

No More Tears: Thomas Watson Absolved

The Tears of Fancie, or Loue Disdained, printed by William Barley in 1593 and entered into the Stationers' Register by John Danter on August 11, 1593, has long been considered the work of Thomas Watson, author of *The Hekatompathia, or Passionate Centurie of Loue* (1582). (*Tears* presumably consists of sixty sonnets in sequence but was carelessly printed, and four consecutive pages were left blank.¹ Poems 9–16 are therefore missing.) The work is ascribed to Watson by Allibone,² and by Sidney Lee in the *DNB*³ and is listed under his name in the 1926 *Short Title Catalogue* (25122). Yet such attribution rests solely on the printed initials "T.W." on the last page of the work and on an entry in the *Stationers' Register* which has subsequently been shown to be a forgery. The *Hekatompathia* is remarkable not only in displaying the erudition of its author but in the meticulous acknowledgment of his sources, which are entirely drawn from classical and continental literature. The author of *Tears* shows neither the same learning nor the same compunction. It is my aim in the present article to attempt by means of stylistic analysis to show that Watson did not, in fact, write *Tears of Fancie*. Conclusive proof is probably out of the question, but close comparison of the two works may help to show that they are the products of different minds.

Although there are many contemporary references to Watson's work, I have found none to *Tears of Fancie*. Allott's *Englands Parnassus* (1600) contains twenty-six quotations from the *Hekatompathia* attributed to Watson but none from *Tears*. The work is first mentioned by Collier in the mid-nineteenth century, and then by Edward Arber. In 1870 Arber was delighted to be able to publish it in the English Reprint series together with the *Hekatompathia*, the *Meliboeus* (Watson's Latin elegy for Sir Francis Walsingham), and *An Eglogue upon the death of the Right Honorable Sir Francis Walsingham*,⁴ thus making it appear that *Tears of Fancie* constitutes a third of Watson's writings in English.⁵ The importance of this distortion for any attempt at critical consideration of the Watson canon as a whole can easily be seen.

The bulk of Watson's work was in Latin: a translation of Sophocles' *Antigone* (1581), with original "pomps" and "themes" added; two long pastoral works, *Amyntas* (1585) and *Amintae gaudia* (1592); *Meliboeus* (1590); a translation of *Helenaë raptus* by Coluthus (1586); and *Compendium memoriae localis*, written about the same time. Lost works include his translations of Petrarch into Latin,⁶ a *De remedio amoris*,⁷ and "certaine Latine verses of his owne, made long agoe upon the love abuses of *Iuppiter* in a certaine peece of worke written in the commendation of women kinde; which he hath not yet wholie perfected to the print."⁸

Posterity's impression of his English works is already distorted by the fact that, although he is known to have been a dramatist,⁹ none of his plays has survived.¹⁰ Besides the three works in the Arber edition, we have only the *Italian madrigalls Englished*, a few commendatory poems, and sundry verses posthumously anthologised, to represent Watson's whole English canon. Of this canon *Tears of Fancie* thus appears to be one quarter. Although there are more recent editions of the *Hekatompathia*,¹¹ *Tears* has been reprinted only by Arber,¹² and by Lee in *An English Garner* (1904),¹³ so Arber's edition tends to be the first recourse of any reader seeking Watson's English poems.

Since Janet Scott's article, "The Sources of Watson's 'Tears of Fancie'" (*MLR* 21, 1926), and her influential book, *Les sonnets Elisabéthains* (1929), which has been quoted by virtually every subsequent Watson scholar,¹⁴ the title *Tears of Fancie* has been inseparable from charges of plagiarism. In her brief introduction to the appendix of sources in her book, Scott takes credit for revealing "Watson's" plagiarisms, mostly from Gascoigne, in the *Tears of Fancie*.¹⁵ Her article states that "Nine of the sonnets are adaptations of the older poet's verse to Watson's metre, often with no alteration from the original" (303), that the last sonnet (60) varies only in minor details from 'Love thy Choyse' by the Earl of Oxford (305),¹⁶ and in an addendum (435) she traces six lines in Sonnet 51 to Spenser's *FQ* 2.6.13. She cites even more examples in the appendix of her book, but adds: "Il est inutile de citer tous les emprunts ou plagiats de Watson."¹⁷ [It is useless to cite all Watson's borrowings or plagiarisms.] To Scott's list of Watson's debts, William Murphy added another: "Watson's own *Tears of Fancie*, published posthumously in 1593, was itself inspired by Sidney."¹⁸

In 1960 Franklin Dickey exposed the forgeries in the Stationers' Registers perpetrated by John Payne Collier in the mid-nineteenth century. Beneath the entry "*The tears of fancy*," the words "By T Watson" had been inserted at the left. Dickey found eighteen different forgeries, but it was "Collier's own disingenuous remark that the note 'By T Watson' beneath

the entry of the *Tears of Fancy* (August 11, 1593) looked like 'an after-thought'¹⁹ sent me down to Stationers' Hall."²⁰ Dickey gives a list of

all suspicious additions among the book-entries. Some, like the 'Watson' entry already mentioned, are of literary importance, for it is largely on the grounds of the Register that the *Tears* are assigned to Watson rather than to some other 'T.W.'—whose initials are printed on the last page of the book.²¹

Palgrave, in 1872, had written that *Tears of Fancie* "is, in fact, identifiable only as Watson's by his initials at the close, and by the evidence of style,"²² evidence which is highly debatable.

Perhaps because Watson himself is of little interest to many scholars, and *Tears* has elicited less critical response than any of Watson's other works,²³ Dickey's article appears to have gone almost unnoticed. Walter F. Staton, Jr., mentions it in the introduction to his 1967 edition of Watson's Latin *Amyntas*,²⁴ but then Dickey edited the companion piece in the same volume, so such an oversight on Staton's part would have been highly unlikely. The 1976 edition of the *STC* lists *Tears* under Watson's name as before, but now adds the editorial note: "[Init. T. W. Not by Watson. In verse.]," a comment that could easily be overlooked. Harry Boyle's 1966 dissertation on Watson's Latin works, Cesare G. Cecioni's introduction to his 1964 edition of the *Hekatompathia*, and his 1969 book, *Thomas Watson e la tradizione petrarchista*, ignore Dickey's findings and continue to treat *Tears of Fancie* as part of the Watson canon. In her 1975 edition of *A Hundredth Sundrie Flowres*, Ruth Lloyd Miller can still write: "Watson's authorship of the poems in *The Tears of Fancie* has not been questioned."²⁵

While proof of Watson's authorship has now been disclaimed, proof of his *nonauthorship* is not necessarily thereby established, even though the editors of the *STC* have conceded the point. Comparison of the text itself with that of Watson's *Hekatompathia* may provide, if not conclusive proof, at least enough to tip the scales one way or the other.

The first difference that immediately catches the eye is the form of each sonnet. Throughout the *Hekatompathia* Watson uses an eighteen-line iambic pentameter form, rhyming *a b a b c c / d e d e f f / g h g h i i*, for his "sonnets" or "passions" (he uses these terms interchangeably). He writes only one conventional sonnet (in modern terms) as a prologue to the sequence, and this he calls a "quatorzain." His poems are not printed as three separate stanzas, but could be so divided. Each stanza would

then be recognizable as the form generally known nowadays as the "Venus and Adonis" stanza, of which there were many examples before Watson's time.

While this form is not capable of the subtle effects achieved by an Italian sonnet, it has certain advantages. It puts no strain on the rhyming capacity of the English language since no rhyme is repeated. (The task of rhyming in English, with its dual Germanic and Romance origins, is more complex than rhyming in Italian or French.)²⁶ It allows for continuous narrative, as in *Hekatopathia*, sonnet 7, which is a simple blazon based on sources in Ariosto and Aeneas Silvius, or *Hek.98*, which is a catalog characterizing the despicable qualities of Love (Cupid). The form can also be broken in different ways. In *Hek.8* Watson refers to the story of Actaeon in the first "stanza," applies it to metamorphosis of himself due to the sufferings of love in the second, and to his death in the third. In *Hek. 89* the first twelve lines form a unit in which each line is based on a quotation from a different source, and the remaining six lines consist of an admonitory summation. A similar division in *Hek.92* lists the attributes of various deities in the first twelve lines and uses four of the remainder to list the obnoxious qualities of Love, concluding with an exclamatory couplet: "O happye howre wherein I did forgoe/This litle God, so greate a cause of woe." Most commonly Watson uses the final couplet to encapsulate the theme of the poem, or to provide a personal application of it. This gives his poems the ring of a "Shakespearean" rather than an Italian style of sonnet.

His "Echo" poem (*Hek.25*) shows the form's suitability for dialogue. In *Hek.5*, which is a close translation of a petrarchan sonnet, he finds the eighteen lines too ample for his purpose and uses lines 11 and 12, i.e. the couplet of the second "stanza," to insert a sententious comment: "And touching him, whome will hath made a slave,/The Proverbe saith of olde, *Selfe doe, selfe have*." In both the printed text and the manuscript the couplets ending each "stanza" are indented, giving them a visual emphasis which enhances Watson's use of them for these various rhetorical effects.

The sonnets in *Tears of Fancie*, with two exceptions, are all regular fourteen-line sonnets, Shakespearean in form, rhyming *a b a b / c d c d / e f e f / g g*. They are printed without indentations, except for the second and third lines where indentation is physically necessary to accommodate the oversized initial capital of each first line. The last couplet of the final sonnet is also indented, probably because this sonnet, as Janet Scott pointed out, was actually by Edward de Vere, Earl of Oxford, and is printed so in his works. The two exceptions mentioned above are sonnet 39, which

has only thirteen lines, probably due to the compositor's carelessness,²⁷ and 46, which has fifteen lines, the exclamation, "But oh coy Dame intollerable smart" (which rhymes with lines 9 and 11) being inserted following line 12 and before the final couplet. The author, not the printer, is obviously responsible for this. The additional line is uncharacteristic of Watson, the form of whose English poems in the *Hekatompathia* was never varied.

The ear also discerns a marked qualitative difference in the two cycles. The *Hekatompathia* is notable for the unwavering regularity of its meter; even a simple trochaic substitution is extremely rare. *Tears of Fancie* contains several examples of trochaic feet: "Wantonlie playing nere to Paphos shrine"; "Scorning that I should checke his Deitie" (2.6-7); "Which in my breast beautie should set on fire" (3.8); "Hopeles and helpeles too, poore loue amated" (5.1); "Partners in loue and partners in lamenting" (17.7). In many places, too, the meter is simply off: "But earths sole wonder whose eies my sense appalled,/The fault was loues, then pardon me, for loue is franticke called" (18.13-14); "So th'one did weepe th'other sighed, both griued" (19.13); "Be thou to me no more inconstant variable" (42.13); "Enuyng that anie should inioy her Image" (46.5). Sonnet 32, line 13, contains six feet, but there is also one alexandrine in the *Hekatompathia*: "*Melissa* mother is, and fautrix to the *Bee*," (*Hek.*92.3).²⁸

A notable feature of the *Hekatompathia* is that throughout the sequence Watson uses not one feminine rhyme. Most of his lines are end-stopped, and most of his rhyme words are not only masculine but monosyllabic. This gives a strikingly monotonous effect. *Tears of Fancie*, on the other hand, abounds in an extraordinary number of feminine rhymes. Over one third of the rhymes in the cycle are feminine. In fact, sonnet 38 is composed entirely of feminine rhymes:

O would my loue although too late lament mee,
 And pittie take of teares from eies distilling:
 To beare these sorrowes well I could content me,
 And ten times more to suffer would be willing.
 If shee would daine to grace me with her fauour,
 The thought thereof sustained greife should banish:
 And in beholding of her rare behaiour,
 A smyle of her should force dispaire to vanishe:
 But she is bent to tiran[i]ze vpon me,
 Dispaire perswades there is no hope to haue her:
 My hart doth whisper I am woe begone me,

Then cease my vaine plaints and desist to craue her.
 Here end my sorrowes here my salt teares stint I,
 For shes obdurate, sterne, remorseles, flintie.²⁹

Sonnet 38 has six pairs of feminine rhymes, and 26, 28, 39, and 54 have five pairs each. In only ten poems are the rhymes entirely masculine.

Watson's rhymes are unfailingly exact, e.g. *Hek*.16: late, mate; kind, mind; cage, page; delight, light; joy, annoy; suppose, Rose; will, fill; sing, spring; hard, marde. *Tears* contains many slant rhymes, wrenched rhymes, and rhymes that are inaccurate or just plain awkward, such as the "stint I, flintie" quoted above. Other examples include "horror, abhorre her" and "mourning, groaning" (18); "greeving, revealing" and "grounded, wounded" (28); "desolation, compassion" (30); "appearance, endurance" and "sorrowe, for woe" (31); "rest, alway" (36); "honor, dolor" and "image, my gage" (46); "heavens, beames" (55); and "songs, swans" (59). Even in Watson's *Italian Madrigalls Englished not to the sense of the original ditty, but after the affection of the note* which, as the title indicates, are quite experimental,³⁰ the rhymes are still exact. Here he does mix masculine and feminine rhymes and even manages *sdrucchiola* or trisyllabic rhyme. But as these examples will show, the rhymes are true, not approximate: bowres, flow'rs, recordeth, affordeth, inflamed, named, pleasure, treasure (*Madrigalls* 4); mate, relate, state, prate, consociate; louingly, antiquitie, jealousy, iniquitie (*Madrigalls* 2). The Italian original for the latter madrigal contains three interlocking sets of *sdrucchiola* rhymes and one line that does not rhyme. Discussing Watson's madrigals, Carpenter mentions his pedantry and the "discouraging lack of reality or of personal accent in his verse," but says nevertheless that "so far as matter and manner can be dissevered, Watson must be regarded as a minor master of metrical form in his day."³¹ Murphy, too, asserted that Watson had many virtues: "excellence in meter, accuracy in rhyme, taste in diction."³²

Perhaps even more significant than considerations of rhyme is the fact that certain words are pronounced differently in the two works. For the author of *Tears*, "power" is a two-syllable word: "Whose dreaded power tam'd the gods diuine" (2.8); "And all his skill and power spent in vaine" (5.3); "How I surui'd and scornd Loues sacred power" (5.11) (this last word rhymes with "discouer"). In the *Hekatompathia* "power" is always a monosyllable: "And to my double hurt his pow'r do proue?" (65.10); "And powrs diuine restore my liberty" (69.8); "And still beleu'd Loue was some pow'r diuine" (93.16). Even when Watson spells it "power," the word is probably still a monosyllable; it rhymes with "lowre"—"lour" in

modern spelling—though its position at the end of a line makes this assertion difficult to prove:

Theire beames drawe forth by great attractiue power
 My moistned hart, whose force is yet so small,
 That shine they bright, or list they but to lowre,
 It scarcely dare behold such lights at all.

(*Hek.*21.13–16).

Similarly, the word “houres” in “Shee shines by months, thou houres, months, and yeares,” (*Tears* 55.13) is a disyllable, but in the *Hekatompathia*, although Watson spells it differently in different poems, it is always monosyllabic. Besides metric necessity, his spelling “how’r” (*Hek.*10.17; 74.7; 77.1; 93.1; 93.7; 93.13) emphasizes the fact that the word is a monosyllable; it is still such, even when spelled “howre” (30.5; 54.1; 92.17; 94.11). This is a small but significant point, since Watson is generally quite consistent. Even had he experimented with a different style, he would have been highly unlikely to change his pronunciation of a commonly used word. *Tears* 17, line 11, contains the three-syllable word “captiued”: “For none that sees her but captiued is.” This is probably pronounced with a long “i,” as it would be hard to do otherwise. Watson does not use this as a verb, but has “captiues” as a noun (98.18) and “captiue” as an adjective (55.10; 91.1). He also has the adjective “captiueyke” (73.6), which asks to be pronounced with a short “i.”

Watson, like his friend John Lyly, has a markedly euphuistic style in the *Hekatompathia*. Besides balance, antithesis, and alliteration, he makes wide use of proverbs and sententious maxims such as “Time shewes Trueth,” “Wit, thats bought, is best,” and “He runnes too farre which never turnes againe,” all from *Hek.*87. Like Lyly, he enjoys metaphors and similes drawn from “natural” history, particularly from Pliny. Peacocks, doves, falcons, swans, nightingales, and vultures ornament his verse, and in two different poems (*Hek.*21 and 99), the eagle proves its young by forcing the chick to stare into the sun, for “No bird but Joves can looke against the sunne” (*Hek.*21.18). Specific flowers, trees, common and exotic animals are pressed into service: the bull, the fly, the fox, the lion, the basilisk, the “poysned cockatrice,” the salamander, and even the mole. By contrast, *Tears* is relatively free of such references. Animals and birds, if mentioned, are non-specific, relegated to the background, and almost confined to the hart/heart pun. Rhetorical devices are plentiful in both sequences, but alliteration is noticeably more pronounced in *Tears of Fancie*: “When weary

woe doth worke to wound my will" (35); "O woefull wearie wonder" (37); "Fie fickle Fortune fie thou art my foe" (40).

Perhaps the most distinctive feature of the *Hekatompathia* is the presence of prose headnotes prefacing each poem, pointing out the poet's devices and listing his sources. They are somewhat analogous to, though not as detailed as, "E.K." 's glosses to Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar*. Written in the third person, they are nonetheless almost certainly by Watson, who occasionally slips into the first person. The purpose of these notes is not merely to acknowledge indebtedness to classical, neo-Latin, Italian and French writers such as Apollonius Rhodius, Aristotle, Ausonius, Horace, Juvenal, Martial, Marullus, Musaeus, Ovid, Pliny, Propertius, Seneca, Sophocles, Theocritus, Virgil, Xenophon, Aeneas Silvius, Apuleius, Ariosto, Erasmus, Firenzuola, Forcatulus, Saint Jerome, Mantuan, Parabosco, Petrarch, Poliziano, Ronsard, Serafino, Strozzi, and Trithemius—to name but a few—but to display the fact with pride. Watson's knowledge of the classics did not come, as for some of his contemporaries, from classical dictionaries. He not only cites primary sources but is sufficiently familiar to be able to play with them. His knowledge of continental literature came from seven and a half years spent in Italy and France.

His treatment of his sources is far from slavish imitation. Sometimes he paraphrases, sometimes translates exactly; often he combines two or three sources in one poem. In *Hek.*24 he combines about ten of Serafino's *strambotti* on the theme of a looking-glass; in *Hek.*89 he quotes twelve different authors in as many lines, each offering a definition of love; in *Hek.*92, "Phebus delights to view his Lawrel Tree," he recites the animal or vegetable attributes of various gods; in *Hek.*35 he treats the theme of blindness by listing its natural causes—sun, fire, and snow—and also manages to introduce references to Tiresias, Actaeon, Perseus and Medusa, and Oedipus. One of his greatest strengths is the ability to effect a valid and convincing synthesis of quite eclectic elements.

By contrast, classical allusion in *Tears* is quite sparse. If one were to eliminate the references to Venus and Cupid and their attributes (mostly in the earlier poems), allusions would be limited to Aetna (18), Medusa (21), Echo (28 and 29), Diana and Actaeon (49), Apollo (52), Ariadne and the Labyrinth (53), and Cynthia and Endymion (55). These myths are treated superficially, whereas Watson's thorough assimilation of his classical learning allows him to visualize his sources and to vary them in a way that will not produce absurdities.

To take the labyrinth poem as an example, the author of *Tears of Fancie* treats the subject far less logically than Watson does. Watson's "Labyrinth of Loue" (*Hek.*55) is a metaphor for the overthrow of Reason. The Mino-

taur breaks the "guiding thrid by Reason spun" and enslaves the poet, who thereupon invites his mistress to become Ariadne and free him by means of a second thread. In *Hek.* 95—a companion poem in the palindodic section of the sequence, when the poet is at last free from love—Love is still the Minotaur, but Ariadne is Reason, and the poet is a potential Theseus abandoning his savior. Neither poem introduces any element inconsistent with the legend, nor any metaphor that is visually confused. *Tears* 53, on the other hand, confuses two metaphors, the mastless ship (line 2) and the "darke and obscure Laborinths of loue" (line 6). The poet is both adrift in the ship and fettered in the labyrinth. The mistress is simultaneously the sun, the guiding light for the ship, and the one who holds the thread to the labyrinth (presumably Ariadne).

It could be argued that had he lived to see it through the press, the author would have added similar notes acknowledging the sources of *Tears of Fancie*, but that would not explain why a poet like Watson, who took such obvious delight in transmitting the cream of foreign learning into his native language, should suddenly choose to lift undigested passages from Gascoigne and the Earl of Oxford. The only English poet he mentions in the *Hekatompathia* is Chaucer,³³ and that merely to point out that Chaucer had previously translated the same petrarchan sonnet but that their versions differed. It cannot be convincingly argued that this is an early work, posthumously discovered and printed: Watson's early works were in Latin; his road to poetry led through the classics.

If the *Tears of Fancie* is included in the canon, the charge of plagiarism overshadows the *Hekatompathia* also, which is indebted to so many prior models and owes its very form to Petrarch. This is the first sonnet sequence with a single connected theme to be published in English. Watson imports all the petrarchan conventions (too well known to enumerate here) and even divides his sequence into two uneven parts as Petrarch does. Laura's death provides a natural division between the sonnets *in vita* and *in morte*. Watson creates an artificial division at poem 80, and the remaining twenty poems are all headed "MY LOVE IS PAST" to accentuate the device. Petrarch had been translated earlier into English (by Chaucer and Wyatt), but to Watson belongs the honor of turning his methods into a cult:

Questa formula era infatti ancora nuova in Inghilterra . . .
 Watson ebbe pertanto il merit—o il demerito secondo i punti
 di vista—di fare esplodere in Inghilterra questa moda.³⁴

To consider this accumulation of classical and continental sources as plagiarism is to misunderstand completely Watson's motives. We possess no poetic manifesto of his, but the *Pléiade* poets in mid-sixteenth century

France provide a useful analogy. It was Ronsard's frequently stated aim to bring the Muses to France from their native Greece, to teach the Muses to speak French. He also used Petrarch as a model in his *Amours*, and his own poetry provides Watson with sources for four poems in the *Hekatompathia* (27, 28, 54, and 83). In a commendatory verse to Watson, C. Downhalus urges him to become an English Ronsard:

Gallica Parnasso coepit ditescere lingua,
Ronsardique operis Luxuriare novis.

.
Ingenio tandem praestans Watsonus, et arte,
Pieridas docuit verba Britannia loqui.³⁵

Cecioni, perhaps the most serious modern Watson scholar, gives a useful explanation of Watson's intentions:

Ma il petrarchista non è un plagiatario nel senso moderno della parola: è un poeta rinascimentale, e cioè un razionale imitatore di quello che egli riteneva essere il meglio delle opere che prendeva a modello. . . . e Watson senti come proprio compito aggiornare la poesia inglese avvalendosi di tutti quei fermenti culturali con i quali le sue peregrinazioni continentali lo avevano portato a contatto. Non di plagio, dunque, è il caso di parlare, ma di cosciente, faticosa scelta, come il suggerire del nettare dai fiori da parte delle api, per riprendere un'immagine usata dallo stesso Watson nei suoi versi dedicati a George Whetstone.³⁶

It is now time to acquit Watson of the charge of plagiarism. Having freed him from the shackles of a work that can only be considered a liability, we can then appreciate him more accurately for what he was. He was primarily a Latinist, and his English writings—the *Hekatompathia*, the *Eglogue* on the death of Walsingham, and the *Italian Madrigalls Englished*—consist almost entirely of translation. Yet the *Hekatompathia* was sufficiently influential to start the trend of sonnet sequences and petrarchan imitation that flourished in the 1590s. Contemporary references to his wit, his jests, and his work as a playwright serve only to tantalize posterity, for as yet none of his dramatic works has come to light. Since the name Thomas Watson is reasonably common and the initials "T.W." are even more so, one encounters particular difficulty in researching his biography and in attempting to attribute works to him. Yet the attribution of *Tears of Fancie* was made (erroneously, as I believe) on the basis

of those initials alone. In the absence of conclusive proof, one can only weigh the evidence for the inclusion or exclusion of any work from the Watson canon, but it should become apparent to any informed reader that *Tears* was written by some poet, as yet unidentified, who borrowed freely from both Gascoigne and Watson and whose aim was to imitate the *Hekatompathia*.

Wendy Phillips

Wendy Phillips is a native of England and a graduate of Cambridge University. She holds an MA in English from UCLA (1981) as well as from Cambridge (1958). After a brief teaching career followed by over twenty years of full-time motherhood, she returned to academia to study for the Ph.D., which she received from UCLA in 1989.

NOTES

1. Cf. Harry H. Boyle, "Thomas Watson, Neo-Latinist" (Ph.D. diss., UCLA, 1966), 129-30, for a description of the printer's errata.
2. S. Austin Allibone, *Dictionary of English Literature and British and American Authors* (Philadelphia & London: J. B. Lippincott, 1897), 2608.
3. *Dictionary of National Biography* 20:948.
4. Watson's English translation of his own *Meliboeus*, published the same year (1590).
5. Arber's introduction does also mention Watson's *Italian madrigalls Englished* (1590) and the posthumously printed poems in *The Phoenix Nest* (1593), *England's Helicon* (1600), and Davidson's *Poetical Rapsodie* (1602): a total of twenty-four madrigals and about eighteen poems, some new but many reprinted from the *Hekatompathia*.
6. Watson included a few of these in the *Hekatompathia*. See his introductory note to sonnet 6 (Arber ed., 42). Page numbers given in these notes all refer to the Arber edition as the most readily available.
7. As this was never published, it is not possible to determine whether it was an original work or a translation of Ovid. Watson mentions it in the introductory note to *Hekatompathia* 1 (37).

8. *Hekatompathia* 75 (111).
9. William Cornwallis wrote in a letter to Sir Thomas Heneage, March 25, 1593, that Watson "could devise twenty fictions and knaveryes in a play w^{ch} was his daily practise and his living." In Hubert Hall, "An Elizabethan Poet and his Relations" (*The Athenaeum* No.3278, Aug. 23, 1890) 256. For the fascinating story of Watson's friendship with Marlowe, including their arrest for murder and incarceration in Newgate, see Mark Eccles, *Christopher Marlowe in London*, Harvard Studies in English 10 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1934). For evidence of Watson's collaboration with Kyd, see Levin L. Schücking, "Zur Verfasserschaft der 'Spanish Tragedy,'" *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte* 4 (Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1963).
10. A possible exception, noted by Cesare G. Cecioni, *Thomas Watson e la tradizione petrarchista* (Milan: Giuseppe Principato, 1969), 6, is *Thorney Abbey, or the London Maid*. Listed in Alfred Harbage, rev. S. Schoenbaum, *Annals of the English Drama, 975-1700* (London: Methuen, 1964) as a "History play published as by 'T.W.'" in *Gratae Theatrales, 1662*."
11. A modern print edition by Cesare G. Cecioni, Università di Catania, Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, 1964; also a facsimile reproduction with an introduction by S. K. Heninger, Jr. (Gainesville, Florida: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1964). The Spenser Society limited edition facsimile reprint (Manchester, 1869) has also been reprinted by Burt Franklin (New York, 1967).
12. Arber's reprint, *Thomas Watson's Poems* (London: Constable, March 1870), was made from what is apparently the unique extant copy of the first edition. Owned at the time by S. Christie-Miller of Britwell, it is now in the Huntington Library, San Marino, California.
13. *An English Garner, Elizabethan Sonnets Newly Arranged and Indexed with an Introduction by Sidney Lee* (Westminster, Constable, 1904) 1:137-64.
14. See William Murphy, "Thomas Watson's *Hekatompathia* or *Passionate Centurie of Loue* [1582]" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1943) 121; Harry H. Boyle, "Thomas Watson, Neo-Latinist" (Ph.D. diss., UCLA, 1966) 131; and Cecioni, *Thomas Watson e la tradizione petrarchista*, 35, 37, 80, 263, and 265.
15. "La découverte des plagiate de Watson dans les *Tears of Fancie* . . . est due à nos recherches" (Janet Scott, *Les sonnets Elisabéthains*, 303). She lists sonnets 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, and the first quatrains of 43, 47, 48, and 58 as derived from Gascoigne. She traces stolen lines or phrases in sonnets 1, 7, 19, and 20. In fact, such borrowings had previously been noted by Charles Crawford in his 1913 edition of *Englands Parnassus* (1600), 507-8. He lists sonnets 7, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 43, 47, 48, 52, 55.
16. See Oxford *Works*, ed. Grosart, 65.
17. Scott, *Les sonnets*, 67.
18. William Murphy, "Thomas Watson's *Hekatompathia* [1582] and the Elizabethan Sonnet Sequence," *JEGP* 56 (July 1957): 419.
19. Collier, *N&Q*, 3rd ser., 1 (1862): 402.

20. Franklin Dickey, "The Old Man at Work: Forgeries in the Stationers' Registers," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 11 (1960): 41.

21. Dickey, 44.

22. Francis Palgrave, "Thomas Watson the Poet," *North American Review* 114 (Jan. 1872): 90.

23. Cf. Cecioni, 37, "Quanto ai contributi critici, essi, ad eccezione delle note della Scott, sono praticamente inesistenti." [As for critical contributions, those, with the exception of Scott's notes, are practically non-existent.]

24. Walter F. Staton, Jr., ed., "*Thomas Watson's Latin Amyntas (1585)*" and Franklin M. Dickey, ed., "*Abraham Fraunce's Translation The Lamentations of Amyntas (1587)*," *Renaissance English Text Society* 2 (University of Chicago Press, 1967), 10.

25. "Verses Made by 'Spræta Tamen Vivunt' in 'Flowres' Reappear in Thomas Watson's '*Tears of Fancie*,' 1592." In *A Hundredth Sundrie Flowres*, from the Original Edition of 1573, ed. Bernard M. Ward (1926), 2nd ed. Ruth Lloyd Miller (Port Washington, New York and London: Kennikat Press, 1975), 90.

26. Cf. Sidney, *Defense of Poetry*, ed. Jan Van Dorsten (Oxford University Press, 1966), 73-4. Sidney praises the versatility of English and does not dwell on the difficulty of rhyming.

27. The rhyme scheme is *a b a b / c d c d / e e f / g g*, so the missing line is obviously the tenth.

28. Given the exactitude of the rest of the work, Watson probably intended to correct this line. It may have escaped his attention because, although metrically long, it is visually short. Watson saw the *Hekatompathia* through the press himself, and in general the book is very accurately printed.

29. It is interesting to note that both this sonnet and the whole of the *Hekatompathia* contravene Ronsard's suggested law for alternating masculine and feminine rhymes. See "Abbregé de l'art poétique françois," (1565) 11: 101-12. In Pierre de Ronsard, *Oeuvres complètes*, 18 vols., ed. Paul Laumonier, Société des textes français modernes (Paris: Droz, 1937) vol. 14:9f.

30. For an interpretation of this title page, see F. I. Carpenter, "Thomas Watson's 'Italian Madrigals Englished,' 1590," in *JEGP* 2 (1899): 324-5.

31. Carpenter, 323.

32. Murphy, 419.

33. *Hekatompathia* 5, headnote.

34. Cecioni, 261. [This formula was in fact still new to England . . . Watson therefore has the merit—or demerit, depending on one's point of view—of causing this style to boom in England.]

35. [The French language is beginning to enrich itself at Parnassus and to rejoice in Ronsard's new works. . . . but at last Watson, pre-eminent in talent and in art, has taught the Muses to speak English.] "Eiusdem aliud de Authore," in *Hekatompathia* 34-5.

36. Cecioni, 266-7. [But the petrarchan is not a plagiarist in the modern sense of the word: he is a Renaissance poet, i.e. a rational imitator of what he considers

the best in the works he takes as models. . . . and Watson felt it to be his own duty to bring English poetry up to date, using all the cultural leavening with which his continental journeying had brought him into contact. Plagiarism, then, is not the proper word, but conscious, laborious selection, like the gathering of nectar from flowers by the bees, to cite an image used by Watson himself in his dedicatory verses to George Whetstone.]