abroad, my only arrant was to preach, in which my sermons I could not cease to inuey 
against the abuses of these dayes ". When he
found honesty of purpose and moral 
rectitude unprofitable and dangerous he 
willingly " set aside satirical sermons and 
became a plausible preacher ". and a boon 
companion. Thus the " Author " self-
righteously, and quite properly, dismisses 
the degenerate priest as a detestable practi-
tioner of the inglorious " filthy Science "). of 
flattery, and relegates his soul to the " arch-
deaconry of Pluto's infernall Court ".

One accepts that very few recorded facts 
are available about the life of Ulpian Ful-
well; but it is misleading to infer an auto-
biographical note from Sir Symon's speech.

EDWARD C. WRIGHT.
Njala University College, Illinois.

WYATT AND CHAUCER'S
" LUSTY LEESE "

SIR THOMAS WYATTS " Myne owne 
John Poyntz " contains a Chaucerian 
echo unrecorded by editors of the poem, 
including Kenneth Muir and Patricia 
Thomson in their recent edition.' In lines 
82-3 of his satire, Wyatt praises the pleasures 
of the retired life : " No man doeth marke 
where so I ride or goo; / In lusty lees at 
libertie I walke " (ed. Muir and Thomson, 
p. 90). In Book II of the Troilus, Criseyde, 
deating the merits of accepting Troilus as 
her lover, states : " I am myn owene womman, 
wele at ese, / I thank it god, as 
for this me gyve. Of myghty love the winges 
doeth lend her lusty syd. My kyng, my Contry, 
spurr and sayle, go seke the Tems, that 
TAGUS, fare well, that westward with thy stremes 
Turns vp the grayns off gold alredy triyd : With 
some that shewth her welthi pryd And to the town 
which Brutus sowght by drems Like bendyd mone 
doeth lend her lusty syd. My kyng, my Contry, 
alone for whom I lyve, Of myghty love the wines 
for this me gyve.

In my copy of Collected Poems of Sir 
Thomas Wyatt, ed. Kenneth Muir (London, 
1949; I quote from the fourth impression, 
1963, henceforth M), there is no punctua-
tion in lines 3-6 except for the full stop in 
line 6. And indeed no other punctuation 
is needed. However, MT's Commentary 
(p. 343) seems to support the introduction 
of the comma by asserting that the word 
" that " which follows the introduced 
comma in line 4 refers back to the Tagus. 
It does not. Rearranging the text only a 
little, we can readily bring out the syntacti-

cal structure of lines 3-6 : " For I, with 
spurr and sayle, go seke the Tems, that 
shewth her welthi pryd gaynward the some 
and (that) like (a) bendyd mone doth lend 
her lusty syd to the town which Brutus
sought by drems." While "that" is relative to "the Tems", it is also the subject of "shewth" and "doth lend", a point which is obscured in Miss Foxwell's punctuation. F. M. Padelford, however, in *Early Sixteenth Century Lyrics* (Boston and London, 1907; henceforth P) probably already interpreted lines 3-6 as I do, for he printed (p. 30) a comma after "Tem" (line 3), while he avoided a comma between "sonne" and "yet" in line 4. Moreover, P's punctuation in line 5 seems to support my interpretation, because there is a comma before "to", and one after "drem".

MT's defective reading is remarkable anyway, but the more so because P's punctuation could have been taken account of.

Possibly, we would have been better off with completely unpunctuated poems. That way, at least, what looks like a misprint in line 7 of poem LIX might have been avoided. In MT, the last four lines of the poem (lines 5-8) run:

Lo! how desire is both sprong and spent!
And he may see that whilome was so blynde;
Mashed in the breers that erst was all to tome.

The full stop in line 7, whether intentional or not, is the more unfortunate because the last two lines of the poem have been misunderstood by several readers, as I show in my article "Wyatt and Tottel: A Textual Comparison" (to appear in *Southern Review*). We should of course relate line 7 (at the end of which the manuscript has a virgula) with line 8, and could paraphrase: "He who was formerly torn to pieces while he was entangled in the thorny bushes of passion can now laugh contemptuously, thinking of all the painful energy he has wasted."

MT is by no means the only edition to provide punctuation where it is not wanted. The comma in line 14 below, for instance, is shared with—at least—Tottel and Foxwell. Here are lines 12-14 of MT's printing of poem IV:

What may I do when my maister fereth,
But, in the felde, with him to lyve and dye?
For goode is the liff, ending faithfully.

S (p. 81) quite rightly does not print the comma. For that matter, neither did P in 1907 (p. xx). The relation between "ending faithfully" and "For goode is the liff" is restrictive, and the sense is: "For the life which ends with faithful service is good."

Elsewhere, the modern reader for whom Professor Muir professes to cater has a right to complain that MT underpunctuates, as for instance in stanza 3 of poem LI:

For cruelitie
Most that can be
Hath soveraynte
Within your hert
Which makeith bare
All my wylere
Nought do ye care
How sore I same

As I have indicated before, I do not believe that MT should have provided unannounced editorial punctuation anywhere, but if such punctuation is offered, it should consistently be offered wherever the text seems to demand it. From that point of view, there should have been a punctuation mark at least after line 6 of the stanza.

To my mind, the punctuation in MT is unsatisfactory for a number of reasons. (1) MT provides its own punctuation along with some of the punctuation found in the Egerton MS, but we are not told which is which. The modern reader may wrongly reject a manuscript because he thinks it is Muir's, or he may equally wrongly accept a mark introduced by Muir as coming from the manuscript. (2) It would matter comparatively little that the latter situation arises if Professor Muir's marks could not lead the innocent reader astray. Many of Professor Muir's marks are in fact syntactically innocuous, but, as we have seen, others are not, and impose syntactical non-sense on the manuscript. (3) The reader, while perhaps in some places finding helpful editorial punctuation, in other places (as in stanza 3 of poem LI above) does not find any. (4) In a great many instances, the manuscript punctuation (which, where present, cannot be distinguished from Muir's) has been withheld from the reader, who, however, surely has a right to judge for himself whether he finds a manuscript mark syntactically or rhythmically significant or not.

In poem II, lines 1-3, the situation is complicated in yet another way. Lines 1-5 appear as follows in MT:

WHAT vaileth trouth? or, by it, to take payn?
To stryve, by stufenstnes, for to attayne,
To be last and true: and flie from dowblenes:
Sythens all alike, where rueleth craftines
Rewarded is boeth fals, and plain.

We should remember that the punctuation which we are here offered in line 1-3, without any comment, is meant to make sense
—no matter how Professor Muir arrived at it—to the unenlightened modern reader. Such a reader, however, confronted with question marks in line 1, certainly has a right to expect one at the end of line 3. If "...fle from doubleness", as is perhaps most likely (though in any case it should be followed by a question mark), then there should be a question mark after "true" (line 3) also.

In M, there is a question mark after "doublenes", but also after "attayn" (line 2). Perhaps MT, in dropping the question mark after "attayn", was influenced by the manuscript (see below), perhaps by Tottel, who read "...to attayn/How to be just". But in either case, I see no reason for MT's comma after "attayn". Indeed, it seems to me that grammatically the comma in MT is misleading, and that Tottel got the sense right.

Consider the alternative in M:

WHAT vaieth trouthe? or, by it, to take payn? To stryve by steadfastnes, for to attayne? To be iuste and true, and fle from doublenes?

In this interpretation, "attayn" has no direct object. But surely it is available in the next line: it is the speaker's goal "To be iuste and true".

Hence, I would suggest that an appropriate punctuation of the lines could be as follows:

WHAT vaieth trouthe? or, by it, to take payn? To stryve, by steadfastnes, for to attayne? To be iuste and true, and fle from doublenes?

Somewhat ironically, however, MT's version has manuscript authority; Southall (p. 165) quite correctly reproduces the lines from the manuscript as follows:

WHAT vaieth trouthe? or, by it, to take payn? To stryve, by steadfastnes, for to attayne? To be iuste and true, & fle from doublenes.

However, S, equally correctly, explains that this version is not what the manuscript had originally, and that most of the marks are additions by Nicholas Grimald. These are therefore marks introduced at a later stage, though by a sixteenth-century writer. Originally, the manuscript probably had:

WHAT vaieth trouthe? or, by it, to take paye:
To stryve, by steadfastnes, for to attayne
To be iuste and true, & fle from doublenes:

With due explanations, MT might have offered this reconstruction. Instead, it offers a punctuation which is a confusing mixture of two very different systems. For, while Grimald's question marks in line 1, for instance, can be seen as part of a"

modern" system, Grimald did not revise consistently, and the colons in line 3 are survivors of an older tradition. But not only does MT fail to comment on the situation in the manuscript, it also offers the peculiar sixteenth-century mixture to the modern reader as though that mixture were comprehensible as modern punctuation.

Neither can the unenlightened modern reader feel very happy with MT's punctuation in the second stanza of this poem:

Decyved IS he by crafty trayn
That meaneth no gile and doeth remayn
Within the trapp, withoute redresse.
But, for to love, lo, ruche a masteres, Whose cruelty nothing can refrayn,
What vaieth trouthe?

Wyatt must have intended one of two possibilities. In one reading, which seems to be that of M, "But...in line 4 means "other than", and the first sentence terminates with "refrayn" in line 5 (M has a full stop there, and no commas after "redresse" or "but"). On the other hand, as MT's textual apparatus, which is quite uninformative on punctuation variants, does not tell us, Tottel has a full stop after "redresse...". Although Tottel makes a mess of the remainder of the poem, this full stop, if introduced into MT, would of course give a meaning to the last three lines which is entirely different from M's. Either meaning seems possible, but one must doubt whether both are meant to be present at the same time, as they are in MT's version. Of course, in an instance like this, an editor's defence can be that the manuscript itself does not indicate clearly which meaning is intended. But in that case we should not be left under the impression, as we are, that MT's punctuation is invariably meant to help us in determining the syntactical sense of the manuscript.

These examples are only a selection. They are of importance in themselves, but they also serve to show the general point that a future edition of Wyatt ought to be more careful in its handling of punctuation.

University of Otago.

"WHERE THE TURK'S HORSE ONCE TREADS,"

HERE appears to be an allusion to the proverb "Where the Turk's horse once treads the grass never grows" in Part I of

M. P. Tilley, Dictionary of the Proverbs in

Oxford University Press.
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