“PICTURES…OF A GOOD SUBJECT”: FRIENDSHIP, THE COMMONWEALTH, AND THE CARE OF THE SELF IN EARLY MODERN LITERATURE AND CULTURE

By

Andrew Scott Kranzman

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

English – Doctor of Philosophy

2015

ABSTRACT

"PICTURES…OF A GOOD SUBJECT": FRIENDSHIP, THE COMMONWEALTH, AND THE CARE OF THE SELF IN EARLY MODERN LITERATURE AND CULTURE

By

Andrew Scott Kranzman

This dissertation argues that emphases on self-knowledge and duty within friendship discourse of the early modern period repudiates a common assumption that friendship is primarily a private, selfless, apolitical affair separate from public life. This discourse largely highlights fashioning the self as an ethical and political subject while the friend per se remains of secondary concern. As the Early Modern Research Group observes, "the commonwealth…act[s] as a language to articulate personal and public vices and virtues" (Early Modern Research Group 670). An emphasis on obligation and reciprocity for the common good or *bonum commune*, the importance of social hierarchy, obedience, and subordination, as well as a belief in moral discipline as the anodyne to social ills prove to be recurring components of this "language." Some major concerns within friendship discourse and practice include: the realization of membership in a larger community; the importance of measure and mean to both individual and community well-being; the obligation to admonish community members who fail to uphold duties and shared moral standards; and the necessity of social concord across various classes. Moreover, period conceptions of friendship demonstrate that the formation of "good" and "dutiful" does not proceed without cognitive, moral, and emotional struggles, particularly, as regards indifference, selfishness, flattery, and resentment.

Each chapter explores a specific facet of early modern friendship discourse and practice and places it in conversation with the "language" of the commonwealth: self-knowledge, the care of the self, frank speech, and gender. My first chapter argues that Tudor friendship pamphlets

and Tottel's *Songs and Sonnets* exploit the sentiment that self-knowledge fosters concord, where one learns to fashion the self into a dutiful subject to God and man. As I delineate in this chapter, discussions of self-knowledge frequently focus on the possibility of sedition arising from a lack of knowledge about one's duty and obedience to the commonwealth. The second chapter examines the disciplinary function of self-knowledge and duty within friendship discourse and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Concerns surrounding self-love and temperance in friendship focus on the potential for disaster when one does not know the extent of their duties to the commonwealth. As I demonstrate in my third chapter, which focuses on Plutarch and *King Lear*, the sense of duty to authority that guides self-fashioning in friendship and buttresses self-knowledge also highlights the necessity of fashioned speech, particularly the tactful articulation of one's conscience in order to preserve ethical bonds and duties within the community. However, as regards the practice of tactful antagonism, that is, "parrhēsia" or frank speech, concerns surface because it potentially disrupts social hierarchies and so closely resembles the very thing it supposedly combats: flattery. In my final chapter, I examine themes discussed in earlier chapters (i.e., self-knowledge, temperance, and admonishment) through the lens of gender and class. Amelia Lanyer's poems, and early modern culture and literature in general, depict *caritas*, or friendship between the self and others mediated by Christ, as one way to cultivate private virtue and public concord that surpasses social divisions. As I argue, divisions and faultlines that are mostly class-based, along with visions of a lack of social mobility, pressure the utopian idea of friendship among women put forth by Lanyer as well as general discussions of social concord among all classes in the commonwealth.

For my best friends and bedfellows, Marilyn, Rosemary, and Pete.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My dissertation committee of Jyotsna Singh, Steve Deng, Sandra Logan, and Craig Dionne were invaluable to the completion of this project. As friends and mentors, my co-chairs Dr. Singh and Dr. Deng provided a steady hand when my dissertation (frequently) went awry. Their guidance, best summarized by Aristotle's praise of the ever attentive friend who anticipates the needs of another and "freely commeth to succor & help…without calling, or sending for," has had a lasting impact on me as a writer, scholar, teacher, and human being. I also gratefully and sincerely thank Dr. Logan and Dr. Dionne for their skepticism, enthusiasm, and encouragement. Special thanks goes to Dr. Dionne, who was willing to serve on my dissertation committee.

I am also indebted to the early modern cohort for their intellectual and moral support, particularly Lisa Barksdale-Shaw, Neal Klomp, Amirta Sen, and Jennifer Toms. I thank Hannah Allen, Rituparna Mitra, and Nicole McCleese for their fellowship and "sharing a bushel of salt" with me during my time at MSU. I hope more lie ahead. My students at Modesto Junior College in Modesto, CA have taught me the importance of being a citizen-scholar in and out of the classroom. I owe much to them.

The love and support of numerous friends inspire much of what I write in the following pages: Daniel and Christine have shown me that friendship brings with it a quietness of mind; Marybeth that friendship helps one, to quote Cicero, "to look at things as they are in the experience of everyday life and not as they are in fancy or in hope;" Margot, a "lamp of uprightness," that friends should be bold to speak their mind; Jaco and Rachel have shown me that one of friendship's numerous fruits is that "it projects the bright ray of hope into the future;"

Lecia and Lane, that frank speech is an ethical responsibility one must not eschew; Sarah, Dedric, Sandy, Cynthia, and Larry have taught me that friendship surpasses bonds of kinship. The Rev. Dove Love has taught me one of the more valuable lessons: ethical care of the self is the foundation of any friendship. I am fortunate to call all of you my friends.

Derek R. Conrad and Bob Coleman-Senghor have taught me the most about friendship, and although neither lived to see the completion of this project, they remain a constant in my daily life. To quote Donne, "[t]hough they are buried and taken from the world of the living, yet to my spirit they seem to never have died." I hope Derek and Bob approve of the finished product.

This project was made possible through the financial support and "friendly help," to quote Helena, of a community of strangers joined by a love of learning. I am forever indebted to the generosity of the John Yunck Fellowship, the Dissertation Completion Fellowship from the Graduate School at Michigan State University, the Graduate Merit Scholarship, and the Marion Kurtz Croak Scholarship. I also thank the Michigan taxpayer for supporting the work of a world-class research university; I would not have been able to attend graduate school without their support. Thank you is also necessary to Sandy for the use of her cabin in bucolic Albion over the summer of 2014 as well as Rachel and Jaco for generously allowing me to write most of this dissertation from their lovely perch atop Mt. Tamalpais.

Finally, and most importantly, you would not be reading this without the tireless love, support, and inspiration of Marilyn, Rosemary, and Peter. They have taught me that there is nothing more pleasant than to have a friend with whom you may dare speak as with yourself. I dedicate this dissertation, as well as my life, to all of them. Pete, I promise to write about cross-species friendship in early modern culture one of these days.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

"He that loveth pureness of heart, for the grace of his lips, the king shall be his friend" (Proverbs 22:11)

Project Overview

In what follows, I will argue that a period emphasis on self-knowledge and duty in friendship repudiates a common assumption that the early modern era envisions friendship as primarily a private, selfless, apolitical affair divorced from public life.[1] This is not to say that early modern friendship discourse refrains from representing friendship as a private and inherently apolitical relationship predicated on self-abnegation – indeed, just to name a few, friendship narratives such as Richard Edwards's *Damon and Pythias* or Sir Thomas Elyot's "The wonderfull history of Titus and Gisippus" make this all too frequent claim in spite of numerous internal contradictions. As I will show, through its emphasis on self-knowledge and duty, early modern friendship discourse and practice identify friendship as a corollary of ethics and politics and, more generally, communal life. Moreover, these facets of friendship speak to larger concerns of the form and function of the commonwealth in early modern England, among which the idea of 'the common good' and the subject's duty to it prove central. As a 1598 'Englished' translation of the French humanist Loys Le Roy's commentary on the *Politics* by John Dee aptly puts it, "a city is ordained for honest actions, and not for living together onely…[and this] is the work of friendship, for friendship is nothing but an election of living orderly together, and therefore the purpose and end of cities is to live well" (sig. Q3r).

[1] For friendship as a site of alienation in early modern literature and culture see Tom MacFaul, *Male Friendship in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries* (Cambridge, 2007). For friendship as largely a private affair removed from public politics see Laurie Shannon, in *Sovereign Amity: Figures of Friendship in Shakespearean Contexts* (Chicago, 2002)

Given an emphasis in friendship discourse on "honest action," social concord, and moral obligation, as well as on its popularity as a perennial topic of interest to readers, spectators, and writers throughout the period, it should come as no surprise that friendship provides a vocabulary for the era to think about what it means to be a 'good' and 'dutiful' subject in the commonwealth. [2] Some of the major concerns taken up by friendship discourse and practice in this light include: the realization of membership in a larger community (chapter one); the importance of measure and mean to both individual and community well-being (chapter two); the obligation to admonish community members when they fail to uphold their duties and a shared moral standard (chapter three); and the necessity of social concord across various classes (chapter four). Moreover, period conceptions of friendship demonstrate that the formation of "good" and "dutiful" does not proceed without cognitive, moral, and emotional struggles, particularly, as regards indifference, selfishness, flattery, and resentment (key topics, as I demonstrate, of great interest to early modern "commonwealth men," who frequently exhort subjects to follow friendship practices that buttress the commonwealth). One must add to this the gender inflections embedded in early modern friendship discourse – a discourse primarily addressed to men and one that reminds them of their moral and social roles within the community – and the manner in which it underscores the exclusion of women. As I demonstrate, the call for self-regulation and moral imperative in early modern friendship discourse and practice emanates from a perceived necessity to harness friendship to a higher cause, such as the

[2] Likewise, it should come as no surprise that since the establishment of Caxton's printing presses in England, when Cicero's text on friendship and duty to the commonwealth were some of the first turned out in 'Englished' form, texts on friendship tend to appear during times of social and political change (such as 1531-1534 during the English Reformation, 1553-1555 during the Marian Counter-Reformation, 1584-1588 during the war with Spain, etc.).

common good or a shared, moral code. It also proceeds from a belief in the responsibility of the self to perform continual maintainece on his ethical identity, through self-reflection, temperance, and courage.

Before going into detail about the contents and claims of each chapter, I first outline the framework of my project. This entails a brief discussion of an example from the period (a sermon John Donne delivers before a group of administrators); a literature review of scholarship on early modern friendship discourse; an overview of early modern friendship discourse, including the classical antecedents from which it draws; and, finally, a brief discussion of the term 'commonwealth' in early modern culture.

The "picture…of a good subject"

John Donne, in a sermon delivered at St. Paul's on March 24, 1616 to celebrate "the Anniversary of the King's coming to the Crown," examines Proverbs 22:11 at length in relation to "two pictures,...a good picture of a good king, and of a good subject" (99). The sermon, which uses friendship to emphasize how "spiritual duties and services towards him [Christ]" correspond to "external duties as belong to the maintenance of this world" (and which reads contrary to his advice on friendship to Sir Henry Wotton in the verse-letter, "To Sir, with Love") outline these "two pictures" of subject and sovereign in affective and ethical terms (130):

> Here in our text [Proverbs 22:11], we find the subject's picture first; and his marks are two: first, pureness of heart, that he can be an honest man; and then grace of lips, that he be good for something; for, by this phrase, grace of lips is expressed every ability, to do any office of society for the public good….In the king's picture, the principal mark is, that he shall be friendly and gracious; but

> gracious to him that hath this grace of lips, to him that hath endeavored, in some way, to be of use to the public. (100)

In this example, the relationship between the subject and sovereign envisioned by Donne, as well as his description of their respective "picture[s]," is a commixture of "achieved" and "ascribed" bonds, to borrow two phrases from David Konstan's study of friendship in antiquity (1). Indeed, as Donne contends, such a relationship is a combination of affective bonds (that is, "achieved") and territorial bonds (that is, "ascribed") based on both a moral code and a social obligation. [3] This commixture is perhaps the clearest in Donne's discussion of the "picture…of a good subject," where "pureness of heart," defined as the formation of an ethical or "honest" self, and later, a "noble,…sovereign,…and possessory affection," is joined to a "grace of his lips," defined as service for the "public good" and sovereign (101). [4] These same terms also limn the "picture…of a good king," where the hospitality, "gracious[ness]," and "friendl[iness]" of the sovereign extend to those who perform works "of use to the public."

Throughout his sermon, Donne draws heavily on the language and image of friendship to paint the "picture" of a subject and sovereign. He explicitly grounds the discussion of these "picture[s]" in the "spiritual…and civil offices of friendship," that is to say, in religious, moral, affective, social, and political obligations (119). In this context, the meaning of the term "office"

[3] Kinship and citizenship are two examples of "ascribed" bonds while neighborliness, patriotism, or romantic love are examples of "achieved" bonds. See Konstan, "Introduction," 1-14.

[4] Donne follows this excerpt with one of many brief commentaries on Proverbs 22:11: "*He that loveth pureness of heart* (for there is the foundation) *for the grace of his lips* (there is the upper building) *the king shall be his friend*."

thus broadens to not only include, to quote period understandings of the term as listed in the *OED*, “a position or post to which certain duties are attached,” but also “the performance of…a duty, function, [or] service,” and, perhaps most important for the current study, a “duty towards others; [a] moral obligation” (*OED*). Understood in this light, the “spiritual…and civil offices,” as well as their corresponding obligations, apply just as much to general subjects of the Realm as they do its bureaucrats and local office-holders Donne addresses. Indeed, Donne affirms this sentiment later in his sermon. Even though he delivers his sermon before a group of administrators, and not the general public, he nonetheless claims that the lessons derived from Proverbs 22:11 equally apply to all subjects: “But if these words be not only intended of the king literally,...but extended to all men in their proportion, that all that are able should do good to such persons” joined through friendship with Christ and their earthly sovereign (130).

Moreover, Donne explicitly qualifies friendship between the sovereign and subject, and reveals, through this rhetorical move, a greater concern with the “picture” and conduct of the subject: "the king's friendship that is promised here, (*The king shall be his friend*) is *utilis amicitia* [an instrumental friendship], all such friends as may do him good"(125). Indeed, while Donne goes to great lengths to stress the need for the subject to reform his heart and *ethos*, as well as be cognizant of how his actions might serve the greater good, he paints the “picture” of a king interested only in utility, particularly how subjects performing their duties contribute to the social, spiritual, economic, and political well-being of the realm. Moreover, this qualification is necessary for political and theological reasons, since as Donne later observes, it prevents the subject from thinking he is equal to his sovereign and God’s emissary on earth: "as moral men

have noted, friendship implies some degrees of equality, which cannot stand between king and subject" (131). [5]

Donne's tendency to draw on the vocabulary of friendship when discussing the subject's moral and political duties to the self, sovereign, and commonwealth is far from anomalous; rather, as I shall demonstrate in this project, it draws from and belongs to a well-known discourse of friendship that is frequently used to underscore such concerns. Indeed, this discourse consistently circulates broadly throughout the period (particularly from the latter part of the fifteenth-century through the end of the Tudor era) and is inspired largely by classical treatments on the topic by Cicero, Aristotle, and Plutarch; the "moral men" that Donne surely alludes to when noting that the sovereign cannot literally be friends with his subjects. Furthermore, Donne's audience, as well as an early modern English public, would, in all likelihood, be extremely familiar with the tenets of friendship discussed by these "moral men" since these ideas appear in a variety of literary forms during the period, that range (to name only a few), from the 'vulgar' or 'Englished' translations of classical texts on friendship for general readers to Latin curriculum in lower form and university classrooms; commercial drama to university and court drama; prose literature to manuscript and printed poetry; pamphlets to low ballads; and, a host of

[5] He begins this passage noting how the hierarchy of God, king, and subject influence friendship with the sovereign: "Step we a step lower, from God to the king; for as kings have no example but God, so according to that example they are reserved, and sparing in affording that name of friend to any" (131). It is interesting to note that Donne does not completely foreclose the possibility of the sovereign having friends.

See Ernst Hartwig Kantorowicz's magisterial, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1997), for further information about the theological assumptions embedded in period conceptions of sovereignty. Originally published in 1957, Kantorowicz's text proves useful for understanding early modern "political theology."

sermons, miscellanies, images, etc. [6] Thus, before I proceed further with the thesis and outline of this project, it is important to broadly sketch and summarize early modern friendship discourse, particularly its tenets, the classical antecedents that inspire it, and provide a brief overview of the select texts and social situations in which friendship discourse makes an appearance. After the cultural and literary contexts have initially been introduced, I will then elaborate my thesis that early modern culture uses friendship discourse to stress the formation of a moral and political subject in service to the commonwealth.

The Early Modern "cult of friendship"

Donne, in a letter to Sir Henry Goodyer (who, if the records are reliable, served in the Parliament of James), famously refers to friendship as "my second religion" (86). [7] Whether Donne speaks hyperbolically to Goodyer (which might be the case since he does so in other letters where friendship is characterized as analogous to religion), modern scholars such as Horst Hutter have noted how a "veritable cult of friendship" exists in early modern culture and literature (*Politics* 9). Though the term "cult" might conjure up images of a discourse, to quote the *OED*, comprised of "beliefs or practices regarded by others as strange or sinister," the interest in friendship during the period is far from peripheral (*OED*). Jeffrey Masten, responding to Clifford Leech's introduction to the second Arden edition of Shakespeare's *The Two Gentlemen of Varona*, takes issue with the qualifier "cult" for its connotation of an esoteric and

[6] See Shannon, 33-40, for a discussion of emblems of friendship in Stuart culture.

[7] There are several Sir Henry Goodyers affiliated with the Court around this time; moreover, most of them are related.

For other instances where Donne equates friendship with religion, see 116 and 246**.**

marginal discourse; friendship, as Masten rightly observes, "[i]s at the very center of English social structure" (270). [8] While I agree with his objection to Leech's use of the term, Hutter's qualification stresses a sentiment similar to Masten's, insofar as he does not employ the term "cult" in order to "undercut the importance of friendship" discourse in early modern culture, but to underscore its centrality and exaltation in the period's culture and literature (270). Although he does not use similar language, Tom MacFaul, in *Male Friendship in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries* (Cambridge 2007), nonetheless notes the import of friendship during the era. As MacFaul observes, an early modern "[h]umanist ideology of friendship trie[s] to make friendship the most important thing in the world" through considerable discussion of the ideal and universal subject (1). Taken as a whole, Hutter, Masten, and MacFaul's observations demonstrate how, in this sense, cult refers to a "reverential homage" or "intense admiration…for an idea," to quote the *OED* once again, in a manner not far from Donne's praise of friendship cited in his correspondence and sermon (*OED*). [9]

Additional scholarship on early modern culture readily affirms Hutter, Masten, and MacFaul's claims of the significance accorded to friendship during the era. Indeed, as Daniel Lochman observes in the introduction to a recently published collection of essays on friendship, *Discourses and Representations of Friendship in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700* (Palgrave 2011), "the period between 1500 and 1700 saw a flurry of works" devoted to the topic (2). A few

[8] See Masten, "Two Gentlemen," 270. According to Masten, "In 1969 the word 'cult' might have lent friendship a sense of either/both the primitive – an "early" formulation that Leech implies Anglo-American culture has now progressed beyond – or/and the delusional (*OED*)."

[9] Compare to Hutter, *Politics*, 8-9.

examples of this enormous output, of which there are innumerable titles, include: Sir Thomas More's 1516 "On a False Friend," Sir Thomas Elyot's "Wonderfull historye of Titus and Gisippus" in his 1531 *Boke named the governour*, John Lyly's 1578 *Euphues*: *The Anatomy of Wit*, Michel de Montaigne's 1580 "Of Friendship," BK IV of Edmund Spenser's 1594 epic *The Faerie Queene*, as well as a significant portion of Shakespeare's corpus, among which may be counted the1607 *Timon of Athens*, the 1613 *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and the aforementioned 1593 *The Two Gentlemen of Varona*. Aside from these select literary titles, a host of explicitly didactic texts also take up the topic of friendship: Desiderius Erasmus's 1514 *Adages*, Richard Edwards' 1564 *Damon and Pythias*, Edmund Tilney's 1567 *The Flower of Friendship*, the 1584 anonymously penned *The Mirror of Friendship*, Thomas Churchyard's 1586 *A Spark of Friendship*, Walter Breme's 1596 *The Triall of True Friendship*, and Francis Bacon's 1625 "Of Friendship." Lastly, a body of 'vulgar' or 'Englished' translations of classical texts on friendship are also produced during this era, namely those by Cicero (*De amicitia* or *On friendship*), Aristotle (*The Nicomachean Ethics*), and Plutarch ("How to Tell a Friend From a Flatterer" and "On Having a Pluralitie of Friends"). The presence of these disparate representations of friendship in an array of social settings such as the classroom and the alehouse, as well as the stages in London, Oxford, and the Court, speak to what William C. Carroll characterizes, in his discussion of early modern curriculums and Cicero's *De amicitia*, as "the widening arc of transmission" of friendship in early modern culture (5). It likewise offers further evidence of widespread dissemination of conceptions of friendship by Donne's "moral men" and suggests that Carroll's estimation how "anyone could have learned the essay's basic insights elsewhere, from both elite and popular culture" proves highly probable (5).

Since the publication of Laurens J. Mills' exhaustive account of "the friendship theme" in Tudor and early-Stuart literature, *One Soul in Bodies Twain: Friendship in Tutor Literature and Stuart Drama* (Principia 1937), early modern cultural studies have come to recognize friendship and this "flurry" of material as a historical and cultural phenomenon worthy of study (16). [10] Comprehensive in thematic scope, geographic range, and interdisciplinary approach, and rigorous in their historicizing, many of these studies consider how early modern literature vexes the theoretical elegance of the era's friendship discourse through an emphasis on practice. For instance, the edited collections of Laura Gowing et al, *Love, Friendship and Faith in Europe*, 1300 -1800 (Palgrave 2005), as well as Lochman et al, illustrate how friendship and love, perceived in England and on the Continent as intimate, social, and political acts, reveal, to quote Lochman, "emergent relationships within a unique early modern ideological and psychological framework" (Lochman 2). Monographs by Alan Bray, Lorna Hutson, Laurie Shannon, and Ullrich Langer also historicize friendship and make similar claims as to its usefulness for examining relationships in a larger social context. Langer, for instance, in *Perfect Friendship: Studies in Literature and Moral Philosophy from Boccaccio to Corneille* (Librairie Droz 1994), demonstrates that the persistence of "commonplaces of friendship" in early modern French literature and culture, along with its cultural capital during the era, is fruitful for understanding how period specific notions of ethics and "love move through historical, theological, and political paths" in early modern England (13). Shannon, in *Sovereign Amity: Figures of*

[10] Charles George Smith's published dissertation, *Spenser's Theory of Friendship* (Johns Hopkins 1935), is another early piece of criticism on friendship in early modern culture and literature. Unlike Mills' published dissertation, which performs an exhaustive historical, social, and cultural analysis of "the friendship theme," Smith confines his study to BK IV of *The Faerie Queene* and mostly provides a list of proverbs from a broad range of period texts.

Friendship in Shakespearean Contexts (Chicago 2002), illuminates how paradigms of likeness, a core tenet of early modern friendship discourse, "create[s] a unit (*e pluribus unum*) with its own experimental relations to agency and polity," while Hutson, echoing Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, demonstrates, in *The Usurer's Daughter: Male Friendship and Fictions of Women in Sixteenth-Century England* (Routledge 1994), that the representation of "women as signs of love and friendship extended between men" underscore an emergent recognition of friendship as both "economic dependency as well as an affective bond" (1; 2-3). [11] Finally, in his posthumous study, *The Friend* (Chicago 2003), Bray examines how practices of "friendship [serve] as the interpretive crux" for the history of the family, politics, and ethics in early modern culture (6). Bray magisterially shows how the ethics of friendship, viewed from the perspective of "a capacity to love, and a desire to give," illuminate polyvalent ideas of kinship and community during the era (7). Furthermore, Bray contends that germane to this practice is "the conviction [that]…the ethics of friendship operated only in a larger frame of reference that lay outside of the good of the individual for whom friendship was made" (6).

Before advancing further, a brief synopsis of early modern friendship discourse proves necessary. As current scholarship on the topic abundantly demonstrates, the era's discourse derives its conceptual framework from Latin and Greek sources on the subject, most notably Cicero's *De amicitia* [*On Friendship*], Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, and Plutarch's essays in the *Moralia* on flattery and having a multitude of friends. Drawing on these antecedents, and *De amicitia* in particular, early modern examinations frequently anatomize friendship through a distinction between, as Cicero terms it, "ordinary and commonplace friendship" in opposition to

[11] See, Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (Columbia, 1985).

a "pure and faultless kind" (Falconer VI.22). Furthermore, these articulations claim that what prompts the friendship limns the distinction between "faultless" and "commonplace, for instance, virtue and selflessness as regards the former, and selfishness and pleasure in the latter, as does unanimity between friends of characteristics such as likeness, benevolence, fidelity, and proximity. While early modern formulations of friendship bear a decidely clear Ciceronian influence, they are simultaneously an amalgam of other classical antecedents, namely Aristotle and Plutarch. Thus, it is important to briefly consider the unique formulations of friendship in these texts followed by their larger cultural, social, and political significance during the early modern period.

An Appeal to the Ancients: Classical Sources on Friendship

While these texts each have their particular focus, (that is, for Aristotle, friendship as *philia* cultivates our *ethos* and the relationship we have with ourselves; for Cicero, friendship as *amicitia* cultivates our virtue and the relationship we have with the republic; and for Plutarch, friendship cultivates how we use frank speech or *parrhēsia* to admonish our friends and have them repair their *ethos* and strengthen community), all are grounded in a common vocabulary of proverbs and tenets that early modern friendship discourse readily incorporates. [12] For instance, by the end of the era proverbs on friendship become, to quote Erasmus' characterization of the form, "well known and in popular currency" (4). Some proverbs that circulate widely and shape a discourse of friendship include: "Among friends all things should be common" (Dorke sig. A4v), "A freend… is another I" (Harington sig. G3v), "One soul in bodies twain" (Elyot 2:122).

[12] Ancient Greek does not have a word for 'friendship.' However, the word *philia* is synonymous with 'friendship' in ancient Greek texts. Latin texts like Cicero, however, do have a word for friendship: *amicitia*. I elaborate below on the denotation and connotation of these terms.

Indeed, as Robert Stretter notes in his examination of friendship in mid- and late-Tudor literature and culture, "[b]y the Renaissance, perfect friendship had become a rigorously theorized tradition with a canon of 'laws' set down in proverbs such as *amicitia inter bonos* (friendship [is possible only] between good men), *amicus alter ipse* (a friend is another self), *amicorum communia sunt omnia* (friends hold all things in common), and *amicitia etiam post mortem* (friendship extends even beyond death)" (347).

While self-abnegation and care for the other form the basis of "faultless" friendship, self-interest and selfish desire typically function as the definitive characteristics of "commonplace" friendship. Aristotle, long credited for introducing the dichotomy of "perfect" and "imperfect" in theoretical discussions of friendship (both of which, denotatively, are akin to Cicero's "faultless" and "commonplace"), anatomizes the latter form of intimacy even further by making a distinction between "imperfect" friendships of utility and pleasure as well as friendships predicated on "natural affinity," to quote Hyatte (3). [13] According to Aristotle, friendships of "natural affinity" are grounded in a 'natural' bond in species, family, or territory; thus, such friendships explain why two dogs form a companionship, why a mother loves her child, or citizens feel compelled to live harmoniously in their city-state. Consequently, "natural affinity," as Aristotle contends, illuminates how concord is a universal principle of the cosmos toward

[13] It is important to note that these forms of friendship, rather than being discrete, almost always overlap. Indeed, a 1547 'vulgar' translation of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* by Thomas Wilkinson, amply demonstrates this through a discussion of friendships of "natural affinity" and utility or "necessitie." Wilkinson acknowledges the necessity of friendships of utility because, as he notes, "no man [c]ould have al the goodes of the world to live alone…[i]t is a natural thinge to man to live citizenly and a necessary thing to a manne to accomplishe his business of necessitee by his neighbores and frendes, whiche cannot bee doen by himself. To do well it is a noble and delectable thing" (72).

which all beings (human and non-human alike) 'naturally' strive. Next, "perfect" friendship is presented as possible only between two individuals, typically similar in goodness and *ethos*, formed after a fair passing of time (or "sharing a bushel of salt," as he famously puts it), and self-sustaining in perpetuity. "Perfect" friends likewise provide counsel, love one another for their goodness (not because of the pleasure or utility they present), hold possessions in common, and, similar to friendships of "natural affinity," are reliant on proximity. "Imperfect" friendship, on the other hand, can be between a great number of persons of different levels of goodness, are typically transitory and dissolve once one no longer finds pleasure or utility in the other. These friendships tend to be superficial, particularly since one loves the other not for their goodness or who they are, but for the profit or delectation they bring, and though they are still reliant on proximity, it is possible to form friendships over long distances.

Despite the differences between "perfect" and "imperfect" friendships, where "perfect" friendships, by the very nature of Aristotle's characterization, seem to be the best, he does concede that "imperfect" friendship is not entirely without its merits. Indeed, Aristotle contends that "imperfect" friendships of either utility or pleasure can potentially help one develop their *ethos* and character, and thus lead one to become a better friend and person. [14] Moreover, and perhaps most germane to the current study, Aristotle makes an exception to this dichotomy of

[14] Aristotle believed, according to Hyatte, that "utility and pleasure are both necessary components of the highest order of *philia* because, first, the true friend needs to demonstrate his usefulness in order to be happy" (19). Aristotle and Cicero, though not in entire disagreement, argued that this distinction & necessity was the degree to which "moral/ethical competence" was fostered and improved through imperfect forms of friendship (5).

There is much debate in classical sources regarding the necessity of imperfect friendships in relation to forging perfect affective bonds, particularly "in regards to the part that utility plays" (Hyatte 5). Plato, various early Stoics, and the Epicureans believed imperfect friendship was the "prerequisite to the ends of wisdom and happiness" of perfect friendship (5). Aristotle and

"imperfect" and "perfect" in the case of civic friendship, where self-interest, especially when tempered with measure and mean, is "identifie[d]…as an important means of achieving social concord…Just as imperfect individuals aid one another to grow in virtue, a morally sound political community seeks the good of fellow citizens by providing good laws that foster the virtue of justice," to quote Lochman et al (5-6). Thus, Aristotle's emphasis on action in friendship, particularly in terms of character development and civic concord, are twin concepts that Cicero and early modern conceptions of friendship keenly incorporate. Indeed, Cicero's *De amicitia* also foregrounds friendship in relation to the community, particularly the republic or "*res publica*", and this emphasis is readily embraced by early modern texts, such as Donne's sermon, where friendship is aligned with the commonwealth and the development of the 'good' subject.

Cicero, the Roman philosopher, political statesman, and orator, best known, to students and scholars of early modern literature and culture, for *De officiis* (*On duties*), a treatise on *officia*, that is, duties or "obligations of role or relationship," to quote Melissa Lane, also proves to be the era's foremost authority on friendship. Indeed, both *De amicitia* and *De officiis* are perceived during the era, to quote T.W. Baldwin, as "the pinnacle of moral philosophy" (2:590). Both prove essential for education, as evinced from their extensive use in lower form education, university curriculum, and private study, and, just as important, both align with fundamental principles of early modern humanism, most notably its emphasis on the *vita activa*, or belief in an active life in service to the commonwealth. As Jonathon Woolfson observes, the "pragmatic

Cicero, though not in entire disagreement, argued that this distinction & necessity was the degree to which "moral/ethical competence" was fostered/improved through imperfect forms of friendship (5).

application…of classical learning," particularly the belief that the self enhances his service to a civic community through cultivation of a strong "moral foundation," and vice versa, resonates with Cicero's texts on duties and friendship (9). [15] In many respects, Cicero blends the ethical, social, and political dimensions of friendships similar to Aristotle; indeed, Cicero also emphasizes the four forms of friendship outlined by Aristotle (that is, friendships of "natural affinity," necessity, pleasure, and virtue), places a strong emphasis on ethical self-love, where one must first befriend the self before befriending others, and also reiterates many of the same tenets. [16] Lastly, the Roman term for friendship, *amicitia*, replaces the Greek idea of friendship

[15] See Mills, 111 for how friendship appeals to humanism's *vita activa*. For a succinct overview of republican virtue in *De amicitia*, see Hyatte, 27. For a thorough discussion of civic humanism in Tudor culture, see Jonathan Woolfson, "Introduction," *Reassessing Tudor Humanism* (Palgrave, 2002), 1-21. Despite the caution one should exercise in investing humanism with a broad ideological program or philosophy, since, as Alastair Fox and John Guy remind us, it flattens sixteenth-century English culture, Woolfson nonetheless provides three reasons to consider Christian and civic humanisms as coherent projects during the Tudor era: (1) both embody an interest and concern in "supplying the practical skills and a moral formation appropriate to public life"; (2) both function as "a tool of other ideological purposes"; and, (3) both reinvigorate and underscore the cultural differences between modern and early modern humanisms (4). See Alastair Fox and John Guy, *Reassessing the Henrican Age: Humanism, Politics and Reform 1500-1550* (Blackwell, 1986), 1-76. Also see Markku Peltonen's examination of the legacy of Roman republicanism in early modern English political thought, particularly in relation to conceptions of *vita activa*: *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570-1640* (Cambridge, 1995). Mike Pincombe's monograph on Tudor humanism is also enlightening, certainly his sustained discussion of "Ciceronian humanitas" (1). See Pincombe, *Elizabethan Humanism: Literature and Learning in the Later Sixteenth Century* (Longman, 2001), 1-36. Finally, Arthur Kinney's *Humanist Poetics: Thought, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century England* (Massachusetts, 1986), 3-40 provides a succinct overview of early modern humanism.

[16] Though he too talks about "natural affinity," Cicero also remarks how men lacking moral discipline and commitment to obligations shirk their 'natural duties' and thus are on the same level as animals "[A]ll men are meant by nature to have some sort of companionship one with another, and that the depth and significance of this companionship varies according to the degree of relationship between them…. it is stronger between citizen and citizen than between

as *philia*, and with it, one's relationship and obligation to the political community. While ancient Greek does not have a dedicated word for 'friendship,' *philia* is synonymous with it, and can best be defined, to quote Hyatte, "at its broadest as the mutual goodwill and the feeling of love or esteem that unite people" (16). Latin texts like Cicero, however, do have a word for friendship: *amicitia*. In a strict sense (which early modern texts render rather elastic), *amicitia* is not an affective relationship; rather it is predicated on duties to others, particularly the republic. As Hyatte succinctly observes, this republican aspect of friendship "assumes the subordination of the individual's will and friend's common will to the higher interests of the state" (27). Konstan reiterates this characterization: "[t]hough *amicitia* has a certain breadth of meaning…it does not normally designate love in general but rather the specific relation between friends (*amici*) (122). As I shall demonstrate in the next section, discussions of the "commonwealth" and "*res publica*," terms which refer to the polity, common good, and private household, are embedded in early modern representations of friendship, particularly given its decidely Ciceronian flavor.

Plutarch's essays from the *Moralia*, particularly his essay on flattery, also proves of great importance to an early modern discourse of friendship. [17] Aptly titled, "How to Tell a Flatterer From a Friend," Plutarch's essay focuses on issues readily taken up by early modern texts on

citizen and foreigner, between those who are related by blood than those who are not" (Falconer V19).

Cicero, explicating how certain men display a "Beastliness" that belies their rational nature and duty to others (and reiterating an early modern interest in *vanitas*), notes: "For what is so trastlie, as to be delited with these many kynde of vaine thinges, as honour, glorie, building, apparell, and deckeing of the bodie, and not marveilousely to be delighted, with suche a mind endewed with vertue, as bothe can loue and yelde loue for loue againe" (Harrington sig. E2v).

[17] A chapter entitled "On Pluralitie of Friends" in Plutarch's *Moralia* addresses the problem of having more than one friend, namely, it lends itself to superficial relationships, jealousy, and flattering. However, Plutarch's essay does not circulate as much in the era's

friendship: flattery promotes self-love and retards the growth of one's *ethos*; flattery promotes social discord and paranoia; and lastly, flattery is antithetical to the responsibility of the friend to boldly speak "truth to power." Plutarch's treatise on flattery and frank speech, taken from a miscellany of seventy-eight essays on ethics known as the *Moralia*, also proves influential to early modern English culture and friendship theories. Like *De amicitia*, the *Moralia* is used extensively in lower and higher form curriculums to teach grammar and, more importantly, ethics, as T.W. Baldwin and Martha Hale Shackford observe. [18] It likewise appears in a variety of social and textual environments, not only in the form of the advisor, such as Gaveston or Spencer Jr. to an oblivious Edward II, or Iago to the increasingly jealous Othello, but also, to an extent, in the form of the parasite, such as Paroles, Timon's patrons, or the gentlemen of Dionysus' court, Aristippus and Carisophus.

As this brief overview of the predominant influences on early modern friendship discourse has demonstrated, classical antecedents such as those by Cicero, Aristotle, and Plutarch, provide the basic vocabulary, concerns, and ideal ends of friendship. An implicit and recurring characteristic in all three is linking the social and moral code of friendship to both private, affective, "achieved" relationships between a few and public, "ascribed" relationships between many occupying the same territory or space. For instance, Aristotle emphasizes moral

friendship discourse like the essay on flattery or texts by Cicero and Aristotle. This is rather surprising, given that the text largely addresses how having too many friends can compromise concord. Indeed, Plutarch contends that having "a great multitude" of friends is difficult, not only because one "can not make any certain account" of them, but more importantly, one is unable to cultivate a deep and meaningful bond of intimacy due to the fact that "a man is not able to converse with them, nor to frame and sort with them all" (Holland 224-5).

[18] See Baldwin, 1:208-09; 1:406; 1:535; 1:540. Also see Shackford, *Plutarch in Renaissance England, with Special Reference to Shakespeare* (Wellesley, 1929), 22.

development and civic concord as twin concepts of friendship inextricably interrelated, while Cicero binds moral development and duties to the republic and claims that one's relationship to the republic always trumps any friendship. Finally, Plutarch provides instruction on how to admonish the other so that the wayward friend may attend to both moral development and duties to the republic. Indeed, the ethical and political dimensions of friendship discussed by these classical antecedents occupy a central place in early modern friendship discourse. Of particular import to the current study, which I shall now broadly sketch, is the ethical commitment to the self and a larger community, ideas undergirding, as I shall demonstrate in this project, early modern claims on both the necessity of friendship to the commonwealth and the obligation to fashion the self into a moral subject.

Friendship and the Commonwealth

As mentioned above, the call for self-regulation and moral imperative in early modern friendship discourse and practice emanates from a perceived necessity to harness friendship to a higher cause, such as the common good or a shared, moral code. Not only is this apparent in period representations and discussions of friendship, but its interconnection with "duty" and the "common good" become evident when read alongside texts on the commonwealth (indeed, this overlapping theme of "dutiful" and "good" brings the topic of self-fashioning in service to a community to the forefront).

As Sir Thomas Smith, Elizabeth's ambassador to France from 1562 to 1566 and one of the writers informally known as "commonwealth men," famously defines the commonwealth in *De republica Anglorum* (subsequently published as *The common-wealth of England*): "A commonwealth is called a society or common doing of a multitude of free men collected together and united by common accord and coveauntes among themselves, for the conversation of

themselves as well in peace as in warre" (20). [19] In Smith's definition of "a commonwealth," and largely in accordance with the period's understanding of the term, space is given to both governance and cohabitation. Indeed, on the one hand, commonwealth, as well as related appellations like "common weal," refer to domestic politics, in particular the responsibilities of government and "its duty to provide for security, social order, justice, peace, and prosperity" for all of its subjects, to quote a recent study by the Early Modern Research Group (664). [20] In England, this refers to the governing structures of the polity, not only the monarch, but also the administrators comprised of "free men" from the ranks of the elite, though Smith also includes in his taxonomy "Yeomen" (someone possessing land valued at 40s) and, to a lesser extent, "poor husbandmen,…merchants or retailers…copyholders, and all artificers" who hold office (42; 45). [21] On the other hand, the term also refers to mass cohabitation of a collective as well as the various social and domestic mores that correspond to "notions of the 'commune' or 'community'

[19] R.G. Elton's overview of early and mid-Tudor "commonwealth-men," although dated in its critical approach and confined to the era of Somerset, remains one of the best introductions and overviews, particularly how ethics and politics are inextricably intertwined in period conceptions of the commonwealth. See "Reform and Commonwealth-Men of Edward VI's Reign" in *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government: Vol 3, 1973-1981* (Cambridge, 2003), 234-253. Also see Whitney R.D. Jones, *The Tudor Commonwealth* (Athlone, 1970) as well as David Landreth's introduction to *The Face of Mammon* (Oxford, 2012).

[20] Members of the Early Modern Research Group include Mike Braddick, Steve Hindle, Ann Hughes, Joad Raymond, Cathy Shrank, and Phil Withington.

[21] See Smith, 46. Also see Harrison, *The Description of England* (Folger Shakespeare Library, 1968), 117.

Sir Thomas Elyot, in the opening chapter of book one of *The boke named the governour*, is more hardline in his definition of the "public weal," a term he favors over "common weal" due to the fact that the latter emphasizes an equality that Elyot sees as unrealistic when compared to the social reality of hierachies. See 3; 7.

of the realm of England" (664). Here too, governing structures are vital, but rather than function as visible institutions where only a select group can participate, they broadly operate as secular and social *habitus*; it is in this respect that "the commonwealth…act[s] as a language to articulate personal and public vices and virtues" (670). Frequently, this dual-emphasis on the polity and social aspects of commonwealth merge, as evinced by Le Roy's definition of the "Common-weale", where "publique" and "private" are given equal place, along with "prosperitie and safetie" and a host of preferred virtues perceived as lending themselves to the "common commodity, sufficiencie, discipline and honour of a Common-weale":

> But a Common-weale is the best of all companies; therefore of all companies it hath the greatest and chiefest good: and that is the soveraigne felicitie or welfare, consisting both in the publique and in the privat fruition of all kind of goods both of soule and bodie, and also of fortune. For that Common-weale is counted happie, which enioyeth all the three sortes of goods togither; the which to maintaine it selfe long time in prosperitie and safetie, it behooveth to be wise, mild, rich, just, mightie, friendly to it selfe, and religious: wherein consist the common commodity, sufficiencie, discipline and honour of a Common-weale. (sig. C5r)

The term, commonwealth has a rich history in England, as the Early Modern Group, Phil Withington, Whitney R.D. Jones, and others note. Derived from the "fifteenth-century neologism 'common weal': a term of for the common good," it was frequently pictured as an organic

society in which members from all levels perform their divinely prescribed duty for the common welfare (EMG 663). [22] This latter characteristic of the 'common good', or "*bonum commune* or *bonum publica*," as Withington notes, originally focused on "the good of human society in terms of the just and equitable distribution of resources (material and moral) and the preservation of those resources from various kinds of threats: external enemies, private interests, institutional corruption, and so on" (139). It likewise emphasized the relationship between local communities and larger political institutions and, as the sixteenth-century was well under way, "the obligations and reciprocities that *communitas* entailed" (140). This is further compounded by the introduction of the term "*res publica*" in early modern political thought. The term, taken from Cicero's lost work *De re republica*, emphasizes a political body predicated on common interests and the public life of subjects, including, their "affective obligations" toward their community and the larger body (141). However, it is important to note that in the sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century, 'common good' is not synonymous with Cicero's republic or a constitutional government. Equally important, an emphasis on the commonwealth in daily life did not plead for an eradication of social inequalities or subordination. Indeed, regardless of a tendency to argue for economic and spiritual equity, the "commonwealth men" emphasize the importance of social hierarchy. For instance, Thomas Lever, in a sermon delivered in December of 1550, declares such a sentiment through his emphasis that, in the commonwealth, "there must nedes be divers me[m]bers [in order that]…in the come[n]wealth…diverse dueties of diverse

[22] A few examples include: Thomas Starkey, *A dialogue between Cardinal Pole and Thomas Lapset* (1536) as well as *Exhortation to the people, instructing them to Unitie and Peace* (1536). Smith also draws on the organic metaphor.

necessarie offices be done" (sig. B4v). In a similar manner, Sir Thomas Elyot, in *The boke named the governour*, claims subordination as key to a healthy (and godly) "Public Weal" (1:7). [23] As Elyot contends, "[w]here all things are common, there lacketh order: and where order lacketh, there all things are odious and uncomely" (1:7). However, as the sixteenth-century progresses, and enclosure, rackrenting, usury, debasement of coinage, rebellion, vagrancy, and poverty emerge as serious issues, a group of writers from the mid-Tudor era (c. 1514-1558), known as "commonwealth-men," address what they perceive as a link between a rapidly deteriorating society and an unscrupulous pursuit of profit for a few at the expense of many that increasingly left the commonwealth "[in]sufficiently furnished" and threatened the public welfare at large (288). Indeed, individuals such as Hugh Latimer, Bishop of Worcester and eventually one of the "Oxford Martyrs," Thomas Starkey, humanist and political theorist, the Protestant clergyman Robert Crowley, Richard Morison, humanist scholar and Henry VIII's propagandist, and Sir Thomas Smith, proclaim a return to virtue as the anodyne to social and moral ills. Moreover, as the sixteenth-century progressed, and the death of Mary gives way to the ascension of Elizabeth I, writings on the commonwealth continue to emphasize "the cardinal necessity for good order and obedience within a hierarchal society," to quote Whitney R.D. Jones, and expand to include "a concern for the nation's security and destiny which [i]s politico-religious," as Patrick Collinson observes (34; qtd in Jones 34). It is against this backdrop and through this lens, particularly a period emphasis on the "necessity for good order and obedience," that early modern friendship discourse should be read. As I demonstrate in this project, early modern friendship discourse frequently overlaps with an emphasis in

[23] See f.n. 19 for a brief explanation of why Elyot prefers the term "Public Weal" over "common weal."

commonwealth discourse on the function of the "politke order," most notably its ability to "knitte together in justice, tem[p]era[n]cie, modestie, and honest libertie, one to helpe and comforte an another [and] oone to instruct and teach an other," to quote Richard Morison's 1539 *Exhortation to stirre all Englishe men to the defence of their countreye* (sig. B2r).

Chapter Summaries

The current project has much in common with recent emphasis on "agency and polity" in early modern friendship discourse by Laurie Shannon and Alan Bray. Unlike recent scholarship on the topic, however, I argue that the era's discourse largely privileges fashioning the self as an ethical and political subject while an emphasis on the friend is secondary. Furthermore, I contend that the prominence attached to self-fashioning in early modern literature and culture highlights the quotidian function of friendship as a didactic enterprise ideal for fashioning model subjects of the commonwealth. Indeed, Elyot, in a much often quoted passage from *The boke*, underscores this function of friendship narratives for his readership: "Whiche example, studiousely radde, shall ministry to the redars singuler pleasure and also incredible comforte to practise amitie (sig. A7r). The four chapters in this project accordingly examine how the emphasis accorded to contemplation, self-regulation, counsel, and charity in representations of friendship repeatedly underscore one's ethical and political duty to the self and others in the commonwealth. Moreover, as I claimed at the outset of this introduction, each of these facets illuminate larger issues such as the realization of membership in a larger community; the importance of measure and mean to common well-being; the obligation to admonish community members when they fail to uphold a shared moral standard; and the necessity of social concord across various social classes. At the same time, regardless of the perceived utility of friendship discourse to the commonwealth and its subjects, period conceptions of friendship demonstrate that the formation

of “good” and “dutiful” does not proceed without cognitive, moral, and emotional struggles, particularly, as regards indifference, selfishness, flattery, and resentment

Thus, each chapter provides a complex discussion of how early modern friendship discourse illuminates subjectivity and self-fashioning, contains political ideologies, and gestures toward social concerns.

In my examination of friendship, I focus on three social bodies: the self, other, and the commonwealth. In my opening chapter, “[L]ove we the frendful minde: The Politics of Self-knowledge in Tudor Friendship Pamphlets and Richard Tottel’s *Songs and Sonnets*," I read the printed pamphlets on friendship by Thomas Churchyard, Walter Breme, and others, alongside selections from Richard Tottel’s printed miscellany, *Songs and Sonnets*, and texts that emphasize self-examination or “nosce teipsum” (that is, the Delphic command to “know thy self”) by Thomas Rogers, Sir Thomas Elyot, Erasmus, and others. The import accorded to self-knowledge in poems and pamphlets on friendship, similar to the discussion of self-knowledge in religious texts, center on its ability to bring one closer to God and humanity by illuminating the fact that one is a political subject in a larger community. I argue the sentiment that self-knowledge fosters concord, where one learns to fashion the self as a dutiful subject to God and man, takes on great significance in the miscellanies and friendship pamphlets, certainly given the attempts of these texts to appeal to a shared, identity and subjectivity through the symbol of friendship. As I delineate in this chapter, concerns surrounding self-knowledge focus on the possibility of sedition arising from a lack of knowledge about one’s duty and obedience to the commonwealth. Indeed, Robert Crowley, in his 1550 *The way to wealth*, contends that a lack of knowledge about oneself obscures duty to God and the “commone wealth” and ultimately encourages rebellion: “They know not themselves,...they regard no lawes (142). The surest remedy, as Crowley

commands, is to cast about the mind: and using "knowledge that is godly / …[learn] al that thou shalt do:" In fine, knowledge that is godly / Will teach the[e] al that thou shalt do / Belonging to thine owne duty, / And other mens duty also" (lines 1264-1268). Accordingly, this "knowledge" allows "every true Englishman [to perform his] duty forth with [and] to employe his whole study to the removing so great an evil out of so noble a realme and commone wealth" (sig. A2r).

In my discussion of self-knowledge, I demonstrate how Michel Foucault's 1981-1982 Collège de France lectures on subjectivity and "the care of the self" prove particularly fruitful for an examination of early modern friendship. Foucault's lectures on the "connection between the care of the self with politics, pedagogy, and self-knowledge" also prove insightful for an examination of the overlapping themes in friendship discourse as well as commonwealth discourse. The lectures, delivered after Foucault's "ethical turn" where he examines the "freedom" or agency accorded to self-fashioning, outlines three practices associated with the directive "know thy self." On a fundamental level, according to Foucault, the imperative "know thy self" compels one to practice "a counsel of prudence" and to reflect on personal shortcomings or imperfections, while a slightly more complex connotation centers on "a methodological question" of what constitutes a self (35; 67). According to Foucault, the third, and inarguably most important, iteration of the imperative "know thy self" in "all its splendor and fullness [is the realization that] [c]are of the self must consist in knowledge of the self" (67).

As I discuss in the next chapter, friendship discourse and writings on the commonwealth perceive self-love and the moderation of desire, or the ability to "care for the self," to borrow a phrase from Michel Foucault, as key to the practice "Temperance" and "the middle state." I again turn to the 81-82 Collège de France lectures on "the care of the self" in antiquity. Focusing on conceptions of the self and self-study in Hellenic and Roman culture, along with its legacy in

modern thought, Foucault "steps back a bit" from the topic of "the question of the regimen of sexual behavior and pleasures in Antiquity" addressed the previous year and broadly examines the ethics of self-fashioning (2). While he claims that it is a complex activity frequently difficult to delineate, caring for the self implies, firstly, reflecting on how one is an emotional being, and secondly, recognizing and realizing the agency bestowed upon the self in forming this being. According to Foucault, a product of this realization and practice concerns self-governance where moral beliefs and constraints illuminate one's ethical identity and responsibilities not only to the self but to others.

In my second chapter, "'I to myself am dearer than a friend': The Problem of the Care of the Self and Care of Others in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*", I continue the discussion of self-knowledge and duty in friendship through an examination of its disciplinary function. As texts on self-knowledge repeatedly claim, to quote Erasmus, "moderation" of pleasure and the ability to sustain a "middle state" where self-regard and abnegation are balanced prove fundamental, although highly challenging, in social relationships at all levels. In this chapter, I read Shakespeare's early comedy alongside pamphlets on friendship, period translations of Cicero's *De amicitia* (*Of friendship*), and treatises on the passions or 'emotions' like Thomas Wright's *The Passions of the Minde in Generall*. A common concern in these texts revolves around loving the self in an ethical manner and exercising will over passions that cloud one's duty to the commonwealth. As these texts contend, by learning to love the self ethically, one also learns to love others ethically, and thus be a dutiful subject to a wider community. Moreover, learning to use passions "stirred up for the service of vertue", to quote Wright, requires the ability to balance self-regard and abnegation through continual reflection and restraint. I argue the centrality afforded to self-reflection and measure and mean fosters a subjectivity deemed essential to the

cultivation of reason and discipline since it draws attention to the end toward which all actions should be directed in friendship: the commonwealth. As I show in this chapter, concerns surrounding self-love and temperance in friendship focus on the potential for disaster when one does not know the extent of their duties to the commonwealth or, to quote Edmund Dudley's 1510 *The tree of commonwealth*, how the "root of truth or fidelity must fasten itself in the hearts of all subjects" and manifest in behavior that reflects one's 'proper' place in the social order (qtd. in Jones 30). [24]

The political and pedagogical aspects of caring for the self also solidify communal relationships. Indeed, discussions in antiquity concurrently emphasize how taking care of the self is essential for the health of the polis and the wider community – Foucault, citing Plato's Alcibiades, argues that this centers on promoting the belief that one "had to take care of himself if he wished to take care of others later" (494). Likewise, Foucault contends that the care of the self, including its political and pedagogical facets, is reliant on numerous social relations to help guide it, such as "scholastic organizations," "private counselors" and tutors, "family," patronage, elder relationships, and "friendship" (497). This dependency on others underscores how "[n]ot being able to take care of oneself without the help of someone else was generally an accepted principle" (496). As such, controlling one's emotions become more significant, since it not only curbs mental anguish but also helps "produce or induce behavior through which one will actually be able to take care of others" (198).

While the chapter demonstrated how Tudor friendship discourse perceives caring for the self as a series of inward actions, such as emotional awareness tethered to what Foucault terms a

[24] Indeed, Dudley contends that when fidelity flourishes: "What friendship and confidence shall then be between men and men from the highest degree to the lowest."

"counsel of prudence," one wonders how these disparate materials simultaneously explore how the self convinces the other to take care of himself (*Hermeneutics* 35). The obligation of the friend to admonish the other in order that he learn to take care of himself proves a central claim in friendship discourse: friends must, to quote Plutarch, "shew themselves…bolde to speake their minds and to finde fault, which it one of the best and surest marks of true friendship" (84). However, a general concern of the potential of "bolde" speech to do more harm than good emerges in discussions of frank speech between friends. Rogers notes how even "good intent…[may] cause infinite hurtes" when one boldly speaks their mind to the friend: "Rashe counsaile, although sometime it maye have good intent,…hath evill success and is the cause of infinite hurtes both private and publike" (Rogers sig. N4r).

As I demonstrate in the next chapter, early modern friendship discourse frequently presents a novel way to minimize "infinite hurtes" or "displease[ure] while simultaneously allowing the friend to "bold[ly]…speak their minde." 'Tactful antagonism,' that is, provoking the other to become self-conscious and critical by deliberately angering them, proves one of the best ways to convince the other to take care of himself. Foucault's 1983-1984 lectures on frank speech or *parrhēsia* help illuminate how the care of the self in early modern friendship discourse is often perceived as reliant on the antagonism of others. The "ethics of anger," a provocative idea Foucault raises but never elaborates in his 1983 Berkeley and 1984 Collège lectures on frank speech proves helpful in this investigation, Reading the overlapping theme of tactful antagonism in Foucault and early modern friendship discourse illuminate how questions of how to use frank speech in order to ethically anger the other are linked to period questions of how to cultivate and deploy one's moral conscience for the benefit of the self and commonwealth.

As I demonstrate in my third chapter, the sense of duty to heavenly and earthly authority that guides self-fashioning in friendship, and buttresses self-knowledge, also highlights the necessity to fashion speech. In the context of this chapter, fashioned speech in friendship goes beyond the flatterer who manipulates others with rhetoric to include the tactful articulation of one's conscience to preserve ethical bonds and duties in the community. In "'Speak what we feel, not what we ought to say': Frank Speech and Tactful Antagonism in *King Lear*", I read Shakespeare's tragedy alongside Plutarch's text on flattery and frank speech in friendship as well as period rhetorics on "parrhēsia" or frank speech. A common emphasis in texts on friendship is the obligation and pleasure in strongly rebuking the other when they fail to uphold a common moral standard. Frequently, friendship discourse stresses that one tactfully temper the "plaine" reproach with rhetoric so as to increase the probability the other will correct his *ethos* and realign it with the friend. I argue an emphasis on tactful rebuke in friendship practices privilege the ability to 'tactfully antagonize' the friend in order to intervene in the process of how others fashion themselves. The ability of subjects to discipline another proves paramount to the commonwealth, particularly because it highlights obedience to heavenly and earthly authority. It also diversifies the channels through which the characteristics of the ideal subject can be transmitted. However, concerns circulate as regards the practice of tactful antagonism, not only because it potentially disrupts social hierachies but also because it so closely resembles the very thing it supposedly combats: flattery.

Finally, in "*Caritas* and Female Polity in Amelia Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum*", I examine themes discussed in earlier chapters (i.e., self-knowledge, temperance, and admonishment) through the lens of gender and class. I read Lanyer's volume of poems alongside representations of female friendship, such as those by Montagne and others, as well as

discussions of charity (*caritas*) in sermons and translations of the Bible alongside materials that stress the import of social concord among all stations in the commonwealth. Early modern culture and literature depict *caritas*, or friendship between the self and others mediated by Christ, as one way to cultivate private virtue and public concord that surpasses social divisions. However, Lanyer's depiction of female friendship, where *caritas* supposedly levels social hierachies, proves problematic. As I argue, divisions and faultlines that are mostly class-based, along with visions of a lack of social mobility, pressure the utopian idea of friendship among women put forth by Lanyer as well as general discussions of social concord among all classes in the commonwealth. Chapters one and four bookend my project by establishing the import of duty and self-reflection; the latter revisits earlier themes from the vantage point of gender and class.

As a final note, it is important to address briefly why this dissertation does not discuss the sexual dimensions of early modern friendship – a dimension which one undoubtedly cannot deny (nor would they be wise to do so). I chose not to discuss this aspect for two important reasons: (1) this ground has thoroughly been covered by numerous scholars and it is my hope to examine early modern friendship from a different, yet equally important, perspective; and, (2) following Bray and Mendelson and Crawford, while it is inarguably important to examine the erotic dimensions of friendship, it is just as important not to reduce human relations to purely sexual terms, not only because, to quote the latter, it "devalues the non-physical or emotional aspect of women's [and men's] intense relationships" but also, to quote the former, "the effect of a shaping concern with sexuality is precisely to obscure that wider frame" in which friendship can be viewed (244; 6). At the risk of promoting a reading of friendship that represses sexuality and

pleasure, I hope to demonstrate that Bray's "wider frame" includes one's moral identity and her perceived obligation to the wider body politic.

Again, I think Foucault proves productive for this maneuver (even if it may appear somewhat ironic to those familiar with his work on "sexual austerity" in volume three of *The History of Sexuality*). Although a few studies of early modern literature and culture employ the care of the self as a theoretical frame through which to examine a discourse of pleasure and desire, the topic of friendship has yet to be approached using ideas Foucault expounds upon in his Collège lectures. [25] Foucault's thought after his "ethical turn," particularly as concerns self-knowledge, the care of the self, and parrhēsia, amply demonstrate how care of the self has broader applications and implications beyond pleasure or *aphrodisia*. [26] Though composed prior to the publication of the Collège lectures, Wolfgang Detel notes in his study of Foucault and antiquity that Hellenic and Roman thought situates the care of the self, first and foremost, in relation to happiness (*eudaimonia*) and virtue (*arête*) rather than pleasure and desire (*aphrodisia*) (58). A broader meditation on the care of the self is perhaps most evident in classical discussions of friendship, since these texts typically construe friendship as the principle source

[25] A general application of the care of the self, albeit derived from Foucault's The Use of Pleasure, can be found in Michael Schoenfeldt's study of inwardness in early modern literature and culture.

[26] Alan Bray arrives at a similar conclusion in his discussion of "modern debates" of Renaissance friendship in purely sexual terms, 6-7. Heyking and Avramenko echo this sentiment through their clam that "we seem unable to understand friendship and the act of sharing in terms that are neither romantic nor sexual" (3).

from which *arête* and *eudaimonia* spring.[27]

Discussions of friendship in early modern literature and culture echo this sentiment of friendship as the wellspring of happiness and virtue and simultaneously expound upon ideas discussed by Foucault in his 1982 Collège lectures. Tudor translations of De amicitia, for instance, claim friendship is the definitive example of "the happy life" and that "vertue it is, whiche bothe engendreth and upholdeth freendship" (Tiptoft sig. G5v; Harington sig. B6v). Erasmus, in the 1508 preface to the Adages, echoes Cicero through his contention that friendship is "the whole of human happiness" while Thomas Churchyard's 1588, A spark of frendship, claims "friendship is a ring-leader to all happiness" (15; sig. C2r). [28] Richard Edwards' mid-century tragicomedy, the 1564 Damon and Pythias, likewise envisions friendship as "conserved by virtue," and Nicholas Grimald, in his 1557 versification of De amicitia in Tottel's Miscellany, observes how "True virtue gets, and keeps a friend" (line 44; line 6). While early modern theories of friendship, at their most eloquent, starkly divide friendship as either "ordinary" or "faultless," that is, predicated on utility or pleasure as opposed to virtue, they also stress vigilance as regards its everyday practice (Falconer VI.22).

As I show in this dissertation, early modern friendship discourse largely highlights fashioning the self as an ethical and political subject while the friend per se remains of secondary concern. By adding to our understanding of early modern friendship discourse and the culture in which it is situated, I hope to demonstrate how it repudiates a common assumption that

[27] Zeno of Citium, the founder of Stoicism would be one exception. According to Zeno, friendship may lead to happiness but it is not a prerequisite for happiness. See Hyatte, 23.

[28] Unless specified, citations of the *Adages* refer to Phillips.

friendship is primarily a private, selfless, apolitical affair separate from public life.

Chapter One: "love we the frendful minde": The Politics of Self-knowledge in the Tudor Friendship Pamphlets and Richard Tottel's *Songs and Sonnets*

Introduction: The Self as an Object of Study

"[A]mity and friendship is the greatest of all goods and commodities that any City or Common-weale can attaine and come unto & the most apt thing to defend them from sedition and uproars. And Socrates dooth highly extoll the uniting of a City, which in his opinion seemeth to be the worke of friendship," writes Roy Le Roy, the French humanist, in a 1598 'Englished' version of his commentary on the *Politics* translated by John Dee (*Aristotles* sig. L3r). Le Roy's contention that friendship, as the foundation of social concord and unity, proves the greatest product of "any City or Common-weale," resonates widely in early modern friendship materials. For instance, Walter Dorke's 1589 pamphlet, *A tipe or figure of friendship*, expresses a similar sentiment. Friendship, as Dorke notes in a pedestrian observation, is the foundation of civil, religious, and 'private' life in the commonwealth: "as [T]*ully* [i.e. Cicero] testifieth, there is no gift given of God to man (Sapience only excepted) more agreeable to nature, more comfortable to the heart, more pleasant to the minde, or more profitable to a Publique weale" (sig. B1v-B2r). Cicero, the Roman philosopher, political statesman, orator, and, during the early modern era, foremost authority on friendship, contends that although friendship is a bond which can never be severed once formed (it even extends beyond death, as he famously declares), one must nonetheless dissolve it when the friend commits an act that is "treasonable," "disloyal, or in violation of an oath, or unpatriotic," or, as Harrington renders this passage, "against their faith,

against their othe, or against the commonwealth" (X 39-40; sig. D4r).[29] Dorke's claim that "if our friends conspire against the commonwealth, we ought to forsake them and also reveal them," resonates with Cicero and Crowley and underscores, as I will show shortly, a period perception of the link between friendship and duty to the commonwealth (sig. A4v).

The topic of sedition, which Dorke and Cicero align with a failure to recall one's obligation and duty to the republic, occupies a central place in the writings on the commonwealth, including the "commonwealth men." Robert Crowley, in his 1550 *The way to wealth*, lays the blame of sedition, which he characterizes as "a dangerous disease in the bodie of a commen-wealth," squarely at the feet of those who lack self-knowledge about their duty and place in the social hierarchy (131). According to Crowley, the genesis of sedition arises from a lack of self-knowledge: since men "know not themselves [they naturally]…regard no laws" (142). As he contends in his didactic poem, *The Voice of the Last trumpet*, "Knowledge that is godly / …[and teaches] thine own duty," according to Crowley, proves the surest anodyne to this "dangerous disease" of sedition: "In fine, knowledge that is godly / Will teach the[e] al that thou shalt do / Belonging to thine owne duty, / And other mens duty also" (lines 1264-1268). In a similar vein, Thomas Lever, in a 1550 sermon, declares that lack of knowledge about one's duties "destroy [both] the congregacion, the misticall bodye of Christ…& the come[n]wealth" (sig. B4v). Drawing on the organic metaphor, as well as Paul's "many members, one body" parable about the spiritual and earthly body of believers, Lever contends: "there must nedes be divers me[m]bers in diverse places, havinge diverse dueties. For as Paul saith: if all the bodye be

[29] "Wherfore in frendship the absent be present, the nedie never lacke, the sicke thincke them selves whole, and that which is hardest to be spoken, the dead never dye" (sig. C1r).

an eye, where is then hearing? or if all be an eare, where is then smelling? meaning therby, that if all be of one sorte, estate, & roume in the come[n]wealth, how can then diverse dueties of diverse necessarie offices be done?" (sig. B4v).[30] Obedience to duty and community is the key to peace and prosperity in the commonwealth. Indeed, Richard Morison, reformer and chief propagandist of Henry VIII, using language that echoes Cicero's "knot of friendship," declares that "obedience undoubtedly is the knot of all common weals, this broken they must needs run all headlong to utter destruction" in his 1539, *Exhortation to stirre all Englishe men to the defence of their countreye* (sig. B2r).

In this chapter, I read selections from Tudor printed miscellanies alongside early modern texts on self-knowledge and friendship. As I demonstrate, the pleasure accorded to self-knowledge in poems and pamphlets on friendship, similar to the discussion of self-knowledge in a religious context that centers on its ability to bring one closer to God and humanity, is depicted as strengthening one's relationship with the commonwealth. I argue that the sentiment that self-knowledge fosters concord and clarifies one's membership in a larger community, most notably by stressing the need to fashion the self as a dutiful subject to God and man, proves central to representations of friendship in the miscellanies and pamphlets. In these materials, the symbol of friendship is used to appeal to a shared identity and subjectivity of the "commonwealth."

In order to expound on these claims, I divide my chapter into three sections that examine self-knowledge as it relates to duty, moral self-fashioning, and communal membership in general

[30] See 1 Corinthians 12:12-27. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body…. That there should be no schism in the body; but *that* the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it."

cultural texts, friendship materials, and printed miscellanies of poetry. The first outlines the numerous ways in which self-knowledge, frequently represented as the Delphic imperative *nosce teipsum* ('know thyself'), appears in early modern culture. This section focuses largely on texts by Sir Thomas Elyot, Thomas Rogers, Nicholas Grimald, and others, that align self-knowledge with the duties of the self in the commonwealth toward a spiritual and secular community. The second section demonstrates how 'friendship materials' (a term I use to refer to a corpus of texts on the topic of friendship) stress the import of self-knowledge in fashioning the moral subject. Similar to the texts examined in section one, a host of texts on friendship by Elyot, Rogers, Richard Edwards, and others, envisions self-knowledge as central to the formation of a spiritual and political subject. In this section, I focus on a collection of late-Tudor pamphlets on friendship by the Tudor courtier, Thomas Churchyard, as well as works by the lesser known Thomas Breme, Walter Dorke, and the anonymous M.B. Having established the prominence attached to self-knowledge and the commonwealth in these discourses, I turn in the third section to poems on friendship in the printed miscellanies. This section examines one of the earliest printed miscellanies of poetry, Richard Tottel's 1557 *Songs and Sonnets*, and considers how it aligns self-knowledge and friendship with the formation of a moral subject tied to the commonwealth. In this section, I examine selected poems from *Songs and Sonnets*, most notably those by the humanist scholar Nicholas Grimald as well as various anonymous authors, and consider how accounts of the "frendful mind," to quote Grimald, use friendship to emphasize the link between interiority and social concord. Conversely, I demonstrate how discussions of friendship and self-knowledge in these poems also articulate a common anxiety posed to living an orderly life in established social hierarchies: particularly, the danger posed to the commonwealth when one does not know the self. As these poems demonstrate, harkening back

to cultural texts on self-knowledge, one's inward self is perceived as inherently malicious, a threat to communal stability, and in need of self-discipline – a form of discipline best provided, as early modern texts frequently claim, by friendship. Thus, the import ascribed to introspection in these materials finds its import in service to the self's moral well-being as well as the "commonwealth's" well-being. Before proceeding with this thesis, however, a brief review of current scholarship on self-knowledge in early modern culture and literature is necessary in order to establish the broader import of examining self-knowledge to the field of early modern studies.

As a topic of scholarly inquiry, particularly as regards the formation of the subject's moral and ethical conscience, self-knowledge in early modern literature and culture has received some well-deserved attention recently. However, its relation to friendship, for the most part, has remained unexamined – one rare example is Laurie Shannon's brief discussion of the "self-possessed integrity" perceived to be crucial to friendship (56). As Rolf Soellner demonstrates in his erudite quasi-source study of self-knowledge in Shakespeare, the topic proves central to the era's intellectual background, as evinced by a cursory glance of grammar school texts, high and low theology, contemporary translations of classical philosophy and literature, conduct manuals, etc. A common concern in these texts, as Soellner observes, centers on "the difficulty of knowing oneself, the obligation to improve the self, and the need to observe others in order to understand the self" (3). Moreover, the rich variety of discussions of self-knowledge frequently produces overlapping claims as regards the end toward which it should be directed. For instance, in texts such as Thomas Rogers's *Anatomie of the minde*, Sir John Davies's *Nosce Teipsum*, Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Boke named the governour*, and Nicholas Grimald's translation of *De officiis* (*Of Duties*), the ultimate aim of self-knowledge ranges from developing greater knowledge of God's majesty and the allegiance owed to him, to developing one's *ethos* in order to live a morally

oriented life, to understanding how one may better serve the commonwealth and increase its prosperity. Regardless of potentially conflicting or competing narratives of self-knowledge, however, a consistent claim throughout its discussion during the era centers on a utopian idea "that man can control himself, limit his power, and even resign it voluntarily" in the service of something larger whether it be God, reason, or, as I demonstrate in this chapter, the commonwealth (459). In a manner similar to Soellner, Deborah Harkness locates the "popular injunction *Nosce teipsum*" as central to early modern medical discourse, or what she terms "cultures of therapeutics" (171-72). As Harkness cogently argues, these "cultures" promote a narrative of normativity through an emphasis on "the patient's subjectivity – his or her embodied knowledge of the body or self – in matters of health" (171-72). Michael Schoenfeldt also focuses on the agency encouraged by self-knowledge in his study of early modern inwardness and the body, though he envisions it as potentially liberating rather than, like Harkness, restrictive. Writing about how self-knowledge problematizes our assumptions of the flattening of the self's agency, Schoenfeldt contends, "allows us to see that this self is far more than an effect of discourse, or the product of socio-cultural discourses, institutions, and practices. Looking closely at these past discourses allows us to see what these individuals made of the materials of their culture, and their bodies, as well as what their culture and bodies made of them" (12). Thus, for Schoenfeldt, Harkness, and Soellner, self-knowledge in early modern culture raises questions about conscious self-fashioning and the influence of social and cultural forces.

An enduring interest in the Delphic imperative "know thy self" across the sixteenth-century also reinforces the import recent scholarship accords to interiority and discovery in early modern culture, particularly as it concerns a desire in the period to understand the 'secrets' or 'truths' of one's heart. For instance, Elizabeth Hanson, in her work on early modern interiority

and subjectivity in drama, explores the era's "tendency [in its legal, political, and religious discourses] to construe other people in terms of secrets awaiting discovery" (2). While Hanson focuses largely on how such an interest results in the objectification of the self by others, she nonetheless acknowledges how "self-reflexiv[ity]" encourages the self to become the "object of his thinking" (2). Katherine Eisaman Maus, in her magisterial examination of interiority and "epistemological anxieties" expressed in the era's drama, law, religion, and politics, focuses largely on "the sense of discrepancy between 'inward disposition' and 'outward appearance'" (2; 13). While Maus limits her examination largely to the objectification of the self by others, again, she likewise acknowledges a broad period response that emphasizes a "therapeutic [effect where]…self-knowledge despite its painfulness is invariably ameliorative" (167). Indeed, she demonstrates how self-knowledge is a major topic of interest to dramatists such as Marlowe and Shakespeare, theologians like Daniel Dyke and William Perkins, as well as medical philosophers like Thomas Wright.

Hanson and Maus' examinations of the self perceived as a mysterious "object" necessitating self-study frequently appears in early modern discussions about membership in spiritual and earthly communities. For instance, the Anglican clergyman Thomas Rogers contends in his 1581 translation of St. Augustine, that in order to comprehend God and "knowledge of the truth," one's enigmatic inwardness must come under close scrutiny (sig. D4v). As Rogers claims, it is important "first to know the self, and…both studie to be as thou oughtest to be and also amend that which is to be reformed" (sig. D4v). As Rogers makes clear, self-knowledge supports both the discovery or "studie" of one's inwardness and its improvement, "amend[ment]," and "reform[ation]."

However, as the phrase "as thou oughtest to be" indicates, a larger cultural frame guides both of these actions, and to assume that the "studie" and "reform[ation]" of the self are inherently apolitical or untouched by culture would be erroneous. Indeed, in the next sentence, Rogers clarifies that the frame of reference that limns how one "oughtest to be" is one's relationship with God, since "to knowe, and to love thy maker;…is [the essence of] al mans happiness" (sig. D4v). Period texts repeatedly employ this line of thinking, where the frame of reference that instructs how one should fashion the self, or "oughtest to be," is explicitly based on the needs of a spiritual community. As I demonstrate later in this chapter, this frame of reference also extends to the making of a national community where fashioning the self after the model of an ideal subject aware of its duties proves paramount.

"Thou shalt love thy Lord God…in all thy mind": *Nosce Teipsum* and Duties

Erasmus Desiderius, in the 1508 edition of the *Adages*, an extensive collection of over three thousand proverbs and their philological histories, and itself a product of friendship, classifies "*Nosce Teipsum*" as "easily the most famous of all the utterances of wise men" (97).[31] Quoting a letter by Cicero, the learned Rotterdam clerk notes how this "utterance" is a clarion

[31] Erasmus would later recount the origins of the *Adages* as stemming from a need to demonstrate his friendship with his patron, William Blount, the fourth Lord of Mountjoy. Returning to Paris broke after a lengthy visit to England, and having Lord Mountjoy's financial gift confiscated by English custom officials, Erasmus quickly fell to work on a project that would prove his fidelity and indebtedness, and, it should be added, generate some much needed income: "I decided to publish something forthwith. Having nothing ready at hand, I accumulated at random from a few days' reading some sort of a collection of adages, guessing that this book, such as it was, might find a welcome among those who wish to learn, at least from its utility. This I used as evidence that my friendship had not grown cold" (qtd. in Barker xi). By 1536, as Barker notes, the *Adages* include over four thousand proverbs (xviii).

Erasmus identifies two other proverbs in the beginning of this entry as belonging to "the most famous utterances of wise men": "Nothing to excess" and "Stand surety, and ruin is at hand" (Baker 96).

call for introspection where one learns to balance self-love with humility and simultaneously temper acknowledgment of personal strengths with a need for considering others: "As for that famous *Know thyself*, you must not think it was uttered merely to reduce our self-conceit; we should also recognize our own blessings" (97).[32] However, as Erasmus makes abundantly clear through a quote attributed to the pre-Socratic philosopher Thales, such a venture toward self-knowledge proves arduous: "Thales when asked 'What is difficult?' replied 'To know oneself.' Asked 'What is easy?' he said 'To give another man good advice'" (97). As I demonstrate in the following section, discussions of self-knowledge generally attribute its import to understanding the duties and prohibitions of a spiritual community, which, in a wider context, also limns how the self, as a political subject, is bound to the earthly community of the "commonwealth." Furthermore, as I demonstrate later in this chapter, discussions of self-knowledge largely perceive the difficulty "to know oneself" as stemming from the self's sinful nature and predisposition to spurn order and earthly as well as godly rule. For now, however, it is important to examine how an array of texts takes up the question of how the self can best understand its responsibilities to a larger spiritual and political community.

As stated toward the beginning of this chapter, a rich body of literature during the period explores *nosce teipsum* from a variety of viewpoints and thus the perceived end toward which it

[32] I think Erasmus has in mind Cicero's recognition of man's limited self-sufficiency as put forth in *De officiis*. Thomas Rogers, in an entry entitled "Of Civill Friendship" in his *Anatomie of the minde*, summarizes Cicero's acknowledgement of the limits of self-sufficiency: "nature hath not so made us, that of our selves we can doo all things without the aide of others, and no one is more apt to one thing then an other" (sig. Aa1r). Cicero sees the unwillingness to help one another as one of the greatest threats to the Republic. See his claim in *De officiis* where, citing Plato, Cicero contends that **"**[w]e are not born, we do not live for ourselves alone; our country, our friends, have a share in us" (1:22). Also see Grimald's *Three Books*, B2r.

should be directed often fluctuates. For instance, texts "in the tradition of Cicero and Plato [that] equate self-knowledge with the soul's knowledge of itself," to quote Soellner, emphasize self-discipline and control of passions and lower appetites in order to shape the moral self as well as strengthen the relationship with God.[33] Texts inspired by this outlook include the 1599 poem "Nosce Teipsum" by Sir John Davies, member of Parliament during the reign of Elizabeth and eventual Attorney General of Ireland under James; the opening homily on the "miserie of al mankind" by Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the 1547 edition of *Certain Sermons*; the 1576 *A treatise of the immortalitie of the soule*, by John Woolton, Bishop of Exeter; as well as the 1576 *A Philosophicall Discourse, entituled, The anatomie of the minde* by the Anglican theologian, Thomas Rogers (13).[34] Furthermore, Rogers' insistence in an entry that "man [is] called a little worlde: because that with everie thing created of God, he hath some affinitie" draws on a quasi-organic metaphor of man and the body politic in order to stress the

[33] Thomas Wright's 1601 *The Passions of the minde in general* is another important work that equates self-knowledge with self-discipline. I discuss Wright's text in my next chapter on self-discipline and "the care of the self" in early modern friendship discourse and Shakespeare's *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*.

In a similar manner, Sir John Davies, in his 1599 poem on the immortality of the soul and man's innate depravity, urges one to use this utterance as a guide to live a morally upright life. Davies contends (somewhat ironically) that his contemporaries, largely prompted by 'the new learning' of humanism, focus on examining the natural world at the expense of their inward moral and spiritual condition: "All things without, which round about we see, / We seeke to know, and have therewith to do: / But that whereby we *reason*, *live*, *and be*, / Within our selves, we strangers are theretoo" (lines 89-92). In a manner reminiscent of Erasmus, Davies exhorts one to study the self in order to foster self-consciousness and, diverging slightly due to his Calvinist leanings, to clarify whether one is of the elect or reprobate: "My selfe am *Center* of my circling thought, / Onely *my selfe* I studie, learne, and *know*" (lines 167-168).

import of developing one's moral self to a political community (sig. Aa1r).[35] Indeed, similar to the use of the organic metaphor in texts by the "commonwealth men" like Sir Thomas Elyot, where the "Public Weal is a *body living* composed of many and sundry degrees of men…and governed by the rule and moderation of reason," Rogers claims that self-knowledge helps one cultivate "moral vertues" in order to "wish wel unto all men [as]…provoked unto by the rites, lawes, and customes of our Countrie, or otherwise by any common thing to all men" (1; sig. Z8r). Moreover, Rogers draws a connection between self-knowledge, "moral vertues," and the tendency to "wish wel unto all men," by explicitly stating, via a reading of *De amicitia*, how those lacking self-knowledge contribute to the dissolution of the commonwealth, claiming, "those citizens whiche will not willingly helpe one another, doo in that which in them lieth, go about to overthrowe the common estate of a common weale, and to disturbe the fellowship of this life" (sig. Z8r). In this vein, texts such as Cicero's *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, translated by Thomas Newton in 1569 (who, coincidentally, also translates *De amicitia* in 1577), echo a sentiment of self-knowledge as a necessary step in the development of agency and "vertue" (sig. C6v). Moreover, it likewise presents self-knowledge as colored by a certain pragmatism to be "obedient to the Lawes, not for feare, but because [one] thinketh it to be a thing expedient" (sig.

[35] Also see Woolton's 1576 *A New anatomie of whole man*; Richard Carew's 1594 translation of Juan Huarte de San Juan's *Examen de ingenious: The examination of mens wittes*; and Stephen Gosson's 1585, *Playes confuted in five actes*.

John of Salisbury's medieval text, *Policratius* provides the model for the "organic metaphor." See *Policraticus* I-IV (Brepols, 1993). Paul's letter to the Corinthians in 1 Corinthians, in which he attempts to allay in-fighting and division by drawing attention to the unifying power of *caritas* (i.e., friendship between self and others mediated by Christ), is another example where self-knowledge corresponds to the self's participation in both heavenly and earthly communities. I discuss *caritas* at length in my final chapter on friendship and female polity in the poetry of Aemilia Lanyer.

C6v). Texts composed according to this outlook in Rogers, Elyot, and Cicero perceive knowledge of God and the soul as corresponding to knowledge of the social hierarchy in the political community and the self's status as a subject.

As evinced by pedagogical texts used widely in grammar school, as well as private letters, *nosce teipsum*, is perceived as the crux of the self's moral development and general social concord. For instance, the *Sententiae Pueriles*, one of the earliest books students encounter in grammar school, and extremely popular in both Tudor and early-Stuart classrooms, includes "Know thy selfe" and "Dwell with thy selfe" as two of its introductory lessons "for the first young beginners of: the Latine tongue" (sig. B1r; sig. B3r). [36] Moral instruction contained in the reader, such as "Follow after concord," "Men are governed by wisdome; not by their strength," and "Exercise temperance, [or moderation]," appear, in one form or another, in a variety of texts that stress self-knowledge (sig. B2r; sig. F8r). In a similar manner, Sir Philip Sidney's private correspondence with friends argues that "knowledge of ourselves" assists one in "seek[ing] what is to be truly just, truly valiant, rightly temperate, and rightly friendly" (213). Moreover, according to Sidney, "the Holy Scriptures…[as] certainly the incomparable lantern in this fleshly darkness of ours" also illuminates how one "ought" to form his moral being (212). [37] In *An Apology for Poetry*, he also clarifies the import that self-knowledge give way to action, or, as he eloquently puts it, "the knowledge of a man's self, in the ethic and politic consideration, with the

[36] See Baldwin, I.581-606. It should be noted that the theme of friendship dominates the text. In fact, some of the first lessons emphasize friendship and include "Help [thy] friends", followed closely by "Prove [thy] friends", and "Use thy friends." See sig. B1r.

[37] See his letter to Edward Denny dated May 22, 1580.

end in well-doing, and not of well-knowing only" (70-71).[38]

Perhaps one of the best places to turn in order to find self-knowledge aligned with the commonwealth can be found in Sir Thomas Elyot's seminal 1531 text on education, moral training, and governance, *The Boke named the governour*. It is here that a discourse of self-governance informed by understandings of heavenly and earthly polities can be seen. Likewise, his general conception of self-knowledge and governance emphasizes a fashioning of the self as a moral and political subject that Reformation discussions of friendship will later address.[39]

Writing about "Reason, Society, and Knowledge," Elyot, an accomplished humanist scholar and, for a brief period, clerk in Henry's Privy Council and diplomat, contends that "knowledge of Justice", which he defines as the "Law of God" (and aligns with sovereign authority in the beginning of Book Three), corresponds to the self's place in earthly communities.[40] As Elyot contends, quoting Matthew 22:37-40, the duty of the self to God limns the self's duty to others: "Society was first ordained of God, and is of such authority, that the only Son of God, being demanded of a Doctor of Law, which is the great commandment in the Law of God, answered: Thou shalt love thy Lord God with all thy heart, and in all thy soul, and in all thy mind: that is the first commandment. The second is like unto the same: Thou shalt love

[38] Sidney restates this toward the end of the next paragraph, where he excoriates philosophers and scholars, as a reminder that one's *ethos* "extends itself out of the limits of man's own little world to the government of families and maintaining of public societies" (71).

[39] The enduring popularity of Elyot's *Boke* in post-Reformation England, particularly his discussion of friendship, must be noted.

[40] See "Chapter I: Of the Noble and Most Excellent Vertue Named Justice", 165-66.

thy neighbor as thyself" (173).[41] Moreover, according to Elyot, knowledge of the "Law of God," coupled with loving him "in all thy mind," allows the self to control sinful pleasures and lowly appetites that might disrupt peaceful society. Indeed, knowledge prevents the self from "foolishly apply[ing] himself to the nature of creatures…embracing sensuality" rather than a publicly-oriented virtue (173). Knowledge also encourages empathy, which in turn, lends itself to "Society and Benevolence, [rather than] willfulness and malice, and…blind ignorance and forgetfulness" (173).

According to Elyot, "Nosce te ipsum" proves the best method to love God "in all thy mind," and additionally, the surest way to cultivate inwardness, social concord, and "Justice" (174). He contends that this "brief sentence…declareth by what means the said precepts of reason and society may be well understood, and thereby Justice finally executed" (174). In a manner similar to his thoughts on friendship, the practice of "Nosce te ipsum, which is in English, know thyself," contains the whole of human experience, particularly its moral and ethical foundation (174).[42] According to Elyot, through the act of self-investigation and disclosure one comes to know God, "reason and societie," as well as "the residue of Justice" and how to "execute it" (203-204). More broadly, he argues that self-knowledge advances social concord and empathy insofar as it reveals to the self its inward and outward condition and

[41] See Naomi Tadmore for a discussion of how the moral dimension of neighborliness becomes instrumental in promoting communal cohesion and reproduction. See *The Social Universe of the English Bible: Scripture, Society, and Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2010), 23-49.

[42] See 161-186, "XI: The true discription of amitie or frendship" and "XII: The wonderfull history of Titus and Gisippus, and whereby is fully declared the figure of perfet amitie."

promotes a universalism so that, "in knowing the condition of his soul and body, he knoweth himself, and consequently, in the same thing he knoweth every other man" (175). However, the equality claimed by Elyot through the act of self-knowledge does have its limits, and he is keen to clarify that "the inferior person or subject ought to consider…[as concerns] the disposition of reason, be not every man equal," and that the self is in need of "a Governor, or leader, toward whom all the others have a vigilant eye, awaiting his signs or tokens, and according thereto repairing themselves most diligently" (176-77). Thus, for Elyot, the import of "Nosce te ipsum" is how it fundamentally reminds the self of the need to accord to a prescribed set of communal rules and conditions of the commonwealth: "this sentence, know thyself, which of all others is most compendious,…induceth men sufficiently to the knowledge of Justice" (177).

In a similar manner, Nicholas Grimald, humanist scholar, lecturer of rhetoric at Christ Church, Oxford, purported co-editor of the first edition of *Tottel's*, and controversial convert to Catholicism, aligns self-knowledge with the formation of the moral and political subject in his 1556 translation of Cicero's *De officiis* (also known by its Englished title, *Cicero's Three Books of Duties*).[43] Cicero's exhaustive treatise on *officia* or duties, understood broadly, as Melissa Lane notes, as the "obligations of role or relationship…attached to someone in virtue of a distinct *persona* (as father, consul, neighbor, etc.)", is perceived during the era, to quote T.W. Baldwin,

[43] As Arthur F. Kinney notes, Grimald was "[s]ympathetic to the Reformation,…but when jailed under Mary Tudor's government he prudently reverted to Catholicism and gained a reputation for at best, timeserving, and at worst, treachery" (311). Suspicions that Grimald may have informed against Nicholas Ridley, Bishop of London, and eventual martyr, only added to perceptions of his "treachery." See Kinney and David W. Swain, *Tudor England: An Encyclopedia* (Garland, 2001), 311-312. It is assumed that this is why texts authored by Grimald, including his poems in *Tottel's*, drop his name and use the initials N.G. after 1557. Also see R.L. Merrill, *The Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald* (Yale, 1925) as well as Holton and MacFaul, xx-xxii.

as "the pinnacle of moral philosophy" – indeed, Elyot recommends it as essential reading for young gentlemen along with Aristotle's *Ethics* and the complete works of Plato (Lane; 2:590). [44] Grimald, in a manner reminiscent of Roger Ascham and Elyot, identifies the moral instruction of *De officiis*, particularly "how to live among men discreetly and honestly," as on par with the holy "Scripture": "the bokes, that of duties be written, by Marcus Tullius Cicero: a mater conteining the holle trade, how to live among men discreetly, and honestly: and so rightly pointing oute the pathwaye to all vertue: as none can be righter, onely Scripture excepted" (sig. A3v).[45]

While Cicero contends that four kinds of virtue frame a *persona's* obligation ("wisdom, justice…, greatness for spirit, and decorum" or, as Soellner terms them, "prudence," "justice," "fortitude," and "greatness"), decorum and ethical behavior prove central to Grimald's discussions of self-knowledge as well as more general discussions of *nosce teipsum* in early modern culture (Lane; 11). [46] Grimald interprets Cicero's insistence on decorum, where "everie ma[n] therefore [must] know his owne disposition, and…make himself a sharpe judge both of his vices and his vertues," as synonymous with the imperative "Know your selfe" (sig. F5r). Indeed, the ability of the self to reflect on his faults and merits, as Grimald demonstrates in the preface to

[44] See Elyot 1: . As Lane observes of virtue in *De officiis*, "some virtues are rooted in one's *persona* as a human being subject to natural law, others in the specific roles and customs of one's city."

[45] See Baldwin 2:585-86.

[46] Soellner distinguishes between two forms of decorum in *De officiis*: "*decorum generale* and *speciale*" (12). The former concentrates on the regulation of base appetites in order to separate man from animal. The latter concerns the regulation of moral defects and strengths. See 12-13.

the reader, is a continual process that impresses on "us the best ende, to use ourselves well and worthyly" (sig. A5r). Accordingly, frequent reflection on how "to use ourselves well" encourages the cultivation of an *ethos* that illuminates 'proper' conduct of the self: "our dutie shall wee do best: if we employe the using of ourselves to deedes, that be honest, & co[m]me[n]dable…. For whether we be doing somwhat, or at rest: whether wee abide in the countrey, or in the citie: whether we be occupied in ernest, or in game: no pawse ther is at all, but night & day we use ourselves continually" (sig. A6r). Moreover, knowledge of what constitutes a morally oriented life, as well as how best to achieve it through the "us[e] of ourselves through deeds," extends to 'proper' conduct or obligations towards others. In this sense, knowledge of self-governance also limn duties toward a larger community. To illustrate this point, Grimald uses the family and "holle commons" or commonwealth:

> Now, when a man is so enstructed with philosophie: that he can full co[n]uenie[n]tly live sole, & at pointe device by himself: he must be brought forth abrode into the face of the worlde: to the intent he may procure, not onely that becomes himself to do, but also the welth of other folke. He must remember the three folde state, & diversitie, that he hathe espyed, & practised in himself [i.e., how to live, behave, and observe moral obligations] and must trans[f]erre the same to the governau[n]ce bothe of his housholde privatlie, and of the holle commons openly. (sig. A3r)

Thus, for Grimald, self-knowledge fosters the fashioning of the moral self as well as the prosperity of the "holle commons." As Grimald makes explicit in the dedication to Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Ely, part of the impetus behind his reason to "english" *De officia* is "chiefly for our unlatined people…[to] br[ing] into light that from them so longe was hidden" (sig. A3r).

Indeed, Grimald chooses to "english…a boke used but of few,…so that our me[n], understa[n]ding what a treasure is amonge them, for the fashioning of their life," can improve the commonwealth and their *ethos* simultaneously. Similar to his discussion of duties, where self-governance "must [be] trans[f]erre[d]…to the governau[n]ce both of [the] householde privatlie and of the holle commons," Grimald envisions self-knowledge as ultimately strengthening a glorious "nation give[n] to civilitie & humanitie [and]…beeing by nature most of all other nations give[n] to civilitie, & humanitie: whe[n] they shall be aided & directed by these perfite percepts, may, in all pointed of good deameanour, beco[m]e people peerless" (sig. A3r).

While the aim of self-knowledge in each of the above examples varies from modesty and self-affirmation, to knowing God and the condition of one's soul, to social concord and empathy, to strengthening the self's moral identity and the commonwealth, the centrality accorded to inwardness and *ethos* remains fairly consistent throughout Erasmus, Rogers, Elyot, and Grimald. Indeed, all these texts construe self-knowledge as the basis of self-consciousness and subjectivity, and all three implicitly align this basis with one's emerging ethical and political identity. Moreover, while self-knowledge is emphasized in religious writings of the period, or at best, demonstrates a decidedly religious influence in discussions of one's inwardness, as is the case with Sidney's letter, as well as concord, as evinced by Elyot, it is also a central component of early modern friendship discourse.[47] As the next section demonstrates, friendship materials stress the import of self-knowledge in fashioning the moral subject. Similar to the texts examined

[47] Both the Old and New Testament are rife with instances of self-knowledge. See, for instance, Psalm 34, which Fields characterizes as "exercises in self-examination," as well as I Corinthians 13:5, Matthew 7:3, Luke 6:41, Luke 17:22 (18).

in the above section, a host of texts on friendship by Elyot, John Lyly, Richard Edwards, and others, envision self-knowledge as central to the formation of a spiritual and political subject.

Self-knowledge in Early Modern Friendship Materials

In this section, I explore how early modern 'friendship materials' (that is, the numerous texts devoted exclusively to the topic of friendship such as contemporary pamphlets, sermons, treatises, poems, drama, prose fiction, and translations of classical expositions) stress the import of self-knowledge in fashioning the moral and political subject. As I demonstrate, early modern texts on friendship align self-knowledge with the development of one's inwardness, which, in turn, is equated with the 'healthy' maintenance of the commonwealth. Indeed, these materials place significant emphasis on the contribution of friendship to the stability of the commonwealth even while they simultaneously claim it to be an apolitical social relationship. As such, friendship materials collapse the supposed difference between the moral and political subject, as well as the micro and macro function of friendship, by emphatically demonstrating how the moral subject *is* the political subject. Similar to Elyot's contention that self-knowledge advances social concord through an appeal to a universal subjecthood and spiritual condition, friendship materials frequently represent the didactic function of self-knowledge as that which illuminates a universal *ethos* and foundation to any 'natural' and orderly life. In many respects, such a claim made by early modern friendship materials echoes Grimald's discussion, in his translation of *De officiis*, of how the self must learn "to use ourselves well and worthly" for their own benefit as well as that of the "holle commons."

The topics around which views of self-knowledge are assembled in the texts discussed in the previous section also surface in early modern friendship materials. For instance, John Donne, in a 1598 verse letter to Sir Henry Wotton, aptly titled, "To Sir Henry Wotton," contends that

friendship teaches the import of self-knowledge and inwardness, particularly the palliative aspect of caring for one's *ethos*: "Be then thine owne home, and in thy selfe dwell; /… Be thine owne Palace, or the world's thy goale" (line 47-52). In a letter to Sir Henry Goodyer (c. 1620-1621), a member of the early-Stuart Parliament, Donne writes about his "second religion, friendship," and in another letter to Goodyer in the same period, he invests friendship with a religious value in order to illuminate its inward and outward influence on the self: "friendship…which hath in it so much divinity, that as we must ever be equally disposed inwardly so to doe or suffor for it, so we must sepose some certain times for the outward service thereof, though it be but formall and testimoniall" (letter XLV and XXIV). [48] In a similar manner, religious discourse colors discussions of inwardness and self-knowledge in pamphlets on friendship, as evinced by Thomas Churchyard's characterization, in his late-Tudor pamphlet, of "friendshippe [a]s a certaine felicitie of the minde, a sweete insense that burnes before God" (sig. C2r). As Walter Breme demonstrates in his 1584 pamphlet on friendship, one may locate this pleasure or "felicitie" in the act of self-knowledge and moral improvement. Indeed he urges the reader "often to examine thy self" and reflect on the level of command or degree of "temperance" of emotions such as

[48] The relationship between friendship and letter writing is a topic that merits further examination. While scholars such as Constance Furey have examined the textual exchange between individuals like Erasmus, More, and Giles, a sustained examination of letters by other writers and humanist scholars merits consideration. It would be most interesting to examine collections of private letters made public during the era and marketed toward a general readership, such as those of More, Sidney, and Donne. On Donne, letter writing, and friendship, see Ramie Targoff "Letters" in *John Donne, Body and Soul* (Chicago 2008), 25-48. Also see Ted-Larry Pebworth and Claude J. Summers, "'Thus Friends Absent Speake': The Exchange of Verse Letters between John Donne and Henry Wotton," *Modern Philology* Vol 81.4 (May 1984), 361-377. On Erasmus, More, and Giles, see Constance M. Furey, "Triangulating Humanist Friendship: More, Giles, Erasmus and the Making of the Utopia," in Lochman et al (Palgrave 2010), 45-64.

"clemency," "patience," and "humanity" in order to improve one's *ethos* and serve as a model for others (sig. B8v). John Lyly, in his highly popular 1579 *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit*, has an old gentleman of Naples instruct the titular character to meditate on his *ethos* lest he fall into eventual moral ruin: "Descend into thy own conscience and consider with thyself the great difference between staring and stark-blind wit, wit and wisdom, love and lust" (37-38). As these examples demonstrate, and the plays of Lyly, Marlowe, and Shakespeare reiterate, moral improvement is continually grounded in the twin practice of self-knowledge and friendship.[49] Likewise, friendship and self-knowledge are frequently invested with a certain religiousness in friendship materials, of which the most notable would be the original source of inspiration as well as its ultimate end. While materials acknowledge limited knowledge about the internal workings of an emotional experience like friendship, which, as one pamphlet contends, is "so secrete a mysterie (shrined in an honest hart) that few can describe it and tel from whence comes the privie and inward affection," they nonetheless frequently claim divine origin as the source of friendship (sig. C1v). Indeed, as Grimald contends in his versification of *De amicitia*, friendship is a "heavenly gift" (line 10). Other materials make a similar claim of friendship as a "gift given of God to man," such as the friendship pamphlet of Walter Dorke, but add that it is a gift whose end is directed toward the public good and "profit to a Publique weale" (sig. B1r).

While numerous texts distance the practice of friendship and self-knowledge from

[49] In addition to Lyly's *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit*, his court drama *Endymion* also links friendship with self-knowledge. Shakespeare's *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, *King Lear, Timon of Athens* are just a few of the many titles that explore this relationship between self-knowledge and friendship. Also see Marlowe's *Edward II* and *Dr. Faustus*.

worldly, political affairs, such as that of Donne, who in his poem to Wotton claims that the affairs of country, city, or court result in estrangement from the self (e.g. "I think if men, which in these places live / Durst look for themselves, and themselves retrieve, / They would like strangers greet themselves"), other friendship materials explicitly connect self-knowledge and friendship to the formation of the political subject and, what's more, the stability of the commonwealth (lines 43-45). For instance, Richard Edwards, lecturer at Christ Church, Oxford, poet, playwright, musician, and likely editor of *The Paradise of Dainty Devices* (the second anthology of English poems printed in 1576), claims in his 1566 tragicomedy, *Damon and Pythias*, that friendship "frames the mind of man, all honest things to do" and that "*The strongest guard that kings can have / Are constant friends their state to save*" (16.25). [50] In a similar fashion, Churchyard, in his 1588 pamphlet, *A sparke of frendship and warme goodwill* declares that self-knowledge and friendship limn one's duty to the commonwealth, particularly maintaining its stability as well as advancing common welfare and good: "man is not made for himself, created to be king of earthly delights, and placed amidst the pleasures of the worlde, to doe what he pleaseth, but chiefly to looke and with good aduisement to search, how and in what sort he may be duetiful and beneficiall to his countrie" (sig. B2r). Leroy, in a similar vein,

[50] Edwards's play is performed before Elizabeth at Oxford in 1566 and in this context the presentation of friendship takes on an even greater political significance. Indeed, in the "Last Song" alluded to above, Edwards demonstrates how the fashioning of the moral self is also the fashioning of the political self. In this song, which is printed in its entirety in the first edition of 1571, as well as all subsequent editions during the era, Edwards underscores the duty of the subject as friend to the commonwealth and, in this instance, the state, similar to the duty of Pythias toward Damon, as grounded in a self-sacrifice for the political community: "True friends for their true prince, refuse not their death, / The Lord grant her such friends, most notable Queen Elizabeth" (Epilogue lines 7-8).

declares “amity and friendship [a]s the greatest of all goods and commodities that any City or Common-weale can attain” (sig. L5r).

The late-Tudor pamphlets on friendship are perhaps one of the best places to perform a sustained analysis of the perceived link between self-knowledge and the formation of the political subject in friendship materials. These texts prove invaluable to the current discussion in this chapter and dissertation for three reasons: (1) the pamphlets have yet to be heavily scrutinized by scholars of early modern friendship or its culture and literature in general; (2) they offer one of the more clear and direct discussions of the political function of friendship, despite a narrative tension that aims to belie such claims; and, (3) they draw on a common language of friendship that is present in practically all of the friendship materials in the early modern era. [51]

The pamphlets on friendship by Breme, Churchyard, Dorke, and the anonymous M.B. focus on self-knowledge and its centrality to the formation of the political subject from a variety of perspectives. [52] Although these pamphlets sometimes claim friendship to be an exclusively private and apolitical affair, they simultaneously underscore the embeddedness of friendship in political or “worldly affaires,” to quote one pamphlet (Breme sig. C4r). For instance, Thomas Breme, in the 1584 *The mirrour of friendship*, argues that in friendship one must “separate his mind from these worldly affaires” if he wishes to improve his *ethos*: it is “a great travaile and wearinesse to the body of man, and greater perrill to his soul, when he occupies all his dayes and

[51] Laurie Shannon and Laurens Mills prove the exception of scholars who examine these pamphlets. See Shannon, 32-33, and Mills, 166-68.

[52] See my introduction for a brief history of these pamphlets.

all his life in the affaires of this world and cannot separate his minde from these worldly affaires" (sig. C4r). However, although Breme offers self-knowledge as an anodyne that counters the "travaile and weariness" and "perrill" accumulated by body and mind (indeed, as noted in the previous section, Breme encourages the reader "often to examine thy self" in order to stave off the psychic damage wrought by day to day living), he also qualifies the contention that one withdraw and "separate his minde from these worldly affaires" by distinguishing between virtuous behavior worthy of one's attention and superfluous behavior that impinges on the formation of one's *ethos*: "of all the treasures, ritches, prosperities, services, authorities and powers that you have, and possesse in this your mortal life, you shall carrie nothing with you, but only the time that you have well employed and spente virtuously, during the course, and time of this your mortall life" (sig. C4r). While Breme contends that a majority of "worldly affaires," particularly most "treasures, ritches, prosperities, services, authorities and powers," prove inessential to the cultivation of one's *ethos*, he simultaneously argues that friendship, "well employed and spente virtuously," numbers among the few worthwhile worldly ventures. The centrality of friendship to the private life of man, including household governance, is the primary reason given in his concession of certain "services" vital for one's *ethos*. Moreover, by paraphrasing a passage from Cicero's *De amicitia* on the etymology of "*Amicitia*…named in englisshe friendshippe or amitie," Breme also concedes that friendship and concord are 'naturally' and divinely political, and thus "service" something greater than the self or a private circle of friends:

> For in god, and all thinge that commeth of god, nothing is of more greatter estimation than loue, called in latin *amor*, whereof *Amicitia* commeth, named in englisshe frendshippe or amitie; the whiche taken a way from the lyfe of man, no

> house shall abide standinge, no felde shall be in culture. And that is lightly parceiued, if a man do remember what commeth, of dissention and discorde. Finally he semeth to take the sonne from the worlde, that taketh frendshippe from mannes life. (sig. C4r) [53]

This passage from Cicero, much favored by early modern friendship materials (particularly those of Elyot, from whome Breme takes this passage virtually word for word), claims friendship as the bedrock of society. [54] Indeed, according to Cicero and writers such as Breme, friendship lends itself to the stability of the household and "the lyfe of man" in general. In addition to operating as the foundation of man's governance in private, household affairs, friendship also fosters the cooperation necessary for the stability and regeneration of a larger community, which, as Breme suggests, is most readily achieved through the advancement of concord and prevention of "dissention and discorde." Moreover, drawing on the metaphor of the cultivated field to discuss concord, Breme argues that friendship ensures that "the lyfe of man" does not become fallow; indeed, according to this metaphor, friendship simultaneously operates as the technique and nourishment essential for (a moral) life to take root.

In order to make sense of this agricultural motif and its relation to politics, one must turn to other friendship pamphlets to see how they address the embeddedness of friendship in

[53] See Falconer, vii.24. "But if you should take the bond of goodwill out of the universe no house of city could stand, nor would even the tillage of the fields abide. If that statement is not clear, then you may understand how great is the power of friendship and of concord from a consideration of the results of enmity and disagreement. For what house is so strong, or what state so enduring that it cannot be utterly overthrown by animosities and division?"

[54] For instance, see Elyot, 1:122-123..

"worldly affaires." Walter Dorke, in his 1589 pamphlet, *A tipe or figure of friendship*, paraphrases part of the same passage from Cicero (or Elyot) as Breme, although he exponentially expands on "the co[m]modities of *Frie*[n]*dship*" through commentary, focusing in particular on the myriad ways in which it is "profitable to a Publique weale":

> SO necessarie, great & infinit are the co[m]modities of *Frie*[n]*dship,* that they seeme to take the Sunne out of the world, which would remoove *Friendship* from amongst us: without the which, nothing is so well staid, but it may bee soone destroyed, nothing so strong but it may easely be beaten downe, nothing so firmly settled but it may be utterly subverted: yea without *Friendship* no house can be wel guided, no Citie well governed, no Countrey safe preserved, no State long continued, no nor anie thing in the use of man rightly ordered. It is so convenient for the Court, and so fit for the Countrey; it is such a treasure abroad in the warres, and such an ornament to the Citie in time of peace; that as [T]*ully* testifieth, there is no gift given of God to man (Sapience only excepted) more agreeable to nature, more comfortable to the heart, more pleasant to the minde, or more profitable to a Publique weale. (sig. B1v-B2r)

Similar to Breme, Dorke (of whom little is known) perceives friendship as the essential force that drives the cultivation of one's *ethos* and, more generally, society; indeed, as a stabilizing force, friendship buttresses and renders a variety of social relationships "so well staid," "strong," and "firmly settled." Drawing on the "Sunne" metaphor, Dorke also characterizes friendship as the most vital source of moral, emotional, and political instruction and formation in both private, household affairs and the affairs of a larger, public community: "without *Friendship* no house can be wel guided, no Citie well governed, no Countrey safe preserved, no State long continued,

no nor any thing in the use of man rightly ordered." He likewise emphasizes, to a greater degree and perhaps more forcefully than Breme, the innumerable, "great & infinit…co[m]modities of *Frie*[n]dship." Not only does Dorke discuss how, as something 'naturally' and divinely inspired, friendship "guide[s]," "govern[s]," "preserve[s]," "continue[s]," and "orders," the entire spectrum of human affairs from the "house," to the "Citie," to the "Countrey," to the "State" and "Publique weal," but he also explicitly contends that friendship serves a variety of purposes, among which social stability and concord can be counted as the most significant. According to Dorke, friendship: solidifies martial bonds during times of "warre;" enriches civic life "in time[s] of peace;" "comfort the heart… [and]minde;" and, given its promotion of moral and civil concord in the self and others, proves of great "profit to a Publique weale." It is due to this perceived utility and "profit" of friendship to the cultivation of a moral self and community, "not onely in private affaires, but also in publique, in travailes, in voyages, in sojourning at home and abroad," that Dorke, along with countless other friendship materials, find it so "laudable," "glorious," "precious," and "miraculous" (sig. B2r).

While this brief discussion has demonstrated how friendship materials draw a clear link between friendship and politics, most notably its perceived contribution to the stability and reproduction of a community, friendship's relation to the reproduction of the moral subject (a topic addressed at length in future chapters) remains partially unclear. [55] The friendship pamphlet of the courtier and prolific writer Thomas Churchyard, proves apropos for introducing this aspect, given his emphasis, in his preface to Sir Walter Raleigh, on the danger posed to the

[55] The next chapter on ethical self-love in Shakespeare's *The Two Gentlemen of Varona* explores in detail how friendship materials emphasize the reproduction of the moral subject. The purpose of the following discussion is mostly to lay the foundation for the proceeding chapters.

commonwealth when men do not know themselves or the "natural affection [they should bear] towards their countrie and friends" (sig. B3r). [56]

Of particular import to Churchyard is how friendship, "enforced by affection, [that] leades the mindes of men to a multitude of causes," can be harnessed for the benefit of the commonwealth and the moral subject (sig. A2r). Given an emphasis in friendship materials on self-fashioning and self-governance, and present in practically every representation of friendship during the era, it should come as no surprise that Churchyard emphatically envisions "friendship, [a]s the ring-leader to all happinesse, and the guide that shewes men the high way to all worldly exercises" (sig. C2r). In a similar manner, his claim that friendship simultaneously operates as the guiding principle of self-governance and self-fashioning, as well as the stability of a larger political community, reiterates a common thread of early modern friendship discourse. Indeed, Churchyard envisions this recurring theme of the unity fostered by friendship on both the micro and macro level as the "league of love" that exists between a private circle of friends in addition to persons brought together by geographic proximity and common interests: "friendship is (without comparison) the only true love knot that knits in conjunction thousands together" (sig. C1v). [57] In order to stress this relationship between friendship and the political body, he invokes

[56] See Kinney's informative entry on the interesting life of Churchyard, 136-137. As Kinney notes, "Churchyard published approximately forty-five books and pamphlets in both poetry and prose…..[H]is best known work remains 'Shore's Wife,' which appeared in the 1563 edition of *A Mirror of Magistrates*" (137).

[57] In many respects, this passage elucidates LeRoy's contention that a city is both a place and a collection of individuals who have decided to live harmoniously and in abidance with laws and customs: "*Wherfore a city is not* [only] *a community of place, neither was it ordained to the end that they should be safeguarded from injury, nor yet or traffickes sake, but those things must be provided for before it be a city, and though they be already provided, yet shal it not be a city:*

the organic metaphor where friendship is likened to the organic structures that nourish and sustain the physical body: "as the sinowes is needful for the body, the marrow for the bones, and the blood for the life: so friendship is most fittest to knit the jointes and minds of men together, and bindes them about with such brazen bandes, that no barres of yron may break, nor policie of people put asunder" (sig. B3v).

Although Churchyard suggests that friendship on a macro level is threatened by the "policie of people," he contends that self-knowledge curtails the possibility of discord and thus works to further "knit" and "bind" a community of subjects. In this context, and similar to the texts discussed above, self-knowledge fosters the cultivation of an *ethos* that helps one live a morally oriented life directed toward the self, other, and the commonwealth. Churchyard articulates this position through a discussion of the import of self-knowledge and friendship to concord, where he broadly outlines how both benefit and serve the interests of others and simultaneously compels his countrymen to increase their practice of self-knowledge. Moreover, he envisions the primary function of friendship as "the affectionat love that al men in generall ought to beare to their countrie" (sig. B2r). As Churchyard demonstrates, this "affectionat love," which works to promote the common well-being, takes on a definite practice that blends private and public as well as the personal and political:

but a city is a society ordained to liue wel in houses and families; and to this end, to lead a perfect and sufficient life: which indeed cannot be unlesse they inhabite one place, and have the use of mariages: wherfore there have ben brought in into Cities, both affinities, cobrotherhoods, sacrifices, and other manners and customes of living togither, which is the work of friendship, for friendship is nothing but an election of living orderly together, therfore the purpose and end of cities is to live wel, and a city is a society of families and boroughes in a perfect and sufficient life, which is, as we have already affirmed, to liue in al felicity and wealth. Now then a city is ordained for honest actions, and not for living togither onely" (sig. Q3r).

> So if in those dayes (a great while agoe) millions of men helde the loue and friendship of their countrie so deere and precious, as in deede it ought to be esteemed: now in our ripened yeeres when wittes are mellowed and seasoned with the sweete savour of long experience, the folly and foule facts that by over great boldness make many runne mad, should be a general warning, and teach all kinde of people, to keepe the right and plaine path of natural affection towards their countrie and friends." (B3r)

Drawing the reader's attention to an exceptional past (in this case, a decidely Roman past), when in "those dayes (a great while agoe)" men held an esteem, "love and friendship" for their "countrie," Churchyard compels his countrymen to (re)create an exceptional commonwealth that mirrors the past through the practice of friendship and self-knowledge. [58] According to this claim, "friendship" as a practice of "natural affection towards [both] countrie and friends," collapses the supposed difference between a private, apolitical affair between a few (what Churchyard characterizes earlier as a "privie and inward affection" between the self and another) and a public, political arrangement between many (sig. C1r). Moreover, he underscores the import of self-knowledge primarily through an emphasis on the danger posed to the

[58] In an earlier passage, Churchyard offers the Roman statesmen "*Musius Scaeuola, Horatius Cocles, Marcus Curtius,* [and] *Marcus Regulus*" as models of friendship for his readers to mimic. The ideological and cultural uses of drawing connections between ancient Rome and early modern England is well documented. See Freya Cox Jensen, *Reading the Roman Republic in Early Modern England* (Brill, 2012); Barbara J. Bono, *Literary Transvaluation: From Vergilian Epic to Shakespearean Tragedy* (University of California, 1984); Richard Hingley, *The Recovery of Roman Britain 1586-1906: A Colony So Fertile* (Oxford, 2008); and Markku Peltonen, *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570-1640* (Cambridge, 1995).

commonwealth when men do not know themselves or the "natural affection [they should hold] towards countrie." According to Churchyard, this absence disrupts the common peace by lending itself to "folly" and an "over great boldness [that] make[s] many runne mad." In many respects, Churchyard's warning about the dire consequences for the commonwealth when friendship is absent echoes LeRoy's contention that friendship, "[a]s the greatest of all goods and commodities that any City or Common-weale can attaine,…[is] the most apt thing to defend them from sedition and uproars" (sig. L5r). It likewise harkens back to discussion at the beginning of this chapter of the "commonwealth men" and their interest in ensuring the common well-being while simultaneously limiting sedition and rebellion. It is this precise danger of sedition and rebellion that many of the poems in Tottel's *Songs and Sonnets* frequently address, often through the use of friendship images and language, and which I now turn to in the next section on the miscellany.

Fashioning the Self and the Nation in *Tottel's Miscellany*

Thus far, the examination of self-knowledge in early modern culture has amply demonstrated a number of things: self-knowledge is perceived to limn the ethical duties of the self to a larger community; the illumination of these duties show how self-knowledge contributes to the formation of a moral and political subject; the formation of an ethical political subject is seen as necessary for the stability and continuation of the commonwealth; and, finally, friendship, particularly through its stress on self-fashioning and self-governance, provides the vocabulary and skills through which all of the above can best be articulated. In the following section, I continue tracing this thread of self-knowledge, friendship, and the formation of the moral and political subject in early modern literature and culture through a reading of selections from Richard Tottel's 1557 printed miscellany of poetry, *Songs and Sonnets*. As an attempt to

use print to create a shared, public literature, particularly one with a strong emphasis on, to borrow a phrase from Arthur F. Marotti, "moral self-improvement" and friendship, Richard Tottel's *Songs and Sonnets* proves apropos for the current examination of self-knowledge and the formation of the ethical and political subject (215). The poems in *Songs and Sonnets*, which Tottel claims to have published for the moral self-improvement of "the unlearned" as well "for the profit" of country and countrymen, frequently focuses on self-knowledge in the context of friendship. As I demonstrate, not only does this focus reiterate the discussion of self-knowledge and friendship to date in chapter one, but more importantly, it touches on the import of knowing "the secretes of th[e] minde," to borrow a phrase from Grimald's versification of Cicero's "Of friendship," for the good of the commonwealth and the potential danger posed to its stability when one does not know the self (line 11).

The printed miscellany of poetry, that is, a collection of poems on a variety of subjects by multiple poets, proves to be rather popular during the era, as evinced by the twenty titles printed between 1557 and 1603, many of which are reprinted numerous times for different London booksellers and in formats designed for preservation in libraries rather than disposable consumption. [59] For instance, nine editions of *Songs and Sonnets* are reprinted at least eleven times between 1557 and 1587. Many of the reprints of the second edition, as Holton and MacFaul note, are produced "in octavo rather than quarto format [since octavos]…could be more readily bound for preservation in libraries" (x). Richard Edwards's 1576 *The Paradise of Dainty*

[59] See, for instance, Richard Edwards' 1576 *A Paradise of Dainty Devices*, Thomas Proctor's 1578 *A Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions*, Clement Robinson's 1584 *A Handful of Pleasant Delights*, Richard Stanyhurst's 1593 *The Phoenix Nest*, and Nicholas Breton's 1591 *Britton's Bower of Delights* and 1597 *The Arbor of Amorous Devices,* John Flasket's 1600 *England's Helicon*, and Francis Davison's 1602 *Poetical Rhapsody*.

Devices, typically held to be the second printed miscellany after *Songs and Sonnets* (and frequently printed in octavo format as well), goes through three editions, with the latter printed upwards of five times through 1606. Drawing from, to quote Arthur F. Marrotti, "the manuscript system of transmission" still prevalent during the period of print culture in Marian and Elizabethan England, the printed miscellanies make poems and topics previously confined to private collections and commonplace books with a limited circulation amongst friends available to a wider reading public (211). [60]

Given their popularity, steady source of revenue for printers and booksellers, and the continual revision of poems and poets in successive editions (including the addition, deletion, reordering, or substantial revision of existing poems), early modern miscellanies prove to be an excellent bellwether for gauging what assumptions and beliefs were fashionable at given moments of time. Although Elizabeth Pomeroy urges one to read Elizabethan miscellanies "cautiously and…broadly," she nonetheless rightly contends that "[h]istorically, they provide an index in theme and technique" and, I would add, impact of cultural and political events (121). [61]

[60] See Marotti, 209-290, for further information on the manuscript system of poetry and its incorporation in early modern print culture. For a general historical, yet thorough, introduction to early modern print culture, see H.S. Bennett's magisterial three volume study of printed books in early modern England: *English Books and Readers, 1475-1557* (Cambridge, 1952); *English Books and Readers, 1557-1603* (Cambridge, 1965); and, *English Books and Readers, 1603-1640* (Cambridge, 1970). For a critical and historical overview of print culture, including some of its broader social and political ramifications, see both volumes of Elizabeth Eisenstein's *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* (Cambridge 1979), Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin*, The Coming of the Book* (Verso, 1976), and Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print* (Cambridge, 1997).

[61] For additional criticism on early modern printed miscellanies, including *Songs and Sonnets*, see: Mary Thomas Crane, *Framing Authority* (Princeton, 1993); Wendy Wall, *The Imprint of Gender* (Cornell, 1993); Seth Lerer, *Courtly Letters in the Age of Henry VIII*

In terms of the former, while an interest in fortune, battles, and mean estates as topics of poems fluctuate as the period progresses, Petrarchan love-lyrics, moral odes, and friendship remain perennial topics in Elizabethan printed miscellanies of poetry. Likewise, in terms of the latter, Christopher J. Warner, in a recent historical and materialist study of *Songs and Sonnets*, contends that Tottel's 1557 printed miscellany is "both a pragmatic and an idealistic response to the religious, political, and social upheavals of the English Reformation and Counter-Reformation – including the 'lurid glare' of that summer's martyrs' fires" (a topic which I address below) (2). In his study of the print history of *Songs and Sonnets*, Paul A. Marquis makes a similar claim through his contention that Tottel's anthology interrogates "the cultural attributes of change" that occur during the Marian and Elizabethan eras (John Guy qtd in Marquis 19).

Richard Tottel's *Songs and Sonnets* (hereafter referred to as *Tottel's*) proves no exception to the broad characterization of printed miscellanies of poetry outlined above. Printed in the summer of 1557, the inaugural edition of *Tottel's* includes two hundred and seventy one poems by Henry Howard, the Early of Surrey (poems 1-36 and 262-265), Sir Thomas Wyatt (poems 37-127 and 266-267), Nicholas Grimald (poems 128-167), and a host of "Uncertain Auctours" (poems 168-261), including two who authored friendship materials discussed in this project: Thomas Churchyard, the author of the pamphlet *A sparke of frendship* (poem 175), and John Harrington of Stepney, the translator of the 1550 edition of Cicero's *De amicitia* (poem 139). However, as Marquis and others have noted, subsequent editions of *Songs and Sonnets* radically reorder the number of poems. The contribution of Nicholas Grimald,

(Cambridge, 1997). Also see the recently published collection edited by Stephen Hamrick entitled, *Tottel's Songes and Sonettes in Context* (Ashgate, 2013) as well as Holton and MacFaul's "Introduction" (Penguin, 2011), ix-xxvii.

another author of friendship materials, is also reduced from almost forty poems to ten and his name is removed and replaced by the initials "N.G." in later editions. [62] According to the preface, Richard Tottel markets his miscellany as an act of public service for the commonwealth and "gentle readers" of the middling sort, which, as Catherine Bates contends, indicates for his readership how his anthology offers "a passport to gentility" and common prosperity (38). [63] Moreover, as Holton and MacFaul speculate, the work also "may have targeted…Inns of Courts students, who seem to have been as much in need of the flowers of courtly rhetoric and verse therein as they were of legal textbooks" (ix). [64]

As one of the earliest printed anthologies of poetry in English (excluding the c. 1539 fragmented *The Court of Venus*), *Tottel's Miscellany* not only establishes many of the themes that come to dominate early modern printed miscellanies of poetry, and thus garner such overly dramatic sentiments from modern scholars like Hyder Rollins that "the beginning of modern English verse may be said to date from its publication in 1557," but also, and perhaps more importantly, it uses these themes didactically to stress moral improvement for the benefit of the self and the commonwealth (2:5). [65]

[62] See f.n. 16 above. Also see Marquis, 15-17.

[63] See Bates for further discussion of the "mixed messages" of Totell's "passport" as regards climbing the social ladder.

[64] Marotti makes a similar claim as regards Tottel's intended audience, 211-214.

[65] See Pomeroy 3-6 for an overview of *The Court of Venus*. Also see Russell A. Fraser's edition of *The Court of Venus* (Duke, 1955).

Not all modern scholars, however, agree with Rollins. Indeed, C.S. Lewis famously sizes up the miscellany as "A Drab Age anthology" that pales in comparison to "Golden Age" verse.

An emphasis on improvement in the miscellanies, particularly the notion that through reading, "the less refined can become more refined," to quote Marotti, accords with the "model of intellectual and moral self-improvement that is basic to print culture and to developing notions of social progress" during the era (215-216). Among the reasons Tottel provides for his decision "to publishe" the manuscript poems of Surrey et al. is moral self-improvement of "the unlearned" as well as the promotion of a shared, public literature and identity (3). In his prefatory note "To the reder," Tottel, a publisher largely of legal texts on common law for students at Inns of Court, requests that his more "gentle reder[s]" refrain from passing judgement on his decision to make public some very private poems since he does so "for the profit" of country and countrymen: "It resteth now (gentle reder) that thou thinke it not evil don, to publishe, to the honor of the english tong, and for the profit of the studious Englishe eloquence those works which the ungentle horders up of such treasure have heretofore envied the[e]" (5). [66] Tottel's claim that he published the miscellany for the betterment of his readers and English rhetoric in general (as well as to provide a window into courtly language and life), simultaneously has a much greater application for the commonwealth; namely, the promotion of peace and social concord through widespread use of eloquence. [67] Gently chastising his social betters as

[66] As Holton and MacFaul note, Edward VI grants Richard Totttel "a patent…to produce common law texts – a very lucrative monopoly which [i]s renewed under Mary in 1556 and Elizabeth in 1559"(ix).

[67] For claims of the relationship between eloquence and peace, see Henry Peacham, *The garden of eloquence*, (London, 1593), AB2v. Also see Cicero's *De invention* where he contends that "the man who equips himself with the weapons of eloquence, not to be able to attack the welfare of his country but to defend it, he, I think, will be a citizen most helpful and most devoted both to his own interests and those of his community." See *De inventione, De optimor*

"ungentle horders up of such [richly instructional] treasures" as contained in the manuscript poems that could benefit those below them, Tottel likewise encourages the middling and "unlearned" sort to improve their *ethos* and "to purge the swinelike grosseness" through reading the *Miscellany*: "I exhort the unlearned, by reding to learne to bee more skillful and to purge the swinelike grossenesse, that maketh the swete marjerome not to smell to their delight" (5).

While Tottel's gentle admonishment certainly functions as a marketing ploy, where, as Holton and MacFaul contend, Tottel signals to the reader "that he is letting the general public in on works that had been hoarded, even kept secret, by the aristocracy," his assertion should also be read in the larger context of promoting an idea of Englishness in the commonwealth (x). Indeed, similar to Churchyard, who in his pamphlet compels his countrymen to (re)create an exceptional commonwealth that mirrors an exceptional Roman past through the practice of friendship, Tottel aligns the English language and culture with the more prestigious aspects of Latin and Italian culture: "That to have wel written in verse, yea and in small parcelles, deserveth great praise, the woorkers of Latine, Italians, & other, doe prove sufficiently" ("To the reader"). [68] The alignment of the English commonwealth and culture with antiquity

genere, Orartorum topica. Trans. H.M. Hubbell (Harvard, 1949) 1.1; 4-5; and, Rhetoricorum ad C. Herennium libri quattuor. M.T. Ciceronis De inventione libri duo (London, 1579). Also see Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric* (Cambridge, 2002).

[68] For information on the status of Latin in early modern England, see J.W. Binns, *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: The Latin Writings of the Age* (Francis Cairns, 1990). George Puttenham, in his 1589 *The Arte of English Poesie* praises *Songes and Sonnets:* "Such honour as seemeth due to them for having by their thankefull studies so beautified our English tong, as this day it will be found our nation is in nothing inferior to the French or Italian for copie of language, subtitie of device, good method and proporation in any forme of poeme"

finds its clearest expression in *Tottel's Miscellany* through discussions of friendship (215). Such discussions, as I shall now demonstrate, frequently occur in two ways: transmitting classical ideas of friendship for English to practice and using the idea of friendship to discuss political relationships, among which the most important includes self-knowledge and the promotion of the common peace.

As previously stated, many of the poems in *Tottel's Miscellany* place a strong emphasis on cultivating one's *ethos*, and the topic of friendship proves to be one of the more useful vehicles for this emphasis. Indeed, aside from Petrarchan love-lyrics and occasional eulogies, like Grimald's "Upon the decease of W. Ch" and "Of N. Ch" that meditate on the "good thews [i.e., qualities of]… / The hartiest mate, that ever trod the mold", poems on friendship, like poems on moral topics such as *vanitas* (e.g., "Descripcion of an ungodly worlde") or the import of patriotism (e.g., "Of the troubled comon welth restored") tend to be didactic pieces that stress moral improvement ("Of N. Ch" lines 9-10). [69] For instance, Wyatt's "Of the fained frend" addresses how excessive self-love attracts sycophants and flatterers. [70] His primary concern in this poem is the danger posed by the back biter or "frendly fo" as well as the reason why one should avoid cultivating vainglory. One of the primary reasons Wyatt gives is that vanity

[69] Also see Grimald's other moralistic poems "Of lawes," "Musonius the Philosphers saying," "Marcus Catoes comparison of mans life with iron," "The death of Zoroas," and "Of the golden meane." Wyatt also pens a number of moralistic poems in the miscellany, among which are included: "Of the meane and sure estate", "Theyof the meane estate are happiest," "The courtiers life." Also see the anonymously penned, "The felicitie of a minde imbracing vertue."

[70] Also see Wyatt's "Of dissembling wordes" as well as the anonymously penned "The wise trade of life," "Totus mundus in malign positus" ("The whole world lieth in wickedness"), and "Description of an ungodly worlde" for further discussions of friendship and sycophants.

eventually leads to self-ruin or harm: "many a man such fire oft times he kindleth: / That with the blaze his berd him self singeth" (lines 6-7). The anonymously penned "The praise of a true frende," is far more didactic. It uses the discussion of what constitutes the "frendly hart" in virtuous friendship to advise the reader on how to develop his or her own *ethos* (line 4). By mimicking the "frendly hart" of the virtuous, one learns, according to the poem: the import of constancy, including the support and care of others during times of need (5-16); the import of counsel, particularly of "the wise," and the ability to impart it to others effectively (lines 17-24); and, the import of knowing one's limits and when to ask for "ayde" (lines 25-31). However, Grimald's didactic versification of Cicero's *De amicitia*, aptly titled "Of frendship," proves to be the friendship poem most germane to the current discussion of self-fashioning the moral and political subject. [71]

Aside from Edwards's tragicomedy *Damon and Pythias*, and the ballad renditions of Elyot's Titus and Gisippus, Grimald's poem serves as the most didactic instances of transmitting classical ideas of friendship for the English to practice in early modern letters and, by far, the most didactic in the printed miscellany. Practically devoid of style, Petrarchan aesthetics, and narrative found in many of the poems included in *Tottel's Miscellany*, Grimald's intention in the forty line poem is to transmit Cicero's classical treatise in abbreviated form to a general audience. Included in all subsequent reprints of *Tottel's Miscellany*, the poem contends that friendship: is a "heavenly gift" far more valuable than material or worldly goods, including health and power (lines 1-4); instills "True vertue" that helps one conquer the "bodies lust" and

[71] I discuss *De amicitia* at length in the next chapter on ethical self-love and caring for others.

other lowly appetites that run counter to "good…pursutes" (lines 5-6); creates a bond that is stronger than family or "kin" and leads to a fidelity grounded in "good will" (line 10); encourages one to share and "repose the secretes of th[e] minde" and, more generally, live an emotionally invested life (lines 11-14); creates, to quote Shannon, a "civic parity" between friends where one may, to quote Grimald, "Behold thy frend, and of thy self the pattern see: / One soull, a wonder shall it seem, in bodies twain to bee" (lines 15-16); provides the foundation of private and public governance and concord of "eche house, eche towne, eche realm" (lines 19-23); has a strong precedent in Greek and Roman culture and political life (lines 24-32); is rare in the contemporary world, and nearly impossible between a tyrant and his subjects (lines 33-38); and, perhaps most important given that the final couplet ends where the poem begins, is a natural relationship that encourages wisdom and sapience (lines 39-40).

Grimald's versification of Cicero's treatise ponders the question "Of all the heavenly giftes, that mortall men commend, / What trusty treasure in the world can countervail a frend?" ("Of frendship" lines 1-2). While the poem affirms that few things "countervail" or are more valuable than friendship, it simultaneously suggests that one's inwardness and self-consciousness, particularly when tethered to one's moral development and social concord, come rather close in worth (line 9). Even though Grimald contends that unlike the body, honor, power, and time, "this knot [of friendship] endureth" and transcends the material realm, his rhetorical question, "What sweter solace shall befall, than one to finde, / Upon whose brest thou mayest repose the secretes of thy minde?," suggests that friendship's greatest value rests just as much, if not slightly more, in its encouragement of the articulation of one's inwardness and improvement of *ethos* (lines 11-12). Grimald expresses a similar sentiment of the primacy accorded to one's inwardness in friendship in the poem's conclusion: "Wherefore sins nothing is more kindly for

our kinde: / Next wisdome thus that teacheth us, love we the frendful mind" (lines 39-40). Similar to Erasmus's contention that "The First Point of Wisdom is to Know Yourself," Grimald holds "wisdome" in greatest esteem, particularly since it "teacheth us," as he notes a few lines earlier, how to ethically love the self and the friend (*Enchiridion* 207).[72] In this formulation, the "frendful mind" of the other is in close second after one's own inwardness, and, read in correlation with the opening couplet, and similar to Erasmus, Elyot, and theological understandings of self-knowledge discussed in the first section, wisdom and sapience are a "heavenly gift" from God.

Moreover, Grimald's account of the "frendful mind" emphasizes, similarly to Elyot, its relationship to social concord and interiority. As a "good guide of our pursute," friendship simultaneously cultivates one's *ethos* and "wisdom," and more broadly, contributes to social concord ("Of frendship" line 6). While the former claim has been broached through a brief discussion of "wisdom" in Grimald's versification of *De amicitia*, he touches on the latter through an emphasis on the unifying power of friendship where, to quote Cicero, "oure willes studyes and felynges were all one" (sig. A5v-A5r). Through a gesture toward Cicero's "knot of frendship," as well as an echo of the friendship pamphlets by Churchyard and others discussed above, Grimald adjoins social concord and friendship: "Eche house, eche towne, eche realm by steadfast love doth / stand: / Where fowl debate breeds bitter bale, in eche devided land. / O frendship, flowr of flowrs: O lively spirit of life, / O sacred bond of blisfull peace, the stalworth

[72] See line 36. "And as thou wilt esteem thy self, so take thy chosen fere" (i.e., companion). In the next chapter, I discuss the significance of self-love in greater detail.

staunch of strife" ("Of frendship" 19-22). [73] Self-knowledge, according to Grimald, thus lends itself to the formation of an inward "sacred bond," where one works on his ethical being, as well as an outward "sacred bond," where "blisfull peace" and "steadfast love" between the self and others occurs.

However, an emphasis on self-knowledge in *Tottel's Miscellany* is considerably complicated when one considers the cultural and historical events that occur in England between1555 and 1558 as well as their resonance across the latter part of the sixteenth-century. As Hyder Rollins notes in his edition of *Tottel's Miscellany*, during this time, "martrys' fires were sending a lurid glare throughout England" as the persecution of Protestants under Mary continued to mar social concord (2.3). If one is to believe John Foxe's martyrology, then the cry "Put to fire, set to fire" must have been heard frequently in the area around London between February 1555 and November 1558 when, as John Guy notes, some two hundred and eighty seven people were burned at the stake as heretics (122; *Tudor* 238). Undoubtedly, these public burnings, regardless of how widespread the practice may have actually been throughout England (and numerous historians contend that, in all likelihood, they were localized primarily to London), created a grotesque spectacle where one might have witnessed such a sight as described by Foxe: [74]

[73] Cicero's famous proverb depicts "the knot of frendship" as the binding force of concord, where without it "n[e]ither can there be any house, neither any citie be able to continue, no not the tillage of the land can endure." See my discussion of the "occasional pamphlets" on friendship above.

[74] See Guy,238; A.G. Dickens, 338.

> In the which flame this good and blessed man bathed his hands so long, until such time as the sinews shrunk, and the fat dropped away….At last the extremity of the fire was so vehement against his legs, that they were consumed almost before the rest of his body was burned: which made the whole body fall over into the fire sooner… it cannot be said that he suffered or felt any great pain,…he abided both quietly and patiently, even unto the departing of his life. (122-123)

As Christopher J. Warren astutely observes in his examination of the cultural context of *Tottel's* production, the events surrounding the "martyrs' fires" influenced the poems of Surrey, Wyatt, Grimald, and the numerous anonymous contributors. The *Miscellany's* frequent allusions to "Strange kinds of death…[that] in love's fire burn," to quote Surrey's canonical sonnet "Descripcion of the restless state," render some of the most beloved and canonical works of *Tottel's* all the more sinister, and also suggest that the burnings clearly impacted the public, including the poets of the *Miscellany* (2). [75] However, one should not construe that the incorporation of such imagery means that Tottel and the *Miscellany's* poets sympathize with Marian politics. Indeed as Holton and MacFaul note, both poets and Tottel alike find it necessary to remain as nonpartisan as possible, although one only need look at Grimald's poem that rounds

[75] Also see Wyatt's "How the lover perisheth in his delight, as the flie in the fire," "Of the fained frend," and the anonymous "The complaint of a hot woer, delayed with doutfull cold answers." The latter, though a lover's complaint, resonates eerily with the excerpt from Foxe quoted above.

Holton and MacFaul note that "twenty-eight Protestants…were burned in the month of the *Miscellany's* publication" (377).

off the first edition, a eulogy for Cicero on his execution by Mark Antony that warns the reader of the danger of tyranny, to see how difficult it was to remain neutral. [76]

Other poems in *Tottel's*, such as the anonymously penned, "Of the troubled common welth restored to quiet by the mighty power of god," also demonstrate how the miscellany converses with the "lurid glare" permeating England during this time. It likewise touches on the import of knowing "the secretes of th[e] minde" for the good of the commonwealth. Indeed, the poem's treatment of the fall of Troy and failed rebellions against God, such as that of Pharaoh in *Exodus*, as well as possible allusions to the failed 1554 Wyatt rebellion, relates the difficulty of knowing "the secretes of th[e] minde" in the context of (an undoubtedly Protestant) conspiracy: "Of treason marke the nature and the kinde, / A face it beares of all humilitie. / Truth is the cloke, and frendship of the minde, / And depe it goes, and worketh secretly, / Like to a mine that creepes so nye the wall, / Till out breakes sulphure, and oreturneth all" (lines 49-54). [77] As the anonymous poet suggests, it is difficult, if not impossible, to detect early signs of "treason," such as conspiracy, since outwardly "A face it beares of all humilitie." Indeed, the poet claims that

[76] See Paul A. Marquis reading of this poem in "Politics and Print: The Curious Revisions to Tottel's 'Songes and Sonnettes'" (*Studies in Philology*, Spring 2000), 145-164.

[77] Grimald alludes to Wyatt's rebellion in "Of lawes," though, as I read it, he boldly claims that religious intoleration of Protestants under Mary largely contributes to political uprising: "When princes lawes, with reverend right, do keep the / commons under / As meek as lambs, they do their charge, & scatter not / asunder. / But if they raise their heads aloft, and lawe her bridle slake: / Then, like a tiger fell, they fare, and lust for law they take. / Where water doth prevail, and fire, no mercy they express: / But yet the rage of that rude rout is much more merciless" (lines 1-6). Note Grimald's use of friendship language is similar to Churchyard's discussion friendship above on page twenty-four; laws are friends to subjects, and promote social concord by preventing subjects from "scatter[ing] not asunder." Moreover, subjects should be friendly with the law and not, as Grimald levels at the "rude rout," be "merciless."

treason festers "and worketh secretly" in the mind and only comes to light once it manifests in action or, as he eloquently puts it, "out breakes sulphure, and oreturneth all." Moreover, conspiracy is buttressed by seemingly frank speech that appeals to reason ("Truth is the cloke, and frendship of the minde"), and echoes Wyatt the elder's poem on the "frendly fo" in *Tottel's* or the period's common perception of the flatterer, who, to quote Plutarch, "often times, that we esteeme to be our perfect friend" because they "shew themselves…bolde to speake their minds and to finde fault, which is one of the best and surest marks of true friendship" (84). [78]

Other poems in *Tottel's Miscellany*, many penned by anonymous authors, continue this theme of the unexamined self and the "frendly fo" within that threatens moral and social stability. For instance, the anonymously authored "That eche thing is hurt of it self" discusses, in a fashion similar to the above poem on conspiracy, how the greatest danger to man is his own unexamined self: "Why fearest thou thy outward fo, / When thou thy selfe thy harme dost fede, / Of grief, or hurt, or paine or wo, / Within each thing is sowen the sede?" (lines 1-4). Conversely, the anonymously penned "Descripcion of an ungodly worlde" emphasizes peace of mind and service to "god and man" as two fruits of self-knowledge that can ease social turbulence (line 40). After a lengthy catalogue of acts in this "ungoldly worlde" that readily lend themselves to "troublesome times," among which is included "fraud in frendly lokes [and] such frendship al for gaine," the poet argues, "The cause and ground of this [suffering and wickedness] is our unquiet minde" (lines 3; 57; and 31).

The "frendful minde" Revisited

By now, it should be apparent that the answer to the question, "What is the link between *nosce*

[78] Flattery, frank speech, and the care of one's *ethos* is the subject of chapter three.

teipsum, friendship, and the formation of the subject in early modern culture?,' is that the era largely perceives self-knowledge and inwardness as inextricably bound to, and in fact fostered by, friendship. Friendship, in turn, is seen as an important didactic force that provides the subject with a moral and political education – indeed, the language of friendship is frequently yoked to discussions of the commonwealth. Moreover, I have shown that friendship does not compete with one's self-knowledge and inwardness; rather, early modern friendship discourse, for the most part, depicts friendship as an educational experience that, to reiterate Davies, enables one to "studie, learne, and *know*" the self as well as the duties required of it as a moral subject in a political community. In other words, in friendship, to borrow a quote from W.F. Fields' discussion of *nosce teipsum* in Elizabethan culture, one "indirectly arrive[s] at self-knowledge by seeing himself mirrored in the soul of another" – indeed, to reiterate Churchyard, author of one the friendship pamphlets, self-knowledge in friendship curtails the possibility of discord and thus works to further "knit" and "bind" a community of subjects (4).

While this chapter has focused primarily on the concept of self-knowledge as envisioned by early modern texts, it has only gestured broadly toward its practice in the world. Thus, a broader question to consider is: how do early modern texts see this practice manifest in society? How does the subject learn about duties and realize them through action? To return to Erasmus' discussion of the proverb *nosce teipsum* introduced earlier in this chapter, "moderation" of desire and the ability to sustain a "middle state" where self-abnegation and self-regard are tempered is fundamental to the practice of knowing oneself: "[k]now thyself,…recommends moderation and the middle state, and bids us not to pursue objects either too great for us or beneath us. For here we have a source of all life's troubles: everyman flatters himself, and blinded by self-love takes to himself without deserving it all the merit he wrongly denies others" (97). Praise of "the middle

state" or "the mean" also finds articulation in *Tottel's*, where the anonymous poet of "The praise of measurekeeping" envisions it as the location where "vertue" manifests: "The auncient time commended, not for nought, / The mean: what better thing can there be sought? / In meane, is vertue placed: on either side, / Both right and left, amisse a man shall slide" (lines 1-4). Rogers, likewise aligns the "Temperate man," or one who pursues moderation and the mean, as "a notable member in a common weale" (sig. P4v). Finally, Sir Thomas Elyot, in his 'Englished' version of the Venetian humanist Vives' *Introduction to the wisdome, Banket of sapience*, follows "Know thy selfe" with "Use temperance" (sig. N7v). As I discuss in the next chapter, friendship discourse and writings on the commonwealth perceive self-love and the moderation of desire, or the ability to "care for the self," to borrow a phrase from Michel Foucault, as key to the practice "Temperance" and "the middle state."

Chapter Two: "I to myself am dearer than a friend": The Problem of Care of the Self and Care of the Other in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*

Introduction: A "temperate and moderate person"

According to Ecclesiastes 7:18-19, the avoidance of extremes through the pursuit of a "middle state" or "mean" proves the best strategy to live a temperate and virtuous life in the body of Christ: "Be not thou just overmuch, neither make thyself overwise: wherefore shouldest thou be desolate? Be not thou wicked overmuch, neither be thou foolish: wherefore shouldest thou perish not in thy time?" (*Geneva*). Following the general theme of Ecclesiastes, wherein the author instructs the reader how to life a meaningful and enjoyable life, an aversion to being overly righteous, wicked, foolish, and pedantic is the key piece of advice in this passage; indeed, in a manner reminiscent of the anonymous poet from *Tottel's* who declares that "in meane, is vertue placed," throughout Ecclesiastes the author stresses temperance as way to cultivate a godly *ethos* on Earth. In a similar manner, Thomas Rogers explicitly connects temperance as an admirable trait of "member[s] in a common weale" through his discussion of "a prettie saying in our English tongue, too much one thing, is good for nothing:"

> Nothing to much, nor to often. We have a prettie saying in our Englishe tongue, too much of one thing, is good for nothing. Observe a meane, and then shall you be that Temperate man, of which we doo here talke, a notable member in a common weale, for by Temperance he embraceth Modestie, Shamefastnesse, Abstinencie, Continencie, *Pudicitia* [sexual virtue], Honestie, Moderation, Sparingnesse, and Sobrietie: without which Tem|perance can not be." (sig. P7r)

As Rogers contends, the ability to "observe a meane" between excess and deficiency produces

the ideal or "notable member in a common weale." Moreover, the temperate man "embraceth" or practices a host of mannerisms such as "Modestie, Shamfastnesse, Abstinencie, Continencie, *Pudicitia* [sexual virtue], Honestie, Moderation, Sparingnesse, and Sobrietie." Indeed, according to Rogers, the sum total of these practices contribute to the formation of the "notable member in a common weal," and, as he notes later in this passage when discussing the cause of Rome's dissolution, also stave off and minimize social discord: if the "rare moderation [of temperance] [o]f others in his time [i.e., Caeser] had [been] set before their eyes, their perils had been so great, nor the common wele of Rome so overthrowen" (sig. O1v). Richard Morison, in his 1539 *Exhortation*, also situates temperance as a vital component of subjects in the commonweal and, more generally, the stability of the "politike order" (sig. B2r). He envisions "tempera[n]cie" as a key characteristic of "mannes life" and of "civile ordinaunce [and] obeysaunce" (sig. B2r). Indeed, as Morison contends, "[w]hat thinge is more beneficiall unto mannes life, then politike order, then mutual societie of men, knitte together in justice, tempera[n]cie, modestie, and honest libertie, one to helpe and comforte an other" (sig. B2r). In Elyot's 'Englished' version of Juan Luis Vives (and which, in the 1550 edition, Morison pens a dedication to Gregory Cromwell, son of Thomas Cromwell), he includes a lengthy entry on "Temperance," and reiterates its centrality to the life of man and the political order: "To a wel ordered cou[n]trey or citee those expenses be thought mete and convenient, that be littell & moderate, the end whereof is necessary and hones, pleasant and thankful, so that it lacke bothe reproche and damage" (sig. Bb1r). Furthermore, Sir Thomas Elyot describes a "temperate and moderate person [as] not wanton nor affectionate to his owne apetite, [who] maie be to no manne in his countrey chargouse, to no man cruell or grevous, to no ma[n] dangerous: For he is of Nature familiar and gentill, easy to men that wilcome & speake with him, whose house is unlocked, not shut, but open to all men, where everye manne,

as it were in tempestes and stormes, may repaire for their succours" (sig. Bbr-Bbv). Taking the concerns of these texts on the commonwealth, temperance, and social and political stability as a point of departure, the current chapter shows how a central aspect of Tudor friendship discourse stresses the dilemma of how one forms the self as a moral being primarily through emotional awareness and constraint.

The Two Gentlemen of Verona, I argue, suggests that attempts to balance selfishness and selflessness in friendship hinge on one's ability to reflect on their emotions and desires and temper self-abnegation with self-regard. Such a dialectical emphasis on friendship, particularly the "contradictory requirements" of caring for the self and others, to borrow a phrase from William K. Rawlins, can best be understood through a reading of Cicero's *De amicitia* [*Of friendship*] and Michel Foucault's Collège de France lectures on subjectivity and "the care of the self" (2). [79] Broadly conceived as understanding the self as provisional and contingent on social situations, Foucault's lectures on "the care of the self" in antiquity demonstrate that, while it is a complex activity frequently difficult to delineate, caring for the self implies, firstly, reflecting on how one is an emotional being, and secondly, recognizing and realizing the agency bestowed upon the self in forming this being. Caring for the self likewise reveals how the affective and political dimensions of friendship (that is, the "achieved" and "ascribed"), similar to the self and other, are inextricably bound. Considering how Tudor friendship discourse perceives, to quote Bray, "the ethical praxis" of friendship in relation to the individual's inward being also

[79] Rawlins, in his study of friendship in middle-class American culture, examines the "contradictory requirements" of friendship along with their corresponding "social predicaments." See the introduction to *Friendship Matters*.

underscores one's moral and political agency – twin concepts of great import to the era's articulations of the commonwealth.

The first part of the current chapter thus examines Foucault's lectures in order to clarify how understanding the self as an emotional being is perceived as synonymous with forming oneself as a moral being – an endeavor Foucault characterizes as "a principle of restlessness and movement, of continuous concern throughout life" (*Hermeneutics* 8). The second section considers how one of the most influential texts on early modern friendship discourse, Cicero's *De amicitia*, addresses caring for the self. As I demonstrate, reading Cicero through a Foucauldian lens illuminates the primacy given to "the care of the self" in *De amicitia* and early modern friendship discourse, particularly the import of realizing that one forms the self as a moral being, firstly, by learning to love the self before loving others, and secondly, by maintaining an equilibrium between self-regard and self-abnegation. A product of this realization and practice concerns self-governance where moral beliefs and constraints illuminate one's ethical identity and responsibilities not only to the self but to others. Having established my critical terms and concepts, the third section turns to one of Shakespeare's early comedies to examine a sustained representation of "the care of the self" in friendship. As I demonstrate in this section, *Two Gentlemen* readily underscores the import of emotional awareness and reflection in friendship through numerous soliloquies, monologues, and duologues. Characters likewise use interior speech, along with limited conversations with others, to reflect on how their emotions are tethered to friendship practices and, in numerous instances, how their passions impact others. As such, the play's depiction of self-awareness in friendship practices illuminate how the care of the self informs the formation of the subject, not only as a moral being, but also, to borrow a phrase

from Regenia Gagnier's study of Victorian subjectivity, as "a subject to itself,…an 'I' [with] its own viewpoint" and experiences, as well as "a subject to, and of, others" (qtd in Hall 2-3).

As Shakespeare demonstrates, however, the ability to balance one's desires and a sense of duty to others often produces an internal struggle, although conscious self-regard, as suggested through the figure of Proteus, can potentially lead to the ethical caring for others. Indeed, because Proteus is so self-regarding, he is able to redeem himself at the end of the play. Proteus's self-regard, which strikes us as initially selfish, potentially signals to an early modern audience that he is cultivating the kind of concern for self that enables him to become a true friend in the end. The play thus articulates a practice of early modern subjectivity wherein a sense of self is believed, one the one hand, to emerge from perceived duties to others, and on the other hand, from a duty to the self. However, the tension between understanding and forming the self as both an individual and a friend, as well as the conundrum arising from the perception that one's subjectivity is potentially compromised by friendship, drives the narrative of *Two Gentlemen*.

One of the many things that makes *Two Gentlemen* particularly interesting is the fact that it is composed amidst an explosion on the commercial stage of plays devoted to the topic of friendship – indeed, if a 1592-1594 composition date is assigned to the title, it would occur during the 'first wave' of commercial staging of friendship. Likewise, unlike the dramatic and literary antecedents of Edwards, Elyot, and Grimald, the didacticism of *Two Gentlemen* occurs at the level of action rather than pedantic description. Prior to the 1594 acquisition by the Admiral's Men of "rights from Henry Chettle to a *Damon and Pythias*," the staging of friendship tends to

be accessible to only a privileged audience at court or in 'private' theaters (Stretter 351). [80] A cursory glance of their repertoire reveals other titles on friendship, such as the lost plays *Alexander and Lodovick* (1597), *Palamon and Arset* (1594), and *Love Parts Friendship* (1602) (Stretter 351). Although these titles demonstrate the popularization of the topic on the commercial stage in late-Tudor England, one can only guess as to what degree, if any, they address the reflective dimension of friendship or caring for the self (Stretter 351). George Peele's *The Old Wives' Tale* (1594) and Christopher Marlowe's *Edward II* (1594) also attest to the growing interest of friendship as a viable topic for the commercial stage, as do titles tangentially concerned with friendship, such as the anonymous *Arden of Feversham* (1592), Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* (1587), and Ben Jonson's *The Case is Altered* (1600). Shakespeare proves rather prolific in his examination of friendship – indeed, as *Two Gentlemen* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* demonstrate, the theme bookends his literary output, and it is likewise predominately featured in most of his titles composed in the intervening years. [81]

[80] Whether this is Edwards' *Damon and Pythias* or that of another playwright remains a mystery since the title obtained from Chettle is no longer extant. One of the more famous titles from the private theater proves to be Edwards. It is performed before Elizabeth I at Whitehall in 1564 and revived during her visit to Oxford in 1568. Lyly's *Endymion* is first performed before Elizabeth in 1588 at Greenwich Palace. Both titles are not available in print until 1571 and 1591 and their performance on the early modern commercial stage is murky. For a thorough discussion of the stage history of *Endymion*, see David Bevington's introduction to *The Revels* edition (Manchester, 1997), 1-6 and 49-59. Also see E.K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Clarendon, 1951), II.496-7. Ros King's introduction to *The Collected Works of Richard Edwards* (Manchester, 2001) proves equally insightful in terms of the stage history of *Damon and Pythias* as well as Edwards' legacy during the early modern period. See 32-39 and 87-96.

[81] See, for instance, *All's Well That Ends Well* (1602), *The Merchant of Venice* (1597), *Twelfth Night* (1600), and *The Winter's Tale* (1611).

These commercial plays, of which one would include *Two Gentlemen*, tacitly assume audience familiarity with basic tenets of friendship theory, and, unlike the earlier works of Elyot, Edwards, and Grimald, typically refrain from lengthy explication of the canon or "statutes of the lawe of Amitie," to quote Walter Dorke's 1589 pamphlet on friendship, *A Tipe or figure of friendship*; rather, these texts focus on presenting action consistent with, or, contrarily, in opposition to, fundamental doctrines of Tudor friendship discourse (sig. A4v).[82] In the case of *Two Gentlemen*, this assumption of prior audience knowledge liberates Shakespeare from lengthy elucidation of friendship conventions, and, keeping with the play's emphasis on the import of ethical action, multiplies the opportunities to demonstrate how caring for the self is grounded in mindfulness of emotional investment. Moreover, assumptions of audience knowledge in *Two Gentlemen* underscores the methodological conundrum faced by literary scholars and social historians that Alan Bray characterizes as "the beguiling assumptions" a culture inscribes in its material and cultural texts – that is, the "points that are too obvious to need explanation, [because] their import will be self-evident to the reader" (20).

A closer examination of these earlier materials, particularly *De amicitia* and the friendship pamphlets of Breme et al., illuminate how a belief that one must first learn to take care of the self before others functions as a general imperative of Tudor friendship discourse and an assumption that has yet to be considered at length. Indeed, Cicero's claim that fundamentally "everyone loves himself…and unless this same feeling were transferred to friendship, the real friend can never be found" attests to the import accorded to the care of the self (Falconer

[82] See Mills, 259.

XXI.80). [83] An anonymously authored pamphlet from 1596, *The Triall of true Friendship*, broaches the topic of caring for the self more bluntly by asking the reader "how should we thinke that they [the friend] wil always l[o]ve us, when they wil hate themselves" (sig. C2r).

To a large degree, Tudor friendship discourse depicts self-discovery wrought by the care of the self as the linchpin of society. The inverse, however, is also true. Affection, as a normative marker through which communal duties are measured, suggests that community is equally the linchpin of friendship and the care of the self. In order to better illuminate the import attached to what Hutter terms the "psychic regimes of the self" – regimes that he sees encompassing both affective and civic relationships – in the era's friendship materials and Shakespeare's *Two Gentlemen*, I now turn to the posthumously published lectures of Michel Foucault entitled *The Hermeneutics of the Subject* ("Virtue" 134).

Delivered at the Collège de France during the 1981-82 academic year, Foucault's lectures on the "connection between the care of the self with politics, pedagogy, and self-knowledge" prove insightful for an examination of emotional awareness and subjectivity in Shakespeare's comedy as well as Tudor friendship discourse (494). Not only does Foucault discuss at length friendship and the care of the self in Epicurean and Stoic thought, both of which leave an indelible mark on Tudor friendship discourse and sixteenth-century translations of *De amicitia*, but he likewise examines how these materials align undisciplined emotion in friendship, often perceived as encouraging excessive selfishness or selflessness due to lack of reflection, with

[83] Unless noted, modernized citations of *De amicitia* refer to Falconer's *Loeb* edition. For ease of cross-reference with other modern translations, I cite the text according to section and paragraph number.

"erratic…concern for the other" (198). [84] Foucault's contention that the "care of the self and care of others" is inextricably bound illuminates the dialectical tension, discussed in Tudor friendship discourse, between selfishness and selflessness (195). It likewise helps us understand how the era's friendship discourse frequently perceives caring for the self as a continual struggle encountered in attempts to fashion oneself to be a 'good man.'

The import attributed to self-love and self-knowledge in early modern friendship discourse has not been completely overlooked in current literary and cultural scholarship. Laurie Shannon, for instance, tangentially notes that Cicero's belief in"[t]he feeling of self-love" in *De amicitia* underscores how love of the self "must actively be transferred and reconfigured toward another" in order to realize friendship (41). Wendy Olmsted likewise observes how early modern rhetorical handbooks, along with the literature of Sidney, portray "self-knowledge" as a corrective to "the influence of innate self-love" (42). While both scholars gesture toward the centrality accorded to emotional awareness in early modern literature and culture, they refrain from elaborating how these concerns richly articulate a Tudor conception of the care of the self – indeed, Shannon restricts her comment to general characterizations of *De amicitia* rather than a period specific reception in Tudor literature, while Olmsted, for the most part, confines her

[84] See, Jill Kraye et al, *Humanism and Early Modern Philosophy* (Routledge, 2000), xi-xiii; Kraye, "Moral Philosophy" and Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Humanism," in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988), 301-86 and 111-138; Reid Barbour, *English Epicures and Stoics* (Amherst, 1998); Catherine Wilson, "Epicureanism in Early Modern Philosophy," in *Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism* (Cambridge, 2009), 266-86; and, Geoffrey Miles, *Shakespeare and the Constant Romans* (Clarendon, 1996).

discussion of self-knowledge to modes of persuasion amongst friends.

Although a few studies of early modern literature and culture employ the care of the self as a theoretical frame through which to examine a discourse of pleasure and desire, the topic of friendship has yet to be approached using ideas Foucault expounds upon in his Collège lectures. A general application of the care of the self, albeit derived from Foucault's *The Use of Pleasure*, can be found in Michael Schoenfeldt's study of inwardness in early modern literature and culture. Indeed, Schoenfeldt's examination of the technique of self-regulation demonstrates, for instance, how Shakespeare represents the care of the self in the sonnets as "a practice by which one can become master rather than slave of one's own pleasures and desires," or Spenser, in his *Faerie Queene*, as an "'ascetics' that enable[s] one to make oneself into an ethical subject" (95; 70). Gur Zak likewise draws on the latter volumes of *The History of Sexuality* in his exploration of the fragmented self in Petrarch's sonnets and, more generally, Petrarchan humanism. Similar to Schoenfeldt, Zak contends that Petrarch employs the care of the self in order to underscore the necessity of governing one's passions as well as minimizing mental anguish or what Petrarch terms one's inward "exile from virtue" (87). Drawing on the scholarship outlined above, this chapter thus aims to demonstrate how Foucault's 1982 lectures on the care of the self in antiquity prove invaluable to an examination of Shakespeare's maligned comedy, texts central to the study of Tudor friendship discourse, as well as recent interest in the discourse of emotions in early modern English culture.

Foucault and the Care of the Self: The 1982 Lectures

Delivered during the period of Foucault's thought commonly referred to by scholars as his 'ethical turn,' the 1982 lectures survey the "history of practices of subjectivity" in antiquity

(11). [85] Focusing on conceptions of the self and self-study in Hellenic and Roman culture, along with its legacy in modern thought, Foucault "steps back a bit" from the topic of "the question of the regimen of sexual behavior and pleasures in Antiquity" addressed the previous year and broadly examines the ethics of self-fashioning (2). [86] In the inaugural 1982 lecture, Foucault argues that according to classical thought, ethical agency depends on the practices of "*epimeleia heautou* (care of the self) and the *gnōthi seauton* ('know yourself')" (3). According to Foucault, 'care of the self' broadly encompasses three significant practices that fluctuate throughout history: (1) a behavior or "attitude towards the self, others, and world"; (2) an ability to reflect and "attend to what we think or what takes place in our thought"; and, (3) the ability to realize an ideal self through "a number of actions [such as]…techniques of meditation…[or] examination of conscience" (10-11). In later lectures he likewise outlines three practices associated with the

[85] Works produced during this period include the latter titles from the recently published Collège de France lectures, volumes two and three of *The History of Sexuality*, and myriad interviews. See, *The Government of Self and Others* (Palgrave, 2010); *The Courage of Truth* (Palgrave, 2011); *The Use of Pleasure* (Vintage, 1990); *The Care of the Self* (Vintage, 1990). Two invaluable interviews are "On the Genealogy of Ethics" and "The Ethics for the Concern of Self as a Practice of Freedom," in *The Essential Works of Michel Foucault, vol 1* (New Press, 1997), 253-80 and 281-302. Also see Foucault's 1983 Berkeley lectures, *Fearless Speech* (Semiotext(e), 2001).

[86] Foucault's 1980-81 lectures on *aphrodisia* provide the foundation for *The Care of the Self*. Frédéric Gros, in the epilogue to *Hermeneutics* contends that the 1982 lecture is an expanded version of the chapter entitled, "The Cultivation of the Self" (507-8). See *The Care of the Self*, 37-68. While Foucault firmly remains in the realm of classical thought in the 1982 lectures, most notably Plato, Epictetus, Epicurus, Seneca, and Galen, he also stress how the history of ethics, which he understands to be a history of the subject and its relation to "spirituality" and "truth," is at odds with modern perspectives of subjectivity and knowledge. See the lecture from January 6, 1982, hour one and the appended course summary. Also see Mark G.E. Kelly's review of the published lectures on how the 1982 seminar was, in all likelihood, an outline of the fourth volume in *The History of Sexuality*. "Review: Michel Foucault, *The Hermeneutics of the Subject.*" *Foucault Studies* 3 (2005): 107-112.

directive 'know yourself.' On a fundamental level, or what he terms its "weak form" in antiquity, the imperative 'know yourself' compels one to practice "a counsel of prudence" and to reflect on personal shortcomings or imperfections, while a slightly more complex connotation centers on "a methodological question" of what constitutes a self (35; 67). According to Foucault, the third, and inarguably most important, iteration of the imperative 'know yourself' in "all its splendor and fullness [is the realization that] [c]are of the self must consist in knowledge of the self" (67). Foucault ultimately demonstrates in his lectures that while care and knowledge of the self are construed as inseparable prior to the emergence of Cartesian thought, the imperative "know yourself [is always] subordinate to take care of yourself" (4).[87]

A course summary submitted by Foucault to the Collège in June of 1982 where, as Ewald and Fontana note in the foreword to the *Hermeneutics*, he "retrospectively [reflects on] the intention and objectives of the course," clarifies how his lectures prove germane to understanding an emphasis in Tudor friendship discourse on fashioning oneself a 'good man' or moral subject (xvi). [88] This is particularly the case with the import attributed in Tudor friendship materials to emotional awareness and communal duties since Foucault contends that these twin practices underpin the care of the self. His discussion of "the connection between the care of the self with politics, pedagogy, and self-knowledge" is perhaps the best place to turn since he tethers these aspects to one's awareness of emotions and communal affiliation (494).

[87] See "6 January 1982: First hour," 14-17.

[88] See "Course Summary," 491-505. For an alternative translation of the summary by Paul Rabinow, see Foucault, *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth* (New Press, 1997), 93-106.

Similar to an emphasis in Tudor translations of *De amicitia* on first learning to cultivate a 'love and dearness' toward the self before extending it to others, Foucault observes how classical texts stress the necessity to political life of "taking care of oneself, for oneself" (494). This is not to suggest that the care of the self is prior to or somehow divorced from politics – indeed, a central facet of the 1982 lectures focus on how caring for the self is fundamentally informed by politics or, as "a form of life," *is* fundamentally political (494). [89] Rather, Foucault claims that on a basic level, care of the self in antiquity stresses the need for one to be an active in terms of cultivating, disciplining, and relishing the self. In this respect, care of the self is "sometimes conceived in terms of the juridico-political model: being sovereign over oneself, [and] exercising perfect control over oneself," particularly in terms of curtailing destructive behavior arising from unruly emotions, anxiety, lack of empathy, etc., but also in regards to "self-enjoyment, taking one's pleasure with oneself, finding all one's delight in the self," to the point that self-respect demands one to be an active, ethical agent (495).

According to these discussions, the surest way of learning to take care of the self is cultivating a critical awareness of bad habits and striving toward their cessation. As a "critical function," taking care of the self, first and foremost, involves "unlearn[ing]" and relieving "oneself of all bad habits," including, as Foucault demonstrates in his lectures, "irrational impulse[s]" arising from excessive passion (496; 98). [90] Learning to master emotions and overcome disproportionate "pleasures, desires, sorrows, fears, greed, stupidity" etc. is seen as

[89] See "06, January, 1982: Second Hour."

[90] See "20 January 1982, First Hour," 97-99; "20 January 1982, Second Hour,"115-7; and "3 February 1982: Second Hour," 197-98.

minimizing mental anguish in the self and encouraging overall well-being (116). A desire to attain such mastery, Foucault contends, forms the "curative and therapeutic function" of learning to care for the self (496).

The political and pedagogical aspects of caring for the self also solidify communal relationships. Indeed, discussions in antiquity concurrently emphasize how taking care of the self is essential for the health of the *polis* and the wider community – Foucault, citing Plato's *Alcibiades*, argues that this centers on promoting the belief that one "had to take care of himself if he wished to take care of others later" (494). Likewise, Foucault contends that the care of the self, including its political and pedagogical facets, is reliant on numerous social relations to help guide it, such as "scholastic organizations," "private counselors" and tutors, "family," patronage, elder relationships, and, apropos to the current chapter, "friendship" (497). This dependency on others underscores how "[n]ot being able to take care of oneself without the help of someone else was generally an accepted principle" (496). As such, controlling one's emotions become more significant, since it not only curbs mental anguish but also helps "produce or induce behavior through which one will actually be able to take care of others" (198). But how does one learn to take care of the self and to distinguish between 'productive' and 'unproductive' emotions in friendship? A lecture from the second hour of February 3rd proves germane to this question as well as the link between 'politics, pedagogy, and self-knowledge' in the care of the self and friendship.

In his discussion of Stoic 'commutuality' and Epicurean friendship, Foucault argues that an awareness of one's status as "the object of his care" readily lends itself to an awareness of community, most notably how "care of the self and care of others" is inextricably bound (195-7). For instance, the "Stoic conception of man as a communal being" advanced by Epictetus, a

Green Stoic from the second century CE, locates this awareness in the catechism conducted by the self on the self (195). As Foucault explains:

> Taking himself as the object of his care, he has to ask himself what he himself is…and what are the things that are not him. He has to ask himself what depends on him and what does not depend on him. And finally he has to ask himself what is appropriate for him to do or not to do, in accordance with the categories of *kathēkonta* or *proēmena* [i.e., communal responsibilities and mores], etcetera. Consequently, the person who takes care of himself properly…will at the same time know how to fulfill his duties as part of the human community. He will know how to fulfill the duties of father, son, husband, and citizen, precisely because he will attend to himself. (196-7) [91]

Here, Foucault demonstrates how an awareness of self-knowledge and practice prove intrinsic to classical conceptions of the care of the self. In what he later describes in the course summary as the merger of knowledge and practice – i.e., the merger of "an attitude of awareness" with "a regular occupation" – Foucault illustrates in the above instance how a cognizance that the self is entrusted to take care of itself – i.e., that the self, as a sovereign subject and "the object of [its] care," is capable of internal deliberation and external action – comes to fruition only when

[91] As Frédéric Gros observes in his endnote to this passage, "[i]n Stoicism *kathēkonta* (translated by Cicero as *officia*: duties, functions, offices) designates activities that conform to and realize a being's nature; *proēmena* refer to those actions that, although not of absolute value from the moral point of view, are liable to be preferred to their contraries." See *Hermeneutics* 203, e. n. 13. For clarity as to how *kathēkonta* are colored by communal affiliation, see Epictetus *Discourse 2.10* in Brad Inwood and Lloyd Gerson's *The Stoics Reader: Selected Writings and Testimonia* (Hackett, 2008), 200-202.

tethered to a host of communal responsibilities and mores (492). As this passage demonstrates, classical discussions of the care of the self claim that social positions such as "father, son, husband, and citizen" limn the responsibilities and duties of the self toward itself and a wider community. Furthermore, the connection between self and community is illuminated through Epictetus's contention that the ability to "properly…attend to [the] self" is part and parcel of an ability to attend to the wider "duties…of the human community" in which it resides. In the following section, I examine how Tudor friendship materials, most notably translations of Cicero's *De amicitia* and the late-sixteenth-century pamphlets on friendship, make a similar claim. Indeed, one late-Tudor pamphlet, Walter Breme's 1584, *The mirrour of friendship*, mostly concerns itself with "what dueties of humanitie the most excellent name of friendship doth mutually require" one to achieve for both the self and a broader community – a sentiment that Tudor translations of *De amicitia* stress (sig. A3r).

Inherent to the recognition of learning to 'properly attend to the self' is the import of not forgetting oneself by being "disturbed by passion and affection" for others (198). As Foucault observes in the inaugural lecture, this is the "general rule" of caring for the self in Hellenic and Roman thought: "You must attend to yourself, you must not forget yourself, you must take care of yourself" (5). Subsequently, he contends that forgetting oneself manifests through "erratic care or erratic concern…for the other" or an imbalance between utility and selflessness in friendship (198).

Foucault's 1982 lectures amply demonstrate how care of the self in Hellenic and Roman

culture has broader applications and implications beyond *aphrodisia*.[92] Though composed prior to the publication of the Collège lectures, Wolfgang Detel notes in his study of Foucault and antiquity that Hellenic and Roman thought situates the care of the self, first and foremost, in relation to happiness (*eudaimonia*) and virtue (*arête*) rather than pleasure and desire (*aphrodisia*) (58).[93] A broader meditation on the care of the self is perhaps most evident in classical discussions of friendship, since these texts typically construe friendship as the principle source from which *arête* and *eudaimonia* spring.[94]

Discussions of friendship in Tudor literature and culture likewise echo this sentiment of friendship as the wellspring of happiness and virtue and simultaneously expound upon ideas glossed by Foucault in his 1982 Collège lectures. Tudor translations of *De amicitia*, for instance, claim friendship is the definitive example of "the happy life" and that "vertue it is, whiche bothe engendreth and upholdeth freendship" (Tiptoft sig. G5v; Harington sig. B6v). Erasmus, in the 1508 preface to the *Adages*, echoes Cicero through his contention that friendship is "the whole of human happiness" while Thomas Churchyard's 1588, *A spark of frendship,* claims "friendship is

[92] Alan Bray arrives at a similar conclusion in his discussion of "modern debates" of Renaissance friendship in purely sexual terms, 6-7. Heyking and Avramenko echo this sentiment through their clam that "we seem unable to understand friendship and the act of sharing in terms that are neither romantic nor sexual" (3).

[93] See Detel, 58-92. A manuscript of the 1982 lectures circulated widely among scholars for numerous years prior to their 2004 publication.

[94] Zeno of Citium, the founder of Stoicism would be one exception. According to Zeno, friendship may lead to happiness but it is not a prerequisite for happiness. See Hyatte, 23.

a ring-leader to all happiness" (15; sig. C2r). [95] Richard Edwards' mid-century tragicomedy, the 1564 *Damon and Pythias*, likewise envisions friendship as "conserved by virtue," and Nicholas Grimald, in his 1557 versification of *De amicitia* in *Tottel's Miscellany*, observes how "True virtue gets, and keeps a friend" (line 44; line 6). [96] While Tudor theories of friendship, at their most eloquent, starkly divide friendship as either "ordinary" or "faultless," that is, predicated on utility or pleasure as opposed to virtue, they also stress vigilance as regards its everyday practice (Falconer VI.22). [97]

In a manner reminiscent of Foucault's discussion of caring for the self in friendship, Tudor translations of Cicero emphasize the import of practicing "a counsel of prudence" in which one cultivates an awareness of potentially 'unproductive' emotions and reflects on what it means to be a sovereign self responsible for the modification of one's behavior. Given its pervasive influence in Tudor culture as well as friendship discourse, translations of *De amicitia* prove invaluable to this examination. Not only does *De amicitia* play a crucial role in Tudor education and humanism, as T.W. Baldwin and others note, but it also leaves an indelible mark on Tudor characterizations of friendship – indeed, most of the early modern texts previously

[95] Unless specified, citations of the *Adages* refer to Phillips.

[96] Grimald's poem is included in all subsequent editions of *Tottel*, although its position changes after the first edition. See Amanda Holton and Tom MacFaul, "Introduction," *Tottel's Miscellany* (Penguin, 2011), xx-xxii.

[97] John Tiptoft, in his late 1481 translation of *De amicitia* uses the terms "vulgar & meane" and "very and parfyght"(sig. A7v). John Harington uses "common or meane" and "true and perfecte" in his 1550 translation ,while Thomas Newton, in his 1577 translation, employs "vulgare or meane" and "true and perfect" (sig. B8r; sig. B3r).

cited derive their estimation of friendship as the wellspring of happiness and virtue from Cicero. More important to the present discussion, however, is the attention devoted in *De amicitia* to the primacy of caring for the self. Translations of *De amicitia* lay claim to the belief that taking care of the self engenders an ability to take care of others, and thus, one's behavior or what Foucault terms "attitude towards the self, others, and world" should be closely monitored. Both of these sentiments are elaborated in the late sixteenth century friendship pamphlets. Indeed the pamphlets of Breme et al. claim that the "therapeutic and curative" function of taking care of the self is readily achieved through reflection and meditation on one's emotions. These texts likewise clarify the quasi-republican aspect of *De amicitia* that being sovereign over the self centers on one's duties to a wider community. Friendship pamphlets such as Churchyard's contend that "man is not made for himself, created to be king of earthly delights, and placed amidst the pleasures of the worlde, to doe what he pleaseth, but chiefly to looke and with good aduisement to search, how and in what sort he may be duetiful and beneficiall to his countrie" (sig. B2r). The proceeding section thus also considers how these pamphlets, along with Tudor translations of *De amicitia*, portray the "politics, pedagogy, and self-knowledge" Foucault sees as intrinsic to the care of the self.

"the knot of frendship": The Care of the Self in Tudor Friendship Pamphlets

As current scholarship on the topic of early modern friendship abundantly demonstrates, the era's discourse derives its conceptual framework from Latin and Greek sources on the subject, most notably Cicero's *De amicitia,* Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, and Plutarch's essays on flattery in the *Moralia*. Drawing on these antecedents, and *De amicitia* in particular, Tudor examinations frequently anatomize friendship through a distinction between "ordinary and commonplace friendship" in opposition to a "pure and faultless kind," to use Cicero's

terminology (Falconer VI.22). In "theoretical structures and exemplary narratives" of friendship in Tudor culture, to borrow a phrase from Lochman and López, the impetus behind friendship further limns the distinction between "faultless" and "commonplace" (26). Virtue and goodness, or at least, according to Elyot, one's ability to "followe [them] (as moche as men may)," are seen to form the basis of "pure and faultless friendship," while utility and pleasure are perceived as the foundation of typically short-lived "ordinary and commonplace" friendships (122). As Shannon persuasively demonstrates, an approximate unanimity of characteristics between friends such as likeness, benevolence, fidelity, counsel, and proximity of habitation are also depicted in theoretical and narrative articulations as germane to both "faultless" and "commonplace" friendships.

A focus on Cicero in the current discussion should not be taken as a sign of the irrelevancy in Tudor culture of other Hellenic and Roman texts on friendship, particularly those by Plato, Aristotle, and Plutarch; rather it stems largely from the general visibility of *De amicitia* in English culture and literature. [98] As T.W. Baldwin notes in his magisterial study of Tudor

[98] Extant Tudor friendship materials demonstrate the centrality of *De amicitia* to the era's discourse. They also underscore the near absence of Greek sources, or, at best, their confinement to specific intellectual circles. For instance, aside from Marsilio Ficino's Latin commentary on *The Symposium*, Plato's treatment of friendship in either the aforementioned text or the *Lysis* receives scant attention, although Elyot, in the *Boke named the governour,* is rather fond of Plato, as is Erasmus in the 1508 edition of the *Adages*. Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* fares slightly better, particularly in English universities such as Oxford and Cambridge, which favor him over Cicero's dialogue. For an overview of Tudor Platonism, see Sears Jayne, "Platonism of the English Renaissance." *Comparative Literature 4.3* (1952), 214-38. Also see his more recent *Plato in Renaissance England* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1995). For an overview of *Aristotelianism* in Tudor England, particularly, its dissemination in university and other intellectual circles, see Charles B. Schmitt, *John Case and Aristotelianism in Renaissance England* (McGill-Queen's, 1983), 1-29. Also see Case's 1585 *Speculum moralium quaestionium*, which as Schmitt notes, is the standard textbook for studying the *Ethics* at the university- level in late-Tudor culture (3). It is reprinted eleven times between 1585 and 1630. Only one translation

education, *De amicitia* functions as a core text of lower form curriculums, most notably, as an introduction to Latin language and moral philosophy (2:590). [99] In addition to its pedagogical role in the classroom, where, as Shannon observes, "it must be among the most commonly learned Latin texts in the Tudor era," *De amicitia* enjoys a wide circulation in the era's literature (28). Cicero's text on friendship appears in a variety of literary forms during the period, ranging from the 'vulgar' translations printed in English, to a variety of texts on friendship which it clearly influences, including, among the more prominent examples, pamphlets, university drama, and low ballads. [100] Indeed, as Mills notes, some of the earliest titles turned out by Caxton

of the *Ethics* in the "vulgare toung," as Wilkinson characterizes his 1547 abridgement of Brunetto Latini's medieval translation, is produced during the sixteenth-century (sig. A2r). Wilkinson's translation is never reprinted. For the an overview of Cicero in Tudor university curriculums, see Howard Jones, *Cicero: Master Tully in Tudor England* (De Graaf, 1998), 217-19 and 231-46. Two essays by Plutarch, "How a Man May Discerne a Flatterer From a Friend" and (to a lesser extent) "Of the Plurality of Friends," leave an indelible mark on sixteenth-century formulations, particularly in terms of hazards caused by excessive self-love, instrumental use of persuasive speech, and an inordinate number of friends. See Philemon Holland, *The philosophie, commonlie called, the morals written by the learned philosopher Plutarch of Chaerones,* (Arnold Hatfield, 1603), sig. G6r-K4v and sig. T4v-U1r. Holland's text is one of the earlier, if not earliest, 'vulgar' translations of Plutarch's *Moralia.* I discuss Plutarch at length in the next chapter.

[99] See, Baldwin, 1:287; 1:341; 1:349-50; 1:367; 2:593; 2:601**.** Also see, Carroll, 5; Howard, 197; King, 56-7; Mills, 78-79; Shannon, 26-7.

[100] Though it is difficult to determine with certainty the various Latin editions of *De amicitia* imported from the Continent and in circulation during the era, it is far more manageable to identify the English translations. The ease of this task arises, surprisingly, from the few 'vulgar' translations available during the Tudor era. During this period, as Ruth Hughey and Mills note, English printing presses only produce three translations: John Tiptoft's translation from the Latin text (printed by Caxton in 1481 and reprinted by W. Ratsell in 1531); John Harington's translation from a French edition (printed by T. Berthelette in 1550 and T. Powell in 1562); and Thomas Newton's translation from Latin supplemented by a revision of Harington (printed by T.Marshe in 1577). See Hughey, *John Harington of Stepney: Tudor Gentlemen; His Life and Works* (Ohio State, 1971), 259; Mills, 79-81. It would be fallacious, however, to assume

include Cicero's *De amicitia*. [101] The presence of *De amicitia* in an array of social settings such as the classroom, the alehouse, and the university and popular stage, speak to what William C. Carroll characterizes in his discussion of early modern curriculums as "the widening arc of transmission" of Cicero in Tudor culture (5). It likewise offers further evidence of widespread dissemination of Ciceronian conceptions of friendship and suggests that Carroll's estimation how "anyone could have learned the essay's basic insights elsewhere, from both elite and popular culture" proves highly probable (5).

Aside from its extensive utility in lower form education and broad presence in the era's literature, the prominence of *De amicitia* in Tudor culture stems, in all likelihood, from an alignment of Cicero's republican idea of friendship with fundamental principles of Tudor civic humanism, most notably its emphasis on the *vita activa*. The "pragmatic application…of classical learning" that Jonathan Woolfson observes as central to the *vita activa* of Tudor civic humanism, particularly the belief that the self enhances service to the common weal through cultivation of a strong "moral foundation," and vice versa, resonates with Cicero's text on friendship (9). [102] An interest in the instrumental and political use of humanist education surely

that a slim number of translations equate a narrow impact on Tudor friendship discourse. Indeed, as I demonstrate in this chapter, the visibility of *De amicitia* in a variety of cultural texts and venues lends credence to claims of its centrality in Tudor friendship discourse. Many of the titles that incorporate *De amicitia* are cited in the chapter introduction**.** Shannon, quoting Roger Chartier, observes how during the era "the same texts and the same books often circulated in all social milieus" (29).

[101] See Mills, 79.

[102] See Mills, 111 for how friendship appeals to humanism's *vita activa*. For a succinct overview of republican virtue in *De amicitia*, see Hyatte, 27. For a thorough discussion of civic

found a boon in Cicero's depiction of "friendship as the microcosm of politics," to borrow a phrase from John von Heyking (9). [103] Indeed, as Tom MacFaul contends, a Renaissance "[h]umanist ideology of friendship tried to make friendship the most important thing in the world" (1).

A belief in the necessity of caring for the self in Tudor friendship discourse, particularly as regards cultivating the 'moral foundation' Woolfson envisions as endemic to Tudor humanism, is readily affirmed through the import attached to self-love. Different from the vainglory discussed in Sonnet 62 or embodied by the steward Malvolio, this form of love is more akin to the "allowable self-love" of Jonson's Storge, that "natural Affection…given to us to

humanism in Tudor culture, see Jonathan Woolfson, "Introduction," *Reassessing Tudor Humanism* (Palgrave, 2002), 1-21. Despite the caution one should exercise in investing humanism with a broad ideological program or philosophy, since, as Alastair Fox and John Guy remind us, it flattens sixteenth-century English culture, Woolfson nonetheless provides three reasons to consider Christian and civic humanisms as coherent projects during the Tudor era: (1) both embody an interest and concern in "supplying the practical skills and a moral formation appropriate to public life"; (2) both function as "a tool of other ideological purposes"; and, (3) both reinvigorate and underscore the cultural differences between modern and early modern humanisms (4). See Alastair Fox and John Guy, *Reassessing the Henrican Age: Humanism, Politics and Reform 1500-1550* (Blackwell, 1986), 1-76. Also see Markku Peltonen's examination of the legacy of Roman republicanism in early modern English political thought, particularly in relation to conceptions of *vita activa*: *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought 1570-1640* (Cambridge, 1995). Mike Pincombe's monograph on Tudor humanism is also enlightening, certainly his sustained discussion of "Ciceronian humanitas" (1). See Pincombe, *Elizabethan Humanism: Literature and Learning in the Later Sixteenth Century* (Longman, 2001), 1-36. Finally, Arthur Kinney's *Humanist Poetics: Thought, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century England* (Massachusetts, 1986), 3-40 provides a succinct overview of Tudor humanism.

[103] See Nicorgski, 94, for other instances in *De amicitia* that underscore how friendship is perceived by Cicero as a political microcosm.

procure our good" and ensure the development of our virtue (5.7.26-28). [104] The difference between a self-love where one learns to be virtuous by loving the friend as an "alter-ego" from one "motivated primarily by passion and desire" and "self-seeking," as Hutter characterizes Aristotelian claims of its efficacy in friendship, surface in Tudor discussions of friendship, including Cicero's *De amicitia* (*Politics* 113-14). [105] Sir Thomas Elyot's 1539 collection of aphorisms, *The bankette of sapience*, for instance, begins its section on "Amitie" by noting, via an adage attributed to Augustine, that "the very true law of amitie [requires] a man to love his frende no lesse nor more than he loveth him selfe" (qtd in Mills 106). Thomas Wilkinson's 1547 "vulgare" and abridged translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics* echoes this sentiment of self-love through Aristotle's insistence that "A manne ought to love his frend, for in loving him he loveth him self" (sig. A2r). John Dee's 1598 commentary on Aristotle and Plato warns against the unscrupulous use of self-love for profit or pleasure, noting, "Hee that loveth himself too much shall have no friend" (sig. K2r). In *De* amicitia, Cicero likewise denounces a self-love driven by selfishness, utility, or pleasure, and implores the reader to meditate on how, as one Tudor translation phrases it, "every man loveth him self and loketh after no reward for his love" (Tiptoft sig. C6r). [106]

[104] For a brief discussion of self-love in *Cynthia's Revels* see James P. Bednarz, *Shakespeare and the Poets War* (Columbia, 2001), 182-85. Jonson's depiction of a virtuous and "allowable self-love" is indebted to Aristotelian thought on self-love in friendship. See Hutter, *Politics*, 113-114, for a succinct summary of friendship and self-love in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. For a counter argument to the role of self-love in Aristotle, see David Konstan, 77-78.

[105] See Shannon, 1-53.

[106] "For everyone loves himself, [but] not with a view of acquiring some profit from his self-love." See Falconer, XXI.79-80 and XXII.82.

While ethical self-love is typically seen as exclusive to Platonic, Aristotelian, and, to a degree, Augustinian theories of friendship, it is also a facet of Ciceronian conceptions.[107] In *De amicitia*, as Alexander Lee notes in his recent study of Petrarch's use of antiquity, Cicero contends that "loving a friend [i]s akin to loving oneself" (236). Indeed, Cicero's emphasis on the import of ethical self-love, cited above, lays claim to the belief that in loving the friend one also loves oneself: "Every man loveth him self and loketh after no reward for his love ffor every man for his owen sake is dere enough to him self. And onlesse that the said and same dernesse and love may be used in frendship a verray frende shal never be founde ffor he is as though it were another than the same" (Tiptoft sig. C6r). Shannon, in her commentary on this passage, notes that "Cicero takes up an Aristotelian analogy between self-love and friendship" in order to clarify how self-love should be "distinguished from selfishness" (40). In a manner reminiscent of Aristotle's claim, to quote Reginald Hyatte, that ethical self-love promotes "betterment through self-knowledge," Cicero contends that it is not sufficient to simply recognize one's natural capacity for self-love – i.e., that "every man for his owen sake is dere enough to him self"; rather, as he later argues, one cultivates an ethical self and "learns self-love by clinging to virtue and rejecting all vice," to borrow a phrase from Lee (18; 236).

The perceived primacy of the self in friendship is not lost in Tudor translations of *De amicitia*. John Harington, in prefatory material to his 1562 translation, contends that friendship, above all, centers on how to "order and govern [the] self" (sig. A7v). As his translation of Cicero later clarifies, 'governing the self' begins with the recognition that "by nature…man…loveth

[107] See Plato, *Lysis (or On Friendship*) and *Symposium* in *Lysis, Symposium, Gorgias* (Harvard, 1983), 1-72 & 73-246; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* (Harvard) BK VIII & IX.

him self" (sig. G3v). 'Ordering the self' likewise proceeds from joining this recognition with an ability to bestow on the friend a similar degree of "love and deareness" 'naturally' held toward the self (sig. G2v). If one finds these forms of governing and ordering too arduous or impossible to achieve, Cicero advises that "it is first m[ean]te, that one be good himself, and the[n] s[e]ke after for his like" (sig. G4r). John Tiptoft's 1481 translation renders this latter directive more eloquently as "a man [must] first make him self a good man and thenne seke another like him self":

> [B]y nature in a man that he sholde love him self, and gete him another, whos will he shold medle with his, that of tho tweine he shold make wel nigh one. But many men ful cursedly, I wil not saye unshamefastly, refuse to have suche a frende, ffor they can not be suche one theym self. And they desire of their frendes suche thinges, as they wolde not departe with them self, at their frendes desire. It is resonable that a man first make him self a good man and thenne seke another like him self. And in suche tweine that stablenesse of frendship that we trete of before may be confermed, whan men joined togedre in benevolence can gete the soverainte of suche lustes. (sig. D1v)

But according to Cicero and Tudor friendship discourse, how does one "make him selfe a good man"? Equally important, what does it mean in this discourse to be "a good man" to the self and to others?

According to Tudor translations of *De amicitia*, the ability to control emotions, or "gete the soverainte of suche lustes," is the principal strategy for fashioning the self to be a good man. Mindfulness proves germane to this counsel, most notably as a way to temper potentially 'unproductive' emotions and behavior – indeed, Cicero stresses the need for the self to not forget

that friendship, as "the helper of vertue and not the felawe of vice," contributes to the development of benevolence, constancy, and love in the self (sig C6v). Accordingly, friendship essentially hinges on this pedagogical facet, since it quickly dispels the notion that "by freendship, a gate is set open to all luste and vice" (sig. C6v).

The friendship pamphlets from the latter part of the sixteenth-century complement Cicero's directive of mindfulness by stressing the import of regularly reflecting on one's command of their emotions. *De amicitia* advises the self to moderate emotions such as "sadnesse," "souwerness and solemnesse" due to their disruptive nature in caring for the self and others – this is later echoed in Dorke's pamphlet as the need to shun "lumpish sadnesse, and sullen sowrenesse" (sig. B2v). Friendship pamphlets such as Breme's 1584 likewise urge one "often to examine thy self" and reflect on the level of command or degree of "temperance" of emotions such as "clemency," "patience," and "humanity" (sig. B8v). [108] Although the discussion of mindfulness of emotions in both Cicero and the friendship pamphlets address how it can usefully serve as an anodyne to selfishness, *De amicitia* is one of the few Tudor texts on friendship before *Two Gentlemen* that broaches how excessive selflessness can potentially arise from undisciplined emotion – indeed, Cicero cautions one to be mindful that the "grefe of minde that is oftentimes to be taken for freendes is not so great as it ought to take awaye freendship."

[108] Plutarch likewise contends that reflection is the best way to avoid the flatterer. He advises, in a manner similar to Cicero, to eschew the ego and selfishness that is contrary to ethical self-love. See Plutarch, "How a Man May Discern a Flatterer From a Friend." *The philosophie, commonlie called, the morals written by the learned philosopher Plutarch of Chaeronea. Translated out of Greeke into English, and conferred with the Latine translations and the French by Philomen Holland of Coventrie* (London, 1603), sig. G6r-K4v.

The import attributed to the care of the self in Tudor friendship discourse, particularly as the pivotal method of learning through affection how to 'properly' function socially, demonstrate that fashioning one's self "a good man" is seen during the era as inextricably linked to larger social formations. The classical antecedents from which Tudor friendship discourse freely draw hinge on the period specific notion that "affections [are]…a certain rule to measure duties by," to quote one mid-sixteenth text on sociality, a 1567 translation of *The manuell of Epictetus* (sig. D5v). Indeed, similar to Foucault's discussion of Epictetus and the need for one to 'tak[e] himself as the object of his care', texts such as Breme's assert that affection in friendship acts as a pedagogical device which clarifies "what dueties of humanitie the most excellent name of friendship doth mutually require" one to achieve for both the self and a broader community (sig. A3r). Similar to Cicero's imperative in *De amicitia* that one must transfer the "love and deareness" 'naturally' held toward the self to another, pamphlets such as Churchyard's extend this "natural disposition" to realizing and perfecting through friendship the "affectionat love that all men in general ought to bear to their countrie" (sig. B1v-B2r). Churchyard likewise contends that internal discipline of emotion encourages one "to keep the right and plaine path of natural affection towards their countrie and friends" (sig. B3r). [109] Indeed, one should, according to

[109] For the polyvalence of the term 'societie' in early modern English culture, see Phil Withington's recent monograph, *Society in Early Modern England* : *The Vernacular Origins of Some Powerful Ideas* (Polity, 2010), 102-133 and 169-201. For a discussion of the body as metaphor for the commonweal, see David Gregory Hale, *The Body Politic*: *A Political Metaphor in Renaissance English Literature* (Mouton, 1971) and Jonathan Gil Harris *Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic: Discourses of Social Pathology in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1998), 1-19.

Churchyard, reflect and "chiefly to look and with good advisement search, how and what sort he may be duetiful and beneficiall to his countrie" (sig. B2r).

Cicero contends that friendship, as eloquently expressed by Harington, functions as the basis of all civic organization to the extent that "if you should take out of the worlde, the knot of fre[…]ndship, n[e]ither can there be any house, neither any citie be able to continue, no not the tillage of the land can endure" (sig. B8r-C1v). Breme likewise contends that friendship concurrently functions as a private affair and the basis of community. In an appeal to the polyvalence of the term "societie" in Tudor culture as a marker of intimate fellowship between few and many, and likewise drawing on the organic metaphor of the body, Breme claims friendship as "one of the most precious ornaments and necessary instruments belonging to this our variable life, and without it (no more then the body of man without sinews and joints the societie of men cannot exist") (sig. A3r). Churchyard likewise appeals to an organic metaphor, and echoes Breme, through his contention that "as the sinowes is needfull for the body, the marrow for the bones, and the blood for the life: so friendship is most fittest to knit the jointes and mindes of men together, and bindes them about with such brazen bandes, that no barres of iron may breake, nor policie of people may put asunder" (sig. B3v)..

Breme's "dueties of humanitie" and Churchyard's "natural affection towards…countrie" suggest that one's emotional well-being in friendship, particularly as it relates to the ability to identify and suppress 'unproductive' emotions, is perceived as pivotal to the care of the self, the community, and the country. The correlation between care of the self and community in Tudor materials can be traced back to foundational texts on friendship by Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero. As Hutter notes in his study on friendship in industrialized society, these classical antecedents consistently claim that "[f]riendship between two persons was possible only to the extent which

the inner war had been resolved. Only those who had become friends of themselves…could truly be friends to others. The regimes of civic and personal friendship, hence, depended for their existence and quality on the psychic regimes of the self" ("Virtue" 134). Hyatte and Shannon likewise observe how self-love in antiquity and *De amicitia* is seen, first and foremost, as a precondition of friendship. Hyatte notes that "the ancients considered [self-love] a prerequisite to *amicitia*" while Laurie Shannon, more specifically, observes how in *De amicitia* "[t]he feeling of self-love is not [perceived as] friendship, but must actively be transferred [and] reconfigured toward another" (54; 41).

By now, it should be fairly clear that Foucault's 1982 lectures illuminate how the care of the self is portrayed in Tudor friendship materials as primarily a 'psychic regime' in the service of the self and others. As a 'form of life,' Foucault's stress on the care of the self as a process that must be pursued "throughout one's life" highlights an aspect of *De amicitia* mostly overlooked by contemporary early modern cultural studies on friendship: ethical self-love and friendship must be continually cultivated along with the dialectal tension between selfishness and selflessness (494). [110] As Walter Nicorgski observes, in refuting "the Perfect Wiseman of the Stoic tradition," Cicero argues that "friendships cannot be unions in perfect goodness but only at best unions of good people pointed to and striving for even greater goodness" (97). [111] Both Foucault and Tudor friendship materials likewise emphasize the ability to reflect on and temper supposedly 'counterproductive' emotions. While Foucault locates this in an emphasis in

[110] Cicero's claim of continual regeneration of self-love and friendship echoes a platonic idea found in the *Symposium*, 207 d-e: "he is continually becoming a new person…not only in his body but in his soul."

[111] See, for instance, Cicero's definition of 'goodness' in Tiptoft sig. A6v.

antiquity on how one must learn "not to let ourselves be carried away by emotions," and Cicero, in his stress on the cautious use of apathy in ethical self-love and friendship, the late-Tudor friendship pamphlets, such as Breme's, highlight the import of reflecting on one's passions: "for commonly greate hurte doeth a man procure to himselfe in following his owne will, without resting vpon the rocke of good consideration and reason" (494-5; sig. C5v). According to Foucault and Tudor friendship materials, the ultimate end of caring for the self is an ability to care for others. The relationship between caring for the self and others is likewise perceived as dependent on emotional awareness and discipline, or as Churchyard claims in his friendship pamphlet, as previously cited, a reminder that "man is not made for himself, created to be king of earthly delights, and placed amidst the pleasures of the world." [112] Part and parcel of learning to care for the self and fashion oneself a 'good man' in friendship is the cessation of mental anguish, or, as Foucault discusses in the second hour of a lecture dated February 3, "ataraxy (the absence of inner turmoil, the self-control which ensures that nothing disturbs one)" (184). Indeed, Tudor materials, such as Churchyard's, stress how "friendshippe is a certain felicitie of the minde," or a "quietness of mind," as the anonymous 1596 pamphlet, *Triall of true friendship*, eloquently states (sig. C2r).

As a 'psychic regime' of the self,' Tudor friendship materials and Foucault underscore how caring for the self, including the cessation of inward anguish, centers on internal discipline. As Schoenfeldt contends, the early modern era often envisioned "the self as an edifice needing not only meticulous care in construction but also continual vigilance in maintenance" (74). The

[112] *The Triall of true friendship* echoes this sentiment, albeit somewhat cynically: "man is not borne onely for himself, but also for his neighbors" (sig. C1r).

following section examines how caring for the self in friendship manifests in Shakespeare's *Two Gentlemen*. Of great import to this discussion is how the comedy stages the inward struggle of caring for the self through an emphasis on emotional awareness. The play likewise illuminates how caring for the self is a continual struggle similar to that discussed by Cicero, Tudor friendship pamphlets, Foucault, and Schoenfeldt where one must continually moderate their emotions lest they become too selfish or selfless.

Indeed, as a text occupied with learning how to fashion the self to be a gentleman, as the opening scene and later conversation between Antonio and Pantio in 1.3 demonstrate, Shakespeare's comedy also concentrates on learning how to fashion and care for oneself as a friend. This latter emphasis manifests in *Two Gentlemen* primarily through the inward struggle of Proteus, whose lack of emotional control results in his belief for most of the play that "I to myself am dearer than a friend," although it may also be extended to the overemotional Lance (2.6.20-23). Indeed, although on the surface Lance's "ordinary" relationship with Crab is admirable for the formers self-abnegation, benevolence, and fidelity – characteristics mostly missing from the supposedly "faultless" friendship of Valentine and Proteus – the play nonetheless presents Lance as committing the grievous error of excessive concern and care for the other. In both instances, Lance and Proteus wrestle with the practice of forming the self. Likewise, Proteus's claim, stated somewhat ironically, that friendship "hath better deeds than words to grace it," echoes the common belief that the fruits of internal, emotional discipline lends itself, firstly, to fashioning the self a 'good man,' and secondly, to the benefit of others (2.2.18). The play typically stages the import of these facets by demonstrating how a failure of

self-reflection or the rejection of counsel gives way to selfishness or selflessness, and it simultaneously draws on these moments to underscore the claim that duties to others underscore the care of the self. The play thus articulates a practice of early modern subjectivity wherein a sense of self is believed, one the one hand, to emerge from perceived duties to others, and on the other hand, from a duty to the self. The play stages this split focus between the self and other in friendship as a dialectical tension that frequently produces an inward struggle between pursuing one's passions and pursuing the needs of others.

The Two Gentlemen of Verona and The Problem of the Care of the Self

I am not the first to examine what is possibly Shakespeare's most maligned play in the context of friendship; however, following Bray's contention that "the effect of a shaping concern with sexuality is precisely to obscure th[e] wider [cultural and historical] frame" in which friendship discourse is situated, my examination prioritizes the care of the self over concerns of homosocial bonds or sexuality. Indeed, criticism has keenly considered how homosocial concerns, such as the tension arising from heterosexual desire, along with Tudor friendship discourse, informs Shakespeare's comedy. Ralph M. Sargent, in an essay about the influence of Elyot's "wonderfull historye of Titus and Gisyppus" on *Two Gentlemen*, for instance, identifies "masculine friendship" as the structuring theme "involving an ideal which rivals the demands of romantic love" (34). Jeffrey Masten, in his critique of an "authorial-developmental model" that denigrates attaching critical import to Shakespeare's early works such as *Two Gentlemen*, likewise observes how the "vocabulary of Renaissance friendship" pervades the play (*Two Gentlemen* 277). In his work on early modern collaboration, Masten also sees the play situating "the utility of Petrarchan poetics within a network of homosociality," a sentiment echoed by

René Girard, who argues that Silvia functions as an object that mediates a homosocial desire between Proteus and Valentine (*Textual Intercourse* 45). [113]

I likewise draw on previous criticism in my examination of how the play emphasizes the import of caring for the self through Valentine and Proteus as well as Lance and his "cruel-hearted cur," Crab (2.3.9). To approach the theme of caring for the self in *Two Gentlemen* from the perspective of these marginal characters keeps with scholarship on the play which typically reads Lance and Crab as a parallel of the two gentlemen, Valentine and Proteus. As William C. Carroll observes in his preface to the third Arden edition, "the Lance-Crab episodes are so expertly crafted to reflect, parody or subvert the values and pretensions of the major characters and their actions, right down to the verbal echo of individual words in different scenes (e.g.'tide' at 2.2.14 and 'tied' at 2.3.35-48)" (127). Robert Weimann notes that Lance provides a vital meditation on friendship and desire, and Shakespeare employs the clown and his dog "to define and to control, though not necessarily to belittle, the main theme of love and friendship" (40). Erica Fudge likewise argues that the play draws a strong parallel between Lance and Proteus in order to highlight the "failure" of friendship that results from "emotional confusion" in both cases (201). I do not mean to suggest, however, that scholarship on the play all but ignores Lance and Crab outside of their parallel to other characters, as comments by Carroll and Weimann, along with recent essays testify to the contrary – though, it should be noted, the lion's share focus on Crab. These instances, however, tend to privilege dramaturgy (Beadle, Bliss, and Brooks), formal analysis (Dobson), or larger cultural and historical phenomena, such as the

[113] See Girard, "Love Delights in Praises: A Reading of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*," *Philosophy and Literature 13.2* (1989), 231-47.

status of the animal (Boehrer and Peachman) over critical discussion of the duo's relation to friendship discourse.[114]

Given its minor status in the Shakespeare corpus, and, as Ann Barton notes in her spirited defense, the "inevitable distinction of being the least loved and least regarded of Shakespeare's comedies," a succinct synopsis proves necessary (177). Following the synopsis, I discuss how *Two Gentlemen* broaches what Foucault terms the "problem of care for the self / [and] care for others" (197). Perceived in antiquity as the product of "erratic concern and care for the other," and portrayed in Tudor friendship materials as predicated on the lack of emotional awareness and discipline, *Two Gentlemen* stages the "problem of care for the self [and] care for others" as rooted in excessive passion as well as disproportionate selfishness or selflessness. I also demonstrate how the play suggests that deliberating on one's emotions and, to reiterate Cicero, gaining "soverainte of suche lustes" that encourage socially 'unproductive' behavior, such as the "pleasures, desires, sorrows, fears, greed, [and] stupidity" discussed by Foucault in his lectures, is the surest way to minimize "erratic concern." Finally, I end with a brief examination of how *Two Gentlemen* illustrates that taking care of the self properly, most notably in terms of curbing inward passion and anguish, allows one to take care of others. This brief discussion proves

[114] See Richard Beadle, "Crab's Pedigree," in Michael Cordner's et al *English Comedy*, (Cambridge, 1994), 12-35. Beadle's examination of the theatrical history of the crying dog and improvisational comedy in medieval theater is a fascinating read. Also see, Matthew Bliss, "Property or performer? Animals on the Elizabethan Stage," *Theater Studies 39* (1994), 45-59; Harold F. Brooks, "Two Clowns in a Comedy (to say nothing of the Dog): Speed, Launce (and Crab) in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*." *Essays and Studies 16* (1963), 91-100. Michael Dobson, "A Dog at all Things: The Transformation of the Onstage Canine," *Performance Research 5* (2000), 116-24; Bruce Boehrer, *Shakespeare Among the Animals,* (Palgrave, 2002), 138-68; John Peachman, "Why a Dog? A Late Date for the Two Gentlemen of Verona," *Notes and Queries 54* (2007), 265-72.

helpful for considering how the comedy stages Hutter and Foucault's assertion that 'psychic regimes' of the self are tethered to both personal and civic relationships, a concern, as I demonstrated in the previous section, which is at the center of Tudor friendship materials. Ultimately, the staging of reflection and emotional awareness illuminates how friendship is frequently perceived as dialectical and wrought with tension, most notably the tension between selflessness and selfishness.

The Two Gentlemen of Verona tells the story of the titular gentlemen, Valentine and Proteus, and their struggle to reconcile friendship with personal ambition and love. The play opens with Valentine set to depart Verona and travel the world to acquire a gentleman's education while his friend Proteus remains behind to be near Julia, for whom he pines "heart sick with thought" (1.1.69). At his father's behest, and due partially to Proteus's dishonesty about a letter from Julia, he too travels to Milan in order to "be [made] a perfect man /…tried and tutored in the world" (1.3.20-1). On his departure, Proteus pledges "true constancy" to Julia, but this proves short-lived as he falls in love on arrival in Milan with Silvia, the Duke's daughter and Valentine's beloved (2.2.8). In the pursuit of Silvia, Proteus "slander[s] Valentine / With falsehood, cowardice, and poor descent," and informs the Duke of Valentine's intention to abscond with his daughter, who subsequently banishes Valentine (3.2.31-2). Silvia ventures into the forest in search of the exiled Valentine and is pursued by Proteus and the disguised Julia who is employed by Proteus as a male page, replacing the recently dismissed Lance. Silvia confronts Proteus about his infidelity and accuses him of being "a counterfeit to thy true friend" Valentine (5.4.53). In a fit of rage, he attempts to "woo [Silvia] like a soldier, at arm's end," but is prevented by Valentine, who chastises Proteus for his trespass against the law of friendship, and not, to the dismay of modern audiences, the attempted rape of Silvia (5.4.57-8). Proteus,

overcome with "shame and guilt," apologizes (5.4.74). Satisfied with his contrition, Valentine "once again…receives" Proteus as a friend, and "give[s]" Silvia to Proteus for marriage as an offer of goodwill and demonstration that his "love may appear plain and free." At this, Julia swoons, and thus reveals herself. Proteus, moved by her devotion and the epiphany that "were man / But constant, he were perfect," decides to marry Julia while his friend marries Silvia. The play ends with a celebration of the impending marriages, which, according to Valentine, shall be "One feast, one house, one mutual happiness" (5.4.171).

Throughout *Two Gentlemen*, servitude to emotion is depicted as the primary factor that unhinges friendship, generates inward anguish, and encourages disproportionate concern for the self or other. Utilizing the trope of male friendship disrupted by a love interest, the play echoes the contention of Foucault and Tudor friendship materials that excessive passion produces "irrational impulses" and all but ensures that "a gate is set open to all lustes and vice." [115] The friendship of Valentine and Proteus is the best place to turn to see how *Two Gentlemen* stages these concerns. Indeed, Proteus's passion for Silvia renders him "reasonless" and encourages his "transgression" against Valentine, while love in general produces an inward struggle and "[w]ar with good counsel" that Shakespeare will develop in later scenes through soliloquy and monologue (2.4.196-7; 1.1.68). [116] Valentine likewise displays the "follies" of a stupefied lover

[115] See Mills, 103, for a brief discussion of how Tudor literature exploits the clash between male friendship and a medieval doctrine of love. Also see Catharine Belsey, "Disrupting Sexual Difference" in John Drakakis's *Alternative Shakespeares* (Routledge, 2002), 193. Also see Laura Gowing, "The Politics of Women's Friendship in Early Modern England," in Gowing et al *Love, Friendship and Faith in Europe, 1300-1800* (Palgrave, 2005), 132.

[116] See Sargent and Mills for discussions of the potential conflict between the emotions required in cross-sexual love and those required in friendship. Elyot's "wonderfull historye of

due to his passion for Silvia which, similar to Proteus, forces him to forget his friend (2.1.35). Excessive passion also cultivates inner anguish in Valentine and, drawing on stereotypical terms of the forlorn lover, "bitter fasts [and] penitential groans" (2.4.129). Unlike in his treatment of Proteus, however, Shakespeare does not provide Valentine with substantial monologues or soliloquies; aside from a soliloquy toward the end of the play, Valentine's inward struggle is mediated to the audience/reader through others such as his servant, Speed, or the Duke.

The sway that excessive passion is seen to hold over male friendship and one's inward self emerges as a topic of conversation in the opening lines of the play. Valentine, who rebukes Proteus for his decision to remain behind while his friend travels abroad, notes:

> Home-keeping youth have ever homely wits.
> Weren't not affection chains thy tender days
> To the sweet glances of thy honoured love,
> I rather would entreat thy company
> To see the wonders of the world abroad
> Then, living dully sluggardized at home,
> Wear out thy youth with shapeless idleness. (1.1.2-8)

While these lines establish many of the themes pursued across the comedy, for instance, male friendship disrupted by a female love interest, the import of a gentleman's education, friendly counsel, and civic engagement, the problems generated by immoderate passion looms largest. According to Valentine, excessive "affection" or passion for Julia "chains" Proteus to Verona and produces a dull, "homely wit" that disrupts their friendship and hinders his friend's worldly

Titus and Gisyppus," in *The boke named the governour*, is perhaps the most famous example during the era. It is also, as noted above, influential to Shakespeare's comedy.

engagement. In a similar manner, Valentine claims that servitude to "affection" cultivates a "sluggardized" life of "idleness" at odds with the "world" of action that forms the gentleman's education. [117] The detriment of such erratic passion is characterized as "boots" or a "yoke" that impede one's personal growth (1.3.14-16). This sentiment is likewise echoed by Pantino, steward to Proteus's father, Antonio, who implores his master "To let him [i.e., Proteus] spend his time no more at home, / Which would be great impeachment to his age / In having known no travel in his youth" (1.3.14-16). Regardless of Valentine's friendly counsel and the Tudor proverb, attributed to Aristotle, that "long voyages depart friendship," Proteus's desire encourages him to remain "A home-keeping youth" rather than a young gentleman who travels "to see the wonders of the world abroad" (Wilkinson sig. N5r). [118]

Just as the opening words of Valentine broadly establish the detriment posed by excessive passion, Proteus's soliloquy at the conclusion of this conversation explicitly articulates how desire unsettles friendship and destabilizes the care of the self and others:

> He after honor hunts, I after love:
>
> He leaves his friends to dignify them more;
>
> I leave myself, my friends and all, for love.
>
> Thou, Julia, thou hast metamorphosed me:

[117] Carroll contends that "this opening speech reflects a common theme for young men in the early modern period: to form themselves by encountering the world of action, rather than becoming *shapeless* through *idleness* (which was particularly to be avoided." See, 137, f.n. 5.

[118] See Wilkinson sig. N5r. As Wilkinson clarifies, this proverb demonstrates that friendship "shoulde not stande if they [friends] were farre of[f], [as] this maye bee a departing and going out of the mindful frendship."

Made me neglect my studies, lose my time,

War with good counsel, set the world at nought;

Made with musing weak, heart sick with thought. (1.1.63-69)

For the first time in the play, the audience/reader is presented with a variation of forgetting oneself that stems from 'erratic care and concern for the other.' 'Disturbed by passion and affection' that Foucault sees as anathema to the general rule of caring for the self, Proteus forgets not only himself, his friends and family, but also his duty as a gentleman, owing to his passion for Julia. Indeed, he claims that desire for Julia moves him to seek "love" narrowly for himself rather than the "honor" after which Valentine "hunt[s]" in order to "dignify" his family and "friends." [119] Moreover, "love" causes Proteus to "leave myself, my friends and all" as well as shun the "studies" that are surely part of what Pantino sees as "worthy of his youth and nobleness of birth" and the foundation of his "preferment" as a young gentleman (1.3.33; 1.3.7).

Proteus likewise admits to practicing a form of self-love motivated by passion and selfishness rather than virtue and goodness directed toward his betterment; he stays behind not out of duty, but, as mentioned in his soliloquy, because of "love" for Julia. He likewise shuns the duties and responsibilities of a friend and young gentleman, and thus, spurns Epictetus's contention, iterated numerous times in Tudor friendship materials such as Churchyard's, that "affections [are]…a certain rule to measure duties by." Indeed, passion influences Proteus to perform duties contrary to his position as a young gentleman in the making: he "neglect[s] [his]

[119] As numerous scholars observe, in early modern culture, 'friend' can also mean family. See, for instance, Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (Harper & Row, 1979), 97. Also see, Bray, chapter three in *The Friend*; Gowing, 16.

studies [wastes or] lose[s] [his] time, / War[s] with good counsel, [and] set[s] the world at nought," or neglects his business.

As I discuss shortly, the play also represents "War with good counsel" as an inward affair. One of the more famous soliloquies of *Two Gentlemen*, where Proteus deliberates on whether he should abdicate his duty as a friend to Valentine, a lover to Julia, and to himself as a young would-be gentleman, aptly demonstrates how excessive passion generates inward anguish. Moreover, the soliloquy illuminates the "counsel of prudence," or reflecting on personal shortcomings and imperfections, that Foucault sees as a fundamental aspect of self-knowledge in caring for the self and Tudor friendship discourse as endemic to tempering unruly passion. First, however, it is important to briefly examine how the play employs other characters, most notably Valentine and Lance, in its representation of the pitfalls of erratic concern and care.

While Proteus's "inner struggle and fall form the heart of the dramatic conflict," as Sargent observes, to a limited degree, Shakespeare locates the same conflict generated by unruly emotions in other characters. Valentine, for instance, becomes insensible due to his passion for Silvia and displays the "follies" of a stupefied lover who inwardly struggles to control his emotions (2.1.35). Not only does Valentine exhibit signs of the inner anguish felt by the heartsick lover who tends, for instance, "to walk alone,…to sigh,…to weep,…to speak pulling," but he also recognizes the power that unruly emotions hold over his thoughts. "Love's a mighty lord," Valentine informs his friend, and it holds such powerful sway over him that "Now, no discourse, except it be of love; / Now can I break my fast, dine, sup, and sleep / Upon the very naked name of love" (2.4.139-40). In a poem to Silvia, Valentine compares the command of these emotions and thoughts to a perverse subjection where servants are granted more freedom than their master: "I, their king, that thither them importune, / Do curse the grace that with such

grace hath blessed them, / Because myself do want my servants' fortune" (2.1.19-23; 3.1.145-47). Valentine's disruptive passion, in a manner similar to Proteus's, contribute to his fickleness toward his friend and demonstrates Foucault's claim that forgetting oneself, due to being 'disturbed by passion and affection,' can likewise extend to forgetting others – indeed, he tells Proteus, "Forgive me that I do not dream on thee, / Because thou seest me dote upon my love" (2.4.170-71).

It would be remiss however to assume that the problem of the care of the self is limited in *Two Gentlemen* to the tension between male friendship and a female love interest. Indeed, the Lance-Crab subplot offers a nuanced depiction of how erratic concern generates anguish and encourages disproportionate care for the other. The subplot, operating primarily as comic-relief, and possibly composed as an "afterthought, imperfectly welded into a plot which originally employed only one comic servant," as Barton and other scholars contend, briefly relays the exploits of Proteus's page, Lance, and his dog, Crab (177). [120] Focusing mostly on Lance's emotional departure for Milan, discussion with Speed about his anonymous love, and chaotic dinner scene with Silvia and her retinue, the Lance-Crab subplot brings attention to the problem of the care of the self from a perspective that deviates from that offered by the titular gentlemen; if Valentine and Proteus serve as exempla of disproportionate selfishness due to disruptive emotions then Lance functions as the play's exemplum of excessive selflessness.

From his earliest appearance, when he reflects with the audience/reader on his emotional response to departing Verona for Milan, Shakespeare presents Lance as predisposed to excessive

[120] See, Beadle 13-14; Carroll, 125-7; Leech, xlviii; and MacFaul, 99. Numerous scholars contest the theory that the Lance-Crab subplot is an "afterthought." See, for instance, Brooks, 99, and Masten, *Two Gentlemen*, 275.

passion and irrational impulses. His great "weeping," which Lance characterizes as a "fault" common to his family – indeed, "all the kind of Lance's have this very fault" – contributes to the breakdown of Lance's social relationships, or at least their representation on stage (2.3.1-2). Similar to Proteus and Valentine, Lance's anguish results in a literal and comical forgetting of the self as he struggles, in the midst of what Fudge terms his "emotional confusion," to remember which objects and species stand-in for his family and himself:

> Nay, I'll show you the manner of it. This shoe is my father. No, this left shoe is my father. No, no, this left shoe is my mother. Nay, that cannot be so neither. Yes, it is so, it is so: it hath the worse sole….Now, sir, this staff is my sister; for, look you, she is as white as a lily and as small as a wand. This hat is Nan, our maid. I am the dog. No, the dog is himself, and I am the dog. O, the dog is me, and I am myself. (2.3.13-22)

In an attempt to remember his family, at least for the convenience of reenacting his emotional departure for the audience, Lance's disruptive emotions foster, as Masten notes, "a complicated mixing, and mixing up, of kinds and species (mother, father, sister, cat, Jew, stone, shoe, hat, maid, man, dog)" (*Two Gentlemen* 276).

In addition to Lance's lament on leaving home, his incessant tears throughout most of the play highlight a tendency to be overemotional. Not only does Lance "lay the dust with [his] tears" while Crab remains stoic and "all this while sheds not a tear nor speaks a word," but his later comment to Pantino further limns an inability to curb his emotions: "Why, man, if the river were dry, I am able to fill it with my tears; if the wind were down, I could drive the boats with my sighs (2.3.29-30; 2.3.49-51).

Crab's stoic indifference, embodied by Lance's infamous complaint that he "is a stone, a very pebblestone, and has no more pity in him than a dog," ruptures Lance's benevolence and fidelity due to the absence of reciprocity (2.3.9-10). It likewise depicts Lance as a fool, both literally and figuratively, for offering his humility and charity in a later scene despite that, as master, his "servant [has just]…play[ed] the cur with him" (4.4.1). Although Lance displays the most compelling example in *Two Gentlemen* of the 'good man' who virtuously practices fidelity, benevolence, and selflessness in friendship – core tenets Cicero and Tudor exempla see as endemic to 'faultless' friendship – his relationship with Crab is also one of the more destructive, since Lance forgets himself and his duty as the son venturing out into the world, as servant to Proteus, as well as lover to the unnamed milkmaid. [121] As a result of practicing excessive selflessness when he willingly suffers punishment on behalf of Crab no less than three times, Lance forgets to take care of himself, and in doing so, cancels any hope, security, or future with Crab. [122] This is compounded by the fact that Crab displays no empathy or interest in Lance, or, as Fudge contends, "interest in the world around him" (192). In the chapter conclusion, I return briefly to how issues of hope are entwined with the "problem of the care of the self and the care of others" in *Two Gentlemen*. For now, however, I turn my attention to the comedy's depiction of self-knowledge and self-love as part and parcel of caring for the self.

Although *Two Gentlemen* devotes most of the dramatic action to the conflict engendered

[121] Elyot's Titus and Gisippus as well as Edwards' Damon and Pythias are the most famous Tudor exempla of the selfless friend willing to be punished in order to spare the other pain.

[122] See 4.4.29-31. Also see Cesar Barber, *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy* (Princeton, 2012), 14.

by excessive passion, the play likewise suggests that deliberating on one's emotions and practicing what Foucault terms a "counsel of prudence" is perhaps the best way to minimize "erratic concern" for the self or other. The comedy largely stages the import of emotional awareness in the negative, that is, through moments where reflecting on emotions are altogether absent or severely limited. On the one hand, then, the play stages the import of emotional awareness by demonstrating how limited 'counsel' or reflection cultivates selflessness or selfishness. For instance, both Valentine and Lance's inward struggles are kept at arm's length from the audience/reader; we never gain direct access to their thoughts or inward counsel and are only privy to what they willingly narrate. On the other hand, this presentation is in contrast to Proteus, who Shakespeare positions as the central figure of the text through numerous soliloquies and monologues devoted to his inward struggle. Although Proteus fails remarkably at tempering his passion for most of the play, it is nonetheless important to recognize how he consistently strives to practice what Foucault terms the "curative and therapeutic function" of caring for the self. For instance, unlike Lance and Valentine, Proteus does reflect on his emotions and considers how they might impact others if he is unable to gain "soverainte of suche lustes," to quote Cicero. His ability for reflection, however elementary it appears for most of the play, also lends itself to his eventual 'redemption,' however troubled that word may appear to moderns in the context of the play's ending.

Two Gentlemen readily underscores the import of reflection and emotional awareness in friendship through numerous soliloquies, monologues, and duologues. On a general level, Shakespeare often links these speeches to instances where the self deliberates internally, with the audience, or another character, on prevailing terms of friendship. For instance, in his earliest monologue, Lance deliberates with the audience on similitude in friendship and its relation to the

self: “I am the dog. No, the dog is himself, and I am the dog. O, the dog is me, and I am myself” (2.3.21-2). Regardless of his limited reflection, Lance’s stymied attempt at separating himself from Crab – illustrated through the mangled “I am the dog. No, the dog is himself”– foreshadows a tendency to abdicate his own desires in favor of his companion’s. As this monologue and other instances, such as the dinner scene monologue in Act 4 scene 4, demonstrate, Lance’s penchant for excessive affection arise from his undisciplined emotion – indeed, he begins this soliloquy by noting how “all the kind of Lances have this very fault” of being overemotional and throughout the play his frequent tears readily attest to the veracity of his observation (2.3.1-2).

Characters also use interior speech, along with limited conversations with others, to reflect on how their emotions are tethered to friendship practices and, in numerous instances, how their passions impact others. For example, Proteus’s soliloquy on desire considers how his infatuation with Silvia affects his friend, Valentine, beloved, Julia, and himself:

> To leave my Julia shall I be foresworn;
>
> To love fair Silvia shall I be forsworn;
>
> To wrong my friend, I shall be much forsworn….
>
> If I keep them, I needs must lose myself.
>
> If I lose them, thus find I by their loss,
>
> For Valentine, myself, for Julia, Silvia.
>
> I to myself am dearer than a friend. (2.6.1-3 & 20-3)

Proteus begins his soliloquy by reflecting on the repercussions of forgetting his duty as a lover, friend, and young gentleman. Indeed, he notes that if he chooses infidelity to Julia and Valentine, he will violate his oath as a lover and friend and be “foresworn,” or as Carroll notes, “guilty of perjury” (197 f.n. 3). However, although he demonstrates an awareness of the potential

repercussions his desire may have on others, as his ability to entertain opposing ideas such as "If I keep them,… / If I lose them" illustrate, a surfeit of passion nonetheless motivates his contemplation and eventual actualization of selfishness. Similar to Lance, Proteus also observes, how excessive passion governs his actions: "that power [i.e., love] which gave me first my oath / Provokes me to this threefold perjury" (2.6.3-4). The prominence of the first person pronoun in his soliloquy, coupled with the conclusion that "I to myself am dearer than a friend," foreshadows his later machinations against Valentine and likewise illuminates the failure of self-knowledge in this instance to strengthen ethical self-love; Proteus practices self-love not to better himself as a 'good man,' but in order to selfishly pursue his desires.

Proteus's conclusion "I to myself am dearer than a friend," is indicative of more than just selfishness; it also suggests the problematic relation between a self and a friend. His declaration, in addition to illuminating the dialectical tension between self and other, demonstrates a self-consciousness about his status as a subject or, to borrow a phrase from Donald Hall, consideration of "the question of how and from where identity arises [and] to what extent it is understandable" (3). In this instance, Proteus's recognition that identity arises from his status as a desiring subject also underscores how the self is tethered to, or as he envisions it, compromised by, his friendship with Valentine. "If I keep them [Valentine and Silvia], I needs must lose myself," further limns the conundrum arising from duty to the friend and to the self. This duty to the self, however, is presented as requiring a dear payment; the detachment or separation from his friend. Indeed, Proteus's claim that he can only "find" himself through the loss of his friend is eloquently stated as "I cannot now prove constant to myself / Without some treachery used to Valentine" (2.6.31-32). In choosing to "prove constant to [him]self" rather than his friend, Proteus demonstrates how the problem of the care of the self is deeply rooted in the problem of

one's connection and distinction from the friend. Indeed, this conundrum, the tension between understanding and forming the self as both an individual and a friend, or how one's subjectivity is frequently perceived as compromised by friendship, drives the narrative of *Two Gentlemen*.

Proteus's ability to recognize his selfishness, coupled with an earlier reflection on how he will strive to be a 'good man' and, "If I can check my erring love, I will," depicts an inward struggle to improve through self-knowledge (2.4.210). However weak his effort for betterment may be across the play – and it is considerably feeble – *Two Gentlemen* nonetheless suggests that his redemption in the dénouement, when Proteus becomes cognizant of his selfishness after Valentine's rebuke, is made possible by his tendency for self-reflection. Indeed, immediately following his attempted rape of Silvia, and Valentine's claim that "The private wound is deepest," Proteus confesses to Valentine about forgetting his duty as a friend (5.4.71):

> My shame and guilt confounds me.
> Forgive me, Valentine; if hearty sorrow
> Be sufficient ransom for offence,
> I tender't here. I do as truly suffer
> As e'er I did commit. (5.4.73-77)

While Proteus claims to be engulfed or "confound[ed]" by "shame and guilt," he contends to inwardly experience a "hearty sorrow." He likewise claims that the anguish generated by his friend's rebuke is just as bad, if not worse, than the actual attempted rape – "I do as truly suffer / As e'er I did commit." Proteus's contrition, however suspect it may be that he employs the "gentle spirit of moving words" only to appease Valentine, nonetheless calls attention to how the care of the self is tethered in the play to the care of others (5.4.55). I thus briefly turn to how the dénouement of the comedy demonstrates how taking care of the self, explicitly in terms of

curbing inward passion and anguish, allows one to take care of others.

The final scene of *Two Gentlemen*, long seen as one of the more problematic endings in the Shakespeare corpus, if not the most troublesome, focuses on how Valentine's ire with Proteus swiftly turns to forgiveness once his friend apologizes for rape. This moment takes on an even more problematic tone when Valentine's compassion is followed by 'giving' Silvia to his friend. Immediately following Proteus's reflection on "guilt and shame," noted above, which results in his contrition, Valentine remarks:

> Then I am paid,
> And once again I do receive thee honest.
> Who by repentance is not satisfied
> Is nor of heaven nor earth. For these are pleased;
> By penitence th' Eternal's wrath's appeased.
> And that my love may appear plain and free,
> All that was mine in Silvia I give thee. (5.4.77-83)

As noted by Michael Dobson, what may seem like a perversion to the modern audience/reader would be received by Shakespeare's contemporaries as "the romantic celebration of male friendship over love." Camille Wells Slight likewise contends that, to a Tudor audience/reader, "Valentine's offer to give up Silvia to Proteus is not boorish but generous, the magnanimous sacrifice of friendship" (116). This estimation by Dobson and Slight is evident in Valentine's immediate reaction to Proteus; rather than reproach his friend for intending to commit such a heinous act, he instead accuses him of being a "friend of an ill fashion! / Thou common friend, that's without faith or love" (5.4.61-2).

Equally germane to the dénouement is how it demonstrates that caring for the self simultaneously means caring for others. It must be noted, however, that 'others' in early modern theories of friendship refers exclusively to men – women were traditionally excluded as subjects capable of friendship, since, according to Montaigne, "the ordinary sufficiency of women cannot answer this conference or communication [i.e., friendship]…nor seem their minds strong enough to endure the pulling of a knot so hard, so fast, and so durable." While early modern literature pushes back against such essentialist claims of friendship and caring for the self – which I explore in my final chapter on the poetry of Aemilia Lanyer – this gesture is mostly absent from *Two Gentlemen*. Although the play presents the relationship between Julia and her servant, Lucetta, as an approximation of friendship, it is a relationship rendered unstable by Julia, "wayward [due to her]…foolish love" for Proteus (1.2.57).

The contention of Foucault and Tudor friendship materials that properly taking care of the self is essential for the health of the community, as I have demonstrated throughout, hinges primarily on one's ability to control unruly emotions and reconcile the tension between caring for the self and others. The ending of *Two Gentlemen* suggests that Proteus's redemption is the result of his ability to be emotionally aware and to reflect on how his emotions limn his duties to a wider community. Caring for the self thus reveals how the affective and political dimensions of friendship, similar to the self and other, are inextricably bound. Indeed, as Hutter claims in his discussion of "self-friendship" in both classical thought and industrialized societies, achieving inward concord and resolving one's emotional distress is perceived in both "Platonic-Aristotelian" and "Stoic-Epicurean" models as "require[ing] a 'political' ordering" (*Virtue* 132; 134). Not only does this "'political' ordering" entail orientating one's emotions to a dominant mode of thought, such as, virtue or goodness, but it also requires one to achieve sovereignty or

mastery over their emotions. However, as Hutter and Thomas Heilke persuasively contend, such an "ordering" should not be construed as proof that friendship arises from politics; rather, it illuminates how "[p]olitics does not 'enable' friendship…friendship *begets* politics" (225).

Proteus's remark on the fallibility of man's mind and emotions, "were man / But constant, he were perfect," speaks to Hutter's claim and likewise echoes Elyot's entry on "Sapience" in *The bankette:*

> A temperate and moderate personne, n[e]des must be constant, he that is constant, is quiete of minde, he that is quiete, hath n[o] vexacion, and consequently no greefe or disease: and all these thinges no perteine to a wise man wherfore it foloweth, no griefe or disease may be in a wise man.

This aphorism, which Elyot attributes to "Tullius," emphasizes how a "temperate" mindfulness cultivates a "quiete of minde" free from anguish, "vexacion," and "greefe or disease." This is similar to the emphasis in Foucault and Tudor friendship materials on learning how to fashion oneself a 'good man.' Indeed, Foucault claims that mental anguish is radically diminished when one learns mindfulness of disproportionate "pleasures, desires, sorrows, fears, greed, stupidity." Cicero echoes this through his contention that the ability for one to "gete the soverainte of such lustes" that encourage selfishness and unethical self-love proves to be the foundation of fashioning the self a 'good man.'

As a result of Proteus gaining "soverainte of such lustes" that disturbed his friendship with Valentine as well as development of a gentleman in the making, the play closes with the two friends making amends. Equally important, however, is the communal celebration that Valentine promises will result in the marriages of each friend to his beloved: "our day of marriage shall be yours, / One feast, one house, one mutual happiness" (5.4.170-1).

"The good hope that is to come"

If Lance's selflessness for Crab forms one of the more moving moments in *Two Gentlemen*, as scholars often contend, it also presents one of the more problematic instances when read against Tudor friendship discourse. While Ciceronian accounts of friendship put great stock in the absence of reciprocity, insofar as it renders self-abnegation all the more admirable, they likewise stress the need for reciprocity due to the hope that it fosters the continuation of friendship into the unforeseen future. Indeed, in *De amicitia* Cicero argues that reciprocity does matter because without it, friendship cannot exist: "where freendshippe hath in it manie and greate commoditees, yet this exceedeth al the rest, that she foreco[m]fortes us, with the good hope that is to come" (Harington sig. L1v). In locating the problem of the care of the self in the Lance-Crab subplot as well as the friendship between Valentine and Proteus, the play can be read as an attempt to address the conundrum of balancing selfishness and selflessness and also maintaining hope of developing as a self and a friend.

While this chapter demonstrated how Tudor friendship discourse perceives caring for the self as a series of inward actions, such as emotional awareness tethered to what Foucault terms a "counsel of prudence," one wonders how these disparate materials simultaneously explore how the self convinces the other to take care of himself (*Hermeneutics* 35). The obligation of the friend to admonish the other in order that he learn to take care of himself proves a central claim in friendship discourse: friends must, to quote Plutarch, "shew themselves…bolde to speake their minds and to finde fault, which it one of the best and surest marks of true friendship"(84). However, a general concern of the potential of "bolde" speech to do more harm than good emerges in discussions of frank speech between friends. Rogers notes how even "good intent…[may] cause infinite hurtes" when one boldly speaks their mind to the friend: "Rashe

counsaile, although sometime it maye have good intent,…hath evill success and is the cause of infinite hurtes both private and publike" (Rogers sig. N4r). John Heywood, in his 1556 allegorical poem *The Spider and the Flie*, echoes this concern through his contention that friends tend to be more dishonest with one another for fear of "causing infinite hurtes." Indeed, according to Heywood: "No friende, with friende (in friendship) will be plaine. /… / Love, to tell trewth, doth ofte for love refraine, /… / Loue, lockth in trewth, least trewth might friend{is} displease" (sig. A4r).

As I demonstrate in the next chapter, early modern friendship discourse frequently presents a novel way to minimize "infinite hurtes" or "displease[ure] while simultaneously allowing the friend to "bold[ly]…speak their minde." 'Tactful antagonism,' that is, provoking the other to become self-conscious and critical by deliberately angering them, proves one of the best ways to convince the other to take care of himself. Foucault's lectures on frank speech or *parrhēsia* help illuminate how the care of the self in early modern friendship discourse is often perceived as reliant on the antagonism of others. The "ethics of anger," a provocative idea Foucault raises but never elaborates in his 1983 Berkeley and 1984 Collège lectures on frank speech, proves helpful in this investigation, as does the 'Englished' translation of Plutarch's essay on flattery and friendship, as well as Shakespeare's *King Lear*, a lengthy meditation, as I read it, on frank speech and 'tactful antagonism' (375). As a careful consideration of these texts indicate, questions of how to use frank speech in order to ethically anger the other are linked to period questions of how to cultivate and deploy one's moral conscience for the benefit of the self and commonwealth. As Thomas Lever notes, in a 1550 sermon, "false crafty flatterers" hinder the development of self-knowledge, prove detrimental to the cultivation of one's *ethos* and, more

generally, "contrarye to that reverent zele and faithful love towards God, the king, and the co[m]men wealth:"

> if ye use the servise, or hear the advise of false crafty flatterers, ye shall therewith be so blinded that ye can neither perceive by your selves, nor beleve when as ye be plainely and faithfully tolde, that manye of your owne doinges, comming of mans freyltye, do tend muche unto the displeasure of God, dishonour of the kinge, and discredit of your selves, being moste contrarye to that reverent zele and faithful loue towards God, the king, and the co[m]men wealth, which zeleand love god of hys goodnes hath grafted in your hartes, and the…praise of flatterers, laboreth to deface, pervert and destroye" (sig. A6v).

Chapter Three: "Speak what we feel, not what we ought to say": Frank Speech and Tactful Antagonism in *King Lear*

Introduction: "give no credence to [an]other"

Thomas Lever, in a sermon from 1550, decries how self-interest and flattery, with the aid of Satan, contribute to the dissolution of communal cohesion and charity: "lest that Satan banishing al faithful Christians, which should and wold provide to helpe one an other, do fil this realme ful of crafty flatterers, which can and will deceive, begile, and spoile one another" (sig. A2v). In a similar vein, Morison construes the flatter as one of the most "pernitiouse" or malevolent forces in the commonwealth due to the havoc it inflicts on both individuals and communities (sig. D3r). As Morison contends, "[a]mong the wilde beastes, there is none more pernitiouse then envie; among the tame, none soo hurtfull as flattery" (sig. D3r). Hugh Latimer likewise identifies the "malitious hartes" of the flatterer as perilous to the commonwealth; indeed, according to Latimer, there is "no greater mischie[f]es in the commune wealthe then these flatterers" (sig. N4r). Far from simply decrying the threat posed to the stability of the commonwealth, these texts frequently suggest an anodyne to flattery: self-knowledge. Morison, paraphrasing Seneca, claims the ability "to know what thou art" allows one to be receptive to and simultaneously skeptical of the counsel of others: "[w]ithin thy selfe, behold wel thy selfe, & to know what thou art, give no credence to other" (sig. T2r). Lever explicates Morison's advice of when to be receptive and skeptical by noting the emotional reaction generated by the counsel of a friend versus the flatterer; the counsel of a true friend frequently angers the other and causes him to "be greved because his sore is touched" (sig. C6r). Lever continues by juxtaposing anger with the "deceitefull kisses of the hater" and flatterer:

> But & if any man be greved because his sore is touched, let him remember the sayinge of the wise man: *Meliora sunt uulnera di|ligentis, quam fraudulenta oscula odientis:* the woundes of the lover be better then the deceitefull kisses of the hater. For the woundes whiche the frinde openeth, be to le[t] olde sores: and the disceitfull kisses of the enemies be to make newe woundes. I speake plainelye to open the [w]ounde, [t]o roote oute and heale the disease…whiche wold be to the wounded and to every man, c[o]mfort. (sig. C6r)

While the previous chapter showed how Tudor friendship discourse perceives caring for the self as a series of inward actions and dialectical tensions, such as emotional awareness tethered to what Foucault terms a "counsel of prudence," the current discussion demonstrates how these disparate materials also contend that this self-consciousness engenders an ability to take care of others (*Hermeneutics* 35). The imbrication of self and other, particularly as regards caring for the self in a manner that will "produce or induce behavior through which one will actually be able to take care of others" has already been tangentially introduced through the discussion of Foucault's lectures on the care of the self in the previous chapter (*Hermeneutics* 198). In a similar manner, the previous chapter gestured toward how canonical texts of Tudor friendship discourse, such as Cicero's *De amicitia* and late-Tudor pamphlets on friendship, echo this sentiment through the contention that one must first cultivate an ethical self-love in order to ethically love others – a sentiment translated by John Tiptoft in his 1484 edition of *De amicitia* as "a man [must] first make him self a good man and thenne seke another like him self." As the previous discussion of Shakespeare's *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* demonstrated, the need to balance self-regard and self-abnegation in friendship underscores the dialectical tension encountered by one's position as a self and a friend. The current chapter approaches this tension

from the perspective of frank speech and considers how the friend employs it in order to stress that the other must take care of himself. Similar to the dialectical tension discussed in chapter two, chapter three examines how friendship materials stress that candid or 'plaine' speech and criticism simultaneously be tempered with rhetoric and tact so as to increase the probability that the other will take care of himself while also allowing for one to speak his conscience. While terms such as 'candid', 'plaine', and 'frank' suggest a form of speech that is transparent and unmediated by culture, and 'rhetoric' or 'tact' an instrumental use of language employed mostly for selfish gain, representations of frank speech between friends in early modern culture frequently stress the need to judiciously craft a verbal articulation of one's conscience or *ethos* that persuasively encourages the other to realize the folly or errors of his way.

In order to adequately elaborate this claim, as well as demonstrate its import to the care of the self in early modern friendship discourse, I first discuss Foucault's Berkeley and Collège lectures on frank speech. Toward the end of the 1982 lectures on caring for the self discussed in the previous chapter, Foucault gestures toward specific actions one should employ in the care of others. Through his examination of *parrhēsia* in subsequent lectures at Berkeley in the fall of 1983 and the Collège de France in the spring of 1983 and 1984, he significantly expands on how one can help the other realize the need to work on his ethical being. As an act that teaches others how to properly care for themselves, *parrhēsia* "aims to transform the mode of being of its interlocutor in order that he learns to take care of himself correctly" (*Courage* 348). As I show in the second and third sections, Foucault's 1983-84 lectures on *parrhēsia* illuminate how the care of the self in early modern friendship discourse is often perceived as reliant on the antagonism of others. Indeed, early modern friendship discourse frequently presents caring for the self as readily accomplished through the use of tactful antagonism, that is, provoking the other to

become self-conscious and critical by deliberately angering him. The second section examines a central text in early modern friendship discourse and discussions of *parrhēsia*: Plutarch's "How to Tell a Flatterer From a Friend," translated into English by Philemon Holland in 1603 as "How a man may discerne a flatterer from a friend." [123] Characterized by Troels Engberg-Pedersen as a "technical analysis of παρρησία [*parrhēsia*] or frank criticism…as it coheres with friendship and flattery," "How to Tell a Flatterer From a Friend," I argue, instructs one how to use tactful antagonism in order to admonish and convince the friend to take care of himself, or, as Plutarch contends, properly teaches how "one ought to hurt a friend only to help him" (62; Babbitt 55D). [124] As I demonstrate below, tactful antagonism, like the tactful *parrhēsia* discussed by Foucault and Plutarch, is often employed in an attempt to convince the other to care for the self. Likewise, such antagonism is portrayed as abiding by a discernible ethics. The third section examines *parrhēsia* and the care of the self in Shakespeare's tragedy *King Lear*. As a play concerned with frank speech, among other things, *King Lear* uses tactful antagonism in order to illuminate how caring for the self involves both an ethics of practice and a practice of developing an *ethos*. Indeed, the figures of Cordelia, Kent, and the Fool demonstrate that speaking frankly entails a knowledge of how to tactfully chastise the other, while King Lear and Gloucester demonstrate

[123] Robert C. Evans contends that Holland's essay probably circulated in manuscript several years prior to 1603 (3-5). See "Flattery in Shakespeare's *Othello*: The Relevance of Plutarch and Sir Thomas Elyot." *Comparative Drama* 35.1 (2001): 1-41.

[124] See Shannon, 191. According to Shannon, Plutarch's treatise is "a practical, how-to manual [with] and emphasis on skills and techniques." Unless noted, modernized citations of "How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend" refer to Babbitt's *Loeb* edition. For ease of cross-reference with other modern translations, I cite the text according to section number and paragraph letter.

how the goal of this speech is to make the other aware of the need to care for himself. *Parrhēsia* is thus a pivotal part of self-knowledge explored in earlier chapters, insofar as it lends itself to the formation of the moral and political subject. While chapter one located self-knowledge in the humanist emphasis on *nosce teipsum*, most notably, the belief that it forms the basis of one's realization that he has a moral and political identity, the second chapter examined how this knowledge, through the care of the self, must be realized through continual practice. Chapter two likewise demonstrated how practice is tethered to one's realization that moral and political identities are tethered to communal duties. The current chapter continues this narrative thread by showing how frank speech cements one's moral and political identity (that is, knowledge and care of the self) through further development of the conscience, most notably by drawing attention to one's *ethos* as well as attempting to foist this upon the other through an emphasis that he "learns to take care of himself correctly."

Scholarship has not completely overlooked frank speech in early modern literature and culture, as demonstrated by studies devoted exclusively to the topic, such as those of Diane Parkin-Speer and David Colclough, as well as examinations of *parrhēsia* in more general contexts, such as Andrew McRae's discussion of satire in early-Stuart culture or Martin Dzelzainis's examination of gender in the poetry of Andrew Marvell. [125] Both Parkin-Speer and Colclough, for instance, examine a similar corpus of Tudor rhetorics and consider how the era perceives frank speech along with the corresponding political and social ramifications of this

[125] See, McRae, *Literature, Satire, and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge, 2004), 83-152; Dzelzainis, "Truth-telling and Gender in Andrew Marvell's *The Third Advice to a Painter*" in Jennifer Richards and Alison Thorne *Rhetoric, Women and Politics in Early Modern England* (Routledge, 2007), 111-128.

perception. Their examinations of Thomas Wilson's *The Arte of Rhetorique* (1553), Fraunce Abraham's *Arcadian Rhetorike* (1588), Henry Peacham's *The Garden of Eloquence* (1577), and George Puttenham's *Arte of English Poesie* (1589), however, yield different results. Indeed, for Parkin-Speer, discussions of *parrhēsia*, also referred to during the period as "free speech" or speech that is "licentious" or spoken with "liberty," "candor," and "boldness," frequently emphasize ethical and moral duties over rhetorical applications (66-67). [126] Accordingly, Parkin-Speer sees the frankness of *parrhēsia*, particularly the belief in "freedom of speech as duty and right," as greatly influencing the era's political culture, as evinced by one of its early proponents, Sir Thomas More, who "claim[s] [it] as first right in Parliament" (72). In a similar vein, she claims that *parrhēsia* becomes so enmeshed in early modern culture that it eventually ushers in the English Civil War – indeed, in Parkin-Speer's historical narrative, "the concept of the freedom of speech current in the Puritan Revolution originates in the sixteenth century parliaments, rhetorics, and theological works" (65).

Colclough resists reading early modern *parrhēsia* as "uncover[ing] a teleology of the right of free speech in a recognizable form," and focuses instead on the social and political conundrums arising from representations of frank speech in early modern rhetorics (15). For Colclough, representing a form of speech "linked so easily to democratic or republican politics" poses a "potential danger to rigid social stratification" of the era – a sentiment echoed by Stella Achilleos in her examination of *parrhēsia* and friendship in *The Essays* of Francis Bacon (1625)

[126] See Shannon, 51. "Elyot intermittently uses the phrase 'liberty of speech'; Holland uses it countless times" in addition to phrases such as "liberty of speech," "speaking freely," and "free speaking."

(41). [127] He contends that as an anodyne to this anxiety, early modern rhetorical handbooks typically present frank speech in one of two ways: as "boldness of speech" or as an "apology for speaking out, rather than the act of speaking out" itself (41). In the first instance, which, according to Colclough, few handbooks employ, frank speech is seen as speaking out to a person believed to be beyond reproach, and it is here that the risk of contesting social stratification primarily occurs. The latter instance of presenting frank speech as an "apology," however, renders it fairly innocuous in that it becomes a rhetorical procedure which is "more susceptible to intelligible explanation than the figures of thought," such as boldness of speech, since "a writer can easily suggest an example or typical formulation" (46).

Though their theses may be questionable (particularly, the *telos* Parkin-Speer accords to *parrhēsia*), a closer examination of sixteenth-century rhetorics demonstrates a period perception of frank speech as both an ethical obligation to freely speak one's conscience and an expression of regret for overstepping social boundaries. Thomas Wilson, a Protestant who fled to the Continent upon the accession of Mary, characterizes "Frenesse of speache" in his 1553 *The art of rhetorique* as a moment:

> when wee speake boldely, & without feare, even to the proudest of them, whatsoever we please, or have list to speake. Diogenes herein did excel, and feared no man when he sawe just cause to saie his mynde. This worlde wanteth suche as he was, and hath over many suche, as never honest ma[n] was, that is to say, flatterers, fawners, and southers of mennes saiynges. (sig. Dd2v)

[127] According to Achilleos, Bacon's suggestion that the friend is a counselor both situates friendship and frank speech in the "context of hierarchal relationships of patronage" and potentially disrupts the social order since supposed social inferiors chastise those believed to be infallible or beyond reproach (643). Also see Shannon, 185-222.

Abraham Fraunce (beneficiary of Sidney and admirer of Spenser), in *The Arcadian rhetorike* likewise depicts "libertie of speach" as a moral obligation where one courageously and frankly speaks to one "to whome otherwise wee owe dutie and reverence": "Licence also & libertie of speach seemeth to be a certaine exclamation; when in the presence of those to whome otherwise wee owe dutie and reverence, wee speake boldly and confidently" (sig E4v). In both instances, frank speech is perceived as an opportunity or "just cause" for unapologetic criticism; one can "boldly and confidently" speak their conscience and say "whatsoever [they] please, or have list to speake". The moral fortitude and conviction required to 'speak one's mind,' at least according to Wilson, is increasingly rare in a world full of "flatterers, fawners, and southers [i.e., soothers]", and it is this rarity that buttresses the power and moral value of frank speech.

While these texts depict frank speech as an external manifestation of one's conscience, handbooks such as the senior Henry Peacham's *The garden of eloquence* or George Puttenham's *The arte of english poesie* characterize *parrhēsia* as a rhetorical maneuver expressing regret for speaking out of turn or place. In his definition of "Parrhesia", the curate Peacham emphasizes the remorse or contrition one should express for their "boldenesse": "Parrhesia, when speaking before them whome we ought to reverence and feare, & having something to say, which either toucheth th[em]selves, or their friends so, desire them to pardon our boldenesse" (sig. M2v-M3r). The 1593 edition places an even greater emphasis on the explanatory element of *parrhēsia*, all the while downplaying the moral significance of speaking frankly: "Parrhesia is a forme of speech by which the Orator speaking before those whom he feareth, or ought to reverence,…preventeth the displeasure and offence that might be taken, as by craving pardon afore hand, and by shewing the necessitie of free speech in that behalfe, or by some other like forme of humble submission and modest insinuation" (sig. R1r). Puttenham places an equal

emphasis on "bespeak[ing] pardon before hand" in his discussion of "Parsia," and similar to Peacham, underscores the rhetorical and instrumental maneuvering necessary in order to minimize offence: "The fine and subtill perswader when his intent is to sting his adversary, or els to declare his mind in broad and liberal speeches, which might breede offence or scandal, he will seeme to bepeake pardon before hand, whereby his licentiousness may be the better borne withall" (sig. Cc1v).

Recent studies on early modern friendship also consider how the era's discourse intersects with frank speech and rhetoric. Such a focus concentrates, first and foremost, on the figure of the flatterer, characterized by Sir Thomas More in his Latin poem, "On a False Friend," as "one's worst enemy who in the guise of a friend deceitfully works mischief by unsuspected guile" (194). Echoing More, Laurie Shannon observes how the era's friendship materials depict the flatterer as one who disrupts or "disables…friendship's unity" by "[d]irectly disjoining truth and language" (47). Through the use of rhetoric, the flatterer adroitly exploits one's self-love to his own advantage and his opinions and loyalties shift depending on the mood of the other. He is thus chameleon-like and, as Wendy Olmsted notes, frequently portrayed as "hard to see, for he is, above all, changeable, having no anchor in virtue" ("Plainness" 182).

In addition to flattery, Shannon and Olmsted demonstrate how the era's friendship discourse keenly recognizes the frequent need to fashion frank speech for social, political, and ethical purposes. Different from the flatterer who uses rhetoric, according to Olmsted, to "enslave others," or the humanist scholar who uses it to achieve upward mobility, as Alan Stewart claims, fashioned speech is frequently depicted, as it is in Sidney's *The New Arcadia*, as

a way in which "virtuous persons govern themselves and others by persuasion." [128] Shannon affirms Olmsted's contention through a reading of Francis Bacon's "Of Counsel" and "Of Friendship" (1612) as well as Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*. As she contends, Bacon and Shakespeare demonstrate "the degree to which frank, truthful speech alone is inadequate to fully perform th[e] office" of friendship; rather, the friend must learn to practice the "craft" of frank speech sensibly and ethically and not be afraid to employ rhetoric when necessary (190). Indeed, according to Shannon, "friendship's practical modalities of speech," like the polity discussed by Bacon, is a "science or craft" necessary for its maintenance (190; 188). The "friend, as a prudential practitioner," must cultivate a "practice of judging cases, timeliness, circumstances, and the probabilities of efficacy" when choosing to speak frankly (191-2). Olmsted, in another text on frank speech and friendship, examines how friendship material, as well as a tragedy such as Shakespeare's *King Lear*, address the potential failure of frank and "plain speech" ("Plainness" 181). According to Olmstead, such a failure necessitates the use of unethical means, such as disguise or false speech, in order to maintain one's ethical bond to the friend. Olmsted contends that in a text such as *King Lear*, "friendship [i]s [often perceived as] a social instrument adaptable to the cultivation of ethical friendships" (181). Building on Olmsted's essay, I demonstrate how antagonizing and deliberately angering the friend is another strategy that Tudor and early-Stuart friendship discourse and Shakespeare's tragedy suggest should be employed in the maintenance of ethical bonds – according to these texts, one angers the friend in order to

[128] See Stewart, *Close Readers: Humanism and Sodomy in Early Modern England* (Princeton, 1997). Also see Lorna Hutson, *The Usurer's Daughter: Male Friendship and Fictions of Women in Sixteenth-Century England* (Routledge, 1994), as well as her "Afterword" in Lochman, 239-48.

encourage them to take care of the self. Moreover, as Plutarch and Foucault demonstrate, tactful *parrhēsia* is not so much an outright failure of frank and "plain speech" as it is a fundamental component of the *tekhne* of *parrhēsia* – indeed, Plutarch contends that "it is necessary [for the friend] to treat frankness as a fine art," and Holland construes this as the need for one to employ, among other things, "great discretion and circumspection…in making remonstrances & speaking freely unto friends" (74D; sig. K4v).[129]

In addition to Olmsted's essay, Scott Francis's astute study of "friendly antagonism" in Montaigne and early modern French translations of Plutarch help clarify the "ethics of anger" glossed by Foucault. It also profoundly informs my reading of tactful antagonism in early modern friendship discourse and Shakespeare's *King Lear*. Francis, reading Montaigne's "Of the disadvantage of greatness" and "Of the art of discussion" (c. 1585-88) as chapters unified by Plutarch's treatise on flattery and frank speech, contends that the French skeptic outlines "an ethics of antagonism with repercussions for both friendship and politics" (124). Unlike the flatterer, who employs false speech for "simple adulation" or a superficial "frankness which is not genuine or beneficial,…antagonistic friendship may be recognized by the pain it causes for the sake of the truth; the truth hurts, but sometimes, a friend must hurt a friend in order to help him" (124). In terms of politics, Francis claims that "an ethics of antagonism" is best exemplified through the sovereign-counselor relationship where one learns either how to receive frank criticism, as is the case of the ruler "no one ever challenge[s]…in word or deed," or how best to

[129] Holland clarifies that this "discretion and circumspection" requires knowledge of " how much it is the greater and stronger remedie that friendship can use, and hath more need to be used in time and place convenient, and more wisely to be tempered with a meane and mediocrity."

deliver it, as is the case with his counselor or the one in the precarious situation of challenging the sovereign (125). This latter element, the "repercussions" of "friendly antagonism" on sixteenth-century French politics, is of chief concern to Francis, who examines Montaigne's two essays for how they query the susceptibility of the powerful to self-love and flattery as well as resistance to frank speech and guidance – a query which Francis reads as Montaigne's critique of Henry III of France.

Francis's emphasis on the biographical aspect of Montaigne's life, most notably, Henry III's request that he join him as an advisor, while illuminating, overshadows an examination of the "repercussions" of "friendly antagonism" as regards both the era's friendship discourse and politics (128). While Francis narrowly views the politics of "friendly antagonism" as that which pertains to the sovereign and his or her counselor, and thus elides, labor, household, or religious relationships in a broader context, he also marginalizes the "repercussions" to France's friendship discourse in the sixteenth-century. For instance, he does not account for how "friendly antagonism" complicates the theoretically elegant claims of friendship as a quasi-utopia, where, to quote another essay by Montaigne, "Of friendship," there is a "generall & universall heat, and equally tempered, a constant and setled heat, all pleasure and smoothnes, that hath no pricking or stinging in it." In a similar vein, Francis refrains from considering at length how "friendly antagonism" ruptures the belief in the friend as an alter ego, where, to quote Montaigne once again, a "complete fusion of…wills" occurs. It would benefit a study of early modern friendship discourse to consider how it depicts frank speech and responds to the idea of "friendly antagonism." Indeed, how is the idea of one "who venture[s] to criticize" and anger the friend received in Tudor and early-Stuart friendship materials? Is it, as Montaigne claims, "a remarkable act of friendship," or is it perceived as insidious and unbecoming of the friend? Is it

perhaps a hybrid of these two positions? How do these materials respond to Plutarch's advice that one recognize that speaking frankly is always bound to a rhetorical situation where one must tactfully admonish the friend? Is this advice construed as unnecessarily making "concessions to self-love," as Francis claims in his reading of this treatise, or is it perceived, as Plutarch contends, as aiding in self-knowledge and improvement of the other (125)? More important, how does the idea of "friendly antagonism," and more specifically tactful antagonism, manifest in discussions of caring for the self and others in early modern English literature and culture, in terms of friendship and the maintenances of one's conscience?

Parrhēsia and "the art of life": Foucault at Berkeley and the Collège de France

While Foucault focuses on clarifying in the 1982 spring lectures how caring for the self contributes to the formation of the ethical subject, toward the end of the year, he begins to gesture toward specific actions that one should employ in the care of others. In subsequent lectures at Berkeley in the fall of 1983 and the Collège de France in the spring of 1983 and 1984 he significantly expands on this idea of how one can help the other realize the need to work on his moral being. Published posthumously as *Fearless Speech, The Government of Self and Others,* and *The Courage of Truth* respectively, Foucault's emphasis on *parrhēsia,* or 'frank' and 'free speech,' illuminates his earlier claims from spring 1982 that caring for the self involves "an attitude towards the self, others, and world" (*Hermeneutics* 10). Indeed, the care of the self discussed in the 1982 lectures is also, in the Berkeley and later Collège lectures, to borrow a quote from Frédéric Gros, "a care for truth-telling, which calls for courage, and especially a care for the world and for others" (*Courage* 349). As Foucault claims in *The Courage of Truth*, according to Socratic and other philosophical schools, most notably, Platonism, Epicureanism, and Stoicism, *parrhēsia* is an attempt at "truth-telling whose final objective and constant concern

[i]s to teach men to take care of themselves" (110). As an act that teaches others how to properly care for the self, *parrhēsia* "aims to transform the mode of being of its interlocutor in order that he learns to take care of himself correctly" (348).

Toward the end of the 1982 lectures, Foucault broaches a topic that comes to occupy most of the publicly expressed thought of his final years: *parrhēsia*. Broadly characterized in a lecture dated March 10 as a form of "government of oneself or of others" and a "moral quality…demanded of every speaking subject," Foucault provides an overview of *parrhēsia* in antiquity that he will exponentially expound upon in the Berkeley and 1984 Collège lectures (*Hermeneutics* 404). [130] According to Foucault, "[e]tymologically, *parrhēsia* is the act of telling all (frankness, open-heartedness, plain speaking, speaking openly, speaking freely)" (366).[131] As such, he initially contends that *parrhēsia* is construed as speech "released from the rules [believed to govern social interactions and hierarchies and] freed from [their corresponding] rhetorical procedures," though he later demonstrates the import of rhetoric to frank speech (406).

While *parrhēsia* is typically thought of as speech from below, insofar as a subordinate speaks frankly to a superior or one perceived to be beyond reproach, it can also occur, as Foucault demonstrates, between anyone willing to "take a risk" (16). As such, orators, politicians, strangers, and friends can be said to use *parrhēsia* in a variety of circumstances. For instance, Foucault observes how an orator runs the risk of endangering his "popularity because

[130] Also see "3 March 1982: Second Hour," 366-68 and "10 March 1982: First Hour," 371-391.

[131] While Foucault mostly uses the Greek term even when discussing Roman and early Christian thought, he notes that "[t]he Latins generally translate *parrhēsia* as *libertas*" (*Hermeneutics* 366). For a succinct history of parrhēsia in antiquity, see *Fearless Speech*, 11-24. Also see Colclough, 16-37.

his opinions are contrary to the majority's opinions," or a stranger, his safety when in a new city (16). In terms of friendship, Foucault notes how it is thoroughly imbued with *parrhesia*: "[w]hen, for example, you see a friend doing something wrong you risk incurring his anger by telling him he is wrong, you are acting as a *parrhēsiastes*" (16). Duty is another central feature of *parrhēsia* and, like taking a risk, it too demonstrates how frank speech is not confined solely to speech from below. Indeed, drawing on the example of the friend, Foucault shows the broad applications of frank speech beyond the subject-sovereign relationship and simultaneously points to the ethical import underpinning *parrhēsia*: "to criticize a friend or a sovereign is an act of parrhesia insofar as it is a duty to help a friend who does not recognize his wrongdoing, or insofar as it is a duty towards the city to help the king better himself as a sovereign. Parrhesia is thus related to freedom and duty" (19). The perceived association of friendship and frank speech is a topic of considerable import to Plutarch's discussion of flattery, a text, which as noted in the introduction, leaves an indelible mark on early modern friendship discourse similar to Cicero. Later, I discuss how early modern friendship discourse, drawing largely on Plutarch, envisions the role of *parrhēsia* between friends. I likewise discuss in a later section how Foucault's claim that "[p]*arrhēsia* is thus related to freedom and duty" manifests in early modern discussions of the conscience, most notably, as it relates to earthly and heavenly duty.

The *parrhēsiastes*, or the one prompted by conviction to courageously speak 'truth' to power, likewise embodies a "commitment to a bond" between speech and "conduct" (406). Indeed, on a fundamental level, the *parrhēsiastes* "commits himself to do what he says and to be the subject of conduct who conforms in every way to the truth he expresses," which, simply put, means that his speech and action align (406). In this way, *parrhēsia* fulfills in antiquity what Foucault terms a "pedagogical" and "psychagogical" function (407). As a "pedagogical"

function, *parrhēsia* "endows any subject whatsoever with aptitudes, capabilities, knowledges, and so on, that he did not possess before," meaning that the other learns different ways to act – ways that the *parrhēsiastes* views as more ethical – through hearing one frankly speak (407). The perceived extent and nature of these skills, as well as how they solidify the relationship between both speaker and auditor, depend on the school of thought. For instance, according to Epicureanism, most notably that of Philodemus, *parrhēsia* generates benevolence and reciprocity since one is grateful to/for the other and his frank speech. [132] According to Stoic philosophers like Seneca, *parrhēsia* illuminates the import of transparent and eloquent speech since the *parrhēsiastes* must be mindful of the other's precarious situation if he wishes to successfully teach one to care for the self. [133] As I demonstrate below, the concern that the *parrhēsiastes* must employ tact when speaking frankly can also be found in the work of Neoplatonic philosophers such as Plutarch and thus causes pause to consider how Foucault's contention, in the 1982 Collège lectures, that *parrhēsia* is "released from the rules [of]…rhetorical procedures" surfaces in early modern friendship discourse as well as in his later 1984 lectures (406).

Foucault contends, however, that *parrhēsia* is far more than a transmission of knowledge; in fact, it demands a transformation of the auditor, or the one to whom frank speech is directed. Foucault terms this demand the "psychagogical" function of *parrhēsia*, which, as he observes, is a requirement to "modify the mode of being of the subject whom [the speaker] addresses" (407). As he clarifies in the Berkeley and 1984 Collège lectures, in late-antiquity, this function

[132] See his discussion of Philodemus, 387-90.

[133] See his discussion of Seneca, 400-404. Also see, Lucius A. Seneca, *Epistles*, *vol 1-3* (Loeb, 1917).

emphasizes the import of "*askesis*," or a "kind of practical training or exercise," where one cultivates, among other things, "a specific relationship to oneself – a relationship of self-possession and self-sovereignty" (*Fearless* 143).[134]

In six lectures delivered at UC Berkeley in the fall of 1983, Foucault explicates aspects of *parrhēsia* first introduced in the earlier 1982 Collège series. [135] In particular, he examines how *parrhēsia* functions as a frank account of one's inwardness, free from unnecessary rhetoric, and arising from a conviction and duty to the self and others. Foucault reiterates the general claim that *parrhēsia* is frankness of speech, although he is more explicit about how the *parrhēsiastes* feels compelled to give a full account of his conscience – indeed, Foucault contends that the *parrhēsiastes* "is someone who says everything he has in mind: he does not hide anything, but opens his heart and mind completely to other people through his discourse" (*Fearless* 12). This is readily accomplished through the use of transparent speech where one eschews "any kind of rhetorical form which would veil what he thinks," and aims, rather, to "make it manifestly clear and obvious that what he says is his own opinion" – an opinion which the *parrhēsiastes* sees as tantamount to the 'truth' (12). [136] Foucault likewise clarifies that *parrhēsia* entails a

[134] For Foucault's definition of *askesis*, which, as he contends, radically differs from "Christian asceticism," see *Fearless*, 143-45. In this context, "askesis" refers to: (1) "self-possession" rather than "renunciation of the self;" (2) engagement with the world, rather than "detachment;" and, (3) practical advice for living, rather than theoretical.

[135] In his preface to *Fearless Speech,* Joseph Pearson notes that "the lectures were given as part of Foucault's seminar, entitled 'Discourse and Truth,' devoted to the study of the Greek notion of *parrhesia*" (7).

[136] "The *parrhēsiastes* says what is true because he *knows* that it *is* true; and he *knows* that it is true because it really is true. The *parrhēsiastes* is not only sincere and says what is his

commitment to one's opinion in spite of danger and that the *parrhēsiastes* is readily identifiable as "a speaker [who] says something dangerous – different from what the majority believes" (15). *Parrhēsia* is thus linked to conviction and "courage in the face of danger" where one takes a risk of one form or another, whether it be of friendship, political standing, or even life. (16).

Of greatest import, however, is the fact that frank speech arises from one's integrity and commitment to "a moral duty instead of self-interest or moral apathy" (20). *Parrhēsia* tethered to one's *ethos* or moral character distinguishes "courageous speech" from a "pejorative sense of the word not very far from 'chattering,' and which consists in saying any- or everything one has in mind without qualification" (13). The courageous speech of the *parrhēsiastes*, grounded in a risk of incurring the anger of another, is thus depicted as arising from acts such as informing one of the need to modify behavior or declaring his thinking or action wrong, though in some instances, the *parrhēsiastes* may also make a confession to a person of power. The *ethos* of the *parrhēsiastes*, as well as the inherent risk of speaking frankly, thus limns a "specific relationship to [the] self [where the *parrhēsiastes*] prefers himself as a truth-teller than as a living being who is false to himself" and to others (17).

In the latter part of the Berkeley series, Foucault discusses at length the relation between *parrhēsia* and the practice of caring for the self – a relation which he contends illuminates how frank speech is an integral part of "an art of life" promoted by ancient philosophy (23). "'[P]hilosophical' *parrhēsia*," characterized as the political and ethical dimensions of frank

opinion, but his opinion is also the truth. He says what he *knows* to be true" (14). While Foucault's exhaustive discussion of 'truth' is a crucial part of his 1982-1984 Collège lectures, I tangentially broach the topic through my examination of the alignment of speech and action in *parrhēsia*. See *Fearless Speech*, 13-15, for a succinct discussion of 'truth' at odds "with the modern (Cartesian) conception of evidence" (14). Also see, *Courage*, 2-3, 8-9, and 218-220.

speech, is conceived "not primarily [as] a concept or theme, but [as] a practice which tries to shape specific relations individuals have with themselves" (105-6). [137] As a practice, "philosophical *parrhēsia*" encourages one to forge an *ethos* where one is "courageous in his life and in his speech" (101). This practice is heavily predicated on an ability to align speech with action, or as Foucault observes, "to show [through frank speech] that there is a relation between the rational discourse, the *logos*, [one is] able to use, and the way that [one] live[s]" (97). Foucault terms this ability to couple frank speech with the ethical action it demands an ability "to 'give an account' of oneself," and he broadly defines it as an alignment of one's "*bios*" and "*logos*," rather than a "confession" or an "autobiographical account" (96).

It would be remiss, however, to claim that *parrhēsia* is solely a "specific relationship to [the] self" as this would overlook the other "human relationships" Foucault aligns with frank speech; namely, "community life," "public life," and "individual personal relationships" (108). As an exemplum of ethical speech and action through his *logos* and *bios*, the *parrhēsiastes* employs frank speech "to convince someone that he must take care of himself and of others; and this means that he must *change his life*" rather than simply his opinions or beliefs (*Fearless* 106). This defining characteristic of "philosophical *parrhēsia,*" similar to Foucault's 1982 Collège lectures, illuminates how the care of the self and others are inseparable – indeed, the *parrhēsiastes's* imperative for one to "*change his life*" centers on a directive for another to "change one's style of life, one's relation to others, and one's relation to oneself" (101).

It is equally important to recognize the role of rhetoric that Foucault assigns to

[137] See *Fearless*, 169-173. Foucault's concluding remarks on the lecture series underscore the political import of critical, frank speech. This is most evident in his discussion of the "problematization" of *parrhēsia* in "Socratic-Platonic" thought (172).

parrhēsia in his later lectures as this illuminates how frank speech, as a "moral quality" that contributes to one's *ethos*, is also a skill or, to an extent, a *tekhne* (*Hermeneutics* 377). Indeed, contradicting claims by scholars that Foucault presents frank speech as completely divorced from rhetoric, he amply demonstrates in his Collège and Berkeley lectures how the *parrhēsiastes* often strategically employs frank speech when criticizing others – this is particularly true in late-antiquity with individuals such as the rhetorician Quintillian. [138] According to Foucault:

> What characterizes *parrhēsia* is above all that basically it is not so much defined by the content itself – which, it goes without saying is given, is the truth – but that it is a specific, particular practice of true discourse defined by rules of prudence, skill, and the conditions that require one to say the truth at this moment, in this form, under these conditions, and to the individual inasmuch, and only inasmuch as he is capable of receiving it, and receiving it best, at this moment in time. (*Hermeneutics* 384)

In this passage, while "content itself" undoubtedly forms a significant part of *parrhēsia*, the manner in which one employs "rules of prudence [and] skill" when speaking frankly and 'truthfully' proves to be of greater import. Accordingly, what "characterizes *parrhēsia*" and one's ability to skillfully and prudently speak 'truth to power' is an awareness of "conditions," such as the action that elicits frank speech, the social occasion where censure occurs, and, most important, emotional sensitivity toward the individual to whom it is addressed.

This latter component encourages a mindfulness of speech in hopes that it will increase

[138] See *Hermeneutics*, 381-83 for his discussion of Quintillian, *tekhne*, and *parrhēsia*. Also see *Fearless*, 20-21.

the likelihood that the one to whom the *parrhēsiastes* speaks is "capable of receiving" criticism and, equally important, changing or transforming his life. Thus it is sometimes necessary for the *parrhēsiastes* to utilize rhetoric or a "tactic of *parrhēsia*" in order to compel the auditor to take care of himself – indeed, Foucault argues that while "*parrhēsia* is fundamentally freed from the rules of rhetoric, it [nonetheless] takes up rhetoric obliquely and only uses it if it needs to" (385-86). [139]

Although tactful use of rhetoric by the *parrhēsiastes* increases the likelihood that the auditor will be receptive to criticism, it also raises concerns of unethical use of frank speech. This is particularly true as concerns flattery, which Foucault characterizes as the "moral adversary of speaking freely" (*Hermeneutics* 373). Although tactful *parrhēsia* is often helpful in admonishing the friend, frequently, "rhetoric is…its [i.e., flattery's] ambiguous partner [since]…the privileged instrument of flattery is of course the technique, and possibly the tricks of rhetoric" (373). [140]

The antagonism between rhetoric as possible handmaiden to flattery or frank criticism is central to a canonical text on *parrhēsia* and friendship in antiquity and early modern England: Plutarch's "How to Tell a Flatterer From a Friend" – translated into English by Philemon Holland in 1603 as "How a man may discerne a flatterer from a friend." Foucault characterizes

[139] Also see *Hermeneutics*, "10 March 1982: First Hour." Foucault reiterates the relationship between *parrhēsia* and rhetoric: "Speaking freely must free itself from rhetoric, but not only or solely so as to expel or exclude it, but rather, by being free from its rules, to be able to use it within strict, always tactically defined limits, where it is really necessary"(373).

[140] See *The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the Collège de France 1982-1983* (Macmillan, 2010), 302. " *[P]arrhēsia's* shadow, its bad and dubious imitation. It is what is called flattery."

this essay as "entirely taken up with an analysis of *parrhēsia*, or rather of the two opposed, conflicting practices of flattery, on the one hand, and *parrhēsia* (free-spokenness) on the other" (*Courage* 7). While Plutarch devotes considerable attention to the outward signs that allow one to discriminate the friend from the flatterer, among which is included the tendency of the flatterer to use "plaine and free speech [that is] neither sincere and naturall," he likewise implores the reader to learn how to tactfully correct and admonish the other through the use of frank speech (sig. H3r). The treatise is divided in two, with the first part devoted to flattery and the latter part frank speech. Plutarch's dual interest in fashioned speech, while emphasizing how it can be used instrumentally for selfish and selfless ends, simultaneously "exhibits a certain anxiety over the flatterer's ability to mimic the behavior of a true friend," to quote David Konstan (98).[141] Indeed, Plutarch contends that "flattery, which blends itself with every emotion, every movement, need, and habit, is hard to separate from friendship," since it draws from "that frankness of speech, [which] by common report and belief, is the language of friendship" (51B; 51D). Although current scholarship on early modern friendship astutely identifies the slipperiness in the era's discourse between the flatterer and the friend, as well as flattery and frank speech, the centrality accorded to rhetorical antagonism, as noted in the introduction, has garnered little discussion. Plutarch's treatise, which as Laurie Shannon observes, "has a readily visible impact on period thought" – most notably, the advice genre of the 'prince's mirror,' as

[141] Also see Konstan, "Friendship, Frankness, and Flattery" in *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World* (Brill, 1996), 7-20. While Konstan does not consider how rhetoric can be used tactfully by the *parrhēsiastes* to antagonize the auditor, and thus increase chances that he will learn to take care of himself, he does rightly observe how the flatterer uses rhetoric for instrumental purposes. In Plutarch, the task of "discriminate[ng] friends from flatterers remain[s] on the level of rhetoric and overt behavior [particularly] the [flatterer's] excessive compliance with the companion's desires" (18).

well as friendship discourse in general – also elaborates on a facet of frank speech partially absent from Foucault's lectures on the care of the self: anger (191). [142]

While Foucault discusses the danger posed to the one who speaks frankly, which ranges from losing a friend or political advantage to losing one's freedom or life, a detailed account of anger is surprisingly absent from his lectures on *parrhēsia*.[143] A rare instance can be found in a lecture dated March 10, 1982 on the "twin adversaries" of frank speech, that is, flattery and rhetoric (373). Here, anger is tangentially discussed as an emotion frequently "paired with" flattery– indeed, Foucault notes that in classical discussions of *parrhēsia*, "anger and flattery go together" (374). He also contends that similar to flattery, anger is an important component in "the practice of the self," insofar as it potentially teaches one "self-control and command over others" (374). That is, anger, when encouraging self-reflection and positive action, can instruct one on how to exert power over the self and others in an ethical and moderate manner. Foucault defines anger as "the uncontrolled, violent rage of someone towards someone else over whom the former, the angry person, is entitled to exercise his power, is in a position to do so, and who is therefore in a position to abuse his power" (374). Similar to the discussion of emotional awareness in the 1982 Collège lectures, anger is perceived to originate from an absence of self-consciousness and will. Accordingly, "the question of anger [is the question] of being carried away by anger or the impossibility of controlling oneself" (374).

[142] Examples of the "prince's mirror," or *speculum principum*, include Desiderius Erasmus's *The Education of a Christian Prince* (1516), Sir Thomas Elyot's *The Boke Named the Governour* (1531), and Niccolò Machiavelli's *Il principe* (1532). Also see Judith Ferster, *Fictions of Advice: The Literature and Politics of Counsel in Late Medieval England* (University of Pennsylvania, 1996).

[143] See, *Fearless Speech* 16-19.

In early modern friendship discourse, particularly discussions of flattery and anger, "self-control" focuses on tempering excessive self-love which, to quote Plutarch, works to minimize "self-conceit and opinion of his owne," and thus make one less susceptible to flattery, while anger is broadly seen as potentially teaching one how to master their passions and improve their moral being – Foucault refers to this as the ability to attain "sovereignty over oneself" (sig. G8v; 374). The "ethics of anger," a provocative idea Foucault raises but refrains from elaborating on in his Berkeley and Collège lectures, manifests in Plutarch's discussion of frank speech where anger is presented as fruitfully encouraging the other to care for the self when judiciously invoked by the *parrhēsiastes*, or one who speaks frankly – indeed, Plutarch claims that "a man may offend his friend with intention to doe him good" (375; sig. H4v). [144] By learning how to 'properly' "hurt" or "offend a friend," and thereby make the other aware of the import of caring for the self, the *parrhēsiastes* thus becomes, in a reoccurring analogy in Plutarch, a physician who administers "a sharpe rebuke, as…some bitter or tart medicine, to save or p[r]eserve the life of his patient" (sig. H4v). [145]

The following section, which outlines the import of Plutarch to early modern friendship discourse, focuses on how frank speech is presented as a *tekhne* where one learns to use "the sharpe rebuke" tactfully to anger the friend. A frequent concern of Plutarch's treatise is to impress on the reader how "it is necessary to treat frankness as a fine art," as Babbitt's modern translation eloquently phrases it, where one practices "great discretion and circumspection…in

[144] See 55D. "For one ought to hurt a friend only to help him; and ought not by hurting him to kill friendship."

[145] See 55D. Babbitt refers to this "sharpe rebuke" as the "stinging word."

making remonstrances & speaking freely unto friends," to quote Holland (74D; sig. K5v). "How a man may discerne a flatterer from a friend," along with other early modern friendship materials, demonstrates how frank speech broadens the rhetorical and emotional repertoire of caring for the self and others, and thus calls for a broader reading of the treatise than has historically been the case in early modern literary and cultural studies.

Tactful Antagonism in Plutarch

Similar to 'vulgar' translations of Cicero's *De amicitia*, which, as the previous chapter demonstrated, appear in a variety of cultural settings and provide a framework for the era's friendship discourse, Plutarch's treatise on flattery and frank speech, taken from a miscellany of seventy-eight essays on ethics known as the *Moralia*, also proves influential to early modern English culture and friendship theories. Like *De amicitia*, the *Moralia* is used extensively in lower and higher form curriculums to teach grammar and, more importantly, ethics, as T.W. Baldwin and Martha Hale Shackford observe. [146] For instance, John Cheke, tutor to a young Edward VI, more or less adheres to a general scaffolding of teaching moral philosophy in the era when he has students read the *Moralia* immediately after the Gospels and Proverbs. [147] Nicholas Udall, in his forward to *Apophthegmes* (1536), an 'Englished' version of Erasmus's *Adages*, echoes humanist pedagogues and scholars such as Cheke and Erasmus through his contention that "never hath there been among the Greke writers (especially as touching matters of virtue and

[146] See *William Shakespeare's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke* (Illinois, 1944), 1:208-09; 1:406; 1:535; 1:540. Also see Shackford, *Plutarch in Renaissance England, with Special Reference to Shakespeare* (Wellesley, 1929), 22.

[147] Cheke echoes the advice of Erasmus that after students read the Gospels, Ecclesiastes, and Proverbs, they should then "read the *Apophthegmata* of Plutarch and then his *Morals*, for nothing can be found purer than these works." See Baldwin 1:208-09.

good behavour) any one more holy then Plutarchus, or better worthie of al men to bee reade" (qtd in Shackford 23). While "references to Plutarchan texts," such as those made by Cheke, Udall, and Erasmus, "are legion in the Renaissance," to quote Shannon, one may also locate specific references to "How to Tell a Flatterer From a Friend" (191). Although, as Shannon rightly asserts, allusions "invoking his *Lives* (first translated into English from French by Thomas North in 1579) are perhaps easiest to document," texts such as Erasmus's *Education of a Christian Prince* (1516), Elyot's *The boke named the governour* (1531), Stephen Gosson's *The ephemerides of Phialo* (1579), Sir Thomas Hoby's translation of *The Book of the courtier* (1561), and Sir Thomas More's poem cited above, incorporate or allude to Plutarch's treatise on flattery and frank speech (191).[148] Additionally, Philemon Holland's 1603 *The philosophie, commonly called, the morals*, provides the era with an 'Englished' version of Plutarch's treatise. Holland, whose father, John, fled to the Continent with Miles Coverdale during the reign of Mary, produces the only English translation during the era, although it is used heavily in lower form and university curriculums well into the Interregnum (Lee 152).

As the title of Plutarch's treatise suggests, he outlines how to distinguish a false friend and sycophant from a true friend and *parrhēsiastes*. The flatterer, characterized as a fickle "Chamoelion" who feigns unanimity with the other in mood, opinion, and speech, simultaneously presents himself as inferior to the friend and frequently blames himself as well as

[148] For discussions of texts where "How to Tell a Flatterer" appears, see: Colclough, 192; Shannon, 48; and Shackford, 24-28. For an overview of Shakespeare's use of Plutarch's *Lives*, see Stuart Gillespie, *English Translation and Classical Reception: Towards a New Literary History* (Blackwell, 2011), 47-59.

others for the friend's shortcomings (sig. H3v). [149] Furthermore, as Babbitt succinctly observes, Plutarch's "essay is not concerned with the impecunious and dependent adherents (parasites) of the rich, but with the adroit flatterers of a higher standing who worm their way into the confidence of great men" (263). Thus, unlike parasites such as Sir Toby, the flatterer "keepeth not companie nor sorteth with poore folke, or such persons as live obscurely & are of no abilitie;" rather, he attaches himself to "great houses" and "mighty States," and, like Gaveston or Iago, is always "sober,…hath an oare in every boat, [and]…hath a minde to be privie and partie in all deep secrets" concerning the friend (sig. H1r-H1v).

While a common perception contends that it is "a difficult matter…to discerne a flatterer from a friend, seeing there is no difference between them, either in doing pleasure or, or yielding praise [and thus]…a right hard matter it is to know the one from the other," Plutarch nonetheless identifies two ways to discoverer the sycophant: inconstancy and 'soft' or inoffensive frank speech (sig. H1v). For instance, keen awareness of the "uniforme equalitie in all [the flatterer's] intentions and actions" across time, including "the course of his former life" – or as Babbitt eloquently translates it, "mode of life" – provide a window through which one may determine whether the friend "changes his shape to fit his receiver" or maintains a fairly consistent *ethos* (sig. H2v-H3r; sig. 52F). [150] The flatterer's use of frank speech, which is rarely used to admonish, but almost always to praise, agree with, or entertain the friend, offers another method

[149] For instance, see 60B-E & 61E-F; 53D; 64E-65E.

[150] "[F]rankness of speech, by common report and belief, is the language of friendship" (51C).

of discovery. Plutarch warns that one must be "in suspition the conversation and acquaintance of such, as never doe or say any thing but that which is pleasing, continually keeping one course without change, never rubbing where the gall is, nor touching the sore, without reproofe and contradiction" (sig. H5r). This is not to say that pleasure is antithetical to friendship, a point Plutarch and other classical texts on the subject readily concede; rather, it is to claim that disagreement and rebuke, that is, the "gall," "reproofe," or "sting" of friendship, is construed as a cornerstone of friendship since it improves the other's *ethos* when judiciously practiced: "he [the flatterer] is of the opinion that he ought to do all for to be pleasant, whereas the true friend doing alwaies that which his dutie requireth, many times pleaseth, as often againe he is displeasant" (sig. H4r). [151] When the flatterer does employ a semblance of the "sting" of frank speech however, it is not to be "displeasant" in hopes of encouraging moral growth in the other, but only to encourage "that part which is voide of reason and full of passions" and provoke negative emotions such as envy, temper, bitterness, paranoia – indeed, "if a man looke neerely and have good regard unto a flatterer, he shall never finde that all the words he useth, minister or procure one jot of good to him that is wise and governed by reason, but feed fooles with the pleasant delights of love, kindle and augment the fire of inconsiderate anger, provoke them unto envie, breed in them an odious and vaine presumption of their owne wit, and increase…their diffidence and distrustfulnesse of others" (sig. J2v). Plutarch envisions the tempering of pleasure with rebuke as a form of great felicity in friendship, stating, "we are to thinke well of friendship when it is pleasant, delightsome and cheerful, if otherwhiles also it can displease and crosse againe"

[151] See 54D-E.

(sig. H5r). In other words, one should find the bitterness and antagonism of admonishment palatable if it ultimately improves one's *ethos* and strengthens their bond with the friend.

Not only does Plutarch discuss how to detect a sycophant, but he also advises how to avoid becoming one in friendship. An emphasis on frank speech in the latter part of his treatise, most notably how to properly use it so that the "friend assistenth evermore the better part [of man's 'rational nature'], in giving counsell and comfort, even as an expert and skilfull Physition," proves to be of great import to his advice (sig. J2r).[152] Indeed, unlike the flatterer, who "appeereth like a botch [i.e., a tumor], rising estsoones upon the corrupt, diseased or inflamed parts of the soul," the friend who has learned to responsibly wield frank speech "that aimeth alwaies at the maintenance and encrease of health," aids the other in learning to care for themselves (61F). As I demonstrate shortly, a common claim in early modern friendship discourse is that the best way to ensure "the maintenance and encrease of health" in the friend, or as Babbitt translates it, the ability to "foster growth," is through the use of rhetorical antagonism, that is, using frank speech to deliberately anger or emotionally move the other in hopes that he improve his moral being (sig. J2r; 61E).

Echoing Foucault's statement of the "rules of prudence" governing frank speech, albeit in greater detail, Plutarch instructs the reader on the necessary tact that the *parrhēsiastes* must employ. According to Plutarch, "it is necessary to treat frankness as a fine art." As such, the *tekhne* of frank speech includes: knowing the "time convenient" to admonish the friend so as to

[152] The influence of Neoplatonism should be evident here, most notably in Plutarch's claim that the "soule consisteth of two parts, whereof the one is addicted to the truth, loving honestie and reason; the other more brutish, of the owne nature unreasonable, given to untruth and withall passionate."

"take away the excessive vehemencie and force of sharpe words;" employing "a certaine kind of elegancie and civilitie" where one "purge[s] cleane from [their frankness] all contumelious [i.e., insulting] and injurious words, [such as] laughter, scoffes, and scurrile taunts"; clarifying that one does not speak out of self-interest but only as "toucheth those errors & misdemeanors only which concerne others," including the friend; strategically choosing what reason, trait, or action to admonish, reserving frank censure for "greater and more grosse faults"; ensuring that one be "most readie to praise" before admonishing the other; and finally, recognizing that sometimes when one is "desirous to incite and stirre them forward unto good things…there would be practiced a cleane and contrarie course", most notably "be[ing] vehement, inexorable and never giv[ing] over nor yield[ing]" in speech" (sig. J5r; sig. J8r; sig. K3v; sig. K4r-v). The most important skill of the *parrhēsiastes*, however, is the ability to alleviate the "sting" of speaking frankly by ending with "more mild and pleasant discourses [that] aswage their [i.e., the other's] grief and refresh their hart again that is caste downe and discomforted" (sig. K4v). In order to illustrate this point, Plutarch again draws on the example of "good Physicians and Chirurgians, [who] when they have made [an] incision or cut any member, they leave not the place in paine and to[r]ment still, but use certaine fomentations and lenitive infusions to mitigate the anguish" (sig. K4v). In a similar manner, the *parrhēsiastes* must ensure that admonishment is immediately followed by moderate speech that calms and "aswages" the chastised friend – indeed, like the surgeon who must apply an anodyne to the aggravated area, "they that after a civill maner have chid or rebuked,…[must] chang[e] their maner of spech [and] entertaine their friends thus galled or wounded" (sig. K4v). Such 'after-care' is of great import to the success of future admonishments, the friendship itself, and the success of convincing the other to care for the self because "a man stung and nipped once, or touched to the quicke by some objurgatorie

reprehension,…is ever after hardly quieted or reclaimed, and no consolation will serve the turne to appease and comfort him againe" if his passions, including choler, is not kept reasonably at bay (sig. K4v).

Teaching the friend to control his passions and correct his faults, that is, to care for the self, is the ultimate aim of the *parrhēsiastes*. Unlike the flatterer, who prevents the other from cultivating self-awareness, and thus "opposite he is alwaies and contrarie to this precept…*Know thyselfe,* causing a man to be abused and deceived by his owne selfe, yea and to be ignorant of the good and evill things that be in him," the *parrhēsiastes* speaks frankly in order to encourage critical, self-reflection in the friend (sig. H1v). As Plutarch contends, "the true and friendly libertie of speech indeed, taketh hold of those that are delinquent" (sig. J1r). Generally, these errors of the "delinquent" are construed as emanating from excessive self-love such as the conceits and desires mentioned by Plutarch in the beginning of his treatise. The *parrhēsiastes* thus urges that "every man would labour and strive with himselfe to roote out that selfe love and overweening" because both make one less susceptible to flattery and also increase one's ability to recognize "how in all things we ought to esteeme that oracle of [Apollo's] which commandoth us [t]o know our selves [and] to search into our owne nature and examine withall our nouriture and education" (sig. J7r). The imperative to care for the self by eliminating vainglory fosters self-knowledge, most notably, of one's shortcomings, and likewise underscores the necessity of a friend who speaks candidly rather than insincerely: "if we would looke into our selves and ever and anon consider, how many grosse vices, troublesome passions, imperfections and defects we have, surely we shall finde that we stood in great neede, not of a false friend to flatter us in our follies, and to praise and extoll us, but rather of one that would frankely finde fault with our doings, and reproove us in those vices that ech one privately and in particular doth commit" (sig.

J7r). Likewise, the more one becomes attentive of his emotional investments, however "gross…[or] troublesome" they may be, the less likely he is to fall victim to flattery. Plutarch contends that this is a fundamental product of self-knowledge: "if we be not altogether ignorant of our selves, and wilfully blinde, not seeing that we be covetous, shamelesse, timorous and base minded, we cannot choose but start and finde out a flatterer; neither is it possible that he should escape us" (sig. I2v).

To underscore how frank speech encourages the other to care for the self, Plutarch likens the *parrhēsiastes* and his counsel to the physician and his medicine. Crucial to this analogy is the perceived astringent and restorative qualities of frank speech. According to Plutarch, "a man may offend his friend with intention to doe him good [and] he ought (I say) to use a sharpe rebuke as a Physician doth some bitter or tart medicine to save or p[r]eserve the life of his patient" (sig. H4v). [153] Given that the "libertie of speech where of [Plutarch] speake[s], is [perceived as synonymous] of the nature of a medicine," the *parrhēsiastes* admonishes the other, not because he feels querulous or vindictive, but because the office of friendship construes this as the surest way to correct "misgovernment of [the] selfe" and convince one to care for the self : "the true friend doing alwaies that which his dutie requireth, many times pleaseth, and as often againe he is displeasant: not that his intention is to displease at any time; howbeit if he see it expedient and better so to do, he will not sticke to be a little harsh and unpleasant" (sig. J6r; sig. K1v; sig. H5r). Frank speech, like a medicine designed "to purge and clense the bodie, or to heate and chafe it, or else to incamate and make new flesh to come," may be a bitter pill for the friend to swallow,

[153] See 55D: "for one ought to hurt a friend only to help him."

but it surely proves to be the one of the most "expedient" ways to temper "ignoran[ce] of [the] sel[f]" and increase knowledge of one's "own secret conscience" (sig. H5r – H6r).

Early modern friendship materials are aptly attuned to the efficacy of "the sharpe rebuke" between friends. While this is most evident in Holland's 1603 'vulgar' translation, as well as the aforementioned texts by Erasmus, Elyot, etc., texts on friendship, such as 'Englished' translations of Cicero's *De amicitia* and Michel de Montaigne's *Essays*, in addition to the late-Tudor friendship pamphlets discussed at length in the previous chapter, make much of the "sharpe" and "stinging" word. Echoing Plutarch's claim about the expediency of frank admonishment in urging the other to care for the self, Cicero contends that "the Aucthoritie of Freendes (giving sou[n]d counsel) beare great sway and force in Friendship, and let the same be used to warne one another, not onely plainly, but (if occasion so serve) sharplye" (Newton sig. C5v). [154] Montaigne also observes the frequent necessity of speaking "sharplye" and "boldlye" to the friend, and characterizes such speech as the hallmark of "true friendship" and "truly-perfect love": "*A man had neede of long-tough eares, to heare himselfe freely judged.* And because there be few that can endure to heare it without tingling: those which adventure to undertake it with us, shew us a singular effect of true friendship. For, *that is a truely-perfect love, which, to profit and doe good, feareth not to hurt or offend*." Walter Dorke, in his 1589 pamphlet on friendship, lists among the "Articles, precepts, or statutes of the lawe of *Amitie*" the duty of

[154] Also see Tiptoft (sig. B5v) and Harington (B7v). The marginal gloss in Newton further qualifies this passage by noting that "Frendes maye not flatter but freelye & boldlye advertise & counsel one an other."

the friend to deliver frank counsel to the other "boldly and freely": "Friends must not flatter, but boldly and freely advertise, admonish, and counsell one another" (sig. A4v-r). Finally, Walter Breme, in another late-Tudor "occasional publication" on friendship, contends "[g]ood counsell is of great efficacie in a friend," and that, similar to Plutarch's call for "tact and urbanity," "[i]n counsell that thou shalt give, be not affectionate: be not presumptuous or severe against them you may command" (Shannon 5n. 15; sig. C4r-v).

An array of texts on topics such as melancholia, pedagogy, and civil conduct also draws on Plutarch's discussion of frank speech, most notably the analogy of the *parrhēsiastes* as physician. Robert Burton, in his exhaustive 1621 compilation, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, observes that frank speech is like a medicine that tempers the "heart-eating passions" of the other. According to Burton, "when the patient himself is not able to resist or overcome these heart-eating passions, his friends or Physician must be ready to supply that which is wanting" (472-3). William Kempe, in his 1588 *The education of children in learning*, applies the tactics of the *parrhēsiastes* in friendship to the pedagogue in the classroom, noting that:

> [to] allure Schollars to vertue, and to drive them from vice, which, as *Plutarch* counselleth, must be used by turne, sometime to the one, and sometime to the other, after the fashion of a loving nurse, who when she hath made her child weepe for his fault, giueth him the teat to still him againe: which resembleth also the discretion of the cunning Physician, that tempereth his bitter medicines with sweete and pleasant drinke. (sig. D3v)

Stephen Gosson likewise draws on this familiar analogy in his 1579 *The Ephemerides of Phialo*, most notably, in his discussion of the "method which [on]e ought to follow that desireth to

rebuke his freend, when he seeth him swarve, without kindling his choler" (sig. C4r). [155] Like the advice dispensed by Plutarch, and repeatedly stressed in the aforementioned texts, Gosson contends that the *parrhēsiastes* can increase the likelihood that his reprobation will be received by his friend through the use of rhetoric, specifically, "by tempering thy speaches with commendations" :

> in making thy friend acquainted with his faulte, too use a shadowe, may bee done by tempring thy speaches with commendations. The Phisition is more desirous too cure his Patient by sleepe, then by *Rubarbe*... So shal it behooue thee in reforming thy friend, and purging the humor whiche hurteth him most, too take away the bitternesse of thy Lozinge, with sweete Syrops, commending him for that he hath done wel, auoyding comparisons, bycause they are odious." (sig. C4r-v)

While Gosson is keen to stress that one not anger or "kindl[e] [the] choler" of the other when speaking frankly, as I demonstrate in the next section, dramatic representations of frank speech, similar to the friendship materials quoted above, frequently contend that anger is a vital component in attempts to teach the other to care for himself. However, as the previous sections on Foucault and Plutarch demonstrate, and which Kempe echoes in his advice to pedagogues, the *parrhēsiastes* must employ a degree of tact and rhetoric when speaking frankly, that is, he must "tempereth his bitter medicines with sweete and pleasant drinke," if he wishes to convince the other to transform his moral being. The next section thus considers how Shakespeare's tragedy presents frank speech, to reiterate a claim Foucault makes in his 1984 Collège lectures, as a form

[155] See Mills, 192-196 for a discussion of this text as well as Gosson's debt to Lyly.

of tactful "truth-telling whose final objective and constant concern [i]s to teach men to take care of themselves."

King Lear and Tactful Antagonism

While the language of Plutarch and Foucault previously discussed is generally absent from recent examinations of Shakespeare's tragedy, contemporary criticism tangentially echoes the general spirit of their theories of friendship, frankness, and caring for the self. Kenneth J.E. Graham, for instance, contends that frankness or "plainness" in *Lear* can be viewed from the perspective of justice as "the principle that permits the rediscovery of 'commonplace' truths in corrupt and skeptical surroundings" (218). [156] While Graham refrains from an explicit discussion of *parrhēsia* and the *parrhēsiastes*, his emphasis on "plainness" of speech as the catalyst by which one "finds new ways to perform the conviction of love" in this "rediscovery" nonetheless resonates with Plutarch and Foucault, particularly as regards conviction and conduct tethered to one's speech as well as bond to the other (218). In a similar vein, and without explicit discussion of caring for the self, Enid Welsford and Jay Halio discuss how the play emphasizes developing a critical attitude toward modes of life. For Halio this involves the play's emphasis on the renaissance commonplace *nosce teipsum* ('know thyself') in order to underscore that "*King Lear* is first and foremost about self-knowledge" (1). According to Welsford, the play's incorporation of "fool literature" conventions, most notably the fool as "an 'all licensed' critic

[156] All citations of *King Lear* refer to the third Arden edition, which is a conflation of the quarto and folio versions of the play, particularly Q1 of 1608 and F1 of 1623. For an overview of the idiosyncrasies of these texts, as well as the merit in considering Q and F as different authorial versions of *Lear*, see R.A. Foakes, "The Texts of *King Lear*," in Jay Halio *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's King Lear* (G.K. Hall, 1996), 21-34. Also see Gary Taylor and Michael Warren *The Division of the Kingdoms* (Oxford, 1983). When warranted, I note how Q and F idiosyncrasies render different interpretations.

who sees and speaks the real truth about the people around him," illuminates how Lear's Fool functions as "a vehicle for a reasoned criticism of life" (103). In both Halio and Welsford, observations about the centrality of self-consciousness and "plainness" of speech and criticism resonate with Foucault and Plutarch's emphasis on the bond between frank speech and other "human relationships," such as "community life," "public life," and "individual personal relationships." It likewise underscores Foucault's observation, implicit in Plutarch, that frank speech is a directive for the other to "change his life," rather than simply his opinions or beliefs, by learning to care for the self.

Criticism on the play also tangentially broaches the import of tact in friendship, most notably, in terms of admonishment and disguise. Wendy Olmsted reads *King Lear* as a text that addresses how to admonish a friend, and, perhaps more important, the lengths to which one may go, regardless of the danger or moral dilemma, in maintaining an ethical bond to the other. According to this reading, the play "dramatizes the costs of losing the space where friends speak freely" (181). Not only does this entail a literal loss of friendship, as evinced through Lear's severing of his relationship with Kent or sudden departure of the Fool, but it also illuminates how friendship, when under duress, is frequently compromised in order to paradoxically maintain it. The exemplum in *King Lear*, according to Olmsted, is the disguised Kent, who as Caius, "reshapes friendship as a social instrument in order to move towards virtuous friendship" (182). Michael Warren, in his essay on the dramatic "function" of Kent in Q and F versions of the play, also notes how his disguise is an emblem or "powerful image of love, loyalty, and fidelity" to the choleric Lear (61). Warren likewise contends that Kent's disguise serves an instrumental purpose insofar as it provides him with further opportunities to try and convince Lear to curtail his passion, or, echoing the Fool, it provides "the means by which the dog Truth

can avoid going to the kennel in the vicinity of Lear" (61). [157] However, as Warren astutely observes, an emphasis on Kent's disguise in both versions diminishes as the play progresses, and greater attention is once more devoted to his frankness. Indeed, Warren contends that "Kent is no longer [portrayed as] interesting for what he does so much as for what he says" (63). As I demonstrate in the following section on the numerous *parrhēsiastes* in *King Lear*, with the exception of Cordelia, whose "love's / More ponderous than [her] tongue," the play presents *parrhēsia* as a combination of tact and frankness (1.1.78). The *tekhne* of frank speech in Shakespeare's tragedy encompasses both verbal and visual realms, and while emphasis is placed on the import of disguise, equal, if not greater, attention is devoted to the verbal rhetoric of the *parrhēsiastes*. Echoing Plutarch and Foucault, *King Lear* presents a common concern of the *parrhēsiastes*: tactful antagonizing of the other in order to become self-conscious and critical. While this is met with mixed results in the play, as evinced by the tragic events of the dénouement, an emphasis is nonetheless attached to the import of frank speech and caring for the self. Indeed, to quote Edgar, the tragic outcome that befalls Lear underscores that by striving to "[s]peak what we feel, not what we ought to say," one learns to minimize suffering and reign in unruly passion, so that, unlike Lear, "[t]he oldest [who] hath borne most; we that are young / Shall never see so much" (5.3.323-325). However, this is not to suggest that to "[s]peak what [one] feel[s]" is synonymous with unimpeded speech, that is, the "chattering" that Foucault aligns with the "pejorative sense" of *parrhēsia*, since this can potentially be just as destructive as

[157] See 1.4.109. Scholars have long noted how Kent's faithfulness and loyalty to Lear manifests in the name of his adopted persona, Caius, as an obvious reference to John Caius, author of *De canibus Britannicis*, a late-sixteenth century treatise on dogs translated by Abraham Fleming in 1576 as *Of Englishe dogges*. For a discussion of Kent's 'dog-like' faithfulness,.

speaking "what [one] ought to say;" rather, it is to ground candid speech and "what we feel" in *ethos* of deliberation, action, and tact. [158]

Added to this emphasis on the influence of one's speech on others in *King Lear* is an examination of the murky territory of friendship, most notably its overlap with other social relationships such as kinship, service relations, and political subjects. Holland, in his prefatory commentary to Plutarch's essay on flattery, contends that the Greek philosopher is essentially interested in the effect of speech on another's *ethos*: "for that our nature is proud and blind withall, having the need of good friends to guide and direct it, he [Plutarch] describeth with what maner the eie and eare we ought to see and heare those that procure our good" (sig. G7v). As the division scene suggests, Lear's vanity and pride encourages a blindness to the frank counsel of Cordelia and Kent and his "eie and eare" preference for the flagrant sycophancy of Regan and Goneril.

However, in addition to an emphasis on the "glib and oily art" of flattery in the opening scene, an emphasis on frank counsel also suggests that friendship is inextricably intertwined with an array of social relations (1.1.226). The staging of frank counsel in this scene exploits Plutarch's image of the friend who speaks out of duty in order to bring attention to the other's "misgovernment of himselfe" by aligning it with the dutiful subject (Kent and Cordelia) who speaks frankly to his or her sovereign in order that he learn to rule better, or the dutiful daughter (Cordelia) who speaks to her father in order that he learn to be a better parent (sig. K1v). In addition, this multivalent staging of duties presents a series of ethical situations for the

[158] See R.A. Foakes, *Hamlet Versus Lear: Cultural Politics and Shakespeare's Art* (Cambridge, 1993), 213-14.

spectator/reader that drive home a similar point; namely, the import of cultivating an inward *ethos* and conscience that manifests in outward action and speech. It likewise sets the state for the political and social dimensions of friendship explored throughout the play by bringing attention to the heterogeneous function of friendship (640).

A focus on the self-consciousness and frank speech of Cordelia and Kent not only illuminates how friendship is grounded in an ethics of responsibility (that is, what Derrida refers to as the present and future "commitment" underpinning friendship where one is obliged to ""answer for,' 'answer to,' [and] 'answer before'...a moral, legal, or political community"), but more importantly, it addresses the issue of whether daughters and subjects can be considered 'friends' and therefore be relevant to categories like parrhesia within friendship discourse (637-38). [159] A central feature of *King Lear* is its contestation of friendship as a purely affective and apolitical bond between two private persons. This is readily accomplished, as Olmsted notes in her discussion of instrumentality and disguise in *King Lear*, by the play "going beyond Cicero [and] Plutarch…to produce a searching inquiry into the intersection (or lack of it) between Ciceronian virtuous friendship and social efficacy" (184). Indeed, Olmsted points to the valence of the term in the play: for Edgar, 'friend' refers to "his allies and helpmates"; Gloucester uses it in deference to strangers, such as the Old Man and Casius, to signify "good will but nothing more"; and Albany uses the word 'friend', similar to Edgar, to "include family members and

[159] According to Derrida, "[t]hese three modalities are no juxtaposable; they envelop and imply each other. One *answers for*, for oneself or for something (for someone, for an action, for a thought, for a discourse), *before*, before another, a community of others, an institution, a tribunal, a law. And always one *answers for*, or *before*, by answering first *to*" (638).

allies" (185). [160] Lawrence Stone, in his magisterial tome on kinship in early modern England, also notes how the term 'friend' frequently refers to "a loved one," particularly when "[u]sed in the singular," as well as, when used in the plural, "to someone who could help one on in life, with whom one could safely do business, or upon whom one was in some way dependent" (97).

This versatility of friendship discourse in the play, which ranges from political associates to the polite greeting of strangers to parent-child as well as master-servant relations, exploits the broad adaptability of the category 'friend(s)' during the period. Indeed, added to the contestation of friendship is a contestation of the friend as a coherent and singular social identity separate from an array of other roles. In terms of contesting friendship and the friend as a singular social identity that is private and apolitical, the play, to apply Shannon's shrewd reading of *The Winter's Tale* to the current discussion, portrays figures such as Cordelia, Kent, and, to an extent, the Fool, as "a mingling of political and personal relations,…two roles (counselor and friend) in one person rather than one role refracting between two" (204). Such a fracturing of friendship in the play mirrors the network of embedded relations widely encompassed by friendship discourse during the era. Indeed, Bray contends that kinship, broadly conceived during the period as a relation based on more than blood or marriage, such "households", "fraternities and trade guilds", "houses of call" occupied by iterant artisans and actors, "adoption", and lastly, "the movement of adolescents between families to act as servants in other households,…readily

[160] See (4.5.2.44-46; 4.1.15; 2.2.13; 3.4.149; 5.3.276-78). One may find resonances of Olmsted's claim in Bray, particularly his emphasis on the public and private functions of friendship. Among the former, he includes the public use and consumption of the rhetoric and countenance of friendship as well as public acknowledgment of the friend transforms the body into a gift. See Bray, chapter two.

overlapped and created the web of obligations and friendship that held the society of England together" (105).

Shakespeare's *King Lear* has much to say about frank speech and the formation of one's ethical being at the center of caring for the self. Aside from its central *parrhēsiastae*, Cordelia, Kent, and the Fool, Shakespeare uses minor characters, most notably Cornwall's servant and Lear's knight, to underscore frank speech and its relation to one's *ethos*.[161] As the division of the kingdom in the opening scene demonstrates, Lear's vainglory and penchant for flattery set the tragic events of the play in motion and hinder his development of self-knowledge. Lear's preface to his daughters before the division invites some of the tragedy's earliest, if not greatest, instances of flattery: "Which of you shall we say doth love us most, / That we our largest bounty may extend / Where nature doth with merit challenge" (1.1.51-53). Lear's offering the "largest bounty," or parcel of his kingdom, to the daughter who can, as Cordelia candidly observes, "heave / [their] heart into [their] mouth," and "say [who] love [him] most," encourages the flattery of Goneril and Regan that immediately follows (1.1.91-92). His vanity likewise gestures toward a self-love predicated on conceit and pleasure in contrast to the ethical self-love, discussed in the previous chapter, perceived as increasing self-knowledge and the ability to care for the self. Indeed, Lear's vanity stokes his choler and obscures the practice of *nosce teipsum* that early modern humanists envision as vital to the care of the self. [162] Vanity not only causes

[161] See 3.7.71-81; 4.2.74-79; and, 1.4.49-64.

[162] See1.1.294-95: "'Tis the infirmity of his age, yet he hath ever but slenderly known himself." Also see the introduction of my dissertation for *Nosce teipsum* in early modern literature and humanist thought as well as its relation to the care of the self.

dissonance between how Lear expects to be treated by his daughters and how they treat him, which he envisions as a literal forgetting of the self ("Who is it that can tell me who I am?"), but it also produces extreme choler that limits his ability for self-reflection and care – that is, vanity creates a "tempest in [Lear's] mind / [that] doth from [his] sense take all feeling else" (1.4.221; 3.4.12-13).

The figure of the *parrhēsiastes* also fuels Lear's choler in the opening scene and, as the play progresses, contributes to the limited growth of his self-consciousness. While Goneril and Regan use flattery to exploit Lear's vanity during the division of the kingdom, Cordelia and Kent deploy frank speech to achieve different ends. For Cordelia, *parrhēsia* reverberates with the speech act characterized by Foucault as "released from the rules of rhetorical procedure," insofar as she gives a frank account of her inwardness to Lear and speaks out of duty to her conscience rather than duty to the rhetorical situation created by her father and to which her sisters eagerly respond. Indeed, Cordelia's earliest aside, where she asks herself, "What shall Cordelia speak? Love, and be silent," responds to Goneril's bombastic proclamations that love renders speech ineffectual: "Sir, I do love you more than word can wield the / matter…A love that makes breath poor and speech unable" (1.1.54-62). [163] Her second aside is likewise an interior response to Regan's sycophancy where Cordelia again affirms that her love outweighs the flattery and rhetoric of her sisters: "my love's / More ponderous than my tongue" (1.1.77-78). These reflections ultimately give way to the succinct response of Cordelia to Lear's command to "[s]peak" adulations in exchange for the "more opulent" portion of his kingdom:

[163] See James E. Hirsh, *Shakespeare and the History of Soliloquies* (Fairleigh Dickinson, 2003), 22. Hirsh provides a nice overview of asides in "theatrical history" as well as Shakespeare.

Cordelia: Nothing, my lord.

Lear: Nothing?

Cordelia: Nothing.

Lear: How, nothing will come of nothing. Speak again.

Cordelia: Unhappy that I am, I cannot heave

My heart into my mouth. I love your majesty

According to my bond, no more no less. (1.1.87-93)

Cordelia's courage to speak to Lear contrarily, as evinced by his astonished reply of "Nothing?," as well as her multiple refusals to obey his command to "[s]peak again" and "[m]end her speech a little, / Lest [s]he may mar [he]r fortunes," underscores how *parrhēsia* operates as a specific relationship to the self (1.1.87-94). Likewise, her claim to "love your majesty / According to my bond, no more no less", reiterates the versatility, as previously noted, of friendship discourse.

As *parrhēsiastes*, Cordelia's "plainness" of speech eschews the "glib and oily art" due to her integrity and commitment to "a moral duty instead of self-interest or moral apathy," to reiterate a remark Foucault makes in his Berkeley lectures (1.1.30). While Cordelia never gives a full account of why she speaks frankly, that is, why she "cannot heave / [her] heart into [her] mouth" like Goneril and Regan, her motivation derives mostly from the import she attaches to an *ethos* where speech and action align. Through her emphasis on truthful action and speech, Cordelia displays what Foucault terms a "commitment to a bond" between "conduct" and speech, or Plutarch, "uniforme equalitie in all intentions and actions." Indeed, one of the clearest reasons she gives Lear for why she speaks frankly is virtue and loyalty – she characterizes her "heart" as "So young, my lord, and true," to which Lear replies that "truth then be thy dower"

(1.1.108-09). [164] France also suggests that Cordelia's frank speech is a virtue, since he, unlike Burgundy, agrees to take her hand and her "virtues…seize upon" after being impressed by her exchange with Lear (1.1.254). Cordelia's insistence that she speaks frankly because "since what I well intend, / I'll do't before I speak," further limns the source of her courage as *parrhēsiastes*, as does her remark that "[a] still soliciting eye and such a tongue [as Goneril and Regan] / That I am glad I have not" (1.1.227-233). In contrast to Goneril and Regan, who flatter Lear with "large speeches" that later prove to be meaningless, Cordelia places great import on speech and action. An emphasis on aligning one's *bios* and *logos,* to reiterate Foucault and Plutarch's general claim about the *parrhesiastes*, is restated by the banished Kent as he exits the throne room. In a manner reminiscent of Cordelia, Kent proclaims to Regan and Goneril: "And your large speeches may / your deeds approve, / That good effects may spring from words of love" (1.1.184-6).

Whereas Cordelia speaks frankly to Lear in order to shape the relationship she has with herself, namely, her *ethos* or what France refers to as the "virtues" which make her "most rich being poor," Kent's candid speech arises primarily from his relationship with Lear (1.1.252.54). This is not to suggest that Kent, as *parrhēsiastes*, is detached from his *ethos*; rather, it is to underscore that Kent speaks frankly in hopes that it will convince Lear to reflect on his own actions and curtail his folly and rashness. In short, Kent employs *parrhēsia* so that Lear will learn to take care of himself. In this instance, *parrhēsia* is less about the conscience or *ethos* of the speaker – that is, what Foucault characterizes as a "specific relationship to [the] self" – and more about the speaker's concern for the other's interior and moral being – that is, what Plutarch

[164] France's earlier exchange with Burgundy cements this reading. See 1.1.214-224 and 1.1.237-243.

envisions as the fundamental characteristic of frank speech to "assisteth evermore the better part [of the other's *ethos*], in giving counsell and comfort."

Kent's status as a different kind of *parrhēsiastes*, more akin to a counselor than one who objects because they perceive their moral being and conscience compromised, is evident through the language of rebuke and insistence that Lear reflect on his *ethos*. Regardless of this distinction, however, Kent, like Cordelia, reminds the spectator/reader that without friends who speak boldly and bluntly, albeit with a degree of tact, society rapidly unravels. In a world such as Lear's, where ethical subjects are replaced with calculating and sycophantic individuals who prioritize personal gain over community cohesion, there is an even greater need, to return to Edgar's closing remark, to "[s]peak what we feel, not what we ought to say". Moreover, Kent, like the other *parrhesiastes*, serves as a reminder, to quote Lochman and Hutson, "that in tyranny, where friends cannot speak freely, friendship cannot exist" (24).

The versatility of friendship discourse in the play, particularly as regards the "mingling of political and personal relations", is readily apparent through Cordelia and Kent's stress on "duty" (1.1.97). Both likewise demonstrate the multivalence of friendship discourse, most notably its embeddedness in an array of social relations, by speaking from multiple positions as daughter, servant, subject, and friend. Cordelia and Kent's relationships with Lear, to quote Bray's discussion of the imbrication of "voluntary kinship" with early modern friendship discourse, illuminate how "[t]he outline of these friendships – a friendship that signified a kinship – unlocks the larger whole of which their friendships were perceived to be a part" (104).

While both Cordelia and Kent speak frankly to Lear from several positions or "dut[ies]" – Cordelia from her "dut[ies]" as a daughter subject and Kent from his "dut[ies]" as a subject, servant, and friend – it is Kent who advises Lear to change his "relation to others

and…[him]self," to quote Foucault (1.1.148). [165] Likewise, it is Kent who recognizes, to reiterate Plutarch, how the "true friend doing alwaies that which his dutie requireth, many times pleaseth, as often againe he is displeasant" in his speech to the other. Kent's initial attempts to be a measured voice of reason embody the apology for *parrhēsia* Colclough sees as endemic to the era, and Plutarch envisions as frequently necessary for the "elegancie and civilitie" of effective frank speech. It is only after Lear's fuming dismissal of Kent's advice to temper his self-love and refrain from royal divestment that the Earl is moved to speak bluntly and boldly. Kent first attempts to gingerly disrupt Lear's anger with the composed "Good my liege," and when Lear rejects this effort to challenge his self-love with the forceful "Come not between the dragon and his wrath!," Kent tries to preface his admonishment by noting a history of steadfast obedience and deference: "Royal Lear, / Whom I have ever honoured as my king, / Loved as my father, as my master followed, / As my great patron thought on in my prayers –" (1.1.122-123; 1.1.140-143). Lear's interruption and warning to Kent to "make from the shaft" of his anger, lest he be injured politically or physically, provides the impetus for the blunt and "unmannerly" speech of Kent:

> Let it fall rather, though the fork invade

[165] For valence of the term 'friend' in early modern England, see Olmstead, "Plainness" 184. Olmstead, quoting Lawrence Stone, notes during the period "[t]he category of friends included relatives, members of the household 'such as a steward, chaplin or tutor, or a neighbor; or a political associate sharing a common party affiliation." Also see Thomas MacFaul, *Male Friendship in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries* (Cambridge, 2007). Michael Neill notes a similar valence surrounding the term 'service' and 'servant.' As Neill observes, "'service' in the early modern period was a remarkably inclusive concept, embracing in its most elastic definition virtually all forms of social relationship – since even the bonds between husbands and wives, parents and children involved the same principles of authority and obedience." See Neill 162 as well as David Schalkwyk, *Shakespeare, Love and Service* (Cambridge, 2008).

The region of my heart: be Kent unmannerly

When Lear is mad. What wouldst thou do, old man?

Think'st thou that duty shall have dread to speak,

When power to flattery bows? To plainness honour's

bound

When majesty falls to folly. Reserve thy state,

And in thy best consideration check

This hideous rashness. (1.1.145-152)

Kent's contention that he has an obligation to dispense with "elegancie and civilitie" and be "unmannerly / When Lear is mad" and has faltered in caring for the self and others, frames the speech where all decorum is immediately dispatched. Indeed, he boldly addresses Lear as an inferior through his use of "thou," which as Geraldine Byrne and numerous scholars note, is often "a term of reproach" during the period as well as a marker of social distance and superiority when invoked by the speaker (xxxi). [166] Kent uses "thou" and the determiner "thy" no less than four times in this speech, and an additional dozen times across the remainder of the exchange in the first Act, to emphasize his moral superiority and highlight the intimacy between the king and his Earl. Unlike Lear, whose mind is clouded by narcissism and the sycophancy of

[166] For discussions of the thou/you distinction in early modern English culture, see Penelope Freedman, *Power and Passion in Shakespeare's Pronouns* (Ashgate, 2007). Also see Terry Walker, *Thou and You in Early Modern English Dialogues* (John Benjamins, 2007). Walker notes that "those of greater status would tend to address those of lesser status as THOU, but receive YOU. In addition, the greater the social distance and/or formality, the greater the likelihood that You would be used, while strong emotion is said to encourage the use of THOU" (2).

Goneril and Regan, Kent sees with clarity the error of divestment and anger with Cordelia for her honesty.

Abiding by Plutarch's advice that the *parrhēsiastes* must "roote out th[e] self-love and overweening" in the other, Kent observes the problems arising from instances where "power to flattery bows," particularly, how the narcissism ruling over Lear causes his "majesty [to] fall to folly." Moreover, sycophancy and Lear's "hideous rashness" create the characteristic that Plutarch envisions as the hallmark of flattery: "ignoran[ce] of our selves and wilful[l] blind[ness]" to our *ethos*. Indeed, Kent's rhetorical questions to Lear attempt to elucidate why he speaks candidly and simultaneously generate self-consciousness in his "king," "father," "master," and "patron." Asking Lear, "[w]hat wouldst thou do, old man?" if self-love drives the other to "mad[ness]," "folly," and "rashness," Kent makes a case for the necessity of being "unmannerly" in speech. He likewise clarifies that he does not shirk from "duty [nor]…have dread to speak" candidly when Lear abdicates his responsibilities; rather, Kent is "to plainness honour's / bound" as a subject and friend in such a situation. In this brief passage, Kent embodies the stereotypical *parrhēsiastes* who, in the name of "ethical friendship… gives loving and frank advice in the name of the hearer's good," as Shannon observes of early modern friendship discourse (51). His position as a subject and servant likewise attests to the period perception that friendship encompasses an array of social relations beyond the affective, singular, and apolitical friend. In one respect, this is apparent through Kent participation in friendship discourse, most notably his use of a speech act not only accorded preeminence among the "Articles, precepts, or statutes of the lawe of *Amitie*" discussed by the numerous occasional pamphlets, cited above, as well as Plutarch, Montaigne, and Cicero. Perhaps more importantly, however, is Kent's direct address to his sovereign, a clear and political act that both commixes

his social "dut[ies]" as subject, servant, and friend and ruptures the supposed private, affective, and apolitical space occupied by the friend. Likewise, Kent's participation as a subject and servant in friendship discourse reiterates the claim made through this section, and which I elaborate in the concluding discussion of the conscience and its relation to earthly and heavenly authority, that the friend occupies a political space where self-fashioning occurs. Indeed, Kent perfectly embodies Shannon's astute observation that early modern friendship discourse, understood broadly, articulates the "law of the subject – but not of his subordination" (6). Not only does Kent readily apply this "law" to his own conduct, particularly as a friendly counselor and servant, but perhaps more important, to his insistence that Lear, his sovereign, reform his *ethos* through critical self-reflection.

In attempting to correct Lear's "misgovernment of [the] selfe," Kent repeatedly encourages critical self-reflection. Echoing the import Plutarch attaches to the "precept…*Know thyselfe*," most notably as an anodyne to the "dece[ption]…and…ignoran[ce] of the good and evill things" arising from self-love, Shakespeare invokes the "esteeme[d] oracle" Apollo:

> *Kent:* See better, Lear, and let me still remain / The true blank of thine eye.
>
> *Lear:* Now by Apollo –
>
> *Kent:* Now by Apollo, King,
>
> Thou swear'st thy gods in vain (1.1.159-161)

While Lear invokes Apollo, the god of archery, in order to continue the image, introduced a few lines earlier, of his anger as a "bow that is bent and drawn," Kent turns the invocation on its head to refer to Apollo as the oracle "which commandoth us [t]o know our selves," as Plutarch contends in his essay. In this way, Kent emphasizes how Lear does not "see better" due to his self-love and choler, nor is he willing to accept the advice of his loyal Earl, "the true blank of

thine eye;" rather, Lear "swear'st thy gods in vain" since his anger emanates from folly not wisdom and narcissism not ethical self-regard. Shakespeare further underscores how Lear's choler obscures self-knowledge and fosters "rashness" and "folly" toward Kent by the sovereign's cry of "O vassal! Miscreant!" (1.1.162). This response, coupled with Albany and Cornwall's "Dear sir, forbear!," as well as Kent's defiant "Do, kill thy physician," suggests that Lear's reaction to frank speech and sound advice is bodily violence rather than the patience accorded to the supposed wise and benevolent ruler (1.1.163-65). [167] Indeed, Lear's choler is depicted in this instance as so extreme that he foolishly perceives his servant as a "recreant," or "one who breaks faith" as Foakes notes, rather than a trustworthy friend, acting in a manner synonymous with a counselor or "good Physician and Chirurgian", who seeks to check his folly and preserve his well-being (1.1.168; 1.1.168n.).

The analogy of the *parrhēsiastes* as an "expert and skilfull Physition" is invoked through Kent's characterization in this exchange. Kent's statement of "Do, kill thy physician, and thy fee bestow / Upon the foul disease," clearly envisions Lear's self-love as an illness that can best be cured through frank speech (1.1.64-65). It likewise calls attention to the import of tact that Plutarch and Foucault envision as necessary to achieve the restorative qualities of frank speech. As Plutarch contends, it is vital that the friend know how to skillfully use "a sharpe rebuke, as…some bitter or tart medicine, to save or p[r]eserve the life of his patient." However, Kent's failure to convince Lear to temper his choler, reflect on his actions, and ultimately his relationship with himself – that is, to take care of himself – suggests the centrality of rhetorical

[167] As Foakes observes, "stage tradition suggests" Albany and Cornwall's utterance refer to action that "prevent[s] Lear here from drawing his sword or doing violence to Kent." See Arden edition 169. Also see Bratton 73 and Rosenberg 72.

tact and skill needed for the friend's frank speech to be effective. Indeed, this need can be found in the visual rhetoric that Kent and Edgar adopt through their personas of Old Tom and Caius, which to a certain degree, prove to be of greater assistance in teaching Lear and Gloucester to care for themselves, although Kent appears to be more successful in encouraging self-reflection in Lear than Edgar in his venture to aid his father. As Edgar later observes in an aside commenting on his father's suicide attempt, "Why I do trifle thus with his despair / Is done to cure it" (4.6.33-34). Undoubtedly grotesque, and to an extent, comical, there is a degree of truth to Edgar's statement and actions in feigning to lead Gloucester to his death; often, the surest way to help the other improve their *ethos* is through skillful antagonism. However, any success is short lived given Gloucester's later comment in this scene on being robbed of his sovereignty through an inability "[t]o end [him]self by death" (4.6.61). His later request for Oswald to kill him by "let[ting] thy friendly hand / Put strength enough to" the sword "[t]hat must destroy" Gloucester, as well as his lament to Edgar that "a man may rot even here" during Cordelia's failed invasion, suggests that too much visual deception, while appearing closely synonymous with tactful antagonism, is in no way a sure substitute (4.6.226-227; 5.2.8).

While Kent and Edgar, with the help of their disguises, prove fairly adept at helping others become self-conscious, although, as noted above, this adeptness is in no way as sufficient as their speech, the Fool is one of the more interesting figures of tactful antagonism in *King Lear*. Indeed, the Fool, perhaps more than the other characters, helps Lear gain a limited degree of self-consciousness by deliberating angering him. The Fool likewise complicates the play's depiction of frank and fashioned speech as mutually exclusive speech acts through his word play and numerous jests, the latter almost always at Lear's expense.

On the surface, *King Lear* appears to position the fashioned speech of the flatterer in opposition to the frank speech of the *parrhesiastes*. However, on closer examination, the distinction between crafted and candid speech collapses, particularly when characters encourage the other to care for the self. This is not to claim that characters such as Cordelia, Kent, or Edgar use "that glib and oily art" of flattery. As previously demonstrated, Cordelia and Kent fail to convince Lear to reflect on his *ethos* primarily because they speak without the tact and urbanity that Plutarch and Foucault align with the *parrhesiastes*; that is, they speak *too* bluntly and do not necessarily employ a *tekhne* of frank speech, although Kent strives to encourage reflection through his deliberate and antagonistic questions. As I have suggested, however, Kent and, to an extent, Edgar, prove to be more successful in their efforts once they begin to fashion both their appearance and speech. Likewise, as Kent notes in his reentry as Caius, the fashioning of oneself, unlike flattery, but in a manner similar to tactful antagonism, is undertaken so as to assist the other in improving his moral being:

> If but as well I other accents borrow
> That can my speech diffuse, my good intent
> May carry through itself to that full issue
> For which I razed my likeness. Now, banished Kent,
> If thou canst serve where thou dost stand condemned
> So may it come thy master whom thou lov'st
> Shall find thee full of labours. (1.4.1-7)

Although the Fool does not literally disguise himself and draw on "other accents" or "raze [his] likeness," he nonetheless proves to be "full of labours" and "good intent" for his "master" Lear. Steeped in a tradition of playful, yet insightful, ambiguity of the fool common to

many of Shakespeare's plays, the Fool uses "forms of folly [to] variously inspire [and] confound" Lear to reflect on his *ethos*, as Robert H. Bell characterizes the general function of the figure in Shakespearean tragedies (4). Regardless of outlining for Kent the import of fashioning speech and action to please Lear – "an thou canst not smile as the wind sits, thou'lt catch cold shortly" – the Fool tactfully antagonizes his "nuncle" through a mixture of allusion, clever word play, and frank speech (1.4.99-100; 1.4.104). For instance, in one of their earlier interactions, the Fool alludes to Lear's divestment as an act of folly that rivals any of his own: "If I gave them all my living [i.e., the Fool's hypothetical two daughters], I'd keep my coxcombs myself. There's mine; beg another of thy daughters" (1.4.106-7). Lear's threatening response to "Take heed, sirrah, the whip," is followed by the Fool's observation that Lear does not tolerate counsel counter to his vainglory and pomposity (1.4.108). In an allusion to Lear's banishment of Kent and Cordelia for candidly speaking their conscience, as well as rewarding Regan and Goneril for their flattery, the Fool also envisions himself as a *parrhēsiastes*: "Truth's a dog that must to kennel; he must be whipped out, when the Lady Brach [i.e., bitch] may stand by the fire and stink" (1.4.109-10). Later in the scene, the Fool again suggests his propensity for speaking the truth and inability to flatter Lear:

> *Fool:* Prithee, nuncle, keep a schoolmaster that can teach thy fool to lie; I would fain learn to lie.
>
> *Lear:* An you lie, sirrah, we'll have you whipped.
>
> *Fool*: I marvel what kin thou and thy daughters are. They'll have me whipped for speaking true, thou'lt have me whipped for lying, and sometimes I am whipped for holding my piece. I had rather be any kind o'thing than a fool, and yet I would

not be thee, nuncle. Thou hast pared thy wit o'both sides and left nothing i'the middle. (1.4.170-78)

As a "pestilent gall to" Lear, the Fool continually employs jest and song to tactfully anger his "nuncle" in hopes of aiding him to learn to care for the self. [168] Indeed, Lear's plea for someone to "tell me who I am," is roundly answered by the Fool, who readily identifies as "Lear's shadow" (1.4.221-22). However, in claiming to be "Lear's shadow," the Fool does not simply claim to be Lear's *alter ego*, "that is, another himself," to quote Dorke, although he is making the claim that Lear too is a fool (Dorke sig. B2r). Nor does he claim to mirror Lear in a manner similar to that of the sycophant who Plutarch condemns: "I have no neede of such a friend, that will alter as I doe, and follow me every way (for my shadow can do that much better) I had rather have one that with me will follow the truth, & judge according to it and not otherwise" (sig. H3r). Rather, the Fool underscores his bond to Lear, to whom he is tethered like a shadow until his sudden disappearance, and through the use of rhetoric and jest he attempts to help Lear "follow the truth & judge according to it and not otherwise." Indeed, the Fool later admits this bond to Kent. Lear's fair-weather friends "Will pack when it begins to rain, / And leave thee in the storm; / But I will tarry, the fool will stay, / And let the wise man fly: / The knave turns fool that runs away, / The fool no knave perdy" (2.2.269-74). However, the Fool's sudden disappearance in Act 3 suggests that perhaps he too is a fair-weather friend who must leave when the "tempest in [Lear's] mind" shows no sign of abating or when his "nuncle" proves unwilling to reflect and work on his *ethos*.

[168] Also see 1.4.134-169 and 1.4.180-90.

As the play progresses, Lear gains limited empathy, as well as brief moments of insight into the errors resulting from his folly, due to the Fool. A key moment in Lear beginning to meditate on the need to care for himself, particularly, how his *ethos* and conscience are tethered to the just treatment of others, occurs after much antagonizing by the Fool and the feigned concern of Goneril. As Lear begins to reflect on the "folly" of dispossessing Cordelia, he observes:

> O, most small fault,
> How ugly didst thou in Cordelia show,
> Which like an engine wrenched my frame of nature
> From the fixed place, drew from my heart all love
> And added to the gall. O Lear, Lear, Lear!
> [*striking his head*] Beat at this gate that let thy folly in
> And thy dear judgement out. (1.4.258-64)

Although Lear still perceives Cordelia's speaking truthfully as a "small fault" that "ugly didst…in Cordelia show," he nonetheless acknowledges what the Fool has been antagonizing him to long recognize: that his choler, self-conceitedness, and "gall" caused him to rush to judgment and act in "folly." Lear's contention that his "gall… /…let thy folly in / And thy dear judgement out" readily affirms this acknowledgement. Later, he reiterates this realization to the Fool through the simple, yet powerful, declarative, "I was wrong" (1.5.24).

Lear's limited empathy, along with his extremely limited self-consciousness, manifest at other moments. While on the heath, Lear meditates on his guilty conscience, those "Close pent-up guilts," and proclaims the need to recognize and come to terms with the damage wrought by his follies (3.2.57). Lear's realization that he must acknowledge the injuries and those

"undivulged crimes, / Unwhipped of justice," he has inflicted on others, particularly since his "guilts" breach and "Rive [the] concealing continents" that comprise his conscience, point to an emerging sense of the need to care for the self (3.2.52-53; 3.2.58-59). Indeed, Lear's emerging perception that he needs to work on his *ethos* and "change his life," particularly as regards "one's relation to others, and one's relation to oneself," is the hallmark of the caring for the self as discussed by Foucault and Plutarch. However, Lear's recognition that his speech, conduct, and conscience must be more fully aligned is not altogether realized, as demonstrated by the lines that immediately follow his call to probe his guilty conscience and "cry / These dreadful summoners grace" (3.2.59). Indeed, regardless of the moment of inward clarity just experienced, Lear still perceives himself as "a man / More sinned against than sinning" (3.2.59-60).

Even though Lear's self-consciousness is severely limited by self-love and choler, he partially displays empathy and the ability to care for others while on the heath. One such instance occurs when Lear, Kent, and the Fool find the hovel during the "contentious storm" (3.4.6). In a simple and quiet gesture that recognizes the needs of another, Lear insists that the Fool enter the hovel ahead of him. Despite the implied protests, Lear is resolved that the Fool go ahead of him: "In boy, go first. You houseless / poverty – / Nay, get thee in. I'll pray, and then I'll sleep" (3.4.26-27). Another instance of empathy occurs in the hovel when Lear encounters Edgar disguised as Poor Tom. Simultaneously insightful and problematic, Lear again proves capable of pity for another, although it is an empathy that he can only understand in relation to his own suffering. Indeed, as far as Lear is concerned, Poor Tom has been reduced to "such a lowness [by] his unkind daughters": "Didst thou give all to thy two daughters? And art thou come to this?" (3.4.48-49; 3.4.70).

Any empathy or clarity on the need to care for the self and others garnered by Lear on the heath disappears as the play progresses. As demonstrated by Lear's imprisonment with Cordelia, the king falls back to his own ways of self-love and abdication of the suffering of others. Envisioning their imprisonment as joyous opportunity to rekindle their relationship, Lear proclaims to Cordelia: "Come, let's away to prison; / We two alone will sing like birds i'the cage" (5.3.8-9). Lear's refusal to acknowledge the suffering of Cordelia and the severity of their imprisonment is met by a further retreat inward – indeed, his speech is peppered with the 'royal we.'

The tragic events of the end illuminate how caring for the self is a lifelong practice that one must continually cultivate, rather than a single and lasting moment of clarity fostered by another – indeed, frank speech may act as a catalyst, but it is no replacement for caring for the self. In many respects, this creates the greatest tragedy in the play given Lear's inability to sustain critical self-reflection, maintain his *ethos*, and be receptive to the speech of others. "[T]he friend hath lost his friend / And the best quarrels in the heat are cursed / By those that feel their sharpness" (5.3.56-58). Though Edmund speaks these words in reference to the recent civil war, and in order to buy his assassin time, an emphasis on the "sharpness" of the sword as well as poignancy of losing a "friend" resonates with Lear's social forfeitures throughout the play, particularly those that arise from his fuming reaction to the frank speech of family, servants, and political allies. Indeed his loss of friends, understood widely to include both affective and political relationships (or "achieved" and "ascribed" bonds), embodies the tragedy of Edmund's words and the play in a double sense. On the one hand, any self-consciousness Lear gained from the "heat" and "sharpness" of Cordelia, Kent/Casius, or the Fool's frank speech is ephemeral and not fully "fe[lt]", thus suggesting that their "quarrels" were made in vain due to Lear's vanity.

On the other hand, and recalling that friendship includes more than one party, the "sharpness" of the sword, like the "sharpe rebuke" discussed by Plutarch and Foucault, is "fe[lt]" by the speaker and encourages self-awareness. In this instance, the loss of a "friend" through "quarrels" that are "cursed" by unfiltered antagonism both clarifies the need to balance "[s]peaking what we feel, [partially with]…what we ought to say".

"Speak what we feel"

Throughout this chapter, an explicit concern has addressed how the period, through the lens of friendship discourse and its emphasis on frank speech joined to action as well as rhetorical tact, perceives the way in which one's conscience and ethical identity manifests. Furthermore, the role of gender, both in regards to frank speech and early modern friendship discourse have barely been broached, and thus both merit examination.

Toward the beginning of Foucault's inaugural Berkeley lecture on *parrhēsia*, a member of the audience inquires about the predominance of masculine pronouns in his description of frank speech. As Joseph Pearson, the editor of these lectures, notes, "[r]esponding to a student's question [about the absence of female pronouns], Foucault indicate[s] that the oppressed role of women in Greek society generally deprive them of the use of *parrhēsia* (along with aliens, slaves, and children)" (12, f.n. 4). Aside from Pearson's gloss, Foucault has very little to say about the relation of gender to the practice of frank speech during his Berkeley and Collège lectures, although the work of Euripides' and the Christian Bible (two texts he discusses later in his lecture), offer numerous examples of female *parrhēsiastae*. [169] By the same token, the Tudor

[169] See *Fearless Speech*, 34-35 and 74-75.

rhetorics discussed in this chapter virtually present *parrhēsia* as exclusively a male concern.[170] In the rare instance that these period handbooks do include women as *parrhēsiastae*, or those who speak frankly and with courage, it is to underscore a confession of misconduct and plea for male forgiveness, rather than moral objection or conscientious resistance to authority. Such is the case with Abraham Fraunce, who in his 1588 *Arcadian Rhetorike*, cites as one "example" of "libertie of speech" Queen Gynecia's confession before Euarchus in Book 5 of Sidney's *Arcadia*.[171]

As the discussion of *parrhēsia* in *King Lear* illustrated, however, early modern literature frequently depicts women using frank speech to vocalize moral resistance rather than to demonstrate the supposed "degenera[cy]" and "shame" of their sex fostered by period conceptions of gender (Fraunce sig. E4v). In the case of dramatic characters, Shakespeare's Cordelia, Constance, and Paulina serve as a few examples of 'positive *parrhēsia,*' that is, they embody the "courageous speech" previously discussed where speech is seen as an external manifestation of one's moral conscience and *ethos* defiantly directed toward a supposed social

[170] See Henry Peacham's 1577 *The Garden of Eloquence*, sig. M2v-M3r, as well as sig. R1r in the 1593 edition. Also see George Puttenham's 1589 *Arte of English Poesie*, sig. Y5r, and Thomas Wilson's 1553 *The Arte of Rhetorique*, sig. Dd2v.

[171] "I therefore say to thee, o just Judge, that I, and onlie, I, was the worker of *Basilius* death: they were these hands that gave unto him that poisonous potion, that hath brought death to him, and losse to *Arcadia.* It was I, and none but I, that hastned his aged yeares to an unnaturall end, and that have made all this people orphanes of their royal father: I am the subject that have killed my Prince: I am the wife that have murdered my husband: I am a degenerate women, an undoer of this Countrey, a shame of my children" (sig. E4v).

See *The Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia* (John Windet, 1593), sig. Qq4v. Also see Katherine Duncan-Jones edition of *The Old Arcadia* (Oxford, 1985), 330. On the sincereity and truthfulness of Gynecia's claim, see Colclough, 51-52.

superior. [172] To return to Edgar's closing remarks, the need for the inhabitants of Lear's England to "[s]peak what we feel, not what we ought to say," resonates with two core concerns addressed thus far in this project: self-knowledge and concord.

To return to an issue broached in the introduction of my dissertation, the necessity of concord across various social classes proves essential to early modern articulations of the social landscape of the commonwealth and friendship. Indeed, Ciceronian influenced accounts of friendship stress the need for "betters" and "inf[e]riours" to form friendships absent of class-resentment; according to these accounts, friends should not be willfully blind to differences in status, however, they should also not be jealous or resentful, lest they sow social discord. As Cicero notes, "[t]herfore as those whiche in freendeshippe be the betters in degree, ought to equall theim selves with their inf[e]riours, so ought inf[e]riours not to be greeved, if either in

[172] While social rank, in many respects, provides these women a privilege of speech not afforded to those of lesser rank (although characters such as Helena in *All's Well That Ends Well* and Mary Frith in *The Shoemaker's Holiday* complicate the extent of this exclusion), nevertheless, their actions lay claim to degrees of political subjecthood that could potentially be available to others – indeed, a hallmark of frank speech is that it is speech from below. Female writers hailing from the gentry, such as Anne Askew, and those of the middling-sort, such as Rachel Speght, Isabella Whitney, and Aemilia Lanyer, also serve as instances of positive female *parrhēsia* and, more broadly, female political subjecthood.

See Elaine V. Beilin's edition of *The Examination of Anne Askew* (Oxford, 1996). One must approach Askew's *Examination* with trepidation, given that its publication by John Bale (1546), and later incorporation by John Foxe in his *Book of Martyrs* (1563), make it nearly impossible to separate their textual embellishments from Askew's narrative. See Thomas S. Freemand and Sarah Elizabeth Wall, "Racking the Body, Shaping the Text: The Account of Anne Askew in Foxe's *'Book of Martyrs'*" *Renaissance Quarterly* (Winter 2001): 1165-1196. Also see Barbara Kiefer Lewalski's *The Polemics and Poems of Rachel Speght* (Oxford, 1996), 1-42. Speght's *A Mouzell for Melastomus* (1617) and *Certaine Quqeres to the Bayter of Women* (1617) are two interesting examples of what I term 'positive female *parrhēsia*'.

witte, either fortune, either worship, their freendes doe excede theim" (Harrington sig. F6r).[173] In a similar manner, writings on the commonwealth, particularly those that stress Christian charity or *caritas*, stress the need for concord between disparate social hierarchies. For instance, Lever, drawing on the image of the flock and shepherds, where commoners are equated with "Christes shepe" and "officers…[as] shepherds of the fold and stewardes," stresses a concord fostered by Christ and imbued with the power and authority of "Goddes woorde:" "Is not everye Christen commonwealthe the folde of Christes shepe, the house of his familye? Be not then all officers in a Christen commonwealthe named by Goddes woorde sheppeherdes of the fold, and stewardes of the familye of Chryste?" (sig. C3r). Regardless of this stress on concord across social hierachies, texts on the commonwealth likewise articulate an anxiety about the potentially disastrous outcome if hierarchies were erased. Indeed, as briefly mentioned in the introduction, and which I shall now turn to in my final chapter on female *caritas* in the poetry of Aemilia Lanyer, a common concern in commonwealth texts centers on the danger when men "entending therby to make all alike, do utterly destroy…the misticall bodye of Christ…and the commonwealth," to quote Lever (sig. B4v). As I shall demonstrate in the final chapter, commonwealth texts also see ambition (taken in Lanyer's poetry to include both female and class parity), as a grave threat to the moral, social, and political stability of the commonwealth. As Lever notes, "when as they hunt after the same immoderatly, not according to the rules of wisedome, they are counted ambitious, and pricked thereunto because they woulde be in the eyes of men gratious, not for any good they meane to the common weale." Thus, the next chapter explores some of the concernsembedded in one of the more famous friendship proverbs

[173] See Tiptoft, sig. C4r.

championed by Erasmus and others: “Among Friends all things should be common” (Dorke sig. A4v).

Chapter Four: *Caritas* and Feminine *Ethos* in the *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum*

Introduction: "there must nedes be divers me[m]bers"

Sir Thomas Elyot, in *The boke named the governour*, claims social subordination as the bedrock of a healthy and godly "Public Weal":

> [I]t is only a Public Weal, where, like as God, hath disposed the said influence of understanding, are also appointed degrees and places, according to the excellence thereof...which also impresseth a reverence and due obedience to the vulgar people or commonality, and without it that can be nore said, that there is a Public Weal, than it may be affirmed, that a house without its proper and necessary ornaments, is well and sufficiently furnished. (1:7) [174]

Drawing on the analogy of a well-ordered "house" fitted with "proper and necessary ornaments" in their appropriate places, Elyot emphasizes the importance of the "degrees and places" of social hierarchies, as well we the centrality of "obedience," in the "Public Weal." Hierarchy, as Elyot claims, cultivates concord through the promotion of "reverence and due obedience [of] the vulgar people or commonality" to their betters and the governing class; a "Public Weal" lacking either " reverence [or]…due obedience" is not a "Public Weal." Moreover, Elyot argues that there must be a clear social order of subordination, lest one contradict God's design or invite social upheaval: "Where all things are common, there lacketh order: and where order lacketh, there all things are odious and uncomely" (1:7).

[174] Elyot favors the term "public weal" over "common weal" due to the fact that the latter emphasizes an equality that he sees as unrealistic when compared to the social reality of hierarchies. Elyot contends that England cannot be a common weal, since this term requires either that "the commoners must only be wealthy...or else, excluding gentility, all men must be of one degree and sort" (1:3).

Elyot's insistence on subordination also manifests in the writings of the "commonwealth men." Indeed, regardless of a tendency to argue for economic and spiritual equity, the "commonwealth men" emphasize the importance of social hierarchy. For instance, Thomas Lever, in a sermon delivered in December of 1550, declares such a sentiment through his emphasis that "there must nedes be divers me[m]bers" in the commonwealth lest concord become decentered and duties murky:

> And they that wolde have like quantitie of every thing to be given to everye man, intending therby to make all alike, do utterly destroy the congregacion, the misticall bodie of Christ, wher as there must nedes be divers me[m]bers in diverse places, havinge diverse dueties. For as Paul saith: if all the bodye be an eye, where is then hearing? or if all be an eare, where is then smelling? meaning therby, that if all be of one sorte, estate, & roume in the come[n]wealth, how can then diverse dueties of diverse necessarie offices be done? (sig. B4v)

Robert Crowley echoes Lever's contention that an erasure of hierarchies undermines the integrity of concord in spiritual and earthly communities by noting how a desire for "all things in commune" frequently manifests when lawlessness and a lack of self-knowledge of duties exist (142). According to Crowley, not only do such men "know not themselves [and]…regard no lawes, [but more importantly], they would have no gentlemen, they would have al men like themselves, they would have all things in commune!" (142). When "commonwealth men" do broach the topic of equity and economic fairness, it is done so in regards to spiritual equality. As Hugh Latimer declares in his 1550 sermon, "[t]he poorest ploughman is in Christ equal with the greatest prince," and thus it is the duty of governors to provide "sufficient [goods] to maintain them and to find them their necessaries." However, lest one imagine Latimer radically forward

thinking, he takes pains to clarify that, nonetheless, inferiors should not desire additional material wealth since Christ has provided all they need; any more would encourage "covetousness [which] is the cause of rebellion," and work to undermine social hierarchies.

As the "commonwealth men" argue, ambition and covetousness sow the seeds of discord and rebellion and undermine the "reverence and due obedience" of which Elyot and, as earlier chapters note, friendship materials echo. Lever warns that through "vainglory, covetousness, & ambicio[n]" of the lower sorte, the commonwealth could cease to exists (sig. A6r). As he sternly declares, "ye shal cause covetous, sedicious, proude, & vicious England, sodenly, miseraliy, yea & shamefully in the sighte and judgement of the world, to vanish away" (sig. A6r). Likewise, Elyot characterizes "[a]mbition [a]s a subtill mischiefe" that fosters vice and discord in the commonwealth and "a privie poison, a covert pestilence, the forger of deceite, the mother of hypocrisie, the nourice of envie, the fou[n]taine of vices" (*Sapience* sig. A5v). Furthermore, Elyot contrasts the ills of "[a]mbition" with the amity wrought by charity, or *caritas* (that is, a love of God redirected towards members of a community). According to Elyot, charity, as the wellspring of concord, promotes self-abnegation, humility, tranquility of mind, obedience, and, implicitly, class harmony: "charitee is pacient & ge[n]til. Charitee hath envy at no man, it doth no thing amisse, it is not puffed up with pride, it is not ambicious, she seketh not hir profite, she is not moved, she thinketh none ill, she rejoyseth in no mischief, she joyeth with truthe, all thing she suffereth, all thing she beleveth, all thinge she hopeth, all thing she beareth, Charitee never faileth" (sig. A6r). Using, as a point of departure, these discussions of charity as a promoter of concord and the concernsof decentering social hierarchies due to ambition and covetousness, the final chapter considers how both themes manifest in Amelia Lanyer's discussion of female friendship in her poetry.

In this chapter, I read Lanyer's 1611 poem, *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum*, and her 1610 country house poem, "Description of Cook-ham," alongside early modern texts on female friendship and charity. As I demonstrate, Lanyer's poems, through a steady application of *caritas*, challenge an early modern orthodoxy that claims women as spiritually and morally inferior and incapable of forming meaningful friendships. Throughout both poems, Lanyer employs *caritas* to refute misogynist interpretation of the Bible and to promote an image of social harmony among women of disparate classes. Indeed, she uses friendship to acknowledge a community of women brought together through the love of Christ and comprised not only of patronesses, but readers of the gentry, middling-classes, and those "of the meaner sort" (4 line 50). However, faultlines in both poems put considerable pressure on the notion of a community of women as a community of equals in terms of *caritas*. As I argue, divisions and faultlines that are mostly class-based pressure the utopian idea of friendship among women put forth by Lanyer.

In order to support this thesis, I first examine how the era perceives the difference between female and male as well as how this surfaces in the friendship materials. In the first section, I broadly examine period assumptions of gender, a term which, Valerie Traub succinctly defines as, "those meanings derived from the division of male and female, and thus the attributes considered appropriate to each: 'masculine' and 'feminine'" ("Gender" 129). Of particular import, is the supposed physical and moral deficiencies that set women apart from men, the miscellaneous ways in which these ideas are disseminated in early modern culture, and the frequent contradictions and ambiguities of women's supposed inferiority. Having established a broad historical and cultural frame of reference, I turn to the era's friendship materials, most notably the occasional pamphlets and translations of classical antecedents, in order to examine

how they construe these differences as disqualifying women from forming virtuous or 'perfect' bonds of friendship. In the second section I examine *Salve Deus* and consider how Lanyer envisions friendship as *caritas*. I also consider how her critique of misogynist exegeses of the Bible, which she characterizes as a "Falsehood [that] beares the shew of formall Right" in interpretations of the Fall as well as in the actions of Adam and Pontius Pilate, is central to understanding *caritas* as that which encourages virtue but is also fragile given the constant assault on female friendship by earthly forces. This section also examines her country house poem, "Description of Cook-ham," and considers how it simultaneously praises Cook-ham and female friendship as utopian sites where class ceases to denote difference as well as a sacred, class-based place built around exclusion of the lower social order.

Up to this point, my examination of friendship and the care of the self in the preceding chapters has commented little on the implicit gender bias of early modern friendship discourse, though, as I will show shortly, this bias is frequently explicit as well. Indeed, early modern friendship discourse assumes friendship to be solely a masculine endeavor from which women are disqualified due to a host of supposed intellectual and moral deficiencies. As Tom MacFaul observes, a consistent attribute of "the Renaissance praise of friendship [is a] tende[ncy] to emphasize its importance for a *man's* life" while remaining fairly silent on its significance in the lives of women (3). According to Alan Bray, theories of friendship based on a male paradigm of intimacy underscore how the period's knowledge of friendship is narrated, first and foremost, "in men's voices and about male concerns" (11). The implicit gender bias and "masculinity of

Renaissance ideas of friendship," as Laurie Shannon notes, "is *almost* as proverbial as the description of the friendship pair as 'one soul in bodies twain'" (55). However, Bray observes that while early modern friendship discourse is decidedly male-centered, and thus mostly excludes women from its *mentalité* or attitude towards intimacy and ethics, we should not assume that the practice of friendship is strictly confined to men. Echoing Sara Heller Mendelson and Patricia Crawford, Bray stresses how the visibility of evidence can generate a false impression of early modern friendship practices. He likewise cautions scholars against replicating the kinds of unfounded qualitative claims directed toward women in early modern friendship discourse: "it may be more *visible* to men, but that it was restricted to them is another matter" (175).

In rare instances that these materials include or address those of the opposite gender, as in the case of Cicero and Montaigne, they typically draw on "the perennial allegation of a disabling womanly weakness" to underscore how "a woman will not have the capacity to perform the friendship role" (Shannon 58-9). Typically, these allegations result, as Albrecht Classen observes in her survey of representations of female friendship in premodern and early modern culture, in "friendship among women [a]s mostly excised, ignored, or cast into a shadow of doubt since only men [a]re regarded as strong enough to maintain the serene, mostly rational, idealistic friendship with another person" (81). Thus, a partial aim in this chapter is to demonstrate how concepts central to theoretical and practical representations of early modern friendship introduced in chapters one through three are also predicated on period understandings of gender, and that when this is taken into account and read closely in the poetry of Lanyer, not only does a more nuanced narrative of friendship, caring for the self, and political subjectivity emerge, but it does so without falling back on an either/or narrative of purely suppressed or resistant

women.[175] Lanyer's *Salve Deus* proves invaluable for demonstrating this approach to a patriarchal discourse of friendship, insofar as she demonstrates in great detail that women can form a polity of friendship, regardless of the opinion of men such as Montaigne who claim this impossible due to be woman's 'natural' inability to be "guided by vertue and conduct of reason" (sig. J7r).

Gender, Friendship, and the Care of the Self

Before proceeding to an examination of gender in early modern friendship materials, it would be helpful to broadly establish how the era perceives gender as well as how the concept is disseminated across the culture. I make no pretense that the following is an exhaustive account (obviously, a few pages cannot do justice to such a vast and complex topic); rather, an overview of early modern accounts of gender is important in order to emphasize its historicity, cultural diffusion, and contradictions. As Valerie Traub notes, "the terms of gender change over time," and hence, ideas of what it means to be a woman or man, as well as 'feminine' and 'masculine,' differ radically from our own ("Introduction" 4). [176] Janel Mueller, writing about Lanyer and

[175] Remarking on the positive product of such a both/and approach to female writers of the era, which acknowledges how women frequently both work within patriarchal discourse and simultaneously contest it, Barbara Smith and Ursula Appelt contend that "[r]ather than either bewailing the reality of patriarchal oppression or lauding valiant efforts at resistance, [we should] consider women poets' efforts to engage, respond to, and problematize cultural injunctions" (x).

[176] For more thorough accounts of gender in early modern cutlure, see Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: The Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Harvard, 1990). Also see Susan Dwyer Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (Columbia, 1988); Laura Gowing, *Gender Relations in Early Modern England* (Routledge, 2012); Kim Hall, *Things of Darkness: Economies of Race and Gender in Early Modern England* (Cornell, 1995); Katherine U. Henderson, *Half Humankind: Contexts and Texts of the Controversy about Women in England* (University of Illinois, 1985).

"the cultural embeddedness" of gender, reminds us that "essentialist ideas of 'feminine' and 'masculine' as innate features of the female and male sexes" are culturally constructed and contingent on a specific time and place rather than natural, universal, and immutable (101). Moreover, as Traub observes, due to its "provisional and contradictory nature, gender itself continually must be reproduced," thus making it equally important to briefly consider, in the current section, the social structures and cultural channels through which this primarily occurs (4). Lastly, given that gender is culturally fashioned, and is articulated in numerous texts from 'high' sonnets and learned treatises to 'low' ballads, pamphlets, and jest books, it is equally important to recognize a few of the significant contradictions and ambiguities occurring in early modern accounts of women.

While the era understands differences between woman and man to be manifold, as demonstrated, for instance, by a perceived disparity in the sexes as regards "intellectual and physical capacity, sexual and emotional self-control, and the ability to reason," to quote Amanda Flather, the current discussion focuses narrowly on the supposed physical and moral differences of woman, even though, as it implicitly demonstrates, most of the above characteristics are inextricably entangled with discussions of woman's corporeal and spiritual condition (20). Indeed, the anonymous author of the 1617 *The worming of a mad dogge*, a response to Joseph Swetnam's misogynist pamphlet, *The arraignment of lewd, idle, froward, and unconstant women*, sardonically declares woman to be "half humankind" in terms of her physical and spiritual condition while also noting the power and responsibility bestowed unto her by God for bringing new life into the world (sig. C1r). Although meant to be taken ironically, this characterization of woman as 'naturally' less than man is taken seriously by most during the era,

and is widely promoted in medical and theological discourses, to name only a few. As Mendelson and Crawford note in their magisterial study of women in the long seventeenth-century, of the many sites where claims to "woman's otherness, weakness, inferiority, and passivity" occur, the female body and its spiritual condition are two of the most significant (18). The female body, believed to be comprised of humors that fostered "different temperaments [in] the two sexes" (e.g., "man was hot and dry," and thus understood to be closer to perfection, and "woman cold and moist," and thus given over to numerous deficiencies), is also perceived as the force behind the different "qualities and virtues" in each (19). [177] Accordingly, "man [i]s [not only] active and woman submissive," due to the radical difference in humors, but "man [i]s energetic, brave, and strong, while woman [i]s gentle, tender, kind, and timorous" (19-20). In addition to humoral theory, the narrative of woman's otherness is also promulgated by cultural reactions to other biological functions such as menstruation (women are seen as toxic, "polluted and polluting"), lactation (milk is blood transformed), and "parturition" (women "[a]re by nature insatiable for sex and children") (21; 26).

Early modern humoral theory is not only the explanatory force behind the 'natural' physical and emotional differences between woman and man, but, as Gail Paster Kern astutely observes, it also envisions the body as a "vessel of liquids" where choler, blood, black bile, and phlegm are "imbued with moral density and spiritual import" (4; 6). Thus, the otherness narrated by the female body is, according to Protestant theology and humoral theory, inextricably linked to woman's supposed spiritual and moral inferiority. According to early modern theology, the central narrative that rationalizes this weakened physical and spiritual state in woman, and

[177] Also see Flather 17-20.

simultaneously promotes what Mendelson and Crawford label a culture of "male spiritual hegemony," is Eve's condition in Genesis 2:18 and 3:16, where she is seen, to quote William Gouge's treatise, *Of domesitcall duties*, as the "weaker vessel" of God's creation (32; qtd in Flather 17). [178] Eve's secondary creation from Adam, as well as her perceived principal role in the Fall, is seen as having "general consequences for succeeding generations" of women, among which includes "the assumption that the female sex [i]s subject and subordinate to the male sex" in addition to an alleged "moral and intellectual weakness" (32). Indeed, a significant consequence for woman, according to the narrative of Eve's transgression in Genesis, centers on the pain of childbirth and rearing, and more important, loss of power, independence, and political subjecthood. [179] It was frequently argued that while Christ had made redemption of woman possible through his crucifixion, his sacrifice on the cross did not restore her prelapsarian political state. As the theologian Francis Dillingham contends in his 1609, *Christian Oeconomy, or Household Government*: "many women might thinke that by reason of religion, all were equal…but…Christ hath freed men and women from the bondage of sinne and death, and not from outward subjection" (qtd in Mendelson and Crawford 31).

Representation of woman's 'natural' physical, moral, and spiritual weakness is not confined to theological and medical treatises, but can also be found in an array of 'low' or 'popular' texts like ballads, jest books, and proverbs. [180] For instance, ballads such as "A new

[178] Other important verses include 1 Corinthians 11:7-10, 1 Timothy 2:14, and 1 Peter 3:1-7.

[179] See Mendelson and Crawford, 33-34.

Song of a Young mans opinion, of the difference betweene a good and bad Women," jokingly characterizes woman as a social pestilence, given her intellectual and moral inferiority to her male betters: "This Maxem oft hath past in Scholes / Our greatest plagues are women fooles." It likewise contains the ever popular joke, reiterated in ballads such as "How the Devill, though subtle, was guld by a Scold," of the nag or shrew who exhausts Satan with her incessant chatter and scolding: "Be her tongue so truely evill / That well might tire the very Devill".[181] Contemporary proverbs, as M.P. Tilley demonstrates in his exhaustive catalogue, also promote notions of woman's subordinate status. Indeed, "A woman is the weaker vessel" or "woman is the woe of man" echo biblical accounts of Eve as a feeble creature crafted by God, while "Nature miscarries when she brings forth Women," comment on the perceived physical and moral inferiority of woman arising from other 'natural' processes (qtd in Mendelson and Crawford 60-61).

Although this overview may give the impression of a coherent denigration of woman across a variety of cultural venues, like any overdetermined representation, there existed numerous contradictions and ambiguities as regards this 'weaker vessel.' For instance, while woman were expected to remain silent and obedient, through the teachings of Protestantism, she

[180] Mendelson and Crawford also include "folklore, charms and rhymes, ballads and songs, jokes and anecdotes, 'old wives tales', and nursery and fairy tales." They likewise group visual texts such as "emblem books, woodcuts for ballads and broadsheets, engravings, and frontispiece illustrations [as texts that] helped define beliefs about gender attributes" (59).

[181] For further information on how jest books respond to period assumptions of gender, see Pamela Allen, *Better a Shrew than a Sheep: Women, Drama, and the Culture of Jest in Early Modern England* (Cornell, 2003), 1-29.

was likewise encouraged to speak frankly when moved by God and her conscience. [182] Thus, Anne Askew is, on the one hand, esteemed for her disobedience even though, on the other hand, she is expected, as a woman, to be subservient. In a like manner, early modern friendship discourse contains similar incongruities and ambiguities. While woman is excluded from friendship due to her 'naturally' substandard intellectual and moral status (a topic which I turn to next), friendship is frequently characterized in feminine terms, such as that by Thomas Churchyard, who claims friendship to be "the mother and nurse of mutual love" (sig. C1r). Now that a concept such as gender has been broadly situated in its cultural *milieu*, I now turn my attention to investigate how it manifests in early modern friendship materials.

Similar to Pearson's gloss on the student's inquiry, the marginal status of women in early modern friendship materials, most notably the occasional pamphlets and translations of classical antecedents discussed in earlier chapters, is mostly evident through the predominance of masculine pronouns, though it also manifests in explicit explanations of what makes women unsuitable for virtuous friendship. While a cursory glance of occasional pamphlet titles readily affirm this claim, as evinced, for instance, by the subtitle of Breme's 1584 *The mirrour of friendship: both how to knowe a perfect friend, and how to choose him*, canonical proverbs, such as "*Friendship* is onely among good men" or "A faithfull Friend is as a man's owne selfe," likewise illustrate period assumptions of friendship as exclusively a male prerogative (Dorke sig. A4v).[183] A poem Churchyard uses as a prologue to his pamphlet on friendship, wherein it is

[182] See Woods, xxxi. Also see Mendelson and Crawford, 16-17.

[183] One may likewise turn to any arbitrary page in these pamphlets and compare the use of masculine and feminine pronouns.

likened to a tree that once established in "good ground to growe upon, / It takes sound roote, and spreads his braunches out," encapsulates how the language of early modern friendship discourse is fundamentally male-centered (A4v). Discussing "this tree [of friendship, which] in breast must needs be shrined," Churchyard repeatedly emphasizes a conception of friendship as naturally masculine:

> Where Friendship findes, good ground to growe vpon,
> It takes sound roote, and spreads his braunches out:
> Brings foorth fayre fruite, though spring be past and gon,
> And bloweth where, no other grayne will sprout:
> His flow'rs are still, in season all the yeere,
> His leaves are fresh, and greene as is the grasse,
> His sugred seedes, good cheape and nothing deere,
> His goodly barke, shines bright like gold or brasse:
> And yet this tree, in breast must needes be shrinde,
> And liues no where, but in a noble minde. (sig. A4v)

As this excerpt demonstrates, through his use of masculine pronouns, Churchyard fashions his analogy of friendship and the process of its regeneration after men. Not only is "Friendship" imagined as a tree composed of decidedly male "braunches," "flow'rs," "leaves," "sugred seedes," and "goodly barke," but Churchyard's insistence that friendship "liues no where, but in a noble mind," read in conjunction with the numerous instances of "his"/"His," implies a moral status conceivably available only to men.

Churchyard's suggestion that only the minds of men are capable of receiving and

realizing friendship is a common topic of discussion in early modern friendship materials, particularly translations of classical antecedents on the topic by Cicero, Plutarch, and Aristotle. Unlike Churchyard, however, these materials are frequently explicit in their dismissal of a woman's capability to form meaningful bonds of intimacy with either women or men. Generally, these materials disqualify women from virtuous friendship due to supposed 'natural' differences in their gender of intellect, virtue, and strength. [184] Indeed, Montaigne's 1580 essay, "Of friendship," while not a translation of classical antecedents, is heavily influenced by Aristotle, argues that women have long been excluded from friendship mostly as a result of their supposed inability to be "guided by vertue and conduct of reason," although he also identifies historical precedent as an additional contributing factor (sig. J7r). In reference to the classical antecedents from which early modern literature and culture derive their theories of friendship, Montaigne observes that "this sex could never yet by any example attaine unto it [i.e., friendship], and is by ancient schooles rejected thence" (sig. J4v). [185] According to Montaigne, the female tendency to be fickle and feeble minded render them incapable of forming and sustaining intimate bonds of friendship: "Seeing (to speake truly) that the ordinary sufficiency of women, cannot answer this conference & communication, [and] the nurse of this sacred bond: nor seeme their mindes strong enough to endure the pulling of a knot so hard, so fast, and durable" (sig. J4r). Similarly, period translations of *De amicitia* contend that enfeebled persons lacking this capacity, strength, or

[184] For the gendered dimension of the term 'virtue,' most notably its etymology and connotation of 'manliness,' see Allison Johnson's dissertation, "'Virtues Friends': The Politics of Friendship in Early Modern English Women's Writing" (University of Miami, FL, 2008), 8-9.

[185] See Shannon, 60, f.n. 13, for classical antecedents that discuss female friendships.

"sufficiency," that is, those whom he terms the "weykest and of leest power,… sholde… seke out grettest frendshippis or the frendshippe of grettest men" (Tiptoft sig. B5r).[186] While he originally includes men in this category of those who need political patronage and friendships of utility the most, Cicero makes it clear that this arrangement is of particular import to women: "every man [who] is weykest and of leest power, so sholde he seke grettest frendshippis or the frendshippe of grettest men. And by this meane as I trowe, that Sely wymmen sholde rather desire the helpe of frendship than men. And also they that were nedy, rather than they that were riche, & they that were wretched, than they that were weleful" (sig. B5r-B5v). As Cicero "trowe[s]," that is, as he has the utmost trust or confidence in his claim, "Sely," miserable, or poor creatures such as "wymmen" have a remarkable need or "desire" for the "helpe of [male] friendship" more "than men." Indeed, according to Cicero, not only are "wymmen" apparently incapable of forming friendships for the ethical reasons outlined in chapter two of this project, but due to the 'natural' weakness of their gender, they are also morally bankrupt like the "wretched" poor and lack the same degree of agency found in the more "weleful." Plutarch, by the same token, also confines his discussion to "friendship among men" in the essays "How a Man may discerne a Flatterer from a Friend" and "Of the Pluralitie of Friends," and while elsewhere in the *Moralia* he does entertain the possibility of female friendship, he does so narrowly and in support of patriarchal power (sig. H2r). In his essay "Of Love," Plutarch ridicules those who believe women incapable of friendship, stating that "to holde, that being by nature not indisposed unto other vertues, they are untoward for amitie onely and frendship, (which is an imputation laid upon them) is altogether beside all reason" (sig. Eeeee2r). While

[186] See Harington, sig. D8v, and Newton, sig. C5r.

Plutarch appears to diverge from Cicero's estimation of "Sely wymmen" by making a case for their possibility to enter into virtuous "amitie," as well as reprimand those absent of "all reason" for believing that women, like Montaigne contends, "lack minds strong enough" or are "not indisposed" to "friendship," in reality, to quote Valerie Wayne, he "relates friendship to marital affection," and thus makes an implicit claim for female subordination to men, rather than parity (16). Indeed, following Aristotle's contention in the *Nicomachean Ethics* that marriage can sometimes (though rarely) be a perfected form of friendship, and keeping with early modern humanism's stress on *conjugium* as the linchpin of marriage, Philomen Holland's Plutarch writes, in this instance, of the "conjunction of man and wife, *filos* [beloved or dear], that is to say, amity and friendship" (Eeeee2r). [187] In seeing marriage as "the best and most pleasurable form of love and the most beneficial form of friendship," as Wayne observes of the essay "Of Love," Plutarch, similar to Aristotle and Cicero, subjugates women to husbandly, or in the case of the latter, male, authority (17).[188] In *The Taming of the Shrew*, Katherine's instruction to the

[187] See *The Nicomachean Ethics*, 1162a. Also see Wayne, 24. As Wayne observes in her introduction to Edmund Tilney's 1568, *The Flower of Friendship*, *conjugium* was "a term humanists often used to identify marriage….The word emphasizes the marital union of husband and wife, spiritually as well as physically, and their reciprocal responsibilities" (24).

[188] In stating that "the family is an earlier and more fundamental institution than the State," Aristotle characterizes the husband as ruler of the household. He likewise classifies women as the weaker of the sexes in describing how the "division of labor" in marriage demonstrates that "man and woman have different functions" and that each perform work according to their gender. See 1162a.7-8. Also see Robert Cleaver, *A godlie forme of householde government for the ordering of private families* (London, 1598), sig. F8r and sig. K4r, for a period example that fuses friendship discourse with that of marriage and also draws upon models of government to discuss familial organization.

other women demonstrates a period understanding of *conjugium* as articulated by Plutarch and Aristotle: "Thy husband is thy lord, thy life, thy keeper" (5.2.150).

Narratives of "idealistic friendship" frequently depict women as a token that solidifies male bonding, as is the case with the nameless maiden of Elyot's "The wonderfulle historie of Titus and Gysippus" (referred to as Sophrone in ballad versions of the tale), or as a wedge that comes between men, such as Lucilla in Lyly's *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit*, Bellaria in Greene's *Pandosto: The Triumph of Time*, and Emilia in Shakespeare's *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (just to name a few). [189] These instances demonstrate how women are often characterized in friendship narratives as mediators, "facilitators, or enemies, of male bonding," rather than active participants, as Laura Gowing and others note (132). [190] However, even when women are perceived as "enemies of male bonding," such as in *Euphues* and *Noble Kinsmen*, they are also presented as the party that ultimately reconciles strife between male friends. This is represented as easily achieved in these narratives when women are reduced to a gift or a "sign of love and friendship" that circulates among men, as Lorna Hutson notes in her research on friendship and service in the sixteenth-century (2-3). [191]

Notwithstanding the marginal status of women in these occasional pamphlets and translations, one would give a false impression of the era's friendship discourse to claim that

[189] See Wyllyam Walter's 1525 ballad, *Here begynneth y^e^ hystory of Tytus & Gesyppus translated out of latyn in to englysshe by Wyllyam Walter*.

[190] See Bray 175 and Mills 430.

[191] Also see Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (Columbia, 1992).

representations of female friendship are altogether missing. This is certainly not the case when attention is directed towards early modern literature, where one may locate sporadic instances of active friendship between women often fused with representations of them as tokens or enemies of male friendship. For instance, Thomas Lodge, in his prose romance *Rosalynd*, has the titular character proclaim to Alinda, despite their banishment by Torismond, not "to be melancholy, when thou hast with thee *Alinda* a friend, who wil be a fathful copartner of al thy misfortunes, who hath left her father to follow thee, and chooseth rather to brooke al extremities then to forsake thy presence" (sig. D2v). Lodge draws on various motifs of friendship, particularly the classical exempla of virtuous male friends such as Damon and Pythias or Orestes and Pylades, as well as what Bray refers to as "the epithet of 'bedfellow,'" in order to stress the amity of Alinda and Rosalynd: "cheerly woman, as wee have been bed fellowes in royaltie, we wil be felow mates in povertie: I wil ever be thy *Alinda,* and thou shalt ever rest to me…so shall the world canonize our friendship, and speake of *Rosalynd* and *Alinda,* as they did of *Pilades* and *Orestes.* (sig. D2r; 153). [192] Shakespeare echoes this sentiment in *As You Like It,* his adaptation of *Rosalynd*, through Rosalind and Celia's relationship. Similar to Lodge's treatment, however, the ultimate fate of Rosalind and Celia's "love / Which teacheth thee that thou and I am one" is highly problematic since both are eventually married off to men, thus suggesting that women who make good friends make even better wives, or, to put it another way, that same-sex friendship prepares women for heterosexual marriage and subservience (a theme to which I shall return in my discussion of "Cook-ham" below) (1.3.92-93). [193] *A Midsummer Night's Dream*,

[192] See Hanes Walton, Jr's modernized edition of *Rosalynd* (Edinburgh, 1995), 47.

provides a more nuanced view of female friendship, though it too is not without its share of problems. Indeed, the friendship of Hermia and Helena, which the latter characterizes, drawing on the proverb 'one soul in bodies twain,' as a "warbling of song, both in one key, / As if our hands, our sides, voices, and minds / Had been incorporate," suffers a fate similar to that of Rosalind and Celia in *As You Like It* (3.2.206-208). In an interesting twist on the trope of women as enemies of male bonding, however, heterosexual love, particularly that of Hermia and Lysander, drives a wedge between female friendship. Titania's friendship with the deceased mother of the changeling is a more compelling representation of female friendship that refuses to conform to period understandings of gender and friendship. Indeed, friendship with the departed fuels Titania's sense of duty to care for the child: "And for her sake do I rear up the boy, / And for her sake I will not part with him" (2.1.136-137). [194] Titania's commitment to the changeling's mother, especially the respect and honor she bestows on their friendship, echoes a fundamental and exalted proverb of virtuous male friendship in early modern culture: "*amicitia etiam post mortem* (friendship extends even beyond death)" (Stretter 347). Finally, in refutation of the belief in women's inability to form meaningful bonds with others, Donne's elegies for Lady Markham and to Lady Bedford argue that women too are endowed with the virtue and agency friendship demands of men. Indeed, "An Elegy upon the Death of Lady Markham," can

[193] For Shakespeare's interpretation of the brief dialogue on friendship between Rosalynd and Alinda, see 1.3.90-94. Also see Hymen's officiating of the wedding of Rosalind and Orlando at 5.4.107-114 and 5.4.124-139 for instances where the discourse of marriage draws on that of friendship.

[194] See 2.1.121-137 for Titania's memory of her friendship**.** Also see Montaigne's "Of friendship" for discussions of friendship with the dead. Friendship with the dead in early modern literature and culture is a topic that merits further examination at length.

be read as a direct response to individuals such as Montaigne who declare the supposed womanly weakness of mind and body as traits that disqualify women from actively participating in friendship. Donne, writing of Lady Markham's virtue or "good[ness] in all her titles" as woman, wife, and widow, contends such traits "To have reformed this forward heresy: / 'That women can no parts of friendship be" (56-58). In "Elegy: To the Lady Bedford," written for the Lady on the death of a close friend, he draws on familiar tropes of virtuous friendship, most notably that of 'one soul in bodies twain' and 'friendship extends even beyond death,' to present the friendship of these two women as comparable to the male exempla known to Alinda and Rosalynd, as well as many others during the era:

> And since you act that part, as men say 'Here
> Lies such a prince,' when but one part is there,
> And do all honour and devotion due
> Unto the whole, so we all reverence you.
> For, such a friendship who would not adore
> In you, who are all what both was before –" (lines 15-20) [195]

Aside from addressing, as Shannon notes, "the strange post-mortem economies familiar from Montaigne," and, I would add, Cicero, and Shakespeare's *Midsummer*, Donne also "envisions female friendship as fully commensurate with the masculine norm" outlined in the occasional pamphlets and translations (87; line 4). However, it is troublesome that according to Donne, female friendship is only admirable or intelligible through a male paradigm, that is, only when women "act that part" commensurate to men or when they abide by the culturally scripted duties

[195] Also see lines 1-14 for further use of friendship proverbs.

of maid, wife, or widow should "we all reverence" them. This is to say nothing of the fact that it is a man who authorizes these attributes of Bedford and Markham as constituting virtuous friendship respectively.

Nonetheless, Donne's poem is remarkable for envisioning the friendship of women, and the subsequent "reform[ation of] this forward heresy," as analogous to the upheaval of a tyrannical power. While in his eulogy for Lady Markham this "reform[ation]" concerns a transformation of received wisdom of what constitutes friendship, as well as who can participate, his poem to Lady Bedford references the apocryphal story of Judith, a woman who literally overpowers a tyrant, Nebuchadnezzar, by beheading his general Holofernes.[196] Lanyer includes Judith as one example of "power[ful]…wise and virtuous women" that other females should emulate. Remarking on this reference to Judith in Donne, which can easily be extended to his comment on the upheaval of the popular opinion of friendship, Shannon argues that "nothing less than an image of a tyrannical force undone by a pair of women seems to be the proper compensatory contemplation for a Lady mourning her friend" (89).

While a survey of female friendship offers a more comprehensive account than that narrated by the era's friendship discourse as a whole, it also illuminates many of the contradictions and ambiguities that stem from claims about gender. However, simply to catalogue instances of female friendship in early modern friendship materials is ultimately of slight value to our study of the era – indeed, we must make something of these representations,

[196] For the biblical significance of Judith, see the Book of Judith 8-13**.** In a sermon delivered March 4, 1625, Donne says of Judith, that upon her killing the Assyrian general Holofernes: "So the priests and the elders come to Judith, and they say to her: 'Thou art the exaltation of Jerusalem, thou art the great glory of Israel, thou art the rejoicing of our nation, thou hast done all these things by thy hand.'" See f.n. 44 in Donne.

contradictions, and ambiguities in relation to the wider culture. As Penelope Anderson notes in a recent review of scholarship on early modern friendship, "the writing of the female body back into the narrative of friendship is not the boldest claim an author can make for female friendship. The boldest claim is instead that for the *language* of friendship, the public, ethical significations of friendship's tropes and history" (250).[197] With an eye toward the critical significance of female friendship, most notably as regards its "public, ethical significations," the next section turns to the poetry of Lanyer and considers how she employs friendship and the care of the self in order to comment on the cultural constraints placed by men on a community of women.

As the next section on the *Salve Deus* demonstrates, Lanyer frequently aligns the plight of Margaret, Eve, and Christ, with male tyranny in a double sense of men's deliberate misreading of the Genesis narrative and the history of their abuse of earthly power. In doing so, Lanyer characterizes the friendship of women, envisioned as joined through *caritas*, as endangered by a tyrannous biblical interpretation that disregards how Adam, abdicating his friendship with God and Eve, as well as Pontius Pilate, with his wife and his conscience, are akin to forms of despotism. Lanyer depicts such misinterpretation and despotism as decidedly male and as a form of "tyrannical rule [in which occurs] a negation of reason, restraint, virtue, and law in favor of the lawless regime of abandonment to passion," to borrow a quote from Shannon's discussion of Elizabeth Cary's *The Tragedy of Miriam* (74). Lanyer contrasts instances of tyrannical rule in the Bible, as well as misapprehension of Scripture, with moments where the friendship of women is strengthen through their commitment to God, such as in *The teares of the daughters of Jerusalem*

[197] Also see Traub, "Gender," 129-131.

or Sidney's female utopia. Moreover, she depicts *caritas* as that which encourages virtue but is also fragile given the constant assault on female friendship by earthly forces.

Tyranny, *Caritas,* and Feminine *Ethos* in Lanyer

As a topic frequently used to emphasize inordinate self-love or a deficient conscience, early modern friendship discourse makes considerable use of the figure of the tyrant. As evinced by Cary's *The Tragedy of Miriam,* Edwards's *Damon and Pythias*, and Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, the tyrant is often used to signify myriad characteristics, such as excessive passion that overrules reason, a hardened conscience, or a usurper who works against the laws of God and 'nature.' [198] Indeed, friendship discourse, particularly Cicero's *De amicitia*, likens the friend who refuses the other's counsel to a tyrant: "It is not all one to live with a tiraunt and to live with a frende." Likewise, friendship materials frequently emphasize a Christianized form of friendship, *caritas,* or 'charity' as it is sometimes called, in order to underscore a spiritual and tripartite relationship where one's "love addressed to God [is] redirected to fellow humans only via his intermediate position," as Klaus Oschema characterizes it in premodern society (qtd in Classen 19). The fourth book of Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* is undoubtedly one of the best examples in early modern literature of friendship as *caritas*, as is George Herbert's *The Temple* and most of Donne's corpus. [199] *Caritas* and the belief that "*Deus amicitia est*" [God is friendship] broadly

[198] See Cary 1.6.453-54. The tyrant also signifies one who refuses frank counsel and opts instead for flattery. See Shannon 52-53; 73-74; 86-89; and 108-113. Also see Mills 142-44 and 173.

[199] Similar to the topic of gender, *caritas* is rather complex and what is presented here is extremely simplified. For greater detail, see Bray's discussion of Aelred of Rievaulx's twelfth century text, *De Spiritali Amicitia* [Of spiritual friendship], 254 – 261. Also see Mary E. Laker's translation of *Spiritual Friendship* (Cistercian, 1977). Matthew 18:20 clarifies why *caritas* is a

underpins the *Salve Deus*, most notably in terms of an emphasis on a friendship with Christ as that which unifies a community of women and promotes their inward virtue as well as outward political agency, as evinced by the female utopia in the dedication to Mary Sidney, the numerous addresses to Margaret, and the section on Pilate's wife (qtd. in Bray 257). [200] Furthermore, Lanyer presents the tyrant as a necessary oppositional figure and textual practice that threatens the possibility of *caritas*, and female ethical and political agency in particular and simultaneously provides opportunities for its creation and expression.

Throughout the *Salve Deus*, Lanyer gestures toward tyranny several times, where she sporadically depicts it as a natural phenomenon necessary for the redemption and grace of mankind. Through Lanyer's early address to Margaret, tyranny is first introduced as a natural force, the "tyrant Time," that brings the ruin of earthly and superficial beauty "unaccompanied with virtue" and subsequently elevates a "Heavenly grace" in its wake that "doth all imperfect Thoughts controule, / Directing thee to serve thy God aright" (187; 248-251). Her characterization of "tyrant Time" as a force necessary to raise "Heavenly grace" resurfaces in the end of her narrative of the Passion through her observation that the death of Christ's earthly body allows him, as well as the community of believers, to transcend such material power as "That prowd insulting Tyrant" death: "Being dead, he killed Death, and did survive / That prowd

tripartite relationship between two believers and God. While the brothers Triamond, Priamond, and Diamond are born of Agapē, that is, the spiritual community, kinship, or brotherhood formed through the love of Christ, the period often conflates *agapē* and *caritas*.

[200] Also see the discussion of community formed by dwelling "within [Christ's] Tabernacle" in lines 129-136.

insulting Tyrant in whose place / He sends bright Immortalitie to revive / Those whom his yron armes did long embrace" (1209-1212).

Although Lanyer depicts tyranny as a force that ultimately buttresses *caritas* and virtue, insofar as the community and *ethos* cultivated through Christ arise as a response to tyranny, she nonetheless explicitly condemns it as an act against God. This is most evident in her discussion of Pilate, whose actions she characterizes as "wrong, [and committed] with tyrannie, and might" (844). She does, however, include Adam in this category, whose eating from the Tree of Knowledge Lanyer perceives as an act of ambition that defines everything a Christian should strive to avoid, choosing rather to emulate and improve upon the moral condition embodied by Eve (844). According to Lanyer's accusation of Adam's tyranny, if tyranny can be construed as a sovereign's annulment of responsibility, reason, and law in exchange for what Laurie Shannon terms an "abandonment to passion," then his actions can reasonably be perceived as tyrannous. Indeed, in Lanyer's interpretation, Adam's trespass "can not be excused," since "Being Lord of all" on earth, he abdicates his responsibility to God and Eve in order to pursue his own passions:

> But surely *Adam* can not be excused,
> Her fault though great, yet hee was most too blame;
> What Weaknesse offerd, Strength might have refused,
> Being Lord of all, the greater was his shame:
> Although the Serpants craft had her abused
> Gods holy word ought all his actions frame,
> For he was Lord and King of all the earth,
> Before poore *Eve* had either life or breath. (777-784)

Reiterating in the couplet that God had bestowed sovereignty unto Adam as "Lord of all," which is doubly emphasized through the title "Lord and King of all the earth," Lanyer stresses the severity of his trespass. Indeed, although Adam should have refused Eve's offer through "Strength" of will as well as knowledge of, and in accordance with, the law of "Gods holy word," Lanyer suggests that he selfishly gave into passion rather than wisely rule. As the next stanza clarifies, he willingly chose to disobey the law due to his desire's appetite:

> Who being fram'd by Gods eternall hand,
>
> …And from God's mouth receiv'd that strait command,
>
> The breach whereof he knew was present death:
>
> …Yet with one Apple wonne to loose that breath
>
> Which God had breathed in his beauteous face" (787-791).

Ultimately, Lanyer posits that Adam's hunger for the inherent power of the fruit, not Eve's persuasion or Satan's guile, provides the reason for his disobedience: "The fruit being faire perswaded him to fall: / No subtill Serpents falsehood did betray him, / If he would eate it, who had the powre to stay him?" (798-800). As the final line of the couplet suggests, a sinister motivation for Adam arises from a lust for even greater power – indeed, "If he would eate it, who had the powre to stay him?." Marginalia to this passage in the Geneva Bible supports such a reading, noting that Adam was moved to eat the fruit "Not so much to please his wife, as moved by ambition at her persuasion." However, though Lanyer perceives Adam's abdication of responsibility to God as subject and Eve as sovereign as a grievous act of ambition, she places a great emphasis on the tyranny of Pontius Pilate, characterizing it as greater than "If many worlds would altogether trie, / By all their sinnes the wrath of God to get" (821-822).

Lanyer's critique of Pilate, whom she epitomizes as "a faultie Judge [who] condemnes the Innocent," occupies a central place in her Passion narrative, and it is here that she offers an extended critique of tyranny of the few and the many directed against Christ – a critique, which I show shortly, she also extends to a community of women and *caritas* (938). Similar to her discussion of Adam's culpability for the Fall of humankind, where tyranny is expressly perceived as "an abandonment to passion" at the expense of reason and responsibility for the care of others under the law, Lanyer presents Pilate as captive to his hardened heart, as well as the multitude, and thus unable to partake of friendly counsel. Lanyer draws on a variation of the tyrant prevalent in friendship discourse as one who "fears or prohibits 'friendly' communications of a different view," as Shannon aptly characterizes this archetype (52). Indeed, the tyrant typically "fails to see the virtue of a counselor speaking the sharp language of a healthy truth in the exercise of liberty of speech," choosing instead to remain steadfast (or in this case, absolutely silent), in his obstinacy and depravity (52). Lanyer depicts Pilate's "most worthy wife" as the counselor or *parrhēsiastes* who, unlike Adam in his refusal to use "those sharpe words, which he of God did heare" in order to chastise Eve, readily relays to her husband the holy wisdom she received from Heaven: "Witness thy wife (O *Pilate*) speaks for all; / Who did but dreame, and yet a message sent, / That thou should'st have nothing to doe at all / With that just man" (751; 834-837). She employs a range of approaches in her attempts to frankly counsel Pilate and steer him from tyranny, including rhetorical questions ("Art thou a Judge and asketh what to do, / With one, in whom no fault there can be found?"), comparisons to infamous tyrants ("Why wilt thou be a reprobate with *Saul*?"), tactful rebuke ("Thou art against all truth and right, / To seale this act… / With blood, and wrong, with tyrannie, and might"), and stern disapproval ("Let barb'rous crueltie farre depart from thee, / And in true Justice take afflictions part; / Open thine

eies, that thou the truth mai'st see, / Doe not the thing that goes against thy heart") (857-858; 838; 842-844; 751-756).

Lanyer compounds the individual tyranny of Pilate with that of "[t]his rude tumultuous route" demanding the crucifixion of Christ (754). As Lanyer observes, "these sinful people" further embolden Pilate to ignore his responsibility to "true Justice" and abandon himself to his passions, "malice," and "sinne" (841; 816; 823). On the one hand, Pilate's cruelty is depicted as partially arising from his inability and unwillingness to listen to his conscience – indeed, his wife perceives his tyranny as so great that even "thine owne conscience seeks this sinne / to shunne" (864-865). However, Lanyer also suggests that the tyrant paradoxically rules out of fear of the crowd, and thus earthly power and a "base dejection of this Heavenly Light" or authority occupy a greater part of his conscience and decision "The multitude…to appease":

> Yea, so thou mai'st these sinful people please,
> Thou art content against all truth and right,
> To seale this act, that may procure thine ease
> With blood, and wrong, with tyrannie, and might;
> The multitude thou sleekest to appease,
> By base dejection of this heavenly Light. (841-846)

She further underscores this through the discussion of the "Three feares [that] at once possessed *Pilates* heart," among "that which proov'd the deepest wounding dart, / Is Peoples threat'nings, which he so much feares, / That he to *Cæsar* could not be a friend" (913; 917-919). This picture is complicated by demonstrating how, ultimately, "*Pilate* thou art proov'd a painted wall, / A golden Sepulcher with rotten bones," that cannot fully rise to execute an act of tyranny against Christ and his own conscience (921-922). Calling upon Herod, who as Shannon notes, is "an

archetypical despot" in early modern literature and culture, Lanyer presents this as necessary in order for Pilate "To reconcile thy selfe [and conscience] by tyrannie" (876).

Adam and Pilate are not the only examples of male tyranny in *Salve Deus*, however. Lanyer locates tyranny throughout the poem, most notably in the "High Priests and Scribes, and Elders of the Land, / Seeking by force to have their wicked Wils" (489-491). Indeed, she draws on much of the same language used to describe Pilate and Adam in her castigation of the Pharisee: they are "stony hearted,… /…void of Pitie,…full of Spight" and with great "Zeale, Lawes, Religion, now they doe pretend / Against the truth, untruths they seek to frame"; (508-509;548-549). Although she depicts the unjust actions of these men and "their wicked Wils" as directed toward persecuting Christ, she simultaneously locates a resonance in the biblical interpretation of contemporary men that fault woman as the reason for the Fall as well as her subsequent moral and intellectual inferiority. As alluded to in the introduction to this chapter, the significance of this parallel is established in the dedication "To the Vertuous Reader" where "evill disposed men" who speak ill of woman are likened to "Vipers [that] deface the wombs wherein they were bred" (48 lines 19; 22-23). Lanyer positions these "men, [who]…unjustly lay to their charge" the inferiority of woman as akin to the Pharisee who unjustly persecuted Christ and his community of believers: "Such as these, were they that dishonoured Christ his Apostles and Prophets, putting them to shameful deaths. Therefore we are not to regard any imputations, that they undeservedly lay upon us, no otherwise than to make use of them to our owne benefits, as spurres to vertue, making us flie all occasions that may colour their unjust speeches to passe currant" (48-49 lines 24-30).

Throughout *Salve Deus*, Lanyer demonstrates how male tyranny directed against women, whether terrestrial or textual, actually strengthens *caritas* by providing women opportunities, or

what she refers to as "spurres to vertue," to exercise political agency and solidarity. She provides copious examples of biblical, apocryphal, and real women whose virtue, heroism, and friendship with Christ prove the "imputations" leveled against women by "evill disposed men" erroneous. For instance, Pilate's wife contests assertions of woman's culpability for the Fall and introduction of sin into the world, stating that it is absurd and hypocritical of men "to lay the fault on Patience backe, / That we (poore women) must endure it all" (793-794). In a similar manner, Lanyer writes "contrary to this custome" of denigrating women by appealing to biblical authority (48 line 4). Her reading is populated with "wise and virtuous women [charged] to bring down th[e] pride and arrogancie" of male tyrants as well as misogynist interpreters of the Bible (48 line 4; 49 lines 31-33).

Claims of woman's marvelous responsibility to act on behalf of God and check men who "have tempted the patience of God himself" are most evident in her catalogue of virtuous and heroic women previously mentioned (49 line 31). Indeed, Lanyer presents her readers with a history of woman rife with examples of courageous females who have been divinely ordained to protect the community of believers on earth. For instance, Lanyer uses the figure of Deborah, depicted in the Old Testament as a divinely inspired champion who defended the oppressed Israelites, to emphasize how God imbues woman with power and political agency in order to make his love manifest on earth: "Wise *Deborah* that judged Israel, / …God did his will reveale, / And gave her powre to set his people free" (1481-1484). In a like manner, she uses the figure of Judith to express a similar sentiment of female political agency divinely ordained to quash tyranny: "*Judith* had the powre likewise to queale / Proud *Holifernes*, that the just might see / What small defence vain pride and greatnesse hath / Against the weapons of Gods word and faith" (1485-1488).

More broadly, Lanyer provides numerous instances where male oppression in the Bible contributes to the cultivation of *caritas* among a community of women. Indeed, God speaks to Pilate's wife in a dream, but not Pilate; Christ is moved by the tears of women on his way to Calvary, but not the threats of tyrants; Christ is not abandoned by women as he dies, but his disciples all but disappear out of cowardice; and, perhaps most famously, after his resurrection, he first appears to Mary Magdalen and his mother Mary, rather than men. [201] In these instances, tyranny is depicted as a crucial part of "Providence" used by God to bestow favor or "countenance," that is a publicly displayed marker of friendship, on a community of believers that fortifies their resilience in the face of oppression:

> The righteous Lord doth righteousness allow,
> His countenance will behold the thing that's just;
> Unto the Meane he makes the Mightie bow,
> And raiseth up the Poore out of the dust:
> Yet makes no count to us, nor when, nor how,
> But powers his grace on all, that puts their trust
> In him. (121-127)

In representing *caritas* and the resulting community founded in and through Christ as partially contingent on one's willingness to "put their trust / In him" and simultaneously beyond one's control, insofar as the "righteousness allow[ed]" by Christ occurs at a place and time he deems appropriate (i.e., he "makes no count to us, nor when, nor how, / But powers his grace on all"),

[201] See 834-837; 969-1008; 50 lines 48-54.

Lanyer suggests that to deprive women of political and ethical agency is fundamentally at odds with the spirit of God's law (an idea which I discuss in the concluding section of this chapter).

Lanyer does not confine her choices of female exempla to biblical and apocryphal women but also includes contemporaries, among whom Margaret, Countess of Cumberland proves to be one of the more important examples. In writing to individuals such as Margaret and Mary Sidney, as well as "vertuous Ladies in generall," Lanyer demonstrates how the courageous females from history given the task to promote *caritas* extends to her contemporaries. However, Lanyer's exploration of female friendship also reinscribes and legitimates the social heirarchies so crucial to a male-centered discourse of friendship where bonds of amity are imbued with power and social prestige. Lanyer's community of women appears to have little room for those not of the gentry (indeed, even the middling-sort, aside from Lanyer, seem to be largely excluded); rather, the friendship she writes of is reserved for "all virtuous Ladies and Gentlewoman" (48 lines 6-7; 4 line 50). In other words, Lanyer's representation of 'great' women work against the notion of general female friendship, which assumes a community of equals.

Writing the *Salve Deus* for her patron, the Countess of Cumberland, Lanyer explicitly situates Margaret in a genealogy of women that includes Deborah and Judith, proclaiming: "Loe Madame, heere you take a view of those, / Whose worthy steps you doe desire to tread" (1825-1826). [202] Moreover, Lanyer uses spiritual exempla to underscore contemporary issues, such as Margaret's ongoing legal and financial issues, and to emphasize political agency of women from

[202] See 1496-1504 for Lanyer's discussion of how Margaret's virtue and actions exceed those of Deborah and Judith.

the aristocracy. In her dedication to the Margaret, Lanyer alludes to Margaret's troubles securing her daughter's inheritance, writing: "Right Honourable and Excellent Lady, I may say with Saint *Peter, Silver nor gold have I none, but such as I have, that give I you*…I present unto you even our Lord Jesus himselfe, whose infinit value is not to be comprehended within the weake imagination or wit of man: and as Saint *Peter* gave health to the body, so I deliver you the health of the soule" (34 lines 1-10). Lanyer invokes Saint Peter in a later address to Margaret in *Salve Deus*; this time, however, an emphasis is placed on spiritual and earthly powers to heal:

> These are the those Keyes Saint *Peter* did possesse,
> Which with a Spirituall powre are giv'n to thee,
> To heale the soules of those that doe transgresse,
> By thy faire virtues: which, if once they see,
> Unto the like they doe their minds addresse,
> Such as thou art, such they desire to be:
>
> If they be blind, thou giv'st to them their sight,
> If deafe or lame, the heare, and goe upright. (1369-1376).

As Lanyer suggests, mostly in reference to virtue, faith, and charity, Margaret has inherited terrific "Spirituall powre" that allow her to heal the "the soules of those that doe transgresse," along with the "blinde," "deafe or lame." Bestowing "apostolic healing powers" on Margaret, as Woods characterizes this stanza, Lanyer presents her patron as imbued with a mystical privilege traditionally perceived as confined to men (110 f.n. 1379). Although she suggests that this this privilege and power extends to "all vertuous Ladies in generall," it is important to note that Lanyer refrains from situating them in a genealogy of courageous women and investing them with priestly powers typically reserved for men; rather, Lanyer reserves this honor mostly for

members of the aristocracy, most notably Margaret, Elizabeth, and Queen Anne. The alignment of these women with Aaron, "the first true priest and typological forerunner of Christ," as Lynette McGrath notes, not only claims that God has bequeathed great power unto (a select circle of) women, but, more importantly, it undermines Lanyer's claims that the community of women, opened to all regardless of social standing, is created and sustained through *caritas* (212). Thus, one must question who is "[a]nnoynt[ed]…with *Aarons* pretious oyle" and Christ's blessings in Lanyer's vision of female community: "Annoynt your haire with *Aarons* pretious oyle, / And bring your palmes of vict'ry in your hands / To overcome all thoughts that would defile / The earthly circuit of your soules faire lands" (36-39). Lanyer's *Salve* Deus, written for her chief patroness, Margaret, Countess Dowager of Cumberland as an offer of solace from her legal troubles (she was disputing the inheritance accorded to her daughter, Anne Clifford), places Margaret in a privileged place with Christ that, as far as one may gather from an absence of women from other social classes, is foreclosed to those of lower classes. Indeed, the clear hierarchy in the dedications in prefatory materials along with sites of class privilege in *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum* and lamentations of class-difference and alienation in "Cooke-ham," suggest that in spite of the rhetoric that friendship fosters concord that transcends class, where, according to Cicero, "betters in degree, ought to equall theim selves with their inf[e]riours, so ought inf[e]riours not to be greeved," her poetry is abound with instances where social heirarchies are reinscribed (Harrington sig. F6r).[203] Writing on "female friendship and alliance" in the late-seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-centuries, Amanda Herbert notes that period conceptions of *caritas* both recognize social inequality among members within a community of

[203] See Tiptoft, sig. C4r.

women and simultaneously encourage ethical and political participation from all its members: "in the family of Christian believers not everyone was equal, but they didn't need be. By embracing caritas, or charity, followers of Christ were prompted to love one another despite their differences and inequalities and to beneficently and charitably offer succor to all members of the Christian community" (26).

However, as Lanyer demonstrates in *Salve Deus* and more poignantly in "Description of Cook-ham," the extent of "succor to all members of the Christian community" nonetheless tends to be compromised by differences in class hierarchy. Indeed, she opens "Cook-ham" with a "Farewell" to Margaret and lamentation how she shall never return to the estate because, as she hints and later elucidates, due to class differences:

> Farewell (sweet *Cook-ham*) where I first obtain'd
> Grace from that Grace where perfit Grace remain'd;
> … /
> Farewell (sweet Place) where virtue then did rest,
> And all delights did harbor in her breast;
> Never shall my sad eies again behold
> Those pleasures which my thoughts then did unfold: (lines 1-10)

Noting that the favor of Margaret (the first of two "Grace[s]"), whom she characterizes as an example of "perfit Grace" and virtue, did permit her entrance to Cook-ham, that place that inspired her to write *Salve Deus*, Lanyer laments her departure, now tantamount to exclusion, from the stately Cook-ham. Indeed Lanyer reinforces how "Never shall my sad eies again behold" Cook-ham through the observation that her time with Margaret and Anne is a never-to-be-repeated experience: "Vouchsafe to thinke upon those pleasures past, / As fleeting worldy

Joyes that could not last: / Or, as dimme shadowes of celestiall pleasures, / Which are desir'd above all earthly treasures" (lines 13-16). Likewise, Lanyer centers her lamentation that friendship with Anne is short-lived due to differences in social standing, itself characterized as a product of arbitrary circumstances rather than a testament to supposed deficiencies in virtue:

> And yet it grieves me that I cannot be
>
> Neere unto her,…
>
> … /
>
> Unconstant fortune, thou art most to blame,
>
> Where our great friends we cannot dayly see,
>
> So great a difference is there in degree.
>
> … Nearer in show, yet farther off in love,
>
> In which, the lowest alwayes are above. (lines 99-111)

As Lanyer makes painfully clear in this excerpt, "Unconstant Fortune," or the circumstances beyond her control and "difference[s]…in degree" or social standing are what contribute the most to dissolutions of friendship and Cook-ham's concord. Indeed, Lanyer observes how she cannot be friends with Anne because of class hierarchies, although both are equal in virtue. Furthermore, she notes, somewhat bitterly, the lack of reciprocity of affection between friends of disparate social standing; indeed, Lanyer concludes this passage with a couplet that contends those of lower standing display an affection to their superiors that is rarely returned due to hierarchies. As Lanyer proceeds to note her fading friendships with Margaret and Anne, as well as access to Cook-ham, she again invokes class differences as the primary reason a once unified community of women now dissolves. Indeed, in a manner reminiscent of the proverb "friendship extends even beyond death," where death might separate two bodies but not their love, Lanyer

employs images of a dying Cook-ham "Drowned in dead sleep" (line 190). However, as the final lines of the poem suggests, class differences, rather than death, separates her from friends:

> To our last words, did now for sorrow die:
>
> The house cast off each garment that might grace it,
>
> Putting on Dust and Cobwebs to deface it.
>
> … /
>
> This last farewell to *Cook-ham* here I give,
>
> When I am dead, thy name in this may live,
>
> Wherein I have perform'd her noble hest,
>
> Whose virtues lodge in my unworthy breast,
>
> And ever shall, so long as life remaines,
>
> Tying my heart to her by those rich chaines. (lines 200-210)

"Modest sensures"

As I have sought to demonstrate in this chapter, the themes of self-knowledge, temperance, and duty discussed in chapters one through three resonate throughout Lanyer's poems. Indeed, the import of self-reflection and consciousness central to the era discussed in chapter one, and succinctly embodied by the phrase *nosce teipsum* (that is, the Delphic command to 'know thyself'), appears in Lanyer as an appeal for women to be conscious of their inward self as well as the inherent bias of male-centered interpretations of the Fall. For instance, Lanyer claims in "To the Vertuous Reader" that her poem, along with "the modest sensures of both" female and male Christians who promote such faulty interpretations, will enable readers to become more aware of their interior condition as well as improve upon it: "To the modest sensures of both which, I refer these my imperfect indeavours, knowing that according to their

own excellent dispositions, they will rather cherish, nourish, and increase the least sparke of virtue where they find it, by their favorable and best interpretations, than quench it by wrong constructions" (50). Likewise, the realization of *nosce teipsum* in the practice of consciously forming the self as a moral being manifests in Lanyer through her advice on how women should conduct themselves virtuously and model their behavior after many of the strong females in the Bible. Not only does the poem suggest that women tame their passions through the cultivation of wisdom – "Who is more wise? or who can be more sage, / Than she that doth Affection subject bring" – but it implores constancy and abstinence from slander and selfishness, opting rather for frank speech and the practice of *caritas*, or friendship "rooted in love of God and neighbor," to quote von Heyking and Avramenko (lines 171-172; 6-7). The poem also includes exempla of "power[ful and]…wise and virtuous women" for readers to emulate in caring for the self – "heere take you a view of those, / Whose worthy steps you doe desire to tread" – among which Lanyer identifies as Hester, Deborah, Judith, and, perhaps most famously, Pontius Pilate's wife (49 lines 32). A reoccurring motif in Lanyer's depiction of these women is their courage to challenge male tyranny through a host of "noble acts," among which she includes "speaking truth according to God's word" (line 1820). In numerous instances, for example Pilate's wife, women speak frankly in an attempt to convince the other to improve his moral being and conscience, thus echoing central themes of the previous chapter, particularly the role of criticism and demand for one "to change his life," as Foucault summarizes the defining trait of *parrhēsia*. More important, throughout *Salve Deus* frank speech is employed to address a fundamental problem associated with *parrhēsia* and, more generally, friendship: tyranny. Indeed, male tyranny is a recurrent theme in the *Salve Deus*, and at one point in the middle of the Passion, Pilate's wife forcefully inquires (and which I unpack at length below): "Then let us have our

Libertie againe, / And challendge [or claim] to your selves no Sov'raignte; / You came not in the world without our paine, / Make that a barre against your crultie; Your fault being greater, why should you disdaine / Our being your equals, free from tyranny?" (lines 825-830).

Moreover, given that early modern friendship discourse, as noted in through this dissertation, envisions friendship and the care of the self as the microcosm of politics, even as it simultaneously claims it to be a private and apolitical affair available only to men, Lanyer's poetry complicates this myth through her emphasis on a friendship between women that is undoubtedly political, however vexed it may be by issues of class disparity. As such, her poetry aids substantially in an examination of friendship as it pertains to women and, more generally, political subjecthood. Indeed, she uses friendship to acknowledge a community of women brought together through the love of Christ and comprised not only of patronesses, but, of readers of the gentry, middling-sort, and, if we are to believe her rhetoric in the *Salve Deus*, those "of the meaner sort" (4 line 50). She depicts this community as ground in the cultivation of a Christian *ethos*, and uses her dedications along with the poem *Salve Deus*, to instruct women how to "in Virtue spend / Your precious time to beautifie your soules" (12 lines 1-2). Lanyer's advice to care for the self extends to both the formation of one's moral being as well as one's political being, a sentiment which is emphasized through the rich image of a polity of the self and others in her counsel "To overcome all thoughts that would defile / The earthly circuit of your soules faire lands" (14 lines 38-39). Lanyer likewise demonstrates how community and friendship are positively political and public, as evinced by her discussion of Christian spirituality, and, more specifically, false charges against Eve, and subsequently all women, for bringing the downfall of man due to her alleged weakness: "why are poore Women blam'd, / Or by more faultie Men so much defam'd?" (6 line 77-78). In examining the spiritual and political

ramifications for women gathered under "That mightie Monarch both of heav'n and earth," Lanyer makes a case for active female political and ethical participation that has primarily been denied to women based on what she construes as faulty readings of the Old and New Testaments along with miscellaneous apocryphal books (5 line 44).

The inclusion of Lanyer and other "Judith Shakespeares," to borrow a phrase from Virginia Woolf, likewise expands our understanding of early modern friendship discourse and illuminates what Mendelson and Crawford, in reference to female friendships of the long eighteenth-century, refer to as "'female consciousness,' [or] an awareness of themselves as a social entity distinct from men" (qtd in Woods ix; 231). While the term "female consciousness" may dangerously appear to essentialize women, insofar as it flattens any nuance or difference between women based on social rank, religion, age, and historical-cultural locations, the term, nonetheless, proves useful for thinking about how women negotiate, challenge, or respond to cultural assumptions foisted upon them by men during the period. In terms of Lanyer, "female consciousness" makes a variety of appearances in her poetry, among which may be included the opening lines of the first of many dedications in the *Salve Deus* (in this instance, to Queen Anne), where she requests her patronesses to willingly entertain or "Vouchsafe to view that which is seldome seen, / A Woman's writing of divinest things" (3 line 3-4). "Eves Apologie," a shorter poem embedded in the *Salve Deus*, is an example of "female consciousness" on a scale broader than Lanyer's acknowledgment of the apparent oddity of a woman engaged in such a masculine enterprise as publishing in print. [204] Indeed, the "Apologie," which as Lanyer indicates in the dedication "To the Vertuous Reader," is to redeem the perceived culpability of

[204] See Wall, 1-22, for a discussion of writing as gendered.

Eve for the Fall so as "to inforce all good Christians and honourable minded men to speake reverently of our sexe, and especially of all virtuous and good women" (50 lines 54-56). Likewise, Lanyer's presentation of the *Salve Deus*, including the dedications, "The Description to Cooke-ham," and the postscript, "To the doubtfull Reader," frames the work in its entirety as a commentary on the need for woman's political and ethical agency to be recognized by men. Moreover, her invocation of divine inspiration in "To the doubtfull Reader," particularly that she "was appointed to performe this Worke," presents this commentary and demand for political subjecthood as both a concern of women and God (139). As such, the text, as Barbara K. Lewalski astutely observes, demonstrates, on the one hand, how the *Salve Deus* is "conceived as a Book of Good Women [that] imagin[es] a female community sharply distinguished from male society and its evils that reaches from Eve to contemporary Jacobean patronesses," while on the other hand, the its positions women squarely within the society of men ("Discourses" 49).

Afterword: "Many souls, so to speak, become one": Friendship is the Commonwealth

Throughout this dissertation, I have demonstrated how reading early modern literature and culture through the lens of friendship (and vice versa) enriches our understanding of the social and political facets of the era. Despite the insistence among contemporary scholars, such as Tom MacFaul, that friendship is an intimate and private affair "ultimately independent of the public sphere," early modern friendship discourse almost consistently characterizes it as the unifying force of community and the guardian of its integrity (6). Cicero's contention that "the essence of friendship, consists in the fact that many souls, so to speak, become one" underscores this intersection of friendship with domestic and political arrangements, among which the form and function of the commonwealth is paramount.

Friendship ultimately concerns itself, as I have argued, with how the self relates to the law (understood broadly to encompass a shared, moral code which supposedly promotes the common good, rather than a discrete body of law such as the common law) and how they put it into practice. Thus, an emphasis in friendship discourse and practice on self-knowledge and duty, meditation and self-regulation, conviction and responsibility, and private relationships and social concord, illuminate the necessity to harness friendship to a higher cause once work on the self is well underway. Moreover, period conceptions of friendship demonstrate that the formation of "good" and "dutiful" do not proceed without cognitive, moral, and emotional struggles, particularly, as regards indifference, selfishness, flattery, and resentment. It is my hope that this dissertation not only encourages early modern scholars to reevaluate friendship discourse and practice as it intersects with texts on the body politic and commonwealth, but, equally important, that it illuminates how Foucault's notion of the care of the self has the potential to produce rich (re)readings of texts and contexts which seem firmly established.

A recurring motif in early modern friendship discourse centers on the belief that the commonwealth can be managed at the site of the self. According to this narrative, friendship, as an "ethical heuristic," simultaneously instructs how to form the self as an ethical and political subject. However, this study also raises many questions that merit consideration in future research on early modern friendship. For instance, why is friendship everywhere in early modern literature and culture? How might its redeployment in a variety of cultural milieus signal a larger problem lurking beneath the idealized "One soul in bodies twain"? How is friendship linked to early modern discourses of civility and courtesy? Nostalgia surfaces at the center of all of these questions (for the family, the court, social practices and rituals, etc.) and stagings of friendship in early modern culture. Moreover, viewing early modern friendship discourse as inextricably linked with nostalgia and civility also pushes back against the almost strictly *mentalities* reading of my project. While I firmly believe that the era envisions the care of the self as the central focus of friendship (a focus which it inherits from the classical antecedents), I have not fully considered the richer dimensions of friendship as reflected in the political practices and social realities of the era. It is my hope that future scholars will consider a few of these questions and concerns in their own explorations of such a fascinating and complicated subject as friendship.

WORKS CITED

WORKS CITED

Achilleos, Stella. "Friendship and Good Counsel: The Discourse of Friendship and Parrhesia in Francis Bacon's *The Essays or Counsels, Civill and Morall*." *Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: Explorations of a Fundamental Ethical Discourse*. Eds. Albrecht Classen and Marilyn Sandidge. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.

Anderson, Penelope. "The Absent Female Friend: Recent Studies in Early Modern Women's Friendship." *Literature Compass* 7.4 (2010): 243-253.

Anonymous. "A new song of a young mans opinion, of the difference between a good and bad Women." London: 1618.

---. "How the Devill, though subtle, was guld by a Scold." London: 1619.

Aristotle. *The ethiques of Aristotle, that is to saye, preceptes of good behavouvte and perfighte honestie, now newly tra[n]slated into English.* Trans Thomas Wilkinson. London: Richard Grafton, 1547.

---. *Aristotles politiques, or Discourses of gouernment by Loys Le Roy*. Trans John Dee. London: Adam Islip, 1598.

---. *The Nicomachean Ethics.* Trans. Horace Rackham. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.

Baldwin, Thomas Whitfield. *William Shakespeare's Small Latine & Lesse Greeke*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1944.

Barton, Ann. "Introduction: The Two Gentlemen of Verona." *Riverside Shakespeare*.

Breme, Thomas. *The mirrour of friendship both how to knowe a perfect friend, and how to choose him.* London: Able Jeffes [and William Dickenson], 1584.

Bray, Alan. *The Friend*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Carroll, William C. "Introduction." *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. London: Metheun Drama, 2004.

Churchyard, Thomas. *A sparke of frendship and warme goodwill, that shewest the effect of true affection and vnfoldes the finenesse of this world.* London: [Thomas Orwin], 1588.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *De Senectute, De Amicitia, De Divinatione*. Trans William Armistead Falconer. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1923.

---. *The booke of freendeship of marcus tullie cicero*. Trans. John Harington. London: Thomas Berthelette, 1550.

---. *Fovvre seuerall treatises of M. Tullius Cicero: conteyninge his most learned and eloquente discourses of frendshippe: oldage: paradoxes: and Scipio his dreame. All turned out of Latine into English, by Thomas Newton.* London: Thomas Marshe, 1577.

---. "Here foloweth the said Tullius de Amicicia translated in to onr [sic] maternall Englissh tongue by the noble famous Erle, the Erle of wurcestre [John Tiptoft]." *Here begynneth the prohemye vpon the reducynge, both out of latyn as of frensshe in to our englyssh tongue, of the polytyque book named Tullius de senectute.* Westminster: William Caxton, 1481**.** Q^2 a-f.

---. *Marcus Tullius Ciceroes thre bokes of duties*. Trans. Nicholas Grimald. London: Richard Tottel, 1556.

Classen, Albrecht. "Women as Friends in the Middle Ages and Beyond: Still a Thorny Issue." *Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: Explorations of a Fundamental Ethical Discourse*. Eds. Albrecht Classen and Marilyn Sandidge. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010. 81-91.

Colclough, David. *Freedom of Speech in Early Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Crowley, Robert. *The way to wealth*. *The Select Works of Robert Crowley*. Ed. J.M. Cowper. London: The Early English Text Society, 1872.

Culmann, Leonhard. *Sententiae Pueriles*. London: Thomas Man, 1612.

Davies, John, Sir. *The Poems of Sir John Davies.* Ed. Clare Howard. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.

Derrida, Jacques. *The Politics of Friendship*. London: Verso Press, 1997.

Detel, Wolfgang. *Foucault and Classical Antiquity*: *Power, Ethics and Knowledge*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2005.

Dobson, Michael. "*The Two Gentlemen of Verona*." *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare Online.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Donne, John. *The Works of John Donne*. Henry Alford, ed. Volumes 1-6. London: J. W. Parker, 1893.

Dorke, Walter. *A tipe or figure of friendship VVherein is livelie, and compendiouslie expressed, the right nature and propertie of a perfect and true friend.* London: Thomas Orwin and

Henry Kirkham, 1589.

Early Modern Research Group. "Commonwealth: The Social, Cultural, and Conceptual Contexts of an Early Modern Keyword." *The Historical Journal* 54.3 (2011), 659-687.

Edwards, Richard. *Damon and Pythias*. *The Collected Works of Richard Edwards: Politics, Poetry and Performance in Sixteenth-Century England*. Ed. Ros King. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.

Elyot, Thomas. *The Boke Named the Governour: Edited from the 1st ed. Of 1531*. 2 vols. Ed. Henry H. Stephen Croft. New York: Burt Franklin Press, 1967.

---. *The boke named the governour*. London: Thomas Berthelet: 1537.

---. *The bankette of sapience*. London: Thomas Berthelet: 1539.

Epictetus. *The manuell of Epictetus*, *translated out of Greeke into French, and now into English.* Trans James Sanford. London: H. Bynneman, 1567.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *Adages*. *Vol 31 of the Collected Works of Erasmus*. Margaret Mann trans. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Flather, Amanda. *Gender and Space in Early Modern England*. Suffolk: The Royal Historical Society, 2007.

Foucault, Michel. *The Courage of Truth: The Government of Self and Others II*. Ed. Frédéric Gros. Trans. Graham Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

---. Foucault, Michel. *Fearless Speech*. Ed. Joseph Pearson. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2001.

---. *The Hermeneutics of the Subject*. Gros and Burchell, 2005.

Francis, Scott. "The Discussion as Joust: Parrhesia and Friendly Antagonism in Plutarch and Montaigne." *Comparatist: Journal of the Southern Comparative Literature Association* 37 (2013 May): 122-137.

Fraunce, Abraham. *The Arcadian Rhetorike: or the praecepts of rhetorike: Greeke, Latin, English, Italian, French, Spanish, out of Homers Ilias, and Odissea, Virgils Aeglogs, and Aeneis, Sir Philip Sydnieis Arcadia, songs and sonets*. London: Thomas Orwin, 1588.

Fudge, Erica. "'The dog is himself': Humans, Animals, and Self-Control in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*." *How to do Things with Shakespeare*. Ed. Laurie Maguire. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008. 185-209.

Gowing, Laura. "The Politics of Women's Friendship in Early Modern England." *Love,*

Friendship, and Faith in Europe, 1300-1800. Eds. Laura Gowing, Michael Hunter, and Miri Rubin. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 131-149.

Graham, Kenneth J.E. "'Without the Form of Justice': Plainness and the Performance of Love in King Lear." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42.4 (1991 Winter): 438-461.

Grossman, Marshall. *Aemilia Lanyer: Gender, Genre, and the Canon*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1998.

Guy, John. *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Halio, Jay. "Introduction." *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's King Lear*. New York: G.K. Hall, 1996, 1-18.

Hall, Donald. *Subjectivity*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Hamrick, Stephen, Ed. *Tottel's Songes and Sonettes in Context*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2013.

Hanson, Elizabeth. Discovering the Subject in Renaissance England. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Harkness, Deborah. "Nosce teipsum: Curiosity, the Humoural Body and the Culture of Therapeutics in Late Sixteenth- and Early Seventeenth-Century England." *Curiosity and Wonder from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment.* Eds. R.J.W. Evans and Alexander Marr. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. 171-192

Heyking, John von and Richard Avramenko. "Introduction: The Persistence of Friendship in Political Life." *Friendship & Politics: Essays in Political Thought*. Eds. von Heyking and Avramenko. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008. 1-20.

Heywood, John. *The spider and the flie: A parable of the spider and the flie*. London: Thomas Powell, 1556.

Holton, Amanda and Tom MacFaul. "Introduction." Holton and MacFaul, ix-xxviii.

Hutson, Lorna. *The Usurer's Daughter: Male Friendship and Fictions of Women in Sixteenth-Century England*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Hutter, Horst. *Politics as Friendship: The Origins of Classical Notions of Politics in the Theory and Practice of Friendship*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1978.

---. "The Virtue of Solitude and the Vicissitudes of Friendship." *The Challenge to Friendship in Modernity*. Eds. Heather Devere and Preston King. London: Frank Cass, 2000. 131-148.

Hyatte, Reginald. *The Arts of Friendship: The Idealization of Friendship in Medieval and Early*

Renaissance Literature. Boston: Brill, 1994.

Jonson, Ben. *Cynthia's Revels*. *The Complete Plays of Ben Jonson*, *vol 2*. Ed G.A. Wilkes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.

King, Ros. "Introduction." *The Collected Works of Richard Edwards: Politics, Poetry and Performance in Sixteenth-Century England*. Ed. Ros King. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001, 1-108.

Kinney, Arthur F. and David W. Swain. The Routledge Encylopedia of Tudor England. New York: Garland Publishing, 2001.

Konstan, David. *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Kraye, Jill, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*.2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Lane, Melissa. "Ancient Political Philosophy." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ancient-political

Lee, Alexander. *Petrarch and St. Augustine: Classical Scholarship, Christian Theology, and the Origins of the Renaissance in Italy*. Boston: Brill, 2012.

Lever, Thomas. *A fruitfull sermon made in Poules churche at London in the shroudes, the seconde daye of February by Thomas Leuer*. London: John Day, 1550.

Lewalski, Barbara. "Seizing Discourses and Reinventing Genres." *Aemilia Lanyer: Gender, Genre, and the Canon*. Ed. Marshall Grossman. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1998. 49-59.

Lochman and López. "Introduction: The Emergence of Discourses: Early Modern Friendshp." *Discourses and Representations of Friendship in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700*. Eds. Lochman, López, and Lorna Hutson. Burlington: Ashgate, 2011. 1-26.

MacFaul, Tom. *Male Friendship in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

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

Masten, Jeffrey. "The Two Gentlemen of Verona." *A Companion to Shakespeare's Works, Volume III: The Comedies.* Eds Richard Dutton and Jean E. Howard. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005. 266-88.

---. *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Maus, Katharine Eisaman. *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Mendelson, Sara Heller and Patricia Crawford. *Women in Early Modern England 1550-1720*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Mueller, Janel. "The Feminist Poetics of Aemila Lanyer's Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum." *Feminist Measures: Sounding in Poetry and Theater*. Eds. Lynn Keller and Cristianne Miller. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 1994. 208-236.

Mills, Laurens J. *One Soul in Bodies Twain: Friendship in Tudor Literature and Stuart Drama*. Bloomington, Indiana: Principia Press, 1937.

Morison, Richard. *Exhortation to stirre all Englishe men to the defence of their countreye*. London: Richard Bertheleti, 1539.

Nicgorski, Walter. "Cicero's Distinctive Voice on Friendship: *De amicitia* and *De Re Republica*." von Heyking and Avramenko. 84-114.

Olmsted, Wendy. *The Imperfect Friend: Emotion and Rhetoric in Sidney, Milton, and Their Contexts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.

Parkin-Speer, Diane. "Freedom of Speech in Sixteenth Century English Rhetorics." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 12:3 (1981): 65-72.

Paster, Gail Kern. *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespeare Stage*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2010.

Peachum, Henry. *The garden of eloquence*. London: H. Jackson, 1577.

Pomeroy, Elizabeth. *The Elizabethan Miscellanies: Their Development and Conventions.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Plutarch. *The philosophie, commonlie called, the morals written by the learned philosopher Plutarch of Chæronea*. Trans. Phelimon of Holland. London: Arnold Hatfield, 1603.

Puttenham, George. *The arte of english poesie*. London: Richard Field, 1589.

Rawlins, William. *Friendship Matters: Communication, Dialectics, and the Life Course*. New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction, 1992.

Rogers, Thomas. *A philosophicall discourse, entituled, The anatomie of the minde*. London: John

Charlewood, 1576.

---. *A pretious booke of heauenlie meditations, called a priuate talke of the soule with God*. London: H. Denham, 1581.

Sargent, Ralph M. "Sir Thomas Elyot and the Integrity of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*." *Two Gentlemen of Verona: Critical Essays*. Ed. June Schulueter. New York: Garland Press, 1996. 33-48.

Schoenfeldt, Michael. *Bodies and Selves in Early Modern England*: *Physiology and Inwardness in Spenser, Shakespeare, Herbert, and Milton*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Schlueter, June. Two Gentlemen of Verona: Critical Essays. New York: Garland Publishing, 1996.

Shakespeare, William. *King Lear*. Ed. R. A. Foakes. London: Thompson Learning, 1997.

---. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Ed. William C. Carroll. London: Methuen Drama, 2004.

Shannon, Laurie. *Sovereign Amity: Figures of Friendship in Shakespearean Contexts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Sidney, Phillip Sir. *Sir Philip Sidney's An Apology for Poetry and Astrophil and Stella: Texts and Contexts.* Ed. Peter C. Herman. Glen Alan: College Publishing, 2001.

Slight, Camille Wells. "*The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and The Courtesy Book Tradition." Schulueter. 115-132.

Smith, Barbara and Ursula Appelt. *Write or Be Written: Early Modern Women Poets and Cultural Constraints.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.

Smith, Thomas, Sir. *De republica Anglorum*. Ed. Mary Dewar. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Soellner, Rolf. *Shakespeare's Patterns of Self-Knowledge*. Columbus: Ohio University Press, 1972.

Stretter, Robert. "Cicero on Stage: *Damon and Pithias* and the Fate of Classical Friendship in English Renaissance Drama." *The Culture of Early Modern Friendship.* Spec. issue of *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 47.4 (Winter 2005): 345-65.

Stone, Lawrence. *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800*. New York: Harper, 1977.

Taylor, Gary and Michael Warren. *The Division of the kingdoms : Shakespeare's two versions of King Lear*. Eds. Gary Taylor and Michael Warren. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Tottel, Richard. *Tottel's Miscellany: Songs and Sonnets of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, Sir Thomas Wyatt and Others*. London: Penguin, 2011.

Traub, Valerie. "Gender and Sexuality in Shakespeare." *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 129-146.

---. *Feminist Readings of Early Modern Culture: Emerging Subjects*. Eds. Valerie Traub, M. Lindsay Kaplan, and Dympna Callaghan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Warner, Christopher J. *The Making and Marketing of Tottel's Miscellany, 1557*: *Songs and Sonnets in the Summer of the Martyrs' Fires.* Burlington: Ashgate, 2013.

Wayne, Valerie. "Introduction." Wayne, 1-96.

Weimann, Robert. "Laughing with the Audience: *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and the Popular Comedy Tradition." Schulueter, 35-42.

Welsford, Enid. "The Court-Fool in Elizabethan Drama." *King Lear: Critical Essays*. Ed. Kenneth Muir. New York: Garland, 1984. 103-118

Wilson, Thomas. *The art of rhetorique*. London: Richard Grafton, 1553.

Woolfson, Johnathan. "Introduction." *Reassessing Tudor Humanism*. Ed Jonathan Woolfson. Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.

Zak, Gur. *Petrarch's Humanism and the Care of the Self*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.