<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Beauty, Masculinity, and Love between Men: Configuring þý Emotions with Michael Drayton s Peirs Gaveston

Korhonen, Anu

Pickering & Chatto
2012

Korhonen , A 2012 , Beauty, Masculinity, and Love between Men: Configuring Emotions with
þý Michael Drayton s Peirs Gaveston . in J Liliequist (ed.) , A History of
Pickering & Chatto , pp. 135-151, 237-241 .

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/39211>

publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

9 BEAUTY, MASCULINITY AND LOVE
BETWEEN MEN: CONFIGURING EMOTIONS
WITH MICHAEL DRAYTON'S *PEIRS GAVESTON*

Anu Korhonen

Let me start by suggesting that early modern men had a problem with love – a problem that had its roots deep in classical and medieval culture. Let us take it in five easy steps. Emotions were considered to be bodily reactions to outward stimuli. Love, one of the most common of these emotional reactions, was caused by perceiving something good in the world. Good could be sensed with any of the five senses, but the most powerful was sight, and the good perceived by sight was, most often, beauty. The most beautiful objects detected by sight, and so the ones that most had the ability to arouse love, were human beings, especially women. Those most powerfully affected by the beauty of women were men, which made men potential slaves to their affects and affections, and rendered the heady mix of beauty, love and lust an acute dilemma in men's everyday lives.

This account is of course a simplification; both in theory and in practice things were more complicated. Yet this train of thought seems never to have been far from the minds of those commenting on beauty, love and sexual desire. It worked as a standard resource for interpreting gender relations, sensory perceptions and emotional reactions – as a kind of master narrative for plotting the emotional life of both literary characters and actual living persons, extending implicitly backwards and forwards from any of its discrete components.

What I want to do in this article, however, is queer the heteronormative agenda of the standard account of early modern sexual love, and discuss male emotional reactions to male beauty. The gender scheme described above was very prominent in early modern English popular texts, despite learned access to the classical tradition where both beauty of men and love between men were much discussed and appreciated. But more popular thinking had its way of dealing with these topics too. The poet Michael Drayton's (1563–1631) historical complaint poem *Peirs Gaveston, Earle of Cornwall*, published in 1593, presents us with one such negotiation. While telling the life of Gaveston, the friend and lover of the early fourteenth-century King Edward II, it suggests that male

beauty too could have an effect on men, and that that effect could be conceptualized as love, just as the effects of women's beauty were.¹ Furthermore, it shows that men in the late sixteenth century, in all their susceptibility to human beauty, were considered very emotional indeed, and emotions in turn an essential component of masculinity.

By looking at love and beauty I would also like to comment on the history of emotions more generally, and suggest that we need to read for the specific ways in which different historical periods and communities described and explained their emotional processes. Here, I am most interested in two related features of early modern emotion discourse: the communicative nature of emotions, and the role of the trigger in the production of emotions.

In order to understand early modern emotional experiences and their articulations, we must take seriously their claim that emotions are born from outward triggers, out of perceiving something in the world. Early modern emotions were conceptualized as communicative and social events, produced through an individual's interaction with the world, not as autonomous occurrences arising from deep individuality. Treating early modern emotions in the way that is more familiar to us – as inner private movements that are potentially beyond sharing – is going to lead us astray. Yet emotions and emotional dispositions were certainly building blocks for early modern identities as well. Paying close attention to the emotional process as they described it, taking into account the role of the trigger as well as what happens in the body and mind of the experiencing individual, will let us have a fuller view into how emotions were understood, and perhaps also felt, in the early modern period.

Inspired by Iris Marion Young's two-part formulation of gender as, first, a constituent of subjectivity or the 'lived body' and, second, as social structure, I have constructed my article around two overlapping perspectives that will help us envision how beauty was believed to operate in the early modern social imaginary.² In the first section, I will look at male beauty through Gaveston's fictional self-portrait which allows us to imagine a potential 'lived body' with its projected emotional life, constructed mainly through the idea of exceptional beauty. Gaveston talks about his beauty all through the text; it is a central facet in his way of envisioning his selfhood, his body and his life story. He accounts for other people's actions mainly as reactions to his dazzling looks and his own choices as answers to others' being dazzled – in the end, everything that happens only happens because of his beauty. However imaginary this Gaveston is, constructing an identity upon outward appearance and its emotional significance was an interesting choice for Drayton to make, and an interpretive gesture that could potentially be employed by his contemporaries as a figure of identity formation, whether in real life or in literature.

In the latter part of my article, I will discuss the ways in which Gaveston's looks can contribute to our understanding of how love and bodily beauty were thought to work in early modern culture more generally. We don't know whether the real Gaveston actually was beautiful. There are no reliable sources – and anyway, what source could possibly be reliable about a thing like this. Drayton may have invented the whole thing, because it suited his purpose and his cultural milieu, or because that is how the story made sense to him. In the end, that is also what interests cultural historians: here, I want to look at how beauty was placed in the Elizabethan epistemological order, and how we could understand the importance of beauty for early modern people's emotional experiences. Drayton's text opens a view into a dialogue between the heterosexual beauty matrix and the conventions and ideologies of friendship and love between men.

Was Drayton's portrayal of Edward and Gaveston, then, a deviant and disrupting narrative that through its protagonist's exceptional voice rendered a sodomitical relationship less sinful, explained the processes of its construction, and delineated its potential for affective intimacy in a way that was rare elsewhere in early modern English literature? Or was bodily beauty perhaps a technique to tame the unruly relationship between Edward and Gaveston? I will argue that youthful male beauty could be read in both ways. It made a sodomitical relationship seem understandable and even inevitable to a heteronormatively oriented readership. At the same time, however, it suggests a heteronormative counterattack where the radically unsettling potential of literary homosexuality was domesticated by applying the conceptual framework of beauty, with its heavily gendered positions of agent and object, as the explanatory grid for a relationship between two young men.

Emotion and Identity

Despite the importance of homosociality in early modern English culture, sexual love between men was of course both a sin and a crime. In England, it was by no means clear that sex between men involved love at all – lust yes, but love? Love between men was thought to reside in friendship and kinship, not in sexual relationships. Sex between men was against nature, and categorized under sodomy; emotion talk was not the primary context for discussing and understanding it. What Drayton does with Gaveston is explain, well within current emotion theory but against social prescription, how exceptional bodily beauty could force an irresistible emotional reaction from any spectator, whatever their gender.

Piers Gaveston was a well-known figure in Elizabethan times; he appears in historical chronicles and figures in Christopher Marlowe's play *Edward II*, for example. Where other texts focus on the political implications of a close relationship between the king and his favourite, Drayton's poem is more interested in the

private bond between the two young men and emphasizes its main character's good looks in an unprecedented way.³ This impression is further enhanced by a first-person narrative voice: *Peter Gaveston* is a fictional autobiography. In his choice of genre, Drayton was influenced by the *Mirror for Magistrates* – a popular collection of complaint poems where historical and legendary figures recounted their lives, loves and sins.⁴ While telling his life story from beyond the grave, Drayton's Gaveston gives the main role not to his political choices but to his outward appearance and how it affected other people. What he offers us is an emotional history of a certain kind of masculinity – or at least that is how I want to read it here.

Gaveston starts his account from his early youth and the beginnings of his relationship with Edward, then a crown prince, and recounts the progression of their relations from pure youthful friendship through a deepening attachment to a sodomitical partnership. As was typical in the complaint genre, Gaveston's telling of his life reveals an innocent youth corrupted more by circumstance than his own volition, but taking full responsibility for his grave sins and thus tilting the narrative towards a confessional exposé. We could even read Gaveston's story as an imaginary witness statement: where early modern courts had trouble sentencing perpetrators of sexual crimes for lack of evidence and confession, in literary portrayals 'sex offenders' like Gaveston could plead guilty while also offering compelling reasons for their behaviour.⁵

While presenting his gradual descent into deadly sin, Drayton positions Gaveston both as a questionable sexual predator engaging in a sodomitical relationship, and as a universally understandable victim of the all-powerful effects of beauty. The basis of Gaveston's negotiation of both his intimate relationships and court politics lies in embodiment – the way in which his body interacts with other bodies, be it through gazes, gestures or sexual pleasure. The most important trigger for these interactions, as presented by Drayton, was his outward appearance. This is how Gaveston describes himself:

My tender youth yet scarce crept from the shell,
Unto the world brought such a wonderment,
That all perfection seem'd in me to dwell,
And that the heavens me all their graces lent:
Some sware I was the quintessence of nature,
And some an Angell, and no earthly creature.

The heavens had lim'd my face with such a die
As made the curiost eie on earth amazed,

Tempring my looks with love and majestie,
A miracle to all that ever gazed,

So that it seem'd some power had in my birth
Ordained me his Image here on earth.⁶

Although, read on its own, Gaveston's self-image may sound nothing short of smug, it is not only vanity and pride he feels; beauty is what explains his life. It is indeed the grounds for him having a 'lived body' at all, however fictional. Drayton constructed for his protagonist an identity that was wholly based on conceptions of beauty and its emotional power, and if that was not a typical way of delineating a male identity, neither was it a novelty: early modern people saw questions of beauty to be absolutely central to constructing female identities, and Gaveston's vacillation between pride and shame is an exact parallel to how women were thought to manage their looks socially.

To reach this conclusion, we might want to approach identity in the way delineated by Joan Scott in her article *Fantasy Echo*. For Scott, identity is produced in a process of echoing where cultural fantasies are invoked to inform the process of identity formation – for Scott's purposes, the category of 'woman' and its different reverberations are the most interesting.⁷ For a sexual and emotional identity in its early modern formation, the site of the echoing centre, or imagined 'voice', is in the body and how it was conceptualized. In Gaveston's case, his particular form of embodiment, the fantasy of beauty, was assembled as it was projected towards others and as others reacted to it. Beauty became a bodily understanding, built on echoing perceptions between self and others, but it also constituted a quality of the lived body, tangibly present in an individual's daily life. In other people, the presence of beauty necessarily invited a corresponding emotional reaction, love, and that emotional reaction was understood as being in direct relation with bodily action – to be precise, the sexual act arose as a response to another body's beauty. Beauty was, then, a discursive formation that could reveal how embodiment and identity were joined in early modern culture. But it was also viewed as a physical fact which triggered and forced agency and action in others.

This is clear in what Gaveston says about the reasons for the developing amity between him and Crown Prince Edward: 'With this fayre bayte I fisht for *Edward's* love, / My daintie youth so pleas'd his princely eye.'⁸ Gaveston's beauty is not only the basis for his imagined self but for his relations to all others. Because he is so divinely beautiful, everybody, both men and women, must love him. The most fateful of these loving reactions comes from his master, Edward. The bait of beauty is overpowering, and Gaveston himself cannot *not* use it – it forces its presence on every encounter and every significant episode of his life. But he also uses it very deliberately to fish for affection and to lavish others with his favours – using beauty as a social tool could prove irresistible to good-looking people even if moralists issued constant warnings against it. This was indeed how beauty was believed to affect the lives of beautiful people in the early modern period.

Although early modern writers in general were not very interested in discussing how beauty worked as subjective experience, they had a lot to say about the

beautiful person's side of things by implication. This should not surprise us: they were mostly men, after all, and more interested in what perceiving beauty did to *them* in the most typical of gendered contexts. Perhaps the most direct formulation was that of the Italian humanist Tommaso Buoni, whose half-humorous compilation of aesthetic knowledge *The Problems of Beauty* was translated into English in 1606: those who were the most beautiful were also the most frequently loved, which excited in them a more loving disposition towards all and sundry. As both the most loved and the most loving, the most beautiful were, all in all, the most fortunate people in the world.⁹

Although Buoni's text seems to envision the beautiful as female, its 'vicious' circle of beauty's powers is not unlike Gaveston's way of living his extraordinary body. Edward's love for him, according to Gaveston's own opinion, was born out of his beauty. Gaveston, on the other hand, needed no special incitements to enflame his passions: Edward's love for him made him fall in love in return. Although beauty works as the initial instigator of love, its power spins into motion a reciprocal display of affection.

I would hesitate to generalize that this would be a usual way of conceptualizing the fact of living in a beautiful (male) body. Quite the contrary, it is an exceptional way of explaining a relationship between two men. It is, however, the paradigmatic model for presenting the emotional and sexual bond between a man and a woman. I would suggest that Drayton's poem made sense to its contemporary readers specifically because the early modern repertoire of emotion talk included the connection between being beautiful and being loved.

Interestingly enough, Drayton's Gaveston also presents his sodomitical fall through the imagery of outward appearance. When the horrors of sexual sin take over his life, the first to go is the 'image of perfection', his white beauty blotched with 'the black pencil' of immorality. The metaphors used to set forth his dilemma repeat the vocabulary of light, brightness and sun, all central ingredients in perceiving and describing beauty.¹⁰ The emphasis on the visual continues in the curious language of dissection used to describe Gaveston's death: when the envious courtiers who had so disapproved of Gaveston's and Edward's relationship pursue him, they 'anatomize' his life and 'embowel' his youth with 'their curious eyes'.¹¹ Loss of reputation and social condemnation receive a bodily guise, closely related to the annihilation of beauty. Where the most typical formula of extolling female beauty, the blazon, glides along the surface of the female body, taking it apart in separate exquisite fragments, sentencing Gaveston for his sinfulness is an anatomical project with a suggestion of a counter-blazon, a desecration of bodily beauty that not only defames the surface but reaches towards the inner corruption of sinful good looks.¹²

It should not surprise us then that Drayton's Gaveston conceptualizes even his own death as an undoing of his beauty. Even in death he is Adonis, the

embodiment of male beauty and love, but he is also a breathless, headless body whose fair alabaster skin is stained with his own blood and gore. What remains is his soul, upon which the sins committed and experienced during his life will have stamped their mark. To himself and to the Almighty, the dead Gaveston no longer appears beautiful: he is 'scarred' and 'botched', 'filthy, ugly, and deformed', a horrid opposite of his living self. This opposite, 'the loathsome dunghill' of bodiliness, was of course what each beautiful body would turn out to be, according to medieval and early modern popular theology, if only we were able to see through to the inside of its glossy surface.¹³ Happily, however, to those still living Gaveston's beauty never faded: even in death he still had – or indeed was – exactly the same divinely beautiful body that could be portrayed with conventional expressions, familiar from descriptions of female beauty.¹⁴

Imagining sin as bodily decay was a handy way to discuss morality in early modern culture, although more frequently with respect to women. An interesting parallel to Gaveston's loss of looks can be found in the story of Jane Shore, another guileless youngster tempted and forced by her beauty to succumb to a sinful partnership with a king. Where Gaveston gazes at his own body after death and reflects on the looks of his body and soul, his female double Jane weeps, blushes and shrouds herself in a 'shere of shame', even as a ghost. Both Jane and Peirs present the reader with a personal history of misguided sexuality: both too react to their sins after their death in a bodily way. This vacillation between life and death allows both to alternate between titillation and lamentation, exposing their sexuality and condemning it at the same time.¹⁵

Now why all this emphasis on looks? I would like to argue that the reasons for Drayton's choice may lie in his attempt to portray his protagonist as not only a distant and stylized figure of a sinner but as a character the reader could sympathize with. This was also typical to other stories in the complaint genre. Without the text seducing the reader to feel for the unfortunate characters of these moralities, empathy would not lead him to examine his own sinfulness, which was at least the overt explanation for the usefulness of these texts. Titillation and excitement were surely behind their popularity too, but one cannot deny completely their edifying aims. So, Drayton's Gaveston is not so much a political climber taking advantage of a silly monarch's infatuation, as a supposedly credible figure giving account of his mistakes, explaining them through an inevitability built into the discourses of beauty and affect in sixteenth-century culture. The mechanism is exactly the same as in renditions of the Jane Shore story: the sexually risqué life of the royal mistress had begun because men could not leave her alone. Jane herself only succumbed after much coaxing – and indeed coercion, since one could not very well say no to a king's express command.¹⁶ Where Jane lapsed when forced, Peirs was seduced by existing intimacy and friendship, but both were victims of their beauty. Not only were they to be

condemned for their sins, both political and sexual; they could also be understood and even sympathized with.

By letting Gaveston tell his own story, Drayton also invites the reader to follow his particular ways of reasoning and accounting for his actions. Alan Bray, in a different context, has seen rationalization and justification of one's own behaviour within the prevailing moral code as one of the choices an individual could make in the face of society's condemnation of (homo)sexual desire. His example is the Rev. John Wilson, of Arlington in Sussex, an orthodox but unconventional clergyman who adjusted his views of his own sexual practices to moral values, claiming that his preference for buggery kept him from the more threatening sin of consorting with women.¹⁷ Although the moves that Drayton's Gaveston makes in order to make his choices understandable are not perhaps as drastic, the same technique is undoubtedly at play. Appealing to the discourses and theories of the unbreakable link between beauty and love justified Gaveston's and Edward's behaviour, and Gaveston let himself partly off the hook by acknowledging the limited choice he and his partner had in the situation. He juggled the conflicting discourses on love and sexuality in a way that prioritized his own interests.

What is clear, however, is that the fictionalized Gaveston, like other early modern representations of homoerotic desire, never attributed his actions to a 'homosexual' inclination. Gaveston's and Edward's sexuality was not determined on the basis of their desiring men, mainly or only. In Drayton's telling, they became sodomites because they fell in love and acted like lovers do; they did not fall in love and desire each other because they were sodomites.¹⁸ The explication for their desire could be found in beauty. In that way, sodomy was the result of object choice, but not of choosing, specifically, a same-sex object. Even if restraint was prescribed by the moral code, the popular belief in beauty's almost supernatural power worked towards rationalizing and naturalizing the youngsters' attraction towards each other, despite the revulsion and condemnation that sodomy, in cultural terms, implied in early modern England.¹⁹ For this to work, an implicit or explicit reference to emotion theory, with its organization of affects and triggers, was needed.

If we want to talk about early modern subjects' sexual identifications, then, we need to let go of our own categorizations and look for the early modern categories against which the operations of identification could function. As the division into hetero- and homosexual identity is not of much use in figuring early modern sexuality, we need other ways of conceptualizing the origins of desire in that culture. What the early modern writers stressed, indeed where they found an explanation for sexual feelings and actions, was the beauty of the human body. Not everyone possessed it in the same amounts, and according to

emotion theory and literary representation at least, this indicated different projections of identity and action.

Violating Scott's elegant thinking only slightly, I hope, I would like to put 'fantasy echo' to work in a concrete setting and suggest that an early modern sexual identity could be based on the kind of embodiment which was then seen as primarily anchored in beauty. The outward appearance of an attractive body emanated its quality to others' perception, then echoed back as an emotional and sexual reaction, again inviting a response and offering materials for a construction of a sexual identity. And this echoing was, of course, a continuing process, present in all human interactions. What Gaveston suggests to us is that his handsome frame was what informed his understanding of his self and his sexuality. Acts of sodomy were the physical manifestations of the irresistibly beautiful body in which he lived. It was not 'homosexual desire' which led him to a sexual relationship with his partner; it was his beauty and the king's inability to resist it.

In this way, another level of echoing may be at work in our attempts to understand early modern sexuality: the play of categories has not been transformed beyond all recognition, but our queering voice echoes back from the past in unexpected formations. As historians have already learned, when we ask the past about 'homosexuality', early modern texts may answer back with different constructions – ones we have termed 'sodomy', 'homoerotic desire' or 'erotic friendship between men', for example. Beauty offers a categorization for desire from a different perspective, and is gendered in a different way. With beauty, the desiring subject imagines his object as beautiful and finds a vocabulary for his emotions and actions in that principle. Although beauty was gendered primarily female, its potential to delineate a male identity as well is clear from the Gaveston poem. Perhaps this would also suggest the need for more critical work on the role of beauty and its different temporal echoes in queer history more generally.

Love and the Cultural Uses of Beauty

Bruce Smith sets the stage in his book on *Homosexual Desire* by asking what kinds of 'love games' men desiring men could play in early modern England – what were the special rules, objectives and strategies of such games?²⁰ Looking from *Petrus Gaveston's* perspective, beauty seems one of the key concepts through which such games could be initiated – a 'rule' by which all participants had to play. In fact, the whole emotional, sexual and social process that went into male–male erotic relationships could be narrated through the conceptual matrix of beauty. We come, then, to the second part of my story, and can start looking for the cultural scripts and structures that informed the use of beauty when delineating emotions and gender.

As we have seen, what love meant, according to early modern emotion discourse, was the desire for something good perceived in the world; beauty was the ultimate good that could be detected by sight. What made beauty such a powerful instigator of love was the relationship emotion theory had to conceptualizations of the senses: sight was understood as the sense that affected a person in the quickest and most direct way possible – one could and should admire a person's inner beauty and goodness as well, but that took some time and effort to detect.²¹ The idea that bodily beauty produced love and desire was so well known that one felt no need to justify it; in countless early modern texts it was enough to just praise someone's beauty in order to imply that spectators as well as readers could follow the attraction that beauty called forth.

The gendered division of subject and object positions in early modern beauty and emotion theory was generally very clear. Women were determined as the beautiful sex, and men as the privileged spectators of that beauty. Various rationalizations for this state of affairs emerged, but the most frequent was extolling women for their weaker and more delicate bodies; their lack of physical and mental strength was made up for by their delightful looks. Women's beauty thus resulted from the hierarchical positions in which the (male) seer and the (female) seen were generally placed:

... this glorious Idea drawne out from the secret temper of the graces, nature bestowed more prodigally vpon women then men, as creatures more worthy and excellent: the richest gold hath the rarest colour, the purest stones are most cleare, the sweetest Flowers most pleasing to the eye; and women as the purest quintessence incolated from all other liuing things, are therefore the most beautiful and faire: yea in their own sex, beauty is the touchstone of vertue, and the fairer a woman is, the fuller of good conditions.²²

If beauty was understood as a feminine characteristic, the desire to possess it was a male agent position and entailed the power of the spectator to determine what was and what was not beautiful, and what kinds of reactions beauty produced. The desire for beauty was, indeed, a central tenet of male sexuality.

The clarity of this gender division is of course partly an effect of who was writing, and who was imagined as the reader, of early modern texts. If romance was a genre particularly favoured by women readers, then it comes as no surprise that that was also where the number of beautiful male characters was the greatest. Needless to say, most descriptions of either male handsomeness or its effect on a spectator are presented from the female point of view. Drayton's text reaches for a different perspective.²³ Here the union of beauty and love has a definite erotic tinge no matter the gender of the people experiencing it. Gaveston's description of his life with Edward is quite explicit compared to most texts dealing with desire between men:

My youth the glasse where he his youth beheld,
Roses his lipps, my breath sweete *Nectar* showers,
For in my face was natures fayrest field,
Richly adorn'd with Beauties rarest flowers.
My breast his pillow, where he laide his head,
Mine eyes his booke, my bosome his bed.

My smiles were life, and Heaven unto his sight,
All his delight concluding my desier,
From my sweete sunne, he borrowed all his light,
And as a flie play'd with my beauties fier.
His love-sick lippes at every kissing qualme,
Cling to my lippes, to cure their griefe with balme.²⁴

Early modern culture encouraged close and affectionate friendships between men, particularly on higher levels of the social ladder, and rarely regarded them as a danger to heterosexual ideals.²⁵ Kissing, cuddling and sleeping together may well have been familiar behaviour in these intimate friendships, but Gaveston's insistence on beauty gives Drayton's account a different tone. Yet it is also a far cry from the classically inspired renditions of Plato's *Symposium*, for example, where the model for male–male love is usually taken to come from. Gaveston does not pretend that his beauty elevates its spectators – he evokes an earthy and lustful gaze, not an expression of the beautiful male intellect reaching towards its God via the work of beauty, as neo-Platonists might have suggested.

Drayton in fact lets Gaveston compare his relationship with Edward directly with the more typical passionate relationships men had with women – his reference point is social life, not neo-Platonic theory:

Who ever had his Ladie in his armes,
That hath of love but felt the miserie,
Touching the fire that all his senses warms,
Now clips with joy her blushing Ivorie.
Feeling his soule in such delights to melt,
Ther's none but he can tell the joye, we felt.²⁶

As Mark Breitenberg has suggested, in the early modern period 'the cultural codes in which desire is expressed are more often based on heterosexual models even if individual practices are not always consonant with that model'.²⁷ Here, too, knowledge of love between a man and a woman would help envision what went on between the two young men. Drayton's chosen strategy was to speak in the tradition of heterosexual desire, marking the love between two young men as something that needed an extra gesture of interpretation in order to be understood and accommodated. The imagined reader, here, was not necessarily someone experientially familiar with homoerotic desire, but he (and it was a 'he' holding a lady in his arms) was expected to identify with the experience by refer-

ring to his own sexual pleasure.²⁸ What was it that made the interpretive gesture of crossing the gendered sexual prescription possible? The key, again, was the appeal to beauty.

Beauty, then, was a gendering device that worked in quite a complicated manner. Despite its being classed as a predominantly feminine characteristic, it could also reside in a male body and produce its customary sensations and passions in both male and female viewers. Yet on the discursive level its feminine quality was overriding: male beauty worked *in the same way* as the more conventional female beauty. Beauty's femininity was the standard gendered matrix that accommodated male beauty when needed, as a particular variation of the norm.²⁹ Even if sex could not determine the force of one's beauty or whom it affected, its workings were never independent of understandings of gender.

Turning the tables a bit, then, how did women look at Gaveston? Drayton's text is mostly silent on this, but the general assumption would have been that women, too, felt desire and love in the face of male beauty. Emotions raised by beauty in their own sex would have been somewhat different; early modern male writers, at least, suggested that women felt either envy or pride, not love and desire, when evaluating their sisters.³⁰ Gaveston's situation was in fact highly complicated. He was so beautiful that even women looked at him with not just desire and jealousy, but indeed envy. The beautiful Gaveston usurped the place reserved for female bodies and stole men's gazes away from women. Women also have a central role in Drayton's depiction of Gaveston's fall: where those who could experience the effects of his beauty could understand and accept his actions, 'grave matrons' emerge as his gossiping, whispering enemies.³¹ Elderly women were typically envisioned as beyond sexual interests; they no longer yearned for the pleasures of sex, they could no longer instigate desire in men, and love produced by male beauty could no longer touch them. This cultural stereotype was why Drayton could portray them as beyond Gaveston's powers. Where men could feel the effects of beauty in their bodies until the bitter end, aging women found the door slammed on their face almost as soon as their reproductive period was at an end. The political import of beauty was closely tied to gender and age.

In any case, the possibility of a young man's beauty inviting affection, friendship and erotic love was not unknown in Renaissance texts – we need only think about Shakespeare's sonnets or Marlowe's plays. But when Michel de Montaigne, in John Florio's translation of 1613, discussed pederasty in his essay *Of Friendship*, he condemned the Greek custom as not true friendship because it was only based on the beauty of the beloved boy: it is 'simply grounded upon an external beauty; a false image of corporall generation', whereas proper emotional bonds of friendship existed between equals in a truly voluntary relationship.³² Despite Montaigne's negative attitude, what remains clear is the idea that youthful

beauty could and did arouse desire in same-sex spectators. Even though Gaveston's and Edward's relationship, as described by Drayton, by no means followed the Greek habit – they were the same age, for example, and neither was in a sexually subordinate role – the rationale behind their love was the same as that depicted by Montaigne. Drayton, however, departs from Montaigne's Aristotelian objections by seeing the love of men both as a sin and as a true, if misguided, form of friendship.

As Bruce Smith has noted in relation to Christopher Marlowe's play, the power games between King Edward and his favourite are not straightforward, and neither does Gaveston nicely fit any of the period's homoerotic stereotypes. Despite his subordinate status, he is not a boy, a servant, an effeminate companion or a minion. The erotic and emotional components of their relationship, together with the political power that Gaveston has appropriated in various ways, make Edward's position, as well, quite complicated.³³ What are we to make of the power play of this sinful friendship, specifically as it appears in Drayton's story?

One noteworthy dimension in Gaveston's fascination with his own body is that – again completely within the heteronormative imagery – he experiences his beauty as the empowering agent which gives him control over others, especially Edward: his beauty was the lodestar to Edward's thinking, his looks were the pilot to Edward's wandering eye – in fact, his hand was the racket and the king was his tennis ball.³⁴ Edward's attraction to Gaveston raises the latter from a subordinate position into a ruler of the ruler, just like beautiful women were imagined to lord over their admiring husbands and lovers. Early modern women, too, seem to have thought that beauty was almost the only 'natural' force that could give them authority over men.³⁵ The young Gaveston, politically and socially inferior to the crown prince, climbed on the social ladder with the help of his good looks – a perennially feminine course of action, if we are to believe the long-term political paranoia of our gendered culture. But he also illustrates another Renaissance anxiety: the threat that a close male friendship between the monarch and his subject posed to traditional understandings of hierarchy and status.³⁶

Gaveston is a man of his time in feeling that his social advancement is not wholly correct and justified but constitutes a politically questionable misuse of beauty's emotional powers. Competing for position was an integral part of manhood, but good looks were not supposed to interfere with social hierarchy, certainly not if the partner witnessing the beautiful subject was a king.³⁷ This indeed is the problem most texts about Edward and Gaveston seem to determine as the cause of their fall. Their sexual relationship was certainly sinful, but most portrayals of this couple pay more attention to the political problems of their intimacy. Gaveston had too much influence over Edward – influence that should have been reserved for the aristocracy, and for men much older than him.

Questions of state and questions of the monarch's personal relationships were inextricably linked, in Elizabeth's England as well as in James's, only a few years after Drayton's *Gaveston* was published.³⁸

In early modern culture, intimacy between men, whether brought about by friendship or sex, often seems to have had this potential for disruption of order. At court, where male friendships had a specially normative and formative function but where social status, too, was paramount, such relationships were fraught with ambiguity. The young prince, superior to any of the courtiers, was in an especially problematic situation: his friendships with aristocratic youths were indispensable, but once these relationships acquired the potential for being interpreted as sodomitical, they offered powerful weapons for criticism and control. Gaveston, then, embodies both the male images that Alan Bray saw as the basis for the Elizabethan dilemma of male-male relationships, the masculine friend and the sodomite.³⁹ In Drayton's text, Gaveston indeed plays with both of these roles and creates tension within the story by suggesting the moral combat involved in his gradual slippage towards the sinful side.⁴⁰ It is important to note that these two figurations are not separate. The dividing line may have been between the morally and socially cultivating kind of friendship and its distorted sinful equivalent, but the sodomite was still a friend.

But where most Gaveston texts, including Marlowe's version, deal with the political implications of erotic male friendship, Drayton was concerned with its causes.⁴¹ The reason for Edward's unorthodox behaviour was not disregard for political correctness or the wishes of his aristocracy, but the forceful effect of Gaveston's looks. Compared to standard depictions of men being ruled by their erotic passions for women, there is nothing special as such in Edward's emotional weakness. Succumbing to passion caused by the beauty of the beloved, and at the same time supposedly relinquishing all pretensions to social power, even revelling in the subordinate position of the lover in the face of the beloved, was a pose early modern men seem to have delighted in. Without trying to diminish the power of this vocabulary to represent men's emotions and experiences, one can say that the willing suspension of male mastery hardly resulted in actual changes in the power hierarchy between the genders. Beloved women remained subordinate to their loving male partners.⁴² Assuming such a position in the face of a male courtier, however, had somewhat different consequences. If the beauty of the intimate male friend overran both reason and convention, the result was social disorder, with the king being subordinated, both emotionally and politically, to the favourite. Beauty indeed became a politicized fact.

Gaveston certainly seems to have made Edward feel weak in the knees, but was he weak in a gendered sense as well? It has often been stated that sexual desire in any form was considered a lapse of masculine control – if not a feminized state then at least it was a less manly, passionate, sensual and unreasonable state.

Whether desire was directed at a woman or a man, sensual pleasures diminished one's rational and moral capabilities.⁴³ Yet to call these 'fond affections' feminine or to claim that men who temporarily gave up on control and restraint in sexual matters lost their masculinity misses the point. Looking at discourses on sexual love and beauty, it is clear that presenting men as helpless victims of the beauty of the desired object is an integral and necessary part of manhood.⁴⁴ The ideals of emotional strength and social control could be held up only with the help of their repressed others. Claiming irresponsibility and powerlessness in the face of the sexual object was a way of relinquishing the demand that manliness must always be controlled. It also shifted responsibility for sinful sexual actions to the person seen as instigating lust, the socially and sexually subordinate other, be it a woman or a beautiful young man. When stressing Gaveston's beauty instead of his hunger for social advancement, Drayton makes Edward more of a man and less of a king.

Another interesting factor in this power play between men is the gendered position of the desired subordinate Gaveston. It is fairly typical of the early modern language of homoerotic desire that the younger or socially inferior partner is presented as 'sodomized' and thus in the social and sexual role of a woman: the one used and penetrated, 'like a woman'.⁴⁵ This is not the image that Drayton presents. For him, Edward and Gaveston are intimate friends and partners, not a temporary coupling of a sodomite and the sodomized. At the same time, however, Gaveston talks about himself as Ganymede, serving his master the king and retaining without flaw the patriarchal hierarchy of male status. As the socially inferior partner, Gaveston-Ganymede takes part in formulating power hierarchies not across, but within gender positions.⁴⁶

Thus their relationship can perhaps also be used to question the power hierarchy of the active adult male and the feminized object of his desire. Despite early modern parlance which situated the less powerful partner at least temporarily on the other side of the gender divide, how productive is it for us to take this vocabulary at face value? Do we need to think along polarized, dichotomous gender lines and see the desired adolescents as pseudo-women, and the active partners as, in the end, traditional males turning everything they desire into 'woman'?

In the thoroughly hierarchical early modern culture, perhaps another figuration would serve as well. When the basic tenet of masculinity was social status, the need to assert one's place in different ways became crucial to early modern masculine identity. Sexuality and desire by no means stayed outside this system.⁴⁷ Ideologies of masculine virility demanded that adult men dominate their sexual partners, but not everything men dominated needed to be a woman. Do we not accept a decidedly heteronormative and dichotomizing view of sexuality if we claim, together with our early modern texts, that the boys of sodomitical

couplings were the 'feminine' partner? Drayton's representation of Edward and Gaveston is an example of how love between men could be figured without loss of masculinity – although the hierarchical aspects of their relationship point towards other instances of shifting power.

We come back, then, to the way Alan Bray, Bruce Smith, Mario DiGangi and Michael Rocke, among others, have conceptualized early modern homoerotic desire.⁴⁸ The ties of hierarchical status, personal service, age and youth, and gender were constructed around any intimate early modern relationship. In relationships between men, the potential disruptions that reversals of these hierarchies could cause were of a different order than in relationships between men and women. Whatever the imaginary authority that women were able to gain through their beauty, the primary fact of their gender and its subordinate status could not be forgone in early modern culture. For men, the reliance on other kinds of hierarchy to organize the relations of intimate friends made beauty's powers potentially revolutionary.

After the history of our unfortunate couple has been told from Gaveston's perspective, Drayton gives the last word to Edward, the inconsolable king who has lost his love. In his farewell words, Edward describes Gaveston in the way that male intimates thought about each other: as a 'companion' and 'sweet friend', as 'soul's delight' and the source of all his mirth, indeed as a 'second self'.⁴⁹ At the same time, the emotional attachment that Drayton imagines for his protagonists is that of marriage, and the loss of the beloved is experienced as widowhood. Yet these two were not and could not be joined in any formal way. In the eyes of their family and friends, they were grave sinners and behaved intolerably in view of social hierarchy. Yet in Drayton's imagination at least, anyone who had ever loved was expected to understand them.

In a recent article, Mario DiGangi reflects on why early modern same-sex relationships and the stigma attached to them seem so incoherent, and answers by suggesting that 'there was no discrete discourse or site of "queerness" in that culture'. No stable sexual identity based on same-sex object choice can be found; neither can we ascribe clear boundaries to sexual acts and the conceptualizations they were given on the basis of our own categories. In DiGangi's terms, 'queerness could subtly, unpredictably, fluctuate into and out of visibility' in the early modern practices and representations that we find in our texts.⁵⁰ The ways in which bodily beauty figured in early modern men's emotional lives is one such site of fluctuating queerness.

One can certainly start unravelling the mystery of Drayton's luminously, brilliantly beautiful Gaveston by pointing towards the gendered norms of understanding beauty. Where the standard 'woman' was imagined as beautiful, and individual ugly women as exceptions to the rule, a beautiful man was experienced as a singular anomaly, as an exception to the male norm. Men could

indeed be less or more attractive, but evaluations of their beauty were not central to determining their social worth. Following this rule, men's emotional or sexual reactions to other men's beauty could be viewed as exceptions as well, as an inevitable but unusual response to the emergence of a singular beautiful individual.

But if a man was beautiful enough to incite this sort of reaction, the early modern mind was quite willing to conceptualize men's reactions to other men as the perfect parallel to their love and attraction to beautiful women. This, at least, is the way in which Drayton's Gaveston explains the love between him and Edward – as a completely natural and understandable consequence of his exquisite looks. The ultimately sinful partnership slips in an astoundingly easy way into the grand framework of beauty and heterosexual desire. The role of beauty as the power behind love and sexuality was so manifest that it made a man's sexual love for another man not only possible but unavoidable.

If beauty could make sodomitical acts understandable in a heteronormative context, then its emotional power must be viewed, at least partly, as a principle beyond sex and gender. The threat proposed by homoerotic desire was channelled into the familiar story of social and gender hierarchy, where beauty marks the subordinate object who nevertheless comes to hold an affective power over the admiring subject. In this way, the game of gender that men desiring men played was rendered much less threatening than it would have seemed if placed squarely under the rubric of sodomy. But if Gaveston and Edward can unsettle our views of how beauty was gendered, they also, by their very digression from the norm, seem to redirect our gaze back towards the normative gender positions where men looked and desired, and women and other subordinates were created beautiful to allow that gaze and desire. What goes unquestioned is the position of the male lover whose eyes were the wounded and delighted recipients of the beloved's beauty.

48. G. Braden, *Renaissance Tragedy and the Senecan Tradition: Anger's Privilege* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1985), pp. 5–27; A. Shifflet, *Stoicism, Politics, and Literature in the Age of Milton: War and Peace Reconciled* (Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 3–34.
49. Chapman, *The Tragedy*, 1.2.1–7.
50. A. Findlay, *A Feminist Perspective on Renaissance Drama* (Oxford: Blackwells, 1999), p. 69. Findlay's analysis does, however, take into account the possible effect of the performance of vindictiveness and anger on members of the audience. This is an aspect that is missing in my analysis here, and which I will take up in my current research project *Moving Scenes*.

9 Korhonen, 'Beauty, Masculinity and Love between Men: Configuring Emotions with Michael Drayton's *Peirs Gaveston*'

1. M. Drayton, 'Peirs Gaveston Earle of Cornwall' (1593), in *The Works of Michael Drayton, Volume 1*, ed. J. Hebel (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1931).
2. I. M. Young, *On Female Body Experience. 'Throwing Like a Girl' and Other Essays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 16–22.
3. Raphael Holinshed says nothing about Gaveston's looks, but mentions that Edward was 'indifferently tall of stature, strong of bodie, and healthfull'. R. Holinshed, *The Firste Volume of the Chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande* (London, 1577), pp. 847–51, 884. According to John Stow, the king was 'fayre of body, but vnstedfast of maners'. J. Stow, *A Summarie of Englyshe Chronicles* (London, 1565), f. 105'. Christopher Marlowe, in turn, does not describe the outward appearance of the pair in any detail; Gaveston is compared to Helen of Troy by Lancaster, but the only characters in the play who are explicitly called fair, mostly to mark their high status, are queens. See C. Marlowe, *The Troublesome Raigne and Lamentable Death of Edward the Second* (London, 1594). Interestingly, Drayton also described the reign of Edward II after Gaveston's death in *Mortimeriados*, giving hardly any role to beauty. M. Drayton, *Mortimeriados* (London, 1596), see e.g. sig. B3v–B4v, N1r. On different emphases in Marlowe and Drayton, see also S. Gianvalley, 'Barnfield, Drayton, and Marlowe: Homoeroticism and Homosexuality in Elizabethan Literature', *Pacific Coast Philology*, 16:2 (1981), pp. 9–24.
4. For *Peirs Gaveston*'s place in the complaint genre, see K. Quinn, 'Mastering Complaint', *English Literary Renaissance*, 38:3 (2008), for gender in the complaint, R. Helgerson, 'Weeping for Jane Shore', *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 98:3 (1999), pp. 458–9, and for Drayton's literary career, J. M. Brink, *Michael Drayton Revisited* (Boston, MA: Twayne, 1990).
5. Drayton, *Peirs Gaveston*, p. 208. On legal problems in sodomy and rape cases, see C. Herlihy, *A House in Grass Disorder: Sex, Law, and the 2nd Earl of Castlehaven* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 28–9.
6. Drayton, *Peirs Gaveston*, p. 162.
7. J. W. Scott, 'Fantasy Echo: History and the Construction of Identity', *Critical Inquiry*, 27:2 (2001), pp. 292–3 and passim.
8. Drayton, *Peirs Gaveston*, p. 163.
9. T. Buoni, *Problems of Beauty and All Humane Affections*, trans. S. Lennard (London 1606), pp. 21–2.

10. Drayton, *Peirs Gaveston*, p. 167. On light in beauty theory, see e.g. A. Romei, *The Courtiers' Academie*, trans. I. K[e]pers (London, 1598), pp. 27–8.
11. Drayton, *Peirs Gaveston*, p. 169.
12. On the blazon see N. Vickers, 'Diana Described: Scattered Woman and Scattered Rhyme', *Critical Inquiry*, 8:2 (1981), pp. 265–6 and passim.
13. Drayton, *Peirs Gaveston*, p. 202; A. Korhonen, *Silmän ilot* (Jyväskylä: Atena), pp. 87–8.
14. Drayton, *Peirs Gaveston*, p. 204.
15. T. Churchyard, 'Howe Shores Wyfe, Kinge Edwarde the Fowerths Concubine, Was by Kinge Richarde Despoiled of All Her Goods, and Forced to do Open Penaunce', in W. Baldwin, *The Myrrour for Magistrates* (London, 1571), f. 162. On Jane's flirtatious dubiety, see R. D. Brown, 'A Talkative Wench (Whose Words a World Hath Delighted in)': Mistress Shore and Elizabethan Complaint', *Review of English Studies*, 49 (1998), pp. 399–402.
16. Churchyard, 'Shores Wyfe', ff. 162v–163r; A. Chute, *Beauwre Dishonoured Written under the Title of Shores Wyfe* (London, 1593), pp. 27–8, 30–2.
17. A. Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England* (1982; New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), p. 66.
18. The interpretive gesture here is the same as in A. Bray, 'To Be a Man in Early Modern Society: The Curious Case of Michael Wigglesworth', *History Workshop Journal*, 41 (1996), pp. 156–8; see also N. F. Radcl, 'Can the Sodomite Speak? Sodomy, Saire, Desire, and the Castlehaven Case', in K. O'Donnell and M. O'Rourke (eds), *Love, Sex, Intimacy, and Friendship Between Men, 1550–1800* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), p. 149.
19. Bray, *Homosexuality*, pp. 58–62.
20. B. R. Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England* (Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press, 1991), p. 19.
21. For concise formulations of this principle, see e.g. J. Banister, *The Historie of Man* (London, 1578), f. 102; Buoni, *Problemes of Beautie*, pp. 7–8; A. Darcie, *The Honour of Ladies* (London, 1622), pp. 54–5.
22. R. Greene, *Greene's Orphan* (1599), in *Life and Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Robert Greene, Volume 12: Prose*, ed. A. B. Grosart (London, 1881–3), pp. 66.
23. Although I cannot discuss the figure of Narcissus here, the possibilities of male beauty forcing a sexual reaction in a male viewer could not be made more explicit than in Ovid's well-known story. Ovid, *The .XIV. Bookes of P. Ovidius Naso, Entituled, Metamorphosis*, trans. A. Golding (London, 1593), ff. 36–7.
24. Drayton, *Peirs Gaveston*, p. 165.
25. See e.g. T. Betteridge, 'Introduction', in: T. Betteridge (ed.), *Sodomy in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), p. 7. Alexandra Shepard has noted, however, that intimate male friendships may also have given rise to fear and suspicion, especially lower down on the social scale, where more transient forms of camaraderie may have been preferred. A. Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 95–6.
26. Drayton, *Peirs Gaveston*, p. 176.
27. M. Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 9.
28. Not much is known about Drayton's own sexual preferences. This is perhaps where they might matter: surely the meaning of this gesture changes according to whether he chose it to appeal to his readers' imagination or simply because that was how he himself was

- able to make sense of his protagonists. Drayton did not have a questionable sexual reputation, but we have no record of him being married either. Anne Lake Prescott in *ODNB* notes Drayton's partiality to male beauty and his relish in imagining homoerotic desire, and suggests that this may be a signal of his own feelings. Interestingly, Bernard Capp has found him mixed up in a rather seedy affair: accused of incontinence with one Mrs Mary Peters in her room in a lodging-house, Drayton appeared in court and denied the whole thing. If, as seems likely, Mrs Peters's landlady had cooked up the accusation in order to extort money, we have no idea if the case speaks about Drayton's sexual interests at all. What it does say is that, for contemporaries, his sexual involvement with women was believable. But even that, considering the nature of same-sex practices in early modern culture, in no way resolves where his preferences lay. B. Capp, 'The Poet and the Bawdy Court: Michael Drayton and the Lodging-House World in Early Stuart London', *Seventeenth Century*, 10:1 (1995), pp. 27–32.
29. Perhaps a note on effeminacy is merited here. I would not characterize Gaveston in this text as 'feminized', but in *Mortimeriados*, Drayton lets Queen Isabella describe Gaveston and Edward's later favourite Spencer as 'mistresse' and 'lemman', explicitly marking them as womanish. Drayton, *Mortimeriados*, sig. H2v. In other texts, hints of effeminacy may be detected in his status as a fashionable courtier and his Gascon birth. Effeminacy was after all not a category that indicated sexual preference – although one could indeed become effeminate through too much (hetero)sexual activity – but interest in fashion, luxury, pleasure and sociability. On effeminacy as a continental influence, see e.g. W. Rankins, *The English Ape* (London, 1588), p. 5; I. F. Moulton, *Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 113–7; R. Hentschell, 'Treasonous Textiles: Foreign Cloth and the Construction of Englishness', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 32:3 (2002), pp. 543–5. On Gaveston and effeminacy, A. Bray, *The Friend* (Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press, 2003), p. 190; and S. C. Shapiro, 'You Plumed Dandebrot': Male "Effeminacy" in English Satire and Criticism', *Review of English Studies*, 39:155 (1988), pp. 400–7; A. Fletcher, 'Manhood, the Male Body, Courtship and the Household in Early Modern England', *History*, 84:275 (1999), p. 87; M. DiGangi, 'How Queer was the Renaissance?', in O'Donnell and O'Rourke (eds), *Love, Sex, Intimacy, and Friendship*, pp. 141–2; J. C. Vaught, *Masculinity and Emotion in Early Modern English Literature* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 76–80. Unlike Drayton, Marlowe made clear that his Gaveston delighted in Italian fashions and courtly ostentation, Marlowe, *Edward II*, sig. D1v, and Elizabeth Cary in her later retelling of the story made much of Gaveston's foreign descent, E. Cary, *The History of the Life, Reign, and Death of Edward II* (1680), in *The Early Modern Englishwoman: A Facsimile Library of Essential Works*, ed. B. S. Travitsky and P. Cullen, part 1: Printed Writings, 1500–1640, vol. 2 (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1996), p. 4.
 30. Valerie Traub's discussion of women's desire for women offers a healthy correction to the one-sided views of most male authors – and historians interpreting them. See V. Traub, *The Renaissance of Lesbianism in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), ch. 4, esp. pp. 170–5.
 31. Drayton, *Peirs Gaveston*, p. 169.
 32. M. de Montaigne, *Essays*, trans. J. Florio (London, 1613), p. 92. See also Smith, *Homosexual Desire*, pp. 41, 197.
 33. Smith, *Homosexual Desire*, pp. 211–4.
 34. Drayton, *Peirs Gaveston*, p. 165.

35. S. H. Mendelson, *The Mental World of Stuart Women* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1987), pp. 22–3; K. Hodgkin, 'Thomas Whythorne and the Problems of Mastery', *History Workshop Journal*, 29 (1990), pp. 000–000, p. 30; Korhonen, *Silmän ilot*, p. 121.
36. L. Shannon, *Sovereign Amity. Figures of Friendship in Shakespearean Contexts* (Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press, 2002), pp. 2–3, 7–11.
37. On manhood as social competition, see Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, pp. 173–4, 183.
38. See for example R. Shepard, 'Sexual Rumours in English Politics: The Cases of Elizabeth I and James I', in J. Murray and K. Eisenbichler (eds), *Desire and Discipline: Sex and Sexuality in the Premodern West* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), pp. 101–22.
39. A. Bray, 'Homosexuality and the Signs of Male Friendship in Elizabethan England', *History Workshop Journal*, 29 (1990), pp. 1, 15; Bray, *The Friend*, pp. 189–91; see also S. Orgel, *Impersonations: The Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p. 49; Herrup, *A House in Gross Disorder*, p. 146.
40. As Danielle Clark has pointed out in the context of Edward II stories of the 1620s, the technical term 'sodomy' itself was not usually employed in these discourses. D. Clark, "'The Sovereign's Vice Begrets the Subject's Error': The Duke of Buckingham, "Sodomy" and Narratives of Edward II, 1622–1628", in Betteridge (ed.), *Sodomy in Early Modern Europe*, pp. 000–000, at p. 50.
41. Gaveston was usually mentioned in early modern texts as a symbol of political disorder. See for example, W. Martyn, *Youths Instruction* (London, 1612), pp. 38–9; Cary, *Edward II*, p. 4. The various depictions of Gaveston, particularly Marlowe's, have also mostly been studied from that perspective. See, for example, J. Goldberg, *Sodomities. Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992), p. 122; M. DiGangi, *The Homoerotics of Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 102, 113–14; C. Perry, 'The Politics of Access and Representations of the Sodomite King in Early Modern England', *Renaissance Quarterly* 53:4 (2000), pp. 1054–83; Clark, 'The Sovereign's Vice'; L. Kekki, "Joutavat triumfit, naamiaiset, irsaat näytökset": Sodoman performatiivinen rakentuminen Christopher Marlowen tragediassa *Edward II*", in L. Kekki and K. Ilmonen (eds), *Pervot pidot. Homo-, lebo- ja queer-näkökulmia kirjallisuudentutkimukseen* (Helsinki: Like, 2004).
42. On the medieval legacy of this ideology, see R. M. Karras, *From Boys to Men. Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), pp. 25, 53–4.
43. Fletcher, 'Manhood', p. 95; Bray, 'To Be a Man', pp. 159–61; Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity*, pp. 49, 57; Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood*, pp. 78–9, 83–4.
44. A. Korhonen, 'Järien veit, orjan teit? Rakastumisen kokemukset uuden ajan taitteissa', *Tieteesä tapahuu*, 5 (2006), p. 18.
45. M. Roche, *Forbidden Friendships. Homosexuality and Male Culture in Renaissance Florence* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 106–8.
46. Smith, *Homosexual Desire*, pp. 196–7.
47. Fletcher, 'Manhood', p. 93.
48. Smith, *Homosexual Desire*, pp. 192–5; Bray, *Homosexuality*, pp. 46–9; M. DiGangi, 'Queering the Shakespearean Family', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 47:3 (1996), p. 282; Roche, *Forbidden Friendships*, pp. 87–8, 94–5.
49. Drayton, *Petrus Gaveston*, p. 172. Drayton's Gaveston is speaking within typical humanist friendship discourse when he models the king as his second self, however. Early modern writers inherited the popular poetic conceit of the friend as another self from Cicero's

De amicitia, and it could also be found in Erasmus's *Adagia* and Thomas Elyot's *The Boke Named the Governour*, for example. Shannon, *Sovereign Amity*, pp. 3–5.

50. DiGangi, 'How Queer was the Renaissance?', p. 142.

10 Kaartinen, "Pray, Dr, is there Reason to Fear a Cancer?" Fear of Breast Cancer in Early Modern Britain'

1. To Jurin, Clonfert, 1 June 1733, Letters from Mordecai Cary, MS 6140, Wellcome Library (hereafter MS 6140), f.1.
2. To Jurin, Clonfert, 12 June 1733 (MS 6140), f. 3. I discuss the history of early modern breast cancer in detail in my forthcoming book *Cancer in the Breast: The Cultural History of an Early Modern Illness*.
3. For an overview of the history of emotions, see Barbara Rosenwein's important review essay in which she suggests we should study 'emotional communities'. See B. Rosenwein, 'Worrying about Emotions in History', *American Historical Review*, 107:3 (2002), pp. 821–45.
4. In this chapter I discuss ideas presented from the sixteenth to the early nineteenth century, that is, in the 'long early modern period'.
5. See for example R. Guy, *An Essay on Scirrhus Tumours, and Cancers. By Richard Guy, Surgeon, in London. To which are added, the Histories of Cases cured by the Author, by means of Mr. Plunkett's Medicine* (London, 1759), p. 6.
6. D. de Moulins, *A Short History of Breast Cancer* (Kluwer: Dordrecht, Boston, London 1983–9), p. 17.
7. Cited in E. Crane: "I Have Suffer'd Much Today" The Defining Force of Pain in Early America', in R. Hoffman, M. Sobel, F. Teute (eds), *Through a Glass Darkly. Reflections on Personal Identity in Early America* (Chapel Hill, NC and London: The Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture and the University of North Carolina Press, 1997), p. 394.
8. J. Rodman, *A Practical Explanation of Cancer in the Female Breast, with the Method of Cure, and Cases of Illustration* (Paisley, 1815), pp. 56–7.
9. Anon., *Treasure of Pore Men. Here begynneth a Newe Boke of Medecynes Intrybuld or Calbyd the Treasure of Pore Men whiche Sheveth many Dyverse Good Medecines for Dyverse Certayn Dysseases as in the Table of this Present Boke more Playnly shall Appere. The Boke of Medecines* (London, 1526), p. 28.
10. Anon., *An Account of the Causes of some Particular Rebellious Distempers viz. the Survey, [H] Cancers in Women's Breasts, etc. Vapours, and Melancholy, etc. Weaknesses in Women, etc. Gout, Fistula in Ano, Dropsy, Agues, etc.: together with the Vertues and Uses of a Select Number of Chymical Medicines Studiously Prepar'd for their Cure and Adapted to the Constitutions and Temperaments of all Ages and Both Sexes / by an Eminent Practitioner in Physick, Surgery and Chymistry* (London, 1670), pp. 19–20.
11. The most important reason for this practice was to keep alive the first child's memory.
12. The biographical details are merely a suggestion given by the internet databases. There seem to have been two Mordecai Carries in London around the time – either the records are confused or there indeed were two men of the name.
13. To Jurin, Clonfert, 1 June 1733 (MS 6140), f. 1, ff.1–1v.
14. To Jurin, Clonfert, 9 June 1733 (MS 6140), f. 2.
15. To Jurin, Clonfert, 1 June 1733 (MS 6140), ff.1–1v.

STUDIES FOR THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR
CULTURAL HISTORY

Series Editors: Anu Korhonen
Birgitta Svensson
Editorial Board: Chris Dixon

TITLES IN THIS SERIES

Statistics, Public Debate and the State, 1800–1945: A Social, Political and
Intellectual History of Numbers
Jean-Guy Prévost and Jean-Pierre Beaud

FORTHCOMING TITLES

A Cultural History of the Radical Sixties in the San Francisco Bay Area
Anthony Ashbolt

Breast Cancer in the Eighteenth Century
Marjo Kaartinen

Crime and the Fascist State, 1850–1940
Tiago Pires Marques

A HISTORY OF EMOTIONS, 1200–1800

EDITED BY

Jonas Liliequist

PICKERING & CHATTO
2012

Published by Pickering & Chatto (Publishers) Limited
21 Bloomsbury Way, London WC1A 2TH

2252 Ridge Road, Brookfield, Vermont 05036-9704, USA

www.pickeringchatto.com

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise
without prior permission of the publisher.

© Pickering & Chatto (Publishers) Ltd 2012
© Jonas Liliequist 2012

To the best of the Publisher's knowledge every effort has been made to contact
relevant copyright holders and to clear any relevant copyright issues.
Any omissions that come to their attention will be remedied in future editions.

BRITISH LIBRARY CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION DATA

A history of emotions, 1200–1800. – (Studies for the International Society for
Cultural History)

1. Emotions – History. 2. Emotions – Religious aspects. 3. Affect (Psychology)
4. Sensitivity (Personality trait)
I. Series II. Liliequist, Jonas.
152.4'09-dc23

ISBN-13: 9781848933569
e: 9781781440049

This publication is printed on acid-free paper that conforms to the American
National Standard for the Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials.

Typeset by Pickering & Chatto (Publishers) Limited
Printed and bound in the United Kingdom by the MPG Books Group

CONTENTS

List of Contributors	vii
List of Figures	xi
Introduction – <i>Jonas Liliequist</i>	1
I. Theoretical Issues	
1 Theories of Change in the History of Emotions – <i>Barbara H. Rosenwein</i>	7
2 Ottoman Love: Preface to a Theory of Emotional Ecology – <i>Walter Andrews</i>	21
II. Emotional Repertoires	
3 Preachers, Saints, and Sinners: Emotional Repertoires in High Medieval Religious Role Models – <i>Christina Lutter</i>	49
4 Theology and Interiority: Emotions as Evidence of the Working of Grace in Elizabethan and Stuart Conversion Narratives – <i>Paola Baseotto</i>	65
5 'Finer' Feelings: Sociability, Sensibility and the Emotions of <i>Gens de Lettres</i> in Eighteenth-Century France – <i>Anne C. Vila</i>	79
III. Music and Art	
6 Music as Wonder and Delight: Construction of Gender in Early Modern Opera through Musical Representation and Arousal of Emotions – <i>Johanna Ethnersson Pontara</i>	95
7 <i>Politesse</i> and <i>Sprezzatura</i> : The History of Emotions in the Art of Antoine Watteau – <i>Pamela W. Whedon</i>	105
IV. Gender, Sexuality and the Body	
8 Emotions and Gender: The Case of Anger in Early Modern English Revenge Tragedies – <i>Kristine Steenberg</i>	119
9 Beauty, Masculinity and Love Between Men: Configuring Emotions with Michael Drayton's <i>Peirs Gaveston</i> – <i>Anu Korhonen</i>	135
10 'Pray, Dr, is there Reason to Fear a Cancer?' Fear of Breast Cancer in Early Modern Britain – <i>Marijo Kaartinen</i>	153