, 'however alien to modern taste and however poor as poetry by enduring standards'.[14]

This pose of unwilling scholarly obligation does not explain Higgins's absence from the body of recent scholarship on early modern nationalism, with the notable exception of Philip Schwyzer's *Literature, Nationalism and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* which devotes a chapter to the *Mirror* between 1559 and 1587. Higgins's engagement with questions about empire and colonialism, ethnicity and regnal succession should have been explored more fully to enlarge our understanding of the earlier stages of this debate's development, while his defining influence on the poetry and drama of the 1590s has also been predominantly overlooked. Where Higgins could be read as a political writer, criticism has been confined to ungenerous assessments of his poetic skill.[15] Coming to Higgins's defence in 2009, Pincombe at last advanced the suggestion that 'in fact, he is a decent writer';[16] Jennifer Richards's chapter of the same year on the *First Part*'s affective force both treats Higgins's poetry seriously, and recuperates him as alive to the 'moral-political purpose' of the *Mirror*, where the majority of other critics have argued that he failed.[17]

---

[13] Human, 'House of Mirrors', at 784.
[14] E. M. W. Tillyard, '*A Mirror for Magistrates* Revisited', in Herbert Davis and Helen Gardner (eds.), *Elizabethan and Jacobean Studies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), 1-16 at 10.
[15] See, for example, Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 5.
[16] Mike Pincombe, 'The First Part of the Mirror for Magistrates (1574)', *HRI Online*, accessed 16/05/12 .
[17] Richards, 'Transforming', p. 49.

Higgins is difficult to place in narratives of Elizabethan literary development: a vernacular poet of national origins dedicated to modish translation; an innovator in verse history deeply rooted in early Tudor humanism.[18] Higgins has been figured as something of an arriviste in the *Mirror*'s editorial ranks, and Campbell renders him ridiculous by hypothesizing a 'conviction that he was anointed to be Baldwin's successor'.[19] Moreover, the impression is quite widespread that Higgins's verse is, in a pejorative sense, 'medieval'; Budra's dismissive claim that 'Higgins took the *Mirror* back to Lydgate and the hoary tradition of the dream frame' is the latest iteration of a strong critical tradition.[20] Recent studies of the *Mirror*, and of the boundary between the Middle Ages and Renaissance,[21] have exposed the deficiency of this approach. Pincombe, for example, insists that the original *Mirror* collection itself belongs more properly to poetic continuity with the medieval period.[22] Indeed, Budra, and before him Farnham, both examined the medieval origins of the *Mirror* and its legacy in drama.[23] While they present consideration of its medieval roots as a fundamental contribution to the study of the 1559-1563 text, Budra refers repeatedly to the retrospective technique of Higgins's work as a 'retreat': Higgins retreats 'from the current concerns of historiography' and 'the immediate past', taking the *Mirror* 'out of the process of patriotic self-definition that directed so much of the intellectual energy of the late Tudor period', and making it 'a

---

[18] Cf. Cathy Shrank, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 220-1.
[19] Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 8.
[20] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 33. See also Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 13, p. 17; Douglas Bush, 'Classical Lives in *the Mirror for Magistrates*', *Studies in Philology,* 22, 2 (April 1925), 256-66 at 256. Cf. Willard Farnham, 'John Higgins' *Mirror* and *Locrine*', *Modern Philology,* 23, 3 (February 1926), 307-13 at 309-10.
[21] See Helen Cooper, *Shakespeare and the Medieval World* (Arden Critical Companions; London: Arden Shakespeare, 2010), Brian Cummings and James Simpson (eds.), *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), and Alexandra Gillespie, *Print Culture and the Medieval Author: Lydgate, Chaucer and Their Books, 1473-1557* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 7-9.
[22] See, for example, Pincombe, 'William Baldwin and *A Mirror for Magistrates*', at 16.
[23] Willard Farnham, *The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956); Budra, *De Casibus*, especially the final chapter on *Richard II*.

book of sweeping antiquarian lore rather than English political history'.[24] The suggestion that Higgins's *First Part* of the *Mirror* is medieval is often deployed to distance his contribution from Baldwin's, which by contrast has been historically located as a precursor to late sixteenth-century tragedy. Much of the critical bias against Higgins's work is therefore based on the premise that while Baldwin's text anticipates, Higgins's regresses.

Although critics like Campbell and Budra dismiss Higgins's work as 'medieval', Higgins actively alludes to and appropriates a number of medieval styles and tropes, drawing in particular on the work of Chaucer and Lydgate. It becomes problematic to denounce Higgins for his work's medieval features when we recognise that these were part of a deliberate aesthetic choice. The *First Part*'s 'medievalness' is not the medievalism which would become pivotal in the history of sixteenth-century literature when Spenser employed deliberately archaic diction and form for his *Shepheardes Calender* five years later. Instead, it arguably stemmed from an awareness of Lydgate in the background of the *Mirror* project which the earlier editions had played down.[25]

In addition to his assimilation of some facets of medieval poetics, Higgins's approach to text and authorship exhibits purportedly medieval characteristics. Robert S. Sturges claims that the Renaissance reader is distanced from the text, and discouraged from participation,[26] where the boundaries between medieval author and reader were more fluid. Sturges contends that, after the invention of print, '[n]o longer can a reader become a writer simply by writing between the lines'.[27] However, the *First Part* demonstrates precisely this facility for readers to participate, and to become writers, and

---

[24] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 26-7.
[25] See Human, 'House of *Mirrors*', at 775, on Higgins's incorporation of Lydgate's title 'in order to lend prior authority to his later text'.
[26] Robert S. Sturges, *Medieval Interpretation: Models of Reading in Literary Narrative, 1100-1500* (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1991), p. 223.
[27] Ibid., p. 223.

for their new compositions to reconfigure their source material. Additionally, 'the reader is central to this work's moral-political purpose', and 'fully implicated in its practice'.[28] The shifting status of the author/reader is central to the 1559-1563 *Mirror*, too; Baldwin's prose frame blurred the distinctions between readers and writers from the start, as the collaborators wrote, read and copied their own and others' poems. As we have seen, the early *Mirror* was fundamentally concerned with modes of textual interaction and transmission. If Higgins extends this practice, he is building on rather than rejecting the earlier example. Instead of teasing out the problem of whether Higgins's *First Part* is 'medieval' or not, though, we should ask what it meant in the 1570s to allude to medieval texts. If Higgins was not an exponent of the nascent Renaissance medievalism, what did he hope to achieve by resurrecting literary tropes from the recent past?

Although the authorship of Higgins's 1574 text is not contested or collaborative in the same way that the 1559 and 1563 editions' had been, Higgins also complicates the idea of authorship through his persona's status as amanuensis. The addition of Higgins's complaints to the *Mirror*, and the later publication of this collection as a single book in 1587, altered the purpose, genre, and audience of the work. Given this instability, Higgins's role and the status of his text are yet to be adequately defined. As in much critical discussion of the *Mirror*, terminology poses problems when it comes to describing Higgins's contribution. Is it an extension or a recension? Based on the *Mirror* or a part of it? Jessica Winston calls Higgins's 1574 volume a 'prequel' to Baldwin's text (and Thomas Blenerhasset's 1578 *Second Part* a 'continuation' of Higgins's prequel).[29] By contrast, W. F. Trench did not seem to acknowledge Higgins's work as connected to the *Mirror* at all, instead noting that 'other collections...appeared claiming the same title',[30] which may include any combination of Higgins's *First Part*, Blenerhasset's *Second Part*,

[28] Richards, 'Transforming', p. 61.
[29] Winston, '*A Mirror for Magistrates* and Public Political Discourse in Elizabethan England' at 399.
[30] W. F. Trench, *A Mirror for Magistrates: Its Origin and Influence* (1898), p. 73-4.

Anthony Munday's *Mirrour of Mutabilitie*, and George Whetstone's *Mirror for Magistrates of Cities* (1584). According to Andrew Hadfield, Higgins makes 'additions' to the *Mirror*.[31] But for Elizabeth Human and Philip Schwyzer his texts are 'editions'.[32] When we come to Higgins's 1587 publication, is he an author, an editor, a compiler, or all of these?

Part of Higgins's and the *Mirror*'s significance, though, resides in this difficulty. The fact that adequate critical terms do not exist to define this work demonstrates its potential as a site for theoretical as well as literary re-evaluation. Gerard Genette cites Jean-Baptiste le Rond d'Alembert's distinction between sequel and continuation as the 'genetic' difference between these types of hypertext: 'One may write a continuation of someone else's work and the sequel to one's own'.[33] This would appear to place Higgins's *Mirror* text as a 'continuation'. Genette, however, goes on to extend the definition to identify continuation as specifically the act of 'finishing the work in the author's stead', which as a result 'can only be the work of another'. By contrast the sequel 'exploit[s] the success of a work that in its own time was often considered complete, and in setting it into motion again with new episodes'.[34]

So Higgins's contribution lies somewhere between 'sequel' and 'continuation' depending on his relationship with Baldwin's collective. Baldwin was dead by the time Higgins's *First Part* was printed, and since it is unlikely that Baldwin and Higgins were acquainted, they cannot have collaborated. However, Gary Taylor rejects the relevance of Barthes's 'death of the author' to textual criticism on the basis that 'in any editorial situation, the author has always already passed away': this level of independence both

[31] In Andrew Hadfield, *Literature, Politics and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
[32] Human, 'House of *Mirrors*'; Philip Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
[33] Gerard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree (1982)*, trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 161.
[34] Ibid., p. 162.

informs and complicates a reading of Higgins's role as editor/continuator.[35] The addition of his work to the *Mirror* canon effects a 'redistribution of intertextual space, by the introduction of new reference points', and as such constitutes an editorial act.[36] For this reason, our understanding of the *Mirror for Magistrates* and its context is not simply incomplete, but also incorrect if we neglect Higgins's contribution. Budra states that '*de casibus* tragedy depends for its political/historical meaning on the teleology manifest in the narrative aggregate'.[37] The idea of a 'prequel' is both built out of and extraneous to narrative teleology: it is contingent on the assumption that a narrative progresses from its earliest stages towards a defined/anticipated end point, but the existence of the hypotext prevents any impact by the prequel upon that end point. Higgins's, and indeed, as we shall see, Blenerhasset's narrative frameworks are characterized by problematic, abrupt or non-existent endings which embody this relationship. It could be argued that they therefore also subsume the political/historical meaning of Baldwin's text at the same time as altering it by aspiring to a comprehensive verse chronicle.

The capacity to name parts of the *Mirror* accurately is important, too, because Higgins changes his own terminology between 1574-5 and 1587. In 1574-5, each complaint is preceded by a verse Induction. Higgins renames the Inductions 'Lenvoys' in the later work,[38] and therefore effectively shifts his allusive allegiances from Sackville, whose Induction was added to the *Mirror* corpus in 1563, to Chaucer, and Lydgate, whose tragic Roman prose narrative *Serpent of Division* (1422), for example, ended with a verse envoy. Higgins's decision to rename sections of his work demonstrates that his

[35] Gary Taylor, 'The Renaissance and the End of Editing', in George Bornstein and Ralph G. Williams (eds.), *Palimpsest: Editorial Theory in the Humanities* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993), 121-49, p. 125.
[36] Ibid., p. 131.
[37] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 67.
[38] The use of the term 'Lenvoy' is unusual, and its use with a definite or indefinite article seems counterintuitive, etymologically. However, this is how Higgins uses it, as in 'It lothed me a L'enuoy here to write' (*Mirror*, 1587, f. 45v), and Campbell follows this practice. It is unclear why Higgins, who claims to have been a translator of French, does not prefer 'envoy' here.

desire for an immutable textual record of the British past does not preclude textual revisions. It also reveals his concern for precision, and an evolving relationship with his generic precursors.

Higgins undoubtedly reconfigured the *Mirror*'s function. The *First Part* is a 'continuation' of the 1559-63 *Mirror* in its desire to perfect the original text, and a 'sequel' in the sense that it attempts to exploit the original's popularity. For Genette, the continuation is a 'restricted' form in that 'it is an imitation with a partially prescribed subject': 'the hypertext must constantly remain continuous with its hypotext'.[39] But Higgins flouts this restriction, and puts in place a number of fundamental changes which recast the earlier *Mirror* format. He uses verse throughout rather than verse in combination with prose, replacing the prose frame with his dream vision narrative in verse instalments, but maintaining the distinction between frame and complaints using contrasting typefaces.[40] The fiction of authorial collaboration gives way to Higgins's single, dreaming first-person narrator, who takes down the accounts provided by his visions. Higgins advances a different view of the textual past, anxious to patch up holes in the historical record rather than exposing holes in the historiographer's argument. And Higgins's historical characters offer broader moral messages than Baldwin's topical allegory. What does Higgins's approach tell us about how he is reading the text he has inherited, and his plans for the project?

The Paratext

A bold statement of intent is to be found in Higgins's Dedication which opens the *First Part*. As Jennifer Richards has shown, Higgins shifted the moral focus of the *Mirror* right from the start by emphasising in the Dedication not justice, as the 1559 *Mirror* had done,

[39] Genette, *Palimpsests*, pp. 162-163.
[40] See Geller, 'Editing under the Influence', at 58-61.

but temperance.[41] To do this, the Dedication's first sentence follows that of the 1559 *Mirror* exactly, substituting Higgins's Plotinus and temperance for Baldwin's Plato and justice, but otherwise maintaining an identical structure.[42] Such a forthright appropriation of the original undermines the humility Higgins expresses before Baldwin's example in the subsequent paratext, 'Higgins to the Reader', replacing rather than augmenting Baldwin's text, and draws attention to Higgins's assertion of a new, modified agenda.

Richards suggests that Higgins was compiling his *Mirror* at a time 'when the language of reformation government was more conciliatory…Thus, he rewrites Baldwin's Dedication, re-interpreting his emphasis on 'justice' to accommodate...moral compromises'.[43] Higgins may be updating the ethical stance of the *Mirror* through this change, to reflect new norms of political discourse, although Aristotle demonstrates the centrality of temperance to justice.[44] But the matrix of philosophical authorities which Higgins cites to support this shift also constructs a network of texts grounded in mid sixteenth-century intellectual culture, and the conduct manual tradition. This is another hint that Higgins's work should be read as a parallel thickening of select aspects of the earlier *Mirror*s, rather than part of a linear development or straightforward expansion.

Early modern thinking about the four cardinal virtues – justice, prudence, temperance and fortitude – derived from ideas which evolved through the writings of, in particular, Plato, Cicero, Augustine and Aquinas, as well as Aristotle's *Nicomachean*

[41] Richards, 'Transforming', p. 61.
[42] Cf. Jennifer Richards, 'Shakespeare and the Politics of Co-Authorship: *Henry VIII*', in David Armitage, Conal Condren, and Andrew Fitzmaurice (eds.), *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 176-94, p. 192.
[43] Richards, 'Transforming' p. 60.
[44] '…if what is unjust is unequal, what is just is equal; as is universally accepted even without the support of argument. And since what is equal is a mean, what is just will be a sort of mean…So justice is a sort of proportion'; Book V, Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. J. A. K. Thomson (London: Penguin, 2004), pp. 118-19.

Ethics.[45] Higgins claimed his definition of temperance from Plotinus, though, 'that wonderfull and excellent Phylosopher', who, Higgins says, 'hath these wordes':

> The propertie of Temperaunce is to couet nothing which maye bee repented: not to exceade the bandes of measure, and to keepe desire vnder the yooke of Reason. (1574F, sig. *3r)

Higgins probably did not read Plotinus himself. Editions of *Plotini divini illius e platonica familia philosophi, de rebus philosophicis libri*, or the *Six Enneads*, were printed at Solingen in 1540, and Basel in 1559 and 1562, but not in London, and although Higgins was obviously adept at Latin translation, his quotation from Plotinus follows almost verbatim that of his contemporary John Bossewell's *Workes of Armorie* (1572).[46] Both could be drawing on Thomas Elyot's *Boke Named the Gouernour* (1537), which offers a near identical summary of Plotinus's dictum.[47] Elyot and Bossewell's texts refer to the 'boundes of Mediocritie', instead of Higgins's 'bandes of measure'; Higgins could have replaced the term to echo the 'boundes of measure' found exceeded by tyrants in Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*;[48] Alexander Bercley's translation of the *Myrrour of Good Maners* (1518), Dominicus Mancinus's treatise on the cardinal virtues, also uses the phrase in relation to drunkenness.[49] So Higgins's focus on temperance is a product of the early Tudor advice literature of which the 1559-1563 *Mirror* was also a scion. Higgins's *First Part* arguably plugs the *Mirror* tradition back into this genre, reconnecting with a

---

[45] See Joshua Scodel, *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2002), Introduction.
[46] See John Bossewell, *Workes of Armorie Deuyded into Three Bookes, Entituled, the Concordes of Armorie, the Armorie of Honor, and of Coates and Creastes* (London: Richard Tottell, 1572), f. 7v; Bossewell has 'Mediocritie' instead of 'measure'.
[47] Thomas Elyot, *The Boke Named the Gouernour* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1537), f. 207v; Elyot also has 'Mediocritie' for 'measure', like Bossewell, but he describes Plotinus as 'wonderfull', as Higgins does.
[48] Giovanni Boccaccio, *Here Begynnethe the Boke Calledde Iohn Bochas Descriuinge the Falle of Princis Princessis [and] Other Nobles*, trans. John Lydgate (London: Richard Pynson, 1494), sig. O4v.
[49] Dominicus Mancinus, *Here Begynneth a Ryght Frutefull Treatyse, Intituled the Myrrour of Good Maners Conteynyng The .IIII. Vertues, Called Cardynall*, trans. Alexander Bercley (London: Richard Pynson, 1518), sig. G1v. The other two major sixteenth-century proponents of the phrase were Thomas Churchyard and William Perkins (*EEBO* search, 26/09/12).

morality discourse which the earlier *Mirror* paratexts had generalised: Baldwin's Epistle focused broadly on 'the goodnes or badnes of the rulers' (1559, C2v).

The virtue of temperance looms large in a series of other early Tudor mirrors, including the *Myrrour of Good Maners* as well as John Goodale's *Myrrour or Lokynge Glasse of Lyfe* (1532), and later Thomas Palfreyman's *Myrrour or Cleare Glasse for All Estates* (1560). Tracts on the duties of magistrates and the nobility also feature temperance prominently; the Marian *Memorial*'s change of title seems to advertise its membership of this group, and Higgins's Dedication fleshes out the generic affiliation by drawing yet closer links with Grimald's translation of Cicero's *De officiis* (1556), Johannes Ferrarius's *Good Orderynge of a Common Weale* (1559), Castiglionge's *Courtier* (1561), and Laurence Humphrey's *The Nobles or Of Nobilitye* (1563), in addition to his obvious debt to Elyot's *Gouernor*.[50] It was in these advice books, and treatises on virtue like Lydgate's *Verses on the Seven Virtues* (1500), John Hall's *Court of Vertue* (printed by Marshe in 1565), and the *Book of Wisdom or Flower of Vertue* (1565) by John Larke, where analogous treatments of temperance could be found, not in British chronicles which might instead address the virtue of justice, or the sin of ambition as in the opening of Baldwin's Epistle. Canutus is a rare model of temperance for Fabyan, and Marshe's Cooper,[51] although Roman histories such as Anthony Cope's popular *Historie*

[50] This text and Elyot's hugely popular *Castle of Health* (1539) have been recognised as major influences on later sixteenth-century treatments of temperance especially in the *Faerie Queene*; see, for example, D. T. Starnes, 'Sir Thomas Elyot and the "Sayings of the Philosophers"', *Studies in English* 13, (1933), 5-35, John C. Bean, 'Cosmic Order in the *Faerie Queene*: From Temperance to Chastity', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900,* 17, 1 (1977), 67-79 and John Wesley, 'The Well-Schooled Wrestler: Temperance and Rhetoric in *the Faerie Queene*, Book II', *The Review of English Studies,* 60, 243 (2008), 34-60.

[51] See Robert Fabyan, *Fabyans Cronycle Newly Prynted, Wyth the Cronycle, Actes, and Dedes Done in the Tyme of the Reygne of the Moste Excellent Prynce Kynge Henry the VII* (London: William Rastell, 1533), f. 130r; Thomas Lanquet, Thomas Cooper, and Robert Crowley, *An Epitome of Chronicles Conteyninge the Whole Discourse of the Histories as Well of This Realme of England, as Al Other Countreys, with the Succession of Their Kinges, the Time of Their Reigne, and What Notable Actes They Did* (London: William Seres for Thomas Marshe, 1559), f. 193r.

of Hannibal and Scipio,[52] and Rainolde's *Chronicle of all the Noble Emperours of the Romaines* (printed by Marshe in 1571) cite the quality more frequently.[53]

In particular, Lodowick Lloyd's *Pilgrimage of Princes* (1573) combines ancient historical accounts by classical authors with ethical teaching, arranged by moral theme (as well as more unexpected topics like 'Painting'). Lloyd includes a chapter 'On sober and temperate Princes', in which he describes Julius Caesar as 'for his abstinence the onely mirrour of *Italy*'.[54] Like Higgins, Lloyd presents his 'liues of Princes' as a process of 'gathering the fragments & broken sentences, as a beginning vnto others that are better stored',[55] and writes his exemplars into a history of textual counsel, imagining the close, almost intimate material relationship of classical rulers with their books:

> *August[us] Caesar*…would neuer be without Virgil in hande, nor *Alexander* the great without Homer vnder his Pillow. Happy was *Pompeius* when hee had Cicero in his bosome, and glad was *Scipio* when he had Enneus in his sight.[56]

Higgins's Dedication echoes Lloyd's highly referential style, also listing Alexander the great, Caesar, Pompey, Cyrus and Hannibal, while for the first time in the *Mirror*'s development his paratext is studded with citations and marginal references to Plotinus, Quintus Curtius, Justinus, Plutarch, Livy, Polybius, Aristotle and Cicero; shorthand for the intellectual traditions they represented.[57] The *Pilgrimage* was evidently popular; it was reprinted in 1586 and 1607, and in 1659 as *The Marrow of History: or, A Looking-Glass for Kings and Princes*. This publishing history, as well as the commendatory poem in the 1573 edition by Thomas Churchyard, suggests the existence of a greater contemporary affinity between the *Mirror* and texts of this kind than modern criticism

[52] Most recently printed by Thomas Marshe in 1561.
[53] See also Plutarch, *The Educacion or Bringinge Vp of Children*, trans. Thomas Elyot (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1530), and Plutarch, *A President for Parentes, Teaching the Vertuous Training Vp of Children and Holesome Information of Yongmen*, trans. Ed. Grant (London: Henry Bynneman, 1571).
[54] Lodowick Lloyd, *The Pilgrimage of Princes, Penned out of Sundry Greeke and Latine Aucthours* (London: John Charlewood and John Kingston for William Jones, 1573), f. 49v.
[55] Ibid., sig. **2r.
[56] Ibid., 'Epistle', sig. **1r-v.
[57] See, for example, Gillespie, *Print Culture and the Medieval Author*, p. 5.

recognises, borne out by Higgins's new ethical focus. The 1574 complaints did not employ anything like the schematic approach to virtue and vice taken in Lloyd's prose histories, or later poetic endeavours Spenser's *Faerie Queene* (1590), divided into books whose narratives interrogate alternate Christian and classical virtues,[58] or Munday's *Mirrour of Mutabilitie* (1579), whose biblical *de casibus* complaints each specifically address a different sin. However, Higgins's *First Part* is significant to the heredity of those works,[59] bridging a gap between their exemplary verse histories and a longer tradition of advice literature. Richard Harvey's prose *Philadelphus, or a Defence of Brutes, and the Brutans History* (1593) also underscores the *First Part*'s endurance in modes of thinking about ancient British history, and exemplarity, dividing his treatment of the legend based on virtues and vices, and opening with examples of temperance.

If Plotinus's teaching of temperance was 'so surely fixed in minde, as it is printed in his woorkes', then great danger would be avoided (1574F, sig. *3r). Higgins's invocation of print here suggests faith in the medium as a stable means of preserving information, setting up the role of his text in fixing lost British history. If only 'it were so ofte read and regarded of all Magistrates as the matter requireth' (1574F, sig. *4v-*5r). Morindus, the last of Higgins's negative *exempla*, is the only historical character to use the term 'temperance' in the *First Part*, hoping that in his death,

> …maist thou see of fortitude the hap,
> Where prude*n*ce, Iustice, Te*m*peraunce hath no place:
> How sodainly we taken are in trap,
> When we despise good vertues to embrace.

[58] On Spenser's exploration of temperance see Helen Cooney, 'Guyon and His Palmer: Spenser's Emblem of Temperance', *The Review of English Studies,* 51, 202 (2000), 169-92, Kasey Evans, 'How Temperance Becomes "Blood Guiltie" in *the Faerie Queene*', *SEL,* 49, 1 (2009), 35-66, and Gerald Morgan, *The Shaping of English Poetry: Essays on Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, Langland, Chaucer and Spenser* (New York: Peter Lang, 2009), Ch. 11.

[59] Is it significant that the book of the *Faerie Queene* which Spenser devoted to temperance, Book II, is also the book in which Higgins's ancient British verse history is recapitulated as *Briton Moniments*? The connection between the 1587 *Mirror* and Spenser's exploration of temperance in the *Faerie Queene* was discussed by Gillian Hubbard in her paper, 'King Iago and the Political Instability Caused by Gluttony and Sloth', *Fame and Fortune: The Mirror for Magistrates, 1559-1946* (Magdalen College, Oxford, 2012).

> Intemperaunce doth all our deedes deface,
> And lettes vs heedlesse headlong run so faste,
> Wee seeke out owne destruction at the laste. (1574F, f. 67v)

In this way Higgins's emphasis on temperance as the crucial virtue out of the cardinal four frames his *Mirror*, leaving Nennius's complaint which closes the collection to depict 'the *very paterne of a valiaunt, noble, and faithful subiecte*' (1574F, f. 68v).

The second paratext, then, presents another, parallel agenda, which builds on the *Mirror*'s ostensible moral aims, while also perpetuating its dissatisfaction with textual history. 'Higgins to the Reader' bemoans the inadequacy of modern historiography, and the absence of a satisfactory narrative of Britain's foundation. It is this which Higgins sets out to provide, somehow avoiding the paradox which ought to prevent him researching it – his own ancient manuscript is also absent:

> I haue seene no auncient antiquities in writte*n* hand but two, one was *Galfridus of Munmouth* which I lost by misfortune, the other an old Chronicle in a kind of Englishe Verse, beginning at *Brute* and endinge at the death of *Humfrey* Duke of *Glocester,* (1574F, sig. *5v)

Higgins's focus here is on written records; this belies the orality of historical transmission enacted by the complaints themselves, which anticipate more closely North's near-contemporary translation of Amyot's analysis:

> bicause that men in those daies deliuered in their lifetimes the remembrance of things past to their successors, in songes, which they caused their children to learne by hart, from hand to hand, as is to be seene yet in our dayes, by thexample of the barbarous people that inhabite the newfound landes in the West, who without any records of writings, haue had the knowledge of thinges past, welneare eight hundred yeares afore.[60]

A sense of the insubstantial, or unreliable, as a characteristic of physical relics of the ancient past more generally permeates Higgins's complaints. Morgan's armour, for example, is

[60] 'Amiot to the Readers' in Plutarch, *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes Compared Together by That Graue and Learned Philosopher and Historiographer, Plutarke of Chaeronea; Translated out of Greeke into French by Iames Amyot*, trans. Thomas North (London: Thomas Vautroullier and John Wight, 1579), sig. *3v.

> ...not so braue in sight,
> Nor sure as ours, made now adayes by skill:
> But clampt together, ioynts but ioyned ill (1574F, f. 54v)

Histories, too, are 'clampt together' from what is to hand.

In the frame surrounding Mempricius's complaint, Higgins comments on the contingency of history writing, and the impact of this contingency on accuracy; the writer's lack of skill may transform the narrative. He will recite Mempricius's tale, 'though nothing nere so well' as Mempricius had related it (1574F, f. 36v). The reader's interpretation plays a part, too, in how accurate a historical text is judged to be.

> Nowe (Reader) if you thincke I miste my marke,
> In any thinge whilere but stories tolde:
> You must consider that a simple Clarke,
> Hath not such skill theffect of things t'unfolde,
> But may with ease of wiser be controlde:
> Eke who so writes as much the like as this,
> May hap be demde likewise as much to misse. (1574F, f. 39r)

The final section of the verse frame added in 1575 suggests that Higgins's complaints are 'fragmentes' which might gain legitimacy once they have passed through the 'Printer's presse', and found favour with readers (1575F, f. 81r).

But the impression offered by these references is misleading when it comes to Higgins's own approach to the writing of history. In 'Higgins to the Reader' he frames an arresting, simplified problem, and admits to having invented some histories because 'in some suche places as I moste needed their ayde [the chronicles] wrate one thing: and that so brieflye that a whole Princes raigne, life and death, was comprised in three lines' (1574F, sig. *6r). But the paratext also reveals that his reading has been extensive; multiple sources *do* exist to support his new history. Furthermore, this reading consists of contemporary or near contemporary publications; a far cry from the lost, and implicitly

ancient and damaged, texts ('mine olde booke', for example, taking the place of Geoffrey of Monmouth's own *liber vetustissimus*)[61] whose failure he sets out to remedy.

Hugo Zimmermann and Campbell identify the historical sources listed in 'Higgins to the Reader' as follows:

> Richard Grafton, *A chronicle at large*, 1569, 1568; Thomas Lanquet, *An epitome of chronicles*, 1569; John Stowe, *A summarie of Englyshe chronicles*, 1565 [mistakenly given as 1561]; Matthew of Westminster, *Flores historiarum*, first published as *Elegans, illustris, et facilis rerum praesertim britannicarum A.D. 1307 narratio* in 1567 and as *Matthaeus Westmonasteriensis de rebus britannicis* in 1570; and the *Chronicle of St Albans* (there were, in fact, two editions of the same work in 1515 – one published by Wynkyn de Worde, the other by "Julyan Notary").[62]

Nearly all of these texts were printed no more than nine years before the *First Part.* His paratextual citations create a serious dissonance between Higgins's representations of his historiographical methods here and in the main body of the text, but the paratext is also misleading in itself. Higgins's reference to Grafton's *Chronicle at Large* (1569) dismisses the work – 'he is most barraine and wantes matter' (1574F, sig. *5v) – in order to denigrate a competitor. Grafton's dedication actually anticipates rather too closely the motivations set out in 'Higgins to the Reader' for composing a new English chronicle, namely that no history of ancient Britain exists without treating the histories of other nations in tandem.[63] Higgins also mentions 'the right reuerende father in God *Matthew* Archbishoppe of *Canterbury* & Metropolitane of Englande', who

> hath brought such ayde as well by printing as preseruinge the written Chronicles of this Realme that by his Graces studye and paines, the labour in time to come wilbe farre more easye to them shall take such trauaile in hande. (1574F, sig. *6r)

---

[61] See Arthur B. Ferguson, *Utter Antiquity: Perceptions of Prehistory in Renaissance England* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993), p. 117.
[62] Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, pp. 26-7, enlarging on Hugo Zimmermann, *Quellenuntersuchungen Zum Ersten Teil Von J. Higgins Mirror for Magistrates* (München, 1902).
[63] See Richard Grafton, *A Chronicle at Large and Meere History of the Affayres of Englande and Kinges of the Same Deduced from the Creation of the Worlde, Vnto the First Habitation of Thys Islande: And So by Contynuance Vnto the First Yere of the Reigne of Our Most Deere and Soueriegne Lady Queene Elizabeth* (London: Henry Denham for Richard Tottel and Humphrey Toye, 1569), 'The Epistle', sig. 2v.

Jostling for position amongst other contemporary chroniclers, Higgins clearly wishes to associate, and perhaps ingratiate, himself with Matthew Parker, a figure at the forefront of contemporary antiquarian activity. Campbell notes that Higgins is also doubtless indebted to additional chronicles which he does not name, as well as to 'literary treatments of history'.[64] So Higgins's representations of the work's composition make up a layering of authorial fictions, whose rhetoric holds the multiple aims of the *First Part* together.

The Dream Frame

Another of these fictions is set out in the verse 'Author's Induction' which follows. Higgins's new choice of form also signals his departure from the original *Mirror*'s purpose, replacing the realistic narrative of composition with a meta-textual dream vision. Again, though, Higgins's modification takes its lead from the 1559-1563 *Mirror*, echoing Baldwin's inset dream of Richard Plantagenet, duke of York (1559, f. 48r-v), and Sackville's Induction.

The inscribed Higgins decides to 'refreshe my wittes oppreste' by choosing a book from the printer's shop (1574F, f. 1r); this book is the *Mirror*, which he reads several times over before Somnus, the personification of sleep, 'appeard in purple colour blacke'. Higgins thinks he will be able to rest, but instead Somnus 'Reuiued all my fancies fonde'; this evokes the process which Baldwin describes more prosaically, when he 'began…to slumber: but my imagination styll prosecutyng this tragicall matter, brought me suche a fantasy' (1559, f. 48v). Somnus, with the help of 'his seruaunt Morpheus' leads Higgins 'into a goodly hall' (1574F, f. 2v) and calls up 'the Britaynes'. Higgins is terrified by what he sees; 'wylde they seemde as men dispeyring mad', some injured so badly they are 'disguisde' by their wounds, recalling Aeneas's dream of

[64] Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 27.

Hector, 'squalentem barbam et concretos sanguine crinis| vulneraque…gerens'.[65] Whereas the *Mirror* Higgins reads impresses him – it is 'So finely pende, as harte could well desire', and Higgins 'marked playne eache party tell his fall' (1574F, f. 1r-v) – his response to the dream shows that it is altogether more visceral and appalling. His role is not specified, but Morpheus tells Higgins to stay and listen to the Britons' stories. When the first begins to speak, with blood 'freshly trick[ling] from his wounde', 'With Ecco so did halfe his wordes rebounde,| That scarce at first the sence might well appeare' (1574F, f. 3v); not for the last time, Higgins is initially unsure whether he will be able to catch and record the ancient speaker's testimony.

Although Higgins replaces the celebrated 'pseudo-nonfiction' of Baldwin's 'poets-at-work' frame with that of a traditional dream vision, both framing devices arguably stand for the process of creative production, and neither describes the real circumstances of the *Mirror*'s composition. The *First Part*'s dream vision, however, tacitly acknowledges the difficulty of accessing accounts of the ancient past by rendering their transmission more explicitly fictional. Richard Robinson introduces his own *Mirror*-style complaint collection with a similar dream vision trope, also in 1574. Robinson claims in 'The Author to the Reader' that 'I collected this together, faining that in my sleepe *MORPHEUS* took me to *PLUTOS* Kingdome in a Dreame: The which device, I mistrust not, but thou shalt thincke well of'.[66] The coexistence of fictive and factual narratives of composition suits Robinson's chosen ensemble; his collection includes complaints by overtly mythological figures like Tantalus, Medea and Helen of Troy, mixed in amongst various popes and biblical characters. Higgins's dream, on the other hand, somehow coheres with his prose address to the reader, suspending disbelief in a

[65] 'With ragged beard, with hair matted with blood, and bearing…wounds': *Aeneid*, Book II in Virgil, *Virgil I*, trans. H. Rushton Fairclough (Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2001), ll. 277-8.
[66] Robinson, *The Rewarde of Wickednesse* (1574), p. 20.

visionary dimension of historiography. Although Higgins's *Mirror* is a product of lone rather than collaborative composition, his fictive role as amanuensis might be seen paradoxically to reintroduce the 'notional instability both of texts and the category *author*', which Ralph G. Williams identifies as a specifically medieval function of text,[67] following Baldwin and his associates' explicit co-*authorship* as, albeit fictional, poets-at-work.

Higgins's dream vision owes much to Sackville's Induction. Indeed, Lady Anne Clifford's marginal annotations of her copy of the *Mirror* indicate that she mistook Higgins's Induction for Sackville's, so closely did the later poem imitate its predecessor.[68] But Higgins's work internalizes the genre rather than treating the exercise as an isolated set-piece. His *Mirror* is designed to fit alongside the model that Sackville had apparently proposed, 'to continue and perfect all the story him selfe', 'backeward euen to the time of William the conquerour' (1563, f. 114v). In this respect it is Sackville in particular, not Baldwin and his other collaborators, whose example Higgins appears to emulate. Richard Hillman assesses the levels of artifice at work in Sackville's contribution, identifying the use of 'a naive authorial persona to generate a quasi-Medieval framing narrative, which purports to fill – but effectively enlarges – the eschatological vacuum standard in the *Mirror*'s histories'.[69] Higgins's persona certainly appropriates the naivety of Sackville's; Higgins, however, goes some way to divert attention from the 'eschatological vacuum' of which Hillman speaks rather than augmenting it. His 'guides' Morpheus and Somnus, for example, act as literary muses of history unlike Sackville's neo-Platonic personification of Sorrowe.

[67] Ralph G. Williams, 'I Shall Be Spoken: Textual Boundaries, Authors, and Intent', in George Bornstein and Ralph G. Williams (eds.), *Palimpsest: Editorial Theory in the Humanities* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1993), 45-66, p. 51.

[68] Orgel, 'Marginal Maternity', p. 270.

[69] Richard Hillman, *Self-Speaking in Medieval and Early Modern English Drama: Subjectivity, Discourse and the Stage* (London: Macmillan, 1997), pp. 80-81.

Hillman notes a connection between Sackville's Induction and Robert Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid.*[70] Both begin with a typical description of the weather that the current season and corresponding astrological sign have brought with them, and equate these with the emotions of the speaker.[71] The opening of Henryson's *Testament* also, however, shares these and other similarities with Higgins's Induction. Various lexical echoes suggest that Higgins may have been influenced by Henryson not just through Sackville, but also directly – although Higgins could have known Henryson as Chaucer: the *Testament of Cresseid* was first printed as part of William Thynne's 1532 *Workes*.

Higgins's Induction in the *First Part* begins,

> As Somer sweete with all hir pleasures paste,
> And leaues began, to leaue both braunche and tree,
> While winter colde approatched nere full fast
> Mee thought the time, to sadness moued mee
> On drouping daies, not halfe such mirth haue wee:
> As when the time of yeare and wether-s fayre,
> So moue our mindes, as mocions moue the ayre.
>
> The wery nightes, approatched on apace
> With darksome shades, which somewhat breedeth care,
> The Sun had take more nere the earth his race,
> In Libra than, his greatest swinge hee bare,
> For pardy then, the days more colder are,
> Then fades the greene, fruite timely, herbes are don,
> And winter gines to waste that sommer won. (1574F, f. 1r)

The intertextual debt to Sackville is obvious when their opening stanzas are compared. Sackville's Induction begins,

> The wrathfull winter prochinge on a pace,
> With blustring blastes had al ybared the treen,
> And olde Saturnus with his frosty face
> With chilling colde had pearst the tender green:
> The mantels rent, where enwrapped been
> The gladsom groves that nowe laye ouerthrown,
> The tapets torne, and euery blome downe blowen. (1563, f. 116r)

[70] Ibid., p. 81.
[71] Cf. Mike Pincombe, 'A Place in the Shade: George Cavendish and *De Casibus* Tragedy', in Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 372-88.

Sackville is more explicit than Higgins about the philosophical message of the transition from summer to winter, claiming that 'It taught me wel all earthly things be borne| To dye the death, for nought long time may last.| The sommers beauty yeeldes to winters blast'. Higgins can be seen to emulate Sackville's diction but not his interpretation. Instead, he shares with Henryson the belief that,

> Ane doolie sessoun to ane cairfull dyte
> Suld correspond and be equiualent:
> Richt sa it wes quhen I began to wryte
> This tragedie; the wedder richt feruent,
> Quhen Aries, in middis of the Lent,
> Schouris of hail gart fra the north discent,
> That scantlie fra the cauld I micht descend.[72]

In contrast to Higgins and Sackville's autumnal setting, for Henryson March-April are the cruellest months and most fitting to tragedy, but it is his example and not Sackville's that Higgins follows when he is convinced by bad weather to read and write sad stories.[73]

Sackville extends his description of the season and the zodiac, and encounters the weeping figure of Sorrowe without the help of textual mediation. Henryson and Higgins, however, both proceed quickly from the conventional seasonal description to an encounter with their source material. Henryson

> …mend the fyre and beikit me about,
> Than tuik ane drink, my spreitis to comfort,
> And armit me weill fra the cauld thairout.
> To cut the winter nicht and mak it schort
> I tuik ane quair – and left all vther sport –
> Writtin be worthie Chaucer glorious
> Of fair Cresseid and worthie Troylus.[74]

[72] *Testament of Cresseid*, in Denton Fox (ed.), *The Poems of Robert Henryson* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), ll. 1-7.
[73] Higgins's revision of the passage in 1587 includes a reference to 'th'Antarctique' which echoes Henryson's 'Arctick'; perhaps this addition could be explained by new interest in that continent piqued in 1578 by Sir Francis Drake's accidental voyage around Cape Horn.
[74] Fox (ed.), *The Poems of Robert Henryson*, ll. 36-42.

Higgins's narrative becomes explicitly early modern at this point; instead of settling beside a fire, he 'went the Printers straight vnto' (1574F, f. 1r). However, his source text is introduced in a comparable way:

> At length, by hap, I found a booke so sad,
> As time of yeare or wynter could require,
> The Mirroure namde, for Magistrates he had
> So finely pende, as harte could well desire (1574F, f. 1r)

In this way Higgins echoes Henryson's presentation of his fictive self as reader, dreamer and writer which has no analogue in Sackville's Induction. Higgins's framing narrative therefore arguably leapfrogs its immediate predecessor in the 1563 *Mirror*, and instead re-engages with an earlier approach to historical re-writing. Rather than hanging onto Sackville's coat tails, Higgins sets a clear aesthetic agenda which reaches beyond his hypotext.

Andrew Hadfield argues that Higgins quashes the polyvocality of the *Mirror* as it was under Baldwin's editorship, and thus renders it woefully 'unproblematic', providing a 'crudely ideological series of narratives'.[75] However, Higgins's voice is hardly dominant among the plethora of historical figures whose narratives he records. And rather than presenting himself as the author of the complaints, as Baldwin's co-authors do, the narrator Higgins is merely an amanuensis for the dead. The dream conceit further removes our sense of his creative agency, and positions Higgins as listener alongside the reader, as audience to rather than originator of the text. Moreover, both Higgins and the speakers of the complaints themselves suggest that the process of transmission and notation is far from 'unproblematic', and the relentless exposition of indiscriminate misfortune further complicates Higgins's moral-historiographical purpose.

We do hear from Higgins the author after Mempricius's complaint in the 1574-5 editions. Higgins's fiction of authorship splits the complaints into two sections, with a

[75] Hadfield, *Literature, Politics and National Identity*, p. 102.

break where he awakes and writes up the accounts he has heard, reported between the tragedies of Mempricius and Bladud. Higgins provides a literary *curriculum vitae* to silence those who would question his poetic skill:

> …the first two yeares I Grammer taught:
> The other twaine, I Huloets worke enlargde:
> The last translated Aldus phrases fraught
> With eloquence, and toke of Terence charge
> At Printers hand, to adde the flowers at large
> Which wanted there, in Vdalles worke before:
> And wrote this booke with others diuers more. (1574F, f. 40r)

Meredith Skura does not find Higgins's presence in the text 'helpful' or desirable, unlike Campbell,[76] perceiving in his defence a 'self-serving' 'preoccupation with himself'. This imbues the text, for Skura, with an 'overtly self-scrutinizing authorial stance', in a 'dream-vision unified only by his own consciousness'.[77] However, dream vision as a form is necessarily more introspective than the conceit Baldwin perpetuates, and the dreaming Higgins struggles to unify a series of exchanges which clearly bewilder him. The depiction of a personal encounter with the historical figures he depicts is also key to Higgins's new model. Richards suggests that Higgins's additions 'made affective appeal integral to the *Mirror*'s argument'; 'pity and compassion are foregrounded as proper responses to the complaints'.[78] We also feel for Higgins himself: King Morindus's gruesome appearance 'rayde with matter vyle, or slimy mud' repels him, but in putting aside his 'squemishnes' to record the 'worthy wight''s tale (1574F, f. 65v), Higgins heightens our sense of the significant moral purpose of his record-making enterprise. Higgins's presence within the fiction as a terrified, then sympathetic dreamer is central to his ability to summon and convey compassion, where Baldwin's framing device distances

[76] Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 7.
[77] Meredith Anne Skura, *Tudor Autobiography: Listening for Inwardness* (Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 2008), pp. 96-7.
[78] Richards, 'Transforming', pp. 58-9.

the collaborators from the reality of their subjects.[79] Furthermore, in the frame of the 1574 edition, Higgins dreams himself into Romano-British history, as he is caught up in the patriotic enthusiasm of Nennius's account:

> But when they came to tell of Caesars flight,
> I sawe the Romaines fall me thought full fast,
> And all the Britaines, chace them euen till night:
> Where with the sounde of Britishe trompets blast.
> Made mee so madde and mazed at the last:
> I lookt about for sword or weapon I,
> To runne with Britaynes, cryde they flie they flie. (1574F, f. 74r)

Dream vision is therefore an indispensable tool for the kind of history Higgins embarks on here. Moreover, it allows him to write the *Mirror* corpus back into a substantial textual heritage, while also 'tacitly declaring his literary ambition' like George Gascoigne, whose 'deliberate medievalising' in his 1575-6 revision of *The Complaynt of Phylomene* re-presents the narrative as a Chaucerian dream vision, and places Gascoigne 'more firmly in the native poetic tradition'.[80] Higgins's use of the dream vision form at once fictionalizes the process of composition, and alludes to the work of Chaucer, a substantial, 'apparently stable' textual monument in which readers had faith;[81] Higgins tries to pin down a coherent narrative while acknowledging it to be imaginary. The conflicted status of dreams, increasingly deemed unreliable by the later sixteenth century,[82] must have contributed to the collection's unstable relation to historiography, while enabling its emotional affectiveness. So there is an acknowledgement of uncertainty in this new choice of form, as well as stability lent by the tradition, inherited from canonical authors Higgins admired: Chaucer, Lydgate and Sackville.

---

[79] We are told that Baldwin's collaborators become downcast as a result of their sad subject matter, but this is a very different process.
[80] Gillian Austen, *George Gascoigne* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2008), pp. 155-6.
[81] Gillespie, *Print Culture and the Medieval Author*, p. 105.
[82] See, for example, Derek B. Alwes, 'Elizabethan Dreaming: Fictional Dreams from Gascoigne to Lodge', in Constance C. Relihan (ed.), *Framing Elizabethan Fictions: Contemporary Approaches to Early Modern Narrative Prose* (Kent, Ohio and London: Kent State University Press, 1996), 153-67.

On a basic level, Higgins's *First Part* might be read as an exercise in historiographical wish-fulfilment, filling in missing 'eye-witness' accounts. For Higgins, the function of the dream vision is to have the past revealed to him. In the prologue to the *Legend of Good Women*, Chaucer claims that 'if olde bokes were aweye,| Yloren were of remembraunce the keye'.[83] While dreaming, Chaucer is told that he may find the women 'in thy bookes', and on waking 'my bokes gan I take,| And ryght thus on my Legende gan I make'.[84] But Higgins's dream takes him beyond the book he has read, filling in a narrative it did not provide. While asleep, he

> ...humbly did request:
> Him [Morpheus] shewe th'vnhappy princes were of yore,
> For well I wiste that hee could tell mee more,
> Sythe vnto diuers Somnus erste had tolde,
> What things were done in elder times of olde. (1574F, f. 2v)

In fact, dream visions rarely simply describe 'what things were done in elder times'. More often they contain allegory or moral guidance (although, of course, for the sixteenth century these too were functions of history). Higgins thus invokes and then modifies the literary tradition into which he writes himself as another in a long succession of dreamers. His desire to be shown 'what things were done' taps into the growing contemporary anxiety about the absence of reliable historical evidence.

Higgins composed his complaints at a time when English antiquarians were beginning to face up to the simple absence of documentary evidence about their nation's past beyond a certain point, and negotiate the implications of this absence for contemporary historiography.[85] In both his 1574 and 1587 *Mirror*s, Higgins replicates the use of textual sources by "reproducing" imagined letters as part of his complaints. Bale and Leland had drawn attention to the loss of textual records as a result of Henry VIII's

[83] Benson (ed.), *The Riverside Chaucer*, p. 589, ll. 25-6.
[84] Ibid., p. 603, l. 556 and l. 578.
[85] See Andrew Escobedo, *Nationalism and Historical Loss in Renaissance England: Foxe, Dee, Spenser, Milton* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2004), especially p. 55.

dissolution of religious houses and their libraries. Later efforts by Archbishop Matthew Parker and his circle of collaborators to preserve and analyse Anglo-Saxon manuscripts – praised in 'Higgins to the Reader' – served as a reminder of their scarcity and, in many cases, their language's inaccessibility. The Galfridian narrative, of which Leland had been a vehement defender, was for the first time being seriously discredited, with the result that a substantial portion of British historical legend could effectively be cancelled. Budra claims that 'in reciting tragedies from legendary prehistory [Higgins] was retreating from the concerns of current historiography'.[86] But in fact, his reimagining of the *Mirror* form struck at the heart of contemporary concerns.

Both Higgins and Blenerhasset's prefaces to their *Mirror* additions are wistful with references to absent texts: Higgins's historical manuscript is lost; Blenerhasset is separated from his books by an ocean.[87] 'The convergence of spectral complaint with British antiquarianism' Philip Schwyzer suggests, 'should come as no surprise. Both modes of writing were means of achieving, or at least imagining, communion with the vanished past'.[88] Andrew Escobedo also identifies this anxiety in Higgins's work, and sees it as symptomatic of the concerns of the time marked by 'a profound sense that the English past was missing and unrecoverable' and 'alien to the present'.[89] Escobedo cites Higgins's identification of this 'temporal isolation' as 'a distinctively English fate': Higgins wrote, 'amongst diverse and sundry Chronicles of many Nations, I think there are none (gentle reader) so uncertain and brief in the beginning as ours'.[90] Higgins's *First Part* was composed in a period when, as Escobedo notes, 'the question "What is

[86] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 26.
[87] See Ch. 3, below.
[88] Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory*, p. 112.
[89] Escobedo, *Nationalism and Historical Loss*, p. 3. Cf. Timothy Hampton, *Writing from History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1990), p. 14.
[90] Escobedo, *Nationalism and Historical Loss*, p. 3.

English?" [became] deeply tied to the question "When did England begin?"'.[91] The dreaming Higgins requires the manifestation of the extra-textual sources Somnus and Morpheus to help him answer these questions where his copy of the *Mirror* is lacking. The innovation of the dream vision is therefore crucial to Higgins's representation of historical distance, difference and loss. His debt to Chaucer and Sackville, and the Lydgate of the *Temple of Glas* and *Serpent of Division*, as well as the *Fall of Princes*, helps him to combine the *de casibus* narrative trajectory with the dream vision to structure his new history of absent origins.

In his search for the British past, Higgins does not weigh specific sources against each other as the late medieval complaints and prose frame had done.[92] Instead he foregrounds the insubstantial nature of his visions, and the uncertainty surrounding their validity: immediately after Locrinus's complaint, 'this king was vanisht quite and gone,| And as a mist dissolued into ayre' (1574F, f. 21r); Elstride likewise 'flitted in the ayre abrode,| As twere a miste or smooke dissolued quite' (1574F, f. 28r). Following Madan's complaint, the dream frame's speaker considers,

> (If it were he) but sure I half suspecte
> It was some other else, so seru'de had bene,
> For that all stories do not so detecte
> His death, or else I did perhaps neglecte
> His tale, bicause that diuers stories brought,
> Such fancies of his death into my thought. (1574F, f. 34r)

Where Baldwin and Ferrers analysed their sources' disagreements, Higgins stresses that he is dreaming, and that his dreams have assimilated the stories of others. A fundamental hesitancy lies at the heart of Higgins's representation, portrayed by agonising pauses before many of his legendary figures speak. Manlius's complaint, for example, is delayed, 'as to mynde he musde his factes to call'. When 'At length…to me he spake', Higgins

---

[91] Ibid., p. 13.
[92] In 'Higgins to the Reader' he notes that '*Lanquet*, *Stowe*, and *Grafton* were alwayes nighe of one opinion' (1574F, sig. *6r).

cannot be sure if it was 'these wordes, or like' (1574F, f. 34r). Lord Irenglas pauses for a full stanza before his 1575 complaint, as Higgins's framing narrative enacts the distancing and silencing effects of time (including a year's delay in publication) on historical accounts:

> At length he tryde, which way to tell his mynde:
> Yet how to speake his tonge had quite forgotte:
> Each instrument forgotten had his kinde,
> That erste could run at randon and by roate,
> But then me thought, with fist his brest hee smote,
> The other hande his musing browes did holde:
> And ass awakte (at laste) this tale he tolde. (1575F, f. 75v)

In making the reader persevere to reach these stories through grinding delays, Higgins emphasises how hard-won his ancient narratives are. By foregrounding the scarcity and fragility of their accounts, he also increases the impact of the characters' moral messages as the reader strains to hear them.

The *First Part*, then, shares the 1559-63 *Mirror*'s anxieties about historical records but for different reasons. Where the early collections were concerned with textual reliability and the manipulation of textual accounts, Higgins worries about the accessibility or even the existence of historical documentation.[93] The choice of foundational subject matter foregrounds the retrieval of this lost national history rather than the political topicality to be extracted from more recent examples, and in this way, too, Higgins departs from his hypotext.

What emerges from an analysis of this departure, though, is a complex interaction of various modes of contemporary history writing, drawing on epic poetry, the example of the earlier *Mirror* texts, and newly emerging ways of thinking and writing about the past. Higgins also draws together the old and new, as familiar features of historical myth collide with modern historiographical practices, such as chorography and archaeology.

[93] See Allen J. Frantzen, *Desire for Origins: New Language, Old English, and Teaching the Tradition* (New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, 1990), pp. 47-8.

Different accounts of Higgins's methodology compete with one another, through his paratextual introductory pieces, the dream vision frame's narrative, and the claims of the historical figures themselves who participate in the fictionalized version of Higgins's attempts to stabilize the foundational narrative.

Even when the narrator does 'write', he displaces his own agency by personifying his pen, which 'did trudge to wryte these verses fast' (1575F, f. 81r). This positioning contrasts sharply with the active role of the fictive Baldwin and his colleagues in the process of composition as depicted by the original *Mirror*'s prose frame. The contrast illustrates the comparative functions of the two works, and the different ways in which they are to be read. While Baldwin's prose frame is concerned with the instability of text, and the bearing that this might have upon political authority and government, Higgins's conflation of historical traditions and methods focuses specifically on the instability of history, and the resulting loss of cultural identity. As for John Leland in the early sixteenth century,[94] Higgins's retrieval of national history was a fundamentally patriotic endeavour.

The Complaints

As we will see, the form and structure of the verse complaints added to the collection is one of the more stable aspects of the *Mirror*'s expansion. Higgins's ancient British complaints predominantly follow the 1559-1563 texts' rhyme royal, and remain faithful to the *de casibus* plot trajectory. However, in his choice of characters Higgins does reformulate his model. The *First Part* does not set out to reflect or critique specific contemporary figures as Lucas argues the earlier editions did. Nor does Higgins draw on figures familiar outside of historical texts in imaginative literature or the exemplary

---

[94] Herbert Grabes, 'The Creation of "English Literature" by Early Modern Literary Histories', in Mihaela Irimia and Dragoş Ivana (eds.), *Imitatio-Inventio: The Rise of "Literature" from Early to Classic Modernity* (New Europe College, Bucharest: Institutul Cultural Român, 2009), 119-37, p. 124. On Leland's patriotic historiographical project, see also Shrank, *Writing the Nation*, Ch. 2.

tradition for the most part,[95] although *Gorboduc* had extracted topical significance from the ancient British legend of Forrex and Porrex. Higgins's complaints predominantly work to create a continuous narrative, supplementing chronicle history efficiently but methodically. They do not regularly explore a single reign from various perspectives as the 1559 text had done for Richard II, or the 1563 'Second Part' for Richard III, although the overlap between accounts does allow for polyvocal representations of particular events.

Campbell argues that Higgins introduces for the first time historical figures whose lives may be construed as positive, rather than negative, *exempla*. She claims that '[w]ith the introduction of an admirable hero tragedy loses its moral as well as its political significance'.[96] But the 1559 *Mirror* had represented admirable contemporary heroes as moribund historical villains to explore tragedy's moral workings, complicating Campbell's opposition. And how positive *exempla* fail to contribute to a morally educative programme is unclear,[97] even if they problematize the notion of divine retributive justice, or Aristotelian tragic inevitability. In his *True Order and Methode of Wryting and Reading Hystories*, (also printed in 1574), Thomas Blundeville asserts that '[a]ll those persons whose lyues haue beene such as are to bee followed for their excellencie in vertue, or else to be fledde for their excellencie in vice, are meete to be chronicled'.[98] The complaint of Nennius upholds this recommendation,[99] while later, in the Lenvoy which precedes Pinnar's complaint in 1587 Higgins claims that 'The good deserue to haue their praises wrote| To spread their fames, t'incourage those aliue', while

---

[95] Cf. Hampton, *Writing from History*, p. 25.
[96] Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 15.
[97] See, for example, Hampton, *Writing from History*, p. 3 and *passim*.
[98] Thomas Blundeville, *The True Order and Methode of Wryting and Reading Hystories, According to the Precepts of Francisco Patricio, and Accontio Tridentino* (London: William Seres, 1574), sig. C2r.
[99] See John E. Curran, Jr., *Roman Invasions: The British History, Protestant Anti-Romanism, and the Historical Imagination in England, 1530-1660* (Newark and London: University of Delaware Press, 2002), pp. 166-7.

more traditionally, 'Of wicked Princes wee the falls doe note| A *Caueat*, for kingdomes were they striue' (1587, f. 46r). The reward of the good is specifically textual recognition, rather than earthly or heavenly bliss here. The practice of including positive *exempla* with tragic ends steps away from ingenuous confidence in ineluctable moral justice. Higgins perpetuates the *de casibus* mode of worldly success followed by tragic fall, and his paratextual prefaces firmly foreground the moral value of historical examples, but his characters are frequently sympathetic, guiltless, and merely unfortunate.[100]

Higgins's characters offer different reasons for reporting their falls from those of the earlier *Mirror*s. In addition to those who wish to be examples to other, garner fame, or correct historiographical mistakes, their accounts take on a new therapeutic dimension. Cordila, for example, finds comfort in relating her story,

> For why to tell that may recounted be againe,
> And tell it as oure cares may compasse case:
> That is the salue and medcine of our paine,
> Which cureth corsyes all and sores of our disease:
> It doth our pinching panges, and paines a pease:
> It pleades the part of an assured frende,[101]
> And telles the trade, like vices to amende. (1574F, f.47v)

Mempricius is reluctant to share his history, but is also compelled to for emotional relief, 'because it moueth in my brest| Compunction still' (1574F, f. 37v). Irenglas suggests that the complaints 'bring the Readers hartes such ease', too (1575F, f. 76r). The causes and means of the characters' falls also depart dramatically from the model set by the 1559-1563 *Mirror*. Although political intrigue and ambition are still rife,[102] Higgins's narrative does stray occasionally into the realm of the marvellous. Mempricius, for example, had appeared in Pierre Boaistuau's compilation of *Certaine Secrete Wonders of Nature*

[100] See Richards, 'Transforming', p. 59.
[101] Later, Higgins will compare the *Mirror* to the company of a friend; see Ch. 4, below.
[102] *Pace* Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 26.

(1569), having been eaten by wolves.[103] Morindus, of course, is devoured by a monster from the Irish Sea which had been terrorising the North West coast of the island; Morindus attempts, like a British Perseus, to defeat the monster, but is swallowed whole. Higgins enlivens the brief chronicle accounts of this fabulous event, describing the innards of the monster full of 'rammishe stenche, bloud, poyson, slymy gere',[104] and its movement: when Morindus attacked, it 'roarde, & belcht, & groande, & plungde & cride,| And toste me vp and downe, from side to side' (1574F, f. 67v). Although Stow and Cooper had emphasised Morindus's cruelty as a ruler, they did not draw a moral from the manner of his death; by contrast, Higgins reactivates the moral role of equivalence found in Baldwin's prose frames, suggesting that

> …thus one beastly monster did deuoure,
> An other monster moodelesse to his payne:
> At once the realme was rid, of monsters twayne. (1574F, f. 67v)

The other particularly fantastical complaint in the collection is that of Bladud, who 'practisinge by curious arts to flye, fell and brake his necke' (1574F, f. 40v). This title, though, like all of Higgins's ancient British tragedies, is accompanied by a date – in this case BC 844 – reflecting the historical precision inherited from the 1571 *Mirror*. This feature reinforces the sense that the reader ought to have confidence in the veracity of Higgins's stories, and Bladud's complaint in particular works hard to justify his magical skill through a painstaking account of his learning. Individual stanzas are devoted in turn to *Grammer*, *Rhetoricke*, *Logicke*, *Musicke*, *Geometrie*, *Astronomie*, *Phisiognomie* and *Metoposcopie*, *Chiromancie* and *Geomancie*, *Augurium* – and *Magicke*. The complaint celebrates the academic culture of ancient Greece, following Hardyng's embellishment of

[103] Pierre Boaistuau and E. Fenton, *Certaine Secrete Wonders of Nature Containing a Description of Sundry Strange Things, Seming Monstrous in Our Eyes and Iudgement, Bicause We Are Not Priuie to the Reasons of Them* (London: Henry Bynneman, 1569), f. 7r.
[104] This episode rather recalls the Pearl-Poet's description of Jonah's experience inside the whale, which 'stank as Þe deuel', full of 'glaym ande glette'; *Patience*, in Malcolm Andrew and Ronald Waldron (eds.), *The Poems of the Pearl Manuscript* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2002), p. 197.

Bladud's education in Athens,[105] and showcases Higgins's stake in this culture in its bilingual final stanza,

> Farewell, will students keepe in minde,
> οὐκ ἀρετᾷ κακὰ ἔργα:
> Els May they chaunce like fate to finde,
> For why, τοῖς κακοῖς τρὶς κακά.[106] (1574F, f. 47r)

Bladud insists that 'wooden birdes' can be made to fly 'Through Magicke Mathematicall' (1574F, f. 45v).[107] Although this also 'swarues from Natures will', Higgins's language suggests that Bladud's flight is a result of scientific application, in contrast to the occult tenor of Golding's description of Daedalus, who 'to vncoth Arts…bent the force of all his wits| To alter natures course by craft'.[108] At the same time, though, Higgins condemns Bladud's 'witched wiles' and 'Darke dreames', while his aspiration to 'eternall fame,| Which I esteemde the greatest good' unambiguously deserves punishment. This equivocal response to the wonders, achievements and profanities of the ancient world typifies Higgins's approach to classical culture in the complaints: Irenglas vilifies the invading Romans, but seems also to hold up the *Aeneid* as an exemplary moral guide (1575F, f. 79r).

Additionally, Higgins's legendary characters are often – like the late medieval figures – aware of their contested historical status. They also reflect on the role of the historian. Evidently the categories of historian and poet were entwined and fluid from their perspective as for many in the period; although Blundeville draws a distinction between 'poets historical' and historiographers, as Sidney would six years later, these views are not representative of current thinking more broadly, and instead illustrate the

[105] See John Clark, 'Bladud of Bath: The Archaeology of a Legend', *Folklore,* 105, (1994), 39-50, at 44.
[106] 'Deeds which are not virtuous are terrible…Vices are paid back threefold'; my thanks to Chris Noon and Chris Rawlinson for help with this translation.
[107] With admirable prescience, as it turns out.
[108] Ovid, *The XV Bookes of P. Ouidius Naso, Entytuled Metamorphosis*, trans. Arthur Golding (London: William Seres, 1567), f. 98v.

alternative directions in which historiographical and poetic practice could develop.[109] Higgins's historiographical role is held in tension with the *Mirror*'s morally educative and exemplary function, and the structural constraints of the *de casibus* form. Indeed Irenglas, whose complaint was added to the collection belatedly, worries aloud that

> …I feard, of late the *Romaine* warre
> Thou wrotst: had ended all thy former frame,
> And I had bene, excluded from the same[.] (1575F, f. 76v)

Irenglas digresses on the subject of history writing, and the fame his story will bring him and his author, wandering from the narrative, only to describe a fall that was not deserved. The *First Part* faces up to a contradiction embodied, according to Maura Nolan, in Lydgate's *Serpent of Division*, where 'Lydgate attempts to write an exemplar in Gowerian fashion even as he gives in to the desire to amplify and correct the historical authorities that provide him with the story itself'.[110] While sixteenth-century history is almost always read for its potential to provide moral precepts, the *First Part* noticeably grapples with a dissonance between inherited form and intended content; 'the classical notion of the purpose of histories as sources of moral exempla', Nicholas Popper suggests, 'constituted a component of the trend that ultimately brought historians' credibility under scrutiny'.[111]

Although the Galfridian legends would become central to the imaginative literature of the later sixteenth century, like the 1559-1563 *Mirror*s Higgins's *First Part* was rare amongst contemporary verse history in its choice of subject matter. In his Henrician verse *Chronycle* (1547), Arthur Kelton had shared Higgins's desire to consider

---

[109] See Blair Worden, 'Historians and Poets', in Paulina Kewes (ed.), *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 2006), 69-90.
[110] Maura Nolan, *John Lydgate and the Making of Public Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 51.
[111] Nicholas Popper, 'An Ocean of Lies: The Problem of Historical Evidence in the Sixteenth Century', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 74, 3 (2011), 375-400, at 377.

'fortunes mutabilitee',[112] and have British genealogy from the foundation by Brutus 'Enrolled vp with golde pearle and stone| Registred in a boke',[113] but his delineation of the Galfridian narrative was very vague, and named only its most famous protagonists. These were 'stories every patriot ought to learn about and learn from',[114] but they were yet to be tapped for their moral lessons or dramatic potential in poetry by the 1570s. The first complaint of the collection, that of Albanact, lends itself to comparison with epic since it retells the fall of Troy, and Brutus's journey to Britain.[115] But Higgins keeps to the matter of Britain, covering mainstays of the foundational narrative such as the naming of Albion, and the island's inhabitation by giants,[116] rather than succumbing to Virgil and Chaucer's examples of Latin and vernacular epic. John Hardyng's *Chronicle*, printed in 1543 by Richard Grafton but written in the mid fifteenth century, was a lone analogue, narrating British history in verse 'fro*m* the first begynnyng of *Englande*, vnto ye reigne of Edwarde ye fourth'. Hardyng, too, is said to have followed his historical sources without complete faith in their authors,

> Nor well assured, who were corrupte or pure
> Nor whether they were certaine orelles vnsure
> Whether fabulous, or menne of veritee
> Whether vaine, or of good authoritee.[117]

And in the chronicle itself, Hardyng utilises the verse form to emphasise his mistrust of the transmission of textual history. The second stanza of his second chapter ends with the stock expression, 'as chronicles do compile', only for the third stanza to begin 'But I dare

[112] Arthur Kelton, *A Chronycle with a Genealogie Declaryng That the Brittons and Welshemen Are Linealiye Dyscended from Brute* (London: Richard Grafton, 1578), sig. c4v.
[113] Ibid., sig. b1v.
[114] John E. Curran, Jr., 'Geoffrey of Monmouth in Renaissance Drama: Imagining Non-History', *Modern Philology,* 97, 1 (1999), 1-20, at 3.
[115] Additionally, it does not recount Albanact's own fall; see Pincombe, 'The First Part of the Mirror for Magistrates (1574)', entry 6 in 'Main Text'.
[116] See Laura Ashe, 'Holinshed and Mythical History', in Paulina Kewes, Ian W. Archer, and Felicity Heal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).
[117] John Hardyng, *The Chronicle of Ihon Hardyng from the Firste Begynnyg of Englande, Vnto the Reigne of Kyng Edward the Fourth* (London: Richard Grafton, 1543), 'To the Reader', sig. *7r.

saye, this chronicle is not trewe'.[118] In the *First Part*, Lord Nennius takes on inaccurate and absent ancient sources in his own complaint, where Higgins's verse links are more circumspect. Higgins advances his parallel educative and restorative aims when Nennius argues that

> I May by right some later wryters blame,
> Of stories olde, as rude or negligente:
> Or else I may them well vnlearned name,
> Or heedlesse in those thinges about they wente:
> Some tyme on mee as well they might haue spente,
> As on such traytours, tyrauntes, harlottes those,
> Which to their countreyes, were the deadliest foes. (1574F, f. 68v)

Nennius is a 'worthie Britaine', 'valuiaunt souldier and faitherfull subiecte', so this opening stanza helps to justify Higgins's inclusion of positive examples, as well as firming up an unfamiliar story. John E. Curran suggests that 'Nennius's insistence that history has unfairly forgotten him reminds us that he has indeed been forgotten…Higgins lapses into signalling the manifold holes perforating the Galfridian tradition'.[119] Rather than a lapse, though, this problem may be read as central to Higgins's engagement with the national past, and the difficulties in trying to recount it. Nennius's criticism of historians becomes more specific, claiming later that 'writers misse.| Or if I may be bolde to saye: they lye' (1574F, f. 69v) in accounts of his father; his 'boldness' here echoes Hardyng's 'daring' to take on the deceptiveness of textual histories, above. Nennius is 'ridiculously, uncertain as to whether his father Heli reigned for one or forty years',[120] because of conflicting historical records – Higgins's marginalia indicate that Lanquet, Stow and Grafton claim one year, 'Flores Hist.' forty – and at least one must be untrue. The 'ridiculous' situation in which Nennius finds himself, though, foregrounds his existence purely as a product of textual transmission; he is unable to resolve the conflict, because he has no reality outside of the chronicles. Unlike the authors of late sixteenth-

[118] Ibid., f. 7r.
[119] Curran, *Roman Invasions*, p. 167.
[120] Ibid., p. 167.

century Galfridian drama, who Curran suggests 'were unsure both whether they were imagining real people and whether they were generating examples from actual history',[121] Nennius suggests that Higgins was grappling with the textual rather than the historical realities of his characters.

The veracity of ancient historical records was a fraught and contentious issue in the period. In surveying the tradition leading up to this state of confusion, Arthur Ferguson claims that the situation had been complicated by medieval exegetes who held that 'a history need not be true at all in any objective sense provided it be edifying and sufficiently verisimilar to be convincing'.[122] Tiller echoes this idea in his description of Geoffrey of Monmouth and Layamon's historiographical context when history was a 'broadly conceived genre', in which ''historical truth' or 'verifiable history'' were 'often dependent upon adherence to other texts and textual traditions'. Tiller notes that readers of the period 'interpreted texts and re-presented them for new contexts, often dramatically altering the meaning or 'sentence' of the original, according to ideological or religious predispositions'.[123] The choice of the *Mirror* formula as a vehicle for a retelling of the Galfridian legend foregrounds the way in which history had been open to interpretation and re-reading for diverse moral and social ends, of a sort which was perhaps about to become invalid. But Higgins's characters' own attention to the 'truth' of their stories complicates our understanding of how this moral history ought to be read.

Higgins follows in the wake of Wace and Layamon's *Brut* in turning the *Historia* from a Latin prose text into vernacular poetry. In contrast to Layamon, however, Higgins does not engage with the process of translation, or even mention a particular source text within his verse, merely citing Geoffrey as a source in 'Higgins to the Reader'. Tiller

[121] Curran, 'Imagining Non-History', at 3.
[122] Ferguson, *Utter Antiquity*, pp. 115-6.
[123] Kenneth J. Tiller, *Layamon's Brut and the Anglo-Norman Vision of History* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2007), p. 1.

notes that Layamon's prologue seems 'to reflect the mysterious inspiration *topos* of the medieval dream vision', such as that found in the opening of Chaucer's *The Book of the Duchess*, or Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid.*[124] Higgins, too, employs this *topos*; but the book which inspires his visions is Baldwin's *Mirror for Magistrates*, not Geoffrey's text. Higgins's Induction thus performs a bold conflation of influences across genres, periods and historiographical traditions.

The Galfridian narrative is infamous for its propagation of the Arthurian legend. Retellings of ancient British history like Hardyng's *Chronicle* betray their disproportionate interest in this myth: Hardyng devotes thirteen chapters to Arthur and his knights, as against, for example, the one he gives to Humber, one to Locrine, and one to Madan earlier in British history. However, Higgins's appropriation of the Galfridian story did not include any Arthurian material; the *First Part*'s historical coverage did not reach that far, and it is notable that Higgins chose to omit the legend in a patriotic history of the nation's origins. Although the whole of Geoffrey's history is likewise dubious if not outright fictional, Arthur's notoriety as a site for historiographical contention, inflamed by Polydore Vergil's *Anglica Historia* (1534) and Leland's *Assertio inclytissimi Arturij Regis Britanniae* (1544) seems to have discouraged Higgins. Three years later, Blenerhasset would hedge around Arthur's story, writing a complaint of Uter Pendragon for his *Second Part* while omitting Arthur himself because the legend was too well rehearsed (1578S, f. 40r). It was only in 1610 that Arthur finally entered the *Mirror* canon, in Niccols's *A Winter Nights Vision*. By this time, questions about the veracity of Geoffrey's narrative were beside the point; Niccols appropriated the figure not from history, but from Spenser, in order to make a very different statement about the textual past and its present pertinence.

[124] Ibid., pp. 108-9.

Wyman Herendeen cites Spenser, along with Sidney, Drayton and Shakespeare, as figures inspired by the 'hybridity' of William Camden's *Britannia* (1586) to create 'works with historical content but of mixed or uncertain literary form'.[125] Higgins arguably anticipates this process, combining prose and verse sources, and textual, archaeological and chorographical details, in line with the contemporary evolution of historiographical methods in which Camden played a significant part. One strand of this development may be seen in Higgins's concern with the historiography of place. The earlier editions of the *Mirror* exhibited an increasing preoccupation about specificity with regard to the locations of historical events,[126] but the *First Part* raises the stakes. In the latent national chorography which underlies Higgins's collection, we can see a means by which Higgins is able to connect contemporary England with the ancient past. Many of his chosen characters influence the names of British geography, and make much of their remembrance in topographic features.[127] Humber, for example, gives his name to the river in which he meets his death. (Higgins could also have noted the same process with regard to Sabrine who was drowned in the Severn).[128] Morgan 'Was at *Glamorgan* ... stricken downe'; Morgan tells Higgins, with something approaching pride, that 'The place is cald *Glamorgan* to this daye' (1574F, f. 66v). King Leir dies and is buried at Leicester; Lud lends his name to Luds-town, or London. These hints are inherited from source material, and rehearsed across the Elizabethan retellings of the Galfridian narrative, as in William Warner's *Albion's England*, and Spenser's *Briton Moniments* in the *Faerie Queene* (Book II). Higgins's emphasis on this form of link between the present day and mythical history, and its significance in piecing together a fuller story about national origins, is motivated

[125] Wyman H. Herendeen, *William Camden: A Life in Context* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2007), p. 208.
[126] See Ch. 1, above.
[127] Cf. D. R. Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 315.
[128] Pincombe, 'The First Part of the Mirror for Magistrates (1574)'.

by the same desire for comprehensive explanation and record that drives his appropriation of the *Mirror*, and paves the way for the formal chorographies and itineraries which made the study of the landscape for links with the past an explicit and significant part of later sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century prose and verse historiography.[129]

Conclusion

Despite their ostensible conflict, it is possible to resolve Higgins's multiple agendas – the shift from justice to temperance as the *Mirror*'s primary ethical focus; the introduction of a medieval-style dream vision to conjure up lost ancient history; and the contradictory real history Higgins seems simultaneously to undertake. All promote the stabilisation of the commonwealth, by cementing its past in the recapitulation of national origins, and its future by regulating the behaviour of those in positions of power. His new focus on sympathy, and the measured interpretation of moral lessons, mitigates the barbarity of the ancient past, and forges a compassionate corporate identity. Higgins's Britons are not, ultimately, uncivilised Welshmen,[130] but a *locus* for nationalist pride; he envisages a complete history not of England, but 'oure Ilande'.[131]

But Higgins's stated ambitions for completeness belie his editorial practice. In the compendious 1587 edition, he passed over Blenerhasset's continuation which could have advanced these aims, including only the *First* and *Last* parts of the *Mirror* printed by Marshe. Why did Higgins reject Blenerhasset's *Second Part*? Chapter Three will suggest that far from assisting Higgins in his mission to complete the *Mirror*'s coverage and patch

[129] See Lesley B. Cormack, '"Good Fences Make Good Neighbours": Geography as Self-Definition in Early Modern England', *Isis,* 82, 4 (1991), 639-61; Richard Helgerson, 'The Land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography, and Subversion in Renaissance England', *Representations,* 16, (1986), 50-85.

[130] Cf. Harriet Archer, 'Holinshed and the Middle Ages', in Paulina Kewes, Ian W. Archer, and Felicity Heal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook to Holinshed's Chronicles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).

[131] This still may mean 'England' in effect; see Alan MacColl, 'The Meaning of "Britain" in Medieval and Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies,* 45, 2 (2006), 248-69. 'Britain' and its cognates are used 72 times in the *First Part*, 'England' 5. Traditionally, the British 'become Welsh' under Vortiger, and England was still an anachronism in the historical period Higgins's *First Part* describes.

up the historical record, Blenerhasset's text works to expose the flaws in an attempt to reconstruct history using only imperfect memory and invention.

Chapter Three

Thomas Blenerhasset's *Second Part of the Mirror for Magistrates* (1578).

Memory opens Blenerhasset's *Second Part* by asking Inquisition, her companion, to help 'renew the decayed *Memory* of those men' who were 'excluded out of the English *Mirrour of Magistrates*'. In fact, Blenerhasset himself has for the most part been excluded from the *Mirror*'s critical treatment, as well as from Higgins's final *Mirror* edition of 1587. This chapter offers a new reading of a work which has been either ignored or drastically misinterpreted.

Blenerhasset's *Second Part* exposes the ease with which textual memory can be lost, and interrogates the validity of attempts to restore it. Where previous analyses have positioned Blenerhasset alongside Higgins as another inferior versifier misguidedly plundering Baldwin's successful model, I will suggest that Blenerhasset engages more subtly with the 1559 *Mirror*, to extract his own poetics of textual loss, as well as the means by which to convey the contingency of historiographical reconstructions of the past. In the 1559 *Mirror*'s prose frame, the inscribed poets confront a patchy and unsatisfactory historical record:

> I finde mencion here … of a duke of Excester found dead in the sea betwene Dover and Calays, but what he was, or by what adventure he died, master Fabian hath not shewed, and master Hall hath overskipped him: so that excepte we bee friendlier vnto him, he is like to be double drowned, both in the sea, and in the gulfe of forgetfulness. (1559, f. 75r)

This passage, with its capricious historians, watery oblivion, dark punning humour, and use of suggestive liminal space, will become crucial to understanding Blenerhasset's esoteric appropriation of the *Mirror* tradition.

Blenerhasset's collection of historical complaints is a unique and somewhat mysterious addition to the *Mirror* corpus. When Blenerhasset composed the work, which

he claims was completed by 15th May 1577 (1578S, sig. *4v), the *Mirror* as conceived by Baldwin and his associates had been printed in four repeatedly revised editions by Thomas Marshe, in 1559, 1563, 1571 and 1574. Higgins's continuation, *The First Part of the Mirror for Magistrates*, had been printed in 1574; Blenerhasset's *Second Part* was clearly designed to slot into the corpus after the first. It contains the complaints of Guidericus, Carassus, Queen Hellina, Vortiger, Uter Pendragon, Cadwallader, Sigebert, Lady Ebbe, Alurede, Egelrede, Edricus, and Harold, spanning a period of British history 'from the Conquest of Caesar, vnto the commyng of Duke William the Conqueror'. However, Blenerhasset's text is anomalous among the late medieval *Mirror* and Higgins and Niccols's later appropriations of the *Mirror* formula. Blenerhasset does not seem to have been associated with Baldwin, or Thomas or Henry Marshe.[1] Unlike Baldwin, Higgins, and Niccols, Blenerhasset was not, *pace* Paul Budra, an editor of the *Mirror*.[2] Ostensibly, he did not even participate in or oversee the publication of his own work, let alone sections of others' texts. He added only twelve complaints. He does not appear as a character within the body of his *Mirror* text. His addition to the *Mirror* is, and seems always to have been, problematic. Twentieth- and twenty first-century critics are reluctant to discuss it, frequently referring to 'Higgins and Blenerhasset', a rather disreputable double act, and refusing to attend to their differences.

Higgins himself, deliberately or not, had nothing to do with Blenerhasset. He omits any reference to Blenerhasset's *Second Part* in his 1587 edition. However, the three subsequent editors of the *Mirror* all reprinted Blenerhasset's complaints: Richard Niccols in 1610, Joseph Haslewood in 1815, and finally Lily B. Campbell in 1946. It is clear that

[1] Very little is known about who printed the *Second Part*. The text is signed 'Richard Webster', who Budra notes was 'singularly unsuccessful'; he is not known to have printed anything else (Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 32). McKerrow identifies him as 'Richard Webber', see Aldis et al., p. 286, but Campbell suggests that the *Second Part* could actually have been printed by Thomas Dawson, who printed Blenerhasset's *A Revelation* (Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 502).
[2] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 27.

they believed his work belongs in the *Mirror* corpus, where the work of others who appropriated the title for their own 'unofficial' *Mirror* texts, such as Anthony Munday's *The Mirrour of Mutabilitie* (1579) and George Whetstone's *A Mirror for Magistrates of Cities* (1584), was rejected. Should we group Blenerhasset's text with these unofficial imitators of the *Mirror*, given its atypical nature, or should we regard it as an integral if inconsistent part of the collection? The *Second Part*'s paratextual material echoes 'The Author to the Reader' which prefaces Richard Robinson's *Rewarde of Wickednesse* (1574), a collection of *de casibus* complaints that hovers like George Cavendish's *Metrical Visions* (MS, 1550s) on the edge of the *Mirror* tradition. Both Robinson and Blenerhasset present themselves as extrinsic to literary communities by virtue of their physical isolation in fortified castles, Robinson at Sheffield and Blenerhasset on Guernsey.[3] But Blenerhasset's stance arguably constructs a more complex relation to his source text.

Blenerhasset was stationed on Guernsey as a captain at Guernsey Castle from 1577.[4] His first literary work, a translation of Ovid's *De remedio amoris* (1578S, sig. *3r), is no longer extant, but places Blenerhasset's appropriation of the *Mirror*'s *de casibus* form within a tradition of its appropriation by translators, including Baldwin and Higgins most prominently. Furthermore, his known printed works and professional career offer parallels with Spenser's which might inform a new reading of the *Second Part*.[5] Blenerhasset's visionary panegyric, *A Revelation of the True Minerva* (1582), 'the first direct imitation of *The Shepheardes Calender*',[6] and his prose tract, *A Direction for the Plantation of Ulster* (1610), do not cohere with the *Second Part* to form so identifiable an

---

[3] See 'The Author to the Reader', Robinson, *Rewarde*, pp. 20-21.
[4] See Sidney Lee, 'Blenerhasset, Thomas (*c.*1550–1624)', rev. Andrew Hadfield, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2636, accessed 8 Sept 2012].
[5] Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 376-7.
[6] David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 80.

approach or agenda as Higgins's oeuvre presents. But all three texts work towards a perceived shoring up of English history, territory and reputation in the face of erosive forces: mutability, savagery, and unreliable textual transmission.

Critical Reception

Although Blenerhasset's contribution to the *Mirror* constitutes a bold act of poetic and historiographic appropriation, critical treatment of his work remains markedly limited.[7] The repeated confirmation of the *Second Part*'s place in the *Mirror* canon by the editorial work of Niccols, Haslewood and Campbell should have boosted scholarship on, or at least curiosity about, Blenerhasset's intriguing publication. Critics, though, have devoted very little more than asides to his *Mirror* text, and he is perhaps better known to literary criticism for the *Revelation*.[8] Richards and Geller's papers on the *Mirror*, which are more receptive than previous scholarship to an assessment of the later additions, do not touch on Blenerhasset's contribution.[9] Neither does Lucas's monograph, which addresses only the late medieval complaint collection.[10] Budra criticizes Blenerhasset for his 'pretensions to didacticism' and objects that 'a disproportionate number of the stories he chooses to recite teach [lust's] perils'.[11] Aside from these comments, though, even Budra rarely addresses the place of the *Second Part* in the *Mirror*'s development, and does not offer any textual analysis. Human provides a comparatively thorough assessment of

[7] The one monograph on Blenerhasset's *Second Part* remains Rudolf Lämmerhirt, *Thomas Blenerhassets "Second Part of the Mirror for Magistrates". Eine Quellenstudie* (Weimar: Druck von G. Uschmann, 1909).
[8] See John N. King, 'Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen', *Renaissance Quarterly,* 43, 1 (Spring 1990), 30-74, at 58, Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, pp. 80-81, Ivan L. Schulze, 'Blenerhasset's *A Revelation*, Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender*, and the Kenilworth Pageants', *English Literary History,* 11, 2 (June 1944), 85-91, and Linda Shenk, *Learned Queen: The Image of Elizabeth I in Politics and Poetry*, eds Carole Levin and Charles Beem (Queenship and Power; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 90-108.
[9] Sherri Geller, 'Editing under the Influence'; Richards, 'Transforming'.
[10] The single reference to the *Second Part* lists Blenerhasset among Robinson, Munday and Whetstone as 'Other poets' who 'seized on the admonitory power of Baldwin's collection for general rather than strictly political calls to morality'; Lucas, *Politics*, p. 233.
[11] Budra, *De Casibus*, pp. 27-8.

Blenerhasset's text, but focuses on the way in which the *Second Part* continues the tradition of 'the printer as the source of the *Mirrors*,' and briefly critiques the paratext without reference to Blenerhasset's verse complaints.[12] Human is unusual in her acknowledgement that 'the relationship between this text and the other *Mirrors* is...a vexed one';[13] this chapter will unpack her statement, beginning with the idea that Higgins and Blenerhasset's *Mirror*s are related but not homogeneous.

Can terminology help elucidate Blenerhasset's authorial practice, and contested status within the *Mirror* corpus? As with Higgins's new *Mirror* complaints, critical vocabulary is problematic when it comes to discussing Blenerhasset's contribution. In narrative terms, Blenerhasset's *Second Part* is at once a sequel and a prequel to the *Mirror* as it existed in 1577: the historical content of the complaints it contains chronologically precedes that of the original collaborative *Mirror* work, and follows on from Higgins's additional material. Gerard Genette's term 'supplement' may provide a useful way to think about Blenerhasset's text. Genette's 'supplement' suggests

> …an optional addition, or at the very least an eccentric or marginal one that brings a surplus to the work of another – a surplus in the nature of a commentary or a free, even illegitimate interpretation ... [T]he hypotext here is no longer anything but a pretext, the point of departure for an extrapolation disguised as an interpolation.[14]

The idea of literal 'eccentricity' is important to understanding the relationship of the *Second Part* to the *Mirror* tradition as a whole. As we will see, Blenerhasset was physically and intellectually cut off from the environment in which previous *Mirror* editions had been produced, and his *Mirror* text reflects this independence. The potential 'illegitimacy' of Blenerhasset's text is borne out by Higgins's rejection of it from his 1587 edition, as well as the *Second Part*'s circumstances of publication, although it seems to have been accepted by the *Mirror*'s wider contemporary readership. Baldwin and

[12] Human, 'House of *Mirrors*', at 778-9.
[13] Ibid., at 778.
[14] Genette, *Palimpsests*, pp. 202-3.

Higgins's evolving hypotext exists very much as an inherited pretext for this autonomous commercial and artistic venture, which appropriates the early *Mirror*s' unease about textual reliability and re-presents it for a new cultural context.

Using the term 'supplement' to describe Blenerhasset's addition to the *Mirror* would help to distinguish it from Higgins's work. This distinction is long overdue, since, as noted above, most critical responses to Blenerhasset's *Mirror* text have generally treated it alongside Higgins's *First Part*, with little or no regard for the *Second Part*'s dramatic deviation from its predecessors. Higgins's *Mirror* project has traditionally been presented as the product of his misreading the early *Mirror* as a primarily historiographical, rather than topical and politically engaged work. Meanwhile, his verse has been denigrated for its dubious aesthetic value.[15] The idea that Blenerhasset's *Mirror* text merely provided the early modern reader with 'more of the same' probably goes some way to explain the reluctance with which scholars approach his supplement, so this idea has been perpetuated. But Blenerhasset's text and paratext do not have to be read as a bland, mechanical extension of Higgins's lapsed project.

The lack of discrimination between Higgins and Blenerhasset began with their early twentieth-century reception, when Campbell's 1946 edition reignited critical 'interest' in their work. Opinion at this point ranged from indifference to disapproval, following Campbell's lead, which stemmed in part from Lämmerhirt and Zimmermann's earlier source studies,[16] in dismissing Higgins and Blenerhasset as secondary to Baldwin.[17] The current *ODNB* entry concurs, stating that 'Baldwin's original version used

[15] See, for example, C. S. Lewis, *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966) and Tillyard, '*A Mirror for Magistrates* Revisited'.
[16] Lämmerhirt, *Quellenstudie*; Zimmermann, *Quellenuntersuchungen Zum Ersten Teil Von J. Higgins Mirror for Magistrates*.
[17] See Willcock, 'Parts Added to the Mirror for Magistrates [Review]', at 104-5. Cf. D. M Cappuyns, 'Parts Added to the Mirror for Magistrates [Review]', *Recherches de theologie ancienne et medievale,* 14, (1947), 238-9.

episodes from English history to reflect on the present, whereas Blenerhasset – like Higgins – simply tells patriotic stories of England's past'.[18]

Philip Schwyzer also groups Higgins and Blenerhasset together in his examination of the role of ghosts in early modern remembrance of the past.[19] Schwyzer suggests that they 'not only recognise' a trend he identifies by which 'with each new edition of the *Mirror* the dead speakers become more like the ghosts of Catholic tradition', 'but ratify it' – by using the word 'ghost' which Baldwin and his associates avoided.[20] The Chantries Acts of 1547 and 49 precluded prayer for souls in Purgatory, so ghosts, as souls which had not yet reached heaven or hell, became politically as well as ontologically contentious. Schwyzer's argument implies that as the memory of the Acts grew fainter, the *Mirror* poets became less averse to remembering the dead as ghosts. (Blenerhasset's reference to 'Limbo Lake', for example, reinstates the purgatorial landscape with which the Chantries Acts had done away). Schwyzer states that both authors' chosen characters share

> with the souls in Purgatory…a burning need to be remembered. It is this need – more than a desire to edify the living – that prompts them to appear to Higgins and Blenerhasset.[21]

Aside from the problems raised by generalisation – Higgins's Caesar, for example, describes at great length just how well known his own story is – this statement misrepresents the way in which the complaints are delivered in both *Mirror* texts, although for different reasons.[22] It is not true that ghosts appear to Blenerhasset – they are heard by the personifications Memory and Inquisition who replace Baldwin and

[18] Lee, 'Blenerhasset, Thomas (c.1550–1624)', rev. Hadfield, *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2636, accessed 8 Sept 2012]. See also J. Swart, '[Review] Parts Added to the Mirror for Magistrates, by John Higgins & Thomas Blenerhasset.', *English Studies,* 27, 1 (1946), 157-59, and R. B. Mckerrow, 'Review [Untitled]', *The Review of English Studies,* 16, 61 (Jan. 1940), 78-81 at 79.

[19] Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory*.

[20] Ibid., p. 115.

[21] Ibid., pp. 115-6.

[22] I oppose Schwyzer's view that Higgins's complaints emphasise the need to be remembered more than the desire to edify; see Ch. 2, above.

Higgins's inscribed authorial figures. Furthermore, they do not 'appear to' them through their own choice, but rather are corralled by Memory and Inquisition as a result of their 'continuall complayninges' about having been left out of Baldwin and Higgins's cumulative history. Memory and Inquisition do emphasise the need to remember these figures, and their current plight 'couered and hidden with those misty cloudes of fylthy forgetfulnes' (1578S, f. 1r). But while less emphasis is placed on the edification of the reader/listener than in the late medieval complaints and Higgins's text, Memory and Inquisition stress that the figures' 'ensamples be patternes passing singular, to refourme the deformities of this age'; the 'great iniurie they suffer, because they bee excluded' out of the *Mirror* is secondary, and the need to be remembered more belligerent than 'burning'.

Blenerhasset's *Second Part* does seems to fit into the spirit of the ongoing project which Higgins intended to complete, so it is at first glance logical that Higgins and Blenerhasset should be grouped together in critical discussion.[23] In his paratextual address to the reader, Higgins expresses his opinion that 'it were worthily done if one Chronicle were drawne from the beginning in such perfect sort' (1574F, sig. *5v). Although Blenerhasset's argument differs (he is protesting his unworthiness to the task), the outcome is the same when he notes in his Epistle that the *Mirror* 'is left euen vnto this day, like the vnperformed image of *Venus*, paynted by *Apelles*[.] No man is able to finish the work' (1578S, sig. *3r).[24] Blenerhasset's printer, too, claims that he was moved by 'diuers men' to print the text and 'make perfite the former booke' (1578S, sig. *2r).[25] Both poets are engaging in the completion of a work that has been left unfinished.

[23] Cf. Human, 'House of *Mirrors*', at 778.
[24] According to Pliny the Elder's *Historia Naturalis*, Apelles died before finishing his painting of Aphrodite of Kos, and there was no artist skilled enough to complete the picture. Since Higgins and Ferrers were both alive in 1577, could this allusion imply that Blenerhasset regards their contributions as inferior to those produced before Baldwin died in 1563?
[25] Stephen Orgel notes that 'the final, correct, uniform text was not what the book was conceived to embody – it was left to the *reader* to produce the correct text': Orgel, 'Marginal Maternity', p. 289.

Higgins describes how, having written complaints spanning the time between Brutus's arrival in England and the birth of Christ, a friend 'desired mee t'accomplish the residue til I came to the Conquest' (1574F, sig. *6v). But before Higgins had produced a new collection, Blenerhasset's printer hijacked Higgins's intended continuation by bringing out the *Second Part*.[26] In order for it to be successful, both commercially and artistically, the *Second Part* should, one might argue, predominantly model itself on the work it purported to extend.

Structurally, Blenerhasset's complaints resemble Higgins's closely. Blenerhasset's verse predominantly takes the form of rhyme royal stanzas, and therefore preserves the pace (and, significantly for the text's visual affinity with the *Mirror* corpus, the appearance) of the earlier *Mirror* work. Higgins and Blenerhasset's verse complaints share the idea that they are delivered by the figures in whose voices they are written, in contrast to the late medieval *Mirror*. The concept of literary composition is, however, included in both Higgins and Blenerhasset's texts. As well as a discourse of writing and reciting which permeates the complaints and the framing narratives, the characters in both texts are intermittently aware that they are part of a new historical record.

But the two collections reveal different attitudes towards the textual transmission of history. Blenerhasset reshapes the formal and conceptual attributes of his hypotext through the application of a new mediating framework, and the layering filters of paratext and prose frame which complicate an attempt to read the complaints. Higgins attends to a fragmented historical record, while Blenerhasset interrogates this aim through his text and paratext, and their interrelation. Although Blenerhasset extends Higgins's narrative, it is Baldwin's skeptical reflection on the transmission of history which informs his approach.

[26] While this publication's content did not overlap chronologically with the work Higgins intended to complete, the title of Blenerhasset's text effectively closed off the market for Higgins's additional material.

Read in isolation from their framing narratives and paratext, Higgins and Blenerhasset's *Mirror* complaints are similar in form and structure. However, a reading of the paratextual and framing material alongside the complaints casts a very different light on the texts' respective functions, and exposes the methodological discrepancy between Higgins and Blenerhasset's historiographical practice.

The Paratext

Human notes that Blenerhasset's 'title certainly implies continuity; it seems as if he too wishes to go through the door Higgins had opened'. 'But', as Human continues, 'the introductory material tells a slightly different story'.[27] Quite apart from the text's difference of focus, the presentation of the *Second Part*'s publication circumstances in both Blenerhasset's Epistle and the printer's note to the reader emphasises its '*un*official' nature. And yet, its title claims a confident hold over Baldwin and Higgins's readership. This paratextual paradox provides an illuminating starting point for a new reading of Blenerhasset's anomalous position within the *Mirror* canon. The *Second Part* emerges as an irreverent subversion of the historical monument Higgins had attempted to construct.

Geller reformed the way in which the late medieval portion of the *Mirror* is read by describing the prose links which surround the verse complaints as a 'pseudo-nonfictional' narrative.[28] There is no doubt that the printer's introductory address 'To the Reader' and Blenerhasset's Epistle to his friend should be read with similar caution;[29] as texts which are 'very clearly written for consumption by a wider audience than purported by their author', they should be situated between the categories of 'primary' epistle – a genuinely private letter intended for a specific, probably specified recipient – and

[27] Human, 'House of *Mirrors*', at 778.
[28] Geller, 'Editing under the Influence'.
[29] Cf. Scott Lucas, 'Hall's Chronicle and the *Mirror for Magistrates*: History and the Tragic Pattern', in Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 356-71, p. 369, n. 10.

'secondary' – a self-consciously and deliberately 'imaginative' piece intended for publication.[30] Once Blenerhasset's Epistle has been appropriately positioned between autobiography and fiction, it becomes possible to align his adoption of a semi-autobiographical persona with Baldwin's technique. We know that the boundaries between categories of literature and autobiography, fiction and historical account were far from formalised in early modern England; Baldwin is increasingly held up as a master of negotiation between these modes.[31] But the implications of reading Blenerhasset's work in this light have barely been taken into account.[32]

The *Second Part* begins with a note from Blenerhasset's 'Printer to the friendly Reader'. This in itself is unique among the texts of the *Mirror* and its additions,[33] which are otherwise prefaced by statements of intent by their author-editors. The printer sets out his motivations for publishing Blenerhasset's work, which will both 'encourage the Authour to set thynges of greater price in Print',[34] and act 'as a Lanterne, hauying lyght sufficient to guyde thy wandryng steppes, both vnto the happynesse of this worlde, and of the world to come' (1578S, sig. *2v). It is the printer, not Blenerhasset who is presented as having an eye towards the *Mirror*'s moral function. As Human notes, Baldwin was asked to contribute to the *Mirror*, rather than choosing to do so independently, and his contribution was mediated by printers.[35] Higgins's personal decision to extend the *Mirror* is significantly different, and contrasts with the production of Blenerhasset's text which

[30] Jo-Marie Claassen, *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius* (London: Gerald Duckworth &Co. Ltd., 1999), p. 90.
[31] See, for example, R. W. Maslen, *Elizabethan Fictions: Espionage, Counter-Espionage, and the Duplicity of Fiction in Early Elizabethan Prose Narratives* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997) and Maslen, 'William Baldwin and the Tudor Imagination'.
[32] The contradictions in Blenerhasset's paratext are noted but not explored at length in Edwin Miller, *The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England: A Study of Nondramatic Literature* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 144-5.
[33] With the exception of the Dyce edition of the *Memorial*, which contains a 'Printer to the Reader' address. Meaghan Brown argued that the 1559 prose frame functions as an extended 'Printer to the Reader' device in her conference paper, '"By Examples Passed in this Realm": Narratives of Print-Production in *The Mirror for Magistrates*', presented at *The Book Through Time* (Merton College, Oxford, June 2012).
[34] 'Price' conveniently elides commercial and moral/literary value.
[35] Human, 'House of *Mirrors*', p. 779.

was fuelled more by opportunism and irreverence, in some ways like that of Baldwin and his collaborators.

The printer must have noticed that Marshe's 'first' and 'last' parts of the *Mirror* were being sold separately. The title given to Blenerhasset's work complements this arrangement, and the mendacious misrepresentation of the existing texts in the printer's note implies that Blenerhasset's is a vital missing component: he claims, speciously, to have found a book 'Entituled, *The first and third part of the Mirrour for Magistrates*' (1578S, sig. *2r), which sounds distinctly unsatisfactory. Extant copies of the *Second Part* are indeed seen bound between Higgins and Baldwin's sections,[36] although these are not contemporary bindings.[37] Gabriel Harvey describes the *Mirror* as 'thre books', which probably demonstrates that even if the works were bound separately, Blenerhasset's text was generally accepted as a part of the *Mirror* canon by contemporaries.[38]

The printer also claims that Blenerhasset's *Mirror* text was printed without Blenerhasset's knowledge. He asserts that Blenerhasset 'wyl marueile at his returne [from 'beyond the Seas'], to find thys imprinted[, f]or his intent was but to profite and pleasure one priuate man' (1578S, sig. *2r). This idea is belied firstly by the form of the *Mirror* itself, whose title implies that it is a public medium for morally educative history. Secondly, the high rhetorical style of Blenerhasset's Epistle (down to, perhaps, the fact that it is called an 'Epistle' rather than a letter) suggests that Blenerhasset had ulterior intentions for his composition.

[36] Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Y.6.3 (1-3), and BOD Malone 270 and BOD Douce B subt.269.
[37] The libraries of Edmund Malone, 1741-1812, and Francis Douce, 1757-1834, were acquired by the Bodleian in the nineteenth century; the Cambridge volume was bound in the seventeenth century, see http://search.lib.cam.ac.uk/?itemid=|collandb|618750 (accessed 30/09/12).
[38] Edward John Long Scott (ed.), *The Letter-Book of Gabriel Harvey* (The Camden Society, 1884), p. 167. The editor's note to this letter suggests that Harvey is referring to the 1578 edition of Baldwin's *Mirror*, which presumably also includes Higgins's 1574-5 additions. While Baldwin's text was in turn subdivided into the 'first' and 'last' parts, however, this would not have involved a physical division into two distinct books (+ Higgins's = 3), as Harvey's phrase seems to suggest.

The affectation of coyness and concern of the part of authors, whose work is allegedly appropriated by printers, was also a common feature of contemporary publications.[39] Paratextual narration of the journey from manuscript to print was a regular occurrence in the period. John Day famously figures the text of *Gorboduc*, printed in 1565 without Sackville and Norton's approval, as a young woman who 'ranne abroad without leaue, whereby she caught her shame'; in his own 1570 edition, Day has 'harbored her for her frendes sake and her owne, and I do not dout her parentes the authors will not now be discontent that she goe abroad among you good readers'.[40] In a letter of 1579, Gabriel Harvey, in his customary style of rhetorical burlesque, condems Spenser's 'publishing abroade in prynte to the use or rather abuse of others' his collection of poems,[41] and goes on to assert that he is 'as affectionate towards your Mastershippe as ever heretofore, conditionallye that nether this palting letter nor that tell tale obligation cum forthe in printe'.[42] Alexandra Halasz suggests that Harvey's 'fantasy of publication has a double movement of fear and desire; his inevitable degradation in the marketplace is compensated by his renown'.[43] Blenerhasset's Epistle and the printer's note cumulatively deploy these tropes,[44] which, as Day and Harvey demonstrate, can speak to the unpredictability of print transmission while remaining open to play.

Blenerhasset almost certainly wanted his *Mirror* text to reach a wider audience than his Epistle and the printer's note suggest.[45] Perhaps he wished to avoid the 'stigma of

[39] See Miller, *The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England*, pp. 140-148.
[40] Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville, *The Tragidie of Ferrex and Porrex Set Forth without Any Addition or Alteration but Altogether as the Same Was Shewed on Stage before the Queenes Maiestie, About Nine Yeares Past, Vz. The XVIII. Day of Ianuarie. 1561* (London: John Day, 1570), sig. A2r. Cf. Breitenberg, 'Semiotics of Reform', p. 204.
[41] Long Scott (ed.), *The Letter-Book of Gabriel Harvey*, p. 59.
[42] Ibid., p. 64.
[43] Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 96.
[44] Cf. Michael Saenger, *The Commodification of Textual Engagements in the English Renaissance* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 30.
[45] See Miller, *The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England*, p. 145.

print' and retain his reputation as an amateur poet and professional soldier.[46] Blenerhasset states in his Epistle that his complaints are 'the fruites of these my idle howres' (1578S, sig. *4v), while in the prose frame the personification Memory also emphasises the amateurish nature of her and Inquisition's pursuits: 'these labours wil get thee no liuing, and these be but trifles of thy idle houres' (1578S, f. 40v). Blenerhasset presents his work, then, as part of a coterie exchange. It is not so much the stigma of print that he seeks to avoid but the literary cachet of manuscript circulation that he seeks to gain, while fully intending for the work to reach a paying public.[47] The publication of Blenerhasset's *Revelation of the True Minerva* suggests that he was not without literary ambition, which extended beyond manuscript circulation into the marketplace.[48] Furthermore, all of the representations of texts found in Blenerhasset's work involve printed books, suggesting that this was the medium to which he truly aspired. Following his evocation of the physical circumstances in which he read and extended the *Mirror* at Guernsey Castle, and the books he had to hand, the *Revelation*'s Preface locates the inscribed reader in a recognisably early modern library situated on Mount Parnassus; the book, clearly a bound and expensive volume, is 'fast lockt', 'with golden chain on deske of Genepire'.[49]

Blenerhasset's Epistle and the printer's note to the reader have significant implications for a reading of the rest of the text. For one thing, they complicate – in part by contradicting each other – the reader's sense of how the *Second Part* should be

[46] Cf. J. W. Saunders, 'The Stigma of Print: A Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry', *Essays in Criticism,* 1, (1951), 139-64.
[47] Cf. Cathy Shrank, '"These Fewe Scribbled Rules": Representing Scribal Intimacy in Early Modern Print', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 67, 2 (2004), 295-314.
[48] Although, as Linda Shenk notes, following Josephine Waters Bennett, here too Blenerhasset 'is writing for an audience of insiders'; Shenk, *Learned Queen*, p. 103.
[49] Thomas Blenerhasset, *A Reuelation of the True Minerua* (London: Thomas Dawson for Thomas Woodcoke, 1582), 'Preface'. 'Genepire' possibly means 'juniper' (sometimes spelt 'genepere'), and juniper would certainly be an appropriate material for a desk in this context: in Bossewell, *Workes of Armourie*, one of the books Blenerhasset cites among his own small collection in the Epistle, juniper is said to be a heraldic symbol of 'excellente, and prompte witte, apte to do Iustice without corruption, parcialitie, or fauour', f. 17v. It is claimed in Conrad Heresbach, *Foure Bookes of Husbandry*, trans. Barnabe Googe (London: Richard Watkins, 1577) that 'the tymber wherof wyll endure a hundred yeeres. And therefore *Hanibal* commaunded, that the temple of *Diana* should be built with rafters and beames of Iuniper, to the ende it might continue', f. 107r-v.

received: what is it for, and what is the reader's role in interpreting and/or creating its meaning? The controlling authorial voice is removed from the main body of Blenerhasset's text, breaking away from the authorial involvement common to (although manifested in different ways in) the earlier *Mirror* works. Baldwin and his collaborators are inscribed in the prose frame linking their complaint poems, while in the *First Part* the dream vision scenario allows the fictional Higgins to mediate and comment on the complaints he witnesses and transcribes. Blenerhasset, by contrast, is removed from both his complaint poems and their prose frame, distancing him from the process of composition, and the *Second Part* from the *Mirror* tradition as a whole. In contrast to the addresses 'to the reader' which preface the 1559-75 *Mirror* editions, whereby the reader/buyer 'becomes his or her own authority for reading, for making meaning, for completing the trajectory from author to recipient',[50] Blenerhasset's Epistle to an unnamed but specific correspondent appears to shut down the text to interpretation, and maintains an illusion of privacy and exclusivity. This contributes to the fiction of a text written to be shared only between educated friends, a pretence which simultaneously flatters both author and reader, and perhaps harks back to the small community of manuscript circulation which Baldwin created and then made public in the 1559-63 *Mirror*'s prose frame. In addition, though, the 'authorial' agency of the reader-editor, (which Higgins saw in Baldwin's call for further contributions), and the moral accountability that the *Mirror* form ostensibly seeks to encourage and elicit, is written out of Blenerhasset's paratextual set-up.

Although the first-person authorial persona does not bridge the gap between them as in the late medieval and ancient British collection, there is nevertheless a very close relationship between Blenerhasset's text and paratext. The Epistle in particular is a vital

[50] Liebler's Introduction in Naomi Conn Liebler (ed.), *Early Modern Prose Fiction: The Cultural Politics of Reading* (New York and London: Routledge, 2007), p. 9.

resource for understanding how the main text is located in relation to the earlier *Mirror*s, and, more generally, early modern historiographical thought. The Epistle sets up themes and concerns which are reflected throughout the main text.

Blenerhasset carves out the opportunity for authorial inventiveness in the monotonous and repetitive tradition of *de casibus* complaint by emphasising his distance from any kind of textual heritage. The Epistle stresses Blenerhasset's physical isolation from the English mainland, and equates this geographical distance with an intellectual dislocation, both through the Epistle's content, and as a result of the function of the letter, 'a form of communication predicated on distance'.[51] His complaints were composed while

> sittyng on a Rocke in the Sea, not in *Spaine*, *Italie*, *Fraunce*, *Scotlande*, or *Englande*, but in *Garnzie* Castle,[52] where although there be learned men, yet none whiche spende their tyme so vainely as in Poetrie.[53] (1578S, *4r)

While his claim that 'the want of helpe dyd diuersly daunt me with despayre' is far too alliterative to be credible, and indeed the next sentence expresses Blenerhasset's continued pleasure at living in Guernsey Castle 'separate from any lande', historical accounts of 1570s Guernsey also emphasise the island's cultural detachment.[54] An 'Elizabethan troublespot', the island's proximity to France meant that the inhabitants' 'laws, customs, ecclesiastical allegiance and, at least in the countryside, their language

[51] Laurie Ellinghausen, *Labor and Writing in Early Modern England, 1567-1667* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), p. 25.

[52] Blenerhasset almost certainly means Castle Cornet, the residence of the governour of Guernsey. In *Historia Mundi* we are told that 'The entrance into the Haven is fortified on either side with Castles, on the left hand is an ancie*n*t Castle, [Vale Castle, restored in 1616] & on the right hand another which they call *Cornet*, seated on a high rock, & environed with the Sea', Gerhard Mercator, *Historia Mundi: Or Mercator's Atlas*, trans. Wye Staltonstall (London: T. Cotes, for Michael Sparke and Samuel Cartwright, 1635), 'The Seventh Table of England', p. 120.

[53] The literal truth of Blenerhasset's description is borne out in, for example, John Speed's *Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine* (1612), which says of Guernsey, 'It standeth for the most part vpon a rocke, verie high in many places from the Sea', Book I, p. 94. Together with Mercator's depiction of Castle Cornet 'seated on a high rock', above, Blenerhasset's physical isolation is doubly justified.

[54] The Book of Common Prayer was reportedly printed in French at Guernsey before 1571; see Dudley Digges, *The Compleat Ambassador, or, Two Treaties of the Intended Marriage of Qu. Elizabeth of Glorious Memory* (London: Thomas Newcomb for Gabriel Bedell and Thomas Collins, 1655), p. 103.

were all Norman-French', and Guernsey thought of 'as parcel of the duchy of Normandy'.[55]

With the unfolding of religious conflict in France, the Channel Islands became a key 'refuge and transition point for French Protestants' fleeing Catholic persecution at home, particularly after the St Bartholomew's Day massacres in 1572.[56] While close to the reasonably significant print centres of Rennes and Le Mans on the French mainland,[57] their printing houses would have offered a predominantly hostile intellectual culture to the Protestant Blenerhasset, although Caen in particular, along with Lyons and Orléans, acted as centres of heretical thought from which the 'Norman reformation' of the Channel Islands profited.[58] Jersey and Guernsey were given a special dispensation by Elizabeth I in 1565 to allow limited Presbyterian preaching and worship in their major towns.[59] As a result, the islands found themselves under greater threat from French retaliation – as well as ecclesiastically distinct from either mainland – and Sir Thomas Leighton, Elizabeth's Lieutenant and Governor of Guernsey, fought to keep his garrison fortified against attack.[60]

Adrian Saravia bore witness to an atmosphere of license on Guernsey in the 1560s,[61] when he wrote to William Cecil,

> ...as to religion there are only three or four people in the island who attend service, and if an ecclesiastic goes into the country, he is greeted with jeers and laughter,

[55] Michael A. R. Graves, *Thomas Norton: The Parliament Man* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994), p. 141.
[56] Tim Thornton, *The Channel Islands, 1370-1640: Between England and Normandy* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2012), p. 113.
[57] Rennes, and Le Mans to a lesser degree, specialised in the production of French royal edicts in the sixteenth century, as well as occasional ecclesiastical tracts and local history (see *USTC*).
[58] Thornton, *The Channel Islands*, p. 80 and Andrew Pettegree, 'Centre and Periphery in the European Book World', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 18, (2008), 101-28, at 112. See also Andrew Pettegree, *The French Book and the European Book World* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 68-84.
[59] Ferdinand Brock Tupper, *The Chronicles of Castle Cornet, Guernsey* (Guernsey: Stephen Barbet, 1851), p. 28.
[60] A. J. Eagleston, *The Channel Islands under Tudor Government, 1485-1642: A Study in Administrative History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Guernsey Society, 1949), pp. 72-3.
[61] Adrian Saravia, or Hadrian à Saravia, was headmaster of Elizabeth College (founded 1563) on Guernsey, and a minister in St Peter Port with the reformed minister Nicholas Baudouin in 1565 (Andrew Spicer, 'Saravia, Adrian (1532–1613)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2006 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24664, accessed 8 Sept 2012]).

> and often has dirt thrown at him...Robbery and slaughter are committed with impunity, there being no laws, and the decisions of the judges various.[62]

Marie Axton notes that later, 'English common law clashed uneasily with Guernsey's elusive mixture of Norman customary law and unwritten island precedents',[63] where the usual problems associated with managing strategic outposts of English rule were compounded by the island's 'remoteness' from London.[64] In response to outbreaks of lawlessness, and perhaps owing to his physical distance from higher authority, Leighton's widely unpopular governorship turned tyrnannical and his law martial;[65] Graves suggests that the conflict between local aristocracy, the island's inhabitants and their governor was 'exacerbated' by Leighton's 'authoritarian temper'.[66] (Elizabeth's privy council was petitioned in 1578 to help 'bring the people to better obedience and reform abuses',[67] and it was none other than Thomas Norton who was commissioned with Dr John Hammond in 1579 to prepare a 'written codification' to stabilise Guernsey's law).[68] In his Epistle, Blenerhasset likens Leighton to, among others, Lycurgus, famous for his militaristic legal reforms in Sparta. Personally, Blenerhasset must have regarded Leighton highly: a distinguished soldier, Leighton held puritan beliefs,[69] and 'had been named by William Cecil in his list of [Robert Dudley, earl of] Leicester's particular friends' in 1565.[70] In 1578 Leighton was married to Elizabeth Knollys, the daughter of Sir Francis Knollys,

[62] Letter dated 26th February, 1565, cited in Ferdinand Brock Tupper, *The History of Guernsey and Its Bailiwick* (Guernsey: Le Lievre, 1876), p. 155.
[63] Marie Axton, 'Norton, Thomas (1530x32–1584)',*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20359, accessed 8 Sept 2012].
[64] Graves, *Thomas Norton*, p. 143.
[65] See A. J. Eagleston, 'Guernsey under Sir Thomas Leighton (1570-1610)', *Société Guernsiaise. Report and Transactions for 1937,* 13, 1 (1938), 72-108.
[66] Graves, *Thomas Norton*, p. 143.
[67] R. Lemon and M. A. E. Green (eds), *Calendar of State Papers*, *Domestic Series*, London, 1856-72, *Elizabethan Addenda*, *1566-79*, vol. 25, no. 128, cited in ibid., p. 142.
[68] Axton, 'Norton, Thomas (1530x32–1584)', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20359, accessed 8 Sept 2012]. See ibid., pp. 140-146.
[69] See Eagleston, *The Channel Islands*, p. 72.
[70] D. M. Ogier, 'Leighton, Sir Thomas (*c.*1530–1610)',*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/68015, accessed 8 Sept 2012].

who was first cousin once removed of Elizabeth I; Lettice, Elizabeth's sister and countess of Essex, married Leicester in the same year.[71] But instead of describing the island or Leighton's governorship, Blenerhasset provides a quotation from Seneca,

> Where Gouernours be good, and rule their charge aright,
> Without an ebbe, there flowes the flood, which vertuous minds delight.
> (1578S, sig. *4v)

The syntactic arrangement of this couplet leaves the reader with an uncertain and troubled picture of Guernsey, since the island's prosperity is contingent on information with which we have not really been provided.

The Epistle's sense of intellectual isolation – the dearth of other poets or access to books in the Guernsey Castle garrison – extends metaphorically into Blenerhasset's conscious distancing of his text from source material. This in turn necessitates the exercise of invention, on Blenerhasset's part, and forgetfulness, on the part of his readers. His physical and cultural distance from the mainland left Blenerhasset isolated, or free from, any real sense of canon or intellectual network. While Higgins's preface to the reader bemoans the inadequacy of his source material, Blenerhasset is gleefully adrift. His narrative hints at the creative possibilities of exile in a way that shares both context and terminology with Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* (1579).[72] As in Blenerhasset's paratext, 'exile functions [in the *Shepheardes Calender*] as a metaphor for the exclusion … from the company of learned and eloquent tongues';[73] Spenser's vernacular excludes him from a classicised elite, while Blenerhasset's work is distanced from the historiographical canon. His alienation may also, like Spenser's, be read as 'enabling',[74]

---

[71] She had previously been married to Walter Devereux, who died in 1576; see Simon Adams, 'Dudley , Lettice, countess of Essex and countess of Leicester (1543–1634)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8159, accessed 8 Sept 2012].

[72] See Catherine Nicholson, 'Pastoral in Exile: Spenser and the Poetics of English Alienation', *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual,* 23, (2008), 41-72 at 44-5.

[73] Ibid., at 52.

[74] Ibid., at 53.

particularly in helping to navigate the problematic absence of source texts, not just from Blenerhasset's remote garrison but more generally in the sense of extant historical documents.

He proclaims, 'I had not those Chronicles whiche other men had: my Memorie and Inuention were vnto me instead of Grafton, Polidore, Cooper, and suche like' (1578S, sig. *4r). His use of the dismissive phrase 'and suche like' at once evokes the homogeneity of the sprawling Elizabethan chronicle literature, (Grafton apologises in his dedication to William Cecil to present him with a chronicle 'after so many books alreadie set forth, bearing the names and tytles of Chronicles of Englande'),[75] and Blenerhasset's disregard for it, although his paraliptic reference to these three chroniclers in particular provides insight into his actual reading of history. He probably means Richard Grafton's *Chronicle at Large* (1569), or one of the editions of Grafton's *Abridgement of the Chronicles of England*, printed and enlarged between 1562 and 1572; Polydore Vergil's *English History*, first printed by Johann Bebel in Basel as *Polydori Vergilii urbinatis Anglicae historiae libri XXVI* in 1534, and subsequently revised in 1546 and 1555; and *Cooper's Chronicle*, printed in London in 1560 and 1565, in which Thomas Cooper extended the chronicle history of Thomas Lanquet (1521-1545) up to the present day. *Cooper's Chronicle*, in particular, is pertinent to Blenerhasset's assumed project: the main text begins with a treatise on 'the use and profite of histories', stating that 'the readynge of histories doth indifferently availe al men, yet moste specially perteyneth…to kings and great princes', placing the text at the heart of the tradition of conservative, morally eduactive history which is the *Mirror*'s foundation. Additionally, the 'Admonition to the Reader' which opens the 1565 edition notes that 'certaine persons, for lukers sake contrarie to honestye, had caused my chronicle to be prynted wythout my

[75] Grafton, *Chronicle at Large*, sig. 2r.

knowlegde, alterynge…what they lyked',[76] reinforcing the expression of anxieties about unwanted publication, and the instability of text beyond one's control. As Lämmerhirt has shown, these were precisely the texts which underpin the *Second Part*'s historical narratives.[77]

But Blenerhasset tells the reader that, instead, since 'I could not beare about with me a librari',[78] he has with him 'the thirde *Decade* of *Titus Liuye*',[79] '*Boswelles Concordes of Armorie*', and '*Monsignor de Lange*, that notable Warriour' (1578S, sig. *4r).[80] None of these can have offered Blenerhasset much assistance when composing the *Second Part*'s histories. However, Livy's focus on personal morality and the causation of historical events, (of which Blundeville was also a vehement advocate),[81] was finding favour in contemporary European intellectual culture,[82] and by drawing attention to Livy in this context, Blenerhasset's Epistle highlights the *Mirror*'s comparable use of these techniques, and reinvigorates the form as a fashionable mode of history writing. Livy's acknowledgement that ancient histories about the foundation of Rome were fictional reinforces the skepticism exhibited in the *Second Part* regarding the validity of passing

[76] Thomas Lanquet and Thomas Cooper, *Coopers Chronicle Contenynge the Whole Discourse of the Histories as Well of Thys Realme, as All Other Countreis* (London, 1565), sig. Av.
[77] Lämmerhirt, *Quellenstudie*. Blenerhasset's use of sources will be discussed at greater length below.
[78] Richard Grafton notes that the length of most chronicles histories means that they 'coulde not in the whole be folowed without pestering the Reader with importable Volumes', in Grafton, *Chronicle at Large*, 'The Epistle', sig. 2r.
[79] The so-called third decade of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*, describing the second Punic War (218-201BC), was printed in numerous volumes across continental Europe in the sixteenth century. The most recently printed in 1577 was *Decas Tertia*, a Latin edition produced in Lyon by Sébastien Gryphe in 1554. In 1561, Thomas Marshe printed Anthony Cope's *History of Two the Moste Noble Capytaynes of the Worlde, Anniball and Scipio*, (previously printed in 1544 and 1548 by Thomas Berthelet), 'gathered and translated into English oute of Titus Liuius, and other authoures'. This treated the same period as the third decade. William Painter translated the first and third parts of Livy's history as part of his *Palace of Pleasure* (1566).
[80] Possibly the latest Italian edition of Raymond De Rouer, *Della Disciplina Militare Di Mons*, trans. Mambrino Roseo (Venezia: Giovanni Maria I Bonelli, 1571). The work, first printed in French as *Instructions sur le Faict de la Guerre* in 1548, by Michel de Vascosan for Galliot du Pré in Paris, was attributed to Guillaume du Bellay, seigneur de Langey (elder brother of Joachim).
[81] Blundeville, *Of Wryting and Reading Hystories*, sig. C4r.
[82] Warren Boutcher, 'Polybius Speaks British: A Case Study in Mid-Tudor Humanism and Historiography', in Fred Schurink (ed.), *Tudor Translation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 101-20, p. 110; cf. Peter Culhane, 'Philemon Holland's Livy: Peritexts and Contexts', *Translation and Literature,* 13, 2, Versions of Ovid (Autumn 2004), 268-86, at 271-2.

off imaginative literature as true history.[83] Although less apposite, Bossewell's *Concorde of Armourie* delineates the four cardinal virtues, Prudence, Justice, Fortitude, and Temperance – mainstays of Higgins's *Mirror* preface – and their necessity in those of noble rank, based on Cicero's *De Officiis*.[84] The collection seems orchestrated to emphasise Blenerhasset's military credentials,[85] and command of Latin and perhaps Italian, rather than his qualifications as a historian of Britain or a poet. Furthermore, Blenerhasset's offhand claim that while writing the *Second Part* his copy of 'the vnperfect *Mirrour for Magistrates*' 'made nothing to this purpose' writes generic predecessors out of his process of composition (1578S, sig. *4r).

The rhetoric of isolation, which generates the potential for deviation and originality, is central to Blenerhasset's first-person voice. The concept of narrative agency which is produced as a result, however, poses significant problems in the context of the *Mirror* as a whole, insofar as the collection functions as a poetic re-presentation of existing chronicle histories. Where the late medieval complaint collection had interrogated the unreliability of textual transmission, Blenerhasset draws attention to the contingencies of historiographical invention. He dramatizes his construction of history *ex nihilo* in militaristic terms which suggest that the enterprise is ultimately futile: 'how hard a thing it is to compell *Clio*, with her boysterous banners, to couch vnder the compasse of a few metered lines' (1578S, sig. *3r). The customary *humilitas affecta* and pleas to his reader for lenience culminate in the climactic demand that they 'cease then to thinke on *L. Buchurst*, or *Sackuyll*, let *Gascon* and *Churchyard* be forgotten' (1578S, sig. *3v). Blenerhasset is alone in tackling the next instalment of the *Mirror*, assisted only by the rather unlikely Erato and Terpsichore, muses of erotic lyric poetry, and choral song and

[83] Cf. S. Clark Hulse, *Metamorphic Verse: The Elizabethan Minor Epic* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 215.
[84] See Bossewell, *Workes of Armourie*, f. 4v.
[85] See Grafton and Jardine, "Studied for Action", at 40-42 for the specifically military reading of Livy in the early 1570s.

dancing.[86] Again, though, we should be alert to the use of paralipsis when Blenerhasset lists texts he does not have, and authors we ought to forget. As much as Blenerhasset tries to distance himself from analogues, his work is situated within a broader contemporary dialogue about history, poetry and invention.[87]

Why should we cease to think on this particular trio? All three seem to have participated in the speculative debate around Elizabeth I's marriage,[88] to which Blenerhasset also adds in his complaint of Hellina, but it is unlikely that this connection is of pressing significance here. Sackville and Churchyard both contributed complaints to the 1563 *Mirror*, so it is logical that Blenerhasset should wish to surpass or supersede their examples within the *de casibus* genre.[89] This also tells us that it is a post-1563 edition of the *Mirror*, in addition to Higgins's *First Part*, which Blenerhasset reads and then, apparently, casts aside.

Sackville, of course, wrote the feted Induction and the complaint of Buckingham, and Churchyard the complaint of Jane Shore. Sackville's Induction anticipates Blenerhasset's *Second Part* in some respects, more so than the rest of the 1559-63 collection; his use of personifications, and an overtly fictive, rather than 'pseudo-nonfictional' frame, as well as his ostentatious use of classical referents. Additionally Sackville, with Thomas Norton, was an early proponent of blank verse in *Gorboduc*.[90] Aside from Churchyard's connection to the *Mirror* corpus, his other work lends itself to Blenerhasset's emerging interest in the risks and opportunities of unstable textual transmission and interpretation. In *The Contention bettwyxte Churchyard and Camell,*

[86] Melpomene (tragedy) or Clio (history) seem more appropriate – however, Erato is invoked at the opening of Book 7 of Virgil's *Aeneid*.
[87] Maslen explores the deep contemporary suspicions around fiction in the Introduction to Maslen, *Elizabethan Fictions*, pp. 1-20.
[88] See King, 'Virgin Queen'; Rivkah Zim, 'Dialogue and Discretion: Thomas Sackville, Catherine De Medici and the Anjou Marriage Proposal 1571', *The Historical Journal,* 40, 2 (1997), 287-310.
[89] Churchyard was also a 'soldier-poet', like Blenerhasset, and had also been stationed on Guernsey; see Thomas Churchyard, *The Firste Parte of Churchyardes Chippes Contayning Twelue Seuerall Labours* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1575), f. 63r.
[90] The complaint of Cadwallader is written in unrhymed hexameter; see the 'Prose Frame' section, below.

vpon David Dycars Dreame (1560), 'Churchyard…counters Camell's charges of offensive intent by insisting that *Davy Dycars Dreame* be read as a work of fiction, a monologue spoken in character rather than as a direct authorial address'.[91] Reversing Baldwin's tactic of concealing potential controversy in the fictive prose frame, Churchyard achieves the same degree of protection using a comparable technique: the generation of hermeneutic uncertainty around authorial personae. In asking readers to 'forget' Churchyard, then, is Blenerhasset actually demonstrating his poetic heredity by deploying a similar device?

Churchyard and Gascoigne both combined the writing of poetry with military careers; perhaps Blenerhasset saw them as fellow 'soldier poets'.[92] Otherwise, Gascoigne appears at first to be an odd addition to the group. He died in 1577, so Blenerhasset's plea to forget him is rather tactlessly timed. Furthermore, he did not contribute to the *Mirror*, although his *Steele Glas* (1576) and *Glasse of Government* (1575) do draw his oeuvre closer to the mirror tradition.[93] However, as Gillian Austen argues, the 'thoroughly medieval' *Steele Glas* 'has its revolutionary aspect as the earliest original, nondramatic experiment in English blank verse'.[94] The work, which 'was particularly highly esteemed by his contemporaries',[95] 'is valued as an experiment in blank verse, not as a moralising exercise'.[96] So Blenerhasset's reference to Gascoigne draws on the reputation of a popular contemporary to bolster his own poetic interests, and perhaps liken his experiments with metre to those of the innovators Gascoigne and Sackville – could he also wish to signal the lesser significance of the *Second Part*'s moral content? If

[91] Lucas, 'Diggon Davie and Davy Dicar', at 156.
[92] See Adam McKeown, *English Mercuries: Soldier Poets in the Age of Shakespeare* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2009).
[93] Strangely, Austen's account of Gascoigne's relation to the mirror tradition in general does not mention the *Mirror for Magistrates*; see Austen, *Gascoigne*, pp. 163-4.
[94] Ibid., p. 164.
[95] Ibid., p. 153.
[96] Ibid., p. 18.

Churchyard sought to deflect blame by highlighting multiple possible interpretations, Gascoigne did so by constructing multiple motivations; it has been acknowledged relatively recently that his paratextual accounts of composition and publication are the product of carefully constructed personae. Adrian Weiss, for example, notes that 'The preliminaries to *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* [(1573)] reveal that Gascoigne was capable of constructing an elaborate fiction to conceal both himself as an author and his own involvement with the text's publication';[97] Cyndia Clegg argues that '*The Posies*' preliminaries were an elaborate "devise" that sought to depoliticize its reception'.[98] Austen explains that 'as well as being a successful moralistic writer, Gascoigne was also a highly successful courtly writer, continually metamorphosing his literary personae and manipulating his own literary profile'.[99] Through its evocation of these three figures, Blenerhasset's paratext is re-situated among authors not primarily known for their moral or historiographical writings, but for poetic innovation and the construction of authorial fictions, signalling a new context for Blenerhasset's appropriation of the *Mirror* form.

While the *Second Part* purports to complete or at least continue Higgins's project, especially given the endorsement of the printer, the basis of isolation and invention provided by the Epistle in fact works to subvert Higgins's approach to the British past, and to destabilise its historiographical basis. The Epistle also writes Blenerhasset into a literary community. Crucially, this is a modified version of the print communities created by Baldwin and Higgins's paratexts, which at once distances Blenerhasset from their models, and illuminates the ways in which those models were being read in the later 1570s.

[97] Clegg, *Elizabethan Censorship*, p. 104.
[98] Ibid., p. 103.
[99] Austen, *Gascoigne*, p. 18.

The Prose Frame

So, Blenerhasset's emphasis on physical and intellectual isolation ostensibly provides the potential to deviate from the *Mirror* tradition as he found it in 1577, while the names he drops set up an artificial intellectual community in which to situate his wilful deviation. The *Second Part*'s prose frame, segments of which alternate with the verse complaints, forms the most significant departure from Baldwin and Higgins's texts, both formally and stylistically. It is, at the same time, the most critically neglected aspect of Blenerhasset's *Mirror* text; scholarship to date has not come anywhere near fully exploring this curious and innovative addition and its interpretative implications.

The prose frame removes the first-person author figure from the narrative of composition, in contrast to Baldwin's account of collaborative authorship found in the original *Mirror* prose links and the dream frame of Higgins's verse inductions, as well as, for example, the prose links between Anthony Munday's verse complaints in *Mirrour of Mutabilitie, or Principall part of the Mirrour for Magistrates* (1579). Blenerhasset's prose frame is instead made up of a dialogue between the personifications Memory and Inquisition, who are characters with historiographical agency unlike the guiding but ultimately passive roles of Sackville's Sorrowe and Higgins's Morpheus. Blenerhasset claims in the *Second Part*'s Epistle that where '*Higgins* vsed (I know not what) *Morpheus*, the God of dreames' and 'the other had *Baldwine* for their hearer', he has 'diligent *Inquisition*, who can find out al things, and Memorie, who knoweth al thinges, for the Arbiters of my matter' (1578S, sig. *4v). The term 'Arbiters' gives Memory and Inquisition a legalistic authority, and Blenerhasset's description suggests that his narrators represent a mental process by which the complaints will be communicated to him, their ultimate amanuensis. No more is heard from Blenerhasset, however. Unlike Higgins and Sackville's personifications, who inhabit symbolic landscapes, Memory and Inquisition

are themselves isolated in a de-contextualised, incorporeal world which is never fully formalised or explained.

It is a Renaissance commonplace to invoke memory in the writing of history, originating with the first historical text printed in England, Higden's *Polychronicon*.[100] Andrew Hiscock suggests that while 'key concepts associated with acts of cognition, such as *memoria*, would undergo intense and sustained interrogation' across the sixteenth century, historians of all stripes shared the view 'that the parentage of memory, writing and history is…invaluable for the growth in human understanding'.[101] The correlation between memory and history was frequently figured in very logical symbolic terms: since memory's antithesis is forgetfulness, commonly associated with oblivion and death, history works to stave off oblivion by commemorating the past. Walter Raleigh famously opened his *History of the World* (1614) with the description of its frontispiece, in which this logic is translated into the basic oppositions of light and dark, high and low:

> FRom *Death,* and darke *Obliuion* (neere the same)
> The *Mistresse of Mans life,* graue *HISTORY,*
> Raising the *World* to good, or euill *FAME,*
> Doth vindicate it to *ETERNITY.* [102]

Some sixty years earlier, Edward Hall's *Chronicle* had decried 'Oblivion, the cankered enemy to Fame and renown, the sucking serpent of ancient memory',[103] suggesting that the 'antidote to oblivion…is historical writing'.[104] Although, as we have seen, Hall was a central source for Baldwin, it is in Blenerhasset's *Mirror* that this doctrine is overtly addressed, and interrogated for the first time in the *Mirror* canon.[105]

---

[100] Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past*, pp. 268-9.
[101] Andrew Hiscock, *Reading Memory in Early Modern Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 28.
[102] Walter Raleigh, *The History of the World* (London: William Stansby for Walter Burre, 1614), 'The Minde of the *Front*'.
[103] Cited in Escobedo, *Nationalism and Historical Loss*, p. 55.
[104] Ibid., p. 55.
[105] See Donald Jellerson, 'The Spectral Historiopoetics of the *Mirror for Magistrates*', *Journal of the Northern Renaissance,* 2, 1 (Spring 2010), 54-71, on the way in which the early *Mirror*s differ from Hall's stance on 'the moral effect of memorializing the dead' (at 61).

The *Second Part*'s prose frame does foreground the avoidance of oblivion for its speakers as a central concern, in a way that the earlier *Mirror*s rarely did. The main text begins with Memory asking Inquisition to 'beholde in the bottomlesse pyt of blind *Obliuion*: there remayneth as yet a multitude' who are 'couered and hidden with those mistie cloudes of fylthy forgetfulnes' (1578S, f. 1r). Blenerhasset is evidently interested in the commemorative function of memory, in the first prose link. The pertinence of memory to the later *Mirror*s' project is exemplified in the verse dedication of William Fulwood's translation of *The Castel of Memorie* (1562) to Robert Dudley:

> Lyke as Obliuion is the losse,
> of high renoumed actes:
> And causeth many worthy wightes,
> forgo both fame and factes.
>
> Lyke as it is an eatyng moth
> and sore corrupting rust:
> Abasyng things of noble state,
> no better then to dust.
>
> […]
>
> So doth [Memory] pourge ech mans estate,
> and skoureth it full bright:
> Wherby appeares as in a glasse
> his liuely shining light.[106]

Here, as in Blenerhasset's first prose link, memory allows forgotten examples of virtue 'to come into the light' (1578S, f. 1r). The discourse of decay and corruption is also shared. Notably, where Higgins wants to correct the absence of historical records, he does not frame this concern in terms of remembering and forgetting; by contrast, Blenerhasset directly equates 'defaced' 'Recordes of time' with 'decayed *Memory*'.

But the relation of memory to history in the period is more complex than the simple equation of one with the other. The early modern functions of memory help to

[106] Guglielmo Gratarolo, *The Castel of Memorie Wherein Is Conteyned the Restoring, Augmenting, and Conseruing of the Memorye and Remembraunce, with the Safest Remedies, and Best Preceptes Therevnto in Any Wise Apperteyning*, trans. William Fulwood (London, Gutter Lane: Rouland Hall, 1562), sig. A3v-A4r.

illuminate the significance and value of history in the sixteenth century, and how that feeds into the *Mirror*'s moral-educative project. Mary Carruthers argues that 'it was memory that made knowledge into useful experience, and memory that made these pieces of information-become-experience into what we call "ideas"'.[107] The moral usefulness of historical information stems from the role memory plays in turning 'facts about the past' into the morally educative force that 'history' is. So memory is a fundamental part of history, not just in creating and sustaining it, but in what it is used for.

Sixteenth-century representations of Cicero's stance, 'that memory should be exercised in order to preserve evidence of human greatness and to restore (moral) direction',[108] exemplify this connection. The dedication of Cooper's *Chronicle*, which Blenerhasset is believed to have relied heavily upon, cites Cicero's definition of history as 'the witnes of time, ye light of trueth, the life of memorie, maistres of life, & messenger of antiquitee',[109] ('Historia est testu temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoria, magistra vitae, nuncia virtutatis', also printed on the title page of *Historia Breuis Thomae Walsingham, ab Edwardo Primo, ad Henricum Quintum* (1574), for example). The other *Mirror*s, and the socially conservative idea of morally educative history that underpins the *Mirror* corpus, are very much inspired by this Ciceronian definition of history, while Higgins's Dedication draws on Cicero's definitions of temperance and fortitude. Furthermore, the translations of Cicero's works by John Dolman and Thomas Newton, and editions printed by Thomas Marshe, demonstrate his significance as a central part of the intellectual culture out of which the *Mirror* emerged. But as recent work has shown, Renaissance

---

[107] Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 1.
[108] Hiscock, *Reading Memory*, p. 20.
[109] Lanquet and Cooper, *Coopers Chronicle*, sig. A2r. It is this facet of Cicero's writing on history which is most frequently cited, and not, for example, his exploration of the processes and exercise of memory in old age found in 'The Book of Oldage', in *Fowre seuerall treatises of M. Tullius Cicero conteyninge his most learned and eloquente discourses of frendshippe: oldage: paradoxes: and Scipio his dreame*, trans. Thomas Newton (London: Thomas Marshe, 1577).

intellectual thought about memory encompassed not only its uses, but how it works, where it is located, how to improve it, and its inherent moral implications, deriving theories from Aristotle's *De memoria et reminiscentia*, and the handbooks of rhetoric which included memory as a crucial component of the orator's skill, such as the classical *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*, as well as Stephen Hawes's *Pastime of Pleasure* (1509). The earlier *Mirror*s do not engage with the processes of memory, described and theorised at length in the period.

A significant part of the early modern theorisation of memory's workings is its depiction as a physical object or place. Sometimes this will be a textual object like a book or register,[110] aligning memory closely with the idea of written history. In his translation of Amiot's Preface to Plutarch's *Lives*, Thomas North shows how the process and moral functions of memory combine, noting that 'an historie is an orderly register of notable things said, done, or happened in time past, to mainteyne the continuall remembrance of them, and to serue for the instruction of them to come'.[111] Alternatively, though, memory can be a storehouse, treasury, house, or the rooms of a palace.[112] North notes too that

> …like as memorie is as a storehouse of mens conceits and deuises…So may it also be sayd, that an historie is the very treasury of mans life, whereby the notable doings and sayings of men, and the wonderfull aduentures & straunge cases (which the long continuance of time bringeth forth) are preserued from the death of forgetfulnes…And we may well perceiue how greatly we be beholding vnto it, if we doe no more but consider in how horrible darkenes, and in how beastly and pestilent a quamyre of ignorance we should be plunged: if the remembrance of all the thinges that haue bene done, and haue happened before we were borne, were vtterly drowned and forgotten'.[113]

---

[110] Cf. D. R. Woolf, 'Memory and Historical Culture in Early Modern England', *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association,* 2, 1 (1991), 283-308, at 288.
[111] Plutarch, *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes*, sig. *3v.
[112] See William E. Engel, *Mapping Mortality: The Persistence of Memory and Melancholy in Early Modern England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995), pp. 101-5, p. 109. These two ideas are combined, the 'places' being cardes or scroll[s] or other thynges for to wrytte in', in Ravennas Petrus, *The Art of Memory, That Otherwyse Is Called the Phenix*, trans. Robert Copland (London: Wyllyam Myddylton, 1545), sig. A2v-A3r.
[113] Plutarch, *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes*, sig. *3v.

Blenerhasset's Memory claims to 'haue howrded vp in my treasury the knowledge of all thinges' (1578S, f. 1r). North's reference to drowning highlights the connection between forgetting and being forgotten, and death or sleep. Images of oblivion as a sea or the river Lethe act as corollaries to the spatial depiction of memory, and evoke the landscape of the classical underworld (Blenerhasset's Edricus situates himself in '*Limbo Lake*' or '*Plutoes* lothsome lake', ff. 59v and 60v). Thence Memory also has a moral function as an antithesis to idleness, to an idle body and/or sleep. Andrew Hiscock notes that in William Rankins's *Mirrour of Monsters* (1587) 'the general malaise of human delinquency is linked specifically to the faulty operations of memory';[114] Rankins equates forgetfulness to sleep, and idleness to the absence of memory and virtue:

> …the infection of this vice is so contagious, that as the Ryuer *Laethes* maketh hym that drynketh therof, presentlie to forget his own condition & former deedes, so this damnable vice of idlenes, so besotteth the sences, and bewitcheth the myndes of menne, as they remembred not the profitable fruites of vertuous labor.[115]

In this respect, Blenerhasset's Memory is problematic, in that she goes to great lengths, like Blenerhasset himself in the Epistle, to insist that the *Second Part*'s history is the product of idleness. While idleness was conventionally linked to forgetfulness, it also played a part in poetic invention; early modern thought framed 'imagination as the melancholy breeding ground of "idle thoughts and fantasies"',[116] or *vice versa*, presenting vivid and imaginative dreams as 'the children of an idle brain'.[117] Spenser would later voice the anxiety that

> ...all this famous antique history,
> Of some th'aboundance of an ydle braine
> Will judged be, and painted forgery,

[114] Hiscock, *Reading Memory*, p. 5.
[115] William Rankins, *A Mirrour of Monsters Wherein Is Plainely Described the Manifold Vices, &C Spotted Enormities, That Are Caused by the Infectious Sight of Playes, with the Description of the Subtile Slights of Sathan, Making Them His Instruments* (London: Iohn Charlewood for Thomas Hacket, 1587), f. 8r-v.
[116] Engel, *Mapping Mortality*, p. 116.
[117] Shakespeare, William, *Romeo and Juliet*, I.iv.98.

Rather than matter of just memory[.][118]

But Blenerhasset elides these two ideas, and radically complicates his ostensibly historiographical project.

The Aristotelian distinction between memory and recollection, described by Rhodri Lewis as 'crucial' to 'classical and early modern ideas about the psychology of memory', underpins Blenerhasset's personification of the process of memory as the two distinct figures.[119] Aristotle's *De memoria et reminiscentia*, part of the *Parva naturalia*, locates memory in the heart, while recollection, or 'being reminded',[120] is a process which may act upon the memory's stored material (images).[121] These separate aspects of remembering also 'belong to different faculties of the tripartite soul…memory belongs to the sensing soul, recollection to the thinking soul'.[122] Blenerhasset's Memory and Inquisition clearly dramatise the duality of the process; while Blenerhasset's Memory may 'haue howrded vp in my treasury' all of the material needed to compile the complaints, she admits that it is not quite accessible without 'a new inquirye' (1578S, f. 1r).[123] The late fifteenth-century interpretation of the *De memoria* which Lewis suggests exemplifies 'how mnemotechnique came to be understood at the beginning of the early modern period', figures memory as passive, like '"a sheet of paper, or a book", while recollection was active, comparable to "a sound, an utterance or a voice"',[124] following Aristotle's distinction between 'the passive state of memory' and recollection which is 'a

[118] Spenser, Edmund, *The Faerie Queene*, II.Proem.1.
[119] Rhodri Lewis, 'A Kind of Sagacity: Francis Bacon, the *Ars Memoriae* and the Pursuit of Natural Knowledge', *Intellectual History Review,* 19, 2 (2009), 155-75, at 155.
[120] See Richard Sorabji, *Aristotle on Memory* (Second edn.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), p. 35.
[121] Recollection is 'not necessarily the recovery of memory'; ibid., p. 88.
[122] David Bloch, *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection: Text, Translation, Interpretation, and Reception in Western Scholasticism* (Philosophia Antiqua; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007), p. 75.
[123] Cf. Plato, *Meno*; see Elaine Landry, 'Recollection and the Mathematician's Method in Plato's *Meno*', *Philosophia Mathematica,* 20, 2 (2012), 143-69, Norman Gulley, 'Plato's Theory of Recollection', *The Classical Quarterly,* 4, 3/4 (1954), 194-213. Platonic *anamnesis* allows one to 'remember' innate knowledge, and functions differently to Aristotelian recollection. It is unclear here whether Memory's 'treasury' contains innate or pre-learned knowledge, but it does not seem to be readily available to her without Inquisition's aid at this stage.
[124] Lewis, 'A Kind of Sagacity', at 161.

kind of active search, or, even more revelaingly, a kind of deduction'.[125] Memory and Inquisition, however, confuse the difference between memory as a conceptual question, and recollection as a procedural or practical question,[126] by externalising the passive memory store in the figure Memory's treasury, and also complicate the distinction between 'passive state and active process',[127] since both figures play active, vocal roles.

The *Second Part* is clearly troubled by memory, unpacking its workings as both a mental function and a courtesy paid to the dead. Woolf notes that, in the early modern period, '[t]he relationship among memory, reading, and writing was fluid and dynamic';[128] by choosing to introduce the lively personifications into the *Mirror*'s investigation of reading and writing history, Blenerhasset explores this potentially problematic fluidity. But Memory and Inquisition seem to have little basis in contemporary mnemotechnique. While their roles evidently build on existing philosophical thought, there are no definitive literary models for their existence as anthropomorphised characters,[129] and no personified figure of Memory corresponding to Blenerhasset's is mentioned in the recent surveys of medieval and early modern thought on the topic.[130] The dual personifications appear again in Spenser's *Faerie Queene* and Thomas Tomkis's *Lingua* (1607).[131] Higgins's *Mirror* is recognised as one model for the content of *Briton Moniments*, the chronicle text that Arthur encounters in the House of

[125] Bloch, *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection*, p. 72. Cf. Sorabji, *Aristotle on Memory*, where memory is described as 'an ability or tendency', p. 88.
[126] Bloch, *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection*, p. 74.
[127] Ibid., p. 75.
[128] Woolf, 'Memory and Historical Culture', at 291.
[129] 'Dame Memory' features in a relatively simple allegorical way in, for example, John Skelton's translation of Diodorus Siculus's *Bibliotheca Historica* (1487), and in Stephen Hawes's *Pastyme of Pleasure* (1509).
[130] Mary Carr, K. P. Clarke, and Marco Nievergelt (eds.), *On Allegory: Some Medieval Aspects and Approaches* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008); Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Second edn.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); Michael Rossington and Anne Whitehead (eds.), *Theories of Memory: A Reader* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007); Anne Whitehead, *Memory* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2009).
[131] See Alan Stewart and Garrett A. Sullivan, '"Worme-Eaten, and Full of Canker Holes": Materializing Memory in *the Faerie Queene* and *Lingua*', *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual,* 17, (2002), 215-38.

Alma in Book II,[132] while the custodians of the collection of historical documents of which this is a part, Eumnestes and Anamnestes, are thought to have been inspired specifically by Blenerhasset's Memory and Inquisition.[133] Spenser includes two references at other points in the poem to Dame Memory, a straight-forwardly allegorical representation echoed later by Niccols's Lady Memorye in his seventeenth-century editions of the *Mirror*. But it is Eumnestes and Anamnestes, in the house of Alma, who evoke the pair's historical and historiographical function. Jerry Leath Mills suggests that while 'they are not explicitly contrasted in terms of age' like Spenser's characters, Memory and Inquisition 'maintain a relationship identical with Eumnestes and Anamnestes, and they serve, as do their Spenserian counterparts, to introduce a chronicle of legendary British kings'.[134] If Spenser responds to the duality in Aristotle's depiction of memory, his response appears to be mediated through Blenerhasset's work, since their diversions from Aristotle's theory are very similar. The description of Eumnestes's room,

> ...hangd about with rolles,
> And old records from auncient times deriu'd,
> Some made in books, some in long parchment scrolles,
> That were all worme-eaten, and full of canker holes[,][135]

does recall Blenerhasset's 'auncient Historyes, and Recordes of time...vtterly defaced' (1578S, f. 1r), (as well as the appearance but not the symbolism of Sidney's historian 'loden with old Mouse-eaten records'),[136] while Memory's claim to 'haue howrded vp in my treasury the knowledge of all thinges' anticipates Eumnestes's 'infinite remembrance' and 'immortal scrine'.[137] But their relationships cannot be called 'identical'. Blenerhasset's Memory and Inquisition have interchangeable functions, where Eumnestes

[132] Carrie Anna Harper, *The Sources of the British Chronicle History in Spenser's Faerie Queene* (Bryn Mawr College Monographs, VII; Philadlephia, Pennsylvania: Bryn Mawr, 1910) et al.
[133] *The Spenser Encyclopaedia*, Hamilton, A. C., ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990); Jerry Leath Mills, 'A Source for Spenser's Anamnestes', *Philological Quarterly,* 47, 1 (Jan. 1968), 137-9.
[134] Ibid., at 139.
[135] Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, II. IX.57.
[136] Sir Philip Sidney, 'The Defense of Poesie', in Elizabeth Porges-Wilson (ed.), *"The Defense of Poesie," "Astrophil and Stella," and Other Writings* (London: J. M. Dent, 1999), 111, p. 93.
[137] Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, II.IX.59.

and Anamnestes have set roles. Eumnestes and Anamnestes are silent, their functions pertaining to the physical retrieval and reorganisation of texts; by contrast, Memory and Inquisition are vocal and disorganised. However, Spenser's characters demonstrate the way in which Blenerhasset's text made an impact on the characterisation of memory in the period, *contra* Scott Lucas's assertion that, while Higgins 'provided inspiration to contemporaries such as Spenser and Sidney', 'Blenerhasset's *Second Part* did not have the influence upon later writers that Baldwin's and Higgins's collections were to enjoy'.[138] Helen Cooper has suggested that '[t]he richness of the Tudor context for *The Faerie Queene* has for too long been overshadowed by scholarship on…the New Historicist emphasis on its immediate political context'.[139] It seems likely that this context includes Blenerhasset's text, as well as the *Mirror* corpus more widely; when Lucas claims that '[f]ew works of Tudor literature were as long-lived and influential in early modern England as the *Mirror*',[140] the *Second Part* should also be acknowledged.

Blenerhasset's pairing of Memory and Inquisition seems to be free from the generic influence of previous English examples, but even his indebtedness to an established intellectual tradition allows Blenerhasset the opportunity to demonstrate further irreverence for source material. He mixes up the roles of his two narrators, so that their firm philosophical basis is compromised. In the Induction to the Complaint of Edricus, for example, their apparent functions are reversed, as Inquisition, who ought to perform the function of *anamnesis* or recollection, asks Memory 'what dyd become of *Edmund Ironsyde*, of whom you made mention...?' (1578S, f. 58v). As seen above, Blenerhasset's Memory is forgetful, and the 'diligent Inquisition' of the Epistle gives way to a thrown-together historical patchwork.

[138] Lucas, 'History and the Tragic Pattern', pp. 369-70.
[139] Helen Cooper, 'Edmund Spenser and the Passing of Tudor Literature', in Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 749-66, p. 750.
[140] Ibid., p. 750; Lucas, 'History and the Tragic Pattern', p. 362.

The aspect of mnemotechnique that Blenerhasset's text addresses more enthusiastically is the role of the author's own personal memory in the writing of his history, rather than the lost cultural memory that exercises Higgins.[141] Memory is personified as a fallible historian, rather than a pure embodiment of an abstract. In this way, the *Second Part* shifts the valency of memory away from its role as cultural shorthand for national history, what Daniel Woolf has described as 'social memory',[142] and focuses instead on the practical role of personal memory in the writing of history. Historical texts are therefore exposed as doubly unreliable, since both social memory and personal memory are depicted as flawed in Blenerhasset's prose frame.

This is firstly because of the susceptibility of the text to the caprices of the memory, and in particular the failure of the memory of its author. In combination with the sense of the malleability and instability of text which we also saw in the early *Mirror*s, Blenerhasset's prose frame 'draws attention to a potential conflict between the claims for the truth of history and the human error of historians'.[143] The treasury metaphor noted above actually compounds this conflict by introducing the concept of choice, as it implies that memory is a storehouse out of which material may be selected and arranged by an author in order to create history: Erasmus depicted Plutarch's historiographical practice as a process of compilation 'from the remote storerooms of all kinds of authors and disciplines, in such a way that one could not qualify it a coherent discourse but rather a patchwork'.[144] Blenerhasset's Memory and Inquisition dramatise the danger of this process by making thoroughly disorganised choices. They pluck characters at random from a dimly recalled ancestry, but they are aware at the same time of, for example, the

[141] Cf. Woolf, 'Memory and Historical Culture', at 296.
[142] Ibid., at 285.
[143] Cf. Griffiths, *John Skelton and Poetic Authority*, p. 44.
[144] Quoted in Paul J. Smith, 'Montaigne, Plutarch and Historiography', in Karl Enenkel et al. (eds.), *Recreating Ancient History: Episodes from the Greek and Roman Past in the Arts and Literature of the Early Modern Period* (Boston and Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, Inc., 2002), 167-87, p. 171.

substantial body of early modern writing that deals with the Arthurian tradition, and therefore decline to participate in it ('of *Arthur* there be whole volumes…let vs therefore passe them ouer', f. 40r). Given the well-documented investment of the Tudor dynasty in Arthurian legend, Blenerhasset might be expected to jump at the opportunity to rework some popular, commercially viable material, which he would not need much prompting to remember. Indeed, Richard Niccols appears to do just that in his *Mirror* collection in 1610, the first to include a complaint of Arthur. Additionally, the building controversy around the legend's legitimacy, ignited again in the early sixteenth century by one of the historians Blenerhasset specifically purports to ignore, Polydore Vergil, could have fed into the debates with which the Mirror repeatedly engages regarding historical truth and reliability. The innovative use of antiquarian and archaeological techniques in the period was providing new kinds of evidence for and against the myth, while the concept of a British monarch whose dynasty might restore the putative union with Scotland had growing symbolic weight for Elizabeth I and the question of her successor. (Blenerhasset himself would rehearse the foundational myth which connects Elizabeth's dynasty to the legacy of Aeneas and Brutus just four years later in *A Revelation*). Here, though, Memory and Inquisition illustrate the process by which the validity of historical narratives becomes destabilised, forgetting Arthur in their enthusiasm for stories in which they are less well versed:

> The greate desire (quoth *Inquisition*) whiche we haue had to heare this man, hath made vs to ouerpasse king *Arthur* and *Cariticus*, the one no lesse famous for his noble actes, then the other for his vices and wretchednes infamous. Yea (said *Memory*) so haue we forgot two or three other, whose examples would haue been goodly lanternes to lighten wandryng pylgrimes. But it is not much amisse, for…of the rest ther be the like ensamples both in *Bochas* and *Baldwin*: let vs therefore passe them ouer, and speake somwhat of some of the *Saxons.*
> (1578S, f. 40r)

This passage also damages the *Mirror* premise and renders Memory and Inquisition quietly subversive; that they should 'pass over' characters because 'of the rest ther be the

like ensamples both in *Bochas* and *Baldwin*' negates the need for Higgins and Blenerhasset's additions to the *Mirror* at all.

Finally and most alarmingly, the storehouse model of memory which allows this kind of choice quickly gives way to narratological agency, while the inability to access memory precipitates the need for invention. Writing just a few years later, Montaigne admitted in the *Essais* (1580) that his lack of memory led him to rely on invention instead.[145] In a literal sense, memory is seen as the capacity to 'image' or 'imagine' things: according to Aristotle, 'It is obvious…that memory belongs to that part of the soul to which imagination belongs; all things which are imaginable are essentially objects of memory'.[146] If we can 'image' an object in the mind's eye, we are remembering it. This is distinct from the multiple late antique senses of *imaginatio*, which included 'fantasy', 'simple mental image' and 'a mental image produced by an intentional act of combination',[147] as well as from the early modern uses of 'invention'.[148] By 1605, the distinction would be solidified in, for example, Francis Bacon's *Twoo Bookes…Of the Proficience and Aduancement of Learning*, in which Bacon divides learning into three parts, history, poesy, and philosophy, dependent respectively on man's memory, imagination, and reason.[149] For Blenerhasset, the division between history/memory and

---

[145] Michel De Montaigne, *The Essayes or Morall, Politike and Millitarie Discourses of Lo: Michaell De Montaigne, Knight of the Noble Order of St. Michaell, and One of the Gentlemen in Ordinary of the French King, Henry the Third His Chamber. The First Booke.*, trans. John Florio (London: Val. Simms for Edward Blount, 1603), 'The Ninth Chapter: Of Lyers', p. 15.

[146] Aristotle, 'On Memory and Recollection', in Jeffrey Henderson (ed.), *On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath: Aristotle VIII* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1957), 285-313, p. 293.

[147] Todd Breyfogle, 'Memory and Imagination in Augustine's *Confessions*', in Todd Breyfogle (ed.), *Literary Imagination, Ancient and Modern: Essays in Honor of David Grene* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 139-54, p. 146.

[148] Although invent was predominantly meant in the sense 'To come upon, find; to find out, discover' in this period, the *Oxford English Dictionary* does cite Abraham Fleming's use in *A panoplie of epistles* (1576) as an example of the sense 'To compose as a work of imagination or literary art; to treat in the way of literary or artistic composition': 'invent, *v.*', 1 and 2b, *OED* Online. March 2013. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/98960?rskey=zkMZOt&result=3&isAdvanced=false (accessed April 11, 2013).

[149] Francis Bacon, *The Twoo Bookes of Francis Bacon. Of the Proficience and Aduancement of Learning, Diuine and Humane* (London: Thomas Purfoot and Thomas Creede for Henrie Tomes, 1605), The Second Booke, f. 7r.

poesy/imagination was not yet fixed,[150] but Montaigne's contemporary taxonomy of liar-inventors who either 'invent, seale, stampe and all', or 'disguise and change a true grounde' elucidates the ways in which the absence of memory, either social or personal, may be played out around those categories.[151] We do not actually witness Memory and Inquisition inventing history in the prose frame, but the slippage between Blenerhasset's use of the terms 'Inquisition' and 'Invention' in the Epistle allows for this possibility, setting up the parallel pairing of 'Memory and Inuention' in place of a textual source (1578S, sig. *4r),[152] and the modern reader might be tempted to read this as a hint that Blenerhasset's 'history' is partially fictive.[153] We know that Blenerhasset himself deviated deliberately from his sources.[154] The teaming of Memory and Invention also prefigures Spenser's pairing of Eumnestes and Phantastes in the house of Alma, and their complicated interrelation. Through his contrasting portrayals of Phantastes and Eumnestes, Spenser flouts Aristotle's close connection of *phantasia* and *mnēmē*,[155] to explore the contradictory coexistence of invention and historical memory. James J. Paxson argues that Spenser's Phantastes and Eumnestes 'are really the operators or structural functions of an allegory of textuality':

> The poem's passage from the first form of information to the second establishes an illusory gradation to the imagined comfort of the written text. But in truth the

---

[150] See Worden, 'Historians and Poets'.
[151] Montaigne, *The Essayes*, 'The Ninth Chapter: Of Lyers', p. 16. Cf. Ellen Loughran, 'Defective Memories, Deception, and the Writing Process: Montaigne's Attempt at Truth in Essay I: 9', *Neophilologus,* 94, 1 (2010), 33-41.
[152] In terms of speech, this pairing is a common, recognised rhetorical technique combining memorised and *extempore* material; Bacon argues that contemporary universities 'make to great a diuorce betweene Inuention & Memory: for their speeches are either premeditate in *Verbis conceptis,* where nothing is left to Inuention, or meerly *Extemporall,* where little is left to Memory: wheras in life & action, there is least vse of either of these, but rather of intermixtures of premeditation, & Inuention: Notes & Memorie' in Bacon, *Of the Proficience and Aduancement of Learning*, The Second Booke, f. 5r. However, Blenerhasset seems to mean to use 'Memory and Inuention' to compile the factual *content* of his complaints, which is more problematic.
[153] While it is well established that 'history' frequently takes the meaning of the modern 'story' in the period and therefore fictional history is not problematic from that perspective, this is not what Blenerhasset aims to write: in the first induction, Memory links 'auncient Historyes' with 'Recordes of time' (p. 384).
[154] See 'The Complaints', below.
[155] See Aristotle, 'On Memory', p. 292.

> passage marks the motion from a primal modality of expression and response to a devitalized, exhausted, and "material" one.[156]

But where Spenser's Eumnestes is dusty and bookish, and Anamnestes subservient, in contrast to the colourful invention of Phantastes, Blenerhasset's Memory and Inquisition are still boisterous and active. Their records are not definitively textual. The division between history and imagination is not so finely or finally defined as in the house of Alma, and the abstracted characters are still permitted to leap off the page into the space between the textual and dramatic, that is, into the world of pageant and masque. The *Second Part* anticipates Spenser's complaint, 'The Ruines of Time', which shares the rhyme royal stanza with most of Blenerhasset's verse, in contrast to the rest of the *Complaints* (1591), as well as the concern that worthy or significant historical figures will 'Die in obscure oblivion' and 'in rustie darknes ever lie'.[157] Furthermore, the complaint's speaker envisages a procession of figures corresponding to the *Mirror*'s structure:

> At length by demonstration me to teach,
> Before mine eies strange sights presented were,
> Like tragicke Pageants seeming to appeare.[158]

Memory describes the *Second Part* as a pageant in the Induction to the Lyfe of Queene Hellina (1578S, f. 17v). This induction exemplifies the role of pageant in eliding monarchy and mythology, through Inquisition's catalogue of goddesses and literary figures who Hellina is not – 'no *Diana*, no *Gonzaga*, no *Emilia*, no *Cariclia*, no *Pallas*, no *Iuno*, no, not knowing *Minerua*, may compare with her' (1578S, f. 16v) – followed by a reworking of her life which is itself fictional. Blenerhasset's *Second Part* is an imaginative exercise in pretend history, whose fictionality is foregrounded, and thus diffused, by the presence of allegorical figures. The *Second Part* shares this with pageant,

---

156 James J. Paxson, *The Poetics of Personification*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 147.
157 William A. Oram et al. (eds.), *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1989), p. 247, ll. 346-49.
158 Ibid., p. 253, ll. 488-90.

in which history acts as a crucial reinforcement of monarchic authority, but in which the problem of the mythical basis for this royal history is defused by the overt artificiality of a written and performed text which hovers between poetry and drama. The way in which Blenerhasset aligns his text with pageant shifts his work away from the professional world of Balwin and Higgins into a more courtly, mythographical mode, heightening his proximity to the Leicester circle,[159] and the literary model of, for example, Petrarch's *Trionfi*.[160] It also anticipates the millenial pageant of the *Revelation*. Blenerhasset's characters are not fully performative, like Baldwin's writers reciting their complaints in character. Nor do they take to an imaginary stage like Higgins's ghosts, or expect their listeners to take dictation. It is possible to perceive Spenser's Phantastes and Eumnestes as crystallisations of forces which are at play in Blenerhasset's *Second Part*, but whose role in his historiographical commentary are not fully realised.

The ostensible function of Memory and Inquisition is to hear the ghostly complaints, with the implication that they will be recorded or reproduced in some way. However, their authorial agency undermines the status of the stories as the text's primary focus, while the characters' moral functions are shown to be subject to interpretation. Just as Jack Cade's social status and even his blameworthiness are put into question by the learned text of his complaint in the 1559 *Mirror*, Blenerhasset's Memory also endows text with the power to expunge guilt: she judges Uter Pendragon's complaint 'Verye well sayde', and on that basis claims 'I would I had habilitie to redeeme this princes soule out of *Lymbo lake*' (1578S, f. 35r). According to the premise of the prose frame, the act of including Pendragon in the *Second Part* has done just that, or at least redeemed his

[159] In keeping with his connection to the Leicester-Knollys family through Thomas Leighton's marriage, and the more explicit link made by the dedication of *The Revelation of the True Minerva* to Lady Leighton, formerly Cecilia Knollys, sister of Lettice, Countess of Essex; see Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, pp. 371-2, and Shenk, *Learned Queen*, p. 91.

[160] The highly revered work portrays a pageant of sequentially triumphant personifications within a dream vision. See Robert Coogan, 'Petrarch's *Trionfi* and the English Renaissance', *Studies in Philology,* 67, 3 (Jul. 1970), 306-27, from 320.

narrative from (typically watery) Oblivion, while Memory's comment on the story has challenged his function as a negative *exemplum*. Blenerhasset imbues another scribe with the capacity to edit later in the *Revelation*, when Brutus describes his lineage to a herald, who 'markte and did his misse amend'.[161] How much do Memory and Inquisition try to amend, and how accurate are their corrections? They demonstrate that history as a product of memory and invention is fallible, both explicitly and tacitly, while the textuality of history means that 'the past may be subject to revision'.[162] Memory and Inquisition orchestrate the historical narrative, but in doing so they impose their flaws and contradictions onto the *Mirror* form. Their control is of a loose and haphazard nature. In the Induction to the Complaint of Edricus, Inquisition states doubtfully,

> ...an Earle? ... I haue here an Earle called *Edricus*, who murthered a Kynge, it maye bee, that chaunce hath yeelded vntoo us the factour vnlooked for.
> (1578S, f. 58v)

Their reconstruction of history is based on chance and supposition, and this spills over into the reader's confidence in the possibility of writing history of any kind. As a result, the reader's faith in Higgins's attempts to fill the gaps in the *Mirror*'s British history is seriously compromised.

Furthermore, the prose frame touches on interpretation of the complaints and their moral function while also encompassing a range of other concerns. In contrast to Higgins's *Mirror* in which the Inductions essentially just summarise the content of the complaints, and Baldwin's where the prose frame, particularly for modern critics, eclipses the verse by its meta-textual literary debate,[163] Blenerhasset's narrators chat and bicker about additional matters around their content.

[161] Blenerhasset, *A Reuelation of the True Minerua*, sig. A4r.
[162] Cf. Hiscock, *Reading Memory*, p. 4.
[163] See in particular Jessica Winston, '*A Mirror for Magistrates* and Public Political Discourse in Elizabethan England', *Studies in Philology,* 101, 4 (2004), 381-400 and Geller, 'Editing under the Influence'. This approach is rejected in Pincombe, 'William Baldwin and *A Mirror for Magistrates*'.

For example, Memory and Inquisition take on the contemporary controversy regarding the adaptation of classical meter for English verse. From the 1540s in England, the quantitative verse movement pitted metres 'based on the time value of syllables' against accentual verse, based on rhythm or rhyme.[164] Like the more famous correspondence between Spenser and Harvey, *Three Proper, and Wittie, Familiar Letters* (1580), Blenerhasset's Memory and Inquisition address this debate in an ostensibly private yet ultimately publicized exchange, also foregrounding Blenerhasset's engagement with contemporary poetics, in terms of both theoretical debate and recent publications. Blenerhasset is frequently cited as an early proponent of blank verse, on account of his complaint of Cadwallader which is written in unrhymed hexameter.[165] The prose link following the complaint of Cadwallader states that his tragedy

> ...agreeth very wel with the *Roman* verse called *Iambus* ... so proper for the Englishe toung, that is is greate maruaile that these ripewitted Gentlemen of *England* haue not left of their Gotish kinde of ryming, (for the rude *Gothes* brought that kind of writing fyrst, &imitated the learned Latines & greekes) O what braue beames and goodly tymber might be found amongst *Churchyardes Chippes*, if he had not affected the ryming order of his predecessors?
> (1578S, f. 40r)

The prose link thus strays from a framing commentary on the complaints at hand, to discourse on a theme which Blenerhasset returns to in later works: the contrast between the 'rude *Gothes*', symbolic of an uncivilised 'dark age' in European history, and the cultural and moral perfection brought about in Elizabethan England. As Kelly A. Quinn notes, 'the association of rhyme with the "rude" Middle Ages…is clearly an element of the quantitative verse movement from its earliest inception in England'; the prose link closely echoes, for example, the description of 'our rude and beggerly ryming, [which was] brought first into Italie by *Gothes* and *Hunnes*, whan all good verses and good

[164] Kelly A. Quinn, 'Samuel Daniel's Defense of Medievalism', in Clare A. Simmons (ed.), *Medievalism and the Quest for the "Real" Middle Ages* (London; Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2001), 29-44, pp. 30-32.
[165] See Derek Attridge, *Well-Weighed Syllables: Elizabethan Verse in Classical Metres* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), p. 111, and Robert Cummings, 'Abraham Fleming's *Eclogues'*, *Translation and Literature,* 19, (2010), 147-69, at 166.

learning to, were destroyed by them' in Roger Ascham's *The Scolemaster* (1570).[166] Memory and Inquisition subordinate their historiographical task to a fashionable literary row.

Why exactly does Blenerhasset cite *Churchyardes Chippes* here, (printed by Thomas Marshe in 1575 and 1578), when he eschews all formally historiographical material? Among prose and verse accounts of more recent national events (for example, the Siege of Leith (1560), and 'The Roed made by Syr William Druery Knight, into Skotland' (1571)), as well as anecdotes and fables, Churchyard includes in this collection the *de casibus* tragedy of Sir Simon Burley, who was executed for treason under Richard II in 1388. Churchyard's complaint not only appropriates the 1550s *Mirror* form, but also treats appropriate late medieval subject matter. The speaker, Burley, takes personal issue with Baldwin for being excluded from the 1559-63 collection. Is he so insignificant or base that Baldwin has forgotten his name, Burley asks.[167] His tragedy remains 'vnmade'. Blenerhasset's reference to the *Chippes*, then, points the reader not primarily to an example of unsuccessful poetry, (Blenerhasset clearly does not have too much of a problem with *de casibus* complaints in rhyming stanzas, after all), but to a missing link between the 1563 *Mirror* and Blenerhasset's supplement, hinting at a text which inspired the restoration of 'forgotten' historical accounts. His inversion of Churchyard's chip metaphor allows the prose frame to distance the *Second Part*, again, from analogues, and belittle a competitor, while acknowledging an additional proponent of the *Mirror* form.

Aside from Churchyard, Inquisition cites a series of contemporary translators whose poetry, he suggests, cannot be as good as their source texts because of the weakness of English rhyming verse,

[166] Quinn, 'Samuel Daniel's Defense of Medievalism', p. 31.
[167] Churchyard, *The Firste Parte of Churchyardes Chippes*, f. 46v.

> Which Meeter made not onely hym [Churchyard] inferiour vnto *Horace*, but it also made a great inequalitie to be betwixt *Buchurst* and *Homer*: betwixt *Phaer* and *Virgill*: betwixte *Turberuile* and *Tibullus*: betwixt *Golding* and *Ouid*: betwixt *George Gascon* and *Seneca*. (1578S, f. 40v)

While the links between Churchyard and Horace,[168] Sackville (Lord Buckhurst) and Homer are less clear, Blenerhasset is evidently referring to Thomas Phaer's *Seven First Bookes of the Eneidos of Virgil converted into English Meter*, printed in 1558. George Turberville's comparison is also confused. Turberville was, like Blenerhasset, a translator of Ovid; his *Heroycall Epistles* was printed by Henry Denham in 1567, 1569 and 1570. He also translated Mantuan's *Eglogs*, and his translation was printed in 1567 and 1572 by Henry Bynneman, arguably prompting Spenser's appropriation and transformation of the eclogue later in the decade. The translation of Dominicus Mancinus's *Plaine Path to Perfect Vertue* (1568) connects Turberville's oeuvre to the *Mirror*'s ostensible aims, but his relation to Tibullus (Albius Tibullus, *ca*. 55-19 BC) in Blenerhasset's prose frame probably derives from his *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* (1567),[169] which Turberville hopes will 'be a Glasse and Myrror' for his readers,[170] and in which Turberville, like Tibullus, writes poems to a pseudonymous lover.[171] However, Tuberville does use blank verse in six of the *Heroycall Epistles*.[172] His collection closes with 'The Translator to the captious sort of Sycophants', in which he asserts,

[168] Churchyard was, like Blenerhasset, a translator of Ovid, who also played on the possibilities of exilic writing. See Liz Oakley-Brown, 'Elizabethan Exile after Ovid', in Jennifer Ingleheart (ed.), *Two Thousand Years of Solitude: Exile after Ovid* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 103-17.
[169] Mike Pincombe, 'The Second Part of the Mirror for Magistrates (1578)', *HRI Online*, accessed 15/05/12 Section 17.
[170] George Turbervile, *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets with a Discourse of the Friendly Affections of Tymetes to Pyndara His Ladie. Newly Corrected with Additions* (London: Henry Denham, 1567), 'To the Reader'.
[171] Turberville's love poems 'are written in honour of Anne Russell, daughter of the second earl of Bedford, under the name of Pandora or Pyndara' (Raphael Lyne, 'Turbervile, George (*b.* 1543/4, *d.* in or after 1597)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27825, accessed 8 Sept 2012]), while Tibullus addresses Delia, actually Plania. The most recent publications of Tibullus's work were Joseph Scaliger's *Castigationes in Catullum, Tibullum, Propertium* and *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii nova editio*, and *Recueil des Poesies Latines*, a French edition, all printed in Paris in 1577.
[172] These are Epistle xj, Canace to Machareus; xij, Medea to Iason; xiij, Laodameia to Protesilaus; xiv, Hypermnestra to Lynceus; xx, Acontius to Cydippe; and xxj, Cydippe Acontius.

For though the thing but slender be in sight,
And vaine to vewe of curious carping skull,
In mother tongue a forraine speach to write:
Yet he shall finde he hath a Crow to pull,
That vndertakes with well agreeing File
Of English verse, to rub the Romaine stile.

Deuises of the language diuers are,
Well couched wordes, and feately forged phrase,
Eche string in tune, no ragged ryme doth iarre,
With figures fraught their bookes in euery place:
So that it is a worke of prayse to cause
A Romaine borne to speake with English iawes.[173]

Like his bid to dismiss Sackville, Gascoigne and Churchyard in the paratext, Blenerhasset's disparaging reference to Turberville here seems to belie their common interests, and Blenerhasset's evident familiarity with his work. Greenhut asserts that Turberville's *Epistles* 'do not exactly stand alone, independent of other voices, as do Ovid's *Heroides* epistles', because of the arguments with which Turberville introduces each complaint: 'the tone of these Arguments implies a not-so-silent auditor who is probably not interested in the woman's side of the story, except in that it prohibits the achievement of sound didactic purposes'.[174] The *Mirror* complaints are, of course, similarly mediated by additional voices, but Blenerhasset's Memory and Inquisition rarely intervene didactically.

As to Inquisition's other references, Arthur Golding's popular translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* first appeared in 1565, and was printed a further two times by 1575. Golding 'enjoyed the patronage of the Earl of Leicester', as Blenerhasset may have aspired to do, and his *Metamorphoses* have a sympathetic confessional tenor, hinting like the *Second Part* at contemporary disputes over church adornment and apparel.[175] Golding

[173] Ovid, *The Heroycall Epistles of the Learned Poet Publius Ouidius Naso*, trans. George Turberville (London: Henry Denham, 1567), 'The Translator to the captious sort of Sycophants', sig. X2r-v.
[174] Deborah S. Greenhut, *Feminine Rhetorical Culture: Tudor Adaptations of Ovid's Heroides* (American University Studies IV: English Language and Literature; New York: Peter Lang, 1988), p. 76.
[175] Raphael Lyne, 'Golding's Englished *Metamorphoses*', *Translation and Literature,* 5, 2 (1996), 183-200, at 191-2; see below.

translated the Latin text in hexameter couplets. Hexameter, even in accentual verse, was considered a sufficiently close approximation of Latin poetry, 'As that he may in English verse as in his owne bée soong.| Wherein although for pleasant style, I cannot make account,| Too match myne author, who in that all other dooth surmount'.[176] Inquisition's connection between George Gascoigne and Seneca could derive from his translation with Francis Kinwelmershe and Christopher Yelverton, of *Jocasta* (1566, not printed until 1572/3) as part of the revival of interest in Senecan tragedy at the Inns of Court during the 1560s,[177] although *Jocasta* is actually 'a translation of an Italian play, itself a version of a Latin rendering of Euripides',[178] and written in blank verse. As Winston and others have demonstrated, the *Mirror* emerged from Inns of Court culture, while also encouraging the development of dramatic tragedy in the 1560s; '*Jocasta* is very much a product of the Inns of Court avant-garde in its choice of subject, its topicality and its treatment'.[179] Austen notes that the 'tacit connection' between *Jocasta* and *Gorboduc* 'is confirmed by [Gabriel] Harvey, who notes both 'The Myrrour of Magistrates' and 'The Tragoedy of King Gorboduc' on the (cropped) title page in his copy of [Gascoigne's] *Posies*'.[180] Once again, Blenerhasset signals his aims and affiliations through contradictory assertions. In addition to Gascoigne's translation of *Jocasta*, Lämmerhirt cites his 'Certayne notes of Instruction concerning the making of verse or ryme in English' (1575) as another connection with Blenerhasset's own interests.[181] Significantly, the text makes up part of the epistolary frame of the *Posies*, and is presented as a letter to Edouardo Donati, an Italian gentleman of whose existence there is no evidence.[182] Austen suggests that

[176] Ovid, *Metamorphosis*, Preface, sig. A3r-v.
[177] See Winston, 'Seneca in Early Elizabethan England'.
[178] Austen, *Gascoigne*, p. 54. The Italian play was Lodovico Dolce's *Giocasta* (1549), derived from R. Winter's Latin version of *Phoenissae* (Basel, 1541).
[179] Ibid., p. 54.
[180] Ibid., pp. 54-5.
[181] Lämmerhirt, *Quellenstudie*, p. 63, n. 3. See also Austen, *Gascoigne*, p. 101.
[182] Austen, *Gascoigne*, p. 102.

Gascoigne's choice of medium allows him to 'understate the significance of what he would have known was a new kind of writing in English', and while ostensibly written for manuscript circulation, Gascoigne may have intended to have it printed from the outset.[183] This scenario correlates closely to the *Second Part*'s paratextual set-up – like Gascoigne, Blenerhasset too may be seen to slip 'behind a ludic mask which is neither certainly fictional nor certainly fact'.[184] Like his exhortation to forget Sackville, Gascoigne and Churchyard, or his claim not to have had access to Grafton, Polydore Vergil and Cooper, this critical passage provides us with insight into what Blenerhasset was reading, and creates another intratextual community within which our reading of his work should be situated.

Blenerhasset is both a theorist and practitioner of translation. Translation is very much central to the intellectual culture in which the *Mirror* was composed and extended, from its inception in the Inns, and the noted translators such as Phaer who participated in its composition, and in this respect Blenerhasset builds on the model he inherited. Translation was a significant part of early modern humanist education, and it would have been unusual for the learned contributors to the collection not to engage in the process at least as part of their training, but Warren Boutcher makes an explicit connection between the *Mirror* and Elizabethan translation, suggesting that in his 1568 translation of Polybius, Christopher Watson 'was offering – just like the authors of *A Mirror* – a work "crafted to evoke mid-Tudor events and figures" even as it appeared to speak only of a distant past'.[185] More pertinent here, though, Boutcher describes Watson's adaptation of an excerpt from Edward Hall's *Union* as a 'translation' as well,[186] uniting the two techniques as part of a 'broader attempt to shape the reading and rewriting of the whole

[183] Ibid., p. 102.
[184] Ibid., p. 103.
[185] Boutcher, 'Polybius Speaks British', pp. 102-3, citing Lucas, *Politics*, p. 3.
[186] Boutcher, 'Polybius Speaks British', p. 110.

pre-Reformation past in the contemporary context of the "British question" and of Protestant nation-building'.[187] Higgins and Blenerhasset both draw attention to their previous experience as translators in the course of the narratives of composition they provide for their *Mirror* texts; the processes of appropriation and translation can be read as functions of each other, and both Higgins and Blenerhasset demonstrate the interrelation of these skills in their common treatment of their hypotexts.[188]

His translation of Ovid's *De remedia amoris*, though not extant, complicates Blenerhasset's modern reputation as a puritanical opponent of lust. More germane to Blenerhasset's subsequent work is the incidental passage in the *Remedia* in which various verse forms, such as hexameters, 'the tragic style', iambics, elegies and epic, are matched to appropriate subject matter.[189] While Ovid's speaker offers advice on how to suppress and extinguish sexual attraction as well as romantic love, the *Remedia*'s salacious suggestions and explicit scenarios do not quite accord with the stern morality Budra and Lucas posit for Blenerhasset,[190] unless it is manifested as a kind of prurience. However, the translation of Ovid was subject to a complex process of legitimation in the sixteenth century, as commentators sought to stabilize and contain a process of textual transmission which in fact demonstrated the potential multiplicity of interpretation.[191]

Liz Oakley-Brown suggests that translations are 'supplements which threaten "to take the place of" the original or, at the very least, to fragment the problematic binary

---

[187] Ibid., p. 116.
[188] See, for example, Rhonda Knight, 'Stealing Stonehenge: Translation, Appropriation, and Cultural Identity in Robert Mannyng of Brunne's *Chonicle*', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies,* 32, 1 (Winter 2002), 41-58.
[189] 'Cures for Love' in Ovid, *The Love Poems*, trans. A. D. Melville (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), ll. 373-82, p. 161.
[190] Lucas, 'History and the Tragic Pattern', p. 70.
[191] See Liz Oakley-Brown, *Ovid and the Cultural Politics of Translation in Early Modern England*, eds Martin Stannard and Greg Walker (Studies in European Cultural Tradition; Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 193; Heather James, 'Ovid and the Question of Politics in Early Modern England', *English Literary History,* 70, 2 (2003), 343-73, at 348; Lee T. Pearcy, *The Mediated Muse: English Translations of Ovid, 1560-1700* (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1984), p. xiii; cf. Raphael Lyne, 'Writing Back to Ovid in the 1560s and 1570s', *Translation and Literature,* 13, 2 (Autumn 2004), 143-64.

opposition of "original" and "translation"'.[192] Having identified Blenerhasset's *Second Part* as a supplement earlier in this chapter, the significance of translation to Blenerhasset's poetics, and the similarity between translation and the appropriation and adaptation of the *Mirror* form become more evident. If 'all translation is only a somewhat provisional way of coming to terms with the foreignness of languages',[193] it is the foreignness of his own language that seems to exercise Blenerhasset the most, as he scrambles to foreground his difference and simultaneously to accumulate analogues. Memory suggests that, seeing the efforts of the translators cited, the critics '*Zoilus* and *Momus*, will crie out, O vayne glorious heade, whiche now for a singularitie dooth indeuour to erect a new kinde of Poetrie in England' (1578S, f. 40v). Tantamount to a mission statement, this calls for a new reading which locates Blenerhasset's work between that of Gascoigne, whose English blank verse was already '*un nuovo & strano stile*',[194] and Spenser, whose *Shepheardes Calender* '[inaugurated] the New Poetry of England's Renaissance' the following year.[195]

Blenerhasset and his contemporaries' interrogation of poetic practice had theological as well as philological implications. Derek Attridge suggests with reference to Blenerhasset's involvement in this debate that 'Protestant humanists might see a further reason for disliking medieval verse (and often, therefore, any rhymed verse) in its association with the monastic orders',[196] and indeed the commentary on the poetics of translation above is included in the context of a vehemently anti-Catholic episode in the *Second Part*. Memory is viciously scathing in the induction preceding Cadwallader's complaint about his habit, (a criticism which references the 1560s vestiarian controversy

[192] Oakley-Brown, *Ovid and the Cultural Politics of Translation*, p. 193.
[193] Walter Benjamin, 'The Task of the Translator: An Introduction to the Translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens*', in Hannah Arendt (ed.), *Illuminations* (London: Pimlico, 1999), 70-82, p. 75.
[194] Austen, *Gascoigne*, p. 164.
[195] Thomas H. Cain's Introduction to *The Shepheardes Calender*, in Oram et al. (eds.), *Spenser's Shorter Poems*, p. 10.
[196] Attridge, *Well-Weighed Syllables*, p. 101.

fuelled by Thomas Cartwright in the early 1570s),[197] asking rhetorically, 'What, shal we alowe tippet wearers to pleade amongst Princes? Me thinke by the deformitie of his apparel, he shoulde not be of the *Religion*, nor of the reformed Church' (1578S, f. 35r). Scott Lucas stresses Blenerhasset's Presbyterian leanings,[198] and states that the *Second Part* offers 'important glimpses into the nascent literary culture of separatist English Puritanism', while Norbrook describes Blenerhasset's imitation of the *Shepheardes Calender* in the *Revelation* as 'sternly Calvinist'.[199] Following the confessional trepidation which characterised the early Elizabethan editions of the *Mirror*, the *Second Part* is actually the most out-spoken on specific matters of doctrine. Thomas A. Prendergast argues that, for the late sixteenth-century poet and historian, earlier forms of verse history 'present phantastical and seductive idols of the Catholic medieval past, idols that threaten to corrupt the Protestant commonwealth', a threat which ties Blenerhasset's scepticism regarding the invention of history to his metrical purism.[200]

So Blenerhasset's prose frame seems to communicate anxieties about the corrupting potential of pre-Reformation poetic forms, while still seeking to remember and glorify this profane history. Memory and Inquisition, even as mediators with a Catholic past speaking out of a purgatorial landscape, do not threaten the dominance of Protestant beliefs, since they demonstrate the way in which stories are selectively remembered and re-written according to the demands of contemporary mores. By composing Cadwallader's complaint in blank verse rather than the 'Gotish kind of ryming' (1578S, f.

[197] See, for example, Thomas Cartwright, *A Defense of the Ecclesiastical Regiment in Englande, Defaced by T. C. In His Replie Agaynst D. Whitgift* (London: Henry Bynneman for Humfrey Toy, 1574). Cartwright was appointed chaplain to Thomas Leighton and minister of Castle Cornet on Guernsey in 1596 where he remained until 1601 (Patrick Collinson, 'Cartwright, Thomas (1534/5–1603)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4820, accessed 8 Sept 2012]).

[198] Although he makes no reference to the legally Presbyterian milieu in which Blenerhasset found himself on Guernsey.

[199] Lucas, 'History and the Tragic Pattern' p. 370; Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, p. 80.

[200] Thomas A. Prendergast, 'Spenser's Phantastic History, *The Ruines of Time*, and the Invention of Medievalism', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies,* 38, 2 (Spring 2008), 175-96, at 182.

40v), this 'tippet wearer' is effectively recuperated: Inquisition 'refused oftentimes to heare' his complaint, but 'when I gaue eare vnto him, I reioyced' (1578S, f. 35v).

The abrupt way in which Blenerhasset's narrators end their task just before the end of the *Second Part* leaves the circumstances and outcome of their work unexplained, and casts their authority in a still more doubtful light. In their final prose link, Memory and Inquisition abandon the project, saying:

> ...nowe our idle houres be spent, tyme and our affaires do call vs from the further hearing these mens complayntes. (1578S, f. 61v)

This unceremonious exit conveys the failure of Memory and Inquisition as personifications, in that they fail to accomplish or embody permanently the qualities assigned to them. What are the 'affaires' of Memory and Inquisition except to remember? This sense of dislocation is compounded by the mysteries surrounding their gender, physicality, location and origin.[201] Blenerhasset's prose frame provides a picture of historiographical disillusionment, and the openness of history writing to error. How do Blenerhasset's verse complaints bear up within this framework?

The Complaints

The enigmatic prose frame is fitting, given that Blenerhasset's history begins with figures of murky ancient British legend. Murkier still is Blenerhasset's historiographical practice. Scott Lucas's discussion of Blenerhasset's verse in 'Hall's *Chronicle* and the *Mirror for Magistrates*' emphasises his 'entirely unhistorical claims', and the tendency to 'depart from his chronicle sources'.[202] Perhaps the unorthodox orthography of the characters' names provides an early indicator of Blenerhasset's loose relationship with the historiographical canon: his speakers' names as they appear in the table of contents

[201] Memory is traditionally female: mother of the muses in Greek myth, Dame Memory in Skelton and Spenser, Lady Memory in Richard Niccols's seventeenth-century *Mirror* texts. There is one use of 'she' to refer to Memory in the *Second Part*; Inquisition's gender remains ambiguous.
[202] Lucas, 'History and the Tragic Pattern', p. 370.

(Guidericus (Guiderius), Carassus (Carausius), Queen Hellina (Helena or Helen), Vortiger (Vortigern), Uter Pendragon (Uther Pendragon), Cadwallader, Sigebert (sometimes Sigeberht), Lady Ebbe (Saint Ebbe or Abb), Alurede (Alfred), Egelrede (AEthelred), Edricus (AEdric) and Harolde) nearly all need to be amended in order to be identified in other historiographical works. But these features, as we have seen, are of a piece with Blenerhasset's depiction of Memory and Inquisition's haphazard tendencies. Curran suggests that Blenerhasset's goal 'of reclaiming national stories thought to be lost' is 'unravelled' by his 'manufacturing' of particular narratives.[203] Far from 'unravelling' Blenerhasset's intentions, though, it is by these means that the *Second Part* actually reveals the inadequacies of imaginative historiography to offer 'true' history, as well as the problematic creative agency of the historical poet. Blenerhasset's interrogation of historiographical practice in the complaints emerges one the one hand through his interaction with historical source material, and on the other through the *Second Part*'s relation to its generic source texts, the first and last parts of the *Mirror* itself.

Lucas's criticism builds on the unique study of Blenerhasset's sources by Rudolf Lämmerhirt.[204] Lämmerhirt found that the *Second Part*'s complaints depend primarily on the chronicles of Grafton and Cooper,[205] as well as sharing conspicuous similarities with Polydore Vergil in the tragedy of Harold;[206] precisely those authors to which Blenerhasset declared he had no access in the Epistle. In addition, Lämmerhirt records Blenerhasset's debt to Fabyan, (an influence in common with the earliest *Mirror* texts, and one which Blenerhasset does not signpost in the paratext), and occasional similarities with Hardyng, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Stow and Matthew of Westminster. Despite his thorough demonstration of textual parallels, however, Lämmerhirt also vehemently decries

[203] Curran, *Roman Invasions*, p. 199.
[204] Lämmerhirt, *Quellenstudie*.
[205] Ibid., throughout, but particularly p. 98.
[206] Ibid., p. 94.

Blenerhasset's arbitrary use of these source materials, and his unhistorical deviation from their accounts.[207] In particular, he finds the complaints of Alfred (Alurede) and Harold to be almost 'hideous fakes'.[208] Is it possible that Blenerhasset was just a typical 'moderately well-educated Elizabethan gentleman, dabbling in history' who might 'rely on his memory rather than on written notes for…historical citations'?[209] Both Lucas and Lämmerhirt explain his deviation from textual sources as a part of Blenerhasset's ethical agenda. Lucas suggests that it is 'Blenerhasset's revulsion for lechery' that 'leads him several times to depart from his chronicle sources to compose matter that insists upon the numerous miseries awaiting those who indulge in wantonness';[210] Lämmerhirt argues that his motivation in changing the cause of Alfred's death from an unknown illness to a specifically venereal one was to capitalise on the hints by other authors at licentiousness in Alfred's youth, in order to draw a stronger contrast and sharper moral from the militant chastity of Lady Ebbe in the previous complaint.[211] Blenerhasset certainly does manipulate the complaint narratives in order to promote particular readings, even inventing stories where the 'admission of the unavailability of ancient Britain' and 'an imaginative historical reconstruction' are combined.[212] But this extends beyond heightening the moral force of the tragic falls, which in themselves take in many more sins than lust, including 'pride and arrogancy', 'suspition', gluttony, usurpation, adultery, sloth, regicide, and dissatisfaction with one's lot in life. When read alongside the prose frame and paratext, and as a response to the earlier *Mirror*s, the complaints expose a broader project behind this contentious deviation from source texts.

---

[207] Ibid., p. 97.
[208] Ibid., p. 97.
[209] Woolf, 'Memory and Historical Culture', at 298.
[210] Lucas, 'History and the Tragic Pattern', p. 370.
[211] Lämmerhirt, *Quellenstudie*, p. 79. This point is also made in more general terms on p. 98. Cf. Simon Keynes, 'The Cult of King Alfred the Great', *Anglo-Saxon England,* 28, (1999), 225-356, at 246.
[212] Curran, *Roman Invasions*, p. 199.

Blenerhasset's loose inheritance of the *de casibus* form registers further potential for dissonance in the transmission of textual histories. Like Higgins's legendary and historical characters, not all of the figures included in the collection purport to be tragic. Blenerhasset includes exemplary as well as cautionary tales, notably those of Queen Hellina and Lady Ebbe. This has been unsatisfactory for some readers in itself, but Pincombe has drawn attention to the questionable tragedy of some of those who do claim to be unfortunate, notably Cadwallader.[213] While Pincombe sees this as evidence of Blenerhasset's poetic failings – '[t]his is a "tragedy" in search of tragic content' – as a technique it allows the *Second Part* to problematize the *de casibus* format as a vehicle for recounting historical narratives, and an inadequate moral model. Cadwallader's fall takes the form of a decline in status, as he renounces his kingship in Britain to become a priest in Rome, but Blenerhasset depicts his comfort *increasing*: the moral of Cadwallader's story derives not from the fact of his fall, but from the satire on the comforts of ecclesiastical life which follows.

The variable tragic status of the characters is matched by disagreement among the complaints over the extent to which man plays a part in his own downfall. This disparity does fit with the *Mirror*'s traditional polyvocality, but it does nothing to reassure readers seeking guidance. The contrast between the two positive *exempla* is particularly stark: whilst Queen Hellina, held up as an exemplary – and transparently topical – monarch, lives and dies predominantly happily, Lady Ebbe, a paragon of virtue who cut off her nose and upper lip in order to avoid being raped by invading Danes, dies when 'With fiery flames they burnt our Nunnery,| And vs therein' (1578S, f. 50r). It is difficult to equate this story to the doctrine which governs Uter Pendragon's earthly punishment for his lust, or to find a moral at all in Vortiger's conclusion that 'he who now doth flourish

[213] Pincombe, 'The Second Part of the Mirror for Magistrates (1578)', Section 16.

freshe and greene,| Must fade and fal as *Hyems* frostes doo frette' (1578S, f. 29r). Anticipating the pathetic fallacy of Spenser's annual and diurnal model of prosperity in the *Shepheardes Calender*, Vortiger's complaint removes human agency entirely from our inevitable downfall. By contrast, Carassus offers a straighforward balance of crime and punishment:

> As due desert did force my shippe to flote,
> So vices vile me drencht in waues of woe. (1578S, f. 16r)

If the reader were to recognise themselves in the mirror of this complaint, though, there is no hope for salvation, since 'The crooked Crabbe wyl alwayes walke awry'.

Like the earlier *Mirror* collections, too, the form of the *Second Part*'s complaints is very varied. Despite his comments on the inadequacy of English rhyming poetry in the prose frame, Blenerhasset demonstrates its variety and showcases his own skills as a poet, shifting between rhyme royal, octains, nonains, and abbaaccdd stanzas, unrhymed hexameter and hexameter couplets. This diversity appropriates and expands the forms of the earlier editions, and perpetuates the atmosphere of the miscellany or compendium, with its implications of multiple authorship. The complaints are generally stylistically similar to Baldwin's and Higgins's, but at times Blenerhasset's highly alliterative, often tautological phraseology resembles the poetry anthologised in contemporary collections such as the *Paradise of Dainty Devices* (1576) and *A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions* (1578). Lines such as 'Must deepe desire die, drenched in direfull dread' in Thomas Proctor's 'Mirror of Mortality' recall the *Second Part* at its most extreme.[214] This suggests that Blenerhasset was conversant with contemporary poetic fashions: Hyder E. Rollins stresses the great popularity of these poetical miscellanies, and suggests that 'the extremely popular *Mirror for Magistrates*' could be considered an anomalous constituent

[214] Hyder Edward Rollins (ed.), *A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926), p. 94.

of the trend.[215] Blenerhasset refers in the *Revelation* to the debasement of poetic skill, through the metaphorical deterioration of Parnassus, where Blenerhasset claims that '[t]he gorgious garlands gone'.[216] This too seems to allude to the miscellany tradition, through both its style and phraseology. His use of copious alliteration here might be said to satirise the excessive tendencies of 1570s miscellany style, while he laments lost poetic talent.

The effect of Blenerhasset's paratextual introduction to his collection of complaints is to establish a hermeneutics of contradiction and instability. In the Epistle, Blenerhasset apologises for the style of his complaints, stating that

> I haue not thought it conuenient to write the complaynts of these men, with so obscure a stile as some other haue done, but with so playne an exposition, that he who doth reade them shal not neede to be *Oedipus*, for euery playne *Dauus* shall by reading them, easely vnderstand the Authours drift. (1578S, sig. *4v)

This allusion to the Latin 'Davus sum, non Oedipus', from Terence's comedy *Andria* which in turn alludes to the myth of Oedipus and the Sphinx,[217] rather confounds the sentiment that one does not need to be learned (or a solver of riddles) to appreciate the text. This sentiment, but not the means by which it is expressed, contradicts Baldwin and his colleagues' reliance on 'reader competence' in 1563.[218] Blenerhasset also justifies his low style in a different way, asking his reader to

> remember, that they whose falles I haue here penned, were not of late tyme, but suche as lyued presently after the Incarnation of Christe: and I haue not thought it decent, that the men of the olde worlde shoulde speake with so garnished a Style, as they of the latter tyme. (1578S, sig. *3v)

---

[215] Ibid., p. xiii.
[216] Blenerhasset, *A Reuelation of the True Minerua*, sig. A3r.
[217] Terence, 'Andria', in G. P. Shipp (ed.), (London: Bristol Classical Press, 2002), I.ii.194, p. 72. Peculiarly, this phrase is not excerpted from the *Andria* in John Higgins and Nicholas Udall (eds.), *Flowers or Eloquent Phrases of the Latine Speach, Gathered out of All the Sixe Comoedies of Terence Whereof Those of the First Three Were Selected by Nicholas Udall. And Those of the Latter Three, Nowe to Them Annexed by John Higgins.* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1575), although Davos's previous line from the play is quoted in Udall's selection: 'non hercle intelligo', 'In good soothe I knowe not what you meane', A3r. Shipp notes that 'the phrase *Davos sum non Oedipus* became proverbial', Terence, 'Andria', p. 137, but it does not seem to have been prevalent in England until the seventeenth century.
[218] See Ch. 1, above.

This emphasis on lexical decorum perpetuates the eagerness of the early *Mirror*s to ensure appropriateness in their complaints' discourse. 'Garnished' does, however, strike the modern reader as quite an apt term for Blenerhasset's voice. His paratextual prose, and the verse of the complaints, are characterised by learned flourishes, either in scattered references to classical mythology, history and philosophy, or rhetorical figures; Lämmerhirt, for example, lists instances of anaphora, epiphora, epanodos, epizeuxis, annominatio, polysyndeton, asyndeton, pleonasm, and tautology in his breakdown of Blenerhasset's rhetorical technique.[219]

The complaints' contents proffer neither a uniform linguistic or poetic style, nor a consistent frame of reference. Sigebert, for example, appeals to classical statesmen Antigonus, Ptolemy, Caesar, Mithridate, Darius, Antiochus, Cambises and Pyrrhus to support his argument. His narrative draws, anachronistically, on the language of courtliness, and he formulates a semi-allegorical chess metaphor, which blurs the distinction between signifying and signified Bishop, Queen and Knight. By contrast, the Complaynt of Alurede builds up a proto-Spenserian allegorical 'wildernesse of woe', complete with 'Daungers denne', 'Hatreds house', and the 'caue of Care' (1578S, f. 51v). Blenerhasset snatches remembered snippets from biblical, classical and vernacular sources, with Carassus's beast fable clashing against Sigebert's dream vision and Uter Pendragon's alliterative anti-lust catalogue.

The historical figures themselves are seemingly well-versed in contemporary as well as canonical and classical literature. Carassus, for example, refers to '*Hob and Ihon*, *Rafe Royster*, and his mate' (1578S, f. 15r), invoking Nicholas Udall's 1550s comedy *Ralph Roister Doister* (printed 1567) to stand for unsuitable companions, and Alurede

[219] Lämmerhirt, *Quellenstudie*, pp. 114-9.

cites 'Scoggin', '*Skeltons* mate' (f. 53r).[220] There is a certain disreputableness to these references, and, as in Baldwin and Higgins's collections, the complaints' speakers engage skeptically with oral and written modes of textual transmission. Rumour, and through rumour the manipulation of narrative and reputation, stresses the dangers of orality over written accounts. Vortiger's claim that 'Silence shall do no wrong| To *Marlayne*…If auncient write to vs the truth hath taught' (1578S, f. 29r) suggests that any narrative stability that exists resides in ancient records, but may be threatened by a hasty oral rehearsal of the story. Indeed, Vortiger initially asks that he be allowed not to speak (1578S, f. 25r), saying that 'Silence is best', since 'As good men can by wicked workes beware,| So wicked men by wicked workes be wise'. Guidericus describes the power of 'Roming *Rumor*' and 'false Report' to defeat cities before the approach of the army, while the recounting of military misfortunes carries an extraordinary force: 'They hate to tel, they lothe that hap to heare' (1578S, f. 5v).

Popular misrepresentation is associated predominantly with female characters in the earlier collections. Eleanor Cobham and Jane Shore both have to perform public penance, which exposes them to public disgrace and foregrounds what is at stake in loss of reputation before and after death. Their stories, they worry, will be constructed and manipulated orally, by crowds who witness their disgrace. The two female characters in the *Second Part*, Queen Hellina and Lady Ebbe, are radically different, from Shore and Cobham as well as from each other. The safeguarding of textual reputation remains paramount, but these women hope to enter the historical record to secure their histories, the like of which 'The eare of man…hath neuer hearde,| No penne, nor tounge the like hath euer tolde' (1578S, f. 50r). In fact, though, where the disfigured abbess Ebbe

[220] See ibid., p. 75 n. 1.

(actually a product of misremembered chronicle history)[221] is confident of securing praise from posterity ('when your wits haue wayed well the case,| You wyll commende me much', f. 48r), it is Queen Hellina's complaint which foregrounds the precarious position of women in the male-dominated textual past.

While the collaborative authors note the scarcity of women's complaints in the *Mirror* in their discussion of Cobham's tragedy, Hellina draws attention to this discrepancy herself. It is not just the *Mirror* which is at fault, but all historians. Hellina claims,

> Mens due desertes ech Reader may recite,
> For men of men doo make a goodly show,
> But womens workes can neuer come to light,
> […]
> No writer wyll a litle time bestowe,
> The worthy workes of women to repeate. (1578S, f. 18r)

A stanza later, this omission is reformulated as deliberate dishonour, when Hellina claims that

> …writers would al honour from me reaue,
> Of al renowne they would depriue me quite.

The process of restoring this lost honour and renown is presented in artisanal terms; Hellina is now able 'My spotlesse life to paynt in perfect white', and provide a 'true report' which will 'burnishe' and 'rubbe the rust' off of her actions. Later in the poem she demonstrates her specifically female vulnerability to the workings of rumour, when her dedication to chastity is compromised:

> …flittinge Fame the truth to testifie,
> Against my wyl, at *Rome* made such reporte,
> That *Constantinus* thence dyd hether hye,
> And being come vnto my *Brittayne* Court,
> With louers lookes hee striude to scale the Fort
> Of my goodwyll. (1578S, f. 19v)

[221] Ibid., pp. 70-1.

The sexually charged metaphors of conquest and occupation locate Hellina as a victim, taken advantage of by masculine historiographical narrative.

While Hellina is concerned about women specifically being excluded from the historical record, she does not appeal to female writers or readers of history to rectify this situation. There were very few available. Anne Dowriche's 'revisionary' Protestant verse adaptation,[222] the *French Historie*, of Thomas Tymme's *Three Partes of the Commentaries…of the Civill Warres of Fraunce* (1574), which shares Blenerhasset's highly selective historiographical approach and 'propensity to convey moral rather than evidentiary truths',[223] would not be printed until 1589. However, two European mirror texts were translated by women in the sixteenth century: Elizabeth Cary translated Abraham Ortelius's *Le mirroir du monde* (1598), while Margaret Tyler's translation of Diego Ortúñez de Calahorra's *Espejo de Principe y Cavalleros* (1562) was printed as *The Mirrour of Princely Deedes and Knighthood* in 1578. Tyler's 'provocative'[224] preface draws attention to history as a realm dominated by men in the same year that the *Second Part* was printed.[225] Deborah Uman and Belén Bistué argue that Tyler's translation functions as a collaboration between Tyler and Ortúñez; Tyler plays on Ortúñez's own manipulation of layers of authorial fictions by writing herself into the text as a co-author, while by adapting details of the Spanish romance she 'invites her readers to consider the historical similarities between *The Mirrour* and the politics of sixteenth-century

---

[222] Randall Martin, 'Anne Dowriche's *the French History*, Christopher Marlowe, and Machiavellian Agency', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900,* 39, 1 (1999), 69-87, at 71.
[223] See Megan Matchinske, 'Moral, Method, and History in Anne Dowriche's *the French Historie*', *English Literary Renaissance,* 34, 2 (2004), 176-200, at 176-7.
[224] Chris Laoutaris, 'Translation/Historical Writing', in Caroline Bicks and Jennifer Summit (eds.), *The History of British Women's Writing, 1500-1610* (The History of British Women's Writing; Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 296-327, p. 317.
[225] See Catherine Gallagher, 'A History of the Precedent: Rhetorics of Legitimation in Women's Writing', *Critical Inquiry,* 26, 2 (2000), 309-27, at 312-18.

England'.[226] Once again Blenerhasset's approach to historiography seemingly resonates with the expression of contemporary dissatisfactions, although he does not engage with the implications of Memory's gender in the narration or construction of the past, and includes only two female complaints in his collection of twelve (which, of course, cannot ultimately escape male authorial 'mediation'). Blenerhasset demonstrates the raised stakes of female learning and erudition under Elizabeth I in the *Revelation*, in which his 'praise for Elizabeth as a learned queen served, in part, to counter the criticisms that moderate Puritans and many other English Protestants were beginning to level at her and the National Church'.[227] As a partial allegory of Elizabeth I, Hellina's case may be read against its apparent promotion of a potential marriage, perhaps to the Duke of Anjou; in fact, Hellina's story is quite frequently retold in the sixteenth century, in ecclesiastical and Roman as well as British histories, but her role is primarily defined by her relationship to her husband Constantius and her son, Constantine.

Further to this, the speakers' concern regarding the safe transmission of their stories prompts the question, how were they being transmitted outside of the *Second Part*? Not where did Blenerhasset source these accounts, but what did it mean to invoke these legendary and historical figures in the print culture of the 1570s? For example, Hellina's reputation as an exemplary female monarch is put to work variously advocating charitable donations and defending Mary Stuart's right to the English throne.[228] Blenerhasset's treatment of these figures has an element of topicality, although more in the form of contemporary relevance and panegyric than Baldwin's covert local

---

[226] Deborah Uman and Belén Bistué, 'Translation as Collaborative Authorship: Margaret Tyler's *The Mirrour of Princely Deedes and Knighthood*'', *Comparative Literature Studies,* 44, 3 (2007), 298-323, at 299, 317.

[227] Shenk, *Learned Queen*, p. 101.

[228] Henry Bedel, *A Sermon Exhorting to Pitie the Poore* (London: John Awdely, 1571), sig. D4r, and John Leslie, *A Defence of the Honour of the Right Highe, Mightye and Noble Princesse Marie Quene of Scotlande and Dowager of France with a Declaration Aswell of Her Right, Title & Intereste to the Succession of the Crowne of Englande* (London [i.e. Rheims]: Eusebius Dicaeophile [i.e. J. Foigny], 1569), f. 133r.

commentary.[229] His characters are taken from Christian and dynastic legend, (Vortiger and Uter Pendragon, for example), as well as 'true' history, (Harold and William the Conqueror), but as Lucas and Curran note, Blenerhasset does not even retell these figures' stories accurately. Other sixteenth-century verse chronicles of ancient British, and English and Saxon history,[230] to say nothing of their prose counterparts,[231] demonstrate the vast range of potential subjects for complaints. Just how and why did Blenerhasset choose these particular characters to populate his educative, interrogative history?

Memory and Inquisition turn, after Cadwallader's complaint, to the Saxons, 'for seeing they were made of fleshe and blood, no doubte some of them stumbled also' (1578S, f. 40r). This gives the impression that the personifications, who have taken on Baldwin's role of marshaling and orchestrating the complaints, are casting about at random for examples, and hoping that their selections will prove instructive. Unlike Higgins's dynastic progression and historical gap-filling, Memory and Inquisition display no organising principle behind their narrative. There is no hint of concern for chronology, or any desire to contextualise the complaints within a meta-narrative. The prose frame's references to the process of choice in the text's construction stem, as we have seen, from a fictional narrative of composition, even more overtly than Baldwin's. The reasons for their choice of speakers which Memory and Inquisition advance therefore cannot be read literally as Blenerhasset's own. So what does motivate Blenerhasset's choices?

---

[229] Lucas, *Politics*, p. 233.

[230] For example, Hardyng, *The Chronicle of Ihon Hardyng*, and later William Warner, *Albions England or Historicall Map of the Same Island: Prosecuted from the Liues, Actes, and Labors of Saturne, Iupiter, Hercules, and Aeneas: Originalles of the Brutons, and English-Men, and Occasion of the Brutons Their First Aryuall in Albion. Continuing the Same Historie Vnto the Tribute to the Romaines, Entrie of the Saxones, Inuasion by the Danes, and Conquest by the Normaines* (London: George Robinson and R. Ward for Thomas Cadman, 1586).

[231] The definitive digest of sixteenth-century chronicle history, Holinshed's *Chronicle*, was first printed in 1577.

Certain characters carried particular educative weight as *exempla*, bringing contemporary debates to bear on Blenerhasset's broad moral agenda, as well as his historiographical commentary. While Blenerhasset's *Second Part* has nothing like the oppositional local meaning suggested by Lucas for the earlier *Mirror*s, or the developed allegorical *schema* appropriated by Richard Niccols in his early seventeenth-century satire, topical resonance does play a significant, and overlooked part in its selection of ghosts. For example, during the reign of Mary I, the radical Protestant John Ponet demonstrated the 'inwarde sedicion and ciuile discorde' caused to a nation by the usurpation of its monarch, particularly by foreigners, using the example of the British king Vortiger.[232] Vortiger's kingship is compromised by the insidious promotion of Saxons at his court, who are 'placed nyghest the kyng, and haue the greatest offices', with the result that 'our countreymen the Britaynes [were] remoued from their king, straungers placed in all offices and holdes, and at leynght the lande was ouerrunne, and possessed of Straungers'.[233] Under utterly different circumstances, Arthur Hall's *Letter* (1576) similarly describes Vortiger's reliance on the Saxon Hengist to subdue his enemies, who 'brought hether certain souldiers Panims by whose valure *Vortigers* contraries were tamed: by the continuall repaire and flocking hether of those straungers, the inhabitaunts were put to the dore'.[234] Blenerhasset's complaint follows the enduring association of Vortiger with civil conflict and the suffering of the British, and in particular Ponet's 'statement of the lawfulness of forcible resistance' against a 'ruler who had…inflicted

[232] John Ponet, *A Shorte Treatise of Politike Pouuer and of the True Obedience Which Subiectes Owe to Kynges and Other Ciuile Gouernours, with an Exhortacion to All True Naturall Englishe Men* (Strasbourg: The Heirs of W. Köpfel, 1556), sig. L2r.
[233] Ibid., sig. L2v.
[234] Arthur Hall, *A Letter Sent by F.A. Touchyng the Proceedings in a Priuate Quarell and Vnkindnesse Betweene Arthur Hall, and Melchisedech Mallerie Gentleman, to His Very Friende L.B. Being in Italie* (London: Henry Bynneman for Arthur Hall, 1576), sig. A2v.

grievous injuries on his people' by presenting the usurpation of the usurper Vortiger in a reasonably positive light.[235]

The topicality of Blenerhasset's complaints can expose historiography as local or arbitrary, when contemporary concerns divert focus, and even narrative, in a more relevant direction. For example, Queen Hellina's account of religious reforms and her resolute chastity for the sake of national security ('I who did regard my Comons good,| Refusde to linke my selfe with forrayne blood' (1578S, f. 19r); 'priuate pleasures luste| May neuer make me throwe my Realme to duste', (f. 20r)) constitutes one of Blenerhasset's most overt fabrications, while clearly making reference to Elizabeth I's policies.[236] Inquisition also affords Hellina specifically Elizabethan renown. With 'incomprehensible complexion', (evidence of the 'epideictic recourse to the topos of poetic indescribability' which Anna Riehl identifies as central to early modern praise of Elizabeth I's beauty),[237] and 'knowledge of Tongs, &...diuers gifts of the mind' (1578S, f. 16v), there is little ambiguity over the allegorical valency of this 'Goddesse', 'chiefest among men'.

Following such an overt evocation of Elizabeth's chastity, however, Hellina is married to the Roman Constantinus; 'There to the Duke the *Britayne* Crowne I gaue,| With sacred spousall ryghtes' (1578S, f. 21r). Blenerhasset alludes to the conflicted hierarchy the marriage of a female monarch was thought to generate, with the suggestive claim that 'His myghtie Mace did rule the Monarchie,| My wyt did rule (some wryters say) his Mace' (f. 21r), hedging the judgement by invoking historiographical disagreement in his sources. The complaint, composed as Elizabeth's marriage negotiations with Anjou were about to reach a second peak, seems to advocate a union

[235] D. G. Newcombe, 'Ponet, John (*c.*1514–1556)',*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22491, accessed 8 Sept 2012].
[236] The fourth stanza of the complaint is especially explicit.
[237] Anna Riehl, *The Face of Queenship: Early Modern Representations of Elizabeth I*, eds Carole Levin and Charles Beem (Queenship and Power; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 92.

with a European duke. But it resonates with contemporary fears about a foreign marriage by describing their opposites: Hellina reassures her subjects, for example, that 'This *Roman* heyre…will restore your ancient lybertie' (1578S, f. 20v), when a major contemporary concern was that ancient English liberties would be curtailed. Theologically, too, Hellina mirrors Elizabeth when she states that

> …by my meanes al people did imbrace
> The fayth of Christ, the orders I did set
> They were obayd. (1578S, f. 19r)

This seems to refer fairly unambiguously to the Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity (1559) which codified the Church of England's doctrine and independence from Rome after Elizabeth's accession, and sits uncomfortably alongside Hellina's marriage to 'The *Roman* Duke'. Although Hellina offers a positive example of a married queen, Blenerhasset's position regarding the marriage to Anjou remains unclear. Anjou's sympathy towards the Huguenot opponents of his brother Henri III must have recommended his suit to Blenerhasset to some degree, and as a resident on Guernsey, Blenerhasset would have had some direct contact with Huguenot refugees. However, John Stubbes's *The Discouerie of a Gaping Gulf whereinto England is like to be Swallowed by Another French Mariage* (1579) represented one facet of the public opinion on the matter, and the ambiguity of Hellina's complaint may have been calculated to avoid the censorship and punishment that greeted Stubbes's pamphlet.[238]

While obvious topical resonance motivated Blenerhasset's choices to some extent, on the other hand he also derives morals from some complaints which have no basis in the usual interpretations of their narratives. For example, Carassus, or Carausius, is a soldier of lowly birth who comes to usurp British rule. Blenerhasset's complaint suggests that his downfall is inevitable since 'A Clowne cannot from Clownish deedes refrayne'

[238] See Clegg, *Elizabethan Censorship*, p. 123.

(1578S, f. 14v), and Carassus's origins ultimately get the better of him, but this connection is not made in contemporary versions of the story. Sigebert, the king of the West Saxons, is one of the stronger examples to engage with the debate around the right to depose tyrants, but Blenerhasset's decision to recount 'The Complaint of Sigebert' in the voice of his killer modifies the *Mirror* formula in order to 'teach both Prince and subiect his duetie at large' (1578S, f. 41v), signalling the reciprocal duty of the ruler and ruled in a topical way which his sources do not. Blenerhasset eschews the obvious topical capital to be made out of Cadwallader as an ancestor of the incumbent dynasty (later, Pistol uses Cadwallader to mock Fluellen's Welshness in *Henry V*).[239] Instead, Blenerhasset focuses on the pertinence of Cadwallader's story to contemporary religious questions. Cadwallader's complaint is made up of two phases, depicting two versions of the spiritual contrasted with the temporal lifestyle. First, Cadwallader explains his rejection of kingship, in favour of the simpler, more modest life of the friar, anticipating Shakespeare's Henry VI in his antipathy towards the responsibility and cares suffered by the monarch. He claims that poverty 'beareth much more blesse, then hygh and courtly state', since 'the more of wealth I had, the more I dyd desire' as king (1578S, f. 38v). Subsequently, though, the portrayal of a pure, spiritual existence shades into satire. While all other estates from the king to the labourer have to work hard, 'Churchmen…be blest' because 'they turne a leafe or two,| They sometime sing a Psalme', and 'labour not at al, they knowe no kinde of payne'; we realise that the contrast drawn between the 'courtly pompe of wearing royal crowne' and the option to become 'A Deacon, or a Deane, Prebende, or Minister' is ironic, given the ceremonial listing of roles in the 'Romishe route' who 'did nought but play and pray', and yet 'sit in highest place' (1578S, f. 39r). As a satire of contemporary religious practices, Cadwallader's complaint draws attention

[239] T. W. Craik (ed.), *King Henry V* (The Arden Shakespeare, London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 1995), 5.1.28: 'Not for Cadwallader and all his goats'. See Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory* on the sixteenth-century significance of Cadwaladr.

to its ahistoricity. The suggestion that faults, ostensibly Catholic specifically, are shared by Protestant clergy situates the complaint in a post-Reformation theological landscape.

Individual topical resonance aside, the broader narrative trajectory of Blenerhasset's *Second Part* is defined by conquests. It is a long-standing convention that, in medieval and early modern historical narratives, '[e]ach age is initiated by conquest'.[240] Blenerhasset chooses to cover national history from the Roman Conquest to the Norman Conquest. The structure echoes that of Richard Grafton's *Chronicle at Large* (1569), of which we can be reasonably confident Blenerhasset was aware. Grafton's *Chronicle* divides world history into the Seven Ages, the seventh of which exactly correlates to Blenerhasset's chosen date range, spanning the period between Christ's birth, and, at the beginning of the 'Seconde Volume', William's accession. Additionally, William I's reign marked a shift in English textual culture for early modern readers, as the new bureaucracy which characterised his government was remembered in 'the legend that [he] had brought the English from the uncertainty of reliance on memory to the use of written law'.[241]

The defining nature of conquest in the unfolding of national history arguably has topical resonance for readers in the late 1570s. While not so urgent as at the peak of anxiety in the 1580s, the threat of invasion by Catholic Spain was constantly present. For Blenerhasset in particular, so close to the coast of France, conquest must have felt like a very real possibility. Blenerhasset aligns invasion and exile with shifting identities: Cadwallader's move to Rome comes with a change of dress, while Vortiger's deferral to Hengist displaces the British to Wales, having been '*Welchemen*…calde'; 'this realme of Englande tooke her name' from the victory of the *Angli* (1578S, f. 39r).

---

[240] Nolan, *Lydgate*, p. 47.
[241] Woolf, 'Memory and Historical Culture', at 290.

Although the complaint of Guidericus deals with his resistance to the Emperor Claudius, and Carassus is a Roman who briefly 'conquers' Britain, the conquests with which the *Second Part* is most concerned are those of the Saxons and Danes; eight out of the twelve complaints address this period, perhaps in response to the 'Renaissance rediscovery of the Anglo-Saxon past'.[242] This rediscovery came about as religious reformers looked to the national past for theological precedents. In particular, 'a burgeoning national interest in the language of Anglo-Saxon England' stemmed from the antiquarian study of Old English manuscripts by Archbishop Matthew Parker and his circle in the 1560s and 70s,[243] although this phase had been preceded by the more polemical interests of Bale and Foxe.[244] Allen J. Frantzen has noted the logical opposition between Germany and Rome in conceiving of both the Anglo-Saxon past, and the ecclesiastical conflict of the present,[245] which reinforced the 'Protestant motivations underpinning these early Anglo-Saxon studies, prompting the exploitation of certain resonances between reformist beliefs and pre-Conquest theology', accomplished through a 'peculiarly linguistic' approach to the rediscovered textual records.[246] For example, *A Testimonie of Antiquitie shewing the Auncient Fayth in the Church of England* by Aelfric, Abbot of Eynsham, '[p]erhaps the first edition of Anglo-Saxon texts set in type',[247] was printed in 1566 by John Day, and presented 'a testimonye of verye auncient tyme, wherin is plainly shewed what was the iudgement of the learned men in [the matter of the

[242] Robert Allen Rouse, *The Idea of Anglo-Saxon England in Middle English Romance*, eds Corinne Saunders and Roger Dalrymple (Studies in Medieval Romance; Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2005), p. 7.
[243] Hannah Crawforth, 'Strangers to the Mother Tongue: Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* and Early Anglo-Saxon Studies', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies,* 41, 2 (2011), 294-316, at 294.
[244] Frantzen, *Desire for Origins*, pp. 35-47. See also Timothy Graham, 'Anglo-Saxon Studies: Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries', in Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (eds.), *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 415-33, pp. 415-23.
[245] Frantzen, *Desire for Origins*, p. 31.
[246] Crawforth, 'Strangers to the Mother Tongue', at 294.
[247] Frantzen, *Desire for Origins*, p. 43.

sacrament], in the dayes of the Saxons before the conquest'.[248] Parker argues in his preface that while 'many be charged and condemned of heresye, and reproued as bringers vp of new doctryne, not knowen of olde in the church' in the days of William the Conqueror,[249] Aelfric's testimony offers confirmation of his doctrine's legitimacy. John Asser's tenth-century *AElfredi Regis Res Gestae* was printed by John Day in 1574. Although Blenerhasset's complaint of Alurede/ Alfred does not follow Asser, his decision to include Alfred's story responds to contemporary interest and commercial potential.

E. G. Stanley has noted that 'the Saxonists of Archbishop Matthew Parker's time and those who followed him looked back to their ancestors before the Norman Conquest for the civil liberty extinguished, as they thought, under the Normans and only slowly restored'.[250] This is not what motivates Blenerhasset's portrayal of the period, however. Although he notes the significant achievements of the period, especially in Alfred's complaint which describes his foundation of abbeys, Winchester Minster and a grammar school in Oxford '[b]y meanes whereof my common weale was filde| With learned men' (1578S, f. 53r), the account does not include any comparison with post-conquest history. In fact, the complaint of Harold foregrounds William's legitimacy, when '[m]y kingdome then was proude his lawful price,| With conquest he recouered his right' (1578S, f. 65v). As seen above, the *Second Part* also portrays the Anglo-Saxon period using a 'dark ages' discourse which denigrates the 'Gothic' in opposition to the linguistic and intellectual superiority of the classical past. In this respect, too, Blenerhasset's depiction of the period does not match that of Parker's circle, and his manipulation of the multiply significant term 'Rome' produces an ambiguous, layered moral history when read through the lens of

[248] Aelfric, *A Testimonie of Antiquitie Shewing the Auncient Fayth in the Church of England Touching the Sacrament of the Body and Bloude of the Lord Here Publikely Preached, and Also Receaued in the Saxons Tyme, Aboue 600. Yeares Agoe* (London: John Day, 1566), 'Preface to the Christian Reader', f. 2v.
[249] Ibid., 'Preface to the Christian Reader', f. 2r.
[250] Eric Gerald Stanley, *Imagining the Anglo-Saxon Past: The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism, and Anglo-Saxon Trial by Jury* (Second edn.; Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000), p. vii.

contemporary religious debate. Blenerhasset's approach does, however, accord with the 'assumption of…meddling' in textual history, which 'had a direct bearing on the reception of Anglo-Saxon historical texts in the mid-sixteenth century'.[251] While '[t]he charge that earlier scholars had rewritten texts for political ends is richly ironic, for those activities describe precisely the scholarly endeavors of Bale and Parker and his assistants',[252] the *Second Part* draws attention to this process, complicating and confounding a political reading of the Anglo-Saxon past.

William E. Bolton suggests that, later, in 'Spenser's version of British history, Anglo-Saxons are the antagonists of the historical and allegorical virtues he is espousing. They are the people who depose the Welsh ancestors of his own monarch, and they are the antithesis of temperance'.[253] However, this oversimplifies the cultural valency of Anglo-Saxons in the sixteenth century, and flattens the differences between distinct phases of Saxon rule. Blenerhasset's Saxon complaints do not prescribe the loyalty of his readers in the way that Bolton suggests Spenser's poem does, and the polyvocality of this section of the *Second Part* provides a nuanced, or at times confused, portrait. Edricus falls foul of the manoeuvring between Saxons and Danes when he kills King Edmund Ironside, 'hoping', according to his complaint's title, 'to haue greate preferment for his labour of Canutus the Dane'. He drastically misjudges the situation. Cnut jokes cruelly, in a dark comic vein reminiscent of the early *Mirror*s, that 'sith that loue did moue thee doo that deede,| Thou for thy paynes shalt be preferde with speede' (1578S, f. 60r), and orders the hangman to place Edricus's head as high as possible on London's walls. The Saxon Egelrede is hated by his subjects, and a clear negative example ('I did delight in euerye villannye' (1578S, f. 56v)), but the 'dreadful diuelish *Danes*' are no better. Egelrede

[251] Frantzen, *Desire for Origins*, p. 46.
[252] Ibid., p. 46.
[253] William E. Bolton, 'Anglo-Saxons in Faerie Land?: A Note on Some Unlikely Characters in Spenser's *Briton Moniments*', *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual,* 23, (2008), 293-301, at 299.

concludes that 'Al murthering *Massacers* be vile and vayne' (1578S, f. 57v), and suggests that the nation suffered under both his own and Cnut's rule, because 'alwayes that which wanteth gouernment,| That fyrst dooth feele the force of dangers dent' (f. 58r).

Lady Ebbe's complaint compares the Saxons and Danes, when she presents the Saxons as especially ineffectual in the face of the Danish invasion:

> Amazde, they gazde, not knowing what was best,
> So strayghtly were the *Saxons* then distrest. (1578S, f. 48v)

By contrast, the Danes are active, savage and wicked, and their invasion is characterised by the destruction of buildings, particularly religious houses. This accords with the account given in Parker's Preface to Aelfric's *Testament of Antiquitie*, based on Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon*, of the Danes as a divine scourge to the Saxons' Catholicism.[254] Blenerhasset's decision to represent the destruction of the abbey as the means whereby the nuns 'gaynde…a heauenly happinesse' (1578S, f. 50r) therefore becomes double-edged in the context of contemporary providentialist readings of British history: is their spiritual happiness augmented by the dissolution of religious houses? Considering the close parallels between Blenerhasset's linguistic and religious interests and Spenser's, demonstrated in his antipathy towards the Gothic corruption of language, and Catholic vice of Cadwallader and his fellow clergy, it is perhaps surprising that he did not anticipate (or even echo in the *Revelation*) Spenser's exploration in the *Shepheardes Calender* of whether 'a return to origins might be possible, in language and – by analogy – in the English Church'.[255] Judging by the references to ecclesiastical apparel in the prose link preceding Cadwallader's complaint, it seems that Blenerhasset may have been on the opposing side of the vestiarian controversy to Archbishop Parker, although this would be a petty reason to reject the Parker circle's efforts in Anglo-Saxon studies.

[254] See Aelfric, *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*, f. 6v.
[255] Crawforth, 'Strangers to the Mother Tongue', at 295.

However, Blenerhasset's negative portrayal of conquest in the complaint of Lady Ebbe speaks to contemporary fears of invasion, and demonstrates the contingency of personal perspective and historiographical interpretation in its alternative take on the significance of the Saxon defeat.

Blenerhasset's complaints, then, offer a varied and sometimes surprising portrayal of Anglo-Saxon history. His cavalier treatment of source material, and adaptation of the *Mirror* form, contributes to this unusual picture, while his evident engagement with contemporary literature and topical religious and political questions show the construction of historical accounts mediated through the personal interests of the historian. King Harold is particularly aware of the limits of written text, and his complaint, the last of the collection, draws a formal distinction between oral and written utterances. His narrative takes place in a heuristic historic present, and he urges his troops as in an exhortatory speech on the battlefield to 'Come forth, and purchase Fame. Geue me my swoorde' (1578S, f. 62r). Harold admits, however, that the Norman Conquest essentially comes about through the correspondence with William, in which his 'letters were of little might', his 'yfs and ands were vaine' (1578S, f. 64r-v). Is this story of the defeat of the written text the 'fit conclusion' Memory foresees in Harold's complaint for her and Inquisition's work?

Conclusion

Blenerhasset's *Second Part* exposes the openness of mid-sixteenth-century historiography to human error as well as deliberate distortion, and demonstrates that the invention which plays a large part in the reconstruction of the past is beginning to make history writing a newly troubling and contested area. Blenerhasset not only commandeers Higgins's putative project, but also questions such a project's possibility or legitimacy. It is only through a reading of the *Second Part* which analyses all three parts of the text – the

paratext, prose frame, and complaints – that this underlying skepticism about contemporary historiographical practice emerges. In this way, the text as a whole demonstrates the inherent epistemological dangers of memory, invention and appropriation in the writing of history. Yes, Blenerhasset's work further diverts the *Mirror* from the *Fall of Princes* project of which it was originally a part, but the *Second Part* actually has this in common with Baldwin's contributions. Blenerhasset's depiction of the threat inherent in fabulous history is light-hearted as well as cautionary, and follows Baldwin's lead in particular in the construction of paratextual authorial personae to critique the form in which he also participates.

Later work by Blenerhasset is less subversive and unstable, but both of his later works, the *Revelation of the True Minerva* and the *Direction for the Plantation of Ulster*, are also concerned with morally debased and corrupt communities who may be civilised,[256] as well as with the transmission of text, the physical circumstances of reading, and its limitations. In the *Revelation*, 'The truth' appears embroidered on Neptune's crown; it reads, 'The tearing tract of time hath wasted and worne out the worthie'.[257] His Elizabeth, 'a divinely wise queen whom God has elected to usher in the millenial age',[258] will restore England's 'worthie'; indeed, she comes to represent textual stability, through her association with the Gospel as 'a Queen of God's Word'.[259] But the fact remains that 'truth' resides in this powerful, textual image – what hope for textual stability if time is a 'tearing tract'? Blenerhasset's evocation of mutability here and in the *Second Part* anticipates Churchyard's complaint of Wolsey which concludes the 1587 *Mirror*,[260] as well as Spenser's final cantos of the *Faerie Queene*. He foreshadows their shifts from inexorable cycles of history to a more chaotic sense that the only certainty is

---

[256] See Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory*, pp. 155-6.
[257] Blenerhasset, *A Reuelation of the True Minerua*, sig. A4r.
[258] Shenk, *Learned Queen*, p. 92.
[259] Ibid., p. 97.
[260] See Ch. 1, above.

change. He also extends the *Mirror*'s broad Stoicism into existential nihilism, citing Democritus's recognition of life's absurdity in Cadwallader's complaint. Noting that 'Nothing but death doth bring [man] peace and quiet rest.| Yet that which bringes hym blesse, he most of all doth hate', 'He laughing aye, did mocke the madnesse of mankynde' (1578S, f. 38r).

Blenerhasset's dubious claim to a position in the *Mirror* canon, following his rejection by Higgins in the edition of 1587, was strengthened in 1610 when his *Second Part* was reprinted as part of Richard Niccols's new edition. Niccols was clearly influenced by Blenerhasset's contribution to the *Mirror* corpus, and put his complaints somewhat incongrously to work in the ruthlessly revised final collection.

Chapter Four

The Mirour for Magistrates (1587)

Nine years after Blenerhasset's *Second Part* was printed, Higgins and Henry Marshe created a monumental, compendious edition of the *First* and *Last* parts of the *Mirror*. Both parts were enlarged and revised.[1] This proved to be an enduring iteration of the form, and was probably the edition in which Shakespeare encountered the *Mirror* corpus. It was the 1587 edition which had such a transformative impact on late Elizabethan historical poetry and drama, and on the ways in which the earlier *Mirror*s were read. Instead of suppressing the texts' potential contemporary resonances as critics have argued, the 1587 edition re-engaged with the crucial political concerns of its day, taking on treason, Roman Catholicism and civil conflict, where the *First Part* had focused more closely on historical loss and British identity.

The new edition also responded to the considerable developments in English intellectual culture which had occurred since these texts' last outings in print. Higgins returned to the *Mirror* nearly ten years after Holinshed's *First Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande and Irelande* (1577) had been printed, for example, and as the second, thoroughly updated version of that text was about to go to press.[2] Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* (1579) had recalibrated the sixteenth century's relationship with Virgil and Chaucer,[3] while North's Plutarch (1579) and Camden's *Britannia* (1586) made

[1] Ch. 1, above, discusses Higgins's treatment of the *Last Part* in this edition.
[2] See Felicity Heal and Henry Summerson, 'The Genesis of the Two Editions', in Paulina Kewes, Ian W. Archer, and Felicity Heal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook to Holinshed's Chronicles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming), and W. H. Herendeen, 'Later Historians and Holinshed', ibid.
[3] Cf. William Kuskin, '"The Loadstarre of the English Language": Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* and the Construction of Modernity', *Textual Cultures,* 2, 2 (2007), 9-33.

readers conceive of Roman and Romano-British history in new ways.[4] In this chapter, the revisions and additions to the *Mirror* corpus in the 1587 edition are re-examined, to shed light on how the literary and political priorities of historical representation and transmission were changing during the troubled 1580s.

Campbell suggests that because '[b]y 1587 a good many hopeful poets were apparently writing poems in the manner of the *Mirror* tragedies', the 1587 edition was 'primarily important as an attempt to issue a definitive edition and establish a canon'.[5] She adds that the intention 'was doubtless also to fix Higgins's place as a canonical writer', and to ensure that the *Mirror* was 'regarded henceforth as one and indivisible'.[6] Campbell may very well be referring to Thomas Blenerhasset's *Second Part of the Mirror* here, which had appropriated the *Mirror*'s form and name, as well as Higgins's plan for his own 'Second Part'. Certainly, Higgins could have known Blenerhasset's supplementary text. A reference to the 'Lethian lake', for example, creeps in to the 1587 Induction; although a common enough phrase, this does echo the diction of Blenerhasset's prose frame.[7] But in addition to solidifying the *Mirror* canon, and eliminating competitors, the 1587 edition may be read as the expression of new aims for the corpus of complaints. Interrupted by Blenerhasset's attempted interpolation, Higgins's *Mirror* project seems to have changed tack.

Higgins added twenty three new and three revised complaints in 1587. Aside from his *First Part* and the three re-written complaints, Higgins included the laments of Iago, Pinnar, Stater, Rudacke, Brennus, Emerianus, Chirinnus, Varianus – these were interspersed with the complaints printed in 1575 – followed by fifteen Roman complaints.

[4] See D. R. Woolf, 'From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking About the Past, 1500-1700', in Paulina Kewes (ed.), *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 2006), 31-68, pp. 64-5.
[5] Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 9.
[6] Ibid., p. 9.
[7] See Ch. 3, above.

As shown in Chapter One, the late medieval collection was also enlarged. This vast expansion of the *Mirror*'s *dramatis personae* chimes with the need identified by Richard Helgerson to write the history of England in 'large, comprehensive and foundational works' which characterised the late sixteenth century.[8] Like the second edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles*, also printed in 1587, Higgins's *Mirror* was to fuel the explosion of interest in national history in the drama and poetry of the 1590s.

While Higgins's new *Mirror* built on the foundational narrative begun a decade earlier, his revisions and additions speak to a purpose beyond simply filling out and continuing the story. He wouldn't have been alone if that had been his intention – while his verse history of ancient Britain was unusual in the 1570s, the market was now awash with similar ventures, and perhaps for that reason his 1587 *Mirror* took on a topical edge which was lacking in the proliferating imitations, as well as from his earlier work. William Warner's *Albion's England* was first printed in 1586, and contained, in Books 3 and 4, a verse history of Britain from Brutus to the Norman Conquest, the period which Higgins and Blenerhasset's texts had covered. Instead of rhyme royal, the narrative was written in fourteener couplets, the verse form Richard Niccols would incorporate into his 1610 *Mirror,* for his Induction to the section *A Winter Nights Vision*. Additionally, Warner provided classical, mythological stories, and a brief history of Aeneas; as we will see, Higgins too increasingly embellished his British history with classical details. Meanwhile, George Whetstone's *English Mirrour* (1586) had returned to the more recent past, offering prose summaries of the reigns of Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary I, before enumerating the successes of Elizabeth's rule. A new edition of the *First* and *Last* parts of the *Mirror*, which played up its role as a wide-ranging compilation of morally educative histories, was perhaps a shrewd commercial move. The local

[8] Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1992), p. 4.

significance of the late medieval complaints was long defunct, but their interest in civil conflict and rebellion was growing ever more resonant, and Higgins drew this theme out to permeate the collection as a whole.

Revisions

As the market changed, the audience of Higgins's *Mirror*, as defined by the text itself, was also subtly shifting. Higgins's 1574-5 Induction states that the characters whose complaints he read in Baldwin's *Mirror* were of diverse social status:

> For some of these were kings of highe estate:
> And some were Dukes, and came of Regall race:
> Some Princes, Lordes and Iudges great that sate
> In councell still, decreing euery case:
> Some other Knightes, that vices did imbrace:
> Some Gentlemen: some poore that looked hie,
> Yet every one had played his tragoedye. (1574F, f. 1v)

These lines are retained in the 1587 edition, but now the terms 'Prince' and 'Princely' are inserted in five places over the 145 line Induction. The revision of phrases to contain 'Prince' recurs throughout the 1587 edition, predominantly in the Lenvoys. Some show a higher frequency of this than others; for example, the 1587 Lenvoy between the complaints of Madan and Manlius introduces four cognates of the term into a passage that is actually reduced from four stanzas to three.

These interpolations both distance Higgins's *Mirror* from its actual readership – his intended audience is not royal – and incorporates them into his nation-building narrative through the inclusiveness of the body politic. Andrew Hadfield explains that this new focus on 'princes, and by implication any of their subjects', means that '[t]he question of…how the individual governs, has been replaced by the "imaged community" of the nation'.[9] In the context of Higgins's treatment of the role of history in shaping

[9] Hadfield, *Literature, Politics and National Identity*, p. 102.

national identity, this shift is absolutely appropriate. Higgins says of the 1559-63 *Mirror* that

> Examples there for all estates you finde,
> For iudge (I say) what iustice he should vse:
> The noble man to beare a noble mynde,
> And not him selfe ambiciously abuse:
> The Gentleman vngentlenes refuse:
> The ryche, and poore: and euery one may see,
> Which way to loue and lyue in his degree. (1574F, f. 1v)

As seen in Chapter One, however, Baldwin's immediate circle of readers was actually an elite, highly educated group. Although Higgins appears to raise the social status of the audience with which his 1587 work is *concerned* by the addition of specific references to 'Princes', the readership for whom the text is *intended* is actually broadened by this change. Higgins writes into his source a general applicability which Baldwin did not have in mind. Both Schwyzer and Hadfield recognise this expansion of Higgins's audience, Hadfield being explicitly critical of it.[10] Rather than being a fault or a sign of ineptitude, however, this broader appeal and accessibility fits with the purposes of Higgins's chosen form of history writing.

Higgins and his printer Henry Marshe did little to alter the presentation of the late medieval *Mirror* material in 1587, beyond the addition of four final complaint poems, those of Sir Nicholas Burdet, James IV and the Battle of Flodden Field, and Churchyard's Cromwell.[11] Like the collection of late medieval complaints, though, Higgins's ancient British complaints and frame narrative were also subject to editorial intervention in the process of transmission, which drastically refocused the work and wrote in a new topicality. Higgins's approach to legendary history had also evidently changed, while his literary standing is much more stridently asserted.

The carefully revised paratexts of the 1587 *Mirror* proffer some incisive updates

[10] Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory*, 112; Hadfield, *Literature, Politics and National Identity*, p. 102.
[11] See Ch. 1, above.

which reconfigure the new edition. Where the *First Part*'s Dedication suggests that the text to follow 'reproued foly in those which are heedelesse: iniurie in extortioners, rashnes in venterers, and excesse, in such as suppresse not vnruly affections' (1574F, sig. *5r), for example, the 1587 version adds 'trecherie in traytours', and 'riote in rebelles' (1587, sig. Br). This revision combines a flashier rhetoric, echoing Blenerhasset's (perhaps excessive) use of alliteration, with explicit condemnation of civil disobedience – newly pertinent, in the wake of the Throckmorton and Babington Plots (1583 and 1586) against Elizabeth. Where 'Maister Baldwin hath so learnedly touched in his Epistle of the other volume of this book' on the dangers on ambition in the 1574 text, in 1587 'learnedly' is struck out, and the earlier volume is not an 'other', but the 'last' (1587, sig. Bv). Higgins's flattery of his readers, and self-deprecation, are removed. And the closing of the dedication is amended to claim that Higgins wrote the piece 'At Winceham the vii. day of December. 1586' (1587, sig. Bv). This misrepresentation of his *Mirror*'s composition (by now a familiar phenomenon) provides us with two suggestive impressions. Firstly, that it was Higgins who revised the whole text for the new edition, since an alternative editor would probably not have amended the signature of the original author; and secondly, then, that the new edition allows the text's fiction of composition to be remade. Higgins has no qualms about presenting as new a text which had first been printed a decade earlier.

The 1587 dream vision reconfigures Higgins's initial encounter with the text of the *Mirror*. In this way, both the fictional and ostensibly factual accounts of the work's origins are re-presented for this new context. In 1574, the Induction had presented an exploratory reader: he 'deemde some booke, of mourning theame was beste| To reade', and set out accordingly to find something appropriate. The 1587 reader, by contrast, has a clear agenda and the expertise to devise a suitable programme of reading. Interestingly, in

1587 he also introduces the idea that he is reading 'For conference of frende to stande in steade,| when I my faithfull frende was parted fro'; this seems to be a tantalising glimpse into Higgins's personal life, and the use to which the *Mirror* could be put, but he does not mention his absent friend again. Higgins's 1587 Induction also depicts his readers' encounter with the *Mirror*, where the 1574 edition had simply suggested that noble men 'might beware by others harme,| And eke eschue to clamer vp so hye'. Now, the speaker asserts,

> I wishe them often well to reade it than,
> And marke the causes why those Princes fell:

'Marke', here, cries out to be read as a physical as well as mental marking of the *exempla* on the page. Higgins himself takes up this practice in the 1587 edition, marking *sententiae* in the Roman complaints with marginal stars, and recalling the common-placing and excerption which underpinned collections like Higgins's revised *Flowers of Terence* (1575 and 1581).

After the opening dream vision, Higgins replaced the Inductions of his original text with newly composed Lenvoys. This alters the medieval flavour of the collection, evoking Chaucer, Lydgate and Skelton, as well as the early Tudor printer Robert Copland, a particular devotee of the device, more overtly in addition to the more obvious genetic link with Sackville. More recently, the envoy or lenvoy had come to be associated with verse tragedy and the *de casibus* form. Robert Sempill's *Tragical End and Death of the Lord Iames Regent of Scotland* (1570) had concluded with 'The Tragedies Lenvoy', while George Turbervile's contemporary *Tragicall Tales* (1587) even announced as part of the title that that author had appended a '*lenuoye to eche tale*'. Spenser and Harvey's exchange of letters printed in 1580 had also closed with an envoy, following Harvey's

parodic verse on mutability and fortune, and the immortality of virtue.[12] In the new framing passages Higgins refers repeatedly to 'mine Author'; although a common phrase, it is particularly redolent of Chaucer and Lydgate, as well as late medieval/ early Tudor chroniclers like Fabyan and Froissart, and adds an extra dimension of archaism which Higgins had not affected in the *First Part*.

In her discussion of Spenser's use of envoys in *The Shepheardes Calender*, a game-changing addition to the early modern canon which had been printed in the intervening decade, Alexandra Gillespie states that an envoy at the beginning of a text, as Chaucer positioned his, provides 'a reminder that the on-going processes of transmission, reproduction, interpretation, and preservation that comprise its trajectory are themselves constitutive of meaning'.[13] Higgins's Lenvoys act as both introductory and valedictory comments for each ghostly speaker and indeed their task is to foreground the process of transmission – within the fiction, from speaker to amanuensis, and in actuality from author to reader. Latent within this reminder of transmission is the translation and intertextual transmission of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia* from Geoffrey's fictional source to his Latin text through Wace and Layamon to Higgins and, laterally, numerous prose chronicles. As Gillespie observes, this transmission itself is 'constitutive of meaning', and the attention Higgins paid to his framing devices, evinced by their systematic revision, hints that he was alive to the implications of re-presenting historical texts and textual history.

The Lenvoys with which Higgins replaced his 1574-5 Inductions also radically reshape the ancient British collection. Where the complaints had been linked by Higgins's awestruck dreamer, uncertain of what he had heard and seen, the 1587 verse frame is

[12] Gabriel Harvey and Edmund Spenser, *Three Proper, and Wittie, Familiar Letters: Lately Passed Betvveene Tvvo Vniuersitie Men: Touching the Earthquake in Aprill Last, and Our English Refourmed Versifying* (London: H. Bynneman, 1580), p. 69.

[13] Alexandra Gillespie, 'Chaucer and Lydgate in Print: The Medieval Author and the History of the Book, 1476-1579', D. Phil Thesis (Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 2001), p. 316.

more confident and more learned. Gone are his visceral responses to the Britons' wounds, as well as no small degree of compassion. His textual frame of reference expands; after Albanact's lament,

> …I cal'd to my minde
> In historyes what I of *Troia* read,
> And what of *Brutus* I in bookes did finde
> Likewise I cast, and counted in my head. (1587, f. 9v)

As in the revised Induction, Higgins seems keen to emphasise his access to a sort of mental library, which his 1574-5 persona had not possessed. His repeated invocation of 'mine Author' also creates the (more realistic) impression that Higgins is composing his histories from a textual source, rather than recording the first-hand testimony of the figures themselves, and more attention is paid to what 'auncient authors tell' (1587, f. 60v), than what they do not. There is a far greater frequency of mythographical allusions, as well as evocations of material books. Higgins notes, for example, that the beauty which provoked Elstride's downfall also 'caused *Hercules* to slay th'O*Echalian* King,| And *Deianire* her worthy fere to bane'; the passage also incorporates a reference to the fall of Troy, and a vivid description of sirens, monsters and 'toyling tempests' (1587, f. 20v). The murder of Sabrine by Gwendoline is likened to the myths of Procne, Medea, and Agave (1587, f. 24); Bladud is compared to Icarus and Simon Magus. John E. Curran notes a similar process at work in *Locrine* (1595), where 'the matter of Troy can combine with any hackneyed story from the classics…Troy seems indistinguishable from any other mythology'.[14] However, where this raises the problem of anachronism in 'historical' drama, Higgins's verse is arguably drawing on a widely shared contemporary pool of exemplary analogues. The prevalence of this practice in the 1587 text over that of 1574 suggests a new aesthetic agenda; the only exception is the heavily allusive, annotated 1574 complaint of Porrex.

[14] Curran, 'Geoffrey of Monmouth in Renaissance Drama: Imagining Non-History', at 10.

The new Lenvoys pay more attention to the workings of fortune, too, than the old verse frame had, offering more commentary on the speakers' faults. The moral emphasis of the Dedication re-emerges here; after Humber's complaint, the Lenvoy asserts that 'true the golden mean is best' (1587, f. 11v), writing temperance back into the body of the text, where previously it had been predominantly held at a remove in the paratext. In keeping with his more forthright moral stance, Higgins's Lenvoys also reinforce specifically Christian virtue, which was not overtly brought out in the earlier version of the text. 'God' and 'Gods' had been used fairly interchangeably in the 1574-5 *Mirror*, implying no real distinction between polytheistic and monotheistic religious feeling. However, the Lenvoy following the complaint of Locrinus draws a distinction between the marriage of 'Pagan Princes' and 'christen men', suggesting that 'Iehouah' must object strongly to the breaking of 'the sacred band of holy wedlocke' now if, as the complaints show, he had in pre-Christian times (1587, f. 15r). The relative punishment of pagan and Christian transgressions is taken up again in the new Lenvoy following Stater's complaint:

> For if these Pagans proud so plagued were,
> Which tooke on them ambitiously the sway,
> Wil not th'almighties Iustice soone appeare,
> When Christian men their Christian Kinges betray? (1587, f. 48r)

Although the *First Part* had emphasised the otherness of the ancient Britons through their frightening, wild appearance, and uncertain status as dreams, ghosts or visions, their alterity was eventually subsumed in Higgins's patriotic participation in Nennius's battle.[15] The new framing narrative makes a more concerted cultural and confessional division between Higgins and his subjects. His observation that '[f]ewe seeke, by Christ, the heauenly way to wend' (1587, f. 60v) seems anachronistic in a history of ancient Britons which predates Christ's birth, and it is perhaps for this reason that Higgins refers so

[15] See Ch. 2, above.

frequently in the 1587 verse frame to Jehovah,[16] the ‘principal and personal name of God in the Old Testament’.[17]

In addition to individual lexical revisions in the ancient British collection, Higgins rewrote three of his 1574 complaints in their entirety. These were the tragedies of Bladud, Forrex and Porrex, conspicuous in the 1574 and 1575 editions because they were the only three pieces written in quatrains, rhyming ABAB in that of Bladud, and ABCB in the other two. In 1587, the complaints of Bladud and Forrex conform to the rhyme royal scheme, while Porrex takes the form of sixains, or heroic sestets.[18] This enhances the visual and metrical uniformity of the edition, while adding weight to the characters. They have more space to remark on the circumstances of their complaints’ delivery, although this varies between them; Bladud requests that ‘*Higgins* take in hand thy pen,| And write my life and fall among’st the rest’ (1587, f. 30r), while Forrex begins, ‘Complayne I may with tragiques on the stage’ (1587, f. 42r), perhaps in reference to *Gorboduc*. The narratives of these complaints do not change dramatically, but their diction is updated to echo that of the other new 1587 material.

Additions to the Ancient British Collection

The new ancient British complaints were interspersed among the existing collection, such that the historical scope of the *First Part* was not extended, but instead filled out. In 1575, the narrative concluded with the deaths of Nennius and Irenglas in 51 and 50 BC, whereas Iago (d. 612 BC), Pinnar, Stater and Rudacke (d. 441 BC), Brennus (d. 375 BC), Emerianus (d. 225 BC), Chirinnus (d. 137 BC), and Varianus (d. 136 BC),[19] take Higgins

[16] This is particularly prevalent in the Lenvoys which precede Iago and Porrex’s complaints, but is noticeable throughout.
[17] ‘Jehovah *n.*’, 1, *OED* Online. March 2013. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/100996?redirectedFrom=jehovah (accessed April 11, 2013).
[18] Campbell notes that this form is also ‘used by Shakespeare in his *Venus and Adonis*.’ Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 167.
[19] These dates are all Higgins’s own, from the 1587 edition.

back into more ancient territory. These complaints are mostly very short, and split into three distinct groups: those of Pinnar, Stater and Rudacke, who are killed together by Mulmucius Dunwallo; Dunwallo's son, Brennus's complaint, which is by far the longest,[20] and narrates his conflict with his brother Belinus before his famous downfall at Delphi; and those of Iago, Emerianus, Chirinnus and Varianus, whose falls are precipitated by their specific vices, lethargy, tyranny, drunkenness and lust. These three groups show Higgins taking on three facets of the *Mirror* tradition, as it stood in 1586: the polyvocal depiction through several complaints of a single event; the retelling of an ancient mythological narrative as true history;[21] and the denunciation of a particular vice through a single, negative *exemplum*.

The first of the groups dramatises the uprising of Pinnar of England, Stater of Scotland and Rudacke of Wales against the rightful heir, Duke Cloten of Cornwall. Each of the three emphasises the foolishness of ambition, particularly for usurpers and traitors, but they theorise different phases of rebellion. Stater's complaint argues that, while he was a 'stout' king of his own nation, 'Intruders' are 'vntrusty the Realme for to guide' (1587, f. 47r), so the country is unsafe under an illegitimate ruler. Pinnar notes that the reign of rebels cannot last, and will inevitably be overthrown (1587, f. 46v). Finally, Rudacke establishes the circumstances in which rebellions occur. Following the deaths of Forrex and Porrex, he says, '*Britayne* was restlesse, wanting a Kyng'. Without a clear-cut successor,

> The land many peeres ambitious did wring,
> Endeuouring each the kingdome to gayne.
> The heires good apparent forsake it were fayne,
> The subiects were armed, wee nobles did striue,

[20] Higgins follows Stow in this regard, who devotes considerably more space to Brennus than his other ancient figures; see John Stow, *The Chronicles of England from Brute Vnto This Present Yeare of Christ. 1580* (London: Henry Bynneman for Ralph Newberie, 1580).

[21] Although Higgins's Brennus invokes 'Bochas', his narrative excises Lydgate's references to Diana, Minerva and Apollo. Cf. Curran, *Roman Invasions*, p. 140.

At length we amongst vs deuision contriue. (1587, f. 48v)

The local significance of a nation potentially divided by ambitious nobles in the absence of an heir apparent must have been felt by Higgins's readers, as hopes of Elizabeth's marriage vanished and she refused to name her choice of inheritor. Was Higgins's decision to revisit an older period of British history motivated by this topicality, which had not been so resonant in 1574?

Around the new complaints, Higgins's expanded verse frame re-engages with questions of the transmission of history. The narrator assesses the tragedies in terms which reflect the presence of the *First* and *Last* parts of the *Mirror* side by side in the 1587 volume. The Lenvoy following Pinnar's complaint, for example, returns to the 1559-63 *Mirror*s' consideration of poetic decorum in the prose frame. For the most part, Higgins's dreaming persona describes the process of listening and recording, but here, as in Baldwin's narrative of composition, he notes that,

Thus though vnorderly his tale hee tell,
As was his raygne: yet orderly it standes.
Euen such decorum deckes the person well,
Who in his life decorum due abandes.
No fyner fyled phrase could scape my handes,
When I began for him to penne the same:
Let *Pinnar* then receive thereof the blame. (1587, f. 47r)

A disorderly reign leads to a disorderly tale, as Michael Joseph's verse had been uncouth, and Richard III's unpleasant. The following complaint, too, is 'vnstatelike stammer[ed] out' by Stater, in 'staylesse staggering footed verse' – in his case Higgins urges us not to blame him, or Scotland, his country of origin (1587, f. 47r). Equivalence seems to take on renewed significance for Higgins in this edition (although Humber the Hun had been 'hungry' in 1574), and might explain one of his more consistent revisions: four out of the five uses of the adjectives 'brute' and 'brutish' are expunged in the new text. His Britons

are no longer 'brutish', as though his reinvigorated awareness of lexical equivalences precluded the use of the term in what was intended as a patriotic history.

The delivery of the ghostly complaints is also updated for a new context. Hillman observes that '[t]he *Mirror*'s use of dramatic monologue is explicitly and insistently linked with the commonplace figuration of the world as a stage'.[22] This link far more pronounced in Higgins's additions, as numerous Lenvoys and the characters themselves refer to 'taking the stage' when it is their turn to speak. Instead of the defined fictive setting of Baldwin's poets-at-work, Higgins's *Mirror* presents the reader with a fragmented series of locations – a stage, the dreamer's chamber, the printer's shop, a battlefield – which have more in common with the labile imaginative space of early modern theatre than his source material. The significance of the trope is made explicit, too, by Thomas Newton's prefatory poem to the 1587 *Mirror* in which he states,

> Certes this worlde a Stage may well bee calde,
> Whereon is playde the parte of eu'ry wight.

The rest of the stanza repeatedly invokes the metaphor, extending its meaning from a mere proverb or commonplace to encompass ideas of authorship, authority, tragedy and identity. Newton claims that

> Some, now aloft, anon with malice galde
> Are from high state brought into dismall plight.
> Like counters are they, which now stand in sight
> For thousand or ten thousand, and anone
> Remooued, stande perhaps for lesse then one.

The notion of characters 'from high state brought into dismall plight' provides a basic definition of tragedy, recalling but moving away from the medieval wheel of fortune *topos*. The simile of 'counters', though, complicates the stage metaphor, which usually does not incorporate a recognition of authorship or authorial control. The counters are assigned values without which they become worthless, and implicit in Newton's image is

[22] Hillman, *Self-Speaking*, p. 83.

the suggestion that identity and authority, like dramatic roles and numerical values, can be exchanged and re-assigned.

Higgins himself is quick to assign judgements in the 1587 Lenvoys, where the 1574-5 verse frame had taken a more compassionate stance. The Lenvoy following Emerianus's complaint comprises only one stanza, because 'I must but briefly these vnworthy tutch' (1587, f. 63v), and he dismisses Varianus, saying 'What should I longer on such Princes stay,| Whose factes vnworthie were to be enrolde' (1587, f. 66r). This pose of unwillingness to offer a Lenvoy for negative *exempla*, and perpetuate their fame textually, echoes Lydgate's *Fall*. Book VII decries the intemperance of a series of Roman emperors, and 'In stede of a Lenvoye' for Nero, for example, Lydgate suggests,

> To rede the processe no man should haue ioye,
> For al concludeth of murdre and of treason,
> On aduoutry excesse and poyson,
> Riot, gluttony, lechery, vengeaunce,
> Slaughter of him selfe ended with mischau*n*ce
>
> If that I myght I wolde race his name
> Out of this boke that no man should it rede,
> His vicious lyfe chefe myrrour of diffame,
> Set hym asyde let no wyght take hede
> For to remember so many a cruell dede,
> Saue onely thys to thinke in substaunce
> Howe euery tiraunt endeth in mischaunce.[23]

Soon afterwards, in Higgins's *Mirror*, we hear from Nero himself.

Higgins's Roman Complaints

Most striking in the 1587 edition was Higgins's new collection of Roman tragedies. A far cry from contemporary reflections on the ruined remains of antiquity, like Spenser's *Ruines of Time* (1591), which followed the lead of the *First Part* in their desire to access

[23] Boccaccio, *Fall of Princes*, f. 157v.

lost records,[24] these complaints appropriate Roman history from contemporary accounts. They were *not* linked together by a prose or verse framing narrative,[25] and also diverted Higgins's historical account away from Britain, a move to which Higgins had explicitly objected in the original address 'To the Reader' in 1574. The 1587 version of this paratext, now called 'A Preface to the Reader', removed Higgins's claim that chronicles neglected British history, and

> …are faine in steede of other stuffe to talke of the *Romaines*, *Greekes*, *Persians*, *&c*. and to fill our Historyes with their facts & fables. This I speake not to the end I would haue ours quite separate from other without any mention of them, but I would haue them ther onelye named wher th'affayres of both countryes by warre, peace, truce, mariage, trafique or some necessary cause or other is intermixed. (1574F, sig. *5v)

Higgins's comments on the absence of historical records are also removed – perhaps in response to the publication of Holinshed's *Chronicle* (1577), and Stow's *Chronicles of England from Brute* (1580) since the *First Part* was printed. Why had Higgins changed his mind about foreign histories, and why choose partially to integrate this new collection of Roman 'facts & fables' in 1587? Indeed, Higgins's Caesar anticipates the reader's surprise, 'Why I a *Romayne* Prince, no *Britayne*, here| Amongst these *Britayne* Princes now appeere' (1587, f. 77v).

Unlike the heavily annotated Dedication, Higgins does not annotate his Roman complaints beyond marginal acknowledgement of what he cites as 'Flores' in the complaint of Claudius Tiberius Nero.[26] Suppressed within their history, however, is a body of classical learning; Douglas Bush reconstructs a web of scholarship beneath Higgins's 'classical lives', which reveals a depth of research unprecedented in Higgins's

---

[24] See Bart Van Es, *Spenser's Forms of History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), Ch. 1; also Andrew Escobedo, 'The Tudor Search for Arthur and the Poetics of Historical Loss', *Exemplaria,* 14, 1 (2002), 127-65.

[25] The Roman complaints were connected to the previous material by a verse link, but not linked to each other.

[26] See Cox Jensen, 'Reading Florus'.

ancient British complaints, derived from more easily accessible vernacular sources.[27] Interest in Roman history was to flourish in the 1590s and 1600s, as Henry Savile's translation of Tacitus's *Historiae* and *Agricola* (1591) prompted a marked increase in English translations.[28] Romans were also about to become popular subjects in imaginative literature, as Elizabethan court culture 'was being transformed through the influence of classical models emphasising political treachery and a moral corruption associated with luxury and cultural sophistication'.[29] Richard Niccols's revision and expansion of the 1587 collection in 1610, which included the Roman complaints in full, could be read as politically motivated in the midst of oppositional Jacobean Neostoicism, and the context of Ben Jonson's *Sejanus His Fall* (1605) and *Catiline His Conspiracy* (1611). However, as his ancient British focus in 1574 had, Higgins's Roman series anticipated this surge in popularity, at a time when translations of Latin historiography 'were few and far between'.[30]

Higgins included the complaints of Caius Julius Caesar, Claudius Tiberius Nero, Caius Caesar Caligula, Guiderius, Laelius Hamo, Claudius Tiberius Drusus, Domitius Nero, Sergius Galba, Silvius Otho, Aulus Vitellius, Londricus, Severus, Fulgentius, Geta, and Aurelius Antonius Bassianus Caracalla. This covers the period from just after 100 BC to AD 217. It is of course notable that Higgins chose to recount stories from this central period in the history of Roman rule, rather than a foundational narrative to parallel the story of Brutus, such as Aeneas's foundation of Lavinium, or Romulus and Remus's foundation of Rome. Contrary to Curran's suggestion that 'the essence of the Brute myth

[27] Douglas Bush, 'Classical Lives in *The Mirror for Magistrates*', *Studies in Philology,* 22, 2 (1925), 256-66. It is interesting to note that the only complaint in Higgins's collection augmented by printed marginalia is the 1574-5 version of 'Porrex': this complaint is replaced in 1587, and its marginalia excised. Reasons for this are worth further investigation. It may be that 'Porrex' was composed with a view to separate publication, although there is no other evidence of this.
[28] See Kewes, 'Politics of Roman History', especially at 518-19.
[29] Malcolm Smuts, 'Court-Centred Politics and the Uses of Roman Historians, *c*. 1590-1630', in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds.), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), 21-44, p. 30.
[30] Kewes, 'Politics of Roman History', at 518.

was…that Britain had emerged *while* Rome was emerging…mirroring Rome was what it was *about*',[31] Higgins redirected his focus to more reliably recorded territory in a comparatively recent period. Sackville had pre-empted Higgins's incorporation of Roman history into the *Mirror*'s *de casibus* schema in the manuscript of his Complaint of Buckingham, where Buckingham's claim that 'whan fortune frownd the feller made my fall' is followed by the note,

> *so felle Iulius*
> *so fell Nero*
> *And so furth.*[32]

Sackville may have taken his lead from Lydgate's translation of Boccaccio's Roman tragedies.[33] But the period was familiar in the 1580s not so much from imaginative literature or verse history – Lydgate's history of Caesar, *The Serpent of Division*, which was reprinted in 1559 and 1590, was his only foray into prose – as from the limited selection of Roman historical works translated into English at the time. These show a noticeable bias towards the years Higgins selected. Thomas Paynell's translation of *The Conspiracie of Catiline* (1557) and Arthur Golding's *Eyght bookes of Caius Iulius Caesar conteyning his martiall exploytes in the realme of Gallia* (1565) treated the early part of this date range, while Richard Rainolde's *Chronicle of all the Noble Emperours of the Romaines*, printed by Thomas Marshe in 1571, also placed heavy emphasis on Caesar.

Bush's painstaking study of Higgins's sources for the Roman complaints reveals that the majority of his material derives from Herodian, Suetonius and Plutarch.[34] Higgins was a translator as well as a vernacular poet, and Bush concludes that his Roman complaints rely substantially on Suetonius, whose *Historie of Twelue Caesars* was not translated until Philemon Holland's version of 1606. However, *The History of Herodian*

---

[31] Curran, *Roman Invasions*, p. 88.
[32] Hearsey (ed.), *The Complaint of Henry, Duke of Buckingham*, p. 88.
[33] As seen in Ch. 1, above, we know that Sackville read Wayland's 1554 edition of the *Fall*.
[34] Bush, 'Classical Lives', at 266.

(1556), translated by Nicholas Smyth, the 1578 edition of Appian's *Auncient Historie and Exquisite Chronicle of the Romanes Warres*, and Thomas North's *Liues of the Noble Grecians and Romanes* (1579), translated from Amyot's French Plutarch, form the intellectual and commercial backdrop to Higgins's choice of characters. Moreover, while Edward Hellowes's translation of Antonio de Guevara's *Chronicle, Conteyning the Liues of Tenne Emperours of Rome* (1577) did not touch on the Romans included in Higgins's collection, the author's Prologue makes clear, following Plutarch, that the *Chronicle* should be read as advice and warning to princes.[35] Certainly, figures such as Caesar, Nero and Caligula would be appealing to read about for Higgins's contemporaries, either because of their historical significance in Caesar's case, or the salacious contents of their stories. Additionally, though, it is impossible to ignore the topical resonance the period of Roman civil conflict – the fall of the republic and the establishment of imperial rule – had in the final years of Elizabeth's reign.[36]

Bush shows that only one of the Roman complaints is indebted to Plutarch's *Lives* as a source.[37] As a model, though, this text looms large in the series, not to mention in Higgins's new exemplary histories. Angus Vine has called Drayton's *Piers Gaveston* (1593-4), 'written in the style of the *Mirror for Magistrates*', the opposite of Plutarch's exemplary lives.[38] However, Higgins's Romans bridge this opposition, giving full autobiographical accounts in cases such as Caesar's, and offering occasional positive *exempla*. Indeed, in 1607, John Harington likened the *Mirror* to exemplary works by Suetonius and Plutarch,

[35] Specifically Emperor Charles V, to whom Guevara's work was originally dedicated. See Antonio De Guevara, *A Chronicle, Conteyning the Liues of Tenne Emperours of Rome*, trans. Edward Hellowes (London: Henry Middleton for Ralph Newberie, 1577), pp. 1-11.
[36] See Freyja Cox Jensen, *Reading the Roman Republic in Early Modern England* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2012), pp. 2-3.
[37] Bush, 'Classical Lives', at 266.
[38] Angus Vine, *In Defiance of Time* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 176.

> Neither onely haue men of good deserts bene praised for their vertues, but also the wicked haue bene blazed for their faults…In both which kinds, diuerse haue employed their pennes, both in former ages and now of late, to the great good and delight of the studious reader. Witnesse *Plutarks* liues called his Paralels, comparing the notable men of Rome and Greece: *Suetonius* booke of the twelue *Caesars*…And of our owne countrie and in our owne language, the Mirrour of Magistrates, in which the life and fall of many great persons is very well set downe, and in a good verse.[39]

Was Higgins inspired particularly by North's 1579 edition? Early in his complaint, Caius Julius Caesar asks his amanuensis, 'What neede I more of these…recyte,| Sith *Plutarch* hath at large describde it all to thee' (1587, f. 78r). There is a tension here between the parallels between Plutarch's *Lives* and the *Mirror*'s ostensible function – Penry Williams notes that 'Plutarch and others were devoured by the political classes as handbooks of conduct'[40] – and the awkward contrast with Higgins's ancient Britons, whose lives (they claimed) had not been described at all. By opening his Roman sequence with Caesar's complaint, ('Although by *Bocas* I haue whilom told my mind,| And *Lydgate* haue likewise translated wel the same', 1587, f. 67[i.e.77]r), Higgins signals that a very different phase in his verse chronicle has begun.

In amongst his Latin scholarship, it is also possible to discern Higgins's allusion to another source. Higgins's diction and choice of analogies in the Roman complaints seems to be influenced by Blenerhasset's *Second Part*: in Londricus's tragedy, for example, Higgins uses the example of 'a countrey Clowne' to make the same point about inherent qualities as Blenerhasset in Carassus's story. Carassus claims,

> From Cart to Court, a Countrye man to call,
> With braue attyre to decke a dunghyll Dycke,
> Is lyke a painted Image in a wall,
> Which dooth deceiue, and seemeth to bee quicke,
> Through woorkmanship most trimly dooth it tricke,
> Yet of a stone, a stone wyll still remayne:
> A Clowne cannot from Clownish deedes refrayne. (1578S, f. 14v)

[39] Lodovico Ariosto, *Orlando Furioso in English Heroical Verse*, trans. John Harington (London: Richard Field, for Iohn Norton and Simon Waterson, 1607), 'The Life of Ariosto Briefly and Compendiously Gathered out of Sundrie Italian Writers', p. 414 (wrongly paginated 114).

[40] Penry Williams, *The Later Tudors: England 1547-1603* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p. 421.

Higgins's complaint also combines the clown with reference to a deceptive painted image:[41]

> …though a countrey Clowne doe keepe a stately porte,
> And in expenses great, and idle charge is rife:
> Although he brauely builde his house, and proudly paint his wife,
> Yet he is but a Clowne, and makes (in deede) himselfe a scorne:
> Full hard it is to make such one a gentill borne (1587, f. 95v)

While the 'country clown' is a common enough trope in itself, it cannot be mere coincidence that Higgins uses the same set of images, for the same purpose, in Londricus the Pict's complaint, as Blenerhasset does in the complaint of Carassus, the 'Husbandsmans sonne' who Blenerhasset claims 'slew Lodricke the King of the Pictes'.[42] Silvius Otho's complaint also echoes Blenerhasset's Carassus in his use of the proverb, 'Like will to like', while the 'hatefull hellish hagge' in the new complaint of Forrex recalls Edricus's 'hellish hagges of *Limbo Lake*'. Higgins's reading of 'Carassus' in particular provides further insight into the *Mirror* corpus's complex and self-referential transmission history, which the 1587 edition embodied.

Thomas Newton's commendatory poem which opens the 1587 collection forges a significant link between Higgins's work and the intellectual culture in which the earlier *Mirror*s were composed. Furthermore, it evinces the new relationship of the 1587 *Mirror* with contemporary uses of and engagement with history in imaginative literature. Newton was, as seen in Chapter One, particularly notable for his involvement in the Elizabethan translation and transmission of Senecan tragedy. He had compiled the celebrated edition of the *Tenne Tragedies* (1581) as a part of what Winston identifies as the second phase of

[41] The phrase 'painted country clown' is used to make the same point in 'Plain Jane Country' (1972), by Eddy Raven for Roy Orbison, which suggests that while unusual in early modern printed works, the use of the pair of images in this context was possibly a commonplace of the ballad tradition, on which Higgins and Blenerhasset do very occassionally draw (see Ch. 3, above).
[42] Higgins's Londricus, in accordance with Fabyan, is killed by Marius.

Seneca's reception in sixteenth-century England.[43] Newton had not been involved with Baldwin's *Mirror*; but the Inns of Court circle engaged in the early Elizabethan translation of Seneca's plays and the composition of new Senecan tragedy was heavily influenced by the text. Winston highlights the *Mirror*'s relevance to a culture interested in 'participating in the political life of the state' allowing authors and readers 'to think through, and comment upon, contemporary political questions'.[44] Newton's endorsement of the 1587 *Mirror* underscores its significance to this intellectual culture, and creates a further personal connection between Higgins's work and the original editions. But Newton's involvement also enriches the relation of Higgins's additions to his hypotext. As well as his extensive work as a translator, Newton had adapted *A View of Valyaunce, Describing the Famous Feates, and Martiall Exploites of the Two Most Mightie Nations, the Romains and the Carthaginians* (1580), an abridgement of Appian's *Iberikê*.[45] In this text, he posed as a captain under Scipio, and claimed that the *View*, a 'Monument of great antiquitie', had been 'happilye founde' in Italy and translated by an unnamed friend.[46] His use of this authorial fiction, in which he takes on the persona of a Roman in order to legitimate a fictive textual record, hints at Newton's occupation of a suggestive common ground between Baldwin's exploration of textual instability and Higgins's new interests.

The complaints themselves offer further links back to the 1559-63 texts, or rather forward, to these texts as they were reprinted in the 1587 edition. Higgins's Caligula, for example, recalls Collingbourne's execution for treason, when he suggests that after his death,

---

[43] Jessica Winston, 'Seneca in Early Elizabethan England', *Renaissance Quarterly,* 59, (2006), 29-58 at 30.
[44] Ibid., at 41.
[45] See Gordon Braden, 'Newton, Thomas (1544/5–1607)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20069, accessed 8 Sept 2012].
[46] Thomas Newton, *A View of Valyaunce, Describing the Famous Feates, and Martiall Exploites of the Two Most Mightie Nations, the Romains and the Carthaginians, for the Conquest and Possession of Spayne. Translated out of an Auncient Recorde of Antiquitie, Written by Rutilius Rufus, a Romaine Gentleman, and a Capitaine of Charge Vnder Scipio, in the Same Warres.* (London: Thomas East, 1580), 'To the Reader', sig. A4r.

The worthy writers may their workes set out,
They neede no longer feare theyr foule decay. (1587, f. 86v)

When Sergius Galba asks, ‘who may wordes or actions donne reuoke?| The stayne abides’ (1587, f. 93), he reworks Lord Hastings’s observation that ‘[f]orth irreturnable flyeth the spoken word’, reinterpreting the earlier *Mirror*s’ anxieties about speech and reputation.

While they are not in danger of being forgotten, loss of fortune and identity is also contingent on textuality for Higgins’s Roman characters, in the renegotiation of sources and documentation. In the 1587 edition, for example, Claudius Tiberius Nero quotes Pontius Pilate’s letter to him, and begins the narrative of his downfall by recalling his reading of it. Although some of the Roman figures are confident in their textual records – Severus, for example, announces that ‘Poets pennes perpetuate my prowes, facts and fame’ (1587, f. 97r) – others destabilise this confidence. Geta acknowledges that his own story might not be trustworthy, since he speaks for himself (1587, f. 100v), and implicitly questions the reader’s faith in all of the previous accounts. Caius Julius Caesar feels that the ‘worthy fame’ he deserves is not complete without Higgins’s written record in spite of ‘Bocas’ and Lydgate’s retellings, and the fact that

No noble authour writes that can forget the same:
My prayse I know in print through all the worlde is blowne,
Ther’s no man scarce that writes, but he recytes my fame. (1587, f. 86r)

The internal rhyme of ‘write’ and ‘recyte’ emphasises the susceptibility of writing to repetition (through printing, translation or reading aloud), and its consequent instability. Whenever a text is re-cited, it is recontextualised and made vulnerable to new interpretation.

Higgins’s collection of Roman complaints is entangled in the broader political potential of the 1587 edition. After the more blandly historical 1574-5 editions, 1587 saw Higgins reassert the *Mirror*’s potential contemporary relevance. He was not the only one

to imbue his verse with retroactive allegorical weight. Higgins's *First Part* of the *Mirror* might not have set out to hint at specific topical resonances in the stories of his fallen leaders, but the strength of the *Mirror* tradition's popularity, and the entrenchment of its accompanying interpretative practices, meant that reflections of contemporary figures were read back into the work. In his extravagant tract in praise of the sailor, Henry Haslop suggested that Sir Francis Drake, who had returned from looting and sacking towns in the West Indies in 1586 before 'cingeing…the King of Spaines beard' in the raid on Cadiz in 1587,[47] was 'now knowne to be no lesse fortunate then the prowdest *Romaine* whose honour *Plutarch* reports to the full'. Having compared Drake to Caesar, Haslop then posits a skewed analogy between the pirate Drake, who had acquired a recent haul by ransoming then burning Spanish Cartagena on the northern coast of Colombia, and Higgins's Nennius, who had defended Britain against Caesar's invading forces. He notes,

> The Author of that mirror of Tragedies touching *Brittish* princes, amongst others bringeth in *Ninius*, complaining that his honours were forgotten, and left vnwritten, and discoursing his life sets down how his death was only by offe*n*ding *Caesar* and defending his countrie, making his *Catastrophe* mightily to perswade other to the like honor. Then let not this seruant of our *Cassibilane* rest without his reward, but register his deedes, write his honours in golde, and praye for his successe…[H]e hath not freed his countrie, yet he defendeth it, by wounding the enimie, and breaking his speare: and in al his actions obserue but his order, and then can you not but confesse it is full of honour.[48]

In serving Elizabeth I, 'our Cassibilane',[49] Drake plays the part of Nennius in defending the nation against the Roman, or here 'Romish', threat. Higgins's 1587 *Mirror*, with its complaints of Britons and Romans side by side, gives voice to the contradictions which Haslop breezes past in his extraction of contemporary local analogies from ancient invasions.

---

[47] Francis Bacon, *Considerations Touching a Warre with Spaine* (London, 1629), p. 26.

[48] Henry Haslop, *Newes out of the Coast of Spaine the True Report of the Honourable Seruice for England, Perfourmed by Sir Frauncis Drake in the Moneths of Aprill and May Last Past, 1587* (London: W. How for Henry Haslop, 1587), sig. A3v.

[49] Cassivellanus, the Briton who led the defence against Caesar's second invasion (54 BC).

1586 was a particularly fraught year in Elizabeth's reign, as anxieties heightened regarding the succession, foreign invasion, and the threat posed by Mary Stuart in relation to both. Higgins's edition engaged with these concerns at a local, narratological level, as individual occurrences in the new complaints resonated with contemporary events, while more generally, the material added offered an ever more intense depiction of the competition between Britain and Rome.[50] Julius Caesar's complaint equivocates, reporting confidently that the Britons are 'noble' and 'valiant', and using the same epithet, 'stout', to describe both Romans and Britons, but concluding that ultimately,

> …I wanne to *Rome* eternall fame,
> Though he [the Earl of London] in *Britayne* beare for aye a shrowding sheete of shame. (1587, f. 81r)

Higgins's Roman sequence dramatised the most difficult period of British history for sixteenth-century historians. They wanted to cement their cultural inheritance from esteemed ancient cultures, in particular the Roman, and seamlessly appropriate the mantle of imperial success. However, at the same time, they wished to acknowledge their Britishness, and suppress the violence and barbarism on both sides which could be revealed by delving too deeply into the origins of Roman rule in Britain. This tension between alterity and familiarity is played out in Higgins's representation of his characters' language: Julius Caesar is 'halfe in doubte| In the'nglish tongue what he were best to say' (1587, f. 66v), while Silvius Otho's one Latin phrase misquotes a commonplace from Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*,[51] with which readers would have been conversant.

The intersection of British and Roman history was beginning to have additional significance as a result of the threat of invasion by Catholic Spain in the late 1580s. Higgins does not try to portray the ancient Romans as Catholics throughout his history.

[50] Cf. Curran, *Roman Invasions*, p. 140.
[51] Book II, line 13: 'Nec minor est virtus, quam quaerere, parta tueri'. Higgins has 'non minor est virtus quam querer parta tueri', 1587, f. 94r.

The reference, however, to 'curious artes of sprites to finde| Who should procure in th'end my fatall fall' in the complaint of Aurelius Antonius Bassianus Caracalla writes the language of superstition which characterised contemporary representations of Catholic beliefs into the speech of the Roman invaders.

Caracalla is perhaps the least attractive figure encountered in Higgins's Roman complaint collection. Incestuous and brutal, his complaint, which ends Higgins's section of the 1587 *Mirror* without any form of concluding framework, leaves the reader with a picture of reprehensible political dissembling, to rival the once-topical medieval figures which follow. Caracalla "quotes" in full his own speech, delivered to the Senate to protest the necessity of the fratricide he had committed (1587, f. 105r-v). He cites the murder of family members by Romulus, Germanicus, Titus, and Marcus, arguing that their actions were justified, since '[t]o take reuenge on such, is due: as custome telles of yore'. This invokes the traditional educative use of classical *exempla*,[52] in a metatextual nod to the *Mirror*'s own form, as well as to the work historical figures were co-opted to do in contemporary political tracts. But Caracalla's transparent motives undermine the moral, humanist associations of this practice, and muddy residual faith in ancient Rome's virtuous example with their evocation of Tacitean political intrigue.

The additions in 1587 suggest new engagement with topical concerns about empire and national identity defined against external, hostile forces. But they also build on the theme of internal conflict set up by the earlier *Mirror* editions. The complaints of Cordila and Morgan, for example, and those of Forrex and Porrex which immediately follow, work as a group to elucidate the dangers of uncertain succession and divided dynasties. Higgins reappropriates the subject matter of *Gorboduc* from his fellow *Mirror* contributors, and reinvigorates its contemporary pertinence.

---

[52] Cf. Cox Jensen, *Reading the Roman Republic*, pp. 7-8.

Fratricide and Civil War

In 1586, Higgins replaced the complaints of Forrex and Porrex with revised versions, and added the new tragedy of Geta, all of whom were murdered by family members (Forrex and Geta by their brothers, Porrex by his mother). These complaints, and those which refer back to them, might have carried particular topical resonance for some readers in anticipation of the execution of Mary Stuart at Elizabeth I's command, as well as Mary's supporters' attempts on Elizabeth's life during the 1580s, and the ideological problem posed by the threatened murder of one monarch by another. Higgins signs his revised Dedication the 7th December, 1586, just a month before Mary Stuart's execution on January 8th, 1587. The theme of fratricide which pervades the 1587 additions responds to this possibility, while familial disputes are frequently extrapolated into national civil conflict.

The 1574 tragedy of Morgan arguably hints at Mary's imprisonment, when Morgan, Gonerell's son, describes himself as a 'traytour', and 'caytife vile', because he has 'constrainde a Queene' (1574F, f. 56r): his aunt, Cordila. This unease with the legitimacy of Mary's punishment clearly carries over into the 1587 compilation; the Lenvoy which follows Cordila's complaint rewrites the old Induction to place renewed emphasis on a queen's imprisonment by her blood relatives. In 1574, Higgins's narrator notes that,

> Hir nephewes dealings were me thought to bad:
> Which greude me much, but Morpheus bad let bee,
> And therewithal presented one to mee. (1574F, f. 54v)

In 1587, though, this passage appears substantially extended, and its language is revised to make a sharper topical point:

> Her sisters dealings were (mee thought) to bad.
> Her cosens cruell both, for Kingdomes mad.
> Her owne estate most pityfull to see,
> A Queene by kindred captiue kepte to bee.

> So wise a Queene, so fayre a Princesse wrongde,
> So dutifull in parents plight of yore:
> By rebells vile her cousens to bee throngde,
> Such hatred hir ambitiously that bore.
> Who euer saw such cruelty before?
> *Cordilaes* state most pitifull to see,
> By kindred cloce in prison kepte to bee. (1587, f. 38v)

The replacement of 'nephewes' with 'sisters' and 'cosens' draws a much closer link between Cordila's story and the conflict between Elizabeth and Mary. The new reference to her dutiful behaviour 'in parents plight of yore' could conceivably allude to Mary's early accession, following her father's death in 1542 when she was six days old. Although Higgins's consternation over the threat to a queen could cut either way in the debate, with support for Elizabeth being a more likely reading, this particular passage which objects to the imprisonment of a female monarch seems to speak to Mary's, rather than Elizabeth's plight.

The new Lenvoy which introduces the 1587 tragedy of Bladud begins, 'Marke but the end of brother quellers all,| And you shall see what woefull ends they had' (1587, f. 29v). Porrex's new complaint in particular features a catalogue of historical and mythic fratricides, the warning that 'killers of their brothers, frends, and kinne,| In like degree well nigh of treason stoode', and the advice,

> Example take you Princes of the land,
> Beware of discord, shun ambitious pride:
> By right take yee the scepter in your hand,
> Let not your sword with soueraignes bloud be dide. (1587, f. 45r)

This sort of warning to modern princes, and the emphasis on Porrex's punishment being deserved, is not to be found in the 1574-5 editions. Readers of these complaints in 1587 must have been alert to the parallels with the turn contemporary political events could take; Higgins's text here warns both Elizabeth and Mary against the ambition which might lead to the murder of a royal family member. But the fratricides depicted, often

committed for reasons of self-defence, also justify Mary's putative execution following the many failed assassination attempts on Elizabeth with which she was involved.

While the topical resonance of Higgins's new complaints cannot be ignored, especially with hindsight, fratricide featured prominently in the longer history of imaginative engagements with tyrannicide and regicide. The earlier editions of the *Mirror* did not make so much of the theme as Higgins's verse frame does, although of course it was an ingredient in the late medieval struggle for the English throne. The third book of Lydgate's *Fall*, though, concludes with an Envoy on 'fraternal strife', which follows the story of Artaxerxes, Cyrus and Darius. Lydgate describes how 'deuision of all mischefe maistresse,| Gan enter in through fraternall hatrede',[53] exemplifying the way in which conflict between brothers can stand metaphorically for broader civil discord as well as providing a literal cause. The envoy concludes with a stanza which asks,

> Noble princes lift vp your eyen clere,
> And consider by great auisenes
> The wofull stryues, the odious fell dangere,
> Sowen in kinredes of wilfull straungenes:
> Of all rancoure your courage do redresse,
> Peysying the mischeues folowyng in dede,
> Of bloude vnkinde borne of one kynrede.[54]

Higgins is seen again deploying allusions to Lydgate which resonate with his *Mirror*'s new context, re-integrating aspects of both the first *Mirror* and its hypotext into his additions.

The complaint of Manlius, another of Higgins's 1574 tragedies which engages with fratricide, has its two climactic stanzas removed, and replaced by one much less vivid stanza. Manlius and his brother decide in the 1574 edition that one must be defeated by the other to eliminate competition in order for the reign to 'be sure and good':

> Wherfore as eache did watche conuenient time,

[53] Boccaccio, *Fall of Princes*, f. 92r.
[54] Ibid., f. 92r.

For to commit this haynous bloudy facte:
My selfe was taken not accusde of crime,
As if I had offendid any acte.
But he as one that witte and reason lacte,
Said traitour vile thou arte to me vntrue:
And therewithal his bloudy blade he drewe.

Not like a king, but like a cutthrote fell:
Not like a brother, like a butcher brute:
Though twere no worse, then I deserued well:
He gaue no time, to reason or dispute.
To late it was, to make for life my suite:
Take traytour here (quoth he) thy whole deserte,
And therwithall he thrust me to the harte. (1574F, f. 35v-36r)

The alliteration and repetition in these stanzas may strike the modern reader as overdone, but the narrative is undeniably gripping. The 1587 stanza into which these two were conflated is far calmer (although its syntax is outrageously skewed):

At last a time of parle appointed was,
And true concluded for our titles right:
Wherein I hoped might bee brought to passe
That I enjoy in peace my kingdome might.
But secretly by pollecy and sleight
Hee slewe mee with his swoord, before I wist:
Where crowne, peace, Kingdome life and all I mist. (1587, f. 27r)

This revision connotes court intrigue and concealment in contrast to the overt violence of the original stanzas, rendering the passage, as with many of Higgins's lexical alterations, more engaged with a late Elizabethan atmosphere of courtly corruption, plotting, and conspiracy. The final line of the new stanza also connects the ruler and the nature of government more closely with the nation, where the original verses had struck a more personal note, and the act of fratricide precluded kingship: 'Not like a king, but like a cutthrote fell'. The personal culpability of Manlius is also gone from the 1587 stanza. Newton's prefatory poem claims that

…thinges forepast are presidents to us
Whereby wee may thinges present now discusse.

While Higgins's *First Parte* and 1587 additions do not respond to political events in the

incendiary detail that the suppressed *Memorial* did, the suggestion that the 1574-5 and 1587 editions are entirely immune to topical application is clearly inaccurate.

Conclusion

In the 1587 edition, Higgins uses the Romano-British conflict, and the fall of the Roman republic, as sites for the exploration of national identity, imperial expansion, and political vice. Together in print for the first time, the *Mirror* corpus is reframed as an exemplary echo chamber, where parallels and paradigms reverberate between dynasties. Higgins's revisions rework the *First Part* to create a more assertive and stable compilation, in keeping with the 1587 *Mirror*'s status as the definitive version of these tragedies. But a new engagement with the *Last Part* of the *Mirror* qualifies the verse frame's assurance, and the Romans' swagger, constantly writing doubt and uncertainty back into the ways we are told to interpret speech. Rather than lost ancient records, these complaints are often concerned with misleading textual representations. The collection aims in part to close these alternatives down, proffering an imperious but easily extracted moral, of the kind which Abraham Fleming also wrote into the 1587 edition of Holinshed,[55] and which Robert Albott obligingly excerpted under moral themes in *Englands Parnassus* (1600).[56] But the vast collection's polyvocality cannot be suppressed, and repeatedly reminds the reader of historiographical contradictions and the contingencies of transmission.

Higgins is remarkably important, then, to the *Mirror*'s later influence. But his edition of 1587 did not provide the whole story of the *Mirror*'s expansion, and Richard Niccols's alternative iteration of this story in 1610 demonstrates that not all of Higgins's

[55] See Archer, 'Holinshed and the Middle Ages', and Felicity Heal and Henry Summerson, 'The Genesis of the Two Editions', ibid.

[56] Robert Greene also supports his denunciation of 'harlots', 'Whereof Maister Huggins hath well written in his Myrror of Magistrates', with an excerpt from the complaint of Mempricius; see Robert Greene, *A Disputation, Betweene a Hee Conny-Catcher, and a Shee Conny-Catcher Whether a Theefe or a Whoore, Is Most Hurtfull in Cousonage, to the Common-Wealth* (London: A. Ieffes for T. Gubbin, 1592), 'Epistle', sig. A2v.

readers were fooled by his bold statement of control. Niccols re-interpolated Blenerhasset's complaints, and reverted to what he thought was the original plan for the *Mirror*'s arrangement. But he carried forward the topicality of Higgins's re-politicized compendium, encouraging readers to see reflected in the *Mirror* the vices and virtues of a new regime.

Chapter Five

A Broken Mirror? Richard Niccols's *Mirror for Magistrates* (1610)

The final edition of the *Mirror for Magistrates* was printed in 1610, twenty three years after its immediate predecessor.[1] That the *Mirror* was still considered a viable commercial venture after such an interval serves as testament to the popularity of the expanding collection. As shown in Chapter One, Niccols's edition radically altered the *Mirror*'s engagement with the complications of textual transmission by removing the prose and verse links between complaints. His revisions, too, write uncertainty out of their presentation of historical records. In doing so, Niccols appropriates the *Mirror* and remakes it, suppressing qualms about transmission the better to support his own oppositional project. This final fiction again foregrounds the materiality of the book, and the potent political agency of a volatile textual past.

The 1610 edition comprises Baldwin and his co-authors' medieval complaints, most of Higgins and Blenerhasset's ancient British and Anglo-Saxon material, and the Roman characters Higgins included in his 1587 volume. As well as adding several paratextual pieces explaining his approach to the existing collections, Niccols provided ten new complaints prefaced by a dream narrative. This material, called *A Winter Nights Vision*, is set apart from the rest of the collection. In the new extended dream vision which echoes Higgins and Sackville's *Mirror* Inductions, Niccols's narrator wanders dejectedly through an allegorical winter landscape. When he returns home, unable to sleep, he reads his copy of the *Mirror*,[2] and Lady Memory appears ('[w]hether...some dreame it only was...Or vision sent Ile not discusse', (1610, p. 558)) to ask for his

[1] While Niccols's work was reissued later as *The Falles of Vnfortunate Princes*, this was the last edition called the *Mirror*.
[2] Presumably the 1587 edition.

assistance as amanuensis. Niccols concludes the collection with a retrospective panegyric, *England's Eliza*, also set up as a dream vision, in which the speaker recounts the highpoints of Elizabethan military history.[3] Niccols's collection was reissued twice in 1619 and twice in 1620 with new frontispieces under the title *The Falles of Vnfortunate Princes*; since Niccols is thought to have died in 1616, it is unlikely that this final act of rebranding was his idea.[4]

Richard Niccols was probably born in London in 1583/4. He studied at Oxford from 1602 to 1606, and was evidently proud of his degree, signing his name 'R. N. Oxon'. He had sailed with the earl of Nottingham as part of Robert Devereux, the earl of Essex's Cadiz expedition in 1596,[5] and this formative experience seems to have directed much of his later work, as his association with the Essex faction continues through the influence of Spenser on his pastoral and satirical writing,[6] Sidney and Fulke Greville on his politics,[7] and the circle which gravitated towards Prince Henry on his aesthetic and ethical values.[8] Niccols's poetry, and particularly the introductory passages, contains frequent autobiographical allusions to experiences, familiar locations and other texts; references to the Thames which echo Spenserian chorography, for example, also carry personal significance for Niccols, educated at Oxford and living in London. While, when read in isolation, Niccols's edition of the *Mirror* can appear a rather bland and old

[3] This verse history mistaken for Thomas Heywood's prose account *Englands Elizabeth* (1631) in Stephen Orgel, 'Margins of Truth', in Andrew Murphy (ed.), *The Renaissance Text: Theory, Editing, Textuality* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 91-107, p. 96, and Orgel, 'Marginal Maternity', p. 267.
[4] According to their frontispieces, these texts of *The Falles of Vnfortunate Princes* were printed by Felix Kyngston once for Thomas Adams and once for William Apsley in both 1619 and 1620 (also in 1621). They contain reissued pages of Niccols's 1610 *Mirror*. See Human, 'House of *Mirrors*'.
[5] See Andrew Hadfield, 'Niccols, Richard (1583/4–1616)',*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20082, accessed 8 Sept 2012].
[6] Cf. O'Callaghan, *The "Shepheards Nation"*.
[7] See Elizabeth A. Spiller, 'The Counsel of Fulke Greville: Transforming the Jacobean "Nourish Father" through Sidney's "Nursing Father"', *Studies in Philology,* 97, 4 (2000), 433-53 and Lisa Richardson, 'Elizabeth in Arcadia: Fulke Greville and John Hayward's Construction of Elizabeth, 1610-12', in Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (eds.), *The Myth of Elizabeth* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 99-119.
[8] See Roy Strong, *Henry Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Pimlico, 1986) and Timothy Wilks (ed.), *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England* (Southampton: Southampton Solent University and Paul Holberton Publishing, 2007).

fashioned publication amid the vibrant literary culture of the 1600s, Niccols's other works create a very suggestive matrix within which the *Mirror* takes on new significance. His three laments for recently deceased figures, *Expicedium: a Funeral Oration, upon the Death of the Late Deceased Princesse of Famous Memorye, Elizabeth* (1603), *The Three Sisters Teares, Shed at the Late Solemne Funerals of the Royall Deceased Henry* (1613), and *Monodia, or, Walthams Complaint* (1615), for Lady Honor Hay, the wife of James Hay, earl of Carlisle, all utilise memorial forms for a political purpose. More overtly oppositional are *The Cuckow* (1607), a pastoral satire, and the beast allegory *The Beggars Ape* (1627), thought to have been composed in the early 1600s, but too incendiary to be printed in Niccols's lifetime. *London's Artillery* (1616) perpetuated his advocacy of armed peace, calling for a city militia, and extended his equation in *A Winter Nights Vision* of the 'current decline of the nation into a peaceful inertia…with the fall of Republican Rome'.[9] *Sir Thomas Ouerburies Vision* (1616) makes the connection between ghost complaint and court satire explicit, adapting the *Mirror*'s form to denounce favouritism and corruption among James I's advisers, and once again drawing on imagery which evoked the fall of the Roman republic. The figure of Philomel reappears throughout Niccols's oeuvre, standing for that which is abused, unwanted or cast out, but potentially salvaged by a redemptive Elizabethan aesthetic.[10]

Niccols's was the last of the many permutations of the *Mirror for Magistrates*. His preface 'To the reader' which precedes *A Winter Nights Vision* describes how he encountered the *Mirror*'s 'imperfect historie' and purposed to extend it. But,

> being called away by other employments, I must of force leaue it either vnto those, whose good opinion of so worthie an historie, may induce their endeuors towards perfecting of the same, or vntil I shal find occasion hereafter to continue that, now almost finished, which I haue left vnaccomplished.
> (1610, 'To the Reader')

[9] Cf. O'Callaghan, *The "Shepheards Nation"*, p. 71.
[10] As an Ovidian figure, Philomel also contributes to Niccols's engagement with the politics of Roman imperial poetics.

Like Higgins and Blenerhasset, Niccols seized the opportunity presented by the 'imperfect' *Mirror*, and like all the contributors he left it prematurely, having been called away by other commitments. However, his invitation to others to perpetuate the text's expansion was not taken up.

As we have seen, during the six decades across which it was expanded and edited, the *Mirror*'s focus and function shifted in line with aesthetic taste and editorial preference. Its reflection on the processes of appropriation and adaptation by which textual histories are transmitted was complicated by its own transmission history. Niccols's edition of 1610 is important because it re-presents the *Mirror* as what it had come to signify: a fundamentally Elizabethan monument of national history. From a twentieth-century perspective, this appeared to flatten the text's intricate development, but by contextualising its publication, we can see how Niccols mobilised something of a literary white elephant to create a powerful oppositional symbol.

Critical Reception

Niccols's *Mirror* material is reproduced in Joseph Haslewood's 1815 edition, but has not been republished or edited in full since the nineteenth century.[11] Lily B. Campbell omits his complaints from *Parts Added to the* Mirror for Magistrates (1946) despite having chosen to edit Higgins and Blenerhasset's work, a decision which appears fairly arbitrary given the equally shady critical reputation of all three authors. Campbell does, however, add to the body of negative commentary on Niccols's treatment of the sixteenth-century *Mirror* texts. She endorses W. F. Trench's view that 'the text of every tragedy is mutilated' in Niccols's edition, and states that the 'the disintegration of the

[11] Haslewood's edition of the *Mirror* was reproduced in facsimile in 2010 as part of the Nabu Public Domain Reprints series, but as such these texts feature no additional editorial input.

Mirror...culminated in the work of Niccols'.[12] Likewise, G. D. Willcock describes the 1610 edition as 'botchery', while Haslewood's introduction asserts that Niccols took an 'unwarrantable liberty' with his predecessors' work.[13]

Like the late Elizabethan additions to the *Mirror*, Niccols's writing has received little critical attention. Even so, what there is varies dramatically in its assessment of him. His principal detractor is Paul Budra: in keeping with his *de casibus* narrative of aesthetic and ideological decline, Budra declares that 'Niccols finally broke the *Mirror*',[14] a criticism which will be explored throughout this chapter. Budra's principal basis for this accusation is that Niccols 'retreated into myth, Stuart propaganda, and Tudor nostalgia'.[15] His work is 'sentimental', 'banal' and 'sycophantic': 'in this last edition of the *Mirror*, then, the voices of intellectual engagement, of historiography, are...silenced'.[16] Campbell also compares Niccols's *Mirror* unfavourably to Baldwin's: she claims that, '[t]he original purpose of the *Mirror* was now disregarded, its usefulness as a political mirror for magistrates apparently forgotten'.[17]

Glyn Pursglove, though, suggests that Niccols's *Mirror* 'could reasonably be argued to be the most coherent, and certainly the fullest, of all versions', and James Davies grudgingly admits that Niccols's 'own personal contributions have a higher poetic value than those of the preceding writers, exclusive of Sackville'.[18] Michelle O'Callaghan's is the most substantial reading of *A Winter Nights Vision* to date, but

---

[12] Trench, *A Mirror for Magistrates: Its Origin and Influence*, p. 131, cited in Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 10; ibid., p. 13.
[13] Willcock, 'Parts Added to the Mirror for Magistrates [Review]', at 104; Haslewood (ed.), *Mirror for Magistrates*, 1, p. xxx.
[14] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 38.
[15] Ibid., p. 28.
[16] Ibid., p. 28; p. 32; p. 37.
[17] Campbell (ed.), *Parts Added*, p. 11.
[18] Pursglove (ed.), *Selected Poems*, p. 16; James Davies, '"A Myrroure for Magistrates." Considered with Special Reference to the Sources of Sackville's Contributions', (University of Leipzig, 1906), p. 17.

essentially treats Niccols's text independently of its *Mirror* context.[19] Pursglove edited a selection of Niccols's poems in 1992 which includes some *Mirror* material. His introduction read Niccols's work as political for the first time, in line with a spate of publications on the interrelation of early seventeenth-century literature, historiography and politics by, for example, D. R. Woolf and Linda Levy Peck, in the early 1990s.[20] Pursglove's edition did little to stimulate further critical commentary on Niccols's work, though, beyond interest in his treatment of the Overbury scandal of 1616. The complaints in *A Winter Nights Vision* can advance views which are unattractive to modern readers – he can be sexist, xenophobic, and jingoistic – but this is no reason to exclude his work from the *Mirror* canon, or to ignore what it tells us about the *Mirror*'s interaction with Jacobean literary culture.

At issue, then, are Niccols's treatment of the text as a whole, his politics, and the question of how he engages with the processes and flaws of early modern historiography. A new study of Niccols's *Winter Nights Vision* as a part of the *Mirror* and in the context of its expansion reveals a complex combination of aims at work. The oppositional political stance posited by Pursglove and O'Callaghan represents one facet of Niccols's nationalism, which is also manifested in his appropriation of Virgilian epic tropes, and his revisionist Protestant historiography. Niccols's contribution reflects back on existing *Mirror* texts, carefully reworking generic features to advance his cause. The complaint of King Arthur, for example, provides a metatextual *Mirror* in microcosm, as Arthur himself

[19] Michelle O'Callaghan, 'Dreaming the Dead: Ghosts and History in the Early Seventeenth Century', in Katharine Hodgkin, Michelle O'Callaghan, and S. J. Wiseman (eds.), *Reading the Early Modern Dream: The Terrors of the Night* (New York and London: Routledge, 2008), especially pp. 88-9.

[20] In particular, D. R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology and 'the Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1990), Linda Levy Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London: Routledge, 1990), Linda Levy Peck (ed.), *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), David Lindley, *The Trials of Frances Howard: Fact and Fiction at the Court of King James* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), Rowland Wymer, 'Jacobean Pageant or Elizabethan Fin De Siecle? The Political Context of Early Seventeenth-Century Tragedy', in James Hogg (ed.), *Jacobean Drama as Social Criticism* (Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Jacobean Drama Studies; Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995), 45-58.

experiences a dream vision, witnesses the 'tragick fall' of Mordred (1610, p. 583), and calls Gawin 'a mirror of true constancie'. In the Induction, Niccols draws on aspects which Higgins and Blenerhasset introduced to Baldwin's *Mirror*, conflating Higgins's dream narrative with Blenerhasset's figure of Memory, to create what is arguably a coherent synthesis of *Mirror* work to date. The complaints as a group encapsulate the Elizabethan *Mirror*s' interests, bringing together negative and positive *exempla*, unfortunate and deserving falls, conquest and civil discord, providence and mutability. Budra is scathing about *A Winter Nights Vision*, describing Niccols's dream frame as 'a doggerel introductory device' that 'attempts' to imitate Sackville's 1563 Induction.[21] But this chapter will show that Niccols's aesthetic choices are significant precisely because of their retrospective nature.

The 1610 *Mirror* in Context

The impact of the *Mirror for Magistrates* on sixteenth-century literature becomes evident when we note the extent to which Niccols's Jacobean additions drew on writing which had itself been inspired by earlier editions. In this respect Niccols should have been perfectly placed to re-launch the Elizabethan *Mirror*, in a literary culture and fuelled by the same ancient British, Anglo-Saxon and medieval narratives. Schwyzer notes, too, that '[r]enewed interest in the *Mirror* had perhaps been sparked by the unionist campaign [in Ulster], in which specters of Britain figured very prominently',[22] while the ghostly pageants in Anthony Munday's early seventeenth-century Lord Mayor's shows were about to forge further links between civic responsibility and reanimated historical figures.[23]

---

[21] Budra, *De Casibus*, pp. 34-5.
[22] Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory*, p. 156.
[23] See Daryl W. Palmer, 'Metropolitan Resurrection in Anthony Munday's Lord Mayor's Shows', *SEL,* 46, 2 (Spring 2006), 371-87.

The complaint, whether in the pastoral mode or modelled on Ovid's *Heroides*, flourished during the last decades of the sixteenth century.[24] The *Mirror*'s influence on this form, aside from marked generic proximity, is evident in 1590s title such as Thomas Lodge's *Tragicall Complaynt of Elstred*, annexed to *Phillis: Honoured with Pastorall Sonnets, Elegies, and Amorous Delights* (1593), following the complaint of Elstride printed in Higgins's 1574-5 and 1587 *Mirror* texts. Anthony Chute's *Shores Wife* was also printed in 1593, the same year as the publication of an extended version of Churchyard's complaint of Jane Shore from the 1563 *Mirror*, while Giles Fletcher's complaint of Richard III, again printed in 1593, was another *de casibus* verse history to revisit *Mirror* material. Drayton's *Englands Heroicall Epistles* (1597) 'englishes' Ovid's *Heroides* using characters also treated in early *Mirror* collections, most notably the pair of epistles between Duke Humphrey of Gloucester and Dame Eleanor Cobham. Meanwhile, *Penelopes Complaint: or, A Mirror for Wanton Minions* (1596) by Peter Colse demonstrates the broader association of complaint poetry with the mirror *topos* in a translation adapted from Homer's *Odyssey.*

The complaint form continued to be a popular medium for the retelling of historical or mythical narratives in the early seventeenth century. The subjects had always been conclusively dead by the time of their complaint's composition whether they were based on real or fictional characters, and were frequently the victims of tragic circumstances. But at the turn of the century these subjects began to be depicted more specifically as ghosts. Niccols's *Mirror* was the first edition to refer explicitly to the speakers of the complaints as such: for example, introducing the 'princes in the tower', Edward V and Richard Duke of York, Memory asks,

> The truth of which that we may heere partake,
> Their princely ghosts let Fame from sleepe awake. (1610, p. 735)

[24] See Jellerson, 'Spectral Historiopoetics', at 57.

Memory makes clear in the argument before every complaint that she is calling on the historical figure's ghost, and in this respect Niccols may be seen to keep pace with recent developments by updating the *Mirror*'s complaint form.[25] However, the proliferation of individual ghost narratives replaced the *Mirror*'s anthology-like structure which had fitted so well among Elizabethan compendia and miscellanies. Complaints such as Christopher Brooke's *Ghost of Richard the Third* (1614), the anonymous translation of *The Duke of Mayennes Ghost speaking to the Princes, Lords, and Gentlemen of France* (1622), Thomas Scott's imitative *Robert Earle of Essex his Ghost, sent from Elizian to the Nobility, Gentry, and Communaltie of England* (1624) and Scott's *Sir Walter Raleighs Ghost, or England's Forewarner* (1626) demonstrate the way in which this genre emerged as a new mode of advice literature and political commentary from the *Mirror* tradition.

The use of prosopopoeia to distance authors from potentially seditious utterances made the ghost complaint and dream vision, 'already near neighbours',[26] natural allies of the satirists who rushed to appropriate the Martin Marprelate persona's irreverent style in the final decades of the sixteenth century,[27] and by 1610 literary ghosts frequently carried satirical or oppositional weight.[28] Michelle O'Callaghan locates the rise of ghost complaint in the early part of James I's reign 'when the ghosts of the Elizabethan dead returned to lament the demise of a political ethos'.[29] O'Callaghan claims that 'early Jacobean-Elizabethan ghosts provided writers with emotionally charged and politically freighted figure that, in turn, gave new urgency to the dream-vision poem, and

[25] Blenerhasset's Edricus uses the term to describe himself, and Harolde suggests that the 'guilty ghost' of a (living) sinner will regret his past actions, but both of these instances take 'ghost' to mean 'spirit' or 'soul' more generally, rather than the spirit of a dead person returning to walk the earth.
[26] O'Callaghan, 'Dreaming the Dead', p. 88.
[27] See Joseph L. Black, *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: A Modernized and Annotated Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), Introduction.
[28] See Sandra Clark, *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers: Popular Moralistic Pamphlets, 1580-1640* (London: Athlone Press, 1983).
[29] O'Callaghan, 'Dreaming the Dead', p. 82.

foregrounded its proximity to the complaint'.[30] This in turn demonstrates the way in which Niccols's *Mirror* project may be read as a coherent and perceptive synthesis of the existing *Mirror* material with contemporary literary trends as well as political concerns. The ghost complaint, its engagement with the past, and more broadly the theme of endings (for example, the ending of the year in *A Winter Nights Vision*) allow Niccols to comment obliquely on the present. Budra claims that by 'drawing a line between then and now, Niccols finally broke the *Mirror*',[31] but it is possible to argue conversely that in doing so he resurrected shades of the political function Baldwin originally envisaged. However, Niccols's *Mirror* may have been outstripped by the vogue for single-character publications, and his work might have been better received had he split the *Winter Nights Vision* into ten separate complaints.

Between 1578 and 1610, distinctions between imaginative literature and historiography were becoming further solidified.[32] John Selden's skeptical annotations to Michael Drayton's verse chorography *Poly-Olbion* (1612) paradoxically demonstrate the separation of history from historical poetry by juxtaposing the differing disciplines.[33] However, Niccols's text still hovers over the dividing line, and he maintains the moral educative stance which Baldwin and Higgins had adopted.

While Higgins and Blenerhasset's contributions reflect the changing historiographical and literary tastes, Niccols's edition, begun just four years after James I's accession to the English throne, belongs to a fundamentally different era. In this respect, it echoes the re-presentation of the *Memorial* in 1559-63 in the context of, and partially as a response to, a new political and legal environment. The landscape of history writing in the early seventeenth century was very different to the intellectual culture in

[30] Ibid., p. 82. Cf. Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory*, p. 156.
[31] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 38.
[32] Cf. Worden, 'Historians and Poets'; see Jellerson, 'Spectral Historiopoetics', at 59-60.
[33] See Anne Lake Prescott, 'Marginal Discourse: Drayton's Muse and Selden's "Story"', *Studies in Philology,* 88, 3 (Summer 1991), 307-28.

which the *Mirror* had first morphed into a primarily historical text, although the periodic expansion of Warner's *Albion's England* throughout the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries offers continuity. If we read Niccols's edition as an extension of the 1587 *Mirror* which maintains the spirit and purpose of that publication, it might seem anachronistic, though not unique. Higgins's additional 1574-5 complaints had attempted to compensate for the absence of ancient sources for British history, while his compendious 1587 edition had shifted the emphasis of Baldwin's topical, allegorical work, engaging with contemporary politics while also providing his new readership with memorable, easily digested highlights from chronicle history. In the 1600s, though, this was no longer a priority for readers. Whether moving in the direction of chorography or politic biography, military, economic or natural history, interest in the past had become more specialized, and left the broad sweep of chronicle history behind.[34] Warner and Niccols's Jacobean accounts of the Elizabethan period illustrate a move away from generalized social memory to personal recollection, in keeping with the emergence of evidence-based historiography, and autobiography. While the *Mirror* tradition had played a significant role in the rise of autobiography in the period,[35] its collection of short, imaginative lives and use of *prosopopoeia* quickly became outmoded in favour of real memoirs. The history play and historical tragedies on ancient British subjects such as the anonymous *No-body and Some-body* (1606), Shakespeare's *King Lear* (1608) and, later, Middleton's *Hengist, King of Kent* (1616-20), had all but supplanted verse retellings of chronicle narratives, so the *Mirror*'s function in that regard was also usurped, while Samuel Daniel was abandoning verse history and *Mirror*-inspired complaints for prose.[36] The British foundational story was relocated from the fall of Troy to the Creation in

[34] See Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, especially on Camden and Selden.
[35] See Meredith Anne Skura, '*A Mirror for Magistrates* and the Beginnings of English Autobiography', *English Literary Renaissance,* 36, 1 (2006), 26-56.
[36] See Bart Van Es, 'Michael Drayton, Literary History and Historians in Verse', *The Review of English Studies,* 59, 239 (2007), 255-67, at 268.

editions of work by Richard Grafton, Anthony Munday, Samuel Purchas, and even in Thomas Heywood's *Troia Britanica* (1609). Parallel foreign and international histories also proliferated. The idea of tracing exclusively English history down from its ancient British origins suddenly became problematic following the Scottish James's accession, and the prospect of the union, or reunion, of England and Wales with Scotland.[37] Niccols's *Mirror* might well appear out of date and antiquated in this context. It was the only historical work with the term 'chronicle' in its title (apart from summaries of Froissart and Stow's older histories) printed between 1595 and 1610; the others are for the most part dramatic, and the use of the term reflects their recourse to chronicle histories as sources for individual stories, rather than the reproduction of sweeping catalogues.[38]

The 1610 edition may keep pace with the historical poetry of Daniel and Drayton: *England's Eliza*, for example, includes marginal citations of chronicle source material, anticipating Selden's annotations in *Poly-Olbion* (1612). However, the rigorous recording of national history is not the primary focus of Niccols's *Mirror* work, which perhaps partly explains why the *Mirror*'s new incarnation was sidelined as historiographical methods became increasingly the subject of contemporary critical scrutiny.

A Winter Nights Vision does, though, demonstrate that Niccols took some steps to update the *Mirror* and bring its appearance and focus in line with modern verse and prose history writing. For example, Niccols included a woodcut of each historical figure after his 'argument' and before their complaint. Budra interprets this move as further evidence of Niccols's debasement of the *Mirror* form, claiming that it shows how 'the

---

[37] Cf., for example, Mary Floyd-Wilson, 'Delving to the Root: *Cymbeline*, Scotland, and the English Race', in David J. Baker and Willy Maley (eds.), *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 101-15. The political dimension of Niccols's response to the putative union with Scotland will be discussed further below.

[38] See D. R. Woolf, 'Genre into Artefact: The Decline of the English Chronicle in the Sixteenth Century', *Sixteenth Century Journal,* 19, (1988), 321-54 and Woolf, 'From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking About the Past, 1500-1700'.

entertainment value of the *de casibus* form was heightened in a bid for wider acceptance'.[39] But in the late sixteenth century Thomas Talbot's *Booke Containing the True Portraiture of the Countenances and Attires of the Kings of England, from William Conqueror, vnto our Soueraigne Lady Queene Elizabeth* (1597) collected woodcuts of monarchs for their antiquarian interest. The same technique is adopted by John Clapham in *The historie of Great Britannie* (1606), where woodcuts of Roman coins depict the rulers whose reigns he describes in his prose history, while John Speed's prose *History of Great Britaine* (1611) uses images of coins and a limited number of whole figures to illustrate British history from the Roman conquest to James's reign.[40] John Taylor's *A Briefe Remembrance of all the English Monarchs* (1618) also provides woodcuts of the twenty five figures included.

So Niccols's text might actually be seen to reflect, if not emulate, some contemporary historiographical trends. Taylor's work is closest in structure and genre to *A Winter Nights Vision*, as each illustration is followed by a sonnet in the voice of the relevant monarch.[41] Woolf's discussion of the prose histories of Britain printed during James I's reign also demonstrates that while methodologies were evolving in the more capable, innovative hands of writers such as Camden, Bacon and Selden, much early Stuart historical writing was based on the model of 'a series of regnal narratives'; aside from John Taylor's verse collection, the prose histories of John Clapham, John Speed, and William Martyn's *The Historie, and Lives, of the Kings of England* (1615) share this structure with the *Mirror*.[42]

---

[39] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 37.
[40] John Cunnally explores the contribution of coin illustrations 'to the moral education of the Elizabethans' in Cunnally, *Images of the Illustrious: The Numismatic Presence in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), pp.121-2. The close association of illustrated emblem books and coin books with moral instruction provides further generic justification for the woodcuts in Niccols's *Mirror*, and certainly brings to life the role of historical narrative in moral education.
[41] Except for James I and Prince Charles's sonnets – as both were still alive they did not provide appropriate material for ghost complaints.
[42] Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, pp. 69-74.

The historiographical remit of Niccols's edition is complicated by the implications of a putative union with Scotland following James VI's accession to the English throne. The political significance of Niccols's treatment of Scotland will be addressed below. But perhaps the task of Niccols's *Mirror* should have been to adapt the tradition to the new demands of British, rather than English, dynastic regnal history. Instead, Niccols's approach to Scottish history increased in hostility compared to that of previous editions. Furthermore, while Holinshed and his co-authors had expanded the scope of English historiography by including the corporate history of the British Isles in their *Chronicles*,[43] Niccols's *Mirror* effectively shut down the potential for expansion and even narrowed his *Mirror*'s focus from ancient Britain to England specifically. In this way the 1610 *Mirror* as a whole reflects a tension explored by Andrew Escobedo 'between a sense of a British nation, awkwardly heterogeneous but linked to antiquity, and an English nation, potentially pure but severed from tradition', as the vast array of existing British *Mirror* complaints by previous authors are funneled into the narrower national focus of *England's Eliza*.[44] Niccols's Prince Edward addresses the nation, 'O England', and suggests that in some way he might 'reclaime thee,| By sounding former euils in thine eare' (1610, p. 746).

The 'matter of Britain' was therefore central to the early seventeenth-century engagement with the national past, as well as to the imaginative literature created around and for James I's accession.[45] Higgins's treatment of ancient British history in his *First Part* of the *Mirror* was partially behind the proliferation of drama on this subject towards the end of the sixteenth century, which multiplied further as the political valency of

[43] See Paulina Kewes, Ian W. Archer, and Felicity Heal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook to Holinshed's Chronicles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).
[44] Andrew Escobedo, 'From Britannia to England: *Cymbeline* and the Beginning of Nations', *Shakespeare Quarterly,* 59, 1 (Spring 2008), 60-87, at 63.
[45] For example, Anthony Munday's pageant for the Merchant Taylors, *The Triumphes of Re-United Britannia* (1605).

'Britain' shifted from the exploration of the current dynasty's putative Welsh origins to a figure for the new united kingdom.[46] While Higgins's contribution to the *Mirror* which traced ancient British history from the arrival of Brutus may have been showing its age historiographically, as antiquarians and historians grew ever more skeptical about the Galfridian legend, Brutus's lineage still had plenty of cultural capital.[47] Where George Salteren offered a reasoned take on the problem ('ALthough concerning the Historie of *Brutus,* there may bee some reasons to doubt which learned men haue gathered, yet,…if there were no such *Brit,* yet why the whole Historie of Britaine Princes should for the fabulous interposition of one or two men be reiected, as some haue done?'),[48] the Welsh antiquary George Owen's *Genealogy of the High and Mighty Monarch, Iames* (1604) confidently went ahead in tracing James descent *via* Brutus from Noah. However, Niccols's single portrayal of the British past, in his complaint of Arthur, evaded the potential topical significance of his British identity, and instead focused on his pugnacious imperial expansion. This too, of course, had its parallels in contemporary engagement with the Roman invasion of Britain, and its implications for modern English imperial ambitions. Schwyzer has argued that 'the Jacobean *Mirror* was even more overtly nationalistic, and more British in tone than its late Elizabethan precursors'.[49] But in fact Niccols's nationalism turned away from the British towards English history. He could have rewritten the complaint of Cadwallader, which Blenerhasset had diverted away from its potential Welsh/Tudor resonance to provide a satire of contemporary clergy, to capitalise on its new topical pertinence. In *A Prophecie of Cadwallader, Last*

[46] See in particular the Scot John Gordon's enthusiastic use of this putative union to promote the 'ancient', or Protestant, religion, in *A Panegyrique of Congratulation for the Concord of the Realmes of Great Britaine* (1603); *England and Scotlands Happinesse in Being Reduced to Vnitie of Religion* (1604); *Enotikon or A Sermon of the Vnion of Great Brittannie, in Antiquitie of Language, Name, Religion, and Kingdome* (1604); and *The Vnion of Great Britaine*, (1604).
[47] See John Kerrigan, *Archipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics 1603-1707* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 115-16.
[48] George Salteren, *Of the Ancient Lawes of Great Britaine* (London: Edward Allde for John Jaggard, 1605), sig. G3v.
[49] Schwyzer, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory*, p. 156.

King of the Britaines (1604), for example, 'William Harbert of Glamorgan rejoiced that James had fulfilled to perfection the angel's ancient promise to Cadwaladr'.[50] But Niccols actually played down the ancient British content of his own *Mirror* collection.

Niccols's *Mirror* also appeared to have closed off the complaint history, even while he sought to extend it, in a number of different ways. Apart from anything else, the addition of *England's Eliza* brought the collection's chronological scope up to the very recent past, rendering it essentially closed off to later contributions (although Niccols himself did not see his text as complete). While the whole *Mirror* tradition right from its Marian inception is fundamentally appropriative, Niccols did more than the other authors and editors to tie his work to the *Mirror*'s own Elizabethan history. The *Mirror* therefore effectively reflected back on itself to a much greater degree in the seventeenth century than before, creating a sense of exclusivity, in contrast with the inclusive ethos of Baldwin's collaborative model and Higgins's broader readership. The change of title in 1619 to *The Falles of Vnfortvnate Princes* took the text back to its original function as an extension of Lydgate's *Falls of Princes*. Apart from creating a circular compositional history, and writing out the space for further additions, this removed the commercially successful and much-imitated 'mirror' trope – if Kyngston, Adams and Apsley wanted to rebrand the text for reissue, they made a mistake in suppressing what was both a conspicuously Elizabethan characteristic, and its main selling point.[51]

So its historical content and method offer some clues as to why the 1610 *Mirror* concluded the tradition. Niccols seems to have relied on popular, well known material rather than new scholarship, comprehensive historical coverage, or novel perspectives or techniques to boost his text's marketability. However, Niccols's innovations, such as his addition of woodcuts, show that he made attempts to update or rebrand the collection in

[50] Ibid., p. 152.
[51] For more on the immense sixteenth-century popularity of the 'mirror' as a title motif, see Grabes, *The Mutable Glass: Mirror-Imagery in Titles and Texts of the Middle Ages and English Renaissance*.

line with Jacobean trends. Though ultimately unsuccessful, Niccols's appropriation and adaptation of the *Mirror* form for a new context may be read as a strategic ideological decision that back-fired, rather than merely a misjudged marketing ploy.

Revisions

O'Callaghan and Curtis Perry have analysed the extent to which the dawn of Stuart rule also heralded a new literary age.[52] It is possible to overstate the contrast between the character of late sixteenth-century and early seventeenth-century literary culture, and since current trends in early modern scholarship highlight the previously suppressed continuity between medieval and Renaissance,[53] it would be as well to remember the pitfalls of overzealous periodization here too. However, Niccols's work clearly engages with Elizabethan tropes from the perspective of a new regime. We saw in Chapter One, above, the kinds of changes that Niccols made to the body of early *Mirror* material in his 1610 edition, and the precedent within the *Mirror* tradition for editorial revision of that sort. It is possible to read Niccols's *Mirror* not as a corruption of the original texts, but, rather, as the final expression of a literary tradition which was characterised by revisions in response to changed circumstances.

Although they have earned him critical notoriety, the most heavy-handed revisions Niccols undertakes are metrical, and usually do neaten the complaints' scansion. He clearly aims to unify the collection by making as many complaints as possible conform to the rhyme royal scheme. In Higgins's complaints of Londricus and Severus, for example, this entails cutting a whole line from each stanza, with mixed results as far as the fluency of the narrative is concerned. Niccols's individual lexical revisions generally also improve the scansion to this specification.

---

[52] See O'Callaghan, *The "Shepheards Nation"*; Curtis Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
[53] See, for example, Cooper, *Shakespeare and the Medieval World* and Cummings and Simpson (eds.), *Cultural Reformations*.

Where the sense of Higgins's complaints is changed in the course of Niccols's revisions, it often pertains to questions of transmission, either of texts – oral or written – or of reputation. 'Fame' and 'shame' are central to the way in which Niccols conceptualises divine as well as worldly reward and punishment. Higgins's Caracalla claims that, following his dissembling speech, 'My brother's householde then I made a way a pace' (1587, f. 105v), but in Niccols's version he admits 'My brother's house and fame I did deface' (1610, p. 180), drawing attention to the lasting impact of his words. But where he acknowledges the tendency of spoken rumour and report to manipulate the truth, Niccols's revisions reveal his discomfort with the uncertain transmission of ancient narratives, and the equivocation of characters about factual details. Higgins's Nennius is unsure of his own history, and the revisions go about stabilising his account. Nennius had flagged up historiographical discrepancies, suggesting that although his father reigned less than a year according to some authorities,

> Hee raygned forty yeares, as other tell,
> Which seemes (as tis) a tale more true by farre. (1587, f. 67r)

But Niccols excises altogether the stanza which claims that some historical accounts lie, and replaces the lines above to claim,

> Hee raygned forty yeares, as stories tell,
> And fame did beare his name both wide and far. (1610, p. 116)

Bladud's historical uncertainty is also suppressed; 'some say' is removed from his account of the baths at Bath. Niccols's Caesar no longer allows the listener to adjudicate between versions of his story; 'take the viewe| Thou maist by talke of those which erst me knewe' (1587, f. 78r) becomes 'write the truth' (1610, p. 130).

Niccols makes remarkably few editorial alterations to Blenerhasset's complaints, even where the verse form strays from his aesthetic ideal. As seen in Chapter Three, though, Blenerhasset's tragedies depend in large part on the paratexts and prose frame for

their significance, so the effect of the collection is fundamentally changed by their excision. And while Niccols cut Blenerhasset's complaint of Alurede, he interpolated a long passage, of seven stanzas, into that of Uter Pendragon. The first stanza recaps Blenerhasset's story, agreeing that Uter's lust for Igren led him to 'forgoe the golden flower of fame', and 'cast great Vter's conquests in the dust'. However, the following stanza effects an outrageous revision of the complaint's moral stance, as it continues,

> Yet no such blame as writers do record
> Do I deserue for this vnhappie deed[.] (1610, p. 216)

Uter proceeds to justify his murder of Gorolus, who deserved his fate, in terms which anticipate Niccols's own complaint collection, and demonstrate the martial qualities he prized:

> …enforc'd I was with *Mars* to rise
> From *Venus*' bed, and arme me for the field,
> Where like a storme in thunder clad from skies,
> Vpon my foes I fell[.]

Here, Niccols rewrites history to provide modern magistrates with an image of assertive leadership, clamping down on textual instability even as he enacts it.

A Winter Nights Vision

But what of Niccols's own collection of new complaints? The content of *A Winter Nights Vision* is clearly distinct from the *Mirror* material Niccols edits. His own complaints are significantly longer than those of the previous contributors, and set apart rather than interspersed in 'their proper places, as I did purpose' (1610, 'To the Reader'). Niccols's additions to the *Mirror* corpus in *A Winter Nights Vision* opened with an Induction in fourteener couplets. Niccols describes how he read the *Mirror* before going to bed; an apocalyptic vision presents him with the figures of Fame and Memory. Fame will summon historical characters 'That mongst our Mirrours are not found' (1610, p. 560), and Niccols is to transcribe their stories. It is unclear, though, quite where the boundaries

between author, reader, and listener lie, when Memory begins to read what follows from an updated version of the *Mirror* which Niccols already owns. The narrative then continues in the Arguments which frame the complaints, passages in heroic couplets usually of about twenty two lines where Memory summarizes the life and misfortune of next figure. These are each followed by ‘Another Argument’, one heroic couplet which very briefly sets up the complaint, reminding the reader of the collaboration of Fame and Memory, and their respective roles calling up and hearing the ghosts.

Niccols then hears the complaints of King Arthur, King Edmund, Prince Alfred, Earl Godwin, Robert Curthose, Richard I, King John, Edward II, Edward V and Richard Duke of York, and Richard III. The complaints in *A Winter Nights Vision* retain the predominant stanzaic form of the previous editions, rhyme royal, and there is a greater emphasis on the aesthetic quality of Niccols’s verse than in Higgins’s heavy, principally narrative pieces and Blenerhasset’s cosmetically alliterative complaints. The sense of the author as a poet emerges more forcefully from Niccols’s collection than either Baldwin or Higgins’s work, (in spite of the amanuensis status of his inscribed persona).

In his paratextual material Niccols states that,

> ...not taking a poeticall licence to fashion all things after mine owne fancie, but limiting my selfe within the bounds of an historicall writer, I haue followed those authors, who in the censure of our best iudgements are the most authenticall. (1610, ‘To the Reader’)

It is notable, though, that these authors are not named in the preface as Baldwin, Higgins and Blenerhasset’s sources are, perhaps because Niccols relied heavily in places on the poetry of Spenser and Drayton, and Shakespeare’s plays, rather than a more conventional historiographical source. It is necessary to pay attention to the difference between the ‘fanciful’ aspect of writing poetry, which Niccols rejects here, and the aesthetic awareness with which he writes history, and the historical figures frequently claim that their accounts are true, although Niccols does not cite his sources here either, in contrast

to the detailed marginal references and end notes which support his verse in *Englands Artillery.*

At the end of his Induction, when Niccols's narrator agonises conventionally that 'the taske [Memory] dost impose| Exceeds the compasse of my skill', and '[t]he pinions of my humble muse be all too weake to flie| So large a flight' (1610, p. 559), Memory offers a critique of contemporary poetic talent, betraying Niccols's literary interest.

> ... "[A]las," quoth Memorie, "it grieues me to behold
> [...]
> The loathed lozell to prophane that sacred mysterie:
> Each vulgar wit, that what it is, could neuer yet define,
> In ragged rimes with lips profane, will call the learned nine
> To helpe him vtter forth the spawne of his vnfruitfull braine,
> Which makes our peerelesse poesie to be in s[u]ch disdaine,
> That now it skils not whether Pan do pipe, or Phoebus play,
> Tom Tinkar makes best harmonie to passe the time away:
> For this I grieue, for this the seed of Ioue are held in scorne[.] (1610, p. 560)

Niccols echoes the sentiments of John Harington, who in *A Preface or Rather a Briefe Apologie of Poetrie* (1591) decried 'the common sort that term all that is written in verse poetry' and 'bestow the name of poet on every base rhymer and balladmaker'.[54] By denouncing 'Tom Tinkar', who would become a fixture of seventeenth-century broadside ballads, Niccols seeks to elevate not only his work but also his readership. He certainly aims above the level of popular verse, but perhaps also above that of the sixteenth-century *Mirror*'s poetry; the learning of the earlier editions originally resided in their reference to classical philosophy, theology and rhetoric, rather than (except perhaps in Blenerhasset's tongue-in-cheek case) the high mythology of Pan and Phoebus. Indeed, Niccols would return to this theme in *Monodia, Or Waltham's Complaint* (1615) in which the death of Honour Hay, his patron's wife, is given as a cause for the death of his Muse's poetic skill:

> ...your art must now needs perish,
> Since all are dead with her, that arts did cherish.

[54] Cited in Williams, *The Later Tudors*, p. 447, from Natascha Würzbach, *The Rise of the English Street Ballad, 1550-1650*, trans. Gayna Wells (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 253-9.

> Looke not in court or Citie anie more
> To find that grace, was give you of yore,
> Now gentle blouds train'd up in fancies schoole,
> Doe give the due of learning to the foole.[55]

Here, in addition, Niccols hints through his references to 'court or Citie' and fancy (markers of Jacobean Spenserian displeasure) that it is not just the death of Honour, but also that of Elizabeth I that has caused the decline in literary – and thereby moral – standards.

A Winter Nights Vision's Induction states in Virgilian/Spenserian terms that the narrator's muse, who 'rustick tunes did sing,| Now...must mount a pitch more hie' (1610, p. 555). Here Niccols refers to his own previous works, including *The Cuckow* (1607), an Arcadian pastoral allegory. He hints at similar epic ambitions in the complaint of Robert Curthose: Robert claims that, in describing his voyage to Palestine, Niccols's muse must achieve a new 'loftie pitch' in her flight (1610, p. 640), and Robert's crusade is framed as an epic battle superimposed onto the classical landscape of the Levant. These extracts serve, along with Niccols's dedicatory sonnets to Lord Charles Howard,[56] and Lady Elizabeth Clere, to demonstrate the extent of his aspirations for the new edition.

Niccols's address 'To the Reader' and the verse induction echo aspects of Blenerhasset's Epistle and prose frame, leaving Niccols more indebted to the *Second Part* than any other *Mirror* text. Although it is not conceived of as a private enterprise, his preface notes that Niccols spent 'some truant houres' studying poetry (1610, 'To the Reader'), foregrounding once again the ostensibly amateur nature of his interest. Like Higgins and Blenerhasset, too, Niccols describes the *Mirror* as unfinished, calling it 'that imperfect historie', and noting his intention to compose inductions which would 'haue

[55] Richard Niccols, *Monodia or Walthams Complaint Vpon the Death of That Most Vertuous and Noble Ladie, Late Deceased, the Lady Honor Hay* (London: William Stansby for Richard Meighen and Thomas Iones, 1615), sig. B5v.

[56] 'Earle of Notingham, Baron of Effingham, Knight of the noble Order of the Garter, Lord high Admirall of England, Ireland and Wales, &c. one of his Maiestie's most Honorable priuie Counsell', (Haslewood, p. 543), also Elizabeth I's cousin, Admiral and advisor.

continued through the whole worke, if time and mine owne affaires would haue suffered me to proced'. This almost exactly quotes the final prose link of the *Second Part*, in which Memory and Inquisition depart, since 'nowe our idle houres be spent, tyme and our affayres doo call vs from the further hearing these mens complayntes' (1578S, f. 61v); the allusion to a section of the *Mirror* which Niccols himself excised points to a buried intertextuality which emerges at points throughout the work. We are also reminded that his paratextual claims are no more reliable than those of Blenerhasset's fictional narrators, or Blenerhasset himself.

Niccols's Memory is clearly a descendent of Blenerhasset's. She maintains 'the wealthie store| Of time's riche treasure', reviving the fame of any historical figure whose record has decayed (1610, p. 559). Richard Coeur de Lion asks,

> Why should the glorie of so great a king
> Be darkned by obliuion's cloudie frowne?
> Why should this age, as loathing euery thing
> Of th'elder world, my trophies all cast downe,
> And let my deeds in waues of silence drowne? (1610, p. 661)

The symbols of oblivion, dark clouds and drowning, directly imitate Blenerhasset's first prose link,[57] but also write into his discourse Niccols's key theme: modern contempt for, and degeneration from, the old world. In addition, Niccols's description of Memory's appearance borrows from Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, and Drayton's dream vision opening of the *Tragicall Legend of Robert, Duke of Normandy* (1596). Niccols retains the figure of Memory but presents her in a more traditional form. Like Eumnestes, 'Ladie Memorie' 'keepes the store-house of the mind', but she is altogether more classical and majestic: '[a] golden trumpe her right hand held', 'her wings were white as snow', and '[u]pon her head a chaplet stood of never vading green'. She is a 'goddesse dread', and instead of the anxiety for the loss of ancient history conveyed by Spenser's Eumnestes with his wall of

[57] Itself an echo of Baldwin's prose lament for the duke of Exeter's memory (1559, f. 75r) as we have seen (Ch. 3, above).

moth-eaten records and stacks of rotting books, she is an image of confidence in textual memory. The personification Inquisition who assists Blenerhasset's Memory is replaced by Fame, 'the trumpeter of heav'n, that doth desire inflame| To glorious deeds', who acts as an agent of *anamnesis*, or recollection, calling up the historical characters at Memory's request in the main body of the text, while the Induction also presents as her assistants '[f]ive Damsels' to provide her with whatever information she seeks (1610, p. 559).[58] Niccols's Fame and Memory also draw on Drayton's Fame, Fortune and Time. Both depictions of Fame describe her as a lady of 'Princely port',[59] (a phrase used by Spenser to describe Britomart, one of his more flattering 'mirrors' of Elizabeth I, in the *Faerie Queene* (II.iii.28)), while each procession of personifications features garments which record heroic deeds: Drayton's Fame wears

> ...a Robe of Gold,
> (Whose Trayne old *Time* obsequiously did beare)
> Whereon, in rich Embrod'rie, was enrol'd
> The Names of all that Worthies ever were,
> Which all might reade, depainted lively there,
> Set downe in loftie well-composed Verse,
> Fit'st the great Deeds of HEROES to rehearse.[60]

By contrast, it is Niccols's 'Ladie Memorie' who appears 'In golden garments clad',

> ...which time can never weare,
> Nor fretting moth consume the same, which did embroydered beare
> The acts of old *Heröes* dead, set downe in stately verse,
> Which sitting by the horse-foot spring, *Joves* daughters did rehearse[.]
> (1610, p. 559)

As well as providing material for Niccols, Drayton's visionary introduction also draws on the older *Mirror* corpus, eliding ideas from Sackville and Blenerhasset's allegorical frames.

---

[58] Fame evokes Chaucerian and Spenserian allegory, but for Niccols the character is not problematic, and silently obeys Memory's demands. Readers might question the logic of Fame following Memory's lead rather than *vice versa*. See Ch. 1, above, for Niccols's debt to Drayton in this passage.
[59] Pursglove (ed.), *Selected Poems*, p. 99; J. William Hebel (ed.), *The Works of Michael Drayton*, 5 vols. (2; Oxford: Blackwell, 1961), p. 385.
[60] Hebel (ed.), *Drayton*, p. 385.

Where Niccols does not follow Blenerhasset, and instead echoes Baldwin and his collaborators' assumption of 'reader competence', is in his bold statement that 'To the learned only I write' (1610, 'To the Reader'). Easily read as an expression of elitism and exclusivity, I would suggest that by 'the learned…in whom is my chiefest hope', Niccols really means something akin to 'intellectually sympathetic', as he reaches out to a community of like-minded Protestant Spenserians who oppose James's regime. In the verse induction, too, Niccols notes contemporary 'contempt' for 'learned wits' (1610, p. 560), with whom he seems to sympathise. Niccols's reading of the *Mirror* appears to lead him to the conclusion that the fall of 'the vertuous and the vicious prince' alike is inevitable, since death destroys everything (1610, p. 557). The *Mirror*, he suggests, perfectly reflects the message of seasonal mutability which he read in the winter landscape the previous day. Even a 'vertuous name' dies if it is not immortalized in verse, and when reading the *Mirror*, Niccols found 'many a prince…exempt, as if their names be dead'. This has led, understandably, to Budra's conclusion that the function of Niccols's *Vision* is primarily commemorative, and lacking in topical bite. But the reason Niccols offers for the *Mirror*'s omissions belies his innocuous moral. Why should anyone wish to write, when not only 'the baser sprite' but also 'they that boast themselues to be in honor's bosome borne,| Disdaine your wisdome'? 'Is vertue dead?', he asks. '[H]ath daintie ease in her soft armes surpris'd| The manhood of the elder world?' (1610, p. 557). Niccols aligns learning and virtue, suggesting that under James I both have been lost. Re-reading and re-writing the *Mirror* provide him with the means to reinstate them for the benefit of a particular community of learned readers – among them, the Jacobean Spenserians.

While Niccols frequently places ambition and flattery or dissembling, and idleness or indolence at the heart of his speakers' falls, he does maintain the earlier editions'

diversity of approach with respect to the role of fortune in man's downfall. Apart from the exemplary history of King Arthur, Niccols's ghosts, and even Richard III, are presented as more unfortunate than villainous, in keeping with Higgins and Blenerhasset's work but in contrast to the usual interpretation of Baldwin's compilation. Edmund Ironside, for example, dies 'by the cruell fates vniust command' (1610, p. 585), rather than through divine providence as punishment for his behaviour. Where Blenerhasset's complaints sometimes struggled to concoct a fatal flaw for their speakers, Niccols neglects altogether this aspect of the *de casibus* mode he purports to adopt. Mirroring Memory's book in which the characters deeds are commemorated is Jove's book in Robert Curthose's complaint, 'Compiled ere time had any wings to moue', in which individuals' fates are decreed (1610, p. 632). In contrast to Godwin's claim that he and his sons are killed, deservedly, to avenge Alfred's death, Robert states that even if you 'Iustly derserue [a crowne] for thy deeds of fame', you will never receive one 'If thou in that star-text of euery thing| Foredoom'd for fate, be not inrol'd a king' (1610, p. 633). (Niccols's 'star-text' exists somewhere between Richard II's 'book of heaven',[61] and Jupiter's metaphorical scroll of fate in the first book of Virgil's *Aeneid*).[62] In *Monodia, or Walthams Complaint*, these ideas are brought together to explain how death, while inevitable, can be used to serve providential justice. Death,

> Th'ineuitable end of things design'd,
> And written by the great Creators hand
> In the star-text of Heauen, shall euer stand,
> And in it selfe is good, but euery end
> Vpon a mediate cause doth still depend.
> And though by meanes at euil ends we aime;
> Yet diuine prouidence directs the same,
> And makes, when wicked we all good neglect,
> An euill cause produce a good effect[.][63]

[61] Cf. Scott, *The Idea of the Book*, pp. 103-4.
[62] Cf. Virgil, *Virgil I*, *Aeneid*, Book I, l. 262.
[63] Pursglove (ed.), *Selected Poems*, p. 181.

However, it is in the *Mirror*'s moral interests to maintain the suggestion that virtuous action may eventually be rewarded. Richard I, who rebels against his father Henry II, finds that he and his brother John are 'The rods of heau'n's reuenge for his misdeed', but notes also that 'The rods, with which Ioue executes his ire,| He oft in iudgement casts into the fire' (1610, p. 663). This neatly covers the fate of those who rebel against tyrannical rulers. Niccols's conception of fate, though, is driven by his classical and astrological imagery. Richard I claims, for example, that Nature's antipathy towards rebellion against parents causes 'the starres at such abortiue birth,| With bad aspects to frowne vpon the earth' (1610, p. 660). Niccols's cosmic conception of fate threatens to remove human agency from the tragic falls he describes, but it also contributes to the epic nature of his English history in which Roman gods play a newly central part.

Niccols added only ten new complaints, ranging from the legendary and ancient to the relatively recent. A much larger proportion of his historical speakers are kings, rather than leaders of different kinds, and a substantial proportion are positive *exempla*. All are male. In selecting the content of *A Winter Nights Vision*, Niccols certainly seems to have deliberately chosen characters with popularity or notoriety on their side, to a far greater extent than Higgins or Blenerhasset did, perhaps with a view to making his edition more marketable. Of Richard III's complaint he wrote in his preface that,

> though it were written before in the former part, yet for that the matter and stile thereof were generally disliked of M. *Ferrers*, M. *Baldwine*, and others: and also for that many principall occurrents in the same were exempted, I haue written againe. (1610, 'To the Reader')

It is noteworthy that Niccols chose to rewrite and draw attention to the complaint of Richard III, which treated such a familiar and infamous figure. Edward II might also be seen as a character popularized by historical drama. Marlowe's play must have given his story a higher public profile, while King John had received extensive dramatic treatment in the very recent past as well. Richard Coeur de Lion hopes that Niccols's pen 'will

helpe to raise my name| Out of obliuion's den where it did dwell' (1610, p. 661), but he too was in fact a familiar historical figure.[64]

Similarly Niccols's complaint of King Arthur, a character purposefully omitted from Blenerhasset's *Second Part* of the *Mirror* because of his over-familiarity, appears in part to trade on the contemporary controversy over Arthur's existence. Niccols does not engage with this question, (although he glancingly refers to it when Arthur states that his 'corrupted storie' has been 'Defaced by fleeting time's inconstant pen' (1610, p. 562), but Arthur's political and cultural capital as a symbol, real or not, must have contributed to the decision to rehearse such a well-known story.[65] Woolf notes that the Brutus and Arthur legends were being rejected or at least played down by history writers such as Speed in the 1600s.[66] Niccols's *Mirror* retains Higgins's complaint of Albanact which tells the story of Brutus's arrival, Blenerhasset's Uter Pendragon, and adds the complaint of Arthur, a decision which, aside from general popularity, might have been motivated by Niccols's high regard for Spenser, as the inclusion of these figures maintained British history's ties to the Spenserian national myth.

Although Niccols argues that his complaints fill the gaps left by the historiographical coverage of the existing *Mirror*, and this is true of the period from 1066-1377, he actually rewrites aspects of previous complaints, most notably the pre-Conquest period described in Blenerhasset's *Second Part*. Given Niccols's nationalist celebration of England and Englishness throughout *A Winter Nights Vision*, he might be expected to revisit the period when '[p]olitically, England was born'.[67] Scragg suggests that the 'concept of 'Englishness' in vernacular literature' is correlated to King Alfred's

[64] Not least from the treatment of King John. See also the Anonymous, *Kynge Rycharde Cuer Du Lyon* (London: The Son of Wynkyn de Worde, 1509), reprinted in 1528.
[65]Cf. Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 28.
[66] Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, p. 69.
[67] Donald Scragg, 'Introduction. The Anglo-Saxons: Fact and Fiction', in Donald Scragg and Carole Weinberg (eds.), *Literary Appropriations of the Anglo-Saxons from the Thirteenth to the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 1-21, p. 3.

'revival of Christian learning and teaching', including the translation of Latin works into the vernacular.[68] Alfred, whose complaint by Blenerhasset was excised, could be expected to have played a central role in Niccols's new history, especially given Niccols's high regard for learning, expressed in his prefaces to *A Winter Nights Vision* and also *Englands Artillery.* Niccols's new collection coincided with a resurgence of scholarly interest in the Anglo-Saxon period, following its rise to prominence in the 1560s thanks to Archbishop Matthew Parker's circle. Richard Verstegen's *A Restitvtion of Decayed Intelligence in Antiquities* (1605), which countered the Protestant motives of the Parker circle's interest in Saxon religion, had an 'almost immediately discernible' impact on contemporary historiography, prompting a renewed engagement with Anglo-Saxon history and particularly pagan mythography by William Camden in his enlarged *Britannia* (1607), and John Speed in the *History of Great Britaine under the Conquests of the Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans* (1611).[69] However, Niccols's Prince Alfred, or AElfred AEtheling ('the Noble'), plays a lesser role in Anglo-Saxon history, and serves principally to build up hostility towards Godwin, earl of Kent, before his complaint which follows. Niccols describes Alfred's isolation, starvation, torture and death on the island of Ely.[70] He employs a classic Ovidian *locus horridus*, where '[t]he black night's shreeking bird, the ghastlie oule| With balefull notes in waking woe did keepe| My greeued soule', which abstracts Alfred as a generalised tragic Philomel, 'that spends her time of sleepe| In mournefull tunes recording his misdeed' (1610, p. 614).

---

[68] Ibid., p. 4.

[69] Rolf H. Bremmer, 'The Anglo-Saxon Pantheon According to Richard Verstegen (1605)', in Timothy Graham (ed.), *The Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 2000), 141-72, pp. 159-60.

[70] Niccols's account of Alfred's torture is closest to John Speed, *The History of Great Britaine under the Conquests of Ye Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans Their Originals, Manners, Warres, Coines & Seales: With Ye Successions, Lives, Acts & Issues of the English Monarchs from Iulius Caesar, to Our Most Gracious Soueraigne King Iames* (London: William Hall and John Beale, to be sold by Iohn Sudbury & Georg Humble, 1611), p. 395, and probably shared a source. Speed's marginal note 'Wil. Caxton' suggests *Polycronicon* but Niccols's diction is closer to Speed's; cf. Ranulf Higden, *Polycronicon* (London: William Caxton, 1482), f. 310r.

Edmund Ironside, an early chronicle history play written in the early 1580s, and the lost *Hardicanute*, possibly a sequel, dramatise episodes from the period covered by Blenerhasset's Anglo-Saxon complaints, and perhaps such dramatic treatments prompted Niccols to revisit and flesh out this era in his own *Mirror*. The portrayal of Edricus in *Edmund Ironside* as a Machiavellian villain certainly anticipates Niccols's handling of his character in Edmund Ironside's complaint,[71] which differs substantially from Blenerhasset's depiction of Edricus in the *Second Part.* In the play, Canutus denounces Edricus as a 'flatterer' and 'all-soothing sychophant',[72] terms which closely mirror Niccols's own rejection of court corruption generally, and Edricus's tactics in particular. However, the focalisation of Niccols's Ironside necessarily depicts his Canute as a ruthless enemy, unlike the balanced, parallel roles played by the play's Edmund and Canutus.[73] Ironside had been a point of contention in the late sixteenth-century succession debate: Robert Parsons claimed that the commonwealth's interest had played a part in deciding his successor,[74] while John Hayward's response claimed that it would have been impossible for the English to exercise any kind of choice under Danish rule.[75] Interestingly, Niccols comes down on the Catholic Parsons's side in this debate; the complaint of Alfred notes that Canute was 'seated on the English throne| By ioynt consent of the nobilitie' (1610, p. 609), but it is unlikely that this has to do with the question of Elizabeth's successor since it post-dates James's accession by seven years. More recently, George Buck had traced James I's legitimacy via Edmund Ironside in *Daphnis*

[71] See Larry S. Champion, '"By Usurpation Thine, by Conquest Mine": Perspective and Politics in *Edmund Ironside*', *Studies in Philology,* 85, 2 (1988), 211-24, at 213-4.
[72] II.iii.801 and 799, quoted in ibid., at 215.
[73] Ibid., at 216.
[74] Robert Parsons and William Allen, *A Conference About the Next Succession to the Crowne of Ingland Diuided into Two Partes* (Antwerp: A. Conincx, 1595), pp. 184-5.
[75] John Haywood, *An Answer to the First Part of a Certaine Conference, Concerning Succession, Published Not Long since Vnder the Name of R. Dolman* (London: Eliot's Court Press, R. Bradock, P. Short, T. Snodham, R. Field, and J. Harrison for Simon Waterson, and Cuthbert Burbie, 1603), sig. Rr-v.

Polystephanos (1605).[76] Niccols's complaint focuses predominantly, though, on the conquest by the Danes; in the subsequent Argument, Memory claims that 'By death of this braue prince…The English lost both fame and libertie' (1610, p. 603).

As a group, the first half of the collection contributes to the meta-narrative of national conquest which also runs through Blenerhasset's *Mirror* text, 'conteining the falles of the infortunate Princes of this Lande: From the conquest of Caesar, vnto the comyng of Duke William the Conqueror'. This is complicated, though, by his presentation of the international success of King Arthur, Richard I and Elizabeth as laudable. Arthur, for example, forces Gwillamore to pay 'golden tribute yearely' (1610, p. 570), which sits uncomfortably alongside Higgins's portrayal of British resistance to Roman tribute, and Blenerhasset's depiction of the Anglo-Saxons ruined by the Danes' financial demands. Within Arthur's complaint itself, the speaker rehearses the four conquests of Britain, by the Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans, which demonstrate the 'ruine-thirsting hate' of Fortune (1610, p. 563). Much critical work on notions of British identity in the early modern period has commented on the transference of imperialist behaviour from the conquerors to the conquered;[77] Niccols's narratives of invasion and colonization illustrate (but do not question) the contradictions between representations of conquest as defeat and colonization as part of providential progress.

The Argument which precedes 'The Famovs Life and Death of King Arthur' notes that Arthur 'heere at home subdues the Saxon kings:| Then forren nations in subiection brings' (1610, p. 562). This echoes and interestingly modifies the claims of

[76] George Buck, *Daphnis Polystephanos: An Eclog Treating of Crownes, and of Garlandes, and to Whom of Right They Appertaine* (London: G. Eld for Thomas Adams, 1605), 'Preface', sig. B3v.
[77] See, for example, this discussion in relation to *Cymbeline* in Escobedo, 'From Britannia to England', at 69; Willy Maley, *Nation, State and Empire in English Renaissance Literature: Shakespeare to Milton* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), Ch. 2. Also Andrew Hadfield, 'Bruited Abroad: John White and Thomas Harriet's Colonial Representations of Ancient Britain', in David J. Baker and Willy Maley (eds.), *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univeristy Press, 2002), 159-77, and Joan Fitzpatrick, *Shakespeare, Spenser and the Contours of Britain: Reshaping the Atlantic Archipelago* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, 2004), Ch. 3.

Blenerhasset's Hellina, who asks rhetorically, 'Who did the force of forrayne foes withstand?| Who all the world subdude' (1578S, f. 18v). This parallel suggests that Niccols sees something of Elizabeth I in his portrayal of Arthur, since Hellina's achievements unambigously reflect Elizabeth's reign. (Arthur's 'taint of bastardie' also recalls the claims of Elizabeth's opponents). Niccols also moves the formulation forward, and implies that his ambitions for English foreign policy are a step ahead of the 1570s, when perhaps stability was more of a priority than expansion.

A notable new aspect introduced to the *Mirror* corpus in *A Winter Nights Vision*, then, is the greater connection with international dimensions of English history, as a large proportion of Niccols's narrative is set abroad. The notion of nationality is pertinent to the discussion of how the *Mirror* differed in focus in 1610, as Niccols's edition represents a marked change from the treatment of England, Britain and continental Europe by previous *Mirror* authors. This trend fits with both the growing market for printed books on foreign history, travel and colonial expansion, such as Richard Hakluyt's *Principall Navigations* (1599-1600) which catalogues, for example, the voyage of Edmund Ironside's sons to Hungary and that of Robert, Duke of Normandy to Jerusalem. The 'adventure narrative' component of romance literature also pertains to Niccols's interaction with Spenserian features. Arthur, for example, is inspired by his desire for fame to sail to the Arctic, Russia and Lapland, extending 'Oure Britaine empire's bounds' (1610, p. 572). The extensive description of foreign campaigns in *A Winter Nights Vision* is rarely found elsewhere in the *Mirror* corpus,[78] and is indeed explicitly rejected at times: 'one of the company' asked after James I of Scotland's complaint that the writers 'returne...to our *English* storyes which minister matter enough of tragedy, without seking or trauayling to forayne countreyes' (1587, f. 140r). This, though, is reflected by the high

[78] An exception is Thomas Montacute's French campaign narrative (1559, ff. 33r-35v).

to late medieval second half of Niccols's collection of complaints, marked perhaps by King John's opening stanza which strongly evokes the early *Mirror*s' discourse:

> Discord the daughter of dissenion,
> Home-hel-hatcht furie with bewitching charmes,
> Doth sooner ruine *Caesar*'*s* royall throne,
> Then all the imminent inuading harmes,
> That can inferred be by forren armes:
> Where people hate, and where the prince doth frowne,
> What might builds vp, dissension soone puls downe. (1610, p. 681)

As Niccols's subject matter approaches that of the earliest *Mirror*s, the focus turns inwards again, and the series' renewed emphasis on internal conflict culminates with Niccols's rewritten complaint of Richard III. In this complaint, another union is enacted, which resonates once again with the union of Britain under James. It may be somewhat provocative that this contemporary resonance is immediately cast out, since what follows Richard III's complaint is 'The Victorious and Triumphant Reigne of that Virgin Empresse of Sacred Memorie', *Englands Eliza.*

Throughout *A Winter Nights Vision*, the complaints had also offered various paeans to England itself. Edmund, for example, asks,

> (O noble England, nurse of my renowne,
> Queene of all ilands canoped of heauen),
> How was thy towring state then troden downe? (1610, p. 587)

The Saxons are 'English' under Danish rule, which situates the Danes as clearcut enemies, in contrast to Blenerhasset's more personally nuanced portrayal of the period. Edmund also calls Oxford (where Niccols is believed to have studied) 'the Muse's bower,| England's Parnassus' (1610, p. 601); the collection makes much of English toponyms generally, drawing on the chorographic focus of Drayton and Spenser's poems echoed in subsequent English pastoral itineraries like William Browne's *Britannia's Pastorals* (1613). Niccols also clearly delineates the separateness of archipelagic racial identities even as he depicts them united against the Saracens:

> Behold the English famous for his bow,
> […]
> The Scot with his long pike his cunning show,
> The Britaine big-bon'd-bold, not borne to yeeld,
> […]
> See how the Norman manageth his horse,
> The Irish shakes his dart with manly force. (1610, p. 640)

Sir Thomas Ouerburies Vision (1616) concludes with Overbury's description of England, 'Who of all Iles most gracefully dost stand| Upon this earths broad face…Which as an other *Eden* heav'n hath close,| In which the tree of life and knowledge growes'.[79] It is only in the revisionist complaint of King John that the epithets turn negative; John calls England 'stubborne' and 'vnkind'. In *Englands Eliza* itself, the nationalist stance which had directed the earlier histories becomes fully fledged, as the influence of Virgil and Spenser in combination with chronicle accounts resolves into an efficient national epic. Matthew Woodcock describes the poem as a 'wonderful, celebratory pre-Camden account of Elizabeth's reign', which 'closely follows the contours of Chettle's prose biography in *Englandes Mourning Garment*'.[80]

Niccols's nostalgia for the Elizabethan age is not restricted to the events recounted in *England's Eliza*, but also celebrates stylistic modes from both the beginning and end of Elizabeth's reign. Niccols's admiration for the work of Sackville and Spenser in particular informs and directs much of his original *Mirror* work, as well as the rest of his oeuvre. As we will see below, Niccols had ideological as well as aesthetic reasons for imitating these authors. In addition, though, his respect for their poetic skill permeates his edition of the *Mirror*, to the extent that he reorders Baldwin and his collaborators' material to give Sackville's Induction prominence, and originally intended to follow a Spenserian structure in *England's Eliza*: the plan 'to haue distinguished it by section into cantoes or bookes' is an endearingly transparent effort to emulate *The Faerie Queene*'s

[79] Pursglove (ed.), *Selected Poems*, p. 226.
[80] Matthew Woodcock, 'Edmund Spenser and the Commemorations of the Death of Elizabeth I', *Notes and Queries,* 42, 6 (2009), 42-46, at 46.

organization.[81] In the Induction for *England's Eliza*, the speaker also hopes to be inspired by Spenser's spirit, when he bemoans Spenser's death in conjunction with '[t]hat virgins timelesse tragedie':

> (O) did that Faerie Queenes sweet singer live,
> That to the dead eternitie could give,
> Or if, that heaven by influence would infuse
> His heavenlie spirit on mine earth-borne Muse (1610, p. 779)

These lines really encapsulate the attitude towards Elizabeth, Spenser and Niccols's own poetic abilities which defines Niccols's *Mirror* – and in doing so perhaps alienates his potential Jacobean readership. Niccols approaches the sixteenth-century *Mirror* through a Spenserian filter, too. *England's Eliza* is itself a Spenserian narrative which draws on ancient historiographical subject matter and techniques which are then fused with chivalric heroism, and classical and biblical imagery. When the speaker in the Induction to *England's Eliza* sits 'in contemplation of that royall Queene,...thinking, what a Mirrour she might be| Unto all future times prosperitie' (1610, p. 779), we cannot tell if he is justifying the inclusion of his panegyric in the collection, or remembering the opening stanzas of *The Faerie Queene* in which Spenser addresses Elizabeth as 'Mirrour of grace'.[82]

Pursglove asserts, with specific reference to Niccols's *Mirror*, that '[t]o be writing in a Spenserian manner in 1610 was...to put oneself outside of the fashionable mainstream', although not 'to deny oneself readers'.[83] These readers belonged to a specific sector of the literary community: O'Callaghan observes that 'Niccols's revised edition of the *Mirror for Magistrates* was part of a broader Spenserian revival of political poetic traditions in this period', which suggests that, while drawing on aesthetic and ideological trends which were current, Niccols's *Mirror* was unlikely to strike a chord

[81] Haslewood (ed.), *Mirror for Magistrates*, p. 818.
[82] Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, 1.4.
[83] Pursglove (ed.), *Selected Poems*, p. 21.

with a wide range of readers in the period.[84] But whether it was read or not, (and Budra suggests that the reissued editions of 1619 and 1620 were attempts to get rid of unsold copies), this disregard for apolitical fashion must have contributed to the sense that the *Mirror* was no longer a desirable project with which to be involved.[85] Niccols casts the whole work in a new Spenserian light, which plays up both the *Mirror*'s medieval origins and its nostalgia for the Elizabethan period.

Where Baldwin's prose frame had raised questions about the conflicting accounts of chronicle source texts, Niccols's additions do not engage extensively with the problems involved in writing history. 'Records' must be maintained and not allowed to decay, but the composition of these records is not complicated by questions of authorship to any serious degree. The dream vision within which he situates *A Winter Nights Vision* also distances the author from the process of composition. Authorial responsibility is shifted away from the speaker, who becomes a scribe, and onto the collaboration of Memory and Fame. There is none of the anxiety over lost historiographical texts or the imaginative composition of history here that are to be found in earlier additions; in the Induction to *A Winter Nights Vision* Memory asks the dreaming Niccols to be her 'pen-man', but she is only concerned 'that many Kings| Exempted are, whose noble acts deserue eternitie' (1610, p. 559), and that is simple enough for her to rectify.

The major exception to this is Niccols's complaint of King John. Although Peele's *Troublesome Reign of King John* (*c.* 1589) and Shakespeare's play may have prompted Niccols's decision to portray the character in *A Winter Nights Vision*, it is not just contemporary popularity which causes him to appear in the *Mirror.* In the Argument which precedes John's complaint, Memory claims that 'many writers in his daies,| Of very malice writ in his dispraise' (1610, p. 681), which suggests that Memory aims to

[84] O'Callaghan, *The "Shepheards Nation"*, p. 71.
[85] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 38.

improve John's reputation and present a more accurate account. John himself believes that he might have been an exemplary mirror,

> If to this age my storie truth had told:
> But th'vnkind age presents to iudgement's eye
> My shame at large, but lets my praise go by. (1610, p. 682)

So what were the 'false traditions' and 'forged rimes' 'inuented by my foes', and why does Niccols choose to interrogate the transmission of history so forcefully in this particular complaint? Recent scholarship has shown the work which John's narrative was made to do in the literature of the Elizabethan succession crisis, from pamphlets to the plays themselves.[86] But following James's accession, it was the Protestant rhetoric of early Tudor revisionist accounts like John Bale's which informed Niccols's presentation of the story, echoing the Reformation re-reading of John's confessional identity which Carole Levin describes as 'a complete rehabilitation' of his character amid centuries of antipathy; for that short period, 'the medieval villain became a hero of English liberty, a kind of anticipant Protestant, a lonely pioneer in resisting the tyrannies of Rome'.[87] Niccols's John, too, rewrites himself as an incipient enemy of Catholicism, although his morose tone is hardly heroic. John is unambiguously set against 'blood-built Rome, our Albion's ancient foe' (1610, p. 688), and by eliding Pope Innocent's Rome with that of Julius Caesar's assassination, he creates a picture of political instability and religious corruption which resonates with both contemporary opposition to popery, and the current climate of court faction and unrest.[88]

---

[86] See Paulina Kewes, 'History Plays and the Royal Succession', in Paulina Kewes, Ian W. Archer, and Felicity Heal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook to Holinshed's Chronicles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming); also Robert Lane, '"The Sequence of Posterity": Shakespeare's *King John* and the Succession Controversy', *Studies in Philology,* 92, 4 (1995), 460-81.

[87] Carole Levin, 'A Good Prince: King John and Early Tudor Propaganda', *The Sixteenth Century Journal,* 11, 4 (1980), 23-32, at 23; see also Felicity Heal, 'Appropriating History: Catholic and Protestant Polemics and the National Past', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 68, 1-2 (2005), 109-32.

[88] Cf. Paulina Kewes, 'Henry Savile's Tacitus and the Politics of Roman History in Late Elizabethan England', *Huntington Library* Quarterly, 74, 1 (2011), 515-51.

Polemic to panegyric?[89]

Budra contends that the *Mirror* under the post-Baldwin editors 'retreated from the capacity that textual authority, especially the authority of historical *exempla*, had to challenge political power'.[90] In this way, Budra suggests, Niccols 'broke' the *Mirror* by suppressing its original purpose. His use of 'retreated' again implies that there is something cowardly or ignominious about the developmental course the *Mirror* tradition took.[91] Subsequent studies have suggested that in fact, Niccols's *Winter Nights Vision* does the opposite of what Budra claims.[92] There is more to be said, though, about Niccols's place within the *Mirror* tradition in this regard, and how the oppositional stance of *A Winter Nights Vision* relates to the body of work he appropriated and repackaged for a new political context.

The ostensible purpose of John Wayland's Marian project, *A Memorial of Such Princes*, was, of course, a continuation of Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*, with a morally educative purpose, which Baldwin's new title, devised for the publication under Elizabeth, directed towards the magistrate class. The text as it was eventually printed served generally as a warning to those in office, but also functioned as a framework for the authors' allegorical response to specific instances of Marian corruption. Additionally, as Lucas has shown, the 1563 edition acted as a call for legislative clarification of the limits of poetic freedom of speech under the new political regime.[93] By drawing attention to conflicting historiographical accounts and the susceptibility of speech to misinterpretation, Baldwin and his collaborators transformed their virtuous continuation

[89] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 37.
[90] Ibid., p. 22.
[91] See Ch. 2, above.
[92] Pursglove (ed.), *Selected Poems*, Introduction; O'Callaghan, *The "Shepheards Nation"*, and 'Dreaming the Dead'.
[93] Lucas, *Politics*, pp. 202-3.

of Lydgate, and covert topical allegory, into a broader reflection of textual transmission and its discontents.

This purpose changed, as we have seen, over the course of Elizabeth's reign, first as a result of Higgins's intervention. Both Baldwin and Higgins were concerned with historiography, but while Baldwin's exploration of historiographical process highlighted conflict between sources, and the potential for political manipulation, Higgins's tackled the total absence of historical records for ancient British history, before updating the text to create resonance with the political climate of the 1580s. The intended readership of the collection changed too, as the target audience moved from Baldwin's Inns of Court lawyer, to Higgins's upwardly mobile history buff, whose place in society could be stabilised by a solid understanding of unknowable British origins. Finally, Niccols's dedicatory sonnets to the nobility seem to target the learned courtier as its primary reader. Budra claims that in the later stages of its development the *Mirror* narratives became 'pocket histories': given Higgins's oeuvre and background this assessment is not too far off the mark, although the shift should not be read as negatively as Budra does.[94] Furthermore, at some 900 pages, it would have been difficult to pocket Niccols's edition.

However, it is possible to contest the idea that Niccols followed on from Higgins as another in a line of misguided Baldwin imitators, diluting and diverting the *Mirror* formula as they went. In contrast to Higgins's *Mirror* editions, which had their own separate historiographical agenda, Niccols's 1610 revival of the form is politically motivated. Can this political engagement be read as a new dialogue with Baldwin's original model?

[94] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 37. It is important to remember just how important 'pocket histories' were to the mid sixteenth-century chattering classes.

Niccols's treatment of Elizabeth I in the 1610 *Mirror*, a standard feature of compendious histories like Warner's *Albion's England*,[95] and George Whetstone's *English Mirrour* (1586), has provoked a series of antithetical responses: while Pursglove presents Niccols's stance as evidence for strong antipathy towards James I's new court ethos, Budra reads it as 'Niccols's bid to give the tragic history of England a happy ending', which 'gave up all pretense of being a critical mirror'.[96] Budra argues that *England's Eliza* acts as a break from the *de casibus* tradition.[97] But if we apply an awareness of the *de casibus* model to Pursglove's assessment, Niccols's panegyric for Elizabeth becomes the most damning *de casibus* narrative of all, suggesting that England's dynastic greatness has crumbled under James's rule. The dichotomy between these readings needs to be contextualized within the historical debate surrounding James's reputation.

Late twentieth- and early twenty first-century historical scholarship, as well as literary criticism, has frequently addressed the contested question of James I's popularity in the first two decades of his reign among his English subjects. In particular, political and literary historians have asked how the juxtaposition with his predecessor Elizabeth I affected his reception in London in 1604 and the crucial years that followed. The various phases of nostalgia for Elizabeth which occurred during the first half of the seventeenth century have suggested a coded disaffection with the new monarch. In 1985, however, D. R. Woolf held that to assume 'all reference to Elizabeth during the reign of James is, *prima facie*, an expression of discontent with the King' is to read Stuart history too teleologically, based primarily on Civil War polemic.[98] Ten years later, Rowland Wymer

[95] *Albion's England*, first printed in 1586, was still being released in enlarged and revised editions into the early seventeenth century, in some respects in parallel with the *Mirror*'s expansion.
[96] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 38; p. 12.
[97] Ibid., p. 36.
[98] D. R. Woolf, 'Two Elizabeths? James I and the Late Queen's Famous Memory', *Canadian Journal of History/ Annales Canadiennes d'Histoire,* 20, 2 (Aug. 1985), 167-91, at 170.

applied this argument to what he presents as an erroneous interpretation of Jacobean tragedy. He suggests that while 'Jacobean tragedy [has been] seen as vividly registering the growing disgust with the Stuart court which would inevitably precipitate the English Civil War' by, in this case, Marxist critics, the themes of court corruption and intrigue which characterize tragic drama performed in the 1600s in fact emerge from concerns of 'the recent past rather than the immediate present'.[99]

Woolf and Wymer's readings stand in stark contrast to the acceptance in later work that the rhetoric of nostalgia for the Elizabethan period, largely focused on Elizabeth herself, represents a critique of James's government.[100] David Norbrook contends that the residual admiration for Sidney and Spenser among certain sections of court and poetic communities 'took on a political colouring, given that the new regime had rejected the ideals of Protestant chivalry', while Steven W. May suggests that the idealization of Elizabeth which occurred in this period would not 'have grown to such robustly mythical proportions had the Stuarts been more able monarchs'.[101]

It seems necessary to take a more nuanced approach to this question, particularly in the light of the unease and political volatility caused by anxiety over the succession in the 1590s. Alan R. Young, for example, asserts that '[w]hen Queen Elizabeth I died...the well-crafted propagandist image of herself that she had so encouraged was barely intact'.[102] Peter Hyland, in the same volume, asks, '[h]ow would the London audience [of, in this case, *The Revenger's Tragedy*] in 1607 have remembered Elizabeth?' and suggests

---

[99] Wymer, 'Jacobean Pageant or Elizabethan Fin De Siecle?' pp. 45 and 50.
[100] Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture*, p. 12.
[101] Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, p. 177; Steven W. May, '"Tongue-Tied Our Queen?": Queen Elizabeth's Voice in the Seventeenth Century', in Elizabeth H. Hageman and Katherine Conway (eds.), *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England* (Madison, Teanick: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2007), 48-67, p. 48.
[102] Alan R. Young, 'The Phoenix Reborn: The Jacobean Appropriation of an Elizabethan Symbol', ibid., 68-81, p. 68.

that 'though greatly loved by her subjects', Elizabeth 'had become increasingly a burden on the public spirit'.

> ...her death returned the kingdom to the "normality" of patriarchy and, equally important, to a monarch who had sons, removing the possibility of a repetition of the nightmare of succession fears that had plagued the country for too much of Elizabeth's reign.

He adds, though, that 'by 1607 the euphoria that had accompanied the accession of James in 1603 was giving way to a deepening disappointment'.[103] We must remember that the historians and poets writing in the early years of James's reign also lived through the transition from one period to the next, and public opinion as well as literary convention was likely to fluctuate, rather than effecting a clean break between regimes. According to these interpretations, then, a writer's mourning the loss of Elizabeth in 1603 could stem either from genuine (if generalized) grief, or from relief, while the continuation of this *topos* into the late 1600s and 1610s might have been more heartfelt as the memory of the troubled 1590s receded, more patriotic as Elizabeth came to stand for an idealized form of the current regime, or more politically charged as a reaction to the distance 'between Elizabethan expectation and Jacobean reality'.[104] So where does Niccols stand on this spectrum?

The 1610 *Mirror* approaches the difference in character between Elizabeth and James's reigns in a variety of ways. These may be broken down into, first, Niccols's treatment of the existing *Mirror* material; second, the content of his ten new ghost complaints; third, the political resonances of Elizabethan nostalgia – in part via retrospective Spenserian poetics – and of the ghost complaint form in the early Jacobean period; and fourth, the allusion and affinity of certain passages and aspects of Niccols's *Mirror* text to his wider, more overtly political oeuvre. While never explicitly critical of

[103] Peter Hyland, 'Re-Membering Gloriana: *The Revenger's Tragedy*', ibid.(Fairleigh Dickinson Univeristy Press), 82-94, p. 84.
[104] Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture*, p. 2.

James, these techniques build up a picture of mourning for the lost past which suggests a distinct dissatisfaction with the present.

Niccols's decision to remove certain complaints seems to have been motivated more by their specific content than a desire to reduce the size of the now unwieldy publication – the 1610 edition still contains more than ninety complaint poems, not including the lengthy epilogue *England's Eliza* and its induction – and this motivation points towards an ideological shift. The relationship of the *Mirror* to the new Stuart regime is complicated by an exploration of Niccols's excisions. At the textual level, Niccols removed references to Scotland from Blenerhasset's complaint of Vortiger. Additionally, he did not include the complaints of James I of Scotland, printed first in 1559, or the sections treating James IV and The Battle of Brampton or Flodden Field, added in 1587. Budra suggests that Niccols left these complaints out since they 'might cause offence to the Scottish king', once again implying that Niccols was a sycophant.[105] Admittedly, these passages do not portray the Scots in a flattering light, but they are no more critical of Scottish misrule than of the corrupt and perfidious English characters who populate the rest of the early editions. Budra goes on to describe Niccols's additions as 'the standard rogues' gallery of Tudor myth', but these figures represent a series of dynasties with which James I was keen to connect himself: indeed, Budra states that 'James claimed a dual lineage (both Tudor and Stuart) from Arthur'.[106] The ostensible purpose of the *Mirror* tradition is, after all, cautionary, and functions by the provision of negative *exempla*. Furthermore, Edward Ayscu's *A Historie Contayning the Warres, Treaties, Marriages, and other Occurrents Betweene England and Scotland from King William the Conqueror, Vntill the Happy Vnion of them Both in our Gratious King Iames* (1607) demonstrates that 'warres...betweene England and Scotland' were not a taboo

[105] Budra, *De Casibus*, p. 28.
[106] Ibid., p. 28.

subject for historians of the time. Ayscu's aim is to synthesize the chronicle histories of both nations in one text on the occasion of their putative union in the 1600s. He states in his address to the reader that

> whereas the Chronicles of both nations containe matter of reproach and disgrace one against the other: I have had an especiall care to carry my selfe so indifferently betweene them as I hope neither of both will haue iust cause to take offence therat.[107]

Ayscu asks his reader rhetorically, 'Are we not all (for the most part) the broode and off-spring of the same parents, the auntient English Saxons?' So Ayscu rewrites canonical history with a new, pro-union slant. By contrast, Niccols introduces in the preface to *England's Eliza* the notion that Elizabeth was held highly in 'all true borne English estimation', as opposed to 'those mongrill English' who 'barke at the maiestie of that most noble princesse' (1610, p. 774). This could be read as a rejection of common British ancestry in the face of the contemporary attempt at national unity, through the promotion of a 'true borne English' rather than British perspective.

Niccols edited Baldwin and his co-authors' original *Mirror* complaints, and rewrote the complaint of Richard III from scratch. If he was capable of this sort of revision, it would have been possible, and perhaps more flattering to James I, to have edited the Scottish *Mirror* material such that it anticipated or at least left open the possibility of political and national unity. Instead, Niccols removed all references to Scottish history from the sixteenth-century *Mirror* texts, at a time when extra emphasis was being placed on the shared origins and parallel stories of the two nations, culminating in their effective unity under James. Niccols's decision regarding this question of content points to a more troubled relationship than Budra admits between the 1610 *Mirror* and James I.

[107] Edward Ayscu, *A Historie Contayning the Vvarres, Treaties, Marriages, and Other Occurrents Betweene England and Scotland from King William the Conqueror, Vntill the Happy Vnion of Them Both in Our Gratious King Iames.* (London: G. Eld, 1607).

A Winter Nights Vision paints a much clearer picture of this troubled relationship. The section which reflects most explicitly on the current political situation and its failings is the Induction, in which Niccols's dream vision set-up is established. The only detailed commentary on the Induction does not read this passage politically,[108] but Michelle O'Callaghan describes the Induction as a 'Jacobean rendition of Spenser's 'Bower of Bliss'' in which 'the erotic temptation of 'daintie ease' is a metaphor for a debased political state': '[t]he public political sphere is currently locked in a state of inertia, a debilitating stasis that has unmanned the nation'.[109] While I agree with O'Callaghan's assessment, this reading is based on a limited excerpt in which the speaker asks unambiguously, 'Is vertue dead?' There are additional points to be made about the topical pertinence of Niccols's imagery.

The deployment of the sun as a metaphor works to evoke a critical response to the current political situation. The whole premise of the collection, a dream which arises from the dolorous effects of the season, uses the onset of winter as a reflection of dissatisfaction with the present through juxtaposition with a happier summer that has ended. The title of Niccols's new text brings to mind Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and through this contrasts James's reign with that of the 'fairy queen'.[110] Thomas Dekker allegorically resurrects Elizabeth as Titania in *The Whore of Babylon* (1607), while Ben Jonson played on this association by representing Prince Henry, whose court had offered an 'Elizabethan' rival to James's, as the 'Spenserian faerie king' in *Oberon* (1611), in which Jonson, too, 'may perhaps have been hinting at the defects of James's court'.[111] The speaker claims that '[t]he Sunne in heav'n shone pale on earth to see her wombe so wasted' (1610, p. 556). This evokes a distant and ineffectual monarch

[108] See Alan T. Bradford, 'Mirrors of Mutability: Winter Landscapes in Tudor Poetry', *English Literary Renaissance,* 4, 1 (Dec. 1974), 3-39.
[109] O'Callaghan, 'Dreaming the Dead', p. 89.
[110] Cf. Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, p. 181.
[111] Ibid., p. 182.

unable to alleviate the country's wintry misery. Some lines later we encounter the sun again, who this time abandons the land without moral leadership to bask in his indolence:

> The golden Sunne, daies guide, was gone, and in his purple bed
> Had laid *him* downe, the heav'ns about their azure curtains spread,
> (1610, p. 557)

This sun's 'purple bed' and 'azure curtains' bring connotations of royal luxury and sloth, typical of the Jacobean Spenserians' quarrel with the rotten languor of the Stuart court. In the late Elizabethan period, the sun had been used as a metaphor for Elizabeth's successor, often explicitly James, then VI, whose revelation would dispel the dark uncertainty of the 1590s succession crisis. Peter Wentworth, for example, pressed for Elizabeth to name her successor and dispel the threat to national security using the image:

> …as the bright shining of the sunne doth cause the clouds to vanish and flee away… and as the sunne, though it bee (indeed) the moste excellent ornament of the firmament is not seene in his bewtie, whiles it is shadowed with clouds.[112]

The Dedication of the Authorized King James Bible to James I later appropriated the symbol in its description of James's accession:

> For whereas it was the expectation of many…that, upon the setting of that bright *Occidental Star,* Queen *Elizabeth,* of most happy memory, some thick and palpable clouds of darkness would so have overshadowed this land, that men should have been in doubt which way they were to walk, and that it should hardly be known who was to direct the unsettled State; the appearance of Your Majesty, as of the *Sun* in his strength, instantly dispelled those supposed and surmised mists.[113]

That Niccols should deploy the image of the sun in such a negative light seems to speak to his disappointment in this Jacobean 'dawn'.

Contemporary texts comment more explicitly on the association to which Niccols alludes between peace, idleness and vice. For example, Barnabe Rich, in spite of his well-

[112] Peter Wentworth, *A Pithie Exhortation to Her Maiestie for Establishing Her Successor to the Crowne Whereunto Is Added a Discourse Containing the Authors Opinion of the True and Lavvfull Successor to Her Maiestie* (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1598), pp. 48-9.

[113] Cornelius Bol, *The Holy Bible Conteyning the Old Testament, and the New* (London: Robert Barker, 1611), Dedication, sig. A2r. I originally drew attention to this pair of quotations in my Masters essay, 'Writing the Succession Crisis: Bodies Politic and Natural in *Titus Andronicus*, The *Love of King David and Fair Bethsabe*, and Wentworth's *Pithie Exhortation*', Michaelmas Term, 2007.

known *Farewell to the Militarie Profession* (1581) states in *Faultes, Faultes, and Nothing else but Faultes* (1606) that,

> Peace draweth the very corruption of manners after it, and there is nothing that brings so sweete and easie a subiection to vice, as the season and idlenes of Peace, it enfeebleth the minds of yong men, it maketh them become Hermaphrodites· halfe men, halfe harlots, it effeminates their minds, and nuzleth them vp in all folly.[114]

Thomas Heywood, meanwhile, speaks in his *Apology for Actors* (1612) of 'the fatnes and ranknes of a peacable Common-wealth', and comments sardonically that 'amongst many other thinges tollerated in this peaceable and florishing State, it hath pleased the high and mighty Princes of this Land to limit the vse of certaine publicke Theaters', suggesting that the intellectual corrosion of peacetime contributes to misplaced intolerance and licence.[115] Fulke Greville's *Dedication to Sir Philip Sidney*, completed in 1612, reflects these authors' contemporary warnings when he describes how Sidney observed, in contrast to the prudent defensive warfare in which Elizabeth I was engaged, 'fatal passiveness' in continental Europe, including Henri III of France 'buried in his pleasures', and 'his country apt, through scorn of his effeminate vices, either to become a prey for the strongest undertaker, or else to be cantonized by self division'.[116] Niccols's text is very clearly situated within this discourse, which extends well beyond the work of other Jacobean Spenserians.

The complaints, too, play on the image the peaceful, indolent monarch.[117] Robert Curthose asks in his complaint, '[s]ay, glorie, say, hath peacefull follie furl'd| Thy flag of honor[?]', describing his own era as an '[i]nglorious age, made drunke with dregs of peace', (1610, p. 641), which evokes an environment antithetical to the discourse of

[114] Melvin H. Wolf (ed.), *Faultes, Faultes, and Nothing Else but Faultes (1606)* (Gainsville, Florida, 1965), pp. 52-3.
[115] Thomas Heywood, *An Apology for Actors, Containing Three Briefe Treatises. 1 Their Antiquity. 2 Their Ancient Dignity. 3 the True Vse of Their Quality.* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1612), Book 1.
[116] John Gouws (ed.), *The Prose Works of Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), p. 48.
[117] Cf. Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, p. 174.

Protestant militancy which Norbrook, O'Callaghan and Perry have identified. Particularly telling in this regard is Niccols's complaint of Richard III. In composing this complaint, Niccols drew heavily on Shakespeare's play, first printed in 1597, and particularly its opening soliloquy. Shakespeare, though, had appropriated material for this soliloquy from Sackville's *Mirror* Induction,[118] manipulating Sackville's vignette of the horror of war into a grotesque rejection of peace, which leaves the audience in no doubt of Richard's villainy. Shakespeare's Richard's 'grim-visaged War' originates in the Induction, in which the figure of Warre appears, 'in glitterying armes yclad| With visage grym' (1563, f. 121v), wielding a bloody sword. But in the soliloquy,

> Grim-visaged War hath smoothed his wrinkled front,
> And now, instead of mounting barded steeds
> To fright the souls of fearful adversaries,
> He capers nimbly in a lady's chamber
> To the lascivious pleasing of a lute.[119]

For Sackville, war is explicitly negative – cities that had been honorable and glorious are 'Consumed, destroyed, wasted' (1563, f. 122r). Richard's portrayal of an effeminate, mincing figure, debased and corrupted in order to represent peace, marks the transition between his sarcastic acceptance of a 'summer' and 'son of York' he despises, and his disclosure to the audience that in fact he is 'determined to prove a villain| And hate the pleasure of these idle days,' this 'weak piping time of peace'.[120]

Niccols idolized Sackville's work, and this particular example was not removed when Niccols's replaced the 1563 Richard complaint. Indeed, Niccols foregrounds Sackville's Induction in his reworking of the *Mirror*, placing it at the beginning of the late

[118] In addition Shakespeare drew on the relevant late medieval complaints, as well as Higgins's complaint of Claudius. See James R. Siemon (ed.), *King Richard III* (The Arden Shakespeare London: Methuen Drama, 2009), 1.1.50 n., 1.1.65 n., 1.3.196 n., 1.4.76-83 n., 1.4.180-7 n. (Clarence); 1.2.19 n. (Richard, Duke of Gloucester, and Rivers); cf. 1.4.93-5 n. (Richard, Duke of Gloucester); 1.2.156-7 n., cf. 2.2.123-40 n., cf. 3.3.18-22 n. (Rivers); 2.3.21 n (Salisbury); 3.1.60 n., 3.2.21 n., cf. 3.4.67-71 n., cf. 3.4.74 n., 3.4.97-100 n., cf. 4.4.72 n. (Hastings); 3.2.39 n. (Richard); 4.2.63-4 n., 4.4.118 n. (Buckingham); 1.1.18-23 n. (Claudius).
[119] Siemon (ed.), *King Richard III*, 1.1.9-13.
[120] Ibid., 1.1.30-31; 1.1.25.

medieval collection. Nevertheless, the poetics of peace which Shakespeare's Richard uses to express his disdain chime precisely with Niccols's militant discourse. The debt to Shakespeare in the following stanza is obvious:

> God Mars laid by his Launce and took his Lute,
> And turn'd his rugged frownes to smiling lookes,
> In stead of crimson fields, warres fatall fruits,
> He bath'd his limbes in Cypris warbling brookes,
> And set his thoughts upon her wanton lookes,
> All noise of warre was husht upon our coast,
> Plentie each where in easefull pride did boast. (1610, p. 753)

Instead of 'grim-visaged War', Niccols presents Mars, with rugged frowns –both have lutes – but this transition, too, is symptomatic of Niccols's aesthetic overhaul of the Mirror's style; rather than the remarkably modern-sounding, Anglo-Saxon discourse of Shakespeare's Richard III, *A Winter Nights Vision* is characterised by more Latinate diction, and a profusion of Roman deities. So Niccols's Richard internalises Shakespeare's distorted allusion to Sackville, not to condemn Richard but to promote Niccols's militant Protestant, oppositional stance.

The prevalence of accounts of Richard III's reign and deposition in the sixteenth century laid his story open to a proliferation of allegorical purposes. Suitable for arguments against tyranny and usurpation, on the necessity of an established successor, and of the importance of an adult rather than child monarch, the story could be put to work for any political cause, and had endlessly recycled local significance. In libels, too, Richard was a useful card to play; he was explicitly associated with Robert Cecil, for example, sometimes with the possible implication that Cecil was worse.[121] This interpretative context, though, where Richard's absolute villainy was not quite fixed, complicates Niccols's reappropriation of Shakespeare's diction in a positive light. Mark

[121] See Margaret Hotine, '*Richard III* and *Macbeth* - Studies in Tudor Tyranny?', *Notes and Queries*, (December 1991), 480-86; Pauline Croft, 'The Reputation of Robert Cecil: Libels, Political Opinion and Popular Awareness in the Early Seventeenth Century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 1, Sixth Series, (1991), 43-69; M. G. Aune, 'The Uses of Richard III: From Robert Cecil to Richard Nixon', *Shakespeare Bulletin,* 24, 3 (Fall 2006), 23-47.

Rankin notes the delicate balance of historical parallels attached to James I following his accession; Henry VIII, for example, provided an analogue for James's reign, despite the more pertinent analogy with Henry VII, 'through whose bloodline James claimed the succession',[122] while in *The Vision and Disourse of Henry the Seuenth* (1610),[123] Henry VII is explicitly used to support James's proposed unification of England and Scotland. This is not to suggest that Niccols tried to rehabilitate Richard's character in order to demonise his allegorical opposite. But his lexical borrowings invoke aspects of the range of contemporary allegorical possibilities, which jostle and coexist. We should think of Niccols's complaint as composed in amongst these possibilities.

Arthur's complaint, the first of the collection, also places strong emphasis on the virtue of martial prowess and armed peace:

> In Courts where Kings, adore *Bellonaes* shrine,
> There the bright blaze of Chivalrie will shine. (1610, p. 564)

The plural 'Courts' and 'Kings' make Arthur's statement explicitly general, which allows Niccols at once to distance himself from specific criticism of James and to suggest that the ghostly speaker's advice is applicable at a local level. The placement of this statement in Arthur's complaint along with the Latinate personification of *Bellona* and invocation of medieval chivalry locate Niccols's discourse in dialogue with Spenserian content and style, which in turn contributes to a critical reflection on James through its Elizabethan associations. In the Induction, Memory is presented as an almost apocalyptic, and perhaps by implication specifically Protestant, force, as the speaker is startled in a discourse redolent of the Book of Revelation:

[122] Mark Rankin, 'Henry VIII, Shakespeare, and the Jacobean Royal Court', *SEL,* 51, 2 (2011), 349-66, at 349.
[123] T. G., *The Vision and Discourse of Henry the Seuenth. Concerning the Unitie of Great Brittaine* (London: G. Eld for Henry Fetherstone, 1610). T. G. was possibly Thomas Gainsford, the soldier and historian; see S. A. Baron, 'Gainsford, Thomas (*bap.* 1566, *d.*1624)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10284, accessed 8 Sept 2012].

> A sudden sound of trumpe I heard, whose blast so loud was blowne,
> That in a trance I senselesse lay, fraile mortall there was none
> That heard such sound, could sense retaine: my chamber wals did shake,
> Up flew the doores, a voice I heard, (1610, p. 558)

An analysis of Niccols's *Mirror* in the context of work by militant Protestants Brooke, Wither and Browne, helps to illuminate not only the aesthetic and ideological criticisms directed at Niccols, but also a reading of his work which places interlocked aesthetic and ideological concerns at the heart of his *Mirror* for the new political era. Niccols does not fit entirely comfortably within this community: unlike the Jacobean Spenserians, his work is not predominantly pastoral. The term 'Spenserian', though, is also misleading when used to describe Brooke, Browne and Wither's work, as Spenser's oeuvre is more varied than the specific portions of it that they venerated would imply.

Spenser's influence colours Niccols's oeuvre in diverse ways. When read in isolation, it should be difficult to ignore *A Winter Nights Vision*'s stylistic, generic and historiographical allusions to a contemporary discourse of discontent, from which a specific dissatisfaction with the Jacobean court may easily be extrapolated. In conjunction with the rest of Niccols's extant work, however, the 1610 *Mirror* forms part of an even more politically engaged oeuvre which renders it impossible to consider this text a passive reiteration of establishment-led historical narrative. It is not necessary to choose to read the 1610 *Mirror* against Niccols's *The Cuckow* (1607) and *The Beggers Ape* in order to perceive topical significance. Niccols's Induction alludes to both texts. He opens by telling his reader that,

> My Muse, that mongst meane birds whilome, did wave her flaggie wing,
> And cuckow-like of *Castae*'s wrongs, in rustick tunes did sing,
> Now with the mornes cloud-climing Lark must mount a pitch more hie,
> And like *Joves* bird with stedfast lookes outbrave the Sunnes bright eie:
> Yea she, that whilome begger-like her beggers ape did sing,
> Which injur'd by the guilt of time to light she durst not bring,
> In stately stile tragedian-like with sacred furie fed,
> Must now record the tragicke deeds of great *Heröes* dead[.] (1610, p. 555)

This passage sets out not only his poetic credentials and an aspiring Spenserian career trajectory but also the potential for overlap between the texts' political stances. Both texts employ animal allegory to comment on the corruption of James's court, allegory which in the case of *The Beggers Ape* was too contentious to be published in Niccols's lifetime. It is clear from these opening lines that Niccols wished to connect his works (while differentiating between their genres), and also that he had a particular, politically engaged readership in mind for all three – the allusion to the unpublished *Beggers Ape* suggests that it may have been circulated in manuscript, and extensively enough to merit a reference.

The Beggers Ape echoed the allegorical stance and scheme of Spenser's *Prosopopoia:* Or *Mother Hubberds Tale* (1591), and in conjunction with the pastoral and elegiac pieces gives his oeuvre more in common with Spenser than with the Jacobean Spenserians. Following the satirical tropes employed by Spenser in particular, Niccols participated in the antipathy towards court favourites Robert Cecil and Robert Carr, (who were themselves 'deeply antagonistic' towards one another),[124] which grew steadily through the 1600s. The opening lines of the poem, for example, depict the sun, '[d]ayes bright King', bringing 'his golden Carre' to Olympus, and seem to represent the collusion of the sun/King and 'Carre' in violently destroying the pastoral landscape beneath.[125] The *Beggers Ape* is thought to have been finished in 1607, and is only understood to be Niccols's work from his reference to it in the opening lines of *A Winter Nights Vision*.[126] Niccols follows a similar allegorical key to that in *Mother Hubberds Tale*, using the Ape to represent Sir Robert Cecil, on the grounds of his slight physical deformity. The Ape, 'the proverbial imitator of human gesture', arguably suggests in Spenser's poem the 'self-

[124] Croft, 'Robert Cecil', at 63.
[125] Richard Niccols, *The Beggers Ape* (London: Bernard Alsop and T. Fawcet for L. Chapman, 1627), sig. A2r-v.
[126] See Brice Harris (ed.), *The Beggers Ape (1627)* (Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, New York, 1936).

fashioning' of the early modern courtier,[127] and Niccols decries this in his beast fable too, as well as returning to the idea in later work. In Niccols's poem, the Fox represents the earl of Northampton; the Horse, 'his old hero' the Lord Admiral, Charles Howard, earl of Nottingham with whom Niccols served at Cadiz; the Elephant, Thomas Sackville, by now Earl of Dorset; the Goat, Philip Herbert, and the Ass his brother, Edward; the Sheep is Walter Ralegh; and the Ox, Henry Percy, earl of Northumberland.[128] Spenser's Fox had represented Lord Burghley; William Oram suggests that *Mother Hubberds Tale* 'was not reprinted with the rest of the *Complaints* in the 1611 edition of Spenser's works, probably for fear of antagonizing Robert Cecil, earl of Salisbury, Burghley's son'.[129] Otherwise, the significance of Spenser's allegory is less clear – it may have been written to oppose the possible marriage of Elizabeth to Alençon in 1579,[130] or, as Norbrook argues, to attack 'the growing political influence of Sir Robert Cecil, who was considered by his enemies to have achieved his control over the patronage system by bribery and corruption'.[131] This was certainly Niccols's intention.

Niccols's framing narrative follows Spenser's closely, as both speakers suffer from the summer heat, and hear a series of tales on all kinds of subjects told amongst a group, then choose to retell the story of the ape. For Niccols's speaker, though, it is a group of beggars, not his own friends, who share their stories, and the speaker hides to hear them. While Spenser's speaker rejects high, classicised style, claiming that 'No Muses aide me needes heretoo to call;| Base is the style, and matter meane withall',[132] Niccols seems to overlay a stylised 'Spenserian' classical pastoral onto his beast fable, and evokes an ideal Elizabethan era through allusions to the emperor Augustus, a golden

[127] Oram et al. (eds.), *Spenser's Shorter Poems*, p. 330.
[128] Harris (ed.), *The Beggers Ape (1627)*, and Pursglove (ed.), *Selected Poems*, pp. 10-12.
[129] Oram et al. (eds.), *Spenser's Shorter Poems*, p. 327.
[130] Ibid., p. 329.
[131] Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, p. 173.
[132] *Mother Hubberds Tale*, in Oram et al. (eds.), *Spenser's Shorter Poems*, p. 336, ll. 43-4.

'old Age', and 'heauens faire Virgin in her siluer throne', 'not many yeares' since.[133] Cutting to the quick much faster than Spenser's satire, the *Beggers Ape* sets up the abhorrence of idleness, luxury and courtly sycophants which pervades Niccols's *Mirror* complaints. The tale's claim that 'bare degrees that want true vertues merit| Shall in fames golden booke no place inherit' also foreshadows *A Winter Nights Vision*, which is itself conceived as a scion of 'fames golden booke', recording mirrors for true virtue.[134] It is notable that here and in his complaints, Niccols expresses contempt for lowly characters – unlike in the sixteenth-century editions, learning and eloquence or virtue cannot rehabilitate anyone of ignoble birth. *The Beggers Ape* does not refer at any point to a mirror, but its portrayal of Sackville, the Elephant, alludes to his ability to expose political corruption rhetorically:

> The noble Elephant, who as he stood
> From his sweet mouth powr'd forth a fluent [fl]ood
> Or honied eloquence, which wanting skill
> If I expresse the same, soone should I spill
> With sharpe inuectiue, first against that sort
> O[f] hungry Beggers that frequent the Court
> Hee did inueigh[.][135]

This seems to position the Elizabethan *Mirror* within his allegory, *via* Sackville's power as an Elizabethan statesman (apparently contrasted with Niccols's own facility with language) to oppose the failings of the Ape and the Fox.

Oram notes that Spenser's generic title, *Prosopopoia*, suggests personification or counterfeiting; prosopopoeia is also the genre of the original *Mirror* complaints, which were supposed to be read aloud by the writers' collective rather than delivered by the historical figures themselves. Is it possible that Niccols's removal of the linking sections of the earlier editions, which excised this element from the 1610 compilation, could be traced to a new ethical interpretation of prosopopoeia which followed his reading of

[133] Niccols, *The Beggers Ape*, sig. A3r.
[134] Ibid., sig. Cr.
[135] Ibid., sig. E2r.

Spenser's satire? If his central literary influence had drawn attention to the function of role-playing in court corruption, can we blame Niccols for wishing to purge that trope from a new edition which focused primarily on that vice? Andrew McRae notes that 'the courtier's arts of dissimulation, which had been lauded in literature of the sixteenth century, were increasingly refigured as strategies of mere deception'.[136] Where Blenerhasset's Edricus is portrayed as having acted in good faith and fallen foul of confusing power structures, for example, Niccols's Edmund Ironside repeats a dissembling speech of 'false *Edrick*' in order to demonstrate his 'craftie wile| Of seeming sorrow' (1610, p. 591), which foregrounds his dishonest attempts at preferment. Later in *Monodia, or Waltham's Complaint*, Niccols employed the figure of the ape again to represent courtly dissembling:

> Nor let those Pallace parasites, those apes,
> Who putting on the gestures and the shapes
> Of graver men, with their profaner lips
> To make their Ladies laugh, spit forth court quips
> Against devotion.[137]

Throughout his oeuvre, then, Niccols makes it his mission to oppose opportunism and the construction of personae. Small wonder that the previous incarnations of the *Mirror* had to be re-formed to serve his new polemic purpose.

Middleton's *Father Hubburd's Tales* (1604) has not been raised in this connection to date, but is also pertinent to Niccols's negotiation of early seventeenth-century literary culture as part of his oppositional project. A collection of tales framed by a verse narrative, *Father Hubburds Tales* features paratextual prefaces which 'become part of the work and fundamentally modify its narrative structure as well as its basic fiction'.[138] The series of tales by various figures satirize courtly excess and urban degeneracy, as well as

---

[136] Andrew McRae, *Literature, Satire, and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 89.
[137] Niccols, *Monodia*, sig. B4r.
[138] Adrian Weiss's Introduction in Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (eds.), *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 150.

envy and greed, and although uncharitable readers might see shades of Niccols in Middleton's scholar, the work functions as a link between Spenser's satire and the form the *Mirror* took in the seventeenth century. Its concluding verses 'evoke a paranoia about the danger of satirically attacking those in positions of power and rank',[139] expressed in familiar terms: the nightingale Philomel fears that the other birds 'abroad will blab our words' and in response her listeners, the ants 'hold their tongues',[140] ironically since in the Ovidian myth it is Philomel's tongue which is removed. The particular danger of oral transmission at work here, when words are taken out of context or misrepresented by others, echoes its portrayal in earlier editions of the *Mirror*, and Niccols's own frequent allusions to Philomel perpetuate a latent sense of this threat. In 1610, therefore, a broad satirical tradition which may have developed oppositional literary tactics from the early *Mirror* texts *via* the Martin Marprelate tracts informed Niccols's reconfiguration of the collection for a new political context.

The best known of Niccols's works, *Sir Thomas Ouerburies Vision*, contained additional complaints by the ghosts of 'Weston, Mistress Turner, and Franklin', and was one of the many contemporary poetic responses to the so-called Overbury scandal; the anonymous *Iust Down[fall of] Ambition, Adultery, and Murder* (1616) and Samuel Rowland's *Sir Thomas Overbury, or, The Poysoned Knights Complaint* (1614) also used ghost complaint and multiple perspectives to tell the story. It was thought that Overbury was murdered, while imprisoned in the Tower of London in 1613, as a result of his opposition to the relationship between Robert Carr – a Scot, Viscount Rochester, later Earl of Somerset and favourite of James I – and Frances Howard, Countess of Essex. James supported the annulment of Frances Howard's marriage in order to pave the way for her marriage to his close friend, which Overbury refused to endorse. Howard and Carr

[139] Ibid., p. 150.
[140] *Father Hubburds Tales, or The Ant and the Nightingale*, in ibid., p. 182.

were sentenced to death in 1616 for Overbury's murder, but James granted them pardons and eventually, in 1622, released them from imprisonment in the Tower.[141] Linda Levy Peck is right to note that while 'Niccols's strong attack on court corruption' in *Sir Thomas Ouerburies Vision* 'drew a significant line between the monarch and his favourites', 'by equating Somerset with Gaveston the poet also suggested dangerous similarities between the [Edward II and James I]'.[142] In *Sir Thomas Ouerburies Vision* the poet advises the ghost of Helwys,

> Thy foes decline, proud *Gaveston* is downe,
> No wanton *Edward* weares our England's crowne.[143]

This allusion to Edward II works here to avoid implicating James in the sleaze of court scandal, but it also effectively refers the reader back to Niccols's complaint of Edward II in *A Winter Nights Vision*. There, Niccols's necessary circumlocution on the subject of Edward's homosexuality allows his metaphoric portrayal of it as a disease or infection to stand more generally for court favoritism and corruption. 'In Court',

> ... the leprous spots of his delights
> Vnto the Palace wals so fast do cleaue,
> That from my presence all the noblest wights
> Withdraw themselues, (1610, p. 705)

while the country at large is reduced to civil conflict: as a result of '[t]he ranke contagion of this foule disease', '[w]arre rouz'd himselfe at home'. Outbreaks of plague in 1600s London would have given the description even greater topical resonance. The translation of Gaveston's 'evils' from sexual to politic is made more overt when Edward's ghost states that '[h]is lips were made the oracles, from whence| I tooke aduice' (1610, p. 708),

---

[141] For further details of the Overbury affair see the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, from which these details were taken (accessed online 20/05/10). For analysis of the contemporary literary response, see Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption*, from p. 175; Alastair Bellany, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

[142] Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption*, p. 177.

[143] Richard Niccols, *Sir Thomas Ouerburies Vision with the Ghoasts of Weston, Mris. Turner, the Late Lieftenant of the Tower, and Franklin* (London: for R. Meighen & T. Jones, 1616), p. 48.

while the pertinence of his warning is explicitly extended outwards by the following stanza:

> If slie dissimulation credit winne
> With *any* Prince, that sits on highest throne,
> With honied poyson of soure sugred sinne,
> It causeth him turne tyrant to his owne,
> And to his State workes swift confusion,
> Aboue his cedars top it high doth shoot,
> And canker-like deuoures it to the root. (1610, p. 704, my emphasis)

By alluding in *Ouerburies Vision* not only to Edward II's actual reign but also to his own treatment of it in the complaint, printed six years earlier and possibly composed three years before that, Niccols is able to highlight the progression from his warnings about court corruption to an analysis of its lethal effects – it is essentially a spectral 'I told you so'.

The Overbury scandal lent itself to the *de casibus* complaint form, and furthermore to a complaint collection like the *Mirror*, since its multiple participants could offer different perspectives on the narrative, as well as a different moral each. Public appetite for the salacious details of the scandal could be satisfied within an established morally educative framework. Since Overbury himself had been the author of the astonishingly popular poem *The Wife*, and the subject of so many printed eulogies,[144] the materiality of textual transmission and exchange became central to the contemporary retellings of his story by the 'politicized textual community that had joined together to expose court corruption'.[145] 'Mistress Turner', in the *Iust Downfall of Ambition*, for example, figures her own story as an extract in the 'Calender of time', and claims that

> Many a Widdow reading there my name,
> Will curse it, & the leafe that holds the same:
> Children as yet vnborne, comming to spell,

[144] See, for example, Thomas Overbury, *Sir Thomas Ouerburie His Wife with New Elegies Vpon His (Now Knowne) Vntimely Death : Whereunto Are Annexed, New Newes and Characters Written by Himselfe and Other Learned Gentlemen* (London: Edward Griffin for Laurence L'Isle, 1616), which contains six elegies for Overbury, and eleven poems in praise of *The Wife*.
[145] O'Callaghan, *The "Shepheards Nation"*, p. 16.

> Will take it for a Furies name in Hell;
> And casting by the Booke no more will read[.][146]

Niccols's poem depicts Overbury's ghost calling on 'Thy pens assitance' to 'paint out my tragicke woe', as in 'that true (*Mirrour for our Magistrates.*)',[147] in order to stabilise and dignify 'Those uncouth tidings', which Fame had begun 'with horried voice to sing…in each itching eare'.[148]

Sir Thomas Ouerburies Vision ends with a passage in praise of James I. England is happiest, Overbury says, 'In having such a holy, happy King'. Niccols clearly separates his criticism of court corruption from a potential attack on James, as he does throughout *A Winter Nights Vision* too.[149] However, his praise of the king as an enemy of Antichrist ('that seven-headed beast') seems to write James into a religious policy not quite his own. The evocation of 'A King, whose justice will at last not faile,| To give to each his owne in equall scale' remembers the unequal rewards received by the Fox and Ape in Niccols's beast fable, and 'at last' hints that this might represent a change of approach.[150]

Niccols's aesthetic choices in compiling, editing and adding to the Jacobean *Mirror* all point to the recreation of an Elizabethan poetics, perhaps to the detriment of the text's popularity in the seventeenth century. The Elizabethan flavour of the text is also due in part to the form itself. For a Jacobean readership, another edition of the *Mirror* must have felt dated, and was certainly not avidly anticipated. Where Higgins and Blenerhasset's continuations capitalized on Baldwin's success while the *Mirror* was still prominent in readers' minds, Niccols's sequel came twenty three years after its most recent predecessor, and forty seven years after Baldwin's death. Niccols was only three or

---

[146] I. T., *The Iust Downfall of Ambition, Adultery, and Murder Where-Vnto Are Added 3. Notorious Sinners. Weston. M. Turner and Franklin with His Arraignement, Confession and Execution Who All Suffered Death for the Murder If Sir Tho: Ouerbury, Poysoned in the Tower* (London: G. Eld, 1616), sig. B3r.
[147] Niccols, *Sir Thomas Ouerburies Vision*, p. 17.
[148] Ibid., p. 1.
[149] See, for example, King John's plea for loyalty to the king, which seems to address the contemporary reader directly (1610, p. 697, 'Woe to the wretched people of this land…').
[150] Pursglove (ed.), *Selected Poems*, p. 226.

four years old when Higgins's last edition was printed. So why choose the *Mirror* form at all? I would like to suggest, in line with the political argument advanced above, that Niccols saw Henry Marshe's 1587 edition as evocative of a triumphant and pivotal moment in Elizabeth's reign, which encapsulated all the idealized qualities thought to be lacking from James I's arsenal: decisive and successful armed action against two major Catholic threats; Spain, and James's mother, Mary Stuart. Niccols describes the Babington Conspiracy in *England's Eliza* (1610, pp. 808-811), and while he does not mention Mary Stuart he refers to 'the Babylonian bawd' (p. 810), invoking the typical invective used to depict her.[151] Niccols's dedication of *A Winter Nights Vision* to Lord Charles Howard, his commander in the 1596 expedition to Cadiz, may also have drawn readers minds back to the events of 1587-8. Howard was appointed Lord High Admiral by Elizabeth I in 1585, and was instrumental not only in preparing the fleet that was to have countered the Spanish Armada but also in Elizabeth I's final decision to execute Mary Stuart, following his attendance of Privy Council meetings regarding the Babington conspiracy.[152] Although these would not have been publically available, Howard's letters also record his antipathy towards attempts at peace with Spain, and his views that such a peace would be both foolish and humiliating.[153] While Howard continued to serve under James, his close familial and political association with Elizabeth contributes to Niccols's evocation of a previous era. The decision to print *England's Eliza*, in which England's naval triumphs are described, alongside Niccols's *Mirror* allows the verse historical account of Elizabeth's reign to be read with a scion of 1587 literary enterprise, making a subtle but damning political point.

[151] Cf. Thomas Dekker, *The Whore of Babylon as It Was Acted by the Princes Seruants* (London: for Nathaniel Butter, 1607), for example.
[152] Robert W. Kenny, *Elizabeth's Admiral: The Political Career of Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham, 1536-1624* (London: John Hopkins Press, 1970), pp. 104-6.
[153] J. K. Laughton (ed.), *State Papers Relating to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada, Anno 1588* (2nd edn., Aldershot: Temple Smith for the Navy Records Society, 1987), Vol. I, pp. 50-51.

Conclusion

In as much as the *Mirror* tradition as a whole is linked to the genre of advice to princes, and advice to citizenry at large, Niccols's 1610 edition fits with Higgins's sixteenth-century additions, providing bland moral advice to the public and specific words of warning to those in power. At its least polemical, Niccols's *Mirror* could be read as a cautionary exploration of the consequences of court favoritism and a promotion of militant Protestant zeal. But when we read his Induction to *A Winter Nights Vision* along with the sporadic anti-Scottish hints and alterations, and in combination with his other works, it becomes clear that their admonition is more than merely hypothetical. His adherence to an oppositional aesthetics brought the *Mirror* closer to the function, if not the method, of the early editions than in the intervening years.

Niccols's role in the closing stages of the *Mirror* tradition has been overplayed. His retrospective poetics and old-fashioned historiographical techniques cannot have helped to promote the *Mirror* in Stuart England. But instead of the subservient viewpoint Budra posits as the basis of the tradition's downfall, it may have been because Niccols actually engaged combatively with contemporary politics through the medium of the *Mirror* tradition that it did not sit appropriately with the literary mood of the time. The early seventeenth-century expansion of the complaint genre and dramatic appropriation of Galfridian narratives, as well as Niccols's own work, illustrate the ongoing impact of the *Mirror* tradition as a whole. While we should avoid a teleological reading, the disintegration of Stuart rule and the rise of more overt satire and polemic as the seventeenth century progressed displaced the sort of topical commentary to which the *Mirror* was suited. Niccols's revised collection, then, might not have enjoyed the same success as the sixteenth-century texts did, but the collection itself acknowledged and challenged this unfavorable literary climate, and Niccols's decision to appropriate the

Elizabethan *Mirror* to convey his criticism of a new political age was ingenious and apposite.

General Conclusion

> IT is wonderfull (good Reader) to see the sundry diuersities of wittes what meanes they inuente to declare & publishe suche thynges as they thinke necessary to be knowe*n*, some vnder the colour of fayned histories, some vnder the persons of specheles beastes, and some vnder ye shadow of dreames and visions, of which thou haste here a notable and wurthy example.[1]

Thanks to the recent resurgence of scholarly interest, it is now possible to approach the *Mirror for Magistrates*, without Baldwin's irony, as a 'notable and wurthy' text which played a pivotal role in shaping early modern imaginative literature. Critical bias still persisted, however, against the 'sundry diuersities' of its subsequent development. This thesis has aimed firstly to embrace and explore the complexity of the *Mirror*'s transmission history, and to challenge the reductive assessments by previous critics. Secondly, it aimed to trace the appropriation and adaptation of the *Mirror* form by the later contributors and editors, and to resituate these appropriations in their literary, political and historiographical contexts. Why did they choose to add to the *Mirror*, and how did their treatment of it advance their projects? Thirdly, the thesis set out to focus in particular on the different ways in which each edition of and addition to the *Mirror* corpus engaged with and presented processes of reading and writing history.

In pursuing these aims, this study has traced the development of several themes and their place in sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century intellectual culture. How significant or relevant is the truth of historical accounts? What part does social memory play in shaping contemporary political culture and conceptions of virtue? To what extent does ethical worth inhere in aesthetic value? How far can we trust oral and written

[1] *Wonderfull Newes of the Death of Paule the .iii. Last Byshop of Rome*, trans. W. B. Londoner (London: Thomas Gaultier, 1552), 'W. B. to the louyng Reader', sig. A1v. The *Wonderfull Newes* was once attributed to Matthias Flacius Illyricus but is now thought to be the work of Pier Paolo Vergerio the Younger; see Anne Overell and Scott C. Lucas, 'Whose Wonderful News? Italian Satire and William Baldwin's *Wonderfull Newes of the Death of Paule the III*', *Renaissance Studies*, 26, 2 (2010), 180-196.

narratives, and what happens when those narratives are manipulated for political or personal ends? In addressing these questions, and how the answers to them shift across its fifty-year expansion, I hope to have demonstrated the centrality of the *Mirror* to early modern understanding and representations of the past.

Critics frequently write of the *Mirror*'s contemporary popularity. But scholarship has not gone nearly far enough in taking on board that popularity's implications. This thesis explores the expansion of the *Mirror* as its reputation took hold, and the ways in which the 'brand' was exploited and deployed for new purposes. The *First* and *Second* parts of the *Mirror*, by Higgins and Blenerhasset respectively, have been treated as minor works in the early modern canon. But what did it really mean to hijack a project so popular that it could be identified simply by the (inaccurate!) abbreviation, 'M. of M.', as in Robert Albott's *Englands Parnassus* (1600)? Albott attributed some three thousand words of verse to the *Mirror* in his anthology of 'flowers of Learning',[2] alongside extracts by poets such as Sackville, Gascoigne, Spenser, Drayton, Daniel, and Chapman, as well as dramatists like Shakespeare, Marlowe and Kyd. In order to appreciate how the *Mirror* functioned in amongst these luminaries, its full transmission history has to be reconsidered.

The 1559-63 *Mirror* is well-known as a source and influence for Shakespeare's tetralogies. But to posit the earliest iterations of the text as the inspiration for late Elizabethan drama is to conflate the fluctuating topical resonances of late medieval history at distinct points in the sixteenth century into a single cultural response. Richard II, for example, had become a common figure for Elizabeth I by the time of her notorious

[2] Robert Albott (ed.), *Englands Parnassus: Or the Choysest Flowers of Our Moderne Poets, with Their Poeticall Comparisons Descriptions of Bewties, Personages, Castles, Pallaces, Mountaines, Groues, Seas, Springs, Riuers, &C. Whereunto Are Annexed Other Various Discourses, Both Pleasaunt and Profitable* (London: N. Ling C. Burby and T. Hayes, 1600), Dedication, sig. A4r.

claim in 1601, ‘I am Richard II. Know ye not that?’[3] The comparison by this point in her reign referred to the uncertain succession, and Elizabeth’s increasing vulnerability as a monarch, and Shakespeare’s play is regularly read as a response to this context.[4] However, in 1578, Sir Francis Knollys had defended his unpalatable advice to the queen by claiming that he refused to ‘play the partes of King Richard the Second’s men’.[5] Here, at a peak of the *Mirror*’s late sixteenth-century expansion, Knollys used the allusion to denounce court flattery, not to equate Elizabeth with Richard *per se*. When Richard II’s downfall was depicted in the *Mirror* through a series of *de casibus* complaints back in 1559, its topical force was different again.[6] If the original complaints of the suppressed *Memorial* had been calculated to ‘protest specific instances of Marian officers’ abuse of English law on the queen’s behalf’,[7] the re-presentation of these complaints under Elizabeth represented the first of a series of renegotiations of the narratives’ topical applicability in the history of the *Mirror*’s transmission and reception. The influence of the *Mirror*’s brand of history on Shakespeare’s plays provides one expression of the way in which the texts, and their particular historical characters, had come to be read by the end of the century. The evolution of the *Mirror* from its Marian beginnings forms a part of the cultural fabric out of which these characters and this form of history acquired their late Elizabethan and early Jacobean significance.

Around 1595, Shakespeare’s Richard II would shatter a mirror. Its shards stand for the ‘brittle glory’ of his forfeited kingship, more accurately reflected in fragments following his deposition. Well might an Elizabethan Richard expect a mirror to illustrate

---

[3] See Jason Scott-Warren, ‘Was Elizabeth I Richard II?: The Authenticity of Lambarde’s “Conversation”’, *The Review of English Studies,* Advance Access, (July 14th 2012).
[4] From Evelyn May Albright, 'Shakespeare's *Richard II* and the Essex Conspiracy', *PMLA,* 42, 3 (1927), 686-720 onwards.
[5] Charles R. Forker (ed.), *King Richard II* (The Arden Shakespeare, London: Methuen Drama, 2002), cf. Introduction, p. 5 n. 1.
[6] For the on-going modulation of the play’s topical resonance beyond the Elizabethan period see Margaret Shewring, *King Richard II* (Shakespeare in Performance; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).
[7] Lucas, *Politics*, p. 16.

his downfall: by the time of the play's composition, the *Mirror for Magistrates* had been England's principal purveyor of 'sad stories of the deaths of kings' for nearly forty years.[8] The *Mirror* catalogued more candidly than the 'flatt'ring glass' Richard smashes the mutability of fortune, and the mortality of monarchs; in short,

> How some have been deposed, some slain in war,
> Some haunted by the ghosts they have deposed,
> Some poisoned by their wives, some sleeping killed,
> All murdered.[9]

Richard II constructs himself textually, and his fascination with the presentation of his own narrative is informed and shadowed by the *Mirror*'s best-selling *de casibus* formulation.[10]

But it is not just the form of history, and the shape of his own tragic fate which Shakespeare's Richard reads in the *Mirror*. Stories, tales, retold and remade, provide a *locus* in the play for desperate anxiety held in tension with desperate faith. In the *Mirror* as in *Richard II*, the vulnerability of textual history to reconstruction and misappropriation is exposed, while its political and memorial roles in shaping identity are exploited and celebrated. But the *Mirror* also exerted more mercurial influences, perpetuating models of moral providentialism and teleology that were otherwise being superseded, and, crucially, a self-reflexive awareness of these models and how to read them.

By the late 1590s and 1600s, this form of history was obviously so popular, and appropriations of the *Mirror* had proliferated to such an extent, as to have become tedious; indeed, comically tedious, and the object of satire. It is difficult to survey this landscape for evidence of the *Mirror*'s impact, since by this point the tradition was

[8] Forker (ed.), *Richard II*, 3.II.152.
[9] Ibid., 3.2.153-6.
[10] Cf. Budra, *De Casibus*, pp. 85-6; p. 92.

necessarily so pervasive and embedded. Furthermore, the genre's appeal partly has to do with repetition; the texts deployed commonplaces, and were in turn excerpted by readers on the hunt for catchy aphorisms. As in the incestuous, appropriative language of early modern chronicle history, it is impossible to trace individual borrowings. The *Mirror*'s familiarity, though, is reflected back to the audience by *Henry V*'s Fluellen, for example. His repetitive, comic exploration of the depiction of Fortune which follows Pistol's alliterative parody ('And giddy Fortune's furious fickle wheel,| That goddess blind,| That stands upon the rolling restless stone'),[11] alludes to a traditional discourse which had perhaps grown tiresome in its ubiquity:

> Fortune is painted blind, with a muffler afore her eyes, to signify to you that Fortune is blind; and she is painted also with a wheel, to signify to you, which is the moral of it, that she is turning, and inconstant, and mutability, and variation; and her foot, look you, is fixed upon a spherical stone, which rolls, and rolls, and rolls, and rolls. In good truth, the poet makes a most excellent description of it: Fortune is an excellent moral.[12]

The 'spherical stone, which rolls, and rolls, and rolls, and rolls' could advance a sly evocation of the *Mirror*'s more laborious rehearsals of Fortune's fickleness, and its extended publication history. Indeed, Fluellen's "Fluellenism",[13] the tendency to draw tenuous parallels between historical figures, may be read as a parody of that function of the *Mirror*. Also a commonplace of early modern historical interpretation,[14] this was no doubt wearing thin after the repeatedly implied topicality of the eighty five *Mirror* complaints available to Shakespeare's contemporaries.[15] Ben Jonson uses bathos to send up the *Mirror*'s "Fluellenism" explicitly in the opening scene of *Bartholomew Fair*

[11] Craik (ed.), *Henry V*, 3.6.26-8. Craik identifies *Locrine* (1595), Gascoigne's *Jocasta* (1566, printed 1573), and Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* as objects of parody here; see ibid., pp. 233-4.
[12] Ibid., 3.6.29-37.
[13] As identified in Richard Levin, 'On Fluellen's Figures, Christ Figures, and James Figures', *PMLA,* 89, 2 (1974), 302-11.
[14] See Willy Maley, '"Let a Welsh Correction Teach You a Good English Condition": Shakespeare, Wales and the Critics', in Willy Maley and Philip Schwyzer (eds.), *Shakespeare and Wales: From the Marches to the Assembly* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 177-89, p. 186.
[15] In 1610, Niccols's addition of the *Winter Nights Vision* would make this ninety five.

(1614), when his Scrivener asks that the audience give up anyone who attempts to interpret the play topically, or is

> …so solemnly ridiculous, as to search out, who was meant by the *Ginger-bread-woman*, who by the *Hobby-horse-man*, who by the *Costard-monger*, nay, who by their *Wares*. Or that will pretend to affirme (on his owne *inspired ignorance*) what *Mirror of Magistrates* is meant by the *Iustice*, what *great Lady* by the *Pigge-woman*, what *conceal'd States-man*, by the *Seller* of *Mouse-trappes*, and so of the rest.[16]

Another function of the *Mirror* is mocked in George Chapman's comedy *May Day* (1611). In the third act, Honorio and Lodovico plot to deceive Lorenzo, whose erudition is simultaneously proven and lampooned by his reading.[17] He is 'an old Senator, one that has read *Marcus Aurelius, Gesta Romanorum*, the *Mirror of Magistrates, &c*'; Lodovico derides these texts' famous exemplarity, saying 'Let my man reade how hee deserues to be bayted'.[18]

Familiarity, and critical engagement with the *Mirror* tradition are also to be found in late 1590s satire. While John Marston's 'Reactio' in *The Metamorphosis of Pigmalions Image And Certaine Satyres* (1598) seems to defend 'Magistrates mirrour' from 'thy enuious hungry fangs',[19] Joseph Hall's *Virgidemiarum* (1598) comically denounces the fan of 'notes of rufull plaint', who

> Vrgeth his melting Muse with solemne teares
> Rime of some dreerie fates, of lucklesse peeres.
> Then brings he vp some branded whining ghost,
> To tell how olde misfortunes had him tost.[20]

---

[16] Ben Jonson, *Bartholmew Fayre: A Comedie, Acted in the Yeare, 1614 by the Lady Elizabeths Seruants, and Then Dedicated to King Iames, of Most Blessed Memorie; the Diuell Is an Asse: A Comedie Acted in the Yeare, 1616, by His Maiesties Seruants; the Staple of Newes: A Comedie Acted in the Yeare, 1625, by His Maiesties Seruants by the Author, Beniamin Iohnson* (London: I.B. for Robert Allot, 1631), Induction, sig. A6r. Cf. Lucas, *Politics*, pp. 1-3.

[17] Cf. Geoffrey R. Hope, 'Tales of Literacy and Authority in the *Violier* (1521): The French *Gesta Romanorum*', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance,* 59, 2 (1997), 353-63, at 357.

[18] George Chapman, *May-Day a Witty Comedie, Diuers Times Acted at the Blacke Fryers* (London: William Stansby for Iohn Browne, 1611), p. 39.

[19] John Marston, *The Metamorphosis of Pigmalions Image and Certaine Satyres* (London: [Iames Roberts] for Edmond Matts, 1598), p. 62.

[20] Joseph Hall, *Virgidemiarum Sixe Bookes* (London: Richard Bradocke for Robert Dexter, 1598), Book I, Satire V, p. 12.

Hall claims,

> Too popular is *Tragick Poesie*,
> Strayning his tip-toes for a farthing fee,
> And doth besides on *Rimelesse* numbers tread,
> Vnbid *Iambicks* flow from carelesse head.
> Some brauer braine in high *Heroick* rimes
> Compileth worme eate stories of old times.[21]

This could refer specifically to the *Mirror*, including Blenerhasset's experiment with unrhymed iambics, or to the spate of imitators it prompted – either way, the satire's contempt depends on readers' familiarity with the form. For all their scorn, these satires attend closely to the workings of textual transmission in the *Mirror*s, encapsulating the tension between original composition, and the compilation of oral and written narratives.

In short, we need to recalibrate our understanding of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century's literary landscape. We need to recognise that the *Mirror*'s title had passed into idiomatic use,[22] and to take into account contemporary fluency not just with the subject matter or style of the *Mirror*, but with the interpretative strategies it demanded. The poetic transmission and topical interpretation of history are central to the *Mirror*'s early modern reception as well as its practice.

As a wide-ranging re-evaluation of the *Mirror*'s place in the landscape of sixteenth-century writing, this thesis was necessarily not exhaustive, and future work could investigate in greater detail the particular significance and derivation of individual complaint histories, as well as the bibliographic intricacies of the texts' circulation and reception. Reluctantly, many suggestive avenues were not explored here. However, I

---

[21] Ibid., Book I, Satire IV, p. 10.

[22] See, for example, William Est, *The Triall of True Teares. Or the Summons to Repentance Whereby the Secure Sinner Is Taught How to Escape the Terrible Sentence of the Supreame Iudge. Meditated Vpon Christes Weeping Ouer Ierusalem, Very Necessarie for These Present Times* (London: Tho. Creede for Arthur Iohnson, 1613), p. 23; Thomas Gibson, *The Blessing of a Good King Deliuered in Eight Sermons Vpon the Storie of the Queene of the South, Her Words to Salomon, Magnifying the Gouernment of His Familie and Kingdome* (London: Tho. Creede and N. Okes for Arthur Iohnson, 1614), p. 106.

hope that this analysis has gone some way towards unlocking the whole *Mirror*'s incredible richness and variety, and its importance as a site for further research.

Works Cited

Primary Texts

Aelfric (1566), *A Testimonie of Antiquitie shewing the Auncient Fayth in the Church of England touching the Sacrament of the Body and Bloude of the Lord here Publikely Preached, and also Receaued in the Saxons Tyme, aboue 600. yeares agoe* (London: John Day).

Albott, Robert (ed.), (1600), *Englands Parnassus: or the Choysest Flowers of our Moderne Poets, with their Poeticall Comparisons* (London: N. L[ing,] C. B[urby] and T. H[ayes]).

Andrew, Malcolm and Waldron, Ronald (eds.) (2002), *The Poems of the Pearl Manuscript* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press).

Anonymous (1509), *Kynge Rycharde Cuer du Lyon* (London: The Son of Wynkyn de Worde).

Ariosto, Lodovico (1607), *Orlando Furioso in English Heroical Verse*, trans. John Harington (London: Richard Field, for Iohn Norton and Simon Waterson).

Aristotle (1957), 'On Memory and Recollection', in Jeffrey Henderson (ed.), *On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath: Aristotle VIII* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press), 285-313.

--- (2004), *The Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. J. A. K. Thomson (London: Penguin).

Ayscu, Edward (1607), *A Historie Contayning the Warres, Treaties, Marriages, and other Occurrents betweene England and Scotland from King William the Conqueror, Vntill the Happy Vnion of them both in Our Gratious King Iames.* (London: G. Eld).

Bacon, Francis (1605), *The Twoo Bookes of Francis Bacon. Of the Proficience and Aduancement of Learning, Diuine and Humane* (London: Thomas Purfoot and Thomas Creede for Henrie Tomes).

--- (1629), *Considerations Touching a Warre with Spaine* (London).

Bedel, Henry (1571), *A Sermon Exhorting to Pitie the Poore* (London: John Awdely).

Benson, Larry D. (ed.), (1988), *The Riverside Chaucer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Bergen, Henry (ed.), (1924), *Lydgate's Fall of Princes* (Early English Text Society, London: Oxford University Press).

Black, Joseph L. (2008), *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: A Modernized and Annotated Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Blenerhasset, Thomas (1582), *A Reuelation of the True Minerua* (London: Thomas Dawson for Thomas Woodcoke).

Bloch, David (2007), *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection: Text, Translation, Interpretation, and Reception in Western Scholasticism* (Philosophia Antiqua; Leiden and Boston: Brill).

Blundeville, Thomas (1574), *The True Order and Methode of Wryting and Reading Hystories, According to the Precepts of Francisco Patricio, and Accontio Tridentino* (London: William Seres).

Boaistuau, Pierre and Fenton, E. (1569), *Certaine Secrete Wonders of Nature Containing a Description of Sundry Strange Things* (London: Henry Bynneman).

Boccaccio, Giovanni (1494), *Here Begynnethe the Boke calledde Iohn Bochas descriuinge the Falle of Princis Princessis [and] other Nobles*, trans. John Lydgate (London: Richard Pynson).

--- (1554), *The Tragedies, gathered by Ihon Bochas, of all such Princes as Fell from theyr Estates throughe the Mutability of Fortune since the Creacion of Adam, vntil his Time wherin may be seen what Vices bring Menne to Destruccion, wyth Notable Warninges howe the Like may be Auoyded*, trans. John Lydgate (London: John Wayland).

Bol, Cornelius (1611), *The Holy Bible conteyning the Old Testament, and the New* (London: Robert Barker).

Bossewell, John (1572), *Workes of Armorie Deuyded into Three Bookes, entituled, the Concordes of Armorie, the Armorie of Honor, and Of Coates and Creastes* (London: Richard Tottell).

Buck, George (1605), *Daphnis Polystephanos: An Eclog treating of Crownes, and of Garlandes, and to whom of right they appertaine* (London: G. Eld for Thomas Adams).

Calvin, John (1561), *The Institution of the Christian Religion*, trans. Thomas Norton (London: Reinolde Wolfe and Richard Harrison).

Campbell, Lily B. (ed.), (1938), *The Mirror for Magistrates* (Huntington Library Publications, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

--- (ed.), (1946), *Parts Added to The Mirror for Magistrates by John Higgins and Thomas Blenerhasset* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Cartwright, Thomas (1574), *A Defense of the Ecclesiastical Regiment in Englande, defaced by T. C. in his Replie agaynst D. Whitgift* (London: Henry Bynneman for Humfrey Toy).

Cavendish, George (1980), *Metrical Visions*, A. S. G. Edwards (ed.), (Columbia, S. C.: University of South Carolina Press).

Chapman, George (1611), *May-day A Witty Comedie, Diuers Times Acted at the Blacke Fryers* (London: William Stansby for Iohn Browne).

Churchyard, Thomas (1575), *The Firste Parte of Churchyardes Chippes contayning Twelue Seuerall Labours* (London: Thomas Marshe).

--- (1593), *Churchyards Challenge* (London: John Wolfe).

de Guevara, Antonio (1577), *A Chronicle, conteyning the Liues of Tenne Emperours of Rome*, trans. Edward Hellowes (London: Henry Middleton for Ralph Newberie).

De Rouer, Raymond (1571), *Della Disciplina Militare di Mons*, trans. Mambrino Roseo (Venezia: Giovanni Maria I Bonelli).

Dekker, Thomas (1607), *The Whore of Babylon As it was acted by the Princes Seruants* (London: for Nathaniel Butter).

Digges, Dudley (1655), *The Compleat Ambassador, or, Two treaties of the Intended Marriage of Qu. Elizabeth of Glorious Memory* (London: Thomas Newcomb for Gabriel Bedell and Thomas Collins).

Elyot, Thomas (1537), *The Boke named the Gouernour* (London: Thomas Berthelet).

Est, William (1613), *The Triall of True Teares. Or the Summons to Repentance whereby the Secure Sinner is taught how to Escape the Terrible Sentence of the Supreame Iudge. Meditated vpon Christes weeping ouer Ierusalem, very necessarie for these Present Times* (London: Tho. Creede for Arthur Iohnson).

Fabyan, Robert (1533), *Fabyans Cronycle Newly Prynted, wyth the Cronycle, Actes, and Dedes done in the Tyme of the Reygne of the Moste Excellent Prynce Kynge Henry the VII* (London: William Rastell).

Flacius Illyricus (attrib.), Matthias (1552), *Wonderfull Newes of the Death of Paule the III, Last Byshop of Rome*, trans. W. B. Londoner (London: Thomas Gaultier).

Forker, Charles R. (ed.), (2002), *King Richard II* (The Arden Shakespeare, London: Methuen Drama).

Fox, Denton (ed.), (1981), *The Poems of Robert Henryson* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Fulwell, Ulpian (1575), *The Flower of Fame Containing the Bright Renowne, & moste Fortunate Raigne of King Henry the VIII* (London: William Hoskins).

G., T. (1610), *The Vision and Discourse of Henry the Seuenth. Concerning the Unitie of Great Brittaine* (London: G. Eld for Henry Fetherstone).

Gibson, Thomas (1614), *The Blessing of a Good King Deliuered in Eight Sermons vpon the Storie of the Queene of the South, Her Words to Salomon, Magnifying the Gouernment of his Familie and Kingdome* (London: Tho. Creede and N. Okes for Arthur Iohnson).

Grafton, Richard (1569), *A Chronicle at Large and Meere History of the Affayres of Englande and Kinges of the Same Deduced from the Creation of the worlde, vnto the First Habitation of thys Islande: and so by Contynuance vnto the First Yere of the Reigne of our most Deere and Souereigne Lady Queene Elizabeth* (London: Henry Denham for Richard Tottel and Humphrey Toye).

Gratarolo, Guglielmo (1562), *The Castel of Memorie wherein is conteyned the Restoring, Augmenting, and Conseruing of the Memorye and Remembraunce, with the Safest Remedies, and Best Preceptes therevnto in any wise apperteyning*, trans. William Fulwood (London, Gutter Lane: Rouland Hall).

Greene, Robert (1592), *A Disputation, Betweene a hee Conny-Catcher, and a shee Conny-Catcher whether a Theefe or a Whoore, is most Hurtfull in Cousonage, to the Common-wealth* (London: A. Ieffes for T. Gubbin).

Hall, Arthur (1576), *A Letter sent by F.A. Touchyng the Proceedings in a Priuate Quarell and Vnkindnesse betweene Arthur Hall, and Melchisedech Mallerie gentleman, to his very friende L.B. being in Italie* (London: Henry Bynneman for Arthur Hall).

Hall, Joseph (1598), *Virgidemiarum Sixe Bookes* (London: Richard Bradocke for Robert Dexter).

Hardyng, John (1543), *The Chronicle of Ihon Hardyng from the Firste Begynnyg of Englande, vnto the Reigne of Kyng Edward the Fourth* (London: Richard Grafton).

Harris, Brice (ed.), (1936), *The Beggers Ape (1627)* (Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, New York).

Harvey, Gabriel and Spenser, Edmund (1580), *Three Proper, and Wittie, Familiar Letters: lately passed betvveene tvvo Vniuersitie men: touching the Earthquake in Aprill last, and our English refourmed Versifying* (London: H. Bynneman).

Haslewood, Joseph (ed.), (1815), *Mirror for Magistrates* (London).

Haslop, Henry (1587), *Newes out of the Coast of Spaine The True Report of the Honourable Seruice for England, perfourmed by Sir Frauncis Drake in the moneths of Aprill and May last past, 1587* (London: W. How for Henry Haslop).

Haywood, John (1603), *An Answer to the First Part of a Certaine Conference, Concerning Succession, Published not long since vnder the name of R. Dolman* (London: Eliot's Court Press, R. Bradock, P. Short, T. Snodham, R. Field, and J. Harrison for Simon Waterson, and Cuthbert Burbie).

Hearsey, Marguerite (1932), 'The MS. of Sackville's Contribution to the Mirror for Magistrates', *The Review of English Studies,* 8 (31), 282-90.

--- (ed.), (1936), *The Complaint of Henry, Duke of Buckingham, Including the Induction: or, Thomas Sackville's Contribution to the Mirror for Magistrates* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Hebel, J. William (ed.), (1961), *The Works of Michael Drayton* 5 vols. (Oxford: Blackwell).

Heresbach, Conrad (1577), *Foure Bookes of Husbandry*, trans. Barnabe Googe (London: Richard Watkins).

Heywood, Thomas (1612), *An Apology for Actors, Containing Three Briefe Treatises. 1 Their Antiquity. 2 Their Ancient Dignity. 3 The True Vse of their Quality.* (London: Nicholas Okes).

Higden, Ranulf (1482), *Polycronicon* (London: William Caxton).

Higgins, John (1602), *An Answere to Master William Perkins, Concerning Christs Descension into Hell* (Oxford: Joseph Barnes, printer to the University).

Higgins, John and Udall, Nicholas (eds.) (1575), *Flowers or Eloquent Phrases of the Latine Speach, Gathered out of All the Sixe Comoedies of Terence Whereof those of the First Three were Selected by Nicholas Udall. And those of the Latter Three, Nowe to them Annexed by John Higgins.* (London: Thomas Marshe).

Jonson, Ben (1631), *Bartholmew Fayre: a Comedie, acted in the yeare, 1614 by the Lady Elizabeths seruants, and then dedicated to King Iames, of most Blessed Memorie; The Diuell is an Asse: a Comedie acted in the yeare, 1616, by His Maiesties seruants; The Staple of Newes: a Comedie acted in the yeare, 1625, by His Maiesties seruants by the author, Beniamin Iohnson* (London: I.B. for Robert Allot).

Kelton, Arthur (1578), *A Chronycle with a Genealogie declaryng that the Brittons and Welshemen are Linealiye Dyscended from Brute* (London: Richard Grafton).

Lanquet, Thomas and Cooper, Thomas (1565), *Coopers Chronicle contenynge the Whole Discourse of the Histories as well of thys Realme, as all other Countreis* (London).

Lanquet, Thomas, Cooper, Thomas, and Crowley, Robert (1559), *An Epitome of Chronicles Conteyninge the Whole Discourse of the Histories as well of this Realme of England, as al other Countreys, with the Succession of their Kinges, the Time of their Reigne, and what Notable Actes they did* (London: William Seres for Thomas Marshe).

Laughton, J. K. (ed.), (1987), *State Papers Relating to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada, Anno 1588* (2nd edn., Aldershot: Temple Smith for the Navy Records Society).

Leslie, John (1569), *A Defence of the Honour of the Right Highe, Mightye and Noble Princesse Marie Quene of Scotlande and Dowager of France with a Declaration aswell of her Right, Title & Intereste to the Succession of the Crowne of Englande* (London [i.e. Rheims]: Eusebius Dicaeophile [i.e. J. Foigny]).

Lloyd, Lodowick (1573), *The Pilgrimage of Princes, penned out of sundry Greeke and Latine Aucthours* (London: John Charlewood and John Kingston for William Jones).

Long Scott, Edward John (ed.), (1884), *The Letter-book of Gabriel Harvey* (the Camden Society).

Mancinus, Dominicus (1518), *Here Begynneth a Ryght Frutefull Treatyse, intituled the Myrrour of Good Maners* Conteynyng *the .iiii. vertues, called Cardynall*, trans. Alexander Bercley (London: Richard Pynson).

Marston, John (1598), *The Metamorphosis of Pigmalions Image And Certaine Satyres* (London: [Iames Roberts] for Edmond Matts).

Mercator, Gerhard (1635), *Historia Mundi: or Mercator's Atlas*, trans. Wye Staltonstall (London: T. Cotes, for Michael Sparke and Samuel Cartwright).
Montaigne, Michel de (1603), *The Essayes or Morall, Politike and Millitarie Discourses of Lo: Michaell de Montaigne, Knight of the noble Order of St. Michaell, and one of the Gentlemen in Ordinary of the French King, Henry the Third his Chamber. The First Booke.*, trans. John Florio (London: Val. Simms for Edward Blount).
Newton, Thomas (1580), *A View of Valyaunce, Describing the Famous Feates, and Martiall Exploites of the Two Most Mightie Nations, the Romains and the Carthaginians, for the Conquest and Possession of Spayne. Translated out of an Auncient Recorde of Antiquitie, written by Rutilius Rufus, a Romaine Gentleman, and a Capitaine of Charge Vnder Scipio, in the Same Warres.* (London: Thomas East).
--- (ed.), (1927), *Seneca His Tenne Tragedies, Translated into English*, ed. Charles Whibley 2 vols. (The Tudor Translations, Second Series, 2; London: Constable and Co.).
Niccols, Richard (1615), *Monodia or Walthams Complaint vpon the Death of that most Vertuous and Noble Ladie, late Deceased, the Lady Honor Hay* (London: William Stansby for Richard Meighen and Thomas Iones).
--- (1616), *Sir Thomas Ouerburies Vision With the Ghoasts of Weston, Mris. Turner, the late Lieftenant of the Tower, and Franklin* (London: for R. Meighen & T. Jones).
--- (1627), *The Beggers Ape* (London: Bernard Alsop and T. Fawcet for L. Chapman).
Norton, Thomas and Sackville, Thomas (1570), *The Tragidie of Ferrex and Porrex set forth without any Addition or Alteration but Altogether as the Same was shewed on Stage before the Queenes Maiestie, about nine yeares past, vz. the xviij. day of Ianuarie. 1561* (London: John Day).
Oram, William A., et al. (eds.) (1989), *The Yale Edition of the Shorter Poems of Edmund Spenser* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press).
Overbury, Thomas (1616), *Sir Thomas Ouerburie his Wife with new elegies vpon his (now knowne) vntimely death : whereunto are annexed, new newes and characters written by himselfe and other learned gentlemen* (London: Edward Griffin for Laurence L'Isle).
Ovid (1567), *The Heroycall Epistles of the Learned Poet Publius Ouidius Naso*, trans. George Turberville (London: Henry Denham).
--- (1567), *The XV Bookes of P. Ouidius Naso, entytuled Metamorphosis*, trans. Arthur Golding (London: William Seres).
--- (1990), *The Love Poems*, trans. A. D. Melville (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Parsons, Robert and Allen, William (1595), *A conference about the next succession to the crowne of Ingland diuided into tvvo partes* (Antwerp: A. Conincx).
Petrus, Ravennas (1545), *The Art of Memory, that otherwyse is called the Phenix*, trans. Robert Copland (London: Wyllyam Myddylton).
Plutarch (1530), *The Educacion or Bringinge Vp of Children*, trans. Thomas Elyot (London: Thomas Berthelet).
--- (1571), *A President for Parentes, teaching the Vertuous Training Vp of Children and Holesome Information of Yongmen*, trans. Ed. Grant (London: Henry Bynneman).
--- (1579), *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes compared together by that Graue and Learned Philosopher and Historiographer, Plutarke of Chaeronea; translated out of Greeke into French by Iames Amyot*, trans. Thomas North (London: Thomas Vautroullier and John Wight).
Ponet, John (1556), *A Shorte Treatise of Politike Pouuer and of the True Obedience which Subiectes Owe to Kynges and Other Ciuile Gouernours, with an*

Exhortacion to All True Naturall Englishe Men (Strasbourg: The Heirs of W. Köpfel).
Pursglove, Glyn (ed.), (1992), *Richard Niccols: Selected Poems*, eds. James Hogg and Holger Klein (Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Elizabethan and Renaissance Studies, New York: Edwin Mellen Press).
Raleigh, Walter (1614), *The History of the World* (London: William Stansby for Walter Burre).
Rankins, William (1587), *A Mirrour of Monsters wherein is Plainely Described the Manifold Vices, &c Spotted Enormities, that are caused by the Infectious Sight of Playes, with the Description of the Subtile Slights of Sathan, making them his Instruments* (London: Iohn Charlewood for Thomas Hacket).
Robinson, Richard (2009), *The Rewarde of Wickednesse*, (ed.) Allyna E. Ward (London: The Modern Humanities Research Association).
Rollins, Hyder Edward (ed.), (1926), *A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
Salteren, George (1605), *Of the Ancient Lawes of Great Britaine* (London: Edward Allde for John Jaggard).
Sanders, Norman (ed.), (1970), *The Scottish History of James the Fourth, by Robert Greene (1598)* (The Revels Plays, London: Methuen & Co).
Seneca (1563), *The Lamentable Tragedie of Oedipus the Sonne of Laius Kyng of Thebes*, trans. Alexander Nevile (London: Thomas Colwell).
Sidney, Sir Philip (1999), 'The Defense of Poesie', in Elizabeth Porges-Wilson (ed.), *"The Defense of Poesie," "Astrophil and Stella," and Other Writings* (London: J. M. Dent).
Siemon, James R. (ed.), (2009), *King Richard III* (The Arden Shakespeare London: Methuen Drama).
Skelton, John (1983), 'Speke Parott', in John Scattergood (ed.), *The Complete English Poems* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books), 230-46.
Speed, John (1611), *The History of Great Britaine Under the Conquests of ye Romans, Saxons, Danes and Normans Their Originals, Manners, Warres, Coines & Seales: with ye Successions, Lives, Acts & Issues of the English Monarchs from Iulius Caesar, to our most Gracious Soueraigne King Iames* (London: William Hall and John Beale, to be sold by Iohn Sudbury & Georg Humble).
Stow, John (1580), *The Chronicles of England from Brute vnto this present yeare of Christ. 1580* (London: Henry Bynneman for Ralph Newberie).
T., I. (1616), *The Iust Down[fall of] Ambition, Adultery, and Murder where-vnto are added 3. Notorious Sinners. Weston. M. Turner and Fran[klin] With his Arraignement, Confession and E[xecution] Who all suffered Death for the [Mur]der if Sir Tho: Ouerbury, Poysone[d in] the Tower* (London: G. Eld).
Taylor, Gary and Lavagnino, John (eds.) (2007), *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Terence (2002), *Andria*, G. P. Shipp (ed.) (London: Bristol Classical Press).
Turbervile, George (1567), *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets with a Discourse of the Friendly Affections of Tymetes to Pyndara his Ladie. Newly Corrected with Additions* (London: Henry Denham).
Virgil (2001), *Virgil I*, trans. H. Rushton Fairclough (Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press).
Warner, William (1586), *Albions England Or Historicall Map of the Same Island: Prosecuted from the Liues, Actes, and Labors of Saturne, Iupiter, Hercules, and Aeneas: Originalles of the Brutons, and English-men, and Occasion of the*

Brutons their first Aryuall in Albion. Continuing the Same Historie vnto the Tribute to the Romaines, Entrie of the Saxones, Inuasion by the Danes, and Conquest by the Normaines (London: George Robinson and R. Ward for Thomas Cadman).

Wentworth, Peter (1598), *A Pithie Exhortation to Her Maiestie for Establishing Her Successor to the Crowne Whereunto Is Added a Discourse Containing the Authors Opinion of the True and Lavvfull Successor to Her Maiestie* (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave).

Wolf, Melvin H. (ed.), (1965), *Faultes, Faultes, and Nothing Else but Faultes (1606)* (Gainsville, Florida).

Wyrley, William (1592), *The True Vse of Armorie shewed by Historie, and Plainly Proued by Example: the Necessitie therof also Discouered: with the Maner of Differings in Ancient Time, the Lawfulnes of Honorable Funerals and Moniments: with other Matters of Antiquitie, Incident to the Aduauncing of Banners, Ensignes, and Marks of Noblenesse and Cheualrie* (London: I. Iackson for Gabriell Cawood).

Secondary Texts

Albright, Evelyn May (1927), 'Shakespeare's *Richard II* and the Essex Conspiracy', *PMLA,* 42 (3), 686-720.

Aldis, H. G., et al. (1910), in R. B. McKerrow (ed.), *A Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Foreign Printers of English Books 1557-1640* (London: Blades, East & Blandes for the Bibliographical Society).

Alsop, J. D. (1994), 'William Fleetwood and Elizabethan Historical Scholarship', *The Sixteenth Century Journal,* 25 (1), 155-76.

Alwes, Derek B. (1996), 'Elizabethan Dreaming: Fictional Dreams from Gascoigne to Lodge', in Constance C. Relihan (ed.), *Framing Elizabethan Fictions: Contemporary Approaches to Early Modern Narrative Prose* (Kent, Ohio and London: Kent State University Press), 153-67.

Archer, Harriet (forthcoming), 'Holinshed and the Middle Ages', in Paulina Kewes, Ian W. Archer, and Felicity Heal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook to Holinshed's Chronicles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Ashe, Laura (forthcoming), 'Holinshed and Mythical History', in Paulina Kewes, Ian W. Archer, and Felicity Heal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Holinshed's Chronicles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Attridge, Derek (1974), *Well-Weighed Syllables: Elizabethan Verse in Classical Metres* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Aune, M. G. (2006), 'The Uses of Richard III: From Robert Cecil to Richard Nixon', *Shakespeare Bulletin,* 24 (3), 23-47.

Austen, Gillian (2008), *George Gascoigne* (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer).

Bean, John C. (1977), 'Cosmic Order in the *Faerie Queene*: From Temperance to Chastity', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900,* 17 (1), 67-79.

Bellany, Alastair (2002), *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News culture and the Overbury affair, 1603-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Benjamin, Walter (1999), 'The Task of the Translator: An Introduction to the Translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens*', in Hannah Arendt (ed.), *Illuminations* (London: Pimlico), 70-82.

Berek, Peter (2008), 'Tragedy and Title Pages: Nationalism, Protestantism, and Print', *Modern Philology,* 106 (1), 1-24.

Bolton, William E. (2008), 'Anglo-Saxons in Faerie Land?: A Note on Some Unlikely Characters in Spenser's *Briton Moniments*', *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual,* 23, 293-301.

Boutcher, Warren (2011), 'Polybius Speaks British: A Case Study in Mid-Tudor Humanism and Historiography', in Fred Schurink (ed.), *Tudor Translation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), 101-20.

Braden, Gordon (ed.), (2005), *Sixteenth-Century Poetry: An Annotated Anthology* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Bradford, Alan T. (1974), 'Mirrors of Mutability: Winter Landscapes in Tudor Poetry', *English Literary Renaissance,* 4 (1), 3-39.

Breitenberg, Mark (1988), 'Reading Elizabethan Iconicity: *Gorboduc* and the Semiotics of Reform', *English Literary Renaissance,* 18 (2), 194-217.

Bremmer, Rolf H. (2000), 'The Anglo-Saxon Pantheon According to Richard Verstegen (1605)', in Timothy Graham (ed.), *The Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon*

Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University), 141-72.

Breyfogle, Todd (1999), 'Memory and Imagination in Augustine's *Confessions*', in Todd Breyfogle (ed.), *Literary Imagination, Ancient and Modern: Essays in Honor of David Grene* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press), 139-54.

Broadway, Jan (2006), *'No Historie so Meete': Gentry Culture and the Development of Local History in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England*, eds Ann Hughes, Anthony Milton, and Peter Lake (Politics, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain; Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press).

Brown, Barbara (1972), 'Sir Thomas More and Thomas Churchyard's "Shore's Wife"', *The Yearbook of English Studies,* 2, 41-48.

Brown, Meaghan, (2012), '"By Examples Passed in this Realme": Narratives of Print-Production in *The Mirror for Magistrates*, *The Book Through Time* (Merton College, Oxford).

Brown, Richard Danson (1998), '"A Talkatiue Wench (Whose Words a World hath Delighted in)": Mistress Shore and Elizabethan Complaint', *The Review of English Studies,* 49 (196), 395-415.

Budra, Paul (2000), *A Mirror for Magistrates and the De Casibus Tradition* (Toronto and London: University of Toronto Press).

Bush, Douglas (1925), 'Classical Lives in "The Mirror for Magistrates"', *Studies in Philology,* 22 (2), 256-66.

Campbell, Lily B. (1934), 'Humphrey Duke of Gloucester and Elianor Cobham His Wife in the "Mirror for Magistrates"', *The Huntington Library Bulletin,* (5), 119-55.

Canino, Catherine G. and Gutierrez, Nancy A. (2008), '"Trouth ought to be rescude;/ Trouth should nat be subdude": Skelton and the Tudor Myth', in David R. Carlson (ed.), *John Skelton and Early Modern Culture: Papers Honoring Robert S. Kinsman* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies; Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies), 167-88.

Cappuyns, D. M (1947), 'Parts added to the Mirror for Magistrates [Review]', *Recherches de theologie ancienne et medievale,* 14, 238-9.

Carr, Mary, Clarke, K. P., and Nievergelt, Marco (eds.) (2008), *On Allegory: Some Medieval Aspects and Approaches* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing).

Carruthers, Mary (2008), *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Second edn.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Cavanagh, Dermot (2001), 'Review of Paul Budra, A Mirror for Magistrates *and the* De Casibus *Tradition*', *Early Modern Literary Studies,* 7. (2), 1-7.

Champion, Larry S. (1988), '"By Usurpation Thine, By Conquest Mine": Perspective and Politics in *Edmund Ironside*', *Studies in Philology,* 85 (2), 211-24.

Claassen, Jo-Marie (1999), *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius* (London: Gerald Duckworth &Co. Ltd.).

Clark, John (1994), 'Bladud of Bath: The Archaeology of a Legend', *Folklore,* 105, 39-50.

Clark, Sandra (1983), *The Elizabethan Pamphleteers: Popular Moralistic Pamphlets, 1580-1640* (London: Athlone Press).

Clegg, Cyndia (1997), *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Collinson, Patrick (2011), *This England : Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Politics, culture and society in early modern Britain; Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Coogan, Robert (1970), 'Petrarch's *Trionfi* and the English Renaissance', *Studies in Philology,* 67 (3), 306-27.

Cooney, Helen (2000), 'Guyon and his Palmer: Spenser's Emblem of Temperance', *The Review of English Studies,* 51 (202), 169-92.

Cooper, Helen (2009), 'Edmund Spenser and the Passing of Tudor Literature', in Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 749-66.

--- (2010), *Shakespeare and the Medieval World* (Arden Critical Companions; London: Arden Shakespeare).

Cormack, Lesley B. (1991), '"Good Fences Make Good Neighbours": Geography as Self-Definition in Early Modern England', *Isis,* 82 (4), 639-61.

Cox Jensen, Freyja (2009), 'Reading Florus in Early Modern England', *Renaissance Studies,* 23 (5), 659-77.

--- (2012), *Reading the Roman Republic in Early Modern England* (Leiden and Boston: Brill).

Craik, T. W. (ed.), (1995), *King Henry V* (The Arden Shakespeare, London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc).

Crawford, Julie (2010), 'Reconsidering Early Modern Women's Reading, or, How Margaret Hoby Read Her de Mornay', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 73 (2), 193-223.

Crawforth, Hannah (2011), 'Strangers to the Mother Tongue: Spenser's *Shepheardes Calender* and Early Anglo-Saxon Studies', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies,* 41 (2), 294-316.

Croft, Pauline (1991), 'The Reputation of Robert Cecil: Libels, Political Opinion and Popular Awareness in the Early Seventeenth Century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 1, Sixth Series, 43-69.

Culhane, Peter (2004), 'Philemon Holland's Livy: Peritexts and Contexts', *Translation and Literature,* 13 (2, Versions of Ovid), 268-86.

Culler, Jonathan (1975), *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Cummings, Brian and Simpson, James (eds.) (2010), *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Cummings, Robert (2010), 'Abraham Fleming's *Eclogues*', *Translation and Literature,* 19, 147-69.

Cunnally, John (1999), *Images of the Illustrious: the Numismatic Presence in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Curran, John E., Jr. (1999), 'Geoffrey of Monmouth in Renaissance Drama: Imagining Non-History', *Modern Philology,* 97 (1), 1-20.

--- (2002), *Roman Invasions: The British History, Protestant Anti-Romanism, and the Historical Imagination in England, 1530-1660* (Newark and London: University of Delaware Press).

Davies, James (1906), '"A Myrroure for Magistrates." Considered with Special Reference to the Sources of Sackville's Contributions', (University of Leipzig).

Dean, David (1996), *Law-Making and Society in Late Elizabethan England: The Parliament of England, 1584-1601* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Eagleston, A. J. (1938), 'Guernsey Under Sir Thomas Leighton (1570-1610)', *Société Guernsiaise. Report and Transactions for 1937,* 13 (1), 72-108.

--- (1949), *The Channel Islands Under Tudor Government, 1485-1642: A Study in Administrative History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Guernsey Society).

Edwards, A. S. G. (2008), 'A Verse Chronicle of the House of Percy', *Studies in Philology,* 105 (2), 226-44.
Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. (1980), *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe*, 2 vols. (I and II; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Ellinghausen, Laurie (2008), *Labor and Writing in Early Modern England, 1567-1667* (Aldershot: Ashgate).
Engel, William E. (1995), *Mapping Mortality: The Persistence of Memory and Melancholy in Early Modern England* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press).
Escobedo, Andrew (2002), 'The Tudor Search for Arthur and the Poetics of Historical Loss', *Exemplaria,* 14 (1), 127-65.
--- (2004), *Nationalism and Historical Loss in Renaissance England: Foxe, Dee, Spenser, Milton* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press).
--- (2008), 'From Britannia to England: *Cymbeline* and the Beginning of Nations', *Shakespeare Quarterly,* 59 (1), 60-87.
Evans, Kasey (2009), 'How Temperance Becomes "Blood Guiltie" in *The Faerie Queene*', *SEL,* 49 (1), 35-66.
Farnham, Willard (1926), 'John Higgins' *Mirror* and *Locrine*', *Modern Philology,* 23 (3), 307-13.
--- (1956), *The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
Federer, Charles A. (ed.), (1884), *The Ballad of Flodden Field, A Poem of the XVIth Century* (Manchester: Henry Gray, Antiquarian & Topographical Publisher).
Ferguson, Arthur B. (1993), *Utter Antiquity: Perceptions of Prehistory in Renaissance England* (Durham and London: Duke University Press).
Fitzpatrick, Joan (2004), *Shakespeare, Spenser and the Contours of Britain: Reshaping the Atlantic Archipelago* (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press).
Floyd-Wilson, Mary (2002), 'Delving to the Root: *Cymbeline*, Scotland, and the English Race', in David J. Baker and Willy Maley (eds.), *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 101-15.
Frantzen, Allen J. (1990), *Desire for Origins: New Language, Old English, and Teaching the Tradition* (New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press).
Gallagher, Catherine (2000), 'A History of the Precedent: Rhetorics of Legitimation in Women's Writing', *Critical Inquiry,* 26 (2), 309-27.
Geller, Sherri (1999), 'What History Really Teaches: Historical Pyrrhonism in William Baldwin's *A Mirror for Magistrates*', in Peter C. Herman (ed.), *Opening the Borders: Inclusivity in Early Modern Studies* (University of Delaware Press), 150-84.
--- (2007), 'Editing under the Influence of the Standard Textual Hierarchy: Misrepresenting "A Mirror for Magistrates" in the Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Editions', *Textual Cultures,* 2 (1), 43-77.
Genette, Gerard (1997), *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree (1982)*, trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press).
Gillespie, Alexandra (2001), 'Chaucer and Lydgate in Print: The Medieval Author and the History of the Book, 1476-1579', D. Phil Thesis (Corpus Christi College, Oxford).
--- (2006), *Print Culture and the Medieval Author: Lydgate, Chaucer and their Books, 1473-1557* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Gleason, J. H. (1969), *The Justices of the Peace in England 1558-1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
Gouws, John (ed.), (1986), *The Prose Works of Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
Grabes, Herbert (1982), *The Mutable Glass: Mirror-imagery in Titles and Texts of the Middle Ages and English Renaissance*, trans. Gordon Collier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
--- (2009), 'The Creation of "English Literature" by Early Modern Literary Histories', in Mihaela Irimia and Dragoş Ivana (eds.), *Imitatio-Inventio: The Rise of 'Literature' from Early to Classic Modernity* (New Europe College, Bucharest: Institutul Cultural Român), 119-37.
Grafton, Anthony and Jardine, Lisa (1990), '"Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy', *Past & Present,* 11 (129), 30-78.
Graham, Timothy (2001), 'Anglo-Saxon Studies: Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries', in Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (eds.), *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell), 415-33.
Graves, Michael A. R. (1994), *Thomas Norton: The Parliament Man* (Oxford: Blackwell).
Green, Lawrence D. (1981), 'Modes of Perception in the "Mirror for Magistrates"', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 44 (2), 117-33.
Greenhut, Deborah S. (1988), *Feminine Rhetorical Culture: Tudor Adaptations of Ovid's Heroides* (American University Studies IV: English Language and Literature; New York: Peter Lang).
Griffiths, Jane (2006), *John Skelton and Poetic Authority: Defining the Liberty to Speak* (Oxford English Monographs; Oxford: Clarendon Press).
Gulley, Norman (1954), 'Plato's Theory of Recollection', *The Classical Quarterly,* 4 (3/4), 194-213.
Hadfield, Andrew (1994), *Literature, Politics and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
--- (2002), 'Bruited abroad: John White and Thomas Harriet's Colonial Representations of Ancient Britain', in David J. Baker and Willy Maley (eds.), *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univeristy Press), 159-77.
Halasz, Alexandra (1997), *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Hampton, Timothy (1990), *Writing from History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press).
Harper, Carrie Anna (1910), *The Sources of The British Chronicle History in Spenser's Faerie queene* (Bryn Mawr College Monographs, VII; Philadlephia, Pennsylvania: Bryn Mawr).
Hartley, T. E. (1992), *Elizabeth's Parliaments: Queen, Lords and Commons 1559-1601* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press).
Heal, Felicity (2005), 'Appropriating History: Catholic and Protestant Polemics and the National Past', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 68 (1-2), 109-32.
Heal, Felicity and Summerson, Henry (forthcoming), 'The Genesis of the Two Editions', in Paulina Kewes, Ian W. Archer, and Felicity Heal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook to Holinshed's Chronicles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Helgerson, Richard (1986), 'The Land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography, and Subversion in Renaissance England', *Representations,* 16, 50-85.

--- (1992), *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press).

Herendeen, W. H. (forthcoming), 'Later Historians and Holinshed', in Paulina Kewes, Ian W. Archer, and Felicity Heal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook to Holinshed's Chronicles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Herendeen, Wyman H. (2007), *William Camden: A Life in Context* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press).

Hillman, Richard (1997), *Self-Speaking in Medieval and Early Modern English Drama: Subjectivity, Discourse and the Stage* (London: Macmillan).

Hinds, Hilary (2002), 'Anna Trapnel, *Anna Trapnel's Report and Plea*', in Anita Pacheco (ed.), *A Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing* (Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture; Oxford: Blackwell), 177-88.

Hiscock, Andrew (2011), *Reading Memory in Early Modern Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Hope, Geoffrey R. (1997), 'Tales of Literacy and Authority in the *Violier* (1521): The French *Gesta Romanorum*', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance,* 59 (2), 353-63.

Hotine, Margaret (1991), '*Richard III* and *Macbeth* - Studies in Tudor Tyranny?', *Notes and Queries*, 480-86.

Hubbard, Gillian (2012), 'King Iago and the Political Instability Caused by Gluttony and Sloth', *Fame and Fortune: The Mirror for Magistrates, 1559-1946* (Magdalen College, Oxford).

Hulse, S. Clark (1981), *Metamorphic Verse: The Elizabethan Minor Epic* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press).

Human, Elizabeth M. A. (2008), 'House of *Mirrors*: Textual Variation and *The Mirror for Magistrates*', *Literature Compass,* 5 (4), 772-90.

Hyland, Peter (2007), 'Re-membering Gloriana: *The Revenger's Tragedy*', in Elizabeth H. Hageman and Katherine Conway (eds.), *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England* (Madison, Teanick: Fairleigh Dickinson Univeristy Press), 82-94.

James, Heather (2003), 'Ovid and the Question of Politics in Early Modern England', *English Literary History,* 70 (2), 343-73.

Jellerson, Donald (2010), 'The Spectral Historiopoetics of the *Mirror for Magistrates*', *Journal of the Northern Renaissance,* 2 (1), 54-71.

Kenny, Robert W. (1970), *Elizabeth's Admiral: The Political Career of Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham, 1536-1624* (London: John Hopkins Press).

Kerrigan, John (2008), *Archipelagic English: Literature, History, and Politics 1603-1707* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Kewes, Paulina (2011), 'Henry Savile's Tacitus and the Politics of Roman History in Late Elizabethan England', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 74 (1), 515-51.

--- (forthcoming), 'History Plays and the Royal Succession', in Paulina Kewes, Ian W. Archer, and Felicity Heal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook to Holinshed's Chronicles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Kewes, Paulina, Archer, Ian W., and Heal, Felicity (eds.) (forthcoming), *The Oxford Handbook to Holinshed's Chronicles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Keynes, Simon (1999), 'The Cult of King Alfred the Great', *Anglo-Saxon England,* 28, 225-356.

King, John N. (1990), 'Queen Elizabeth I: Representations of the Virgin Queen', *Renaissance Quarterly,* 43 (1), 30-74.

Knight, Rhonda (2002), 'Stealing Stonehenge: Translation, Appropriation, and Cultural Identity in Robert Mannyng of Brunne's *Chonicle*', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies,* 32 (1), 41-58.

Kuskin, William (2007), '"The Loadstarre of the English Language": Spenser's "Shepheardes Calender" and the Construction of Modernity', *Textual Cultures,* 2 (2), 9-33.

Lämmerhirt, Rudolf (1909), *Thomas Blenerhassets "Second Part of the Mirror for Magistrates". Eine Quellenstudie* (Weimar: Druck von G. Uschmann).

Landry, Elaine (2012), 'Recollection and the Mathematician's Method in Plato's *Meno*', *Philosophia Mathematica,* 20 (2), 143-69.

Lane, Robert (1995), '"The Sequence of Posterity": Shakespeare's *King John* and the Succession Controversy', *Studies in Philology,* 92 (4), 460-81.

Laoutaris, Chris (2010), 'Translation/Historical Writing', in Caroline Bicks and Jennifer Summit (eds.), *The History of British Women's Writing, 1500-1610* (The History of British Women's Writing; Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan), 296-327.

Leath Mills, Jerry (1968), 'A Source for Spenser's Anamnestes', *Philological Quarterly,* 47 (1), 137-9.

Levin, Carole (1980), 'A Good Prince: King John and Early Tudor Propaganda', *The Sixteenth Century Journal,* 11 (4), 23-32.

Levin, Richard (1974), 'On Fluellen's Figures, Christ Figures, and James Figures', *PMLA,* 89 (2), 302-11.

Lewis, C. S. (1966), *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Lewis, Rhodri (2009), 'A Kind of Sagacity: Francis Bacon, the *Ars Memoriae* and the Pursuit of Natural Knowledge', *Intellectual History Review,* 19 (2), 155-75.

Liebler, Naomi Conn (ed.), (2007), *Early Modern Prose Fiction: The Cultural Politics of Reading* (New York and London: Routledge).

Lindley, David (1993), *The Trials of Frances Howard: Fact and Fiction at the Court of King James* (London and New York: Routledge).

Logan, Sandra (2007), *Text/Events in Early Modern England: Poetics of History* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate).

Loughran, Ellen (2010), 'Defective Memories, Deception, and the Writing Process: Montaigne's Attempt at Truth in Essay I: 9', *Neophilologus,* 94 (1), 33-41.

Lucas, Scott (2002), 'Diggon Davie and Davy Dicar: Edmund Spenser, Thomas Churchyard, and the Poetics of Public Protest', *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual,* 16, 151-66.

--- (2007), 'Comment: The Visionary Genre and the Rise of the "Literary": Books under Suspicion and Early Modern England', *The Journal of British Studies,* 46 (4), 762-65.

--- (2009), 'Hall's Chronicle and the *Mirror for Magistrates*: History and the Tragic Pattern', in Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 356-71.

--- (2009), *A Mirror for Magistrates and the Politics of the English Reformation* (Massachusetts Studies in Early Modern Culture; Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press).

Lyne, Raphael (1996), 'Golding's Englished *Metamorphoses*', *Translation and Literature,* 5 (2), 183-200.

--- (2004), 'Writing back to Ovid in the 1560s and 1570s', *Translation and Literature,* 13 (2), 143-64.

MacColl, Alan (2006), 'The Meaning of "Britain" in Medieval and Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies,* 45 (2), 248-69.

Maley, Willy (2003), *Nation, State and Empire in English Renaissance Literature: Shakespeare to Milton* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

--- (2010), '"Let a Welsh correction teach you a good English condition": Shakespeare, Wales and the critics', in Willy Maley and Philip Schwyzer (eds.), *Shakespeare and Wales: From the Marches to the Assembly* (Farnham: Ashgate), 177-89.

Martin, Randall (1999), 'Anne Dowriche's *The French History*, Christopher Marlowe, and Machiavellian Agency', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900,* 39 (1), 69-87.

Maslen, R. W. (1997), *Elizabethan Fictions: Espionage, Counter-Espionage, and the Duplicity of Fiction in Early Elizabethan Prose Narratives* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

--- (2009), 'William Baldwin and the Tudor Imagination', in Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 291-306.

Matchinske, Megan (2004), 'Moral, Method, and History in Anne Dowriche's *The French Historie*', *English Literary Renaissance,* 34 (2), 176-200.

May, Steven W. (2007), '"Tongue-tied our Queen?": Queen Elizabeth's Voice in the Seventeenth Century', in Elizabeth H. Hageman and Katherine Conway (eds.), *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England* (Madison, Teanick: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press), 48-67.

McElroy, Tricia A. (2007), 'Imagining the "Scottis Natioun": Populism and Propaganda in Scottish Satirical Broadsides', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language,* 49 (4), 319-39.

McGann, Jerome J. (1991), *The Textual Condition* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press).

McKenzie, D. F. (1999), *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

McKeown, Adam (2009), *English Mercuries: Soldier Poets in the Age of Shakespeare* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press).

McKerrow, R. B. (1913), *Printers' & Publishers' Devices in England & Scotland, 1485-1640* (London: The Chiswick Press for the Bibliographical Society).

--- (1940), 'Review [untitled]', *The Review of English Studies,* 16 (61), 78-81.

McRae, Andrew (2004), *Literature, satire, and the early Stuart state* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Miller, Anthony (2001), *Roman Triumphs and Early Modern Culture* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).

Miller, Edwin (1959), *The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England: A Study of Nondramatic Literature* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press).

Morgan, Gerald (2009), *The Shaping of English Poetry: Essays on Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, Langland, Chaucer and Spenser* (New York: Peter Lang).

Nicholson, Catherine (2008), 'Pastoral in Exile: Spenser and the Poetics of English Alienation', *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual,* 23, 41-72.

Nolan, Maura (2005), *John Lydgate and the Making of Public Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Norbrook, David (2002), *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

O'Callaghan, Michelle (2000), *The "Shepheards Nation": Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture, 1612-1625* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press).

--- (2008), 'Dreaming the Dead: Ghosts and History in the Early Seventeenth Century', in Katharine Hodgkin, Michelle O'Callaghan, and S. J. Wiseman (eds.), *Reading the Early Modern Dream: The Terrors of the Night* (New York and London: Routledge).

Oakley-Brown, Liz (2006), *Ovid and the Cultural Politics of Translation in Early Modern England*, eds Martin Stannard and Greg Walker (Studies in European Cultural Tradition; Aldershot: Ashgate).

--- (2011), 'Elizabethan Exile After Ovid', in Jennifer Ingleheart (ed.), *Two Thousand Years of Solitude: Exile After Ovid* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 103-17.

Orgel, Stephen (2000), 'Margins of Truth', in Andrew Murphy (ed.), *The Renaissance Text: Theory, Editing, Textuality* (Manchester: Manchester University Press), 91-107.

--- (2005), 'Marginal Maternity: Reading Lady Anne Clifford's *A Mirror for Magistrates*', in Douglas A. Brooks (ed.), *Printing and Parenting in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate), 267-89.

Overell, Anne and Scott C. Lucas (2010), 'Whose Wonderful News? Italian Satire and William Baldwin's *Wonderfull Newes of the Death of Paule the III*', *Renaissance Studies*, 26, (2), 180-196.

Palmer, Daryl W. (2006), 'Metropolitan Resurrection in Anthony Munday's Lord Mayor's Shows', *SEL,* 46 (2), 371-87.

Paxson, James J. (1994), *The Poetics of Personification*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Pearcy, Lee T. (1984), *The Mediated Muse: English Translations of Ovid, 1560-1700* (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books).

Pearsall, Derek (ed.), (1999), *Chaucer to Spenser: An Anthology of Writings in English, 1375-1575* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Peck, Linda Levy (1990), *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London: Routledge).

--- (ed.), (1991), *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Perry, Curtis (1997), *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Pettegree, Andrew (2007), *The French Book and the European Book World* (Leiden: Brill).

--- (2008), 'Centre and Periphery in the European Book World', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 18, 101-28.

Pincombe, Mike 'The Second Part of the Mirror for Magistrates (1578)', *HRI Online,* accessed 15/05/12.

--- 'The First Part of the Mirror for Magistrates (1574)', *HRI Online*, accessed 16/05/12.

--- (2009), 'A Place in the Shade: George Cavendish and *De Casibus* Tragedy', in Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 372-88.

--- (2010), 'A Structural Analysis of Two Poems by George Ferrers and William Baldwin from the 1559 *Mirror for Magistrates*', (Unpublished).

--- (2011), 'William Baldwin and *A Mirror for Magistrates*', *Renaissance Studies*, 1-16.

--- (2012), '*The Mirror for Magistrates*: Fame and Blame', *Fame and Fortune: The Mirror for Magistrates, 1559-1946* (Magdalen College, Oxford).

Pincombe, Mike and Shrank, Cathy (2010), 'Doing Away with the Drab Age: Research Opportunities in Mid-Tudor Literature (1530-1580)', *Literature Compass,* 7 (3), 160-76.

Popper, Nicholas (2011), 'An Ocean of Lies: The Problem of Historical Evidence in the Sixteenth Century', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 74 (3), 375-400.

Pratt, Samuel M. (1965), 'Shakespeare and Humphrey Duke of Gloucester: A Study in Myth', *Shakespeare Quarterly,* 16 (2), 201-16.

Prendergast, Thomas A. (2008), 'Spenser's Phantastic History, *The Ruines of Time*, and the Invention of Medievalism', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies,* 38 (2), 175-96.

Prescott, Anne Lake (1991), 'Marginal Discourse: Drayton's Muse and Selden's "Story"', *Studies in Philology,* 88 (3), 307-28.

Quinn, Kelly A. (2001), 'Samuel Daniel's Defense of Medievalism', in Clare A. Simmons (ed.), *Medievalism and the Quest for the "Real" Middle Ages* (London; Portland, OR: Frank Cass), 29-44.

Rankin, Mark (2011), 'Henry VIII, Shakespeare, and the Jacobean Royal Court', *SEL,* 51 (2), 349-66.

Richards, Jennifer (2009), 'Transforming *A Mirror for Magistrates*', in Margaret Healy and Tom Healy (eds.), *Renaissance Transformations: The Making of English Writing, 1500-1650* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), 48-63.

--- (2009), 'Shakespeare and the Politics of Co-Authorship: *Henry VIII*', in David Armitage, Conal Condren, and Andrew Fitzmaurice (eds.), *Shakespeare and Early Modern Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 176-94.

Richardson, Lisa (2003), 'Elizabeth in Arcadia: Fulke Greville and John Hayward's Construction of Elizabeth, 1610-12', in Susan Doran and Thomas S. Freeman (eds.), *The Myth of Elizabeth* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), 99-119.

Riehl, Anna (2010), *The Face of Queenship: Early Modern Representations of Elizabeth I*, eds Carole Levin and Charles Beem (Queenship and Power; New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Rossington, Michael and Whitehead, Anne (eds.) (2007), *Theories of Memory: A Reader* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).

Rouse, Robert Allen (2005), *The Idea of Anglo-Saxon England in Middle English Romance*, eds Corinne Saunders and Roger Dalrymple (Studies in Medieval Romance; Cambridge: D. S. Brewer).

Saenger, Michael (2006), *The Commodification of Textual Engagements in the English Renaissance* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Saunders, J. W. (1951), 'The Stigma of Print: A Note on the Social Bases of Tudor Poetry', *Essays in Criticism,* 1, 139-64.

Schulze, Ivan L. (1944), 'Blenerhasset's A Revelation, Spenser's Shepheardes Calender, and the Kenilworth Pageants', *English Literary History,* 11 (2), 85-91.

Schurink, Fred (2010), 'Manuscript Commonplace Books, Literature, and Reading in Early Modern England', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 73 (3), 453-69.

Schwyzer, Philip (2004), *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Scodel, Joshua (2002), *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press).

Scott-Warren, Jason (2012), 'Was Elizabeth I Richard II?: The Authenticity of Lambarde's "Conversation"', *The Review of English Studies,* Advance Access.

Scott, Charlotte (2007), *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Book* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press).

Scragg, Donald (2000), 'Introduction. The Anglo-Saxons: Fact and Fiction', in Donald Scragg and Carole Weinberg (eds.), *Literary Appropriations of the Anglo-Saxons*

from the Thirteenth to the Twentieth Century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1-21.

Shenk, Linda (2010), *Learned Queen: The Image of Elizabeth I in Politics and Poetry*, eds Carole Levin and Charles Beem (Queenship and Power; New York: Palgrave Macmillan).

Shewring, Margaret (1996), *King Richard II* (Shakespeare in Performance; Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Shrank, Cathy (2004), '"These fewe scribbled rules": Representing Scribal Intimacy in Early Modern Print', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 67 (2), 295-314.

--- (2004), *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530-1580* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

--- (2010), '"This fatall Medea," "this Clytemnestra": Reading and the Detection of Mary Queen of Scots', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 73 (3), 523-41.

Skura, Meredith Anne (2006), '*A Mirror for Magistrates* and the Beginnings of English Autobiography', *English Literary Renaissance,* 36 (1), 26-56.

--- (2008), *Tudor Autobiography: Listening for Inwardness* (Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press).

--- (2012), 'The *Mirror*'s Children', *Fame and Fortune: The Mirror for Magistrates, 1559-1946* (Magdalen College, Oxford).

Smith, Paul J. (2002), 'Montaigne, Plutarch and Historiography', in Karl Enenkel, et al. (eds.), *Recreating Ancient History: Episodes from the Greek and Roman Past in the Arts and Literature of the Early Modern Period* (Boston and Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, Inc.), 167-87.

Smuts, Malcolm (1994), 'Court-Centred Politics and the Uses of Roman Historians, *c.* 1590-1630', in Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (eds.), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Basingstoke: Macmillan), 21-44.

Sorabji, Richard (2004), *Aristotle On Memory* (Second edn.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Spiller, Elizabeth A. (2000), 'The Counsel of Fulke Greville: Transforming the Jacobean "Nourish Father" through Sidney's "Nursing Father"', *Studies in Philology,* 97 (4), 433-53.

Stanley, Eric Gerald (2000), *Imagining the Anglo-Saxon Past: The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism, and Anglo-Saxon Trial by Jury* (Second edn.; Cambridge: D. S. Brewer).

Starnes, D. T. (1933), 'Sir Thomas Elyot and the "Sayings of the Philosophers"', *Studies in English* 13, 5-35.

Stewart, Alan and Sullivan, Garrett A. (2002), '"Worme-eaten, and full of canker holes": Materializing Memory in *The Faerie Queene* and *Lingua*', *Spenser Studies: A Renaissance Poetry Annual,* 17, 215-38.

Strong, Roy (1986), *Henry Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Pimlico).

Sturges, Robert S. (1991), *Medieval Interpretation: Models of Reading in Literary Narrative, 1100-1500* (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press).

Sullivan, Ceri (2007), 'Disposable Elements? Indications of Genre in Early Modern Titles', *The Modern Language Review,* 102 (3), 641-53.

Summit, Jennifer (2008), *Memory's Library: Medieval Books in Early Modern England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Swart, J. (1946), '[Review] Parts Added to the Mirror for Magistrates, by John Higgins & Thomas Blenerhasset', *English Studies,* 27 (1), 157-59.

Taylor, Gary (1993), 'The Renaissance and the End of Editing', in George Bornstein and Ralph G. Williams (eds.), *Palimpsest: Editorial Theory in the Humanities* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press), 121-49.
Thornton, Tim (2012), *The Channel Islands, 1370-1640: Between England and Normandy* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press).
Thorpe, Markham John (ed.), (1858), *Calendar of the State Papers, relating to Scotland, Preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office* 2 vols. (1; London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts).
Tiller, Kenneth J. (2007), *Layamon's Brut and the Anglo-Norman Vision of History* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press).
Tillyard, E. M. W. (1959), '*A Mirror for Magistrates* Revisited', in Herbert Davis and Helen Gardner (eds.), *Elizabethan and Jacobean Studies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 1-16.
Travitsky, Betty S. and Prescott, Anne Lake (eds.) (2000), *Male & Female Voices in Early Modern England: An Anthology of Renaissance Writing* (New York: Columbia University Press).
Trench, W. F. (1898), *A Mirror for Magistrates: Its Origin and Influence*.
Tupper, Ferdinand Brock (1851), *The Chronicles of Castle Cornet, Guernsey* (Guernsey: Stephen Barbet).
--- (1876), *The History of Guernsey and its Bailiwick* (Guernsey: Le Lievre).
Uman, Deborah and Bistué, Belén (2007), 'Translation as Collaborative Authorship: Margaret Tyler's *The Mirrour of Princely Deedes and Knighthood*', *Comparative Literature Studies,* 44 (3), 298-323.
van Es, Bart (2002), *Spenser's Forms of History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
--- (2007), 'Michael Drayton, Literary History and Historians in Verse', *The Review of English Studies,* 59 (239), 255-67.
van Hook, La Rue (1914), 'Greek Rhetorical Terminology in Puttenham's The Arte of English Poesie', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* 45, 111-28.
Vine, Angus (2010), *In Defiance of Time* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Walker, Greg (2010), 'Epilogue: When did "The Medieval" End? Retrospection, Foresight, and the End(s) of the English Middle Ages', in Greg Walker and Elaine M. Treharne (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Wesley, John (2008), 'The Well-Schooled Wrestler: Temperance and Rhetoric in *The Faerie Queene*, Book II', *The Review of English Studies,* 60 (243), 34-60.
Whitehead, Anne (2009), *Memory* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge).
Wilks, Timothy (ed.), (2007), *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern England* (Southampton: Southampton Solent University and Paul Holberton Publishing).
Willcock, G. D. (1948), 'Parts added to the Mirror for Magistrates [Review]', *The Modern Language Review,* 43 (1), 104-5.
Williams, Penry (1995), *The Later Tudors: England 1547-1603* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
Williams, Ralph G. (1993), 'I Shall Be Spoken: Textual Boundaries, Authors, and Intent', in George Bornstein and Ralph G. Williams (eds.), *Palimpsest: Editorial Theory in the Humanities* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press), 45-66.
Winston, Jessica (2004), '*A Mirror for Magistrates* and Public Political Discourse in Elizabethan England', *Studies in Philology,* 4, 281-400.
--- (2006), 'Seneca in Early Elizabethan England', *Renaissance Quarterly,* 59, 29-58.

Woodcock, Matthew (2009), 'Edmund Spenser and the Commemorations of the Death of Elizabeth I', *Notes and Queries,* 42 (6), 42-46.

Woolf, D. R. (1985), 'Two Elizabeths? James I and the Late Queen's Famous Memory', *Canadian Journal of History/ Annales Canadiennes d'Histoire,* 20 (2), 167-91.

--- (1988), 'Genre into Artefact: the Decline of the English Chronicle in the Sixteenth Century', *Sixteenth Century Journal,* 19, 321-54.

--- (1990), *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology and 'The Light of Truth' from the Accession of James I to the Civil War* (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press).

--- (1991), 'Memory and Historical Culture in Early Modern England', *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association,* 2 (1), 283-308.

--- (2003), *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

--- (2006), 'From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past, 1500-1700', in Paulina Kewes (ed.), *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, California: Huntington Library), 31-68.

Worden, Blair (2006), 'Historians and Poets', in Paulina Kewes (ed.), *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, California: Huntington Library), 69-90.

Wymer, Rowland (1995), 'Jacobean Pageant or Elizabethan Fin de Siecle? The Political Context of Early Seventeenth-Century Tragedy', in James Hogg (ed.), *Jacobean Drama as Social Criticism* (Salzburg Studies in English Literature: Jacobean Drama Studies; Lewiston, New York: The Edwin Mellen Press), 45-58.

Young, Alan R. (2007), 'The Phoenix Reborn: The Jacobean Appropriation of an Elizabethan Symbol', in Elizabeth H. Hageman and Katherine Conway (eds.), *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England* (Madison, Teanick: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press), 68-81.

Zim, Rivkah (1997), 'Dialogue and Discretion: Thomas Sackville, Catherine de Medici and the Anjou Marriage Proposal 1571', *The Historical Journal,* 40 (2), 287-310.

Zimmermann, Hugo (1902), *Quellenuntersuchungen zum ersten Teil von J. Higgins Mirror for Magistrates* (München).