

SIDNEY'S SAPPHICS AND THE ROLE OF INTERPRETIVE COMMUNITIES

BY JULIE CRAWFORD

At one point in Sir Philip Sidney's *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* (*The Old Arcadia*), the Amazon Cleophila (the crossdressed hero Pyrocles) "laying fast hold of Philoclea's face with her eyes . . . sang these sapphics, speaking as it were to her own hope."¹ Although the content of the verses Cleophila sings to the woman she loves is somewhat conventional ("If mine eyes can speak to do hearty errand, / Or mine eyes' language she do hap to judge of, / So that eyes' message be of her received, / Hope, we do live yet" [A, 73]), the explicit identification of their form as "sapphics" has, I argue, a different conventional resonance. In her edition of *The Old Arcadia*, Katherine Duncan-Jones footnotes this moment with the comment that "it is appropriate that the first poem sung by Pyrocles while he is disguised as a woman should be in the verse form associated with the best known Greek poetess," yet mentions no other association with Sappho save her gender and profession.² In this essay I discuss what "sapphics," a poetic ode in quatrain stanza form with a complex metrical scheme named after the poet Sappho (7th century BCE), might have connoted to a seventeenth-century writer and audience. I focus on the function and place of Sidney's sapphics in both the narrative context of a crossdressed character who elicits a complicated matrix of desires (Philoclea falls for Cleophila when she hears the sapphics), and in a text explicitly addressed to women.³ I argue that the dedication to and interpellation of women in *The Old Arcadia* is not simply titular or conventional but an integral part of its poetics. In addition to examining the specific place of the sapphics in Sidney's romance, I look at the textual means by which Sappho and sapphics circulated in the early modern period. I argue that the sapphics Sidney uses in the First Eclogues and the sapphic variations that appear elsewhere in *The Old Arcadia* are not merely metrical experiments. Rather, Sidney's sapphics invoke and enact female agency, desire and homoeroticism, and this specific invocation of female desire is part of the "hidden design" of *The Old Arcadia*.⁴ Sidney's sapphics, and the way the text draws reader attention to

them, including the detailed record of Philoclea's sexual response to the sapphics, solicit a moment of undeniable female-female desire. Such attention suggests that the invisibility, or what Valerie Traub has called the "(in)significance," of lesbian desire in the early modern period—in both primary texts and secondary criticism—is not absolute, particularly to readers in the know.⁵ The sapphics invoke female homoeroticism in the story line of the *Arcadia*, but they may also have encoded a register of desire which early modern writers employed specifically to appeal to women readers.

Sidney's sapphics have historical and literary associations at work which no one—with the important exception of Elizabeth Harvey, who noted that Sidney translated Sappho's "Ode to Aphrodite" into anacreontics in the Second Eclogues of the *Arcadia*—has addressed.⁶ The fact that Sidney's anacreontics (a metrical verse form associated with Sappho) are a translation of Sappho's ode and are, like the First Eclogue's sapphics discussed above, addressed by the Amazon Cleophila to the desirous Philoclea suggests that Sidney was versed in Sappho lore and knew the *content* as well as the form of her poems (enough so to deploy them in an explicitly homoerotic context). When Jonathan Goldberg asks what Spenser's imitations of Virgil, a classical poet associated with male homoeroticism, might mean to an audience—"Where does the literary allusion place the erotics of Spenser's text?"—he asks a question that should also be asked of Sidney's sapphics: where, if anywhere, do the *Arcadia*'s literary invocations of Sappho place the erotics of Sidney's work, and what does this have to do with interpretive communities?⁷ Scholars have increasingly drawn our attention to early modern knowledge about Sappho, and Richard Levin has recognized the implications of the scenes between Philoclea and Cleophila for our understanding of female same sex possibilities in the early modern period, but no one has addressed the discursive and poetic forms the seduction takes.⁸ Much like the "utterly confused" category of sodomy—a term which usually names a sexual relationship on the basis of its social transgression—I argue that sapphics carried an unstable weight of (homo)erotic, socially threatening connotations in the early modern period.⁹ But, unlike sodomy, I argue that the term "sapphic," as applied to both (poetic) form and (homoerotic) content, was employed to appeal to women readers. Reading Sidney's sapphics allows us to examine the presence of women in equations of homoeroticism, and to trace a more complicated picture of the roles of gender and desire in the exchange of certain verse forms and "ladies' texts."

The complicated scene of seduction in which Cleophila sings her sapphics and Philoclea receives them occasions much confusion about the manifestations of female desire in the early modern period: Philoclea is “sweetly ravished” (A, 73) by the sapphics and spends much of her time reflecting on her desire for (one whom she sees as) another woman. It also raises questions about how this eroticism is deciphered, both by *The Old Arcadia*’s sixteenth-century audience and its twentieth-century critics. Historically, the desire critics have read in Sidney’s poetry—particularly the *Arcadia*—rarely has to do with female desire. Critical readings of Sidney’s poetry as a sideline to his real work as a courtier, diplomat, and soldier, a way of paying homage to the Queen, or as toys for a male coterie or “areopagus” of versifiers have, while acknowledging its presence, recognized only certain types of desire in the text: self-fashioning, courtly, or male homosocial.¹⁰ Sidney has been historicized as a “man’s man” who “preferred to withdraw from Court, to ‘read and dispute somewhere in an inn with a few University men,’” and his poetry as the product of and entertainment for a male coterie.¹¹ Some have viewed Sidney’s, Edward Dyer’s, and Fulke Greville’s experiments with “artificial [artful] verses” as “the proceedings of a formal literary academy.”¹² Like a number of other sixteenth-century poets, Dyer, Greville, and Sidney experimented with classical meter and verse forms, trying to adapt classical models to the English language and thus create a worthy English national literature, and one of the poetic forms which they shared with one another was sapphic verse.¹³ Greville’s *Caelica* (written between 1577 and 1580) includes a poem written in sapphics which, according to John Buxton, was written to contrast with Sidney’s sapphics that Zelmane sings in the first book of the *Arcadia* (in *The New Arcadia*, Pyrocles is called Zelmane, not Cleophila, when crossdressed).¹⁴ The use of the sapphic verse meter was thus part of Sidney’s poetic coterie and its verse experiments, and an important part of the homosocial exchange of the male poets involved.

Although Duncan-Jones insists that Dyer and Greville were Sidney’s “most deeply rooted attachments,” she cautions that “Sidney’s friendship poems should not be too crudely construed as declarations of homosexual attraction.”¹⁵ Duncan-Jones enacts the critical (homophobic) tension between homosociality—same sex male society—and homosexuality or homoeroticism, at once pointing to a deeper

meaning (Sidney, Dyer, and Greville were not “just friends”) and closing down the interpretive possibilities she has enabled (but they were not “that way”). In contrast, critics like Goldberg have drawn our attention to the homoerotic nature of such male poetic coterie, suggesting that it is homophobia that reads, for example, the Spenser/Sidney relationship as one of “literary ideas untainted by personal regard and male friendship.”¹⁶ However, despite the importance of readings that allow for homoerotic possibilities, male coterie as described by Goldberg often relied on the effectual *exclusion* of women. As Juliet Fleming has argued, texts, even when addressed to women, could be part of a homosocial agenda—men promoting the interests of men—and actually critical of the women they ostensibly addressed (the most notable example being Queen Elizabeth).¹⁷ However, such homosocial exclusion was not true in Sidney’s case. Sidney’s community, particularly during the period in which he was writing *The Old Arcadia*, was not only, nor even most importantly, among men. Although Sidney doubtless had “deeply rooted attachments” with Dyer and Greville, he had an equally deep attachment to his sister Mary and her coterie of women.

One of the many literary tricks that Greville and Sidney shared was devoting their work to Mary; Sidney wrote for and of “Mira,” and Greville called himself “Myraphill” in *Caelica*.¹⁸ Their dedications can be read as a form of the triangulation of desire in which the woman to whom the poetry is dedicated is merely titular, a figure through whom men establish homosocial bonds or enact homoerotic desire.¹⁹ Yet, as Mary’s role as both Mira and the possessor of the *Arcadia* (the text’s full title, remember, is *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia*) attests, it is as likely that the poet’s rivalry for Mary’s attention and readership also had to do with Mary Sidney herself. My focus on Mary’s role raises the important question of how women get lost in critical (re)constructions of male homosociality: why do critics so readily dismiss women’s centrality to poetic circulation as mere form or convenience, or a cover for more important relationships, such as those between men? Do readings of (male) homoeroticism displace women more than they actually *were* displaced historically and textually? Indeed, the fact that the “happy, blessed, trinity” of Sidney, Dyer, and Greville has often overshadowed Sidney’s relationship with Mary is not only the result of (critical) sexism, but also, in more recent criticism, an example of the ways in which concerns about certain types of sexuality—in this case male homoeroticism—can supplant concerns about women and female desire.²⁰ The histori-

cal significance of circulations of texts and desires within coterie, and their influence on the form and content of literary texts, should not be schematized as solely male.

This is particularly true of the *Arcadia*. Sidney's romance was indeed written for a coterie: the ten surviving transcripts of the *Arcadia* all derived at different times from his own working copy and show that Sidney circulated copies among his friends.²¹ The question of who exactly comprised Sidney's literary coterie, particularly for the *Arcadia*, is answered, at least in part, by Sidney's letter to Mary which frames the text. The *Arcadia* is in many ways constructed on a "public privacy," making it clear that the text has a "privileged interpretive community": as Sidney says in his letter to Mary, "Now it is done only for you, only to you; if you keep it to yourself, or to such friends who will weigh errors in the balance of goodwill" (A, 3).²² It is under the dedication of this letter that Sidney's manuscript circulated, within a circle that was largely female; the book's "chief safety," Sidney went on to write, "shall be in not walking abroad." The coterie included, among others, Anne Mantell, who had been governess to both Philip and Mary; other Herbert, Sidney, and Dudley women who spent time at Wilton House during the period in which the *Arcadia* was composed, including Lady Sidney (Barbara Gamage), who was often with Mary Sidney at Wilton and Ivychurch; and Lettys Knollys and Penelope Devereux (both of whom may have been early readers of *Astrophil and Stella*).²³ Margaret Ezell has argued that scholarly focus on print culture and ignorance of women's participation in the coterie circulation of work in manuscript has led to a drastic underestimation of the literary activities of Renaissance women, and work on women who owned manuscripts, such as Lucy, Countess of Bedford, and Anne Cornwallis (who owned a poem miscellany which included poems by Sidney), suggests that women were more than the objects or titular dedicatees of verse.²⁴ Several of the ten surviving manuscripts of *The Old Arcadia* show evidence of female ownership: the Clifford manuscript of *The Old Arcadia*, which was at Wilton in the early 1590s, may have been commissioned by Sidney himself and made its way through Mary Sidney to Lady Anne Clifford, who later married Mary's son; and the Bodleian manuscript of the *Arcadia* includes a number of names on the recto of the first flyleaf, including "Anne, Elisabeth, The[lwall], Dorothy," and on its verso "Anne Myddleton."²⁵ It is also clear that Sidney offered individual poems as gifts to women. In June 1617, for example, Sir Edward Herbert wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton that he had "a good while since promis'd a

Sonnet to Madame la Princesse d'Aurange, which Sir Philip Sidney made her at the Campe at Zutphen, where hee was slaine."²⁶ Poems and poem collections—ladies' texts which were occasionally identified as being "locked in Ladies' casks" away from the public (male) eye—were intimately associated with women in ways beyond the merely dedicatory.²⁷ When Sidney says that his romance is meant for Mary's "eyes onely" and "those friends who will weigh errors in the balance of goodwill," he invokes both the "public privacy" of the coterie text, as well as other possible "hidden designs."

The *Arcadia's* eclogues, or poetic interludes, are explicitly introduced to the audience as containing "hidden designs" in which shepherds "sometimes lament the unhappy pursuit of their affections, sometimes, again, under hidden forms utter such matters as otherwise were not fit for their delivery" (A, 50).²⁸ Sixteenth-century writers viewed pastoral as a form particularly suited to secret commentary and political and topical allegory; it operates, as George Puttenham writes in *The Arte of English Poesie* (1589), by "glaunc[ing] at greater matters" under "the vaile of homely persons."²⁹ As scholars have pointed out, the "greater matters" were often political: texts dedicated to women, such as romances, often offered covert criticism of Elizabeth's rule, or promotion of the authors' own political ambitions. *The Old Arcadia* does include political commentaries, and a number of keys to the *Arcadia* identify one-to-one topical allegories of some of the characters, including Sidney's mentor, Hubert Languet, and his friend Dyer (identified as the shepherd Coredens).³⁰ Yet these details are only some of the allusions and secrecies of *The Old Arcadia*; Mary and the other "fair ladies" whom the text addresses also play important roles, particularly as the dedicatees of individual poems. The eclogues, in which all the sapphic variations occur, are often specifically addressed to women readers. Those offered at the close of the first book, for example, are offered by the narrator to ease the "fair ladies of the tediousness of this long discourse" (A, 55). The individual poems or songs which the shepherds address to the ladies often invoke some of the conventional dynamics of the circulation of verse in the early modern period, much of which was addressed to women. As Wendy Wall argues, "the 'shepherds' in Sidney's *Arcadia* compete with one another by singing songs addressed to their mistresses, a competition that simultaneously confers masculinity and membership within a privileged community." Wall also points out, however, that a poem (she is writing, in particular, about the sonnet) "is written for exchange and given to a reader who has the power to

amend or ‘finish’ the lover’s deficient text by granting it a complete meaning. Although formally finished, the poems take their full meaning through the interactive and eroticized moment between writer and reader.”³¹ Like actual poems which were meant to be answered—one thinks of Sidney’s Stella poems, or John Donne’s exchanges with Lady Bedford—the eclogues’ quantitative poems or songs (they too are “formally finished”) require the woman listener to complete them. The eclogues and sapphics that Musidorus and Pyrocles address to their mistresses, Pamela and Philoclea, within the romance narrative are simultaneously metanarratively addressed by the narrator/Sidney to his coterie of lady readers; Philoclea may be ravished by the sapphics, but the “fair ladies” are invited to enjoy them as well. The poems are offered—on both levels of the romance—for women’s interpretation and for their pleasure.

SAPPHICS

Any discussion of sapphics in the Renaissance must begin with the Greek scholar and printer Henri Estienne (also known by his Latin name Henricus Stephanus), whose work consisted largely of printing newly rediscovered Greek texts. Estienne was the first Renaissance scholar to publish any Sappho poems, fragments, or biographical information about her life and poetry. Estienne published Sappho’s “Hymn to Aphrodite” (fragment 1), (the poem Sidney translates into anacreontics in the *Arcadia*), in his 1554 edition of Anacreon’s verses, and the specifically lesbian “Ode to the Beloved” (fragment 3) in 1556.³² Stella Revard and other scholars of Renaissance appropriations of Sappho, such as Donne’s “Sappho to Philaenis,” see Estienne as key to the Renaissance rediscovery of Sappho as one of the exemplary voices of (homo)erotic lyric poetry.³³ Yet while scholars guess that Donne might have known Estienne’s work on Sappho, Sidney certainly knew it. Estienne dedicated two volumes of his work to Sidney; Sidney was not only aware of Estienne’s publication of the *Anacreontea* and Sappho’s poem—he uses both anacreontics and sapphics in *The Old Arcadia*—but he was also well aware of the Sappho legends and biographical stories.³⁴

Joan DeJean’s contention in *Fictions of Sappho* that Renaissance writers did not see Sappho’s ode as a celebration of homosexual passion (“the initial modern vision of Sappho [is] as the poet of woman’s unhappy heterosexual passion”) is not completely accurate. In fact, the biographical information included in Estienne’s later edition specifically draws attention to Sappho’s homoerotic associa-

tions with other women. DeJean herself writes that Estienne's 1566 volume begins and ends with references to Sappho's sapphism.³⁵ Estienne's Sappho biography is in fact taken from the *Life of Sappho*, from dialogue 9 of Lilius Greg[orius?] Gyraldus, in which Sappho is identified as both "*tribas*" and "*mascula*" (the two terms are still at the root of the extant debate about the 'nature' of Sappho's poetry).³⁶ Estienne's use of the Gyraldus biography actually seems to assert Sappho's reputation as "*mascula*" and to attest to her lesbian sexuality: he ends with a list of her female lovers.

Both DeJean and Harvey discuss how Sappho and metrical experiments in sapphic verse were used by sixteenth-century French and English male poets who wrote more for each other than for any real reclamation of Sappho, and who erased Sappho's homoeroticism in order to insert their own voices (Harvey calls it "ventriloquistic crossdressing").³⁷ Yet despite their heterosexualizing revisions, the male poets who "translated" Sappho's work were dealing not only with Sappho as a lyricist and a woman poet, but with her subject matter and her articulation of desire.³⁸ They employ her poetic voice because of its powerful and ambiguous eroticism, and, as is the case with the French poet Joachim Du Bellay's echoes of Sappho in his "Sonnet Dédicé à la Reine de Navarre" (1561), as a poetic form specifically suited for women.³⁹

In the midst of this male literary fascination with Sappho, I suggest that Sidney's sapphics and anacreontics are not an attempt to "contain Sappho's voice of female desire" (in the way that DeJean and Harvey argue other male poets do), but rather an attempt to *employ* it.⁴⁰ In having a crossdressed heroine sing sapphics to another woman, in a text addressed to the pleasure of women, Sidney was undoubtedly conscious of the ambiguous sexual orientation of Sappho's poetry, and of the associations of sapphics with a woman poet who addressed her erotic poetry, and her desire, to other women. Sidney's deployments of female, and feminine, poetic techniques and allusions, including his use of Sappho's verse form, are specifically directed to female pleasure and desire.

The use of Sappho to flatter or solicit the pleasure of women has a long history and, not surprisingly, sixteenth-century male poets often dedicated sapphic material and verse to Elizabeth I. Arguing against received accounts of the heterosexual nature of the cult of Elizabeth, Philippa Berry asserts that at the heart of her cult were numerous depictions of a woman surrounded by other women, and that Elizabeth was often depicted among ladies-in-waiting rather than

male courtiers (as in *The Shepheardes Calender*) and as Diana surrounded by her nymphs.⁴¹ Berry singles out John Lyly as the writer most insistent that this all female world was a homoerotic or lesbian one.⁴² Lyly's *Sappho and Phao* was performed before Elizabeth in 1584, and although some scholars insist that Lyly's play is empty of female same sex content, Berry argues that the play's emphasis on the queen's withdrawal into an exclusive feminine world as another Diana is "invested with a certain innuendo by its conjunction with the name of Sappho," a name synonymous with great poetry as well as female homosexuality.⁴³

Similar themes of an all female world ruled over by Diana/Elizabeth were also used in poems written for Elizabeth explicitly in sapphic meter. In *A Discourse of English Poetry* (1586), for example, William Webbe turns "the new Poets [Spenser's] sweete song of *Eliza* into such homely *Sapphick* as I coulde" in order to celebrate both the verse form and the queen, and Thomas Campion's "English *Sapphick*" praises Elizabeth by, among other things, comparing her to Diana.⁴⁴ It is clear from these dedicatory sapphics that the form was used in, and meant to be recognized as a register and celebration of, female-specific contexts. Francis Meres's "A Comparison of the English Poets" (1598) offers an intriguing analogue to poets' associations of Sappho and sapphics with Elizabeth. After praising Elizabeth, Meres writes of "learned Mary, the honourable Countesse of Pembrook" who is "a most delicate Poet, of whome I may say, as Antipater Sidonius writeth of Sappho, *Dulcia Mnemosyne demirans carmina Sapphus, / Quaesivit decima Pieris unde foret.*"⁴⁵ Meres's praise of Mary "as if she were another Sappho" suggests not only that Sappho was seen as an appropriate figure to praise powerful and literary women, but that Mary played a complex role in Renaissance literary history in ways similar to Elizabeth: it suggests, in other words, that, as Goldberg argues, "Elizabeth's 'anomaly' might well have been a potentially shareable position."⁴⁶ Like Elizabeth, Mary Sidney had a constitutive role in the cultural artifacts she occasioned, and her association with Sappho and sapphics alluded not only to her own poetic enterprises, but also to the female homosocial environments in which they were written.

Mary's central role in the production of Sidney's *Arcadia* has been aptly argued by a number of feminist scholars.⁴⁷ Sidney was at Wilton, Mary's home, during the periods in which it is widely believed—and which Sidney claimed that—he wrote most of the *Arcadia*.⁴⁸ Sidney's reasons for being at Wilton have been schematized by both sixteenth-

and twentieth-century commentators along gender lines—the split between a man’s world and a woman’s refuge—and as influencing the shape and subject of *The Old Arcadia*.⁴⁹ Wilton was seen as something of a (female) refuge from the affairs of the realm and the duties of a courtier, a place where Sidney chose “the delights in the world” over the “tedious business” of state.⁵⁰ Yet it was also a place which Mary Sidney self-consciously modeled on the continental tradition of noblewomen’s salons described in courtly and educational texts such as *The Courtier* (which centered on the figures of Elizabetha Gonzaga and Emilia Pia), and on actual court salons like that of Marguerite de Navarre in France.⁵¹ As discussed earlier, the coterie with which Sidney associated at Wilton was largely female, and other male writers registered and idealized this community in their texts. In 1592, Nicholas Breton described Mary’s “little court” as a gathering place for poets, scholars, and divines, “her person no lesse then worthily and honourable attended, as well with Gentlewomen of excellent spirits as divers Gentlemen,” and compared Wilton with Gonzago’s Urbino. In Breton’s 1597 *Wits Trenchmour*, the Scholler tells the Angler that he happened upon the “courtlike house of a right worthy honourable Lady.” “The sweet company of that house,” he goes on to say, “is in the company of women, like a meeting of Gossips, in respect of the gracious spirits of the sweete creatures of that little paradise.”⁵² Abraham Fraunce’s translation of Tasso’s *Aminta* includes a description, original with Fraunce, of a “company gallant / Of flowering damselfs waiting on *Pembrokiana* / with bowes and arrows on princelike *Pembrokiana*,” and the *Third Part of the Countesse of Pembroke’s Ivychurch* (1592) alludes to at least one real woman besides *Pembrokiana* who was part of the group storytellings.⁵³ In *The Silkewormes and their Flies* (1599), Thomas Moffet also writes of Mary’s coterie of women—“Laugh now (*faire Mira*) with thy Virgins white”—and even identifies them by their (classical) names, providing a numerical key for their real identities.⁵⁴ These works suggest that their authors envisaged a coterie of women as their audience and created a series of hidden allusions to the women who comprised it.

The narrator of *The Old Arcadia* addresses a reading/listening audience of “fair ladies” fifteen times, and Mary Ellen Lamb suggests that the text encourages all readers to “read like women” in order to be privy to the jokes of a text addressed to women. The woman’s point of view—no matter how it is conceived—is one of the main concerns of the *Arcadia*. I do not claim, as Lamb does, that “[a]mong

Renaissance writers Sidney would seem the most likely to transcend gender ideology,” yet the *Arcadia* often defends women as a sex, using arguments familiar from the *querelle des femmes* and the conventions of female patronage, and defends women’s right to education and reading.⁵⁵ When Pyrocles crossdresses as the Amazon Cleophila, he sets himself up not only as a servant to love but as a servant to women.

In addition to the extranarrative (“fair ladies”) and narrative (female-positive) appeals to women, there are other discursive and poetic techniques in the *Arcadia* which draw readers’ attention to the gender issues at work in the romance. In the Third Eclogues of *The Old Arcadia*, for example, Philoclea’s father, Basilius, who has also fallen for Cleophila, sings a verse on his way to what he thinks is a rendezvous with Cleophila: “his heart could not choose but yield this song, as a fairing of his contentment” (A, 198). Not only is Basilius’s poem the first one in *The Old Arcadia* to use feminine rhymes entirely, but it is also an imitation, in accentual iambics, of a sapphic stanza.⁵⁶ Maureen Quilligan discusses how the technical vocabulary of poetics can mirror social/gender control, particularly the “mimetic biologism” of masculine and feminine rhyme. She argues that Sidney uses feminine rhyme—“the proper prosody for political upset”—at moments of patriarchal chaos in *The Old Arcadia*, but that Spenser chose feminine rhymes in order to *appeal to* women readers (specifically in his appeal for the queen to read *The Faerie Queene*, a work which ends with a feminine rhyme).⁵⁷ The renowned Sidney editor William Ringler makes similar connections between particular types of verse and the speaker’s class status, pointing out that the native Arcadians recite in the common accentual iambics, while the “noble strangers,” including Pyrocles and Musidorus, use artificial quantitative measures.⁵⁸ Sidney’s sapphics are less “mimetic biologism” than mimetic sexual inversion; a crossdressed Pyrocles uses them to seduce a woman, and Basilius uses them to express his desire for a woman who is actually a man. Although the feminine rhymes and quantitative measures do reflect the speakers and the contexts in which they are spoken, the “chaos” the sapphics and feminine rhymes mark is as much about erotic possibilities and trajectories of desire as it is about gender.

The narrator’s shift to referring to Pyrocles as “she” when he is crossdressed as Cleophila has similar gendered and (homo)erotic connotations. It invites the reader not only to enjoy the feminized Pyrocles, but, in Lamb’s formulation, “to enjoy the erotics of sexual

mix-up” that the crossdressing and pronoun shift encourage.⁵⁹ *The Old Arcadia* in fact begins with a warning about a type of “sexual mix-up” which has to do specifically with a woman who will fall in love with another “woman.” As the oracle tells her father, Basilius, “Thy younger [daughter, Philoclea] shall with nature’s bliss embrace / An uncouth love, which nature hateth most” (A, 5). This “uncouth love” is, of course, Philoclea’s love for another “woman,” Cleophila. The adjective “uncouth” is tellingly ambiguous, designating both that which is unfamiliar or “marvelous,” and that which is “[o]f a strange and unpleasant or distasteful character.”⁶⁰ It is under this cryptic specter of “uncouth love” that the *Arcadia* expresses a humorous awareness of the gendered confusion occasioned by Pyrocles’s crossdressing. Musidorus calls Cleophila his “dear he-she friend” (A, 29, 38) and draws attention to the homoerotic tensions of the situation. Musidorus wonders how “so true a chaste boy as [Pyrocles] were could have become a counterfeit courtesan,” and Basilius (falsely) assures his wife that “they must be youths of other mettle than Cleophila who can endanger [Philoclea]” (A, 148, 103). The term “mettle” refers to both material substance (in this case the body’s sex) and “ardent or spirited” temperament or desire; its use both highlights the speaker’s ignorance of Cleophila’s real “mettle” and foreshadows the erotic ardor of Philoclea’s desire for Cleophila.

As if to augment the gender and erotic play within the storyline, Pyrocles’s change in gender and the narrator’s subsequent change in referential pronoun are brought specifically to the attention of the fair ladies by the narrator: “for still, fair ladies, you remember that I use the she-title to Pyrocles, since so he would have it” (A, 34). The ladies, that is, are both insiders to the joke and expressly invited to enjoy its connotations. Narrative descriptions of feelings of desire or passion are also often accompanied by a direct address to the “fair ladies” of the audience.⁶¹ When Cleophila praises Philoclea, the narrator asks if the audience feels envy (“You ladies know best whether sometimes you feel impression of that passion” [A, 35]), and the ladies are similarly asked to empathize with the passion that Basilius and his wife Gynecia feel for Cleophila: “But you, worthy ladies, that have at any time feelingly known what it means, will easily believe the possibility of [being overtaken with passion]” (A, 44). Sidney seems to be playing, *pace* Boccaccio, with the popular idea that romance arouses women, but he complicates it by invoking women’s experience of passion at homoerotic moments in the narrative.⁶²

The “fair ladies” in fact become implicated in and are encouraged to identify with the intricacies of a “sexual mix-up” that include not just the male sexual exploits of Musidorus and Pyrocles, but also *Philoclea’s* homoerotic desire. When the narrator discusses Pamela and Philoclea’s growing desire for their loved ones, he states:

I note this to myself, fair ladies, that even at this time they did begin to find they themselves could not tell what kind of inclination towards them; whereof feeling a secret accusation in themselves, and in their simplicity not being able to warrant it, closed up all such motion in secret. . . . For indeed, fortune had framed a very stage-play of love among these few folks, making the old age of Basilius, the virtue of Gynecia, and the simplicity of Philoclea, all affected to one; but by a three-headed kind of passion. (A, 49, my emphasis)

Although Basilius (a man) sees Cleophila as a woman, and Gynecia (a woman) sees her as a man, *Philoclea*, a woman, sees Cleophila *as a woman*. Furthermore, although a parallel is drawn between Philoclea and Pamela’s desires (in their sexual innocence, *both* sisters are unable to fully or guiltlessly recognize the “inclination” of passion)—which suggests that there is some affinity between heterosexual and homosexual impulses—it is the nature of *Philoclea’s* desire that is singled out for interpretive attention. Based on her identification of Cleophila as a woman, Philoclea grows “into worst terms; for taking her to be such as she professed, desire she did but she knew not what; and she longed to obtain that whereof she herself could not imagine the means. . . . Cleophila hath (I think) said enough for herself to make you know, fair ladies, that she was not a little enchanted” (A 49).⁶³ In the immediate syntactical slip between naming the desire and pinning it to an object (“Desire she did but she knew not what”), the narrator expresses an ambiguous awareness of both female homoerotic desire and the difficulty of enacting it (“she herself could not imagine the means”). Furthermore, at the end of this very complex description of polyvalent eroticism (both homo- and heteroerotic), the narrator reinvokes the “fair ladies” to identify with the desire and its complications, to recognize the varied connotations of this “three-headed kind of passion” (A, 49).

It is in the First Eclogues of *The Old Arcadia*, after our introduction to the “three-headed kind of passion,” that Cleophila sings her sapphics to Philoclea (A, 72). On one level, the sapphics she sings are an insider joke about her crossdressing—Cleophila sings about “the voice of truth” and the “[f]leshy veil” (A, 73)—yet at the same time as

they play on gender identity, the sapphics solicit erotic desire from a woman. The song, as I mentioned earlier, does its erotic work, and Philoclea is “sweetly ravished withal” (A, 73). Yet despite its ravishing power, Philoclea expresses confusion about the nature of her desire: “she did not know to what the desire inclined. Sometimes she would compare the love she bare to Cleophila with the natural good will she bare to her sister; but she perceived it had another kind of working. Sometimes she would wish Cleophila had been a man, and her brother; and yet, in truth, it was no brotherly love shee desired of her” (A, 85–86). Philoclea even prays that Cleophila will have a sex change.⁶⁴ Within the complex structure of the “three-headed” desire, Philoclea cannot fit her desire into a neat familial or heterosexual paradigm. The desire that Cleophila arouses cannot be read one single way, as homosexuality masking for heterosexuality (Philoclea really desiring Pyrocles beneath his female clothes), as only male homoeroticism (Basilius desiring Pyrocles), or female homoeroticism (Philoclea desiring Cleophila); the trajectory of desire is, like Sappho’s, “not unidirectional.”⁶⁵

Yet at the same time, when specific desire is invoked—as I think female/female desire is invoked in Philoclea’s fraught response to Cleophila and her sapphics—it is important to recognize it. Desire is not simply everywhere in the early modern period or text. There were, to be more specific, both inadmissible and admissible desires (as Philoclea states, “my desire must needs be waited on with shame, and my attempt with danger”) and punitive regimes (as indicated by Philoclea labeling her desires “unlawful” [A, 98]). These systems of disapproval led to the veiling and revealing of means of delighting and desiring, ways of hinting at and hiding female homoeroticism in the same syntactical or poetic construction.⁶⁶ The sapphics Cleophila sings give rise to a moment of undeniable specificity of desire—*female* desire for a person whom she considers female—suggesting that the “supposed differentiations of modern object choice as a determinant of sexualities,” which some scholars have seen as an inappropriate understanding of homosexuality in the early modern period, *did* have some purchase in the Renaissance: Philoclea recognizes her desire for another woman—her perception is that her object choice *is* a woman—but does not, clearly, imagine the possibility of an identity, or even a sexual act, based on this object choice (such as lesbian or sapphist).⁶⁷ Philoclea feels her desire for Cleophila both as distinctively homosexual and (thus) as a taboo desire. Her desire, defined largely through negative juxtaposition with easily

recognizable and allowed affections (“it was no brotherly love shee desired of her”), is, however, a real flesh and psychology affecting passion (she experiences it as “burning” [A, 85]), which is nonetheless not easily actionable.⁶⁸

Philoclea’s predicted “uncouth love” and her troubled reaction to its “unlawful” arrival suggest not only that one woman could desire another, but that such desire was somewhat recognizable (“desire shee did”), utterly physically compelling (“vehemen[t]”), and in need of social constraint or “law.” Yet it is an odd critical practice to rely on/read homophobia or social injunction (the judgment of the love of one woman for another as “uncouth” or as that “which nature hateth most”) as a marker of lesbian visibility. It forces us to ask if it is only through the archaeology of homophobia—examining traces of the condemnation of same sex desire—that we as twenty-first-century critics can see or read lesbian visibility, and thus if we are inscribing homophobia as the clear signifier of same sex activity or desire in the past because it is such a violent marker of it in the present. Yet the specific contexts of Sidney’s sapphic moments debunk the argument that lesbian desire was either invisible or unremarkable in the early modern imaginary. Philoclea’s self- and societally monitored desire, first evoked through the seductions of sapphic verse, is a manifestation of female same sex desire. This reading of the use of sapphic versification as a *formal* technique for both signaling and invoking female same sex desire points to the critical need to recognize female same sex desire and the vocabulary and creative scenes used for imagining its fulfillment. It also suggests that we read beyond the traditional male bias of scholarly examinations of homoeroticism and the content focused bias of most examinations of homoeroticism. Like genres, formal and metrical elements carry codes and stories of their own.

Sidney’s deployment of sapphics continues in the Second Eclogue of *The Old Arcadia* in which Cleophila, “desiring her voice should be accorded to nothing but to Philoclea’s ears, put down the burden of her mind in Anacreon’s kind of verses” (A, 143). Sidney’s anacreontics have taken on a certain notoriety that his sapphics have not, largely due to Sidney’s putative renunciation of them on his deathbed. As Thomas Moffet recorded in his biography of Sidney, Sidney “blushed at even the most casual mention of his Anacreontics, and once and again begged his brother, by their tie of common birth, by his right hand, by his faith in Christ, that not any of this sort of poem should come forth into the light.”⁶⁹ Duncan-Jones notes that the anacreontics

correspond with the sapphics Cleophila addresses to Philoclea, and that these two poems represent the poet's abject capitulation to love, the theme of both Anacreon and Sappho's verse.⁷⁰ Yet the argument that Sidney was embarrassed about (or it was felt by his biographers that his memory *should* be embarrassed of) his anacreontics because they were about love as an unmarked (presumptively heterosexual), unheroic sentiment or phenomenon is complicated by the fact that the poem imitates Sappho's "Ode to Aphrodite." As with her sapphics, Cleophila addresses her anacreontic verse to Philoclea, and the "Ode to Aphrodite" is famous for its lesbian context; Sappho asks Aphrodite for help with what her "distracted / heart most wanted," and Aphrodite promises Sappho that if the woman she pursues runs from her, "she will soon run after [Sappho]." While Sappho calls to Aphrodite, Cleophila asks her "Muse" to help her obtain her loved one, and Cleophila's claim that her "limbs shake" (A, 143) in her state of desire invokes Sappho's famous description of lovesickness: "I drip with sweat; / trembling shakes my body."⁷¹ The anacreontics thus invoke Sappho and highlight the complex erotic play in Cleophila's seduction: as Cleophila sings, "the singer is the song's theme" (A, 144). The anacreontics, like the sapphics, encode a whole range of hidden pleasures, not the least of which are homoerotic.

ARCADIA, POST 1586

I conclude this essay with a short discussion of the circulation and ownership of Sidney's *Arcadia* after his death. The battle over how the *Arcadia* would be published broke down not only along gender lines, but also in terms of what the *Arcadia* represented and whom it was for. In 1586, immediately after Sidney's death, his friend Greville took control of *The Old Arcadia* with this letter to Sidney's father-in-law and executor Sir Francis Walsingham:

Sir: This day one Ponsonby, a bookbinder in Paul's Churchyard, came to me, and told me that there was one in hand to print Sir Philip Sidney's old *Arcadia*, asking me if it were done with your honour's consent . . . Sir, I am loath to renew his memory unto you, but yet in this I might presume, for I have sent my lady your daughter at her request, a correction of that old one done 4 or 5 years since which he left in trust with me, whereof there is no more copies, and fitter to be printed than that first which is so common.

Greville goes on to spell out his agenda for Sidney's memory: "I think fit there be made a stei of that mercenary book to [so] that Sir Philip

might have all those religious honours which ar worthy to his life and death.”⁷² Greville attempts to keep the *Arcadia*—and Sidney’s memory—within a moral and religious framework. In his *Life of Sir Philip Sidney* Greville (who planned to build a tomb in St. Paul’s to hold both his body and Sidney’s), further attempts to erase the taint of nonmoral poetry from Sidney’s life, recording that on his deathbed Sidney “discovered not only the imperfection, but the vanity of these shadows [i.e. the *Arcadia*], how daintily soever limned, as seeing that even beauty itself, in all earthly complexions, was more apt to allure men to evil than to frame any goodness in them. And from this ground, in that memorable testament of his, he bequeathed no other legacy but the fire to this unpolished embryo.”⁷³

Yet not all Sidney’s biographers and publishers relinquished the eroticism of the poetry to the cleanliness of eulogy or allowed the *Arcadia* to be critically and interpretively tossed to the flames. Buxton, for example, points out that Mary kept her hand in the circulation and presentation of the *Arcadia*, despite Greville’s hijacking: “To her the *Arcadia* remained always a romance, written mostly in her company and always for her delight, and she preferred it so, rather than in Fulke Greville’s with chapter headings that invite the reader to interpret the romance as a moral allegory.”⁷⁴ As Sidney scholars have amply shown, there were rival interpretations of the importance and meaning of the *Arcadia*.

The Greville version—the revised *Arcadia*—appeared in 1590; Mary’s 1593 version was a hybrid of the old and the revised *Arcadia*.⁷⁵ *The Old Arcadia*, the one which circulated in Sidney’s lifetime and has been the subject of this essay, was not published until the twentieth century. The publication history of the *Arcadia* was, in effect, a battle between Mary Sidney and Hugh Sanford on one hand, and Greville and Gwynne on the other, as can clearly be seen from Sanford’s introduction to the 1593 *Arcadia*, in which he “apologizes” for Greville’s version: “The disfigured face, gentle Reader, wherewith this worke not long since appeared to the common view, moved that notable Lady, to whose Honour it was consecrated, to whose protection it was committed, to take in hand the wiping away those spotted wherewith the beauties thereof were unworthily blemished.”⁷⁶ The “Lady,” Mary, evidently thought that Greville had been presumptuous; the book, above all, and after all, was dedicated to her. Greville wanted Sidney to be seen as a religious man; Mary wanted to include all the “delightful teaching” as well as the “virtuous action” of her

Arcadia. In short, Greville wanted to apologize for the *Arcadia*, and Mary did not.⁷⁷

I do not wish to argue that Mary's *Arcadia* is a truer text than Greville's, nor that she endorsed a nonmoralized *Arcadia* because she wanted to keep it erotic, or specifically sapphic. I do want to suggest that *The Old Arcadia*, written for Mary and circulated in Sidney's lifetime within his circle of friends, is the cultural artifact of a certain relationship—a particular *female* type of circulation—and should be read for the historical and textual hidden designs and feminine interpellations that mark this cultural specificity. The battles over published versions of the *Arcadia* do not erase the conditions under which the text was produced. Despite the ideological decisiveness of Sidney biographers and present day critics, the anacreontics and sapphics remained in the *Arcadia*, and the *Arcadia* remained a romance written for a woman. Similarly, whether Sidney blushed at his anacreontics because they were secular, because of their association with love or eroticism, because of their association (both in verse form and imitation) with Sappho and historical and textual homoeroticism, or whether he rejected them at all, is impossible to determine. Scholars critically reproduce Sidney's deathbed as a space of erasure and idealization when they attempt to pin textual meanings according to particular ideological, hagiographical, or political interpretations. To read Sidney only as Protestant or courtier is as much an ideological and interpretive construction when made by a new historicist like Helgerson as by a sixteenth-century eulogist like Greville; neither claim erases the nuances of the "idle work" (A, 3) or the importance of Wilton's female coterie.

This discussion does not claim Mary's "authorship" of *The Old Arcadia*, but rather points to the "fair ladies[s]" role in the nature of its entertainment and its exchange. The point of this discussion is not to argue that the sapphics and anacreontics are the defining characteristics of the *Arcadia*, but rather that we pay as much attention to their literary and contextual enmeshments as we do to Sidney's allusions to Elizabeth or his male friends. The point of this discussion, in short, is to listen to what Sidney's sapphics might be trying to tell us.

Columbia University

NOTES

My thanks to Margreta de Grazia, Joan DeJean, Maureen Quilligan, Phyllis Rackin, Julie Schutzman, Jean Howard, Rachel Adams, and Liza Yukins, all of whom either read earlier versions of this paper or helped me to think the ideas through.

¹ Sir Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia)*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford and New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1985), 72. Hereafter abbreviated A and cited parenthetically by page number.

² *The Old Arcadia*, 373n.

³ On the text's dedication to women see Mary Ellen Lamb, *Gender and Authorship in the Sidney Circle* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1990); and Margaret P. Hannay, *Philip's Phoenix: Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1990). Lamb interprets the sapphic lyrics as a description of Pyrocles's "poor reason's overthrow" and his transformation to a "woman's hue" (*Gender and Authorship*, 84), but she does not comment on their form as sapphic verse.

⁴ The term "hidden designs" is taken from Jonathan Crewe's *Hidden Designs: The Critical Profession and Renaissance Literature* (London: Methuen, 1986). For a discussion of secrecy and the paradox of hidden design in Renaissance literature, see Richard Rambuss's introduction to *Spenser's Secret Career* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993). See also Annabel Patterson, "'Under . . . Pretty Tales': Intention in Sidney's *Arcadia*," *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 15 (1982): 5–21.

⁵ Valerie Traub, "The (In)significance of Lesbian Desire in Early Modern England," *Erotic Politics: Desire on the Renaissance Stage*, ed. Susan Zimmerman (New York: Routledge, 1992), 150–69.

⁶ Elizabeth D. Harvey, *Ventriloquized Voices: Feminist Theory and Renaissance Texts* (London: Routledge, 1992), 43, n.155.

⁷ Jonathan Goldberg, *Sodomities: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities* (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1992), 64. Goldberg asks if "this classicism—from Virgil's second eclogue to a platonized and delibidinized Socrates—secure[s] the literary propriety of the text?" (66). Alan Bray insists that the Renaissance imitation of classical literature did not necessarily imply a tolerant attitude to homosexuality and could just be a "literary exercise." *Homosexuality in Renaissance England* (London: Gay Men's Press, 1982), 61. Goldberg concedes that this may be so, "except to those readers who wanted to find in such poems justifications for their sexual tastes" (68).

⁸ On Sappho, see Harriette Andreadis, *Sappho in Early Modern England: Female Same-Sex Literary Erotics, 1550–1714* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2001); and on Sidney, see Richard Levin, "What? How? Female-Female Desire in Sidney's *New Arcadia*," *Criticism* 39 (1997): 463–79.

⁹ The descriptor, "utterly confused," is from Michel Foucault. Following Foucault, Bray writes that sodomy is not "so much a set of forbidden acts as the performance of those undefined acts—or the accusation of their performance—by those who threatened social stability—heretics, spies, traitors, Catholics" (17). See also Goldberg, 118.

¹⁰ In *The Elizabethan Prodigals* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1976), Helgerson argues that the predominant view that literary endeavors were a waste of time and poetry only important for its moral example contributed to what he calls Sidney's "morally muscular conception of poetry" (127). Helgerson's attempt to reclaim Sidney as an ideal courtier leads him to marginalize Sidney's "toyfull" poetry.

For work which focuses on male coteries, see Duncan-Jones, "Philip Sidney's Toys," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 66 (1980): 161–78; Louis Montrose, "Celebration and Insinuation: Sir Philip Sidney and the Motives of Elizabethan Courtship," *Renaissance Drama* 8 (1977): 3–33; and Gregory W. Bredbeck, *Sodomy and Interpretation: Marlowe to Milton* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1991).

¹¹ Thomas Moffet, *Nobilis or a View of the Life and Death of a Sidney and Lessus Lugubris*, cited in *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. William A. Ringler, Jr. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), xxvii.

¹² John Buxton, *Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965), 102. The existence of this coterie was proclaimed to the public in *Three Wittie and Familiar Letters*, in which Gabriel Harvey wrote to Spenser in early 1580 praising "those two excellent gentlemen Master Sidney and Master Dyer, the two very diamonds of Her Majesty's Court for many special and rare qualities, as to help forward our new famous enterprise for the exchanging of barbarous and balductum rhymes with artificial [i.e. artful] verses." Cited in Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney: Courtier Poet* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1991), 103. Ralph Sargent calls Harvey's publication a "violation of the code of secrecy surrounding the art of courtly poetry." *The Life and Lyrics of Sir Edward Dyer* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 59.

¹³ According to Buxton, such experiments in classical prosody in quantitative scansion were related to the concerns and classicism of men like Ascham who criticized "our rude beggarly ryming." "Others, like Ronsard and de Baïf, wishing to imitate the Greek custom of singing or chanting poetry, and therefore to make poetry that could be sung saw that observance of quantity was necessary to this end" (116).

"The 'Ottley manuscript,' which contains over forty of Sidney's poems, written probably between 1575 and 1579, includes also his account of 'Rules in measured verse in English which I observe,' suggesting a systematic programme of innovation." Peter Beal, "Poems by Sir Philip Sidney: The Ottley Manuscript," cited in Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney*, 103–4.

Both Sidney and Greville wrote companion pieces to lyrics of Dyer's; Sidney, in commemorating his friendship with Dyer and Greville in *A Poetical Rhapsody* (1602), "describes a summer day's pastime of friendly rivalry given over to songs of their own composition. 'Striving with my mates in Song: / Mixing mirth our Songs among'" (cited in Sargent, 59).

¹⁴ Buxton, 121. Sidney's *Certain Sonnets* (1577–1578) also contains a poem in sapphics which may have been written in response, or as a precursor, to Greville's.

¹⁵ Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney*, 241.

¹⁶ Goldberg, 83.

¹⁷ Juliet Fleming, "The Ladies Man and the Age of Elizabeth," in *Sexuality and Gender in Early Modern Europe: Institutions, Texts, Images*, ed. James Grantham Turner (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993), 158–81.

¹⁸ Sidney's dedication of the *Arcadia* to his sister had other precedents, including the 1577 Accession Day Tilt in which Sidney declared private devotion to "Mira" at the same time as he declared public loyalty to Elizabeth. See Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney*, 144, 195.

¹⁹ See Wendy Wall, *The Imprint of Gender: Authorship and Publication in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1993), 39. As Wall writes, the more common mode of coterie exchange was "between men." The texts presented to

women were “more frequently part of a play for economic rather than for sexual advantage. Extant manuscripts and historical reports make clear that men scribbled appropriate responses to other men’s poetic wooing. This exchange created a network of homosocial rivalry, a dynamic that critics have exhaustively analyzed in terms of the trafficking of women” (38). Wall makes it clear that her point is that in the production and transmission of Renaissance sonnets, the female reader acts as “a median space marking the forging of alliances”: “Gender is the axis on which writers register a specific conception of the literary text, one which de-emphasizes the author in lieu of his role in a set of social relations and bonds” (40).

²⁰ Buxton, 107–9.

²¹ See Ringler’s introduction to *The Poems of Sidney*, lx. See also H. R. Woudhuysen, *Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996). Woudhuysen has amply illustrated Sidney’s strong attachment to the world of manuscript culture and the role that women played therein. In trying to show how Sidney’s works circulated, Woudhuysen draws a parallel with Mary Hobbs’s scribal community for Henry King (219–20).

²² Rambuss, 18 (“public”), 20–21 (“priveleged”). The final stanza in Howell’s 1581 poem, “Written to a Most Excellent Booke, Full of Rare Inuention,” which was written about the *Arcadia* well before its publication, suggests not only the extent to which *The Arcadia* circulated in manuscript, but that it was always associated with Mary:

Goe yet I say with speede thy charge delyver,
Thou needst not blushe, nor feare the foyle of blame:
The worthy Countesse see thou follow euer,
Tyll Fates doe fayle, maintaine her Noble name.

Thomas Howell, *Howell’s Devises, 1581* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), 45.

²³ Barbara Gamage was often at Wilton and Ivychurch throughout much of the Armada year, and Mary also occasionally cared for Barbara’s daughter Mary Wroth through her childhood (Hannay, 20–21). Hannay argues that the Queen of Naples in Wroth’s *Urania* (1621), who walks in the sweet woods with her ladies where “they passed the time together, telling stories of themselves, and others, mixed many times with pretty fine fictions,” is a figure for the Countess of Pembroke (26–27). See also Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney*; and Michael Brennan, *Literary Patronage in the English Renaissance: The Pembroke Family* (New York: Routledge, 1988), 42–48. For the biographies of the women in Sidney’s circle, see Duncan-Jones, *Sir Philip Sidney*, 1–20.

²⁴ Margaret Ezell, “‘To Be Your Daughter in Your Pen’: The Social Functions of Literature in the Writings of Lady Elizabeth Brackley and Lady Jane Cavendish,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 51.4 (1988): 281–96. See also Woudhuysen, 258–59.

²⁵ Woudhuysen, 318. Albert Feuillerat published the first version of *The Old Arcadia* in 1926; it was based on the Clifford manuscript. See *The Countess of Pembroke’s Arcadia Being the Original Version*, ed. Feuillerat (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1962), vii. The manuscript includes the names “Alex. Clifford, Willm Clyforde is my name” and “Mountgomrey.” As Feuillerat writes, “Anne Clifford, daughter of George Clifford, third Earl of Cumberland, married in 1630, as her second husband, Philip Herbert, fourth Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery and Sir Philip Sidney’s nephew” (vii). See also Woudhuysen, 274, 299–300.

²⁶ The full text reads: “I have a good while since promisid a Sonnet to Madame la Princesse d’Aurange, which Sir Philip Sidney made her at the Campe at Zutphen, where hee was slaine, and which Mr. Hottoman a French gentleman who then

followd him, gave mee, I presume it would bee no ill Complement for my Lady to present it her, yf at least your Lordship so thinke fitt, yf not, I desire it may bee given her by some other in my name, and in Discharge of my promise." *Facsimiles of National Manuscripts from William the Conqueror to Queen Anne*, ed. Henry James, 4 vols. (Southampton, 1865–1868), 4:21.

²⁷ In "'Secret Arts': Elizabethan Miniatures and Sonnets," *Representations* 15.2 (1986): 57–97, Patricia Fumerton discusses the ways in which women could both collect and add to the body of poetry they transcribed in their personal anthologies. In some cases, women started or were presented with whole collections of poems. When Thomas Nashe dedicated the first edition of *Astrophel and Stella* (1591) to the Countess of Pembroke, he described his publication of the sonnet sequence as liberatory: "although it be oftentimes imprisoned in Ladyes casks, & the president bookes of such as cannot see without another mans spectacles, yet at length it breakes forth in spight of his keepers." *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, ed. G. Gregory Smith, 2 vols. (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1904), 2:224. The "Ladyes casks" are the private repositories for the poems, but they can also be understood as the veils for the meanings; to have another man's spectacles is to have access to what he sees, to understand the allusions and the relationships the poems encode. Like *Astrophel and Stella*, the poems in the *Arcadia* were clearly seen as "ladies' texts" in a way that was specific to that female audience as well as a possible cover for other male homosocial or sociopolitical motivations. The poems had been locked in "Ladyes" casks, not a lady's; they were addressed to women, but they were also written for women. It is thus important to consider that the secret relationships they encode are not simply between male poet and lady dedicatee, but among a whole network of "Ladyes," women friends, perhaps, "who will weigh errors in the balance of good will."

²⁸ Pamela, for example, discovers Musidorus's identity "under that covert manner" (A, 93).

²⁹ George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie*, a Facsimile Reproduction, with an introduction by Baxter Hathaway (Kent, Ohio: Kent State Univ. Press, 1970), 53.

³⁰ In "'Under . . . Pretty Tales,'" Patterson argues that Sidney intended the reader to read *The Old Arcadia* as a critical analysis of Elizabethan society and that his revisions were meant to show a loss of faith in the power of indirect discourse to make any impact on the monarch (6n.) In a passage in *The Old Arcadia*, Sidney himself refers to the idea that pastoral poems will "[s]ometimes, again, under hidden forms utter such matters as otherwise were not fit for their delivery" (A, 50). Duncan-Jones points out that the majority of Sidney's writings, unlike Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, were not intended for Elizabeth's perusal: "Sidney's *Arcadia*, circulated in manuscript in a way that was at first carefully controlled. If Spenser wanted to criticize some aspects of Elizabeth's policy—and he clearly did—he had to adopt ingeniously covert or ambiguous strategies for doing so. Sidney, writing primarily for his sister Mary and her circle, was able to let off steam in numerous saucy asides" (*Sir Philip Sidney*, 17). On Sidney's allusion to Languet, see Sargent, 65. It is Duncan-Jones who points out veiled references to Dyer in the *Arcadia* as Coredens (*Sir Philip Sidney*, 102).

³¹ Wall, 39, 49. Wall writes specifically about sonnets, but I think the dynamic applies to other poems, such as those in the *Arcadia*, as well. Many of the poems in the eclogues were circulated outside of the romance manuscript as a whole and can be found in commonplace and manuscript books. Fumerton has also described

sonnet giving as a game of public secrecy in which the sonnets are infused with hidden secrets and private loves and play with riddles publishing the identities of themselves and their mistresses. “One penetrates the outer convention of sonnet secrecy—the title page and preface—and beyond the conventional signposts of secrecy within the poems . . . only the intimate could reach the inner sanctum” (85). Fumerton talks about portraits as well as sonnets and points out that in the tournament in book 1 of the *Arcadia*, Musidorus has a “little form” of Pamela fastened to his helmet, while Pyrocles has a picture of Philoclea in his heart (86). Thus the parallel between the erotics of sonnet giving and the exchanges of the quantitative poems or songs in the eclogues is not fanciful; like the emblematic “small texts” of the shepherd heroes, the quantitative poems bear public secrets.

³² Henry Thornton Wharton, *Sappho: Memoir, Text, Selected Renderings, and a Literal Translation*, 3rd ed. (London: McClurg, 1895), xv. Wharton points out how early in the history of printing the literature of Sappho began: “The British Museum contains a sort of commentary on Sappho which is dated 1475 in the Catalogue . . . only one year after the first book was printed in England” (xiv–xv). In *Fictions of Sappho, 1546–1937* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1989), Joan DeJean provides a history of the publication of Sappho’s poetry. “Ode to Aphrodite” was published first in 1546 in Robert Estienne’s Greek edition of the rhetorician Dionysius of Halicarnassus. “Fr[agment] 1 is the first poem to receive independent publication: in his original (Greek-Latin) edition of Anacreon in 1554, Robert Estienne’s son Henri tacks on, as though as an afterthought, with neither fanfare nor even a Latin translation, the Aphrodite ode and a poem whose attribution is questioned today, ‘*La Lune à Fui*’” (DeJean, 30). In 1560, Estienne published a Greek-Latin edition of nine Greek lyric poets with additional fragments of Sappho’s poetry. The second edition of this volume (1566) enlarges her corpus further (see DeJean, 30–37). See also Mary Morrison, “Henri Estienne and Sappho,” *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance. Travaux et Documents* 24 (1962): 388–91. Morrison emphasizes the central role Estienne played in the rediscovery and circulation of Sappho: “Although not the ‘discoverer’ of Sappho in the sense that he was the discoverer of Anacreon . . . it was [Estienne] who launched the vogue for Sappho’s poems by publishing them in his *editio princeps* of Anacreon, so eagerly awaited by the Pléiade group” (391). See also Robert Aulotte, “Sur Quelques Traductions d’une Ode de Sappho au Seizième Siècle,” *Bulletin de l’Association Guillaume Budé* (December 1958), 107–22. Aulotte points out that the French poet Ronsard specifically thanks Estienne for his edition of Anacreon’s verse, indicating Estienne’s centrality to the French poetic movement. Ronsard writes: “*Avant même la fin de l’année, après avoir bu: / à Henri Estienne / Qui des Enfers nous a rendu / Du viel Anacréon perdu / La douce lyre Téienne*” (Ronsard, *Mélanges*: “Odelette à Corydon,” cited in Aulotte, 107).

³³ See Stella P. Revard, “The Sapphic Voice in Donne’s Sapho to Philaenis,” in *Renaissance Discourses of Desire*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1993), 69; and Paula Blank, “Comparing Sappho to Philaenis: John Donne’s ‘Homopoetics,’” *PMLA* 110: 358–68. Andreadis examines contemporary references to the mythologized reputation of the Greek poet Sappho and argues that “the complexities of Sappho’s sexuality, including her passionate involvements with other women, were indeed disseminated and elaborated in England and were, in fact, well known to those able to read Latin, if not always to those who could not.” “Sappho in Early Modern England: A Study in Sexual

Reputation,” in *Re-reading Sappho: Reception and Transmission*, ed. Ellen Green (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1996), 105–6.

There are, for example, explicit references to tribadism in the 1538 and 1543 Venetian versions of the *Heroïdes* (Andreadis, “Sappho,” 107). See also Andreadis, *Sappho in Early Modern England*.

³⁴ Revard suggests that Donne possibly consulted Estienne’s 1567 edition of the nine lyrical poets, *Carminum Poetarum Novem, Lyrical Poeses Principum, Fragmenta*, 2 vols. (Antwerp: Christopher Plantin, 1567), 2:17–34. She also points out that the literary criticism commentary is inseparable from the fragments: “Sappho’s two lyrics, quoted more or less complete by Longinus and Dionysus of Halicarnassus, were celebrated in antiquity and in the Renaissance for their eroticism. This first and second selections in Estienne’s edition both tell of Sappho’s pursuit of young girls and both speak of unrequited desire” (71). On Sidney’s relationship with Estienne, see Buxton, 56–59; and James M. Osborn, *Young Philip Sidney, 1572–1577* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1972), 52, 88–89. Duncan-Jones argues further that Sidney modeled his *Defense of Poetry* on a model “provided by an old friend, the great French scholar Henri Estienne, in his *Project du Livre Intitulé De la Precellence du Langage Français* (1579). . . . In addition to the 1579 treatise, Sidney also drew on Estienne’s *Deux Dialogues* (1578), his *Poesis Philosophica* (1573) and many of his editions of classical writers” (*Sir Philip Sidney*, 233).

³⁵ DeJean, 30–31 (“the initial”), 34–38.

³⁶ On the biography, see DeJean, 37–38; and Revard. “Tribas” was a popular, vulgar term, not a technical or clinical one. The term “tribade”—from the Greek “tribein” meaning “to rub”—was used to identify a woman “who engaged with other women in acts considered unnatural.” Andreadis, “The Sapphic-Platonics of Katherine Philips, 1632–1664,” *Signs* 15 (1989): 54. According to the three page “Sapphus Vita,” Sappho lived a respectable life until her husband’s death when she embarked upon “shameless” or “indecent” (*impudens*) promiscuity with youths of both sexes. Estienne includes a list of the names of her “disciples” and “beloved girls” (*puellas amatas*) (DeJean, 37). For the meaning of “tribade” and the scholarly debate on “mascula,” see Marie Jo Bonnet, *Un Choix Sans Equivoque: Recherches Historiques sur les Relations Amoreuses entre les Femmes XVIe–XX siècle* (Paris: Editions Denoel, 1981), 23–34. The debate over the interpretation of “mascula” continues. See, for example, D. M. Robinson, who calls the sapphic or lesbian interpretation “a filthily wrong interpretation of the word ‘mascula.’” *Sappho and Her Influence* (1924; reprint, New York: Cooper Square Publishers, 1963).

³⁷ Harvey, 2; DeJean, 1–10, 29–37. Robinson Ellis, in his preface to his translation of Catullus, gives some examples of Elizabethan renderings of the Sapphic stanza into English (see Wharton, 47). See also Derek Attridge, *Well-Weighed Syllables: Elizabethan Verse in Classical Metres* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1974), 213, for a list of English sapphics.

³⁸ Andreadis, “The Sapphic,” 54; Revard, 65; Harvey, 133. Whether or not these poets explicitly recognized Sappho’s sapphism, the most complex aspects of the major Sappho odes, what DeJean calls “the evasively undefinable internal signature and the calculated avoidance of stable erotic orientation,” are signs of erotic ambiguity (17). DeJean suggests that if “Sappho is an index, as she must be, sapphism was conceivable in a public literary forum at four moments,” and one of them was off and on from the mid-sixteenth century to about 1660 (23).

³⁹ Aulotte, 111–16; DeJean, 34–36.

⁴⁰ DeJean, 7.

⁴¹ Philippa Berry, *Of Chastity and Power: Elizabethan Literature and the Unmarried Queen* (New York: Routledge, 1989), 65, 123. The two most influential accounts are those of Roy Strong, *The Cult of Elizabeth: Elizabethan Portraiture and Pageantry* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977); and Frances Yates, *Astraea: the Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (1975; reprint, London: Pimlico, 1993).

⁴² Berry, 123–24; Goldberg, 259. Berry argues that “Lyly omitted the dimension of masculine conquest from this play in order to focus on the more feminine world of the court, where he represented Sappho as surrounded not by male courtiers bent on heroic activity, but by her ladies-in-waiting” (122). Sappho was also associated with a female coterie in Mitylene, the capital of Lesbos, “a kind of aesthetic club, devoted to the service of the Muses. Around her gathered maidens from even comparatively distant places, attracted by her fame, to study under her guidance all that related to poetry and music” (Wharton, 24). Like Sappho, and as Goldberg writes, “it is . . . possible to understand that [Elizabeth] wanted these unmarried women for herself, and not merely as her reflections” (41).

⁴³ Berry, 123. Berry says further that “[i]t is difficult to overlook this inference [to Sappho] alongside the near-explicit treatment of lesbianism in Lyly’s next play *Gallathea*, as well as the reference to England as Lesbos in *Midas*” (123). It is interesting to compare Berry’s reading with David Bevington’s, who sees *Sappho and Phao* as being a play about differing attitudes about marriage. See his introduction to *Campaspe and Sappho and Phao* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1991), 175. Bevington insists that if “Lyly was aware of the allegation [of Sappho’s lesbianism] . . . he seems to have chosen to overlook the matter as entirely unsuited to his project of flattering Queen Elizabeth” (153). In contrast, in her discussion of the female erotics of Lyly’s play, Berry points out that when Sappho captures Cupid at the end of the play (as a triumph over her feelings of desire) and takes his bow and arrow, saying, “Cupid, feare not. It is a toye made for ladies, and I will keepe it onely for ladies,” the reader is forced to “remember that the primary allegiance of Diana (goddess of chastity) was to women,” and that Sappho’s words to Cupid are ambiguous (123). Who is to decide what it means to have a love that is “kept onely for ladies,” or which way they were keeping it?

⁴⁴ William Webbe, *A Discourse of English Poesie*, in *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, 1:286. Campion writes: “Faiths pure shield, the Christian Diana, / Englands glory crownd with all devinesse.” Thomas Campion, *Observations in the Art of English Poesie* (1602), in *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, 2:347.

⁴⁵ Meres, “A Comparison of the English Poets” (1598), in *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, 2:322. Nashe’s dedication of *Astrophel and Stella* to the Countess of Pembroke similarly claims that “in [Mary] the *Lesbian Sappho* with her lirick Harpe is disgraced.” Frances Berkeley Young, *Mary Sidney Countess of Pembroke* (London: David Nutt, 1912), 171–72. See also Michael Drayton’s 1593 “Shepheards Garland, Fashioned in nine Eglogs,” in which he writes to Mary, “Sapphos sweete vaine in thy rare quill is seene” (cited in Young, 176).

⁴⁶ Goldberg, 61.

⁴⁷ See Lamb, *Gender and Authorship*; Hannay; and G. F. Waller, *Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke. A Critical Study of her Writings and Literary Milieu* (Salzburg: Salzburg Studies in English Literature, 1979).

⁴⁸ The dates are: August, September, and December 1577; May to August 1580; December 1581 and 1582; and February 1583 (see Hannay, 47; and Ringler, xxvii).

According to Hannay, at Wilton Sidney and Mary read romances together, such as Amadis de Gaule, Montemayor's *Diana*, Sannazaro's *Arcadia*, and the Countess challenged her brother to write a romance in English (47–48).

⁴⁹ Waller sees Sidney's retirement to Wilton in 1580 as being "deliberately . . . contrary to Hubert Languet's advice to join the Prince of Orange and acquire military experience" (44–45). Neil Rudenstine suggests that the correspondence of Sidney and Languet illustrates that Sidney felt torn between the world of men and the pastoral retirement of Wilton. Languet writes to Sidney that "the habits of your court seemed to me somewhat less manly than I could have wished." Cited in Neil L. Rudenstine, *Sidney's Poetic Development* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1967), 11.

⁵⁰ Rudenstine, 9.

⁵¹ Waller, 39–40.

⁵² Nicholas Breton, *The Pilgrimage to Paradise, Joyned with the Countesse of Penbrookes Love, Compiled in Verse by Nicholas Breton Gentleman* (1592), in *The Works in Verse and Prose of Nicholas Breton*, ed. Alexander B. Grosart. 2 vols. (London: Chertsey Worthies' Library, 1879), 2:5 ("her person"); Breton, *Wits Trenchmour, In a conference Had Betwixt a Scholler and an Angler Written by Nich Breton, Gentleman* (London, 1597), F2–F2v ("courtlike"), F3 ("is in"). Breton's dedication to *The Pilgrimage* compares Mary to the Duchesse of Urbina and comments: "and if she had many followers, have not you more servants?"

⁵³ Abraham Fraunce, *The Countess of Pembroke's Ivychurch* (London, 1591), E1v. "Not a name in pastoral literature, 'Dieromena,' with its root 'Dier,' undoubtedly referred to a female friend or relative of Edward Dyer, a close friend of Philip Sidney and the Countess." Lamb, "The Countess of Pembroke's Patronage," *English Literary Renaissance* 12.2 (1982): 162–79.

⁵⁴ Moffet, *The Silkwormes and their Flies* (1599), ed. Victor Houliston (Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1989), 36. The first book ends:

Weepe not faire (2) *Mira* for this funeral.
Weepe not (3) *Panclea*, Miras chiefe delight,
Weepe not (4) *Phileta*, nor (5) *Erato* tall:
Weepe not (6) *Euphemia*, nor (7) *Felicia* white:
Weepe not sweete (8) *Fausta*. I assure you all,
Your cattles parents are not dead outright:
Keepe warme their egges and you shall see anon,
From eithers loynes a hundred rise for one.

See also Lamb, "The Countess," 175.

⁵⁵ Lamb, *Gender and Authorship*, 73, 23. For example, Pyrocles says that "I am not yet come to that degree of wisdom to think lightly of the sex of whom I have my life" (A, 19). Pamela and Philoclea are described as "both so excellent in all those gifts which are allotted to reasonable creatures as they seemes to born for a sufficient proof that nature is no stepmother to that sex, how much soever the rugged disposition of some men, sharp-witted only in evil speaking, hath sought to disgrace them" (A, 4). Pyrocles also praises strong women, in contrast to his friend Musidorus's conventional rejection of love for women as unmanly: "this effeminate love of a woman doth so womanize a man that, if you yield to it, it will not only make you a famous Amazon, but a launder, a distaff-spinner" (A, 18–19). According to Musidorus, Love "utterly subverts the course of nature in making reason give place to sense, and man to woman" (A, 18). Mark Rose argues that Sidney "intended his readers to find

Pyrocles's disguise offensive," a criticism of "his subjection to passionate love." "Sidney's Womanish Man," *Review of English Studies* 15 (1964): 354, 356. Yet Rose fails to account for the fact that Pyrocles, as an Amazon, is the one who triumphs.

⁵⁶ See Ringler, 409.

⁵⁷ Maureen Quilligan, "Feminine Endings: The Sexual Politics of Sidney's and Spenser's Rhyming," in *The Renaissance Englishwoman in Print: Counterbalancing the Canon*, ed. Anne M. Haselkorn and Betty S. Travitsky (Amherst: Univ. of Massachusetts Press, 1990), 315.

⁵⁸ Ringler, xxxiv, xl.

⁵⁹ Lamb, *Gender and Authorship*, 84. Lamb points out that "disturbing overtones" confirm that Pyrocles's transformation proceeds beyond a change of clothes: "The loving detail lavished by the text upon his Amazonian costume . . . invests his newfound femininity with a strong homoerotic appeal" (*Gender and Authorship*, 84). Interestingly, Lamb does not specify *to whom* that homoeroticism appeals, indicating an erotic ambiguity that will be discussed further below. Lamb goes on to write: "Even more unsettling is the subsequent use of the pronoun 'she' to refer to Pyrocles in his female attire" (*Gender and Authorship*, 84). Unlike Duncan-Jones, who insists that "it is undeniably deflating to Pyrocles, who is in any case only seventeen and apparently beardless, that he is referred to as 'she' until the fifth book" (introduction to *Old Arcadia*, xiv), Lamb, despite her comment that the change is "disturbing," resists the homophobic and heteronormative interpretive closures of a moment that is "unsettling" to gendered expectations and allows for an interpretive possibility that includes the "erotics of sexual mix-up" (*Gender and Authorship*, 84). Duncan-Jones's comment illustrates how moments of interpretive ambiguity, if not hidden designs, are often contained and normativized by editors and critics. She writes: "When Pyrocles disguises himself as an Amazon, the narrator seems to embark with gusto on the transformation, which entails a change of pronoun [to refer to Pyrocles as 'she'] which even modern readers might find a little disquieting" (introduction to *Old Arcadia*, xiv). What is fascinating here is that Duncan-Jones draws the reader's attention to this moment but can only see it as "disquieting." However, to say that the pronoun change is "disquieting" or "unsettling" is not in and of itself homophobic; such destabilizations can be erotic, titillating, delighting.

⁶⁰ As a definition of "uncouth," the *OED* offers both pejorative and neutral definitions. "Uncouth" is "unknown and uncertain, unfamiliar, unaccustomed, strange, unusual, uncommon, marvellous. Alien or foreign to something, or Unrecognizable." Yet it is also "[o]f a strange and unpleasant or distasteful character. Unseemly, indecorous."

⁶¹ Lamb argues that "Sidney's inscribed female audience functions as a rhetorical ploy, to guide readers of both genders to 'read like women' in the first three books. In the last two books, all reference to fair ladies drop out of the texts" (*Gender and Authorship*, 75–76). However, Sidney invokes the fair ladies whenever he discusses desire, particularly ambiguous desire, and I argue that these invocations are meant to solicit their pleasure rather than to lead them towards ultimate censure.

⁶² Saltonstall, in *Picturae Loquentes* (1631), pointed towards the problem of women's identification with passion in his maid, who reads "love's histories, as Amadis de Gaule and the *Arcadia*, and in them courts the shadow of love, till she know the substance." Cited in Louis Wright, "The Reading of Renaissance English Women," *SP* 28 (1931): 680–81.

⁶³ Bredbeck offers an insightful, and practical, footnote as a refutation of any attempt to normativize the desire these three feel for Cleophila: "[Philoclea's] desire

is problematized by Basilius's lust for Cleophila (Pyrocles); for if we attempt to explain Philoclea's desire as 'normal' by saying she is really attracted to the man beneath the costume, then Basilius's desire correspondingly becomes abnormal" (107–8). In other words, the desire resists interpretive heteronormativizing.

⁶⁴ The complicated descriptions of Philoclea's desire read thus: "Philoclea found strange unwonted motions in herself. And yet the poor soul could neither discern what it was, nor whither the vehemency of it tended. She found a burning affection towards Cleophila; an unquiet desire to be with her; and yet she found that the very presence kindled the desire" (A, 85–86); "if I have willingly made myself a prey to fancy, or if by any idle lusts I framed my heart fit for such an impression, then let this plague daily increase in me till my name be made odious to womankind" (A, 97–98); "my desire must needs be waited on with shame, and my attempt with danger . . . It is the impossibility that doth torment me, for unlawful desires are punished after the effect of enjoying, but impossible desires are plagued in the desire itself. Then she might wish herself (for even to herself she was ashamed to speak it out in words) that Cleophila might become a young transformed Caenus [whom Neptune changed into a man]" (A, 98).

⁶⁵ The term is DeJean's, 33.

⁶⁶ In *Sappho in Early Modern England*, Andreadis shows how early modern women writers developed a poetry of "erotic ellipses" by which they could simultaneously express their desire and avoid the opprobrium associated with an ever-increasing awareness of transgressive female same sex erotic practices such as tribadism.

⁶⁷ Goldberg, 41.

⁶⁸ See Levin's claim that "[h]er discovery shocked her because she could not assimilate it to what she had been taught of sexuality" (470).

⁶⁹ Moffet, *Nobilis*, 41; Duncan-Jones, "Sidney's Anacreontics," *Review of English Studies* 36 n.s. (1985): 226–28. Duncan-Jones points out that although the anacreontics are spoken to the whole assembly of shepherds, "a covert layer of meaning may be signaled by Cleophila's 'desiring her voice should be accorded to nothing but to Philoclea's ears'" ("Sidney's Anacreontics," 226, my emphasis). The hidden design that Duncan-Jones invokes is not one of same-sex desire, but one of the turn from heroic subjects to trifles ("Sidney's Anacreontics," 227).

⁷⁰ Although Duncan-Jones ultimately rejects the idea "that the word 'Anacreontic' in the Elizabethan period was exclusively a metrical term," she also rejects the idea that there was anything "especially shameful" about the verses. In her summary of what Sidney meant in decrying his anacreontics, she concludes that the term "anacreontics" "must refer broadly to 'secular love poetry' rather than specifically to Greek lyric measures" ("Sidney's Anacreontics," 228).

⁷¹ Mary Barnard, *Sappho; a New Translation* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1958), fragment 1.

⁷² Quoted in Ringler, 530; Duncan-Jones, in *The Old Arcadia*, vii; see also *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia Being the Original Version*, 3.

⁷³ On the plans for the tomb, see Fulke Greville, *The Life of the Renowned Sir Philip Sidney* (1652) (Delmar, NY: Scholars Facsimiles and Reprints, 1984), iii; and for the consignment to the flames, 16–17. Sinfield argues that "Sidney engages in manipulations over the gods and love poetry because he is determined to appropriate classical writing to Protestant purposes," "Sidney, du Plessis-Mornay and the Pagans," *Philological Quarterly* LVIII (1979): 26–39, 30. On this scene, see also

Helgerson, 127; and Duncan-Jones, "Phillip Sidney's Toys," 177. Moffet's *Nobilis* records that Sidney was ashamed of his secular writing and desired "to smother the Arcadia (offspring of no ill penn) at the time of its birth . . . Having come to fear . . . that his Stella and his Arcadia might render the souls of readers more yielding instead of better, and having turned to worthier subjects, he very much wished to sing something which would abide the censure of the most austere Cato" (74).

⁷⁴ Buxton, 134.

⁷⁵ Hannay, 70.

⁷⁶ *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia Being the Original Version*, 524.

⁷⁷ Hannay, 76. In a similar way, Joan Rees's comment that "Lady Pembroke does not seem to have shared the view that there were two distinct books, one the light-hearted private *Arcadia* which Sidney wrote for his sister and her friends, the other the much more serious and ambitious work containing an exhaustive study of public and private ethics," while acknowledging the complicated content of the *Arcadia*, not only finds it necessary to binarize Sidney's work, but to imply that Mary was unaware of Sidney's "true" plans. *Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, 1554–1628. A Critical Biography* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1971), 55.