

CHATTERTON LECTURE ON POETRY

THOMAS CAREW

By JOHN KERRIGAN

St John's College, Cambridge

Read 13 December 1988

EARLY one morning in February 1623, two horsemen set off from New Hall, Essex and made for the Gravesend ferry. The boatman, paid with a twenty-shilling piece, became suspicious of the pair—'John' and 'Thomas Smith', as they called themselves, muffled under false beards—and reported them to the authorities. A note of Quixotic comedy had entered the quest of Buckingham and the Prince of Wales to woo the Spanish Infanta. For the Duke of Savoy, 'it was a Trick of those ancient Knight Errands who went up and down the World after that manner to undoe Inchantments'.¹ The usually down-to-earth Secretary Conway called it a 'voyage of the Knights of Adventure'.² Whether sceptical or sanguine, observers invoked the language of chivalry. King James himself, despondent and elated by turns, addressed 'Tom' and 'Jacke' as 'My sweet boys and venturous knights, worthy to be put in a new romance'.³ He thoughtfully sent them their Garter robes, and scraped the royal coffers to fund tilting gear and horses.⁴ For the Infanta he provided a looking-glass fancifully 'enchanted by art magic'.⁵ She, in turn, wore a 'ribbon about her arm'—blue, for love and sign of the Garter—so that the Prince might distinguish her in the royal train, and fall for her, by this favour.⁶ Mendoza

¹ J. M. Shuttleworth (ed.), *The Life of Edward, First Lord Herbert of Cherbury* (Oxford, 1976), p. 118.

² 3 March 1623, SP 14/139/26. Quoted by Charles Carlton, *Charles I: The Personal Monarch* (London, 1983), p. 34.

³ James Craigie (ed.), *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1955, 1958), Vol. 2, pp. 192–3; G. V. P. Akrigg (ed.), *Letters of King James VI and I* (Berkeley, 1984), No. 190 [27 February 1623], p. 388.

⁴ *Letters*, ed. cit., No. 197, 1 April [1623], p. 403, No. 199, 10 April [1623], p. 407, No. 200, 18 April [1623], p. 408.

⁵ *Letters*, ed. cit., No. 195, 17 March [1623], p. 398.

⁶ According to James Howell, who witnessed events in Madrid; *Epistolæ Holiæ: Familiar Letters*, ed. Joseph Jacobs (London, 1890), 1.3.xv.

describes the Easter games at which Charles ('with the George about his necke, hanging by a watchet riban') was diverted by jousts, and a Pentecost 'Festivitie' which offered further feats of arms.⁷ A chivalrous spectacle was played out in Madrid, almost a diplomatic masquerade.

Elsewhere in the entourage, mock-chivalry took on wilder forms. One group of blades, in the fleet sent to bring Charles and Buckingham home, formed a society called 'the Order of the Bugle'.⁸ Together with a set known as 'Tittere tu', they became notorious in the taverns of London. Sporting ribbons of 'blew or yellow', 'wetched' and 'Orendge Tornye', with officers and watchwords, they gleefully parodied knightly codes. In place of the gravity of the Garter, these 'orders' went in for tobacco-smoking, wenching and scuffling with the watch. John Chamberlain, in his letters, gives us a taste of their 'ridiculous toys' by telling us they had 'a Prince whom they call Ottoman', while Walter Yonge records a ritual oath sworn on a dagger thrust in a bottle.⁹ It sounds like harmless roistering, tricked out with youthful wit.¹⁰ But the King, anxious about recusants and conspiracy, ordered an investigation.¹¹ Amusingly, papers surviving in the Public Record Office show that, while the Order of the Bugle did not slay many dragons, it took a lively interest in giants. In a catalogue of ponderous nicknames—'Giant. Asdrias-

⁷ Andrés de Almansa y Mendoza, *Two Royal Entertainments, Lately Given to the Most Illustrious Prince Charles . . . Translated out of the Spanish originals Printed at Madrid* (London, 1623), esp. pp. 6–7.

⁸ 'The examinacon of michael Constable of West Reason in the Countie of Lincolne gent . . . this 19th daie of december 1623', SP 14/155/82.

⁹ 'Examinacon'; cf. Walter Yonge, *Diary at Coyton and Axminster, 1604–1628*, Camden Society Publications, Vol. 184, No. 8 (London, 1848), pp. 70–1; Norman E. McClure (ed.), *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, 2 vols (Philadelphia, 1939), Vol. 2, p. 530.

¹⁰ On the Virgilian conceit of Tittere tu see Walton B. McDaniel, 'Some Greek, Roman and English Tityretus', *American Journal of Philology*, 35 (1914), 52–66, pp. 62ff., Thornton Shirley Graves, 'Some Pre-Mohock Clansmen', *Studies in Philology*, 20 (1923), 395–421, p. 399, n. 15, and Annabel Patterson, 'Pastoral versus Georgic', in Barbara Lewalski (ed.), *Renaissance Genres* (Cambridge, Mass., 1986), pp. 241–67, pp. 250–2.

¹¹ Chamberlain links Tittere tu with 'Our papists of Cheshire and Lancashire' and reports that 'This combination began first in the Low Countries in the Lord Vaulx his regiment' (loc. cit.), forces which were largely Catholic. Yonge records rumours of Catholicism in the fleet sent to Spain (pp. 68–9). Constable of the Bugle was a suspected Jesuit; cf. *CSPD, 1619–1623*, pp. 180, 199, 272. These and other evidences (see Graves, pp. 402–4) refute Patterson's attempt to align Tittere tu with agitation against Spain.

dust . . . Giant. Drinkittupall . . . Giant. Neuerbegood'—are soubriquets that will recur in the anti-puritan books of drollery.¹² There is also a list of members of the order; among them, 'M^r: Tho: Carew'.¹³

A very different story ran its course in that same year, 1623. Folded into the papers of Boxley Abbey, Kent, in a miscellany compiled by Sir Francis Wyatt, are three elegies on Wyatt's sister, Eleanor. Herself a poet of merit, though to this day passed over and unpublished,¹⁴ she was the first wife of that John Finch who would, during the personal rule, brand Prynne and defend the prerogative. In the early 1620s, however, neither these Wyatts nor Finch held high office. Their interests revolved around the Virginia Company, while John Finch was making a name for himself as a 'puritan and moderate' MP.¹⁵ Culturally

¹² *Wit Revived: Or, A New and Excellent way of Divertisement digested into most ingenious Questions and Answers. By Asdryasdust Tossoffacan* (London, 1674). In the PRO 'Giant. Tossacan . . . Giant. Drunckzadoge/Giant. Drun[k]assaratt' and 'Giant. Drinkittupall' indicate the Bugle's preferred activity. Cf. *Wit Restor'd* (London, 1656), esp. 'The Tytere-Tues, or A Mock-Songe to the tune of Chive Chase. By Mr George Chambers'—known to be of the Bugle—p. 29; and, for generally boisterous Garterism, 'St. George for England' in *Wit and Drollery* (enlarged edn, London, 1682), pp. 273–7.

¹³ These lists follow 'examinacon' in state papers (14/155/84–5). Graves prints them, accurately enough, but ignores Carew. The position of this name near the bottom of a register organized by rank rules out confusion with 'Tho: Carie the Lord Lepingtons younger sonne', though the latter's involvement in the Madrid venture is attested, e.g. by Chamberlain (*Letters*, ed. cit., Vol. 2, p. 482).

¹⁴ The miscellany in BL Add. MS 62135 part ii includes four texts attributed to 'E': a twenty-three stanza autobiographical poem (fols. 334^r–7^r), a sestet (fol. 337^r), advice to a rival in trochaic tetrameters (fols. 337^v–9^r), and 'Sooner the number or the value . . .' (339^v–40^r). The poems recur, ascribed 'E.F.', in a seemingly later Kent anthology, Harvard MS Eng. 703. On the county's literary culture see Peter Laslett, 'The Gentry of Kent in 1640', *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 9 (1947–9), 148–64.

¹⁵ Peter Clark, *English Provincial Society from the Reformation to the Revolution: Religion, Politics and Society in Kent, 1500–1640* (Hassocks, 1977), p. 336, noting Finch's persistence in this role through the election of 1624. Wilfrid R. Prest sketches his Presbyterian background in 'Sir Henry Finch (1558–1625)', in Donald Pennington & Keith Thomas (eds), *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 94–117. The biography by W.H. Terry, *The Life and Times of John, Lord Finch* (London, 1936), is unreliable but usefully prints a Latin elegy on Eleanor Finch from the Boxley church register, p. 65.

they belonged to that fraction of the gentry which could favour, in the 1640s, insurrection. The anti-Spanish rebel Sir Thomas Wyatt was a proudly acknowledged ancestor; Sir Francis married Margaret Sandys, kinswoman to Parliamentary colonels.¹⁶ 1621, indeed, found Margaret's brother Sir Edwin restrained for using his influence in the Commons against *rapprochement* with Madrid.¹⁷ And by 1623, the MP who once declared 'No successive King, but First elected. Election . . . by Consent of People' had earned, along with the Virginia Company as a whole, a decided reputation for opposing royal interests.¹⁸ Economic recession, including a disastrous local harvest in the year of Eleanor's death,¹⁹ did nothing to modify this stance. Nor did subsequent controversy pass Boxley by. Later decades found the area a Brownist stronghold, associated perhaps with Digger activity.²⁰

That Eleanor did not live to see these developments is less painful than the nature of her death, while heavily pregnant or in childbirth. Thus much is clear from her elegies. One of them is attributed to a certain 'C.A.' The second is ascribed to, and known to be by, Carew; but it appears in other places as 'An Elegie on the La[dy] Pen[iston]'.²¹ Paradoxically, the unlikelihood of that poem's being 'An Elegie on E.F.' lends weight to the third elegy's subscription, though hesitant and later deleted, 'T.C.'²² Sir Francis Wyatt probably knew the poet, who was born

¹⁶ Alan Everitt, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion 1640-60* (Leicester, 1973), pp. 63, 117.

¹⁷ Conrad Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics 1621-1629* (Oxford, 1979), Chap. 2, pp. 122-3, 'The Examination of Mr Mallory after the Parliament of 1621', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 50 (1977), 125-32.

¹⁸ Quoted by Noel Malcolm, 'Hobbes, Sandys, and the Virginia Company', *Historical Journal*, 24 (1981), 297-321, p. 302.

¹⁹ Clark, *Provincial Society*, pp. 317ff., relates Kentish involvement in the Virginia Company to the need for economic diversification.

²⁰ Clark, *Provincial Society*, pp. 370, 393.

²¹ In the posthumous edition of Carew's *Poems* (1640), and half a dozen manuscripts listed on pp. 57-8 of the *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, Vol. 2, part i, compiled by Peter Beal (London, 1987). Most quotations below are, contrastedly, from manuscripts with a high proportion of Carew material (e.g., Rosenbach MS 1083/17 [Carey MS], Bodleian MS Don. b. 9 [Wyburd MS.]) and from miscellanies which contain fewer poems but witness Carew's range of circulation in the decades after 1623. Contractions have been expanded, upper-case imposed at the start of certain verse lines; for ease of reference a few titles are regularized from *Poems*.

²² The attribution reads 'Qu [space] By T.C. on E.F.', with 'T.C.' crossed through at some later stage, fol. 348^v. In Harvard MS Eng. 703 the text is not

a few miles from Boxley and had a sister married nearby.²³ His other Carew ascriptions are sound. And do we not find, in this modest provincial text, an anticipation of the poet's Caroline images of vulnerable bowered calm:²⁴

Coward death thy Stigian dart
 Now let fly at any heart.
 Thou hast slaine at once in those
 All that earth could feare to loose. . . .
 She from whom earth hop't to see
 Fruit befitting such a tree.
 Whose sweet branches might afford
 More content then Jonah's guord. . . .

But the poem itself does not concern me, nor even (quite) its ascription. What matters is Wyatt's recollection that Carew had written *an* elegy for his sister. For it points up the 'country' dimension of this poet: the Carew who stayed at Wrest Park, Bedfordshire, Selden's rural retreat; the lyricist who, in his poems on the green sickness, praises Katharine and Mary Neville, a family associated with Protestant and Republican politics; the poet anthologized by Lucy Hutchinson.²⁵ That Carew and his writings enjoyed such a variety of connections does not raise him above the conflicts of his age, but it reminds us how complex they were. In so far as he was a court poet, elite culture was articulate with more ironies than meet the eye. Behind the masquerade cult of the Garter in *Coelum Britannicum*—to take an extreme in-

scribed. That MS includes on p. 15, beside the 'C.A.' poem (under the title 'An Epitaph made vpon y^e same woemans death by C:'), preceded by a love poem and part of another, from 'A'), a touching 'in obitum sobolis'.

²³ The family lived at West Wickham, until about 1598 (when Carew was three or four years old) when they moved to London, taking up residence in Chancery Lane. The poet matriculated as a Kentishman (C. W. Boase & Andrew Clark [eds], *Register of the University of Oxford*, 2 vols [Oxford, 1885–9], Vol. 2, part ii, p. 301). Martha married James Cromer of Tunstall, then Sir Edward Hales of Tenterden, c. 7 and 16 miles from Boxley.

²⁴ Cf. the epistle on Gustavus Adolphus (i.e. 'In answer of an Elegiacall Letter . . .'), where 'Myrtle bowers' are the more vulnerable for their over-protected 'securitie' (quoting St John's College, Cambridge MS S23, fols. 73^r–5^r). Also the erotic shades of 'A Pastorall Dialogue' (both texts) and 'A Rapture', and the association with illness in 'Vpon the sicknesse of (E.S.)', 'Must Feavors shake this goodly Tree and all/That ripened fruite from the fayre branches fall?/Which Princes haue desirde to tast?' (quoting BL Add. MS 25303, fols. 140^v–1^r).

²⁵ On Wrest Park see below, pp. 344–5; on the Nevilles, e.g., *DNB*; Lucy Hutchinson's anthology is in Nottinghamshire Record Office, HU/3.

stance—with its jesting at ‘the annuall celebration of the Gygan-tomachy’,²⁶ lies the parodic cult of the Bugle. But also in so far as he became a courtier, Carew preserved ‘country’ affinities. To read ‘Vpon my Lord Chiefe Iustice’, or the prefatory poem to George Sandys’s *Psalms*, outstanding works from the 1630s, is not only to encounter Finch of the prerogative and Sandys the Privy Chamberer, but the ‘J.F.’ of Wyatt’s miscellany, and the brother of Margaret Sandys who ventured to Virginia and later lived at Boxley—and both poems are changed by that.²⁷ What the manuscript evidences of 1623 show is Carew capable of mourning with one hand an obscure provincial lady while toasting ‘Prince Ottoman’ with the other.

Yet repeatedly in criticism and historical writing, from Hazlitt to the latest textbooks, Carew is presented as ‘the negligent courtier’, a poet of ‘pusillanimous hedonism’, all lace and velvet.²⁸

²⁶ Quoting the first edn (London, 1634), B4^v. In Carew’s source, *Lo Spaccio della Bestia Trionfante* (below, pp. 348–9), Heaven is purified on ‘la festa de la Gigantoteomachia’. Given the overtones of papist conspiracy generated by the Bugle and Tittere tu (above, n. 11), it is interesting that the poet should relocate that feast, away from the occasion of his masque, Shrove Tuesday, to ‘the fift of *November* last’.

²⁷ Strikingly, when Carew’s poem appeared, in Sandys’s second edition (1638), it was with work by Sir Francis Wyatt. That the ‘J.F.’ to whom two poems are ascribed in the Boxley Abbey papers is Finch (‘I will sooner hope to know . . .’, fols. 340^v–1^r, ‘Alas I am content, resolute thou then’, fols. 341^r–^v) appears confirmed by ‘J.Fin.’ after the latter in Harvard MS Eng. 703 (pp. 30–1). His lasting love of rhetoric is remarked, e.g., by *DNB*. Such sophistication puts in doubt the flatly political reading of ‘Vpon my Lord Chiefe Iustice’ proposed by Kevin Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 142–3, 283, 288, 299 (which also overlooks Finch’s early re-marriage). For an index of ‘J.F.’s cultural consistency, protested to the Long Parliament, see Prest, ‘Sir Henry Finch (1558–1625)’, p. 116, recalling that when Evelyn met him in exile at the Hague he was lodged at the house of a Brownist.

²⁸ Hazlitt calls Carew ‘an elegant court-trifler’ in his *Lectures Chiefly on the Dramatic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth* (London, 1820), p. 251. Negligence is glancingly imputed by Alastair Fowler, ‘Country House Poems: The Politics of a Genre’, *The Seventeenth Century*, 1 (1986), 1–14, p. 10, while hedonism is charged in P.W. Thomas’s less considerable ‘Two cultures? Court and country under Charles I’, in Conrad Russell (ed.), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (London, 1973), pp. 168–93, p. 179. The tradition of whig commentary invoked by ‘lace and velvet’ (e.g., C. V. Wedgwood, ‘Cavalier Poetry and Cavalier Politics’ in *Velvet Studies* [London, 1946], *Poetry and Politics under the Stuarts* [Cambridge, 1960]) is often pronounced dead, but its influence

Tarred with the brush of royal 'complacency' and 'ruthlessness',²⁹ he is accused of having 'almost no qualities of his own',³⁰ and selected as the author of a handful of poems in which Jonson and Donne are said to combine.³¹ When larger perspectives are proposed, analysis tends, in the strict sense, to the preposterous: later things come first, and Carew is read in the light of a Revolution or Rebellion he did not live to see.³² Even now, as the poet begins to feature in freshly-informed studies of court culture,³³ the shape of his achievement is overwritten by dubious

remains evident in, e.g., Graham Parry's discussion of masque, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester, 1981), pp. 184-203, and in Derek Hirst's uncharacteristic gesture, *Authority and Conflict: England 1603-1658* (London, 1986), p. 164: 'the revelling cavalier poetry of the likes of Thomas Carew contrasted dangerously with the desperate certainty of puritan sermons that God was turning his back on England'.

²⁹ John Creaser, '“The present aid of this occasion”: The Setting of *Comus*', in David Lindley (ed.), *The Court Masque* (Manchester, 1984), pp. 111-34, pp. 118-19; Martin Butler, *Theatre and Crisis 1632-1642* (Cambridge, 1984), p. 78.

³⁰ Hardin Craig (ed.), *A History of English Literature* (New York, 1950), p. 304.

³¹ Leavis insists in *Revaluation* ([1936] Harmondsworth, 1972), pp. 21-3, that Carew 'should be . . . more than an anthology poet', then reduces to an anthology one of his most achieved epitaphs (pp. 40-2). Disintegrative knowingness disables much subsequent criticism, though the following remain ponderable among older studies: Rufus A. Blanshard, 'Carew and Jonson', *Studies in Philology*, 52 (1955), 195-211 and 'Thomas Carew's Master Figures', *Boston University Studies in English*, 3 (1957), 214-27, Edward I. Selig, *The Flourishing Wreath: A Study of Thomas Carew's Poetry* (New Haven, 1958), D. F. Rauber, 'Carew Redivivus', *Texas Studies in Language and Literature*, 13 (1971), 17-28, G.A.E. Parfitt, 'The Poetry of Thomas Carew', *Renaissance and Modern Studies*, 12 (1968), 56-67.

³² Hence the chronological drift which postdates *Coelum Britannicum* to 1637 (Hirst, *Authority and Conflict*, p. 163), or reserves it for the closing pages of Stephen Orgel's survey of Stuart court theatre: 'That such forms of expression should now seem to us at best obscure, at worst insincere, says much for the success of the Puritan revolution. History has vindicated William Prynne' (*The Illusion of Power* [Berkeley, 1975], p. 88).

³³ Much can be learned from Kevin Sharpe's *Criticism and Compliment*, from the scholarly essays of Raymond A. Anselment—notably 'Thomas Carew and the "Harmlesse Pastimes" of Caroline Peace', *Philological Quarterly*, 62 (1983), 201-19—and from the outstanding work of R. Malcolm Smuts: 'The Puritan Followers of Henrietta Maria in the 1630s', *English Historical Review*, 93 (1978), 26-45; 'The Political Failure of Stuart Cultural Patronage', in Guy Fitch Lytle & Stephen Orgel (eds), *Patronage in the Renaissance* (Princeton, 1981), pp. 165-87; *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia, 1987). Among literary critics, Matthew P. Parker has shown himself most alert to the possibilities of reassessment. His Ph.D., 'Comely

assumptions. High among the reasons for this is a neglect of his medium, and hence relation with his readers. It will be one of my claims today that an intelligible Carew emerges only when early printed texts (the basis of every edition and account so far) are supplemented by, often subordinated to, manuscript.³⁴ As well as recovering a poet peculiarly sensitive to what it means to be read—alert to the ways in which script, music and print modify the significance of language—Carew then shows himself capable of intricate development. In place of the ‘THOMAS CAREVV/ Esquire’ who authorizes *Poems* (1640) there appears an intelligence that defines and refines itself by dispersal as much as concentration. The sophisticated young translator from Italian, born in late-Elizabethan Kent and flourishing by 1623, seems not quite the same figure as the theatre wit of the late 1620s, or Sewer in Ordinary of the 1630s, while the veteran of the Berwick campaign, writing his last, great country-house poem before death in 1640, elaborates the apologist of Charles’s personal rule.

That Carew’s development seems less to possess its own trajectory than dissolve in social circumstance is unsurprising. It is because they have looked for a unique life story that scholars have imagined they know so little about him—and what they have learned, often, misconstrued. Both in general outline (as one of a generation of Kentish lawyers gaining preferment),³⁵ and in the patterns of kinship and patronage which support him, Carew’s career is typical for his period. He matriculated from Merton College in 1608, for example, just as he went into Chambers at the Middle Temple ‘bound with . . . George Carew’ in 1612,³⁶ because of family tradition. His father, Sir Matthew,

Gestures: *Thomas Carew and the Creation of a Caroline Poetic* (Yale, 1979), is extracted and developed in: “‘All are not born (Sir) to the Bay’: ‘Jack’ Suckling, ‘Tom’ Carew, and the making of a Poet’, *English Literary Renaissance*, 12 (1982), 341–68; ‘Carew’s Politic Pastoral: Virgilian Pretexts in the ‘Answer to Aurelian Townsend’’, *John Donne Journal*, 1 (1982), 101–16; ‘“To my friend G.N. from Wrest”: Carew’s Secular Masque’, in Claude J. Summers & Ted-Larry Pebworth (eds), *Classic and Cavalier: Essays on Jonson and the Sons of Ben* (Pittsburgh, 1982), pp. 171–91; and ‘Diamond’s Dust: Carew, King, and the Legacy of Donne’ in the same editors’ *The Eagle and the Dove: Reassessing John Donne* (Columbia, Miss., 1986), pp. 191–200.

³⁴ Only ten of Carew’s poems, plus the masque, were published during his lifetime. They are listed by Rhodes Dunlap (ed.), *The Poems of Thomas Carew* (Oxford, 1949), pp. lix–lxii. Further additions to our knowledge from manuscript are certain; Beal (op. cit., p. 39) notes two unpublished autograph letters in private hands.

³⁵ Clark, *English Provincial Society*, pp. 271 ff.

³⁶ Dunlap, ed. cit., p. xvii, quoting the Temple records.

was a distinguished lawyer. Warden Savile of Merton was a kinsman by marriage.³⁷ The poet's first employment, in 1613, was with Sir Dudley Carleton in Venice: protégé and stepson-in-law of Savile, joint-translator and disseminator of his Chrysostom, patron of Merton graduates.³⁸ Significantly, we hear of Carew reporting back to Savile in 1616 upon his return from Carleton's mission to the Hague.³⁹ Such connections were largely to remain intact. It is in Carleton's circle, for example, that we encounter John Hales, fellow of Merton and another relative of the poet by marriage, who will be associated with Carew in Suckling's 'The Wits', who links him (along with George Sandys) to the culture of Great Tew, and who eventually attends the poet—with a dramatic refusal of absolution (according to Walton)—on his death bed.⁴⁰

Carew's relations with Carleton also reach across two decades. This is worth emphasis, since the received life story, established in Rhodes Dunlap's edition, presents the poet's difficulties in 1616—when he was edged out of employment for writing satirical notes on the Carletons—as a decisive rupture, a moment of 'disgrace'.⁴¹ In its wake, Dunlap believes, Carew came down with the pox and began to write the Psalm translations reserved by Victorian commentators for a late phase of recantation. To read at all widely in the Public Record Office, however, is to hear not only elevating news from Venice, with visits by Hobbes and Cavendish, Arundel and Inigo Jones, but to register Carleton's disapproving fascination with a whole series of drunken wards and kinsmen, among whom Carew was but one.⁴² We learn of

³⁷ Cf. H. W. Garrod, 'Sir Henry Savile: 1549–1949', rpt. in his posthumous *The Study of Good Letters*, ed. John Jones (Oxford, 1963), esp. p. 103.

³⁸ At Venice, for instance, Carleton employed Nathaniel Brent, Isaac Wake as Secretary and Thomas Horne as Chaplain, all three fellows of Merton.

³⁹ Dunlap, ed. cit., p. xxiii.

⁴⁰ Dunlap, ed. cit., pp. xl–xli.

⁴¹ Dunlap, ed. cit., xxi. For an attractive, though finally unpersuasive, interpretation, see Joanne Altieri, 'Responses to a Waning Mythology in Carew's Political Poetry', *Studies in English Literature*, 26 (1986), 107–24.

⁴² Informative Carleton correspondence from this period bulks large in SP 84/72–7 and 99/9–20. Limited selections are available in Philip Yorke (ed.), *Letters from and to Sir Dudley Carleton, Knt. During His Embassy in Holland, from January 1615, to December 1620* (London, 1757) and in Maurice Lee, Jr. (ed.), *Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain, 1603–1624* (New Jersey, 1972). His early career has been examined by Albert Henry Marshall: *Sir Dudley Carleton: James I's Ambassador to Venice, 1610–1615* (M. A., Wake Forest, 1973); *Sir Dudley Carleton and English Diplomacy in the United Provinces, 1616–1628* (Ph.D., Rutgers, 1978).

paintings and marbles procured, but in Carleton's handling of them find an insecure diplomat, eager to trade art for court favour. Carleton's appointment as ambassador to the United Provinces makes him seem a powerful employer, not a man to alienate. But his financial difficulties were compounded by the post, religious turmoil in the Low Countries hampered his efforts, while intrigues over the cloth trade and Treaty of Xanten drove Carleton into political embarrassment. 1616, indeed, brought several problems to a head. Philip Lytton, known associate of Carew, who had been left drunkenly concussed in Venice, arrived in the Hague expecting maintenance. Carleton's protracted effort, following the fall of his patron Somerset, to sell his marbles to Arundel, foundered.⁴³ The ambassador, never in the best of health, was afflicted with gout and the stone. It was not a good time for the poet to commit critical thoughts to paper.

Certain remarks by Carleton complement Dunlap's account of Carew. One letter to Chamberlain overlooked by the Oxford editor warns of 'faults and close knaueries, w^{ch} are of so high a nature in him as you would little imagine'.⁴⁴ But this same missive does not deny the poet's fitness to serve one of the new Privy Councillors; and it must surely be discounted by what Carleton's biographer describes as 'a propensity toward priggishness'.⁴⁵ Interestingly Carew was not the only kinsman shown the door in 1616. Lytton was sent off to make his way in the world.⁴⁶ Yet the pair turn up shortly afterwards, seemingly no worse for their liberty, as strikingly elegant attendants at the investiture of the Prince of Wales⁴⁷—that festival of pageantry memorialized in *Civitas Amor*. By 1619 Carew would be secure in the train of Sir Edward Herbert, Ambassador to Paris. Temporary setbacks of one sort or another were expected in diplomatic life. Carleton had fallen out with his first employer, Parry, in 1603 and he almost exactly duplicated Carew's blunder in 1616 by criticizing Secretary Winwood on paper. If the note-taking poet was, in the

⁴³ Evidence in Carleton's letters is now supplemented by David Howarth, *Lord Arundel and his Circle* (New Haven, 1985), pp. 58–63.

⁴⁴ To Chamberlain from the Hague, 5/15 September 1616, SP 84/73/201–4, 204^r. Compare his relief, and that of Lady Carleton (she had been 'passionately affected and troubled'), at the discrediting of 'a voice . . . here spread' that he would marry a kinswoman, née Lytton, widow of Sir George Smith, 16/26 November 1624, SP 84/121/98–9, 98^r.

⁴⁵ Marshall, Ph.D. cit., p. 16.

⁴⁶ To Chamberlain, 1 May 1616, SP 84/72/169–70.

⁴⁷ Dunlap, ed. cit., pp. xxix–xxx.

words of his distressed father, 'an Aristarchus, to fynd faultes in other', far more so was Carleton in that tactless letter to his superior.⁴⁸ We should think of them less as master and miscreant servant and more as mutual players in the game of patronage, their motives not quite their own.⁴⁹ Certainly, we must consider them in a new light when we learn that the only known Carew poem in holograph—his reply to Jonson's 1631 'Ode to Himselfe'—survives in Carleton's papers.⁵⁰ It is an example of manuscript socializing biography. Whatever may be deduced from the poem being where it is, it cannot suggest an irreparable breach.

Exculpating Carew from 'disgrace' is, though, a minor satisfaction. Of far greater interest is the picture early documents provide of virtuoso culture in the making. From directions given to Inigo Jones, and a list of holdings by Daniel Nys, we can identify works purchased during Carew's stay in Venice: Tintoretto's, Veroneses, a Bassano Vecchio, an Andrea Schiavone.⁵¹ From papers relating to Somerset and Arundel, Buckingham and the acquisitive Rubens, we can gauge the wealth of Carleton's statuary.⁵² In Italy, the Hague and Paris, Carew was initiated into systems of taste which would not find their codification in

⁴⁸ Dunlap quotes Sir Matthew's letter, ed. cit., pp. xxvi–vii; Marshall, Ph.D. cit., gives Carleton's critique of Winwood, pp. 44–5 (4 March 1616, SP 84/72/92); Carleton admits the damage done in a letter of 2 December 1617, SP 84/81/12–13.

⁴⁹ E.g., in their mutual cultivation of Buckingham. 'To the Countesse of Anglesey' shows that Carew, presumably introduced by Herbert, was acting for the Villiers family in 1622 (the marriage of Kit and Elizabeth Sheldon), a time when Carleton, much less successfully (cf. John H. Barcroft, 'Carleton and Buckingham: The Quest for Office', in H. S. Reinmuth [ed.], *Early Stuart Studies* [Minneapolis, 1970], pp. 122–36), was wooing the Duke as an alternative to Arundel.

⁵⁰ Beal, op. cit., p. 39.

⁵¹ Arundel required that £200 be given to Sherburn, Carleton's agent, for *Susanna and the Elders*, the *Benediction of Jacob*, the *Queen of Sheba*, the *Samaritan Woman* and *Ceres, Bacchus and Venus* by Tintoretto (see Howarth, *Arundel*, pp. 60–1). Cf. '3 by Paul Veronese, the *Life of Hercules* . . . 1 by Bassano Vecchio, the *Beheading of St. John* . . . 1 *The Venus of Titian* . . . 1 by Andrea Schiavone, *Shepherds*', quoting 'Danyel Nys his list of pictures', 8 February 1614–15, in W. Noël Sainsbury (ed.), *Original Unpublished Papers Illustrative of the Life of Sir Peter Paul Rubens, as an Artist and a Diplomatist* (London, 1859), p. 275.

⁵² Sainsbury, ed. cit., pp. 9–44, 273–80, 299–303 (cf. Howarth, *Arundel*, pp. 60 and 62, Barcroft, 'Carleton and Buckingham', pp. 130–2). Twenty-four chests, each containing several pieces, are listed in the 'Note of ye Statues' (shipped in the *Falcon of Dort*) endorsed by Carleton.

England until Junius's *Painting of the Ancients*.⁵³ Art and life come into subtler relations, approaching the kind of equivalence that leads Suckling to declare, 'a gallerie hung with *Titians* or *Vandikes* hand, and a chamber filled with living Excellence, are the same things to me'.⁵⁴ Delicacy of effect becomes more than Tudor daintiness: it is a means to the sublime.⁵⁵ In verse born of such virtuosity—small in scale to be large of implication—voice and the body aspire to song and sculpture, while script becomes painterly. Hence the lyric subtitled 'Celia singing' in 1640 and our editions, but associated in manuscript with 'Arundel Garden' and (Buckingham's residence) 'a Gallery at Yorke house'.⁵⁶

Harke how my Cælia with the choice
Musick of her hand and voice
Stills the lowd wind and makes the wild
Incensed Bore and panther mild
Marke how those statues like men mou'd
Whilst men with wonder statues prou'd
The stiff Rock bends to worshipp her
The Idol turns Idolater. . . .

If this modulation of stone to flesh recalls another event of 1623—the printing of Jaggard's *Folio*—the idiom of Leontes' court is perplexed by comparison. Shakespeare anxiously discriminates between 'Faith', 'Oyly Painting' and 'Magick' in the 'Chappell' near Paulina's 'Gallerie'.⁵⁷ Carew, with travelled insouciance, turns his gallery into a crypto-Laudian chapel and embraces the puritan slur that connoisseurship is idolatry.⁵⁸ His may be a quasi-dramatic poem—one Oxford manuscript has notes suggestive of performance⁵⁹—but its artistry is miniature

⁵³ *De Pictura Veterum* (1637); the English translation, dedicated to the Countess of Arundel, appeared the following year.

⁵⁴ Thomas Clayton (ed.), *Sir John Suckling: The Non-Dramatic Works* (Oxford, 1971), Letter 2, p. 108.

⁵⁵ Junius, *Painting*, pp. 330–1.

⁵⁶ Beal, *op. cit.*, pp. 93–5, here quoting the untitled text in BL Add. MS 25707, fol. 7^r.

⁵⁷ *The Winters Tale*, V.ii (Cc^v).

⁵⁸ The Romanist sympathies of the Arundels were notorious. Buckingham's stance remained ambivalent, though he inclined to the Arminians at the York House conference, 1626. Some idea of likely reaction to Carew's lyric can be had by comparing the song in *A Game at Chesse* V.i.

⁵⁹ In 'Early Seventeenth-Century Verse Miscellanies and their Value for Textual Editors', *English Manuscript Studies 1100–1700*, I (1989), 182–210, n. 29, seen in proof, Mary Hobbs records marginal comments at ll. 5 and 18, in Corpus Christi College MS 328, 'Here these co: in', 'here these fall'.

beside Shakespeare's, condensing its marvels into compact tetrameters continuous with the lyricism they celebrate.

Such conceits of scale and instantiations of the medium are a hallmark of virtuosity. In Dutch and Italian painting, contemporaries are fascinated by convoluted lines and spaces, by the unstable perspectives of Titian—much in evidence at York House—detailed with jewels, laces, stars that resolve into knots of pigment, by Still Lives, not read through the photograph, but as feats of the pencilled surface. In such a context, the poet's script (trace of Celia's voice and body) will resemble 'Titians or Vandikes hand' because it uses signs spatially to dispose meanings compact with 'living Excellence'. Carew's being a manuscript poet here becomes as much a creative matter as an aspect of reception; what palaeographers call his 'accomplished italic'⁶⁰ metonymically participates in, for example, 'A Fancy':⁶¹

Marke how this polisht Easterne sheet
Doth with our Northerne tincture meet,
For though the paper seeme to sinke,
Yet it receives, and bears the Inke;
And on her smooth soft brow these spots,
Seeme rather ornaments then blots;
Like those you Ladies use to place
Mysteriously about your face . . .

Writing on oriental paper, the poet displays a calligraphic intentness which would seem Buddhist were it not so worldly. At first, paper-fine distinctions prevent a dispersal of meaning across the work's ornamented surface. The 'Characters' are not 'carelesse', we are told, 'cause you underneath may find/A sence that can enforme the mind'. Yet the poem concludes with a typically startling twist. 'So what at first was only fit/To fold up silkes, may wrap up wit.' What will 'enforme', by wrapping up turns its actual 'underneath' outside, leaving the written surfaces of 'wit' inside like a folded letter. This suggestion is the more problematic given the hint of revised fair copy in 'polisht . . . sheet', as though the revealed blankness were itself opaquely glossed, all script as well as none. There being a fullness in candour is more remarkable than blankness: complexity is exhausted before writing begins, and what Carew disposes is unhurried, supplementary,

⁶⁰ P. J. Croft, *Autograph Poetry in the English Language: Facsimiles of Original Manuscripts from the Fourteenth to the Twentieth Century*, 2 vols (London, 1973), Vol. 1, p. 36.

⁶¹ Quoting, accidentals edited, the 1642 edition of *Poems*.

with a spareness which reaches beyond the mannerist. As 'A Fancy' comes to mean 'delicate contrivance' (ahead of general usage), the text seems less 'a curious thought' with the structure of 'musical impromptu'⁶² than a painting which has depths by virtue of imagined internal surfaces.

Lovelace, Herrick and other poets of the generation after Carew will domesticate this love of line and whorl and planisphere in the shoestrings, fans, dewdrops and compendious snails that fill their cabinets of fancy. But such a troping of minutiae into foldings articulate round the inside (emblems becoming monads), through the motif of *multum in parvo*, barely figures in Jacobean writing. When Peacham enthuses about 'a cherrie stone cut in the forme of a basket' or 'the *Ilias* of *Homer* . . . enclosed within a nut'⁶³ his astonishment—'Cicero tels vs he saw it with his eyes'—seems insular. The native appetite that can digest Donne's 'The Flea' strains at Scaliger, 'whether in iest or earnest I know not' (as Peacham admits), reporting 'a flea he saw with a long chaine of gold about his necke, kept very daintily in a boxe, and being taken forth, could skip with his chaine, and sometime suck his mistresses white hand.' For Carew the Grand Tourist such curiosities are familiar. He is fluent in extravagance. One miscellany calls his most popular youthful lyric, on 'A flye that flew into my Mistris her eye', 'extempory', something 'perform'd',⁶⁴ and dramatic in a Marinesque sense it is.⁶⁵ As in 'Celia singing', or that later exercise 'A Fancy', rhyme points up Carew's conceits so lightly as to indicate the shaping rather than completion of contrivance. One is reminded of Junius on the beauty of unfinished art, on canvases in the making.⁶⁶ Deftly the

⁶² *OED*, *fancy* sb. 5.

⁶³ This, and following quotations, from *The Compleat Gentleman* (London, 1622), p. 75.

⁶⁴ Yale, Osborn MS b. 197, pp. 52–3. Compiled by Tobias Alston of Sayham Hall near Sudbury, this manuscript is linked in content as well as social geography to friends of Carew at Little Saxham. See below, p. 342. The poem itself is quoted from the superior Boxley Abbey text, BL Add. MS 62135 part ii, fol. 354^r.

⁶⁵ Marino came to Paris in 1615 and published in the year of Carew's French employment *Galeria*, a collection which glitters with spiders, ants, butterflies entombed in verse. Rivalling the delights of York House and Arundel Garden, it has sections entitled *Pitture* and *Sculture*. That Carew, and Sir Edward Herbert, read Marino is clear from imitation and translation. It is unlikely that they would have omitted to attend one or other of the public improvisations which helped establish his fame.

⁶⁶ *Painting*, pp. 120–1, 187.

means by which Carew's poem becomes an object, wraps itself up, is reinforced as the fly's carefree movement ('She did from hand to bosome skipp') inclines toward resolution in the 'polisht' mobility of his favourite ornament,⁶⁷ the pearl:

At last into her ey she flew,
 There scorch't in flames, and drown'd in dew.
 Like Phaeton from the Sunnes spheare,
 She fell and with her drop't a teare.
 Of which a pearle was straight compos'd,
 Wherein her ashes ly enclos'd.
 Thus she recieu'd from Celia's ey,
 Funerall flame, tombe, obsequy.

'In iest or earnest?' would be Peacham's question. But the poem so busies itself with being lucid that doubt hardly registers, just as wonder supplants surprise. 'Lucidity' in this context might be rendered *arguzia* or *acutezza* since the language of Italian criticism is apter than anything Jacobean: *meraviglia* for artful extraordinariness; *novità*, despite the poem's derivation from Guarini.⁶⁸ The word 'ingenuity' recurs in criticism of the 1620s. Linked to another art term, *ingegno*, it has the advantage in Stuart English of implying almost its opposite: ingenuousness.⁶⁹ Cadenced to elicit (by assuming) consent, the lyric is suavely neglectful of its own brilliance, which outstrips that of its source both in range of reference and dexterity. The compacting of sun and eye, for example, in the simile of Phaeton, is not in Guarini. It satisfies that enthusiasm for cosmographical diminution which leads Peacham, in his paragraphs on tiny things, to celebrate the astrolabe,⁷⁰ while hinting at the mythological wit which will prove sublimely reductive in *Coelum Britannicum*. Carew's lyric displays in little qualities explored in that largest miniature. Indeed it suggests how means justified beginnings, sending the poet to particular, often particularized, matter: subjects which permitted an elegant volution of manner. Confirmed to whatever

⁶⁷ E.g., 'Lips and Eyes', 'To my Rivall' and, in scriptural vein, 'Epitaph on the Lady S. Wife to Sir W.S.' Bejewelled insects, often petrified in amber, were prized by virtuosi; see, e.g., E. S. de Beer (ed.), *Evelyn's Diary*, 6 vols (Oxford, 1955), Vol. 2, p. 47 (26 September 1645).

⁶⁸ The original is reprinted by Dunlap, ed. cit., p. 231.

⁶⁹ E.g., Carew's question 'When didst thou flie/From hence, cleare, candid Ingenuity?' in 'To my worthy Friend, M. D'Avenant, Vpon his Excellent Play, The Iust Italian' ([London, 1630], A3^v).

⁷⁰ *Compleat Gentleman*, pp. 75-6.

degree by the arts of Venice and the Low Countries, those priorities would remain, circumscribing yet defining the detail of his work.

The 'perform'd', the scripted yet 'extempory' aspect of Carew will have struck even early readers with no access to manuscript. His few initial printed works are prefatory verses to plays. In the opening pages of Tom May's *The Heire*, puffed by him in 1622, we seem to eavesdrop on the Order of the Bugle as Philocles and Clerimont dispute 'the Authenticke histories of chiuallrie . . . where those braue men whom neither Enchantments, Gyants, Wind-mils, nor flockes of sheepe could vanquish, are made the trophyes of tryumphing loue.'⁷¹ Eight years later and he is more securely audible in the echoes of his verse which adorn Davenant's *The Just Italian*.⁷² Interestingly, Carew's printed defence of that play provoked an exchange of paper bullets in which his art was challenged wholesale, from its encomiastic and erotic matter to the praise it guaranteed for itself by coterie circulation.⁷³ Given the interaction of 'subiect' and implied occasion apparent in, for instance, 'A flye . . .', the hostile polemic—penned by Massinger—may be apt as well as intemperate in claiming such broad scope. For the dramatist, as Peter Beal has shown, Carew's 'tribe', which scribbles 'In corners and amonge yo^r selues recite', cannot claim out of its exclusiveness the right to determine taste. Yet this exquisite clique treats theatre as its own domain: virtuosi in a muse's cabinet.⁷⁴ A large cultural shift is at issue here, with Aristarchus becoming a fashionable social animal. Discount for a moment Massinger's vehemence and it is possible to reflect that Carew's poems on Jonson and Donne make him our first great critic in verse.⁷⁵

⁷¹ London, 1622, B3^r.

⁷² E.g., of 'A Rapture'; ed. cit., A4^{r-v}.

⁷³ Peter Beal, 'Massinger at Bay: Unpublished Verses in a War of the Theatres', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 10 (1980), 190–203.

⁷⁴ Cf. Michael Neill, "'Wits most accomplished Senate": The Audience of the Caroline Private Theaters', *Studies in English Literature*, 18 (1978), 341–60.

⁷⁵ Variants in the autograph of the former, and between the 1640 and (later) 1633 texts of the Donne elegy, display Carew's genius in practical as well as descriptive criticism. Striking is the way such self-criticism was accommodated by his public image; the 'hard bound' poet ambiguously celebrated in 'The Wits' has passed beyond fluent *copia*. Cf. Junius's *Painting*, pp. 208–9, on this—and elsewhere, for instance pp. 348–9, together with Sir Henry Wotton's *Elements of Architecture* (London, 1624), pp. 84ff., for the emergence of criticism from virtuosity.

But Massinger has more pressing concerns. What finally outrages him is the suggestion that the dilettante translator of 'loose raptures brought/In a Mart. booke from Italy' might enjoy what one of his admirers calls 'a more glorious charge' in 'the state'.⁷⁶ The quarrel glances at Carew's preferment to the Privy Chamber,⁷⁷ yet it carries larger implications. For the harshest of Massinger's lines, and a barbed sheaf against him, are written in the back of a journal of the 1629 parliament: that turbulent last gathering before the personal rule, which ended with Sir John Finch pinned to the speaker's chair as Denzil Holles, Sir John Eliot and other rebels passed 'the three resolutions' on Arminianism, tonnage and poundage. It is a reminder of how inextricable were the arts of poetry and politics. What is to be deduced from the appearance in this journal of Carew's best-known lyric, 'Aske mee noe more', under the title 'verses on the Queene of Bohemia'?⁷⁸ How political does the dialogue implicit in that poem become? Martin Butler has cited the imprisonment of Eliot after the 1629 parliament to characterize Carew's age as 'pre-political in the sense that it did not occur readily to men that society could tolerate dissenting opinion within itself as a matter of course.'⁷⁹ The Trumbull papers, with their avid recording of discord, suggest the importance of this being but a half-truth. 'Aske mee noe more', a lyric always in mid-argument, speaks from a culture as well as for the poet. More than tolerant of dissent, Carew devolves toward disputation. But then, poetic disputes dramatize the consensus which allows of disagreement,

⁷⁶ Quoted in 'Massinger at Bay', pp. 192, 195. These shafts against 'A Rapture' are far from unique; see, e.g., Paul Delany, 'Attacks on Carew in William Habington's Poems', *Seventeenth Century News*, 26 (1968), 36. Carew's own retraction comes in 'To the Queene'.

⁷⁷ 6 April 1630; see Dunlap, ed. cit., p. xxxv. Carew became Sewer in Ordinary shortly afterwards, despite fierce competition (Clarendon notes) from a Scottish candidate. Kevin Sharpe indicates the degree of privilege by citing from SP 16/154/76 (1629) a list of thirty-two Privy Chamberers, four of them Sewers; see 'The image of virtue: the court and household of Charles I, 1625-1642', in David Starkey (ed.), *The English Court* (London 1987), pp. 226-60, p. 244.

⁷⁸ A unique title, though the manuscript (Trumbull Add. MS 51, fol. [62]) is an early witness and textually orthodox, beginning with the stanza which comes second in 1640, 'Aske mee noe more whether doe straie . . .'. It is a measure of the inadequacy of Carew scholarship that the poem should nowhere be edited in the form which multiple manuscripts (and the logic of blazon) show to be authorial.

⁷⁹ *Theatre and Crisis*, p. 19. Butler is following Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics*, p. 416.

while 'Aske mee noe more' assumes an encompassing celebration, no matter how outrageously it makes a mistress, or Queen of Bohemia, the Phoenix's nest. What such a lyric has to do with politics reaches beyond the unlikely notion that its author wrote propaganda for the Palatinate. In Carew, the obliquities of love poetry are continuous with such arguments of state as *Coelum Britannicum*. The poet's elusive accomplishment depends not on some anachronistic quarrel with himself but on a capacity for self-rehearsal in texts which imply other voices.

What is at stake here is clarified by Suckling, two of whose images of Carew take the significant form of dialogue. In the prose example, 'Jack' and 'Tom' dispute the advisability of the latter wedding a widow. The twin epistles, printed in parallel columns in *Fragmenta Aurea*,⁸⁰ are read together, and their both being disagreements—Jack with Tom's intentions, Tom with Jack's dissent—reinforces the pleasure to be had in each voice shaping and confirming the other. 'Jack' and 'Tom', like the 'Tom' and 'Jacke' who went to Madrid, become visors of, or countenance, a situation. 'Upon my Lady Carliles walking in Hampton-Court garden'⁸¹ goes further. Against a barrage of dissent from 'J.S.', 'Thom', author of 'Aske mee noe more', blazons another mistress who scatters 'rare perfumes all about/ Such as bean-blossoms newly out/Or chafed spices give.' The poem contrives parody of the subtlest kind, *self*-mockery almost, because dialogue, not travesty, edges 'Thom' (also 'T.C.') into vulnerable overstatement:

Dull and insensible, could'st see
A thing so near a Deity
Move up and down, and feel no change?

Ultimately the interaction of 'Thom' and 'J.S.' is such as to persuade a Rawlinson manuscript to subscribe the poem 'T:C:'. Since that text is variant, and includes such 'Carewan' readings as 'Arabian gumtrees' for 'bean-blossoms', it is possible, as Suckling's editor notes, that it 'incorporates alterations or suggested revisions made by Carew'.⁸² In a letter tellingly addressed from Wrest Park, Anne Merricke writes of 'the newe playe a ffreind of mine sent to S^r Iohn Sucklyn, and Tom: Carew (the

⁸⁰ Though not in Clayton's edition; Letters 51 (a) and (b), pp. 155–8.

⁸¹ *Suckling: Non-Dramatic Works*, pp. 30–2.

⁸² Bod. MS Rawl. poet. 199; collated by Clayton, discussed p. 238.

best witts of the time) to correct'.⁸³ The idea of texts circulating for revision through the hands of Carew and Suckling writes dissent within consensus into the details of their literary activity. The likelihood that only a rhetorical Carew introduced variant readings suggests his ability, as 'T.C.', to rehearse himself in dialogues not quite his own. Certainly, even more than with 'Aske mee noe more', the drift of 'Thom's and 'J.S.'s disputation cannot be separated from politics: the Countess of Carlisle's exercise of her charms at court, for and against Henrietta Maria and the King, contrary to the interests of Suckling, responsive to wooing by Carew.⁸⁴

That manuscript variation should offer itself under the scheme of dialogue suggests how deeply the principle ran. English Renaissance minds were, through continued rehearsal, 'enformed' by it. At school, at Merton and the Middle Temple, Carew will have disputed. Several of his mature poems are quasi-academic dialogues refined by song, lyrics designed to cope with 'dissenting opinion' at court. 'Of iealousie', for instance, had its beginnings, Thomas Killigrew tells us, in 'a dispute held betwixt M^{tes} Cicilia Crofts and my self'.⁸⁵ In imagery highly political, it recurs in two manuscripts of poems on affairs of state.⁸⁶ Jealousy 'sitting on the usurped Throne', and ruling 'like a Tyrant', sufficiently explains that. Yet the word 'dispute' also implies private difficulties between Killigrew and his future wife, reminding us (in Caroline usage) that the structure of the song was already present in court conversation. Dialogue was so ubiquitous that even poems avoiding the form are spiced by disagreement. On reading at random in *Poems* (1640), 'In Celia's

⁸³ That the epistle may be a faction (*Suckling: Non-Dramatic Works*, p. xlvi, n. 3) complicates, mostly to its advantage, my argument. Even provisionally to examine 'correction' as a creative concept in this period (cf. note 75) is to find the terms in which we customarily discuss, e.g., post-Jacobean versions of Shakespeare—Benson's *Poems* of 1640, Suckling's 'A Supplement of an imperfect Copy of Verses . . .', Folger MS V.a.148 (Hilton Kelliher would add the text described in Quaritch's Catalogue 1027 [November, 1982] item 192 and plate)—inappropriate.

⁸⁴ See Raymond A. Anselment, 'The Countess of Carlisle and Caroline Praise: Convention and Reality', *Studies in Philology*, 82 (1985), 212–33.

⁸⁵ Quoted by Beal, op. cit., p. 65, from the autograph of Killigrew's *Cicilia and Clorinda*, Folger MS V.b.209, pp. 50–1. The text here cited is Bod. MS Don. b. 9, fol. 4^r.

⁸⁶ Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna MS 14090, Victoria and Albert Museum, Dyce Collection, Cat. No. 43. It also, interestingly, features in Lucy Hutchinson's miscellany.

face a question did arise . . .', we expect the quarreling 'Lips and Eyes' to be a pretext for the pleasures of dissent, take the barely interrogative 'question' to speak from a world in which the 'matter of disputation' is more significant than any 'answer' in the emergent sense 'solution' could be.

Our habit of reading Caroline poetry in author-shaped parcels obscures the quality of its disagreements. To encounter Carew's reply to Townshend's 'vpon the death of the King of Sweden' in a collected edition makes for a poorer response than finding it side-by-side with the original—in, say, St John's College, Cambridge MS S23, where the antiphonal logic of the poem is rationalized and amplified by its interrelations with Townshend. That same miscellany begins with Jonson's 'Ode to him selfe' and Carew's 'To Benn Jo[h]nson'. The tactful firmness of Carew's dissent ('Tis true (deare Benn) . . . and yet tis true') is far more pointed in juxtaposition. Its rebarbative praise, 'Tis true . . . thy iust chastising hand/Hath fixed uppon this sotted age a brand', depends not only on the sottishness and branded thumb of Jonson, but on succeeding the evidences of that 'hand' in manuscript. Two poems change in meaning by being together—gain intimacy and equality, as between '*J.S.*' and '*Thom*'—and by heading a manuscript so much concerned with both leaders of a 'tribe'. Almost any arrangement of Carew poems demonstrates, however, that 'To *x*' is his commonest title, that his standard first line is imperative or vocative, positing an interlocutor. He naturally implies relations, what students of pragmatics call 'dialogue games',⁸⁷ and his intelligence gets to work by knowing in advance (though unspoken) that to which his writing answers. His lucidity is social ellipsis, and his verse is glossed with implications not to be mined out as ambiguity. Manuscript elaborates this by virtue of coterie exclusiveness, underwriting texts with the message that a short chain of transcription leads to the poet, overwriting them with courteous knowingness. You are one, manuscript flatters, who can decipher 'To T.H.' or 'To my friend G.N.' You are almost only one, because manuscript publishes yet maintains the fiction that the reader is specially privileged. To examine a lyric such as 'Secrecy protested' is to find little of significance 'in the poem' but much generated by there being dozens of manuscripts which, beginning 'Feare not

⁸⁷ See, e.g., the book of that title by Lauri Carlson (Dordrecht, 1983).

deere Loue that Ile reueale/Those houres of pleasure wee two steale', discreetly betray the protestation, trust us with it.⁸⁸

First and last, though, dialogue is what its root in Greek declares: discourse going across against, *dia-*, joined in separation. This paradox is explored by Carew in a series of erotic poems which are among his best yet least discussed. In all of them the Blackfriars auditor is evident, not only in the speech prefixes, inset observers, echoes of Shakespearean drama,⁸⁹ but in a rhetoric that extends into doing. 'A Pastorall Dialogue: Celia: Cleon',⁹⁰ for instance, moves from vocalized paradoxical embraces—

Then thus my willing armes I winde
About thee, and am soe
Thy pris'ner,

—through a wreathed exchange of lovelocks, her favours, his 'ryme', into affections fraught with Petrarchan contraries, interrupted by a shepherd. Even when voices lose distinction, and only a reader eavesdrops, Carew is interested in fertile apartness. In 'A hymenæal Dialogue', the bride replies to a singing groom,⁹¹ 'whose wordes were those,/For though your voyce the ayre did breake . . . through your lipps my hart did speake'—a pretty sentiment which does not prepare us for the 'disunion' which ends the poem, dividing bodies from souls, 'As two doe one, and one fowre growe/Each by contraction multiplyde.' Implosiveness of dialogue achieves the miniature sublime. As compound obliquity, double scope of indirection, dialogue converges on that inexplicit centre which is for Carew a reflex of movement rather than determinate point from which Jonsonian compasses might reach out to a verge. At its most refined it is voiceless not because 'disunion' vanishes but because words recoil, eddy and reticulate away. 'Though our bodyes are disioynd', the poet appeals 'To his mistress in absence',⁹² 'lett vs work a mystique wreath . . . lett our secrett thoughts vnseene/Like netts be weav'd and entertwin'd'.

The audible influence of that 'dialogue of one', 'The Ext-

⁸⁸ BL Add. MS 25303, fol. 153^r. Agreeably endorsing this some manuscripts (e.g., Bod. MS Eng. poet. e. 14, fol. 12^r) begin 'Think not', admitting a shadow of duplicity. Bod. MS Rawl. poet. 65 even reads 'Doubt not, my Dear . . .', fol. 29^r.

⁸⁹ E.g., *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Tempest*, in 'This mossie bank . . .'

⁹⁰ BL Harley MS 6917, fols. 5^v–6^v.

⁹¹ St John's College, Cambridge MS S23, fols. 60^v–61^r.

⁹² Bod. MS Don. b. 9, fol. 20^{r-v}.

sie',⁹³ on these lyrics is ponderable, because Carew's eroticism is usually related to a different strain in Donne: egotistical and urbane. Part of the achievement of Carew's elegy on the Monarch of Wit, though, beside others of 1633, is its awareness of the Augustan sway he exercised over several realms of writing. To inspect the poem most attacked in the Trumbull papers, and since, 'A Rapture',⁹⁴ is to find a good deal that is Donnean yet not in its immediate model, 'To his Mistris Going to Bed': mutuality, implied dialogue, an aestheticism (as in 'The Extasie') which relates the physical to the spiritual: 'Loves mysteries in soules doe grow, /But yet the body is his booke.' Beyond Donne's 'I', indeed beyond 'we', Carew is free with 'our': something shared, including 'our discourse'. He imagines, in his Arcadian grove, 'our actiue play', 'our soules/In stedfast peace'. If Celia has no reported speech, that at least avoids the betrayal which Randolph perpetrates in 'A Pastoral Courtship',⁹⁵ by giving Phyllis right of reply. What a seduced mistress can say in this period belongs, for the most part, to Complaint. Randolph is less aggressive than Donne *erectus*, 'having the foe in sight,' but his assurance seems to threaten despite itself: 'No wasp nor hornet haunts this grove,' he tells Phyllis, 'Nothing that wears a sting, but I'. The violence implicit in the title of 'A Rapture' (i.e. 'rape'), is modified by Celia's responsiveness into 'ecstasy' and 'poetic exaltation'. When Carew 'wears a sting' it is to become a creative emblem out of the rhetoric books.⁹⁶ Like a bee, that 'Flyes 'bout the paynted feild with nimble winge/Deflowringe the fresh virgins of the spring,' he will kiss his way down Celia's person,

weareing as I goe
A tract for louers one the printed snowe.
Thenc climbing ore the swellinge Appenine,
Retire into the groue of Eglantine:
Where I will all those rausht sweets destill
Through Loues Alembique, and with Chimique skill
From the mixt mass, one soueraigne Balme deriue,
Then bring that great Eli[x]ar to thy hiue.

⁹³ Donne quotations from Helen Gardner (ed.), *The Elegies and Songs and Sonnets* (Oxford, 1965).

⁹⁴ Rosenbach MS 1083/17, fols. 49^v-53^r.

⁹⁵ *Poems with the Muses Looking-Glasse: and Amyntas* (Oxford, 1638), pp. 103-10.

⁹⁶ E.g., *Discoveries* ll. 2466-82; C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson, (eds), *Ben Jonson*, 11 vols (Oxford, 1925-52), Vol. 8, pp. 638-9. On the diffusion of this commonplace see Richard S. Peterson, *Imitation and Praise in the Poems of Ben Jonson* (New Haven, 1981), pp. 6-9.

The most outrageous sexual act in the poem is substantively rhetorical. Tacit dialogue condenses eroticism into a lustrous reticence. Having buzzed across the body's book, rifling the florilegium and lipping his prints as tracts, Carew means to tongue that 'rich myne' which, in the exequy on Donne, is 'a Mine/Of rich and pregnant phansie'.⁹⁷ He may be active, but Celia's 'dumbe eloquence' (another phrase from the Donne elegy) provides his matter. Behind the passage are such lyrics as 'A Prayer to the winde',⁹⁸ in which a sigh, gusted down the mistress's nectarous body returns to the poet, replies wordlessly, with the power to 'chainge . . . Every weede into a flower'.

Hence 'A Rapture's expressive climax. Lucrece, reading Aretine, 'hurles/Her limnes into a thousand windinge Curles,/ And studyes Artfull postures'—attitudes 'Caru'd one the bark of euery neighbring tree': not Marvell's oak inscribed on oak, but erotically articulate windings. When Suckling rewrote Shakespeare's *Lucrece*,⁹⁹ he turned the heroine's modesty into passive display. Carew, by contrast, has her sexualize herself in art. Penelope actively chooses to 'display/Herself before the youth of Ithaca', while Daphne, still more energetic, breaks 'her barke, and . . . doth now unfetter'd, rune/To meete the embraces of the youthfull Sunn.' With her, the poem's imaginary inscribed verdure bursts out in unheard song:

Full of her God she sings inspired layes
Sweet Odes of loue such as deserue the Bayes
Which shee herself was.

Chasteningly this reflexive conceit, though it again seems Marvellian, leaves an impure residue. 'A Rapture' has too many hints of doubtful wreathing (as when the poet hymns 'our twisted loues') not to recall (such is Carew's integrity), beyond the wound arms, exchanged curls and 'ryme' of 'A Pastorall Dialogue: Celia: Cleon', the 'Nets of passions finest thred,/Snareing poems' in his 'Good counsel to a young Maid.'¹⁰⁰ Dialogue is not transcended by virtue of 'dumbe eloquence', not saved from involving persuasion, verbal 'rape'. It could not honour Celia's side of the encounter were it not startled as well as elated by the effect of erotic writing on Lucrece. But then, 'Honour', we are told, is a 'Goblyn'. It is the 'Gyant . . . Masquer' who keeps lovers

⁹⁷ Quoting *Poems, By J.D. With Elegies on the Authors Death* (London, 1633), pp. 385–8.

⁹⁸ BL Sloane MS 1792, fols. 130^r–1^r.

⁹⁹ 'A Supplement of an imperfect Copy of Verses . . .'

¹⁰⁰ 'Gaze not . . .'; BL Add. MS 53723, fol. 109^r.

out of Arcady. One reason why 'A Rapture' concerns itself with rhetoric is that, to imagine sexual liberty, it must posit a world beyond convention. There wishes, bodies and the signs of art can be one, and a nymph's desiring song is crowned (as it were already) with 'the Bayes/Which shee herself was.' Such raptures lie beyond 'A Rapture', must be written out blankly, over the horizons of experience, from a poem whose language is fallen. Carew begins and ends in the social 'Pageant', the 'Gyant's' kingdom, where dislocations between desire and words, warps of 'Honour' which make twined loves twisted, open gaps in which flourish an exalted or risible symbolism: the semiotics of a Garter or the Bugle. It is to Carew's redemption of 'Honour', his attempt to purify the 'Pageant' by a writing out of words, that the argument must now turn.

Consider 'A Ribban',¹⁰¹ further debt to Donne, continuous with much that has been quoted:

This silken wreath, which Circles in myne arme
Is but an Embleme of that Mistick charme,
Wherewith the Mag[i]que of your beautie bindes
My Captive Soule, and round about it winds
Fetters of lasting Loue . . .

Carew calls his token an 'order', as 'The Relique' does not, relating it to a whole series of chivalrous devices from the ribbons of the Bugle (with its 'Giant' names) through the Infanta's knotted favour to the 'Wreathe of bay' deposited in 'For a Pictu[re] whe[re] a Queen Laments over the Tombe of a slain knight'.¹⁰² It is one of the more obvious lacunae in Caroline research that so little attention should have been paid to chivalry and its codes.¹⁰³ From English Cervantes to the 'Mock Romansa' of *Brittania Triumphans*—mentioning only burlesques—romantic knighthood charmed and diverted. Phenomenal was the success,

¹⁰¹ Bod. MS Don. b. 9, fol. 30^r.

¹⁰² BL Sloane MS 739, fol. 100^r.

¹⁰³ Useful first steps are taken by Mervyn James, 'The Changing Emphasis of Honour' in *English Politics and the Concept of Honour 1485-1642, Past and Present* Supplement 3 (1978) and Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison, 1984), Chap. 4.

as publishing records show, of *Arcadia* and its offshoots.¹⁰⁴ For Charles himself, lately masquer to Spain, the Prince Astiagés and Basilino of court romance,¹⁰⁵ chivalry held immense appeal. The Order of the Garter, elaborated by him and codified by Elias Ashmole, satisfied a deep ceremoniousness in his nature.¹⁰⁶ Even in minute detail, ritual 'order' shaped Carew's life from 1630, as Sewer in Ordinary to the King. BL Stowe MS 561, for instance, catalogues the handwashing, toasting in wine and three-times triple-bowing required of Carvers and Cupbearers before serving, as though the royal table were an eucharistic altar.¹⁰⁷ That such procedures, verging into transcendence, were congenial to the poet is suggested by 'A Ribban', where the 'Ceremonie' due to his 'order' allows of 'Faith' to the 'Loue' it enshrines: 'This order as a lay Man I may beare/But I become loues Preist, when that I weare'. Chivalrous ritual lent, then, an aura to its subjects. The looking-glass 'enchanted by art magic' sent by King James to Madrid is no odder than the 'enchanted Crystall', with 'ayrie repercussive sorceries', which 'thy Glasse' becomes in 'To a Ladye mistrustfull of hir owne beautie.'¹⁰⁸ Carew's poetry is continually interested in things which, like a mirror or curl of hair (not to be cracked or given to witches), extend the human into the marvellous. The pearl exalted in his lapidary is an example: most organic of stones, 'geniture of a shell-fish',¹⁰⁹ viscously forming from a dewdrop, tear or smile, held to participate in the character of its wearer. At times his feeling for such

¹⁰⁴ For Sidney's Caroline efflorescence see *STC*, Patterson (op. cit., p. 171) adding dramatizations by James Shirley (1632) and Henry Glapthorne (1638). Cf. the reception and multiple reprints of Francis Quarles's *Argalus and Parthenia* (London, 1629), discussed by David Freeman in his edition (Cranbury, N.J., 1986).

¹⁰⁵ See Antoine Rémy, *La Galatee et les adventures du Prince Astiagés. Histoire de nostre temps, ou sous noms feints sont representez les amours du Roy et de la Reyne d'Angleterre. Avec tous les voyages qu'il a fait, tant en France qu'en Espagne* (Paris, 1625), a wedding present for Henrietta Maria, and Walter Montague, *The Shepheard's Paradise*, perf. 1633 (London, [1659]).

¹⁰⁶ Kevin Sharpe, 'The Personal Rule of Charles I', in Howard Tomlinson (ed.), *Before the English Civil War* (London, 1983), pp. 53-78, esp. pp. 59-60.

¹⁰⁷ Fol. 4^v. Cf. Prynne on Laud, quoted by Smuts, *Court Culture*, p. 228.

¹⁰⁸ St John's College, Cambridge MS S23, fols. 83^v-5^v ('To A.D. . . .' in *Poems*).

¹⁰⁹ Thomas Nicols, *A Lapidary: Or, The History of Pretious Stones* (Cambridge, 1652), p. 75. The emphasis on parturition goes back to Pliny, who classes the pearl apart from gemstones (*Natural History* IX.liv-lx).

tokens smacks of the primitive power anthropologists find in ritual gifts. The jewels and wreaths of Carew's highly-civilized verse might almost be the *vaygu'a* or strings of shell-treasure, at once property, pledge and sacred loan—with all the medicinale virtue ascribed gems in Renaissance digests—given by Trobriand islanders in Marcel Mauss's *Essai sur le don*.¹¹⁰

Certainly Carew's culture was one in which gifts were significant. Ritualized exchanges helped organize court life. Especially on New Year's Day, presents were reciprocated between patrons and their clients. King Charles, not the most assiduous reader of state papers, took care to annotate the annual list.¹¹¹ Gold, pearl and other ornaments were accepted. But as the career of Dudley Carleton reminds us, paintings and sculptures were a means to favour. Poems supplemented gifts,¹¹² or were themselves the art objects given.¹¹³ Father Ong observes that the word 'ornament' described in the period, not only jewelled adornments, but the attire and equipment of a poem—as 'a "praise" (*laus*) or an "honor" (*honos* or *honor*) or a "light" (*lumen*) of words'—and also, in social application, a 'gift' or 'honorarium', as with the annual *ornamentum* which equipped Ramus to discharge his Regius professorship.¹¹⁴ Carew's 'New-yeares gift. To the King' thus constitutes the same kind of honouring ornament as the band of 'whiter stone' which it urges Janus to wreath, pearl-like, about the King's year:¹¹⁵

let them shine
In this succeeding circles twine,
Till it be round with glories spread,
Then with it crowne our *Charles* his head . . .

Manuscript, again, alters meaning. 'To *x*' now implies a thing given as well as address; relations between the poet and his verse

¹¹⁰ 1925; quotations from tr. Ian Cunnison (London, 1954).

¹¹¹ Carleton, *Charles I*, pp. 107, 158. A list of New Year's gifts given by the king, such as that in BL Harley Roll T2, details exchanges more ceremonial than substantial, yet part of a system which involved large benefits.

¹¹² An example by Carew appears to be 'Red, and white roses'.

¹¹³ In addition to Carew's texts note, e.g., 'A New-yeares-Gift sung to King Charles, 1635' by Jonson, Herrick's 'The New-yeeres Gift, or Circumcisions Song', 'Another New-yeeres Gift, or Song for the Circumcision' and 'A New-yeeres gift sent to Sir Simeon Steward', Davenant's 'To the King on New-yeeres day 1630' and his three New Year's gift poems 'To The Queen'.

¹¹⁴ Walter J. Ong, S.J., *Ramus: Method and the Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), pp. 277–8.

¹¹⁵ No manuscripts extant; *Poems*, pp. 151–2.

change by virtue of his praise-emanating accomplishment finding expression in an object. When Carew's holograph of 'To the King', or an ornate fair copy, was presented, wreathed writing marked the *res* with those signs of the giver which Mauss looks for in the archaic *rah* or 'gift';¹¹⁶ ornament was invested with the honour and praise which it was the Renaissance poet's to give. Subtly, and as in 'A Fancy', verse's writtenness was refined into something more beautiful than what it said.

'The whole field over which *laus*, *honor*, *lumen*, and *ornamentum* play', notes Ong, 'is . . . one where the distinctions between persons and objects now made automatically . . . are more or less blurred.'¹¹⁷ If we return to the 'Thom' depicted by Suckling 'in Hampton-Court garden', both the versatility of court ritual informed by these ambiguities, and its tendency to polish away the poetry it generates, come clear. For Carew's radiant address 'To the New-year, for the Countesse of Carlile'¹¹⁸ develops its genre by insisting that, since a Countess called Lucy is her own *lumen*, nothing need be given:

Give Lucinda pearle, nor Stone
Lend them light who els have none
Let her Beauty shine, alone . . .

No attire thou canst invent
Shall to grace her forme be sent,
She adorns all ornament.

Like the mistress or Queen of 'Aske mee noe more', the Countess is called a Phoenix's nest: twined centre of political influence. Such exaltation may threaten the decay of dialogue, yet attributing 'grace'—active principle in Renaissance usage—invites reciprocation. Lamenting the 'frowne' which has marred Lucinda's favour (a bodily pun is palpable), Carew declares:

Janus, if when next I trace
Those sweete lines, I in her face
Reade the Charter of my grace

Then from bright Appollo'es tree
Such a garland wreathd shalbe
As shall crowne both her, and thee.

¹¹⁶ *The Gift*, pp. 48–50.

¹¹⁷ *Ramus*, p. 278.

¹¹⁸ BL Sloane MS 739, fols. 99^v–100^r rev.

Elegantly, without obscuring the unpredictability of court 'grace', Carew imagines the Countess as the kind of honour-radiating text which his court poems might be: they speak the same language, that of patronage and 'grace' 's cognate, 'gratitude'. Even more than 'To the King', the poem is sheened away, exceeds itself in exchanges: the real text is still to be written.¹¹⁹ In the standard Renaissance treatise on gifts, *De Beneficiis*, such a subordination of the object to the mystique of exchange is assumed. Seneca's image of the dancing Graces, as much as Mauss on the *kula* or 'ring' around which *vaygu'a* pass,¹²⁰ explains why the rhetoric of Carew's Arcadian dialogues, with their empty centres of wreathing and curling, should articulate so fluently Charles's year, his *annulus* or 'circle',¹²¹ the crowning of the Countess of Carlisle. 'What meaneth this dance of theirs, in which hand in hand they trip it alwaies in a round [*chorus*]?' Seneca asks. 'Because the order and processe of benefits . . . is such, that they returne again to the giuer, and should wholly loose the grace of all which they should effect, if euer they should bee interrupted.'¹²²

Carew's appeal to Janus is suggestive. For the dialogues and gift poems have as their corollary prayer, the refinement of 'Ceremonie' into 'Faith', objects becoming messages in sacrifice:

Leade the black Bull to slaughter with the Bore
And Lambe, then purple with their mingled gore
The Oceans curled browe, that so wee may
The Sea Gods for their carefull waftage pay.
Send gratefull incense up in pious smoake
To those mild spiritts . . .

Celebrating the return of Walter Montague from the continent,¹²³ Carew heightens Caroline ritual into a neo-classicism

¹¹⁹ BL Harley MS 4955, fols. 206^{r-v}, 'when next I trace,/These smooth lines', though probably corrupt, makes still more intimate the object and means of annual address.

¹²⁰ *The Gift*, pp. 19–29.

¹²¹ John Swan, *Speculum Mundi* (Cambridge, 1635): 'In Latin the yeare is called *Annus*, because we may say of it, *revolvitur ut annulus*. For as in a ring the parts touch one another, circularly joyning each to other, so also the yeare rolleth it self back again by the same steps it ever went.' Quoted by S.K. Heninger in *The Cosmographical Glass* (San Marino, Cal., 1977), pp. 3–4.

¹²² *De Beneficiis* I.iii; *The Workes of Lucius Annaeus Seneca*, tr. Thomas Lodge (London, 1614), p. 4.

¹²³ 'Vppon M^r. W. Mount: his returne from trauell', Rosenbach MS 1083/17, fols. 75^v–76^r.

which honours his friend's incipient or actual conversion to Rome. Imaginatively his prosphneticon belongs in the Queen's chapel at Somerset House, designed by Inigo Jones to Vitruvian principles, with Doric entablatures drawn from 'an antique marble at Arundel house' and scrolled up into 'Mannerist ornamentalism'.¹²⁴ Brilliant was the effect there, when Mass was held for the court, of Dieussart's machine for displaying the eucharist, painted with angels lent voice by a concealed chorus.¹²⁵ Exquisite, likewise, in the poem is the 'Muses Quire' that blesses Montague's 'waftage', and eucharistic Carew's address to his fellow-poet: 'Thus whilst you deale your body 'mongst your freinds . . . As Laymen clapse their hands wee ioyne our feete'. Such an explicit pun (on prosody) is rare in Carew, and this acknowledgement of the medium serves to articulate the transition implicit in 'A Ribban' between the 'Ceremonie' of a 'lay Man' and 'Faith' inspired by 'loues Preist', here between 'Laymen' and 'wee of Delphos'. It makes sacerdotal claims for the poet, underpinned by Horatian phrasing. The shrines and altars of Carew's lyrics are not conventional props, but, embedded in an organized and transcendent view of life, belong to that 'order and processe' out of which 'grace' is wreathed. The 'pearly drops' of 'smooth soft language', which should (he tells a rival) be offered at Celia's 'Altars', partake in priestly sacrifice.¹²⁶ His verse aspires to yield itself in aromatic melting, it gives up its mass as scripted object in curled wreaths of rhetoric. We should remember that Massinger jibed, not only at manuscript circulation, but at poems uttered aloud to a 'tribe' of adoring believers. Nor should we forget the unusually large number of Carew lyrics (about a third of the entire canon) which gravitated to song-books—verses 'perform'd' as airs, of the air, losing verbal distinction as the winding music of William Lawes and Walter Porter suffused and exalted the text.¹²⁷ It was what the lyrics sought, most declared themselves as.

The 'round' or *kula* of givingness resolves in those poems which identify addressee and godhead. In them, the fascination in *De Beneficiis* with prayer escalates into transcendently lucent utterance, imaginary unseen smoke:

¹²⁴ Sir John Summerson, *Inigo Jones* (Harmondsworth, 1966), p. 78.

¹²⁵ Thomas Birch, *The Court and Times of Charles I*, ed. Robert Folkestone Williams, 2 vols (London, 1848), Vol. 2, pp. 311–14.

¹²⁶ 'To my Rivall', BL Harley MS 6917, fols. 4^v–5^r.

¹²⁷ See the list in Dunlap, ed. cit., pp. 289–93.

Those that can give open their hands this day
 Those that cannot, yet hold them up to pray
 That health may Crown the Seasons of this year
 And myrtle dance round the Circle . . .

Carew begins 'A New years Sacrifice to Lucinda'¹²⁸ by rehearsing the *chorus*, but then exaltedly deprecates its tokens. Like the *vaygu'a* thrown at the feet of a great man in Mauss's account,¹²⁹ the poems which stand in for gold and pearl are dismissed as 'cheape and vulgar wishes I could lay/As triviale offerings at your feet this day'. Instead the text projects to an extreme that sacerdotalism which privileges the poet yet abases him at a shrine, his works becoming functions 'of' the gratitude which grace elicits:

Such Incense voves and holy rites as were
 To the involued Serpent of the year
 Paid by Egiptian Preists lay I before
 Lucindas sacred shrine, whilst I adore
 Her beautiful Eyes, and her pure Altars dresse
 With Gumms and Spice of humble thankfulness. . . .

No need to invoke Mauss again, on absolute gifts as sacrifice. The Carew of 'Egiptian Preists' is demonstrably in touch with the new interest in comparative religion and anthropology which informs Sandys's Ovid and Herbert's *De Religione Gentilium*. No need, either, to stress process and dissolution as measures of textual value. 'Incense voves . . . Gumms' are but materials of art; it is for Lucinda, Carew concludes, to 'inspire' those tokens with 'Delphique fire' into a 'blaze' that will manifest her 'name'.

Such writing may seem far removed from the Carew of 1623, elegist of 'E.F.' But the poet's provincial reach not only remained intact: breadth of political vision made court and 'country' inextricable. That generality of reference is apparent even in 'To the King at his Entrance into Saxham, By Master Io[h]n Crofts',¹³⁰ a poem usually dated back to the period in which we started, when Carew's imaginative allegiances included the likes of 'Prince Ottoman'. Undoubtedly its speaker—Crofts the poet,

¹²⁸ Bod. MS Don. b. 9, fol. 27^{r-v} (where it is dated '1632').

¹²⁹ *The Gift*, p. 21.

¹³⁰ Brotherton Collection MS Lt.q 48, fol. 37'. This early text, which Beal dates 'c.1620s-30s' (op. cit., p. 114), can be found among papers relating to the Sebright and Crofts families. Sir John Sebright, 7th bart. (as Christopher Sheppard informs me) married in 1793 Harriet Crofts, daughter of Richard Crofts of West Harling, Norfolk, originally of Little Saxham itself.

colleague of Carew at the embassy in Paris—had access to the King at that time. In 1620, for instance, he carried a book from his master Herbert (another gift text) to James at his family seat.¹³¹ Oddly enough, it was rumoured that the King was often at Little Saxham because he had contracted a marriage, after the death of Queen Anne, to that daughter of the household, Cicilia Crofts, who would later become a Maid of Honour and ‘dispute’ with Thomas Killigrew. If, as E.E. Duncan-Jones has argued, the chambermaid dubbed Queen Cis in *The New Inne* was a satirical barb in her direction,¹³² then Carew’s reply to Jonson’s ‘Ode’ in defence of that play will have been in part precipitated by longstanding provincial loyalties. Certainly the Crofts, while not quite a family of servingmen, were better placed by geography, near the hunting fields of Newmarket, than by wealth or breeding.¹³³

Sir

’Ere you passe this Threshold, stay,
And give your Creature leave to pay
Those pious Rites, which unto you,
As to our Houshold Gods, are due.

Instead of Sacrifice, each Breast
Is like a flaming Altar drest
With zealous fires, which from pure Hearts
Love mixt with Loyalty imparts.

Incense, nor Gold have we, yet bring
As rich, and sweet an Offering;
And such as doth both These express,
Which is our humble Thankfulness . . .

¹³¹ Dunlap, ed. cit., p. xxxii. Herbert’s bookish influence on Carew himself has been neglected (cf. Francis W. Fry on ‘Aske mee noe more’, *Notes and Queries*, n.s. 24 [1977], 140–1); yet he was completing *De Veritate* during the poet’s years of employment. Its model of faculties (inchoate, but more sympathetic to the imagination than Scholastic or Baconian schemes) and hostility to predestinarianism must have been congenial. There are preshocks of *libertin* speculation in Herbert’s circle (the Lucretian Carew of ‘Loves Force’), a flux of ideas aided by Parisian civility. For some suggestive remarks, especially in relation to Herbert’s secretary William Boswell (atomist, Galileist, virtuoso, Arminian), see Nicholas Tyacke, ‘Arminianism and English Culture’, in A.C. Duke & E.A. Tamse (eds), *Britain and the Netherlands*, Vol. 7 (The Hague, 1981), pp. 94–117.

¹³² Unpublished typescript.

¹³³ For a genealogy sparse with honours until the Stuart period, see John Gage, *The History and Antiquities of Suffolk. Thingoe Hundred* (London, 1838), p. 134.

What Carew's speaker offers, yields up in address, is ethically as well as verbally continuous with court gift poems. His climactic 'two-edg'd' verb, for example—which has gold and incense 'expresse' the 'humble thankfulness' of 'A New yeares Sacrifice' until it does them—adumbrates a round-dance in which giving takes predominance over gifts. Also Senecan, though newer in Carew, is the negotiation of a difficulty which exercises *De Beneficiis*: how to place, in a system of giving, the 'Caesar' who (in some sense) 'omnia habet'.¹³⁴ Carew's answer lies in 'Rites . . . As to our Houshold Gods'. The devotion which is Lucinda's at court, Celia's in love poetry, at Saxham is due in the house to the King. As with Walter Montague, the classical 'order and processe' which greets arrival becomes eucharistic, points beyond 'Ceremonie'. Wittily, 'the Gore/Which should be dasht on ev'ry door', at Saxham, 'We change into the lusty Bloud/Of youthfull Vines'. Magical provision is a commonplace in country-house poems. Yet Carew's emphases are different from those of, for example, 'To Penshurst'.¹³⁵ The 'open table', the 'liberall boord', of the Sidneys is no altar. Jonson's '*Penates* . . . entertayne' but are not compared with the King. There is scarcely that sense, as in Carew, that 'your servants . . . bear sway/Here in your Absence'. Continuity with the court is still clearer in what follows: 'having supt', Crofts says, 'We may perchance/Present you with a Country Dance'. The Graces put their clogs on, but a celebration of the *chorus*, the Senecan *kula*, at Saxham, seems intended. Osborn MS b. 197 includes an unpublished 'Maske of S^r John Crofts at the Kings being entertained there' which shows what Carew had in mind.¹³⁶ More than itself 'presented', its dances end with the deities of country life (Diana, Ceres, Pan, and so on) bestowing their gifts on the monarch: game, foison, wool.

Significantly Carew's other Crofts poem, always printed as 'To Saxham', survives in most manuscripts under the title 'A winters

¹³⁴ VII.v and vi. In the Cambridge University Library copy of Lodge's tr. (*Workes*, pp. 144–5), this claim is underlined by an early hand in both chapters of the treatise.

¹³⁵ *Ben Jonson*, ed. cit., Vol. 8, pp. 93–6.

¹³⁶ Pages 169–73. It is possible, though unlikely, that Carew wrote the masque. Internal evidence points to an early Caroline date, before the death of Buckingham, yet the emphasis on youth and a bright future is not incompatible with one of James's visits to Saxham, c.1620. Cf. 'sober, strong, and young' in 'Vppon the kings Sicknesse' (quoting Bod. MS Don. b. 9, fols. 15^v–16^v), apparently the text catalogued 'when k: James was sicke' at the back of St John's College, Cambridge MS S23.

entertainment . . .'.¹³⁷ That the poet was, like James and Charles, wreathed by the Graces in Suffolk, and over a long period, is clear. A Latin epigram, printed in *Nympha Libethris: or the Cotswold Muse* (1651), finds him being sent Davenant's works 'apud J.C.'¹³⁸—yet another textual gift, this one pointing to the 1630s. The political message of 'To Saxham', however, is that more than Kings and poets are 'entertained':

thy Gates haue beene
 Made onely to lett strangers in
 Vntaught to shutt they doe not feare
 To stand wide open all the yeare
 Careless whoe enters for they know
 Thou neuer didst deserue a foe
 And as for theeues thie bounties such,
 They cannot steale thou giu'st soe much.

As in the epistle on Gustavus Adolphus, the elegies for Buckingham, Carew takes his politics seriously enough to admit objections. It is one of the ironies of his subsequent misconstruction that this urge to acknowledge difficulties, to gain edge and obliquity by sailing close to the wind, should be taken as inept apologetics. Does not deserving them, Carew wonders, prevent us having foes? Can stealing be trumped by the gift? The play of sceptical wit does not obscure an engagement with live issues. Entertainment was political; Felicity Heal has shown that conventions of hospitality were under pressure.¹³⁹ 'A winters entertainement' belongs in a larger social dialogue, and should be read against those sternly Protestant treatises which distinguish between locals and strangers, worthy and idle poor. The poet's own stance, where not ambivalent, may seem primitive. Alms in his text relate to sacrifice, as in Mauss; they are a displacement of aristocratic excess as much as an alleviation of popular hardship. But at least the circuit of gratitude avoids means-testing:

¹³⁷ Fourteen out of twenty complete texts mention 'entertainment', four with the qualifying season (significant in that 'winter' found gentry less laudable than the Crofts, contrary to proclamation, 'entertaining' in London). That the seven manuscripts which grant Saxham (or 'Taxum', 'Saxum', 'Sarum') a locale place it in 'Kent' supports the claim that Carew maintained contact with his native region, and underlines the relative obscurity of the Crofts' establishment. The text is quoted here from Bod. MS Don. b. 9, fols.

14^v–15^v

¹³⁸ Rpt., Dunlap, ed. cit., p. 210.

¹³⁹ 'The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England', *Past and Present*, 102 (1984), 66–93..

The could and frozen ayre had steru'd
 Much poore, unless by thee preseru'd;
 Whose prayers haue made thy table blest
 With plentie farr about the rest . . .

All readings mistake which hypostatize the text. Its involvement in the 'round' of benefits described is political. The printed title, 'To Saxham', has this to recommend it, that it adumbrates a rendering of *laus* and *honor*, tribute being paid to, prayer at, the Crofts's 'table'.

Among Carew's estate poems, though, it is 'To my friend G.N. from Wrest'¹⁴⁰ that best demonstrates his continuity of vision and socialized poetic. Far more than Little Saxham, Wrest speaks from the political 'country'. Its owner, Henry Grey, refused the forced loan in 1626–7, lived mostly in retirement thereafter, did not accompany the King during 1639 in his campaign against the Scots.¹⁴¹ Poetic 'address' is reversible. Writing 'from Wrest' is as indicative as 'To Saxham'. At this point, frustratingly, our inherited assumptions risk pushing Carew too far from court, as though his discomfort during the Scottish expedition, grimly depicted in the opening lines of his epistle, left him nowhere to go but Nun Appleton. This analogy is advanced, indeed, in the best account of the poem we have, by Michael P. Parker. Symptomatically, however, it needs support from such evidences as 'the presence of the opposition leader Selden at the de Grey estate'¹⁴²—a misleading description of the great lawyer's role at this, and perhaps any, time. Grey was not decisively retired. In November 1633, for example, the Earl and Countess of Kent featured prominently at the christening of James, Duke of York.¹⁴³ Nor should retirement be taken to indicate a particular ideological stance. Carew had already praised seclusion in a far from 'oppositional' context: his consoling poem 'To the Countesse of Anglesey' compares Kit Villiers' life away from court to an 'Eddy' that 'turnes his water round,/And in continuall Circles dances, free'¹⁴⁴—a passage anticipating, across the detail of Carew's work, Wrest's

¹⁴⁰ No manuscripts extant; quoting *Poems*, pp. 146–50.

¹⁴¹ Richard Cust, *The Forced Loan and English Politics 1626–1628* (Oxford, 1987), p. 102, n. 13; *CSPD, 1638–1639*, pp. 621–2, cf. *CSPD, 1639*, p. 221.

¹⁴² 'Carew's Secular Masque' (above, n. 33), p. 176.

¹⁴³ *CSPD, 1633–1634*, p. 297.

¹⁴⁴ BL Harley MS 6917, fols. 24^r–5^v.

spacious channells, where they slowly creepe
 In snakie windings, as the shelving ground
 Leades them in circles, till they twice surround
 This Island Mansion, which i'th'centre plac'd,
 Is with a double Crystall heaven embrac'd,
 In which our watery constellations floate,
 Our Fishes, Swans, our Water-man and Boate,
 Envy'd by those above, which wish to slake
 Their starre-burnt limbes, in our refreshing lake . . .

Much could be said about the cultural politics of this, touching as it does on such late 1630s issues as Italianate gardening, fen drainage, the wholesomeness of Wrest water compared with the disease-ridden Tweed, complained of by Suckling in his letters from Scotland.¹⁴⁵ But the whorled 'channells' that figure retired life and intimate a political agenda also define an imaginative landscape. Like winding teardrops forming pearl, the double crystal 'channells' are jewels in movement, an involvèd lucid serpent. Partly because 'To my friend G.N.' is a late work, it is tempting to produce it to a creative limit, to render it, as Parker does, a point of 'rest'. But there is no pun on this estate without the 'W' which centres a reflex, nor any creativity, however magical, which is not alive with 'order and processe': 'Wee presse the juycie God, and quaffe his blood,/And grinde the Yeallow Goddess into food'. Above all, while meat, drink and the disposition of ornament make 'Wrest' a chorography of 'entertainment', the conceited zodiac which it shares with *Coelum Britannicum* cannot be made to render in rustic sufficiency a 'protection' which the masque grants 'solely to the court'—the phrasing, again, is Parker's¹⁴⁶—because, given the integrity of Carew's politics, the masque does nothing of the kind.

But then, Carew's greatest achievement has been, more than any other of his works, pre-emptively undervalued. It requires a trust in the poet's range of sympathy to grant the masque's big names—the three Kingdoms, Genius, Eternity—the breadth of reference they claim. Read in political context, though, this playful purging of the zodiac and its peopling with British heroes is Carew's ultimate investment of the *anulus*. Proposing the heavens themselves as ornament, it graces poetry with a radiance which gives of the stars, and offers itself to an addressee who is, by Divine right, an image of God. We should not call the

¹⁴⁵ *Suckling: Non-Dramatic Works*, Letter 40, pp. 145–6.

¹⁴⁶ 'Carew's Secular Masque', p. 184.

heavens, unconceitedly, 'an *Ornament*'. But Junius does, in the opening sentence of his treatise. We hardly think of the zodiac as giving. Yet *De Beneficiis* describes planets, stars and the gods they enshrine as exemplars of a generosity man should emulate.¹⁴⁷ Above all, acting tends, for us, to 'representation'. But the aesthetics and economics of the masque—short braveries seen once, rarely more, as part of a larger festival—translate into the seasonal gift. The congruence with country 'entertainment' is finely observed by Herrick: Pemberton's laden spits, he declares, 'Not represent but give relief'.¹⁴⁸ Masque title-pages, unlike theatre quartos, read: 'presented by *x*, to *y*, on *z*'. *Coelum Britannicum* goes further, writing this into its text: 'The first thing that presented it selfe to the sight', it begins, 'was a rich Ornament, that enclosed the Scæne'. Spectacle becomes jewelry, purified as light and yielded to an audience: 'All this Ornament was heightned with Gold, and . . . was the newest and most gracious that hath beene done in this place" (B1^v). Here the words 'was', 'this place' and 'done' are as important as the gift word 'gracious'. The elaborate description which begins *Coelum Britannicum*, printed in 1634, simply makes the more evident its not delivering up the masque given at Whitehall. Royal policy will have encouraged publication of a work which, typically, answered in its writing to the not yet witnessed *Triumph of Peace*, performed a few weeks before it.¹⁴⁹ But the manuscript poet also seems to welcome print—its definite, almost emblematic disposition, but also leaden-typed fixedness—as a way of enforcing limits familiar from the gift poems. *Coelum Britannicum* begins with 'address', to the extent of staging an introductory leaf, yet presents itself as closed, inert without the 'Delphique flame' which only occasion and the King can give: 'over al was a broken Frontispice, wrought with scrowles and masque heads of Children; and within this a Table adorn'd with a lesser Compartment, with this inscription, *COELVM BRITTANICVM*' (B1^r).

Yet who, or what, says so? No name appears on the printed title-page except that of the 'Cæsar' who commanded the masque. 'Carew' remains an attribute of script. And what of the 'broken Frontispice'? Its description may be the poet's, but Inigo

¹⁴⁷ E.g., IV.xxiii–viii.

¹⁴⁸ 'A Panegyrick to Sir Lewis Pemberton', *Poetical Works*, ed. L.C. Martin (Oxford, 1956), pp. 146–9.

¹⁴⁹ For an excellent analysis of relations between the two see Martin Butler, 'Politics and the Masque: *The Triumph of Peace*', *The Seventeenth Century*, 2 (1987), 117–41.

Jones *fecit*. Certainly the images and issues of the masque's opening 'Scæne' interested the King's Surveyor before and after the 1630s: 'old Arches, old Palaces, decayed walls, parts of Temples, Theaters . . . altogether resembling the ruines of some great City of the ancient Romanes, or civiliz'd Brittaines' (B1^v). Visually this recalls the fallen house of chivalry in *Prince Henry's Barriers*—the design for which was classed by Herford and Bell as belonging to *Coelum Britannicum*; historically, its 'Romanes, or civiliz'd Brittaines' sound very like the builders on Salisbury plain imagined in Jones's posthumous *Stone-Heng Restored*. As a result, the chivalric plot which helps organize the masque, from the Picts who 'dance a Perica or Marshall dance' (E1^v) through the chief Masquers, disguised as 'ancient Heroes' (E2^v), to the hallowed advent of 'Prince Arthur, or the brave/St. George him selfe' (E4^r) appears to stem from Jones as well as Carew, from 'Cæsar's' commitment to the Garter. Indeed, when we learn in the treatise that Stonehenge was built as a temple to Coelus, god of the heavens, that '*Factotum fuisse ad formam coronæ*', that it was 'termed . . . the Giants Dance', was 'orderly disposed' as a zodiac of stones, we seem to be in another 'Hampton-Court Garden', with Carewan material not written by his hand.¹⁵⁰ We return, in short, to the problem of life stories. The very idea of a 'Chatterton' lecture on Carew raises false expectations. He whets yet disappoints our appetite for vivid biography resolved on a death bed. That Clarendon wrote, 'after fifty Years of his Life, spent with less Severity or Exactness than it ought to have been, He died with the greatest Remorse',¹⁵¹ tantalizes but cannot justify the recollection at this point of John Hales. Carew scatters his traces too well, covers his tracks, lips prints, dance steps. Writing or written out, he is 'Thom', 'T.C.', is deleted, deletes himself. As surely as his smallest lyrics, set like gems in miscellanies, *Coelum Britannicum* displays a not at all inward ability to tread 'Lyrique feet' (Carew's self-description, granted him by Townshend)¹⁵² through congeries of dialogue.

¹⁵⁰ Op. cit. (London, 1655), esp. pp. 19, 22, 67ff., 70ff., quoting Camden, Polydore Vergil, *et al.* The work was edited from Jones's notes by John Webb; opinions differ as to the extent of his contribution. That influence by Carew on *Stone-Heng Restored*, in turn, cannot be ruled out, is part of the argument for impersonality.

¹⁵¹ Dunlap, ed. cit., p. xxxix.

¹⁵² See the Gustavus Adolphus epistle, echoing Townshend's 'vppon the death of the King of Sweden', and 'To my worthy friend Master Geo. Sands, on his translation of the Psalmes'.

For reciprocal 'order and processe' remains fundamental. In the exchange between Mercury and Momus which unfolds on Jones's set, informed spectators will have recognized a disputation derived from Giordano Bruno. Carew had precedents in Jonson's *Love's Triumph through Callipolis* for a masque employing Brunescque material.¹⁵³ But it seems characteristic of him to choose a dialogue as source, and a problematic one (cited for heresy) at that. The Classical Republican sympathies of *Lo Spaccio della Bestia trionfante*, its notion that metempsychosis makes Jove fluid and subject to fate, hardly promise a celebration of that royal asterism, the King as Defender of the Faith. Scholarship inclines to overlook this. As Mercury and Momus sinuously debate the rigour and implausibility of Charles's efforts to spread his reforming 'order' to an ungrateful kingdom, their indirectness is polarized by commentary, or glossed as 'sycophantic', or we are solemnly reminded that 'Momus' proclamation . . . comes less than a decade before 1642. . . . All are teetering on the brink of Cromwell's power'.¹⁵⁴ The claim is more than historically ill-judged. By neglecting the openness and volatility of dialogue, it obscures a distinctive dynamic. Carew's extended anti-masques become formless, where, in practice, they proceed with elegant logic, starting from Riches and her opposite Poverty (both dismissed, neither moderated), followed by Fortune (her contraries enacted in battle), to culminate in a figure who herself enshrines extremes: that cynosure of the 'negligent courtier', Hedone. 'Bewitching Syren', Mercury calls her:

gilded rottennesse,
 Thou hast with cunning artifice display'd
 Th'enameld outside, and the honied verge
 Of the faire cup, where deadly poyson lurkes.
 Within, a thousand sorrowes dance the round;
 And like a shell, Paine circles thee without.
 Grief is the shadow waiting on thy steps,
 Which, as thy joyes 'ginne tow'rds their West decline,
 Doth to a Gyants spreading forme extend
 Thy Dwarfish stature. Thou thy selfe art Paine,
 Greedy, intense Desire . . . (D4^v)

¹⁵³ *De gli eroici furori*.

¹⁵⁴ For the polarizing tendency, even in distinguished work, see, e.g., Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, pp. 234-42; 'sycophantic' is P.W. Thomas, 'Two Cultures?', p. 181; 'Cromwell's power', R. Chris Hassell, *Renaissance Drama and the English Church Year* (Lincoln, Neb., 1979), p. 135.

This magnificent passage belongs to a family of Anatomies of Pleasure written in the early 1630s: Randolph's *Aristippus*, for example, Townshend's *Tempe Restor'd*. But the richness and flexibility of its blank verse—the 'Cyrcaean' cup, the dancing round—most recall, and anticipate by only months, *A Maske Presented at Ludlow Castle*. It may seem eccentric to end by invoking Milton, for all that the presence of 'Thomas Egerton' in Carew's cast list prompts it (F2^r). Yet the affinities are extensive, and they run deep enough to discount what remains of 'pusillanimous', poxy Carew. It matters, after all, that Hedone should not appear in *Lo Spaccio*, that she is Carew's addition to Bruno, and that her dismissal should metamorphose the masque in ways which make her central to the poet's diagnosis of the ills of Charles's state. What follows is familiar to Miltonists: a dance of ancient Britons, songs of Druids and Rivers. As ponderable, however, is the common structural extendedness. Because of its principles of address and dialogue, *Coelum Britannicum* diverges from Jonsonian models by not reserving the monarch to hinge the spectacle, and it develops, *Comus*-like, transformations which spread its politics across three realms. Its last phase may not be so bafflingly protracted as Milton's printed text. But the dances of chivalry which begin with Hedone's exit lead to the glittering awkwardness of the Kingdoms' reluctance to have their heroes stellified. Genius has to insist on the mystery which allows, by 'grace', the stars to be both up and down, in a dialogue of what Carew (inflecting constitutional theory) calls 'Homonoia', before the scene can be 'With wreathes of Starres circled about'. It is a culminating vision of the *kula*, a realization, out of song, of the 'chorus' (F1^{r-v}), enabled by sustaining difference.

The Milton who read this grandest of Carew's dialogues was not a courtier and would never, we may safely speculate, have joined an Order of the Bugle. But he belonged to a culture which found Quarles writing *Argalus and Parthenia* as well as Rubens painting Charles as St George, which counted among its Spenserians both Sir Kenelm Digby and William Browne. Nothing but hindsight makes such contrasts seem paradoxical. When Mervyn James notes that Arcadian chivalric codes appealed to 'oppositional' as well as 'court' elements, or John Creaser argues that Milton's 'reforming' masque was composed for an occasion of 'royalism' and 'splendour',¹⁵⁵ there are pressures within the vocabulary working to distort remarkable scholarship. We

¹⁵⁵ *English Politics and the Concept of Honour*, pp. 72–91; 'The Setting of *Comus*', p. 116.

should think less of dialectic than of dialogue, of trans-shifting in a social 'Pageant'—the 'Gyant's' realm, Comus's kingdom—rather than cultural division imposed by some logic of history. When Milton's 'Scene changes, presenting Ludlow towne, and the Presidents Castell'¹⁵⁶ there is no sharp break from, nor aberrant continuity with, that 'prospect of *Windsor Castell*, the famous seat of the most honourable Order of the Garter' which helps resolve *Coelum Britannicum* (F1^v). Carew the Privy Chamberer and Milton the author of *Comus* may not, for us, stand easily together; but unless we can accommodate them to a shared historical moment, we shall continue to underestimate the coherence of Caroline culture, the complexity of its political centre, the integrity and oblique brilliance of those manuscript traces marked 'T.C.'

Note. Thanks are due to Peter Beal and Hilton Kelliher for information about manuscripts, to Jeremy Maule (who introduced me to the Crofts masque), to John Adamson and Kevin Sharpe for historical advice, to Elsie Duncan-Jones for lending work on Queen Cis, and to Anne Barton who read a draft. William L. Mitchell of the Kenneth Spencer Research Library, Vincent Giroud of The Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Sara S. Hodson of The Huntington Library and Laetitia Yeandle of The Folger Shakespeare Library responded to enquiries about manuscripts in their care. Leslie A. Morris of the Rosenbach Museum and Library and Christopher Sheppard of the Brotherton Collection, Leeds University Library were particularly helpful. Permissions to quote are gratefully acknowledged. Queries about Wrest and Boxley were dealt with by Nicola Smith of English Heritage, James Collett-White of Bedfordshire County Record Office and the staff of Kent Archives Office.

¹⁵⁶ London, 1637, F1^r.