

**Richard Lovelace:  
Royalist Poetry in Context,  
1639–1649**

**Susan Alice Clarke**

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy of

The Australian National University

**July 2010**

I, Susan Alice Clarke, hereby declare that, except where otherwise indicated in the customary manner and to the best of my knowledge and belief, this work is my own and it has not been submitted for a higher degree at any other university or institution.

..... July 2010

S.A Clarke

For  
Allen and Mary Pickering

*In memoriam*

## Acknowledgments

Many people have helped me to bring this study to completion. First, my supervisor, Dr Ian Higgins, has overseen the project from its inception. He has been patient and generous with his valuable advice. He has also encouraged further effort. I thank him for all aspects of his assistance. I could not have hoped for a better supervisor.

The Australian National University has supported my work through the provision of travel grants which facilitated visits to British research institutions, primarily the Bodleian Library, Oxford; The National Archives; and the Centre for Kentish Studies. I also profited from time spent at the British Library; the London Metropolitan Archives; and the University of Cambridge Library. Dr Johanna Parker, Librarian at Worcester College, Oxford, provided access to the College's resources on Lovelace and his editor, C.H. Wilkinson. The travel grants allowed me to attend conferences at the Centre for Seventeenth-Century Studies, Durham (2003), the 'Royalists and Royalism' conference at Clare College, Cambridge (2004), and 'Exile in the English Revolution' at the University of London (2006). I delivered papers which have been partially incorporated into the thesis at the first and last of these. The collegial atmosphere and discussion at the conferences were inspiring, for which I thank the organisers and participants.

Various academics in the United Kingdom and the United States have helpfully responded to my requests for assistance. Of particular note (and without diminishing the contribution of those not named specifically), Tim Raylor has been generous with ongoing support, including reading an early version of Chapter Six, part of which was also delivered as a paper at the Australian Universities Language and Literature Association Conference in Cairns (2005). Diana Dethloff was liberal with information relating to Peter Lely. Jason Peacey, then at the History of Parliament Trust, provided a pre-publication copy of the Trust's revealing biography of Sir William Lovelace the Elder, while David Scott provided a pre-publication copy of his paper 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642–49'. Kate Bennett provided information on the text of Aubrey's observations on Lovelace. Jacqueline Eales was welcoming in Kent and read an early version of parts of Chapter Two. Elizabeth Skerpan-Wheeler provided a copy of her unpublished paper on Lovelace's Beast

poems. David Norbrook, Nigel Smith and Blair Worden all helped with information. Daniel Lovelace and Anthony Adolph provided copies of their biographies of Francis Lovelace and Henry Jermyn.

Most of my research was undertaken using the facilities of the Australian National University Library (Document Delivery was notably helpful) and the National Library of Australia. Staff at the British Library, the British Museum, The National Archives, Duke Humphrey's, the Centre for Kentish Studies, the Heritage Centre at Greenwich, the National Trust, the London Metropolitan Archive and the West Sussex Records Office, the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, the Service Historique de l'Armée de Terre and the Dutch Archives have all provided research assistance at various times. Staff at the Guildhall Library gave generously of their time in the search for any record of Richard Lovelace's death. Julia McLaren of CPEDERF carried out research on my behalf at the Bibliothèque Nationale. Oxford University Press allowed the inclusion of copies of articles from *Notes and Queries* and the *Review of English Studies* in the Appendices. Worcester College, Oxford, the Dulwich Picture Gallery, the Archive of the House of Lords, The National Archives and the London Metropolitan Archive gave permission for the reproduction of images of items in their collections. Janet Salisbury, Meg Heaslop and Carrie DeHaan of Biotext, Canberra, helped cheerfully and efficiently with final proof reading and layout.

At a more personal level, Dusia Reichardt, who also studied Lovelace, has provided encouragement. David Game, Debbie Argue and I have shared the PhD experience in a way that made it much richer for me. Emily has barracked her mother along from the sidelines. Most importantly, without Peter's moral and actual support, this project could not have been undertaken, let alone completed. I thank him. In particular, I will always remember with unexpected pleasure the summer month we spent together checking footnotes and quotations.

Note to printer:

Replace this page with Plate 1 (full page)

Plate I John de Critz (attrib.), *Richard Lovelace* [?], c. 1636. Worcester College, University of Oxford (reproduced with permission).

## Abstract

This is a literary-critical, contextual study of important poems by Richard Lovelace (1617–1657) printed in *Lucasta* (1649). It is based on an examination of all Lovelace’s poems and manuscript remains, and of contemporary poems, pamphlets and newsbooks. Those of Lovelace’s poems selected for detailed examination emerge as activist interventions in royalist political debates of the 1630s and 1640s. Their place in the vibrant literary and polemical culture on which Lovelace drew, and to which he contributed, is as central to the study as the interpretations of the poems themselves.

Scholars have long interpreted Lovelace’s densely allusive poems as being disengaged from the royalist cause, or ‘neutralist’. I offer the first major reassessment of Lovelace’s biography since 1925. Significant new information on Lovelace’s life has come to light in manuscripts, contemporary literary and polemical texts and other printed sources, confirming Lovelace’s ongoing commitment to the royalist cause.

The poems chosen for the case studies reveal the complexities of Lovelace’s engagement with royalism. While his loyalty to the cause is constant, he is not blind to its perceived failings. Lovelace often emerges in the classical role of the poet as a source of independent counsel to his king. He invites his readers to discern meaning by constructing and juxtaposing allusions to classical, continental European and English language texts. Lovelace’s contemporaries would have been very familiar both with these texts and with the meaning(s) they had accreted over time. Lovelace’s intertextuality and fields of allusion are discussed in detail. Lovelace’s early love lyrics, ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’, ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’, ‘TO AMARANTHA, *That she would dishevell her haire*’ and ‘TO ALTHEA, *From Prison*’ emerge as engaging with the royal discourses of *honnête* platonic love and chivalric honour to which they demonstrably belong. In doing so, these poems contest the courtly lyrics of William Habington. ‘TO ALTHEA’ also reveals Lovelace’s early interest in an activist construction of the discourse of retirement or *otium* of the kind developed by the Dutch philosopher Justus Lipsius and appropriated by George Withers and others in prison poetry of 1617.

‘TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*’ shows Lovelace entertaining Lipsian expressions of the concepts of ‘love’ and ‘force’ as instruments of state policy, as he engages with the debates which dominated the months leading to the outbreak of war, including that on the *Nineteen Propositions*. In ‘AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*’ and ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’, Lovelace appropriates the allegorical identities of Chloris and Amyntor awarded to Charles I and Henrietta Maria in court literature, including in the songs of Henry Hughes. In doing so, he expresses his concern at the manner in which the king has allowed himself to be represented by parliamentarian propagandists as emasculated by his foreign, popish wife. I conclude with a new reading of ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ in the context of royalist polemic of 1647–1648. The poem emerges as a strong statement of support for the king and the royalist cause, one which is shown to cultivate the activist, Lipsian construction of retirement shown to be prevalent in royalist polemic leading up to the recurrence of civil war in 1648.

***Note on typography and texts***

The irregular typography of the seventeenth century tracts referred to in this study helps convey their energy and spontaneity. In an effort to communicate something of this aspect of the print culture of the time, in the text, I have replicated as far as possible the spelling and typography of the original printed sources, although I have silently corrected the archaic long s, j/i and u/v.

I have used modern, standard editions of other major literary works, again replicating spelling and typography.



# Contents

<b>Acknowledgments</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Plates</b> .....	<b>xi</b>
<b>Abbreviations</b> .....	<b>xii</b>
<b>Chapter One — Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Aims .....	6
Approach .....	14
<b>Chapter Two — Richard Lovelace: A Contested Life</b> .....	<b>27</b>
Genealogy .....	29
‘Meridian Light’ .....	37
The <i>Kentish Petition</i> , 1642.....	50
The War Years, 1642–1648 .....	60
London, 1647–1648 .....	64
Post-1648: Conspiracies .....	68
Last Years.....	72
Private Life and Views.....	78
<b>Chapter Three — Early Poems of Courtly Love and Honour</b> .....	<b>107</b>
Introduction .....	107
Platonic Love .....	111
‘TO LUCASTA, <i>Going beyond the Seas</i> ’ .....	118
Chivalric Honour.....	122
‘TO LUCASTA, <i>Going to the Warres</i> ’ .....	128
Reading the Poems .....	136
<b>Chapter Four — Seize the Day</b> .....	<b>151</b>
‘TO AMARANTHA, <i>That she would dishevell her haire</i> ’ .....	153
‘TO ALTHEA, <i>From Prison</i> ’ .....	165
<b>Chapter Five — Trust the King?: ‘TO LUCASTA. <i>From Prison</i>’</b> .....	<b>187</b>
Dating the Poem.....	188

‘An Epode’? .....	191
The Context .....	193
The Allusive Fields .....	196
Contesting Vocabularies .....	215
<b>Chapter Six — Lovelace, the Queen and Political Allegory: The</b>	
<b>War Years .....</b>	<b>227</b>
The Aliases .....	232
Lovelace’s Connections with the Court .....	239
‘AMYNTOR <i>from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS</i> ’ .....	241
‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE, <i>His CHLORIS, ARIGO, and GRATIANA.</i>	
<i>An Elogie</i> ’ .....	247
The Politics of the Poems .....	258
Where Does Lovelace Stand? .....	275
<b>Chapter Seven — ‘The Grasse-hopper’: A Royalist Call to Arms .....</b>	<b>290</b>
Critical History .....	292
The Text .....	295
Royalist Propaganda and Preparation for War, 1647–1648 .....	297
Classical Allusion and Royalist Propaganda .....	301
Reading ‘The Grasse-hopper’ .....	317
<b>Coda .....</b>	<b>329</b>
<b>Appendix I — Richard Lovelace: Key Dates .....</b>	<b>331</b>
<b>Appendix II — Anthony Wood: Richard Lovelace .....</b>	<b>334</b>
<b>Appendix III — ‘Richard Lovelace’s ‘The Falcon’ in Context’ .....</b>	<b>337</b>
<b>Appendix IV — ‘Richard Lovelace, Anthony Wood and some</b>	
<b>Previously Unremarked Documents’ .....</b>	<b>350</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>355</b>

## List of Plates

Plate I	John de Critz (attrib.), <i>Richard Lovelace</i> [?], c. 1636. Worcester College, Oxford.....	vi
Plate II	William Dobson (attrib.), <i>Richard Lovelace</i> , c. 1645. Dulwich Picture Gallery, London .....	101
Plate III	Richard Lovelace's petition to Parliament for release from prison .....	102
Plate IV	Indenture dated 10 October 1645 signed by Richard Lovelace .....	103
Plate V	Signature of Richard Lovelace on an indenture dated 29 March 1647..	104
Plate VI	Transcription of a verse of Richard Lovelace's poem 'THE SCRUTINIE' .....	105
Plate VII	Letter dated 9 February 1688 from Sir Edward Sherburne to Anthony Wood .....	106

## Abbreviations

<i>CCISP</i>	Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, <i>Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library</i> , ed. by O. Ogle and W.H. Bliss, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869–1970)
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Journals of the House of Commons*</i>
<i>CSPD</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series*</i>
<i>EEBO</i>	<i>Early English Books Online</i> . Electronic resource, Chadwyck-Healey, accessed National Library of Australia, Canberra, < <a href="http://eebo.chadwyck.com.rp.nla.gov.au:2048/home">http://eebo.chadwyck.com.rp.nla.gov.au:2048/home</a> >
Hazlitt	W.C. Hazlitt, ed., <i>Lucasta. The Poems of Richard Lovelace</i> (London, 1864)
<i>LJ</i>	<i>Journals of the House of Lords*</i>
<i>Lucasta</i>	Richard Lovelace, <i>Lucasta: Epodes, Odes, Sonnets, Songs, &amp;c. To Which Is Added Aramantha, a Pastorall</i> (London, 1649)
ODNB	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> . Electronic resource, Oxford University Press, accessed Australian National University, Canberra, < <a href="http://www.oxforddnb.com.virtual.anu.edu.au">http://www.oxforddnb.com.virtual.anu.edu.au</a> >
<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i> . Electronic resource, Oxford University Press, accessed Australian National University, Canberra, < <a href="http://dictionary.oed.com.virtual.anu.edu.au">http://dictionary.oed.com.virtual.anu.edu.au</a> >
<i>Poems</i>	Cyril Hackett Wilkinson, ed., <i>The Poems of Richard Lovelace</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930; repr. 1953)
<i>Poems</i> (1925)	Cyril Hackett Wilkinson, ed., <i>The Poems of Richard Lovelace</i> , 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925)
<i>Posthume Poems</i>	Richard Lovelace, <i>Lucasta: Postume Poems</i> (London, 1659)
<i>TSP</i>	Thomas Birch, ed., <i>A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq.</i> , 7 vols (London, 1742)
Wood	Anthony Wood, <i>Athenae Oxonienses</i> , 2 vols (London, 1691–92) II, cols 146–47, transcribed at Appendix II

\* Full publication details are given in the Bibliography.

# Chapter One —

## Introduction

To “historicize” an author means that one will place his works in the historical context in which they were, or are thought to have been written, and use that information not just to enhance one’s understanding of those works and their motivation, but to give them a political edge they might not otherwise show.

Annabel Patterson<sup>1</sup>

This is a literary critical, contextual study of important poems by Richard Lovelace (1617–1657) printed in *Lucasta* (1649). Formally entitled *Lucasta: Epodes, Odes, Sonnets, Songs, &c. To Which is Added Aramantha, A Pastorall*, the volume is a small octavo. It contains fifty-nine of Lovelace’s poems, including the long pastoral ‘Aramantha’, and fifteen dedicatory poems by Lovelace’s friends.<sup>2</sup> *Lucasta* was licensed for publication on 4 February 1648, but was not entered in the Stationers’ Register until 14 May 1649.<sup>3</sup> The publisher George Thomason annotated his copy, now in the British Library (E. 1373 [1]), on 21 June 1649, indicating that it was in circulation by that date.<sup>4</sup> Parliamentarian censors evidently caused the delay between licensing and publication, which covered the months preceding the second Civil War, royalist defeat, the king’s trial and the Regicide.<sup>5</sup> For part of this period, Lovelace was in prison where, according to his biographer Anthony Wood, ‘he fram’d his Poems for the Press’.<sup>6</sup>

The poems selected for examination are presented as case studies of how Lovelace’s canon can be seen as an activist intervention in royalist political debate of the 1630s and 1640s. Elucidation of the vibrant literary and polemical culture on which Lovelace drew, and to which he contributed, is as central to the study as the interpretations of the poems themselves. For almost a century, critics have tried to portray Lovelace’s lyrics, and those of other royalist poets of the period, as being removed from active engagement in politics and polemic. Critics have put forward three lines of reasoning in support of this argument. The first is that the best poems of the age were not tarnished by any association with grubby politics, but rather illuminated universal human experience. In supporting the poetry of Andrew Marvell (1621–1678) but condemning that of John Milton (1608–1674), the

Anglican and royalist T.S. Eliot defines the ‘the spirit of the age’ in which Milton, Marvell and Lovelace wrote as being ‘quite opposed to the tendencies latent or the forces active in Puritanism’.<sup>7</sup> John Strachey, in his review of C.H. Wilkinson’s two-volume Clarendon edition of Lovelace’s poems, echoes Eliot’s views when he writes that the ‘best verse is not tainted by the sufferings of the time’.<sup>8</sup> Strachey goes on to claim that neither a puritan like Andrew Marvell nor a cavalier like Lovelace ‘writes vindictively against his opponents [...] there is little or no partisanship’. Mario Praz, in his review, notes the quaintness of the verse: ‘only the great poets never appear quaint to us, because they are so much above the fashions of their own day’.<sup>9</sup>

In the light of more than sixty years of contextual studies of the history and literature of the reign of Charles I and the Interregnum (1625–1660), at first from the perspective of parliamentarian and dissenting voices, but more recently shifting towards royalist writing, the views typified by Eliot, Strachey and Praz are risible.<sup>10</sup> It seems unlikely — but not impossible — that intermittent attempts to suppress literary historical enquiry, with a view to a return to more aesthetic literary critical approaches, will be as successful as those occurring between the 1920s and the 1970s.<sup>11</sup> We now recognise the extent to which printed texts of this period — and others — were partisan and polemical. Steven Zwicker has argued that, with the outbreak of civil war in 1642, the nature and role of literature changed, assuming ‘increasing importance both as a site for and as a way of giving shape and authority to the conduct of polemical argument’.<sup>12</sup> To date, there is only one book-length study of a royalist poet of the period: that by Robert Wilcher on Sir John Suckling.<sup>13</sup> However, Lovelace’s poems have featured consistently in the critical literature since Don Cameron Allen’s 1957 essay on ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’.<sup>14</sup> As Thomas Corns has pointed out, during the 1640s, in an era of Puritan ascendancy, Lovelace’s lyrics of courtly and libertine eroticism are not ‘ideologically neutral’.<sup>15</sup> Poems like ‘TO AMARANTHA. *That she would dishevell her haire*’, which Corns characterises as ‘elegant smut’, challenge ‘both Puritan morality and propagandists’ stereotyping in its rehearsal of a value-system remote from the ideology of the new masters’.<sup>16</sup> Lovelace’s platonic poems, like ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’ and ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ equate courtly love with unqualified love of the king. Studies similar to Corns’s have identified the way in which other royalist

genres, including drinking poems and the literature defending old holiday pastimes, similarly contest the values of the puritan regime.<sup>17</sup>

The second line of reasoning used to support the notion that royalist poetry was removed from active engagement in politics invokes philosophies of retirement or *otium*. Its proponents argue that poets like Lovelace transcended ‘public disturbance through the more uplifting, private achievement of stoic or epicurean content’.<sup>18</sup> They appropriated the classical, medieval and renaissance discourses of retirement and retreat in the face of civil disturbance. In an attitude of ‘patient fortitude’, they withdrew to their country houses and gardens where they found virtuous ‘tranquility, wisdom, and patience’, and accepted whatever fate might deliver.<sup>19</sup> This line of reasoning is plausible because the neo-Stoic elements of poems like Lovelace’s ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ seem apparent. In ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’, the speaker and his ‘best of *Men and Friends*’ create ‘A Genuine Summer in each others breast’, waiting out the puritan winter of discontent. They retire into their country house, secure from the ravages of the puritan winter in the company of good friends, good wine and classical poetry.<sup>20</sup>

Raymond Anselment in *Loyalist Resolve* (1988) exemplifies the deployment of this approach. He describes the long, Senecan tradition of Stoic ‘patient fortitude’ which consoled Boethius (c. 420–524) as he faced death, and which sustained the Dutch philosopher Justus Lipsius (1547–1606) as he confronted civil war.<sup>21</sup> Anselment argues that poets like Lovelace survived defeat by retreating into private, Stoic ‘indifference’; in effect, by withdrawing from society into a virtuous life of self-sufficient contemplation and meditation:

A Stoic emphasis on “things indifferent” and “morally indifferent” minimized the importance of events external to the self with the assurance “we can do no more but undertake a matter with wisdom, pursue it with hope, and be ready to suffer whatsoever shall happen with patience.”<sup>22</sup>

He concludes that Lovelace’s struggle, as expressed in his lyrics, is essentially inward looking:

For him the heroic struggle was not on the battlefield, where he distinguished himself, but within the individual; and this inner struggle rather than the war itself remains the subject of his poetry. There in the celebration of the victory still possible in defeat he fulfilled the Augustan ideal of the poet/warrior.<sup>23</sup>

Often, Anselment’s readings of individual poems are sensitive and subtle, but they are skewed by his underlying thesis of Stoic retirement into indifference. Arguably,

Anselment has misinterpreted Justus Lipsius's Christian, neo-Stoic construction of retirement, which is essentially activist in nature.<sup>24</sup> As Gerhard Oestreich notes, the ultimate sense of Lipsian neo-Stoic retirement, *constantia* — from the title of Lipsius's key text, *De Constantia* (1584) — is an activist one. '*Constantia* is defined by Lipsius [...] "Many have prevailed by fighting, but not by fleeing".'<sup>25</sup>

James Loxley, in *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil War* (1997), blames Earl Miner's 1971 study, *The Cavalier Mode*, for recasting royalist commitment 'as an allegiance to the obvious virtues of the good life' and the containment of political zeal by 'a value system prizing the safety and security of disengagement from public affairs'.<sup>26</sup> Miner's work was, in turn, influenced by Maren-Sofie Røstvig's still relevant study of Stoic and neo-Stoic traditions in literature, *The Happy Man*.<sup>27</sup> According to Loxley, in Miner:

Even the military activism of Richard Lovelace is conveniently qualified by a "movement to within", which describes both the poet's distance from partisanship and Miner's own retreat to a discretely literary history.<sup>28</sup>

Loxley is too harsh on Miner, who re-historicised royalist poetry of the civil war years, despite the dominance of formalist criticism in the United States at the time. Anselment would have provided Loxley with a better stalking horse. Miner identified the 'social mode' of cavalier poetry and its advocacy of apparent retreat into retirement as an active statement of support for the king and his return to his throne, an approach most recently resuscitated by Nicholas McDowell.<sup>29</sup> He noted in relation to '*The Grasse-hopper*' that, for the royalist friends, 'full union is not possible until the King, the bishops, and the old celebration of Christmas [...] come back again'; that is, until the king is restored to his throne.<sup>30</sup> The opportunities for royalists like Lovelace to take action in support of the king may be limited by circumstances, but their continuing support for the cause is not in doubt. Miner's then groundbreaking historicising approach to the royalist poets represented a logical extension of work on Marvell and the 'Horatian Ode' in the context of the mid-twentieth century debate on the relative merits of aestheticising and historicising literary criticism between Cleanth Brooks and Douglas Bush.<sup>31</sup> Anselment's focus, on the other hand, is on patient fortitude, on accepting whatever fate may bring, including long term defeat. It is ironic that an argument developed by Miner to show royalist poets' ongoing engagement with the royalist cause should have been reshaped by Anselment to represent disengagement from political involvement.



Like Anselment, Loxley was apparently unaware of the alternative, activist construction of Lipsian neo-Stoicism which Andrew Shifflett elucidates in *Stoicism, Politics, and Literature in the Age of Milton*.<sup>32</sup> However, Loxley comes close to deriving it through his examination of the texts. He argues the activist, polemical nature of royalist poetry by placing the poems he discusses in a broader royalist literary and cultural context. Relying on analysis of classical and renaissance texts, Loxley points out that classical and renaissance constructions of the concept of retirement or *otium* were not uniformly celebratory. He notes that, traditionally, the alternative reading of *otium* as a vice dominated Roman literature.<sup>33</sup> Loxley compares Lovelace's 'The Grasse-hopper' with Martin Lluellyn's little-known elegy for the royalist hero Sir Bevil Grenville, probably written in 1643, which, like Lovelace's poem, appropriates and refracts Aesop's fable of the ant and the grasshopper.<sup>34</sup> He suggests that in the Grenville elegy, the fable is reconfigured. Where the 'idle grasshopper' lacks the resources to withstand the winter, the poet and the friend, 'more careful in the husbandry of their own resources, are able to continue their lives beyond the change in season'.<sup>35</sup> Like Grenville's, their careful husbandry provides the means for active resistance, rather than simply allowing survival.<sup>36</sup> I agree with Loxley's conclusions here, but as Michael Mendle points out in a review of Loxley's book, Loxley does engage in 'mental gymnastics': 'the necessary activism found in any utterance, and especially in publications [...] is turned into evidence that the royalist retirement was neither absolute nor final'.<sup>37</sup> Loxley's case would have been made more convincingly if he had taken the writings of Justus Lipsius into account.

The third line is a variant on the second, although it is based in history rather than philosophy. In his 1985 Chatterton Lecture on Lovelace, Gerald Hammond questioned 'the degree to which his poetry has been obscured by the label *cavalier*'.<sup>38</sup> He noted that, at times, Lovelace fails to deliver the 'expected cavalier sentiment'.<sup>39</sup> Hammond proposed a different Lovelace, a poet who moved towards 'militant neutralism' from early in the war years; one who 'developed politically from an instinctive cavalier into one who shares with Andrew Marvell the claim to be the great poet of the most wide-ranging political belief of the 1640s and early 1650s'.<sup>40</sup> Hammond's view of Lovelace's poems as 'neutralist' had its origins in the work of then dominant revisionist historians.<sup>41</sup> Alan Everitt, for example, argued

that Lovelace's county, Kent, like others, was 'overwhelmingly neutralist in its attitudes'.<sup>42</sup> Anselment also acknowledged the importance of the revisionist historians in forming his arguments. He suggested that 'the majority of the nation, in fact, was not eager to fight, and expressions of neutrality and desire for accommodation were particularly apparent at the outset of the war and again in 1645'.<sup>43</sup> More recent historical research does not support Everitt's and other revisionist historians' conclusions on the 'neutralism' of the counties.<sup>44</sup> The case studies of Lovelace's poems offered here, however, show that Lovelace's engagement with the royalist cause was more complex than the 'die-hard intransigence' argued by Corns, although that element is often present.<sup>45</sup>

## **Aims**

Appropriating the words of Annabel Patterson quoted in the epigraph, this study aims to place a number of Richard Lovelace's poems in the 'historical context in which they were, or are thought to have been written'.<sup>46</sup> Over the years, critics have found Lovelace's poems obscure.<sup>47</sup> Read outside of their historical and literary contexts, these densely allusive lyrics are, indeed, often difficult to understand. This study seeks to use contextual evidence 'to enhance one's understanding of those works and their motivation', and to restore to them the 'political edge', which contextual evidence indicates they would have had for Lovelace's community of readers. Why Lovelace? Lovelace is the most prominent of the cavalier poets of the war years, yet there has been no published monograph study of his work since Manfred Weidhorn's in 1970.<sup>48</sup> Lovelace's contemporaries remembered him as a loyalist, yet there is no evidence that he ever served the king after the Bishops' Wars or went to the courts-in-exile of Henrietta Maria or Charles II. Nor is there any hint that Lovelace engaged with the Cromwellian regime in the way Edmund Waller (1606–1687) certainly did and Abraham Cowley (1618–1667) may have done. Studies such as those by Corns, Loxley and McDowell locate Lovelace's poems as part of the broader royalist and civil war literary enterprise and within genres and forms particularly identified with royalists. They lack the detail that a single author study can offer.

The study opens with the first major reassessment of Lovelace's biography for nearly a century.<sup>49</sup> Critics have been able to speculate about the level of

Lovelace's commitment to the royalist cause partly because we know so little about the poet's life.<sup>50</sup> The accuracy of Anthony Wood's short biographical piece in the *Athenae Oxonienses* (Appendix II), which remains our main contemporary source of information on the poet, has consistently been questioned.<sup>51</sup> Even the most basic records, those of Lovelace's birth and death, are problematic. The only holograph document to survive is Lovelace's petition to the House of Lords, seeking his release from imprisonment in June 1642.<sup>52</sup> None other of Lovelace's personal or literary papers has surfaced, although a collection of indentures signed by the poet relating to the sale of lands in and around Bethersden in Kent, where Lovelace Place is located, came to light at the Centre for Kentish Studies during the course of this study.<sup>53</sup> The indentures had been preserved intact in massive iron chests at a Faversham solicitor's office, where they were located more than half a century ago by a local historian.<sup>54</sup>

The biography provides the foundation on which the case studies of the poems are built. In combination with the contextual evidence offered, it allows contestable assumptions to be made about the timing and political circumstances of the composition of otherwise undated texts. It brings together for the first time all that is currently known about Lovelace's life as a royalist, a poet and a political writer. It recuperates significant information from archival and other sources, which supports Wood's view that Lovelace expended his wealth in the royalist cause and remained committed to that cause until his death.<sup>55</sup> Archival traces have also emerged implicating Lovelace in royalist plotting in London during the 1650s. In the light of these findings, speculation that Lovelace somehow reduced his commitment to the royalist cause is no longer sustainable.

The biographical discoveries do not of themselves negate Hammond's argument that, in key poems, Lovelace refuses to deliver the 'expected cavalier sentiment'.<sup>56</sup> The obvious question is, why should they? As Blair Worden points out, the royalist cause comprised a complex coalition of interests. The range of judgement and feeling provoked by the conflict of cavalier and roundhead, and the vacillations of sentiment produced by its unforeseen events, could not be accommodated within fixed and starkly opposed viewpoints. Its faces 'ranged from piety to hedonism, from Calvinism to paganism'.<sup>57</sup> While royalists were united in their loyalty to King Charles, not all had necessarily supported him throughout the war years, nor admired him in 1648. We do serious poets like Lovelace a disservice

when we assume that their political views were narrow and inflexible over time; or that they were incapable of clear-sighted analysis of the evident weaknesses of their cause while at the same time maintaining loyalty to that cause; or that they were able to write only in one register. The case studies show that, like those royalists described in general terms by Worden, Lovelace's engagement with the royalist cause changed over time according to circumstances. Evidence also emerges that Lovelace tailored the content of his poems according to the audience for whom he was writing.

The case studies illuminate internal royalist polemic. Our knowledge of the early Caroline court is limited but expanding.<sup>58</sup> Recent work by the historians Malcolm Smuts and David Scott, in particular, extends our understanding of factional divisions within the court, both before and during the civil wars.<sup>59</sup> In the absence of diaries and personal papers, it is impossible to locate Lovelace within any of the shifting court factions with certainty. Nevertheless, the case studies show Lovelace exploring issues of loyalty and allegiance, of what it means to be a royalist. They also show Lovelace intervening in some of the most contentious political debates of the period. Zwicker notes the extent to which, during the seventeenth century, 'aesthetic forms and modes were claimed, contested, and deployed for explosive and highly articulate polemical purpose'.<sup>60</sup> With the coming of the civil war, polemic 'became a pervasive condition of literary production and reception.'<sup>61</sup> Lovelace participated in, and contributed to this polemicisation of literary culture.

In his 1998 Wharton Lecture, Corns discusses the generally held view that 'the profoundly and explicitly eroticised version of married chastity' promoted by Charles I and Henrietta Maria 'was at the centre of Caroline court culture'.<sup>62</sup> The case studies of the early poems consistently show Lovelace's speaker calling into play literary and other representations of the royal marriage, and of the cult of chivalry. Before the wars, in poems as varied as the platonic lyrics 'TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*' and 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*' (Chapter 3) and the libertine 'TO AMARANTHA, *That she would dishevell her haire*' (Chapter 4), the poems' intertexts show Lovelace's speaker expressing disquiet with the royal construction of platonic love, particularly the *honnête* form of platonism imported from France by Henrietta Maria and promoted, for example, in the poetry of William Habington (1605–1654).<sup>63</sup> Kevin Sharpe identified this kind of disquiet in the work

of the court poets and playwrights Thomas Carew (1594/5–1640) and William Davenant (1606–1652) in his study *Criticism and Compliment* (1987). Sharpe argues that Carew and Davenant rejected the metaphysics, ethics and politics of neo-Platonism on the Aristotelian basis that they perceived human nature as an entity consisting of body and soul, of physical and spiritual attributes, which must be integrated rather than denied.<sup>64</sup> The case studies show that Lovelace shared Carew's and Davenant's disquiet, demonstrated in part through his frequent allusions to their work. During the war years, in poems like 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*' and 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE, *His CHLORIS, ARIGO, and GRATIANA*' (Chapter 6), Lovelace develops this disquiet into a regretful disapproval of the manner in which Charles I allowed himself to be portrayed as being emasculated by his dependence on his foreign, popish queen.<sup>65</sup> The use of 'Chloris' as an allegorical cognomen for Henrietta Maria is now well established.<sup>66</sup> Using contextual information, I place 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE' at the queen's London palace of Somerset House, a location inextricably associated with the performance of Roman Catholicism. Lovelace is critical of those (including himself) who closed their eyes to the dangers the association with Roman Catholicism posed to the state in the pre-war years. Notably, he does not extend his criticism of the king to open condemnation of the masculine elements of the cult of chivalry espoused by Charles I. However, he does assert the classical duty of the poet to provide independent advice to his ruler.

Margoliouth suggested more than eighty years ago that 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' (Chapter 5), Lovelace's least opaque contribution to political debate, rehearsed the provisions of the *Kentish Petition* of 1642, a view recently contested by Nicholas McDowell.<sup>67</sup> Analysis of 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' in the context of the explosion of printed polemic of 1642 supports Margoliouth's view. The *Kentish Petition* — and Lovelace's poem — both rehearse key royalist arguments being played out through the campaign of petitions, pamphlets, tracts and in the king's correspondence with Parliament in the months before the outbreak of war, particularly in relation to the *Nineteen Propositions*. After this brief foray into overt polemic, Lovelace retreats behind the protective veil of allusion, allegory and fable, which would have been easily interpretable to his community of readers. He reverts

to the familiar imagery of the pre-war court masque and classical allusion to enter into conversation with fellow royalists.

One of the most important findings here for royalist studies more generally is the extent to which Lovelace engaged in his poems with the thinking of Justus Lipsius. Malcolm Smuts and David Scott have recently argued that Lipsian thought was more widely accepted in England than has previously been appreciated.<sup>68</sup> Contextual analysis of 'TO LUCASTA, *From Prison*' shows Lovelace entertaining Lipsian expressions of the concepts of 'love' and 'force' as instruments of state policy.<sup>69</sup> The analyses of 'TO ALTHEA, *From Prison*' (Chapter 4) and '*The Grasse-hopper*' (Chapter 7) reveal Lovelace's, and other royalist writers', interest in Lipsius's activist construction of neo-Stoic retirement.<sup>70</sup> For Lipsius, the state of war is a normal part of the human condition.<sup>71</sup> A man stands and fights, for those 'that for fear turn their backs to their enemies are in the greater danger [...] Above all things it befits you to be constant; for by fighting, many a man has gotten the victory, but none by fleeing'.<sup>72</sup> Gerhard Oestreich, in the standard text on Lipsius, deals at length with Lipsius's paradoxical activist construction of retirement.<sup>73</sup> He notes that Lipsius's ideal individual in the political world is 'the citizen who acts according to reason, is answerable to himself, controls his emotions, and is ready to fight'.<sup>74</sup> This activist construction was identified by Andrew Shifflett in *Stoicism, Politics, and Literature in the Age of Milton* as being important in the writing of Marvell, Milton and the younger poet, Katherine Philips. While it is present in the classical sources he quotes, Vickers (on whom Loxley relied) does not take note of Lipsius's contribution to the definition of *otium* in his detailed discussion of classical and renaissance constructions of the topos.<sup>75</sup> It is diametrically opposed to the view of Lipsius's promotion of stoic indifference put forward by Anselment in *Loyalist Resolve*.<sup>76</sup> In Lovelace's 'TO ALTHEA', Lipsius's activist construction is filtered through the writings of the prison poets of 1614, including those of George Wither, and the work of French Huguenot, François de La Noue, translated and published in Sylvester's *Du Bartas*.<sup>77</sup> Lipsian neo-Stoic activist retirement is a notable presence in royalist writing of late 1647 and early 1648, including in the king's intransigent letter to Parliament of 28 December 1647 after he reached a secret agreement with the Scots.<sup>78</sup> Read in this context, '*The Grasse-hopper*' emerges as a strong statement

of support for the king and the royalist cause, in effect a call to action in the months leading up to the outbreak of war.

The elastic concept of ‘intertextuality’ underpins this study. The term was famously coined by the post-structuralist literary theorist Julia Kristeva in *Semiotikè* in the mid-1960s in Paris, in which she introduced and amplified the work of the Russian literary theorist, M.M. Bakhtin.<sup>79</sup> Kristeva defined intertextuality in her essay, ‘Word, Dialogue, Novel’, as ‘a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another’.<sup>80</sup> That is, texts cannot ‘be separated from the larger cultural or social textuality out of which they are constructed’.<sup>81</sup> It is in this context that Kristeva introduces Bakhtin’s concept of dialogical writing. The problem with the term ‘intertextuality’, as Graham Allen points out, is that it is ‘one of the most commonly used and misused terms in contemporary critical vocabulary’.<sup>82</sup> He goes on to note that ‘such a term is in danger of meaning nothing more than whatever each particular critic wishes it to mean’. William Irwin seeks a more honest use of the term intertextuality, which, he notes, was developed in the context of the French theoretical shift in interpretive power from the author to the reader. He sees it as an attempt to reclothe the ‘hackneyed’ New Critical habit of ‘interpretive pluralism’, which removed the text from its context and intentionality from the author, ‘in fine French garb courtesy of Foucault, Barthes, Kristeva, Derrida, and company’.<sup>83</sup> Irwin argues that ‘at its worst, intertextuality becomes fashionable jargon for traditional notions such as allusion and source study’.<sup>84</sup>

The case studies offered here certainly involve traditional study of classical and contemporary sources on which Lovelace draws in constructing his densely allusive poems. Kristeva’s concept of intertextuality aptly represents the literary practice adopted by Lovelace and his contemporaries. Arguably, its use is more clearly defined in early modern literary studies than in some other areas of enquiry. The concept of the ‘knowing reader’ mentioned so often in the introductory pages to texts of this period, the reader who is conscious of the sources to which the author refers and the issues under consideration in the debate to which a particular text contributes, is fundamental to our understanding of the literature of the civil wars years. Lois Potter in her groundbreaking study of royalists’ self-conscious use of literary codes to bolster oppositional identity, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing* (1989) and Paul Hammond in *The Making of Restoration Poetry* (2006) describe and discuss

the importance of intertextuality in the literature of the mid to late seventeenth century.<sup>85</sup> Potter sets the framework with a consideration of ‘the widespread phenomenon of literary borrowing — borrowing, that is, not merely of the language of other writers but also of the persona which is created by that language’.<sup>86</sup> She notes the existence of the precondition for intertextual reading, the ‘common area of reference’, which resulted from a standard curriculum (for those like Lovelace lucky enough to participate in secondary and tertiary education) and the ‘stress laid on memory’ and repetition, including in commonplace books and through the miscellanies, at school and in later life.<sup>87</sup> Potter also notes that most published renaissance works are ‘scrupulous in the acknowledgement of classical and biblical sources’.<sup>88</sup> Where the allusion is to a text in English, it ‘can easily be confused with the author’s own words. This means that the identification of an author may serve a purpose separate from that of the quotation itself’.<sup>89</sup> Potter illustrates with examples the manner in which royalist writers drew on a range of biblical, classical and contemporary sources in both literary and polemical writing, shaping and sharing tropes until they carried a particular meaning for royalist literary communities.

Hammond’s discussion, published almost twenty years after Potter’s, is more assured, although it covers similar ground. Hammond is writing in this case in the context of the Restoration poets, but his comments are equally relevant to intertextual writing during the preceding years. He opens with the assertion that ‘all poetry in some degree works intertextually, aware if only implicitly of the traditions within which it locates itself, using a vocabulary which is shaped by its predecessors and shared by its contemporaries’.<sup>90</sup> He argues that ‘the poetry of the Restoration is self-conscious and self-referential to an unusual degree’ in part because of the political upheavals of the previous years, but also because of the way in which ‘political changes were debated in the public press, in prose pamphlets and in verse’.<sup>91</sup> Political poems of the period fashion a ‘textual community’ as the author draws on a wide range of poetic, philosophical, and theological ideas through intertextual references, knowledge of which is shared with readers.<sup>92</sup> Words like ‘liberty’, ‘arbitrary’ and ‘tyranny’ (which, incidentally, were as much in use during the debates of 1614 and during the civil war years and the Interregnum as they were after the Restoration) were subject to repetition and reuse over time to the extent that they became ‘counters which were used and reused’.<sup>93</sup> Within the textual communities



formed by the circulation of letters, newspapers, and verses, ‘there emerged an acute consciousness of the semantic field of such terms, and their emotive charge’.<sup>94</sup>

According to Hammond, who is reworking Kristeva’s famous essay here, through the use of allusion and other forms of intertextual reference, the poet creates ‘an imaginatively complex space in response to the unsatisfactory complexities of the political world’.<sup>95</sup> The spaces which are opened up, the ‘worlds elsewhere’ are, ‘in effect kinds of paradise for the writer’s and the reader’s imagination’.<sup>96</sup> Hammond takes from Kristeva the metaphor of a piece of woven fabric to describe how poems work intertextually.<sup>97</sup> The case studies which follow show the wide-ranging nature of the threads Lovelace uses to weave his political poems. These include allusions to the classics and renaissance and contemporary European literary writers, and to the printed newsbooks, tracts, speeches, letters and parliamentary papers of the period, both royalist and parliamentarian. His frames of reference indicate that he is interacting more with other royalists and moderate, anti-Presbyterian parliamentarians, rather than attempting to engage with more radical views. His most frequently appropriated frame of reference is the pre-war court masque. He temporarily returns his readers to that world, before reminding them that not everything was halcyon before the war years. Rather than stating his intent, Lovelace’s habit is to juxtapose contrasting textual allusions, generic forms and concepts. He creates an imaginatively complex space of the kind conceptualised by Kristeva for his readers to occupy, one within which they can develop their understanding of the text in line with their knowledge of its context. In poems like ‘TO AMARANTHA’, there is a real sense that Lovelace wants his readers to let their imaginations play within the allusive frameworks he develops.

As Hammond is well aware, the explosion of a polemical print culture he refers to occurred during the civil war years.<sup>98</sup> There is now a measure of agreement (among early modern scholars, at least) that the ‘bourgeois public sphere’, first defined by Jürgen Habermas as emerging during the Enlightenment, was in evidence in England much earlier.<sup>99</sup> Peter Lake and Steve Pincus argue the existence of a post-Reformation public sphere, which they define by describing its activities. They note the ‘unprecedented proliferation of newsprint, polemic, propaganda, and petitioning’ which was reinforced by the ‘process of fragmentation’ caused by the unprecedented events of the 1640s and 1650s and which in turn increased demand

for printed material.<sup>100</sup> Lake and Pincus suggest that public discursive activity peaked in the civil war years as ‘grandees and their often more radical supporters and clients struggled for control of the political or ideological agenda [...] What was new [...] was the intensity, speed, and sheer volume of popular and public political discussion’.<sup>101</sup> After the Restoration, public discussion never returned to the relative quiescence of the mid-1630s. Rather, it ebbed and flowed, with spikes of activity during periods of crisis.

The existence of the post-Reformation public sphere described by Lake and Pincus both pre-supposes and creates the kind of interpretive literary communities in which Lovelace participated.<sup>102</sup> We know that Lovelace mixed with artists and court musicians, as well as being a notable figure at court. McDowell’s recent monograph, *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars*, deals in depth with the literary community which developed around Lovelace’s cousin, Sir Thomas Stanley (1625–1678) between 1646 and the Regicide, of which Lovelace was a member. He argues that Stanley fostered a ‘culture of poetic experimentation and competitiveness’, in which both Marvell and Lovelace played important roles.<sup>103</sup> McDowell is right in identifying the importance of Stanley’s group for Lovelace. As discussed in Chapter 2, it would have provided a congenial environment in which Lovelace could re-ignite his enthusiasm for the royalist cause after the defeat of 1646 and return to active participation in royalist writing.<sup>104</sup> It is also likely that the group’s focus on translation from the classics and continental European writers expanded Lovelace’s frames of reference. However, this study shows that, as well as being a central member of the Stanley group, Lovelace was at least on the edges of the group of royalist writers which produced the newsbooks and tracts actively supporting royalist political efforts at the time.

## **Approach**

The original aim of this study was to test the extent to which the poems of the royalist civil war poet Richard Lovelace are susceptible to the kind of historicising and politicising contextual and intertextual analysis which has been so successful in relation to the poems of Marvell, Milton and Dryden.<sup>105</sup> The approach was trialled in the article ‘“Bright Heir t’ th’ Bird Imperial’: Richard Lovelace’s ‘The Falcon’ in Context’, which was accepted for publication by the *Review of English Studies*.<sup>106</sup>

A copy of the article is at Appendix III. The poems for the case studies were selected from the 1649 *Lucasta* (rather than some from the *Posthume Poems*) to show how Lovelace interacted with the royalist cause before the Regicide, while there was still some hope of accommodation with Parliament. The published analysis of ‘*The Falcon*’ shows that the approach is similarly applicable to the *Posthume Poems*.<sup>107</sup> The possibilities that might open up from a comprehensive review of Lovelace’s biography became obvious during a study visit to the Centre for Kentish Studies, The National Archives, and the British and Bodleian libraries—the outcome of which was published in *Notes and Queries* (see Appendix IV).

The study is interdisciplinary in that it draws extensively on the work of historians in the fields of politics, cultural studies, art and music. It considers a wide range of primary sources, many of which are more usually studied within these fields. Most of the quoted primary sources are to be found in the Thomason Tracts, the material collected between 1640 and 1661 by the publisher and bookseller George Thomason (c. 1602–1666), reproductions of which are now available online.<sup>108</sup> The historian Blair Worden, one of the first to introduce the study of literary texts into more traditional historical enquiry, recently characterised a discipline-bound approach to studies of the period nicely:

Historians, when they do take notice of poetry, tend to raid it: to detach the content of the poem, especially its most quotable content, from its properties of form and genre. That naivete is a recipe for misinterpretation — but no more so than so than the separation of a literary text from its historical context.<sup>109</sup>

The contextual background to Lovelace’s poems constructed here from various disciplines is integral to understanding how his readers might have understood the texts. I have sought to achieve a balance between literary analysis and historical contextualisation in the study overall. Wilcher, in the ‘Introduction’ to his recent contextual study of the works of Sir John Suckling (c. 1609–c. 1641), discusses the ways in which text and context can usefully be related in studies like this.<sup>110</sup> Drawing on the work of Lauro Martines and (later) Robert Hume, Wilcher argues that ‘to see a text as a simple reflection of its background and to ignore the fact that “the connecting lines are not direct” but “devious, unsteady, and perplexing” ‘is inadequate.<sup>111</sup> This study seeks to illuminate some of those ‘devious, unsteady, and perplexing’ traces. In doing so, it has the capacity to throw new light on the writing of Lovelace’s contemporaries. Like Wilcher, I have engaged in a ‘certain amount of

speculation in the absence of hard facts'.<sup>112</sup> Where this is the case, it is clearly signalled in the text.

Alastair Fowler has recently commented on the problems inherent in treating all poetry as political. He muses that 'anything may be politics to someone; but politics isn't everything to everyone'.<sup>113</sup> I use the term 'politics' in the narrow sense of matters relating to government and affairs of state, including the day-to-day politics of the courts of Charles I and Henrietta Maria. Only one of Lovelace's poems in the 1649 *Lucasta*, 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*', openly discusses political concepts. The balance of the case studies are poems in which the political edge is very lightly concealed. I have avoided a range of other interpretative approaches to the politics of the poems. As Loxley indicates, the literature of the civil wars has not proved amenable to New Historicist readings of culture and authority, which explore the operations of a totalising power.<sup>114</sup> In an era of profound destabilisation of the machinery of government, of civil war and regicide, one would have to stretch credibility to accommodate any concept of totalising power in a meaningful way. Gerald Hammond has written at length on Lovelace's habits of obscurity.<sup>115</sup> It is likely that Lovelace felt the need to conceal his subject matter in part to avoid aggravating Parliament unnecessarily. The subject of censorship in the civil war years, including of Lovelace's *Lucasta*, has attracted sustained attention over the years, most recently by Randy Robertson.<sup>116</sup> Given Robertson's treatment, I have dealt with issues relating to censorship largely by citation. Lovelace's poems have also provided a rich site for feminist analysis.<sup>117</sup> The politics of gender are dealt with in this study as they relate to the politics of the early Caroline court, and in the context of Parliament's use of damaging representations of dominant female power in the relationship between the king and queen. Lovelace, a member of the upper gentry and prominent at court in the pre-war years, writes as a member of the cultural and economic elites. Poems like 'ELINDA'S GLOVE', which are susceptible to analysis in terms of the politics of class, are not dealt with here.<sup>118</sup> Issues of patronage are also passed over. There is no evidence of wide manuscript circulation of Lovelace's poems.<sup>119</sup> Textual and related issues are dealt with as they arise in relation to specific poems.

With one exception, the poems selected for the case studies in subsequent chapters are recognised as being among the most important examples of Lovelace's

work. The little-known ‘AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*’ is a companion piece to ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’.<sup>120</sup> Once the allegorical identities of the protagonists of ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’ are identified as Charles I and Henrietta Maria, ‘AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*’ emerges as an important statement of Lovelace’s apparent, if temporary, disenchantment with the king, and a statement of poetic independence. The case studies cover a wide range of the poetic forms favoured by Lovelace, including courtly platonics, anti-platonics, prison poems, pastoral allegory and fable. The assumptions underpinning what must, in the absence of better information, be provisional datings for the poems, are clearly set out.

It has long been argued that Marvell, the better known poet, owes more to Lovelace than is generally credited.<sup>121</sup> The temptation is always to associate Lovelace’s work with Marvell’s. However, incorporation of the extensive literature on Marvell, recently summarised in Nigel Smith’s variorum edition of the *Poems*, would inevitably have shifted the focus of the study away from Lovelace. Marvell, his poems and Smith’s variorum edition are a (mostly) silent, intertextual presence throughout. In many cases, Lovelace and Marvell explore and contest the same range of intertexts in creating their imaginative worlds. Their conclusions may be at variance, but their approach is the same. It would be foolish to assert that Lovelace is as fine a poet as Marvell. His verse lacks the lapidary quality of his contemporary’s. It is, however, clear, that Lovelace, perhaps with classical precedents for this kind of writing in mind, cultivated the same textual fields as those appropriated by Marvell. Arguably, in the process, Lovelace, who had started exploring this kind of intertextual writing before the wars, revealed its possibilities to Marvell.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Annabel Patterson, 'His Singing Robes', *Milton Studies*, 48 (2008), 178-94 (p. 178).

<sup>2</sup> The volume and its variant states is described in the standard edition of Lovelace's poems, *The Poems of Richard Lovelace*, ed. by Cyril Hackett Wilkinson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930 (repr. 1953)), pp. lxxiii–xxxvii. All future references to the *Poems* are to this edition.

<sup>3</sup> George Edward Briscoe Eyre, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers: From 1640-1708 A.D.*, Facsimile of 1913 edn, 3 vols (New York: Peter Smith, 1950), p. 318.

<sup>4</sup> I have used the Thomason copy as the reference text. All subsequent references to *Lucasta* are to this volume.

<sup>5</sup> The circumstances surrounding the publication of *Lucasta* have been the subject of considerable discussion and speculation; see Chs 2 and 7.

<sup>6</sup> Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 2 vols (London, 1691-92), II, cols 146-47. Wood's biography of Lovelace is transcribed at Appendix II.

<sup>7</sup> T.S. Eliot, 'Andrew Marvell (1921)', in *Selected Essays* (London: Faber and Faber, 1951), 292-304 (p. 294).

<sup>8</sup> J. St. Loe Strachey, 'The Poems of Richard Lovelace. Ed. by C.H. Wilkinson.', *Spectator*, 136 (1926), 802. Eliot, p. 294.

<sup>9</sup> Mario Praz, 'The Poems of Richard Lovelace. Ed. by C.H. Wilkinson.', *Modern Language Review*, 21 (1926), 319-22 (p. 321-22).

<sup>10</sup> For very early studies, see: Cleanth Brooks, 'Criticism and Literary History: Marvell's 'Horatian Ode'', *Sewanee Review*, 55 (1947), 199-222; Cleanth Brooks, 'A Note on the Limits of "History" and the Limits of "Criticism"', *Sewanee Review*, 61 (1953), 129-35; Douglas Bush, 'Marvell's 'Horatian Ode'', *Sewanee Review*, 60 (1952), 363-76; Christopher Hill, 'Society and Andrew Marvell', *Modern Quarterly*, 1, N.S. (1946), 6-31.

Recent general surveys include: Thomas N. Corns, *A History of Seventeenth-Century English Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), Chs 4-5; David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England: 1640-1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994). Major monographs and essay collections on royalist pre-war court culture and politics include: Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday, eds., *Literature and the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981); Kevin Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Kevin Sharpe, *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies* (London: Pinter, 1989); Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, eds., *Culture and Politics in Early*

*Stuart England* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994); Kevin Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwicker, eds., *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987); R. Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987).

On royalism and royalist literature: Jerome De Groot, *Royalist Identities* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004); Gerald Hammond, *Fleeting Things: English Poets and Poems, 1616-1660* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990); Nicholas McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars: Marvell and the Cause of Wit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008); Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Joshua Scodel, *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002); David Scott, 'Counsel and Cabal in the King's Party, 1642-1646', in *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars*, ed. Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 112-35; Robert Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism: 1628-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

On Lovelace, see, for example Don Cameron Allen, 'An Explication of Lovelace's "The Grasse-hopper"', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 18 (1957), 35-43; Raymond A. Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1988), pp. 97-126; Thomas N. Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992); Gerald Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 71 (1985), 203-34; Bruce King, 'Green Ice and a Breast of Proof', *College English*, 26 (1965), 511-15; Bruce King, '"The Grasse-hopper" and Allegory', *Ariel: A Review of International English Literature*, 1 (1970), 71-82; James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997); Manfred Weidhorn, *Richard Lovelace* (New York: Twayne, 1970).

On Lovelace and gender, see, for example: M.L. Donnelly, 'The Rack of Fancy and the Trade of Love: Conventions of Précieux and Libertin in Amatory Lyrics by Suckling and Carew', in *Renaissance Discourses of Desire*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1993), 107-29; Achsah Guibbory, 'Sexual Politics/Political Sex: Seventeenth-Century Love Poetry', in *Renaissance Discourses of Desire*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1993), 206-22. See also, Dossia Reichardt, 'Looking for Lovelace: Identity, Style and Inheritance in the Poetry of the Interregnum', (Unpublished PhD thesis, James Cook University, 2003).

On Lovelace and censorship, see A. Randolph Robertson, 'Lovelace and the "Barbed Censurers": *Lucasta* and Civil War Censorship', *Studies in Philology*, 103 (2006), 465-98. I have referred to the article, rather than either the earlier thesis version or the monograph, which came to hand after this study was completed: A. Randolph Robertson, 'The Subtle Art of Division: Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England', (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Washington, 2002); A.

Randolph Robertson, *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England: The Subtle Art of Division* (University Park, Pennsylvania: State University Press, 2009).

On polemic: Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2007); Jason Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, Hants.: Ashgate, 2004); Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641-1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); Joad Raymond, 'The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century', *Prose Studies: History, Theory, Criticism*, 21 (1998), 109-40.

On Henrietta Maria: Karen Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Erica Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Michelle Anne White, *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

<sup>11</sup> See, for example, Stanley Fish, 'Why Milton Matters: Or, Against Historicism', *Milton Studies*, 44 (2005), 1-12.

<sup>12</sup> Steven N. Zwicker, *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649-1689* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), p. 10.

<sup>13</sup> Robert Wilcher, *The Discontented Cavalier: The Work of Sir John Suckling in Its Social, Religious, Political, and Literary Contexts* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007).

<sup>14</sup> Allen, 'An Explication'.

<sup>15</sup> Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, p. 75.

<sup>16</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 6-7. Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, pp. 75-76.

<sup>17</sup> Leah S. Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); Adam Smyth, ed., *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: D.S. Brewer, 2004).

<sup>18</sup> Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 1.

<sup>19</sup> Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*, pp. 13.

<sup>20</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 34-36.

<sup>21</sup> Anselment, p. 13-14.

<sup>22</sup> Anselment, p. 14, quoting Guillaume Du Vair, *The Moral Philosophie of the Stoicks, Englished by Thomas James*, ed. Rudolph Kirk (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1951), p. 127.

<sup>23</sup> Anselment, p. 126.

<sup>24</sup> Justus Lipsius, *Six Bookes of Politickes or Civil Doctrine*, trans. William Jones (London, 1594); Justus Lipsius, *On Constancy*, ed. John Sellars, trans. Sir John Stradling (Exeter: Bristol Phoenix Press, 2006).

<sup>25</sup> Gerhard Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State*, ed. Brigitta Oestreich and H.G. Koenigsberger, trans. David McLintock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 29.

<sup>26</sup> Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 2.



- <sup>27</sup> Maren-Sofie Røstvig, *The Happy Man: Studies in the Metamorphoses of a Classical Ideal*, 2nd edn, vol. I (Oslo: Norwegian Universities Press, 1962).
- <sup>28</sup> Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 2; Earl Miner, *The Cavalier Mode From Jonson to Cotton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), p. 63.
- <sup>29</sup> McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*.
- <sup>30</sup> Miner, p. 5.
- <sup>31</sup> See, for example, Brooks, 'Criticism and Literary History: Marvell's 'Horatian Ode''; Brooks, 'A Note on the Limits of "History" and the Limits of "Criticism"'; Bush, 'Marvell's Horatian Ode'; Hill, *Society and Andrew Marvell*.
- <sup>32</sup> Andrew Shifflett, *Stoicism, Politics, and Literature in the Age of Milton: War and Peace Reconciled* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). Loxley and Shifflett are reviewed and compared in Michael Mendle, 'An Enduring Discourse Community?: Some Studies in Early Modern English History and Culture', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 53 (2000), 222-38 (pp. 234-37).
- <sup>33</sup> Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 202; Brian Vickers, 'Leisure and Idleness in the Renaissance: The Ambivalence of Otium', *Renaissance Studies*, 4 (1990), 1-37, 107-54.
- <sup>34</sup> Loxley, p. 220.
- <sup>35</sup> Loxley, p. 220.
- <sup>36</sup> Loxley, p. 221.
- <sup>37</sup> Mendle, 'An Enduring Discourse Community', p. 235.
- <sup>38</sup> Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', p. 203. On the development and connotations of the term 'cavalier', see Wilcher, *The Discontented Cavalier: The Work of Sir John Suckling in Its Social, Religious, Political, and Literary Contexts*, pp. 334-36.
- <sup>39</sup> Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', p. 213.
- <sup>40</sup> Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', p. 215.
- <sup>41</sup> On the revisionist historians see, for example, Ronald Hutton, *Debates in Stuart History* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), particularly Ch. 1. Glenn Burgess, 'On Revisionism: An Analysis of Early Stuart Historiography in the 1970s and 1980s', *Historical Journal*, 33 (1990), 609-27, is still helpful.
- <sup>42</sup> Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', p. 216. Hammond quotes Alan Everitt, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1966), p. 96.
- <sup>43</sup> Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*, pp. 16 and 187, n. 32.
- <sup>44</sup> Ch. 2 and see, for example, Jacqueline Eales, 'The Rise of Ideological Politics in Kent, 1558-1640', in *Early Modern Kent, 1540-1640*, ed. Michael Zell (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2000), 279-313; Jacqueline Eales, 'Kent and the English Civil Wars, 1640-1660', in *Government and Politics in Kent, 1640-1914*, ed. Frederick Lansberry (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2001), 1-32.
- <sup>45</sup> Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, p. 79.

<sup>46</sup> Patterson, 'His Singing Robes', p. 132.

<sup>47</sup> For trenchant criticism, see Praz, *Poems of Richard Lovelace*.

<sup>48</sup> Major unpublished theses solely dealing with Lovelace include Erna Kelly, 'Richard Lovelace: Imprisonment and Escape', (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1979); Catherine Sylvia Ker, 'A Bibliography of Lovelace', (Unpublished masters thesis, University of London, 1949); Mark Carpenter McPherson, 'The Life, Reputation and Poetry of Richard Lovelace', (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1983); Dosia Reichardt, 'Looking for Lovelace: Identity, Style and Inheritance in the Poetry of the Interregnum', (Unpublished PhD thesis, James Cook University, 2003); Christopher John Wortham, 'The Poetry of Richard Lovelace: A Study of His Poetic Works, Considered in the Context of His Life and Times', (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 1974).

<sup>49</sup> *Poems* (1925); Cyril Hughes Hartmann, *The Cavalier Spirit and its Influence on the Life and Work of Richard Lovelace (1618-1658)* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1925). See also A.J. Pearman, 'The Kentish Family of Lovelace', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 10 (1876), 184-220; A.J. Pearman, 'The Kentish Family of Lovelace II', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 20 (1893), 54-63; J. Hall Pleasants, 'The Gorsuch and Lovelace Families', *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 26 (1918), 81-93; J. Hall Pleasants, 'The Lovelace Family and its Connections', *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 27 (1919), 393-408; 28 (1920), 83-90, 176-187, 285-295, 375-381, 29 (1921), 110-124, 227-243; J. Hall Pleasants, 'Francis Lovelace, Governor of New York, 1668-1673', *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record*, 51 (1920), 175-94; Arthur E. Waite, 'Richard Lovelace', *Gentleman's Magazine*, (1884), 459-77. Wilkinson in the *Poems* relied heavily on Pearman and Waite. I have largely discounted Waite. Many of his findings are contestable; those which are not are better dealt with by Pearman and Pleasants. Pleasants was a U.S. genealogist and antiquarian. Wilkinson was apparently unaware of his work, or chose to discount it.

<sup>50</sup> Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, p. 245.

<sup>51</sup> Susan A. Clarke, 'Richard Lovelace, Anthony Wood, and some Previously Unremarked Lovelace Documents', *Notes and Queries*, 249 (2004), 362-66, reproduced at Appendix IV.

<sup>52</sup> London, House of Lords HL/PO/JO/10/1/125A, reproduced at Plate III. A schedule of manuscripts and other primary sources which identify key events in Lovelace's life is at Appendix I.

<sup>53</sup> Maidstone, Centre for Kentish Studies, U2035.

<sup>54</sup> Robert H. Goodsall, *Stede Hill: The Annals of a Kentish Home* (London: Headley Brothers, 1949), p. vii.

<sup>55</sup> See Ch. 2; see also Clarke, Appendix IV.

<sup>56</sup> Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', p. 213.

<sup>57</sup> Blair Worden, *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 57.

<sup>58</sup> Julie Sanders, 'Caroline Salon Culture and Female Agency: The Countess of Carlisle, Henrietta Maria, and Public Theatre', *Theatre Journal*, 52 (2000), 449-64 (p. 449). Recent, helpful interdisciplinary collections of essays include: John Adamson, ed., *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-49* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders, eds., *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006); Jason McElligott and David L. Smith, eds., *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). Specific essays are referred to in the text. On the court in exile, see also Geoffrey Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640-1660* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

<sup>59</sup> Scott 'Counsel and Cabal'; David Scott, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642-49', in *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-49*, ed. John Adamson (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 36-60; R. Malcolm Smuts, 'The Puritan Followers of Henrietta Maria in the 1630s', *English Historical Review*, 93 (1978), 26-45; R. Malcolm Smuts, 'Political Thought in Early Stuart Britain', in *A Companion to Stuart Britain*, ed. Barry Coward (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003), 271-89; R. Malcolm Smuts, 'Force, Love and Authority in Caroline Political Culture', in *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*, ed. Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 28-49; R. Malcolm Smuts, 'The Court and the Emergence of a Royalist Party', in *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars*, ed. Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 43-65.

<sup>60</sup> Zwicker, *Lines of Authority*, p. 10.

<sup>61</sup> Zwicker, *Lines of Authority*, p. 10.

<sup>62</sup> Thomas N. Corns, 'The Poetry of the Caroline Court', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 97 (1998), 51-73 (p. 61).

<sup>63</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 1-3, 6-7. *Honnête* platonism is a major theme in Veevers, *Images of Love*.

<sup>64</sup> Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, pp. 280-83.

<sup>65</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 136-39, 85-90.

<sup>66</sup> Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 239, n. 95.

<sup>67</sup> H.M. Margoliouth, 'The Poems of Richard Lovelace', *Review of English Studies*, 3 (1927), 89-95 (p. 94); McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, pp. 147-48.

<sup>68</sup> Anthony Milton, 'Thomas Wentworth and the Political Thought of the Personal Rule', in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621-1641*, ed. J.F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 133-56; Scott, 'Counsel and Cabal'; Smuts, 'Political Thought in Early Stuart Britain'; Smuts, 'Force, Love and Authority in Caroline Political Culture'; Smuts, 'The Court and the Emergence of a Royalist Party'. The standard work on Lipsian neo-Stoicism remains Oestreich, *Neostoicism*. On Tacitism in particular, see G. Baldwin, 'Reason of State and English Parliaments, 1610-42', *History of Political Thought*, 25 (2004), 620-41; Peter Burke, 'Tacitism, Scepticism, and Reason of State', in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought*, ed. J.H. Burns and

Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 479-98; Christopher A. Ford, 'Preaching Propriety to Princes: Grotius, Lipsius, and Neo-Stoic International Law', *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law*, 28 (1996), 313-66; J.H.M. Salmon, 'Stoicism and Roman Example: Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 50 (1989), 199-225; Paul Seaward, 'Clarendon, Tacitism, and the Civil Wars of Europe', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68, no. 1-2 (2005), 289-311; Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 45-64.

<sup>69</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 49-52.

<sup>70</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 97-98, 34-36.

<sup>71</sup> Lipsius, *On Constancy*, p. 128.

<sup>72</sup> Lipsius, *On Constancy*, p. 36.

<sup>73</sup> Oestreich, *Neostoicism*, pp. 13-38.

<sup>74</sup> Oestreich, p. 30.

<sup>75</sup> Vickers, 'Leisure and Idleness'.

<sup>76</sup> Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*, pp. 13-16; Shifflett, *Stoicism*, Ch. 1.

<sup>77</sup> On Lipsius's influence on La Noue, Sidney and others, see Lisa Ferraro Parmelee, *Good News From France: French Anti-League Propaganda in Late Elizabethan England* (Rochester, N.Y.: University Press, 1996).

<sup>78</sup> Great Britain. Public Record Office, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic (Charles I)*, 1645-47, ed. John Bruce and William Douglas Hamilton (London, 1858-1897), <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/virtual.anu.edu.au/statepapers.aspx>>, 28 December 1647, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>79</sup> I have found the following texts helpful in my thinking about intertextuality, adaptation and appropriation: Graham Allen, *Intertextuality*, New Critical Idiom (London: Routledge, 2000); Marko Juvan, *History and Poetics of Intertextuality*, trans. Timothy Pogačar (West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2008); Mary Orr, *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003). For a summary of debate on the interaction of genre and intertextuality, see John Frow, *Genre*, New Critical Idiom (Abingdon, Oxford: Routledge, 2006), pp. 45-50. All references to Kristeva's writings are to Toril Moi, ed., *The Kristeva Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986).

<sup>80</sup> Moi, ed., *Kristeva Reader*, p. 37.

<sup>81</sup> Allen, *Intertextuality*, p. 36.

<sup>82</sup> Allen, *Intertextuality*, p. 2.

<sup>83</sup> William Irwin, 'Against Intertextuality', *Philosophy and Literature*, 28 (2004), 227-42 (p. 239).

<sup>84</sup> Irwin, p. 229.

<sup>85</sup> Paul Hammond, *The Making of Restoration Poetry* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2006), Ch. 4; Potter, *Secret Rites*, Ch. 4.

<sup>86</sup> Potter, p. 113.

- <sup>87</sup> Potter, p. 116.
- <sup>88</sup> Potter, p. 114.
- <sup>89</sup> Potter, p. 115.
- <sup>90</sup> Hammond, *The Making of Restoration Poetry*, p. 73.
- <sup>91</sup> Hammond, p. 73.
- <sup>92</sup> Hammond, p. 84.
- <sup>93</sup> Hammond, p. 84.
- <sup>94</sup> Hammond, p. 73.
- <sup>95</sup> Hammond, p. 84; Moi, ed., *Kristeva Reader*, pp. 36-37.
- <sup>96</sup> Hammond, p. 83.
- <sup>97</sup> Hammond, p. 74. See also, Moi, ed., pp. 36-37.
- <sup>98</sup> Raymond, 'The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere'. On the print revolution in England 1640-60 more generally, see also McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*; Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*; Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper*.
- <sup>99</sup> The debate to date is summarised in Peter Lake and Steve Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (2006), 270-92. See also, for example, James Loxley, 'On Exegetical Duty: Historical Pragmatics and the Grammar of the Libel', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 69 (2006), 83-103; Raymond, 'The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere'.
- <sup>100</sup> Lake and Pincus, p. 280.
- <sup>101</sup> Lake and Pincus, p. 280.
- <sup>102</sup> Kevin Sharpe, in *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), pp. 53-54, 59-60, helpfully discusses Stanley Fish's concept of interpretive communities in the civil war context put forward in Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980), Ch. 13. See also, Elizabeth Sauer, *'Paper-contestations' and Textual Communities in England, 1640-1675* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), pp.4-9.
- <sup>103</sup> McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, p. 3.
- <sup>104</sup> My work on the Stanley group was completed before publication of McDowell's monograph.
- <sup>105</sup> The actual trigger was Derek Hirst and Steven N. Zwicker, 'High Summer at Nun Appleton, 1651: Andrew Marvell and Lord Fairfax's Occasions', *Historical Journal*, 36 (1993), 247-69.
- <sup>106</sup> Susan A. Clarke, "'Bright Heir t' th' Bird Imperial": Richard Lovelace's 'The Falcon' in Context", *Review of English Studies*, 56 (2005), 263-75; reproduced at Appendix III.
- <sup>107</sup> *Posthume Poems*, pp. 21-25.
- <sup>108</sup> *Early English Books Online*, (Chadwyck-Healey), < <http://eebo.chadwyck.com>>. I have usually accessed the site through the National Library of Australia, Canberra, which does not subscribe to the Text Creation Partnership.

- <sup>109</sup> Blair Worden, 'The Politics of Marvell's 'Horatian Ode'', *Historical Journal*, 27 (1984), 525-47; Blair Worden, 'Historians and Poets', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68 (2005), 71-93 (p. 75).
- <sup>110</sup> Wilcher, *The Discontented Cavalier*, pp. 22-24.
- <sup>111</sup> Wilcher, p. 22. Robert D. Hume, *Reconstructing Contexts: The Aims and Principles of Archeo-Historicism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); Lauro Martines, *Society and History in English Renaissance Verse* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985), p. 25.
- <sup>112</sup> Wilcher, p. 24.
- <sup>113</sup> Alastair Fowler, 'Poetry and Politics: Some Reflections', in *Literary Milieux: Essays in Text and Context Presented to Howard Erskine-Hill*, ed. David Womersley and Richard McCabe (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), 23-29 (p. 23).
- <sup>114</sup> Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 2. C.f. Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions*, Ch. 1.
- <sup>115</sup> Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity'.
- <sup>116</sup> See, for example, Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984 repr. 1990); Robertson, 'Lovelace and the 'Barbed Censurers'.
- <sup>117</sup> See n. 10, above.
- <sup>118</sup> See, for example, Anthony Low, 'Agricultural Reform and the Love Poems of Thomas Carew, With an Instance From Lovelace', in *Culture and Cultivation in Early Modern England: Writing and the Land*, ed. Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992), 63-80.
- <sup>119</sup> Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, 4 vols (London: Mansell, 1980-1993), II, 2, pp. 9-16; Dosia Reichardt, 'Some Unnoticed Lovelace Manuscripts', *Notes and Queries*, 49 (2002), 336-38.
- <sup>120</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 136-39, 85-90.
- <sup>121</sup> L.N. Wall, 'Some Notes on Marvell's Sources', *Notes and Queries*, 202 (1957), 170-73.

## Chapter Two —

### Richard Lovelace: A Contested Life

There has been no substantive reappraisal of the available primary and secondary source material on Richard Lovelace's life since Wilkinson and Hartmann published their assessments in 1925.<sup>1</sup> This chapter presents a comprehensive account of what is known of Lovelace's public life and financial circumstances. It aims to provide a firm basis for the case studies of poems in the following chapters. Poems of particular topical relevance which are not the subject of case studies are also dealt with here. Considerable information on Richard Lovelace's life has surfaced during the course of this study and is brought together here for the first time.<sup>2</sup> A schedule of major archival documents and other important primary source material relating to Lovelace is at Appendix I.

Anthony Wood's short biography in the *Athenae Oxonienses* (1691–1692), transcribed in full at Appendix II, remains our main source of information on Lovelace's life.<sup>3</sup> Although his accuracy has been challenged frequently, Wood's papers show that he made serious efforts to verify his information on Lovelace, including with their mutual friend Sir Edward Sherburne (c. 1616–1702).<sup>4</sup> Wood claimed that he had access to considerable additional information on Lovelace: 'many other things I could now say of him, relating either to his most generous mind in his Prosperity or dejected estate in his worst part of Poverty', which he omitted 'for brevity sake'. The presence of a letter in the London Metropolitan Archive from Sherburne to Wood dated 9 February 1687/88, with Wood's distinctive cataloguing in his own hand on the outside, indicates that Wood had access to more information than currently survives among his papers in the Bodleian Library.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless, Wood's assertion that Lovelace died in extreme poverty has been challenged since the nineteenth century. The apparent dearth of documentary evidence of the poet's life, his financial circumstances, and political views over time, combined with the controversy over Wood's accuracy, has allowed successive generations of critics the freedom to construct a view of Lovelace's life, politics and works in line with current theoretical perspectives. Gerald Hammond and Raymond Anselment argued that Lovelace, by birth a member of the Kentish upper gentry, was either neutralist, or

disengaged from politics, from early in the Civil Wars.<sup>6</sup> In rejecting the traditional view of Lovelace as the archetypal loyal royalist, both Hammond and Anselment followed the approach developed by revisionist historians during the latter part of the twentieth century, including Alan Everitt, whose detailed county study of Kent was both early and influential.<sup>7</sup>

While the importance of Everitt's pioneering work continues to be acknowledged, scholars like Jacqueline Eales have more recently challenged the detail of his conclusions. Eales describes the development of ideological politics in Kent in the decades leading up to the Civil Wars, which, she argues, revolved around debates about the extent of royal power and nature of the English church settlement.<sup>8</sup> While explicitly ruling out any suggestion that clearly defined political parties developed in the years before the wars, she describes the important role played by, among others, Lovelace's older kinsmen, Sir Edwin Sandys (1561–1629) and (to a lesser extent) Sir Dudley Digges (1583–1639), in the development of an anti-court position.<sup>9</sup> Eales also recounts the high level of ongoing religious and political commitment across Kentish society, both parliamentary and royalist. She concludes that the county was not neutralist. Rather, a wide range of views were strongly held, at the heart of which lay concern over the balance between central and local affairs:

During the civil war period [...] the county cannot be accurately described as predominantly royalist, parliamentarian, republican or even moderate [...] all of these opinions were strongly represented in the county. This diversity was an outcome of the geographical, strategical and administrative importance of Kent [...] It was not simply local concerns, but the balance between central and provincial affairs, which lay at the heart of county politics in Kent [...] throughout the early modern period.<sup>10</sup>

This study accepts Eales's model of Kentish politics.

Documents which have come to light during this study, described and discussed in 'Richard Lovelace, Anthony Wood, and Some Previously Unremarked Lovelace Documents', confirm the accuracy of Wood's assessment of Lovelace's property holdings at the outbreak of war and his sale of all known assets during the war years.<sup>11</sup> In the light of this evidence, it is no longer tenable to question Wood's careful assessment that Lovelace 'lived beyond the income of his Estate, either to keep up the credit and reputation of the Kings Cause by furnishing men with Horse and Arms, or by relieving ingenious men in want'. However, as I show through detailed contextual analysis of the poems in later chapters, Lovelace's support for the royalist cause is never unthinking. He always maintains sufficient intellectual



independence to enable scrutiny of the king's actions, policies and outcomes. Often, he adopts the classical poet's role of providing independent advice to his ruler.

## Genealogy

Richard Lovelace was the eldest son of a well-established Kentish upper gentry family, which had owned lands at Bethersden, south of Ashford, since 1367.<sup>12</sup>

According to John Philipot in *Villare Cantianum* (1659), published late in the Interregnum, Bethersden was:

the Seminary or Seedplot from whence a Race of Gentlemen issued forth, who have in Military Affairs, atcheived Reputation and Honour, with a prodigal Losse and Expence both of Blood and Life, and by their deep Judgement in the municipal Laws have deserved well of the Common Wealth.<sup>13</sup>

Presumably Philipot had Richard and his brothers in mind when he identified the 'prodigal Losse and Expence both of Blood and Life'. The family flourished under Elizabeth I. Lovelace's great-grandfather, Serjeant William Lovelace (*d.* 1577), embraced the law and public affairs.<sup>14</sup> He was appointed serjeant-at-law from Gray's Inn by 1567, a justice of assize by the end of 1571, and was returned as member of Parliament for Canterbury in 1563, 1571 and 1572. He accumulated considerable wealth in the form of property in Canterbury and other parts of Kent, but his career was prejudiced by his unsuccessful rivalry with the chief baron, Sir Roger Manwood (1524/25–1595), also of Kent. The Serjeant's son, Sir William the Elder of Canterbury (1561–1629), was still a minor at the time of his father's death. He married Elizabeth Aucher, daughter of Edward Aucher of Ottersden and Bishopsbourne in Kent.<sup>15</sup> Admitted to Gray's Inn in 1580, and knighted by the Earl of Essex whilst serving in Ireland in 1599, he was a member of the Virginia Company and was returned as a Member of Parliament for Canterbury in 1614.<sup>16</sup> He served in the Low Countries as a professional soldier. Sir William the Elder inherited substantial debts, from which he never recovered. Sir Roger Manwood pursued him through the courts over his father's property transactions in Canterbury during the 1580s. Sir William the Elder's impecunity was such that he spent some time in the Fleet in 1620. It is possible that he sought entry into Parliament in 1624 to avoid imprisonment for debt. Both his children, a son, later Sir William the Younger of Woolwich, Kent (1584–1627), and a daughter, Mabel, married into wealthy merchant families—unions almost certainly arranged with a view to improving the family's financial position.

Richard Lovelace's father, Sir William Lovelace the Younger of Woolwich, was, like his father, a professional soldier. He served in the Low Countries with Lord Vere in the English mercenary forces fighting for the Protestant Dutch and was knighted by James I at Theobalds in 1609. Like his father, he was a member of the Virginia Company. In addition, he held stock in the profitable East India Company. He married Anne Barne (c. 1590–1632/33), daughter of Sir William Barne of Woolwich and Anne Sandys, on or about 17 May 1611.<sup>17</sup> Her family was 'very prominent in London and in Woolwich, Kent, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, several members being among the "merchant princes" and "merchant adventurers" of this period'.<sup>18</sup> Her paternal grandfather and great-grandfather had both served as Lord Mayors of London and Members of Parliament.<sup>19</sup> For some generations, the family had forged links in upper gentry and government circles.<sup>20</sup> One of Anne Barne's great-aunts married Sir Francis Walsingham, Elizabeth I's secretary. Her eldest brother, Sir William Barne the Younger of Woolwich, married Dorothy Manwood, the grand-daughter of Sir Roger Manwood, the nemesis of Serjeant Lovelace and Sir William Lovelace the Elder. Another brother, Robert, married Elizabeth Twisden, daughter of Thomas Twisden of Wye, Kent, later one of Sir William Lovelace the Younger's executors and uncle to the royalist antiquary, Sir Roger Twysden of Royden Hall, Kent. Her brother Miles, later executor of her will and one of Richard Lovelace's guardians after her death, was rector at Bishopsbourne, where Lovelace's kinsmen, the Auchers, lived. He became chaplain in Ordinary to Charles II after the Restoration, confirming the family's continuing royalist connections.<sup>21</sup> The Barne family held substantial property in and around Woolwich. They lived at Tower Place on the Thames, which later became the Laboratory of the Royal Arsenal.<sup>22</sup>

The Lovelaces and the Barnes shared close links with the descendants of Archbishop Edwin Sandys of York (1519–1588), a family prominent in its commitment to public affairs, its ongoing involvement with the English colonies in North America, its literary interests and its friendships.<sup>23</sup> The Sandys connection may provide an explanation for Lovelace's interest in literature and national politics and the Lovelace siblings' connections with colonial North America. Its members reflect the wide range of strongly held political views which Eales sees as typical of the Kentish gentry. Sir Edwin Sandys of Northbourne, Kent, the Archbishop's

second son, and George Sandys (1578–1644), the youngest child, were brothers-in-law to Elizabeth Aucher, Richard Lovelace’s paternal grandmother, and brothers to his maternal grandmother, Anne Barne. Sir Edwin was a major proponent of the Virginia Company and leader of the House of Commons. After the dissolution of the Addled Parliament of 1614, in which debates over liberty, tyranny, the use of prerogative powers and the granting of subsidies to the king (which featured so heavily in the discourses of the civil war years) were rehearsed, Sandys was called to Whitehall and his papers burned.<sup>24</sup> Sir Edwin supported another candidate against Sir William Lovelace the Elder in the contest for the seat of Canterbury in the parliamentary elections of 1624, spreading rumours, which Sir William strongly contested, that he was “‘a dangerous man” in religion’, indicating hostility between the two men despite the close family connections.<sup>25</sup>

The youngest brother, George Sandys, was the author, traveller and colonial administrator of Virginia, where he was treasurer from 1621 to 1624, courtier to Charles I and member of the circle at Great Tew which formed around Lucius Cary, second Viscount Falkland (1609/10–1643). George Sandys is best remembered as the translator of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, a frequent intertext in Lovelace’s poetry.<sup>26</sup> George Sandys often stayed with his niece Anne, married to Sir Francis Wenman (post 1596–?) of Caswell near Great Tew. Wenman was also a member of the circle at Great Tew. George Sandys’s visits coincided with Lovelace’s years at Oxford, and it may be that the two spent time together then. In his satire ‘*On Sanazar*’, Lovelace writes affectionately and respectfully of his ‘dear *Uncle* [...] heav’nly *Sands*’, in company with Sir Francis Wenman and Lord Falkland.<sup>27</sup> Richard Lovelace, Sir Thomas Stanley and William Hammond (b. 1614), all of whom were related through the Sandys connection, were members of the group of royalists with strongly developed literary interests, which gathered in London between about 1646 and 1649.<sup>28</sup> Dudley Digges (1613–1643) was the third son of Sir Dudley Digges of Chilham, Kent, Sir Edwin Sandys’s close associate in relation to the Virginia Company. The younger Dudley Digges wrote *The Unlawfulness of Subjects Taking Up Armes Against Their Sovereigne* (1643). Although a few years older than Lovelace, Digges was a contemporary at Oxford. Digges’s sister married William Hammond the poet’s older brother, Sir Anthony Hammond (d. 1661) of St Alban’s Court, Kent, another prominent royalist. Digges and Sir Francis Wyatt both

contributed commendatory verses to George Sandys's *A Paraphrase Upon the Divine Poems* (1638), addressed to 'my worthy kinsman' and 'my honoured Kinsman' respectively.<sup>29</sup> Two of Sir Edwin Sandys's sons became colonels in the parliamentary army, one of whom achieved notoriety for his dictatorial administration of Kent. A third served the king. Sir Anthony Aucher (c. 1614–1694) of Bishopsbourne, Kent (another cousin) was imprisoned for nine months in 1643 for his part in the *Kentish Petition*. Aucher fought for the king in the first civil war and was prominent in the Kentish uprisings in 1648 and 1659.<sup>30</sup>

There are indications that Anne Barne's father was familiar with her prospective father-in-law's financial difficulties. Sir William Barne of Woolwich tried to protect his daughter's financial security, and that of any children she might have. The relevant articles of marriage are transcribed in legal documents of 1617–18 relating to court cases brought against Sir William Lovelace the Elder by Sir William Barne.<sup>31</sup> They show that the couple married 'on or about 17 May 1611'. Anne brought with her a substantial portion of £1,500, and 'all the thynges of the mariage and apparel'. In exchange, Sir William Lovelace the Elder undertook to convey encumbered property in and around Bethersden, then worth £100 per annum, into his son's name. The purpose of the transfer was to ensure both the couple's livelihood and Anne's jointure, indicating that Sir William the Younger was still financially dependent on his father. In return, Sir William the Elder undertook to disencumber the lands he transferred to his son, using the proceeds of sale of timber growing on those lands. Once the lands were disencumbered, the value of the rents would have increased dramatically, supporting Wood's estimate of Lovelace's annual income at £500 per annum. The marriage was fruitful. The first child was also called Anne (c. 1611–c. 1652).<sup>32</sup> Her birth was followed after a substantial gap of five years by that of Richard (1617–1657), the eldest son. Six other children were born to the couple during the next ten years. Thomas (c. 1619/20–1689) emigrated to Virginia with Francis after the Restoration. Francis (c. 1620/22–1675) was a more prominent royalist conspirator than Richard. He later became governor of New York in 1668, but was disgraced when New York was lost to the Dutch in 1673. Others included Joan (c. 1622/23–?); William (c. 1623/27–1645), who was killed at the siege of Carnarvon; Elizabeth (c. 1624/26–?); and Dudley Posthumous (1627–1686),

born after his father's death, who served with Richard and Francis at various times in France, the Low Countries, and, after the Restoration, in New York.<sup>33</sup>

The couple's marriage was initially troubled, explaining the gap of five years between the birth of the first child, Anne, in about 1612, and that of Richard, the eldest son, in 1617. Intermittent traces of Sir William the Younger's service in the Low Countries between about 1604 and his death at the Siege of Grolle in 1627 show that he had a record of drunkenness and violence against women, including his new wife. He had killed an English prostitute in Flushing during an altercation over money in November 1606, for which he was pardoned by his patron, Robert Sidney, Viscount L'Isle (1563–1626), brother to the poet Sir Philip Sidney (1554–1586) and then Governor of Flushing.<sup>34</sup> On 8 September 1611, only about four months after the marriage, Sir William the Younger was condemned to death at Flushing 'for being drunck, and extraordinarily disorderly drunck' while he was Captain of the Watch. Having been:

the whole evening untill twelfe a clok in the night in the streats, with his sworde drawne threatening to kill anye man whoe shoulde resist his disorders, resisting the garde [...] he reviled the Martiall in moste viled manner and stroke and buffeted him.<sup>35</sup>

Sir John Throckmorton wrote to Viscount L'Isle at this time that Lovelace:

leadeth a moste leaude and wicked lyfe, by jeliousye with his wyfe, and as often as he is drunck shee is forced to hyde herself from his outragious sworde [...] Although we all beg for his life yet not of us do think him worthy to stay in the Garrison. Having heretofore pardoned him his drunkenness, his temper and attempts to kill his wife, I live more in fear of him than ever I lived of any man'.<sup>36</sup>

Apparently on the recommendation of the burgomasters of Flushing, Sidney pardoned Lovelace and restored his pay and conditions, despite the seriousness of the charges.<sup>37</sup>

It seems likely that Dame Anne Lovelace lived in her family's home at Tower Place in Woolwich while the couple was estranged, and that her husband made his home in England after Richard's conception. During these years, Dame Anne's eldest brother, who would otherwise have been expected to live at Tower Place, was living with his wife, Dorothy Manwood, near Canterbury. It is evident from court documents that Sir William the Elder was living in Canterbury, while Lovelace Place at Bethersden was let.<sup>38</sup> In June 1617, when Dame Anne was pregnant with Richard, her father Sir William Barne took action against Sir William Lovelace the Elder to enforce the terms of the couple's articles of marriage. He followed with another

action the following year, which was apparently successful. The court documents show that Sir William Barne had paid his daughter's portion in full, but that Sir William Lovelace the Elder was still heavily in debt. He had received £1,700 from the sale of timber promised under the terms of the marriage articles, but had failed to disencumber the lands he had duly conveyed to Sir William the Younger. Thus, there was no income from those lands flowing to Sir William the Younger and Dame Anne. To add insult to financial injury, Sir William the Elder had entered into a secret arrangement to pass some of the property nominally conveyed under the terms of the marriage articles to his daughter Mabel's husband, the merchant Sir John Cullimore, to whom he was also indebted.

Sir William the Younger was killed at the siege of Grolle in the Low Countries in 1627. His will dated 15 July 1622 and the inquisition post mortem of 9 August 1628 show that the family's finances overall had improved since the court actions of 1617 and 1618.<sup>39</sup> In the years following their reconciliation, Sir William and Dame Anne had stabilised their financial position. Rents were flowing, indicating that the Bethersden lands had been disencumbered, and Sir William had purchased property for his second and third sons, indicating that he had some surplus income. Sir William the Elder died not long after his son, in October 1629. His will, dated 6 October 1629, and the absence of an inquisition post mortem, indicate that he was still in financial difficulties.<sup>40</sup> He had no real property and minimal personal belongings to leave to his grandchildren. Dame Anne Lovelace was his executor, indicating that any rift between the generations over the older man's financial peccadilloes had apparently been smoothed over. It also indicates a level of faith in Dame Anne's financial management skills. Given Sir William the Younger's absences overseas, it is probable that she engineered the family's return to solvency. Dame Anne Lovelace remarried in 1630. Her second husband, Dr Jonathan Browne of London (*c.* 1601–1643), formerly of Hertingfordbury, Hertfordshire and Gloucester Hall, Oxford, was awarded a Doctor of Civil Law in the year of his marriage.<sup>41</sup> Like the Lovelaces, Browne was a royalist. He was rector of St Faith's, London, from 1628, which was sequestered during the war years.<sup>42</sup> He was rector of Hertingfordbury from 1630; canon of Hereford from 1636; and dean of Hereford, 1636–1639. He was presented by the king as a canon of Westminster in 1639, a

position he held until the year he died, 1643.<sup>43</sup> He and Dame Anne Lovelace had a daughter, Anne.<sup>44</sup>

Under the combined terms of Sir William the Younger's will, dated 15 July 1622, and that of Dame Anne Lovelace, dated 15 May 1632, all eight children of the marriage were provided for.<sup>45</sup> Richard, the eldest son, inherited the family's main holdings in and around Bethersden, on which rents were being paid. Under the terms of Dame Anne's will, Richard's estates were left in trust to his step-father, Jonathan Browne, and his uncle, Miles Barne, until he reached the age of twenty-one years. There is a slight anomaly here, as Sir William the Younger's will sets the age at which Richard was to assume control of his estates at twenty-four years. The second and third sons inherited the other property in Kent. The eldest daughter, Anne, who may also have received a portion at the time of her marriage, inherited her father's 'stock and adventure in the East India Company', together with all the profits. The will allocated portions of up to £300 for the sons and daughters not otherwise provided for, and household goods for the girls.

Dame Anne Lovelace died some time between 16 May 1632, when she made her will, and 22 May 1633, when probate was granted.<sup>46</sup> Her dispositions were careful and caring. One wonders to what extent the disruptions of the Civil War years, and the impoverishment of her eldest son, disrupted the execution of her plans. Her daughters married into their own class, gentry and professional families, albeit mainly younger sons. In the troubled times in which the younger girls reached marriageable age, it would seem that her efforts on the girls' behalf, at least, were successful. The eldest, Anne Gorsuch, emigrated to Virginia with her children following the death of her husband, John Gorsuch, in a haymow while he was being pursued by parliamentarian soldiers, following the sequestration of his rectory at Walkern, Hertfordshire.<sup>47</sup> She died on the voyage or soon after arrival, but her children were able to establish themselves in Virginia. Elizabeth's husband, Daniel Hayne of Berkshire (who left substantial property on his death) was John Gorsuch's nephew.<sup>48</sup> Joane's husband, Robert Caesar of Hertfordshire, about whom little is known, was the younger son of a prominent legal family, which had joined the gentry. He held 'estates of some consideration' and, with Joan, may have played a part in winding up what little remained in Richard's hands at the time of his death.<sup>49</sup>

None of the daughters married into Kentish families, probably indicating that family members no longer maintained close ties with their neighbours in Kent.

Both Wood's estimate of the income from Lovelace's estates of £500 per annum, and the detailed information in the various legal documents identified in Appendix I, place the Lovelace family's wealth at the outbreak of war on a par with that of other, moderately well-off gentry families. The portions of £300 provided for all the daughters and the younger boys were relatively generous, given the large number of children involved. County gentry during this period gave their daughters anywhere between £100 and £1,000.<sup>50</sup> At the upper end, Lady Anne Clifford, one of the wealthiest heiresses in England, received a portion of £17,000 in 1609. Sir Robert Filmer left his daughter £2,500, while the six sisters of Sir Ralph Verney had £1,000 each.<sup>51</sup> The median portion in settlements at issue in Chancery in the latter part of the sixteenth century and the first part of the seventeenth century was £200, indicating just how substantial a contribution to the marriage Anne Barne's portion of £1,500 represented.<sup>52</sup>

While the existing data are patchy and notoriously difficult to interpret — and without entering into the debate over the relative state of the gentry which occasioned its gathering — county studies are illuminating. Alan Everitt's estimates of the income of Kentish gentry and aristocratic families in the years between 1640 and 1660 place peers as receiving an average income of £4,089 per annum; baronets, £1,405; knights £873; and the untitled gentry, £270. As he points out, 'it is important to remember that the great majority were quite modest men, and hundreds had an income under £250 per annum'.<sup>53</sup> On the other hand, Everitt estimates the average income of the 'indigenous gentry' of Kent, those whose families had been settled in the county since pre-Tudor times like the Lovelaces, at £719 per annum — about £200 more than Wood estimates Lovelace's income to have been. Clay, who compared the findings of the major county studies, notes that only about 15 per cent of gentry families in Buckinghamshire in 1640 and just under 11 per cent of gentry families in Yorkshire, had landed incomes of £1,000, while more than half the Yorkshire gentry, and very much more than half of those in the poorer county of Lancashire, received less than £250.<sup>54</sup> It thus appears that the Lovelace income from property in about 1642 was probably less than the average received by the wealthiest gentry families in Kent, but more than most gentry families overall.



Blackwood, in his study of Lancashire (which was poorer than Kent) discusses the fate of younger sons. He notes that most received only a small annuity, rather than land, due to the prevalence of fairly strict adherence to the custom of primogeniture.<sup>55</sup> During the period under discussion, almost 41 per cent of younger sons received an annuity of £19 or less, while just over 33 per cent received between £20 and £29 per annum. The younger Lovelace sons were thus fortunate in being bequeathed either land or a portion of £300 and a reasonable sum for maintenance during their minorities. Waite, on whom Wilkinson relied heavily, introduced something of a red herring when he raised the issue of inheritance under gavelkind law in support of his argument that Richard Lovelace's means were limited.<sup>56</sup> 'Gavelkind' is the Kentish custom of dividing a deceased man's property equally among his sons. It is clear from the probate documents that the family followed neither strict primogeniture, under which Richard would have inherited a much larger proportion of his father's assets, nor strict gavelkind, under which the sons would have received equal shares. In 1632–1633, when Dame Anne Lovelace died, the family's financial security and its potential to increase its wealth depended upon the capacity of the fifteen-year-old orphaned heir and his trustees, the churchmen Miles Barne and Jonathan Browne, to continue to manage the estates as effectively as his mother had done.

### **'Meridian Light'**

Those who wrote of Richard Lovelace after his death in 1657 remembered him as a stellar figure. To Thomas Stanley, Lovelace shone like the sun:

Thy first appearance was meridian light  
Which, as it knew no dawn, shall know no Night,  
Though under an Eclipse it labour'd long. (ll. 3–5)<sup>57</sup>

Philipot described Lovelace Place as a sundial which no longer functions because the sun has been removed: 'alas! this Mansion is now like a Dial when the Sun is gone, that then only is of use to declare that there hath been a Sun, for not many years since colonel *Richard Lovelace* [...] passed away his Right to *Bethersden Lovelace*'.<sup>58</sup> Anthony Wood was fascinated by the stellar trajectory of Lovelace's life, implicitly representing it as a metaphor for the early Caroline Court. He dwells on Lovelace's fall from riches to rags in the royalist cause. In his glory days, the poet dressed in shining 'Cloth of gold and silver'. In poverty later in life, he was reduced to 'ragged Cloaths'.<sup>59</sup> For Wood, the cause of Lovelace's ruin was always exterior to the

character of the person: Lovelace gave up his wealth in the ‘Kings Cause’. Only John Aubrey (1626–97), who co-operated with Wood in the preparation of the *Athenae*, suggested an element of tragic self-destruction. Aubrey repeatedly noted how handsome Lovelace was: ‘a most beautiful gentleman [...] One of the handsomest men of England’.<sup>60</sup> He included a quotation in Latin from Ovid’s story in the *Metamorphoses* of Narcissus (III, 5) falling in love with his own features. Sandys, in the pre-eminent mid-seventeenth century version, loosely translated this extract as Narcissus:

Beholds his eyes, two starres! his dangling haire  
Which with unshorn *Apollo*’s might compare!  
His fingers worthy *Bacchus*! his smooth chin!  
His Ivory neck! his heavenly face! where-in  
The linked Deities their Graces fix!<sup>61</sup>

Here, Aubrey implicitly compares the description of Narcissus’s beauty to Lovelace’s, implying an element of vanitas. Aubrey’s subsequent juxtaposition of the poet’s physical beauty with a suggestion that he suffered from the cardinal sin of pride (‘He was an extraordinarily handsome man, but proud’) reinforces the impression of vanitas.<sup>62</sup>

The likenesses of Lovelace in two extant portraits in oils support Aubrey’s choice of the passage from Ovid on Narcissus to describe the poet. The first (Plate I) is the portrait of a young, richly dressed university graduate, attributed to the court painter, John de Critz. It was discovered by Wilkinson and bequeathed by him to Worcester College, Oxford, where it now hangs. As Wilkinson points out:

It is probably impossible to prove conclusively that the picture of the young Oxford Master of Arts with the scarlet gold-laced coat and the pair of fringed gloves [...] is a portrait of Lovelace at the age of eighteen when he was given his degree on the occasion of the King’s visit to Oxford in 1636. It is, however, highly likely.<sup>63</sup>

The young man’s face and the gold lacing and buttons visible beneath his academic gown dominate the portrait. The similarity of this subject’s features to those of the portrait of Lovelace in the Dulwich Picture Gallery (see Plate II), attributed to William Dobson (c. 1611–46) and painted about 1645, is extraordinary.<sup>64</sup> In the style of Van Dyke, the latter has been described as ‘one of the most haunting images of its time’.<sup>65</sup> It is a head and shoulders portrait of a young man against a plain ground. His face, with chiselled features and hooded brown eyes, confronts the viewer. Light from the right front of the subject reflects off his burnished plate armour, highlighting the fine decorative bands on the arm piece and the gold filigree

edging of the carnation silk shoulder sash. There is another image which may be of Lovelace. Wilkinson identified a print in the British Museum as *Lovelace as Orpheus*.<sup>66</sup> A wreathed, languorous Orpheus sits under a tree playing a lyre, surrounded by mythical and real beasts of the forest. The etching was made by Richard Gaywood, after Francis Barlow or Francis Cleyn, and is tentatively dated 1650–1670.<sup>67</sup> There is no evidence linking Lovelace to this representation of Orpheus before the nineteenth century.<sup>68</sup> However, Orpheus's features resemble Lovelace's in the Dobson portrait.

### **Early Years**

No parish records survive recording Richard Lovelace's birth or death.<sup>69</sup> The inquisition post mortem taken after his father's death indicates that Richard was aged nine years, eight months and three days on the day his father died — 12 August 1627.<sup>70</sup> Thus, Richard Lovelace was born on or about 9 December 1617, not *c.* 1618 as has generally been noted.<sup>71</sup> There is no indication where Richard lived as a young child, although the assumption must be that he was with his mother at her family's house, Tower Place, on the Thames at Woolwich. According to Wood, Lovelace attended Charterhouse School in London, which was established as part of Sutton's Hospital and took its first scholars in 1614.<sup>72</sup> Lovelace's name does not appear in the school's records, probably because, until the eighteenth century, only the names of those 'poor scholars' supported by Sutton's Foundation were recorded. It seems that only the sons of families with a secure income from a landed estate were excluded from funding by the Foundation. Initially, the school did not accept fee-paying students. Scholars to be supported by the Foundation were nominated by the governors. From 1627, the schoolmaster was authorised to accept up to sixty fee-paying students who had 'to be dieted and lodged out of the hospital'.<sup>73</sup> Boys entered the school between the ages of 10 and 14 years. Thus, Richard would have been eligible for entry from late December 1627.

In 1629, the year before her marriage to Dr Browne, Dame Anne Lovelace petitioned the king for the nomination of one of her sons to Sutton's Foundation, which would have meant that she could avoid paying school fees on his behalf. The reason given was that Sir William Lovelace had died at the siege of Grolle after about thirty years of service in the wars (something of an exaggeration) and 'left his

Lady ritche only in great store of Children'.<sup>74</sup> The king duly ordered 'that Thomas Lovelace hir sonne may bee admitted into the said house in our prime place at the next eleccion', that is, at the top of the king's list of nominees. Waite argues that this nomination must have been on Richard's behalf, not Thomas's, on the basis that Thomas would have been too young.<sup>75</sup> If Pleasants's estimates of the Lovelace children's birth dates are accurate, the nomination probably was meant for Thomas. Thomas was born in 1619/20 and would thus have been about to turn ten (the age at which scholars were accepted) when Dame Anne Lovelace sought the king's assistance. Despite the king's nomination, like Richard, Thomas's name does not appear on the register. He may have joined Richard as a 'town boy.' There is no other trace of Thomas's existence until he turns up in New York with his brother Francis who was governor there after the Restoration.<sup>76</sup> During most of his years at Charterhouse, Richard may have been living in his step-father's household. Dame Anne Lovelace refers to her husband in her will as 'Jonathan Browne of London', indicating his continuing association with the metropolis. Dr Browne's parish of St Faiths under St Pauls was not far from Charterhouse.<sup>77</sup> Perhaps the family lived nearby.

It is central to my argument in later chapters that Richard Lovelace makes sophisticated intertextual use of classical allusion in crafting his poetry. It is, therefore, important to establish that he should have had the knowledge to achieve such sophistication. Charterhouse's statutes of 1627 sketch the school's curriculum, which aimed to place it among the leading grammar schools of its day. The schoolmaster was to ensure that the boys 'shall read none but approved Authors, Greek and Latin, as are read in the best esteemed Free-Schools' that is, the best-endowed and most noted of the grammar schools, including St Paul's, Merchant Taylors', Westminster, Eton and Winchester.<sup>78</sup> Scholars in the highest form were required to set up 'four Greek and four Latin verses apiece, upon any part of the Second Lesson appointed for that day, for the Master of the Hospital or any stranger to view and examine'.<sup>79</sup> The school's focus on classical authors and the Christian religion is illustrated in extant lists of text books bought in the years before Lovelace entered. As well as forty-six copies of three different catechisms, there were Latin accidents and grammars, books of easy Latin dialogues for schools, Aesop's fables (in Latin), Erasmus's *Colloquia*, a standard Greek grammar and two copies of the

*Iliad*. There were twenty copies each of Ovid's *Tristia*, the plays of Terence and Cicero's *De Officiis* and *Rhetoric*.<sup>80</sup> Patricia Coughlan undertook an exhaustive study of grammar school curricula in the context of the poetry of Andrew Marvell (1621–1678), Lovelace's contemporary.<sup>81</sup> It is notable that all the texts she mentions for use in the early years of a grammar school education are reflected in the lists of those used at Charterhouse quoted above, confirming (if it were necessary to do so) the standardisation of the grammar school curriculum. From the third form, scholars commenced formal study of Latin poetry, notably Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Virgil's *Eclogues* and works of the other Latin elegists.<sup>82</sup>

Richard Crashaw (c.1613–1649), who was a scholar on the foundation at Charterhouse from 1629 and went to Cambridge as an exhibitor in 1631, was a contemporary of Lovelace's at the school. He recorded his debt to Robert Brooke, the schoolmaster at Charterhouse from 1628 until 1643, for prescribing exercises in imitating Latin and Greek authors, an experience Lovelace would have shared.<sup>83</sup> Coughlan examines the impact of the *imitatio* Crashaw describes on Marvell's poetry. She confirms what has long been assumed, that 'imitation of given patterns is the key principle of seventeenth century pedagogues' and notes that at all stages in the teaching of (mainly Latin) verse composition, students were 'encouraged to juggle with the elements of [their] models — extracts from given authors, particularly through double translation and the rephrasing of given distichs'.<sup>84</sup> In his poetry, Marvell constantly plays with familiar tropes, *topoi* and generic forms — a skill and habit which Coughlan attributes to the verse exercises. These are the skills and habits I argue that Lovelace practises. They would have been enhanced when he was at Oxford and polished later in life when he was associated with some of the foremost translators of his day, many of whom were his relatives through the Sandys connection.

On 5 May 1631, a warrant was issued to swear in Richard Lovelace as a 'Gent wayter extraordinary' to the King, a position he held until at least 1641.<sup>85</sup> This was an honorary position for which the recipient paid a small fee. At the time, Richard was thirteen years old with some years to go at Charterhouse. The school was within walking distance of the queen's court at Somerset House, where many of the masques were performed. Whitehall, although a little further away, was still accessible. In subsequent chapters, I show how Lovelace appropriated and refracted

the language of the court masques, and the world of the 1630s which they reflected. He may well have attended the masques and other court celebrations in his capacity as Gentleman Wayter. It seems likely that he attended at court while still at school, including during the holiday periods when the masques were performed, and continued with this pattern of attendance while he was at Oxford.

### **University**

On 27 June 1634, Lovelace, aged sixteen years, matriculated to Gloucester Hall, Oxford, and signed the Book of Subscriptions.<sup>86</sup> He was already an orphan. It is likely that his step-father, Dr Browne (a graduate of Gloucester Hall) recommended the college he would attend.<sup>87</sup> Degory Wheare (1573–1647), first Camden Professor of History at Oxford, whose contribution to historiography is currently being re-assessed, was principal during Lovelace's time at Gloucester Hall.<sup>88</sup> Wheare, the author of *The Method and Order of Reading both Civil and Ecclesiastical Histories*, could be assumed to have encouraged his students to give attention to the practical and moral applications of classical history, as set out in the *Method and Order*. Wheare may also have introduced Lovelace to the works of the Dutch neo-Stoic philosopher Justus Lipsius, whose influence on Lovelace is discussed in later chapters. Wheare quotes extensively and approvingly from Lipsius's comments on Tacitus in the *Method and Order*. For example, Lipsius, named by Wheare as 'the Prince of Criticks', finds Tacitus 'an usefull and a great writer, and who ought to be in their hands, who have the steering of the Common-wealth and the Government'.<sup>89</sup>

Feingold has reassessed the standard undergraduate humanities curriculum at seventeenth century Oxford, which Lovelace would have studied. He contests the previously accepted view that the curriculum survived and flourished as a relic of narrow, medieval scholasticism. He argues instead that, by the early seventeenth century, the curriculum involved genuine study of language and literature in a broadly humanist context.<sup>90</sup> The grammar schools had assisted in bringing about this change because they were producing scholars 'exceptionally well grounded in the language and literature of Greece and Rome, and not infrequently in logic and rhetoric as well'.<sup>91</sup> Thus, there was no longer a need at university level for an excessive concentration on the acquisition of Latin language, in particular, although few students were as proficient in Greek. Rather, there was a 'genuine passion for

literature, poetry, and wit, and [a] reverence for those who were reputed to have acquired proficiency therein'.<sup>92</sup> The disciplines studied as part of the undergraduate curriculum included rhetoric, logic, moral and natural philosophy, history and mathematics. The aim was to produce erudite generalists. Feingold lists texts known to have been studied as part of the standard undergraduate curriculum in the first half of the seventeenth century. All the classical authors referred to in subsequent chapters in relation to Lovelace's poetry, and those represented in his translations from the Latin at the end of *Lucasta. Posthume Poems* are mentioned, including Horace, Virgil, Ovid, Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, Ausonius, Martial, Juvenal, Sallust, Lucan, Seneca, Livy and Cicero.<sup>93</sup> The passion for literature Feingold describes was not always beneficial. Undergraduates were known to tag along to the wits' meetings in local taverns. The royalist army officer, Sir Bevil Grenville (1596–1643), first encouraged his son Richard, who was at Lovelace's old college Gloucester Hall, to admire poets and historians 'the one sort for their witt and learned allegories, the other [for their] elloquence and glorious examples of courage, magn[animity and] all other virtues'.<sup>94</sup> He later chastised the young man for forsaking logic and philosophy for poetry and convivial company.

While he was at Oxford between 1634 and 1636, Lovelace may well have had contact with fellow students John Berkenhead (1617–1679) and Marchamont Nedham (c. 1620–1678), as well as other Oxford wits. He produced his first known literary work at this time, the play *The Scholars*, which Egerton notes was performed at Gloucester Hall and Salisbury Court.<sup>95</sup> Although the 'Prologue' and 'Epilogue' to the play are included in *Lucasta*, where it is recorded as having been presented at Whitefriars (as Salisbury Court was previously known), the text has been lost.<sup>96</sup> The Prologue is careful to ask the audience not to prejudge Lovelace's play as a boring learned comedy, indicating that some plays by university scholars were too abstruse for London audiences:

Pray be not frighted — Tho the Scaene and Gown's  
 The *Universities*, the Wits, the Town's;  
 The Lines, each honest *Englishman* may speake;  
 Yet not mistake his Mother-tongue for *Greeke*,  
 For stil 'twas part of his vow'd Liturgie,  
 From learned Comedies *deliver me!*<sup>97</sup>

The Epilogue seeks the audience's approbation, without which 'Hee'l not looke farther for a *Second Day*'; that is, a second performance. There is no evidence of a

second production at Salisbury Court, leaving open to question how successful the play was. However, the quotation shows that, even at this early stage, Lovelace was conscious of the needs of the audience for whom he was writing.

Lovelace was awarded his Master of Arts (MA) on 30 August 1636 after an unusually short period of about two years' study. The occasion was Charles I and Henrietta Maria's ceremonial visit to Oxford, the last and most opulent of such visitations.<sup>98</sup> Wood notes Lovelace's atypical period of study and states that the degree was awarded:

at the request of a great Lady belonging to the Queen [...] tho but of about two years standing; at which time his Conversation being made publick, and consequently his ingenuity and generous soul discovered, he became as much admired by the male, as before by the female, sex.

Wood implies that, by 1636, Lovelace was already well known at Henrietta Maria's court. The Convocation at which Lovelace took his degree was called by the king 'to doe honor to the Prince Elector', Prince Rupert, Charles I's nephew.<sup>99</sup> Forty-five MAs were awarded that day, of which Wood lists nineteen. Lovelace was in aristocratic company. Prince Rupert appears first, followed by James Stewart, Duke of Lennox, later also Duke of Richmond; William Seymour, Earl of Hertford, later Duke of Somerset; Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, who had been created MA in 1605 and was created a second time; Thomas Howard, Earl of Berkshire; Thomas Bruce, Earl of Elgin; Henry Spencer, later Earl of Sunderland; George, Lord Digby, son of the Earl of Bristol; William, later Earl of Craven; William Herbert, son of the Earl of Pembroke; Henry Coventry, son of the Keeper of the Great Seal; then Lovelace, followed by seven other commoners who were prominent later in life.<sup>100</sup> Wood's placement of Lovelace directly following the scions of the nobility may indicate the regard in which Lovelace was held at the time; alternatively, it may reflect Wood's personal view.

Given that his degree was awarded under unusual circumstances, it is not possible to judge the extent to which Lovelace met the university's academic standards. Certainly, some of the doctorates awarded that day were honorary.<sup>101</sup> William Winstanley, in his *Lives of the [...] English Poets*, was one of many to compare Lovelace to Sir Philip Sidney, in this context quoting an 'epitaph' on Sidney describing him as 'A Scholar, Souldier, Lover, and a Saint'.<sup>102</sup> It seems unlikely that Lovelace's scholarship would have equalled that of the professional



linguists, Milton and Marvell. On the other hand, one might expect objections to have been raised to the degree being granted if he were not an Horatian ‘forward youth’.

Little is known of Lovelace for the next few years. Evidently, he considered that his formal education should continue in some form. He was incorporated at Cambridge on 4 October 1637 and apparently spent some time there.<sup>103</sup> Andrew Marvell’s commendatory poem to *Lucasta* (1649) is one of a number by Cambridge contemporaries, including Norreys Jephson, Villiers Harrington, Thomas Hammersley and John Needler. It is likely that Lovelace became acquainted with the royalists John Cleveland (1613–1658) and Abraham Cowley, who were at Cambridge at this time. He also retained some connection with Oxford. In 1638, Lovelace contributed commendatory verses to Anthony Hodges’ translation of Achilles Tatius’ *The Loves of Clitophon and Leucippe*.<sup>104</sup> Lovelace’s contribution is conventional. The opening lines: ‘Fairre ones, breathe: a while lay by | Blessed Sidney’s Arcady’, give a good indication of the popularity in which Sir Philip Sidney’s *Arcadia* was held in the pre-war years. The variations between the versions printed in the 1638 volume and *Lucasta* (1649), noted by Wilkinson, provide evidence of the extent to which Lovelace was prepared to work on his poems, rather than tossing them off with gentlemanly ease. In the same year, Lovelace contributed ‘An Elegie. *Princesse KATHERINE borne, christened, buried in one day*’ to Oxford’s commemorative volume to the queen when she lost a new-born child.<sup>105</sup> It was inserted after the volume was prepared for publication, indicating that he had already, at the age of twenty-one, achieved some kind of reputation as a poet.<sup>106</sup> The poem itself is conventional, if occasionally infelicitous. It is hardly tactful to suggest to a grieving mother that she has ‘Dropt both a load to th’ Cradle, and the Tombe’, as if she had dropped a dead foal. Further commendatory verses by Lovelace, again substantially edited for *Lucasta* (1649), appeared in the anonymously authored *Pallas Armata. The Gentlemans Armorie* (London, 1639), which has been ascribed to George Ashwell, a scholar of Wadham College, Oxford and a clergyman.<sup>107</sup> The attribution to Ashwell seems unlikely. It is difficult to reconcile his reputation as a learned, quiet, unassuming, fair-minded man, and the philosophical works with which he is currently credited, with the qualities required of the author of an arms manual.<sup>108</sup>

### ***The Pre-War Years***

According to Wood, Lovelace's education left him 'well vers'd in the Greek and Lat. Poets, in Musick, whether practical or theoretical, instumental or vocal, and in other things befitting a Gentleman.' After Lovelace 'left the University he retired in great splendor to the Court' [where he was] taken into the favour of *George Lord Goring*'.<sup>109</sup> George Goring's (1608–1658) patronage is unlikely to have led Lovelace to develop decorous habits.<sup>110</sup> He was known as the most witty and dashing of the young men about the royal court. He was a reckless gambler, having lost the dowry of £10,000 brought to him by his wife Lettice (1610–1643), daughter of Richard Boyle, Earl of Cork, within a few years of receiving it. His marriage was stormy and seems to have come to an end by 1640.<sup>111</sup> Goring was known to drink to excess. A subordinate, Sir Richard Bulstrode, wrote that he 'strangely loved the Bottle, was much given to his Pleasures and a great Debauchee'.<sup>112</sup> Showing a different side of his character, Bulstrode also saw Goring as 'a person of extraordinary abilities as well as courage and [...] the most dexterous in any sudden emergency that I have ever seen'.<sup>113</sup>

While at court, Lovelace would also have come into contact with Sir John Suckling (c. 1609–c. 1641), who was a contemporary of Goring's.<sup>114</sup> There is no evidence indicating that Lovelace and Suckling were close, although they must have known each other. Lovelace does not feature among the protagonists in Suckling's poem 'The Wits', also known as 'A Sessions of the Poets'. He was significantly younger than Suckling and the other men featured in the 'Sessions', including the royalist poets Thomas Carew, Walter Montagu (1604/5–1677), William Davenant, Edmund Waller; Thomas May (c. 1596–1650); and members of the circle at Great Tew referred to earlier, namely Lovelace's great-uncle George Sandys, Sir Francis Wenman and Lord Falkland.<sup>115</sup> In 1637, when the 'Sessions' was written, Lovelace would only have been about nineteen. He thus may not have achieved sufficient prominence to warrant a mention in a poem of this kind. Nor is there sufficient evidence to judge whether the second speaker in another of Suckling's better known poems, 'A Ballade. Upon a Wedding' (which opens with one rustic addressing another 'I tell thee *Dick*, where I have been') was Richard Lovelace.<sup>116</sup> Suckling's poem is a gently satirical rustic epithalamion, probably written to celebrate the marriage of Lovelace's cousin John, second Baron Lovelace of Hurley, to Lady

Anne Wentworth (c. 1623–1697), daughter of the Earl of Cleveland, in July 1638. The distant Lovelace cousins were well known to each other. *Lucasta* (1649) is dedicated to Lady Anne Lovelace and *Lucasta. Posthume Poems* to her son. Lovelace's poems 'The Lady *A.L. My Asylum in a great extremity*' and 'To a Lady that desired me I would beare my part with her in a Song. Madam *A.L.*' are almost certainly addressed to Lady Anne Lovelace.<sup>117</sup> The first thanks the lady for caring for him in extreme adversity, while the second is a witty, light-hearted play on the difficulties of singing duets. Richard Lovelace would thus have been a suitable addressee for Suckling's ballad. Wilkinson argues that the rustic character of 'Dick' might suggest that Lovelace was not the intended addressee.<sup>118</sup> Wilkinson's argument implies a very literal reading of a burlesque, which appears to refer to specific court personages. Certainly, the use of familiar abbreviations, such as 'Tom', 'Jack', 'Dick' and 'Frank', was common practice.

### ***The Bishops' Wars***

Lovelace gained his first military experience in the Bishops' Wars of 1639 and 1640 against the Scots Covenanters. Wood writes that Lovelace was adopted by Goring as 'a Soldier, and sent in the quality of Ensign' in the first expedition, being 'commissionated a Captain in the same Regiment' in the second. The royalist contacts Lovelace made during the Bishops' Wars were to prove important in later life. Two of Goring's officers, Richard Willys (c. 1614–1690) and Charles Gerard (c. 1618–1694), later Earl of Macclesfield, became prominent royalist conspirators during the Interregnum and may have influenced Lovelace's inclinations in this direction.<sup>119</sup> Both were senior officers in the royalist forces and developed a long term association with Prince Rupert, including when he was out of favour with the king in 1645. Willys, a member of the Sealed Knot, the inner ring of six royalist conspirators in England after 1653, turned traitor to the cause at least by 1657. Gerard lost favour with the young king in exile after the failure of his cousin John's plot to kill Cromwell in 1654, with which Lovelace may have been involved.

According to Wood, Lovelace wrote a tragedy about this time, *The Soldier*, based on his experiences. It was never performed and no copy survives. Lovelace's drinking song 'Sonnet. To Generall Goring, after the pacification at Berwicke' celebrates Goring's contribution to the 1639 campaign.<sup>120</sup> As such, it is the earliest

datable poem by Lovelace to comment on national affairs. It is notable because it demonstrates how, from the start of his poetic career, Lovelace incorporated contemporary poetic imagery and events into his verse, often subtly subverting or changing earlier received meanings in the process. Goring served as lieutenant-general of horse in the first Bishops' War.<sup>121</sup> On 22 May 1639, much of Britain experienced an eclipse of the sun, an event soldiers took as an ill omen for the king's affairs. The omen was apparently fulfilled when the English forces marched on Kelso, where the Scottish forces were massed, on 4 June 1639. The day was mismanaged. The weather was exceedingly hot. The cavalry outdistanced the foot, some of whom were 'so parched that they drank water from filthy pools, lapping it up like dogs'.<sup>122</sup> When he reached Kelso, Holland, the English commander, was convinced, probably wrongly, that he faced stronger Scottish forces and, lacking infantry support, decided to retreat.<sup>123</sup> The Treaty of Berwick, signed on 18 June, brought the campaign to an end. Both sides agreed to disband their forces. The Scots handed back those royal castles they had seized. Charles refused to grant civil power to the Scots, agreeing instead to call a parliament. However, he had handed over effective ecclesiastical control, thus conceding the cause on which the English forces had gone to war.

Read in this context, '*To Generall Goring*' seems sardonic in its defiantly excessive overstatement in the face of defeat. The poem opens with a recognition of the ignominious terms to which the English agreed:

Now the *Peace* is made at the Foes rate,  
 Whilst men of Armes 'to Kettles their old Helmes translate,  
 And drinke in Caskes of Honourable Plate.<sup>124</sup>

The speaker describes Goring as 'He whose Glories shine so brave and high'. While Hutton notes that Goring 'won plaudits for his leadership during the 1639 campaign' it is hard to see how Goring's glories could be said to have shone, except in comparison with the poor performance of other commanders.<sup>125</sup> Perhaps there is an element of criticism of Charles I in '*To Generall Goring*'. The speaker may be suggesting that Goring filled a vacuum of leadership left by the king, that he 'shone', when the king did not. The speaker acknowledges his own overstatement when, after referring to the treaty as being at the 'Foes rate', he notes that the 'Victorie' was 'uncombated'. Goring's partially estranged wife, Lettice, is the 'lovely Bride in love with scars | Whose eyes wound deepe in Peace, as doth his sword in wars'.<sup>126</sup> At

the end of each stanza, the drinkers are called upon to drink copiously, in the last ‘To the Couple! to the Couple! th’are Divine.’ In the last stanza, Lovelace reprises the imagery of the sun:

Give me scorching heat, thy heat dry *Sun*,  
That to this payre I may drinke off an Ocean  
Yet leave my grateful thirst unquensht, undone;  
Or a full Bowle of heav’nly wine,  
In which dissolved Stars should shine  
To the Couple! to the Couple! th’are Divine.

The reference to the circumstances of the English advance on Kelso, in which the heat and lack of water played such an important part, is obvious. The more parched the speaker becomes, the more he can drink the couple’s health and the closer he comes to alcoholic oblivion. It is difficult to read this stanza as other than a consciously futile attempt to turn a negative into a positive.

In a recent detailed study of the Bishops’ Wars — two campaigns in which few shots were fired — the historian Mark Fissell notes that the most telling recurring metaphor to appear in contemporary accounts was that comparing Charles I to the sun and the Covenanters to a ‘murky Scottish mist’.<sup>127</sup> These tropes are important. They appear repeatedly in relation to Charles I and the Scots throughout this study. Suckling, who famously raised and lavishly equipped a troop of horse, wrote a series of letters on the campaign. He uses this metaphor in ‘An Answer to a Gentleman in Norfolk that sent to enquire after the Scottish business’, dated April 1639, where he opined that the Scots’ ‘quarrel to the King is, that which they may have to the Sun: He doth not warm and visit them, as much as others. God and Nature have placed them in the shade’.<sup>128</sup> He uses the metaphor again in his troubled advice poem, ‘On New-years day 1640. To the King’, which opens:

1  
Awake (great Sir) the Sun shines heer,  
Gives all Your Subjects a New-yeer,  
Onely we stay till You appear,  
[...]

2  
May no ill vapour cloud the skie,  
Bold storms invade the Soveraigntie,  
But gales of joy, so fresh, so high.<sup>129</sup>

Eighteen months after the Pacification of Berwick, and following the unsuccessful second Scottish campaign, Suckling is advising the king to use his power wisely in

his subjects' interests, the clear implication being that that power has not been used wisely in the past.

After the Pacification of Berwick, Wood states that Lovelace 'retired to his native Country, and took possession of his Estate at *Lovelace place*'. There is no record, such as a signature in the parish registers for example, that Lovelace did settle at Lovelace Place, which would still have been leased to tenants under the terms of his mother's will.<sup>130</sup> In December 1638, Lovelace turned twenty-one, bringing his wardship to an end. In December 1641, on reaching the age of twenty-four, any remaining constraints which might have been imposed by the provisions of his father's will would have lapsed. Apart from Wood's observation, there is no evidence that Richard Lovelace ever lived at Bethersden. Perhaps he took up residence in Canterbury, or in Woolwich.

### **The *Kentish Petition*, 1642**

In April 1642, Richard Lovelace presented the *Kentish Petition* to Parliament, for which action he spent seven weeks in prison.<sup>131</sup> Arguably, this action shaped the rest of his life. The *Kentish Petition* is, of itself, important. In Gardiner's view, 'if any one moment can be selected as that in which the Civil War became inevitable, it is that of the vote of March 28, by which the Kentish petitioners were treated as criminals'.<sup>132</sup> It is also the only public statement of political principles in non-literary form to which Richard Lovelace is known to have subscribed.

The petition was drafted by Sir Edward Dering of Surrenden Dering, his cousin Sir Roger Twysden of Royden Hall, Sir George Strode of Squerries Court near Westerham, and Richard Spencer of Orpington.<sup>133</sup> It was designed to counter two pro-parliamentarian petitions from Kent delivered to the Lords and Commons in February 1642. The occasion was the March 1642 Maidstone Assizes, for which leading members of the Kentish community had gathered. The petition received strong support from a crowd of about 2000 people. Arrangements were made for its publication and dissemination so that supporting signatures could be gathered before a meeting at Blackheath proposed for 29 April, from which the petition was to be delivered to Parliament.<sup>134</sup>

Read today, *THE PETITION Of the Gentry, Ministers, and Commonalty of the County of KENT* appears to be a moderate statement of mildly royalist concerns. The document is essentially conservative, aimed at maintaining and preserving recently reformed political and ecclesiastical institutions. There are seventeen clauses in all. As was conventional with petitions of this kind, the preamble and first clause praise Parliament. The second clause, that ‘all Lawes against Papists, be put in due execution [...] and that all Children of the Papists, may be brought up in the reformed Religion’, distances the petitioners from any taint of the Roman Catholicism prevalent at court. The main clauses seek for Parliament to maintain ‘the Solemne *Litturgy* of the Church of *England* [...] establisht by the supream Lawes of this Land’; preservation of the episcopacy; settlement of religious differences through the mechanism of a ‘genneral Synod of most grave, learned, pious and Judicious Divines [...] chosen] by all the Cleargy of the Land, because all the Cleargy are to be bound by their Resolutions, and the determination of this Synod to bind us all’; suppression of ‘the odious & abominable scandall of schismaticall and seditious Sermons and Pamphlets’; and the establishment of an alternative system of justice to that previously administered coercively by the ecclesiastical courts. Although the king had refused the royal assent to Parliament’s *Militia Ordinance* of 5 March 1642, Parliament proceeded to attempt to enforce it.<sup>135</sup> In the key clause relating to secular issues (Clause 11), the petitioners ask Parliament to ‘frame an especiall Law for the Regulating of the *Militia* of this Kingdome, so that the Subject may know how at once to obey both his Majesty and both Houses of Parliament’. They also condemn the *Militia Ordinance* as an exercise of ‘Arbitrary power’.<sup>136</sup> In an early expression of the royalist rendering of the discourse of the liberty of the subject, Clause 12 seeks:

That the Precious Liberty of the Subject, (the common birth right of every *Englishman*) may be as in all these poynts preserved entire, so in this also, that no order of either of both Houses not grounded on the Lawes of this Land, may bee enforced on the Subject, till it be fully enacted by Parliament.

Clause 13 asks Parliament to give speedy consideration to the king’s message of 20 January 1642 ‘for the present and future establishment of the Priviledges of Parliament, the free enjoyment of our estates and Fortunes, the liberty of our persons’, and so on. Other clauses seek resolution of the troubles in Ireland, repair of the sea forts, alleviation of poverty and, the sole specifically Kentish issue mentioned in the *Petition*, tariff support for the cloth trade. The petition concludes with a plea

to Parliament to resolve its differences with the king: ‘God direct and guide your consultations for the removing of all distrusts and Jealousies, for the renewing that tie of confidence and trust, (which is the highest happinesse) betweene our gracious Prince, and his loving subjects’. The last lines of Lovelace’s poem ‘TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*’, in which the speaker asks his king to light his way so that he ‘may see | How to serve you, and you trust me’ echo this sentiment.<sup>137</sup>

Parliament’s response was immediate and hostile. Every effort was made to stifle the petition. Its leading promoters were ordered to attend Parliament as delinquents, impeached and detained. Proceedings against them continued throughout April and into May. The petition itself was suppressed and copies ordered to be burnt by the hangman at Westminster, Smithfield and Cheapside.<sup>138</sup> Why did Parliament react so strongly to such a moderate statement of claims? Contemporary indications are that members were particularly concerned about the clause relating to the *Militia Ordinance*. Roger Hill noted in his parliamentary diary entry for 30 April 1642 that the effect of the petition ‘was to oppose the ordinance of parliament concerning the militia’.<sup>139</sup> The charges against Dering, Strode and Spencer also placed the issue of the *Militia Ordinance* first. Clarendon, who kept a copy in his papers, noted the key clauses as being those seeking ‘that the militia may not be otherwise exercised in that county than the known law permitted, and that the *Book of Common Prayer* established by law might be observed’.<sup>140</sup> Everitt suggests that the petition was such a threat because it ‘provided moderate opponents of parliament everywhere with a clear manifesto’, which they had previously lacked.<sup>141</sup> Giovanni Giustinian, the Venetian ambassador to London, saw the potential for the petition to act as a rallying point which could attract a high level of support for the king. He wrote on 11 April (the second part in cypher) that Parliament was:

alarmed lest such a step, based as it is upon the laws, might be imitated by several counties and make a wide breach in the hearts of the people [...] if it does spread, it may serve as a very effective instrument for restoring the King to his former powers, and give back to England with tranquility, the ornaments of its ancient greatness.<sup>142</sup>

According to Giustinian, Parliament was determined to prevent the petition gaining momentum by frightening its supporters into submission.<sup>143</sup>

It is interesting that a county which had been notable for its support for reform in the recent past should apparently be opposing Parliament. According to Eales, in early 1641, the two knights of the shire for Kent, Sir John Colepeper



(c.1600–1660), Chancellor of the Exchequer, who in June 1642 assisted in the drafting of the king's *Answer to the XIX Propositions* (discussed in Chapter Five) and Sir Edward Dering were in broad agreement with Parliament's attempts to restrict royal power.<sup>144</sup> In April 1641, Dering moved the Root and Branch Bill for the abolition of the episcopacy.<sup>145</sup> By November, he opposed the *Grand Remonstrance*, bringing him into line with Colepeper, Edward Hyde, later Earl of Clarendon (1609–1674) and Lord Falkland.<sup>146</sup> In February 1642, after publishing a series of speeches preaching moderation, Dering was expelled from the Commons.

Richard Lovelace came to prominence at the next quarter sessions in Maidstone, which opened on 19 April 1642. By suppressing the petition's promoters so harshly, Parliament had opened the way for a group of younger men, whom Everitt defined as 'hotheads', to play a leading role in the county.<sup>147</sup> These included George Chute of Surrenden Chute, a neighbour of Dering's and of Lovelace Place, who in 1645 witnessed one of the indentures marking the sale of Lovelace's property; Sir William Boteler of Teston (*d.* 1644); Sir John Mayney of Linton Place (1608–1676) who, according to Aubrey, gave Lovelace assistance when he was in need towards the end of his life; Lovelace's kinsmen Anthony Hamond and Sir Anthony Aucher; and others.<sup>148</sup> Lovelace and his friends met in a tavern, then burst into the courtroom, interrupting Thomas Blount and other supporters of Parliament who were drafting a counter-petition. In a highly theatrical manner, they clapped on their hats in contempt of the court and Lovelace destroyed the new draft petition, raising it above his head and tearing it to pieces. Sir Symonds D'Ewes recorded an account of these events given to Parliament by Captain Lee, a member of the House and justice of the peace for Kent.<sup>149</sup> Lovelace and his friends agreed to lead a march from Kent to meet at Blackheath on 29 April 1642 to present the signed petitions. Parliament was aware of these plans and deliberated over how to respond. D'Ewes had opposed an attempt by Sir Henry Vane the Younger to extend the power of the select committee of both houses touching the *Kentish Petition* to cover all petitions on the basis 'that it was the ancient liberty of the subjects of England to petition' and he was 'against any general order to be made which might be subject to misconstruction'.<sup>150</sup>

On 29 April 1642, up to 500 Kentishmen gathered at Blackheath and marched on London, led by Lovelace and Sir William Boteler.<sup>151</sup> Only a few men, including

Lovelace and Boteler, were permitted to cross London Bridge. It was already too late for the group to appear before Parliament. The following day, about fifty representatives presented their petition to the House of Commons. According to the *Commons Journal*, members noted that this was the same petition ‘that was formerly burnt by Order of both Houses by the Hand of the Common Hangman.’ Lovelace and Boteler, who were regarded as dangerous, were called to give evidence to the House. Lovelace was identified as the person ‘who preferred the petition’. Members were particularly interested that Boteler had been with the king before Hull a week or so earlier. They probably feared that the infection of royalist insurrection might move south with news of the events in Yorkshire. Lovelace was committed to the Gatehouse, Boteler to the Fleet. The other Kentishmen were dismissed on the basis that they were ‘young Gentleman, misled by Solicitation of some not affected to the Peace of the Kingdom [...] hoping that you may hereafter prove good members of the Commonwealth’.<sup>152</sup>

### **Prison Poems**

Wood states that, after delivering the *Kentish Petition*, Lovelace ‘was committed to the Gatehouse at Westminster, where he made that celebrated song called *Stone walls do not a prison make, &c*’. Lovelace’s brief sojourn in prison apparently provided him with the opportunity to write. Over time, Wilkinson and others have suggested that many of Lovelace’s poems, including ‘TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*’, were written during the poet’s second period of incarceration in 1648–1649, after *Lucasta* was licensed on 4 February 1648.<sup>153</sup> The textual and other evidence I offer indicates that the poems in the body of *Lucasta* were written before licensing in February 1648, although there may well have been some subsequent editing, as Wood indicates. I thus accept Margoliouth’s argument that ‘there must be a *prima facie* assumption against any particular poem being later than the date of licensing’.<sup>154</sup> None of Lovelace’s poems survives in autograph manuscript. Thus, there can be no definitive statements made on where or when any of the particular poems were written. In the absence of such evidence, I have accepted Margoliouth’s view that ‘TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*’ and ‘TO ALTHEA, *From Prison*’ relate to Lovelace’s period in the Gatehouse.<sup>155</sup>

Lovlace may also have written ‘*A Guiltlesse Lady imprisoned; after penanced*’, which was set to music by William Lawes (c. 1602–1645), while he was in the Gatehouse, or shortly afterwards.<sup>156</sup> The poem probably expresses sympathy for the plight of Frances Coke, wife of the Duke of Buckingham’s brother, Sir John Villiers, Viscount Purbeck (1591?–1658).<sup>157</sup> Viscount Purbeck was, by all accounts, mentally unstable. Lady Purbeck, daughter of the famous jurist Sir Edward Coke, had been married against her will in 1617.<sup>158</sup> She had a long-term adulterous relationship with Sir Robert Howard, which lasted into the war years, and bore Howard a child. Although there was public sympathy for her plight, she was tried and found guilty of adultery in the ecclesiastical High Commission Court in 1627, at Buckingham’s instigation. She was sentenced to pay a fine of £500 and to do a penance, which involved walking barefoot in a white sheet from Paul’s Cross to the Savoy and standing at the church door on a Sunday. Lady Purbeck fled to avoid the penance, and kept a low profile until 1635, by which time she had returned to London. There, she was lodged close to Westminster, where she came to the attention of the king and Archbishop Laud, who pursued her.<sup>159</sup> She was imprisoned in the Gatehouse and the High Commission Court ordered that the penance be enforced. Lady Purbeck escaped and it seems that the penance was never carried out, although Howard also served time in the Gatehouse for assisting in her escape. The poem is sympathetic to her plight:

V.  
 And as thy bare feet blesse the Way  
 The people doe not mock, but pray,  
 And call thee as amas’d they run  
 Instead of prostitute, a Nun.

VII.  
 The sheet’s ty’d ever to thy Wast,  
 How thankfull to be so embrac’t.

As such, it imagines Lady Purbeck in prison and undertaking her penance.

The poem is interesting on a number of grounds. As well as its sympathetic stance towards Lady Purbeck, it shows a detailed knowledge of court scandal. The fact that the text refers to the penance as if it had occurred may indicate that the poem was written in 1635, while Lady Purbeck was again in the Gatehouse awaiting her punishment. However, the sentiment — sympathy for an adulterous woman in an impossible marriage — is not quite the kind of subject matter one would expect an eighteen-year-old to find appealing. Lady Purbeck’s case became an anti-Laudian

*cause célèbre*, an example of the infringement of the rights of the gentry.<sup>160</sup> It surfaced in this context as a major issue in the lead-up to the abolition of the Courts of High Commission and Star Chamber, so it would have still been topical when Lovelace was in the Gatehouse.<sup>161</sup> On 21 December 1640, Sir Robert Howard, once more in prison due to his involvement with Lady Purbeck, was ordered released by the Lords and granted £1,000 damages, including £500 from Laud himself.<sup>162</sup> Lovelace may have written ‘*A Guiltlesse Lady imprisoned*’ while he was in the Gatehouse, contemplating their shared status as prisoners there and imagining what it would have been like had she had to undertake her penance. Its status as an intervention in an ongoing political debate is apparent. The text indicates a significant lack of sympathy with Laudian policies on Lovelace’s part.

### ***Release from Prison***

Wood’s account of Lovelace’s release from prison is not wholly supported by manuscript and other evidence. Wood states that ‘after 3 or 4 months imprisonment, he had his liberty upon bayle of 40000 *l.* not to stir out of the Lines of Communication, without a Pass from the Speaker’. Wood was wrong in suggesting that Lovelace’s bail was set at £40,000. The *Commons Journal* states that Lovelace and Boteler’s petitions for release were read and both men were granted bail on 17 June 1642.<sup>163</sup> The terms of Boteler’s bail were clear. Sir John Mounson and Sir Peter Richault were to put up a security of £5,000 apiece. The terms of Lovelace’s bail were left open, but were clarified on 21 June as being similar to Boteler’s. William Clarke and Thomas Flood, both of Kent, were each required to put up a surety of £5,000.

Lovelace’s undated petition of May–June 1642 to Parliament for release from the Gatehouse is the only autograph document of his known to survive (see Plate III).<sup>164</sup> As such, it is important. It has been traditional to make an unfavourable comparison between John Cleveland’s letter to Cromwell after his arrest in December 1655 and Lovelace’s petition of 1642. Wilkinson, for example, finds Cleveland’s letter to be a ‘manly and sensible appeal to his old enemy’, implying that Lovelace’s is the opposite.<sup>165</sup> This assessment is harsh. The authors’ circumstances were vastly different. Cleveland was about fifty-five years of age when he was imprisoned in December 1655. He had been a major protagonist in the royalist propaganda effort since 1642 and had held positions of trust for the king.

The charges against him (apparently, merely that he had been in London a year previously, in contravention of the Protectorate's general directive against known royalists residing in or visiting the metropolis) were vague in the extreme.<sup>166</sup>

Lovelace, on the other hand, was a promising twenty-five-year-old gentleman courtier from Kent seeking release from imprisonment in the weeks before the outbreak of open warfare, having led an episode of civil unrest which clearly unnerved Parliament. He offers himself to Parliament's 'wise considerations' 'in all humilitie', but avoids reneging on the terms of the petition. Rather than discussing the petition, Lovelace simply seeks that Parliament 'would be pleas'd to make a favourable milde construction of his actions from whence he may receive your gentle thoughts, and by your gracious Order be admitted to his former Libertie'.<sup>167</sup>

Lovelace does not promise to return peacefully to Kent. Rather, he seeks to serve the king in Ireland, where 'open Rebellion treads on the late peacefull bosome of his Maiesties Kingdome' and 'to imploy such summes of monie as latelie he sett out and destin'd to the same intent.' It is possible that Lovelace's offer to go to Ireland and to support the fighting there financially was genuine. Although Parliament refused the king permission to fight in Ireland before Lovelace's arrest, the *Commons Journal* records Parliament's efforts throughout May and June, while Lovelace was in prison and just after his release, to raise additional forces for the war there. There is no evidence that Lovelace ever made good on his offer. Perhaps Parliament was as wary of allowing an emerging royalist leader the potential to act as a focus for dissent in Ireland, as they were of allowing the king to mass his forces there.

There is no known evidence in support of Wood's statement that Lovelace was granted bail on condition that he was 'not to stir out of the Lines of Communication, without a Pass from the Speaker'. Nor is there any record that Lovelace ever fought for the king after the Bishops' Wars. As proposed by Corns, an undertaking of the kind described by Wood might provide an explanation for Lovelace's decision not to fight, particularly given his reputation as the poet of honour.<sup>168</sup> Lovelace's connection and friend, the poet and translator Sir Thomas Stanley, ascribes Lovelace's choice not to fight to his having been 'confin'd to peace', which fits with Wood's statement.<sup>169</sup> However, if Sir William Boteler was required to give an undertaking of the kind ascribed to Lovelace by Stanley and Wood, he apparently did not consider his honour to be impugned when he broke

it.<sup>170</sup> On 8 July 1642, the Commons called in Boteler's bail following an altercation in a London stationer's shop over an anti-parliamentarian pamphlet.<sup>171</sup> Soon after, Boteler took up arms for the king. According to reports, on 29 August, a week after the king raised his standard in Nottingham marking the formal outbreak of war, a party of perhaps 300 Kentishmen passed through Oxford on their way to join the king. They were defeated by Parliamentary forces in an armed skirmish near Daintry [Daventry] in Northamptonshire. Perhaps twenty-six men, including Sir William Boteler and a cousin of Lovelace's, Sir Anthony St Leger, were captured.<sup>172</sup> Boteler and St Leger were transported to London and imprisoned.<sup>173</sup> Boteler escaped from the Gatehouse on about 14 March 1643.<sup>174</sup> If Boteler felt free to fight, why not Lovelace also? While it is tempting to speculate that Lovelace may have taken part in this skirmish, escaped and kept a low profile, there is no indication whatever that he did so.

Andrew Marvell suggests in his commendatory poem to *Lucasta*, 'To his Noble Friend Mr. *Richard Lovelace*, upon his POEMS' that Lovelace was 'under sequestration'.<sup>175</sup> Exhaustive searching at The National Archives has failed to uncover any records indicating that Lovelace's lands were ever sequestered, that he compounded or that his bail was called in.<sup>176</sup> It may well be that, by 1647–1648, when he associated regularly with Stanley and Marvell, the actual terms of Lovelace's release were occluded and it was convenient to all to leave them so, a position Wood apparently accepted fifty years later. The only available contemporary account of the terms of Lovelace's release, which came to light during this study, is in the short-lived newsbook *Some Special Passages*. In an account of events of 17 June, it attributes Lovelace and Boteler's release to the Commons' 'tender' regard for these men in light of the 'importunat affaires of the Kingdom':

Sir *William Butler*, and Captain *Lovelace* (who presented the Kentish Petition, which was formerly voted by both Houses to be scandalous to Parliament, and of dangerous consequence, for which they were committed) were this day, upon their humble Petition and expression of sorrow for their misfortune to be so much misled; bayled, the House being tender to detain men in prison, at a time wherein the importunat affaires of the Kingdom will not admit of a proceeding against them; albeit their charge was Ordered to be brought in, and transmitted.<sup>177</sup>

There is no specific indication why the Commons was so 'tender' in its treatment. It may be that members were sensitive to accusations of the kind discussed in Chapter 5 in relation to 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' that, by imprisoning the Kentish petitioners and others, they were perpetuating the attacks on the liberty of the subject

for which parliamentarians condemned the king. The *Commons Journal* records that the king's answer to the *Nineteen Propositions* and other contentious royal correspondence with Parliament was read on the same day that Lovelace's bail was received and his release ordered.<sup>178</sup> Against the background of debate on the *Nineteen Propositions*, it is not surprising that the Commons would be 'tender to detain men in prison, at a time wherein the importunat affaires of the Kingdom will not admit of a proceeding against them', as the report of Lovelace and Boteler's release states.

In Lovelace's favour, Gerald Aylmer notes the existence of a 'striking' number of cases 'of obviously committed Anglican royalists who did not fight for the King or in some way opted out'.<sup>179</sup> John Evelyn in his diary, for example, ascribes his non-participation to the fact that all his property in Surrey, like Lovelace's in neighbouring Kent, lay in areas controlled by Parliament's forces. Accordingly, the loss to the royalist cause from expropriation of that property 'would have been greater than any possible gain to the King from Evelyn fighting in the royal army'.<sup>180</sup> Lovelace's financial contributions and moral support for three of his brothers and various other friends reported by Wood may indicate that the poet took the same view as Evelyn, although self-serving statements like Evelyn's always need to be regarded warily. If this was indeed Lovelace's view, his decision not to fight for the king may have followed Parliament's punitive raids on the property of Kentish activists, including Boteler and Dering in August/September 1642, led by one of Lovelace's Sandys cousins.<sup>181</sup> During a subsidiary action, thirty-five pieces of royalist ordnance destined for Newcastle were seized at the shipyards at Woolwich, while a quarter of a mile away, plate valued at £1,000 and popish books and vestments, hidden under the stables floor, were seized from the house of Master William Barnes of Woolwich, who had intervened to resist the Parliamentary forces' expropriation of the ordnance at the shipyards. It is likely that Barnes was Lovelace's cousin, while the house was probably Tower Place, Lovelace's grandfather's residence on the Thames, where the poet almost certainly lived as a child.<sup>182</sup> It is reasonable to speculate that Lovelace may have been involved in hiding royalist plate and vestments for transportation to the Low Countries at his childhood home on the river, although this could never be proved. If so, his actions

may indicate the start of a long-term, covert involvement in the royalist war effort, in which guise he emerges in 1648 and again in 1654.

### **The War Years, 1642–1648**

Lovelace disappears from public view between his release on bail from the Gatehouse on or about 21 June 1642 and mid-1648, although there are manuscript and other traces of his private activities. The indentures of sale of the Lovelace family's lands in and around Bethersden, recovered during the course of this study, provide conclusive proof that, as Wood states, Lovelace 'lived beyond the income of his Estate'. The indentures show the gradual sale of all the parcels of land itemised in Dame Anne Lovelace's articles of marriage. It is known that 'sequestered royalists often attempted to dodge the consequences of their delinquency by transferring the titles to their lands'.<sup>183</sup> Presumably the same technique could be adopted to avoid sequestration. It appears from the indentures that one of the Lovelace parcels of land, 'Lamberden farm', was sold twice, once before the war and then again during the war years.<sup>184</sup> This is the only hint that there may have been anything unusual about the sales, perhaps involving collusion to raise money for the cause. Even if the buyer had promised to return the land to Lovelace after the wars, this did not happen.<sup>185</sup> There is no reason to question Wood's assertion that Lovelace used his diminishing funds to 'keep up the credit and reputation of the Kings cause'.<sup>186</sup> Wood also states that Lovelace supplied horse and arms to the cause, and supported his brothers Francis, William and Dudley Posthumous in their military careers. Francis was appointed governor of Carmarthen Castle in Wales in June 1644. He lost it to parliamentary forces in October 1645, after a sharp fight in which William was killed.<sup>187</sup> Richard wrote his fine epistolary poem on this occasion using the topos of tears and pearls, '*To his Deare Brother Colonel F.L. immoderately mourning my Brothers untimely death at Carmarthen*', which I have discussed elsewhere.<sup>188</sup> According to Wood, Lovelace also provided relief to 'ingenious men in want'. The minor poet Henry Glapthorne acknowledges Lovelace's patronage at this time in the epistolary preface to his poem *White-Hall*.<sup>189</sup>

Wood implies that Lovelace was confined to London immediately after his release from the Gatehouse and that he was in Oxford during the siege and at its surrender on 24 June 1646. According to Wood, Lovelace then raised a regiment for



the King of France, of which he was colonel, and was wounded at the siege of Dunkirk, which fell in October 1646. In 1648, Lovelace returned to London with his youngest brother, Dudley Posthumous. They ‘were both committed Prisoners to *Peterhouse* in London, where he fram’d his Poems for the Press’. Wilkinson differs somewhat from Wood, placing Lovelace in the Low Countries and France for most of the war years:

Lovelace certainly spent a part and probably the greater part of the years 1643–6 in Holland and France. He [...] probably went to Holland in September, 1642, in the train of his old commander Goring, who visited the Low Countries after the surrender of Portsmouth to recruit among English troops in the Dutch service.<sup>190</sup>

As discussed above, if Lovelace was confined to London after his release from the Gatehouse, it cannot have been for very long. He signed documents relating to land transactions (examples of which are at Plates IV and V) on 10 March 1642/43; 20 March 1643/44; 25 October 1644; 14 February 1644/45; 4 August, 28 August and 10 October 1645; 29 March and 28 September 1647; and 1 February 1647/48.<sup>191</sup> There is no indication that the documents were signed other than in Kent, in the presence of the witnesses. While Wilkinson’s suggestion that Lovelace went with his patron, Goring, to the Low Countries in September 1642 is attractive, there is no evidence supporting it.<sup>192</sup> However, two poems place Lovelace in the Low Countries. At some stage before 1648, Lovelace must have been at the court of the exiled Winter Queen, Charles I’s sister Elizabeth of Bohemia (1596–1662). He addressed a delightful, relaxed compliment to her daughter, Princess Louise Hollandine (1622–1709). Entitled ‘*Princesse LÖYSA drawing*’, Lovelace’s poem describes the princess sketching figures from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* chasing each other across the page. Louise Hollandine lived with her mother, mainly in The Hague, until 1651.<sup>193</sup> Goring is known to have engaged in some form of flirtation with Louise Hollandine.<sup>194</sup> He was in The Hague in 1642, after the surrender of Portsmouth to Parliament on 8 September 1642. Henrietta Maria was also in The Hague in 1642 and 1643, where she spent some time with Elizabeth of Bohemia.<sup>195</sup> While the presumption must be that Lovelace would have paid his respects to Henrietta Maria had their visits overlapped, no trace of such a meeting has emerged. The royalist playwright and poet John Tatham addressed a song ‘*Upon my Noble friend, Richard Lovelace Esquire, his being in Holland*’, which opens ‘Come *Adonis*, come again’.<sup>196</sup> The lyric was set to music by William Lawes, who died in the king’s service outside Chester in late September 1645. Tatham must have written the lyric before William

Lawes's death, placing Lovelace in the Low Countries during the war years as well as at the siege of Dunkirk in late 1646.<sup>197</sup>

Evidence presented in subsequent chapters in relation to 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' and 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*' indicates that, like many royalists, at various times Lovelace was significantly disillusioned with his king and aspects of the royalist cause.<sup>198</sup> Nevertheless, as the iconic cavalier, Lovelace should have been with the court at Oxford. Unfortunately, Wood's wording is ambiguous: 'After the rendition of *Oxford Garrison*, in 1646, he formed a Regiment for the Service of the French King'. Is Wood implying that Lovelace defended Oxford at the time of its fall, or is he using the fall of Oxford as a convenient *aide memoire* for dating Lovelace's journey to France? An intricate web of associations indicates that Lovelace probably was at Oxford at various times between 1642 and 1646, although there is no hard evidence supporting this assumption.<sup>199</sup> Lovelace's distant cousin, Lord Lovelace, and his wife Lady Anne, to whom *Lucasta* is dedicated, lived at Hurley, a convenient resting place halfway between Oxford and London. The earliest known manuscript version of part of Lovelace's popular antiplatonic, 'THE SCRUTINIE', appears in a stitched volume of the *Royal Ordnance Papers*, part of a series which recorded movements of stores in and out of Oxford. The particular volume containing 'THE SCRUTINIE' is dated November 1643–February 1643/44.<sup>200</sup> Thus, Lovelace's poem was in circulation at Oxford quite early in the war years. The signature of Edward Sherburne is prominent on the page of doodlings where Lovelace's verse is transcribed (see Plate VI). Sherburne was a distant connection of Lovelace's and was closely associated with him as a co-member of the literary community which formed around Thomas Stanley in London between 1646 and 1648. In later years, Wood would approach Sherburne and others for details of Lovelace's, and other associates' lives.<sup>201</sup> Herbert Berry and E.K. Timings, who uncovered the document among the Ordnance papers, were of the view that the signature is not Sherburne's.<sup>202</sup> This is contestable. Sherburne was Clerk of the Ordnance, placing him in a position to doodle on the pages of a rough notebook. Any differences between the signature on the Ordnance document above 'THE SCRUTINIE' and that, for example, on Sherburne's letter to Wood on Lovelace of 9 February 1688 in the London Metropolitan Archive (see

Plate VII), forty-five years later, could be accounted for by the passage of time and the evidence on the page that the writer was trying out signature styles.<sup>203</sup>

William Lawes, who set three of Lovelace's songs to music, was commissary in Charles Gerard's regiment of foot, based first in Oxford and then active in Wales from May 1644, before his death in Chester in September 1645.<sup>204</sup> Given that both Sherburne and William Lawes were responsible for monitoring the movement and allocation in Oxford of military stores for royalist soldiers, Lawes in Gerard's regiment must have had frequent contact with Edward Sherburne in the central Royal Ordnance. Lovelace had served with Gerard under Goring during the Bishops' Wars.<sup>205</sup> Dobson, to whom the major portrait of Lovelace now at the Dulwich Picture Gallery is confidently attributed, was at Oxford between March 1643 at the latest, and 1646.<sup>206</sup> While in Oxford, Dobson painted a series of portraits of members of the royal family and many of the cavaliers who flocked there.<sup>207</sup> This group of portraits is distinctive in style, in terms of dress and pose. It is probable that Lovelace's portrait, which reflects the style of others in the series, was painted in Oxford. Henry Lawes (*c.* 1596–1662), William's elder brother, who also set many of Lovelace's songs to music, was at Oxford with the court.<sup>208</sup> Dobson painted portraits of both brothers, probably while they were in Oxford.

It is almost certain that Lovelace, as Wood states, served the French king at Dunkirk and was badly wounded there. Lovelace's cousin Thomas Stanley, in his *Register of Friends*, writes of Lovelace's service overseas, while John Harmer, in his Latin commendatory poem to *Lucasta*, suggests that Lovelace served in Spain, as well as at Dunkirk.<sup>209</sup> No manuscript or printed evidence of Lovelace's service has yet come to light in the records of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France or the Service Historique de l'Armée de Terre.<sup>210</sup> Details of mercenaries in the service of France at this time, even at senior officer level, are not currently known to exist. No specific references to Lovelace have emerged in contemporary published accounts of the siege, which rarely mention English officers by name.<sup>211</sup> However, Lovelace's peers may have seen his service in France as a loyalist's participation in the preparations for an invasion of England, which later failed to materialise. The siege of Dunkirk lasted from 29 September to 11 October 1646. There were reports in the English newsbooks during these weeks suggesting that the Englishmen who went to fight for the French king at Dunkirk would form the core of a cavalier army of

‘above thirty thousand men’. The core troops were expected to invade England in the following spring.<sup>212</sup> The *Moderate Intelligencer* of 1 October 1646 announced that Parliament had ceased granting passes for the exportation of English horses as ‘horses are very scarce [...] and its not impossible such as may come back and be made use of against us’.<sup>213</sup> Like other newsbooks, the *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* of 20 October reported a false rumour that ‘Prince *Rupert* is made Governour of *Dunkirke*’.<sup>214</sup> If this were true, it would have indicated both a new level of commitment by the French to the English royalists, and that Rupert would organise the invasion from Dunkirk. Invasion was portrayed as a certainty:

There is a noyse, and confirmed from Men of good Authority, that ten thousand Men are designed from *France* to invade the Kingdome of *England*, the onely Question is how they shall come, and being come, the next Question is, how they shall be entertained.<sup>215</sup>

In the issue of 27 October, the editor, Richard Collings, indignantly denied that he had had these rumours from John Berkenhead, who would have been perceived as an unreliable, royalist source.<sup>216</sup> By 4 November 1646, less than a month after the fall of Dunkirk, Lovelace was back in England. Wilkinson sighted a document witnessed by the poet on that date at Charterhouse, which is now missing.<sup>217</sup>

### **London, 1647–1648**

Wood states that Lovelace returned to England in 1648. However, it seems likely that the poet established himself in London after recovering from his wound at Dunkirk, although he would have continued to visit friends and family outside the metropolis. While in London in these years, he was closely associated with the literary community which grew up around his cousin, Thomas Stanley, and flourished in 1647–1648. Nicholas McDowell has recently set out in detail the membership and literary achievements of this group in *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars*.<sup>218</sup> Other important members included Lovelace’s and Stanley’s family connections Edward Sherburne and William Hammond; William Fairfax, the Greek scholar and son of the translator of Tasso; Andrew Marvell; the polemicist John Hall of Durham (c. 1627–1656); and the playwright and poet James Shirley (c. 1596–1666).<sup>219</sup> Richard Brome (c. 1590–1652), Thomas Jordan (c. 1614–1685) and Robert Herrick (c. 1591–1674) were probably on the edges of the group, as were John Berkenhead and John Denham (1614/15–1669). Its project was royalist, although John Hall of Durham had already declared his republican sympathies by 1648 and Marvell was to align himself with Parliament shortly afterwards. This

literary community also formed the core of the covert royalist group which supported the king, the Band of the Black Ribband. The habits of translation and cooperative, collaborate and competitive versifying engaged in by the Stanley group, which McDowell describes, obviously suited both Lovelace and Marvell.<sup>220</sup>

Lovelace also had links with other writers, musicians, artists and artisans associated with the court and the royalist cause during these years. He must have been in contact with Henry Lawes and the other composers who set his lyrics to music.<sup>221</sup> On 26 October 1647, Lovelace was admitted as a freeman of the Painter Stainers' Company. The full entry reads 'George Wyld Doctor of Divinitie, Colonel Richard Lovelace, Thomas Rawlins Esq, graver of His Majesty's Mint and Scales, and Mr Peter Lilley, were all made free at this court'.<sup>222</sup> Lovelace and the three others admitted that day shared close links with the court. Wild (1610–1665) wrote plays in his youth, including for the king and queen's visitation to Oxford, at which Lovelace was awarded his MA.<sup>223</sup> He was chaplain and preacher to the king while the court was at Oxford during the war years. Rawlins (c. 1620–1670), an occasional poet who contributed commendatory verses to *Lucasta*, was appointed graver of seals, stamps and medals to the king at Oxford in 1643.<sup>224</sup> Lely (1618–1680), whom Lovelace addressed as a friend in two poems, famously painted portraits of the king and those of the royal children in London at the time he was made free of the company.<sup>225</sup> The royalist credentials of all four men are sufficiently strong to raise the possibility that the Painter Stainers were declaring royalist allegiance by admitting them, particularly given Lovelace and Wild's lack of a professional claim to membership.

Lovelace seems to have re-embraced the royalist cause with enthusiasm in the months preceding the second Civil War. Poems like '*To my Worthy Friend Mr. Peter Lilly: on that excellent Picture of his Majesty, and the Duke of Yorke, drawne by him at Hampton-Court*' and '*AMYNTOR'S GROVE, His CHLORIS, ARIGO, and GRATIANA*' show him taking a close interest in the court after the king returned to Hampton Court in August 1647. Lovelace may have visited the king there and it is also possible that he accompanied Lely or the Earl of Northumberland on a visit to Somerset House.<sup>226</sup> I argue that '*The Grasse-hopper*', drafted in early 1648, is Lovelace's least guarded statement of support for the royalist cause. That poem's close textual links with royalist polemic of these months show Lovelace in

contact with polemicists like Marchamont Nedham, as well as the members of Stanley's group, like Hall and Marvell.<sup>227</sup>

There is no evidence that Lovelace served with the royalist forces during the second Civil War, although he must have been involved in some capacity. Wood states that 'he, with *Dud. Posthumous* before mentioned, then a Captain under him, were both committed Prisoners to *Peterhouse* in *London*'. The timing and circumstances of this imprisonment are uncertain. James Thompson, then a friend of Marchamont Nedham, wrote to Henry Oxinden of Kent on 26 October 1648, giving an account of the circumstances of Lovelace's arrest:

News to you I believe it may bee that Colonell Lovelace is sent to Peterhouse. The reason and manner of it, (as I am told) thus. Search was made for Franke Lovelace in his lodging, who not being found instantly, the Colonell that was imployed imagined hee might bee concealed (I thinke) in his brother's Cabinet, and commanded the violation of that, where a discovery was made of divers Delinquent Jewells. Them they forthwith seized on as Prisoners. Dicke, incensed at so great a loss, takes upon him stiffly to argue property, a note which it must be supposed they could not digest when it was in order to disgorging a prize and therefore instantly packed him to Peterhouse, upon pretence of answering some matters contained in papers of his; but his Treasure was ordered to a more private prison. When the day of redemption for either will dawne, wee are yet to expect.<sup>228</sup>

Thompson's tongue-in-cheek report seems clear enough, but the evidence of the date of Lovelace's imprisonment is confused. The *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series* records that an order for 'a warrant of commitment be made to send Captain Lovelace to the prison of Peterhouse', dated 10 June 1648, more than four months earlier.<sup>229</sup> Lovelace was known by his rank of colonel from 1646. Some critics have accepted Thompson's letter of 26 October 1648 as evidence that Richard must have been arrested in October rather than June.<sup>230</sup> Wilkinson's view that while the 'Captain Lovelace' in the first of these entries may refer to Dudley, but it is almost certainly a clerical error for 'Colonel Lovelace', is probably correct.<sup>231</sup> It is clear from the 'Ffowle Papers' of the Committee of Both Kingdoms, the Derby House Committee, that officials were unclear as to which Lovelace was intended for arrest on 9 June. The Draft Order Book gives the name the order is to be made out in as 'Capt: [ ] Lovelace'.<sup>232</sup> The *CSPD* for 3 and 17 October 1648 records orders to Colonel Moore to attend at Derby House concerning Colonel Richard Lovelace. Both the Letter Book of the Derby House Committee for the days leading up to the order for 'Captain Lovelace's' arrest on 9 June, and the newsbooks, are dominated by the troubles in Kent, which it dealt with by ordering arrests. There were also concerns raised about a possible uprising in London.<sup>233</sup> The Letter Book and

newsbooks covering October 1648 contain no substantive reports that might be relevant to the circumstances of Richard Lovelace's arrest.<sup>234</sup>

Thus, while there is no way of being certain, it would appear on the balance of the evidence that Richard Lovelace was in Peterhouse from early June 1648 until April 1649. Perhaps the tantalising story of the 'divers Delinquent Jewells' circulated in the aftermath of Richard's appearance in front of the Derby House Committee, leading to a reprise of the story of his arrest in royalist circles. Given what we know from Wood in relation to Lovelace keeping up 'the credit and reputation of the Kings Cause [...] with men and money', it may be that Richard acted as some kind of banker or financier during the war years. This would be consonant both with his assertion in his 1642 petition for release from the Gatehouse that he would 'imploy such summes of monie as latelie he sett out and destin'd to the same intent' on his release and the records of his sales of land.

### ***The Lucasta Volume***

I argue in Chapter 7 that Lovelace's *Lucasta*, which was licensed on 4 February 1647/48, represented an important part of the royalist propaganda effort of early 1648, in the months leading up to the outbreak of war. Soon after his release from prison, which was ordered on 9 April 1649, Lovelace attended to the publication of *Lucasta*. It was entered in the Stationers' Register on 14 May 1649.<sup>235</sup> Thomason annotated his copy (E. 1373 [1]) on 21 June 1649, indicating that it was in circulation by that date. It is probable that publication was postponed in early 1648 as a result of Parliament's efforts to suppress the royalist propaganda campaign which preceded the second Civil War discussed in Chapter 7. In response to increased royalist propaganda activity, 'taking notice of the many Seditious, False and Scandalous Papers and Pamphlets daily printed and published in and about the Cities of London and Westminster, and thence dispersed into all parts of this realm', Parliament had stepped up its censorship activities, passing a new *Ordinance Against Unlicensed or Scandalous Pamphlets, and for the Better Regulating of Printing* on 30 September 1647.<sup>236</sup> Having raised concerns over the publishing of scandalous and libellous pamphlets twice in January 1648, on 3 February, the day before *Lucasta* was licensed, the Commons appointed a committee to sit daily in order to suppress pamphlets it found particularly obnoxious and to consider strengthening its

ensorship powers.<sup>237</sup> It also urged the City to strengthen its efforts to suppress the publishing, including by singing, and sale of libellous ballads and pamphlets. It may be that the act of licensing *Lucasta* was a bureaucratic bungle by Sir Nathaniel Brent, the licenser for books on legal and other matters. Brent was apparently spending most of his time in Oxford during these months, after Parliament commissioned him on 1 May 1647 to head the visitors appointed to reform the university.<sup>238</sup> Perhaps he failed to keep up with Parliament's attempts to suppress royalist propaganda in London and signed off prematurely on *Lucasta* before he learned of Parliament's renewed attempts at censorship. One can imagine bureaucratic efforts to suppress temporarily a decision which had become an embarrassment between the time it was made and the time it was published.

### **Post-1648: Conspiracies**

Lovelace drops from public view after his release from Peterhouse. The *Posthume Poems* show significant disillusion following the royalist defeat. However, there is evidence that Lovelace transferred his allegiance to Charles II. I have argued in the relation to '*The Falcon*' that Lovelace supported the young king at the battle of Worcester in 1651.<sup>239</sup> It is also likely that Lovelace became sporadically involved in royalist conspiracy during the Interregnum.

David Underdown, in his still authoritative *Royalist Conspiracy in England: 1649–1660* (1960), notes that 'Colonel Francis Lovelace' was implicated in information received by John Thurloe, Secretary of State to the Commonwealth, in the still-born Ship Tavern conspiracy of early 1654.<sup>240</sup> However, the documentary evidence that Underdown cites refers only to 'Colonel Lovelace', suggesting that the eldest brother Richard, rather than Francis, was involved. The Ship Tavern conspiracy, so-called because the conspirators were arrested at the Ship Tavern near the Old Bailey, was an amateur affair.<sup>241</sup> While it came to fruition during the early days of the existence of the Sealed Knot, it was (mis)managed by members of the so-called 'swordsmen' attached at various times to Prince Rupert. Two close connections of Charles Gerard were involved in the planning: Gerard's brother John, and his brother-in-law Colonel Roger Whitley (1618–1697). Captain Richard Dutton was also involved. Plotting the Ship Tavern conspiracy started late in 1653 and came formally to notice on 16 February 1654, when a low-level informer, Roger Cotes,



made a detailed statement to Thurloe or his agent.<sup>242</sup> As Underdown points out, Thurloe had been paying Cotes for his information and even subsidising his contributions to the plot from very early on.<sup>243</sup>

The existence and nature of the plot was made public by 18 February when the publisher George Thomason noted receipt of a detailed account, *A Full and Perfect Relation of the Great Plot*. Other accounts appeared in the following days, while one of the conspirators, a Captain Thomas Smith, made a detailed statement to John Barkstead, Lieutenant of the Tower, on 24 February 1654.<sup>244</sup> In essence, the conspirators planned to raise a royalist army of 30,000 London apprentices and others to take control of Whitehall, St James's and the Tower. Cromwell was to be assassinated and Charles Stuart proclaimed king and crowned. Risings were expected in the provinces. The conspirators met in a series of London taverns. The existence of a great council overseeing the plot was mentioned by both Cotes and Smith in their statements. According to Cotes, he was told by Dutton that 'the lord Biron, sir Thomas Sandys, sir Thomas Armstrong, the lord Loughborow, colonel Lovelace, are of the council'.<sup>245</sup> According to Smith, in his more detailed statement, 'about Michaelmas last' (29 September 1653), a Roger Lea met with him and suggested that he join 'a designe on foote' to restore the laws and religion.<sup>246</sup> A group met a few days later at the Feathers Tavern in Cheapside where, after they had drunk 'a quart or two of wine, and eaten some sawceages', Dutton described the plot to the assembled company. Cotes and Lea were selected to go to the great council at the Horne Tavern in Fleet Street:

which this examinant saith they soon after did, and there also mett with colonel Lovelace, and colonel Wheatley, where this examinant saith there was some discourse about the designe; and then the said colonel Wheatley told this examinant, that there was a grand councell, in which persons of quality were engaged, whoe were not willing as yet to be publicly known.<sup>247</sup>

The implication here is that Lovelace was not a member of any grand council. There is no evidence in royalist correspondence or elsewhere that the council actually existed other than in the minds of the plotters, who may have been using the names of prominent persons of quality to give credibility to the undertaking. There were bumbling attempts to raise money from the conspirators to fund Whitley's return to France to seek instructions from Charles Stuart and Dutton's efforts to raise support in the provinces. Eleven of the low-level conspirators, including Captain Dutton and,

for a few days, the informer Cotes, were imprisoned for their part in the conspiracy, but were eventually released without trial before the end of the year.

‘Colonel Lovelace’ was also named as a conspirator in the most detailed contemporary description of the Ship Tavern conspiracy to enter the public domain, *A Treasonable Plot Discovered*, published by Robert Ibbitson and annotated by Thomason on 19 February 1654.<sup>248</sup> The account is so detailed that the author must have had access to Thurloe’s information. It differentiated a number of levels of conspirators among those ‘suspected to be in this Plot’, partly by rank and partly on whether they were based in England or in continental Europe, thus giving the clearest indication that Richard Lovelace was being referred to, rather than Francis.<sup>249</sup>

‘*Charls Stuart*, and his Brother, and *Rupert*, and *Massey*, and the rest of his Council in *France*’ appear at the top of the pyramid, followed by ‘Major General *Middleton*, and other Officers lately gone out of Holland’, then ‘Agents beyond the Seas’. These are followed by the council members named by Cotes: ‘The Lord of *Loughborough*, the Lord *Byron*, Sir *Tho. Sands*, Sir *Tho. Armstrong*’.<sup>250</sup> Then appears ‘Colonel *Lowlis* [Lovelace], and divers other Lords, Knights, and Gentlemen, Colonels of the late Kings Armies, and others in *England*’. On the next page, the low ranking conspirators who had actually been arrested are listed. Francis Lovelace is not known to have been in England between 1650 and May 1655, when Thurloe’s agent Manning refers to ‘colonell Francis Lovelace’ in relation to Penruddock’s rising.<sup>251</sup> Rather, he is believed to have been in continental Europe, associated with the court in exile. He had traveled to Long Island with Sir Henry Moodie on a pass issued by the Council of State on 6 May 1650, ‘they subscribing to the engagement’. This was the occasion of Richard’s poem ‘*Advice to my best Brother. Coll: Francis Lovelace*’. In May 1652, Francis Lovelace petitioned the Council of State for a pass into France. He had been appointed by the Commonwealth’s Commissioners ‘to repair to the late King of Scots, “wheresoever he were,”’ to give an account of the royalists’ surrender of Virginia.<sup>252</sup> On that occasion he was more than just a convenient courier. He carried a letter to the king from the immediate past colonial governor in Virginia, Sir William Berkeley, dated 14 May 1652, suggesting that Charles seek from Francis a fuller relation of what had occurred in the colony.<sup>253</sup> The context of Berkeley’s letter makes it clear that Francis Lovelace was being referred to. He was the bearer of papers to the king from Virginia, a place Richard is not known to have visited. Had

the author of *A Treasonable Plot Discovered* been referring to Francis, his name would logically have been expected to be included among the conspirators from outside England and, as the younger brother in a case where confusion might arise, for his forename to be used.

The only doubt attaching to the identification of Richard Lovelace in this context, rather than Francis, lies in the fact that both brothers had served under Gerard and with Whitley. Thus, either might have been confident in entering into such a risky endeavour with Whitley. Richard Lovelace, Whitley and Gerard were contemporaries, while Francis Lovelace was a few years younger. As noted earlier, Richard served under Gerard during the Bishops' Wars and was at Oxford with Whitley. Whitley and Francis Lovelace both served under Gerard in Wales, Whitley as Governor of Aberystwyth and Francis Lovelace as Governor of Carmarthen. It is thus not surprising that Underdown appears to have confused the brothers. Furthermore, of the two brothers, it is Francis who features most consistently in accounts of various conspiracies after the Ship Tavern fiasco died down. To add to the confusion, the entry on Francis Lovelace in the first *Dictionary of National Biography*, on which Underdown based his identification, wrongly identified Francis as the younger brother of the second Baron Lovelace of Hurley. A third Francis Lovelace, the Recorder of Canterbury, a distant relation, also appears in the archives.

There is no evidence that Richard Lovelace was interrogated or arrested in the months following the Ship Tavern conspiracy, although he must have been nervous. Underdown suggests that Thurloe, perhaps intentionally, failed to make a clean sweep of the suspects, allowing some of them to continue their involvement in what became known as the (second) Gerard plot, in which Thurloe's *agents provocateurs* were also involved.<sup>254</sup> As Underdown points out, the evidence linking the more prominent plotters with the conspiracy was negligible. Loughborough, named as a council member, cleared his name within days in an appearance before the Council.<sup>255</sup> On 22 February 1654 (O.S.), Sir Miles Hobart wrote to Hyde that 'Numerous arrests in London strike a general terror, and have made some principal men needlessly decline that which they thought before could not in reason miscarry'.<sup>256</sup> On 21 March, 'Mr. Berkenhead', in a local letter of intelligence to Thurloe, wrote 'Col. Lovelace (Whitlye's great comrade) sent one Mr. Doubledee to me, on the last Lord's day, to desire to know, what was against him, and wished me

to inquire the utmost'.<sup>257</sup> For the reasons stated above, Berkenhead almost certainly refers here to Richard Lovelace, not Francis. The author was not the poet and journalist John Berkenhead but his brother Isaac, who is known to have been one of Thurloe's double agents.<sup>258</sup> Isaac Berkenhead's letter to Thurloe is interesting on a number of counts. First, Lovelace was sufficiently concerned about reports of his involvement to attempt to find out the extent to which he was implicated. Second, Berkenhead thought that Lovelace's seeking information would be of interest to Thurloe, indicating that, in Berkenhead's mind at least, in the first half of 1654 Lovelace was sufficiently prominent to warrant his naming to Thurloe. Third, Berkenhead names Lovelace as 'Whitlye's great comrade', which might indicate that Lovelace, like Whitley, was aligned in some way with the so-called 'swordsmen' led by Prince Rupert during the war years and with the Gerard faction later on.<sup>259</sup> Gerard had a long and loyal association with Prince Rupert.

## Last Years

The reference in Isaac Berkenhead's letter is the last known probable mention of Richard Lovelace to have come to light in the various collections of state papers. However, there are indications that Lovelace continued to be regarded as a threat by the Commonwealth. The text of his poem 'The *Triumphs* of PHILAMORE and AMORET', an epithalamium addressed to Charles Cotton on his marriage to Isabella Hutchinson in June 1656, implies that Cotton assisted Lovelace during a period of incarceration some time between 1649 and the summer of 1656:

What Fate was mine, when in mine obscure Cave  
 (Shut up almost close Prisoner in a Grave)  
 Your Beams could reach me through this vault of Night,  
 And Canton the dark Dungeon with Light!  
 Whence me (as gen'rous *Spahy*'s) you unbound,  
 Whilst I now know my self both *Free* and Crown'd. (ll. 7–12)<sup>260</sup>

Lovelace was, at the very least, in hiding, most likely in prison. The Ship Tavern conspiracy is so well documented that it is unlikely that Lovelace was arrested at the time, early in 1654. Nor is it likely that this incident relates to Lovelace's imprisonment in 1648–1649, as Cotton would only have been about nineteen years of age at that time.<sup>261</sup> Wilkinson suggests that this third imprisonment could have been the occasion mentioned in Aubrey's account of Lovelace on which: 'George Petty, haberdasher in Fleet Street, carried xxs to him every Monday morning from Sir ... Many and Charles Cotton, esq., for ... (quaere quot) moneths, but was never

repayd'.<sup>262</sup> The 'Many' Aubrey refers to is Sir John Mayney of Linton Place, Kent, who was involved with Lovelace in the *Kentish Petition*. He also served under Gerard and was involved in fundraising and conspiracies for the royalist cause during the Interregnum.<sup>263</sup>

Wilkinson suggests that Lovelace's third period of incarceration probably took place in the second part of 1655, under the rule of the Major-Generals.<sup>264</sup> This is a reasonable assumption. In the aftermath of the royalist insurrection of early March 1655 (Penruddock's Rising) Cromwell and Thurloe became convinced that another uprising was being planned, centring on the Midlands.<sup>265</sup> Much of their information came from Henry Manning, one of Thurloe's spies and a double agent based at the court in exile, who corresponded with Thurloe for nine months between early March 1655 and his execution by royalist exiles in December of that year.<sup>266</sup> On three occasions, Manning alerted Thurloe to Francis Lovelace's activities.<sup>267</sup> Manning is known on occasion to have embroidered and invented information. Nevertheless, whether or not their fears were justified, Cromwell and Thurloe acted. An archival trace places Richard in or around Oxford on 26 March 1655. He witnessed a permit for Robert Warcup to enter and survey lands in Pyrton and Easington, Oxfordshire, held by the President and Fellows of Magdalen College.<sup>268</sup> These parcels of land are about ten miles to the south east of Oxford and just on half way between Oxford and Lord Lovelace's lands at Hurley. A major round-up of known royalists, many of whom had been identified by Manning, started in London on 21 May. On 6 June, Lord Lovelace was arrested at or near Oxford on Cromwell's instruction, with the young Lord Falkland and others. Reports of these arrests and others appeared in the newsbooks.<sup>269</sup> In a letter dated 11 June [N.S] intercepted by Thurloe, one Gilbert Savage commented in relation to the arrests, 'Since you and I knew each other, never were such times as these now instant upon us'.<sup>270</sup> The *Faithful Scout* of 22 June 1655 included an extensive list of prominent people who had been seized 'as being dangerous Instruments to the peace of this Commonwealth' and noted that 'Divers Gentlemen and persons of honour are still dayly apprehended in several parts of England, being charged with disaffection to the present Government'.<sup>271</sup> Underdown suggests that, 'By the end of summer there were few Cavaliers of any note outside the clutches of Thurloe's officers' and estimates, in the absence of reliable returns, that hundreds must have been

arrested'.<sup>272</sup> Given the numbers of royalists involved and the targeting of Lord Lovelace and Francis in correspondence regarding the conspiracy, it seems reasonable at least to speculate that the mid-1655 round-up of royalists was the occasion of Richard's third period of imprisonment.

### ***Death and Posthume Poems***

According to Wood, Lovelace 'died in a very mean Lodging in *Gun-powder Alley* near *Shoe lane*, and was buried at the west end of the Church of *St Bride* alias *Bridget* in *London* [...] in sixteen hundred fifty and eight'. In fact, Lovelace must have died some time between the autumn of 1656 and that of 1657. Lovelace's commendatory verses included in three volumes of poetry published during these months provide some clues as to the date of death, although they do not enable any great degree of certainty. First were those on the occasion of Francis Beale's translation of Giochino Greco's *The Royal Game of Chesse-Play*, 'To Dr. F.B. *On his Book of Chesse*'.<sup>273</sup> Thomason annotated his copy on 12 May 1656. The subtitle of the volume, '*Sometimes the Recreation of the Late King*', demonstrates the royalist allegiance of the volume, which Lovelace's contribution would probably have served to emphasise. Next were those to the republican journalist John Hall's posthumously published translation of *Hierocles Upon the Golden Verses of Pythagoras*, annotated by Thomason on 8 December 1656, although the publishing details indicate that the volume was published in 1657. Hall's *Hierocles* was seen through the press by John Davies of Kidwelly, to whose translation of Voiture's *Letters of Affaires Love and Courtship*, annotated by Thomason on 1 June 1657, Lovelace contributed a few lines of commendation.<sup>274</sup> According to Davies's 'Account of the Author', dated 5 November 1656, Hall died on 1 August 1656.<sup>275</sup> From the text of Lovelace's verses addressed 'To the *Genius* of Mr. *John Hall*', it is clear that they were written after Hall's death. Lovelace refers to the 'sprig of *Elegie*' he stuck to Hall's hearse, indicating that he probably attended Hall's funeral.<sup>276</sup> In the same section of the poem, Lovelace noted their political differences: 'Alas, our *Faiths* made different *Essayes*, | Our *Minds* and *Merits* brake two sev'rall wayes', indicating perhaps that he still regarded his own royalist 'faith' to be as strong as Hall's republican one. This is the last datable comment by Lovelace on his commitment to the royalist cause.

The minor poet Eldred Revett addressed three poems to his mentor in his privately published volume of *Poems*. Revett's 'Epistle Dedicatory' is dated 19 October 1647.<sup>277</sup> The year '1647' must be a simple typographical error. Revett's *Poems* was published in 1657. Unfortunately, there is no extant numbered Thomason copy to confirm this, but there can be no doubt. The text indicates that Richard was dead when Revett wrote the 'Epistle Dedicatory'. Revett gave Lovelace's own commendatory verses 'To my dear Friend Mr. ELDRED REVETT, On his Poems *Moral, and Divine*' pride of place.<sup>278</sup> They open the volume. 'To his Honoured Friend, Col. R.L. upon his second failing' is a short apology for failing in some undertaking on Lovelace's behalf, while 'To my honoured Friend, Coll, Richard Lovelace, On his second Poems' indicates that preparation for the publication of what became the *Posthume Poems* was well under way before Revett's *Poems* went to press and, thus, before Lovelace died.<sup>279</sup> The third poem Revett addressed to the older poet is 'AN ELEGIE, Sacred to the Memory of my late honoured Friend, Collonel Richard Lovelace'.<sup>280</sup> This is the only poem by Revett to be included in the *Posthume Poems*.<sup>281</sup>

Wood attributes Lovelace's death to the melancholy he suffered following the death of Charles I and his poverty which 'brought him at length into a consumption'. The term 'consumption' had a more general meaning than tuberculosis in the mid-seventeenth century, indicating 'wasting (extreme weight loss) of the body'.<sup>282</sup> As discussed above, there are records of Wood's attempts to establish the circumstances of Lovelace's death.<sup>283</sup> Sir Edward Sherburne, in his youth a member of the Stanley group and a distant family connection of both Lovelace and Stanley's, had written to Wood on 29 December 1687, detailing his failure to locate Lovelace's sister, Mistress Joan Caesar, or her husband Robert.<sup>284</sup> Sherburne promised that he would continue his endeavours on Wood's behalf. Another letter from Wood's papers relating to Lovelace, which provides some further information on his death, surfaced during the course of this study. Mistress Caesar did finally respond to Sir Edward Sherburne's attempts contact her for information. Sherburne, in his letter to Wood of 9 February 1687/88 (see Plate VII), described the inconclusive encounter:

Kind S:<sup>r</sup>

Not an [Hour!?] before the Receipt of yo:<sup>r</sup> Last Letter of the 7:<sup>th</sup> of this Present, I had the fortune to see M:<sup>rs</sup> Cæsar, (being sent to Me by some of her friends that I desird to inquire after Her) I discovered her about her Brother M:<sup>r</sup> Richard Lovelace, but found she was <sup>as</sup>

ignorant of his Concernes as a mere Stranger. All she could tell Me was that she was at his funeral, being buried in S.<sup>t</sup> Brides Church London, in w.<sup>ch</sup> Parish he dyed coming from the Country of a Sicknesse he had there taken. But she could neither tell Me the Yeare nor Moneth nor Day wherein he dyed. She hath promised Me to write to her Husband to give Me a more particular Relation, and when I have it from Him, I shall acquaint you with it. In the meane Time I shall, either by my selfe or a friend, consult the Church Register, and what that can make out, I shall impart to you.<sup>285</sup>

The letter is inscribed on the reverse in Wood's handwriting: 'Y 4 | Col. Ric. Lovelace | his sequall'. Wood's inscription is in the form in which he indexed his papers for the *Athenae Oxonienses*, proving conclusively that it was originally included with his papers now in the Bodleian. It is now with the Sherborn family papers in the London Metropolitan Archive. Mistress Caesar is represented in the text as being vague about the circumstances of her brother's death, thirty years previously. She recalls that Lovelace was buried at St Brides Church, London, the parish in which he died. This is consonant with Wood's statement that the poet died 'in a very mean Lodging in *Gunpowder Alley* near *Shoe Lane*', but contradicts Aubrey's recollection that he died near Long Acre.<sup>286</sup> Given that the letter indicates that Mistress Caesar relied on her husband for further details of her brother's death, it may confirm that Robert Caesar played a role in winding up the poet's affairs. Her recollection that her brother died 'coming from the Country of a Sicknesse he had there taken' provides an intriguing final parallel between Lovelace and Andrew Marvell. Marvell also died of a fever apparently contracted on a return journey to London, in his case a 'tertian ague' after a visit to Hull.<sup>287</sup>

There is an intriguing entry in the parish register of St Bride's, Fleet Street, for 5 April 1657 recording the burial of a 'Dudley Lovelace'.<sup>288</sup> Mistress Caesar recalled attending her brother Richard's funeral at St Bride's. The only 'Dudley Lovelace' to have surfaced during this study is Richard's younger brother, Dudley Posthumous, who died in 1686. It may well be that Dudley Lovelace's name was entered in the register in error, when Richard was meant. This can never be proved. Extensive checking of other contemporary parish records have thrown no light on the matter. If Sherburne or his representative visited St Bride's almost thirty years after Richard's death, this is the only record they would have found. The gravestones were, presumably, destroyed with the church in the Great Fire of 1666.

As Wood tells it, after his death, Lovelace's youngest brother, Dudley Posthumous, 'made a collection of his poetical papers, fitted them for the press, and



intituled them, *Lucasta: Posthume Poems*'. He was assisted by Eldred Revett. A draft of a letter to Dudley Posthumous, then in the 'Low Countryes', concerning the *Posthume Poems* has survived in Revett's commonplace book.<sup>289</sup> It is dated 'Junii 20', unfortunately without any indication of the year, although it contains some useful information. Revett notes that 'M<sup>r</sup> Caesar (whom I have solicited by Ire) hath informed M<sup>r</sup>. Davis that by the next opportunity hee will doe something Concerning y<sup>e</sup> desires' and apologises that 'the Collonell Poems are not in y<sup>e</sup> press, if they have birth in Michaelmas Term it will bee y<sup>e</sup> soonest'.<sup>290</sup> Revett's prose is convoluted. A reasonable interpretation of these lines would be that Revett had written to Lovelace's brother-in-law, Robert Caesar, who in turn had told 'Mr Davis' — perhaps John Davies of Kidwelly, given the frequency with which Davies is named in relation to Lovelace in 1656–1657 — that he would do something in relation to a request Dudley had made. One can imagine that Davies might have been asked to contribute commendatory lines to the *Posthume Poems*. Dudley is known to have been in the Low Countries in the first part of 1657. Blank Marshall, one of Thurloe's informers, wrote to him from Bruges on 8 April [N.S.]:

We had yesterday about fifty young blades come from your parts, but in short time they will repent it. [...] There is come hither with these, the lord B—aney, colonel Tracie, and one captain Lovelace, brother to colonel Lovelace, who is always here.<sup>291</sup>

Dudley may also have been at the court in exile in the Low Countries again in early 1658.<sup>292</sup> The mention of 'Michaelmas Term' in Revett's letter could apply to 1659, as the *Posthume Poems* was entered in the Stationers' Register under '14<sup>th</sup> of Novemb. 1659', just after Michaelmas of that year.<sup>293</sup> From the undated and unattributed draft in Revett's commonplace book which follows the letter to Dudley, which may well be to the same addressee, it appears that Revett's letter miscarried.<sup>294</sup>

Francis continued the family's involvement with the royalist cause, playing a more prominent role than has previously been recognised. On 10 February 1657, there is a report in the Clarendon Papers: 'Marmaduke Langdale is gone to .... with Frank Lovelace, John Cooper, and some more; they go to the north'.<sup>295</sup> The sense of the text is that they had gone to the north of England, where Langdale was active at this time, although the balance of the letter deals with royalist activity in continental Europe.<sup>296</sup> On 6 August 1657, 'Fras. Lovelace and servant' were issued with a pass

to leave England and go to Holland.<sup>297</sup> Given that there are no other official passes sanctioning Francis's conspiratorial travel between England and continental Europe during these years, it is possible that this visit was related in some way to Richard's death, which would presumably have been known to the authorities. In late April 1658, Francis carried letters from the king to three unnamed royalists in England seeking their assistance in his cause and referring them to Francis for his advice on how they might contribute.<sup>298</sup> He was committed to the Tower on 6 November 1658, betrayed by Joseph Bampffield, one of Thurloe's most successful spies, apparently for fomenting rebellion in Oxfordshire.<sup>299</sup>

Released by Easter 1659, Francis Lovelace returned to the Continent and then crossed back to England in May of that year. He assisted in the preparations for Booth's unsuccessful uprising, after which he was again arrested.<sup>300</sup> He remained in prison until the Restoration. Francis was eventually rewarded for the family's ongoing commitment to the royalist cause. In 1667, he was appointed Governor of New York.<sup>301</sup> His brothers Thomas and Dudley Posthumous accompanied him there. Unfortunately, New York was seized by the Dutch in 1673, while Francis was visiting friends elsewhere. On his return to England, Francis was involved in an altercation with James, Duke of York over a disputed debt. He was later imprisoned, following questioning over the loss of New York. He died on 22 December 1675 at Woodstock, near Oxford. Dudley Posthumous was granted administration of his estate. The Lovelace brothers' reward for the family's very substantial commitment to the royalist cause was short lived.

## **Private Life and Views**

### ***Lovelace and Women***

Lovelace never married, although Wood, Marvell, Tatham and others attest to his attractiveness and attraction to women. Marvell's lines imagining the ladies of the court sallying forth to Lovelace's defence against the Presbyterians in Parliament, their petticoats flapping, are truly funny. There is no need for readers to be aware of current critical thinking on Marvell's reference to inversionary women-on-top discourse or the possibility that Marvell himself may have had homosexual leanings to appreciate the humour.<sup>302</sup>

But when the beauteous Ladies came to know  
That their deare *Lovelace* was endanger'd so:  
*Lovelace* that thaw'd the most congealed brest,  
He who love'd best and them defended best.  
Whose hand so rudely grasps the steely brand,  
Whose hand so gently melts the Ladies hand,  
They all in mutiny though yet undrest  
Sally'd and would in his defence contest.<sup>303</sup>

Marvell casts himself either as a competitor in their eyes for *Lovelace*'s affections or as one of the 'barbed Censurers' who has stopped the dissemination of *Lucasta* in the months preceding the second civil war:<sup>304</sup>

Thinking that I too of the rout had been.  
Mine eyes invaded with a female spight,  
(She knew what pain 't would be to lose that fight.)

Marvell goes on to convince the ladies that he is on their side.

The eponymous 'Lucasta' is the most important female presence in *Lucasta* and the *Posthume Poems*. Wood states that *Lovelace* was wounded at Dunkirk and that Lucy Sacheverel, the 'Gentlewoman of great beauty and fortune', 'whom he usually called Lux casta [...] after a strong report that *Lovelace* was dead of his wound received at *Dunkirk*, soon after married'. No-one has yet managed to identify 'Lucy Sacheverel', although she may emerge as English parish records are progressively digitised.<sup>305</sup> It is possible that Wood got her name wrong, or even that 'Sacheverell' was her spouse's surname. However, there is no reason to doubt that 'Lucasta' existed. She has substance, for example at the funeral in 'LUCASTA paying her Obsequies to the chast memory of my dearest Cosin Mrs. Bowes Barne'.<sup>306</sup> She is linked in *Lovelace*'s 'ODE (You are deceiv'd; I sooner may dull fair)', with William Habington's 'Castara', Lucy Herbert, and Waller's 'Sacharissa', Dorothy Sidney, other actual women who provided inspiration to *Lovelace*'s contemporaries.<sup>307</sup> She is the subject and object of poems throughout *Lovelace*'s literary career, indicating a long term association probably dating from before the wars.

It is not necessary for readers today to know *Lucasta*'s actual identity to understand her importance in *Lovelace*'s poems. It is too simplistic to cast her in the classic role of the Petrarchan mistress. In the opening pages of *Lucasta*, she represents the female object of his speaker's platonic offerings. In formal court poems set to music and suitable for performance in front of the king, like 'TO

LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*' and 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*', she is all that is good and chaste, tempered with the occasional veiled hope of physical love.<sup>308</sup> In less formal settings, those suitable for performance in relaxed, sophisticated company, perhaps in taverns or at gatherings on the edges of the court, like 'Dialogue. LUCASTA, ALEXIS', she is the speaker's partner in elaborate, sexually charged word games.<sup>309</sup> In 'LUCASTA, *taking the waters at Tunbridge*', she is the object of his frankly erotic imaginings.<sup>310</sup> In 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' she starts to merge with the royalist cause, a role she assumes more and more in later poems.<sup>311</sup> By the end of *Lucasta*, in 'Calling LUCASTA *from her Retirement*' and 'Aramantha', she is a nymph or spirit who has passed to a superior plane, the neo-Platonic world of the spheres, where she is both the object of his love and the personification of royalism. It is not important to the reader to know whether she is dead, or married to another. It is enough that she is unattainable on earth. In the *Posthume Poems* she is alternately the cruel temptress, who laughs at her lover's pain in 'Lucasta *Laughing*', and the incarcerated light of royalism in 'Night. To Lucasta'.<sup>312</sup>

As will be shown in subsequent chapters, Chloris is a pseudonym for Henrietta Maria in a number of Lovelace's allegorical poems. However, it is difficult to imagine that even Lovelace, whom I present as consistently rejecting both Henrietta Maria's pre-war cult of neo-Platonic love and her positions on issues of court politics during the war years, would have written of his queen in the onanistic terms of 'Love made in the first Age: To Chloris.'<sup>313</sup> None of Lovelace's other female addressees can be safely identified, although Ellinda has presence. As well as being the owner of the hand which fills the mildly erotic 'ELINDA'S GLOVE', she is the object of a number of epistolary poems which seem to reflect real situations.<sup>314</sup> In 'Being treated TO ELLINDA', Lovelace thanks her for what may well have been a pleasant, family Christmas dinner. He proffers an elegant apology for failing to write in 'TO ELLINDA, *That lately I have not written*'.<sup>315</sup> 'TO ELLINDA. *Upon his late recovery. A Paradox*', alludes with gentle wit to the paradox that when the speaker was ill, languishing in Ellinda's care, he was at the same time wrapped in the pleasing, gentle warmth of her presence.<sup>316</sup> The poems addressed to 'Ellinda' project a different kind of character from the one that Lovelace usually constructs for his speaker — one who actually seems to like and relate to the women of whom he

writes as people, rather than in stereotypically gendered terms. It may well be that Lovelace went for succour to Lady Anne Lovelace after he was wounded at Dunkirk and learnt that Lucasta had married. His complimentary poem, ‘The Lady *A.L. My Asylum in a great extremity*’, thanks the addressee, presumably Lady Anne, for her assistance in circumstances where he ‘first had lost his Body, now his Minde’; that is, physically, then mentally wounded.<sup>317</sup> If ‘TO ELLINDA. *Upon his late recovery*’ refers to the same period of illness and ill-fortune as that in ‘The Lady *A.L. My Asylum in a great extremity*’, it opens up the possibility that ‘Ellinda’ is a pseudonym for Lady Anne Lovelace. If this is so, it shows that Lovelace had a nice sense of propriety in his selection of addressees, choosing ‘Ellinda’ for the courtly recipient of graceful compliments and the initials ‘A.L.’, signifying the person, in more serious, contemplative poems.

The actor, William Cartwright (1606–1686), may, at some stage, have tried to claim that his daughter, Althea, was the subject of ‘TO ALTHEA, *From Prison*’. Cartwright was connected to the Lovelaces of Hurley. He acquired a sequence of Lovelace family portraits covering four generations of Lovelaces from 1576, including that of Richard Lovelace, and bequeathed them to the Dulwich Picture Gallery as part of his broader collection.<sup>318</sup> A portrait of Lord Lovelace (c. 1640–1693), the dedicatee in the *Posthume Poems*, ends the series. Cartwright had in his collection a portrait of a young woman identified as ‘Althea’.<sup>319</sup> Cartwright’s inventory of his pictures describes the portrait, considered to have been painted after Lovelace’s death, as ‘Altheas pictur her hare deschevell’, in an obvious reference to ‘TO ALTHEA’ and ‘TO AMARANTHA, That she would dishevell her haire’.<sup>320</sup> ‘Althea Cartwright als Lovelace’ is recorded as one of a number of Cartwrights to have died during the great plague. She was buried at St Giles-in-the-Fields, Cartwright’s parish church, on 11 June 1666.<sup>321</sup> This reference is the only contemporary suggestion that ‘Althea Cartwright’ may have been married (formally or informally) to Lovelace. Cartwright would have known Lovelace. As well as the distant family connection, Cartwright played at Salisbury Court (otherwise known as ‘Whitefriars’) as one of Queen Henrietta’s Men, and was a member of the company when Lovelace’s lost play, *The Scholars*, was performed there.<sup>322</sup> He may have been in The Hague when Lovelace was there. Like Lovelace, Cartwright was active in royalist circles in London during 1648, where he participated illegally in the staging

of plays.<sup>323</sup> There is no evidence that ‘Althea’ and Lovelace ever married. It is possible that William Cartwright, or Althea herself, exaggerated the relationship to claim vicarious credit.

### ***Lovelace’s Personal Faith and Royalism***

No manuscript evidence in the form of diaries or correspondence which might have allowed us to locate Lovelace firmly within any particular personal religious allegiance or royalist faction has surfaced to date. Lovelace’s political allegiance to the established Protestant Church of England has not been questioned. He is not known to have flirted with Roman Catholicism. As discussed above, the text of ‘*A Guiltlesse Lady imprisoned; after penanced*’ is probably an intervention in the debate over Archbishop Laud’s long-running pursuit of Lady Purbeck for adultery, which was seen by many as an infringement of the rights of the gentry and aristocracy.<sup>324</sup> In ‘*A Guiltlesse Lady*’, the speaker, like many others who would later demonstrate their firm allegiance to the royalist cause, shows a significant lack of sympathy with Laudian policies. There is no reason to doubt that Lovelace’s own views echoed his speaker’s in this case. There are indications in his poems that religion in the sense of personal belief was not particularly important to Lovelace. For example, he is not known to have written devotional poetry. He opens ‘*To FLETCHER reviv’d*’, his contribution to the collection of commendatory poems preceding John Fletcher’s (1579–1625) and Francis Beaumont’s (1584–1616) first folio (1647), with the lines ‘How have I bin Religious? what strange good | Ha’s scap’t me that I never understood?’, lines which imply that strong personal faith has not guided him.<sup>325</sup> His commendatory poem to Eldred Revett, ‘*To my Dear Freind Mr. E.R. On his Poems Moral and Divine*’, contrasts Lovelace’s ‘divided Quill’, split between Helicon, home of the Muses (‘the watry mount’) and the fires of Mt Sinai, and Revett’s (who wrote devotional poetry) ‘*Angels quil dip’d i’t h Lambs blood*’, an obvious Christian reference.<sup>326</sup>

It is probable that, like so many others, Lovelace’s factional allegiances shifted as circumstances changed. That being said, as indicated earlier, the militaristic idiom Lovelace so often adopts, and biographical traces of his actions and associations, may indicate that at various times during the war years he saw himself among the swordsmen surrounding Prince Rupert. His poems are not a good source

of evidence of any factional alignment. There is no need to argue the difficulties of establishing authorial intention in making this point. The training in rhetoric at school, university and/or the Inns of Court shared by many upper class men and well-off merchants' sons ensured that most were able to argue a position competently, whether or not they believed their own arguments. The 'serial turncoat', Marchamont Nedham, is a case in point.<sup>327</sup> He wrote persuasively for Parliament in *Mercurius Britanicus* (1643–1646); as a convinced royalist in *Mercurius Pragmaticus* (1647–1649); then as a republican (1650) and as editor of the state newspaper *Mercurius Politicus* (1650–1660).<sup>328</sup>

There is no evidence that Lovelace was interested in the development of a philosophy of royalism, for example with his fellow Kentishman, Sir Robert Filmer, or with Thomas Hobbes, although Lovelace must have known Filmer. He wrote the 'Elegiacall Epitaph', '*On the Death of Mrs. Elizabeth Filmer*', almost certainly Sir Robert's sister.<sup>329</sup> The absence of any recorded contact between Lovelace and Hobbes, Hobbes's patron Newcastle, and the royalist poets in exile, Cowley and Davenant, who were linked with Hobbes at this time, while all were in France, may be indicative of this lack of interest.<sup>330</sup> This is not to say that Lovelace had no knowledge of, or interest in, contemporary philosophical debate. It is clear, for example from the beast fables, that he had considerable interest in natural philosophy, including alchemy. We know Lovelace had some skill in music and painting and that he was regarded by his peers as a well-rounded renaissance man in the mode of Sir Philip Sidney.<sup>331</sup> It should therefore come as no surprise that Lovelace also showed interest theories of representation, for example in his poems to Peter Lely, in the context of the renaissance debate over the relative merits of painting and poetry.<sup>332</sup>

The private views of Lovelace, the man, and his circumstances, are elusive. However, the public meaning of his poems can be identified when these are examined in their historical context.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> *Poems* (1925); Cyril Hughes Hartmann, *The Cavalier Spirit and its Influence on the Life and Work of Richard Lovelace (1618-1658)* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1925).

<sup>2</sup> The major biographical findings have been offered to the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, where they have been incorporated into Raymond Anselment's entry on Lovelace. See also, Susan A. Clarke, 'Richard Lovelace, Anthony Wood, and Some Previously Unremarked Lovelace Documents', *Notes and Queries*, 249 (2004), 362-66, reproduced at Appendix IV. The reference in the article to 'Sophia of Hanover' (p. 365) should read 'Elizabeth of Bohemia'.

<sup>3</sup> Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 2 vols (London, 1691-92), II, cols 146-47. All subsequent references to 'Wood' in the text are to this entry. See also Wood, I, col. 887, on Lovelace's graduation.

<sup>4</sup> On the accuracy of Wood's biography of Lovelace, see Appendix IV.

<sup>5</sup> London Metropolitan Archive, MS Sherborn Family ACC/3259/SF3/004.

<sup>6</sup> Gerald Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 71 (1985), 203-34 (p. 216), Raymond A. Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1988), p. 98.

<sup>7</sup> Alan Everitt, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1966), pp. 15, 96.

<sup>8</sup> Jacqueline Eales, 'The Rise of Ideological Politics in Kent, 1558-1640', in *Early Modern Kent, 1540-1640*, ed. Michael Zell (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2000) pp. 279-313 (p. 312).

<sup>9</sup> Eales, 'Ideological Politics', pp. 312, 293-5.

<sup>10</sup> Jacqueline Eales, 'Kent and the English Civil Wars, 1640-1660', in *Government and Politics in Kent, 1640-1914*, ed. Frederick Lansberry (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2001), 1-32 (p. 32).

<sup>11</sup> The article is at Appendix IV; reproductions of one of the indentures and Lovelace's signature and seal are at Plates IV and V.

<sup>12</sup> Unless otherwise stated, the sources from which the genealogical information in the following paragraphs is drawn include A.J. Pearman, 'The Kentish Family of Lovelace', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 10 (1876), 184-220; A.J. Pearman, 'The Kentish Family of Lovelace II', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 20 (1893), 54-63; J. Hall Pleasants, 'The Gorsuch and Lovelace Families', *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 26 (1918), 81-93; J. Hall Pleasants, 'The Lovelace Family and its Connections', *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 27, pp. 393-408; 28, pp. 83-90, 176-187, 285-295, 375-381; 29, pp. 110-124, 227-243 (1919-1921); J. Hall Pleasants, 'Francis Lovelace, Governor of New York, 1668-1673', *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record*, 51 (1920), 175-94. I would like to thank the History of Parliament Trust for making available a pre-publication copy of their biography of Sir William Lovelace the Elder, and Dr Daniel Lovelace for making



available his fully documented biography, Daniel Lovelace, *Governor, Diplomat, Soldier, Spy: The Colorful Career of Colonel Francis Lovelace* (Williamsburg, Virginia: Self published, 2001).

<sup>13</sup> Thomas and John Philipot, *Villare Cantianum: Or, Kent Surveyed and Illustrated* (London, 1659), p. 72.

<sup>14</sup> P.W. Hasler, ed., *The House of Commons, 1558-1603*, 3 vols (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1981), II, pp. 491-93.

<sup>15</sup> Pearman, 'The Kentish Family of Lovelace', pp. 202-07.

<sup>16</sup> Theodore K. Rabb, *Enterprise and Empire: Merchant and Gentry Investment in the Expansion of England, 1575-1630* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967), p. 335.

<sup>17</sup> The National Archives, PRO C 78/216/12 and PRO C 78/277/9.

<sup>18</sup> Pleasants, *Virginia Magazine*, 29 (1921) pp. 110-111, 118.

<sup>19</sup> Hasler, ed. *House of Commons, 1558-1603*, I, pp. 397-98.

<sup>20</sup> Pleasants, *Virginia Magazine*, 29 (1921) pp. 118-124.

<sup>21</sup> Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714*, 4 vols (Nedeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1968), I, p. 74.

<sup>22</sup> Beverley Burford and Julian Watson, eds., *Aspects of the Arsenal: The Royal Arsenal, Woolwich* (London: Greenwich Borough Museum, 1997), p. 23. Burford and Watson provide a detailed history of the tenure of Tower Place. The Barnes family sold considerable property in Woolwich in 1638, perhaps indicating financial difficulties, but leased Tower Place for some years afterward.

<sup>23</sup> Theodore K. Rabb, *Jacobean Gentleman: Sir Edwin Sandys, 1561-1629* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), p. 6.

<sup>24</sup> Rabb, *Jacobean Gentleman*, pp. 203-04. Rabb also prepared the *ODNB* entry.

<sup>25</sup> Pre-publication copy, History of Parliament Trust, 'Lovelace, Sir William (1561-1629)', quoting PRO SP 14/158/67.

<sup>26</sup> James Ellison, 'Sandys, George (1578-1644)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>27</sup> *Posthume Poems*, p. 83. Given the apparent reference to the circle at Great Tew, Wilkinson's alternative suggestion in the *Poems*, p. 335 that 'Waynman' might have been the poet Thomas Wenman seems unlikely.

<sup>28</sup> Stella P. Revard, 'Thomas Stanley and 'A Register of Friends'', in *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000), 148-72 (pp. 148-49). Nicholas McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars: Marvell and the Cause of Wit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), which deals with the Stanley community at length, came to hand after the research for this Chapter was completed.

<sup>29</sup> George Sandys, *A Paraphrase Upon the Divine Poems* (London, 1638), sigs \*\*3r-4v. It is not clear whether Sir Dudley Digges or his son wrote these verses; for the purposes of the argument, this is irrelevant.

- <sup>30</sup> Basil Duke Henning, ed., *The House of Commons, 1660-1690*, 3 vols (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1983), I, pp. 569-70.
- <sup>31</sup> PRO C 78/216/12, C 78/277/9.
- <sup>32</sup> Pleasants, *Virginia Magazine*, 28 (1920), pp. 176-87, 182.
- <sup>33</sup> Pleasants, *Virginia Magazine*, 28 (1920), pp. 182-187.
- <sup>34</sup> Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts Great Britain, *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L'Isle & Dudley*, ed. William A. Shaw, 6 vols (London: HMSO, 1925-1966), III, pp. 329-35.
- <sup>35</sup> HMC De L'Isle and Dudley IV, p. 285.
- <sup>36</sup> HMC De L'Isle and Dudley IV, pp. 285-86.
- <sup>37</sup> HMC De L'Isle and Dudley IV, pp. 297, 306.
- <sup>38</sup> PRO C 78/216/12, C 78/277/9
- <sup>39</sup> PRO PROB 11/153/467, C 142/442/37
- <sup>40</sup> Canterbury Cathedral Archive MS DCb/PRC 32/49 fol. 184.
- <sup>41</sup> Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*, I, p. 195.
- <sup>42</sup> Foster, I, p. 195.
- <sup>43</sup> John Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1541-1857*, vol. VII (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1992), p. 78.
- <sup>44</sup> Pleasants, *Virginia Magazine*, 18 (1920), p. 178, had a copy of Dr Barnes's very brief will (PRO, PROB 10/642/83 fol. 169), proved on 8 April 1645 at Oxford, which indicated that the marriage to Croft took place by 1645, when Anne would have been, at most, fourteen. On this basis, he queried whether she was Anne Lovelace's child, although the documentation for the relationship is strong. Their first child was not born until 1651, so this is not impossible. The fact that the family went to Oxford to prove the will confirms their ongoing royalist connections.
- <sup>45</sup> PRO PROB 11/153/467, proved 23 June 1628; PROB 11/163, proved 16 May 1632.
- <sup>46</sup> PRO PROB 11/163
- <sup>47</sup> Pleasants, *Virginia Magazine*, 26 (1918), p. 88.
- <sup>48</sup> Pleasants, *Virginia Magazine*, 28 (1920), p. 186.
- <sup>49</sup> Charles Caesar, *Life of Sir Julius Caesar, Knt* (London, 1810), p. 54.
- <sup>50</sup> Amy Louise Erickson, *Women and Property in Early Modern England* (London: Routledge, 1993), pp. 86-87.
- <sup>51</sup> Erickson, pp. 86-87.
- <sup>52</sup> Erickson, p. 120.
- <sup>53</sup> Everitt, *Community of Kent*, p. 41.
- <sup>54</sup> C.G.A. Clay, *Economic Expansion and Social Change: England, 1500-1700*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), I, p. 158.
- <sup>55</sup> B.G. Blackwood, *The Lancashire Gentry and the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660* (Manchester: Chetham Society, 1978), p. 13.

- <sup>56</sup> Arthur E. Waite, 'Richard Lovelace', *Gentleman's Magazine*, (1884), 459-77 (p. 465). See also Hazlitt, pp. xxx, 227.
- <sup>57</sup> *Poems and Translations of Thomas Stanley*, ed. by Galbraith Miller Crump (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), p. 360. All subsequent quotations from Stanley's poems are from this edition, unless otherwise stated.
- <sup>58</sup> Philipot, *Villare Cantianum*, p. 72.
- <sup>59</sup> See also Hammond, 'Uses of Obscurity', p. 203.
- <sup>60</sup> 'Brief Lives,' *Chiefly of Contemporaries, Set Down by John Aubrey, Between the Years 1669 & 1696*, ed. by Andrew Clark, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898), II, p.37. Bodleian MSS Aubrey 8, fol. 9<sup>r</sup>. I would like to thank Dr Kate Bennett for her assistance on Aubrey's notes on Lovelace.
- <sup>61</sup> *Ovid's Metamorphosis. Englished, Mythologiz'd, and Represented in Figures*, ed. by George Sandys (Oxford, 1632), p. 90.
- <sup>62</sup> Aubrey, II, p.37.
- <sup>63</sup> *Poems* (1925) I, p. lxxvii.
- <sup>64</sup> Richard Beresford, *Dulwich Picture Gallery: Complete Illustrated Catalogue* (London: Unicorn Press, 1998), p. 88.
- <sup>65</sup> *Mr. Cartwright's Pictures: A Seventeenth Century Collection* (London: Dulwich Picture Gallery, 1987), p. 38.
- <sup>66</sup> *Poems* (1925) I. opp. p. lxxxviii.
- <sup>67</sup> British Museum Registration 1853, 1210.834. I would like to thank Stephen Pigney of the British Museum for making the cataloguing details available.
- <sup>68</sup> Thomas Seccombe, in his entry on Lovelace in the old *DNB* (1893), identifies the print as being of Lovelace. The entry is accessible through Anselment's Lovelace biography in the *ODNB Online*.
- <sup>69</sup> There are no surviving records for parishes in Woolwich prior to 1670, where Lovelace was probably born. The church of St Brides, Fleet Street, where he was buried, was destroyed in the Great Fire of London, 1666. The parish records survived the fire (see discussion below).
- <sup>70</sup> PRO C 142/442/37. I would like to thank Adrian Ailes at The National Archives for checking this calculation. Pleasants's calculation of Lovelace's birthdate is footnoted in *Mr. Cartwright's Pictures*, p. 38.
- <sup>71</sup> Up to and including Anselment in his original *ODNB* entry on Lovelace, now amended.
- <sup>72</sup> Anthony Quick, *Charterhouse: A History of the School* (London: James & James, 1990), pp. 8-16.
- <sup>73</sup> Quick, p. 12.
- <sup>74</sup> British Library, Egerton MS 2553 fol. 50 b.
- <sup>75</sup> Waite, 'Richard Lovelace', pp. 462-63. *Poems*, pp. xvi-xix.
- <sup>76</sup> Pleasants, *Virginia Magazine*, 28 (1920), pp. 183-84.
- <sup>77</sup> Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*, I, p. 195.

- <sup>78</sup> Quick, *Charterhouse*, p. 15.
- <sup>79</sup> Quick, p. 15.
- <sup>80</sup> Quick, p. 16.
- <sup>81</sup> Patricia Anne Coughlan, 'Classical Themes in the Non-Satiric Poetry of Andrew Marvell', (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 1980), Ch. 1.
- <sup>82</sup> Coughlan, p. 28.
- <sup>83</sup> Thomas Healy, 'Crashaw, Richard 1612/13-1648' *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>84</sup> Coughlan, pp. 3, 6.
- <sup>85</sup> PRO LC 5/132 fol. 249; LC 3/1/33<sup>r</sup>; Herbert Berry and E.K. Timings, 'Lovelace at Court and a Version of Part of His "The Scrutinie"', *Modern Language Notes*, 69 (1954), 396-98 (pp. 396-97).
- <sup>86</sup> Oxford University Archives, Subscription Register, 1615-38, S.P. 39, Register Ac fol. 185, in Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, 4 vols (London: Mansell, 1980-1993), II, 1, p. 9; facsimile in *Poems*, p. xix.
- <sup>87</sup> *Poems*, p. xvii.
- <sup>88</sup> Wheare's *Method and Order* is discussed in J.H.M. Salmon, 'Precept, Example, and Truth: Degory Wheare and the *Ars Historica*', in *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500-1800*, ed. Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 11-36.
- <sup>89</sup> Degory Wheare, *The Method and Order of Reading Both Civil and Ecclesiastical Histories* (London, 1685), pp. 105-06, italics reversed. Andrew Shifflett, *Stoicism, Politics, and Literature in the Age of Milton: War and Peace Reconciled* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 28 makes this connection.
- <sup>90</sup> Mordechai Feingold, 'The Humanities', in *The History of the University of Oxford, Vol IV, The Seventeenth Century*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 211-358 (p. 212).
- <sup>91</sup> Feingold, p. 215-16.
- <sup>92</sup> Feingold, p. 254.
- <sup>93</sup> Feingold, p. 250.
- <sup>94</sup> R. Granville, *History of the Granville Family* (London, 1895), pp. 210, 223-24 quoted in Feingold, p. 254. See also, Anne Duffin, 'Grenville, Sir Bevil (1596-1643)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>95</sup> John Egerton, *Egerton's Theatrical Remembrancer* (London, 1788), p. 78.
- <sup>96</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 75-79.
- <sup>97</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 75
- <sup>98</sup> *The Diary of Thomas Crosfield*, ed. by Frederick S. Boas (London: Oxford University Press for the Royal Society of Literature, 1935), p. 91; A.J. Taylor, 'The Royal Visit to Oxford in 1636: A Contemporary Narrative', *Oxoniensia*, 1 (1936), 151-58 (p. 156), <<http://www.oahs.org.uk/>

oxo/vol%201/Taylor.doc>, accessed 20 August 2009; *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, D.D.* (New York: AMS Press, 1975), V, pp. 144-59; John R. Elliott Jr, 'Drama', in *The History of the University of Oxford, Vol IV, The Seventeenth Century*, ed. Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 641-58 (pp. 651-53). Wood, I, 886. states, apparently erroneously, that the ceremony took place on 31 August 1636.

<sup>99</sup> Taylor, p. 156.

<sup>100</sup> Wood, I, cols 886-87.

<sup>101</sup> Crosfield, *Diary*, p. 144, Taylor, 'The Royal Visit', p. 156.

<sup>102</sup> William Winstanley, *The Lives of the Most Famous English Poets* (London, 1687), p. 170.

<sup>103</sup> *Poems*, p. xxi; John Venn and J.A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924), I, III, p. 107.

<sup>104</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 80-82; Achilles Tatius, *The Loves of Clitophon and Leucippe*, trans. Anthony Hodges (Oxford, 1638), sigs A5<sup>v</sup>-A6<sup>f</sup>.

<sup>105</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 20-23; *Musarum Oxoniensium Charisteria Pro Serenissima Regina Maria* (Oxford, 1638), sigs bb1<sup>r</sup>-bb2<sup>f</sup>.

<sup>106</sup> *Poems*, pp. 29-31 and n., pp. 260-61, .

<sup>107</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 83-84; *Poems*, p. 274; Raymond Anselment, 'Lovelace, Richard (1617-1657)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009; *Pallas Armata: The Gentlemans Armorie* (London, 1639), sig. A7<sup>f</sup>.

<sup>108</sup> Phillip Dixon, 'Ashwell, George (1612-1694)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009; Wilkinson suggests Gideon Ashwell of Kings as a possible alternative to the clergyman.

<sup>109</sup> Wood is wrong in stating that Goring was 'afterward Earl of Norwich'. George Baron Goring went into exile in 1645. His father, also George Goring (1585-1663), was created first Earl of Norwich in 1644; Ronald Hutton 'Goring, George, Baron Goring (1608-1657)' *Oxford DNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>110</sup> On Goring, see also Florene S. Memegalos, *George Goring (1608-1657): Caroline Courtier and Royalist General* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007). Memegalos's biography, which came to hand too late for the findings to be incorporated in full, attempts to rehabilitate Goring's reputation.

<sup>111</sup> Hutton, 'Goring', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>112</sup> Quoted in Maurice Percy Ashley, 'George Goring: Royalist Commander and Debauchee', *History Today*, 26 (1976), 188-93 (p. 188).

<sup>113</sup> Ashley, p. 188.

<sup>114</sup> On Suckling, see Robert Wilcher, *The Discontented Cavalier: The Work of Sir John Suckling in Its Social, Religious, Political, and Literary Contexts* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007).

<sup>115</sup> *The Works of Sir John Suckling: The Non-Dramatic Works* ed. by Thomas Clayton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), pp. 71-76 and n. pp. 268-69. All subsequent quotations from Suckling's poems are from this edition, unless otherwise stated.

- <sup>116</sup> Suckling, *Poems*, pp. 79-84 and n. 281-282; Lovelace, *Poems*, pp. xxiii-xxiv. See also Wilcher, *Discontented Cavalier*, pp. 241-48.
- <sup>117</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 69-74, 118-121.
- <sup>118</sup> *Poems*, pp. xxiii-xxiv.
- <sup>119</sup> John Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, 8 vols (London, 1659-1701), II, p. 1245; Edward Peacock, *The Army Lists of the Roundheads and Cavaliers*, 2nd ed. (London, 1874), p. 76; David Underdown, 'Sir Richard Willys and Secretary Thurloe', *English Historical Review*, 69 (1954), 373-87 (pp. 374-75). Subsequent references to 'Charles Gerard' in this study are to this Charles Gerard, unless otherwise stated.
- <sup>120</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 102-03.
- <sup>121</sup> Rushworth, II, pp. 926, 1245; Ashley, 'George Goring', p. 190; Mark Charles Fissell, *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's Campaigns Against Scotland, 1638-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 28. Hutton, 'Goring', *ODNB*, wrongly states that Goring commanded a foot regiment in this campaign.
- <sup>122</sup> Fissell, p. 26.
- <sup>123</sup> Fissell, pp. 26-30.
- <sup>124</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 102.
- <sup>125</sup> Hutton, 'Goring', *ODNB*.
- <sup>126</sup> Ashley, 'George Goring', pp. 188-89. Ashley shows little sympathy for Lettice; he surmises (p. 189) 'that Goring might have been less of a debauchee if his wife had not been a perpetual semi-invalid and unable to bear him children'. For a more sympathetic view of Goring and Lettice, see Memegalos, *George Goring*.
- <sup>127</sup> Fissell, *The Bishops' Wars*, pp. 37-38.
- <sup>128</sup> Suckling, *Poems*, p. 144. Robert Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism: 1628-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 25-32 also discusses literary representations of the 1639 Bishops' War.
- <sup>129</sup> Suckling, *Poems*, pp. 84-85.
- <sup>130</sup> Microform copies of the parish registers of St Margaret's, Bethersden, are held at the Centre for Kentish Studies, Maidstone. The originals are still held by the parish.
- <sup>131</sup> *The Petition of the Gentry, Ministers, and Commonalty of the County of Kent* (London, 1642), E. 142 [10]; all subsequent references are to this edition.
- <sup>132</sup> Samuel Rawson Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642*, 10 vols (London, 1883-84), X, p. 182. For a detailed account of the *Kentish Petition* of Spring 1642, see T.P.S. Woods, *Prelude to Civil War, 1642: Mr. Justice Malet and the Kentish Petitions* (Salisbury: Michael Russell, 1980). There are useful accounts in Everitt, *Community of Kent*, pp. 95-107; Eales, 'Kent and the English Civil Wars', pp. 11-17. The following account is based on Woods, Eales and Everitt, and others as noted. Many of the archival sources

relating to Lovelace's involvement are transcribed in *Poems*, pp. xxiv-xxxix. There is a general discussion of the history of petitioning in these years, the nature of its discourses and its role in shaping public opinion in the context of the formation of a Habermasian public sphere in David Zaret, 'Petitions and the 'Invention' of Public Opinion in the English Revolution', *American Journal of Sociology*, 101 (1996), 1497-555.

<sup>133</sup> Woods, p. 36.

<sup>134</sup> Woods, p. 43.

<sup>135</sup> Woods, p. 77.

<sup>136</sup> Eales, 'Kent and the English Civil Wars', p. 13.

<sup>137</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 52. See Ch. 5; as discussed there, 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' has been viewed by some as an answer to the *Kentish Petition*.

<sup>138</sup> The Thomason copy, British Library E. 142 [10], is inscribed 'burned by the hand of the Hangman'. Great Britain. Parliament. House of Commons, *Journals of the House of Commons* (London: HMSO, 1803-), 7 April 1642, <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/virtual.anu.edu.au/subject.aspx?subject=6&gid=43>>, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>139</sup> Willson Havelock Coates, Anne Steele Young, and Vernon F. Snow, eds., *The Private Journals of the Long Parliament*, 3 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982-92), II, pp. 255-56.

<sup>140</sup> Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library*, ed. O. Ogle and W.H. Bliss, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869-1970), p. 227, Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols (Oxford, 1888), II, p. 28.

<sup>141</sup> Everitt, *Community of Kent*, p. 100.

<sup>142</sup> Public Record Office Great Britain, *Calendar of the State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy*, ed. Allen B. Hinds (London: HMSO, 1925), XXVI, pp. 35-36, quoted in Woods, *Prelude to Civil War, 1642*, p. 76.

<sup>143</sup> *CSP (Venetian)*, XXVI, p. 35, quoted in Woods, p. 78.

<sup>144</sup> Eales, 'Kent and the English Civil Wars', pp. 12-12.

<sup>145</sup> Derek Hirst, 'The Defection of Sir Edward Dering, 1640-1641', *Historical Journal*, 15 (1972), 193-208 (p. 195).

<sup>146</sup> S.P. Salt, 'Dering, Sir Edward (1598-1644)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>147</sup> Everitt, *Community of Kent*, p. 100.

<sup>148</sup> Everitt, pp. 101-02. Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, II, p. 38.

<sup>149</sup> D'Ewes, 30 April 1642 in Coates, Young, and Snow, eds., II, pp. 249-50.

<sup>150</sup> D'Ewes, 21 April 1642 in Coates, Young, and Snow, eds., II, p. 199.

<sup>151</sup> Woods, *Prelude to Civil War, 1642*, pp. 81-85. *Newes From Black-Heath* (London, 1642), E. 144 [13]; *Strange Newes From Kent* (London, 1642), E. 145 [6]; D'Ewes' Journal, Gawdy's Journal,

Hill's Journal, 30 April 1642 Coates, Young, and Snow, eds., II, pp. 249-50, 54, 56. *CJ* 28, 30 April, 4 May 1642; Parliament. Great Britain. Parliament. House of Lords, *Journals of the House of Lords* (London: HMSO, 1802-), <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk.virtual.anu.edu.au/subject.aspx?subject=6>>, 28, 30 April 1642; Great Britain. Public Record Office, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic (Charles I)*, ed. John Bruce and William Douglas Hamilton (London, 1858-1897), <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk.virtual.anu.edu.au/statepapers.aspx>>, 4 May 1642, all accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>152</sup> *CJ*, 30 April 1642, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>153</sup> *Poems*, p. xlix; see also H.M. Margoliouth, 'The Poems of Richard Lovelace', *Review of English Studies*, 3 (1927), 89-95 (pp. 93-94); McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, p. 147.

<sup>154</sup> Margoliouth, 'Poems of Richard Lovelace', p. 94.

<sup>155</sup> C.f. Manfred Weidhorn, *Richard Lovelace* (New York: Twayne, 1970), p. 59; Dosia Reichardt, 'Looking For Lovelace: Identity, Style and Inheritance in the Poetry of the Interregnum', (Unpublished PhD thesis, James Cook University, 2003), pp. 27-28.

<sup>156</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 106-08.

<sup>157</sup> Allen D. Boyer, 'Coke, Sir Edward (1552-1634)', *ODNB*; Stuart Handley, 'Villiers, John, Viscount Purbeck (1591?-1658)' *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>158</sup> Laura Norsworthy, *The Lady of Bleeding Heart Yard: Lady Elizabeth Hatton, 1578-1646* (London: John Murray, 1935), pp. 185-88. See also Gardiner, VIII, pp. 144-46.

<sup>159</sup> Norsworthy, pp. 220-25.

<sup>160</sup> Also discussed in relation to 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*', Ch. 5.

<sup>161</sup> See also H.M. Chichester, *rev.* Sean Kelsey, 'Howard, Sir Robert (1584/5-1653)' *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>162</sup> *LJ*, 21 December 1640, accessed 30 November 2009. Other reports on the case are at 8, 22 and 24 December 1640.

<sup>163</sup> *CJ*, 30 April 1642; *LJ*, 30 April 1642; *CJ*, 4 and 12 May 1642; 17 and 21 June 1642; all accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>164</sup> House of Lords MS HL/PO/JO/10/1/125A (see Plate III).

<sup>165</sup> *Poems*, p. xxxviii-xxxix. Cleveland's letter is reproduced in part at pp. xxxix-xl. A.D. Cousins, 'Cleveland, John (*bap.* 1613, *d.* 1658)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009, for example, describes the letter as having 'been admired for the way in which its author pleads his cause without demeaning that of his party.'

<sup>166</sup> Cousins, 'Cleveland', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>167</sup> HoL MS HL/PO/JO/10/1/125A

<sup>168</sup> Thomas N. Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), p. 245.

<sup>169</sup> Stanley, *Poems*, p. 360.



- <sup>170</sup> P.R. Newman, *Royalist Officers in England and Wales, 1642-1660* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1981), p. 52. See below. Newman notes that Boteler was married to the poet and diplomat, Sir Richard Fanshawe's, sister Ann, daughter to Sir Henry Fanshawe of Ware Park.
- <sup>171</sup> *CJ*, 8 July 1642, accessed 30 November 2009. There is no record of Sir William, or his bail, appearing.
- <sup>172</sup> *Speciall Passages*. 6 September 1642, E. 115 [21]; See also *A Famous and Joyfull Victory* (London, 1642), E. 116 [30].
- <sup>173</sup> *CJ*, 1, 9, 10 September 1642, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>174</sup> *CJ*, 14 March 1643, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>175</sup> *Lucasta*, sig. a7<sup>v</sup>.
- <sup>176</sup> C.f. *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Nigel Smith, rev. edn (London: Pearson, 2007), p. 18. Smith, referring to Annabel Patterson, *Marvell and the Civic Crown* (Princeton, 1978) p. 18, confuses the poet Richard with his cousin, Lord Lovelace. All subsequent quotations from Marvell's poems are from Smith's edition.
- <sup>177</sup> *Some Speciall Passages From London, Westminster, Yorke, and Other Parts* 21 June 1642, E 202 [7], sig. D3<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>178</sup> *CJ*, 21 June 1642, accessed 30 November 2009. Lovelace's textual interaction with the *Nineteen Propositions* is discussed in Ch. 5.
- <sup>179</sup> G.E. Aylmer, 'Collective Mentalities in Mid Seventeenth-Century England: II. Royalist Attitudes', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 37 5th Series (1987), 1-30 (p. 4).
- <sup>180</sup> Aylmer, p. 4. Aylmer refers to *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E.S. de Beer, 6 vols (Oxford, 1955), I, pp. 53-55, ii, pp. 79-80, 81, 81-2.
- <sup>181</sup> *A True Relation of the Late Expedition into Kent* (London, 1642). E. 115 [10]; *A Perfect Diurnall of the Severall Passages in our Late Journey into Kent From Aug. 19 to Sept. 3. 1642* (London, 1642), E. 116 [33].
- <sup>182</sup> *A True and Perfect Relation of the Seizing the House of one Master William Barnes a Cavalier* (London, 1642), E. 115 [13]; Burford and Watson, eds., *Aspects of the Arsenal*, p. 23.
- <sup>183</sup> John A. Shedd, 'Legalism Over Revolution: The Parliamentary Committee for Indemnity and Property Confiscation Disputes, 1647-1655', *Historical Journal*, 43 (2000), 1093-1107 (p. 1102).
- <sup>184</sup> Robert H. Goodsall, *Stede Hill: The Annals of a Kentish Home* (London: Headley Brothers, 1949), pp. 108, 12.
- <sup>185</sup> Goodsall, pp. 113-15.
- <sup>186</sup> See Appendix IV.
- <sup>187</sup> Paul David Nelson, 'Lovelace, Francis (c.1621-1675)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009. Wilkinson, *Poems*, pp. xlv-xlvi, notes other traces of Francis, William and Dudley in the West, where all apparently served under Charles Gerard.

- <sup>188</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 110-11 Susan A. Clarke, 'Royalists Write the Death of Lord Hastings: Post Regicide Funerary Propaganda', *Parergon*, 22 (2005), 113-30 (see Appendix III).
- <sup>189</sup> Henry Glapthorne, *White-Hall. A Poem*. (London, 1643), E. 91 [33].
- <sup>190</sup> *Poems*, pp. xli-xlii.
- <sup>191</sup> Centre for Kentish Studies, MS U2035 T8-T11, T17/1, T18/1; BL Add. Chs 47354, 61215; see Appendices I and IV.
- <sup>192</sup> Like Wilkinson's, my efforts to locate Lovelace in the Low Countries were unsuccessful. I would like to thank Dr R.D.H. van Velden of the Netherlands Nationaal Archief for his assistance in this matter. Traces may emerge as documents are progressively digitized.
- <sup>193</sup> Christopher A. Kerstjens, 'A Princely Painter: Princess Louise Hollandine of the Palatinate, Abbess of Maubuisson', *Court Historian*, 4 (1999), 161-66.
- <sup>194</sup> Memegalos, *George Goring*, p. 169. *Poems*, p. xlii.
- <sup>195</sup> See Ch. 6.
- <sup>196</sup> John Tatham, *Ostella: Or, the Faction of Love and Beauty Reconcil'd* (London, 1650), pp. 82-83.
- <sup>197</sup> *Poems*, p. xliii. Check reference to Lawes's music Select Ayres 1659, p. 37.
- <sup>198</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 49-52, 136-39. Chs 5-6.
- <sup>199</sup> For example, in John Loftis, ed., *The Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett and Ann, Lady Fanshawe* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979). C.f. Marvell, *Poems*, p. 18.
- <sup>200</sup> PRO WO 55/1661/435, see Plate VI. See also, Berry and Timings; Ian Roy, ed., *The Royal Ordnance Papers, 1642-1646, Part 1*, Oxfordshire Record Society, Vol. 43 (Oxford: Oxfordshire Record Society, 1963-64), p. 59.
- <sup>201</sup> *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, Antiquary of Oxford, 1632-1695, Described by Himself*, ed. by Andrew Clark, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891-1900), III, pp. 175, 206, 51. Bodleian MS Wood F 40, fol. 7; MS Wood F 41, fol. 243; Bodleian MS Wood F 44, fol. 283; Bodleian MS Aubrey 7, fol. 5, MS Aubrey 8, fol. 9; LMA MS ACC/3259/SF3/004.
- <sup>202</sup> Berry and Timings, p. 398.
- <sup>203</sup> LMA MS ACC/3259/SF3/004.
- <sup>204</sup> 'Sonnet' (When I by thy faire shape did swear), 'The Vintage to the Dungeon', 'A Guiltlesse Lady imprisoned', *Lucasta*, pp. 42, 45, 106-108. David Pinto, 'Lawes, William (*bap.* 1602, *d.* 1645)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>205</sup> Rushworth, II, p. 1245.
- <sup>206</sup> Katherine Gibson, 'Dobson, William (*bap.* 1611, *d.* 1646)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009; Malcolm Rogers, *William Dobson, 1611-1646* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1983), p. 16; Beresford, p. 88.
- <sup>207</sup> See Rogers; Dobson's portrait of James Graham, Marquess of Montrose, painted between August 1643 and March 1644, (p. 44) forms an interesting comparison.
- <sup>208</sup> Ian Spink, 'Lawes, Henry (*bap.* 1596, *d.* 1662)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>209</sup> Stanley, *Poems*, p. 360; *Lucasta*, sig. A3<sup>r</sup>; *Poems*, p. xlvii.

<sup>210</sup> I would like to thank Nathalie Genet-Rouffiac of the Service Historique de l'Armée de Terre, P. Janin of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France for their assistance. I would also like to thank Julia McLaren, of the Centre Parisien d'Etudes et de la Documentation pour l'Enseignement et le Rayonnement du Français, who examined records and texts at the Bibliothèque Nationale on my behalf. As is the case with the Netherlands archive, further information may emerge as digitization progresses.

<sup>211</sup> The most detailed contemporary account of the siege I have been able to locate is the 'Histoire du Siege de Dunkerque' in Jean Francois Sarasin, *Les Oeuvres de Mr. Sarasin* (Paris, 1694). There are also reports in the *Gazette de France* n<sup>o</sup> 124, 15 Octobre 1646, pp. 905 and 915. The following MS. accounts held at the BNF, were also consulted: Ms Fr 26470, 26471, 26472; N.A.F. 8641; Ms Fr 25861, 25862.

<sup>212</sup> *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, 15 September 1646, E. 354 [5].

<sup>213</sup> *Moderate Intelligencer*. 1 October 1646, E. 355 [23], p. 664.

<sup>214</sup> *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, 20 October 1646, E. 358 [8], p. 272.

<sup>215</sup> The *Moderate Intelligencer* of 22 October 1646, E. 358 [14], has the most detailed account of the siege in the English newsbooks. See also, for example, *Mercurius Civicus*, 22 October 1646, E. 358 [13]; *Scotish Dove*. 21 October 1646, E358 [11]; *Weekly Account*, 21 October 1646, E. 358 [10].

<sup>216</sup> *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, 27 October 1646, E. 358 [21], p. 278; see also *Mercurius Civicus*, 29 October 1646, E359 [9].

<sup>217</sup> Cyril Hackett Wilkinson, 'Richard Lovelace', *Times Literary Supplement*, (1937), p. 592. The Charterhouse archives are now held at the London Metropolitan Archive. Extensive searching of their digitized indexes, and the Charterhouse card catalogues on which the digitized indexes are based, failed to uncover the missing document.

<sup>218</sup> McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*. See also, Stanley, *Poems*, xxv-xxviii; Margaret Flower, 'Thomas Stanley (1625-1678): A Bibliography of His Writings in Prose and Verse (1647-1743)', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 1 (1949-1953), 139-72; Revard, 'Thomas Stanley'. McDowell's work came to hand after my research for this section of my study was completed. I agree with most of his conclusions on the make-up of the group. Given that the material on Stanley is now in the public domain, I have given a very brief account of the group here.

<sup>219</sup> McDowell, Ch. 1.

<sup>220</sup> McDowell sees this kind of collaborative and co-operative writing as a feature of the group's work; see, e.g., pp. 34-35.

<sup>221</sup> The royalist musical circle in London is discussed in Ian Spink, *Henry Lawes: Cavalier Songwriter* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 94-96.

<sup>222</sup> London, Guildhall Library MS 5667/1. I would like to thank Stephen Freeth for providing the full transcript. See also W.A.D. Englefield, *The History of the Painter-Stainers Company of London* (London: Chapman and Dodd, 1923), pp. 113, 21. Englefield gives the date as St Luke's Day, i.e. 18 October 1647.

<sup>223</sup> Richard Bagwell, rev. Jason McElligott, 'Wild, George (1610-1665)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>224</sup> *Posthume Poems*, sig. A2<sup>f</sup>. Michael Sharp, 'Rawlins, Thomas (c.1620-1670)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>225</sup> See Ch. 6. The poems are 'To my Worthy Friend Mr. Peter Lilly: on that excellent Picture of his Majesty, and the Duke of Yorke, drawne by him at Hampton-Court', *Lucasta*, pp. 61-62; and 'Peinture. A Panegyrick to the best Picture of Friendship Mr. Pet. Lilly', *Posthume Poems*, pp. 62-66.

<sup>226</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 61-62, 85-90. See Chs 6 and 7.

<sup>227</sup> See Ch. 7.

<sup>228</sup> Dorothy Gardiner, ed., *The Oxinden and Peyton Letters: 1642-1670* (London: Sheldon Press, 1937), p. 145).

<sup>229</sup> *CSPD*, warrant of 10 June 1648, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>230</sup> See, for example, Anselment, 'Lovelace, Richard'.

<sup>231</sup> *Poems*, p. lii.

<sup>232</sup> PRO SP 21/6, 9 June 1648. See, for example, *Perfect Occurrences*, 9 June 1648, E. 522 [33]; *A Perfect Diurnall*, 12 June 1648, E. 522 [39]; *Mercurius Britannicus*, 13 June 1648, E. 446 [22].

<sup>233</sup> PRO SP 21/24. See, for example, *A Perfect Diurnall*, 2 October 1648, E. 526 [8], where there is a minor report of some cavaliers assaulting a Member of Parliament.

<sup>234</sup> PRO SP 21/25.

<sup>235</sup> George Edward Briscoe Eyre, ed., *A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers: From 1640-1708 A.D.*, Facsimile of 1913 ed., 3 vols (New York: Peter Smith, 1950), I, p. 318.

<sup>236</sup> C.H. Firth and R.S. Rait, eds., *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum*, 3 vols (London: H.M.S.O., 1911), I, pp. 1021-23.

<sup>237</sup> *CJ*, 8 and 11 January 1648, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>238</sup> A.J. Hegarty 'Brent, Sir Nathaniel (1573/4-1652)' *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>239</sup> Appendix III.

<sup>240</sup> David Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England: 1649-1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), p. 98.

<sup>241</sup> Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 76-106. This account relies on Underdown and identified primary source documents, unless otherwise stated.

- <sup>242</sup> John Thurloe, *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq.*, ed. Thomas Birch, 7 vols (London, 1742), II, pp. 95-96.
- <sup>243</sup> Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, p. 100.
- <sup>244</sup> *A Full and Perfect Relation of the Great Plot* (London, 1654), E. 730 [1], annotated on 18 February 1654 by Thomason; *A Treasonable Plot Discovered: With the Names of Those That Are Taken, and Sent Prisoners to the Tower* (London, 1654), E. 730 [2] annotated 1654 by Thomason on 19 February; *Weekly Intelligencer*. 21 February 1654, E. 730 [4]; *Mercurius Politicus*. 23 February 1654, E. 730 [10]; *Severall Proceedings of State Affaires*. 23 February 1654, E. 225 [10].
- <sup>245</sup> *TSP* II, p. 96.
- <sup>246</sup> *TSP* II, p. 114
- <sup>247</sup> *TSP* II, p. 114.
- <sup>248</sup> *A Treasonable Plot Discovered*, p. 7.
- <sup>249</sup> *A Treasonable Plot Discovered*, pp. 7-8.
- <sup>250</sup> *A Treasonable Plot Discovered* includes Sir John Watts in this group; in Cotes's statement, Colonel Lovelace is named as a council member, while Sir John Watts is named as being 'in town very speedily with eight horse.' *TSP* II, p. 96.
- <sup>251</sup> *TSP* III, p. 429.
- <sup>252</sup> Great Britain, Public Record Office, *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, ed. W. Noel Sainsbury, vol. I, American and West Indies, 1574-1660 (London: Longman, Green, 1860 -), p. 339; see also Great Britain. Public Record Office, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic (Interregnum)* ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London, 1875-1886), 1651-52, <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk.virtual.anu.edu.au/statepapers.aspx>>, p. 539, accessed 30 November 2009; *Posthume Poems*, pp. 56-58.
- <sup>253</sup> *CCISP*, II, p. 133; Bodleian MS Clarendon 43 fols 111<sup>r</sup>-112<sup>v</sup>; Warren M. Billings, 'Berkeley, Sir William (1605-1677)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>254</sup> Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 98, 102.
- <sup>255</sup> Underdown, p. 98. *Severall Proceedings of State Affaires*, 23 February 1654, p. 3655, E. 225 [10].
- <sup>256</sup> *CCISP* II, p.318.
- <sup>257</sup> *TSP* II, p. 183. Berkenhead opens his letter 'The day after I last waited on you, Charles Stuart's agent tooke his journey for Cheshire' and closes it 'I shall this evening, I hope, give you a good account of Williamson'.
- <sup>258</sup> P.W. Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead, 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), pp. 10-12. Isaac wrote to Thurloe a year later from Barbados (*TSP* III, p. 157); he is identified there as 'Mr. J. Berkenhead' using the elongated 'J'. See also C.H. Firth, 'Thomas Scot's Account of His Actions as Intelligencer During the Commonwealth', *English Historical Review*, 12 (1897), 116-26 (pp. 121-22).

- <sup>259</sup> On Whitley, see Paul D. Halliday, ‘Whitley, Roger (1618-1697)’, *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009; Newman, *Royalist Officers*, p. 409, Henning, ed., *The House of Commons, 1660-1690*, III, pp. 709-11. On Gerard, see Ronald Hutton, ‘Gerard, Charles, first earl of Macclesfield (c. 1618-1694)’, *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>260</sup> *Posthume Poems*, pp. 49-53; *Poems*, p. 169 and n.
- <sup>261</sup> Paul Hartle, ‘Cotton, Charles (1630-1687)’, *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>262</sup> Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, II, pp. 37-38.
- <sup>263</sup> Newman, p. 250-51.
- <sup>264</sup> *Poems*, p. lvii.
- <sup>265</sup> Unless otherwise stated, this account draws on Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 163-66.
- <sup>266</sup> For a detailed account of Manning’s activities, see Nicole Greenspan, ‘News, Intelligence, and Espionage at the Exiled Court at Cologne: The Case of Henry Manning’, *Media History*, 11 (2005), 105-25.
- <sup>267</sup> *TSP* III, p. 429; *CSPD*, 1655, p. 212, accessed 30 November 2009; *TSP* IV, p. 10.
- <sup>268</sup> BL Add. MSS 71245 A-O fol. 25.
- <sup>269</sup> For example, *Mercurius Politicus* 14 June 1655, E. 842 [19], p. 5404 mentions the arrests of Lord Lovelace and others.
- <sup>270</sup> *TSP* III, pp. 521, 537-38.
- <sup>271</sup> *Faithful Scout*, 22 June 1655, E. 844 [7], p. 1853. Sir Justinian Isham, one of those included in Thomas Stanley’s ‘Register of Friends’, was included in this round of arrests; see Stanley, *Poems*, p. xxxiii n. and p. 361.
- <sup>272</sup> Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, p. 164.
- <sup>273</sup> Geochino Grecho, *The Royall Game of Chesse-Play*, trans. Francis Beale (London, 1656), E. 1612 [1]. *Posthume Poems*, p. 73.
- <sup>274</sup> Vincent Voiture, *Letters of Affaires Love and Courtship*, trans. John Davies (London, 1657). The *Early English Books Online* reproduction of the Thomason copy, E. 1607 [1], lacks the engraving beneath which Wilkinson, *Poems*, p. 236 and n., p. 343, notes that these lines appear.
- <sup>275</sup> Hierocles, *Upon the Golden Verses of Pythagoras*, trans. John Hall (London, 1656), sig. A3v. E. 1651 [1].
- <sup>276</sup> Hierocles, sig. A4.
- <sup>277</sup> Eldred Revett, *Poems* (London, 1657), sigs A3v-A6r.
- <sup>278</sup> Revett, sigs A6<sup>v</sup>-A7<sup>v</sup>.
- <sup>279</sup> Revett, pp. 6, 34-35.
- <sup>280</sup> Revett, pp. 46-49.
- <sup>281</sup> *Posthume Poems*, pp. 67-69.
- <sup>282</sup> *OED Online*, ‘consumption’, meaning *n.* 2. a., accessed 30 November 2009.

- <sup>283</sup> See note above.
- <sup>284</sup> Bodleian MS Wood F 44 fol. 283.
- <sup>285</sup> LMA ACC/3259/SF3/004.
- <sup>286</sup> C.f. Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, II, p.37; MS Aubrey 8, fol 9.
- <sup>287</sup> W.H. Kelliher, 'Marvell, Andrew (1621-1678)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>288</sup> St Brides Fleet Street Parish Register, Burials April 1657, London, Guildhall Library MS 6540/1. I would like to thank the archivists at the Guildhall Library/London Metropolitan Archive for their assistance in tracing and checking this record.
- <sup>289</sup> Cambridge MS Dd.4.55, fol. 167; transcribed by Wilkinson, *Poems*, pp. lviii-lix.
- <sup>290</sup> Wilkinson, *Poems*, p. lix
- <sup>291</sup> *TSP* VI, p. 151.
- <sup>292</sup> Great Britain, Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath: Preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire*, ed. S.C. Lomas, vol. II (London: HMSO, 1907), pp. 119-21, 33. This correspondence is cited in relation to the Lovelaces in Pleasant's 'Francis Lovelace'.
- <sup>293</sup> Eyre, ed., *Stationers Register*, II, p. 241.
- <sup>294</sup> Cambridge MS Dd.4.55, fol. 167<sup>r</sup>; transcribed by Wilkinson in the *Poems*, p. lix.
- <sup>295</sup> *CCISP* III, p. 244
- <sup>296</sup> Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 206-8.
- <sup>297</sup> *CSPD*, 1657-58, p. 549, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>298</sup> *CCISP* IV, p. 43.
- <sup>299</sup> *CCISP* IV, pp. 108, 111; *TSP* VII, pp. 558, 598, 622; *Mercurius Politicus* 11 November 1658, E. 760 [12], p. 163; Alan Marshall, 'Bampfield, Joseph (1622-1685)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>300</sup> Sir George F. Warner, ed., *The Nicholas Papers: Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State*, 4 vols (London: Camden Society, 1886-1920), IV, p. 91. *HMC Bath Manuscripts*, pp.132-33}; *CSPD* 1659-60, p. 75, accessed 30 November 2009; *Mercurius Politicus* 25 August 1659, E. 766 [39], p. 676.
- <sup>301</sup> Nelson, 'Lovelace, Francis', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>302</sup> Marvell, *Poems*, p. 20.
- <sup>303</sup> 'To his Noble Friend Mr. *Richard Lovelace*, upon his POEMS'; *Lucasta*, sig. a7<sup>v</sup>, italics reversed.
- <sup>304</sup> Marvell, *Poems*, p. 20.
- <sup>305</sup> *Poems*, p. xlvi; Hartmann, pp. 74-76; Margoliouth, 'Poems of Richard Lovelace' pp. 91-93; Weidhorn, *Richard Lovelace*, pp. 27-30.
- <sup>306</sup> *Poems*, pp. 95-96, 276. Margoliouth (pp. 92-93) makes a similar point. Mistress Bowes Barne may be the 'M<sup>rs</sup> ANNE BOWES' who is the subject of the eulogy *Some things memorably*

considerable... *Mrs ANNE BOWES* (London, 1641), Thomason 669. f. 4 [29]. Mistress Bowes died at the age of 41 years on 2 January 1640/41.

<sup>307</sup> *Posthume Poems*, p. 30. She is also linked here with Hughes's 'Chloris', whom, I argue subsequently is pseudonymous for Henrietta Maria. Habington and Hughes are discussed in Chs 3, 4 and 6.

<sup>308</sup> See Ch. 3.

<sup>309</sup> See Ch. 6.

<sup>310</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 56.

<sup>311</sup> See Ch. 7.

<sup>312</sup> *Posthume Poems*, pp. 2-3, 5.

<sup>313</sup> *Posthume Poems*, pp. 25-27. I would like to thank Tim Raylor for this point.

<sup>314</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 63-64.

<sup>315</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 40-41, 99-101.

<sup>316</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 134-35.

<sup>317</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 69-74, line 14.

<sup>318</sup> *Mr. Cartwright's Pictures*, pp. 5, 35.

<sup>319</sup> The portrait is reproduced *Poems* (1925), I, between pp. lvi, lviii and at p. xxxi}

<sup>320</sup> *Mr. Cartwright's Pictures*, p. 23.

<sup>321</sup> *Mr. Cartwright's Pictures*, p. 38.

<sup>322</sup> *Mr. Cartwright's Pictures*, p. 5.

<sup>323</sup> *Mr. Cartwright's Pictures*, p. 6.

<sup>324</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 106-08.

<sup>325</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 65.

<sup>326</sup> *Posthume Poems*, pp. 67-69.

<sup>327</sup> Blair Worden, *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 14. Worden describes Nedham's flexible allegiances during his career in some detail in Ch. 1.

<sup>328</sup> Joad Raymond, 'Nedham, Marchamont (bap. 1620, d. 1678)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>329</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 46-48; *Poems*, pp. 47, 265

<sup>330</sup> Hobbes was in exile in France 1640-51; his patron, Newcastle, 1645-48; Cowley 1644-55; Davenant 1648-50. All were associated with Henry Jermyn and the Queen's party while in Paris. In the absence of recent scholarly biographies of Cowley and Jermyn, Anthony Adolph, *Full of Soup and Gold: The Life of Henry Jermyn* (London: Self Published, 2006) is useful here.

<sup>331</sup> Winstanley, *Lives*, p. 170. *Posthume Poems*, 'ELEGIES', particularly those by Eldred Revett, who specifically attests to Lovelace's skill with the lyre and lute (p. 9).

<sup>332</sup> 'To my Worthy Friend Mr. Peter Lilly' (known as 'Clouded Majesty') *Lucasta*, pp. 61-62; and 'Peinture. A Panegyrick to the best Picture of Friendship Mr. Pet. Lily', *Posthume Poems* pp. 62-66.



Printer: replace this page with Plate II [Full page]

**Plate II** William Dobson (attrib.), *Richard Lovelace*, c. 1645. Dulwich Picture Gallery, London (reproduced with permission).

Printer: replace this page with Plate III [Full page]

**Plate III** Richard Lovelace's petition to Parliament for release from prison. House of Lords Archive, London, MS HL/PO/JO/10/1/125A (reproduced with permission).

Printer: replace this page with Plate IV [Full page - LANDSCAPE]

**Plate IV Indenture dated 10 October 1645 between Richard Lovelace and Richard Hulse, signed by Richard Lovelace, relating to the sale of lands in and around Bethersden. Centre for Kentish Studies, Maidstone, MS U 2035 T9 (reproduced with permission).**

Printer: replace this page with Plate V [Full page - LANDSCAPE]

**Plate V** Signature of Richard Lovelace on an indenture dated 29 March 1647 between Lovelace and John Mungeam. Centre for Kentish Studies, Maidstone, MS U 2035 T17 (reproduced with permission).

Printer: replace this page with Plate VI [Full page – LANDSCAPE]

**Plate VI** Transcription of a verse of Richard Lovelace's poem 'THE SCRUTINIE' and signature by Edward Sherburne from the *Royal Ordnance Papers* in booklet dated November 1643–February 1644. The National Archives, London, PRO WO55/1661/435 (reproduced with permission).

Printer: replace this page with Plate VII [full page LANDSCAPE]

**Plate VII** Letter dated 9 February 1688 from Sir Edward Sherburne to Anthony Wood, giving details of Lovelace's sister's poor recollection of her brother's death. London Metropolitan Archive, ACC/3259/SF3/004 (reproduced with permission).

## Chapter Three — Early Poems of Courtly Love and Honour

For us, to think of the cavalier spirit is to think first of Richard Lovelace [...] fame has rightly fixed upon the few lyrics in which Lovelace struck a simple, sincere, and perfect attitude. In them, with an idealism untouched by the sceptical or cynical, he enshrined the cavalier trinity, beauty, love, and loyal honour.

Douglas Bush<sup>1</sup>

No critic living can avoid the subject, and nothing, surely, would seem more necessary or indeed simpler in a book on Cavalier poetry than to write a chapter on love [...] nothing so central to Cavalier poetry as love has turned out to be so difficult for me.

Earl Miner<sup>2</sup>

### Introduction

Lovelace's best known and loved poems, those written before or in the early months of the civil wars, present a critical challenge. Despite their long-acknowledged status as archetypal statements of cavalier sentiment, surprisingly little critical attention has been paid to poems like 'TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*' and 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*'.<sup>3</sup> Manfred Weidhorn, writing in relation to 'TO ALTHEA, *From Prison*' blamed the dearth of criticism on the perfection of the lyrics. For him, Lovelace's poetry defies analysis: 'As with all great art, its essence is simplicity, seeming artlessness obtained from polish and care'.<sup>4</sup> H.M. Richmond suggested that Weidhorn's problem lay in the 'vagueness' and 'banality' of his analysis, rather than in the poems themselves.<sup>5</sup> However, Richmond's own monograph on Stuart love poetry addresses only a few of Lovelace's lyrics, and superficially at that.<sup>6</sup> A.J. Smith expressed extreme frustration with the banality of the Caroline love poets and their poetry in general:

It seems that sexual love no longer offered a proving-ground for the issues which really confronted people. [...] Love was the courtly fashion, as ever; and there are Caroline wits enough who stand at the fag end of the long tradition of court jongleurs, still plying the old prescriptions of lyric love long after they were played out.<sup>7</sup>

In essence, he considered that ‘the love poetry written in England after Donne’s death confirms the decadence of a long European tradition of lyric verse which did not outlast the seventeenth century’.<sup>8</sup> Earl Miner suggested, in refreshingly simple terms, that the poems are hard to write about other than conventionally.<sup>9</sup>

In intellectual terms, these comments predate the historicist turn of the 1980s. Recognition of the highly politicised nature of the representation of love and honour within Caroline court culture has fundamentally changed the way we think about the pre-war period.<sup>10</sup> It is now accepted that Charles I used the symbolism of his loving and remarkably prolific royal marriage with Henrietta Maria as being central to the way in which he defined himself as king and by which he meant to be understood and obeyed by his subjects.<sup>11</sup> Increasing importance is also being accorded to Charles’s representation of chivalric honour, particularly through the Order of the Garter, as a second symbolic representational pillar.<sup>12</sup> Lovelace’s ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’ and ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ self-evidently fit within the politicised discourses of love and honour. It is within this context that Corns, for example, links the anachronisms of ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ to the popular chivalric romances and Charles I’s promotion of the Order of the Garter during the 1630s. Anselment makes a similar point in his *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* entry on Lovelace. Corns argues that the quintessential royalist position which underpins *Lucasta* is to place love of, and loyalty to, the king before self and love of others in all circumstances. As Corns expresses it:

Within the volume is constructed a single synthesizing voice which [...] suggests that being the sort of person who is capable of sensuous and devotional passion brings with it an unqualified love for the king which must express itself in a boundless self-sacrifice, much as the lover sets no limits to his devotion for his mistress. The connection between erotic and political codes of conduct is not arrived at logically: rather, it appeals profoundly to Cavalier modes of self-perception and representation.<sup>13</sup>

Corns’s identification of the sublogical connection between courtly eroticism and the responsibilities of the cavalier is important to our overall understanding of the *Lucasta* poems.

There is a longstanding tendency to read pre-war court lyrics retrospectively; that is, within the terms of the royalist discourses of war and defeat.<sup>14</sup> As Sharpe notes, in part because of the dominance of the image of King Charles as the Christ-like martyr of the *Eikon Basilike*, we are heavily influenced by our knowledge of the outcome of the wars when reading all texts of this period.<sup>15</sup> In addition, court culture



of the 1630s has only received serious critical attention since detailed work on the early Caroline court masques started to appear in the early 1970s.<sup>16</sup> Despite recent widespread acknowledgment of the political capital provided by the masques, and their substantial sophistication, there is still a propensity to ignore all but the best-known of them as major sources of evidence of the range of opinions held at court in the pre-war years, and to write them down as a kind of escapist distraction, naively over-confident and inevitably doomed.<sup>17</sup>

There is also general acceptance that, during the pre-war years, the court was multivocal, a stage of politics on which many voices competed, a place where critical advice and respectful dissent could be (and was) offered to the king.<sup>18</sup> In this Chapter, I locate ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’ and ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ within the discourses of platonic love and chivalric honour in which they were written. Before turning to each poem, I describe the competing representations of love and honour which were in play at the early Caroline court. These introductory discussions form essential background both to the poems discussed here, and those dealt with in later chapters. I discuss the tensions which had emerged at and around the court in relation to those representations, with a view to exploring where Lovelace might have positioned his speaker in these debates. I also attend to the poetic diction of chaste love which William Habington claimed to have developed in *Castara* (1634) to express Henrietta Maria’s form of platonism. Lovelace’s poems allude to Habington’s work and use this diction. We know from poems like ‘TO AMARANTHA, *That she would dishevell her haire*’ (dealt with in the next chapter) and ‘THE SCRUTINIE’ that Lovelace, like other early Caroline court poets, was as capable of subverting, as he was of invoking, the discourses of platonic love.<sup>19</sup> The importance of libertine antiplatonicism in the creation of a wartime cavalier ethos has been dealt with by Corns and others. Libertine antiplatonicism, discussed in detail in the next chapter in relation to ‘TO AMARANTHA’, are also touched upon here.

The intertexts Lovelace incorporates in ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’ and ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’, confirm his capacity to exploit competing discourses from very early in his poetic career. The poems, particularly ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’, emerge from this examination as essentially supportive of the king. However, it would have been open to Lovelace’s community

of readers, who shared his knowledge of the allusive fields on which he drew in constructing the texts, to derive satisfaction from their shared understanding of the complex discourses from which the texts emerged.

### ***Dating the Poems***

‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’ and ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ are linked physically and thematically in Lovelace’s 1649 volume of poems. They open the volume and are valedictions to Lucasta. The poems share a sense that the young male speaker is confident in his expectation that he will retain Lucasta’s love during his approaching absence, and that he will return with honour from his military endeavours. It is thus reasonable to assume that the poems were written at about the same time. There is evidence that ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’ was written before the middle of 1643. Henry Lawes’s musical setting for this poem is recorded in his manuscript songbook, held in the British Library, where it is located among songs which can be securely dated to the first year of the war.<sup>20</sup> It seems to relate to the events of 1642, indicating that it was probably drafted while Lovelace was in the Gatehouse. Wortham suggests that Lovelace may have written ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ when he was preparing to fight for the French king at Dunkirk in 1646.<sup>21</sup> However, Wortham does not consider the likely possibility that Lovelace may have written this poem while he was contemplating going to fight for the king in Ireland — his stated intention in his petition to the House of Lords of June 1642 for freedom from imprisonment.<sup>22</sup>

Both poems may have been written with a view to performance at court, in front of the royal couple. They are notably restrained when compared, for example, with ‘TO AMARANTHA, *That she would dishevell her haire*’ and ‘THE SCRUTINIE’, two of Lovelace’s antiplatonic lyrics which are also among Lovelace’s early poems.<sup>23</sup> There is anecdotal evidence that prominent court musicians, including Lawes, tactfully excised sensitive material when performing in front of the king. In one of the dedicatory poems to John Wilson’s *Cheerful Ayres* (1660), J.H. tells of the king (presumably Charles I) calling ‘WILSON, ther’s more words, let’s heare them all’.<sup>24</sup> The line is footnoted ‘\*When some of these Ayres were presented to him by Dr *Wilson* Mr *Low* [Lawes], and others’. These poems’

privileged positioning at the beginning of *Lucasta* may well represent further evidence of the volume's role as a statement of commitment to the royalist cause.

## Platonic Love

Within the overarching framework of the royal marriage, there was sufficient flexibility to allow for the development of individual, if closely related, iconographies around the personae of Charles I and Henrietta Maria. It is evident that Henrietta Maria chose the cult of platonic love, often within a pastoral context, as her preferred mode of representation.<sup>25</sup> The terms 'neo-Platonism' and 'platonic love' are used interchangeably in writing about early Caroline court culture, a practice which can lead to considerable confusion.<sup>26</sup> They were also used loosely at the early Caroline court. Sharpe differentiates between the 'unifying philosophy' of neo-Platonism, and the 'cult' of platonic love which permeated the court, particularly the circle close to the queen.<sup>27</sup> He describes neo-Platonism's origins in Plato's 'philosophy of forms, or ideals which were the reality beside which particular material objects were but shadows'.<sup>28</sup> By the seventeenth century, neo-Platonism had absorbed significant mystical, Christian and humanist elements. It could be described as a system in which:

it is the purpose of life to come to a knowledge of the form, or essence, by an ascending process of cognition — through an elevation from the world of sense to that of intellect. It is the rôle of education, philosophy and the aesthetic to make possible that cognition.<sup>29</sup>

It is this overarching philosophical system of elevation from the world of the senses to the world of the intellect to which I understand Orgel and Strong are referring when they write of the influence of Platonism on the Caroline masque.<sup>30</sup>

Sharpe describes Plato's delineation of the attainment of love in the context of his overarching philosophy as:

an ascent from a sensual appreciation of earthly beauty to a knowledge of the true form of beauty — virtue. Such love brings man to the realization of his highest self — to virtue and self-regulation.<sup>31</sup>

That is, as in neo-Platonic thinking the ascent is from the world of the senses to the world of the intellect, so, in neo-Platonic love, it is from the sensual pleasure of earthly beauty to virtue and self-regulation. The movement in the understanding of platonic love from Plato's exclusively homosexual application to a focus on heterosexual relationships took place during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, under the influence of the Italian humanist scholars Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499) and

Pietro Bembo (1470–1547).<sup>32</sup> Their ideas reached a wide audience through Bembo's friend Castiglione's (1478–1529) representation of their thinking in *The Book of the Courtier*. Small-'p' platonic love, on the other hand, has broader application. The *Oxford English Dictionary* notes this 'lower case' sense, which it defines as 'love, friendship or affection' which is 'intimate and affectionate but not sexual; spiritual rather than physical'.<sup>33</sup>

Recent studies have delineated two differing usages of the small-'p' platonic love at the early Caroline court.<sup>34</sup> In one sense, the term described the kind of 'woman-worship' promoted and promulgated in Honoré d'Urfé's *Astrée*, which was practised at the salon of the Hôtel de Rambouillet in Paris from early in the century. As defined by d'Urfé's model lover, Sylvandre, platonic love 'is an ideal love, divine in its essence, forever freed from the limitations of mere physical passion'.<sup>35</sup> Julie Sanders describes this kind of platonic love, referred to by others as *préciosité*, as one in which 'Beauty, Love, and Virtue provided a kind of alternative religion'.<sup>36</sup> It is this salon form of platonic love and its counter discourses, the antiplatonics, to which most of the Caroline court poets, including Thomas Randolph (c. 1605–35), Thomas Carew and Sir John Suckling devoted attention, particularly outside the context of the court masques.

The alternative usage is that first delineated by Erica Veevers: the devout humanist or *honnête* form of platonism favoured by Henrietta Maria.<sup>37</sup> This form of platonic love was heavily inflected with Roman Catholic values. It was practised by Henrietta Maria's mother, Marie de Medici, and was at its height in Paris from 1630. Veevers notes that the objective of *honnêteté* was to 'attempt to make piety and virtue compatible with social grace, by placing society under the guidance of religion. [...] the ideal was one in which religion and virtue were made to underpin the refinement and polish of the court'.<sup>38</sup> Its effect was to emphasise qualities of gallantry, elegance, learning without specialisation, distinction and ease. The ideal for women 'stressed the traditionally feminine qualities of piety, chastity, compassion, beauty, and modesty, but at the same time [...] it counselled women against too austere a virtue, or a piety that was frighteningly dull'.<sup>39</sup> It accommodated the concept of chaste virtue within a loving and fruitful marriage adopted by Charles I and Henrietta Maria. Presumably, part of its attraction for the

royal couple lay in its capacity to provide a corrective for the well-known boorishness and libertinism of the court of James I.

James Howell (1594?–1666) defined platonic love in 1634 as ‘a Love abstracted from all corporeal gross Impressions and sensual Appetite, [which] consists in Contemplations and Ideas of the Mind, not in any carnal Fruition’.<sup>40</sup> Howell seems to describe both the salon and the *honnête* usages of platonic love. However, as Veevers points out, Howell’s comment only makes sense if it referred to the arrival of the *honnête* form.<sup>41</sup> Forms of platonic love, including those influenced by Petrarch and, later, Castiglione, had been evident at the English court for generations. While Henrietta Maria may have wished to adopt the *honnête* ideal described by Veevers, there is no evidence that everyone at the English court was necessarily aware of the differences between it and the salon form of platonic love practised at the Hôtel de Rambouillet. Indeed, as Veevers suggests, writers brought up in the ‘English’ tradition of platonic love tended at best to fail, perhaps even to refuse to comprehend, the new French form.<sup>42</sup> Henrietta Maria herself may not necessarily have been clear on details.

### ***Habington’s New Language of Chaste Love***

Lovelace’s poems discussed here and in the following chapter appropriate and refract the poetic diction of chaste love developed by William Habington in *Castara* (1634), which can be read as a manual of *honnête* platonic love, developed specifically for use within Henrietta Maria’s circle.<sup>43</sup> Habington was born into a Roman Catholic family and educated by the Jesuits in France, where he would have become familiar with the *honnête* form of platonism practised at court. He was closely associated with the Roman Catholic faction surrounding Henrietta Maria in England. Habington wrote the early poems to *Castara* while he was courting his future wife, Lucy Herbert, cousin to the prominent courtier Lucy Hay, Countess of Carlisle (1559–1660).<sup>44</sup> The couple married early in 1633. The existence of an explicit literary relationship between *Castara* and *Lucasta* should come as no surprise. The name ‘Lucasta’, ‘chaste light’, derives in part from the same Latin source as ‘Castara’, ‘chaste altar’. Lovelace must have been aware of this association and may have chosen to entitle his mistress ‘Lucasta’ on the strength of it.

In the author's 'Preface', which appears in all three editions of *Castara*, Habington represents himself as having created a new poetic diction specifically to enable expression of the Queen's cult of platonic love. He explicitly politicises his poetry of chaste love, attempting both to support the cult as new and special, and to forestall criticism. He argues that poetry espousing *honnête* platonic love like his, and, by extension, the cult of platonic love itself, enhances masculinity. Traditional poetic dalliance is, on the other hand, effeminising. When poetry:

is wholly employed in the soft straines of love, his soule who entertaines it, loseth much of that strength which should confirme him man. The nerves of judgement are weakned most by its dalliance, and when woman, (I meane onely as she is externally faire) is the supreme object of wit, we soone degenerate into effeminacy.<sup>45</sup>

Habington attacked libertine lyrics then circulating at court, in particular those by Thomas Carew.<sup>46</sup> In 'The Author', for example, he condemns heathen poets of lust, like Carew (and Randolph and Suckling, to name two others):

who can give no nobler testimony of twenty yeares employment, then some loose coppies of lust happily exprest. Yet these the common people of wit blow up with their breath of praise, and honour with the Sacred name of Poets.<sup>47</sup>

He then turns to defending the poetry of chaste love:

Yet if the innocency of a chaste Muse shall bee more acceptable, and weigh heavier in the ballance of esteeme, than a fame, begot in adultery of study; I doubt I shall leave them no hope of competition.<sup>48</sup>

Habington claims that the fire of chastity, rather than 'wanton heate', provided his inspiration throughout, and that existing poetic rhetoric was insufficient to express the ardour his chastity inspired. He describes how, in his view, he has been forced to invent a new poetic oratory to praise Castara's chaste virtues, which he describes in detail:

I found that Oratory was dombe when it began to speake her [...] a lethargie, that dulled too much the faculties of the minde, onely fit to busie themselves in discoursing her perfections [...] And though I appeare to strive against the streame of best wits, in erecting the selfe same Altar, both to chastity and love; I will for once adventure to doe well, without a president.<sup>49</sup>

Habington is quite certain of the originality of his invention, its royal source of inspiration and its importance. As he states, 'Nothing new is free from detraction, and when Princes alter customes even heavie to the subject, best ordinances are interpreted innovations'.<sup>50</sup>

Some might question Habington's claim to have created an original poetic diction. Kenneth Allott, his editor, condemns Habington's poetry on the basis that it is so conventional as to be 'irrelevant and inadequate: and this imitation is produced

in a style which is artificial and rhetorical in that it relies on stock associations and stock responses'.<sup>51</sup> However, the apparent contradiction between the conventionality of Habington's lyrics and his claim for originality can be explained. Habington in fact appropriates the topoi and tropes of the lyrics of 'lust happily exprest', themselves often based on classical models, and uses them to describe chaste love. He also relies heavily on Petrarchan conceits. His application of conventional conceits is 'original' in that it is always in pursuit and praise of chaste love. The fires of love burn on the altar of chastity, rather than lust.

As discussed in the next chapter, it may be that Habington was inspired to develop his diction of chaste love following circulation of Suckling's 'Upon my Lady Carliles walking in Hampton Court garden'.<sup>52</sup> There, Suckling's speakers 'Thom' (almost certainly signifying Thomas Carew) and 'J.S.' (signifying Suckling himself) debate the merits of competing ways of writing about love, the courtly libertinism of Carew's *A Rapture* or the 'coarse voice of the tavern' favoured by Suckling.<sup>53</sup> Wilcher suggests that 'Upon my Lady Carliles walking' was probably written and first circulated in 1632, which would make it current in the months Habington was courting Lady Carlisle's cousin, Lucy Herbert and addressing poems to her. The poetic diction of Habington's *Castara* proposes a third approach to writing love lyrics, one which combines the courtly with the chaste, while ignoring the libertine and tavern modes.

### ***Platonic Love Contested***

Lovelace and his readers could hardly have failed to be aware of the implications of the negative representations of platonic love circulating at court. As Sharpe and others have argued, the apparent incompatibility between nonconsummated platonic love and the reality of human desire, represented at court by the fecund royal marriage, confounded courtiers and commentators alike.<sup>54</sup> This incompatibility is illustrated in *The Temple of Love*, the queen's Shrovetide masque of 1635, written by William Davenant and designed by Inigo Jones (1573–1652), which announced the arrival of the new form of platonic love at court.<sup>55</sup> In Davenant's masque, platonic love is epitomised by the Temple of Chaste Love, which has been hidden from those who would misuse it in mists and clouds (could the Englishman Davenant having a gentle dig at English fog?), but is now revealed by the influence of the beauty of

Indamora, Queen of Narsinga (played by Henrietta Maria) and her ‘Contributory Ladies’. The voices of dissent in the antimasque are represented by magicians of the court, who are doubtful that the young men of the court will be able to put aside sensual love.<sup>56</sup> The antimasquers, who derive their power from profane love poetry, are dismissed and the young men of the court are convinced by Divine Poesie and her followers, including the queen and her ladies, to support the new cult.<sup>57</sup> Although their dissent is largely stilled, it is raised again in the last lines, where a call for acceptance of the new cult of platonic love is starkly juxtaposed against recognition of the sensual nature of the royal couple’s relationship and the call for more royal heirs.<sup>58</sup> Davenant’s masque was well received, although it is not clear that it succeeded in educating and persuading the court in general of the philosophical advantages of the queen’s new cult.

Davenant does not tease out the differences between the various kinds of platonism operating in England at the time in *The Temple of Love*. However, less than a year later, he wrote a play on the same subject. *The Platonick Lovers*, which was licensed on 16 November 1635, directly contested Henrietta Maria’s cult of platonic love.<sup>59</sup> In Davenant’s masque, *The Temple of Love*, the forces of dissent are temporarily stilled by the proponents of platonic love. In the play, Davenant uses satire and burlesque to question the rationality and resilience of the cult. He juxtaposes the platonic lovers, Theander and Eurithea, against the ‘natural’ lovers, Phylomont and Ariola. ‘Natural’ love is represented as that which exists within a fruitful marriage, thus supporting the iconic status of the marriage of Charles I and Henrietta Maria. However, the concept of ‘natural’ love was, and remains, profoundly unstable. At the early Caroline court, it was as often equated with the libertine paradise of free love as with Habington’s chaste love; for example, in the best-known libertine poem of the age, Thomas Carew’s ‘*A Rapture*’.<sup>60</sup> There, Carew’s speaker interrogates the concept of female honour, at the time inextricably linked with chastity. His speaker argues that it would be unjust for Honour, the ‘Tyrant’, ‘Gyant’, ‘Monster’ and ‘Goblin’ of the piece, to ‘Fetter your soft sex with Chastitie, | Which Nature made unapt for abstinence’. That is, women are, by nature, incontinent.

Davenant’s and Carew’s disquiet at the cult of platonic love was more than an expression of incontinent desire by two syphilitic dissolutes. Sharpe argues



convincingly that Davenant and Carew (among others) shared much deeper concerns. They rejected the metaphysics, ethics and politics of neo-Platonism on the Aristotelian perception of human nature as an entity consisting of body and soul, of physical and spiritual attributes, which must be integrated rather than denied. While sexual love could express either the base or loftier attributes of man's nature, man was fulfilled as a human being only when both physical and spiritual aspects were reconciled.<sup>61</sup> Milton's *Comus* (the evil sorcerer in the masque of the same name, which was performed at Ludlow Castle in 1634) condemns platonic love as 'leane, and sallow Abstinence' (l. 708). The masque was performed about four months after Howell heralded the arrival of the new cult, and during the same year as the first edition of Habington's *Castara* appeared. *Comus* draws on the topos of 'natural love' in condemning the cult (albeit in a morally conservative, rather than a libertine, sense), arguing that platonic love is against God's natural law:

if all the world  
Should in a pet of temperance feed on pulse,  
Drink the clear stream, and nothing wear but frieze,  
The all-giver would be unthanked, would be unpraised,  
Not half his riches known, and yet despised,  
And we should serve him as a grudging master,  
As a penurious niggard of his wealth,  
And live like Natures bastards, not her sons. (ll. 719–26)<sup>62</sup>

*Comus* argues here, in terms later refuted by the Lady (the representative of virtue and temperance in the masque) that God, through Nature in her bounty, has provided mankind with physical love, equated here with 'odours, fruits and flocks [...] to please, and sate the curious taste' (ll. 711–13). It would be as foolish, and as offensive to God, for mankind to forgo physical love, as to inflict self-punishment by limiting consumption to pulses, water and rough clothing.

In stark contrast to the success Davenant enjoyed at court with *The Temple of Love*, *The Platonick Lovers* failed.<sup>63</sup> Perhaps the Queen did not enjoy the experience of seeing her new cult satirised. Plays and masques written after 1636 are notably less critical of the cult than those by Davenant and Milton discussed here. However, as Wilcher points out in relation to Sir John Suckling's 'Fruition' poems, disquiet continued to be expressed in the form of the coterie game of competitive versifying using the contrasting discourses of platonic and libertine love.<sup>64</sup> While these poems cannot match the dialectical power of Milton's lines from *Comus*, many are as serious in their criticism. They provide clear evidence of the royal couple's inability

to compel their subjects to adopt what was regarded by many as an essentially flawed philosophy, or to control disquiet.

### **‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’**

By 1642, Lovelace had been at court intermittently for more than ten years. ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’ can be seen as an intervention in the debate on platonic love which was being conducted there at both a philosophical and a literary level, exemplified in the competing representations of Davenant’s masque and play and Milton’s *Comus*. The debate was also being contested in terms of the deployment of an appropriate poetic diction of love. Lovelace demonstrates his awareness of the debate through the facility with which he writes in libertine and platonic modes.

In ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’, Lovelace’s speaker argues the paradox that absence will not constitute parting from his love.<sup>65</sup> In the first stanza, he establishes the framework for the debate:

If to be absent were to be  
    Away from thee;  
    Or that when I am gone,  
    You or I were alone;  
Then my *Lucasta* might I crave  
Pity from blustering winde, or swallowing wave. (ll. 1–6)

As he explains in the third stanza, the lovers are together in spirit in the neo-Platonic world of the spheres:

Though Seas and Land betwixt us both,  
    Our Faith and Troth,  
    Like separated soules,  
    All time and space controules:  
Above the highest sphere wee meet  
Unseene, unknowne, and greet as Angels greet. (ll. 13–18)

At that heightened, spiritual level, they can anticipate heavenly perfection together:

    If thus our lips and eyes  
Can speake like spirits unconfi’d  
In Heav’n, their earthy bodies left behind. (ll. 22–24)

The paradox emerges in the course of *Lucasta* as Lovelace’s favourite rhetorical structure, while the topos of lovers parting and crossing the stormy seas is addressed repeatedly; for example, in ‘Dialogue. LUCASTA, ALEXIS’ and ‘AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*’.<sup>66</sup>

Read in context, ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’ is less pure than it initially appears. It appropriates competing platonic and antiplatonic tropes, which would have been easily recognisable to Lovelace’s community of readers, with potentially comic effect. The poem is closely linked textually with Carew’s ‘*To my Mistressse in absence*’ and ‘*To her in absence. A SHIP*’. In the first of Carew’s poems, the speaker contemplates the paradox of spiritual union but physical separation in very similar terms to those used by Lovelace:

Then though our bodyes are dis-joynd,  
As things that are to place confin’d;  
Yet let our boundlesse spirits meet,  
And in loves speare each other greet. (ll. 7–10)<sup>67</sup>

Both Lovelace’s and Carew’s lovers ‘meet’ in a higher sphere. Lovelace’s lovers ‘greet as Angels greet’, while Carew’s greet each other ‘in loves sphere’. Carew’s lovers are ‘dis-joynd | As things that that are to place confin’d’ where Lovelace’s ‘Can speake like spirits unconfin’d’. Carew’s poems are two in a series probably written while he was in Paris with the embassy of Lord Herbert of Cherbury in 1619–1620.<sup>68</sup> ‘*To my Mistressse in absence*’ circulated in manuscript during the 1630s and was first published in 1640.<sup>69</sup>

The topos of the replacement of a union of bodies with the perfect union of souls always risked playful inversion.<sup>70</sup> In Carew’s ‘*To her in absence. A SHIP*’, he rehearses the trope of the stormy seas which Lovelace also adopts. Carew’s speaker floats ‘Tost in a troubled sea of griefes’:

My fearefull hope hangs on my trembling sayle;  
Nothing is wanting but a gentle gale,  
Which pleasant breath must blow from your sweet lip. (ll. 11–13)<sup>71</sup>

The links between Carew’s ‘*To her in absence. A SHIP*’ and Lovelace’s ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’ are again evident. Where Carew ‘hangs his hope’ on his ‘trembling sayle’, where ‘Nothing is wanting but a gentle gale’, Lovelace’s speaker will not ‘sigh one blast or gale | To swell my saile’. However, in Carew’s ‘*To my Mistressse in absence*’, the speaker is not seeking a sublime, neo-Platonic mingling of souls. Rather, he engages in contemplation of the erotic pleasures the lovers will enjoy when they are united, when ‘soules, and bodyes both, may meet’:<sup>72</sup>

There whilst our soules doe sit and kisse,  
Tasting a sweet, and subtle blisse,  
(Such as grosse lovers cannot know,  
Whose hands, and lips, meet here below;)

Let us looke downe [...]
   
Yet burne, and languish with desire
   
To joyne, and quench their mutuall fire
   
[...]
   
Making our bitter absence sweet,
   
Till soules, and bodyes both, may meet. (ll. 17–35) <sup>73</sup>

Carew confuses the ‘grosse’ and celestial lovers’ experience of passion with diverting erotic effect. The wandering hands and lips should belong to the ‘grosse’ lovers, but are located ‘here’ with the celestial lovers. The ‘mutuall fire’, which should belong to the celestial lovers, is located through the pronoun ‘their’ with the grosse lovers. Randolph, in ‘*A Platonick Elegie*’, which describes the speaker’s love of his mistress in terms of Petrarchan adulation and desire, is verbally close to Carew, but lacks the erotic effects:

Wee weare no flesh, but one another greet,
   
As blessed soules in separation meet. <sup>74</sup>

There is no evidence indicating whether Randolph is borrowing from Carew, or the reverse.

Carew’s ‘*To my Mistresse in absence*’ is conventionally associated with John Donne’s (1572–1631) ‘The Exstasie’ and, more obviously ‘A Valediction: forbidding Mourning’, as well as Thomas Randolph’s ‘*A Platonick Elegie*’. <sup>75</sup> ‘*To my Mistresse in absence*’ and ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’ probably also allude to Donne’s ‘Air and Angels’. <sup>76</sup> Donne’s are complex poems of metaphysical contemplation on the nature of love, including platonic love, and separation, and have attracted extensive critical comment. <sup>77</sup> Donne, in effect, sets the parameters of Lovelace’s allusive field in ‘A Valediction: forbidding Mourning’:

Dull sublunary lovers love
   
(Whose soule is sense) cannot admit
   
Absence, because it doth remove
   
Those things which elemented it.
   
  
But we by’ a love, so much refin’d,
   
That our selves know not what it is,
   
Inter-assured of the mind,
   
Care lesse, eyes, lips, and hands to misse. (ll.13–20) <sup>78</sup>

Through absence, the lovers will achieve a neo-Platonic purified union of two souls. In the next stanza, Donne introduces the famous compasses conceit to indicate the connectedness of the lovers:

Our two soules therefore, which are one,
   
Though I must goe, endure not yet
   
A breach, but an expansion,
   
Like gold to aery thinnesse beate. (ll. 21–24) <sup>79</sup>

As Don Beecher has argued, for early seventeenth century poets, including Donne and Carew, Ficino's writing on this subject 'was rarely a source of doctrine to be retailed in art, but the source of parody and invention — in short, of literary play'.<sup>80</sup> In other words, the topos of platonic love in the world of the spheres was a recognised site for comic subversion.

Davenant also draws on this highly contested allusive field in *The Temple of Love* (1635). At the culmination of the masque, the Noble Persian Youths, having resisted the magicians' temptation to embrace sensual love, cross the seas in search of the Temple of Chaste Love. Orpheus stills the waters with his harp. The masquers arrive on the island and the Temple appears. Sunesis and Thelema, representing understanding and the will, enter the Temple and sing:

BOTH            Thus mixed, our love will ever be discreet,  
                          And all our thoughts and actions pure;  
                          When perfect will and strengthened reason meet,  
                          Then love's created to endure. (ll. 482–86)<sup>81</sup>

It is after these lines that Amianteros, or Chaste Love, and Sunesis enjoin the king and queen to continue to enjoy the benefits of a chastely fruitful marriage. Like Carew, Randolph and Lovelace some years later, Davenant employs the meet/greet/discreet rhyme in the platonic context of souls uniting. The obvious connection between Carew's mildly erotic verses and those of Davenant and Lovelace subtly subverts the wholehearted commitment to platonic love which both Davenant and Lovelace appear to profess. It is interesting to note in this context that, as discussed earlier, the magicians in *The Temple of Love* derive their power in part from the poetry of profane love which Carew's '*To my Mistressse in absence*' represents.<sup>82</sup>

Habington, in '*To CASTARA (Forsake with me the earth, my faire)*', argues that his purer, chaste love should have even greater transformational effects than those affected by the 'adult'rous lust of *Jove*' (l. 23).<sup>83</sup> Like Lovelace's and Carew's, Habington's speaker asks his love to visit the spheres with him:

Forsake with me the earth, my faire  
 And travell nimbly through the aire,  
 Till we have reacht th'admiring skies;  
 [...]
 And taking view of all, when we  
 Shall finde a pure and glorious speare:  
 Wee'le fix like starres forever there. (ll. 1–8)

The speaker and Castara will watch the objects of Jove's passion, Callisto and Leda, 'play the wanton' with the god. Their purer love will transform Castara into a more beautiful star than Jove's lovers have become:

If each of these loose beauties are  
Transform'd to a more beautiful starre  
By the adult'rous lust of *Jove*;  
Why should not we, by purer love? (ll. 23–26)

The rehearsal of the imagery of the spheres exposes the relationship between Carew's and Habington's poems.

Marvell's 'The Definition of Love' provides a bookend to this allusive saga.<sup>84</sup> The penultimate stanza of Marvell's poem links with Lovelace's through the old pun on angels and angles, which is, in turn, a play on Donne in terms of the geometric and celestial spheres. The now familiar meet/greet rhyme features:

As lines so loves oblique may well  
Themselves in every angle greet:  
But ours so truly parallel,  
Though infinite, can never meet. (ll. 25–28)<sup>85</sup>

Nigel Smith, in his variorum edition of Marvell's poems, identifies 'The Definition of Love' as containing 'a more than usually dense set of echoes from a wide variety of mostly English love lyrics. Where there are echoes of whole lines or stanzas, the purpose is almost always to subvert the original.'<sup>86</sup> Smith sees this stanza as reversing '*Going beyond the Seas*'.<sup>87</sup> Where Lovelace's lovers are apparently fulfilled in their platonic union above the spheres, Marvell's are forever fated to move in parallel. Smith's analysis highlights the propensity for poets of this period to borrow from and subvert the work of their contemporaries. It provides support for my argument that Carew's erotic take on the topos of platonic lovers parting, which was appropriated by both Davenant and Lovelace, would have subverted any superficial interpretation of Lovelace's 'TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*' as a simple platonic poem of valediction.

### **Chivalric Honour**

'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*' appropriates the ideals integral to the second pillar of Charles I's representational strategy, chivalric honour.<sup>88</sup> The evidence that the discourse of chivalric honour was central to the royal image developed by Charles I is more dispersed than that relating to platonic love.<sup>89</sup> The following account of representations of the chivalric code at Charles I's court provides the

contextual background necessary to understand ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’.

Elias Ashmole (1617–1692), in his *The Institution, Laws & Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (1672), which drew heavily on histories of chivalry of the 1630s, defines honour as:

the proper Reward of military *Vertue* (which comprehends both Fortitude and Conduct [...]) Honor is the greatest of exterior goods, and being the object of a nobler ambition, than Wealth or Profit, is therefore the aim of that Vertue, to wit *Valour*, which springs from a more generous Spirit.<sup>90</sup>

Ashmole thus places ‘honour’ in a military context. The terms he uses in relation to the virtue to be gained through honourable service on the battlefield are similar to those adopted by Hawkins in his translation of Horace *Odes* III. 2, the source of the epithet *Dulce et decorum est*, ‘It is a sweet and honourable thing to die for one’s country’. Honour is the male equivalent of the chaste virtue privileged by the queen. The questions of what constitutes female honour and its relationship with male honour are excluded from Ashmole’s definition. Charles I used a broad range of forms to project his image.<sup>91</sup> While the importance placed on chivalry and honour is evident in the masques he presented to the queen and the court, it is also an important element in the histories Charles I commissioned, royal portraiture, coins, medals and sculpture, all of which consistently invoke the iconography and ceremony surrounding the Order of the Garter.<sup>92</sup>

### ***Chivalry Transmuted***

During the course of his rule, the king made significant changes to the way in which his image of perfect chivalric knighthood was represented. The royalists’ adoption of the chivalric romance, both as a favoured literary form and as a kind of code during the war years and the Interregnum, is well recognised.<sup>93</sup> Before 1630, royal representations of chivalry emphasised the heroic and romance aspects. After Prince Henry’s death in 1612, many had hoped that Charles would take up his elder brother’s persona as the symbol of militant Protestantism.<sup>94</sup> When Charles and Buckingham returned from their trip to Spain in pursuit of the Spanish match in 1623, often itself perceived as an exercise in knight-errantry, they were celebrated as heroic Protestant knights in the mould of Sir Philip Sidney. Rubens’s allegorical romance, *Landscape with St George and the Dragon* (1629–1630) typifies the early approach.<sup>95</sup> It uses the romance elements of the chivalric mode featured in the

legend of St George rescuing the lady from the dragon. St George is pictured as an heroic knight-errant. The features of the saint are those of Charles I in shining armour, wearing the dark blue ribbon of the Garter, while Henrietta Maria is represented as the princess.<sup>96</sup> It is this archaic image of the knight-errant with ‘A Sword, a Horse, a Shield’ which Lovelace manipulates in ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’.

From early in the reign, Charles I was mindful of criticism of the naivety of the chivalric mode voiced, for example, by Jonson and Cervantes, and expressed in parodic form by groups such as the Order of the Bugle.<sup>97</sup> On his accession in 1625, he discontinued the best known representation of English feudal chivalric culture, the annual Accession Day tilts. At the same time as he increased the importance placed on the Order of the Garter, he changed its focus. While continuing to invoke the figure of St George as patron, he shifted the representation from that of knight-errant to one of a warrior saint and religious patron of the Order of the Garter, an emblem of spiritualised and pacific chivalry. He also increased the emphasis on the Order as a focus of service and loyalty to the king.<sup>98</sup> The visual evidence of this shift in emphasis is strong. The romance aspect of Rubens’ *Landscape with St George and the Dragon* is replaced by the imperial majesty of Van Dyck’s equestrian portraits and Le Sueur’s statue of Charles I, now in Trafalgar Square, all completed in the 1630s.<sup>99</sup> In each case, Charles is represented as effortlessly in control of a great horse, the essential marker of chivalric nobility.<sup>100</sup>

The same shift from knight-errantry to a more serious mode is evident in contemporary texts developing the history of the Order of the Garter. In search of patronage and preferment, the polemicist Peter Heylyn prepared his *Historie of [...]* *St George* (1631) with an eye to Charles’s particular and well-known enthusiasm for the Order.<sup>101</sup> Heylyn’s *Historie* had profile. It was presented by Archbishop Laud to the king, and reprinted with amendments designed to answer critics in 1633. Heylyn was operating in a climate in which Protestant churchmen were attacking the legendary saints. Anthony Milton describes Heylyn’s basic task as being to ‘defend both the existence of St George (against those who claimed that he was fictional) and the church’s high opinion of him (against those who claimed that he did exist but was an Arian heretic)’.<sup>102</sup> From a literary critical perspective, Heylyn’s rhetorical strategy repeats the themes that are evident in the works of art. He diminishes the



importance of the legendary features of the story of St George, while enhancing those with some factual basis. In effect, he disposes of the dragon, but retains the saint as an historical figure. Heylyn is, nonetheless, careful not to condemn the romance genre out of hand. He refers specifically to the Arthurian cycle and to the popular tales of Bevis of [South] Hampton and Sir Guy of Warwick, arguing in relation to each that, just because story tellers created legends about these heroes for their own purposes, his readers should not totally discount their belief that the heroes actually existed.<sup>103</sup> He thus allows his readers to continue to enjoy the romances, including those relating to St George and the dragon, while removing the essence of each story from the romance genre and (re)inserting it into the more sedate form of ‘history’.

It is evident from his text that Tom May (c. 1596–1650) followed Heylyn’s account of the founding of the Order of the Garter closely in his verse epic, *The Victorious Reigne of King Edward the Third* (1635), commissioned by the king. At this time, May was still associated closely with the court. The language of his account conflates Edward’s court at Windsor during peace time with that of Charles I and Henrietta Maria in the masques. Windsor, for example, becomes not only the ‘Throne of *Mars*, and Scene of Chevalry’, but also ‘Loves delicious Bower, more grac’d than e’re | Th’Idalian wood, or gentle Paphos’.<sup>104</sup> ‘Loves delicious Bower’ would have called to the minds of contemporary readers of the texts Inigo Jones’s designs for Davenant’s masque, *The Temple of Love* (1635), if they were sufficiently privileged to have attended or to have obtained a copy of the text. Davenant describes the set for the temple as ‘a spacious grove of shady trees, and far off on a mount with a winding way to the top was seated a pleasant bower’.<sup>105</sup> May bolsters the association of the newly transformed Order of the Garter with the crown. Like Heylyn, he removes the mythical romance elements associated with the Order, as well as incorporating the language and imagery of the court masques into his history. It is notable that May ends his epic before the ‘defects’ of Edward’s reign became evident.<sup>106</sup> Lovelace’s royalist readers would have been aware of the Heylyn’s and May’s nuancing of the archaic discourse of chivalry if they first read ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ in the months leading up to the outbreak of war.

We know from Francis Lenton’s ((fl. 1629–1653) dedicatory poem to *Lucasta*, and William Winstanley’s account of Lovelace’s poetic reputation, that

contemporaries compared Lovelace to the ultimate Renaissance man, the ‘Scholar, Souldier, Lover, and a Saint’, Sir Philip Sidney.<sup>107</sup> Both staunch royalists, Lenton and Winstanley were perhaps unaware of Sidney’s important contributions to radical and republican thought, or else regarded those contributions as of little moment when compared with the literary fame of the *New Arcadia* (1590).<sup>108</sup> They also seemed to see no contradiction between Sidney and Lovelace’s Protestantism. Lovelace certainly admired Sidney and the *New Arcadia*, calling him ‘Heav’nly Sydney’ in ‘A PARADOX’ and referring to ‘Caelestial *Sydney’s Arcady*’ in ‘CLITOPHON and LEUCIPPE *translated*’.<sup>109</sup> This may be because the basis of Sidney’s fame was distanced in mid-seventeenth century royalist imaginations from his politics. The ideals and policies linked with the persona of Sir Philip Sidney were central to late Tudor and early Stuart conceptions of the perfect Protestant knight, and chivalric honour more generally, hence the association of the young Charles I with Sidney on his return from Spain.<sup>110</sup> Mervyn James argues that the Sidney circle at the Elizabethan court achieved a synthesis of honour, humanistic wisdom and the Protestant religion in Sidney’s *Arcadia*. According to James, this synthesis found its closest parallel in the official Caroline court ideology of heroic kingship, courtly love and neo-Platonic idealism, as expressed in the court masques and spectacles.<sup>111</sup> In the early Caroline masques, as in Heylyn’s and May’s histories, the simplistic knightly codes of the past are consistently represented as being obsolete and as demanding replacement by a new, purified, chivalric ethos.<sup>112</sup> In *Coelum Britannicum* (1634), Momus, the central character of the antimasque, is represented wearing Sir Philip Sidney’s crest, a wreath surmounted by a porcupine.<sup>113</sup> The audience must have been aware of the visual pun. The porcupine is featured on the upper and lower escutcheons on the title page of almost all the London editions of Sidney’s *Arcadia* produced between 1599 and 1638.<sup>114</sup> Momus banishes the mementoes of a martial past, while the heroes of the romances, named as Sir Guy, Bevis, Prince Arthur and St George, are brought before the queen and then stelled beside the king.<sup>115</sup> Like Heylyn in his *History of [...] St George*, Carew does not want to forget the English romance heroes. Where Heylyn attempts to reconstruct ‘history’, Carew metamorphoses the heroes into something new, something different and better in an ill-defined way.

The condemnation of old-fashioned chivalric romance is also prominent in Davenant's *Britannia Triumphans* (1638).<sup>116</sup> Davenant's masque self-consciously debates the role of the arts, poetry and the masque itself in the process of educating subjects in self-discipline.<sup>117</sup> It deals substantively with the romance genre, in what the author calls a 'Mock Romansa', conjured up by Merlin after the traditional figures of the antimasque are seen off. During this segment, a knight and his squire attempt to protect the damsel from a giant with a Saracen's face. All are figures of fun, in archaic costumes.<sup>118</sup> The lines are parodic mock heroic verse couplets. The knight, for example, castigates the giant: 'O monster vile, thou mighty ill-bred lubber, | Art though not moved to see her whine and blubber?'<sup>119</sup> After the characters fight their way off stage, Bellerophon, the mythical victor over temptation, condemns Merlin for conjuring such trivial illusions.<sup>120</sup> Having made his point, Davenant allows his audience (and England's poets, including himself) their guilty pleasure in the romances. The masque ends with a sensuous abjuration to the king and queen to go 'to bed, to bed'. Davenant is again promoting the loving and fruitful royal marriage. The bumbling knight-errant of the 'Mock Romansa' is replaced by the heroic, fertile king who will protect his family and his people.<sup>121</sup>

### ***Chivalry Contested***

The fissure between the Sidneyan pro-Protestant, militarily interventionist policies which exemplified chivalry for many and Charles I's policy from 1629 of the pursuit of peace with Europe in general and Spain in particular was evident long before the wars.<sup>122</sup> The king's promotion of the cult of chivalry as his personal form of representation increased the perceived gap between image and reality. Norbrook suggests that Tom May, in avoiding description of the later years of the reign in *Edward III* (1635), was obtrusively steering clear of a period that was constitutionally sensitive, because of the precedents set during those years for annual parliaments.<sup>123</sup> It is also possible that May, in recording Edward's glorious deeds in the wars against the French, was drawing attention to Charles's lack of military commitment to the Protestant cause. *Edward the Third* was published in the same year that the king's nephew, Charles Louis, the exiled Count Palatine, arrived in London with a view to persuading his uncle finally to commit to active support to the Protestant cause of Charles I's sister, Elizabeth of Bohemia. The visit, which began on 21 November 1635, 'resurrected fierce expectations of a return to an old-style

anti-Spanish policy based patriotically on England's national and naval supremacy and reminiscent of her Elizabethan greatness'.<sup>124</sup> It was welcomed most by those who most wished for Parliament to be recalled.

Charles I's efforts to reform the Order of the Garter, and to represent its glories visually, failed. Ashmole records the 'silence and neglect' with which his efforts were met.<sup>125</sup> The great project to record the history and ceremonial of the Order in tapestries to be hung in the Banqueting House did not proceed beyond Van Dyck's sketches in oils, *Charles I and the Knights of the Garter in Procession* (c. 1638), now at the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.<sup>126</sup> Presumably, funds were not available to create representations of chivalry at a time of actual, and notably unsuccessful, war with Scotland. A question also hangs over the success of the king's efforts to transmute the representation of honour from that of the knight-errant to a symbol of spiritualised and pacific chivalry. Why were the chivalric romances such a consistent target in the masques of the Personal Rule, given the ongoing official campaign to remove the representation of chivalry from the romance context? The explanation offered in *Britannia Triumphans*, that the romances are banal, illusionary, and a source of wrong thinking leading to wrong action, seems insufficient, given the prominence Davenant gives to the 'Mock Romansa' in this masque and his general propensity for offering topical political commentary. A simpler explanation — that the romances were outdated and needed to be replaced by new, more glorious forms — is even less satisfactory, given that both Heylyn and Davenant took care to leave room for devotees to maintain their relationship with the old romance genre. It seems likely that Davenant, for example, considered the king's efforts to transmute his representation of chivalry from the romantic to the quasireligious were as futile as those to transmute platonic love. As relations with Scotland soured, Davenant was warning his king and courtiers not to confuse war with chivalric romance, whether it was represented in the guise of archaic romance or religious experience.

### **'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*'**

Lovelace's famous poem, 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*', is a product of the ideological encounters over the representation of honour and chivalry of the pre-war years outlined above.<sup>127</sup> It has attracted some criticism. One strand sees 'TO

LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*' as a more or less successful representation of felt love, either in terms of the older construction of the war of the sexes or in feminist terms.<sup>128</sup> Another important strand sees loyalism and the transcendence of honour as the driving force of the poem.<sup>129</sup> Norman Holland's contributions in the exchange on psychological criticism, which focus on this poem and 'THE SCRUTINIE', are insightful.<sup>130</sup> Bruce King argues interestingly but unconvincingly that the Lucasta poems should be read as a Petrarchan sonnet sequence.<sup>131</sup> Robert Ray suggests an echo of Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella* in the last line of Lovelace's poem.<sup>132</sup>

'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*' is the perfect lyric of Douglas Bush's epigraph:

I  
 Tell me not (Sweet) I am unkinde,  
 That from the Nunnerie  
 Of thy chaste breast, and quiet minde,  
 To Warre and Armes I flie.

II  
 True; a new Mistresse now I chase,  
 The first Foe in the Field;  
 And with a stronger Faith imbrace  
 A Sword, a Horse, a Shield.

III  
 Yet this Inconstancy is such,  
 As you too shall adore;  
 I could not love thee (Deare) so much,  
 Lov'd I not Honour more.<sup>133</sup>

Bush, like many before him, saw Lovelace as having 'struck a simple, sincere, and perfect attitude [...] with an idealism untouched by the sceptical or cynical, he enshrined the cavalier trinity, beauty, love, and loyal honour'.<sup>134</sup> The young man, excited at the prospect of going to war for the first time, leaves his chaste mistress safe in her fictive nunnery. He goes in search of the higher glory to be gained in service to his king. Perhaps there is an element of self-deprecation in the speaker's donning of sword and shield. Does he laugh with his love at his gaucherie? Even if this is the case, the final couplet seems to aim at being something more than the extravagant parting statement of an over-excited young man. Notably, both Bush and Corns, approaching the issue from quite different perspectives, accept that the young man's statement of commitment to his king is serious, even if his delivery is light-hearted.

### ***The Allusive Field***

‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ draws on competing representations of honour in contemporary and classical sources to a greater extent than has previously been recognised. The poem opens with the arresting image of ‘the Nunnerie’ of Lucasta’s ‘chaste breast and quiet minde’. The play on Lucasta’s name — ‘Lux casta’, meaning pure, chaste, pious or sacred light — in ‘chaste breast’ is not subtle. Donne’s nunnery, the ‘cold, white, snowie’ place where the Virgins of ‘The Litanie’ reside, almost certainly forms part of Lovelace’s allusive field. However, the imagery of ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ relates more directly to the language of *honnête* platonism than to Donne. In ‘*To Roses in the bosome of CASTARA*’, Habington appropriates Donne’s conceit to play on the purity of Castara’s breasts:

Yee blushing Virgins happie are  
In the chaste Nunn’ry of her brests,  
For hee’d prophane so chaste a faire,  
Who ere should call them *Cupids* nests. (ll. 1–4)<sup>135</sup>

Over the course of Habington’s poem, ‘those white Cloysters’, where the blushing virgin roses can reside safe from Cupid’s attentions, subtly and infelicitously shift to become a (whited?) sepulchre, a tomb. Her ‘brest’, which ‘hath marble beene’ to the speaker, will form as appropriate a sepulchre for the roses as a marble tomb would be.

In *Castara*, Habington frequently invokes the imagery of enclosure, entrapment and confinement, the metaphorical references to cloisters, marble tombs and suchlike, even to prisons, which Gerald Hammond recognises as a feature of both *Lucastas*.<sup>136</sup> Habington’s (and Lovelace’s) nunnery conceit has Roman Catholic overtones, although these should not be overstated. Montagu’s long play, *The Shepherds’ Paradise*, performed by the queen and her ladies in January 1633, is also recognised as presenting ‘a vision of female responsibility compatible with the spiritualised neo-Platonism popular in devout circles in Paris’.<sup>137</sup> The heterosexual community in search of chaste love in Montagu’s play retreats to a convent-like island sanctuary.<sup>138</sup> Its tendencies are as much symposiac as they are Roman Catholic.

The virtues of chastity and quietude ascribed to Lucasta by Lovelace are those Habington equates with the perfect female practitioner of *honnête* platonism in

‘A Mistris’, part of the introductory material to later editions of *Castara*. ‘A Mistris’:

is the fairest treasure [...] She is chaste, for the devill enters [...] when wantonnesse possesseth beauty and wit maintaines it lawfull. [...] Shee is innocent even from the knowledge of sinne [...] She avoydes a too neere conversation with man [...] Her language is not copious but apposit, and she had rather suffer the reproach of being dull company, than have the title of Witty, with that of Bold and Wanton.<sup>139</sup>

Habington’s short essay reminds us that the term ‘mistress’ was used in the 1630s to refer to a woman loved and courted by a man, as well as with the potentially negative connotation of a loved woman other than a man’s wife.

Lovelace’s use of classical sources in ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ is sophisticated. He invokes the enduring topos of the conflict between love and honour, archetypally played out in the *Iliad*. There, ‘the uxorious Paris is contrasted unfavorably with the virtuous Hector, who subordinates his marital to his martial nature’, thus avoiding any hint of effemination.<sup>140</sup> To date, no definitive classical source has been identified for ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*, although a probable link between Lovelace’s ‘To Warre and Armes I flie’ and the opening line of Virgil’s *Aeneid*, *Arma virumque cano*, ‘I sing of arms and the man’ has been noted.<sup>141</sup> Miner suggests that Ovid, *Amores* I. 1 and, particularly, I. 9, in which the identification between love and war is worked out in witty detail, should be credited ‘for explicit use of the motive as a motif’ by the cavalier poets.<sup>142</sup> However, Ovid’s speaker in *Amores* I. 9, with whom he identifies, is slothful in war and abandons his duty on the field in favour of an energetic night watch in his lover’s tent:

My selfe was dull and faint, to sloth inclin’d,  
Pleasure, and ease had mollified my mind.  
A faire maids care expell’d this sluggishnesse,  
And to her Tents will’d me my selfe adresse,  
Since mayst thou see me watch and night wars move,  
He that will not grow slothfull, let him love.<sup>143</sup>

Ovid’s sloth in war and energetic pursuit of love is the reverse of Lovelace’s speaker’s behaviour. He ‘flies’ eagerly to war from love. Ovid *Amores* I. 9 was a contribution to anti-imperial polemic at the time it was written. As Lyne notes, it was ‘a light-hearted, irreverent, ingenious development’ of the pacifistic theme developed elsewhere by Propertius and Tibullus, in direct opposition to the conventional Roman identification of military service as an integral part of an honourable citizen’s life, one of the foci of Augustus’s program of moral reform.<sup>144</sup> Lovelace and his community of readers could be expected to have been aware of

Augustus's program of moral reform from their studies of classical history and literature at university.

Horace's *Odes* III. 2, which Ovid *Amores* I. 9 directly contests, is also in play in 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*'. *Odes* III. 2 is one of Horace's six Roman *Odes* (3. 1–6), all of which deal specifically with political subjects. The speaker in *Odes* III. 2 positions himself as providing advice to Augustus, praising the emperor's policy and ideology with a view to furthering his program of moral reform.<sup>145</sup> It is the source of the epithet 'Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori', which has been used for two millennia to urge young men to battle and to console mourners on their deaths.<sup>146</sup> As a whole, *Odes* III. 2 urges high endeavour on the youth of Rome. The cap on the translation by Sir Thomas Hawkins (c. 1575–1640?), which was in publication continuously from 1625 to 1680, reads 'Boyes are to be enured from their tender age, to povertie, warfare, and painfull life.'<sup>147</sup> Hawkins's translation is awkward. Unfortunately, neither Sir Richard Fanshawe (1608–66) nor Abraham Cowley, both of whom provided fine translations of other Horatian lyrics, is known to have translated *Odes* III. 2, despite the fact that Fanshawe translated four of the Roman *Odes* and Cowley, one.<sup>148</sup> This may indicate that, after 1649, royalists were sensitive in relation to *Odes* III. 2's praise of the honour to be gained in war, after experiencing a dishonourable defeat, rather than that they had no affinity with this particular text. Hawkins's translation of Dulce et decorum est is in inverted commas, indicating that Horace's tag was already recognised as having entered the contemporary lexicon.

The similarities in the imagery deployed in 'TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*' and *Odes* III. 2 is evidence of their relationship. David West's translation of Horace's *Odes* III. 2 is more accessible modern translation than that by Hawkins. The first four stanzas of West's translation read:<sup>149</sup>

The boy must be toughened by hard campaigning  
and learn to endure poverty happily,  
riding against fierce Parthians,  
spreading terror with his sword,

and living in danger under the open sky.  
When the mother of a warring king and the maiden  
grown to womanhood gaze at him  
from the walls of the enemy city,

let them sigh their sighs for the royal bridegroom  
new to the ranks, in case he rouse the lion



it is death to touch, whose anger whirls him  
in blood through the thick of slaughter.

Sweet it is and honourable to die for one's native land.  
Death hunts down even the man who runs away  
and does not spare the back  
or the hamstrings of young cowards.<sup>150</sup>

Lovelace should have been familiar with *Odes* III. 2. At the very least, he is likely to have encountered it at school, where the subject matter would have made it an appropriate text for use in Latin *imitatio* exercises.

Although Lovelace's speaker addresses the lady and Horace's speaker addresses his emperor, both poems argue the case for moral reform espoused by their ruler. Lovelace's speaker enjoins his lady not to sigh for him, and not to tell him he is unkind, knowing full well that she will. Horace's queen and her marriageable daughter are to 'sigh their sighs for the royal bridegroom' from the safety of the city walls. In both texts, young men are seen to gain more honour by fighting for king and country than by wooing beautiful ladies. Both texts appropriate archaic imagery. Lovelace's speaker embraces 'A Sword, a Horse, a Shield'. Commentators have traditionally regarded the clash between the young nobleman and the lion watched by the queen and her marriageable daughter from the safety of the city walls in *Odes* III. 2 as an archaic fantasy inspired by Homer's *Iliad* (XXII. 25 ff.) referred to earlier. There, Hector's father and mother stand on the walls of Troy and look down on their son waiting outside the gates to receive Achilles' onslaught, before his tragic death.<sup>151</sup> *Odes* III. 2 is, however, focused on persuading young men to fight to the death for honour and virtue, rather than frightening them off the field. Hence the allusive shift from dead Hector to the lion. Both texts incorporate tags enjoining young men to fight for the honour of king and country, rather than just to win the love of the lady.

Although Ovid's *Amores* I. 9 is a presence, Lovelace more closely reflects on the honourable, Horatian model for his poem on love and war, rather than Ovid's subversive contribution to the debate. This may denote the seriousness with which he regarded the subject matter at the time of writing. Throughout the 1649 *Lucasta*, with one minor exception, Lovelace chooses the conventional usage of the term 'honour' over the libertine sense invoked by Carew and other Caroline poets.<sup>152</sup> For Carew, as noted above, 'honour is the 'Tyrant', 'Gyant', 'Monster' and 'Goblin' of

the piece.<sup>153</sup> Lovelace, on the other hand, uses the term infrequently. When he does invoke ‘honour’ elsewhere in *Lucasta*, in funeral elegies to female friends and relatives and in relation to Lady Anne Lovelace in the ‘DEDICATION’, it is in the traditional female senses of sexual probity and social identity.<sup>154</sup> In the post-Regicide *Posthume Poems*, Lovelace rejects honour. In his bittersweet Anacreontic, ‘*A loose Saraband*’, for example, he invokes Carew’s tyrant:

Now, is there such a Trifle  
As Honour, the fools Gyant,  
What is there left to rifle,  
When Wine makes all parts plyant. (ll. 41–44)<sup>155</sup>

After the wars, the construction of honour espoused in ‘TO LUCASTA, Going to the Warres’ is exposed as an empty shell. Alcohol replaces honour in the speaker’s life, making ‘all parts plyant’. Both male and female honour are encompassed and tarnished in these lines.

Not only royalists were interested in the discourse of chivalry. Parliamentary propagandists appropriated and subverted it from early in the war years. The pamphlet *A Declaration of the Valiant Resolution of the Famous Prentices of London*, annotated on 4 August 1642 by Thomason, was published about six weeks after Lovelace was released from prison, where ‘TO LUCASTA, Going to the Warres’ was almost certainly drafted. This pamphlet adopted the rhetorical style of the romances and their central chivalric value of honour. However, roles are reversed. The royalist upper classes are described as traitors, while the apprentices claim the high moral ground as the proponents of honour. As William Hunt points out, the ‘erotic excitement at the imminence of danger and violence’, which the pamphlet describes, ‘very closely resembles the mood of the Cavalier poet Richard Lovelace in “To Lucasta, Going to the Warres”’.<sup>156</sup> In this context, Lovelace’s poem can be seen as an active intervention in an ongoing polemical debate over chivalric honour between royalists and parliamentarians. Subsequently, parliamentarians castigated royalists in the newsbooks for acting rashly like knights-errant, and used the language of the romances to support their contention that their opponents were delusional.<sup>157</sup> The visual imagery of Charles as chivalric knight was consigned figuratively and actually to the shadows. After the outbreak of war, Le Sueur’s equestrian statue of the king was at first stored in the crypt of St Paul’s, Covent Garden, to avoid defacement, then sold in 1655 by

Parliament to a brass maker on the strict condition that he agreed ‘to break the said statue in pieces to the end that nothing might remain in memory of his said majesty’.<sup>158</sup> Once the court left London, the iconic Van Dyck portraits of the royal family in their palaces were less visible. They were offered for sale with the rest of the king’s collection during the Interregnum.

### **Later Reception**

Although Bush and Corns, among many, have accepted Lovelace’s commitment to his king and the concept of honour in ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*, others have not. This may be in part because at various times it has been hard to muster the militaristic idealism, and the lack the cynicism and scepticism, which make such a reading possible. In those times when the call for young men to sacrifice themselves on the altar of duty and honour has had traction, Lovelace’s poem has proved both powerful and disturbing. The couplet ‘I could not love thee (Deare) so much | Lov’d I not Honour more’ was ‘cited in a thousand newspaper leading articles during the years 1914–18’, testament to the lyric’s place in the public imagination.<sup>159</sup>

Robert Graves (1895–1985) was one of the group of poets who served on the Western Front during the First World War and wrote of their experiences. The reality of war in the trenches appalled Graves and his contemporaries. They wrote ‘powerfully and poignantly about the effects of war on the bodies and minds of men, the horror and the waste’.<sup>160</sup> Graves responded to those editors’ and politicians’ admonitions to young men to fight which invoked ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ with an answer poem, ‘To Lucasta On Going to the Wars — For the Fourth Time’, published in *Fairies and Fusiliers* (1917).

Graves prepared his answer to ‘LUCASTA’ while he was in hospital recovering from shell shock. He had already suffered a serious injury at the Battle of the Somme the previous year, but had returned to the front. With the voice of experience, Graves’s speaker contests the insouciance with which Lovelace’s young man leaves for war:

Lucasta, when to France your man  
Returns his fourth time, hating war,  
Yet laughs as calmly as he can  
And flings an oath but says no more,  
That is not courage, that’s not fear –  
Lucasta he’s a Fusilier,  
And his pride sends him here. (ll. 7–13)<sup>161</sup>

Graves's poem rejects the position he sees as being put by Lovelace's speaker in 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*' that young men should fight for love, honour and glory. He argues that it is personal pride and pride in the regiment, rather than the more diaphanous concepts of love and honour, which spur young men to return to battle time and again. Statesmen may 'bluster, bark and bray'. They can quote the final couplet from 'LUCASTA' to goad young men back to the front as they apportion blame to others for causing the affray. In response to the calls, the young soldier can only pretend insouciance:

But he must be stout-hearted,  
Must sit and stake with quiet breath,  
Playing at cards with Death.  
Don't plume yourself he fights for you;  
It is no courage, love, or hate  
[...]  
It's pride that makes the heart be great. (ll. 17–26)<sup>162</sup>

The young woman he leaves behind should not 'plume' herself, believing that she is the source of her lovers' inspiration and courage. She is not. For Graves, Lovelace's poem fails to acknowledge the awful realities of war. It promotes honour and duty over life and love in an apparently unquestioning and incontestible manner. It is possible that those members of Lovelace's community of readers who had themselves fought, whether at the time of writing or on publication, might have shared Graves's views.

### **Reading the Poems**

It is a relatively straightforward exercise to identify the intertexts to Lovelace's two famous platonic poems and to expose the contested discourses to which they contributed. Lovelace's reliance on Carew's well-known libertine lyrics for the intertexts of 'TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*' would have been obvious to his community of readers. It is evident from the preceding discussion of Davenant's play *The Platonic Lovers* and other related texts that, as Sharpe noted, there were real concerns expressed at court about the morality and sustainability of the queen's cult of *honnête* platonic love. One can imagine that Habington's diction of chaste love might have been welcomed with hilarity by poets like Carew, Suckling and, indeed, Lovelace himself. While those who wanted to enjoy a reading of 'TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*' uninflected by fashionable cynicism could do so, the wits at

court and later readers could enjoy their shared knowledge of the way in which Lovelace was manipulating tropes which carried libertine overtones.

‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ is more problematic. Lovelace’s speaker’s lack of emotional warmth towards Lucasta, exemplified by his willingness to forsake her in favour of ‘Warre and Armes’, has irritated many critics.<sup>163</sup> Graves’s answer poem, ‘To Lucasta — On Going to the Wars — For the Fourth Time’ is an indicator both of the perceived power of the lyric to motivate young men to fight and of the irritation it could engender in readers. Like Graves, parliamentary propagandists saw the discourse of chivalry as one worthy of subversion. Arguably, the problem in interpreting ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ lies in its power to engender such strong responses. As a result, it is more difficult than usual to assume an objective stance. The same kinds of arguments which enable contrasting readings of ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’ apply equally to ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’. The king’s identification of his persona with the concept of chivalric honour was undermined by the reality of his attachment to peace during the Personal Rule and his military failures. This disjunction between representation and reality was recognised at court. Davenant’s 1638 masque *Britannia Triumphans* demonstrated the difficulty of moving public understanding of the concept of chivalric honour beyond that of the discredited medieval romance. ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’ has in play the contesting discourses of heroic valour and slothful lust of Horace’s *Odes* III. 2 and Ovid’s *Amores* I. 9, which would have been more recognisable to Lovelace’s readers, who were schooled on Horace and Ovid from an early age. These issues point towards a conclusion similar to that in relation to ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*’.

On the other hand, Corns’s point, previously noted, that for Lovelace, ‘being the sort of person who is capable of sensuous and devotional passion brings with it an unqualified love for the king which must also express itself in a boundless self-sacrifice, much as the lover sets no limits to his devotion for his mistress’ must be taken seriously.<sup>164</sup> This analysis has shown that, during the war years, Lovelace appears not to have subjected the king’s efforts to reform the Order of the Garter and enhance its capacity to engender loyalty to the same kind of interrogation as he does to the queen’s platonic love. In ‘TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*’, Lovelace appropriates Horace’s *Odes* III. 2, the source of the jingoistic tag, dulce et decorum

est, for the purpose. It is open to the reader to contemplate the significance of Ovid's *Amores* I. 9 in the context of Lovelace's poem, a text which directly contests the youthful, military virtue of Horace's *Odes* III. 2, one which proposes love as a preferable alternative to war.

Poems like Graves's, and Wilfred Owen's 'Dulce et Decorum Est' have shaped the cultural and literary memory and understanding of war for subsequent generations.<sup>165</sup> The resulting cultural difference makes it difficult to know how to approach poems like 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*', which equate war with honour. Perhaps the cultural distance between the time Lovelace wrote the poem and our reading of it makes it impossible to reach any firm conclusion on how the lyric might have been read when it was published in 1649. It is possible to read Lovelace's poem as comedic, in effect as a complete inversion of the superficial sense of the text. One can imagine an actor playing the role of the subject of Chaucer's own story in *The Canterbury Tales*, Sir Thopas, carrying off such a representation. It is not clear whether Lovelace's readers would have entertained such a reading.

I have argued that 'TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*' would have been interpreted by different groups of readers according to their existing beliefs on the cult of platonic love. The same could have applied in relation to 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*'. It may be that Lovelace crafted 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*' specifically as a compliment to Charles I. Horace's *Odes* III. 2 provides a precedent for this interpretation. Horace's Roman Odes, including *Odes* III. 2, are political poems. West, like Lyne quoted earlier, argues Horace's task with these poems was 'to contribute to the Augustan cultural renaissance by helping to create an Augustan literature which could stand comparison with the glories of Greek' literature, which was immensely varied in form and genre.<sup>166</sup> In crafting the Roman Odes, Horace was 'adopting a different part of the persona of the Greek lyric poet and addressing the ruler, [...] Here then, he speaks not as a drinker or a lover, but as a prophet addressing the younger generation'.<sup>167</sup> It is conceivable that Lovelace sought a similar outcome.

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Douglas Bush, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945), pp. 118-19.
- <sup>2</sup> Earl Miner, *The Cavalier Mode From Jonson to Cotton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), p. 205.
- <sup>3</sup> Lucasta, pp. 1-4. Substantive analyses of these poems are referenced as the poems are discussed.
- <sup>4</sup> Manfred Weidhorn, *Richard Lovelace* (New York: Twayne, 1970), p. 60. See also A. Waller Hastings, 'Stone Walls, Iron Bars, and Liberal Political Theory: Lovelace's 'To Althea, From Prison'', in *Proceedings of the First Dakotas Conference on Earlier British Literature*, ed. Jay Ruud (Aberdeen: Northern State University Press, 1993), 74-85 (p. 74).
- <sup>5</sup> H.M. Richmond, 'Manfred Weidhorn. *Richard Lovelace*', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 24 (1971), 285-87 (p. 286).
- <sup>6</sup> H.M. Richmond, *The School of Love: The Evolution of the Stuart Love Lyric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), pp. 143, 52-53, 234, 315.
- <sup>7</sup> A.J. Smith, *The Metaphysics of Love: Studies in Renaissance Love Poetry From Dante to Milton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 234.
- <sup>8</sup> Smith, p. 221.
- <sup>9</sup> Miner, *The Cavalier Mode*, p. 205.
- <sup>10</sup> Kevin Sharpe and Stephen N. Zwicker, eds., *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987). See also, for example, Martin Butler, *Theatre and Crisis, 1632-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981), Ch. 9; R. Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), Ch. 9; Roy Strong, *Splendour at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and Illusion* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), Ch. 6. Where Sharpe contests Parry, I have, in general, followed Sharpe.
- <sup>11</sup> Ann Baynes Coiro, 'A Ball of Strife': Caroline Poetry and Royal Marriage', in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 26-46 (p. 26).
- <sup>12</sup> John Adamson, 'Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), 161-97; Barbara Donagan, 'The Web Of Honour: Soldiers, Christians, and Gentlemen in the English Civil War', *Historical Journal*, 44 (2001), 365-89; William Hunt, 'Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War', in *The Transmission of Culture in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Anthony Grafton and Ann Blair (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990), 204-37; Mervyn James, 'English

Politics and the Concept of Honour, 1485-1642', in *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 308-415.

<sup>13</sup> Thomas N. Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), pp. 76-77.

<sup>14</sup> For example, Butler, *Theatre and Crisis*, pp. 7-11; Martin Butler, 'Politics and the Masque: *The Triumph of Peace*', *Seventeenth Century*, 2 (1987), 117-41 (p. 118); Thomas N. Corns, 'The Poetry of the Caroline Court', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 97 (1998), 51-73 (p. 51); Kevin Sharpe, "'So Hard a Text'? Images of Charles I, 1612-1700', *Historical Journal*, 43 (2000), 383-405 (p. 385).

<sup>15</sup> Sharpe, "'So Hard a Text'", p. 385. Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), Ch. 5 evidences the dominance of the iconography of the *Eikon Basilike*, as do many of the essays in Thomas N. Corns, ed., *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

<sup>16</sup> For example, Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong, *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, 2 vols (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973).

<sup>17</sup> Butler, 'Politics and the Masque', p. 117. See, for example, Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones and Parry, The Golden Age Restor'd*, pp. 201-02.

<sup>18</sup> Corns, 'The Poetry of the Caroline Court', p. 51; Sharpe, "'So Hard a Text'", p. 383. Sharpe is contesting the position put forward by Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones*, I, Ch. 4 and Strong, *Splendour at Court*, Ch. 6. More recently, the issue of whether the king's authority was founded in force or love has emerged as a key fault line among royalists. This issue is discussed in later chapters. See Anthony Milton, 'Thomas Wentworth and the Political Thought of the Personal Rule', in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621-1641*, ed. J.F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 133-56; David Scott, 'Counsel and Cabal in the King's Party, 1642-1646', in *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars*, ed. Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 112-35; David Scott, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642-49', in *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-49*, ed. John Adamson (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 36-60; R. Malcolm Smuts, 'Political Thought in Early Stuart Britain', in *A Companion to Stuart Britain*, ed. Barry Coward (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003), 271-89; R. Malcolm Smuts, 'Force, Love and Authority in Caroline Political Culture', in *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*, ed. Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 28-49; R. Malcolm Smuts, 'The Court and the Emergence of a Royalist Party', in *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars*, ed. Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 43-65.

<sup>19</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 15-16.

<sup>20</sup> Henry Lawes Manuscript Songbook, British Library Add. MS 53723.



- <sup>21</sup> Christopher John Wortham, 'Richard Lovelace's 'To Lucasta, Going to the Wars': Which Wars?', *Notes and Queries*, 26 (1979), 430-31.
- <sup>22</sup> House of Lords MS HL/PO/JO/10/1/125A.
- <sup>23</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 6-7, 15-16.
- <sup>24</sup> Attributed to 'J.H. O.C.' Ian Spink, *Henry Lawes: Cavalier Songwriter* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 24; John Wilson, *Cheerfull Ayres or Ballads* (London, 1660).
- <sup>25</sup> Among the earliest to make this point was Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984 repr. 1990), p. 178.
- <sup>26</sup> I have found no evidence that Lovelace engaged with the Cambridge Platonists, although he was a direct contemporary of some members of the group and was at Cambridge at some time during the later 1630s, when the group was active.
- <sup>27</sup> Kevin Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 22-23. There is also a useful discussion on the development of neo-Platonism during this period in Don Beecher, 'Eye-beams, Raptures and Androgynes: Inverted Neoplatonism in Poems by Donne, Herbert of Cherbury, Overbury and Carew', *Cahiers Élisabéthains*, 65 (2004), 1-9; see also Anna Baldwin and Sarah Hutton, eds., *Platonism and the English Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), in particular Jill Kraye, 'The Transformation of Platonic Love in the Italian Renaissance', pp. 76-85.
- <sup>28</sup> Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, p. 23.
- <sup>29</sup> Sharpe, p. 23.
- <sup>30</sup> Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones*, I, Ch. 4; Strong, *Splendour at Court*, Ch. 6. I follow Butler and Loxley in rejecting Orgel and Strong's position on the use of neo-Platonism to reinforce the operation of totalising power at the Caroline court; see Butler, 'Politics and the Masque', pp. 117-18 and James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), p. 2.
- <sup>31</sup> Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, p. 23.
- <sup>32</sup> Kraye, 'The Transformation of Platonic Love', pp. 83-86.
- <sup>33</sup> *OED Online*, Sense 2. a, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>34</sup> The two major studies of the nature and politics of platonic love in the court of Henrietta Maria are Karen Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) and Erica Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989). See also Julie Sanders, 'Caroline Salon Culture and Female Agency: The Countess of Carlisle, Henrietta Maria, and Public Theatre', *Theatre Journal*, 52 (2000), 449-64. Platonic love is a staple of writing on the period, being well dealt with in its broader context by Butler, *Theatre and Crisis* and Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*. The standard early discussions of *libertin* and *précieuse* at the Caroline court are: J.B. Fletcher,

'Précieuses at the Court of Charles I', *Journal of Comparative Literature*, 1 (1903), 120-53; Fletcher Orpin Henderson, 'Traditions of *Précieux* and *Libertin* in Suckling's Poetry', *English Literary History*, 4 (1937), 274-98; Kathleen M. Lynch, *The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy* (New York: Biblio and Tannen, 1965 (repr.)), Chs 3 and 4; and G.F. Sensabaugh, 'Platonic Love and the Puritan Rebellion', *Studies in Philology*, 37 (1940), 457-81. Although Lynch is dated, the examples of platonic and antiplatonic verse and drama she chooses are helpful. A feminist perspective is to be found in Domna C. Stanton, 'The Fiction of *Préciosité* and the Fear of Women', *Yale French Studies*, 62 (1981), 107-34. Odette de Mourgues, *Metaphysical Baroque & *Précieux* Poetry* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953) is useful for a general perspective on the history of *préciosité* in France. Thomas Kaminski, 'Edmund Waller, English *Précieux*', *Philological Quarterly*, 79 (2000), 19-43, examines *inter alia* Waller's links with Voiture's work, with which we know Lovelace was familiar. It highlights both Voiture's influence on English poets and the tendency for *précieux* poetry to incorporate prurient elements. Wilcher covers similar ground in Robert Wilcher, *The Discontented Cavalier: The Work of Sir John Suckling in Its Social, Religious, Political, and Literary Contexts* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007), pp. 129-32.

<sup>35</sup> *L'Astrée* (Rouen, 1646-47), II, ix, p. 676, quoted in Lynch, *The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy*, p. 46. See also Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion*, pp. 16-18.

<sup>36</sup> Sanders, 'Caroline Salon Culture', p. 453.

<sup>37</sup> Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion*, pp. 14-47. Veevers's hypotheses are further developed in Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria*.

<sup>38</sup> Veevers, pp. 26-27.

<sup>39</sup> Veevers, p. 27.

<sup>40</sup> Gerald Eades Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 7 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941-1968), III, pp. 216-17. Bentley suggests some caution on the actual date.

<sup>41</sup> Veevers, p. 134.

<sup>42</sup> Veevers, p. 51.

<sup>43</sup> New, expanded editions appeared in 1635 and 1640. The standard edition is *The Poems of William Habington* ed. by Kenneth Allott (London: University of Liverpool Press, 1948). All quotations from Habington's poems are from this edition, unless otherwise stated.

<sup>44</sup> Robert Wilcher, 'Habington, William (1605-1654)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009. They married, probably clandestinely, in early 1633. See also the 'Introduction' to Habington, *Poems*.

<sup>45</sup> Habington, *Poems*, p. 5.

<sup>46</sup> Paul Delany, 'Attacks on Carew in William Habington's Poems', *Seventeenth-Century News*, 36 (1968), Item 8.

<sup>47</sup> Habington, *Poems*, p. 5.

<sup>48</sup> Habington, *Poems*, p. 5. Habington targets libertine poets – probably Carew – in a number of poems. See Delany, 'Attacks on Carew in William Habington's Poems'.

- <sup>49</sup> Habington, *Poems*, p. 6.
- <sup>50</sup> Habington, *Poems*, p. 6.
- <sup>51</sup> Habington, *Poems*, p. lv
- <sup>52</sup> Suckling, *Poems*, pp. 30-32.
- <sup>53</sup> *The Poems of Thomas Carew* ed. by Rhodes Dunlap (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), pp. 49-53. All subsequent quotations from Carew's poems are from this edition, unless otherwise stated.
- Wilcher, *The Discontented Cavalier*, p. 135.
- <sup>54</sup> Most recently, Sharpe, 'So Hard a Text', p. 388.
- <sup>55</sup> Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, III, pp. 216-17. I draw heavily on Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, in relation to Davenant's *The Temple of Love* and *The Platonick Lovers*. These works are also discussed in Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria*, Ch. 7; Lesel Dawson, 'New Sects of Love': Neoplatonism and Constructions of Gender in Davenant's *The Temple of Love* and *The Platonick Lovers*', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 8, no. 1 (2002), 4.1-36, <<http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/08-1/dawsnew.htm>>, accessed 11 November 2009; Stephen Orgel, 'Inigo Jones' Persian Entertainment', *AARP: Art and Archaeology Research Papers*, 2 (1972), 59-69; Axel Stähler, 'Between Tiger and Unicorn: *The Temple of Love*', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 61 (1998), 176-97; Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion*, pp. 133-49.
- <sup>56</sup> William Davenant, 'The Temple of Love', in *Inigo Jones*, II, 598-605.
- <sup>57</sup> Davenant, 'The Temple of Love', p. 601.
- <sup>58</sup> Davenant, 'The Temple of Love', p. 604.
- <sup>59</sup> Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, III, p. 211.
- <sup>60</sup> Carew, *Poems*, pp. 51-53.
- <sup>61</sup> Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, p. 282.
- <sup>62</sup> *The Poems of John Milton*, ed. by John Carew and Alastair Fowler (London: Longmans, 1968), pp. 212-13. All subsequent quotations from Milton's poems are from this edition.
- <sup>63</sup> Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion*, p. 51.
- <sup>64</sup> Robert Wilcher, 'Suckling's Fruition Poems and Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*', *Notes and Queries*, 53 (2006), 164-66.
- <sup>65</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 1-2, discussed in Raymond A. Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1988), pp. 98-99; Alexander Corbin Judson, 'Who Was Lucasta?', *Modern Philology*, 23 (1925), 77-82; Dosia Reichardt, 'Looking For Lovelace: Identity, Style and Inheritance in the Poetry of the Interregnum', (Unpublished PhD thesis, James Cook University, 2003), pp. 58-62; Weidhorn, *Richard Lovelace*, pp. 91-92; Christopher John Wortham, 'The Poetry of Richard Lovelace: A Study of His Poetic Works, Considered in the Context of His Life and Times', (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 1974), p. 224-27. Dunlap in Carew, *Poems*, pp. 223-24, discusses the poem's intertexts.

- <sup>66</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 37-39, pp. 136-39, discussed in Ch. 6.
- <sup>67</sup> Carew, *Poems*, p. 22.
- <sup>68</sup> Scott Nixon, 'Carew, Thomas (1594/5–1640)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>69</sup> There are fifteen recorded contemporary manuscript copies of this poem, most attributed to the 1630s; Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, 4 vols (London: Mansell, 1980-1993), II, 1, pp. 110-11.
- <sup>70</sup> Beecher, 'Eye-beams, Raptures and Androgynes', p. 1. Beecher uses Donne's 'The Exstasie', *inter alia*, to illustrate this point.
- <sup>71</sup> Carew, *Poems*, p. 23.
- <sup>72</sup> Carew, *Poems*, p. 224.
- <sup>73</sup> Carew, *Poems*, p. 22.
- <sup>74</sup> Thomas Randolph, *Poems, With The Muses Looking-Glasse and Amyntas*, 2nd edn (Oxford: 1640), p. 47.
- <sup>75</sup> Carew, *Poems*, pp. 223-24; *John Donne: The Elegies and The Songs and Sonnets* ed. by Helen Gardner (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), pp. 59-61, 62-64; unless otherwise stated, all quotations from Donne's poems are from this edition; Randolph, *Poems*, pp. 46-48.
- <sup>76</sup> Donne, *Poems*, pp. 75-76.
- <sup>77</sup> These poems have attracted copious criticism, which I do not debate here. Catherine Gimelli Martin, 'The Erotology of Donne's 'Extasie' and the Secret History of Voluptuous Rationalism', *Studies in English Literature*, 44 (2004), 121-47, examines the complexities of Donne's interaction with notions of platonic love.
- <sup>78</sup> Donne, *Poems*, p. 63.
- <sup>79</sup> Donne, *Poems*, p. 63.
- <sup>80</sup> Beecher, 'Eye-beams, Raptures and Androgynes', p. 5.
- <sup>81</sup> Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones*, II, p. 604.
- <sup>82</sup> Orgel, 'Inigo Jones' Persian Entertainment', p. 61.
- <sup>83</sup> Habington, *Poems*, p. 63.
- <sup>84</sup> Marvell, *Poems*, pp. 107-11.
- <sup>85</sup> Marvell, *Poems*, pp. 111.
- <sup>86</sup> Marvell, *Poems*, p. 107.
- <sup>87</sup> Smith in Marvell, *Poems*, p. 107, uses the publication of 'TO LUCASTA *Going beyond the Seas*' in 1649 to locate Marvell's poem in 1649-50.
- <sup>88</sup> George Fenwick Jones, 'Lov'd I Not Honour More: The Durability of a Literary Motif', *Comparative Literature*, 11 (1959), 131-43 (p. 142). The cult was also prominent in popular culture; see Hunt, 'Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War'.
- <sup>89</sup> See, for example, Richard Cust, *Charles I: A Political Life*, repr. (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2007) p. 160. In developing his argument on the centrality of the reinvention of the Order of the

Garther, Cust relies heavily on Adamson, 'Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England'. Also, see above including notes 10-12.

<sup>90</sup> Elias Ashmole, *The Institution, Laws & Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (London, 1672), p. 2. See Donagan, 'The Web Of Honour: Soldiers, Christians, and Gentlemen in the English Civil War', pp. 365-68 for a discussion of the various ways in which 'honour' was understood during this period. I have used Ashmole's definition because it is almost contemporary and contextually relevant. On female honour, see also Garthine Walker, 'Expanding the Boundaries of Female Honour in Early Modern England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Sixth Series*, 6 (1996), 235-45.

<sup>91</sup> Corns, 'The Poetry of the Caroline Court', p. 58; Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 157.

<sup>92</sup> The paintings are Anthony Van Dyck, *Charles I on Horseback with M. de St Antoine*, 1633, The Royal Collection, London; *Charles I in the Hunting-Field (Charles I à la Ciasse)*, c.1636, Musée du Louvre, Paris; *Charles I on Horseback*, c. 1636-37, National Gallery, London. They are reproduced in Susan J. Barnes, Nora De Poorter et al., *Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), pp. 462-64, 66-68, 68-70. John Peacock, 'The Visual Image of Charles I', in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 176-239 discusses the range of visual forms Charles used to represent his image. I have not attempted to cover the role of the Kings Musick in this discussion. Roy Strong, *Van Dyck: Charles I on Horseback* (London: Allen Lane, 1972) is a key text here. Sharpe notes the importance of Strong's contribution in Kevin Sharpe, 'The Royal Image: An Afterword', in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 288-309 (p. 292). Strong's essay has received less attention than one would expect, in part because it was pilloried in review; see Oliver Millar, *Van Dyck in England* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1982), p. 38; Margaret R. Toynebee, 'Van Dyck: *Charles I on Horseback* by Roy Strong', *Burlington Magazine*, 115 (1973), 753. Strong's essay exhibits to a lesser extent the tendency of the early New Historicist project to attempt to explore the Stuart court in terms of the operation of a totalising power, expressed, for example, in Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones*, I, Ch. 4; see Butler, 'Politics and the Masque', pp. 117-18 and Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 2.

<sup>93</sup> Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation*, Ch. 4; Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing*, Ch. 3. Alex Davis, *Chivalry and Romance in the English Renaissance* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003), pp. 187-88, is more equivocal on this point than one might expect.

<sup>94</sup> Sharpe, "'So Hard a Text'", pp. 385-86. See, for example, Francis Delaram's exuberant equestrian engraving of Charles as Prince of Wales with a marshal's baton, wearing the Garter ribbon in Margaret R. Toynebee, 'Some Early Portraits of Charles I', *Burlington Magazine*, 91 (1949), 4-9, fig. 4.

<sup>95</sup> London, Royal Collection. Oliver Millar, *The Age of Charles I: Painting in England, 1620-1649* (London: Tate Gallery, 1972), pp. 56-57. The other important allegorical portrait of Charles I and

Henrietta Maria of this period is Gerrit van Honthorst's *The Liberal Arts Presented to King Charles and Queen Henrietta Maria*, 1628, Royal Collection, London, in which the king is represented as Apollo and the queen as Diana.

<sup>96</sup> Wolfgang Adler, *Landscapes*, vol. I, Corpus Rubenianum Part 18 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 119, 22.

<sup>97</sup> Adamson, 'Chivalry and Political Culture', pp. 166-67.

<sup>98</sup> Adamson, pp. 165-66. See also Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation*, p. 176.

<sup>99</sup> On the equestrian portraits, see n. above and Barnes, De Poorter et al., *Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*, pp. 462-64, 66-68, 68-70; Hubert Le Sueur's statue is reproduced in Strong, *Van Dyck: Charles I on Horseback*, p. 56. Inigo Jones's rejected design for a triumphal arch at Temple Bar in the same mode is also reproduced in Strong, where these works are discussed as a group at pp. 45-57.

<sup>100</sup> Nicholas Morgan's treatise *The Perfection of Horsemanship* (1609), quoted in Strong, *Van Dyck: Charles I on Horseback*, pp. 56-57.

<sup>101</sup> Peter Heylyn, *The Historie of That Most Famous Saynt and Souldier of Christ Jesus; St. George of Cappadocia*, 2nd edn (London, 1633); Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 29-32. See also Anthony Milton, 'Heylyn, Peter (1599-1662)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>102</sup> Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic*, p. 30.

<sup>103</sup> See, for example, Heylyn, *Historie of St. George*, p. 63.

<sup>104</sup> Thomas May, *The Victorious Reigne of King Edward the Third* (London, 1635), sig. F2<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>105</sup> Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones*, II, p. 600. Jones's drawing of the set is at pp. 608-09.

<sup>106</sup> David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 64.

<sup>107</sup> See Francis Lenton's 'To the Honorable, Valiant, and Ingenious Colonel RICHARD LOVELACE, on his Exquisite POEMS', *Lucasta*, sig. A1<sup>v</sup>; William Winstanley, *The Lives of the Most Famous English Poets* (London, 1687), p. 170. See also Ch. 2.

<sup>108</sup> On the politics of the *Old Arcadia*, see Blair Worden, *The Sound of Virtue: Philip Sidney's Arcadia and Elizabethan Politics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996). See also, H. R. Woudhuysen, 'Sidney, Sir Philip (1554-1586)' *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>109</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 5, 80.

<sup>110</sup> Adamson, 'Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England', pp. 171-73; James, 'English Politics and the Concept of Honour', pp. 392-94.

<sup>111</sup> James, pp. 309, 92-93.

<sup>112</sup> Adamson, p. 171.

<sup>113</sup> Adamson, p. 172; Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones*, II, p. 590.

<sup>114</sup> The exceptions are the editions of 1605 and 1628.

<sup>115</sup> Orgel and Strong, II, p. 579.

<sup>116</sup> Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42*, p. 198; James Shirley, *The Triumph of Peace*, in *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, ed. Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973), 536-65.

<sup>117</sup> Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, p. 248. He is contesting Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd*, p. 198.

<sup>118</sup> The old-fashioned nature of the costumes is evident both in Davenant's description and Jones's drawings; William Davenant, *Britannia Triumphans*, in *The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, ed. Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973), II, 660-703 (pp. 665, 96-99).

<sup>119</sup> Davenant, *Britannia Triumphans*, Orgel and Strong, II, p. 665, ll. 423-24.

<sup>120</sup> Davenant, *Britannia Triumphans*, Orgel and Strong, II, p. 666.

<sup>121</sup> Sharpe, *Criticism and Compliment*, p. 250.

<sup>122</sup> James, 'English Politics and the Concept of Honour', p. 391.

<sup>123</sup> Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, p. 64.

<sup>124</sup> Martin Butler, 'Entertaining the Palatine Prince: Plays on Foreign Affairs, 1635-1637', *English Literary Renaissance*, 13 (1983), 319-44 (pp. 320-21).

<sup>125</sup> Ashmole, *The Institution, Laws & Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, pp. 196-98.

<sup>126</sup> Barnes, De Poorter et al., *Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*, p. 476; Millar, *Van Dyck in England*, pp. 86-87.

<sup>127</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 3.

<sup>128</sup> Judson, 'Who Was Lucasta?'; Christopher S. Nassaar, 'Lovelace's 'To Lucasta, Going to the Wars'', *Explicator*, 39 (1981), 44-45; Norman Nathan, 'Lovelace's 'Flie'', *Notes and Queries*, 200 (1955), 428-29; Norman Holmes Pearson, 'Lovelace's 'To Lucasta, Going to the Warres'', *Explicator*, 7 (1948-49), Item 58; Reichardt, 'Looking For Lovelace: Identity, Style and Inheritance in the Poetry of the Interregnum', pp. 70-80; Sharon Cadman Seelig, 'My Curious Hand or Eye: The Wit of Richard Lovelace', in *The Wit of Seventeenth-Century Poetry*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1995), 151-70; Weidhorn, *Richard Lovelace*, pp. 92-98; Wortham, 'The Poetry of Richard Lovelace', pp. 227-30. Reichardt summarises the critical reception of the poem and contemporary intertexts from the war years. Wortham, 'Richard Lovelace's 'To Lucasta, Going to the Wars': Which Wars?', argues that the poem was written in 1646. Bruce King, 'Lovelace's 'Lucasta' and Marvell's 'T.C.': Petrarch (and Dante?) in Seventeenth Century England', *Canadian Journal of Comparative Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée*, 1 (1973), 70-86, argues interestingly but unconvincingly that the Lucasta poems should be read as a Petrarchan sonnet sequence.

<sup>129</sup> Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*, pp. 97-99; Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, pp. 76-77; A.D. Cousins, 'Lucasta, Gratiana, and the Amatory Wit of Lovelace', *Parergon*, 6 (1988), 97-104; Mark Van Doren,

*Introduction to Poetry: Commentaries on Thirty Poems* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1968), pp. 21-26.

On Lucasta and honour specifically, see Jones, 'Lov'd I Not Honour More'.

<sup>130</sup> Norman N. Holland, 'Clinical, Yes: Healthy, No', *Literature and Psychology*, 14 (1964), 121-25;

Norman N. Holland, 'Literary Value: A Psychoanalytic Approach', *Literature and Psychology*, 14 (1964), 43-55; H.M. Richmond, 'A Note on Professor Holland's Psychoanalytic Approach to Lovelace', *Literature and Psychology*, 14 (1964), 125-28; Robert Rogers, 'Literary Value and the Clinical Fallacy', *Literature and Psychology*, 14 (1964), 116-21.

<sup>131</sup> Bruce King, 'Green Ice and a Breast of Proof', *College English*, 26 (1965), 511-15.

<sup>132</sup> Robert H. Ray, 'The Admiration of Sir Philip Sidney by Lovelace and Carew: New Seventeenth-Century Allusions', *American Notes and Queries*, 18 (2005), 18-21.

<sup>133</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 3.

<sup>134</sup> Bush, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century*, pp. 118-19.

<sup>135</sup> Habington, *Poems*, p. 12. *Castara* was obviously popular; it was reissued in enlarged editions in 1635 and 1640. The order in which the early poems appear is the same in each edition, although there is additional introductory matter in the later editions. Wilkinson, *Poems* (1925) I, p. 19 and Weidhorn, *Richard Lovelace*, p. 177, note 8, also note the connection.

<sup>136</sup> Gerald Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 71 (1985), 203-34 (p. 205). The metonymic similarities between Lovelace's early poems and those of *Castara* are sufficiently striking to indicate that Lovelace was very familiar with *Castara*, although the objects of Lovelace's affection do not share *Castara*'s cloyingly chaste religiosity. It may well be that Lovelace was gently parodying Habington's verse; see, for example, 'To *Castara*, A Sacrifice' Habington, *Poems*, p. 11, c.f. 'TO AMARANTHA', discussed in Ch. 4.

<sup>137</sup> Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria*, p. 125.

<sup>138</sup> See Britland, pp. 127-28 for recent debate on the nature of the sanctuary in *The Shepherds' Paradise* as a Catholic or Protestant space. See also, Sarah Poynting, 'A Critical Edition of Walter Montagu's *The Shepherds' Paradise*, Acts 1-3' (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 1999), p. 157, quoted in Britland, p. 128.

<sup>139</sup> Habington, *Poems*, p. 9.

<sup>140</sup> Jones, 'Lov'd I Not Honour More', pp. 135.

<sup>141</sup> Pearson, 'Lovelace's 'To Lucasta, Going to the Warres''; Weidhorn, *Richard Lovelace*, pp. 94-95.

<sup>142</sup> Miner, *The Cavalier Mode*, p. 240.

<sup>143</sup> Ovid, *All Ovids Elegies: 3 Bookes*, trans. Christopher Marlowe (London, 1640), sig. B1<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>144</sup> R.O.A.M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets: From Catullus to Horace* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), pp. 252, 73-74.

<sup>145</sup> David West, ed., *Horace Odes III: Dulce Periculum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 6-7. I have drawn heavily on West's commentary, pp. 24-31, in this section.

<sup>146</sup> *Odes III. 2. 13*; West, ed., *Horace Odes III*, p. 22.



<sup>147</sup> *Odes of Horace: The Best of Lyrick Poets*, trans. Sir Thomas Hawkins, 4th edn (London, 1638), pp. 44-45.

<sup>148</sup> Fanshawe's *Selected Parts of Horace* first appeared in 1652. Alexander Brome, in his post-Restoration *The Poems of Horace ... Rendered in English Verse by Several Persons* (London, 1666), favoured Fanshawe's translations over Hawkins' (which he equated with Barten Holyday's, another common version of the period which drew heavily on Hawkins); Cowley's translations were Brome's third preference.

<sup>149</sup> My strong preference in this study is to quote from mid-17<sup>th</sup> century translations. Unfortunately, the awkward syntax of the Hawkins/Holyday translation makes it a poor choice in this case.

<sup>150</sup> West, ed., *Horace Odes III*, p. 23.

<sup>151</sup> West, ed., p. 26.

<sup>152</sup> In 'LUCASTA, *taking the waters at Tunbridge*' (*Lucasta*, pp. 56-57), the drops of water in the baths pass through all Lucasta's heavens 'Of *Vertue, Honour, Love and Blisse*.' I discuss the conjunction of nature and honour in libertine literature in Ch. 4.

<sup>153</sup> Carew, *Poems*, pp. 51-53.

<sup>154</sup> See 'On the Death of Mrs. ELIZABETH FILMER' (*Lucasta*, pp. 46-48); 'An Elegie. On the Death of Mrs. Cassandra Cotton' (*Lucasta*, pp. 112-115). In 'LUCASTA *paying her Obsequies to the Chast memory of my dearest Cosin Mrs. Bowes Barne*' (*Lucasta*, pp. 95-96), Lovelace describes Lucasta's demeanor at the funeral, where her brow exhibits 'Honor'. See also Walker, 'Expanding the Boundaries of Female Honour'.

<sup>155</sup> *Postume Poems*, pp. 19-20.

<sup>156</sup> Hunt, 'Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War', p. 205.

<sup>157</sup> Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 73. See also Hunt, 'Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War', pp. 204-06.

<sup>158</sup> Jerry Brotton, *The Sale of the Late King's Goods: Charles I and His Art Collection* (London: Macmillan, 2006), p. 349; K.A. Esdaile, 'The Busts and Statues of Charles I', *Burlington Magazine*, 91 (1949), 2, 9-14 (p. 10). Esdaile's account is more colourful than Brotton's, which I have used. He tells the story, loved by generations of Londoners, of the Brazier Rivett burying the statue in his garden and selling brass-handled knives, nominally made from the remains, to royalists and puritans alike.

<sup>159</sup> *Lucasta. The Poems of Richard Lovelace, Esquire*, ed. William Lyon Phelps, 2 vols (Chicago: Caxton Club, 1921), I, p. xiii. Quoted in Reichardt, 'Looking For Lovelace', p. 71.

<sup>160</sup> Santanu Das, 'War poets (act. 1914-1918)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>161</sup> Robert Graves, *Complete Poems*, ed. by Beryl Graves and Dunstan Ward, vol. I (Manchester: Carcanet Press, 1995), pp. 36-37.

<sup>162</sup> Graves, *Poems*, pp. 36-37.

<sup>163</sup> See above.

<sup>164</sup> Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, pp. 76-77.

<sup>165</sup> Das, 'War poets', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>166</sup> West, ed., *Horace Odes III*, p. 24.

<sup>167</sup> West, ed., *Horace Odes III*, pp. 24-25.

## Chapter Four — Seize the Day

I argued in the preceding chapter that the opening poems of Lovelace's *Lucasta*, 'TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Sea's*' and 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*' engage with the courtly discourses of platonic love and knightly chivalry. Charles I and Henrietta Maria developed and propounded these discourses in the context of the perfect, fruitful, stable and irenic royal marriage as representations of the king's rule more generally. In this chapter, I examine two of Lovelace's most anthologised poems, 'TO AMARANTHA, *That she would dishevell her haire*' and 'TO ALTHEA, *From Prison*'.<sup>1</sup> Like the two 'LUCASTA' poems already discussed, both were written well in advance of any recognition that the court, which supported those discourses, had vanished forever.<sup>2</sup> Lovelace does not directly contest the discourse of chivalric honour in *Lucasta*, perhaps because to do so would have involved too great a challenge to the manner in which he represented his commitment to the royalist cause.<sup>3</sup> However, lyric poems like 'TO AMARANTHA' and 'TO ALTHEA' contest the symbolism and imagery of the cult of platonic love practised at court, and gendered constructions of the concept of female honour. 'TO AMARANTHA' offers a fresh, delicate representation of courtly dalliance, one which reframes William Habington's diction of chaste love, which it then juxtaposes against a short libertine lyric, before concluding with a *carpe diem* recognition that time, and love, pass. 'TO ALTHEA' proposes a different kind of royalism, one which embraces the *carpe diem* topos of unbridled passion, in wine, women, and song in support of the king, which would be so prominent in the literary production of the war years. Both poems are notable for the way in which they expose Lovelace's intertextual habits of writing.

Like 'TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*' and 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*', 'TO AMARANTHA' and 'TO ALTHEA' are usually read backwards, from the perspective of the Interregnum. Gerald Hammond argues that poems like these show Lovelace to have withdrawn from the political fray.<sup>4</sup> Corns contests Hammond's reading, which he describes as 'one which locates [Lovelace's] political complexity not in a strenuous and ingenious partisanship, but rather in a Marvellian

ambivalence in the political perspectives it assumes'.<sup>5</sup> Corns sees these and similar poems in *Lucasta* as carrying substantial pro-royalist ideological weight in an era of ascendant Puritanism, which required strictness in behavioural mores.<sup>6</sup> However, in making this important point, Corns locates the poems in the context of Parliament's moral reform legislation of the Interregnum.

Both these poems can also be read as contesting the royal and parliamentary programs of moral reform of the pre-war years. Charles I instigated such a program on his assumption of the throne in 1625. As Lucy Hutchinson (1620–1681) noted approvingly, the loose moral standards of the court of James I were quickly identified as being unacceptable: 'The face of the court was much changed in the king, for King Charles was temperate, chaste and serious, so that the fools, and bawds, mimics and catamites of the former Court grew out of fashion'.<sup>7</sup> The king may not always have been able to enforce his strict code of behaviour on the court, but his views were well known and he reacted firmly to public breaches of morality.<sup>8</sup> The adultery of Lady Purbeck and Sir Robert Howard, with which I argue Lovelace engages in '*A Guiltlesse Lady imprisoned; after penanced*', is a case in point.<sup>9</sup> Charles I used representations of the royal marriage to exemplify those reforms. During the pre-war years, the Long Parliament relaunched the Puritan moral reform program, which had been in abeyance since the early years of the seventeenth century, and which came to fruition with the passage of the *Adultery Act* and related legislation in 1650.<sup>10</sup> In 1640, there was a groundswell of opinion against 'lascivious, idle, and unprofitable bookes' following the publication of, *inter alia*, Thomas Heywood's (c. 1573–1641) translation of Ovid's *Ars Amatoria* and two editions each of Thomas Carew's and Thomas Randolph's *Poems*.<sup>11</sup> In 1641, Parliament wrested control of moral issues from the bishops and the ecclesiastical courts, leaving a void which would not be filled until 1650.<sup>12</sup>

English and continental European poets of this period drew on a common, broad repertoire of classical, Biblical and other sources, as well as those in their native language.<sup>13</sup> For English poets, texts in languages other than English were often available in the original, as well as in English translations, sometimes mediated through a third language or another poet's work. We know that Lovelace had access to the common repertoire. He had some facility in Latin and French, at least a schoolboy's knowledge of Greek, and an attentive traveller's acquaintance with

Dutch. He also had at least a gentlemanly interest in translation.<sup>14</sup> It is typical of Lovelace's finer work that he adds depth to a poem by refashioning the wide-ranging allusive fields on which he draws, often with a subversive or destabilising effect. The resulting spaces between the primary texts and Lovelace's poems present an implicit challenge to the 'knowing reader' to identify and consider the implications of the underlying inconsistencies between the text and its allusive field. When the relative complexity of 'TO AMARANTHA' and 'TO ALTHEA' is taken into account, Lovelace emerges as an author who actively explores the ways in which royalist poets could express the tenet Corns sees as central to cavalierism: the 'sensuous and devotional passion' of the lover for his mistress'.<sup>15</sup> Lovelace rejects the royal platonic idiom. By introducing such strong libertine elements into his poems, he contests Puritan opposition to sexual and other excess.

### **TO AMARANTHA, *That she would dishevell her haire*'**

Lovelace's 'TO AMARANTHA, *That she would dishevell her haire*' is one of a group of poems with obvious erotic elements, which follows the two opening platonic lyrics of *Lucasta*.<sup>16</sup> By juxtaposing these erotic lyrics against the two opening poems, Lovelace subjects to examination the platonic values that he awarded prominence in the opening pages of the volume. While I have chosen 'TO AMARANTHA' for in depth analysis, similar arguments could be mounted for any of Lovelace's antiplatonic. For example, 'THE SCRUTINIE', which was the focus of a notable critical exchange on the value of 'psychological criticism' during the 1960s, expands on Propertius II. 22A.<sup>17</sup> Propertius's speaker is outrageously incontinent. He cannot stay faithful to any woman for more than a day. Lovelace's speaker reduces the period of constancy to a risible twelve hours. Both Sir John Suckling, in 'Out upon it I have lov'd | Three whole days together', and Sir Toby Matthew (1577–1655) in 'Say but did you love so long', had explored this theme, while Habington's emphasis in *Castara* on the lovers' constancy rejects it outright.<sup>18</sup>

The relationship between 'TO AMARANTHA' and the work of other early Caroline poets differs slightly from the kind of competitive versifying Wilcher discusses in relation to the platonic and antiplatonic surrounding Sir John Suckling's 'Fruition' poems.<sup>19</sup> In response to the platonic sentiment of the masques and other royal cultural representations, Suckling, Abraham Cowley, John Cleveland

(c. 1613–1658) and others engaged explicitly with the arguments for and against platonic love. They told their readers they were doing so in indicative titles like ‘An Answer to [...]’, ‘Anti-Platonick’ or ‘Against Fruition’. Lovelace simply juxtaposes examples of the forms and interposes allusions to heavily inflected texts. He expects his readers to recognise and engage with the allusive fields he is manipulating. In doing so, he increases the coterie appeal of his poems to his readers.

### ***A Poem Tripartite***

‘TO AMARANTHA’ is a poem of seven four-line tetrameter stanzas.<sup>20</sup> The first four stanzas are a conventional courtly platonic lyric. In the next two stanzas, Lovelace juxtaposes a short antiplatonic against his chaste opening, before ending with a *carpe diem* call which emphasises the classical origins of his allusive field. As Paulina Palmer noted, ‘TO AMARANTHA’ is a syllogism. The argument is staged in terms of ‘persuasion of Amarantha, consummation of love in the libertine garden [and] meditative comment on the brevity of sexual pleasure’.<sup>21</sup> Its most immediately striking feature is the split between the conventionally graceful description in the first four stanzas of the lady’s silken, sweet-smelling fair hair, and the explicitly erotic charge of the next two stanzas. Initially, Lovelace successfully invokes, in charming and decorously suggestive terms, the common conceit of dishevelled hair as a representation of the unbridling of female passion.<sup>22</sup> This part of the poem works well as a sensual experience. Lovelace opens by evoking the arresting image of the speaker’s ‘curious hand or eye’ hovering near his sweet, fair lady’s head as she plays with her beautiful hair. He is appealing to the senses of both sight and touch. He entices her to increase his sensual enjoyment by letting her hair fly free, where he, like the wind, can ravish it and, by implication, her. However, he is not looking for true abandon. Rather, he wants to maintain a measure of control. In asserting that control, he is acknowledging that Amarantha’s hair is the product not of nature alone, but of nature enhanced by artifice.<sup>23</sup> Every tress, every lock of hair, must be both ‘confest’, appreciated in its own right, but also ravelled, rewound into a curl like a neat ball of thread.

The conceit of a woman’s bound/unbound hair is played out in layers of ambiguity. Amarantha implicitly contemplates confession — of what? — to whom, a priest? — as she plays with each lock of hair. Her ravisher, the wind/the speaker,

helps her wind her hair — and what else? In the fourth stanza, Lovelace introduces the concept of time passing in terms of night and day, foreshadowing the introduction of the *carpe diem* topos in the third section. Amarantha's hair should not be bound up in the dark of night, but rather, like the sun's early morning rays lighting the earth, she should 'shake [her] head and scatter day.' This part of the poem can be read as a successful attempt by Lovelace to show how amatory verse, in the form of gentle sexual innuendo, could still be fresh and inviting. He demonstrates that he does not need to appropriate Habington's language of chaste love, the libertine topos of the golden age paradise, or, for that matter, the scatological amatory verse collected in some commonplace books and printed miscellanies of the period to achieve his end.<sup>24</sup>

In the second section, Lovelace defaces the genre with explicitly sexual description. Critics have traditionally viewed these stanzas as a breach of poetic decorum which taints the poem as a whole. Corns, for example, regards them as 'elegant smut'.<sup>25</sup> However, the second part of 'TO AMARANTHA' is as demonstrably anchored in the 1630s as the first. The speaker places himself, with his mistress, in the 'Grove | The Bower, and the walkes of Love'. Lovelace is invoking the imagery of the court masque, the grove in which the Temple of Chaste Love stands, the bower at Windsor where the ladies watch their Garter knights. It gradually becomes clear, however, that Lovelace has shifted his sights to the libertine groves of poems like Carew's '*A Rapture*'.<sup>26</sup> While the timeframe remains ambiguous — we do not know whether the speaker is imagining past or future delights — his intentions are strictly carnal. The poem ends with wistful *carpe diem* call by the speaker: '*That joyes so ripe, so little keep*'. The effect of the final stanza in this context is a melancholy questioning that the modes of life represented in the previous sections of the poem, the dreamy days of decorous, courtly love, or those of libertine seduction, the '*joyes so ripe*' of the poem, could survive. The effect of the *carpe diem* ending is enhanced when the poem is read from the perspective of royalist defeat and the implementation of Parliament's moral reform program.

### ***Structuring and Dating the Poem***

We know from Wood that Lovelace prepared *Lucasta* for publication. It is therefore significant that the typesetting of the poem reinforces the readers' perception of its

tripartite structure. The first four stanzas can be read as a stand-alone piece. In the original, which Wilkinson reflects in the standard edition, the first stanza is conventionally dominated by a large capital 'A'.<sup>27</sup> In stanzas two to four, the first line of each couplet is heavily indented, while the second line is to the left-hand margin. This pattern is reversed in the sexually explicit fifth and sixth stanzas, emphasising the marked change in register. In the seventh stanza, where the *carpe diem* theme is made explicit, the typesetting reverts to that of stanzas two to four. The last line is in italics, the font used throughout *Lucasta* to give formal recognition to the fact that the poet was quoting from another source. Henry Lawes, who set 'TO AMARANTHA' to music, transcribed the first four stanzas in his manuscript songbook, where it appears on the folio preceding 'TO LUCASTA. *Going beyond the Seas*', indicating that these stanzas at least were written before the war got under way.<sup>28</sup>

The poem's engagement with the cult of platonic love, and Parliament's hostile response to the publication of Carew's and Randolph's *Poems* in 1640, may indicate that it was written in whole or in part at about that time. However, the dating of the final three stanzas of 'TO AMARANTHA' remains an open question. Henry Lawes did not include the last three stanzas in the transcription of the poem in his songbook, where it immediately precedes 'TO LUCASTA, *Going beyond the Seas*'.<sup>29</sup> Perhaps the poem's startling change in register after the fourth stanza was seen as sufficiently offensive when it was written to warrant the suppression of the later stanzas. Perhaps Lovelace wrote the last three stanzas at a different time. Lawes's songbook has the appearance of the kind of manuscript that a working musician would have carried to performances. The anecdotal evidence that prominent court musicians, including Lawes, tactfully excised potentially offensive material from works performed before the king, discussed in the last chapter, may be relevant here. The fact that early printed songbook versions of 'TO AMARANTHA' also suppress the later stanzas is not necessarily significant. There is a helpful textual variant between Lawes's transcription, and the version in the 1649 *Lucasta*, which indicates that the printed songbook versions of the poem used Lawes as a copy text.<sup>30</sup>



### ***The Allusive Field***

In 'TO AMARANTHA', Lovelace invokes classical, Jacobean and early Caroline libertine and platonic texts with which his community of readers could have been expected to be very familiar. Propertius is the likely classical original for Amarantha's dishevelled hair.<sup>31</sup> Wilkinson quotes lines by William Browne (1590/91–1618), which are close to Lovelace's, while Palmer suggests poems by Giambattista Marino (1569–1625), part of the common repertoire, as the likely source.<sup>32</sup> The quotation which forms the last line of 'TO AMARANTHA', '*That joyes so ripe, so little keep*', is from a common source for the carpe diem motif of the period, 'De Rosis Nascentibus', 'On Budding Roses', usually attributed to Ausonius, but sometimes to Virgil.<sup>33</sup> The actual tag is 'brevis quod gratia talis'. There are echoes of 'De Rosis Nascentibus' in Robert Herrick's 'Gather ye Rose-buds while ye may', properly entitled '*To the Virgins, to make much of Time*', and Waller's 'Go lovely Rose', among many others.<sup>34</sup> Sir Richard Fanshawe included a variant of the original Latin and a translation in his *Selected Parts of Horace* (1652), a compendium of translations of favourite royalist texts.<sup>35</sup> Robert Burton (1577–1640) included lines from the same poem in the entertaining compendium of carpe diem tags in his section on the '*Cure of Love Melancholy*' in virgins.<sup>36</sup> Lovelace's decision to end 'TO AMARANTHA' with a line from a poem as well known to his community of readers as Ausonius' 'De Rosis Nascentibus' serves to contrast his approach to the carpe diem theme with others of the genre, while reinforcing his participation in the royalist project.

### **Habington, Carew and Randolph**

As discussed in the previous chapter, William Habington in *Castara* recast the metonymic framework of the libertine poems of poets like Carew and Randolph to create what he considered to be a new diction of chaste love, designed to enable expression of the queen's *honnête* neo-Platonism. In 'TO AMARANTHA', Lovelace in turn refracts Habington's diction of chaste love. The tripartite structuring of 'TO AMARANTHA' makes Lovelace's use of this subversive tactic particularly evident.<sup>37</sup> Habington makes explicit the political commitment of his poems to Castara by associating them with the Queen's cult of *honnête* platonic love.

Lovelace's responses to Habington's poems can, in turn, be read as oppositional criticism of the cult of platonic love at court.

Habington opens *Castara* with the scent of the phoenix's sweet-smelling nest, which, in the second stanza of 'TO AMARANTHA', is carried on the warm east wind that ravishes Amarantha's tresses:

Let the chaste Phoenix from the flowry East,  
Bring the sweete treasure of her perfum'd nest,  
As incense to this Altar, where the name  
Of my *Castara's* grav'd by the hand of fame. (ll. 1-4)<sup>38</sup>

Habington calls on the phoenix and her scented nest so frequently in his poems that his editor, Allot, suggests that Habington should have been interdicted from using the trope.<sup>39</sup> Lovelace alerts his readers to his poem's relationship with Habington when he recycles Habington's overused image, describing the ravisher who has left 'his darling th'East, | To wanton o're that spicie Neast'. However, the poem by Habington with which Lovelace most obviously engages in 'TO AMARANTHA' is 'To CASTARA, *Departing upon the approach of Night*', first published in 1634. It is quoted here in full:

What should we feare *Castara*? The coole aire,  
That's falne in love, and wantons in thy haire,  
Will not betray our whispers. Should I steale  
A Nectar'd kisse, the wind dares not reveale  
The pleasure I possesse. The wind conspires  
To our blest interview, and in our fires  
Bath's like a Salamander, and doth sip,  
Like *Bacchus* from the grape, life from thy lip.  
Nor thinke of nights approach. The worlds great eye  
Though breaking Natures law, will us supply  
With his still flaming lampe: and to obey  
Our chaste desires, fix here perpetuall day.  
But should he set, what rebell night dares rise,  
To be subdu'd ith' vict'ry of thy eyes?<sup>40</sup>

Habington's poem to Castara is a calm, reasoned plea for sexual restraint until the dispensation of marriage is achieved. Castara is offered as a (temporary) sacrifice on the altar of chastity, until a priest blesses the lovers' union and they can enter the state of chaste love symbolised by the royal marriage. Lovelace, in 'TO AMARANTHA', argues for freedom from sexual restraint. In 'To CASTARA, *Departing upon the approach of Night*' the 'coole aire' that 'wantons in thy haire, | Will not betray our whispers'. Amarantha's unconfined hair is a symbol of sexual freedom. The speaker's 'curious hand or eye' will let her 'shining haire' 'flye as

unconfi'd | As it's calme Ravisher, the winde'. In *'To CASTARA, Departing'* the wind sips daintily 'in our fires [...] Like *Bacchus* from the grape, life from thy lip'. In *'TO AMARANTHA'*, the speaker experiences the joys of passion to the full:

Heere wee'l strippe and coole our fire  
In Creame below, in milk-baths higher;  
And when all Well's are drawne dry,  
I'le drink a teare out of thine eye.

In *'To CASTARA, Departing'* day and night, light and darkness are chastely contrasted. The sun, the 'worlds great eye' will 'fix here perpetuall day'. Obeying the speaker, he will light the lovers, to ensure that their love remains chaste. The title tells us that Castara will depart as night falls. She leaves to avoid the greater temptation to sexual indiscretion which comes with darkness. In *'TO AMARANTHA'*, the source of light is not the sun. Rather, it is Amarantha's long hair, shining like strands 'of golden thread'. The speaker enjoins his lover not to 'wind up that light | In Ribands' and braids and 'o're cloud in Night', but rather to 'shake your head and scatter day', to light the lovers' lovemaking. Where Habington constructs cold chastity, Lovelace's speaker urges his lover to seize the day, ending with the satiated lover's concern that sexual pleasure cannot be sustained eternally.

Both *'To CASTARA, Departing upon the approach of Night'* and *'TO AMARANTHA'* draw directly on the best-known libertine poem of the age, Thomas Carew's *'A Rapture'* and its companion piece, Thomas Randolph's *'A Pastorall Courtship'*.<sup>41</sup> Habington's variation on the sonnet form is only fourteen lines, while *'TO AMARANTHA'* is a twenty-eight line poem. Both Carew's and Randolph's poems are much longer pieces. *'A Rapture'* is one hundred and sixty-six lines, while Randolph's idyll is a leisurely one hundred and ninety-eight lines. As a result, Carew and Randolph have more space to develop and to return to ideas, where Habington's and Lovelace's lyrics are compressed. Libertine and other poems by Carew and Randolph were popular. Both their *Poems* appeared in print for the first time in 1640, and frequently thereafter, having circulated in manuscript for many years.<sup>42</sup> Thus, they were current when both Habington and Lovelace wrote their lyrics.

Habington establishes Carew's and Randolph's poems as the objects of comparison in *'To CASTARA, Departing upon the approach of Night'* with the repeated metaphor of the breeze which will keep the lovers' secrets. The space

Habington's Castara occupies is not determined, although it is out of doors and secluded. Habington tells us of 'The winde' which 'conspires | To our blest interview'; the 'coole aire' which will not betray the lovers' whispers; and 'the wind [which] dares not reveale | The pleasure I possesse'. As noted above, the irony is that there is nothing to reveal beyond their meeting, and the chaste sipped kisses. The lovers do not require night to hide their secrets because they have none.

In Carew's '*A Rapture*', the lovers are in a libertine garden of sensual delights, where their lovemaking is hidden and their secrets are safe.<sup>43</sup> The sense of the passage and its relationship with 'TO AMARANTHA' and the other poems discussed here becomes clear in the following lines:

There, no rude sounds shake us with sudden starts,  
 No jealous eares, when we unrip our hearts  
 Sucke our discourse in, no observing spies  
 This blush, that glance traduce; no envious eyes  
 Watch our close meetings, nor are we betrayd  
 To Rivals, by the bribed chamber-maid.  
 No wedlock bonds unwreath our twisted loves;  
 We seeke no midnight Arbor, no darke groves  
 To hide our kisses, there, the hated name  
 Of husband, wife, lust, modest, chaste, or shame,  
 Are vaine and empty words, whose very sound  
 Was never heard in the Elizian ground.  
 All things are lawfull there, that may delight  
 Nature, or unrestrained Appetite;  
 Like, and enjoy, to will, and act, is one,  
 We only sinne when Loves rites are not done. (ll. 99–114)

This passage is of central importance in Carew's poem. Informed readers would have recognised that Carew's grove, and others like it, contest the chaste grove of delights of the early Caroline masques. Carew's lovers do not require darkness to hide their actions. In their Elysian grove, sexual restraint is the only sin which needs to be hidden. Their passion is unbridled. They 'unrip' their hearts and 'Sucke our discourse in'. Terms which invoke chastity or the bonds of marriage and those like 'lust', which implies that unlicensed sexual fulfillment is shameful, are forbidden. 'Nature' equated here by Carew with 'unrestrained Appetite', dominates.

Randolph, in '*A Pastorall Courtship*', makes a similar point to Carew's on the secretiveness of the grove. His terms are closer than Carew's to those chosen by Habington:

Let's enter, and discourse our Loves;  
 These are, my Dear, no tell-tale groves!  
 There dwell no Pyes, nor Parrots there,  
 To prate again the words they heare.

Nor babbling Echo, that will tell  
The neighbouring hills one syllable. (ll. 11–16)

Again, the lovers meet in a libertine grove of delights which will retain the lovers' secrets. Habington's wind, which 'Will not betray our whispers', refracts Randolph's negatives, the 'no tell-tale groves' 'nor Parrots' to 'prate' the lovers' secrets. On the other hand, Habington's verse more obviously contests Carew's at a conceptual level. By repeatedly emphasising the wind's secrecy, Habington is trying to establish that his chaste love is as exciting and fulfilling as Carew's 'unrestrained Appetite'. Delany suggested some time ago that 'four references to "rival poets" in William Habington's poems constitute a sustained attack on the character and writings of Thomas Carew'.<sup>44</sup> In 'To CASTARA, *Departing upon the approach of Night*' (among other poems), Habington not only attacks Carew's sexual ethos, he provides an alternative diction of *honnête* neo-Platonic love.

There are other textual sharings among these poets. Amarantha's well of tears, a common Petrarchan conceit, echoes Carew's lines in the suggestive 'Good Counsell to a young Maid':

When all thy Virgin-springs grow dry,  
When no streames shall be left, but in thine eye. (ll. 17–18)<sup>45</sup>

In 'TO AMARANTHA', the lover will 'drinke a teare out of thine eye', but only after the wells of milk and cream 'are drawne dry'. Lovelace borrows the 'Bower, and the walkes of Love' and the 'milke-baths' from 'A Rapture':

Then will I visit, with a wandring kisse,  
The vale of Lillies, and the Bower of blisse:  
[...]  
Into two milkie wayes, my lips shall slide  
Downe those smooth Allies, wearing as I goe  
A tract for lovers on the printed snow;  
[...]  
Now in more subtile wreathes I will entwine  
My sinowie thighes, my legs and armes with thine;  
Thou like a sea of milke shalt lye display'd,  
Whilst I the smooth, calme Ocean invade. (ll. 67–82)<sup>46</sup>

Lovelace's speaker enters 'this Grove | The Bower, and the walkes of Love'. Randolph's speaker in 'A Pastorall Courtship' invites his lady to join him in similar terms:

Let's enter, and discourse our Loves;  
These are, my Dear, no tell-tale groves! (ll. 11–12)

Randolph describes the warm, west wind playing in his lover's hair:

Being set, let's sport a while my fair,  
I will tye Love knots in thy haire.  
See *Zephyrus* through the leavs doth stray,  
And has free liberty to play;  
And braids thy locks. (ll. 43–47)

In 'TO AMARANTHA', the speaker calls on the 'Ravisher' the east wind to 'wanton o're that spicie Neast'; that is, to ruffle her hair, which is as sweet-smelling as the phoenix's nest. He invites the lady to shake her hair 'and scatter day', like the sun's 'early ray'. Not only will Lovelace's speaker invite the wind to play in Amarantha's hair, 'Evry Tresse must be confest', almost as a sin must be to a priest, but only to the extent that it is 'neatly tangled at the best'.

Randolph invokes the *carpe diem* motif, with echoes of Ausonius's roses, in:  
Say what are blossoms in their prime,  
That ripen not in harvest time? (ll. 129–130).

This is Lovelace's *carpe diem* sentiment in reverse. Where Lovelace mourns the rot which sets in with the passage of time ('*That joyes so ripe, so little keep*'), Randolph welcomes the ripening of the virgin bud, which will soon be ready to pluck. Carew's persuasion to love ends with an impassioned comparison highlighting the inconsistency between definitions of male and female honour, and calls on the 'Goblin Honour' to remove itself from the walks of love:

Then tell me why  
This Goblin Honour which the world adores,  
Should make men atheists, and not women whores. (ll. 164–66)

Randolph ends his poem equivocally. He gives his 'Phyllis' the voice to berate herself for being so stupid as to succumb to his speaker's blandishments and to give up her virginity, then finishes on a masculine, mischievous note:

No hearb nor balm can cure my sorrow,  
Unlesse you meet again tomorrow. (ll. 197–98)

The paradox is that the sorrow caused by the lady's hurt, her loss of virginity, can only be eased by a repetition of her mistake. This section of Randolph's lyric is the only occasion in any of the poems under discussion in which the woman is allowed to speak. Amarantha is the subject of Lovelace's poem and the object of his desire, but has no voice of her own.

## Languages of Chaste and Libertine Love

As noted in passing in the previous chapter, Carew's and Suckling's poems to Lucy Hay, the Countess of Carlisle, may have inspired Habington to create his diction of chaste love and Lovelace to challenge Habington. It is not certain that Carew's '*To the New-year, for the Countesse of Carlisle*' predates Habington's '*To CASTARA, Departing*', although it seems likely.<sup>47</sup> Dunlap suggests that Carew's poem cannot have been written later than 1 January 1632.<sup>48</sup> Wilcher suggests that Suckling's '*Upon my Lady Carliles walking in Hampton Court garden*' was composed within a year of his return to England in April 1632; that is, by early 1633. It probably post-dates Carew's '*To the New-year, for the Countesse of Carlisle*'. Although it was not published until 1646, '*Upon my Lady Carliles walking in Hampton Court garden*' circulated in manuscript during the 1630s.<sup>49</sup> Habington probably married his Castara, Lucy Herbert (a cousin of the Countess of Carlisle), in the early months of 1633. '*To CASTARA, Departing*' was first published in 1634.<sup>50</sup>

Suckling's '*Upon my Lady Carliles walking in Hampton Court garden*' investigates the poet's conception of the garden as a place both of decorous dalliance and of erotic pleasures.<sup>51</sup> In doing so, Suckling compares his simple and forthright poetic diction with what Corns describes as 'Carew's idealizing sensibility'.<sup>52</sup> Where Carew's literary sensibility contemplates the garden in which Lady Carlisle walks as a 'place inspir'd', where sweetly scented flowers, as if with a will of their own, emerge in her footsteps, Suckling rejects both the prospect and the literary sensibility underpinning it:

I must confesse those perfumes (*Tom*)  
I did not smell; nor found that from  
Her passing by, ought sprung up new,  
The flow'rs had all their birth from you;  
For I pass't o're the self same walk,  
And did not find one single stalk. (ll. 10–15)

Where Carew, in Suckling's parody of his writing style, sees Lady Carlisle as 'A thing so near a Deity', Suckling only desires to see her naked:

Alas! *Tom*, I am flesh and blood,  
[...]  
I was undoing all she wore,  
And had she walkt but one turn more,  
*Eve* in her first state had not been  
More naked, or more plainly seen. (ll. 24–31)

Suckling's poem is clever and amusing. Lucy Hay, Countess of Carlisle, was the most admired and influential female courtier of her day.<sup>53</sup> However, her chastity has been questioned. Although she may have been the subject of false libels, Lady Carlisle was suspected of sexual intimacy with both Buckingham and Strafford. She could thus be envisaged equally effectively within Carew's elevated mode and Suckling's earthy sexualisation.

There is no evidence at all that Lovelace equated 'Amarantha' with Lady Carlisle, although it would be nicely symmetrical if such a link did emerge. However, Suckling's and Lovelace's poems are linked in that both interrogate the poetic description of love. Habington's stated intention in developing his language of chaste love 'against the streame of best wits' was to develop a language of 'innocency of a chaste Muse', which would 'bee more acceptable, and weigh heavier in the ballance of esteeme, than a fame, begot in adultery of study'.<sup>54</sup> In 'TO AMARANTHA', Lovelace creates a fresh poem of elegant dalliance in the first section and contrasts it with a kind of libertine writing which refers to, but is more condensed than, Carew's and Randolph's erotic idylls. Lovelace succeeds in being explicit while avoiding the jolting coarseness of Suckling's approach.

Another poem by Marvell, '*The Fair Singer*', provides an appropriate ending to this discussion. In the second stanza, Marvell engages with the field of allusion shared by the Lovelace and Habington poems:

I could have fled from one but singly fair:  
My disentangled soul itself might save,  
Breaking the curled trammels of her hair;  
But how should I avoid to be her slave,  
Whose subtle art invisibly can wreathe  
My fetters of the very air I breathe?<sup>55</sup>

Nigel Smith, quoting Rosalie Colie, notes 'the fusion of amatory commonplaces "so intricately intertwined and so trickily played off against one another, that they are difficult to take seriously"'.<sup>56</sup> Other poems are obviously in play here. However, in this stanza, Marvell plays with the tropes of disentanglement from the singer's hair and the breeze which fetters 'the very air' he breathes. These are the key images which Habington and Lovelace invoke. Perhaps Marvell is entering Lovelace's game, knowingly playing with Lovelace's 'answer' to Habington's poem.



## **‘TO ALTHEA, *From Prison*’**

‘TO ALTHEA, *From Prison*’, best known as the source of the epigraph ‘Stone Walls doe not a Prison make, | Nor I’ron bars a Cage’, is Lovelace’s most enduringly popular poem and one of the few for which there is evidence of an authoritative variant text.<sup>57</sup> It has not received the level of critical analysis one might expect of such an iconic poem. A. Waller Hastings (1993) summarises the critical debate and the problems the poem presents:

Lovelace, himself imprisoned twice for opposing parliament, presents a persona who is resigned to his fate, determined to bear all and not to despair. This speaker asserts that bodily imprisonment does not confine his spirit, which remains free to enjoy the pleasures of women, wine, and song in the first three stanzas. Read in this manner, the poem seems indeed to sustain the epicurean world view attributed to the Cavaliers.

Having said this, we seem close to having exhausted the possibilities of the poem, a staple of survey courses but rarely the subject of extended scholarly analysis.<sup>58</sup>

In other words, over time, the superficial simplicity of ‘TO ALTHEA’ has enabled critics to avoid discussing the poem in depth, or to argue unchallenged that it belongs among the cavalier literature of retreat. Closer examination shows that while ‘TO ALTHEA’ is, indeed, a highly polished artifact, it is anything but artless.

‘TO ALTHEA’, which was probably written while Lovelace was in the Gatehouse, engages with Protestant prison poetry. Lovelace invokes the work of the French Protestant soldier poet, Odet de La Noue, Seigneur de Téligny (d. 1618), and the contestatory poems of the prison writers of the Addled Parliament of 1614, including George Wither (1588–1667). He anchors ‘TO ALTHEA’ in the Stoic paradox of freedom in imprisonment, which was a feature of Protestant prison writing of the period and which he would develop further in ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ (see Chapter 7).<sup>59</sup> He thus places it within an established oppositional discourse of prison verse with which his readers could be assumed to be familiar, one which, in Wither’s hands in particular, argued the need for the poet to have the freedom to give good counsel to his ruler. Lovelace appropriates and polishes the tropes used by Wither, a very prominent anti-royalist author, re-crafting them into a memorable hymn to cavalier hedonism. At the same time, he retains that part of the topos which argues the importance of maintaining the liberty to question and criticise one’s king. Thus, Lovelace’s choice of this paradox as the basis of his poem sets the scene for a sophisticated, if slightly qualified, statement of the cavalier poet’s freedom to sing the praises of his king. It also places the poem as one of the earliest examples of a

royalist discourse which states its opposition to the parliamentary regime by parodying its literature.

### ***Textual History***

‘TO ALTHEA’ was first published in *Lucasta* (1649). It is Lovelace’s only poem addressed to Althea. The name is sometimes thought to be a contraction of ‘Alethea’, the Greek word for ‘truth’. No serious effort has been made to identify the subject, beyond William Cartwright’s attempt to associate the text with his daughter Althea, discussed in Chapter 2. Like Lovelace’s other more popular poems, it was set to music — in this case by Dr John Wilson (1595–1674), a prominent court musician and professor of music at Oxford during the Interregnum.<sup>60</sup> Its location towards the back of *Lucasta*, buried on pages 97 and 98 between less well-known poems with which it is not thematically related, may indicate a certain sensitivity on the publisher’s or the author’s part in relation to the strength of its obviously royalist sentiments.

A twelve-stanza, two-part variation on ‘TO ALTHEA’ exists in the form of a black-letter broadside ballad, *The Pensive Prisoners Apology*. This ballad begins ‘Love with unconfined wings’. It was licensed on 29 March 1656 and again about 1675.<sup>61</sup> There is no indication as to who was responsible for amending and expanding the poem into a form suitable for broadside publication. However, it is notable that much of the text of *The Pensive Prisoners Apology* is more overtly Christian than is usual in Lovelace’s poetry. For example, the fourth stanza reads: ‘So soon as Christ receives my breath, | [...] I gain true Liberty’.<sup>62</sup> Given this marked difference in allusive style, it seems unlikely that the ballad form of the poem should be attributed to Lovelace alone. Both Lovelace’s lyric and Wilson’s musical setting had entered the public idiom by the mid-1670s (if not earlier), when the other extant edition of the ballad appeared. The introductory text noted that it was to be sung to the ‘Tune of, *Love with unconfined wings*’, implying that those who bought the broadside were assumed to know the music.<sup>63</sup> Only the first verse of ‘TO ALTHEA’ was published in Playford’s *Select Ayres* (1659) and *Treasury of Music* (1669), and Wilson’s own *Cheerful Ayres* (1660), indicating that the reader/singer was assumed to be so familiar with the later verses as not to need reminding of

them.<sup>64</sup> Versions also appeared in the miscellanies *A Jovial Garland* (c. 1670) and William Winstanley's *The New Help to Discourse*.<sup>65</sup>

Bishop Percy reproduced 'this excellent sonnet' in his *Reliques* (1765), noting in passing the existence of a textual variant; his source for the poem was *Lucasta* (1649) 'collated with a copy in the editor's folio MS'.<sup>66</sup> Philip Bliss reproduced the poem in full in his early nineteenth-century edition of Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses* and elucidated the nature of the major variation between his and Percy's contemporary manuscript versions and the printed text. Line seven of the manuscripts reads 'The birds, that wanton in the ayre', rather than the 'Gods' of the printed texts.<sup>67</sup> 'TO ALTHEA' continued to appear in anthologies until its place in the canon was cemented by its inclusion in the first edition of Palgrave's *Golden Treasury* (1861).<sup>68</sup> Beal's *Index of English Literary Manuscripts* records twenty extant manuscript copies of all or part of the poem, more than twice the number of manuscript copies of Lovelace's next most frequently scribally reproduced poem, 'THE SCRUTINIE'.<sup>69</sup> The titles of a number of the manuscript versions confirm Wood's assertion that the earliest version of 'TO ALTHEA' was written while Lovelace was imprisoned in the Gatehouse in 1642, or at least soon after. Some refer to the author as 'Captaine' Lovelace, a rank with which he was identified only until 1646, well before his imprisonment in Peterhouse in 1648–1649 — a period with which this poem is sometimes associated.<sup>70</sup> One, in a verse miscellany compiled mid-century by Peter Calfe, is very specific: 'Captaine Loveles made this poem in his duresse at the Gatehouse'.<sup>71</sup>

### **Criticism to Date**

With a few exceptions, criticism of 'TO ALTHEA' has focused on the extent to which the text represents stoic and/or epicurean tendencies in cavalier writing.<sup>72</sup> William Empson noted the importance of the underlying paradox in interpreting the poem and used the last stanza as an exemplar of one kind of ambiguity.<sup>73</sup> Willa McClung Evans (1947) argued in a detailed discussion of Lovelace's '*The Vintage to the Dungeon*', that it and, implicitly, 'TO ALTHEA', were more of a generalised reflection of the cavalier sentiment that 'freedom of the body is not essential to the freedom of the spirit', than necessarily an expression of Lovelace's own experience.<sup>74</sup> There has been some discussion of the poem's contemporary intertexts, including royalist consolatory prison writing and drinking songs.<sup>75</sup> In

addition, the textual variants have attracted detailed analysis.<sup>76</sup> More recent criticism has argued for an activist reading of the poem, one which stresses the poet's agency in structuring a royalist response to the vicissitudes of war and imprisonment.<sup>77</sup>

Raymond Anselment's 1993 analysis of 'TO ALTHEA', the most comprehensive to date, is not without problems.<sup>78</sup> As discussed in the 'Introduction', Anselment's overarching thesis aims to place Lovelace as an initially committed royalist who increasingly adopted a form of Stoic indifference. After locating 'TO ALTHEA' in the context of other, mainly royalist, prison poetry of the civil wars and Interregnum, Anselment concludes that the poem reflects the highpoint of Lovelace's commitment to the royalist cause: 'the song is witness to Lovelace's unvanquished loyalty'.<sup>79</sup> Anselment notes that the kind of stoicism reflected in this poem is 'consciously at odds with prevailing, religiously inspired transformations of prison's harshness', which normally reflect the proverbial patience of Job in the face of harsh adversity.<sup>80</sup> He argues that:

Lovelace's essentially stoic alternative to much seventeenth-century prison literature celebrates, in effect, a trinity [wine, women, and royalism] that is at once traditional and distinctive. [...] Where other writers found it to their advantage to accentuate and perhaps exaggerate the hardships of prison, Lovelace fashioned his own political statement from the well-established conventions of prison literature that redefine the limits of freedom.<sup>81</sup>

Anselment does not look to the early Stuart prison poets for intertexts. Rather, he contrasts the Christian stoicism reflected in, for example, the late Roman Boethius's enduringly popular *Consolation of Philosophy*, and some of the prison poems written a few years after 'TO ALTHEA', with Lovelace's more hedonistic approach, which he claims has 'no immediate parallels among the prison poems prompted by the political upheaval'.<sup>82</sup>

Anselment also teases out the complexity of the imagery of confinement, both physical and that caused by the bonds of love, which is so prevalent in Lovelace's poetry. Following Evans, he seeks to distance 'TO ALTHEA' from the context in which the first version was most likely written: the Gatehouse prison in the months preceding the outbreak of civil war. He argues that 'Lovelace's experience behind stone walls and iron bars cannot be dated much less defined with any certainty'.<sup>83</sup> That is, in his view, the poem may not relate in any way to the months leading up to the war. As a result of his attempt to dislocate the poem in time, Anselment weakens his argument in relation to differences between the various

available texts of the poem. In the absence of a suggested timeframe, the fact that the published version of the poem ‘appears less religiously connotative than any of its six manuscript variations’ and is ‘less neutral’ is interesting, but not necessarily significant.<sup>84</sup>

### ***The Allusive Field***

‘TO ALTHEA’ is characteristic of Lovelace’s early lyrics both in the paradoxical form it employs and the dominance in the text of tropes of confinement and freedom discussed by Anselment and Gerald Hammond. A song of four eight-line stanzas in common metre, its metrical regularity is almost certainly due to the fact that it was written to be set to music.<sup>85</sup> The speaker rejoices in the freedom to worship his mistress — albeit, from a safe distance — and, in a convivial atmosphere, to drink and sing the praises of his king, despite his imprisonment behind ‘Stone Walls [...] and I’ron bars’. This paradox of freedom in imprisonment, which dominates both the poem as a whole and each individual stanza, enjoyed popular currency in England in a range of genres from the late sixteenth century through to the Civil War years.

Anselment’s suggestion that the topos originated in early Christian stoic writing, probably that of Boethius, is only partially correct.<sup>86</sup> It is a variation on the Stoic paradox that a great man, in having everything, has nothing, while a happy man, having nothing, has all, which Lovelace also appropriates in ‘*The Grassehopper*’.<sup>87</sup> The paradox of freedom in imprisonment came to prominence as a popular mode for English Protestant oppositional prison writing through a long poem by the French soldier poet, Odet de La Noue, Seigneur de Téligny, the *Paradoxe, que les adversitez sont plus nécessaires que les prospéritez*, which was first published in 1588. La Noue, like Lovelace, was often compared to Sir Philip Sidney as another perfect, Protestant knight. La Noue, like Sidney, was close to Justus Lipsius and was heavily influenced by his writings.<sup>88</sup> *De Constantia*, in which Lipsius develops his activist neo-Stoic thinking on retirement in adversity, was first published in 1584, four years before La Noue’s *Paradoxe*. It is thus the likely inspiration of La Noue’s poem, which was first translated into English by Joshua Sylvester under the title *The Profit of Imprisonment* in 1594. It was usually re-published with Sylvester’s translation of Du Bartas’s complete *Divine Weekes and Workes*. There were eleven authorised impressions of Sylvester’s translations between 1605 and 1641, when

there were two folio imprints.<sup>89</sup> Thus, La Noue's poem was current at the time of Lovelace's first imprisonment the following year. Norbrook notes the enormous popularity of Du Bartas's work and credits him with Protestantising the courtly poetic of the sixteenth century.<sup>90</sup>

*The Profit of Imprisonment* has strong Protestant overtones. The Calvinist La Noue sets out his argument in these terms:

*Close Prison* (now a-daies) th'extremest miserie  
The world doth deem, I deem direct the contrarie:  
And there-with-all will prove, that even *Adversities*  
Are to be wished more than most Prosperities.  
[...]  
I (a Prisoner) live much more content and free,  
Then when as (under cloak of a false freedom vain)  
I was base slave (indeed) to many a bitter pain. (ll. 29–32, 56–58)<sup>91</sup>

Prison is a place of safety, where men can become closer to God, far from worldly temptation. To pass the time, the speaker reads the classics in a Christian context, sings, plays upon the lute and virginals and bemoans the secularity of contemporary culture. In both *The Profit of Imprisonment* and 'TO ALTHEA', the speakers sing the praises of their king — in La Noue's case, those of God in heaven:

One while upon the Lute, my nimble joints I plie,  
Then on the Virginalls: to whose sweet harmonie  
Marrying my simple voyce, in solemne Tunes I sing  
Some Psalme or holy Song, unto the heav'nly King. (ll. 1139–42)<sup>92</sup>

Lovelace, on the other hand, sings of the 'sweetnes, Mercy, Majesty, | And glories of my KING', Charles I.

The paradox of freedom in imprisonment was adopted in the oppositional writing of the disaffected literary community which produced the pastoral satires, William Browne's *The Shepherds Pipe* and George Wither's *The Shepherds Hunting*, in 1614. These poets wrote against the politically charged background of the Addled Parliament, in the context of satirical treatments of the debates over arbitrary government, abuse of royal prerogative and freedom of speech. The paradox they use thus has a political, as well as a literary, history, which is relevant to Lovelace's experience. The group included John Davies of Hereford (1564/5–1618), Christopher Brooke (c. 1570–1628), the little-known William Ferrar and perhaps John Selden (1584–1654), as well as Browne and Wither.<sup>93</sup> This literary community has attracted considerable critical interest in recent years.<sup>94</sup> Norbrook has argued that it formed part of an emerging Habermasian public sphere, responding

to a growth in economic relationships which were gaining increasing autonomy from the crown, and which brought together representatives of the worlds of economics, politics and literary history.<sup>95</sup> Michelle O’Callaghan develops Norbrook’s thesis in detail. She notes that membership of the multiple groups which formed at this time extended well beyond the liberal bourgeois public sphere envisioned by Habermas. She characterises their writing as ‘oppositional’ in that it was ‘consistently hostile to royal policies that favoured the interests of Spain and to an aggressive use of the [royal] prerogative against the subjects’ liberties’.<sup>96</sup> Andrew McRae credits its members with representing ‘the most concerted effort to fashion a distinctly public form of political satire under James I’, and notes that members of the group contributed to what he calls the ‘epochal debates’ concerning free speech and the poet’s self-assigned role of providing good counsel to the crown.<sup>97</sup>

John Davies of Hereford, who also wrote commendatory verses for Sylvester’s complete translation of Du Bartas with which La Noue’s *Paradoxe* was bound, appears to have been the first of the group to use the paradox in ‘*A sicke Mindes Potion for all in Tribulation in Body: or for the saving of their Soule*’, published in *The Rights of the Living and the Dead* with *The Muses Sacrifice* (1612).<sup>98</sup> The ‘*sicke Mindes Potion*’ is notable in this context because Davies explores at some length the trope of the caged linnet, who nonetheless has the freedom to sing:

But those in Patience that their *Soules* possesse,  
 (while they, in *bonds*, doe *Tyrants* wrath asswage)  
 The sweeter sing, the sowerer their *distresse*,  
 like well-taught *Lynnets* used to the Cage,  
 There learne they sweeter *Notes* than *Nature* gave,  
 when they abroad were in their Pilgrimage.(ll. 804–809)<sup>99</sup>

As with La Noue, the Christian neo-Stoic context is obvious.<sup>100</sup> Davies likens the linnet to those in prison due to a ‘*Tyrants* wrath’, who may initially pine in confinement, but are temporarily safe from predators and will learn to sing ‘sweeter *Notes* than *Nature* gave’. These verses are among the more memorable in ‘*A sicke Mindes Potion*’ and are evidently part of the same allusive field upon which Lovelace drew in ‘*To ALTHEA*’. As Davies’s work did not experience the same wide circulation over time accorded to Sylvester’s translation of La Noue, it is not apparent whether Lovelace drew on Davies directly or through an intermediary source.

George Wither was imprisoned in the Marshalsea in 1614 during the elections for the Addled Parliament, apparently because his *Abuses Stript and Whipt* (1613), a veiled attack on corruption in high places which had gone into a sixth edition by 1614, was considered to be politically inflammatory.<sup>101</sup> While there, he wrote *A Satyre, Written to the Kings Most Excellent Majestie*, in which he sought the king's assistance with a mixture of flattery and admonishment. The trope of prison as a cage which frees the poet to sing, used so effectively by Wither's friend Davies, opens the *Satyre*:

Let it not therefore now be deemed strange,  
My unsmooth'd lines their rudenesse do not change,  
Nor be distastfull to my gracious *King*,  
That in the *Cage* my olde harsh notes I sing,  
And rudely make a *Satyre* here unfold  
What others would in neater teames have told. (ll. 5–10)<sup>102</sup>

Wither's imprisonment became the occasion of the production of Browne's *The Shepherds Pipe* (1614) and Wither's *The Shepherds Hunting* (1615).<sup>103</sup>

O'Callaghan suggests that Wither's imprisonment:

became synonymous with arbitrary government amongst these writers and was represented by himself [Wither] and his fellow poets as an attack on the liberty of the subject and, in particular, the principle of freedom of speech. [...] When these writers produced critiques of the court and royal policy, they were not so much opposing the king as providing counsel and, in the process, asserting the historical and collective agency of the humanist writer.<sup>104</sup>

It is in this context of a statement of freedom of the poet to provide counsel that Wither introduces the paradox of freedom in imprisonment in the 'First Eclogue' of *The Shepherds' Hunting*, a dialogue between Willy (Browne) and Roget (Wither):

Willy leaves his flock awhile,  
Visits Roget in exile;  
Where though prisoned, he doth find,  
He's still free that's free in mind. (ll. 1–4)<sup>105</sup>

Roget values his freedom to speak in accordance with his conscience, rather than as his patron wishes. Like Wither, Christopher Brooke contributed an eclogue to *The Shepherds Pipe* which employed this paradox in rather different terms: 'Thought hath no prison and the minde is free | Under the greatest king and tyrannie'.<sup>106</sup>

The paradox of freedom in imprisonment was a constant feature of Wither's writing through to the Restoration. Wither, in his emblem '*My Fortune, I had rather beare; | Then come, where greater perills are*', used the trope of the generic caged bird protected from predators, which had been developed by Davies.<sup>107</sup> The illustration shows a caged bird being threatened by a large bird of prey in flight, with



its beak and talons extended over the cage. While the topos of freedom in imprisonment is present in the emblem, the focus is much more strongly on that of safety from danger evident in Davies's lines. Given Wither's closeness to Davies, it is highly likely that he was familiar with 'A Sicke Mindes Potion'.<sup>108</sup>

Lovelace had close family connections with the literary and political community to which Wither and his friends belonged, suggesting one avenue through which he may have become familiar with Wither's prison writing. Norbrook notes the Wither group's links with Lovelace's great uncle, Sir Edwin Sandys, effective leader of the House of Commons and a champion of the Virginia Company, who spoke out against the abuse of royal power in 1614 and was called before the Council to explain his words.<sup>109</sup> As discussed in Chapter 2, the relationship between the Sandys and Lovelace families was close. They shared financial interests in the Virginia Company. Sir Edwin's brother George undertook much of his translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* while he was the Company's treasurer in Virginia. Wither was a strong supporter of the Company. The Merchant Adventurers, with which Joshua Sylvester and William Ferrar were both linked, represented a parallel, sometimes competing, set of commercial interests to the Virginia Company's.<sup>110</sup> The link between the older poet, Wither, who became such a famous polemicist for Parliament, and the younger royalist, Lovelace, through ties of commerce and the previous generation's opposition to perceived abuse of royal prerogatives provides a salutary lesson in the shared literary, political and economic heritage of the protagonists on all sides of the propaganda wars of the 1640s and early 1650s.

### ***The Text***

'TO ALTHEA' rejects Protestant virtue in the first three stanzas. The opening image of freedom is that of profane, rather than sacred love, hovering 'on unconfined wings' within the prison gates. It seems as if the archetypal, womanising cavalier speaker is throwing out a challenge to virtuous puritans. The challenge appears even more pronounced if one accepts the suggestion put by Randall in relation to the gates/grates crux of Andrew Marvell's 'To His Coy Mistress' that the term 'grates', which is often applied to a portcullis, had obscene connotations for mid-seventeenth century readers.<sup>111</sup> Although Althea's hair might entangle her lover, and her eyes represent imaginary fetters, she remains firmly outside the 'grates', where, like the

predators of the caged bird discussed in relation to Wither and Davies, the only threat she poses is to the poet's mind. At the end of each stanza, Lovelace returns to the underlying paradox of freedom in imprisonment. In this case, 'The *Gods* that wanton in the Aire, | Know now such Liberty' as the prisoner. As Bliss and Percy recognised, manuscript and other, more or less contemporary, printed texts of the first line of this couplet differ from the 1649 text. Clayton collated seven of the available variant texts and noted that, with one exception, the manuscripts use the term 'birds' rather than '*Gods*'.<sup>112</sup> He argues convincingly that both are apparently authoritative versions and that the version using 'birds' probably preceded the printed text, which uses '*Gods*' and which we know Lovelace edited during his second period of imprisonment in Peterhouse in 1648–1649. Certainly, altering the text from the neutral term 'birds' to the pagan '*Gods*', who may be seen as sexually 'wanton', enhances an antipuritan reading of this stanza.

In the second stanza, the speaker openly declares support for the royalist cause. Lovelace moves from one object of puritanical aversion — loose women — to wine. The atmosphere is Bacchanalian and the inspiration is Anacreontic. As Reichardt points out, there is a close association between Lovelace's 'Cups run[ning] swiftly round' and 'heads with Roses bound' and his cousin Sir Thomas Stanley's translation of Anacreon's 'Now with Roses we are crown'd | Let our mirth and cups go round'.<sup>113</sup> The wreaths of roses are of themselves a statement of loyalty to the king. Charles I was identified in poetic terms with the English royal flower, the rose, throughout his life.<sup>114</sup> The subjects' hearts are bound 'with Loyall Flames'. The strong wine of which they drink as freely as fish that 'tipple' nonintoxicating water inflames their loyalty. Lois Potter argues that royalist drinking rituals of the kind described here had become 'a secular liturgy and a way of parodying the authority of a government they refused to recognise'.<sup>115</sup> She notes that as early as 1643, the year after the first version of 'TO ALTHEA' was written, royalists had responded to a day of public fasting proclaimed by Parliament by riotous drinking and singing. This is the kind of oppositional response Lovelace invokes in this stanza.

'TO ALTHEA' evidently predates the most frequently quoted examples of royalist drinking poems, which represent drunkenness as a means of retreat from the harsh reality of defeat, of escape of the mind from the body and an affirmatory ritual.<sup>116</sup> Most notably, the printed text of Alexander Brome's (1620–1666) poem,

'*The Royalist*', states that it was written in 1646, the year that marked the end of the first Civil War with the surrender of Oxford to parliamentary forces and Charles I to the Scots.<sup>117</sup> The similarities between elements of 'TO ALTHEA' and Brome's '*The Royalist*' are so great as to indicate that Brome must have been familiar with Lovelace's poem. 'The Royalist' reprises the trope of the caged bird singing and the distinctive term 'tippling':

Come, pass about the *bowl* to me,  
A health to our distressed *King*;  
Though we're in hold, lets cups go free,  
Birds in a *cage* may freely sing.  
The ground does tipple healths apace. (ll. 1-5)

However, Brome's poem is more pessimistic than Lovelace's, as befits a poem written in 1646. Lovelace may be in prison in 1642, but the rituals in which he engages do not indicate any experience of ongoing defeat. Brome, on the other hand, drinks to escape reminders of defeat. Reichardt notes that, from 1648, even drinking the king's health became a forbidden gesture.<sup>118</sup> This would have added to perceptions of the oppositional nature of both poems for later readers.

In the third stanza, Lovelace moves to the last element of the trinity: loyal song. Here, he subtly expresses some doubts about the cause. The imagery of a caged chorus of 'committed Linnets' chirping shrilly — perhaps mindlessly — is not as unquestioningly celebratory of the king's goodness and greatness as it is usually taken to be. Anselment suggests that:

Like the linnet, one of the most aerial, free roving, and sociable of finches, the speaker refuses to be bound in song and spirit. In bearing testimony to the King's greatness, albeit with a "shriller throat", the song is witness to Lovelace's unvanquished loyalty. The unheard music to be voiced aloud and the healths that keep the round of flowing wine create harmony in discordant times.<sup>119</sup>

Anselment is right in that the speaker — who can almost certainly be equated with the author here — refuses to be bound in spirit. However, the speaker does not seem to be wholly convinced of the king's greatness. He sings 'how Good' his king is, 'how Great should be', rather than how great he actually is. Nor is it clear that the 'unheard music' in praise of the king will necessarily create harmony in discordant times. The final couplet: 'Inlarged Winds that curle the Flood; | Know no such Liberty' has ambiguous biblical connotations. The speaker seems to be calling into play the story of Moses leading the Israelites through the Red Sea:

And with the blast of thy nostrils the waters were gathered together: the floods stood upright as an heape, and the depths were congealed in the heart of the Sea. [...] Thou didst blow with thy wind, the sea covered them, they sanke as lead in the mighty waters.<sup>120</sup>

One reading would be that the king's enemies should expect to be destroyed by the 'Inlarged winds'. Alternatively, it could be an expression of fear for the future and a cry for help: 'Let not the water flood overflow me, neither let the deepe swallow mee up, and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me'.<sup>121</sup> Neither of these readings carries the implication that harmony can be brought to discordant times; rather, they point to the dangers inherent in those discordant times. While there are minor variations between the manuscript and 1649 texts, none supports a different reading, suggesting that, as early as 1642, Lovelace did not see the role of the committed royalist poet as requiring unquestioning loyalty to the king. Rather, like Wither and the English Spenserians discussed above, he saw it as providing considered, loyal advice. The line that advice might take is better illustrated in 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' discussed in the next chapter, in which Lovelace examines the various institutions of state as potential objects of his devotion, finds faults which could be remedied in all, but nevertheless opts for monarchical government. Nevertheless, the independence of spirit required to give such advice is evident in 'TO ALTHEA'.

The final stanza is an emphatic statement of the paradox around which the poem is constructed: 'Stone Walls doe not a Prison make, | Nor I'ron bars a Cage'. However, it is not a simple restatement of the royalist trinity of women, wine and loyalist song proposed as the elements of a free spirit in the preceding stanzas. Rather, Lovelace returns to the topos of Protestant virtue so evident in the writing of La Noue and the English Spenserians and so evidently absent from the poem to this point. He invokes the concept of prison as a place of temporary refuge from predators evident in the earlier works invoking the paradox: a person with an innocent and quiet mind finds prison to be 'an Hermitage'. Only heavenly 'Angels [...] that sore above' are as free in soul and conscience as the imprisoned speaker. Empson noticed the slipperiness of this stanza. He attributed it to the ambiguity resulting from the use of complex syntax, which is characteristic of much of Lovelace's writing.<sup>122</sup> Empson proposed a range of less comfortable interpretations of the 'Mindes innocent and quiet', for example that:

such minds imprison themselves, escape from life, perhaps escape from their mistress, into jail, and cannot manage without their martyrdom' [or ...] 'such minds may be so innocent

that they know no difference between a prison and a hermitage'; for this they may be mocked and revered, but it is with irony that the poet includes himself among them.

Empson went on to suggest that 'the main meaning is brave and is conveyed with enough fervour to stand alone'.<sup>123</sup> Nevertheless, these elements, which he calls 'grace-notes', are present. Furthermore, by their presence, they add credibility to a double-edged reading of some elements of the earlier stanzas, including the speaker's desire to resist entanglement with 'Althea' and his somewhat guarded support for the royalist cause. In a poem as polished as this, it is hard to argue that such ambiguity is not intentional. In the manuscript versions, the line upon which Empson focuses reads 'A spotless mind/soul, and innocent', rather than the 'plural 'Mindes innocent and quiet' of the 1649 text.<sup>124</sup> Anselment argues that the latter is less religiously connotative, and thus further from the Protestant tradition, than the manuscript versions, on the basis that 'innocent' is a more neutral term than 'spotless'.<sup>125</sup> While Anselment is to some extent correct, he is making the point based on a comparison between 'TO ALTHEA' and a poem sometimes attributed to Lovelace but more likely to have been written by Roger L'Estrange, *The Liberty of the Imprisoned Royalist* (1647), which, like Brome's *The Royalist*, shares many common tropes with Lovelace's poem.<sup>126</sup> When the last stanza of 'TO ALTHEA' is compared with the earlier stanzas of the poem, its relative reliance on a Protestant ethos is evident.

The poem's return in the last stanza to a stance of Protestant virtue is in direct contrast to the hedonistic approach of the stanzas dealing with the first two elements of the trinity. The presence of two such contradictory stances explains, to a large extent, the difficulty critics have had in assigning either a (non-Lipsian) Christian Stoic or an Epicurean reading to 'TO ALTHEA'. However, the poem is less resistant to analysis when it is considered in the context of the oppositional writings of Wither and his literary community earlier in the century and if one accepts that it was first drafted in mid-1642, just before or during the early months of the war. Lovelace was imprisoned by Parliament for delivering the *Kentish Petition*, a statement of measured support for the monarch and the established church. In 'TO ALTHEA', he reworks the earlier usages of the *topos* of freedom in imprisonment by Wither and the other poets of 1614, who had been imprisoned by James I. He supports the king's rights. By invoking the cavalier trinity of women, wine and loyal song, he holds the views of the puritan members of Parliament up to ridicule. He

ends the poem with a guarded statement of belief in freedom of conscience and the innocent and quiet mind. This is a topic to which he returns in 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*'.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 6-7, 97-98.

<sup>2</sup> In the case of 'TO AMARANTHA', at least in part.

<sup>3</sup> He does so in 'A loose Saraband', *Posthume Poems*, (1659), pp. 19-20 and see below.

<sup>4</sup> Gerald Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 71 (1985), 203-34 (pp. 204-05).

<sup>5</sup> Thomas N. Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), p. 78.

<sup>6</sup> Corns, p. 75.

<sup>7</sup> *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, ed. C.H. Firth (New York, 1885), I, pp. 119-20, quoted in Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 212.

<sup>8</sup> Sharpe, p. 212.

<sup>9</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 106-08; see Ch. 2.

<sup>10</sup> Keith Thomas, 'The Puritans and Adultery: The Act of 1650 Reconsidered', in *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill*, ed. Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 257-82 (pp. 275-79).

<sup>11</sup> James E. Ruoff, 'Thomas Carew's Early Reputation', *Notes and Queries*, 202 (1957), 61-62. Ruoff quotes Sir Edward Dering, in Parliament in 1640. Dering, one of the older generation of Kentish gentlemen, was later imprisoned on account of the Kentish Petition.

<sup>12</sup> Thomas, 'The Puritans and Adultery', p. 275.

<sup>13</sup> M.L. Donnelly, 'The Rack of Fancy and the Trade of Love: Conventions of Précieux and Libertin in Amatory Lyrics by Suckling and Carew', in *Renaissance Discourses of Desire*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1993), 107-29 (p. 107).

<sup>14</sup> See Ch. 2.

<sup>15</sup> Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, p. 77.

<sup>16</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 4-16. The group includes 'A PARADOX', 'TO AMARANTHA', 'TO CHLOE, *Courting her for his Friend*', 'Sonnet' (Depose your finger), 'TO LUCASTA. *The Rose*' and 'THE SCRUTINIE'. 'GRATIANA *dauncing and singing*', which appears before 'THE SCRUTINIE', is better considered with the Alexis/Amyntor poems and others specifically dealing with the king and the royal court. See Ch. 6.

<sup>17</sup> Norman N. Holland, 'Clinical, Yes: Healthy, No', *Literature and Psychology*, 14 (1964), 121-25;

Norman N. Holland, 'Literary Value: A Psychoanalytic Approach', *Literature and Psychology*, 14

(1964), 43-55; H.M. Richmond, 'A Note on Professor Holland's Psychoanalytic Approach to Lovelace', *Literature and Psychology*, 14 (1964), 125-28; Robert Rogers, 'Literary Value and the Clinical Fallacy', *Literature and Psychology*, 14 (1964), 116-21.

<sup>18</sup> E.F. Hart, 'The Answer-Poem of the Early Seventeenth Century', *Review of English Studies*, 7 (N.S.) (1956), 19-29 (p. 22). The theme of the inconstant lover is a commonplace of poetry of this period; see, for example, 'To a Wanton' Habington, *Poems*, p. 16; Paul Delany, 'Attacks on Carew in William Habington's Poems', *Seventeenth-Century News*, 36 (1968), Item 8.

<sup>19</sup> See above and Robert Wilcher, 'Suckling's Fruition Poems and Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*', *Notes and Queries*, 53 (2006), 164-66. See also Hart, 'The Answer Poem'.

<sup>20</sup> There has been some critical attention accorded to this poem. Willa McClung Evans, 'To Amatheia', *Philological Quarterly*, 23 (1944), 129-34, and Christopher John Wortham, 'The Poetry of Richard Lovelace: A Study of His Poetic Works, Considered in the Context of His Life and Times', (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 1974), pp. 173-74, 209-14, both address the textual issues. Paulina Palmer, 'Lovelace: Some Unnoticed Allusions to Carew', *Notes and Queries*, 14 (1967), 96-98; Paulina Palmer, 'Lovelace's Treatment of Some Marinesque Motifs', *Comparative Literature*, 29 (1977), 300-12 (pp. 306-09) and Dosia Reichardt, 'Looking For Lovelace: Identity, Style and Inheritance in the Poetry of the Interregnum', (Unpublished PhD thesis, James Cook University, 2003), pp. 81-88, look to possible sources. Earl Miner, *The Cavalier Mode From Jonson to Cotton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), pp. 128-29, touches on the carpe diem theme of the poem, as does Palmer (1977). See also Sharon Cadman Seelig, 'My Curious Hand or Eye: The Wit of Richard Lovelace', in *The Wit of Seventeenth-Century Poetry*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1995), 151-70 and Manfred Weidhorn, *Richard Lovelace* (New York: Twayne, 1970), pp. 129-30.

<sup>21</sup> Palmer, 'Lovelace's Treatment of Some Marinesque Motifs', pp. 308-09.

<sup>22</sup> Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, p. 76.

<sup>23</sup> Palmer, 'Lovelace's Treatment of Some Marinesque Motifs', p. 307.

<sup>24</sup> There are contemporary printed collections in *Choyce Drollery* (London, 1656); *Sportive Wit* (London, 1656). For printed versions of songs in manuscript collections of the period, see John Wardroper, ed., *Love and Drollery* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969).

<sup>25</sup> Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, p. 75. See also, for example, Evans, 'To Amatheia', p. 132; Palmer, 'Lovelace's Treatment of Some Marinesque Motifs', pp. 307-08.

<sup>26</sup> Carew, *Poems*, pp. 49-53.

<sup>27</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 6-7; *Poems*, pp. 20-21.

<sup>28</sup> BL Add. MS 53723, fol. 149<sup>r</sup>. See Evans, 'To Amatheia', p. 132; Wortham, 'Poetry of Richard Lovelace', pp. 173-74, 209-14.

<sup>29</sup> BL Add. MS 53723, fol. 149<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>30</sup> In the second line, Lawes records ‘forbeare to Brade that shyninge Hayre’, where *Lucasta* has ‘Ah brade no more that shining haire!’ The printed texts of ‘TO AMARANTHA’ in Lawes’s *Ayres and Dialogues* (1653), p. 15, and Cotgrave’s *Wits Interpreter* (1655), II, p. 50, follow Lawes’s transcription in the use of ‘forbear’. George Ellis, *Specimens of the Early English Poets* (London, 1790), pp. 186-87 prints the *Lucasta* ‘Ah! braid’ version, indicating that Ellis used *Lucasta* but probably suppressed the last three stanzas on the basis of taste.

<sup>31</sup> Propertius wrote frequently of his mistress’s hair. See, for example, Propertius 2. 22A.

<sup>32</sup> *Poems* (1925) I, p. 21, from ‘On a Faire Ladyes Yellow Haire Powdred With White’. Palmer, ‘Lovelace’s Treatment of Some Marinesque Motifs’, p. 306. She suggests a section of *L’Adone* and notes the Cavalier poets’ shared indebtedness to Marino.

<sup>33</sup> This tag is also occasionally attributed to Virgil. Ausonius, *Works*, ed. Hugh G. Evelyn White, 2 vols, Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann, 1951-61), II, pp. 276-81. It is at l. 41, ‘brevis quod gratia talis’. I would like to thank Dr Elizabeth Minchin and others of the Classics Department at the Australian National University for assistance in the search for, and translation of, this tag.

<sup>34</sup> See notes in *The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick*, ed. by L.C. Martin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), pp. 517-19; unless otherwise stated, all subsequent quotations from Herrick’s poems are from this edition. See also, *The Poems of Edmund Waller*, 2nd ed., ed. by George Thorn-Drury, 2 vols (London: A.H. Bullen, 1901), II, pp. 190-91.

<sup>35</sup> *Selected Parts of Horace, Prince of Lyricks*, trans. Sir Richard Fanshawe (London, 1652), pp. 92-94 is slightly different from the Loeb’s. He gives it as ‘brevis quod gratia florū est’. He entitles the poem ‘EDYL XIV. Ausonii ROSAE’, ‘AUSONIUS His ROSES’. His translation of the full couplet is ‘NATURE, why mad’st thou fading Flow’rs, so gay? | Why shewd’st us gifts, to snatch them streight away?’ A flatter translation would be ‘the loveliness of flowers is short lived.’ I have not been able to locate Lovelace’s line elsewhere, using electronic or more traditional means of searching. Given that Lovelace translated some of Ausonius’ epigrams, the tag in ‘TO AMARANTHA’ may be his own translation.

<sup>36</sup> Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1638), 3. 2. 5. 5.

<sup>37</sup> See, for example, Lovelace’s ‘A PARADOX’, pp. 4-5; c.f. Habington, *Poems*, pp. 17-18, ‘To CASTARA, Inquiring why I loved her’ and, particularly, ‘To CASTARA’ (Forsake with me the earth, my faire), p. 63, in which the chaste lovers explore the bright skies to observe Jove’s offspring with metamorphosed lovers in a different light. See also Lovelace’s ‘TO CHLOE’, pp. 8-9, c.f. Habington’s ‘To a Wanton’, p. 16, in which the speaker compares the magic of his verse inspired by chaste Castara with ‘the whispers of soft Courtiers’; and Lovelace’s Latinate blushing roses in ‘TO LUCASTA, The Rose’, pp. 11-12, c.f. Habington’s chaste flowers in Castara’s marble breast in ‘To Roses in the bosome of CASTARA’, p. 12.

<sup>38</sup> Habington, *Poems*, p. 11, ‘To CASTARA, A Sacrifice’.



- <sup>39</sup> Habington, *Poems*, p. lv.
- <sup>40</sup> Habington, *Poems*, p. 43.
- <sup>41</sup> Carew, *Poems*, pp. 49-53; Thomas Randolph, *Poems, With The Muses Looking-Glasse and Amyntas*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1640), pp. 93-99. On sources for these poems, see Carew, *Poems*, pp. 236-40; Don Beecher, 'Eye-beams, Raptures and Androgynes: Inverted Neoplatonism in Poems by Donne, Herbert of Cherbury, Overbury and Carew', *Cahiers Élisabéthains*, 65 (2004), 1-9; Paula Johnson, 'Carew's 'A Rapture': The Dynamics of Fantasy', *Studies in English Literature*, 16 (1976), 145-55. See also, Palmer, 'Lovelace: Some Unnoticed Allusions to Carew'.
- <sup>42</sup> While Lovelace was alive, Carew's *Poems* were published in 1640, 1642 and 1651; Randolph's *Poems* appeared in 1638, 1640, 1643 and 1652. See Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, 4 vols (London: Mansell, 1980-1993), II, 1, pp. 83-85 and II, 2, pp. 211-12 on manuscript circulation.
- <sup>43</sup> Carew, *Poems*, pp. 49-53. There are echoes of Viola's 'Willow Cabin' speech in *Twelfth Night*, 1. 5. 237-45, in these passages.
- <sup>44</sup> See Delany, 'Attacks on Carew'.
- <sup>45</sup> Carew, *Poems*, p. 25; see Palmer, 'Lovelace: Some Unnoticed Allusions to Carew'.
- <sup>46</sup> Carew, *Poems*, p. 51. Palmer, 'Lovelace's Treatment of Some Marinesque Motifs', p. 308, quotes ll. 81-84.
- <sup>47</sup> Carew, *Poems*, pp. 91-92. Carew's other poem to Lady Carlisle, 'A New-yeares Sacrifice. To Lucinda', is at pp. 32-33 and p. 227-229, n., where Suckling's poem also appears.
- <sup>48</sup> Carew, *Poems*, p. 258, n. 91.
- <sup>49</sup> Beal, II, 2, p. 456.
- <sup>50</sup> Robert Wilcher, 'Habington, William (1605-54)' *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>51</sup> Suckling, *Poems*, pp. 30-32.
- <sup>52</sup> Thomas N. Corns, *A History of Seventeenth-Century English Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), p. 189. See also, Robert Wilcher, *The Discontented Cavalier: The Work of Sir John Suckling in Its Social, Religious, Political, and Literary Contexts* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007), pp. 129-36.
- <sup>53</sup> Roy E. Schreiber, 'Hay [née Percy], Lucy, Countess of Carlisle (1599-1660)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>54</sup> Habington, *Poems*, pp. 5-6. Habington targets libertine poets – probably Carew – in a number of poems (See Delany).
- <sup>55</sup> Marvell, *Poems*, pp. 96-97.
- <sup>56</sup> Marvell, *Poems*, pp. 96-97. Smith is quoting from Rosalie Colie, 'My Ecchoing Song': *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell*, (Princeton, N.J., 1990), pp. 43-44.

- <sup>57</sup> Thomas Clayton, 'Some Versions, Texts and Readings of 'To Althea, from Prison'', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 68 (1974), 225-35; Alexander Corbin Judson, 'A Forgotten Lovelace Manuscript', *Modern Language Notes*, 37 (1922), 407-11.
- <sup>58</sup> A. Waller Hastings, 'Stone Walls, Iron Bars, and Liberal Political Theory: Lovelace's 'To Althea, From Prison'', in *Proceedings of the First Dakotas Conference on Earlier British Literature*, ed. Jay Ruud (Aberdeen: Northern State University Press, 1993), 74-85 (p. 75). Hastings acknowledges his debt to Weidhorn, including in these lines.
- <sup>59</sup> The French school of writers to which La Noue belonged, and its relationship with Lipsius, is discussed in Lisa Ferraro Parmelee, *Good News From Fraunce: French Anti-League Propaganda in Late Elizabethan England* (Rochester, N.Y.: University Press, 1996). Parmelee accepts the older, passive construction of Lipsian neo-Stoic retirement. Maren-Sofie Røstvig, *The Happy Man: Studies in the Metamorphoses of a Classical Ideal*, 2nd ed., vol. I (Oslo: Norwegian Universities Press, 1962), Ch. 1, is still helpful here.
- <sup>60</sup> Ian Spink, 'Wilson, John (1595–1674)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>61</sup> Hyder E. Rollins, *An Analytical Index to the Ballad-Entries (1557-1709) in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London*, repr. ed. (Hatboro, Pennsylvania: Tradition Press, 1967), p. 179; Claude M. Simpson, *The British Broadside Ballad and its Music* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1966), pp. 761-62.
- <sup>62</sup> Wilkinson, *Poems*, reproduces the later edition of the broadside between pages 344 and 345.
- <sup>63</sup> Another currently unlocated tune, 'No, no, no, not yet' is also named as a setting in Simpson, p. 761.
- <sup>64</sup> John Playford, ed., *Select Ayres and Dialogues* (London, 1659), p. 97; John Playford, ed., *The Treasury of Musick* (London, 1669), p. 97; John Wilson, *Cheerfull Ayres or Ballads* (London, 1660), pp. 10-11.
- <sup>65</sup> The only extant copy of *A Jovial Garland*, which I have not seen, is in the British Library. Adam Smyth, 'An Index of Poetry in Printed Miscellanies, 1640-1682', <<http://www.reading.ac.uk/emrc//printedmiscellanies.htm>>, accessed 30 November 2009, shows a 32 line version, with the same opening and closing lines as the 1649 text of 'TO ALTHEA' at sigs E8<sup>v</sup>-F SONG LVII [The Pensive Prisoner]'. William Winstanley, *The New Help to Discourse*, 2nd ed. (London, 1672), pp. 237-38.
- <sup>66</sup> *Poems*, p. lxxv; Beal, II, 2, p. 15, notes that this MS is in the 'Percy Folio', British Library Add. MS 27879, fols 95<sup>v</sup>-6.
- <sup>67</sup> Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. Philip Bliss, New edn, 4 vols (London, 1813-1820), III, p. 462. See Clayton, 'Some Versions', pp. 277-83, for a comprehensive collation of the variants compared by Wilkinson.
- <sup>68</sup> Thomas Campbell, *Specimens of the British Poets*, 7 vols (London, 1819), III, 400-01; Ellis, 188-89; George Gilfillan, ed., *Specimens With Memoirs of the Less-Known British Poets*, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1860), II, pp. 20-21; Francis Turner Palgrave, *The Golden Treasury of the Best Songs and*

*Lyrical Poems in the English Language* (London, 1861), p. 80; Joseph Ritson, *The English Anthology*, 3 vols (London, 1793-94), I, pp. 72-73.

<sup>69</sup> Beal, II, 2, 15-16. Unless otherwise stated, I have not viewed the MS versions of 'TO ALTHEA' identified by Beal.

<sup>70</sup> Beal's references to 'Captaine Lovelace' are LoR 34, 35, 37, 40. While these MSS may have shared a common source, the point about the date is still valid.

<sup>71</sup> Beal gives the date as c. 1650-59, although it may have been earlier. Beal LoR 37, British Library Harley MS 6918, fols 94<sup>v</sup>-5.

<sup>72</sup> Cyril Hughes Hartmann, *The Cavalier Spirit and its Influence on the Life and Work of Richard Lovelace (1618-1658)* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1925), pp. 45-47; See Wortham, pp. 199-209 for a balanced assessment. See also, Raymond A. Anselment, "'Stone Walls' and 'Iron Bars': Richard Lovelace and the Conventions of Seventeenth-Century Prison Literature", *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme*, 27 (N.S.) (1993), 15-34 (pp. 104-05); Dosia Reichardt, "'At My Grates No Althea': Prison Poetry and the Consolations of Sack in the Interregnum", *Parergon*, 20 (2003), 139-61.

<sup>73</sup> William Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity*, 3rd ed. (London: Chatto & Windus, 1963), pp. 209-10.

<sup>74</sup> Willa McClung Evans, 'Lovelace's Concept of Prison Life in 'The Vintage to the Dungeon'', *Philological Quarterly*, 26 (1947), 62-68 (p. 63).

<sup>75</sup> Mainly, Anselment, and Reichardt, "'At My Grates No Althea'".

<sup>76</sup> Clayton, 'Some Versions'; Judson, 'A Forgotten Lovelace Manuscript'.

<sup>77</sup> Hastings, 'Stone Walls'. See also, James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), pp. 216-17; Reichardt, 'Looking For Lovelace', pp. 15-20. Hastings's argument that the poem should be read as an early statement of liberal political theory is interesting. Corns, *Uncloistered Virtue*, p. 76, follows this line. Hammond, 'Uses of Obscurity' only deals with the poem in passing.

<sup>78</sup> Raymond A. Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1988), pp. 104-05; see also, Anselment, "'Stone Walls' and 'Iron Bars'".

<sup>79</sup> Anselment, "'Stone Walls' and 'Iron Bars'", p. 25.

<sup>80</sup> Anselment, "'Stone Walls' and 'Iron Bars'", p. 20-21.

<sup>81</sup> Anselment, "'Stone Walls' and 'Iron Bars'", p. 26.

<sup>82</sup> Anselment, "'Stone Walls' and 'Iron Bars'", p. 26.

<sup>83</sup> Anselment, "'Stone Walls' and 'Iron Bars'", p. 16.

<sup>84</sup> Anselment, "'Stone Walls' and 'Iron Bars'", p. 21.

<sup>85</sup> Evans, 'Lovelace's Concept of Prison Life', p. 63.

<sup>86</sup> Anselment, "'Stone Walls' and 'Iron Bars'", p. 20.

<sup>87</sup> Røstvig, *Happy Man*, p. 331, n. 30.

- <sup>88</sup> Gerhard Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State*, ed. Brigitta Oestreich and H.G. Koenigsberger, trans. David McLintock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 50; Parmelee, p. 120.
- <sup>89</sup> Odet de La Noue, 'The Profit of Imprisonment: A Paradox', in *Du Bartas: His Divine Weekes and Workes*, ed. by Joshua Sylvester (London, 1641), pp. 295-321.
- <sup>90</sup> David Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, rev. edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 173.
- <sup>91</sup> La Noue in *Du Bartas*, p. 296.
- <sup>92</sup> La Noue in *Du Bartas*, p. 320.
- <sup>93</sup> Michelle O'Callaghan, *The 'Shepherds Nation': Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture, 1612-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), p. 26. Not all members contributed to both works.
- <sup>94</sup> Jonathan Gibson, 'Civil War in 1614: Lucan, Gorges and Prince Henry', in *The Crisis of 1614 and the Addled Parliament: Literary and Historical Perspectives*, ed. Stephen Clucas and Rosalind Davies (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 161-76; Andrew McRae, *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 108; Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics*, pp. 173-98; Michelle O'Callaghan, 'Literary Commonwealths: A 1614 Print Community, *The Shepherds Pipe* and *The Shepherds Hunting*', *Seventeenth Century*, 13 (1998), 103-23; O'Callaghan, *The 'Shepherds Nation'*.
- <sup>95</sup> Norbrook, p. 194.
- <sup>96</sup> O'Callaghan, *The 'Shepherds Nation'*, p. 234.
- <sup>97</sup> McRae, *Literature, Satire*, pp. 90-91.
- <sup>98</sup> John Davies of Hereford, *The Muses Sacrifice* (London, 1612), pp. 124-46. See also P.J. Finkelpearl, 'Davies, John (1564/5-1618)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009, where he is described as 'one of the most voluminous didactic poets of the age; he was also one of the most tedious.' Davies's verses follow those by Ben Jonson in the opening pages of *Du Bartas*. A much longer poem by Davies to Sylvester is bound immediately behind the translation of La Noue in *Du Bartas*, sigs. B4<sup>v</sup> and pp. 322-23.
- <sup>99</sup> John Davies of Hereford, *The Muses-Tears for the Losse of Their Hope ... Henry, Prince of Wales* (London, 1613), p. 139.
- <sup>100</sup> Davies is known to have been a Roman Catholic. Possibly because of his loyalty to the memory of his Protestant patrons, Essex and Sidney, he seems to have been in sympathy with Protestant writing; O'Callaghan, 'Literary Commonwealths', p. 107. According to Finkelpearl, *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009, 'nothing in his voluminous religious poetry suggests a strong adherence to Catholicism.'
- <sup>101</sup> Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics*, pp. 187-88; O'Callaghan, 'Literary Commonwealths', p. 105. On Wither's *Abuses Stript and Whipt*, see also Ch. 7.

- <sup>102</sup> George Wither, *A Satyre: Dedicated to His Most Excellent Majestie* (London, 1614).
- <sup>103</sup> James Doelman, ed., *Early Stuart Pastoral: The Shepherd's Pipe by William Browne and Others and The Shepherd's Hunting by George Wither* (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1999); Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 186-87.
- <sup>104</sup> O'Callaghan, 'Literary Commonwealths', p. 105.
- <sup>105</sup> Doelman, ed., *Early Stuart Pastoral*, p. 162.
- <sup>106</sup> Quoted in Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 188.
- <sup>107</sup> George Wither, *A Collection of Emblemes, Ancient and Moderne* (London, 1635), p. 96. Wither's *Emblems* was issued under five different imprints in 1635, indicating its popularity.
- <sup>108</sup> Wither returned to this theme in 1661, while he was in Newgate awaiting trial on a charge of seditious libel against members of the new Parliament, for which he was later convicted and sent to the Tower, in *A Triple Paradox; Wherein are asserted these particulars, that IMPRISONMENT, is more safe than LIBERTY; SLANDER, more advantageous than PRAISE; POVERTY, more profitable than RICHES*. It is interesting to speculate that he had 'TO ALTHEA' in mind.
- <sup>109</sup> Norbrook, *Poetry and Politics*, p. 192. See also O'Callaghan, *The 'Shepherds Nation'*, p. 185; Theodore K. Rabb, 'Sandys, Sir Edwin (1561–1629)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>110</sup> Norbrook, p. 195.
- <sup>111</sup> Dale B.J. Randall, 'Once More to the G(r)ates: An Old Crux and a New Reading of 'To His Coy Mistress'', in *On the Celebrated and Neglected Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1992), 47-69 (p. 64).
- <sup>112</sup> Clayton, 'Some Versions', p. 233.
- <sup>113</sup> Stanley, *Poems*, p. 77; Reichardt, "'At My Grates No Althea'", pp. 145-46.
- <sup>114</sup> See, for example, 'An Ode [...] Commanding the Gentry to reside upon their Estates in the Country', *The Poems and Translations of Sir Richard Fanshawe*, ed. by Peter Davidson, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 55-59, ll. 121.
- <sup>115</sup> Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 138.
- <sup>116</sup> See, for example Marika Keblusek, 'Wine for Comfort: Drinking and the Royalist Exile Experience, 1642-1660', in *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Adam Smyth (Woodbridge, Suffolk: D.S. Brewer, 2004), 55-68; Reichardt, "'At My Grates No Althea'".
- <sup>117</sup> Alexander Brome, *Songs and Other Poems*, 2nd edn (London, 1664), pp. 55-56. This poem is quoted by Anselment, "'Stone Walls' and 'Iron Bars'", p. 25. See also Keblusek, pp. 58-59; Reichardt, "'At My Grates No Althea'", pp. 155-56.
- <sup>118</sup> Reichardt, "'At My Grates No Althea'", p. 156.
- <sup>119</sup> Anselment, "'Stone Walls' and 'Iron Bars'", p. 25.
- <sup>120</sup> Exodus 15: 8-10.

<sup>121</sup> Psalms 69: 15.

<sup>122</sup> Empson, *Seven Types of Ambiguity*, pp. 209-11.

<sup>123</sup> Empson, pp. 210-11.

<sup>124</sup> Clayton, 'Some Versions' p. 232.

<sup>125</sup> Anselment, "'Stone Walls' and 'Iron Bars'", p. 21.

<sup>126</sup> Roger L'Estrange, *The Liberty of the Imprisoned Royalist* (London, 1647); George Thorn-Drury, 'Merry Thoughts In A Sad Place', *Notes and Queries*, s10-I (1904), p. 250.

## Chapter Five — Trust the King? 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*'

'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' is Lovelace's least guarded contribution to political debate in the first *Lucasta*.<sup>1</sup> In this poem, the speaker considers whether he should maintain his commitment to the king in light of the ideological and political debates of the period leading up to the outbreak of civil war. Arguably, it can be read as a decision poem, written at a key moment in history, considering options for allegiance. As such, it is similar in purpose to Andrew Marvell's 'Horatian Ode', written almost a decade later, although the text cannot lay claim to the lapidary quality of Marvell's famous poem.<sup>2</sup> In the introductory stanzas, the speaker severs the ties of love and honour which shackle him to Lucasta.<sup>3</sup> In turning away from 'Peace' and 'War', the speaker explicitly rejects the symbolism of the Personal Rule. In terms which invoke the rhetoric of balance, but have the effect of repressing oppositional thinking, the speaker then engages with the debates of 1640–1642 over the abolition of the episcopacy, the role of the Parliament in levying taxation, the liberty of the subject and property rights, before affirming his commitment to the king. He accepts the necessity for reform, but argues that that reform should be limited in scope and should not impinge on the subject's relationship of trust with the king. In weaving his intertextual web, Lovelace draws extensively on contemporary polemical writing for the first time.

'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' has traditionally been read as a strongly royalist text.<sup>4</sup> Judson, for example, suggests that in it 'there throbs a splendid devotion to Charles'.<sup>5</sup> There is evidence supporting this view. The poem's tightly structured argument is based on a flawed syllogism, which leads the reader to the inevitable conclusion that the only viable option is to maintain support for the king. In effect, the speaker argues not 'A', not 'B', therefore only 'C' will do. It is unlikely that Lovelace, well trained in rhetoric, developed an argument structured to manipulate his readers — and perhaps himself — towards an inevitable conclusion, without recognising the inherent logical flaw. However, despite its tight construction, there is a slight element of ambiguity in the poem's last lines. The

speaker, having committed to the king as ‘th’ only spring | Of all our loves and joyes’, asks that he:

Dispense on me one sacred Beame  
To light me where I soone may see  
How to serve you, and you trust me. (ll. 54–56)

Interpretation of these lines — and the impact of the poem overall — hinges on the word ‘trust’. Does Lovelace’s speaker believe that, like Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford (1593–1641), the only approach open to the loyal subject is to place absolute trust in the king’s irrefutable right and capability to resolve the current crisis appropriately, to light his way?<sup>6</sup> Or does he lack faith in the king’s ability to guide his loyal subjects and to place appropriate trust in them?

The ambiguity is similar in nature to that in ‘TO ALTHEA’ discussed earlier, where the speaker notes that the king is good, but should be great.<sup>7</sup> It is central to Gerald Hammond’s hypothesis that, from early in the war years, Lovelace moved to a stance of ‘militant neutralism’.<sup>8</sup> Hammond suggests ‘that the doubt conveyed here signals the beginnings of Lovelace’s abandonment of the king’.<sup>9</sup> The ambiguity Hammond identifies is real. When examined in terms of its historical context and the wide range of allusive fields on which it draws, ‘TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*’ emerges as a serious attempt to engage with complex issues, briefly allowing some of the competing political voices of the early 1640s to emerge. In this chapter, I first set out the context in which the poem was written and the fields of allusion on which the text draws, before drawing the evidence together. I argue that, on balance, there is probably more evidence in support of a traditional, royalist reading of the poem. However, the opening position of the reader — whether he or she initially subscribes to the rhetorical position the poem argues, that loyalty to the king is the only option — again emerges as the crucial determining factor in how the poem is understood.

### **Dating the Poem**

We need to establish when ‘TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*’ was written before any serious examination of the literary and political contexts of the poem can take place. H.M. Margoliouth’s 1927 position that the poem was drafted, as the title suggests, while Lovelace was in the Gatehouse prison between April and June 1642, had, until recently, achieved a level of critical acceptance.<sup>10</sup> Margoliouth is almost certain that the poem was written in 1642.<sup>11</sup> He rejects Wilkinson’s assertion that ‘TO



LUCASTA. *From Prison*' must have been written while Lovelace was in prison in 1648–1649. He uses contextual evidence to locate the poem in mid-1642, observing that while the 'lines on *Peace* and *War* are quite general' the other key terms Lovelace invokes featured prominently in the pre-war debates of 1640–1642, including in specific clauses of the *Kentish Petition*, which Lovelace unsuccessfully attempted to present to Parliament in April 1642, leading to his first imprisonment.<sup>12</sup> Margoliouth also makes the general argument that 'there must be a *prima facie* assumption against any particular poem being later than the date of licensing' (4 February 1648), although he does not specifically consider the possibility of authorial changes to the text between initial drafting and the volume's preparation for publication in 1648–1649.

More recently, Nigel Smith seems to have been misled by the reference in the sixth stanza to Parliament as 'th' fairest body that's beheaded' into assuming that the poem was written after the Regicide, while Lovelace was in Peterhouse prison preparing *Lucasta* for publication.<sup>13</sup> The reference to Parliament being beheaded would have had a chillingly different resonance for readers when *Lucasta* was published in 1649 (the period Smith is discussing) to that in 1642. Dusia Reichardt, who uncovered a variant contemporary manuscript text of the poem, suggests a date later than 1646 on the basis that Lovelace's poem shares the term 'eclipse' with G. Hils' translation of one of Casimire's odes.<sup>14</sup> Her argument is not convincing. The metaphor of the king's light or sun having been eclipsed by Scottish mists (that is, the Presbyterians) was commonplace in the pre-war years, as discussed in Chapter 2 in relation to Lovelace's poem '*To Generall Goring, after the pacification at Berwicke*'.<sup>15</sup> It dominates the poems in English at the end of *Eucharistica Oxoniensia*, the volume offered by the University of Oxford to celebrate the king's return from Scotland in late 1641.<sup>16</sup>

Nicholas McDowell, in his recent monograph, suggests that 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' was written in the months preceding the licensing of *Lucasta* in February 1648.<sup>17</sup> He uses this argument to support his position that, in this text, Lovelace engages with John Hall's *A True Account and Character of the Times* (1647).<sup>18</sup> McDowell is right to note that the issues under discussion in 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' were reflected in polemical material of 1647 and 1648. The poem engages with ongoing issues of fundamental disagreement between

royalists and parliamentarians. McDowell's approach is similar to mine. However, he has relied upon texts from 1647 and 1648, many of which I also note in later chapters, rather than the texts of 1642, which I argue are relevant. The evidence offered here demonstrates the importance and breadth of discussion of the relevant issues in 1642. It can also be argued that the overtly political nature of 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' indicates that it was written early in the war years, before royalists like Lovelace felt the need to migrate to allegory and fable to disguise their subject matter.

The contextual evidence I set out below strongly supports Margoliouth's position that the poem was drafted in mid-1642, although the variant manuscript text uncovered by Reichardt indicates that Lovelace edited the poem at some time before it was published. The existence of an anonymous ballad of similar structure and argument to 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*', entitled *A Mad World My Masters*, which was published in Alexander Brome's 1662 collection of *Rump* songs, reinforces attribution of the poem to 1642.<sup>19</sup> *A Mad World My Masters*, written in popular ballad form, is structured around the topos of the world turned upside down, which dominated John Taylor the Water Poet's (1578–1653) royalist satirical pamphlet output of these months.<sup>20</sup> The text seeks the overthrow of John Pym (1584–1643), indicating that it must have been written before Pym died in December 1643. It opens with a reference to the title of Francis Beaumont's and John Fletcher's Jacobean tragicomedy, *A King and No King* (1619), while the first stanza as a whole may allude to the imprisonment of John Digby, Earl of Bristol (1580–1653) and Justice Sir Thomas Malet (c. 1582–1665) in the Tower from 28 March 1642 in relation to the *Kentish Petition*:<sup>21</sup>

We have a King and yet no King,  
For he hath lost his Power,  
For 'gainst his Will his Subjects are  
Imprison'd in the *Tower*.<sup>22</sup>

Had the author been referring here to Archbishop William Laud (1573–1645) and the twelve other bishops detained in the Tower on suspicion of high treason between December 1641 and May 1642, rather than lay persons like Digby and Malet, it is likely that he would have said so.<sup>23</sup> The ballad proceeds through the issues Lovelace canvasses in 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*'. 'Estates and Liberties' are now 'voted down'; 'Religion' is 'beaten down with clubs'; 'free Subjects' 'are by force made

Slaves', and so on. The textual similarities between '*A Mad World My Masters*' and Lovelace's poem are sufficient to raise the possibility that one of these poems was written with the other in mind, although the substantial difference in genres makes it unlikely that Lovelace wrote both poems. There are no popular satirical ballads similar to '*A Mad World My Masters*' in the first *Lucasta*, although we know that Lovelace was capable of this kind of writing from '*A Mock-Song*' and '*A Mock Charon*' in the *Posthume Poems* (1659).<sup>24</sup>

### **'An Epode'?**

Lovelace's choice of subtitle for 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*', 'An Epode', may be significant.<sup>25</sup> The term 'epode' was not often used by the early Caroline poets in the pre-war period, other than in translating from the classics. Nonetheless, it would have been very familiar. Horace's second epode, 'Beatus Ille' or 'Happy the man', later a key source for the discourse of royalist retreat, was frequently translated during these years, as were his other epodes.<sup>26</sup> In its most formal sense, an epode is the third part of a Greek choric composition. It is preceded by, and reflects upon, the strophe and antistrophe. Ben Jonson's series of three poems in this general structure in *The Forest* (X and XI) appear to be textually related to 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*'. In the first of Jonson's poems, the untitled 'And must I sing', the speaker examines various of the gods, the graces and the muses as pretenders to acknowledgment as his source of poetic inspiration, in a manner similar to that adopted by Lovelace in his examination of the institutions of state as pretenders to his devotion.<sup>27</sup> The second part of Jonson's series of poems, the 'Proludium' rehearses the subject matter of the first, while the third, the '*Epode*' (XI) moves to a serious discussion of the roles of reason and passion in love.<sup>28</sup> The rhetorical similarities between Jonson's series of poems in *The Forest* and 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*', 'TO ALTHEA, *From Prison*' and 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' seem too great to be merely coincidental. This raises the possibility that, like Jonson's, Lovelace's three poems should be read as a sequence. If, as I argue, the poems were drafted during the weeks Lovelace was in prison between April and June 1642, they are unified in time. Each outlines a response to the imminent outbreak of civil war. 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*' is a kind of strophe, reflecting the excitement of a young man's rejection of his chaste love in favour of a higher cause, his king. The antistrophe, 'TO ALTHEA, *From Prison*' is the young man's

indomitable statement of support for the king after he is captured and imprisoned. The epode, 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*', is a serious reflection on the issues at stake and how a prudent person might respond. Where Jonson uses the strophe to consider the possible objects of his devotion, Lovelace adopts this approach in his epode.

An 'epode' can also simply be a poem of 'grave character', usually with alternating short and long lines.<sup>29</sup> Lovelace could certainly claim serious purpose for a poem which canvasses grave issues of allegiance and belief, while there is some manuscript evidence that he was aiming at a stanzaic structure involving alternating shorter and longer lines. The manuscript text of 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' in Bodleian MS Ashmole 36/37, fol. 217, uncovered by Reichardt, is simply entitled 'An Epode'.<sup>30</sup> The variant title, whether it was assigned by Lovelace or the transcriber of the manuscript, may indicate that the poem's claims to epodic status were recognised at the time. The manuscript is written on both sides of a single sheet in a neat, clear, unidentified hand. Thus, it was evidently a clean copy for circulation, rather than a rough draft. It can be securely located in the middle years of the seventeenth century. Beal dates a manuscript copy of Lovelace's 'TO ALTHEA, *From Prison*', MS Ashmole 36/37, fol. 3, which Reichardt notes is in the same hand, to those years.<sup>31</sup> The manuscript of 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' identified by Reichardt is bound between miscellaneous lyrics in various hands which provide no further assistance in precise dating of either the printed, or the manuscript, version of the text.<sup>32</sup> There are a large number of minor textual variations. In the manuscript version, all lines have four stressed syllables, but many are shorter, containing only seven syllables. This may indicate that Lovelace was attempting to achieve what he believed to be an epodic structure of shorter and longer lines. The overall effect of the variations in the printed version, when compared with the manuscript text of the poem, is to regularise the metre, indicating that the printed version is probably the later form. Those metrical irregularities which remain in the printed text provide emphases that contribute to the sense of the poem. The most substantive change in wording is in the eighth stanza of the printed text, where 'a heavenly salve' in the manuscript appears as Grief's 'Sov'raigne salve', discussed below.<sup>33</sup>

## The Context

In ‘TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*’, Lovelace engages broadly with the issues which were being hotly debated in the months leading up to the formal declaration of war. A brief recapitulation of the events which form the background to this poem serves to remind us just how momentous the weeks during which Lovelace came to national prominence were.<sup>34</sup> The *Kentish Petition*, described in detail in Chapter 2, was only one of a storm of petitions and other tracts which emerged between the summoning of the Short Parliament in April 1640 and the formal outbreak of war in August 1642. All shades of opinion are represented in this polemic, which culminated in the ‘paper war’ involving king and Parliament in the weeks between the king’s arrival in York on 19 March, and after his rejection of the *Nineteen Propositions* on 18 June 1642.<sup>35</sup> It crosses generic boundaries, and includes panegyric, prose and verse satire, records of parliamentary debates and the king’s public statements, usually drafted by Sir Edward Hyde, later Earl of Clarendon, after December 1641.<sup>36</sup> The *Kentish Petition*, drafted by Sir Edward Dering (1598–1644) and others, was presented at the Maidstone Assizes on 25 March 1642. Over the next few days, the main protagonists were imprisoned by Parliament, which ordered on 7 April that copies of the document be seized and burnt.<sup>37</sup> On 19 April, Richard Lovelace flamboyantly destroyed the Kentish supporters of Parliament’s draft counter-petition in the Maidstone courthouse.<sup>38</sup> Only a few days later, on 23 April, Sir John Hotham refused the king admission to the city of Hull and its magazine. On 29 April, Lovelace and Sir William Boteler led royalist Kentishmen in a march to deliver the *Petition* to Parliament, for which act both were imprisoned on 30 April. Parliament sent the *Nineteen Propositions* to the king at York on 2 June. Lovelace’s release from the Gatehouse was ordered on 17 June, the day before the king formally rejected Parliament’s demands.

### ***The Kentish Petition and A Plea For Moderation***

A conservative declaration of a moderate royalist position, the *Kentish Petition* is the only political manifesto to which Richard Lovelace is known to have subscribed. There is no indication that Lovelace himself helped draft the text of the *Petition*. However, as Margoliouth noted long ago, its opening and closing sentiments are echoed in the text of ‘TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*’.<sup>39</sup> The first

clause of the *Kentish Petition* expresses the petitioners' acceptance of the major constitutional reforms which had taken place in 1641:

That you will be pleased to accept our due and hearty thanks for those excellent Lawes (which by his Majesties grace & goodnesse) you have obtained for us.<sup>40</sup>

Lovelace's speaker in 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' implicitly accepts the constitutional reforms of the previous year. He argues that he is looking to preserve what benefits the state and to preclude harming it. Thus, he states in the eighth stanza 'A Reformation I would have', but not so 'As to reforme were to ore'throw'. Both the *Petition* and 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' end with a call to trust the king. The sentiments represented in relation to religion, parliament, liberty, property and reformation are similar in both texts.<sup>41</sup>

The moderate, royalist thinking behind the clauses of the *Kentish Petition* relating to national affairs — and, arguably, by extension, 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' — is set out in more detail in *A Plea for Moderation*, an anonymous pamphlet published in April 1642, the month in which the furore over the *Petition* came to a head.<sup>42</sup> Michael Mendle discusses this pamphlet which, in his view, sought 'the middle ground between vicious extremes', in his analysis of the development of the king's *Answer to the XIX Propositions*, to which he sees *A Plea* as a precursor. As Mendle notes, 'in April 1642 the king's friends [...] adopted the very language their opponents had discarded'.<sup>43</sup> As I shall show by relating the texts of the poem and the tract in the course of this discussion, this is the strategy Lovelace adopts in 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*'. Mendle places *A Plea* as a part of 'the great surge of Kentish royalism of spring 1642', in the community of royalists which included (at that moment) Sir Edward Dering, Sir John Colepeper (c. 1600–1660), and Digby. According to Mendle, there is no need to identify the exact authorship of the text. The content of *A Plea* combines 'the merger of the royalist-based political accommodation sought by [Digby]; the religious compromise sought by Dering, and the language memorialized by' Colepeper and Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland, in the king's *Answer to the XIX Propositions*.<sup>44</sup> It will be recalled that both Dering and Digby were imprisoned for their part in the *Kentish Petition*.<sup>45</sup>

To what extent did Lovelace, or his speaker, subscribe to the tenets of the *Kentish Petition* and, by extension *A Plea for Moderation*? It is inevitable that such documents contain compromises. They do not necessarily reflect the detail of each

subscriber's political beliefs. Nevertheless, Lovelace was sufficiently committed to the *Kentish Petition* to lead a march on Parliament to deliver it, even after Parliament had ordered its destruction by the common hangman and others had been imprisoned. As Hammond suggests, Lovelace and his companions must have been humiliated when the Speaker dismissed them as 'young Gentlemen, misled by the Solicitation of some not affected to the Peace of the Kingdom'.<sup>46</sup> Despite this humiliation — and the discomforts of seven weeks imprisonment — Lovelace does not resile from the terms of the *Kentish Petition* in his own petition to Parliament for release dated 17 June 1642, or in 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*'.<sup>47</sup>

The statements of acceptance of the major constitutional reforms which had taken place during the previous year or so in the *Kentish Petition*, 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' and *A Plea for Moderation* are interesting in this context. They could be read as calculated or cynical rhetorical flourishes, designed to smooth Parliament's sensibilities. On the other hand, there is evidence of real support for the reforms of 1641 among people who later became royalists. Sir Edward Dering had been one of the leading parliamentarians seeking ecclesiastical reform in 1641. Dering's subsequent opposition to the Grand Remonstrance infamously brought him into line with the moderates, many of whom (including Colepeper and Falkland) had also supported religious and constitutional reform short of abolition of the episcopacy.<sup>48</sup> Where did Lovelace stand on the constitutional reforms of the pre-war years? There is insufficient evidence to settle this question beyond doubt. However, we do know that Lovelace's speaker's allegiance to the king was not unquestioning. In the poem '*A Guiltlesse Lady imprisoned, after penanced*', Lovelace's speaker explicitly rejects Archbishop Laud's policy of prosecuting sexual transgressors who were members of the gentry and aristocracy in a manner more usually applied to the common people.<sup>49</sup> Years later, Hyde would in part attribute Laud's downfall to his alienation of the upper classes through his pursuit of this policy.<sup>50</sup> Lovelace's royalism did not necessarily include support for policies which had brought the king into disrepute with his own class. It is likely that Lovelace followed his fellow Kentishmen, Dering and Colepeper, and Falkland, Hyde and others less well known, in supporting other areas of ecclesiastical and legal reform, at least to the extent that reform assured the privileges enjoyed by the gentry and the aristocracy.

## **The Allusive Fields**

Lucasta has no voice in this poem. In achieving release from the shackles of courtly love and honour which bound him to her, Lovelace's speaker assumes permission to absent himself from Lucasta's chaste toils while he searches for a higher cause. In this poem, Lovelace implicitly differentiates his speaker's rejection of courtly platonic love for Lucasta in the first stanza from that of the love which brings peace, and which peace brings. He moves from the playful confines of courtly love, to the more traditionally political, masculine and therefore, in seventeenth century terms, serious and important discursive arena of matters of state. He starts his search for a higher cause in the third and fourth stanzas, where he first assays peace and war as objects of his love or possible ideological resting places. Unfortunately, neither is available. Peace so despises earth that she has fled, while war is 'lov'd so ev'ry where, | Ev'n He disdaines a Lodging here.' The pairing and personification of peace and war and the association of peace with love and plenty are conventional in art and literature of the period. The paired concepts were politically charged in the context of public policy debate of the previous decade over the appropriate use of 'love' and 'force' in monarchical government.

### ***Peace and War: Rubens and Lipsian Thought***

Throughout his reign, Charles I's counsellors stressed the need for the king to gain (or regain) the love of his subjects in terms which make it clear that this approach represented a recognised tool of government. The terms used by counsellors such as Strafford indicate that they were relying for their arguments on the work of the Dutch philosopher, Justus Lipsius.<sup>51</sup> In three recent essays, Malcolm Smuts has argued, in carefully qualified terms, that Lipsius's Tacitean thinking, particularly on the usefulness of the concepts of 'love' and 'force' as instruments of state policy, were more important in early Caroline government than has been recognised.<sup>52</sup> Justus Lipsius published major editions of the works of Seneca and Tacitus. He was a prolific author in his own right, and was responsible for two particularly widely disseminated and influential neo-Stoic treatises, *Two Bookes Of Constancie* and *Six Bookes of Politickes or Civil Doctrine*.<sup>53</sup> *Of Constancy* is the Lipsian text usually associated with Lovelace in the context of its representation of neo-Stoic retirement.<sup>54</sup>



To date, only Andrew Shifflett has given substantive consideration to the relevance of Lipsius's political thought to the literature of the period.<sup>55</sup> Shifflett focuses on Lipsius in a republican context. He specifically — and, in my view, wrongly — excludes any connection between the work of royalist poets like Lovelace and that of Marvell, John Milton and Katharine Philips's (1632–1644) post-Restoration (1663) translation from the French of a play by Corneille, *Pompey*.<sup>56</sup> He accepts the view of neo-Stoic retirement propounded by Røstvig, Miner and Anselment in relation to the royalist poetics of the war years as 'the conservative and reactionary phases of English Neostoicism'.<sup>57</sup>

Lipsian neo-Stoic political thought was an intellectual tool available to princes for use in governing increasingly complex states. Gerhard Oestriech defines the aim of Lipsian neo-Stoicism as being:

to increase the power and efficiency of the state by an acceptance of the central role of force and of the army. At the same time, Neostoicism also demanded self-discipline and the extension of the duties of the ruler and the moral education of the army, the officials, and indeed the whole people, to a life of work, frugality, dutifulness and obedience. The result was a general enhancement of social discipline in all spheres of life.<sup>58</sup>

Like Machiavelli's *The Prince*, Lipsius's *Six Bookes of Politickes or Civil Doctrine*, which first appeared in English in 1594, is a manual of practical statecraft. Lipsius acknowledges in the text that it is what he calls 'a profound sea of precepts'.<sup>59</sup> However, it is much more than a commonplace book. It is cogently argued and, as is the case with *The Prince*, the text is powerful and persuasive. Lipsius argues that prudential government is 'a skill to governe externall matters quietly and safely'.<sup>60</sup> Two elements are required to 'give peace, or settle the kingdome, *Force* and *Vertue*'.<sup>61</sup> 'Force', which is made up of arms, fortresses and colonies, is 'a defence which the Prince to good purpose joineth unto him, either for his owne safetie, or for the assurance of his kingdome'.<sup>62</sup> That is, 'force' is under the prince's control, is a necessary tool of government and has both external and internal uses. However, 'Wherefore *Force* ought to be used even of the best prince, [...] *Vertue* ought much more to be practised, wherein surely, as it seemeth unto me, the chieftest strength & charge of principallitie consisteth'.<sup>63</sup> That is, vertue is usually a more effective tool in managing affairs of state than Force. Lipsius defines 'Vertue' as 'a laudable affection of the king, or towards the king, profitable to the whole estate'.<sup>64</sup> It is thus a reciprocal feeling between the king (or prince) and his people. It has two components, 'Love' and 'Authoritie'. 'Love [...] Is a readie inclination, and liking

*of the subjectes, towards the king and his estate. Which conduceth greatly, or is rather necessarie, in the managing of matters of state.*'<sup>65</sup> Thus love, like force is both a central and necessary tool in government.

David Scott has recently taken Smuts's argument on the relevance of Lipsian thought one step further, arguing that 'Tacitist concepts and language were pervasive in English political culture by the mid-seventeenth century is beyond question'.<sup>66</sup> He examines the use Strafford (among others) made of Tacitean precepts of government in general, and Lipsian neo-Stoicism in particular. According to Scott, the broad principles of Lipsian prudential statecraft which Strafford applied both in Ireland and, later, on the mainland, included:

A deep-seated aversion to mass politics ('popularity'); an intolerance of religious dissent; a willingness to use extra-legal force in cases of necessity; a conviction that a disciplined standing army was essential to political control; and an appreciation of the role of money in enhancing power.<sup>67</sup>

He notes that, during the Second Bishops' War of 1640, Strafford emerged as a leading advocate for the use of force rather than love to resolve the crisis.<sup>68</sup> As Anthony Milton has argued, 'the final emphasis in all of Wentworth's dealings with parliaments was the need for them to trust the king'.<sup>69</sup> To an extent, Strafford disguises his philosophical shift from an emphasis on love to one on force by appropriating the benign term 'trust' — a term Lovelace picks up in this poem.

Lipsius was popular in continental Europe in part because he put a more acceptable, Christian face on the kind of Tacitean prudential politics, which were closely associated with Machiavellian ideas on statecraft, most notably the ruthless pursuit of power in the name of reason of state, and the ready resort to extra-legal force to achieve political goals.<sup>70</sup> Lipsian neo-Stoicism has previously been considered to have failed to achieve in England the popularity it garnered in contemporary France and Spain, not because English thinkers were indifferent to the revival of interest in Tacitus and other Roman Imperial historians, but because they tended to read Tacitus in ways critical of prudential statesmanship and princely power politics.<sup>71</sup> This received wisdom on the apparent lack of traction in England of Tacitean prudential politics may account in part for Smuts's care in invoking Lipsian political precepts. The fact that the *Six Bookes* was not republished in English for some centuries may also be relevant, although *Of Constancie* appeared

twice during the Interregnum.<sup>72</sup> On the second occasion, it was published by the royalist Humphrey Moseley, indicating a level of royalist interest in Lipsius.

Lipsian ideas were appearing prominently in royalist polemic by 1642. In *A Plea for Moderation*, the author devotes the last three pages of his fourteen-page tract to a call to all subjects to love the king and each other.<sup>73</sup> *A Plea* is similar in style to Lipsius's *Sixe Bookes* in that it is peppered with quotations, clearly marked as such in italic font. However, *A Plea* includes a larger proportion of scriptural references than the *Sixe Bookes*, probably with an eye to persuading Puritan readers. In a key passage, the speaker includes the characteristics of Pauline love found in *Corinthians* 1. 13, 'Love suffereth long': 'The Apostle goeth on to tell the nature and condition of Love: and do but view what characters hee puts upon it', the speaker admonishes his readers.<sup>74</sup> In the preceding paragraph, he writes:

And pray tell me, what is the cause why such mistakes and heart-burnings arise in the world, but onely the great want of charity in a number. *Love covers a multitude of sinnes*, saith the Scripture [...] Indeed love gains a multitude of good; good to others, to themselves who use it: and where can wee better manifest it then to those whome God hath placed in eminency above us?<sup>75</sup>

That is, love the king. He ends the tract:

There is much to bee said, but I shut up all in *Love*; [...] So it shall still be one prayer of my Petition, that there may be *Love* at the end of every thing; and I am confident such a Petition as this, needeth neither clubs nor swords to force its admission.

The tone is Christian; the sentiment Lipsian. The author is invoking the use of love as a tool of irenic state policy.

In 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*', Lovelace reflects Lipsian thought in the stanzas on peace and war. While I have suggested in Chapter 2 that the head of Lovelace's college at Oxford, Degory Wheare, may well have introduced Lovelace to Lipsius's work, in this poem Lovelace's references to peace and war as elements of state policy are probably mediated through iconic images of the early Caroline court, paintings by Sir Peter Paul Rubens (1577–1640), the allegory *Minerva Protects Peace from Mars*, and the large, rectangular panel of the Banqueting House ceiling, *The Wise Rule of King James I* and its pendants.<sup>76</sup>

Lipsian neo-Stoic political thought underpinned many of Rubens's major allegorical works on political subjects.<sup>77</sup> Mark Morford, for example, asserts that 'the Whitehall ceiling alludes to Lipsius' doctrines of Stoic prudentia.'<sup>78</sup> The

existence of a long-term relationship between Lipsius and Rubens of the kind that would enable Lipsian ideas to permeate the artist's allegorical works is uncontested and has received considerable attention.<sup>79</sup> Lovelace, a Gentleman Wayter Extraordinary at Court, must have been familiar with the Rubens paintings at Whitehall, given Rubens's position as the premier European court painter of his age and the symbolic importance of the Banqueting House as the location of major court activities. Rubens painted the major work *Minerva Protects Peace from Mars*, which represents Lipsian values, at the time of his successful diplomatic mission in 1629–1630 to the English court as an envoy on behalf of the Spanish king, Philip IV, seeking peace between Spain and England. He left the painting with Charles I as a memorial of his visit. Charles thought *Minerva Protects Pax from Mars* to be of sufficient importance to hang among thirty-five major pictures in the Bear Gallery at Whitehall. The allegory, devised by Rubens himself, depicts Pax as a mother accompanied by a group of small children.<sup>80</sup> She is expressing a rich stream of milk towards a clambering infant's mouth, potentially the 'rich swelling breasts increase' of the poem. The idyllic world of peace is defined by the familial community of relaxed women and children surrounded by plenty. Mars, who is being ejected from the scenario behind Pax by the helmeted goddess Minerva, is the nemesis of family life. The torch-bearing fury Alecto lights him on his way.

The iconography of *Minerva Protects Peace from Mars* is repeated in various panels and decorative strips of the Banqueting House ceiling. The role of peace as the ruler's main support and the protector of his people is brought to the fore in *The Wise Rule of King James I*, which was probably intended to be prominently displayed above the cloth of state.<sup>81</sup> Martin, author of the catalogue raisonné on the Banqueting House ceilings, notes that the panel was designed specifically in response to the irenic foreign policy of King Charles I.<sup>82</sup> At the time of Lovelace's imprisonment, the Court had had a recent reminder of elements of the iconography of Rubens's ceiling paintings. It was reflected in Inigo Jones's artwork for the last early-Caroline masque, *Salmacida Spolia* (1640).<sup>83</sup> William Davenant's text for the masque also wistfully celebrates the spoils of peace.

Lovelace's point in the third and fourth stanzas of 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' is that the usual political levers open to the monarch, peace and war — in Lipsian terms, love and force — are unavailable. England's political state is so

muddled as to confound both options. The king has lost both his people's love and control of the militia. When read today in the context of Rubens's paintings, these stanzas resonate with the stark contrast between the imagery of peace and war reflecting the halcyon pre-war days in Rubens's paintings and the collapse of Charles I's rule epitomised by civil war. For Lovelace's community of readers, the resonance was presumably greater, even before the collapse of court culture became obvious. At the time of the poem's publication in *Lucasta*, only weeks after the king walked out of the Banqueting House to his death, those resonances must have been extraordinarily powerful.

### ***The Body Politic***

In stanzas five to eight of 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*', Lovelace examines the main organs of government in the context of contemporary polemic. He uses the pre-Hobbesian 'body politic' as the organising metaphor for these stanzas. Parliament is 'th'fairest body that's beheaded', it is a parliament without a king at its head. Reformation of church and state requires a '*Sov'raigne* salve', that is, the king, to soothe its wounds and abrasions. The classical metaphor of the body politic 'stood at this time as the most familiar of all analogues for the commoweal'.<sup>84</sup> It had been prominent in Tudor and early Stuart constitutional debate and was so much of a commonplace that Pym opened his speech to Parliament of 9 November 1641 on the king's evil counsellors: 'It is usuall to compare *Politique Bodies* with the *Naturall*'.<sup>85</sup> Pym's use of the metaphor, which concentrates on the diseased parts of the body politic, is illustrative of its application at this time. 'Ill Councells' are like diseases of the 'Inward Parts', such as the liver, heart and brain, and are therefore harder to cure than outward maladies, 'For the Mischiefs that come by *evill Councells* corrupts the *Vitall PARTS*, and overthrowes the Administration of Publique Government'.<sup>86</sup> It appears in the introduction to *A Plea for Moderation* as a mixed metaphor linking the times with the English weather:

This age is much like weather we have had of late, Aguish, therefore distempered [...] There was a time when she was extreamly frozen, both in her Religion and Lawes, and almost lost by scarce feeling [...] the cold had so benumm'd her. Every one might then ghesse that this was not onely a symptom of her disease, but an absolute Ague-fit, fit to be purged.<sup>87</sup>

The 'times in which we live' elides here into the body politic, which has been purged to rid her of her ague and is now recovering.

John Milton had used the same metaphor to organise his argument in *Of Reformation Touching Church Discipline in England*, the first of his antiprelatical tracts, which appeared in late May 1641.<sup>88</sup> Milton argues that ‘a Commonwealth ought to be but as one huge Christian personage, one mighty growth [...] as big, and compact in virtue as in body’.<sup>89</sup> In a rhetorical flourish, he defines the politician’s task as being to establish ‘how to keep up the floting carcass of a crazie, and diseased Monarchy, or State betwixt wind, and water, swimming still upon her own dead lees’.<sup>90</sup> He relates his version of Menenius Agrippa’s fable of the belly, in which ‘a huge and monstrous Wen’ took the seat next to the head and argued for his enrichment at others’ cost.<sup>91</sup> A wise and learned philosopher answered the Wen’s self-serving arguments by exposing it as a ‘swolne Tumor [...] a bottle of vitious and harden’d excrements’, which should be cut off. The Wen is, of course, the ‘hatefull Tyranny of Prelats’, which must be excised:

if we will now resolve to settle affairs either according to pure Religion, or sound Policy, we must first of all begin roundly to cashier, and cut away from the publick body the noysom, and diseased tumor of Prelacie.<sup>92</sup>

It is impossible to establish whether Lovelace was aware of Milton’s *Of Reformation*. However, as a notably flamboyant use of the ‘body politic’ metaphor during these years, it forms an important part of the field of allusion in which Lovelace’s poem was understood by his readers. Although Milton’s tract was published anonymously, its authorship was known. The publisher and collector George Thomason (c. 1602–1666) annotated his copy ‘By Mr: John Milton. Ex dono authoris’. Both Milton and Lovelace were closely associated with the musician Henry Lawes in the pre-war years and may well have known each other in this context. Later, both were friends with Andrew Marvell. Certainly, Milton’s nephew Edward Phillips’s praise of Lovelace as a man in whom one ‘may discern therein sometimes those sparks of a Poetic fire, which had they been the main design [...] might happily have blaz’d out into the perfection of sublime Poesy’ has long been thought of as expressing Milton’s view, which would indicate that Milton was aware of Lovelace’s work.<sup>93</sup>

### **‘Religion’**

Lovelace opens his discussion of the organs of state with ‘Religion’, a theme to which he repeatedly returns. His speaker rejects ‘thorough-shot *Religion*’ on the basis that he does not wish to be associated with its supporters, who are also its murderers, for ‘he lives only that kills thee, | And who so bindes thy hands, is free’.

From a twenty-first century perspective, Laudians and Puritans alike could be seen to have fired the ‘Thorough’ projectiles which were killing the established Church of England in 1642.<sup>94</sup> Historians write of Strafford’s and Laud’s commitment to the policy of ‘Thorough’, particularly in relation to Strafford’s time in Ireland, but also to Laud’s ecclesiastical reforms.<sup>95</sup> However, there are some indications that this usage of ‘Thorough’ was limited to Laud, Strafford and perhaps their closest associates. As Charles Carlton notes, the term mainly appears in correspondence between Strafford and Laud:

Although in his correspondence to Wentworth he talked a lot about reform, about ‘Thorough’, a vaguely defined attempt to promote the public good over private interests and thus create an ideal society, such aspirations were more an outlet for his frustrations than a concrete, realistic goal.<sup>96</sup>

In print, particularly in the context of parliamentary debate, calls for thorough reform appeared in the context of anti-Laudian reform, often (but not always) Presbyterian in nature. The term featured in the petitions from Hertfordshire, Kent (the pro-Parliamentarian petition to which the *Kentish Petition* responded), New Sarum and Cambridgeshire during the campaign of early 1642.<sup>97</sup> It is almost certainly this sense that Lovelace adopts here: the Presbyterians are destroying the established church. He returns to this theme later in the poem. In *A Plea for Moderation*, the author puts a related argument in slightly different terms: ‘Because I would not bee a Papist, a Consubstantiate Lutheran or Ubiquitarian, an Arminian, a Socinian, &c. therefore I must be a Brownist, a Separatist, a Familist, &c nay an atheist’.<sup>98</sup> Like Lovelace, the speaker here explicitly claims the right to be recognised as neither a papist (or a member of a church with papistical tendencies) nor an extreme Puritan. Rather, he is to be recognised as a member of the established Church of England.

### **‘Parliament’**

Lovelace’s next target is ‘Parliament’. The sixth stanza opens with the conditional:

I would love a *Parliament*  
As a maine Prop from Heav’n sent. (ll. 20–21)

‘Would love’ implies that, in the speaker’s view, Parliament should provide an appropriate object for his devotion, a wife or a prop in the same sense that Christ was described as being married to his Church and the king to his nation.<sup>99</sup> The allusion is undercut in the next lines:

But ah! Who’s he that would be wedded  
To th’ fairest body that’s beheaded? (ll. 23–24)

The same allusion is used in *A Plea for Moderation*, where it is thematically linked with divine right theory:

Princes are like the bond of Wed-lock, once make them the Fathers of our Country, and wee take them for better or for worse: wee may perswade them, wee cannot compell them without breach of divine precept; once let them be the *Lords annointed*, and it is sacriledge to touch them, I meane unfittingly.<sup>100</sup>

The association in *A Plea for Moderation* of what might be read as absolutist divine right theory with the concept of the king being wedded to his country seems to open the prospect that Lovelace may be invoking Sir Robert Filmer's (1588?–1653) *Patriarcha*, or at least Filmer's more radical formulation of patriarchal divine right theory, in his poem.<sup>101</sup> This is conceivable, but unlikely. Lovelace almost certainly knew Filmer, who was a few years younger than his own father. Their Kentish family estates were in the same vicinity.<sup>102</sup> Filmer was close to Sir Edward Dering, and stood bail for Sir Roger Twysden (1597–1672) when he was imprisoned for his part in the *Kentish Petition*. Lovelace wrote an 'Elegiacall Epitaph' '*On the Death of Mrs. ELIZABETH FILMER*', probably one of Filmer's many daughters.<sup>103</sup>

However, *Patriarcha* was not in wide circulation in 1642. It did not appear in print until 1680. The king had refused his permission for a licence for publication in 1632, indicating a lack of open support for Filmer's theory. None of Filmer's ancillary works to *Patriarcha* were published before 1648. Both Anthony Milton and Smuts have recently discounted Filmer's influence on royalist political thought in the pre-war period.<sup>104</sup> Glenn Burgess canvasses the possibility that Filmer wrote *Patriarcha* for manuscript circulation among his Kentish friends, but concludes that this was probably not the case, on the basis that Filmer's intellectual interests owed at least as much to his Westminster and London friends, as to Dering and Twysden.<sup>105</sup> The generational difference between Lovelace and Filmer would militate against Lovelace being sufficiently close to the older man to gain access to his unpublished writings, unless they were in wide circulation.

For those who read 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' at the time it was published shortly after the Regicide, Lovelace must have seemed prescient. The (almost) inconceivable had come to pass. The king had lost his head. But in what sense was the body politic decapitated in mid-1642? The answer cannot lie in the *Kentish Petition*, which sought accommodation between the king and the two Houses. It is more likely that Lovelace's speaker is referring here to Parliament's



*Nineteen Propositions*, which went further in attempting to concentrate effective power in its hands than all its previous demands. A draft of the *Nineteen Propositions* was first discussed in Parliament in late May 1642.<sup>106</sup> The document was finalised on 1 June, and forwarded to the king in York.<sup>107</sup> Lovelace was imprisoned during these weeks in the Gatehouse prison, part of the old Palace of Westminster, where Parliament traditionally met. There is no indication that he was in close confinement, and it is likely that he would have kept himself informed of the ongoing Parliamentary debate. In the *Nineteen Propositions*, Parliament demanded, among other things, the right to approve all major appointments, including those of privy councillors, great officers and ministers of state; that all important matters of state be ‘debated, resolved and transacted only in Parliament, and not elsewhere’; that the government, education and marriages of the royal children be approved by Parliament; that ‘such a reformation be made of Church government and liturgy, as both Houses of Parliament shall advise’; strong action be taken against papists; Parliament to control the militia; and no new peers henceforth created by the king to vote in Parliament unless both Houses approved. When the king agreed, Parliament would settle the king’s finances. The *Nineteen Propositions* represented an extraordinary insult to the king. If he had agreed, the body politic would have been decapitated in the sense that its head no longer had the power to guide it.

*His Majesties Answer to the XIX Propositions*, drafted by Falkland and Colepeper, which was debated by Parliament on 23 June 1642, a few days after Lovelace was released from the Gatehouse, shows the (mostly) carefully crafted outrage with which the king and his closest councillors reacted to Parliament’s demands.<sup>108</sup> The *Answer* claims that the Parliament’s ‘Demands are of that Nature, that to grant them were in effect at once to depose both Our Self and Our Posteritie’.<sup>109</sup> Charles I would retain the trappings of monarchy, ‘but as to true and reall Power We should remain but the outside, but the Picture, but the signe of a King’.<sup>110</sup> In a number of places, the *Answer* invokes the metaphorical body politic. The king describes Parliament’s demand for the right to approve all major state appointments as a ‘strange Potion’, which is not ‘prescribed to Us onely for once, for the cure of a present, pressing, desperate disease, but for a dyet to Us and Our Posterity’.<sup>111</sup> In the famous section where, against Hyde’s advice, the king accepted Colepeper and Falkland’s formulation of England’s government as a ‘regulated

Monarchy' in which 'Laws are joyntly made by a King, by a House of Peers, and by a House of Commons chosen by the People', the benefits of a Monarchy are stated as 'the uniting a Nation under one Head to resist Invasion from abroad, and Insurrection at home'.<sup>112</sup>

### **'Liberty' and 'Property'**

In the seventh stanza, Lovelace addresses what were seen at the time as ancient English rights to 'Liberty' and 'Property', which had been guaranteed by *Magna Carta*:

Next would I court my *Liberty*,  
And then my Birth-right, *Property*;  
But can that be, when it is knowne  
There's nothing you can call your owne? (ll. 25–28)

Parliament's supporters had claimed the moral high ground as the protectors of the liberty of the subject and property rights since the Parliament of 1614. They strengthened their claims during the Short Parliament and the early sessions of the Long Parliament.<sup>113</sup> It was in this context that the arbitrary powers of Star Chamber, the ecclesiastical courts (particularly High Commission), and the High Court of Chivalry were contested and the courts abolished. As noted earlier, many of those who came to be recognised at this time as moderate royalists, including Hyde, Falkland and Colepeper, were strident critics of the appropriation by church and crown of discretionary powers previously exercised by Parliament and the civil courts. Lovelace's assumption of the right to criticise the king's adoption of Laudian policies during the Personal Rule on the one hand, while supporting him strongly on the other, should therefore not come as a surprise. His invocation of the terms 'Liberty' and 'Property' in the seventh stanza reflects the concerted attempt by the king's current advisors to reclaim the rhetoric of the role of guardian of liberty and property for the king, in the light of changed circumstances. They were in a position to do so following the king's assent to the great constitutional reforms of 1640–1641, which had removed as issues those policies which many in Parliament, including the king's current advisors, had considered impinged upon the rights of property and liberty of the subject.<sup>114</sup> The reforms included the impeachment of leading advisors, including Strafford and Laud; the *Triennial Act* which guaranteed regular parliaments; the abolition of Ship Money; the Act preventing the dissolution of Parliament without its consent; and the destruction of Star Chamber and the Court of

High Commission.<sup>115</sup> They made the king ‘appear a monarch committed to ruling within the law’.<sup>116</sup> The king’s advisors seized the chance to subvert Parliament’s rhetoric as the protector of liberty when Parliament claimed the right to call out the militia on its own authority; and of property after the king was refused entry to Hull and its magazine.

In *His Majesties Answer [...] to a Printed Paper [...] Concerning the Militia*, the king rejects Parliament’s claim that it has the power to pass a law to call out the militia without his assent, on the basis that, if this were so, Parliament would be as omnipotent as it argues the king is: ‘and then what will become of the long established Rights and Liberties of the King and Subject, and particularly of Magna Carta’?<sup>117</sup> Similar rhetoric appears in *A Plea for Moderation*: ‘Before, men preached for so much libertie, as it was indeed justly stumbled at; now [...] men preach for such a kinde of liberty as we would faine bee quit from, for fear of danger to soule and body’.<sup>118</sup> Parliament summarises its view of the king’s position on Hull in *A Remonstrance or the Declaration of the Lords and Commons* of 26 May 1642:

Another Charge which is laid very high upon us [...] is that by avowing this Act of Sir. *John Hotham*, we doe in Consequence confound and destroy the title and Interest of all his Majesties good subjects to their Lands and goods, and that upon this ground, That his Majestie hath the same title to his towne of *Hull* which any of his subjects have to their houses or lands, and the same to his Magazin and Munition there, that any man hath to his money, plate, or Jewells.<sup>119</sup>

In an effort to regain the moral high ground, Parliament strongly contested the king’s claim to effective ownership of his town and magazine as an ‘erronious maxime [...] the Root of all the subjects misery, and the Invading of their just Rights & Liberties’.<sup>120</sup> It was in the context of the debates over the militia and Parliament’s seizure of Hull and its magazine that Lovelace’s speaker could replicate Parliament’s assertions that all protections of liberty and property had disappeared: ‘But can that be, when it is knowne | There’s nothing you can call your owne?’ If Parliament could call him to arms without his king’s consent, and the king’s (perhaps specious) property rights be disregarded, what protections were left? By 15 July, when the king gave a speech to the people of Lincoln, the rhetoric was polished:

I come to you to assure you of my purposes and Resolutions for the Defence of what ever is or should be dear unto you, your Religion, your Liberty, your Common Interest, and the Law of the Land;

Parliament's actions were:

against the known Law, and an Invasion of my unquestionable Right, and of your Libertie and Property.<sup>121</sup>

Ownership of the rhetoric of liberty and property rights no longer lay solely with Parliament. The waters of the debate were successfully muddied.

### **'Reformation'**

In stanzas eight and nine, Lovelace's speaker welcomes the idea of 'Reformation':

A *Reformation* I would have,  
As for our griefes a *Sov'raigne* salve. (ll. 30–31)

The term 'Reformation' was in common usage at the time in the sense of a return to the true reformed Protestant church, although sometimes it slid into the broader context of reformation of church and state, which Lovelace appears to invoke here. In July 1641, a pamphlet attributed to William Thomason, *Regulated Zeal. Or, An Earnest Request to all Zealously Affected Christians, to Seeke the Desired Reformation in a Peaceable Way*, notes 'The generall crie (at this day) of the Kingdome is Reformation: and in truth this is now a verie seasonable and blessed desire'.<sup>122</sup> On 9 April 1642, Parliament declared that 'they intend a due and necessarie reformation of the government & Liturgie of the Church, & take away in the one or other, but what shall be evill, and justly offensive, or at least unnecessarie and burthensome'.<sup>123</sup> It became a kind of shorthand for the episcopacy debate, as is reflected in the title of Milton's pamphlet, *Of Reformation Touching Church Government*. The need for reformation, particularly of the Laudian church, was well accepted. In January 1641, for example, the royalist polemicist Bishop Joseph Hall of Exeter (1574–1656) called for 'a seasonable reformation, both in Church and State' in *An Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament*, the royalist originating text of the 'Smectymnuus' debate. Hall uses the same metaphorical framework as Lovelace's poem:

Many things there are doubtlesse, which you finde worthy of a seasonable reformation, both in Church and State. Neither can it be otherwise, but that in a pamperd full body, diseases will grow through rest. Ponds that are seldome scoured will easily gather mud; metals, rust; and those patients that have inured themselves to a set course of medicinall evacuations, if they intermit their springs and falls, fall into feverous distempers.<sup>124</sup>

In the manuscript text of 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*', Lovelace uses the term 'heavenly salve'.<sup>125</sup> In 1643, 'soveraigne salve' entered the polemical lexicon in a pamphlet sometimes attributed to Milton, *A Soveraigne Salve to Cure the Blind*.<sup>126</sup>

The topos returned to favour in 1647, when the nonconformist Henry Walker the Ironmonger entitled a short-lived newsbook, *Mercurius Medicus, Or, A Sovereigne Salve for These Sick Times*.<sup>127</sup> Lovelace's appropriation of the term in the later version of 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' thus represents an appropriate choice in a later draft of a poem which seeks to promote the king as the cure for all the ills of the body politic.

Lovelace's acceptance of the need for change reflects the strategy adopted by the king and his advisors during these months, namely, that the constitutional reforms of 1641 had been necessary. I suggested earlier that Lovelace's apparent support for reformation was not *prima facie* a rhetorical gesture, on the basis that many of the king's advisors had actively supported the reforms of 1641. However, the relevant section of the king's *Answer to the XIX Propositions* has a definite rhetorical flourish. It lists the concessions the king has 'willingly' made: 'For the better enabling them in this, beyond the Examples of any of Our Ancestors, We were willingly contented to Oblige Our Self, both to call a Parliament every three years'.<sup>128</sup> It is hard to accept that at any stage the king regarded the concessions of 1641 as other than having been extorted. Lovelace's speaker goes on to seek a conservative's reformation. He shifts the metaphor from the body politic to a watch with a rusty mechanism, perhaps alluding to Bishop Hall's rusting metal, and asks for:

a cleansing of each wheele  
Of State, that yet some rust doth feele:

IX  
But not a Reformation so,  
As to reforme were to ore'throw;  
Like Watches by unskilfull men  
Disjoynted, and set ill again. (ll. 31–36)

Lovelace, like Bishop Hall in early 1641 and the king's drafters in June 1642, glosses over the distinction between church and state government. His speaker accepts that 'reformation' of both is required, but not a reformation that would abolish the episcopacy. The possibility of establishing a middle way is made clear in *A Plea for Moderation*, where the speaker argues ironically: 'Because I doe from my very heart detest and abhorre the Hierarchicall power of Bishops, so farre as it is sutable to that power which, by degrees of usurpation, was gained to the Sea of Rome to make it so; therefore I must have no Bishops at all'.<sup>129</sup>

### **‘Publick Faith’**

The last potential object of devotion Lovelace canvasses is the ‘Publick Faith’, which he rejects on the basis that ‘she is banke-rupt of her store’ and ‘cozens all’.<sup>130</sup> On 9 June 1642, Parliament passed the *Ordinance of Both Houses, for Bringing in Plate, Money, and Horses*, to provide funding for the war effort. This was necessary, in its view, because:

malignant Men, who are about the King; some wherof, under the Name of Cavaliers [...] are ready to commit all Manner of Outrage and Violence, which must needs tend to the Dissolution of this Government, the destroying of our Religion, Laws, Liberty, and Propriety.<sup>131</sup>

Parliament is again appropriating the discourse of protection of ancient rights, also laid claim to by the king, in its efforts to regain the high moral ground. Although the contributions were supposed to be voluntary, the text of the Ordinance makes it clear that every member was expected to give generously, and soon. Parliament undertook to repay the value of these contributions at an interest rate of ‘Eight Pounds *per Cent*’ and engaged the ‘Public Faith’ to secure the loans.<sup>132</sup> Parliament’s approach to funding the war — coercive loans, many of which were never repaid — quickly achieved notoriety. It was reported in *An Extract of Severall Letters Sent From Yorke, Hull, France, and Holland*, printed only a few days later on 22 June:

That which our Cavaliers have most pleased themselves with, in their discourse this week, hath been the Censuring the persons of both Houses of Parliament, a List of many of whose Names they have in every Taverne, that have subscribed for Horse, Mony, or Plate.<sup>133</sup>

The royalist opprobrium aimed at those who subscribed in 1642 lived on. In *An Elegy Upon the Most Incomparable K. Charls the I.*, attributed to Henry King, the speaker abuses those who contributed:

See now ye cursed Mountebanks of State,  
Who have *Eight years* for Reformation sate;  
[...]  
You who did pawn your Selves in *Publick Faith*  
To slave the Kingdome by your Pride and Wrath;  
Call the whole world to witness now, how just,  
How well you are responsive to your trust.<sup>134</sup>

The provision obviously continued to grate. In both ‘TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*’ and *An Elegy* there is a real sense of outrage at Parliament’s appropriation of a concept that should be sacrosanct: the public’s faith in the nation and its government, let alone its much tried faith in the exchequer. This outrage is reflected in Milton’s sonnet ‘On the Lord General Fairfax at the siege of Colchester’ written when Sir Thomas Fairfax (1612–1671) was in command of Parliament’s forces during the

brutal seige of Colchester in 1648. It looks forward to a time after war's end when the commander will restore the public's faith in itself and its leaders:

Till truth, and right from violence be freed,  
And public faith cleared from the shameful brand  
Of public fraud. In vain doth valour bleed,  
While avarice, and rapine shares the land.<sup>135</sup>

Apparently, the disquiet at the gross misuse of terminology which should have been sacrosanct (and rarely is) was shared by both sides.

### **'The KING'**

In the concluding stanzas of the poem, Lovelace turns to the king as the only possible object of his devotion. The sense of these lines is that the speaker feels he has no choice:

XI  
Since then none of these can be  
Fit objects for my Love and me;  
What then remains, but th'only spring  
Of all our loves and joyes? The KING. (ll. 41–44)

He cannot envisage England without a king.<sup>136</sup> The stanzas are organised around the topos of the forces of light and darkness. Throughout, the speaker uses the commonplace of the king as the sun or a star lighting his subjects' way, 'the whole Ball | Of Day on Earth', the constellation 'Charles's Wain' in the northern night sky guiding the traveller's way.<sup>137</sup> As noted earlier, the metaphor of the king as the sun in eclipse had gained traction during the first Bishops' War. By 1641, it was commonplace. Sir John Suckling, for example, having alluded to it in 'On New-years day 1640', used the imagery prominently in his letter to Henry Jermyn (c. 1605–1684), written in the early months of 1641, before he fled to France on 5 May: 'for Majestie in an Ecclypse, (like the Sun) drawes eies that would not soe much as have look'd towards it, if it had shin'd out, and appear'd like it selfe'.<sup>138</sup>

The imagery of light and dark, sun and mist, dominated the panegyric welcoming Charles's return to London in late November after concluding a treaty with the Scots, particularly the poems in English in *Eucharistica Oxoniensia*, Oxford University's volume commemorating the event. To give just a few examples, Robert Chaundler of Christ Church wrote 'When Northerne Mists benighted our cleare day | Bright Sol must rise to force those Mists away', while 'I.T' wrote 'Rebellious vapours dare not then combine | When majesty draws neare'.<sup>139</sup> The Cambridge

volume celebrating the same event, *Irenodia Cantabrigiensis*, is, predictably enough, less effusive, although John Bond of St John's College, in a separately published Cambridge panegyric, *King Charles His Welcome Home*, uses the language favoured by Oxonians:

Welcome thou Sun of glory, whose bright beames  
 Doe so illuminate those obscure dreames  
 Of adverse Fortune, unto which we were  
 Late incident, by our quotidian feare.<sup>140</sup>

The Shakespearean echoes of Richard III's double-edged praise of Edward 'Now is the Winter of our Discontent, | Made glorious summer' in these lines are obvious.<sup>141</sup>

The forces of darkness which seek to eclipse the king's light and which blind his followers to the rectitude of his cause, the 'universall mist Error', include the Scottish Presbyterians, their English Parliamentary allies and the Independents:

XIII  
 And now an universall mist  
 Of Error is spread or'e each breast,  
 With such a fury edg'd, as is  
 Not found in th' inwards of the Abyse.

While *Eucharistica Oxoniensia* reflects concern at the social and political disruption caused by the Scots and their radical religion, it also celebrates the temporarily receding threat of the mist of war. The verses from Revelation on which Lovelace draws in this stanza have a particular religious connotation. In looking to a 'universal mist of error' in 'th' inwards of the Abyse', Lovelace appropriates the millenarian language of what Crawford Gribben describes as 'the defining text of Protestant apocalyptic', Revelation 20, and uses it in the king's cause.<sup>142</sup> In Revelation 9. 2, the Angel:

opened the bottomelesse pit, and there arose a smoke out of the pit, as the smoke of a great fornace, and the sunne and ayre were darkened, by reason of the smoke of the pit.

In Revelation 20. 1–3, the Angel came:

down from heaven, having the key to the bottomles pit, & a great chaine in his hand. And hee laid hold on the dragon that old serpent, which is the devill and Satan, and bound him a thousand yeres, And cast him into the bottomlesse pit, and shut him up, and set a seale upon him.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* is clear that, from the sixteenth century, the 'abyss' or 'abysme' (the archaic form) was used interchangeably with the 'bottomless pit', although it does not appear in translations of Revelation until later.<sup>143</sup> In Lovelace's lines, the smoke out of the bottomless pit becomes a 'universall mist of error'.



England, instead of being on the edge of the second coming, as the Presbyterians hoped, is on the edge of the abyss of civil war. In *TO LUCASTA. From Prison*, the errors of the Antichrist metamorphose into the Scots themselves, and their religion, as England's major threat.

A program of translating, publishing and republishing apocalyptic and Calvinist works, which had been banned under Laud's regime, began after the calling of the Long Parliament.<sup>144</sup> Lovelace was not the first royalist author to claim such millenarian discourse for the king. As Gribben points out, the millenarian tracts of this period repeatedly dwell on the concept of England as an 'elect nation', divinely ordained for a unique role in the unfolding of providence.<sup>145</sup> *Englands Doxologie* for example, attributed to 'J.L. in Art: Mag', which ran to two editions in September 1641, praises the peace which has blessed England for 'above these 80. years'.<sup>146</sup> Like *A Plea for Moderation*, *Englands Doxologie* attempts to find a middle way between Parliament and the king, one which embraces both the true Protestant reformed religion and the monarchy. It opens:

There is no Nation under heaven, that hath received more temporall & spiritual favours from *Almighty God*, then this Kingdome of *England*. Wat blessings can be nominated, which we have not enjoyed?<sup>147</sup>

'J.L.' also invokes the light and the dark:

Though our *workes of darknesse might eclipse the Sunshine of Gods goodnesse*, yet the *bright beames of the Gospell have gloriously shin'd upon us*.<sup>148</sup>

[...]

The black storme in the *North* is now dissipated, the dismall day is cleer'd up, and the faire Sun of consolation hath shin'd upon us; for the two Nations are united.<sup>149</sup>

The cover of *Englands Doxologie* appears to proclaim its royalist allegiance. The cover is illustrated with woodcut of winged angels holding a rectangular plaque with an image of the lion and unicorn on either side of a crowned CR. A separate section appended to *Englands Doxologie*, *A Briefe Relation*, praises Parliament for its 'Memorable ACTS, and prosperous Proceedings'.<sup>150</sup> In another pamphlet of early 1642, *An Alarum to Warre*, 'J.L.' encourages 'all his Majesties true-hearted, and valiant disposed subjects, here in England' to join the 'present Expedition against the Romish Rebels' in Ireland.<sup>151</sup>

Although the king claimed the metaphor of the light and the dark, its ownership was always contested. For example, Parliament's supporters attempted to condemn Laud in mid-1641 by transferring the king's metaphorical mantle to him as

a 'Sulphurous Meteor'. In *The Recantation of the Prelate of Canterbury*, Laud is likened to Lucifer:

Like to a blazing Comet in the North  
Drowning the Neighbour Stars, and casting forth  
A flood of fire, that poyson'd all the aire,  
And darkn'd light, thou didst ere-while appeare,  
Sulphurous Meteor, dangling in the skie,  
Thou thoughtst thou could the Sun with beauty die.<sup>152</sup>

Laud is figured as the fallen angel and prince of darkness, attempting to outshine God and the king. The author maintains some distance between Laud and the king, laying active blame on the archbishop for trying to outshine the monarch. Readers may have been expected to ask themselves to what extent the king was tainted by proximity. Later in the pamphlet, Laud figures as the beast, the dragon prophesied in Revelation to emerge from the abyss.<sup>153</sup>

### ***Mutual Trust***

Lovelace ends this rich poem with a statement that has been read as both a clarion call to support the king and an indication of his move to neutrality:

Oh from thy glorious Starry Waine  
Dispense on me one sacred Beame  
To light me where I soone may see  
How to serve you, and you trust me.

Is he saying that he should follow Strafford's advice to trust the king and all will be well? Or do these lines imply a lack of faith in the king and a neutralist desire to avoid conflict, of the kind which was central to the revisionist historians' project and which Hammond and Anselment reflect? Whichever way Lovelace's readers construed the stanza, it would have called to their minds Strafford's call to 'to put absolute Trust in the king'.<sup>154</sup>

Although it cannot be definitive, the printed contextual evidence I have set out points to Lovelace drawing again and again on the discourses of moderation put forward by those who, in the months leading up to the outbreak of war, supported the king and sought to maintain the monarchy. Many of these authors, most obviously Hyde and Colepeper, stayed loyal to the king and his successor until the Restoration, albeit with differing factional alliances. Sir Edward Dering, who has played an important part in this narrative, publicly returned his allegiance to Parliament in early 1644, a few months before his death. Where Lovelace alludes to those discourses 'owned' by the Parliamentarians, most obviously, the body politic and millenarian

discourses, he does so to assimilate them into a royalist context, thus subverting their meaning. The speaker's call to the king to trust him does hint that Lovelace may have had some doubts about the king's ability to choose his advisors wisely and to prosecute the royalist cause successfully — the kinds of doubts an intelligent royalist may have had following the disasters of the Bishops' Wars and the recent constitutional reforms. Nevertheless, interpretation of the last line of Lovelace's poem does lie with the reader. If the reader's starting position is that the only possible avenue through the current difficult times is to trust and support the king, then that is how the last lines of the poem would be read and understood. This starting position is counter-intuitive for twenty-first century readers who are unfamiliar with — and often philosophically hostile to — the concept of government by an (almost) absolute monarch. Many of Lovelace's readers were, by definition, royalists and would have read the poem from this perspective. Others could read it in different ways.

### **Contesting Vocabularies**

The whole of this poem is greater than the sum of its parts. The rhetorical structure Lovelace adopts in 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' exposes the fundamental breakdown of a common understanding of apparently simple terms among the participants. In examining each of the organs of state, Lovelace introduces the terms in a positive sense. 'Parliament', for example, is a 'maine Prop'. 'Liberty' and 'Property' are his birthright. A 'Reformation' would provide a 'Sov'raigne salve'. He then exposes the negative, royalist interpretation of the impact of Parliament's interventions in each sphere. Parliament is 'beheaded'. Common law rights cannot be assumed. The necessary reformation of church and state, if taken further, will destroy the body politic. Historians have noted this breakdown in the common understanding of important terms. Conrad Russell, for example, writing of the paper war between the king and Parliament of spring and summer 1642, suggests the extent to which 'the presence of the common language was masking the absence of any common meaning to that language'.<sup>155</sup> He argues that the pamphlets:

show parties which had grown much farther apart than they themselves seem to have been able to believe. [...] when Charles used the phrase 'the true Protestant profession', he seems to have been quite unaware that he was describing the same beliefs as Pym was describing when he used the word 'popery'. Other words, such as 'law', 'liberty', and 'privilege' were subject to the same misunderstanding.<sup>156</sup>

Kevin Sharpe suggests that ‘the shared languages and absolutes which had for long held their world together; now [...] obstructed a political settlement that might have saved it’.<sup>157</sup> Sharpe attributes the outbreak of war to this breakdown in understanding.<sup>158</sup> The king’s advisors made a similar point in the *Answer to the XIX Propositions*, indicating that they already recognised the nature of the problem they were facing:

If [various] Demands had been writ and printed in a tongue unknown to Us and Our people, it might have been possible We and they might have charitably beleevd the Propositions to be such as might have been in Order to the ends pretended in the Petition [...] But being read and understood by all, We cannot but assure Our Self that this Profession, joynd to these Propositions, will rather appear a Mockery and a Scorene.<sup>159</sup>

In ‘TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*’, Lovelace illustrates the breakdown in trust and understanding resulting from each side’s manipulation of previously shared discourses.

## **Endnotes**

<sup>1</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 49-52.

<sup>2</sup> The argument that the ‘Horatian Ode’ is a decision poem is explored in, for example Blair Worden, ‘The Politics of Marvell’s Horatian Ode’, *Historical Journal*, 27 (1984), 525-47.

<sup>3</sup> Wilkinson in *Poems* (p. 265) glosses the opening lines, which are syntactically difficult, as ‘I do not ask liberty from my prison but of thee, Lucasta, whose prisoner I have long been, in order that leaving thee for awhile I may be able to turn my fancy to anything else.’

<sup>4</sup> In terms of the main criticism to date, the following argue for an early date for the poem: Raymond A. Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1988), pp. 100-02; Gerald Hammond, ‘Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity’, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 71 (1985), 203-34 (pp. 211-15); James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), pp. 216-17; H.M. Margoliouth, ‘The Poems of Richard Lovelace’, *Review of English Studies*, 3 (1927), 89-95 (pp. 93-94); Manfred Weidhorn, *Richard Lovelace* (New York: Twayne, 1970), particularly pp. 69-71; Robert Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism: 1628-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 123-24. These argue for a later date: Wilkinson, *Poems*, p. xlix; Alexander Corbin Judson, ‘Who Was Lucasta?’, *Modern Philology*, 23 (1925), 77-82; Dosia Reichardt, ‘Some Unnoticed Lovelace Manuscripts’, *Notes and Queries*, 49 (2002), 336-38; Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England: 1640-1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), pp. 254-55 and Nicholas McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars: Marvell and the Cause of Wit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp.143–53. Bruce King, ‘Green Ice and a Breast of Proof’,

*College English*, 26 (1965), 511-15 is detailed and perceptive, although, in my view, his conclusion that the poem represents Lovelace's 'total demoralization' (p. 512) is too strong. Wortham, pp. 98-105, argues that Filmer was a primary influence on Lovelace, a view I later contest. Corns addresses the poem in passing (p. 244) in his section on Lovelace's later poems, in the context of Hammond's argument on Lovelace's neutralism. Dosia Reichardt, 'Looking For Lovelace: Identity, Style and Inheritance in the Poetry of the Interregnum', (Unpublished PhD thesis, James Cook University, 2003), pp. 33-34, summarises work to date. Reichardt, in 'Some Unnoticed Lovelace Manuscripts', identifies an interesting early variant text. Bronwen Price, "'Th'inwards of th'Abyse': Questions of the Subject in Lovelace's Poetry', *English: The Journal of the English Association*, 43 (1994), 117-37 (pp. 124-28) provides a depoliticised analysis.

<sup>5</sup> Judson, 'Who Was Lucasta?', p. 80.

<sup>6</sup> Strafford's use during the 1630s of the argument that the only road open to the loyal subject is to trust the king is discussed, for example, in Anthony Milton, 'Thomas Wentworth and the Political Thought of the Personal Rule', in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621-1641*, ed. J.F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 133-56 (particularly pp. 144-47).

<sup>7</sup> Ch. 4.

<sup>8</sup> Hammond, 'Uses of Obscurity', p. 215.

<sup>9</sup> Hammond, p. 216.

<sup>10</sup> Margoliouth, 'Poems of Richard Lovelace', pp. 93-94; Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism*, p. 123.

<sup>11</sup> *Poems*, p. xlix. Wilkinson follows Hazlitt, *Poems*, p. 43. Margoliouth, 'Poems of Richard Lovelace', pp. 93-94; Hammond, 'Uses of Obscurity', p. 215, accepts Margoliouth's findings, as does Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism*, p. 123 and n. 10, p. 363.

<sup>12</sup> *The Petition of the Gentry, Ministers, and Commonalty of the County of Kent* (London, 1642); Margoliouth, *Poems of Richard Lovelace*, p. 94.

<sup>13</sup> Smith, *Literature and Revolution*, pp. 254-55.

<sup>14</sup> Reichardt, 'Some Unnoticed Lovelace Manuscripts', p. 338. Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 36/37, fol. 217.

<sup>15</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 102-03.

<sup>16</sup> *Eucharistica Oxoniensia* (Oxford, 1641), E. 179 [5]. This argument is developed later in this section.

<sup>17</sup> McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*. McDowell's work came to hand after this chapter was drafted.

<sup>18</sup> John Hall, *A True Account and Character of the Times, Historically and Politically drawn by a Gentleman to Give Satisfaction to his Friend in the Country* (London, 1647), E. 401 [13].

<sup>19</sup> Alexander Brome, ed., *Rump: Or an Exact Collection of the Choycest Poems and Songs Relating to the Late Times* (London, 1662), pp. 47-49. The *Rump* and the 1649 *Lucasta* were printed at the same location, the Gun in Ivy Lane.

<sup>20</sup> Among the few royalist satirists contributing to political debate recorded in the Thomason Tracts for the months in 1641-1642, before the royalist propaganda machine was established in Oxford, John Taylor's prolific writing dominates the field. John Taylor, *Mad Fashions, Od fashions, All Out of Fashions, or, The Emblems of These Distracted Times* (London, 1642), E. 138 [30], provides a good visual and textual example of the use of the world upside down topos at the time; it is bound with documents printed in March 1642. See also *Newes, True Newes, Laudable Newes, Citie Newes, Court News, Countrey Newes: The World Is Mad, Or It Is a Mad World My Masters* (London, 1642), E. 144 [3], for another example of this topos.

<sup>21</sup> *LJ*, 28 March 1642, accessed 30 November 2009. John Digby, Earl of Bristol, was imprisoned for 'concealing' the *Kentish Petition* after he was shown it by Malet, who had presided over the Maidstone Assizes to which it was presented; Malet was in an unfortunately vulnerable position: he was probably the only judge sitting on the woolsacks during the debate of 28 March. See T.P.S. Woods, *Prelude to Civil War, 1642: Mr. Justice Malet and the Kentish Petitions* (Salisbury: Michael Russell, 1980), pp. 52-57.

<sup>22</sup> Brome, ed., *Rump* (1662), p. 47.

<sup>23</sup> Archbishop Laud was imprisoned in the Tower on 1 March 1641 and remained there until his execution in 1645. On the twelve bishops, see *CJ*, 30 December 1641 and *LJ*, 5 May 1642, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>24</sup> *Posthume Poems*, pp. 33-34, 40-41.

<sup>25</sup> C.f. McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, p. 150. McDowell argues that as Horace's epodes were written at a critical point in the history of the Roman civil wars, just as the Republic fell, so Lovelace's epode was written just as the monarchy collapsed.

<sup>26</sup> Including by Jonson, Beaumont and Fanshawe; D.S. Carne-Ross and Kenneth Haynes, eds., *Horace in English* (London: Penguin Books, 1996), p. 555. See also Thomas Randolph, *Poems, With The Muses Looking-Glasse and Amyntas*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1640), pp. 30-32.

<sup>27</sup> Ian Donaldson, ed., *Ben Jonson* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 293-97. All subsequent quotations from Jonson's poems are from this edition, unless otherwise stated.

<sup>28</sup> Jonson, *Poems*, n., pp. 675-677.

<sup>29</sup> *OED Online*, meaning 1 c, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>30</sup> Reichardt, 'Some Unnoticed Lovelace Manuscripts'.

<sup>31</sup> Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, 4 vols (London: Mansell, 1980-1993), II, 2, p. 15, LoR 28.

<sup>32</sup> William Henry Black, *A Descriptive, Analytical, and Critical Catalogue of the Manuscripts Bequeathed unto the University of Oxford by Elias Ashmole, Esq.* (Oxford, 1845), p. 30, n. 214. The manuscripts in MS Ashmole 36/37 bound close to Lovelace's poem relate to events as diverse in time as Strafford's death (fol. 214) and 'The 6 observations of the year 1677' (fol. 218<sup>b</sup>). Reichardt notes

the major variants, including that the first stanza is absent from the manuscript and some stanzas appear in a different order, in her article, where the manuscript is transcribed.

<sup>33</sup> I discuss the significance of this change later in this section.

<sup>34</sup> The events relating to the presentation of the *Kentish Petition* are set out in detail in Ch. 2. For a general account, see Woods, *Prelude*.

<sup>35</sup> The ‘paper war’ is described, for example, in Conrad Russell, *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637-1642* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 504-11.

<sup>36</sup> Michael Mendle, *Dangerous Positions: Mixed Government, the Estates of the Realm, and the Making of the Answer to the XIX Propositions* (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1995), p. 5.

<sup>37</sup> *CJ*, 7 April 1642, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>38</sup> D’Ewes, 30 April 1642 in Willson Havelock Coates, Anne Steele Young, and Vernon F. Snow, eds., *The Private Journals of the Long Parliament*, 3 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982-92), II, p. 249.

<sup>39</sup> McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, p. 149, contests Margoliouth’s argument here.

<sup>40</sup> *Kentish Petition*, clause 1.

<sup>41</sup> Margoliouth, *Poems of Richard Lovelace*, p. 94. Specifically, clauses 2-7 on Religion; clause 17 on Parliament; clauses 12 and 13 on Liberty and Property.

<sup>42</sup> *A Plea for Moderation* (London, 1642), E. 143 [7]. Mendle, *Dangerous Positions*, pp. 180-81.

<sup>43</sup> Mendle, p. 180.

<sup>44</sup> Mendle, p. 180.

<sup>45</sup> See Ch. 2.

<sup>46</sup> *CJ*, 30 April 1642, accessed 30 November 2009. Hammond, pp. 216-17; c.f. McDowell, p. 148.

<sup>47</sup> House of Lords HL/PO/JO/10/1/125A, reproduced at Appendix III.

<sup>48</sup> S.P. Salt, ‘Dering, Sir Edward (1625-1684)’, *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009. Derek Hirst, ‘The Defection of Sir Edward Dering, 1640-1641’, *Historical Journal*, 15 (1972), 193-208. For a recent examination of the tangled issue of the lack of any predictive relationship between members’ voting patterns during the opening months of the Long Parliament and their allegiance during the war years, see John Adamson, *The Noble Revolt: The Overthrow of Charles I* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2007), pp. 181-86.

<sup>49</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 106-08; see also Ch. 2.

<sup>50</sup> Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols (Oxford: 1888), I, p.125; See also I, pp. 372-73 specifically on the abolition of High Commission.

<sup>51</sup> R. Malcolm Smuts, ‘Political Thought in Early Stuart Britain’, in *A Companion to Stuart Britain*, ed. Barry Coward (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003), 271-89 (p. 286).

<sup>52</sup> R. Malcolm Smuts, ‘Force, Love and Authority in Caroline Political Culture’, in *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*, ed. Ian Atherton and Julie

Sanders (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 28-49; R. Malcolm Smuts, 'The Court and the Emergence of a Royalist Party', in *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars*, ed. Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 43-65. See also David Scott, 'Counsel and Cabal in the King's Party, 1642-1646', in *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars*, ed. Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 112-35. The standard work on Lipsian neo-Stoicism remains Gerhard Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State*, ed. Brigitta Oestreich and H.G. Koenigsberger, trans. David McLintock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982). Other helpful introductions to Lipsian political thought include J.H.M. Salmon, 'Stoicism and Roman Example: Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 50 (1989), 199-225; Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government, 1572-1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 45-64. See also 'Introduction'.

<sup>53</sup> *De Constantia* (1584) was translated into English by Sir John Stradling in 1595 as *Two Bookes Of Constancie*. Justus Lipsius, *On Constancy*, ed. John Sellars, trans. Sir John Stradling (Exeter: Bristol Phoenix Press, 2006) and *Politicorum Libri Sex* (1589), translated by William Jones in 1594 as *Six Bookes of Politickes or Civil Doctrine*. According to Oestreich (p. 5), Lipsius's treatment of military affairs in *Politicorum Libri Sex* stimulated the Dutch military reforms. Lipsius's *De Militia Romana*, a commentary on Polybius (1595-96) and *Polioreticon*, a description of ancient combat technique (1595) are also relevant here.

<sup>54</sup> See Chs 4 and 7.

<sup>55</sup> Andrew Shifflett, *Stoicism, Politics, and Literature in the Age of Milton: War and Peace Reconciled* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

<sup>56</sup> Shifflett, Ch. 3. Warren Chernaik, 'Philips, Katharine (1632-1664)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>57</sup> Shifflett, p. 7.

<sup>58</sup> Oestreich, *Neostoicism*, p. 7. See also Salmon, *Stoicism and Roman Example*, and Tuck, *Philosophy and Government*, pp. 45-64.

<sup>59</sup> Justus Lipsius, *Six Bookes of Politickes or Civil Doctrine*, trans. William Jones (London, 1594), p. 72.

<sup>60</sup> Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 66. These definitions have also appeared, for example, in Smuts, 'Political Thought in Early Stuart Britain', (p. 286); Smuts, 'Force, Love and Authority', (p. 29). I have repeated them because they give a flavour of Lipsius's literary style.

<sup>61</sup> Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 72.

<sup>62</sup> Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 73.

<sup>63</sup> Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 74.

<sup>64</sup> Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 74.

<sup>65</sup> Lipsius, *Six Bookes*, p. 75.



<sup>66</sup> Scott, 'Counsel and Cabal' p. 134.

<sup>67</sup> Scott, p. 130.

<sup>68</sup> Scott, p. 130; Smuts, 'Force, Love and Authority', p. 41.

<sup>69</sup> Milton, 'Thomas Wentworth', p. 148.

<sup>70</sup> Scott, p. 128.

<sup>71</sup> Scott, p. 129.

<sup>72</sup> 1653 and 1654.

<sup>73</sup> *A Plea*, sigs. B3<sup>v</sup>-B4<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>74</sup> Better known now as 'Charity is patient.'

<sup>75</sup> *A Plea*, sig. B3<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>76</sup> Peter Paul Rubens, *Minerva Protects Peace from Mars*, 1629-30, National Gallery, London. See Fiona Donovan, *Rubens and England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), p. 74. Rubens' second relevant allegory of this period is *St George and the Dragon*, 1929-30, Royal Collection, Windsor; it is discussed in Ch. 3. The Banqueting House panel is also sometimes known as *The Peaceful Reign of James I* or *The Reign of Solomon: The Golden Age of James I*. There is a lengthy description of the iconography of the painting in Gregory Martin, *Rubens: The Ceiling Decoration of the Banqueting Hall*, 2 vols, Corpus Rubenianum Part 15 (London: Harvey Miller, 2005), I, pp. 152-61. There are relevant discussions of this panel and the importance of the ceiling as a whole in this context, including its relationship with *Minerva Protects Peace from Mars* in D.J. Gordon, *The Renaissance Imagination: Essays and Lectures*, ed. Stephen Orgel (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), pp. 3-10; Oliver Millar, *Rubens: The Whitehall Ceiling*, Charlton Lectures on Art (London: Oxford University Press, 1958); Roy Strong, *Britannia Triumphans: Inigo Jones, Rubens and Whitehall Palace* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), pp. 34-39.

<sup>77</sup> For a detailed examination of the relationship between Lipsian neo-Stoicism and Rubens's work, see Mark Morford, *Stoics and Neostoics: Rubens and the Circle of Lipsius* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991). See also, Donovan, *Rubens and England*, pp. 128-29; Martin, *Rubens, Banqueting Hall*, I, pp. 97-98; Lisa Rosenthal, 'Manhood and Statehood: Rubens's Construction of Heroic Virtue', *Oxford Art Journal*, 16 (1993), 92-111 (pp. 101-03); Simone Zurawski, 'Reflections on the Pitti Friendship Portrait of Rubens: In Praise of Lipsius and in Remembrance of Erasmus', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 23 (1992), 727-53.

<sup>78</sup> Morford, *Stoics and Neostoics*, p. 204. See also, Smuts, 'Force, Love and Authority', p. 37; Morford provides detailed evidence supporting his position, pp. 204-10. Martin, *Rubens, Banqueting Hall*, I, pp. 243 and n., p. 244, is not fully convinced by Morford's argument that 'the influential, neo-Stoic doctrine of Justus Lipsius determined the choice of virtues in the Banqueting Hall cycle' largely on the basis that Morford wrote before the 'Projects' were uncovered. It could be argued that the differences between the texts of the 'Projects' and their realisation provides evidence that Rubens

moved to a clearer implementation of a Lipsian iconographic program than that established in the 'Projects'.

<sup>79</sup> It is the subject of Morford, *Stoics and Neostoics*.

<sup>80</sup> This account of the painting is based on Rosenthal, 'Manhood and State', p. 105.

<sup>81</sup> Martin, *Rubens, Banqueting Hall*, I, pp. 152, 54.

<sup>82</sup> Martin, I, p. 152.

<sup>83</sup> Gordon, *Renaissance Imagination*, pp. 3-10; Millar, *Whitehall Ceiling*, p. 18; Strong, *Britannia Triumphans*, p. 15. The significance of the masque's title, *Salmacida Spolia*, is discussed in Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong, *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, 2 vols (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973), I, pp. 72-73.

<sup>84</sup> Kevin Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 111. A useful discussion of the use of the 'body politic' metaphor during this period is in Annabel Patterson, *Fables of Power: Aesopian Writing and Political History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991), pp. 111-39. See also David Hale, *The Body Politic: A Political Metaphor in Renaissance English Literature* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971).

<sup>85</sup> John Pym, *The Substance of Mr. Pymms Speech to the Lords in Parliament. Novemb. 9. 1641* (London, 1641), E. 199 [24], p. 1. See also, for example, John Milton (attrib.), *A Discourse Shewing in What State the Three Kingdomes Are in at This Present* (London, 1641), E. 160 [27]; and Alexander Leighton, *A Decade of Grievances, [...] Against the Hierarchy or Government of the Lord Bishops* (London, 1641), E. 172 [5].

<sup>86</sup> Pym, p. 2. For other examples of the diseased 'body politic' between late 1640 and early 1642, see *A Satyre Upon the State of Things in This Parliament* (London, 1640), E. 205 [3] (in Thomason's handwriting); Thomas Jordan, *A Medicine for the Times: Or, An Antidote Against Faction* (London, 1642) E. 135 [33]; John Taylor, *The Diseases of the Times: Or, The Distempers of the Commonwealth*, E. 136 [6]; and Taylor, *Mad Fashions*, E.138 [30].

<sup>87</sup> *A Plea*, sig. A2<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>88</sup> John Milton, *Of Reformation Touching Church-Discipline* (London, 1641), E. 208 [3]; Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, *The Life of John Milton: A Critical Biography*, Rev. ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 129-30, 43-44. In preparing this section, I have also consulted Thomas N. Corns, *John Milton: The Prose Works* (New York: Twayne, 1998), Ch. 3; Thomas Kranidas, 'Milton's *Of Reformation*: The Politics of Vision', *ELH*, 49 (1982), 497-513; Thomas Kranidas, 'Style and Rectitude in Seventeenth Century Prose: Hall, Smectymnuus, and Milton', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 46 (1983), 237-69; Patterson, pp. 128-31. Charles W.A. Prior, 'New Light on Milton's 'Fable of the Wen'', *Notes and Queries*, 54 (2007), 395-400, contains useful background material.

<sup>89</sup> Don M. Wolfe, ed., *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, 8 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953-98), I, p. 572. All quotations are from this edition.

<sup>90</sup> *Milton Prose Works*, I, p. 572.

<sup>91</sup> *Milton Prose Works*, I, pp. 583-84.

<sup>92</sup> *Milton Prose Works*, I, p. 598.

<sup>93</sup> Edward Phillips, *Theatrum Poetarum: Or a Compleat Collection of the Poets* (London, 1675), p. 160; Jonathan F.S. Post, *English Lyric Poetry: The Early Seventeenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 124.

<sup>94</sup> The literature on Laudian reform is vast. Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590-164* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987) is a useful introduction, as are the essays in Kenneth Fincham, ed., *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993).

<sup>95</sup> It is difficult to establish an adequate understanding of the application of 'Thorough' in England during the pre-War years. Ronald H. Fritze and William B. Robison, eds, *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603-1689* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1996), p. 514, defines 'Thorough' as meaning 'to govern absolutely, efficiently, in the interest of the Crown alone'. See also, for example, Samuel Rawson Gardiner, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642*, 10 vols (London: Longmans, Green, 1883-84), VIII, pp. 29, 67-68; Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), pp. 134-36.

<sup>96</sup> Charles Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987), p. 108.

<sup>97</sup> *LJ*, 26 January 1642 (Hertfordshire); 8 February 1642 (Kent); 24 February 1642 (New Sarum); 16 March 1642 (Cambridgeshire), accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>98</sup> *A Plea*, sig. A2<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>99</sup> The allusion is to the headnotes of the opening chapters of the *Song of Solomon* in the King James Version, which equate the lover's sensual affection for his new wife with the love of a king for his country.

<sup>100</sup> *A Plea*, sig. B2<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>101</sup> Glenn Burgess, 'Filmer, Sir Robert (1588?-1653)' *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009. See also Sir Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha and Other Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

<sup>102</sup> Filmer's estates at East Sutton were about halfway between Maidstone and Bethersden.

<sup>103</sup> *Poems*, pp. 47-48, n. p. 265.

<sup>104</sup> Milton, 'Thomas Wentworth and the Political Thought of the Personal Rule', pp. 134, 141, 155; Smuts, 'Political Thought', p. 285.

<sup>105</sup> Burgess, 'Filmer', *ODNB*, 30 November 2009.

<sup>106</sup> Unless otherwise specified, I have relied in this account on Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, pp. 514-20, supplemented by Gardiner, X, pp. 196-200. I have used Gardiner's text of the *Nineteen Propositions*: Samuel Rawson Gardiner, *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660*, 3rd rev. edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), pp. 250-54.

<sup>107</sup> *LJ*, 1 June 1642, accessed 30 November 2009.

- <sup>108</sup> Charles I, *His Majesties Answer to the XIX Propositions of Both Houses of Parliament* (Oxford, 1642), E. 151 [25]. Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, p. 517.
- <sup>109</sup> The *Answer*, p. 10.
- <sup>110</sup> The *Answer*, p. 11.
- <sup>111</sup> The *Answer*, p. 9.
- <sup>112</sup> The *Answer*, p. 18. I am not arguing here that Lovelace was engaging in the debate over Estates theory.
- <sup>113</sup> The literature on this subject is vast. For a general account, I have relied on Russell. Parliament's assumption of the role of the defender of liberty and property rights over time is described in Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), II, pp. 322-28. David Smith's account of the formation and convergence of the constitutional royalists, *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c. 1640-1649* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), Ch. 4, is relevant here, although I have not accepted Smith's model of 'constitutional royalism'.
- <sup>114</sup> Smith, *Constitutional Royalism*, p. 77.
- <sup>115</sup> Smith, *Constitutional Royalism*, p. 77.
- <sup>116</sup> Smith, *Constitutional Royalism*, p. 77.
- <sup>117</sup> Charles I, *His Majesties Answer, by Way of Declaration To a Printed Paper, Entituled, A Declaration of Both Houses of Parliament, in Answer to His Majesties Last Message Concerning the Militia* (London, 1642), E. 148 [13], bound with documents dated May 1642. The examples quoted here are representative of a large number of relevant texts which formed the 'paper war' between the King and Parliament in the first part of 1642.
- <sup>118</sup> *A Plea*, sig. A2<sup>v</sup>.
- <sup>119</sup> *A Remonstrance or The Declaration of the Lords and Commons, Now Assembled in Parliament, 26. of May, 1642*, (London, 1642), E.148 [23], p. 4.
- <sup>120</sup> *A Remonstrance*, p. 5.
- <sup>121</sup> Charles I, *His Majesties Two Speeches: One to the Knights, Gentlemen, and Freeholders of the County of Nottingham at Newark. The Other to the Knights, Gentlemen, and Freeholders of the County of Lincoln at Lincoln* (London, 1642), pp. 3-4.
- <sup>122</sup> *Regulated Zeal: Or, An Earnest Request to all Zealously Affected Christians, to Seeke the Desired Reformation in a Peaceable Way* (London, 1641), E. 160 [29], p. 2. The examples are multitudinous. John Taylor (attrib.), *The Divisions of the Church of England* (London, 1642), E. 180 [10] is interesting for its differentiation of the various sectarian positions.
- <sup>123</sup> *CJ*, 7 April 1642; *LJ*, April 1642, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>124</sup> Joseph Hall, *An Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament, By a Dutifull Sonne of the Church* (London, 1641), p. 4. E. 204 [5].
- <sup>125</sup> MS Ashmole 36/37, fol. 217.

- <sup>126</sup> *A Sovereigne Salve to Cure the Blind* (London, 1643), E. 99 [23]. Lewalski, *life of John Milton*, pp. 705-708, does not include it in her list of first editions of Milton's works.
- <sup>127</sup> *Mercurius Medicus, or, A Sovereigne Salve for These Sick Times* (London, 1647), E. 410 [15] and E. 411 [17]; John Gauden, *Hinc Illae Lachrymae: Or, The Impietie of Impunity* (London, 1647), E. 421 [6] and E. 540 [16], also used the topos at this time. The extended title includes the words 'Together with a sovereign salve, and precious plaisture'.
- <sup>128</sup> *The Answer*, p. 19. The detailed list carries through to the next page.
- <sup>129</sup> *A Plea*, sig. A3<sup>r</sup>.
- <sup>130</sup> C.f. McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, p. 148.
- <sup>131</sup> *LJ*, 9 June 1642, 'Preamble', accessed 30 Novemebr 2009. See also Margoliouth, *Poems of Richard Lovelace*, and Gardiner, X, p. 201.
- <sup>132</sup> *LJ*, 9 June 1642, clause 2, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>133</sup> *An Extract of Severall Letters Sent From Yorke, Hull, France, and Holland* (London, 1642), Thomason E. 151 [17]. The letter is allegedly from York, dated 17 June 1642.
- <sup>134</sup> Henry King, *An Elegy Upon the Most Incomparable K. Charls the I* (London, 1649), p. 5. The *Elegy* is inscribed in print 'January 30<sup>th</sup> 1648'. There is also a poem wrongly attributed to John Cleveland called 'The Public Faith'. It was printed with Cleveland's *Poems* in the 1669 edition and is referenced in Hazlitt, *Poems*, p. 45.
- <sup>135</sup> Milton, *Poems*, pp. 322-23; discussed in Lewalski, *Life of John Milton*, p. 215.
- <sup>136</sup> Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism* p. 123, notes that the last three stanzas 'evoke a nation self-blinded by wilfully eclipsing the sun of monarchical 'right''.
- <sup>137</sup> I have written on Charles's Wain in Susan A. Clarke, 'Royalists Write the Death of Lord Hastings: Post Regicide Funerary Propaganda', *Parergon*, 22 (2005), 113-30. C.f. Wilcher, *Writing of Royalism*, p. 124, who sees ambiguity between Lovelace's references elsewhere to Lucasta as that 'bright Northerne star' and the 'Starry Wain' here. While Lucasta is the addressee of this poem, this section focuses almost entirely on the king.
- <sup>138</sup> Suckling, *Poems*, pp. 84-86, 163-167; Sir John Suckling, *A Coppy of a Letter Found in the Privy Lodgeings at White-hall* (London, 1641), E. 163 [4], p. 1.
- <sup>139</sup> *Eucharistica Oxoniensia*; see, for example, the poems by M. Lluellin, Robert Chaundler, George Barlow, Ios Barker, Henry Vaughan, I.T., Wil. Bewe etc., sigs A1<sup>r</sup>- A4<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>140</sup> *Irenodia Cantabrigiensis*, (Cambridge, 1641), Thomason E. 179 [4]; John Bond, *King Charles His Welcome Home* (London, 1641), Thomason E. 177 [18], sig. A2<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>141</sup> Shakespeare, *Richard III*, 1.1.1-2.
- <sup>142</sup> Crawford Gribben, 'Passionate Desires, and Confident Hopes': Puritan Millenarianism and Anglo-Scottish Union, 1560-1644', *Reformation & Renaissance Review*, 4 (2002), 241-58 (p. 248). For a recent, comprehensive discussion of millenarian literature of the period, including a useful literature review see the 'Introduction' to Crawford Gribben, *The Puritan Millenium: Literature &*

*Theology, 1550-1682* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000). Older treatments include Bernard Capp, 'The Political Dimension of Apocalyptic Thought', in *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance Thought and Literature*, ed. C.A. Patrides and Joseph Wittreich (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), 93-124; Paul Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978); Katharine Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530-1645* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979); Tai Liu, *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution, 1640-1660* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1973). Liu is particularly strong on the activities of the Puritan divines and the fast day sermons.

<sup>143</sup> The term 'Bottomless pit', rather than 'abyss', is used in both the *King James* and the *Geneva Study Bibles*. McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, pp. 150-51, also argues the relevance of Revelation here.

<sup>144</sup> Gribben, 'Passionate Desires, and Confident Hopes', p. 252. Gribben names those by Joseph Mede, Thomas Brightman, John Foxe and Cotton Mather. This group of tracts stands out in any survey of the Thomason Tracts of 1641.

<sup>145</sup> Gribben, 'Passionate Desires, and Confident Hopes', pp. 252, 43. A good contemporary example (as opposed to a re-issue) is Henry Burton, *The Sounding of the Two Last Trumpets, the Sixt and Seventh: Or Meditations by Way of Paraphrase Upon the 9th. 10th. and 11th. Chapters of the Revelation, as Containing a Prophecie of These Last Times* (London, 1641), Thomason E. 174 [1].

<sup>146</sup> *Englands Doxologie* (London, 1641), Thomason E. 172 [20], p. 2. It is subtitled 'The Three Kingdomes Eucharistical'. 'J.L.' was a Cambridge scholar.

<sup>147</sup> *Englands Doxologie*, p. 1.

<sup>148</sup> *Englands Doxologie*, p. 1.

<sup>149</sup> *Englands Doxologie*, p. 5.

<sup>150</sup> *Englands Doxologie*, p. 10.

<sup>151</sup> *An Alarum to Warre* (London, 1642), Thomason E. 142 [6].

<sup>152</sup> *The Recantation of the Prelate of Canterbury* (London, 1641), Thomason E. 164 [17], p. 19, italics reversed. The pamphlet is bound among material from July 1641.

<sup>153</sup> *The Recantation of the Prelate of Canterbury*, p. 23.

<sup>154</sup> Milton, 'Thomas Wentworth and the Political Thought of the Personal Rule', (pp. 147-48). Milton quotes *The Earl of Strafforde's Letters and Dispatches, with an Essay Towards his Life*, ed. W. Knowler, 2 vols (1739), I, p. 239.

<sup>155</sup> Russell, *Fall of the British Monarchies*, p. 487.

<sup>156</sup> Russell, p. 487. Skinner, *Visions of Politics*, II, p. 309, discusses the term 'liberty' in this context. All Ch. 12 is relevant.

<sup>157</sup> Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England*, p. 118.

<sup>158</sup> Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England*, p. 117.

<sup>159</sup> *The Answer*, p. 5.

## Chapter Six — Lovelace, the Queen and Political Allegory: The War Years

Our desire to interpret literature in terms of a political code usually follows from the failure to crack its aesthetic code; we cannot be sure that the meaning most interesting to us was equally interesting to its original readers.

Lois Potter<sup>1</sup>

In this Chapter, I analyse two allegorical poems of the war years, ‘AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS. A Dialogue*’ and ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE, *His CHLORIS, ARIGO, and GRATIANA. An Elogie*’.<sup>2</sup> The poems attest to Lovelace’s continuing contact with the court and the issues it faced. They also reflect the damaging effect on the royalist cause of parliamentary propaganda, which promoted gendered perceptions of the king’s effectiveness as a monarch, in particular his perceived domination by his foreign, popish queen. In these poems, Lovelace assumes the poet’s role of loyal critic. The rhetorical strategy he adopts unexpectedly places him in alignment with parliamentary propagandists who prosecuted their attack on the royalist cause by exploiting perceptions that a degenerate literary culture, often specifically associated with the queen, was integral to royalism. As such, the two poems can be seen as interventions in contemporary royalist and parliamentary debates, both at the likely time of writing and on *Lucasta*’s publication in 1649.

In ‘AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*’ and ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’, Lovelace draws heavily on the metaphorical imagery of the pre-war masques, predominantly the queen’s pastorals. As Corns notes, the version of married chastity defined by the court masques before the war was ‘profoundly and explicitly eroticised’.<sup>3</sup> In the Caroline court, royal ‘power is equated with sexual potency, and courtly love is redefined as fertility rite’.<sup>4</sup> Corns sees the evident tension between ‘regal sexuality’ and ‘sexual anarchy’ as being kept largely in balance within the framework of the court masque. Because of their importance in the construction of the mythology of the royal romance, the court masques were particularly susceptible to parliamentary attack. As Worden notes, Marchamont Nedham (c. 1613–1678), editor of *Mercurius Britannicus* during the first Civil War

and thus one of Parliament's most effective propagandists, anticipated John Milton's equation in *Eikonoklastes* of royalist literature with 'dishonesty and escapism'.<sup>5</sup> From as early as November 1643, Nedham 'represented the court's taste for masques as symptoms of its falsity, which he would 'unmasque' and 'unhood' and 'undisguise'.<sup>6</sup> The court masque may have been a source of enchantment in the pre-war years. During the war years, it became susceptible to exploitation almost as a form of witchcraft, which ensorcelled its participants and viewers.

Parliamentarian propagandists like Nedham were able to subvert the positive interpretations of the evident sexuality of the royal marriage that the masques promoted into representations of a marriage in which the queen dominated her husband through her unbridled sexual power. As Purkiss notes, 'the queen's status as an enemy of the nation-state is elided with her disorderly conduct as a woman/wife'.<sup>7</sup> She refuses to be subordinated. She is a threat because she operates in both the public and the private sphere — specifically, in the king's bed. She is consistently represented as 'a foreign, bossy, politically influential Catholic who dominated her husband and interfered in public affairs with the ultimate intent to incline the king to popery'.<sup>8</sup> This negative construction of the queen's role is present in Lovelace's poems.

Jerome De Groot has also discussed representations of female gender during these years.<sup>9</sup> However, in my view, de Groot's Foucauldian model, which he describes as a 'binary nexus of interpolation and suppression', is too rigid to accommodate the complex reality of representations of the queen. He defines Henrietta Maria as 'a symbol of dutiful yet idealized femininity. Her example illustrated how Parliamentarian women were unnatural and subversive'. More in line with Purkiss and White, I argue that Lovelace and others effectively regard the queen as subverting the royalist cause. In fairness to de Groot, he modifies his position later in the text.

It is important to note here that Lovelace was not the only committed royalist to criticise the royalist leadership (including the king) and its policies at times. Recent studies have shown both Sir John Suckling and the Laudian apologist, cleric and royalist paropagandist Peter Heylin expressing doubts about the king and his leadership capacity before the outbreak of war.<sup>10</sup> In a letter to his political masters,



dated 13 February 1643, Gerolamo Agostini, the Venetian ambassador, noted that the queen's 'coming is not pleasing to his Majesty's good and loyal servants as she may by her influence do considerable mischief in the successful conduct of affairs'.<sup>11</sup> These poems by Lovelace can best be interpreted as the work of a person whose royalist allegiance belonged in one of the factions discussed in previous chapters; yet, nevertheless, one of those whom Agostini defines as 'his Majesty's good and loyal servants'.<sup>12</sup> The comparison with the poetry of Mildmay Fane, Earl of Westmorland, at the end of this chapter is particularly revealing.

As well as rehearsing metaphorical elements from the pre-war masques, in these poems Lovelace also draws on the metaphorical framework developed in the popular royalist songs of Henry Hughes (*c.* 1601–*c.* 1652), set to music by Henry Lawes. In the early years of the war, Hughes — and others — cast Charles I as the lachrymose, feckless shepherd Amyntor weeping for his lost love, Chloris, who had crossed the seas.<sup>13</sup> In 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS. A Dialogue*' and 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE, *His CHLORIS, ARIGO, and GRATIANA. An Elogie*', Lovelace borrows the names 'Amyntor' for Charles I and 'Chloris' for Henrietta Maria as a starting point for his coded consideration of aspects of the royalist cause. In doing so, Lovelace conforms with the parliamentary propagandist line that Henrietta Maria exercised undue influence over the king, thereby compromising his ability to rule effectively.<sup>14</sup> His speaker shares Parliament's position that the queen's promotion of the effeminising cult of platonic love, the ostentatious display of her Roman Catholicism and her role as the king's key counsellor substantially damaged the king's cause.

The poems' intertexts thus provide twenty-first century readers with a key to the code which Lovelace uses to mask the identities of his royal protagonists. They also illuminate the kinds of interpretations available to 'knowing readers' of these texts. More than thirty years ago, Raymond Williams noted what he called the 'medieval and post-medieval habit of allegory', particularly pastoral allegory.<sup>15</sup> Lois Potter discusses the dangers inherent in seeking to unlock perceived literary codes, including allegorical codes like those used by Lovelace. As she points out in the epigraph to this chapter, the desire to do so usually follows from the critic's failure to crack the aesthetic code.<sup>16</sup> However, following Potter's seminal work, it is well accepted that royalist writers of the period, including Lovelace, frequently resorted to

the use of generic and other intertextual identifiers. After the outbreak of hostilities, adoption of such generic codes and identifiers helped authors like Lovelace to circumvent parliamentary censorship.<sup>17</sup> It also provided sufficient distance to enable consideration of otherwise unpalatable matters, while at the same time helping to create a sense of shared literary consciousness and identity among ‘knowing’, royalist readers.<sup>18</sup>

In ‘AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*’, probably drafted after the queen’s arrival in Oxford in July 1643, Lovelace’s adoption of the persona of ‘Alexis’ opens a space in which the poet can canvass the kinds of doubts about the king which were difficult for a loyalist to express in print. His use of the dialogic form gives an almost operatic quality to the text, heightening the drama of the exchange in the reader’s eyes. Alexis articulates his concern that the queen has emasculated her spouse. He does this by recasting the imagery of the quintessential statement of the queen’s neo-Platonic ethos — William Davenant’s masque *The Temple of Love* (1635) — to expose the emasculated king’s inability to guarantee the safety of his queen or his subjects.<sup>19</sup> Lovelace equivocates on whether he will join the king, instead declaring his poet’s independence: ‘I move in mine owne Element’.

In ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE, *His CHLORIS, ARIGO, and GRATIANA*’, which was probably drafted during the months of Charles’s detention at Hampton Court in 1647, or shortly afterwards, Lovelace also refracts elements of the metaphorical framework of the country house poem. As is the case in ‘TO AMARANTHA’, there is evidence that Lovelace took a conventional amatory court lyric of the style popular at the early Caroline court and reworked it. He draws on the idealised representations of England in pre-war country house poems by Ben Jonson and Thomas Carew. He uses this framework to expose widely held concerns over the queen’s palace of Somerset House as a foreign, Roman Catholic, debilitatingly luxurious space. He contemplates the short-sightedness of courtiers (including his speaker) who occupied and enjoyed that threatening space during the pre-war years, and the resulting damage which accrued to the king’s cause, before turning to the hope for the future represented by the next generation of Stuarts. In doing so, Lovelace’s speaker restates his ongoing commitment to the royalist cause.

We now know that Lovelace was in sufficiently close proximity to the court at relevant times to have enabled him to construct these highly allusive poems.<sup>20</sup> As background to the political readings offered here, I look first at the origins of the coded names Lovelace appropriates. I then examine the poems from two separate perspectives. I read the texts in the courtly context of Davenant's *The Temple of Love*, Hughes's Chloris poems and Jonson and Carew's country house poems. I then place the poems in the broader political context of contemporary, contrasting parliamentary and royalist texts which represented Henrietta Maria as a causal factor of the war to a greater or lesser extent. Lovelace's rejection of pre-war courtly forms is revealed as part of a broader transfer of responsibility for royalist failings to Henrietta Maria, although Charles I is still implicated. Manuscript and published poems by Mildmay Fane, second Earl of Westmorland (1602–1666), provide a useful comparison with Lovelace's poems considered here. They expose how another royalist poet dealt with the complex issues of allegiance and loyalty thrown up by civil war in a public and a private context, using some of the same tropes and topoi as Lovelace appropriates. Thomas Cain's recent transcription of Fane's manuscript poetry, most of which was not published in *Otia Sacra* (1648), provides insight into how Fane made choices about the suitability of material for publication which are relevant to Lovelace's poems. *Otia Sacra* appeared when royalists could still hope for victory; *Lucasta* appeared after the royalist defeat. The manuscript poetry shows that Fane was less likely to criticise Henrietta Maria in published poems. Poems probably intended for exposure to his friends are more overtly critical of the queen than Lovelace's, as they lack the latter's light allegorical disguise. Fane is overtly critical of the king in unpublished, private musings.

These poems also reflect a notable shift in Lovelace's approach to writing on royalist political issues. I have argued that he composed 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*', a poem dealing overtly with the difficult political issues facing royalists in the weeks leading up to the outbreak of war. Once war broke out, he sought the cover afforded by allegory and the iconic royalist genres, drinking and prison songs, to canvass the complexities of his responses. By 1647–1648, he was also using fable in poems like 'The Grasse-hopper', discussed in the next chapter, to achieve the same effect. With the exception of the atypically reflective 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*', Lovelace's drinking and prison poems of these years largely fit the

roistering royalist propagandist mode, although they are more reflective than some. The allegories and fables represent more complex and nuanced responses.

## The Aliases

### *'Lucasta' and 'Alexis'*

'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*' and 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE' use aliases for the protagonists which would have been easily recognisable by Lovelace's community of readers. There is no reason to doubt that 'Lucasta', the female embodiment of chaste or pure light, actually existed, although there is general agreement that, as the Civil Wars progress, she fades as a person, assuming more and more the personification of both the royalist cause and the poet's imaginary muse.<sup>21</sup> W.C. Hazlitt noted in his 1864 edition of the poems that Lovelace assigns the name 'Alexis' to the poet's persona in some of the poems involving Lucasta.<sup>22</sup> Alexis would also have been known to Lovelace's readers as the pastoral singer/poet/shepherd who appears in Virgil's *Eclogue* II, where the speaker condemns Corydon's extravagant homosexual love for him.<sup>23</sup> This Alexis appears frequently in pastoral of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Thomas Randolph, in '*An Eglogue occasion'd by two Doctors disputing upon Praedestination*', corroborates the role of Alexis as Virgil's singer poet, one which Lovelace presumably found congenial. In Randolph's poem, Thyrsis responds to Corydon's question 'whither in such haste' with the news that Alexis has challenged Tityrus to a competition to establish who is the better poet: '*Alexis challeng'd Tityrus to day | Who best shall sing of Shepherds Art, and praise*'.<sup>24</sup>

Virgil's singer/poet 'Alexis' has a role beyond that of mere celebration of bucolic amorous bliss and heartbreak. He represents at times the classical poet's voice, the source of independent advice and guidance to princes.<sup>25</sup> This enduring topos was delineated by Jonson, including in his translation of Horace's *Ars Poetica* (first published in 1640) and in the introduction to the printed text of *Loves Triumph Through Callipolis*, his first masque for the royal couple performed at court in January 1631.<sup>26</sup> Jonson, in *Albions Triumph* (1632) and Davenant in *The Temple of Love* (1635) assign a similar role to Orpheus, another alias associated with Lovelace.<sup>27</sup> By casting himself within this classical framework, Lovelace

appropriates for his persona, Alexis, the role of poet as independent advisor to princes.

It is not surprising that there would be a renewed sense of the Virgilian origins of pastoral during the war years and appeal in appropriating it. Many royalists would have seen themselves as being in the same position as Melibeous in *Eclogue I*, having lost their lands and/or being in exile.<sup>28</sup> Virgil's *Eclogues*, which were, in turn, a Theocritan construct altered to suit Virgil's audience, are often mediated in mid-seventeenth century literature through Italian Renaissance pastoral, in particular Tasso's *Aminta* and Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido*.<sup>29</sup> Not all early Caroline poems in this genre share the self-consciously critical political edge which characterises the classical models and *Il Pastor Fido*. Some contributions, like I. Goad's, to Oxford University's commemorative volume on Henrietta Maria's arrival in Oxford in July 1643, *Musarum Oxoniensium Epibateria*, have a strong political edge but lack originality or subtlety.<sup>30</sup> Goad's dialogue 'Thyrsis. Melibæ' opens with the shepherds welcoming the return of jollity to the flocks in the face of attacks by dogs and wolves and, worst of all, one of their own, a 'mad Ramme', where previously they had only feared the 'Irish wolfe and Northern Bore'. Music has returned with Henrietta Maria:

The most glorious shepheardesse  
That Heaven's or Mortall Eye have seen,  
Her very shape proclaimes a *Queene*.<sup>31</sup>

Wearing a gold crown and carrying a silver crook, she has come back from the Low Countries and will settle the flocks. While Goad's poem attempts to occlude any criticism of the queen by engaging in a celebratory feast of praise, Goad fails to suppress all concerns. The king's absence is almost palpable in the poem — why has he not settled the flock?

### **'Chloris'**

The association between Henrietta Maria and the ubiquitous pastoral shepherdess 'Chloris' has been recognised by musicologists since the 1940s and accepted by literary critics more recently.<sup>32</sup> 'Chloris' functioned as an alias for Henrietta Maria at least from the time she played the lead nonspeaking role of Chloridia in Jonson's eponymous 1631 masque, while her liking for the role of the shepherdess in court pastoral was established even earlier. The Dutch court painter, Gerrit van Honthorst

(1592–1656), is known to have painted Charles I and Henrietta Maria as shepherd and shepherdess in 1628.<sup>33</sup> Henry Lawes set to music lyrics addressed to Chloris by a number of poets, including Edmund Waller and Henry Reynolds (*fl.* 1628–1632), the latter best known for his 1628 translation of Tasso’s *Aminta*.<sup>34</sup> However, most of the lyrics for Lawes’s Chloris songs were written by the little-known poet Henry Hughes, who seems to have been attached to Henrietta Maria’s court in some capacity, probably as a physician.<sup>35</sup> The tropes Lovelace uses in ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’ to describe Chloris, the gentle shepherdess with the bright eyes, the sweet breath redolent with the scent of the phoenix’s nest, appear repeatedly in the ‘Chloris’ songs in Lawes’s songbooks. These tropes were also staples of the pre-war courtly love lyrics of the queen’s circle, particularly those by William Habington addressed to ‘Castara’ and were parodied in the antiplatonic of poets like Carew, Randolph and Sir John Suckling.<sup>36</sup>

Not all songs addressed to ‘Chloris’ during these years necessarily relate to the queen. However, there is clear evidence that many of Hughes’s songs refer directly to Henrietta Maria. Two of these which are closely related to Lovelace’s dialogue ‘AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*’ refer specifically to Henrietta Maria’s dramatic landing in stormy weather at Bridlington in February 1643.<sup>37</sup> The first is entitled in Lawes’s second book of *Ayres and Dialogues* (1655) ‘*A Storme: Cloris, at sea, neer the land, is surprised by a storm, Amintor on the shore expecting her arivall, thus complains*’.<sup>38</sup> The second, which appears in Lawes’s third book of *Ayres and Dialogues* (1658), is entitled in the index ‘on the Queens landing at Burlington’ and in the text, ‘Cloris *landing* at Berlington’. This song, which appears in a number of manuscript and printed sources, opens ‘See, see! my *Chloris* comes in yonder Bark’. In a Bodleian manuscript copy, the title is given as ‘Upon the Queens comeing over’.<sup>39</sup>

### **‘Amyntor’**

In Hughes’s and Lovelace’s allegorical poems, ‘Amyntor’ is Chloris’s husband. Amyntor must, therefore, be an alias for Charles I. Dosia Reichardt, who also identifies Amyntor with Charles I, is almost certainly correct in claiming that ‘Amyntor derives from the Theocritan Amyntas and from Tasso’s Amintas’.<sup>40</sup> However, the origins of the representation of a feckless, lachrymose Amyntor,

enjoying his excessive grief, are more complex. There was a strong classical tradition, evident in Horace's *Odes*, condemning excessive grief, which Lovelace invokes in 'To his Deare Brother Colonel F.L. immoderately mourning my Brothers untimely death at Carmarthen'.<sup>41</sup> In this tradition, excessive tears were consistently considered to be effeminate.<sup>42</sup> In *Odes* II. 9, 'To Valgius. That he would at last leave from lamenting the death of his boy *Mistis*', for example, Horace warns his fellow poet against shedding oceans of tears on the death of his boy lover, suggesting that Valgius should rather sing Augustus's praises.<sup>43</sup>

The lachrymose 'Amyntor', whom many of Lovelace's contemporaries would have condemned for his effeminising, immoderate grief, became a stock figure of English court literature. He appears in Abraham Fraunce's (c. 1559–1592/93) *The Countesse of Pembrokes Yvychurch* (1591), Francis Beaumont's and John Fletcher's *The Maid's Tragedy* and William Lawes's song 'Charon, O Charon! Hear a wretch opprest'.<sup>44</sup> The *Yvychurch* is particularly relevant in this context because it is a compilation of key pastoral texts. The title pays homage to Fraunce's patron, Sir Philip Sidney's *Countesse of Pembroke's Arcadia*, published a year earlier in 1590. In the *Yvychurch*, Fraunce juxtaposes his translation of Virgil's *Eclogue* II, an example of the classical tradition condemning immoderate grief, against an adaptation of Tasso's *Aminta*, and Fraunce's translation from the Latin of his friend Thomas Watson's (1557?–1592) *Amyntas*, first published in 1585.<sup>45</sup>

Fraunce felt free to alter the names of characters in his source material to standardise them across the various works. He emphasises the mutability of pastoral nomenclature in the introduction to the *Yvychurch*:

I have somewhat altered *S. Tasso's* Italian, & *M. Watson's* Latine *Amyntas*, to make them both one English. But *Tasso's* is Comicall, therefore this verse unusual: yet it is also Pastoral, and in effect nothing els but a continuation of *æglogues*.<sup>46</sup>

There is no reason to believe that such flexible nomenclatorial habits changed in subsequent years. Fraunce shows here that he was conscious of the essential difference between Tasso's comic shepherd *Aminta*, who fails in his attempt to commit suicide and finally wins the lady, and Watson's tragic 'Amyntas', who weeps and dies. Interestingly, Fraunce opens his translation of Virgil's *Eclogue* II with a blunt condemnation of Corydon's teary love for Alexis: 'Silly Shepherd *Corydon* lov'd hartyly fayre lad *Alexis* | His masters dearling'.<sup>47</sup> It is not clear from

the text whether Fraunce regards Corydon as being ‘silly’ because he cries too much, or because the object of his affections is male, or his social superior. It is likely that ‘The Tragedy of *Phyllis*, complaining of the disloyall love of AMINTAS’, a broadsheet ballad that was first recorded in 1625 and reprinted during the war years, had its origins in Watson and Fraunce’s *Amyntas and Phyllis*. This establishes the ongoing currency and infiltration into popular culture of the pastoral texts which made up the *Yvychurch* by the mid-seventeenth century.<sup>48</sup>

The lachrymose ‘Amyntor’ would also have been well known to Lovelace’s literary community from Beaumont and Fletcher’s *The Maid’s Tragedy*. Beaumont and Fletcher’s ‘Amintor’ is ordered to forgo his betrothed, Aspatia, by his king, and to marry Evadne, secretly the king’s mistress, instead.<sup>49</sup> The conflict between monarchic right and personal honour, with which Lovelace is dealing in ‘AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*’, is at the core of the play.<sup>50</sup> This conflict is played out in highly gendered terms. Amintor consistently weeps rather than acts, disempowered by the fact that it is his king who has dishonoured him. As Peter Berek has noted, Amintor occupies a “‘feminized” relationship to the monarch’, while his devotion to both Evadne and Aspatia ‘is small in comparison to his love for his best friend, Evadne’s brother Melantius’.<sup>51</sup> *The Maid’s Tragedy* was popular. It was probably written in 1610–1611, was first performed at Blackfriars in 1613, and remained in print and in the King’s Men’s repertory for the next thirty years, with known performances in 1630–1631 and 1636.<sup>52</sup> We know that Lovelace was familiar with *The Maid’s Tragedy*. He mentions it in his second commendatory poem to Fletcher, ‘*On the Best, last, and only remaining Comedy of Mr. Fletcher. The Wild Goose Chase*’.<sup>53</sup> The currency of the lachrymose ‘Amyntor’ in the early war years is also confirmed in the dialogue ‘Charon and Amintor’, set by William Lawes, which opens ‘Charon, O Charon! Hear a wretch opprest’.<sup>54</sup> Again, Amintor weeps a sea of tears.

Henry Hughes brings together Henrietta Maria and Charles I as ‘Chloris’ and the lachrymose ‘Amyntor’ in the popular song ‘*Amintors welladay*’, set to music by Henry Lawes.<sup>55</sup> This song appears in a number of manuscript copies in the British and Bodleian Libraries as ‘Charles on the Departure of his Queene into France’ or ‘Upon the Queens Departure.’ It was almost certainly written to commemorate the queen’s departure with Princess Mary for the Low Countries in February 1642. It



was omitted from Lawes's first two volumes of *Ayres and Dialogues*, perhaps because Lawes considered that its identification with the king and queen made it too obviously royalist. Alternatively, he may have been sensitive to the use parliamentarian propagandists might make of Hughes's tearful text. It opens:

*Chloris*: now thou art fled away,  
*Amintor*'s sheep are gon astray:  
And all the joy he took to see,  
His pretty Lambs run after thee,  
Is gon is gon, and he alone,  
Sings nothing now but welladay, welladay.<sup>56</sup>

The highly contestatory nature of Hughes's verse is illustrated in the reference in the third stanza to Puritan iconoclastic destruction of the maypole around which Henrietta Maria had danced.<sup>57</sup> In the last stanza, Amintor rests his head permanently on the bank where Chloris 'us'd to tread' and floods it with his tears. He:

whisper'd there such pining woe,  
As not a blade of grass will grow;  
O *Chloris!* *Chloris!* come away,  
And hear *Amintor*'s welladay.

The king, Amintor, is represented here as totally emasculated both by Chloris's absence and by her assumed competence. He has let the flock wander. All he can do is weep and sing in mourning. His tears are so excessive that they blight the usually fertile bank on which he rests his head.

### **'Arigo' and 'Gratiana'**

Arigo and Gratiana are important in 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE' because they represent the royal succession and, thus, the continuation of the royalist cause. Once Charles I and Henrietta Maria are identified as Amyntor and Chloris, it follows that the 'Blooming Boy', 'Arigo', and the 'blossoming Mayd', 'Gratiana', the other named characters in 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE', must be two of the royal children. But which two? As Hazlitt pointed out, 'Arigo' is the Venetian form for Henry.<sup>58</sup> Wilkinson demonstrated that Hazlitt's identification of 'Arigo' with the queen's courtier, Henry Jermyn, could never be sustained, on the basis that 'Arigo' is Amyntor's son, not his friend.<sup>59</sup> Charles I and Henrietta Maria's third surviving son was Henry, Duke of Gloucester (1640–1660). It thus seems likely that Lovelace was referring to Prince Henry and his elder sister, Princess Elizabeth (1635–1650) who, together with their brother James, Duke of York (1633–1701), were under the guardianship of Algernon Percy, Earl of Northumberland (1602–1668) between 1645

and 1649.<sup>60</sup> They lived mainly at Syon House outside London, and spent time with their father while Charles I was under house arrest at Hampton Court between August and November 1647. Northumberland commissioned Lely to paint a series of individual and group portraits of the children.<sup>61</sup> There is a record of an ebony-framed ‘craion’, or chalk drawing, by Lely of ‘Mrs. *Gratiana*’ in the sale catalogue of Lely’s collections prepared after his death.<sup>62</sup> It is reasonable to assume that this is the ‘Gratiana’ who appears as the ‘blossoming Mayd’ in ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’ and in Lovelace’s delightful poem ‘GRATIANA *dancing and singing*’.<sup>63</sup>

Problems arise both in attempting to align the young Prince Henry with Lovelace’s description of Arigo in the poem and in interpreting the complex syntax of ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’ at the point of Arigo and Gratiana’s introduction. In the text, Arigo is described as:

armed so with Majesty;  
[...]  
Besides his *Innocence* he tooke  
A Sword and Casket, and did looke  
Like *Love* in *Armes*; he wrote but five,  
Yet spake eighteene.

As a younger son, rather than heir to the throne, the child Henry’s claim to ‘Majesty’ was tenuous. He turned seven in mid-1647, the earliest the poem was probably written, rather than the ‘five’ years mentioned in the text. As Loxley notes, Lely painted Henry in petticoats at this time, both in the group portrait of the three royal children and in that of Henry alone, indicating that he had not yet been breeched.<sup>64</sup> There is nothing majestic about the ‘helpless condition of infancy’.<sup>65</sup> Loxley sets out detailed evidence of consistent, well-documented rumours between 1643 and 1652 that Henry would be established on the throne and that the Lord Protectorship would be granted to Northumberland.<sup>66</sup> Charles I, when he saw the young prince the day before the Regicide, placed enough credence on these rumours to warn his son to refuse all efforts to make him king. The warnings dominate the printed account of the king’s final meeting with Princess Elizabeth and Prince Henry.<sup>67</sup> If Lovelace did expect that his readers would identify ‘Arigo’ with the young Prince Henry, he was awarding the boy the honour that would be expected to be granted to the heir presumptive.

It is not clear from the syntax of ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’ whether the cherubim fly into a celebration before the wars, or when the speaker and his friends

are recalling past glories in an empty grove, more or less at the time of writing. If the cherubims' first entrance was before the wars, Lovelace could not have been referring to Prince Henry, who was born in 1640 and who would thus have been little more than a toddler. At some imaginative stretch, 'Arigo' could be a poetically licensed reference to the young Charles II (1630–1685). Prince Charles appeared in a masque at his mother's behest, *The King and Queenes Entertainment at Richmond*, in September 1636, when he would have been just six years of age, alongside the young Duke of Buckingham and other sprigs of the nobility.<sup>68</sup> Predictably, he played the role of noble Britomart. The Yale University copy reproduced on *Early English Books Online* is anonymously inscribed 'this folly (as all others doe) had consum'd it selfe, and left no impression [...] had it not bin that much admiration was conceav'd at the great quicknesse, and aptnesse of the Prince', who appeared as 'the Sunne scarce risen'. Lovelace may well have attended this performance. The published text of the masque records that it took place a few days after the king and queen's departure from Oxford, where they had attended a number of celebrations, including the ceremony at which Lovelace was conferred Master of Arts. It is possible that Lovelace was conflating his memory of the young Charles II before the war both with the young Prince Henry in 1647–1648 and that other Protestant prince, Charles I's elder brother, Henry Prince of Wales, in whom so much hope had been invested. On balance, the first, simpler explanation, that Lovelace was referring to Henry, Duke of Gloucester and welcoming the possibility that he might ascend the throne, seems more likely.

### **Lovelace's Connections with the Court**

There is sufficient biographical evidence locating Lovelace in contact with the court at Oxford and in the Low Countries for unspecified periods in 1643–1646, and outside London in 1647–1648, to support the political readings of the poems offered here.<sup>69</sup> He would have had access to Somerset House, identified below as the probable site of Amyntor's allegorical grove, both before the wars and in later years, when the speaker revisited its empty, echoing halls. During the 1630s and early 1640s, the royal apartments at Somerset House were open daily 'to persons of note or quality', enabling gatherings to take place.<sup>70</sup> John Aubrey notes that the usually temperate Edmund Waller, who also wrote poems to Chloris, got 'damnable drunke' there.<sup>71</sup> Somerset House, close to the Inns of Court and the New Exchange, would

have been a convenient meeting place for young men about town. Lovelace could thus have been familiar with the palace both as a rising young poet and in his role as gentleman waiter extraordinary to the king, who visited regularly. There are other details linking Lovelace with Somerset House. It was next door to Arundel House, the London residence home of the second-most assiduous collector of works of art in England, Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel (1585–1646). Arundel's client, Wenceslas Hollar (1607–77), lived at Arundel House for some years.<sup>72</sup> Hollar prepared the engraving of Francis Lovelace's portrait of Richard for the frontispiece of the *Posthume Poems*. There may well be a connection between Hollar's engravings of items of ladies apparel and exotic animals and insects, and some of Lovelace's poems, including 'LUCASTA'S FANNE', 'ELINDA'S GLOVE', 'Her Muffe', 'The Snayl' and others.<sup>73</sup>

More importantly, Somerset House was granted to the Earl of Northumberland for some years in his capacity as guardian of the royal children between March 1645 and May 1649.<sup>74</sup> Lely's portrait *Charles I with James, Duke of York*, which is the subject of Lovelace's poem 'To my Worthy Friend Mr. Peter Lilly', was commissioned by Northumberland while the king was at Hampton Court between August and November 1647, at the same time as a series of portraits of the younger royal children.<sup>75</sup> The painting, which is often known as *Clouded Majesty* after the opening line of Lovelace's poem to Lely, has attracted significant critical attention and is not dealt with in this study.<sup>76</sup> It reprises the trope of clouds and mist which featured in writing on Charles I from the time of the Bishops' Wars. Loxley notes that Lely and Lovelace were both made free of the Painter-Stainers Company on 26 October 1647; that is, around the time Northumberland commissioned the royal portraits. However, Loxley may not be correct in speculating that Lovelace's access to Lely's *Clouded Majesty* was limited to a viewing in the artist's studio.<sup>77</sup>

Loxley suggests that Lely was allowed by his patron, Northumberland, to study works at Somerset House when he was painting the portraits of the royal family in 1647.<sup>78</sup> Depending on the nature of his relationship with the Northumberland household, Lovelace may have accompanied Lely on such a visit, or visited with Northumberland. The 'great and powerful hand' which beckons the speaker's attention to the jewels of the collection could be Northumberland's. Alternatively, Lovelace may have been recalling the king, Amyntor's, pride in

displaying his most prized works before the wars. It is at least possible that at the time he was drafting 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE' Lovelace, as Loxley speculates in relation to Lely, visited Charles I at Hampton Court, or was at Syon House during one of the king's visits there. In September 1647, it was reported that:

the intercourse of the royal family continued to be free and frequent at both Hampton Court and Syon House [...] Whilst with their father, the children were often introduced, not only to members of his court, but to the parliamentary or military officers who visited him.<sup>79</sup>

Perhaps Lovelace saw the royal children in the company of other artists and musicians. The manuscript account book for 1647–1648 recording the Northumberland household's receipts and disbursements shows that a 'Mr Hudson' was paid £6 on two occasions 'for teaching the Duke of Yorke & the Princes Eliz. to playe on the gittar'.<sup>80</sup> The first payment covered the three months to December 1647; that is, about the same time as the portraits were painted. It is likely that this is the 'Mr Hudson' who set to music Lovelace's 'Sonnet', 'Depose your finger of that Ring', and was thus known to him.<sup>81</sup>

### **'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea* to ALEXIS'**

In Lovelace's 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea* to ALEXIS', Amyntor, a well-known alias for the king, tries to persuade the singer/poet Alexis, the alias Lovelace uses to identify his speaker with himself in pastoral, to join him from across the sea. Lovelace specifically invokes the lachrymose Amyntor, who weeps an ocean of tears. In doing so, he weighs down his king with the connotations of effeminacy and excessive grief already attaching to the name in pre-war literature. The poem becomes a verbal dance of courtship, with Amyntor attempting to seduce Alexis into joining him in England. Alexis engages in the dance, wittily rebutting each of Amyntor's arguments. Amyntor yearns for Alexis's 'winged voice', an early reference to the classical poet's role as advisor to princes. In the last line of the poem, Alexis declares his poetic independence: 'I move in mine owne Element', while leaving open the possibility that he might yet join the king.

The poem has not received critical consideration, other than in the context of discussion of Lovelace's many poems of lovers' parting, or of Amyntor's identity.<sup>82</sup> This may be in part because it is buried at the back of *Lucasta*, where it is the third-last poem.<sup>83</sup> Perhaps Lovelace intended to hide the poem because it was contentious,

although it was more likely to stir dissention among royalists than censorship by parliamentary authorities. For twenty-first century readers, the text is so firmly anchored in early Caroline court culture that it only makes sense when it is read in that context. It is interesting for a number of reasons. It identifies Chloris, the alias for the queen, as the debilitating force which prevents the king from carrying out his duties adequately. Lovelace uses the structural conflict between order and disorder, which was integral to the pre-war court masque, to explore the king's impotence. The speaker then makes a feature of his statement of political independence from his king.

There is no evidence that 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*' is scrupulously autobiographical. Rather, Lovelace's speaker imagines how he might (or might like to) reply, should a royal suitor be courting him as Amyntor courts Alexis. The poem refers to events which took place in 1643–1644. In the text, Chloris is stated as being with Amyntor, 'the center of these armes e're blest | Whence may she never move'. There was only a brief period during the war years when Chloris could have been described as being in Amyntor's arms. Henrietta Maria returned to England from the Low Countries under dramatic circumstances in February 1643 and joined Charles I at Oxford in July of that year, events celebrated ad nauseam in the university's commemorative volume *Musarum Oxoniensium Epibateria* and in Hughes's songs, 'A Storme' and 'Cloris landing at Burlington'.<sup>84</sup> Henrietta Maria fled England in April 1644. The royalist John Tatham's poem 'Upon my Noble friend, Richard Lovelace Esquire, his being in Holland. An Invitation' places Lovelace in the Low Countries in the early war years.<sup>85</sup> Written before the autumn of 1645, Tatham's poem shares, in part, the focus of 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*' on the subject as poet rather than soldier. However, in Tatham's poem, Lovelace is represented as the royalist poet of wine ('Sack'), women and song, rather than as an advisor to princes. Female lovers ('Phillis'), male friends, wits, swains who write love poems and Althea summon Adonis back to England.

### **A Dialogue**

Although there is no extant musical setting for 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*', the poem is a dramatic dialogue. It is similar in form to Lovelace's

‘Dialogue. LUCASTA, ALEXIS’, in which the lovers spar over Alexis’s imminent departure using sexual euphemism with comic effect.<sup>86</sup> The setting is a maritime variant on the more usual pastoral background for such dialogues. The use of alternating voices would have heightened readers’ and listeners’ perceptions of the conflict between Amyntor and Alexis, which is integral to the poem. The more philosophical kinds of Renaissance dialogue have received considerable critical attention.<sup>87</sup> However, the particular, pastoral subset which attracted the early Caroline poets, including Carew, Randolph, Robert Herrick, James Shirley, Lovelace and Andrew Marvell (‘Thyrsis and Dorinda’) before and during the war years and the Interregnum has rarely been discussed.<sup>88</sup> Many of these dialogues were set to music by leading court composers of the day. They were published during the Interregnum in separately identified sections in the popular, royalist songbooks of Henry Lawes, John Playford (1622/3–1686/7) and John Gamble (*d.* 1687).<sup>89</sup> Like the rousing, royalist drinking songs which were often set in multiple parts, dialogues such as these may have been popular in part because they do not require costumes, props or orchestras, while the form itself recalls past court glories. They require just a few voices. Even the musical accompaniment is optional. Furthermore, any political content can be lightly concealed behind the allegorical framework.

### ***The King Unmanned***

The dialogue in this poem exposes the king as being unable to govern the nation — that is, to fulfill his royal role — because he is emasculated by his reliance on his foreign wife and his blindness to the forces of disorder at play in his kingdom.

Alexis avoids Amyntor’s first efforts to inveigle him away from Lucasta by trapping Amyntor into admitting his dependence on Chloris. Amyntor lovingly responds to Alexis’s query, where may Chloris ‘that glorious faire be sought?’ with the answer:

She’s now the center of these armes e’re blest  
 Whence she may never move  
 Till Time and Love  
 Haste to their everlasting rest. (ll. 21–24)

Amyntor is entwined with Chloris forevermore. Although Amyntor obscures this admission of dependence by moving the focus to Alexis and his love for Lucasta, the reader is left questioning whether a king should be so entwined with his lover when his realm is in peril.

In the pre-war court masque, the forces of disorder of the antimasque are quelled more or less effectively by the forces of order, represented in the personae adopted by the king and queen and epitomised in the final, harmonising dance. In ‘AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*’, this tension between competing forces is invoked, but it is never resolved, thus exposing the king’s inability to act decisively and effectively. Lovelace portrays the forces of order and disorder through competing representations of the sea god, Neptune, a primal force of nature, who will either assist or prevent Alexis and Lucasta from crossing the sea in safety. The king, Amyntor, sees Neptune’s power as being spent, his ‘fires are done’, he is under control, he will open his treasure to Lucasta when she crosses. In Alexis’s view, Neptune is still powerful. The forces of disorder have not been quelled. The ‘green God’ will only smooth the waters in order to ravish Lucasta. This is the ‘earth shaking’ Neptune that Milton invokes in *Comus* in his parade of sea gods in the song ‘Sabrina Fair’.<sup>90</sup> The poet expects his readers to see through the fatuousness of Alexis’s argument, which is based on a level of cowardice inconsistent with his speaker’s preparedness to oppose his king. Lovelace’s community of readers could not but be aware that Charles I had been unable to protect Henrietta Maria from harassment and bombardment by Parliamentary ships on her return to England in 1643.

Like Lovelace, Henry Hughes, using the same tropes, presented competing views of Neptune’s elemental power in his poems on the queen’s return to England. Lovelace’s Amyntor invokes the tame Neptune of Hughes’s song ‘Cloris *landing at Berlington*’, while his Alexis invokes the earth shaking Neptune of ‘*A Storme*’.<sup>91</sup> In ‘Cloris *landing at Berlington*’, Neptune rises from the deep with his Tritons and saves the day:

Behold, Great *Neptune*’s risen from the deep  
 With all his Tritons, and begins to sweep  
 The rugged waves into a smoother form,  
 Not leaving one small wrinkle of a storm.<sup>92</sup>

In Lovelace’s poem, Amyntor’s Neptune will still the waters:

But all his treasure he shall ope’ that day:  
 TRITONS shall sound, his fleete  
 In silver meete,  
 And to her their rich offerings pay. (ll. 45–48)

In Hughes’s ‘*A Storme*’, Amintor proclaims the violent Neptune’s lustful intent:



Help, help, o helpe, Divinity of Love,  
Or Neptune will commit a Rape  
Upon my Cloris.<sup>93</sup>

Following an evocative description of the storm, the goddess of the waters, Amphitrite/Tethys, saves Chloris from the sea god's rage. In Lovelace's poem, Alexis's Neptune will 'ravish' his Lucasta if she ventures across the sea. Rather than engaging with the mythological figures of the masque, he declares 'I will move in mine owne Element'. In this short sentence, Lovelace's speaker rejects the notion of unquestioning obedience to his sovereign.

In the poems under discussion, Hughes and Lovelace appropriated the metaphorical framework of William Davenant's 1635 masque, *The Temple of Love*, aspects of which he reprised in the last pre-war masque, *Salmacida Spolia* (1640).<sup>94</sup> *The Temple of Love* was the pre-war court's formal homage to the queen's *honnête* version of platonism. In it, Indamora, Queen of Narsinga, played by Henrietta Maria, crosses the sea to re-establish the Temple of Chaste Love in 'this island', Britain, by the influence of her beauty.<sup>95</sup> In Davenant's long antimasque, four groups of elemental spirits, described as 'fiery', 'airy', 'watery' and 'earthy', introduce a typology of the forces of evil at the early Caroline court condemned by Charles I: lust, debauchery, drunkenness and quarrelsomeness.<sup>96</sup> In both of Hughes's songs under discussion here, Chloris's crossing the seas is temporarily threatened by the elements, wind and water. 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*' is organised around a series of witty allusions to the four elements, earth, water, air, and fire. In metaphysical terms, these elements, which feature so prominently in Davenant's *Temple of Love*, were considered to form a sphere or spheres. Petrarchan allusions to eyes, tears and beams overlay the metaphysical framework. How can Alexis stay away, given that 'So much wet and drie' drowns Amyntor's (own royal plural) eye. Water is represented as both the ocean which separates Amyntor and Alexis and the oceans of tears shed by Amyntor and (prospectively) Lucasta, but not by the masculine Alexis. In the third to fifth stanzas of the poem, the elements dominate. England is 'Your watry Land'. Amyntor tells Alexis he should 'call on the helping winds' to 'rowle back' Lucasta's tears 'with kinder force'. Alexis rejects Amyntor with the witty retort that he has his Chloris.

The song which greets Indamora's arrival in *The Temple of Love* invokes the Platonic spheres. It precedes the dancing by 'Indamora and her contributory ladies', the implication being that the dancers' movement is as ordered and stately as that of the planets. The 'maritime chariot' which carries her and her followers 'was drawn by sea monsters [Indamora] sat enthroned in the highest part of this chariot in a rich seat which was a great scallop shell'.<sup>97</sup> In Lovelace's poem, the sea god rides a 'fell | Chariot of shell'. In Hughes's 'Cloris *landing at Berlington*', the 'Queen of Love' crosses the sea waited upon by sirens. Unlike Lovelace, Hughes accepts the king's ability to achieve order in the longer term. In Lovelace's poem, the untamed Neptune remains strong and the seas remain a threat. The king is not in control of entry points to his kingdom. Amyntor's failure to still the forces of disorder in Lovelace's poem exposes both the underlying weakness of the crown in the face of civil war, and the inherent instability of the representational framework developed by Charles I in the pre-war years.

There may also be echoes of Davenant's masque, *The Temple of Love*, in Lovelace's appropriation of the topos of the independence and power of the poet and his voice in 'AMYNTOR from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS'. In *The Temple of Love*, the poet is empowered as the instigator of chaste and unchaste love, the forces which impel and constrain the search for the temple of chaste love. The masque opens with 'Divine Poesy, the secretary of Nature' calling forth 'a company of ancient Greek poets, as Demodocus, Phaemius, Homer, Hesiod, Terpander, and Sappho' who 'first gave words an harmony, | And made false love in numbers flow'.<sup>98</sup> The ancients have been dead for so long that their song 'cannot relish now of sin'. It is the musician poet Orpheus, an alias sometimes given to Lovelace, who suppresses the antimasque of the spirits of fire, air, water and earth, the ungovernable forces of the natural world and human passions, so that Indamora can cross in safety.

In stating his reluctance to join his king, Lovelace is not questioning the well-recognised requirement that princes should seek access to independent counsel, or that poets should provide that counsel. He is instead arguing that this particular prince cannot inspire unqualified loyalty. If Lucasta and Alexis join Amyntor, it will be because they choose to do so. Alexis's declaration 'I move in mine owne Element' shocks the reader so much because, only a few years previously, Lovelace's speaker in 'TO LUCASTA, *Going to the Warres*', announced his flight

‘To Warre and Armes’ in such stark terms. The voice who loved ‘Honour’ more than love itself will now choose whether he joins his king or stays with his lover. In this poem at least, loyalty and honour are demoted in Lovelace’s vocabulary.

**‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE, *His* CHLORIS, ARIGO, and GRATIANA. An Elogie’**

Like ‘AMYNTOR from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS’, ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’ is susceptible to analysis as a coded text, a political allegory which again lightly conceals the real identities of the protagonists, Charles I and Henrietta Maria, behind the aliases ‘Amyntor’ and ‘Chloris’.<sup>99</sup> The logic of the text is that the speaker is reflecting on the distant, halcyon pre-war days during which Chloris presided over a grove of treasures. His train of thought is provoked by a more recent visit to an empty, echoing palace redolent with the lingering scents of perfumes and incense, which inspire memories of courtly entertainments and religious celebration. The speaker is initially overwhelmed by the excellence of this Arcadian, but not bucolic, grove which, in his mind, forever echoes Chloris and her glories and, in turn, glorifies Chloris. Subsequently, the speaker steps back and starts to recognise the artifice, the show exemplified in the grove. A great and powerful hand beckons him to a gallery of old master paintings by ‘Titian, Raphael and Georgone’, leading to brief consideration of the ubiquitous debate on the relative perfection of art over nature. He moves on to look at beautifully painted pictures of saints, and a great cabinet — in this context, a room — with intricately painted and decorated walls. He recalls times when he and his companions sat, thinking themselves gods, drinking from an ‘Oriental bowl’ among clouds of incense before an altar, praising Chloris. So drenched were they in wine, incense and tobacco smoke that they allowed themselves to ignore the gathering storm clouds, the ‘oppressing cares’. The dynastic hope enters in the form of two cherubim, Arigo and Gratiana. The Speaker returns attention to the nymph, Chloris, asking whether she should have foreseen the coming troubles. In the final section, the speaker hopes that the children of the ‘Blooming Boy, and blossoming Mayd’, the two cherubim, will never have to suffer the storms that they and their parents have experienced.

‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’ has attracted considerable critical attention. Early work focused on identifying Amyntor as the key to understanding the poem.<sup>100</sup>

While Hazlitt, Wilkinson and others sensed the allegorical nature of the text, more recent critical analysis of ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’ has largely been in the context of seventeenth century country house poems.<sup>101</sup> Others have seen it as a royalist poem of retreat and a celebration of hedonism.<sup>102</sup> Some attention has been paid to its obvious textual links with Marvell’s ‘The Gallery’, and Liam Semler has highlighted Lovelace’s description of mannerist visual techniques.<sup>103</sup> The long-standing, erroneous belief equating Amyntor with the courtier and collector Endymion Porter has hindered interpretation.<sup>104</sup> Once ‘Amyntor’ and ‘Chloris’ are securely identified as Charles I and Henrietta Maria, a different reading opens up. With the allegory unclouded, the politics of the poem become visible. Lovelace’s speaker is seen to be interrogating the queen’s contentious role as the promoter of Roman Catholicism in the fall of the monarchy and expressing support for a transition of power to a new generation of Stuarts, perhaps with the royal couple’s third son, Henry, as the dynastic hope.

### ***The Text***

There is evidence of considerable authorial reworking of the text of ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’. Leah Marcus is almost certainly correct in locating the poem as having been written in 1648, or perhaps a little earlier.<sup>105</sup> Internal evidence links the poem with the months Charles I spent under house arrest at Hampton Court in 1647, which Anselment describes as at first seeming like a return to the life the king had led in the pre-war halcyon days.<sup>106</sup> There are no extant manuscript copies which might indicate circulation before publication in 1649. However, Hazlitt records that he had access to a currently unlocated variant manuscript, entitled ‘Gratiana’s Eulogy’, which he considered to have been transcribed by Lovelace’s youngest brother, Dudley Posthumous.<sup>107</sup> Hazlitt, who attempted to collate the two texts, indicates where the 1649 printed version contains lines not included in the manuscript, and points out a few other minor textual variants. Hazlitt’s notes are not sufficiently informative to reconstruct the shorter, manuscript text with confidence. It is, however, apparent that the manuscript version started as a conventional compliment in iambic tetrameter quatrains using the established Petrarchan tropes of the early Caroline court lyric favoured by Habington and Hughes:

Her Lips like coral-gates kept in  
The perfume and the pearle within;  
Her eyes a double-flaming torch  
That always shine and never scorch (ll. 7–10)

Balme and Nard, and each perfume  
To blesse this payre chase and consume;  
And the *Phœnix*, see! already fries!  
Her Neast a fire in *Chloris* eyes! (ll. 25–28)

For these I aske without a tush,  
Can kisse or touch, without a blush,  
And we are taught that *Substance* is,  
If uninjoy'd, but th' shade of blisse. (ll. 41–44)

If Hazlitt's manuscript had ended at this point, it would have constituted irrefutable evidence that Lovelace built on a short, pre-existing court compliment in constructing 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE'. However, according to Hazlitt's notes, from this point the manuscript version only omitted a few lines (95–96, 99–105). Even in the absence of such evidence, the manuscript version Hazlitt describes foregrounds the way in which Lovelace refashions an older form, one which represents a now extinct court culture, and turns it into something quite different. 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE' is a place of neither courtly nor libertine delights. In the course of the poem, it becomes the contested site of complex political allegiances.

### ***Amyntor's Grove at Somerset House***

There is evidence locating the allegorical grove of Lovelace's poem at the queen's palace of Somerset House. Lovelace's readers would have quickly made the connection, and would have read the poem with an understanding of the negative connotations that this particular place carried, because of its associations with Henrietta Maria as foreign, Roman Catholic and involved in dramatic productions. The evidence set out below can also assist in interpreting Marvell's poem, 'The Gallery', in which the speaker considers various representations of Clora.<sup>108</sup> The palace was granted by Charles I to Henrietta Maria as part of her jointure, hence 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE', and was the principal London residence of all the Stuart queen consorts.<sup>109</sup> It occupied a large block where its replacement still stands, facing the Strand to the north, the Thames to the south, half-way between St Paul's and Westminster Abbey. Its formal gardens fronted the Thames. Construction commenced on the old palace in 1549. It passed to the Crown following the execution of Protector Somerset, after whom it was named, in 1552. It was

expensively renovated for the queen both before the wars and after the Restoration.<sup>110</sup>

Records show that Henrietta Maria actually represented herself as the ‘Gentlest Sheapherdesse’ of Lovelace’s poem at Somerset House. The queen used Somerset House for the presentation of plays and masques throughout the pre-war years, in which she often played the role of a shepherdess. John Orrell describes Somerset House as ‘the centre of scenic drama in England’ at this time. Representations of the palace were incorporated into Inigo Jones’s sets for pastorals performed there.<sup>111</sup> After the queen and her ladies descended from the stage for the final dance in *Artenice* (1626), Jones’s ‘masterfully designed shutters closed to display a painted image of Somerset House and the Thames, ending the play with an image of the queen’s new residence in England.’<sup>112</sup> As Orrell points out, the effect would have been to bring ‘the philosophical pretensions of the pastoral and the sensuousness of the masque to focus on the Queen’s Court itself, as if the real world might be in tune with the harmony of what went before’.<sup>113</sup> Jones was commissioned to design and build a special temporary theatre in the Paved Court at Somerset House for the production of Montagu’s *The Shepherd’s Paradise*.<sup>114</sup> Veevers shows that Jones reproduced his design for the terms (pillars) of the Somerset House chapel in the set for ‘Loves Cabinett of Relieve’ in *The Shepherd’s Paradise*.<sup>115</sup> Unfortunately, few of Jones’s drawings for the sets of *The Temple of Love* have survived although, interestingly in the context of Lovelace’s poem, his extant drawing for Scene I is entitled ‘The Grove’, suggesting a further link with Lovelace’s ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’.<sup>116</sup> Jones’s description of the design for the temple is consonant both with his design for the screen in the chapel at Somerset House and that in ‘Loves Cabinett of Relieve’ in *The Shepherd’s Paradise*. As Veevers argues, the relationship between the queen’s temple in *The Temple of Love* and her chapel at Somerset House is also central to Davenant’s invention for the masque.<sup>117</sup>

It is possible that Lovelace was referring to the palaces of Whitehall or St James as the site of the courtly grove, but these are less likely candidates than Somerset House. Over time, a number of theatres were used for the presentation of court masques at Whitehall, and more masques were presented there than at Somerset House.<sup>118</sup> Martin Parker (*fl.* 1624–1647), in his popular ballad ‘Upon

defacing of *White-hall*' remarks on 'the rich perfume in every room', which had been a feature of that palace before the Civil War.<sup>119</sup> However, while the queen had a second chapel for worship at St James's, Somerset House was the principal site of the public practice of Roman Catholicism in pre-war London. Inigo Jones's Queen's Chapel there was expressly commissioned for Henrietta Maria as the oratory for her Capuchin priests, who were accommodated in an adjoining building.<sup>120</sup> The queen laid the foundation stone in 1632. The chapel was opened in 1636 with the most elaborate show of Roman Catholic ritual in England for nearly one hundred years.<sup>121</sup>

Marcus sees the celebration Lovelace describes as taking place in 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE' as comparable with the 'solemn-festive paganism like that cultivated in court entertainments and in pre-war Caroline poetry'.<sup>122</sup> It is, in fact, decidedly popish. Clouds of incense, long associated with Roman Catholic ceremonial, 'sore | Higher than Altars fum'd before' (ll. 65–66) The 'Oriental bowle' (l. 57) raised in Chloris's honour in 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE' is evocative of the consecration of the wine at the high mass, which celebrated her triumph in reintroducing public Roman Catholic ceremony in England. The association between the world of the masques, as designed by Jones, and the opening of the chapel at Somerset House was recognised by contemporaries:

This last Month the Queen's Chapel in *Somerset-House-Yard* was consecrated by her Bishop; the Ceremonies lasted three Days, Massing, Preaching, and Singing of Litanies, and such a glorious Scene built over their Altar, the Glory of Heaven, *Inigo Jones* never presented a more curious piece in any of the Masks at Whitehall.<sup>123</sup>

As Veevers argues, the borderlines between theatre and Roman Catholicism were being permeated. Subsequently, the chapel was open to Londoners. Public masses and confessions were held there every day.

Records show that paintings by the famous artists identified by Lovelace, '*Titian, Raphael, Georgone*' (l. 31), were co-located at Somerset House and that a 'Cabinet' of the kind described by Lovelace existed there. Charles I was England's first great royal collector of old master paintings and, as Reichardt has argued, old masters of the quality of those mentioned in the text could only be found in the king's collection.<sup>124</sup> Somerset House was one of the three main places of reception for the works of art which Charles I purchased from the Duke of Mantua.<sup>125</sup> Statuary from the Mantua collection was placed in the gardens, which were also 'embellished with fountains and grottoes'.<sup>126</sup> Transcriptions of two sets of catalogues of the

king's collections survive, one prepared by Abraham Van der Doort in the late 1630s; the other prepared for the sale of the century — the disposal of the late king's goods by the Commonwealth between 1649 and 1651.<sup>127</sup> Paintings by the three artists named by Lovelace are recorded in the catalogues as being co-located at Whitehall, St James's, Hampton Court and Somerset House. Of these, Somerset House was most obviously identified with Henrietta Maria. The 1649–1651 sale catalogue shows that the 'w<sup>th</sup> drawinge Roome' there housed paintings by the artists named by Lovelace, three by Titian, three by Georgeone and 'The Madona. done by Raphaell', valued at £2,000, the prize of the collection.<sup>128</sup>

Lovelace describes 'The Gems so rarely, richly set' which led visitors to 'love the Cabinet' (ll. 47–48). There are two contenders for the 'Cabinet' described in the scholarly account of all building and construction records from the royal residences, *The History of the King's Works*. These are the 'new erected Cabbonett Roome' at Whitehall and the 'queen's new cabinet room' at Somerset House.<sup>129</sup> The walls of the Somerset House cabinet underwent extensive embellishment by the painter Matthew Goodrich between 1628 and 1630, at a cost of £233. Colvin gives a general impression of the work:

There were grotesques over the door and over one of the windows. The entablature which ran round the room under the ceiling was painted and some of the mouldings were gilded and shadowed. The wainscot panelling contained 218 panels and these were filled with grotesques on a white ground and surrounded by gilded mouldings. The stiles [vertical bars of the wainscots] were decorated with gilded and shadowed 'gallosse'.<sup>130</sup>

The whole wall surface was worked, painted, gilded and embossed. Many fine paintings were displayed in the room, against the background of the elaborate wall treatment, 'The Gems so rarely, richly set' described by Lovelace (l. 47). The lines 'But Oh the *Nymph!* did you ere know | *Carnation* mingled with the *Snow?*' (ll. 85–86) may also point to Somerset House. In Van Dyck's famous double portrait of the king and queen with laurel and olive branches, the king's doublet and the ribbons on the queen's white dress are both described as being in the colour 'carnation'.<sup>131</sup> This portrait hung 'in Somsett-house above the Chimney in the w<sup>th</sup> drawing=roome otherwise Called the greate Cabbonett'.<sup>132</sup> The queens' cabinet must have been truly remarkable. The king's 'cabonett' at Whitehall was also remarkable. In it, as well as fine paintings, Charles I kept his collections of coins, medals and limnings, which were housed in carnation velvet cases in specially constructed cupboards and drawers.<sup>133</sup> However, there is no record of the king's cabinet receiving the elaborate



and expensive decorative wall treatment accorded to the queen's cabinet at Somerset House, which fits so well with Lovelace's text.

### ***A Country House Poem?***

In 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE', Lovelace appropriates and recasts the metaphorical framework of the country house poem, including the structural conflicts between substantial old and extravagant new and nature and art/artifice, which are integral to the genre, to illustrate the failure of Charles I and his queen to establish an enduring system of governance in England. As others have recognised, there are close links between Jonson's iconic celebration of rural life, '*To Penshurst*' (c. 1612), Thomas Carew's '*To my friend G.N. from Wrest*' (c. 1639) and 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE'.<sup>134</sup> McGuire notes that 'Lovelace's country-house poem repudiates Jonsonian verities as no longer viable'.<sup>135</sup> Marcus sees Thomas Carew's '*To my friend G.N. from Wrest*', written shortly after Carew returned from the abortive first Bishops' War, as marking a transitional point between the emphasis on the importance of nature in early examples of the country house genre and the art of the court which dominates later poems; that is, between Jonson's archetypal '*To Penshurst*' and Lovelace's poem.<sup>136</sup> Over time, the country house or estate poem genre's intrinsic balance between country nature and courtly artifice tipped in favour of the court. Marcus sees 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE' as taking this isolating consolidation to its logical endpoint, that the 'country house in Lovelace's poem is not only the mirror of the court, it is, amidst the ravages of the Civil War, the only court left'.<sup>137</sup> However, while Marcus senses the presence of the court in the poem, she accepts the received wisdom of its location at Endymion Porter's country residence. Reichardt argues that 'removing Porter from Lovelace's poem [...] reveals it as a critique of the pre-war court'.<sup>138</sup>

Once the grove is identified as representing the queen's palace at Somerset House, Lovelace's text emerges as a kind of answer poem, an antithesis to, or remodelling of, the complexly imagined earlier English country house poems. The juxtaposition of the short, courtly lyric identified from the information provided by Hazlitt against the more contemplative sections of the longer poem enhances the sense of reworking or refashioning the genre. Lovelace is not engaging in a simple condemnation of court life compared with country life. Rather, the implicit

comparison leads readers to question the extent to which the artifice and show at a particular court, expressed in courtly lyrics, masques and Roman Catholic ceremonial, has contributed to civil strife in a previously Edenic England, and whether the protagonists should have foreseen the harm that their popish rituals would cause.

Readers already critical of Henrietta Maria would have made the comparison between the admirable virtues of the English country house as a product of nature (albeit assisted by man) and what could be seen as the profligate foreign artifice of the French queen's court. The fact that the masques had been as much a feature of the much more dissolute Jacobean court is unlikely to have prevented such criticism. The debate over the relative virtues of art and nature are a constant theme of the country house genre. At Carew's *Wrest*, for example, art is not rejected 'where more bounteous Nature beares a part | And guides her Hand-maid' (ll. 70–71). That is, art and nature are kept in balance. In Amyntor's grove, art and artifice always triumph: 'Art' outdoes 'weake *Nature*' (ll. 87–88) and must therefore be preferred. In Jonson's eyes, Penshurst, we are told in the opening line, is not 'built to envious show'. *Wrest* can house its trains of noble guests more conveniently than 'prouder Piles, where the vaine builder spent | More cost in outward gay Embellishment | Then reall use' (ll. 53–55). The implicit contrast in the earlier poems is with the so-called 'prodigy houses', where 'show', in the form of expensive finishes in decorative marbles and porphyry, and foreign works of art, dominate.

At the court of Amyntor's grove, there is only 'show'. In the over-embellished cabinet, there are so many fine paintings set against the heavily worked wall that they 'seem'd to be | But one continued Tapistrie' (ll. 51–52). Tapestry was the most highly desired and most expensive wall covering at this time. In the foreign queen's cabinet in Amyntor's grove, paint emulates tapestry, but cannot replace it in terms of quality and value. The reference is topical. In 1634, Charles I had ordered the removal of Cornelius Vroom's Armada Tapestries from Whitehall to the relative obscurity of Oatlands.<sup>139</sup> Momus, in Carew's *Coelum Briticannicum* (1634), condemns this act in a satirical proclamation. Noting the removal of the tapestries 'wherein the Navall Victory of 88. is to the eternall glory of this Nation exactly delineated', Momus sees the action as the symbolic replacement of the old and good with the new of uncertain merit.<sup>140</sup> By removing the tapestries, the king

has unfurnished and disarrayed his palace. In 1644, in ‘a gesture laden with symbolism’, the iconic tapestries were taken out of mothballs and rehung in the House of Lords, as a constant reminder of England’s triumphs under the Protestant Elizabeth I against the Roman Catholic Spanish.<sup>141</sup> Instead of tapestries celebrating great English deeds, most of the paintings in the foreign queen’s cabinet are works by foreign artists of popish religious subjects and the queen’s progenitors.<sup>142</sup> Even their value is overwhelmed by the highly embellished walls. Marvell makes a similar point about the armada tapestries in ‘The Gallery’. There, ‘the great arras-hangings [...] by are laid’, enabling Chloris’s — the queen’s — image to dominate in the speaker’s mind rather than England’s historical victories.<sup>143</sup>

The theme of nature versus art and foreign versus indigenous carries through into the area of hospitality. In Amyntor’s grove, the paintings and statues, ‘the shadowes’, are ‘livelier, nobler’ (ll. 37–39) than the company they represent. At Wrest:

The Lord and Lady of this place delight  
Rather to be in act, then seeme in sight;  
In stead of Statues to adorne their wall  
They throng with living men, their merry Hall. (ll. 33–34)

The Earl and Countess of Kent offer fine hospitality to appreciative guests, rather than hosting inanimate statues. Gentle nature, and the hard work of well-supervised labourers and servants, provide wholesome food and drink for the many guests in early English country house poems. At Wrest, wine is celebrated for its taste, not for its poetic qualities, or its emblematic representation:

We offer not in Emblemes to the eyes,  
But to the taste those usefull Deities.  
We presse the juycie God, and quaffe his blood,  
And grinde the Yeallow Goddess into food. (ll. 65–68)

There is a significant element of poetic licence here. It is hard to envisage the guests of the Earl and Countess of Kent doing anything more energetic than hunting for game and participating in a harvest celebration for the grain crop, wine generally being an imported commodity. Nevertheless, food and wine are figuratively linked to the estate which produces them.

At Wrest, the deities the guests revere are ‘usefull’ (l. 66). They are Ceres and Bacchus, who provide wine, beer and bread. In Amyntor’s grove, on the other hand, the young men are represented as being effete. After viewing the works of art:

We sate, and pitied Dieties;  
Wee bound our loose hayre with the Vine,  
The Poppy, and the Eglantine;  
One swell'd an Oriental bowle  
Full, as a grateful, Loyal Soule  
To *Chloris! Chloris!* (ll. 54–59)

In contrast with the vigorous guests at Wrest, these young men toast to excess the emblematic ‘Chloris’ of the Petrarchan flaming eyes and pearl-like teeth with Oriental drinking vessels, one of them filled with a narcotic. They pity the old dieties of Wrest, Ceres and Bacchus. The air at Wrest is from the west, ‘steep’d in balmie dew’, rather than the cold, bleak winds of the ‘wilde North’ of Scotland, where Carew had so recently fought in the first Bishops’ War. At Wrest, the pregnant Earth sweats wholesome, natural odours:

Her porous bosome doth rich odours sweate;  
[...]  
Such native Aromatiques, as we use  
No forraigne Gums, not essence fetcht from farre,  
No Volatile spirits, nor compounds that are  
Adulterate, but at Natures cheape expence  
With farre more genuine sweetes repress the sense. (ll. 9–17).

The air in Amyntor’s grove, in stark contrast, is perfumed with foreign, ‘*Arabian gummes*’ (l. 21). The breeze there, like the alien queen herself, the perfumes, the incense, the paintings and the statues, comes from the east, from across the English Channel, if not further afield. One antithesis of the kind described here might have been a coincidence. The presence of a number of closely aligned antithetic sequences would have led Lovelace’s ‘knowing’ readers to draw comparisons between the worlds of Wrest and Amyntor’s grove that were unfavourable to the court. There are also echoes of ‘TO AMARANTHA’ in the east wind, reminding readers that during the pre-war years, groves of this kind were as well known as the location of libertine seduction as of chaste, platonic discourse.

There are classical models on which Lovelace probably drew in constructing this poem. Alastair Fowler notes that Martial and Horace used antithesis in establishing the proper mode for a Roman villa, while there ‘were also pompous Silver Latin encomia of palaces, by Statius and others, who admired villas of just the pretentious sort Jonson was to repudiate’.<sup>144</sup> Amyntor’s grove is similar to Statius’s ‘Villa of Manilius Vopiscus at Tibur’ (*Silvae* I. 3). There, the speaker saw ‘Works of art [...] creations of old masters, metals variously alive. [...] As I wandered agaze and cast my eyes over it all, I suddenly found myself treading wealth. [...] My steps

were aghast'.<sup>145</sup> Statius's speaker tries unsuccessfully to situate his subject as a principled, austere Roman in the country house tradition, by arguing that he 'hides fertile repose and strenuous virtue with brow serene and sober elegance and enjoyment sans luxury'.<sup>146</sup> The speaker in 'The Villa of Pollius Felix at Surrentum' (*Silvae* II. 2), like Lovelace's in 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE', is astounded by the cabinet of fine objects:

My eyes scarce held out in the long procession [...] as I was led from item to item. [...] Should I marvel first at the place's ingenuity or the master's? [...] Some spots Nature has favoured, in others she has been overcome and yielded to the developer, letting herself be taught new and gentler ways. [...] The occupant has tamed it all.<sup>147</sup>

Artifice triumphs over Nature once more. Jonson's satirical 'To Sir Robert Wroth', which may owe its construction to Statius, similarly contrasts the worthy home and its mistress against the unworthy attributes of Sir Robert himself, who would 'blow up orphans, widows, and their states, | And think his power doth equal fate's'.<sup>148</sup> Jonson's refraction of Statius's *Silvae* II. 2 in 'To Sir Robert Wroth' confirms — if it were necessary to do so — that English poets of the previous generation provided models using the kind of play on classical precedents which I am arguing Lovelace is engaging in here.

### **The Succession**

In the last section of the poem, Lovelace's speaker signals his shift in allegiance from Charles I and Henrietta Maria to the next generation of Stuarts who will follow. At line 67, 'So drencht we our oppressing cares', his speaker's recollection of the apparently 'harmlesse sins' (l. 71) enjoyed at Somerset House before the wars is replaced by a sobering assessment of the unforeseen harm done to the fabric of the state by a court dissociated from the reality of people's everyday lives. This dissociation is represented through the underlying presence in the text of exemplary country houses of a lost, golden age. The future flies in on clear skies, in the form of 'two *Cherubims*' (l. 76), Arigo and Gratiana. The boy, 'armed so with Majesty' (l. 76), is figured as the next king. As noted earlier, the syntax is slippery at this point. It is not clear whether the cherubim fly in to recollections of the distant, pre-war celebrations recalled by Lovelace's speaker, or to the near past, when he revisits the grove. The timing is significant. If the reference is to the pre-war years, the boy must be the future king, Charles II. If it is to the immediate past, then 'Arigo' is most likely to be the young prince, Henry, Duke of Gloucester (1640–1660). In the

latter construction, Lovelace is giving credence to commentary that Henry should be crowned in his father's place. The name fits, although the age is out by one or two years. Perhaps Lovelace saw Lely's portrait of the boy in petticoats and guessed wrongly that he was 'but five'. The 'cleare [...] skye from whence they came' (l. 73) could represent the general hopefulness of youth, or the apparent return of the halcyon days during the early months of Charles I's return to Hampton Court in 1647.

Lovelace then returns the focus to Chloris, 'the *Nymph*', asking whether she could, or should, have foreseen the horrors of civil war, the '*Carnation mingled with the Snow*', 'the Lightning shrowd', which were about to envelop the royal family (ll. 85–87). All the evidence is that she had not. Henrietta Maria was seen by many royalists as part of the cause of the wars and an obstruction to any resolution.<sup>149</sup> The speaker is asking his readers to consider the queen's role in fomenting the wars through her arguably arrogant, certainly insensitive, practice of her religion. He shifts responsibility for the monarchy's troubles to the foreign queen, rather than the king. He argues that in the pre-war days, the brightness of her eyes blinded everyone to her failings and the dangers they faced, obstructing clear judgment, just as the speaker's delight in the grove obstructed his ability to judge the excellence of his surroundings. She is thus shown to be foolish, rather than evil. The last fourteen lines form a kind of encomiastic recessional, in which the speaker expresses his hope that the 'faire sprigs', Arigo and Gratiana's children, will never share their parents' and grandparents' experience of civil war and that the halcyon days will return. It is worth noting here that the tropes Lovelace uses to describe the wars are familiar from his much better known poem, '*The Grasse-hopper*': the 'sharpe frost' cutting, the 'North-winde' tearing and the 'sithe', which perhaps indicates that the poems were written at about the same time.<sup>150</sup> The 'Lightning shrowd' which breaks through 'th'opposing cloud' recalls the 'clouded Majesty' and the 'griefe triumphant' breaking through the shadows in '*To my Worthy Friend Mr. Peter Lilly*'.<sup>151</sup>

### **The Politics of the Poems**

Published burlesques demonstrate that royalist poets like Hughes opened their king to parliamentarian and disenchanted royalist derision by portraying him as a feckless, weeping shepherd. '*Amintors welladay*' appeared and was parodied in the 1656

royalist miscellanies, *Choyce Drollery* and *Sportive Wit*, both of which were prohibited and burnt by Oliver Cromwell's regime.<sup>152</sup> The parodies, like Hughes's songs, may well have been written much earlier. In *Sportive Wit* 'Amintors welladay', entitled in this instance 'A Shepherd fallen in love. A Pastoral Song', is followed by 'The Answer', a burlesque of the pastoral mode in general.<sup>153</sup> As one would expect in an answer poem of this kind, the initial stanzas echo those of its subject. Amyntas has 'fled' away since his Cloris has 'gone astray'. Readers are reminded somewhat irreverently of the fecundity of the royal marriage with the lines 'Her apron lies behinde the door; | The strings won't reach now as before'. All Cloris can do is say 'who can help what *will away, will away*'. 'The Answer' in *Sportive Wit* resembles any number of more or less bawdy pastoral ballads.<sup>154</sup> It illustrates just how susceptible early Caroline court pastoral was to parody, satire and burlesque by both sides in the conflict. The answer poems in *Choyce Drollery* make the same point. There, two stanzas are added to 'On a Sheepherd that died for Love' in which Aminta's physical deterioration is described as he, like Abraham Fraunce's 'Amyntas', pines away and dies for his love. It is juxtaposed against a mildly suggestive parodic treatment of the same theme, 'The Shepheards lamentation for the losse of his Love', with a refrain of variants on 'all for the loss of her. Hy nonny nonny no'.<sup>155</sup> The shepherd's tears fall 'as thin, | As water from a Still', while the shepherdess 'With her Mantle tuckt up high, | She foddered her Flocke'. While Lovelace's 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE' is not actively disrespectful or parodic of the queen, readers would have been aware both of Hughes's songs casting the queen as Chloris and Charles I as Amyntor, and of parodies of the kind described here, adding a subversive frisson to their understanding of the Lovelace's poem.

### ***Parliament's View of the Queen***

Parliamentarian propagandists seized the opportunity offered by royalists to parody effeminising representations of the king. A pamphlet published in August 1644, within months of the time Lovelace must have written 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*', which itself draws so heavily on Davenant's *The Temple of Love*, illuminates the way in which parliamentarian propagandists 're-appropriated the cosmological imagery of government propounded in the court masques'.<sup>156</sup> The title page reads:

*The Great Eclipse of the Sun,*  
 OR,  
 CHARLES  
 HIS WAINE  
 Over-clouded,  
 by the evill *Influences* of the *Moon*, the malignan-  
 cie of Ill-aspected *Planets*, and the Constellations of Retrograde and Irregular *Starres*.  
 Otherwise, Great CHARLES, our Gracious KING, Eclipsed  
 by the destructive perswasions of His *Queen*, by the pernicious aspects  
 of his *Cabbinet Counsell*, and by the subtill insinuations of the *Popish Faction*.<sup>157</sup>

The queen is the female moon. She has exercised her unruly, destructive influence over the king. These tropes are the same as those Lovelace had used in ‘TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*’, the king eclipsed and his starry wain overclouded.<sup>158</sup> The sentiment, that the queen improperly influences and dominates the king, is central to both the poems under discussion here. Labelling the king’s ‘*Cabbinet Counsell*’ as ‘pernicious’ buttresses ongoing fears about the king’s counsellors. The way in which the pamphlet explicitly links cabinet counsel with ‘the destructive perswasions’ of the queen opens the possibility that Lovelace, in ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’, was playing with his readers’ perceptions of the threat which the cabinet at Somerset House and its frequenters represented. Indeed, the *Oxford English Dictionary* uses a quote from *Mercurius Britanicus* of 22 July 1644, a few weeks after Marston Moor, as its first example of a usage with negative connotations. The practice of the king’s ‘Cabinet or Junto’ is contrasted with that of ‘our State Committee, and Master *Lenthall* [who] know better how to honour God’.<sup>159</sup> A few paragraphs earlier, *Britanicus* refers to the queen as dominant: ‘some say she is the man, and *Raignes*’.

*The Great Eclipse of the Sun* also explicitly invokes the Lipsian discourse discussed in the previous chapter on whether kings should use force or love to rule their subjects. In the verse on the cover sheet underneath the woodcut illustration, the ghost of Conscience:

tells our mis-laid KING,  
 That firing houses, and his Subjects slaughter,  
 Have so Eclips’d him, hee’l scarce shine hereafter:  
 For when by *Fire* and *Sword* Kings bloody prove,  
 They loose at once their *Light*, and *Subjects* love.<sup>160</sup>

In the woodcut, a rather bored-looking representation of Charles I limp-wristedly holds a sword pointing to the sun eclipsed by smoke from the burning town buildings. Dismembered bodies surround the central figure of Conscience, almost naked, in an open winding sheet which resembles magisterial robes, holding a brand



to light his examination of the king's actions against his suffering subjects. The message conveyed is that the king is unfit to rule because he has lost his subjects' love.

Parliament's often-stated view that the queen exercised inappropriate political influence over the king was evident well before the outbreak of hostilities.<sup>161</sup> On 16 February 1642, the king arrived at Dover to bid farewell to the queen, Princess Mary and, unbeknown to Parliament, the crown jewels, on their trip to the Low Countries, the event celebrated in Henry Hughes's '*Amintors welladay*' with the king's withering tears. On 19 February, the Commons felt sufficiently powerful to include a statement in its *Declaration Concerning Grievances* condemning the queen on the basis that she was ruled by Jesuits and other papists. She was adopting their views, and imposing those views on the State, in particular by inserting her favoured appointees in positions of influence:

2. The Priests, Jesuits, Papists, both Foreign and Native, and other dangerous and ill-affected Persons, have had so great an Interest in the Affections, and powerful Influence upon the Counsels, of the Queen; and that Her Majesty hath been admitted to intermeddle with the Great Affairs of State; with the Disposing Places and Preferments, even of highest Concernment in the Kingdom; which being conferred by her Mediation, thereby not only many of those who are of great Power and Authority, but divers active Spirits, ambitious of publick Employment, have their Dependence upon Her, and are engaged to favour and advance those Aims and Designs which are infused into Her Majesty upon Grounds of Conscience, which is the strongest Bond either to Good or Evil.<sup>162</sup>

These are strong words against the king's spouse by a House of Commons not yet in open revolt. Henrietta Maria attracted an even stronger response from Parliament the following year, about the time Lovelace must have written '*AMYNTOR from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*'. On 23 May 1643, she was impeached for high treason by the Commons for her role in waging war against the Commonwealth.

After 1646, the term 'cabinet', which helps identify Somerset House as the site of 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE', attracted unfortunate connotations of which Lovelace's readers could hardly have failed to be aware. The *OED* separates definitions current at that time relating to a room or space from those with political overtones.<sup>163</sup> Among the former, Lovelace invokes a 'cabin [...] dwelling, lodging, tabernacle', a 'summer-house or bower in a garden', a 'small chamber [...] a private apartment, a boudoir' a 'room devoted to the arrangement or display of works of art [...] a picture gallery' and, contentiously in the context of this poem, a 'case for the safe custody of jewels [...] letters, documents, etc.'. The political sense of the term

as a ‘council-chamber’ and the ‘limited number of ministers of the sovereign [... who have] the determination and administration of affairs’, which had emerged under the Stuarts, is also in play. In the greatest propaganda coup of the war years, the actual extent of the queen’s influence over the king was confirmed when extracts from the royal couple’s correspondence were published after it was captured at Naseby in mid-June 1645.<sup>164</sup> Parliamentary responses immediately focused on what was perceived as the emasculating influence of the queen, ‘proved’ by the letters. Parliament published a selection of the letters in *The King’s Cabinet Opened*, annotated according to Thomason by Henry Parker, probably assisted by Tom May.<sup>165</sup> Although this tract is well known, the opening text of the annotations provides stark evidence of the perceived propaganda value of the argument that the foreign, popish queen dominated the king and interfered in affairs of state. It makes explicit the argument that the king is unmanned by his dependence on his foreign, popish wife:

1. It is plaine, here, first, that the Kings Counsels are wholly managed by the Queen; though she be of the weaker sexe, borne by an Alien, bred up in a contrary Religion, yet nothing great or small is translated without her privity & consent [...]
2. The Queens Counsels are as powerful as commands [...]
3. The Queen appears to have been as harsh, and imperious towards the King [...] as she is implacable to our Religion, Nation and Government.<sup>166</sup>

Marchamont Nedham, in the second of three issues of *Mercurius Britannicus* devoted to the letters, demands rhetorically ‘what may we say, when a *King* (whose private affections ought not to sway him in publique Affaires) shal forsake the *Great Councell* of his Kingdome, to be ruled wholly by his *Wife*?’<sup>167</sup> It emerged in the correspondence that Henrietta Maria perceived herself as having inherited her father’s military prowess, styling herself ‘Sa Majesté Générallissime’. Nedham ridiculed her as ‘*Generallissima* of all the *Traitours* in *England, Scotland* and *Ireland*.’<sup>168</sup> Milton was quite clear on the impact of publication of the letters on perceptions of the king in *Eikonoklastes*, where he simply wrote: ‘to sumn up all, they shewed him govern’d by a Woman’.<sup>169</sup> The searing memory of the impact that the seizure of the king’s letters at Naseby had on support for the royalist cause, in particular that the letters reinforced the perception that the queen dominated the king, would have provided a bitter aftertaste when Lovelace’s readers read of the ‘The Gems’ for which they loved the ‘Cabinet’ in Amyntor’s Grove/ Somerset House.

Somerset House's iconic status as Henrietta Maria's main residence and the centre of Roman Catholicism in London, of the kind reflected in Lovelace's references to Roman Catholic ceremonial in 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE', ensured that it attracted continuing, adverse puritanical and parliamentary attention. There was a riotous attack on Catholics outside the chapel in 1640, and placards posted in 1641.<sup>170</sup> A number of hostile, satirical pamphlets appeared during 1642, seeking the dismissal of the queen's Capuchin friars.<sup>171</sup> On at least seven occasions between 2 September 1642 and 30 March 1643, the Commons sought the expulsion of the Capuchins and the destruction of the altar and 'such Crucifixes, Images, and Monuments of Idolatry, as shall be found in the said Chapel, and Monastery, or Convent'.<sup>172</sup> The Lords were reluctant, partly because of the possible international repercussions. Henrietta Maria's right to worship at a chapel at each of her residences had been recognised in her marriage treaty. The Commons finally took action on or about 31 March 1643, without the Lords' consent, as recorded in the Venetian State Papers:

Although the term allowed to the Capuchin fathers to stay here had not expired, the Lower House, without the knowledge of the Upper, sent three of its members with a good number of troops to their dwelling yesterday evening. After breaking in the doors, they smashed the altars, broke and defiled the images and burned the ornaments and all the books, carrying off the religious as prisoners to the house of one of the sheriffs, to await an opportunity for sending them to France.<sup>173</sup>

In an act of public iconoclasm, the large Rubens altarpiece from the chapel was thrown into the Thames.<sup>174</sup> In an account published in 1648, the Commons' action is linked directly to its perception that the queen's actions were damaging the state:

the Queens Pawning the Jewells of the Crowne in Holland & there with buying Armes to assist the Warr against the Parlament & her owne actual performances with her popish army in the North, [...] high Treason be transmited to the Lords; images, Crucifixes, papisticall bookes in Somerset and Jameses were burnt and the Capuchin friers sent away.<sup>175</sup>

The Somerset House chapel experienced more severe damage than St James's. The attack was Parliament's first direct action against the trappings of monarchy. It thus signalled Parliament's acceptance that civil war was inevitable.

Somerset House remained a target of parliamentary propaganda until the Restoration. In a symbolic act of destruction and denigration of the displaced regime after the regicide, all Charles I's works of art and household goods were collected at Somerset House and displayed there for sale by the Commonwealth between 1649 and 1651. As had been the case with James I and Anne of Denmark, Cromwell's

body was laid out there before his burial. Both Abraham Cowley and Waller wrote commemorative verses on Henrietta Maria's return to her newly renovated palace in the early 1660s, in which they sought redress.<sup>176</sup> Cowley specifically refers to the desecrations represented by the Commonwealth's sale and Cromwell's laying in state:

Nothing remain'd t'adorn this Princely place  
Which Covetous hands could Take or Rude Deface;  
[...]  
Nothing was seen which could content the Eye  
Till Dead the impious Tyrant here did lye.<sup>177</sup>

The insults against the queen were evidently hard felt for years after the Restoration. Readers of 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE' when *Lucasta* was published in 1649 would have been aware of parliamentarian attacks on Somerset House and its role as a negative symbol of Henrietta Maria and her Roman Catholicism. This negative symbolism would have been inflected their understanding of the poem, causing significant disquiet.

### ***Royalist Responses***

How does Lovelace's acceptance of parliamentarian propagandists' attempt to blame an apparently dominant queen for the king's failures compare with those of other royalists? Recent studies of royalism during the war years, even those relating specifically to Henrietta Maria, pay limited attention to this issue.<sup>178</sup> This may be in part because, with a few notable exceptions, royalists themselves were at least circumspect, if not lacklustre, in their defences of the queen and her actions published during the war years.<sup>179</sup> White proposes a number of reasons why royalists may not have defended the queen more strenuously in the later years of the war. She suggests that the queen's royalist opponents 'may not have wanted to further encourage Henrietta by openly defending her actions; [...] many of her royalist critics must have hoped she would just go away'.<sup>180</sup> Perhaps the uninspiring defences were 'rooted in the belief Henrietta's activities were already receiving enough attention from parliamentary papers'.<sup>181</sup> Perhaps they did not want to encourage their own female followers to emulate the 'unruly women' described in the both royalist and parliamentarian propaganda. The queen's supporters were in an impossible situation: 'defending the queen too emphatically might give the misguided impression that women active in the public sphere was acceptable; failing to defend Henrietta might reflect badly on the king'.<sup>182</sup> White does not canvass

another possible reason for the failure of royalists to support Henrietta Maria, the king's spouse: that a significant number considered her, as Scott asserts, 'the most serious challenge to the restoration of the ancient constitution'.<sup>183</sup>

Lovelace was able to publish his poems critical of the queen in *Lucasta* partly because they were lightly protected by their allegorical form, a luxury not awarded to those who tried to defend the queen in prose tracts after Naseby. Furthermore, by 1649 when *Lucasta* was actually published, the argument was moot. The royalists had been comprehensively defeated. Charles I was dead and his queen had been in France for four years. In 1647–1648, when 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE' was probably drafted, Lovelace's criticism would have been calculated to appeal to those royalists whose factional allegiances meant that they were willing to apportion blame to the queen. However, even those royalist poets who had access to allegorical protection and who contributed to the hagiographical *Musarum Oxoniensium Epibateria* (1643), about the time Lovelace must have drafted 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*', struggled to counter parliamentary propaganda against the queen. Henry Berkhed, in his contribution, makes the best he can of perceptions of the queen's masculine dominance. He casts Henrietta Maria as epicene. She has the characteristics of both genders, and thus enhances the king's strengths:

Welcome to dangers, to Alarms,  
    (Best Musick to your Epicæne sense)  
And to your Consort lockt in Armes,  
    Imprison'd in His owne defence:  
Thus *Semele* wisht to greet her Jove of old,  
    Rather in Thunder courting, then in Gold.<sup>184</sup>

Berkhed's argument was probably intended to recall England's glory days under another epicene queen, Elizabeth I. However, his sterling effort fails. With references to her 'Consort lockt in armes, | Imprisoned in His owne defence', the text enhances perceptions that Charles I is impotent and under Henrietta Maria's control, rather than dissipating such concerns. In the then unpublished 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*', Amyntor does not even try to argue for the king's masculine strength and independence. He is locked in Chloris's arms until 'Time and Love | Haste to their everlasting rest'. He is within his wife's control. In 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE', Lovelace's speaker looks to the future, in which the children of a Protestant Stuart prince will herald the return of an Edenic golden age

to England. He is looking to the Stuart succession in Charles II or Henry to restore the fortunes of the monarchy, which he still supports.

A lyric attributed both to John Cleveland and to Francis Lenton uses similar imagery to that adopted by Lovelace in 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE'. It engages with parliamentary efforts to deface the imagery of royal representation implicit in the *The Great Eclipse of the Sun*. It was published in later editions of Cleveland's poems, where it appears as '*The General Eclipse*'. Cleveland's editors, Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington, regard it as 'at least possibly or partially his' and suggest that 'a date of May–June 1646 would not be contradicted by any other reference in the poem'.<sup>185</sup> It appears as '*Beauties Eclyps'd*' in Henry Lawes's first *Ayres and Dialogues* (1653), where it is attributed to Francis Lenton.<sup>186</sup> An anonymous manuscript version entitled '*The Antiparode*', transcribed by Leishman, is particularly close to *The Great Eclipse of the Sun*.<sup>187</sup>

In the versions attributed to Cleveland and Lenton, the queen is the 'glittering Noon'. In the manuscript version, the speaker calls on the queen's ladies to refurbish her reflective powers:

Ladies that guild the glittering Moone  
And by reflection mend her Ray,  
Whose Lustre makes the sprightly Sunn  
To dance as upon Easter day,  
What are yee now the Sunn's away?<sup>188</sup>

Where in Cleveland and Lenton's version she is the source of light, in the manuscript version she shines like the moon with the reflected light of the king, but does not dominate him. The court ladies are nothing in her absence. Men, 'Couragious Eagles, that have whett | Your selves upon Majestick light', cannot fight now that the king's rays are withdrawn.

Like Lovelace's speaker in 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE' a few years later, the speaker looks to the succession. Unlike Lovelace, he does not welcome the passage of the crown to the next generation. In the third and fourth stanzas, those of the royal couple's children who have remained in England are nothing in the absence of the heir to the throne:

Cavalliere Babes whom nature teemes  
As a reserve for England[s] Throne,  
Spiritts whose dooble edge redeemes  
The last age & adornes your owne,  
What are yee now the Prince is gone?

As an obstructed fountains head  
 Cutts the entaile of from the streames,  
 And Brookes are disinherited,  
 Honour & Beautie are but Dreames  
 Since Charles and Mary lost their beames.<sup>189</sup>

Presumably the reference to the Prince's absence is to Prince Charles's departure from England in March 1646, to France by way of the Scilly Islands and Jersey. The speaker sees the remaining children, with or without the Duke of York who escaped to France in April 1648, as disinherited 'Brookes', less than the prince, one of the 'streames', who is in turn powerless because he is cut off from the king, the 'obstructed fountains head'. The fact that the king is still alive but 'obstructed', under house arrest, precludes any of the children from resurrecting the monarchy. The monarchy is not only the fountainhead of the royal children. It is also the source of 'Honour & Beautie', the signifiers of the representational framework constructed by the royal couple. Chaste love is temporarily forgotten here, but the sense is similar. The ideals which Lovelace represented in the opening Lucasta poems, love and honour, are but dreams now that Charles I and Henrietta Maria can no longer illuminate the court and the country.

The speaker in '*The General Eclipse*' acknowledges the end of the halcyon days in which Charles I and Henrietta Maria shone in the court masques and other festivities. The tone is reflective, rather than condemnatory. The speaker cannot see beyond the current stalemate. Even the seven-stanza version of '*The General Eclipse*' attributed to Cleveland ends inconclusively:

Thus 'tis a General Eclipse,  
 And the whole World is al-a-mort;  
 Only the House of Commons trips  
 The stage in a Triumphant sort,  
 Now e'n *John Lilburn* take 'em for't. (ll. 31–35)<sup>190</sup>

One of the Commons's earliest supporters, John Lilburne, is said to recognise the House as tripping the stage 'in a Triumphant sort'. The Commons is portrayed as assuming the panoply of power developed by Charles I and Henrietta Maria. It is stepping into their shoes. There is nothing more to be done. This ineffectual response contrasts with that of Lovelace's speaker in 'AMYNTOR'S GROVE'. Although Lovelace's speaker shares parliamentary interpretations of the queen as dominant and the king emasculated, he actively canvasses the need for a royal succession, whether by the Prince of Wales or Henry, Duke of Gloucester. In both

texts, the authors are engaging directly with parliamentary polemic of the kind evident in the pamphlet, *The Great Eclipse of the Sun* (1644), which uses the imagery of the court masques, the king and queen as the sun and the moon. Lovelace provides a royalist way forward.

Although the perceived dominance of the queen was central in parliamentary propaganda which responded to the capture of the king's correspondence at Naseby, only two of the formal royalist responses identified by Loxley make more than passing reference to the queen.<sup>191</sup> These are Sir Francis Wortley's (1591–1652) *Characters and Elegies* (1646) and Edward Symmons's (c. 1607–1649) *A Vindication of King Charles* (1647). Wortley's contribution is another lacklustre defence. He argues that the best things about Henrietta Maria are those conventional attributes of a queen, that she 'is a Lady of Illustrious blood and birth', beautiful and wise.<sup>192</sup> Both Wortley and Symmons emphasise the positive aspects of being the daughter of Henri IV. According to Wortley, 'She was daughter to that Mars of France [...] (truly the greatest [king] France ever had)', perhaps in an effort to emphasise her Protestant heritage and to counter Nedham's quip in *Mercurius Britanicus* labelling the queen as the 'Generallissima of all the Traitours'.<sup>193</sup> Wortley admires her most because she is elsewhere, in France: 'I could most admire her favours to those of our Nation in France, considering her sufferance [...] yet she is still a Sanctuary to her Husbands friends'.<sup>194</sup> He wishes that she would change her religion. If she were to do so, which all readers would have been aware she would not, 'I know no Nation under heaven so happy as we must then confesse our selves'.

Symmons's *A Vindication of King Charles* represents the most substantive defence of the queen by any royalist. He tries to defend the royal marriage, using all available rhetorical strategies. As such, his response is in direct contrast to Lovelace's attempt to allocate responsibility for the royalists' problems to the queen, and with other, half-hearted attempts by royalist propagandists to defend her. However, it is notable that Symmons consigns his defence to a separate section of *A Vindication*, well towards the back.<sup>195</sup> He admits that this was from choice.<sup>196</sup> Perhaps, he did not want to give the queen's critics unnecessary oxygen. Alternatively, he may have regarded the arguments against the queen as being more difficult to rebut than those against the king alone.



The core of Symmons's argument is that the texts of the letters prove only that the queen loved her husband, and that the king loved her. The 'spiderous' propagandists have refused to see the truth, which is that the letters show that the king failed only in listening to poor advice:

The Queens faults, though (for shew sake) they have branched them out into many particulars, may all be reduced to one, and that is *Loving of her Husband* [...] they can instance neither in word or action, to make the same appear conjecturall.<sup>197</sup>

Like Wortley, Symmons argues that Henrietta Maria has the conventional virtues of a queen, a good wife and 'nursing mother' to many children — that is, producer of many heirs in a country which had suffered from generations of difficult monarchichal transitions — and to Charles I's subjects in France, where she ensured their freedom to practise their Protestant religion.<sup>198</sup> During the seventeenth century, the terms 'nursing mother' and 'nursing father' were 'resonant with political and religious implications'.<sup>199</sup> The reference is to Isaiah 49. 23: 'For Kings shall be thy nursing fathers and Queens shall be thy nursing mothers'. In invoking the reference, Symmons is trying to elide Henrietta Maria's Roman Catholicism by implying that, as a good queen, she will put aside her religious affiliation so that she can mother her people appropriately. He attempts to make a virtue of her loyalty to the king, comparing her favourably with another French Queen of England, Isabella, wife to Edward II. Isabella's reputation suffered in the eighteenth century. She impressed contemporaries by her high lineage, beauty, and tribulations. Her reputation during the seventeenth century was that of a 'lovely and tragic queen' who was effective in undertaking the queen's traditional role as intercessor.<sup>200</sup> Symmons reflects this view of Isabella, arguing that had Henrietta Maria, 'like that Queen *Isabella* [...] joyned issue with some of the Enemies against the King her Husband, she should have been in as high account with these, as that other was with the *Rebells* of those days'.<sup>201</sup> Symmons addresses in detail each of the allegations relating to the queen's inappropriate dominance made in *The Kings Cabinet Opened*. It is not clear whether his sterling defence was influential. It does, however, demonstrate that royalists held a range of views about their queen.

### ***Lovelace, Mildmay Fane and Royalism in Print and Manuscript***

Perhaps the best window on Lovelace's loyalism from a royalist perspective in relation to these two poems is to be found in the manuscript poetry of Mildmay Fane,

second Earl of Westmorland, recently transcribed and edited by Tom Cain.<sup>202</sup> Loxley has argued that Fane's publication of his volume of poetry, *Otia Sacra*, during 1648 was as much of a political statement of loyalism as Fane's client Robert Herrick's *Hesperides* and Lovelace's attempted publication of *Lucasta* at about the same time.<sup>203</sup> Only one hundred and thirty-seven of Fane's English poems appeared in *Otia Sacra*, compared with more than five hundred in the manuscripts.<sup>204</sup> Not all the poems in the published volume appear in the manuscripts, indicating that one volume at least has been lost. Fane was arrested by Parliament and imprisoned in August 1642.<sup>205</sup> Unlike Lovelace, he compounded with Parliament in September 1644, and retired to the country. He was older than Lovelace, and, as a wealthy peer, he had a lot more to lose. Fane's poems show that, like Lovelace, he never abandoned the royalist cause. However, with the exception of 1648, when he was visibly in support of the royalist cause through publication of *Otia Sacra*, Fane kept a low profile until the Restoration.

Loxley argues that Fane's reliance on otium is of the active kind, an argument which is strengthened considerably when the evidence put forward in the next chapter in relation to Justus Lipsius's activist, neo-Stoic construction of retirement is taken into account. It is thus comparable with Lovelace's treatment of otium in 'TO ALTHEA' and 'The Grasse-hopper'.<sup>206</sup> There are indications in Fane's manuscripts and published poetry that he — and, by extension, other royalists — were careful to tailor the level of criticism of the monarchy expressed to the expected audience. As Cain notes, in the manuscript poems, Fane sometimes writes for himself alone, sometimes for a single other reader, at most for a select few readers.<sup>207</sup> The expected audience reveals itself in the texts of the poems. Fane's manuscript works and published poems represent a graduated approach to apportioning responsibility for the troubles to the royal couple. Fane is critical of the king in his private musings.<sup>208</sup> He barely mentions the queen, apparently regarding her as irrelevant. He openly criticises the queen in the unpublished 'The Times Steerage', discussed below. Like Lovelace, he shares the tropes of parliamentary propagandist treatment of Henrietta Maria. Perhaps he showed manuscript poems like this to friends, and found it convenient to shift responsibility from the king to the foreign queen in such circumstances.

Fane's poems discussed here operate within the same intertextual and metaphorical framework as Lovelace's. In *Otia Sacra*, Fane publishes poems which express a range of views of the queen, none of which is as critical as those of the manuscript '*The Times Steerage*', which can be accurately dated.<sup>209</sup> It is annotated 'wrot in July 1643'; that is, while Fane was still under house arrest in London, shortly before he compounded. In July 1643, the queen joined the king outside Oxford. Shortly afterwards, Lovelace probably drafted '*AMYNTOR from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS. A Dialogue*', which was not published until 1649. Fane does not seek the protection of allegory in '*The Times Steerage*', and chose not to publish it in *Otia Sacra* (1648). Fane opens his poem evenhandedly, condemning the stupidity of both sides. He invokes the debates over liberty and property discussed previously in relation to Lovelace's '*TO LUCASTA. From Prison*':

Like Ships by th'same wind favourd, yet can steer  
A severall Course; soe now the Cavallier  
And the Bowle-Noddled-Crue pretend They fight  
Both that Religion and the Lawes have right  
For Liberty tis doubtless thats their own  
Wherby all Property and safety's gon. (ll. 1–6)

Fane goes on to explore 'the origins of the war in meandering, often tortuous detail'. As Cain notes, 'this is clearly a poem in which he is working out his ideas'.<sup>210</sup>

While explicitly condemning factional groupings on both sides as 'the Cavallier | And the Bowle-Noddled-Crue', Fane is more openly critical than Lovelace of the king for cleaving too closely to the queen and her French advisors. He starts by justifying Charles I's actions on the basis that the king is but a man and entitled to the comforts of marriage, much as Symmons would later argue in *A Vindication of King Charles*. However, a hint of doubt, perhaps echoing parliamentarian propagandist attacks on the queen, enters with the reference to Eve, the temptress. While man may have the right to a wife, even a chaste marriage of the kind the Caroline court represented the royal marriage to be carries with it the risk that a man may 'be seduc't', that is, lose his judgment in the marriage bed:

Our Gracious King  
Good in Himself, but ther's an other thing  
He is a Man, may not's affections cleav  
To be seduc't? Had not an Adam Eve? (ll. 19–22)

Fane then puts another position. He argues that the king has been influenced by foreign counsellors who 'bring new Customs in | To Church and State' and promote

worship of the Virgin Mary. The ‘new Customs’ could refer equally Archbishop Laud’s church reforms or to the Roman Catholic ritual publicly countenanced at Somerset House. The counsellors, factional plotters who speak French, implicitly include the queen:

Discerting of His Counsailes Great and Wise  
Through Feares and Jealouzies workes them t’ surmise  
Some dangerous consequence, some Plott to spin  
Out all our owld woffe, bring new Customs in  
To Church and State, and as ther some before  
Had Bodies Could speak French, now teach’t all ore  
The Land, instruct both Kirk and Camp thus after  
T’pray to the Lady (ll. 23–31)

These French voices also counsel use of the royal prerogative. They want to make ‘the King wills it’ (Le Roy Le veut) steer the nation:

In Ceremony, ‘tis Abomination  
To make Le Roy Le veut Rudder th’whol Nation  
And noe Coast made but when the Pylotts heer it  
Fro’ th’ Masters mouth Soy’t faict come ils desirent. (ll. 47–50)

Fane argues that the king requires a ‘large prerogative’, but not so large as to imply infallibility.

The tenor of Fane’s unpublished poem differs markedly from the compliment he wrote at about the same time, formally welcoming the queen’s arrival in Oxford. Published in *Otia Sacra*, the poem is entitled ‘*Upon the King and Queens meeting after a long absence*’.<sup>211</sup> Here, despite his private doubts, Fane invokes the (over) familiar ‘Spicy Gumms that soe perfume the East’ to welcome the ‘Adventurer’ whom ‘noe perills can deterr’ from across the seas. Two of Fane’s poems written the following year and published in *Otia Sacra* are less complimentary of the royalist cause than ‘*Upon the King and Queens meeting after a long absence*’.<sup>212</sup> However, they are more muted in their criticism than that in the unpublished ‘*The Times Steerage*’ of mid-1643. The poems, entitled ‘*My Far-well to Court*’ and ‘*Chloris Complaint*’ are dated in manuscript 25 March and 25 July 1644 respectively.

In ‘AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*’, Lovelace hides his declaration of independence behind the allegorical framework of Davenant’s *The Temple of Love*. In ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’, he uses allegory to disguise his advocacy of a succession. In ‘*My Farewell to the Court*’, Fane sees no need to hide. He explicitly interrogates the representation of majesty in the music and dance of the court masques:

Goe (fond deluder of our senses) find  
Some other Objects henceforth, to make blind  
With that thy glittering Folly; for noe more  
I will be dazed with thy falser ore  
Nor shall thy Cyren-songs enchant, to tast  
Or smell or touch those sorceries thou hast. (ll. 1–6)<sup>213</sup>

The court, with its glittering follies, its ‘falsar Ore’ and ‘Syren songs’, enchanted Fane’s speaker. In contrast with Lovelace’s speaker in ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’, Fane’s will reject such show. He will truly serve his country, rather than merely participate in empty court festivities designed to promote the monarchy:

be firme and Constant, backt with steel  
And resolution for to guive the True  
God what is his, and Cesar tribute due. (ll. 16–18)

The frame of reference in these lines is almost certainly Lipsius’s *De Constantia*. The differentiation between the speaker’s voice and the author’s is important here. There is no evidence that Fane himself was ever ensorcelled by courtly representations of love and chivalric honour.<sup>214</sup>

Fane reinforces his identification of courtly entertainments like the masques, condemned by Nedham and Milton, as sources of the temptation and sorcery which his speaker will, in future, eschew by naming the court musicians Jacques Gaultier (*d.* before 1660), William Lawes and Nicholas Lanier (1588–1666):<sup>215</sup>

Jocky and Jinny footing may appeer  
Most Trim at the next wake in Darbisheer  
Gotier sayle from the Clouds to catch our ears  
And represent the harmony o’th’Sphears  
Will Lause excell the Dying Swan: Laneer  
Nick it with ravishments from touch of Lyre  
Yet uncontrowld by these, I safely may  
Survive. (ll. 33–40)

He belittles the masques by allocating them the same importance as country festivities. Country hicks may dance to the courtly tunes in Derbyshire. He will:

so resolve, dressing my mindes content,  
Hence-forward to be calme, and represent  
Nothing but what my Berth and Calling drawe  
My Purse out for my God, my King, my Lawe. (ll. 43–45)

Again, the commitment to active Lipsian constancy in retirement is present. Fane’s speaker will balance his obligations to the king with those to God and country.

In ‘*Chloris Complaint*’, Fane’s speaker notes wryly that, despite the disruption of civil war and the (temporary?) displacement of the monarchy, the fundamental patterns of nature portrayed in the masques as representing the king’s

power do not change. The planets maintain their orbits. The seasons continue their progression. Fane is casting off as ephemeral the representational framework of the Platonic spheres adopted at court by Charles I and Henrietta Maria:

Doe not the Planets (how-somere  
They wander) stil retain a proper Sphere?  
And Seasons serve the year to bless?  
Although the stormes and tempests are noe less? (ll. 1–4)<sup>216</sup>

While Loxley sees Henrietta Maria as the speaker in this poem, Cain argues persuasively that the desire for reconciliation expressed in the text is uncharacteristic of Henrietta Maria and that the last lines in particular represent Fane's own 'acceptance of the new *de facto* order'.<sup>217</sup> It may be relevant that Fane wrote the poem the day before it was recommended that his estates be freed from sequestration upon payment of a substantial fine, although Loxley relates it to the queen's departure from England about ten days earlier.

The metaphor of the stormy sea adopted by Lovelace in 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea* to ALEXIS' is also appropriated by Fane, without the allegorical overlay. Fane argues that although storms will sink some, others will survive. He, the speaker, will stay constant to his king even though, by compounding with Parliament, he has taken a different path:

Befrend me wind, Ile trye the wave  
Though some ther be must sink, yet some't may save  
My Calender yet markes out Spring,  
[...]  
'Tis reconciling Truth points now the way,  
In which I would be thought as farr  
From Variation, as the Fixed'st starr;  
But with a Constant shining thence  
Serve King and Cuntry by my Influence. (ll. 21–30)

The references to wind and wave inevitably call to mind Lovelace's treatment of the same theme in 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea* to ALEXIS'. The allusion to constancy again implies a reference to Justus Lipsius's activist construction of retirement in *De Constantia*. Fane's speaker's retirement from the cause is an active one. Constant as 'the fixedst Starr', he will serve his king and his country using his considerable influence. The implication is that, like Lovelace's, Fane's speaker sees his loyalty as being to a higher cause, country, rather than to any specific king.

## Where Does Lovelace Stand?

I have argued that ‘AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*’ and ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’ show Lovelace using discourses more commonly associated with parliamentary propaganda to criticise his king and queen. Both poems employ a refracted version of the imagery of the court masques. In both, Charles I is shown to be emasculated by his dependence on his alien, Roman Catholic spouse, Henrietta Maria. She is, at best, feckless, unaware of the damage she is doing to the crown. In the first poem, Lovelace’s speaker asserts his independence to serve the king however he chooses. However, he neither rejects his king outright, nor turns away from the monarchy. In the second poem, written some years later, he looks to the succession to restore the Stuart monarchy to its rightful place through generational change.

Lovelace was not the only loyal royalist poet to appropriate parliamentary discourses in offering criticism of the crown, or to use the pre-war metaphorical framework by which the monarchy represented itself to represent the source the troubles. The range of views expressed in Mildmay Fane’s private papers and published works show that poets at this time were able to write in a range of registers. It is clear that Fane graduated his criticism according to the level of exposure he expected his work to receive. We are able to reach this conclusion because his extensive private papers survived, where others’ did not.

For a range of reasons, loyalists struggled to find a language with which to defend their queen, even when they chose to do so. Henrietta Maria provided a convenient scapegoat for those who did not want to criticise the king or, by extension, the institution of the monarchy. The imagery of the court masque, which had dominated representations of the ethos of the early Stuart court, provided a rich store of poetic language for poets like Fane and Lovelace to plunder. Henrietta Maria had been integral to that discourse before the wars. The association continued in Hughes’s poems. In later years, she became an easy target for parliamentarians and royalists, including Lovelace. It is notable that, once the allegorical covering is stripped away, Lovelace’s criticism of the queen is superficially more overt in the earlier poem, ‘AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*’ than in ‘AMYNTOR’S GROVE’. In the latter poem, the odium attaching to the queen’s palace at Somerset

House and to royal cabinets gives a sharp edge to what might otherwise appear muted criticism.

## **Endnotes**

<sup>1</sup> Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 75.

<sup>2</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 136-39, 85-90.

<sup>3</sup> Thomas N. Corns, 'The Poetry of the Caroline Court', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 97 (1998), 51-73 (p. 61).

<sup>4</sup> Corns, pp. 61-62.

<sup>5</sup> Blair Worden, *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 53.

<sup>6</sup> Worden, *Literature and Politics*, p. 53, quoting *Mercurius Britannicus*, 30 September 1643, p. 399, E. 10 [21]. Other editions of Nedham's *Mercurius Britannicus* alluded to by Worden that make the point on the masques most clearly include those of 16 November 1643, p. 89, E. 75 [38] and 28 October 1644, p. 431, E. 14 [3].

<sup>7</sup> Diane Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 73.

<sup>8</sup> Purkiss, pp. 73-74; Michelle Anne White, *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), p. 103.

<sup>9</sup> Jerome De Groot, *Royalist Identities* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), pp. 117-35; the quotations which follow are from pp. 126-129 sequentially.

<sup>10</sup> Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), p. 130; Robert Wilcher, *The Discontented Cavalier: The Work of Sir John Suckling in Its Social, Religious, Political, and Literary Contexts* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007), pp. 286-87.

<sup>11</sup> Public Record Office Great Britain, *Calendar of the State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy*, ed. Allen B. Hinds (London: HMSO, 1925), XXVI, p. 240. Italics reversed.

<sup>12</sup> See Ch. 2 in particular.

<sup>13</sup> Henry Hughes, *Poems*, ed. by Glyn Pursglove (Salzburg: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, 1997). I would like to thank Tim Raylor for bringing Pursglove's edition of Hughes's poems to my attention.

<sup>14</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 136-39, 85-90.

<sup>15</sup> Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 21.

<sup>16</sup> Potter, *Secret Rites*, p. 75.



<sup>17</sup> The classic treatment of self-censorship during these years is to be found in Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984 repr. 1990). See also, Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2007). For a Lovelace-specific analysis, see Randy Robertson, 'Lovelace and the 'Barbed Censurers': *Lucasta* and Civil War Censorship', *Studies in Philology*, 103 (2006), 465-98.

<sup>18</sup> Potter, *Secret Rites*, pp. 113-17.

<sup>19</sup> Lovelace appropriated similar imagery from Davenant in 'TO AMARANTHA', as discussed in Chapter 4.

<sup>20</sup> See Ch. 2.

<sup>21</sup> See Ch. 2 and, for example, Gerald Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 71 (1985), 203-34 (p. 224).

<sup>22</sup> Hazlitt, *Poems*, p. xxxvi.

<sup>23</sup> Annabel Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valéry* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 151-63, discusses the uses to which Virgil's *Eclogues* were put during the Civil War and Interregnum, including by Marvell and Milton. There is a relevant translation of *Eclogue* II in Abraham Fraunce, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Yvychurch* (London, 1591), sigs L3<sup>r</sup>-L4<sup>r</sup>. For a discussion of the topos, see Maren-Sofie Røstvig, *The Happy Man: Studies in the Metamorphoses of a Classical Ideal*, 2nd ed., vol. I (Oslo: Norwegian Universities Press, 1962). Contemporary translations are in John Bidle, ed., *Virgil's Bucolicks Englished* (London, 1634) and John Ogilby, ed., *The Works of Publius Virgilius Maro* (London, 1649). The shepherd 'Alexis' appears in Thomas Randolph's play, *Amyntas*, first performed 1630 and John Fletcher's, *The Faithful Shepherdess*, relaunched 1632.

<sup>24</sup> Thomas Randolph, *Poems, With The Muses Looking-Glasse and Amyntas*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1640), p. 84.

<sup>25</sup> Blair Worden, 'Historians and Poets', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68 (2005), 71-93 (p. 83).

<sup>26</sup> See, for example, Nicholas Cronk, 'Aristotle, Horace, and Longinus: The Conception of Reader Response', in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism Vol. III*, ed. Glyn P. Norton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 199-204; Ben Jonson, *Love's Triumph Through Callipolis*, in *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, ed. Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973), 404-15. Jonson's translation of the *Ars Poetica* was first published in 1640.

<sup>27</sup> See Chapter 2.

<sup>28</sup> Patterson, *Pastoral and Ideology*, p. 151.

<sup>29</sup> Elizabeth Story Donno, ed., *Three Romance Pastorals: Tasso, Guarini, Daniel* (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1993); Baptista Guarini, *Il Pastor Fido, The Faithfull Shepherd*, trans. Sir Richard Fanshawe (London, 1647); Torquato Tasso, *Torquato Tasso's Aminta Englished*, ed. Henry Reynolds (London, 1628).

<sup>30</sup> *Musarum Oxoniensium Epibateria* (Oxford, 1643). E. 62 [14] This volume has attracted some critical attention; see, for example, De Groot, *Royalist Identities*, pp. 127-37; James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), pp. 81-84; Robert Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism: 1628-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 172-74.

<sup>31</sup> *Musarum Oxoniensium Epibateria*, sigs B2<sup>v</sup>–B3<sup>v</sup>. Italics reversed.

<sup>32</sup> Willa McClung Evans, *Henry Lawes: Musician and Friend of Poets* (New York: MLAA, 1941), p. 222; Hughes, *Poems*, pp. xxiii-xxix; Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 239, note 95; Ian Spink, *Henry Lawes: Cavalier Songwriter* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 82-86; *The Poetry of Mildmay Fane, Second Earl of Westmorland: From the Fulbeck, Harvard and Westmorland Manuscripts*, ed by Tom Cain (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), p. 385; Dosia Reichardt, 'Another Look at 'Amyntor's Grove': Pastoral and Patronage in Lovelace's Poem', *Early Modern Literary Studies* 11, no. 5, 1-20 (2006), <<http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/11-3/reicamyn.htm>>.

<sup>33</sup> Alison McNeil Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia: Pastoral Art and Its Audience in the Golden Age* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press 1983), p. 177. The painting of the queen is recorded as hanging in her dressing room at Whitehall in Oliver Millar, 'Abraham Van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I', *Walpole Society*, 37 (1958-1960)p. 175.

<sup>34</sup> Ian Spink, *Henry Lawes: Cavalier Songwriter* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 45-48, 82-86; Tasso, *Aminta Englisht*. Spink, p. 89, notes that Lawes, in a marginal note to his musical setting to the manuscript version of Waller's 'Love's Farewell' ('Treading the path to nobler Ends'), a companion piece to one of Waller's 'Chloris' poems, identifies 'the Nympe I dare not, need not name' as 'the Queene'.

<sup>35</sup> Ian Spink, 'Hughes, Henry (c 1601-c. 1652)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>36</sup> William Habington, *Castara*, 3rd edn (London, 1640). See also Chs 3-4.

<sup>37</sup> Hughes, *Poems*, pp. xxiii-xxiv.

<sup>38</sup> Henry Lawes, *Ayres, and Dialogues. The Second Book* (London, 1655), p. 1.

<sup>39</sup> Margaret Crum, ed., *First-Line Index of English Poetry 1500-1800 in Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library Oxford*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), II, p.756, n. 260. Bodleian MS Rawlinson Poet. 84, fol. 88. Crum tentatively suggests that this poem relates to the arrival of Marie de Medici in 1638.

<sup>40</sup> Dosia Reichardt, 'Another Look at 'Amyntor's Grove'', para. 10.

<sup>41</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 110-111. Susan A. Clarke, 'Royalists Write the Death of Lord Hastings: Post Regicide Funerary Propaganda', *Parergon*, 22 (2005), 113-30.

<sup>42</sup> Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics*, p. 115.

<sup>43</sup> The title is from 'J.S.' translation *The Lyrick Poet Odes and Satyres* (London, 1649).

<sup>44</sup> Henry Lawes et al, *Select Ayres and Dialogues*, 3 vols (London, 1669), II, pp. 112-13.

<sup>45</sup> Albert Chatterley, 'Watson, Thomas (1555/6-1592)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

- <sup>46</sup> Fraunce, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Yvychurch*, sig. A2<sup>f</sup>. Italics reversed.
- <sup>47</sup> Fraunce, sigs L3<sup>f</sup>-L4<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>48</sup> *The Tragedy of Phillis, complaining of the disloyall love of Amintas* (London, 1641-48).
- <sup>49</sup> Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *The Maid's Tragedy*, ed. by T.W. Craik, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), pp. 3-4. *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher, Variorum Edition*, ed. by Alexander Dyce, 11 vols (London, 1679), I, p. 313. Dyce noted that one element of the largely original plot of *The Maid's Tragedy* drew on Book III of Sidney's *Arcadia*, the combat between Parthenis and Amphialus played out in this context between Amintor and Aspatia.
- <sup>50</sup> Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *The Maid's Tragedy*, ed. by Andrew Gurr (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1969), p. 5.
- <sup>51</sup> Peter Berek, 'Cross-Dressing, Gender, and Absolutism in the Beaumont and Fletcher Plays', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 44 (2004), 359-77 (p. 370).
- <sup>52</sup> Gurr, ed., *The Maid's Tragedy*, pp. 1, 7, 9; Craik ed., *The Maid's Tragedy*, p. 2. Quartos appeared in 1619, 1622, 1630, 1638, 1641 and 1660
- <sup>53</sup> *Posthume Poems*, p. 73, 'Splendid in all the bright *Aspatia's* woes'.
- <sup>54</sup> Lawes et al, *Select Ayres and Dialogues*, II, pp.112-13. There is a setting by another contemporary royalist musician and scholar, Robert Ramsay, in Bodleian MS Doncaster C. 57, No. 2, fol. 4, discussed in John P. Cutts, 'A Bodleian Song-Book: Don, C. 57', *Music and Letters*, 34 (1953), 192-211 (p. 193).
- <sup>55</sup> '*Amintors welladay*' continued to appear into the eighteenth century. See Crum, ed., *First-Line Index*, I, p. 151, no. 212; Henry Lawes, *Ayres, and Dialogues. The Third Book* (London, 1658), p. 10; Bodleian MSS Ashmole 38, fol. 238; Rawl. Poet. 65, fol. 36; Rawl. Poet, 84, fol. 88. See also Dosia Reichardt, 'Some Unnoticed Lovelace Manuscripts', *Notes and Queries*, 49 (2002), 336-38.
- <sup>56</sup> Lawes, *Ayres, and Dialogues. The Third Book*, p. 10.
- <sup>57</sup> Julie Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm during the English Civil War* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2003), p. 232.
- <sup>58</sup> Hazlitt, p. 82.
- <sup>59</sup> Hazlitt, p. 84; *Poems*, p. 274. See also Reichardt, 'Another Look at 'Amyntor's Grove''.
- <sup>60</sup> I would like to thank Anthony Adolph for his assistance in reaching this conclusion.
- <sup>61</sup> Dr Diana Dethloff is in the early stages of compiling a catalogue raisonné of Lely's work. For a description of the portraits of the children, and of problems with identification, see Margaret R. Toynbee, 'The Early Work of Sir Peter Lely', *Burlington Magazine*, 88 (1946), 75-76 and Margaret R. Toynbee, 'The Date of Sir Peter Lely's 'Three Children of Charles I'', *Burlington Magazine*, 121 (1979), 316-37.
- <sup>62</sup> The catalogue is transcribed in 'Sir Peter Lely's Collection', *Burlington Magazine*, 83 (1943), 185-91. It is discussed in Diana Dethloff, 'The Executors' Account Book and the Dispersal of Sir Peter Lely's Collection', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 8 (1996), 15-51. See also Oliver Millar, *Sir*

*Peter Lely, 1618-80* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1978), p. 77, Plate 71. Sir Oliver suggests that ‘conceivably the sitter is identical with the Gratiana whose singing and dancing were celebrated in verses by Lovelace’. He argues that the sketch *Portrait of a Girl* at Plate 71 in the 1978 Lely exhibition catalogue is Lely’s ‘Mrs Gratiana’. He identifies the girl in the portrait as ‘the model for Europa in the painting at Chatsworth [...] and perhaps for the girl in the *Music Lesson* of 1654’. Presumably on that basis, he locates the drawing in the 1650s. If Millar were correct, Lovelace’s ‘Gratiana’ could not equate with Princess Elizabeth, who died in 1650, some years before Lely painted the *Music Lesson*. Dr Dethloff is of the view that the sketch at Plate 71 cannot be the ‘craion’ of ‘Mrs. *Gratiana*’ listed in the sale catalogue. Notes in possession of the author. I would like to thank Dr Dethloff for her generous assistance in this matter.

<sup>63</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 13-14. See, for example, A.D. Cousins, ‘Lucasta, Gratiana, and the Amatory Wit of Lovelace’, *Parergon*, 6 (1988), 97-104.

<sup>64</sup> Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 162.

<sup>65</sup> Loxley, p. 162.

<sup>66</sup> Loxley, pp. 163-64.

<sup>67</sup> *Munday 29th. January, 1648. A True Relation of the Kings Speech to the Lady Elizabeth, and the Duke of Gloucester, the Day before his Death* (London, 1649), 669 f. 14 [9].

<sup>68</sup> *The King and Queenes Entertainement at Richmond After Their Departure from Oxford* (Oxford, 1636), p. 31.

<sup>69</sup> See Ch. 2.

<sup>70</sup> Raymond Needham and Alexander Webster, *Somerset House: Past and Present* (London: Unwin, 1905), p. 97.

<sup>71</sup> John Aubrey, ‘*Brief Lives*,’ *Chiefly of Contemporaries, Set Down by John Aubrey, Between the Years 1669 & 1696*, ed. Andrew Clark, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898), II, p. 277; Needham and Webster, *Somerset House*, p. 97.

<sup>72</sup> Graham Parry, *Hollar’s England: A Mid-Seventeenth-Century View* (Wilton, Wilts.: M. Russell, 1980), p. 14.

<sup>73</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 53-55, 63-64; *Posthume Poems*, pp. 7-8, 15-17. The possibility of such a connection between Hollar and Lovelace is also raised in Joseph Monteyne, ‘Enveloping Objects: Allegory and Commodity Fetish in Wenceslas Hollar’s Personifications of the Seasons and Fashion Still Lifes’, *Art History*, 29 (2006), 414-43 (pp. 433-36). The relevant Hollar engravings are reproduced there. For Hollar’s engravings of the muff, the ostrich, the snail and the grasshopper, see also Parry, *Hollar’s England: A Mid-Seventeenth-Century View*, Plates 42, 47, 58, 50.

<sup>74</sup> George A. Drake, ‘Percy, Algernon, tenth earl of Northumberland (1602–1668)’, *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>75</sup> The painting is in the collection of His Grace the Duke of Northumberland. Millar, *Sir Peter Lely, 1618-80*, pp. 37-38.

<sup>76</sup> Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, pp. 156-57, 66-67; Nicholas McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars: Marvell and the Cause of Wit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 124-28; Potter, *Secret Rites*, pp. 65-70.

<sup>77</sup> Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 166.

<sup>78</sup> Loxley, pp. 160, 65.

<sup>79</sup> Mary Anne Everett Green, *Lives of the Princesses of England*, 6 vols (London, 1849-1855), VI, p. 359-60. Mrs Everett Green remains the most useful source on Princess Elizabeth.

<sup>80</sup> *HMC Sixth Report Appendix*, p. 316; West Sussex Records Office, Leconfield MS, Petworth House Archive MS 172, fol. 11<sup>r</sup>. Loxley quotes this source, p. 187, n. 77-78. I would like to thank Alison McCann of the West Sussex Records Office for helping identify the documents, and Lord Egremont for allowing the Records Office to copy the relevant entries on my behalf. The accounts books (Leconfield MS, Petworth House Archive MSS 172 and 649) show that Princess Elizabeth and her brothers were taught to dance and that the princess gambled small amounts at cards.

<sup>81</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 10. Andrew Ashbee and David Lasocki, eds., *A Biographical Dictionary of English Court Musicians, 1485-1714*, 2 vols (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), I, pp. 600-03.

<sup>82</sup> See, for example, Raymond A. Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1988), p. 102; L.E. Semler, *The English Mannerist Poets and the Visual Arts* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1998), p. 168. For discussion of the poem in the context of female tears, see Dosia Reichardt, 'Looking For Lovelace: Identity, Style and Inheritance in the Poetry of the Interregnum', (Unpublished PhD thesis, James Cook University, 2003), pp. 66-67.

<sup>83</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 136-39

<sup>84</sup> Lawes, *Ayres, and Dialogues. The Second Book*, pp. 1-3; Lawes, *Ayres, and Dialogues. The Third Book*, pp. 1-2. All references to these poems are to the Lawes texts. They are also to be found in Hughes, *Poems*, pp. 20, 26-28.

<sup>85</sup> John Tatham, *Ostella: Or, the Faction of Love and Beauty Reconcil'd* (London, 1650), pp. 82-83. *Poems*, pp. xliii-xliv.

<sup>86</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 37-39.

<sup>87</sup> Peter Burke, 'The Renaissance Dialogue', *Renaissance Studies*, 3 (1989), 1-12 (pp. 3-4), includes a useful typology of dialogues, dividing them into catechistic or didactic, disputational, conversational (for example, Castiglione's *The Courtier*) and dramatic dialogues, of which the royalist musical dialogues form a subset. See also Virginia Cox, *The Renaissance Dialogue: Literary Dialogue in its Social and Political contexts, Castiglioni to Galileo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

<sup>88</sup> Ian Spink, 'English Seventeenth-Century Dialogues', *Music & Letters*, 38 (1957), 155-63.

Marvell's 'Thyrsis and Dorinda' is in John Gamble, *Ayres and Dialogues. The Second Book* (London, 1659), pp. 66-69, where it precedes Lovelace's 'Dialogue. LUCASTA, ALEXIS' (pp. 53-56) by a few pages. Almost all the dialogues published in this volume are pastorals. Dialogues of this kind are also

addressed in passing by Corns, 'The Poetry of the Caroline Court', pp. 58-60. Debate on the authorship of Marvell's 'Thyrsis and Dorinda' is summarised in Marvell, *Poems*, 243-244. See also David Pinto, 'Unmasking Thyrsis and Dorinda: Viper-Wine, Reclaimed Women and Declamatory Song', *The Consort*, 58 (2002), 29-40.

<sup>89</sup> The prefatory material to Lawes, *Ayres, and Dialogues. The Second Book*, includes commendatory poems by Katharine Phillips, John Berkenhead, John Wilson and Charles Coleman. Lawes's dedicatory letter to Lady Dering, wife to the younger Sir Edward Dering, draws attention to this context when he praises Lady Dering for her 'excellent' performance of the songs, some of which she wrote herself. The royalist musical circle in London during the Interregnum is discussed in Spink, *Henry Lawes*, pp. 94-96.

<sup>90</sup> Milton, *Poems, Comus*, ll. 866-85, pp. 220-21.

<sup>91</sup> Lawes, *Ayres, and Dialogues. The Second Book*, pp. 1-3; Lawes, *Ayres, and Dialogues. The Third Book*, pp. 1-2.

<sup>92</sup> Lawes, *Ayres, and Dialogues. The Third Book*, p. 1.

<sup>93</sup> Lawes, *Ayres, and Dialogues. The Second Book*, pp. 1-3.

<sup>94</sup> Martin Butler, 'Politics and the Masque: *Salmacida Spolia*', in *Literature and the English Civil War*, ed. Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 59-74.

<sup>95</sup> Lovelace had already drawn on *the Temple of Love* in his early court lyrics; see Ch. 3. See also Lesel Dawson, '"New Sects of Love": Neoplatonism and Constructions of Gender in Davenant's *The Temple of Love* and *The Platonick Lovers*', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 8, no. 1 (2002), 4.1-36, <<http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/08-1/dawsnew.htm>>, accessed 30 November 2009; Stephen Orgel, 'Inigo Jones' Persian Entertainment', *AARP: Art and Archaeology Research Papers*, 2 (1972), 59-69; Axel Stähler, 'Between Tiger and Unicorn: *The Temple of Love*', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 61 (1998), 176-97.

<sup>96</sup> Stephen Orgel, 'Plato, the Magi, and Caroline Politics: A Reading of *The Temple of Love*', *Word and Image*, 4 (1988), 663-77 (p. 667).

<sup>97</sup> Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong, *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, 2 vols (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973), II, p. 603. The 'Chariot of shell' was a continuing presence in early Stuart maritime masques. In *Loves Triumph*, Amphitrite, entitled 'Wife of Oceanus', probably entered in a shell of the kind described in *The Masque of Blackness* (1605) as 'a great concave shell, like mother of pearl, curiously made to move on those waters'. A similar design is described in *Tethys' Festival* (1610).

<sup>98</sup> Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones*, II, p. 600.

<sup>99</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 85-90.

<sup>100</sup> Hazlitt, p. 84; *Poems*, pp. 274-75; H.M. Margoliouth, 'The Poems of Richard Lovelace', *Review of English Studies*, 3 (1927), 89-95 (p. 93). See also Reichardt, 'Another Look at 'Amyntor's Grove''.

- <sup>101</sup> Manfred Weidhorn, *Richard Lovelace*, (New York: Twayne, 1970), pp. 65-66; Mary-Anne C. McGuire, 'The Cavalier Country-House Poem: Mutations on a Jonsonian Tradition', *Studies in English Literature*, 19 (1979), 93-108; Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*, pp. 107-08; Leah S. Marcus, 'Politics and Pastoral: Writing the Court on the Countryside', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake, (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), pp. 150-151; Kari Boyd McBride, *Country House Discourse in Early Modern England: A Cultural Study of Landscape and Legitimacy* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 146-49.
- <sup>102</sup> Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*, pp. 107-08; Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism*, p. 308.
- <sup>103</sup> Semler, *The English Mannerist Poets*, pp. 168-69; L.N. Wall, 'Some Notes on Marvell's Sources', *Notes and Queries*, 202 (1957), 170-73; Marvell, *Poems*, pp. 92-93.
- <sup>104</sup> Most critics name Porter's grove as being at Aston-sub-Edge, Gloucestershire. Woodhall, Hertfordshire, is named in Alastair Fowler, *The Country House Poem: A Cabinet of Seventeenth-Century Estate Poems and Related Items* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994), p. 270. Ronald G. Asch, 'Porter, Endymion (1587-1649)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009, suggests that Porter did not frequent Aston-sub-Edge in his later years.
- <sup>105</sup> Marcus, 'Politics and Pastoral', p. 150.
- <sup>106</sup> Raymond A. Anselment, "'Clouded Majesty': Richard Lovelace, Sir Peter Lely, and the Royalist Spirit", *Studies in Philology*, 86 (1989), 367-87 (p. 373).
- <sup>107</sup> Hazlitt, p. 84. See Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, 4 vols (London: Mansell, 1980-1993), II, 2, p10, for a discussion of the manuscript. The terms 'eulogy' and 'eulogy were used interchangeably during these years. See Fowler, *The Country House Poem: A Cabinet of Seventeenth-Century Estate Poems and Related Items*, p. 270 and *OED Online*, 'eulogy', definition 3, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>108</sup> Marvell, *Poems*, pp. 92-95.
- <sup>109</sup> H.M. Colvin, ed., *The History of the King's Works*, 6 vols (London: HMSO, 1963-1982), IV, 2, p. 261. On Somerset House, see also Needham and Webster, *Somerset House*; John Newman, *Somerset House: Splendour and Order* (London: Scala Books, 1990). It was known as Denmark House during the previous reign, and was sometimes referred to under that title during the war years.
- <sup>110</sup> Colvin, ed., *The History of the King's Works*, IV, pp. 261-71; V, Fig. 22 Plan and Plate 33 Engraving.
- <sup>111</sup> Karen Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 42; Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones*, I, pp. 80, 389, 97 and II, pp. 505, 725, 826; John Orrell, *The Theatres of Inigo Jones and John Webb* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 81-82; Erica Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 137-39.
- <sup>112</sup> Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria*, p. 42.
- <sup>113</sup> Orrell, *The Theatres of Inigo Jones and John Webb*, p. 82.

- <sup>114</sup> John Orrell, 'The Paved Court Theatre at Somerset House', *British Library Journal*, 3 (1977), 13-19; Orrell, *The Theatres of Inigo Jones and John Webb*, p. 114.
- <sup>115</sup> Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion*, pp. 137-39.
- <sup>116</sup> Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones*, II, pp. 608-09.
- <sup>117</sup> Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion*, pp. 137-39.
- <sup>118</sup> Orgel and Strong, *Inigo Jones*, I, pp. 79-80.
- <sup>119</sup> Peter Davidson, ed., *Poetry and Revolution: An Anthology of British and Irish Verse, 1625-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), p. 321, l. 29.
- <sup>120</sup> For a contemporary account of the chapel and services at Somerset House, see Cyprien de Gamache, 'Memoirs of the Mission in England of the Capuchin Friars', in *The Court and Times of Charles the First*, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1849), 289-501 (pp. 310-16).
- <sup>121</sup> Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion*, quoting Gamache.
- <sup>122</sup> Marcus, 'Politics and Pastoral', p. 151.
- <sup>123</sup> Garrard to Strafford, 8 January 1635/36, quoted in Veevers, *Images of Love and Religion*, p. 168.
- <sup>124</sup> Reichardt, 'Another Look at 'Amyntor's Grove'', paras 6-7.
- <sup>125</sup> Colvin, ed., *The History of the King's Works*, IV, 2, pp. 268.
- <sup>126</sup> Colvin, ed., IV, 2, p. 268-69.
- <sup>127</sup> Millar, 'Abraham Van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I'; Oliver Millar, 'The Inventories and Valuations of the King's Goods 1649-51', *Walpole Society*, 43 (1970-72).
- <sup>128</sup> Millar, 'The Inventories and Valuations of the King's Goods 1649-51', pp. 304-06.
- <sup>129</sup> Colvin, ed., *The History of the King's Works*, IV, 2, pp. 262-63, 341-42. On *Maniera* painting in this context, see S.J. Freedberg, 'Observations on the Painting of the Maniera', *Art Bulletin*, 47 (1965), 187-97 (p. 193); see also, Semler, *The English Mannerist Poets and the Visual Arts*, p. 169.
- <sup>130</sup> Colvin, ed., *The History of the King's Works*, IV, 2, pp. 262-63.
- <sup>131</sup> Millar, 'Abraham Van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I', p. 106.
- <sup>132</sup> Colvin, ed., *The History of the King's Works*, IV, 2, pp. 268-69; Millar, 'Abraham Van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I', p. 105; Millar, 'The Inventories and Valuations of the King's Goods 1649-51', pp. 317-18. The room identified in the Sale Catalogue as the 'great Closett' can be equated with 'queen's cabinet' in Colvin by the location of the Van Dyck portrait described as 'The King & Queene w<sup>th</sup> a lawrell leafe', which Millar identifies from a note in the Van de Doort Catalogue as being placed above the fireplace in the cabinet, in Oliver Millar, 'Some Painters and Charles I', *Burlington Magazine*, 104 (1962), 323-30 (p. 329). In addition, Colvin notes that twenty frames were prepared for paintings for the queen's cabinet in 1631-33. It is unlikely to be coincidental that the Sale Catalogue lists twenty paintings in the 'great Closett'.
- <sup>133</sup> Millar, 'Abraham Van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I', pp. xiii-xiv, 105; Simon Thurley, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240-1698* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), p. 93.



- <sup>134</sup> Carew, *Poems*, pp. 86-89; Jonson, *Poems*, pp. 282-287. On country house poems more generally, see Fowler, *The Country House Poem*; G.R. Hibbard, 'The Country House Poem of the Seventeenth Century', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 19 (1956), 159-74; Hugh Jenkins, *Feigned Commonwealths: The Country-House Poem and the Fashioning of the Ideal Community* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1998); McBride, *Country House Discourse*; William A. McClung, *The Country House in English Renaissance Poetry* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977).
- <sup>135</sup> McGuire, 'The Cavalier Country-House Poem', p. 102.
- <sup>136</sup> Marcus, 'Politics and Pastoral: Writing the Court on the Countryside', p. 146. See also Michael P. Parker, "'To my friend G.N. from Wrest': Carew's Secular Masque', in *Classic and Cavalier: Essays on Jonson and the Sons of Ben*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Pittsburgh: University Press, 1982), 171-91.
- <sup>137</sup> Marcus, 'Politics and Pastoral', p. 150.
- <sup>138</sup> Reichardt, 'Another Look at "Amyntor's Grove"', para. 14.
- <sup>139</sup> John Adamson, 'Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), 161-97 (pp. 173, 88).
- <sup>140</sup> Carew, *Poems*, pp. 164-65, ll. 431-33, 440-50.
- <sup>141</sup> Adamson, 'Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England', p. 188.
- <sup>142</sup> Millar, 'The Inventories and Valuations of the King's Goods 1649-51', pp. 317-18. As well as the great Van Dyck portrait of the king and queen, there were seven religious paintings, six foreign dynastic pieces, two English dynastic paintings (Henry VIII and James I) and four miscellaneous.
- <sup>143</sup> Marvell, *Poems*, pp. 92-93.
- <sup>144</sup> Fowler, *The Country House Poem*, p. 12. See, in particular, Martial, *Epigrams* III. lviii; Horace, *Odes* II. xviii; Statius *Silvae* I. iii, II. ii.
- <sup>145</sup> P. Papinius Statius, *Silvae*, trans. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, 2 vols, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003), I, pp. 65-67.
- <sup>146</sup> Statius, *Silvae*, I, p. 69.
- <sup>147</sup> Statius, *Silvae*, I, p. 127.
- <sup>148</sup> Jonson, *Poems*, pp. 285-287, ll. 79-80. See also Fowler, *The Country House Poem*, pp. 66-69.
- <sup>149</sup> David Scott, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642-49', in *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-49*, ed. John Adamson (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 36-60 (p. 48).
- <sup>150</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 34-36
- <sup>151</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 61-62.
- <sup>152</sup> *CSPD (Interregnum)*, accessed 30 November 2009. *Sportive Wit* (London, 1656), is mentioned on 22 and 25 April 1656. It was edited by 'J.P.', considered to be Milton's nephew, John Phillips. *Choyce Drollery* (London, 1656), is mentioned on 9 May 1656.

- <sup>153</sup> *Sportive Wit*, pp. 15-17. The pagination in this volume is irregular.
- <sup>154</sup> For examples, see the collection in John Wardroper, ed., *Love and Drollery* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969).
- <sup>155</sup> *Choyce Drollery*, pp. 63-67.
- <sup>156</sup> Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria*, p. 197. On Nedham, see above, and Worden, *Literature and Politics*, p. 53.
- <sup>157</sup> *The Great Eclipse of the Sun: Or, Charles His Waine Over-clouded* (London, 1644), E. 7 [30], printed 30 August 1644. The text of this pamphlet is in the same vein as the title page.
- <sup>158</sup> See Ch. 5.
- <sup>159</sup> *OED Online*, 'cabinet', definition II.7.b, accessed 30 November 2009. *Mercurius Britannicus*, 22 July 1644, E.2 [31], p. 347.
- <sup>160</sup> *The Great Eclipse of the Sun*.
- <sup>161</sup> There are detailed examinations of the relevant texts in, for example, Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics*, Ch. 3 and White, *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars*, Chs 4-5.
- <sup>162</sup> *CJ*, 19 February 1642, accessed 30 November 2009. Diane Purkiss refers to this document as *The Declaration of Fears and Jealousies* in her popular history, *The English Civil War: A People's History* (London: Harper Perennial, 2006), p. 107.
- <sup>163</sup> *OED Online*, 'cabinet', meanings I, 1-6 and II, 7-8, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>164</sup> Ann Baynes Coiro, 'A Ball of Strife': Caroline Poetry and Royal Marriage', in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 26-46; Derek Hirst, 'Reading the Royal Romance: Or, Intimacy in a King's Cabinet', *Seventeenth Century*, 18 (2003), 211-29.
- <sup>165</sup> *The Kings Cabinet Opened: Or, Certain Packets of Secret Letters & Papers, Written with the Kings Own Hand* (London, 1645), E. 292 [27], annotated 14 July 1645. May is identified in White, *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars*, p. 166.
- <sup>166</sup> *The Kings Cabinet Opened*, pp. 43-44.
- <sup>167</sup> *Mercurius Britannicus*, 28 July 1645, E. 294 [5]. See also issues of 21 July 1645, E. 293 [15] and 4 August 1645, E. 294 [29].
- <sup>168</sup> *Mercurius Britannicus*, 8 September 1645, E. 300 [6], p. 858.
- <sup>169</sup> Don M. Wolfe, ed., *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, 8 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953-98), III, p. 538.
- <sup>170</sup> Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm*, p. 72. See also Frances E. Dolan, 'Gender and the 'Lost' Spaces of Catholicism', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 32 (2002), 641-65 (pp. 648-50).
- <sup>171</sup> *The Last Will and Testament of Superstition: Eldest Daughter to the Antichrist* (London, 1642), Thomason E. 135 [11]; *A True Inventory of the Goods and Chattels of Superstition* (London, 1642), Thomason E. 135 [19]; *The Friars Last Fare-well: Or, Saint Francis Must Pack for France* (London, 1642), Thomason E. 136 [27].

<sup>172</sup> *CJ*, 10 November 1642; see also *CJ*, 2 September, 26 October, 5 November 1642; 18, 25 and 30 March 1643, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>173</sup> Great Britain, *Calendar of the State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy*, XXVI, p. 262. See also, for example, *A Perfect Diurnall of the Passages in Parliament*, 3 April 1643, E. 247 [18]; *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, 4 April 1643, E. 95 [2]; *A Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages*, 6 April 1643, E. 95 [4]; Gamache, 'Memoirs', pp. 351-54.

<sup>174</sup> Albert J. Loomie, 'The Destruction of Rubens's 'Crucifixion' in the Queen's Chapel, Somerset House', *Burlington Magazine*, 140 (1998), 680-82.

<sup>175</sup> John Vicars, *True Information of the Beginning and Cause of all our Troubles* (London, 1648/49), p. 19. See also Spraggon, *Puritan Iconoclasm*, pp. 71-72.

<sup>176</sup> Abraham Cowley, *Works* (London, 1668), Verses Written on Several Occasions, pp. 26-28; Charles Larson, 'The Somerset House Poems of Cowley and Waller', *Papers on Language & Literature*, 10 (1974), 126-35; Edmund Waller, *Upon Her Majesties New Buildings at Somerset-House* (London, 1665).

<sup>177</sup> 'On the Queens Repairing Somerset House'; Cowley, *Works*, Verses Written on Several Occasions, pp. 26-28.

<sup>178</sup> See, for example, De Groot, *Royalist Identities*; Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*; McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*; Geoffrey Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640-1660* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism*. On Henrietta Maria specifically, see Britland, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria*; Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics*; White, *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars*.

<sup>179</sup> Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, pp. 81-83; White, *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars*, p. 148; Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism*, pp. 172-73.

<sup>180</sup> White, *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars*, p. 148.

<sup>181</sup> White, pp. 104-05. See also Ch. 4.

<sup>182</sup> White, p. 149.

<sup>183</sup> Scott, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642-49', p. 43. Scott names William Cavendish, Henry Jermyn and John Colepeper as notable representatives of this grouping.

<sup>184</sup> *Musarum Oxoniensium Epibateria*, sig. B1<sup>r-v</sup>. Italics reversed.

<sup>185</sup> *The Poems of John Cleveland*, ed. by Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. xxxviii, 69, 157-58.

<sup>186</sup> Henry Lawes, *Ayres, and Dialogues. The First Booke* (London, 1653), p. 35. The attribution to Lenton is in the Table of Contents, opposite p. 1.

<sup>187</sup> Bodleian MS Ashmole 788, fol. 22; J.B. Leishman, '“You Meaner Beauties of the Night”: A Study in Transmission and Transmogrification', *Library*, 26 (1945), 99-121 (p. 116). Leishman thought the lyric was written after the Regicide. A date between 1646 and the Regicide is more likely.

<sup>188</sup> Leishman, p. 116.

<sup>189</sup> Leishman, p. 116. MS Ashmole 788, fol. 22, transcribed by Leishman and quoted here, includes four stanzas, of which these are the third and fourth. The version ascribed to Lenton in Lawes, *Ayres, and Dialogues. The First Booke*, p. 35, omits the third stanza beginning ‘Cavalliere Babes’. The version which is ascribed to Cleveland was not printed until 1677; see Morris and Withington, eds., *The Poems of John Cleveland*, p. 157.

<sup>190</sup> Morris and Withington, eds., *The Poems of John Cleveland*, p. 70.

<sup>191</sup> Loxley, Ch. 4, also identifies Martin Luellyn, *A Satyr, Occasioned by the Author’s Survey of a Scandalous Pamphlet Intituled, The King’s Cabinet Opened* (Oxford, 1645), E. 296 [1]; *Some Observations upon Occasion of the publishing their Majesties Letters* (Oxford, 1645), E. 296 [2]; and Jasper Mayne, *Ochlo-machia. Or The Peoples War, Examined* (London, 1647), E. 398 [19]. I was not able to uncover any substantive additions to his list.

<sup>192</sup> Francis Wortley, *Characters and Elegies* (London, 1646), pp. 3-5. E. 344 [21].

<sup>193</sup> Wortley, *Characters and Elegies*, p. 3. See also, Edward Symmons, *A Vindication of King Charles: Or, A Loyal Subjects Duty* (London, 1648), p. 203, E. 414 [17], annotated ‘Novemb: 1647’ by Thomason. *Mercurius Britannicus*, 8 September 1645, E. 300 [6], p. 858.

<sup>194</sup> Wortley, *Characters and Elegies*, p. 4.

<sup>195</sup> Symmons, *A Vindication of King Charles*, pp. 198-213.

<sup>196</sup> Symmons, p. 199.

<sup>197</sup> Symmons, p. 199.

<sup>198</sup> Symmons, p. 201.

<sup>199</sup> Melinda S. Zook, ‘Nursing Sedition: Women, Dissent, and the Whig Struggle’, in *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s*, ed. Jason McElligott (Aldershot, Hants.: Ashgate, 2006), 189-203 (pp. 191-92).

<sup>200</sup> John Carmi Parsons, ‘Isabella [Isabella of France] (1295–1358)’, *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>201</sup> Symmons, *A Vindication of King Charles*, p. 203.

<sup>202</sup> Tom Cain, ed., *The Poetry of Mildmay Fane, Second Earl of Westmorland: From the Fulbeck, Harvard and Westmorland Manuscripts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001). Unless otherwise stated, all quotations from Fane’s poems are taken from this edition.

<sup>203</sup> Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 223. Fane, *Poems*, p. 2. It is unlikely that Loxley had access to the Westmorland manuscripts.

<sup>204</sup> Fane, *Poems*, p. 1

<sup>205</sup> Stephen Wright, ‘Fane, Mildmay, second earl of Westmorland (1602-1666)’, *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>206</sup> See Chs 4 and 7.

<sup>207</sup> Fane, *Poems*, p. 3.

<sup>208</sup> See, particularly, Northamptonshire Record Office, MS Westmorland (A) 6.vi.I, fols 37<sup>r</sup>-39<sup>v</sup>.

There, Fane constructs a series of riddles which traverse the major issues of contention between the king and Parliament, in terms which condemn the king's actions. The page numbers are reversed. See also, Fane, *Poems*, p. 29, where Cain notes that the Latin musings at fol. 39<sup>v</sup>, which I have not examined, are 'deeply critical of the King's conduct'.

<sup>209</sup> Fane, *Poems*, pp. 82-86. Cain discusses '*The Times Steerage*' pp. 13, 21.

<sup>210</sup> Fane, *Poems*, p. 13.

<sup>211</sup> Fane, *Poems*, pp. 86-87. Entitled in the manuscript '*Upon the King and Queens happy meeting again after an absence (wherin She had changed clime) neer edge hill the 13<sup>th</sup> of July-1643*'; see also *Otia Sacra*, p. 144.

<sup>212</sup> Entitled in manuscript, '*Cloris Complaint – July-25.-1644*' (p. 87) and '*My Far-well to the Court – March-25-1644*' (pp. 127-128). I quote from *Otia Sacra*, pp. 129-130, 160-161.

<sup>213</sup> *Otia Sacra*, p. 127.

<sup>214</sup> Fane, *Poems*, p. 14.

<sup>215</sup> Fane, *Poems*, p. 392, n.

<sup>216</sup> Fane, *Poems*, p. 87.

<sup>217</sup> Fane, *Poems*, p. 385; c.f. Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 239, n. 95.

## Chapter Seven — *'The Grasse-hopper':* A Royalist Call to Arms

Leah Marcus describes *'The Grasse-hopper'* and Lovelace's other small beast poems as 'elusive political hieroglyphs'.<sup>1</sup> *'The Grasse-hopper'* reflects a generic shift in Lovelace's poetry from court allegory to beast fable. It is the only beast fable included in the 1649 *Lucasta*.<sup>2</sup> This chapter seeks to decipher the poem by placing it in the context of royalist polemical writing of 1647–1648, to which it demonstrably belongs. It offers a reading of the poem within an activist construction of the neo-Stoic discourse of retirement. Our understanding of this discursive field has changed in recent years. As discussed in Chapters Five and Six in relation to 'TO ALTHEA', which *'The Grasse-hopper'* echoes, and 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*', attention is now being paid to the importance of a Lipsian, activist construction of Stoicism, albeit in the context of the political history of the period. Andrew Shifflett, in *Stoicism, Politics and Literature in the Age of Milton* (1998), presents an activist account of early modern constructions of neo-Stoic retirement in a literary context.<sup>3</sup> He draws on the work of Justus Lipsius to construct a view of the ideal early modern Stoic individual in the political world as 'the citizen who acts according to reason, is answerable to himself, controls his emotions *and is ready to fight*'.<sup>4</sup> Importantly, Shifflett excludes the possibility that royalist poems of the war years may have incorporated an activist Lipsian construction of the topos of retirement. He conflates the views of Maren-Sofie Røstvig, Earl Miner and Raymond Anselment, which have been so influential in Lovelace studies. He argues that these critics 'stressed the conservative and reactionary phases of English Neostoicism' of which Lovelace was implicitly a member.<sup>5</sup> As he puts it, they have shown us that 'Seneca, Cicero, and Boethius consoled displaced royalists during the 1640s and 1650s, providing them with philosophical warmth during their long "Cavalier winter"'.<sup>6</sup>

Shifflett goes on to argue that post-Restoration royalist writers like Sir Roger L'Estrange, in his popular *Seneca's Morals by Way of Abstract* (1678) and Katharine Philips in *Pompey* (1663) appropriated Lipsian neo-Stoic discourses.<sup>7</sup> The material offered here shows that royalist polemic of late 1647 and early 1648, when Lovelace

almost certainly wrote '*The Grasse-hopper*', engages substantively with, and appropriates, the activist construction of the neo-Stoic discourse of retirement developed by Lipsius. Lovelace's '*The Grasse-hopper*' shares common tropes and topoi with this royalist polemic, drawn from the rich classical allusive field of neo-Stoic retirement and more recent neo-Latin and vernacular contributions. '*The Grasse-hopper*' emerges as an interpolation into the debate which followed the king's letter to Parliament of 28 December 1647, rejecting the *Four Bills* and, in effect, signalling the king's intention to prepare for war. Its speaker calls for royalists to lay in stores for the forthcoming conflict and for poets and polemicists to sing out in praise and support of their king against the witches of Parliament. Any doubts Lovelace may previously have had about his king's effectiveness as a ruler are temporarily papered over in the excitement of the resurgent royalist propaganda campaign preparing for war.

Unlike most of the poems considered in this study, '*The Grasse-hopper*' has attracted sustained critical attention since the late 1950s.<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, some important sources among the many classical and early modern literary texts on which Lovelace drew in constructing the poem have been overlooked and are described here. Horace's *Satires* II. 7. 83–88 is a key exposition of the Stoic paradoxes of freedom and greatness. It was quoted directly by royalist polemicists responding to the king's letter of 28 December 1647 and was thus topical when Lovelace wrote '*The Grasse-hopper*'. The mythical urtext of cyclical rebirth, the story of Ceres and Persephone, retold in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* V and the *Fasti*, also surfaces in '*The Grasse-hopper*' as a metaphor for royalist renewal in preparation for war. The chapter briefly sets out the critical history of the poem as an introduction to the issues which will be considered. It establishes the dating of the poem in late 1647 or early 1648. It then examines the nature of the royalist propaganda effort of these months, and *Lucasta*'s place in that effort against the events which were taking place. It elucidates the polemical texts with which '*The Grasse-hopper*' engages. The chapter concludes with a reading of the text as Lovelace's community of readers might have understood it, in the light of the contextual material discussed.

## Critical History

It is disappointing that Gerald Hammond and Thomas Corns, two of Lovelace's critics most involved in the debate over the extent and nature of Lovelace's commitment to the royalist cause, have only commented on 'The Grasse-hopper' in passing. 'The Grasse-hopper' was prominent in mid-twentieth century critical debates over the relative merits of 'internal and 'aesthetic' interpretation, and contextual or 'historical' interpretation', which centred on Andrew Marvell's 'Horatian Ode'.<sup>9</sup> Much of the criticism has involved classical and contemporary source analysis and some historical contextualisation. Don Cameron Allen, in 'An Explication of Lovelace's 'The Grasse-hopper' (1957), argues that the poem is 'a splendid reticulation of memories and meanings that defy the naked understanding, no matter how sensitive it is.'<sup>10</sup> That is, the poem can only be fully understood when read in its literary and historical context. Allen notes the separation of the poem into two parts. He elucidates the classical connotations attaching to the grasshopper in the first part, including *Anacreontea* XLIII, which Lovelace paraphrases in the first three stanzas; elements from the *Greek Anthology*; Plato's *Phaedrus* 259; and the *Aesopica*.<sup>11</sup> In *Anacreontea* XLIII, the carefree grasshopper is βασιλέυς, a king. Plato's grasshopper in the *Phaedrus* is a singer/poet 'drunk' not on alcohol but on watery dew and the joy of singing his king's praises. Lovelace's grasshopper, who during 'these merry days mak'st merry men', is 'Drunke ev'ry night with a Delicious teare'. From other sources identified by Allen, the grasshopper is 'beloved of the muses [...] an aristocrat, and a poet; [...] he had an easy connection with men in political disfavour'.<sup>12</sup> Allen derives the 'connection with men in political disfavour' from Philostratus's account of the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*.<sup>13</sup> There, the philosopher Demetrius contrasts the joyous freedom of the grasshopper singing in the heat of the day with the political restrictions under which he and Apollonius converse: 'They are allowed to sing, but we not to whisper our thoughts: Wisdome as a crime is laid to our charge'.<sup>14</sup> These connotations were known in the mid-seventeenth century. They are detailed in Thomas Moffett's *Theater of Insects*, first published in Latin in 1634 and in English in 1658.<sup>15</sup>

The fifth and sixth stanzas invoke Aesop's fable of the careful ant who lays in stores against the harsh winter and the carefree grasshopper, 'Poore verdant foole and now green Ice', who sings through summer, but starves when winter comes. The



speaker seeks to learn from the grasshopper's fate, asking it to 'Bid us lay in 'gainst Winter', that is, to lay in stores, and to counterbalance winter's rain and floods of water with 'an o'reflowing glasse', implicitly of wine. This invocation of the royalist drinking song genre, albeit in somewhat restrained terms, leads into the second part of the poem. Allen notes Lovelace's reiteration of Horace's symposiac verse, particularly *Odes* I. 9 and *Epodes* 13, as a comment on the carefree Anacreontic grasshopper.<sup>16</sup> The friends 'richer then untempted Kings', tend 'sacred harthes' that 'shall burne eternally' as 'Dropping *December*' comes 'weeping in'. In 'show'rs of old Greeke' poetry, they re-crown king Christmas, that is, they celebrate the festival despite attempts to suppress its observance by the Puritan-dominated Parliament. However, Allen sees '*The Grasse-hopper*' as more than just a cavalier drinking song.<sup>17</sup> According to Allen, the poem is an allegory on Charles I. In the last stanza, the grasshopper king 'is revealed in his clear title. He is more than the king of the summer fields or the king of Britain, for in owning the world of his creative imagination, he is untempted by the world.'<sup>18</sup>

Subsequent criticism has largely employed the framework Allen established, with a particular focus on the interpretive balance between the mendicant grasshopper of the *Aesopica* and the singer/poets of *Phaedrus* 259. The 'Poore verdant foole and now green Ice' is juxtaposed against Plato's triumphant, carefree singers, descended from men who sang so beautifully when the Muses brought song to the earth, 'forgetting food and drink, until at last unconsciously they died'. The Muses transformed them into grasshoppers:

they have this gift from the Muses, that from the time of their birth they need no sustenance, but sing continually, without food or drink, until they die, when they go to the Muses and report who honours each of them on earth.<sup>19</sup>

The pioneering formalist, Cleanth Brooks, found Allen's 'sheaf of classical associations' suffocating. Nevertheless, Brooks, more perceptive and less rigid in his approach to criticism than some later formalists, engaged with Abraham Cowley's translation of *Anacreontea* XLIII.<sup>20</sup> Other intertexts have been added to those identified by Allen, including Casimire's (Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski, 1595–1640, also known as the 'Polish Horace') translation of *Anacreontica* XLIII into Latin in his *Odes* IV. 23 ('Ad Cicadam'); lines from the chorus to the second act of Seneca's *Thyestes*, which Cowley translated; Casimire's Ode 4.34; and Joachim Camerarius's (1534–98) Emblem III. XCVI.<sup>21</sup>

'*The Grasse-hopper*' has so far resisted attempts to establish its politics, beyond its general location in royalist poetic genres of retirement, symposiac verse and opposition to Puritan suppression of church festivals. Most critics have interpreted the poem as being a royalist celebration of cavalier survival rites of drinking and friendship during the long winter of defeat, within a conventional understanding of its Stoic context. Notable examples of this group include Miner, Anselment, Scodel and McDowell.<sup>22</sup> Both Bruce King and Dale Randall have presented Christian readings.<sup>23</sup> These take the significance of the allusion to Christmas, and the implicit reference to the religious seasonal cycle represented in the *Book of Common Prayer*, further than the largely pagan character of Lovelace's allusive field suggests is appropriate. McDowell, in his recent examination of the poem, uses '*The Grasse-hopper*' as an exemplar of the way in which members of the literary community which gathered around Lovelace's cousin, Thomas Stanley, in London in 1646–1648 interacted co-operatively and competitively in poetic composition and translation from the classics.<sup>24</sup> Many of those texts identified by Allen and others as being associated with Lovelace's '*The Grasse-hopper*' were translated by members of Stanley's group. Stanley translated *Anacreontea* XLIII, '*The Grassehopper*'.<sup>25</sup> Andrew Marvell translated relevant lines from the second chorus of Seneca's *Thyestes*. Marvell's translation is usually attributed to 1671, on the basis of internal evidence.<sup>26</sup> Perhaps he started working on it while he was associated with Stanley's group. Sherburne translated other works by Seneca, while a peripheral member of the group, G. Hils (or George Hill), translated the works of Casimire Sarbiewski.<sup>27</sup> All these texts form part of the discursive field associated with the neo-Stoic discourse of retirement, confirming the groups' general interest in the discourse.

Hammond goes too far in suggesting that '*The Grasse-hopper*' 'is only a royalist poem if one approaches it with cavalier assumptions'.<sup>28</sup> The allusive field (which critics note attaches to the poem) represents a catalogue of favourites of the royalist literary community.<sup>29</sup> As such, it demands that '*The Grasse-hopper*' be interpreted in royalist terms. Anselment's reading, based on a detailed study of the source material, is more qualified than one might expect, given that the basic premise of his monograph is one of royalist Stoic retirement. He recognises the importance given in the text to hope for the rebirth of the royalist cause.<sup>30</sup> Marcus has studied

royalist literary representations of traditional, popular celebrations of seasonal holidays in the Anglican church calendar in the light of Puritan opposition. She has offered a reading of ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ as a royalist call to action.<sup>31</sup> So, to a greater extent, has Loxley in his study of the politics of royalist literary texts.<sup>32</sup> Loxley’s interesting reading of the poem interprets Lovelace’s text in the context of Martin Lluellyn’s elegy for the royalist hero Sir Bevill Grenville, probably written in 1643 and published in 1646.<sup>33</sup> He argues that Lluellyn’s grasshopper, in contrast with Aesop’s and equated in the poem with Grenville, prepared ‘for stormes and tumults’ during the halcyon days. Such effort ‘ensured, as the elegy goes on to say, that he could “*endure*” the bad season, rather than “*hide*” [...] Grenville’s careful husbandry provides the means for an active resistance, rather than simply allowing survival’.<sup>34</sup>

By mounting this argument, Loxley attempts to decrease the relative importance awarded to the Aesopic elements of the poem. Loxley need not have relied on the possibility that Lovelace was aware of the Grenville elegy to reach this conclusion. Lovelace’s syntax in the lines in the fifth stanza, in which the speaker asks the grasshopper to ‘Bid us lay in ‘gainst Winter, Raine, and poize | Their floods, with an o’reflowing glasse’, is characteristically slippery. The effect of the stanza’s enjambment is to lead the reader to run together the two actions described; that is, laying in stores against winter and its rain, and drinking a glass of wine to counterbalance winter’s floods. Once the syntax is untangled, the two actions are seen as separate, removing the need to rely on the Grenville elegy to understand the sense of the stanza. Lovelace’s speaker asks the grasshopper both to remind the friends to lay in stores, and to drink a protective toast.

## The Text

‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ is addressed ‘To my Noble Friend, Mr. CHARLES COTTON’ in the title, described as the ‘best of *Men* and *Friends*’ in the sixth stanza.

Traditionally, it has been assumed that Lovelace is referring to Charles Cotton the Elder (d. 1658) rather than Charles Cotton the Younger (1630–1687).<sup>35</sup> As Corns has noted, there is no evidence supporting this view. However, Lovelace addressed the son in similar terms in the epithalamion ‘*The Triumphs* of PHILAMORE and AMORET’ (1656) as ‘To the Noblest of our Youth and Best of Friends’. Charles

Cotton the Younger would only have been about seventeen years of age in 1647–1648.

A series of received assumptions allows us to locate ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ in the later months of 1647 and early 1648. It is difficult to argue with Margoliouth’s view that ‘there must be a *prima facie* assumption against any particular poem being later than the date of licensing’.<sup>36</sup> Thus, Lovelace must at least have drafted ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ before 4 February 1648. As a poem which has been read as being both on royalist retreat in the face of military defeat, and a call to arms, it can be attributed to the period after the cessation of hostilities in August 1646. ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ is the only small beast poem published in the 1649 *Lucasta*. There is no apparent reason which might account for the licensing authority treating the small beast poems in the *Posthume Poems* differently from ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’. Given the generic similarity, it is likely that the series was written at about the same time period and that, as the first in the series, ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ was written close to the time *Lucasta* was submitted to the licensing authority. Hammond notes that ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ is structurally similar to ‘*To my Worthy Friend Mr. Peter Lilly: on that excellent Picture of his Majesty, and the Duke of Yorke, drawne by him at Hampton-Court*’, in that it moves from ambivalent contemplation of the fate of the king to celebration of the friendships that can preserve and facilitate an imperiled cultural life.<sup>37</sup> If Hammond is right, and the poem should be read as a companion piece to the Lely poem, ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ was presumably written after the king arrived at Hampton Court on 24 August 1647.

The reference to King Christmas in the eighth stanza, ‘Dropping *December* shall come weeping in, | Bewayle th’usurping of his Raigne’, was topical in late 1647 and early 1648. On 8 June 1647, Parliament had passed its *Ordinance for Abolishing of Festivals*, on the basis that the ‘Feasts of the Nativity of Christ, Easter and Whitsuntide, and other Festivals commonly called Holy-Dayes, have been heretofore superstitiously used and observed’.<sup>38</sup> The Puritan suppression of Christmas festivities and the resulting civil disturbance in Canterbury attracted considerable, satirical attention in the royalist newsbooks in the weeks before and after 25 December 1647. Parliament’s satirists answered the royalists in the licensed parliamentarian newsbook *Mercurius Anti-Pragmaticus* of 20 January 1648:

The Rost-meat men of Canterbury  
 Counting it no small injury,  
 To lose their spic'd broth, and their Pies,  
 Their Wassalls and their fooleries,  
 Resolv'd ere Christmasse went away  
 They would some uncouth Gamboll play;  
 ...  
 For GOD, and for K. CHARLES they cry,  
 Plum-pottage and sweet Christmasse-pie;  
 But out alas, this did no good,  
 Their language was not understood:  
 And now these birds in cages sing,  
 Wee'l no more Christmasse revelling.<sup>39</sup>

These lines emphasise, from a parliamentary perspective, the importance royalists placed popular festivities at Christmas in the face of its suppression, which Lovelace also highlights with his speaker's call for convivial celebration in *'The Grasshopper'*. Celebration of Christmas is linked explicitly with loyalty to the king. The cavaliers singing like 'birds in cages' is perhaps a passing reference to Lovelace's 'TO ALTHEA'.

Later, royalists like Matthew Carter saw the harsh parliamentary suppression of civil disturbance in Canterbury as the start of the chain of events which led to the outbreak of the second Civil War in the county of Kent and elsewhere in 1648.<sup>40</sup> Carter, who bills himself as 'A Loyall Actor in that Engagement', opens his *A Most True and Exact Relation of that as Honourable as Unfortunate Expedition of Kent, Essex, and Colchester* with an emotive account of the Canterbury riots. Carter contrasts the 'orderly and Christian Devotion' involved in services based on the Book of Common Prayer with the disorderly conduct of the 'new Saints' who, 'enflamed with fiery zeale, began to make tumults in the streets'.<sup>41</sup>

### **Royalist Propaganda and Preparation for War, 1647–1648**

As Peter Thomas notes, it is anachronistic to think that the royalist literary and propaganda communities in London operated independently during the war years and the Interregnum. Rather, 'an intricate web of friendship, patronage, and kinship connected these Cavalier writers, and sometimes even linked them with political opponents'.<sup>42</sup> Royalist literary figures and propagandists joined in a concerted effort to garner support for the king and the royalist cause in London after the army seized control of the king's person on 4 June 1647. Lovelace was an important member of this intricate web. *Lucasta* was licensed on 4 February 1648, less than three weeks

after Parliament agreed the *Vote of No Addresses* on 17 January. The timing would indicate that the volume was designed as a contribution to the royalist propaganda campaign. It is possible that Lovelace also contributed to royalist polemic around this time. We know he could write in the appropriate mode. ‘*A Mock-Song*’, published in the *Posthume Poems*, is interchangeable with many of the hallmark rhymes which appeared on the front page of the royalist newsbooks at this time.<sup>43</sup> Another of the small beast poems, ‘*The Toad and Spyder. A Duell*’, can best be interpreted as an insider’s satirical account of the paper wars which broke out in 1647 among royalist editors and with the parliamentary press, which continued until the royalist propaganda effort was effectively suppressed in mid-1650.<sup>44</sup>

Lovelace had close connections with those members of his cousin Sir Thomas Stanley’s literary community who were involved in the propaganda campaign of 1647–1648.<sup>45</sup> Lovelace and John Hall were core members of the Stanley group.<sup>46</sup> Hall, a republican, was one of the principal propagandists promoting an anti-Presbyterian alliance between the king and the Independents in 1647. David Norbrook has suggested that Andrew Marvell, another member of the Stanley group whom we know was close to Lovelace, and Lovelace himself, were the targets of Hall’s anti-Presbyterian pamphlet, *A True Account and Character of the Times*, annotated by Thomason on 9 August 1647.<sup>47</sup> Hall’s pamphlet is cast as a letter to a royalist whose estates, like Lovelace’s, had suffered in the war. It seeks to persuade its readers that the cause of learning would best be served by supporting the Independents in their efforts to achieve a settlement between the king and Parliament.<sup>48</sup> Hall’s emerging role as a prominent parliamentary propagandist was criticised by George Wharton, one of the royalist newsbook editors, in *Mercurius Elencticus*, on 31 May 1648. Wharton asked rhetorically whether Jack Hall was ‘a fit Associate for such Ingenious and candid soules as Col. Lovelace, Captaine Sherburne, Mr. Shirley, or Mr. Stanley?’ (all members of Stanley’s group), on account of his traitorous activities.<sup>49</sup> The friendship between Hall and Lovelace was sustained, despite their different allegiances. One of Lovelace’s last poems was his complimentary commemorative poem included in Hall’s posthumously published translation, *Hierocles Upon the Golden Verses of Pythagoras*.<sup>50</sup> Hall clearly bridged the royalist and parliamentary, literary and propaganda communities.

Prominent royalist propagandists and literary figures from the early war years had joined the propaganda campaign by the date of *Lucasta*'s licensing.<sup>51</sup> John Taylor, the Water Poet (1578–1653), and the balladeer Martin Parker probably contributed. John Cleveland collaborated on *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, while John Berkenhead took over *Mercurius Bellicus*, which had first appeared in November 1647.<sup>52</sup> Berkenhead had been linked with Stanley as early as 1640 — he presented Stanley for his degree at Oxford — and had connections with other members of Stanley's group, including Hall.<sup>53</sup> No evidence has so far emerged linking Lovelace directly with Hall's close friend, Marchamont Nedham, although the men were evidently operating within the same literary and social spheres.<sup>54</sup> Nedham edited the parliamentary newsbook *Mercurius Britannicus* during the first civil war, but joined the royalist propaganda effort in the second part of 1647. In his pamphlet, *The Case of the Kingdom Stated*, annotated by Thomason on 12 June 1647, Nedham anticipated the anti-Presbyterian, pro-Independent position put by Hall, advocating a peaceful settlement with the king.<sup>55</sup> Nedham was editor of the royalist flagship of the period, *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, assisted by Samuel Sheppard (c. 1624–1655?) and Cleveland. James Thompson, who wrote to the Kentish gentleman, Henry Oxinden, informing him of Lovelace's arrest on 26 October 1648, was also close to Nedham at this time.<sup>56</sup> Nedham was close to Marvell and corresponded with Oxinden. Nedham, Hall, Marvell and Lovelace shared interests in politics, polemic and poetry. It is thus highly likely that Lovelace and Nedham knew each other, probably well.

The royalist propaganda effort gradually increased in intensity during the later months of 1647.<sup>57</sup> According to Jason McElligott, the campaign was designed to 'generate a cacophony of voices on behalf of the king and his supporters' which would create the impression of 'an overwhelming tide, an unstoppable movement of opinion'.<sup>58</sup> Sufficiently well organised by September 1647 for Marchamont Nedham to begin publishing *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, it was aimed at cementing the allegiance of those already siding with the king, and converting others. It promoted a sense of excitement and increased confidence among royalists. The production of newsbooks and pamphlets, which was collaborative in nature, snowballed. McElligott notes fifty-one separate royalist titles published in London between September 1647 and June 1650, some only for one or two issues.

### ***Negotiating a Settlement***

While he was at Hampton Court, and after his escape to the Isle of Wight, the king attempted to negotiate a political settlement on advantageous terms with opposing enemy factions, including the Presbyterians and Independents in Parliament, the Army, the City of London, and with the Scots.<sup>59</sup> Factional divisions of the kind discussed in relation to 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*', continued among the king's supporters.<sup>60</sup> The moderate Hertford/Hyde faction supported an exclusively English settlement based on the 'Heads of Proposals' drafted by senior army officers, the Independent grandees and the army's closest friends among the London radicals. Hall's and Nedham's anti-Presbyterian pamphlets of 1647 argued this position from an Independent perspective. The hard-line, pro-Scottish royalists sought an alliance with the Presbyterian grandees in Parliament. The queen was less wholehearted in her support of the Scots than she had been in 1646, following their sale of the king to Parliament in January 1647. The king chose to ally himself with the Scots. On 26 December 1647, he signed the 'Engagement'.

Put simply, in return for Scotland sending an army into England 'for defence of His Majesty's person and authority, and restoring him to his government', Charles agreed to the establishment of a Presbyterian church in England for three years.<sup>61</sup> News of the Engagement between the king and the Scots commissioners was not announced until 21 January 1648 in Edinburgh, but it seems that news had leaked out. On 28 December, with the alliance with the Scots secretly secured, the king wrote to Parliament rejecting outright their current offer of terms for a peaceful settlement in the form of the *Four Bills*.<sup>62</sup> On 3 January 1648, in closed session, the Commons reached agreement on the *Vote of No Addresses*, suspending negotiations between the king and Parliament.<sup>63</sup> It was resolved by both houses on 17 January 1648.<sup>64</sup> The moment for a royalist/Independent alliance of the kind envisaged by Nedham, Hall and others had passed. Royalists fell in behind their king and started to contemplate war, buoyed by the optimism expressed in, and supported by, the royalist propaganda effort. It is in this context that Lovelace's *Lucasta* volume was submitted to the licensing authority.



## Classical Allusion and Royalist Propaganda

### *The Royal(ist) Grasshopper*

Does the insect represent the king, with his head cropt, presaging the Regicide; or the royalist poet, singing the praises of his king? Does the interpretative balance lie with the Platonic grasshopper of the *Phaedrus*, who sings and is loved by the Muses, or the starving Aesopic grasshopper, begging food from the parliamentarian ants with the onset of winter? Lovelace would not have been alone if he had imagined the death of his insect as presaging the Regicide. Marchamont Nedham prophesied in *Mercurius Pragmaticus* of 25 January 1648 that the year 1648 would place Charles ‘on his *Throne*, | In *Earth*, or else in *Heav’n*’.<sup>65</sup> Read in the broader context of royalist polemic and literary texts of the late 1647 and early 1648, the balance lies with the singer/poet. Lovelace’s grasshopper certainly occupies a royal space, lying in a ‘Carv’d Acron bed’ (l. 8). This is a topical reference to the grasshopper’s resting place among the acorns in a grove of royal oaks. James Howell, who contributed commendatory verses to Lovelace’s *Posthume Poems*, referred to Charles I as the royal oak in his popular political allegory, *Dendrologia* (1640), also known as *Dodona’s Grove*. *Dendrologia* had currency in 1647–1648. It was reprinted four times during the early war years, while a revised and enlarged edition appeared in 1649. Howell dedicated *A New Volume of Letters* to James, Duke of York, on May Day 1647. There, he reminded his community of readers: ‘*Once in a Vocall Forrest I did sing, | And made the Oke to stand for CHARLES my King*’.<sup>66</sup> In the context of *Dendrologia*, the grasshopper is a courtier poet, singing his king’s praises and sleeping in the safety of the bed of cast-off fruit, under the branches of the royal oak.

Lovelace would have been aware that, during the seventeenth century, the grasshopper was identified more frequently with the Platonic singer/poet than the Aesopic mendicant. Alastair Fowler identifies the trope of the cicada or grasshopper as the archetypal genre metaphor for poetry during the Renaissance.<sup>67</sup> He notes that the account in the *Phaedrus*, identified by Allen in relation to Lovelace’s ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’, is the locus classicus of the trope. Seventeenth century commentators on the classical significance of grasshoppers, Robert Burton and Thomas Moffett, support Fowler’s identification of the cicada/grasshopper with poetry and, on balance, favour a Platonic reading. Burton, in the *Anatomy of*

*Melancholy*, quotes the passage from the *Phaedrus*, but notes the possibility of an Aesopic reading:

Poets, Rhetoritians, Historians, Philosophers, Mathematitians, Sophisters, &c. they are like Grassehoppers, sing they must in Summer, and pine in the Winter, for there is no preferment for them. Even so they were at first, if you will beleeve that pleasant tale of *Socrates*, [...] hee [told ...] how Grashoppers were once Schollers, Musitians, Poets, &c. before the *Muses* were borne, and lived without meat and drinke & for that cause were turned by *Jupiter* into Grashoppers.<sup>68</sup>

Moffett, in *The Theater of Insects*, is more explicit:

Away then with that Fable of *Aesop* which is commonly received, that the Grashoppers begged food from the Ants, for we may learn out of *Plato*, that the Grashoppers are consecrated to *Apollo*, and the Muses bestowed on them this boon, that they should live only by singing, not so much as mentioning the dew.<sup>69</sup>

That is, Moffett explicitly privileges Plato's representation of the grasshopper as the singer/poet loved by the gods over the mendicant of Aesop's fable. Lovelace gives the Aesopic mendicant grasshopper space in his poem. The predominance of references to singer/poets in contemporary sources about the grasshopper increases the likelihood that Lovelace was referring to the insect predominantly in that role.

### **Stanley, Philostratus, Neo-Stoicism**

Stanley's reliance on Philostratus's anecdote on the grasshopper to explain the sense of his translation of '*The Grassehopper*' in his '*Excitations Upon ANACREON*' is worth further examination. It draws attention to the likelihood that he, and others of his group, were relying on a more active construction of Stoicism in their work than has previously been understood, a likelihood confirmed by analysis of the discursive field on which Lovelace drew in '*The Grasse-hopper*'. Stanley tells his readers to think about his '*The Grassehopper*' in the context of Philostratus's anecdote: 'The whole Ode is excellently paraphras'd and explain'd in the life of *Apollonius Tyanaeus*'.<sup>70</sup> Stanley's short quotation in the '*Excitations*' conveys the sense of the passage, that Demetrius envies the grasshopper because it can sing freely 'but we not to whisper our thoughts'. The wider context of the discussion between Apollonius and the philosopher Demetrius is also notable. The two men were visiting Cicero's villa near Puteoli, an iconic site in the literature of retirement, when they heard the grasshoppers singing. Apollonius was fleeing the tyrant Domitian, who, in the anecdote's terms, believed Apollonius was plotting against him. Demetrius calls on Apollonius to sing out loudly like the grasshoppers in public, to act against the tyrant, 'to die while liberating a city, defending your parents, children, brothers, and

other kin'.<sup>71</sup> However, he also warns Apollonius, who was facing false charges of murdering a boy to read his entrails, not to give himself up to the tyrant unnecessarily: 'to die not on true charges but trumped up ones, and to allow a tyrant to appear prudent, is a much more grievous fate than if one were to racked on a wheel in the sky' like Ixion.<sup>72</sup> The analogy between Apollonius's situation and that of the royalist poets is clear: they must sing out loudly against parliamentary tyranny, but they must only sing when they can effect change, rather than throwing away their lives.

It is likely that Philostratus's account of Apollonius and Domitian formed part of the allusive field on which Justus Lipsius drew in developing his activist construction of retirement, discussed below. Loxley notes that 'classical and Renaissance constructions of retirement or *otium*, which provide the imagined space for all such cavalier engagements, were not as uniformly celebratory as has sometimes been assumed'.<sup>73</sup> It is in this context that he argues that Lovelace's friends, like Martin Lluellyn's grasshopper in the Grenville elegy referred to above, can withstand the onset of winter through careful preparation. They can 'lay in' stores 'gainst Winter', prepare for war so that they can triumph.<sup>74</sup> Loxley argues that the Grenville elegy's 'configuration of Aesop correlates closely enough with "The Grasse-hopper" to raise the possibility of influence'.<sup>75</sup> It may be that, rather than Lovelace having seen Lluellyn's Grenville elegy, Lovelace and Lluellyn shared an activist understanding of the Lipsian neo-Stoic discourse of retirement. Stanley would certainly have been aware that Demetrius in Philostratus's account is giving voice to this activist construction of Stoicism. As Shifflett notes, in his *The History of Philosophy* (1655–1662), Stanley writes that a Stoic will do "whatsoever reason requireth to be done" [...] It is not surprising that "reason" required different things to be done by different writers at different times.'<sup>76</sup> In Stanley's and Lovelace's variations on the Anacreontic grasshopper, and in the Grenville elegy, 'reason' required that royalists act in preparation for war, whether by singing out in praise of their king despite efforts to suppress their voices, or by laying in stores, but not in such a way as to invite imprisonment or death.

### ***Death and Regeneration***

The reference in Stanza IV to the ‘Crompt’ ‘Golden Eares’ has been interpreted in a number of ways, usually in the context of the last days of the Stuart court. The cropping of ears was a punishment for sedition, used in the pre-war years against Puritans like William Prynne for his apparent criticism in *Histrionomastix* (1633) of Henrietta Maria for appearing on stage. Positions were now reversed. The profane court culture that Prynne had condemned had now itself been destroyed.<sup>77</sup> In an ironic twist, Lovelace was appropriating a trope usually applied to puritans, to describe the ‘cropping’ of the royalist aristocracy and gentry, the cutting off of their golden locks and their deaths in battle. Others have seen it as emblematic of the Regicide, or of the golden flowers of the nobility who have been killed in the wars or have survived, but been cut down by punitive fines, taxation and confiscations.<sup>78</sup> These interpretations mask the stanza’s importance as a statement of the death of the royalist cause in 1645–1646, and what was seen as its inevitable cyclical rebirth in 1647–1648:

But ah the Sickle! Golden Eares are Crompt;  
Ceres and Bacchus bid good night;  
Sharpe frosty fingers all your Flowr’s have topt,  
And what sithes spar’d, Winds shave off quite.

As winter’s frosts kill off the last of the summer crop, top its flowers, and Ceres and Bacchus retreat into winter darkness, so royalists retreated into darkness after their initial defeat. The allusion is to the iconic classical myth cycle of death and regeneration which evolved around Ceres (Demeter), the goddess of the harvest, who made earth’s soil barren when Hades kidnapped and raped her daughter Persephone (Proserpine) and hid her in the Underworld. Ceres returned her gift of fertility to the earth when an accommodation was reached, allowing Persephone to spend half the year in dark Hades and half on earth. This mythical cycle of death and regeneration was celebrated in ancient Athens in autumn fertility festivals, the Eleusinian and Bacchic mysteries. Ovid retells the story in *Metamorphoses* Book V, translated by Lovelace’s (and Thomas Stanley’s) uncle, George Sandys (1632) and in the *Fasti*, Book IV.<sup>79</sup> Abraham Fraunce included accounts in verse and prose in *The Third Part of the Countesse of Pembrokes Yvychurch* (1592), referred to in the previous chapter.

Lovelace returns to the story of Ceres and Persephone in the ninth stanza, enhancing the importance of the theme of regeneration in the poem:

Night as cleare *Hesper* shall our Tapers whip  
From the light Casements where we play,  
And the darke Hagge from her black mantle strip,  
And sticke there everlasting day.

In the *Fasti* and the *Metamorphoses*, Ceres ignites the two pine trees she uses as tapers to light her search for Persephone at Mount Aetna's fires:

The fearefull Mother sought her childe in vaine.  
Not dewy-hair'd *Aurora*, when she rose,  
Nor *Hesperus*, could witness her repose.  
Two pitchy Pines at flaming *Aetna* lights;  
And restelsse, carries them through freeing Nights.<sup>80</sup>

The implication is that Ceres's tapers have lit the night sky, dulling the light of *Aurora* and *Hesperus*, the usually bright evening and morning stars, as Lovelace's speaker's tapers 'sticke [...] everlasting Day' over the night of parliamentary dominance.

We know that royalists constructed their perceptions of the progress of their cause from golden age, through death and rebirth. Regeneration of the royalist cause is the subject of Martin Parker's most famous ballad, 'When the King enjoys his own again'.<sup>81</sup> Thomason annotated *A New Ballad, Called a Review of the Rebellion*, noted as being set to the tune of Parker's ballad, on 15 June 1647. The final chorus reads:

Then must King Charles alone,  
Be set upon his Throne,  
For which let's joyne in one, with might, and maine,  
For the times will never mend  
Till the Parliament do end.  
And the King injoyes his right againe.<sup>82</sup>

The good times will return when Charles regains the throne.

### ***Royalist Propaganda***

In '*The Grasse-hopper*', as well as drawing on a rich classical field of allusion, Lovelace shares tropes and topoi with the royalist newsbooks and pamphlets of late 1647 and the first half of 1648. The historian Jason McElligott notes the collaborative authorship of political and politicised tracts at this time, where the overriding concern was 'the continued production of the newsbooks in the face of severe harassment'.<sup>83</sup> Even when editors were imprisoned for a short time, their newsbooks continued to appear. McElligott condemns the use of literary techniques

of analysis of the authorship of the newsbooks.<sup>84</sup> Nevertheless, even he notes the ‘fact that the royalist newsbooks shared a common stock of arguments, jokes and motifs’ and the ‘occurrence and recurrence of particular words, tropes and ideas’.<sup>85</sup> To give an example of such shared tropes, we know from Moffett’s *Theater of Insects* that the ‘name Crickets and Grasshoppers, are promiscuously used’; that is, used interchangeably at this time.<sup>86</sup> Nedham, in *Mercurius Pragmaticus* of 14 December 1647, likens the soldiers seeking settlement of their outstanding pay claims to poor crickets who:

mean to creep into their *Chimney-Corners* this *Christmas*, to *drive the cold Winter away*, because the *Presbyteriall Reformation* hath so cleared the Country of *Superstition*, that ther’s like to be no *plum-pottage*.<sup>87</sup>

There may be an element of delineation by class defining difference here. Nedham’s poor army-crickets are less fortunate than the royalist grasshoppers. The flightless crickets have only a warm corner in which to hide over the Puritan Christmas, while Lovelace’s friends share the cavalier comforts of friendship, wine, song and hope.

Earlier in the same issue, Nedham echoes the trope of the caged bird familiar from ‘TO ALTHEA’, when he suggests that members of Parliament should sing ‘like pure *Canary-Byrds* [...] *Eate, Drinke and be Merry*; for, they have *Goods laid up for many yeares*; and having secured the *unrighteous Mammon* of the *City* in Religious hands, and heavenly *Trunkes*’.<sup>88</sup> Nedham’s readers, like Lovelace’s of the earlier poem, would have recognised the witty echoes of parliamentarian oppositional verse of the Addled Parliament by George Wither and his friends, discussed in Chapter 4. Like the eponymous insect satirised in Lovelace’s ‘*The Ant*’, the thieving members are:

*Austere* and *Cynick!* not one hour t’allow,  
To lose with pleasure what thou gotst with pain:  
But drive on sacred Festivals, thy Plow.<sup>89</sup>

Unlike Lovelace’s virtuous royalist friends in ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’, they have sufficient laid by to survive, stolen from the king’s followers. The echoes of ‘TO ALTHEA’ are insistent. Nedham explicitly invokes the familiar Stoic paradox that a great man, in having everything, has nothing, while a happy man, having nothing, has all.<sup>90</sup> The imprisoned speaker in ‘TO ALTHEA’ will sing ‘(like committed Linnets) [...] The sweetnes, Mercy Majesty, | And glories of my KING’ knowing ‘no such Liberty’, although he is ‘fetterd’ to Althea’s eyes and in prison.<sup>91</sup>

Nedham's front page verses reverse the sense of 'TO ALTHEA'. Royalists, although free, will 'sing and play | Like *Birds* within a *Cage*':

*Fetters* are th'only favours now  
The *Houses* give (we see,)  
And since the *King* them weares, I vow  
'Twere *basenesse* to be *free*.<sup>92</sup>

The king, imprisoned at Carisbrooke on the Isle of Wight, is now the one in prison. Given the opportunity to share his imprisonment, loyal royalists would regard their 'fetters' as ladies' favours.

The topicality of the eighth stanza of '*The Grasse-hopper*', with its allusions to the Puritan suppression of Christmas, is well recognised. In the ninth stanza, which is equally implicated in the language of royalist polemic, royalist tapers will 'whip' night from the bright casements, and 'strip' the black mantle from 'the darke Hagge', Parliament. They will replace the darkness of defeat with the everlasting day of a royalist victory. George Wither wrote a popular collection of satirical essays entitled *Abuses Stript, and Whipt*, which went to eight editions between 1613 and 1617. It was during his time in prison following his arrest in 1614 on account of *Abuses Stript and Whipt*, that Wither wrote the prison poems referred to in Chapter 4. In *Abuses Stript and Whipt*, Wither casts himself as 'Vices Executioner', 'sent abroad the World, to purge | Mans vile Abuses with my scourge'.<sup>93</sup> By 1647–1648, 'whipt and stript' had entered the royalist satirical lexicon. John Taylor appropriated it in *A Swarme of Sectaries, and Schismatiques* (1641), where he wished his political opponents were 'well hang'd or whip'd, | And that your shirts were from your corpse strip'd'.<sup>94</sup> In *AQUA-MUSAE* (1645), Taylor answered Wither's 'railing Pamphlet against the King and State, called CAMPO-MUSAE'.<sup>95</sup> Taylor described *AQUA-MUSAE* as 'a short lashing Satyre, wherein the Juggling Rebell is Compendiously finely Firked and Jerked'. Taylor's reference to Wither, dipping his pen 'In sharp *Ramnusiaes* Pisle' to write '*Brittaines* Great *Abuses Whipt and Strip'd*', confirms both the currency and the source of the phrase.<sup>96</sup>

Marchamont Nedham and other royalist propagandists cultivated the topos of whipping and stripping the parliamentary errors of the age, particularly in sexual libels. Nedham concludes *Mercurius Pragmaticus* of 12 October 1647 with a statement that the follies of this age will be seen 'stript and whipt upon the Stage' in another; that is, after the theatres re-open following the king's inevitable victory.<sup>97</sup>

In the issue of 25 January 1648, a counterfeit edition of *Pragmaticus* is described as ‘*Parliament-proase*, and must be soundly *lash’t*, laid bare and naked’; while the Long Parliament must re-new itself with elections, for ‘Is it not rare (my *Lads*) to bee whip’t out of *long-coates* into the *Supreme-Councell*’.<sup>98</sup> In the short-lived *Mercurius Dogmaticus* of 13 January 1648, the author tells us that he is ‘not ignorant that the Inimitable *Pragmaticus*, and the Ingenious *Melancholicus*; do each week sufficiently whip and strip the errors of the age’.<sup>99</sup> The topos was particularly useful in the context of the royalists’ development of the politics of sexual libel, including gender inversion.<sup>100</sup> The counterfeit *Pragmaticus* of 30 November 1647 describes ‘the errors of the age’, the vice it and the other royalist newsbooks consistently attribute to parliamentarians:

Next let me informe you which way all your money goes; to maintaine Strumpets. Black *Corbet* has his *Whore* in *Saint Gileses*, *Martin* the Bel-man keeps his piece of *Iniquity* in *Saint-Martins Lane* [...] my brother *Melancholicus* can informe you where the Parliament men keepe Looms of lust to *weave* the web of their Damnation.<sup>101</sup>

The author of *The Second Part of Crafty Crumwell*, probably Nedham again as it is attributed to *Marcurius* [sic] *Pragmaticus*, uses the same formulation: ‘When mov’d with spleene, I justly on the Stage, | Do whip the crimes of this Vicentious Age’ (p. 3).<sup>102</sup> *The Second Part of Crafty Crumwell* is more difficult to date than other royalist pamphlets, because it is not included with the Thomason Tracts. However, it refers to events of early February 1648 and was almost certainly published then.

The witch or hag who is to be whipt and stript in ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ is variously Parliament, the Presbyterians in Parliament, the Geneva witch or the Scottish Presbyterian witch in royalist polemic. Implicitly, she is the stinking reciprocal of the fragrant, royalist ‘beauteous ladies’ who come to Lovelace’s defence in Marvell’s commendatory poem, probably written a few months later, ‘To his Noble Friend Mr. *Richard Lovelace*, upon his POEMS’. There, the fair ladies are compared with ‘The barbed Censurers’ who look ‘Like the grim consistory’, with an eye ‘Severer then the yong Presbytery’ on *Lucasta*, and allege that Lovelace dishonoured the ‘Houses Priviledge’.<sup>103</sup> The association of witchcraft, Geneva Calvinism, the Scots or the Presbyterian members of Parliament is a feature of royalist polemic. The more general association of the Scots and witchcraft may have alluded to the case of the North Berwick witches, who were tried for an alleged conspiracy to assassinate James VI and I, discovered in 1591.<sup>104</sup> The conspiracy was



still topical when Shakespeare created his witches on the misty Scottish moor in *Macbeth*, not long after James's accession to the English throne in 1603.<sup>105</sup> John Cleveland had referred to Parliament as a witch and a hag in poems that were reprinted in *The Character of a London-Diurnall: With Severall Select Poems*, annotated by Thomason on 13 February 1647.<sup>106</sup> In 'The Mixt Assembly', written in 1643, Cleveland describes the House of Lords as looking 'like the wither'd face of an old hagg'.<sup>107</sup> In 'The Rebell Scot', which Anthony Cousins attributes to Cleveland's years with the king in Oxford, Cleveland seeks help from his fellow satirists to incite his rage:

With all the Scorpions that should whip this age.  
Scots are like Witches; do but whet your pen,  
Scratch til the blood come; they'l not hurt you then.<sup>108</sup>

This version of *The Character of a London-Diurnall* was popular. It appeared in eight variant editions in 1647.<sup>109</sup>

Nedham and the editors of the counterfeit issues of *Pragmaticus* appropriated the topos. In *Mercurius Pragmaticus* of 22 February 1648, the editor asks rhetorically 'what peace could be expected, so long as they [the members of Parliament] were able to prevaile, upon the People by their *Witch-crafts*, and could procure an opportunity to commit *fornication* with *Gold* and *Silver*?'<sup>110</sup> In the counterfeit *Pragmaticus* of 16 November 1647, in a passage which is worth quoting in full to illustrate the energy and style of royalist invective, the author rails that he must:

Encounter with the *Weathercocks* and *Winnils* at *Westminster*, that [...] have for the space of full seaven yeeres ground the face of this *poore* ruined Kingdome; new moulded their *Bach*, and leavened it with *Pharisaicall Leaven*, and now are baking it in the fiery hot Oven of *Persecution* [...] Then I must act the man-midwife, and deliver them of all their prodigious Plots, Treasons, and Rebellions, or with my Satyrick instrument pull these illigitimate State-bastards Lymb by Lymb till I have Anatamized and dissected and laid open all their Cosenage and villany, or with my keen-edg'd Muse rip up the very bowels of this *Geneva-Witch*, squeeze out the very guts and garbidge of her iniquity.<sup>111</sup>

The Geneva witch will be disemboweled by the author's poetry; the pharisaical members of Parliament, the Presbyterians, will be pulled limb from limb. This sentiment is repeated in *The Levellers Levell'd*, attributed to Mercurius Pragmaticus and annotated by Thomason on 3 December 1647:

I That have lasht base Traytors to the bone,  
Have whipt ambition, pride, and spared none;  
Plaid the man-Midwives part, [...]  
And with my keen-edg'd Muse (gone thorow stitch)  
Squeez'd out the bowells o'th Genevah Witch.<sup>112</sup>

It is unlikely that Nedham, who was usually more sympathetic to the Levellers at this time, wrote these lines.<sup>113</sup> Perhaps they were authored by the same Pragmaticus as the counterfeit newsbook of 16 November 1647 quoted above, where the same phrases appear.

The topos of whipping and stripping the Parliament witch is most fully explored in the third Mistress Parliament dialogue, *Mistris Parliament Her Gossipping*, annotated by Thomason on 22 May 1648.<sup>114</sup> *Mistris Parliament Her Gossipping* was authored by ‘Mercurius Melancholicus’, perhaps John Crouch, although Lois Potter suggests that any or all of the royalist propagandists might have been involved.<sup>115</sup> In this dialogue, Mistress Parliament is configured as a ‘*Bawd, Murderer, Witch, and Whore*’.<sup>116</sup> That ‘dam’d Hagge MRS. *Parliament*’, this ‘damn’d *Geneva Witch*’, has bewitched England and is the author of her misery.<sup>117</sup> She must be tried and condemned for her sins:

*Justice.* Mrs. England, our sufferings are all alike: therefore it is but folly to complain of our wrongs; let us finde out the authoress of all this mischief, that by her Witchcraft and black Sorcery hath wrought all our ills; Know you who ‘tis has wrought all this that I may whet my glittering sword, and pierce the Strumpets heart.

*England.* ‘Tis soon known who is the Authour of our miserys ‘tis that dam’d Hagge Mrs. *Parliament*, and her Daughter *Ordinance*, that feeds fat with Theft and Rapine, and quaff whole mazor Bowls of Englands blood.<sup>118</sup>

The ordinance, a form of subordinate legislation which does not require royal assent, was used by Parliament as a legislative instrument during the civil war years. It is in this sense that ‘Ordinance’ is Parliament’s illegitimate daughter.<sup>119</sup> Statutes, acts of parliament, are regarded by the author as the legitimate form of legislation. The dialogue continues:

*Statute.* Let’s apprehend the Witch, and try her and her Daughter by the known Lawes of the Land; but first let us degrade her, strip her out of her Parliament-Roabes, and then search the Imposture, to see what marks she has about her privities, to give such damned Spirits suck, as *Manchester* and *Lenthall* her two Familiars, and those Evill spirits *Mildmay, Veine, Martyn* and *Devoll Challonor* conjur’d as low as hell, and all the damned *Furyes* in the Houses to know their wrists, and bite their finger ends off, tearing their Snaky locks whilst they sit mumbling o’re their hellish Charmes, and execrable Spells, till we have dispers’d all hells balefull Powers.<sup>120</sup>

Statute here alludes to a supposed physical identifier of a witch, extra nipples, with which she could suckle evil parliamentary spirits. *Mistris Parliament Her Gossipping* was published a few months after Lovelace probably drafted ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’. The editor of another of the royalist newsbooks, *The Parliament Kite*, probably Samuel Sheppard, advertises *Mistris Parliament Her Gossipping* in the

edition of 16 May 1648. In a lengthy diatribe, he suggests that the royalists ‘shall go nere to cart [Parliament] for a Bawde, if not burn her for a Witch’.<sup>121</sup>

Two of Robert Herrick’s poems in *Hesperides*, and one of Marvell’s, may also represent interpolations into this discourse.<sup>122</sup> ‘*The Hag*’ describes a witch astride her broomstick.<sup>123</sup> The second poem, ‘*The Hagg*’, in the same metrical and stanzaic arrangement as the first, is more offensive and jarring than is usual in Herrick’s verse. It thus more closely resembles in tone the excerpts from royalist polemic quoted above:

The staffe is now greas’d  
And very well pleas’d,  
She cocks out her Arse at the parting,  
To an old Ram Goat,  
That rattles I’th’throat,  
Halfe choakt with the stink of her farting. (ll. 1–6)<sup>124</sup>

The dark hag is usually presumed to be the primal force Hecate, rather than Parliament. Given the prevalence of the allusive field described here, it would have been open to Herrick’s community of readers to interpret ‘*The Hagg*’, in particular, as a sexual libel on Parliament of the kind referred to above in *Mistris Parliament Her Gossiping*. The last line of Marvell’s ‘*Tom May’s Death*’ presents the chronicler of Parliament as the ‘only Master of these Revels’, vanishing ‘in a cloud of pitch, | Such as unto the Sabbath bears the witch’.<sup>125</sup>

### ***Lipsian Neo-Stoic Retirement***

Critics are right to have interpreted the crucial final stanza of ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ in the context of the royalist neo-Stoic discourse of retirement, albeit with an activist perspective. There is contextual evidence that Lovelace’s community of readers would have read this stanza as a statement of strong support for the king, in preparation for the promised, imminent arrival of a royalist Scottish army, and the expected resumption of civil war. The stanza reads:

Thus richer then untempted Kings are we,  
That asking nothing, nothing need:  
Though Lord of all what Seas imbrace; yet he  
That wants himselfe, is poore indeed.

Anselment sees these lines as presuming ‘an essential Stoic patience [...] Together Lovelace’s speaker and his friend will reign with a sovereignty greater than any monarch’.<sup>126</sup> Scodel largely concurs with Anselment, suggesting that ‘possessing a Stoic wisdom wrested from adversity, the contented friends are “richer” than mere

kings, who (unlike the unfortunate Charles I) are blessed only for as long as they are “untempted”.<sup>127</sup> McDowell argues that those friends, who once lived in the light and warmth of the court during the halcyon days, ‘in the cold, dark winter of war and Puritan rule [...] can yet find warmth and shelter within poetic communities’ like Stanley’s, with its focus on the poetics of retirement.<sup>128</sup> Scodel and others have seen these lines as ‘recalling’ Seneca’s famous chorus from Thyestes: ‘A king is he who shall desire nothing / Such a kingdom on himself each man bestows’ (ll. 389–390).<sup>129</sup> Scodel also identifies lines from Casimire Sarbiewski’s *Odes* IV. 34, ‘He’s poore that wants himselfe, yet weighs | Proudly himself’, as the probable source of the second half of the stanza.<sup>130</sup>

The texts identified as possible sources for the last stanza all form part of the broader discursive field identified by Maren-Sophie Røstvig in her discussion of the Renaissance tradition of Stoic retirement.<sup>131</sup> By the mid-seventeenth century, this discursive field was complex. It included classical sources, particularly Virgil, Horace, Seneca and Martial, available in Latin and in multiple French, Italian and English translations. As discussed above, Philostratus’s *Apollonius of Tyana* was a presence. The better-known classical contributions to the discursive field also appeared in the form of ‘evidence’ supporting arguments, including by continental European authors such as Montaigne translated into English, or in compendia, such as Robert Burton’s *Anatomy of Melancholy*.<sup>132</sup> Towards the end of his life, Cowley gathered the relevant classical sources in his essays considering human happiness, compiling ‘a prose commentary on, or exposition of, the *beatus ille* tradition’.<sup>133</sup> There were also original, neo-Latin contributions by poets and philosophers, including Casimire Sarbiewski. Røstvig sees Casimire Sarbiewski, many of whose Horatian-style odes were translated into English by G. Hils, a peripheral member of Stanley’s literary community as noted above, as being central to the tradition.<sup>134</sup> There were also original, vernacular poetry and prose contributions.

The final lines of the king’s letter to Parliament of 28 December 1647 rejecting Parliament’s *Four Bills* read: ‘his Majesty is very much at ease with himself for having fulfilled the offices both of a Christian and a king’.<sup>135</sup> Royalist propagandists interpreted the lines in the context of the Stoic paradox familiar from ‘TO ALTHEA’.<sup>136</sup> The belief underlying this paradox is that the state of human

happiness relies on intellectual and emotional liberty.<sup>137</sup> As Røstvig puts it in her discussion of Cowley's essay '*Of Liberty*':

A person, as well as a nation, should be *sibi imperiosus*, should be governed, that is, by laws of his own making. The majority of men, however, are slaves to the three great tyrants — ambition, covetousness, and voluptuousness. To be properly free, and therefore happy, a man must liberate himself from the dominion of these three vices, and must learn to remain content with what he has. This Stoic argument [...] is at the very heart of the tradition of the Happy Man, whether the author be Virgil, Horace, or Martial.<sup>138</sup>

The *locus classicus* for this argument is Horace, *Satires* II 7. 83–88, the dialogue between Horace and his slave Davus, which opens with Horace asking '*Who then is free?*' As translated by Alexander Brome, another member of the Stanley group, in a version published in 1666, Davus answers:

*“He that is wise, and can  
“Govern himself, that, that’s the true Free-man;  
“Whom prisons, want, nay Death, can’t terrifie,  
“Who quells his vain desires, and valiantly  
“Contemns the froth of popular applause,  
“And squares his actions all by virtues laws:  
“No outward thing can alter him at all,  
“And Fortune’s baffled if on him she fall.”*<sup>139</sup>

The typesetting, with its use of italics and inverted commas, sets the passage apart from the rest of the text, which is in normal type. It suggests that Brome expected his readers to recognise the passage.<sup>140</sup> The passage predates the lines from the second chorus Seneca's *Thyestes* discussed by Scodel, which it resembles.<sup>141</sup> Like the lines from Seneca, Cowley translated and discussed its significance in his essays.<sup>142</sup> It is the source of the phrase *sibi imperiosus*, that is that one should govern oneself, in the quotation from Røstvig in the preceding paragraph. The paradox it elucidates is central to Lovelace's 'TO ALTHEA' where the speaker, although in prison, is free to sing his king's and Althea's praises. It is an important part of the allusive field on which Charles I drew in crafting his letter to Parliament, as well as that of '*The Grasse-hopper*'.

Only one of the earliest responses to the king's letter, Nedham's in *Mercurius Pragmaticus* of 11 January 1648, seemed to read the king's lines as signaling retirement in a conventional sense. In a clear allusion to the last lines of the king's letter, Pragmaticus wrote that '*His Majestie being in a by corner, in a manner out of the world, minds the things of it very little, but converts His thoughts wholly to matters appertaining to the Soule*'.<sup>143</sup> *Mercurius Anti-Pragmaticus* of 27 January 1648 discounted Pragmaticus's irenic interpretation, quoting as evidence

Pragmaticus's statement of activism at the end of the same page: 'Repent, Repent, for I will ne're have done, | Till I have writ the *King* into his *Throne*'. Anti-Pragmaticus thundered:

How now *Pragmaticus*, wilt thou discover so much Treason, as to call *Cromwell* a King, when CHARLES thy deified Sovereigne is alive, in whose vindication thou like a true papel Champion resolvest to hazard thy life, not many weeks since? else what were the meaning of those thy verses.<sup>144</sup>

Montaigne, in his *Essaies* (1580) I. 42 'Of the inequality that is betweene us', first published in English translation by John Florio in 1603, quoted Horace, *Satires* II. 7. 83–88. Florio opens his translation of Davus's answer in the Satires 'A wise man, of himselfe commander High, | Whom want, nor death, nor bands can terrifie'. Montaigne's comment on the passage, 'Such a man is five hundred degrees beyond kingdomes and principalities: Himselfe is a kingdome unto himslefe', is close to the formulation in the king's letter.<sup>145</sup> The royalist author of the counterfeit *Pragmaticus* of 18 January 1648 quoted Florio's translation of this passage from Horace *Satires* II. 7, with some minor typographical differences, and alluded to Montaigne's framing comment, following his summation of the king's situation and the sentiments of the letter of 28 December 1647:

We may perceive, in what a despicable estate his Majesty now is being destitute of all his friends, and none about him, but cruell Joalers [...] and yet in this sad condition, his Majesties integrity doth so cheare his soule, that he is not the least amated, and though his Crowne be ceized on by trayterous hands, yet he still is King over his great *selfe*, and prudently governs his owne *Microcosme*.<sup>146</sup>

The relationship between Montaigne's comment 'Himslefe is a kingdome unto himslefe' and the counterfeit Pragmaticus's statement that the king 'is still King over his great *selfe*, and prudently governs his owne *Microcosme*' is evident.

Like the counterfeit Pragmaticus, other royalist newsbook editors drew on the classical discursive field of retirement in constructing their responses to the king's letter. *Mercurius Elencticus* of 5 January 1647/48 saw the king's response as demonstrating 'how resolutely and magnanimously he hath deported himselfe throughout all the *surgy* maine of his *Government*; And though he be now *Shipwract* [...] yet can they not but behold him as the purest *Gold*'.<sup>147</sup> *Mercurius Melancholicus* of 8 January 1648 reported that 'His Majestie is close Prisoner in Carisbrook Castle, yet at liberty in himself, and though his Person is subdued; his diviner part remaines invincible'.<sup>148</sup> The verses introducing *Mercurius Pragmaticus*

of 11 January 1648, the edition containing Nedham's apparent statement of retreat, opined 'Princes *may be, like other men, | Imprison'd, and kept under*' but 'Monarchs, *by their owne confin'd, | 'Cause Earth quakes in the State*'.<sup>149</sup> The royalist Mercurius Melancholicus, in the first *Craftie Cromwell* dialogue annotated by Thomason on 10 February 1648, alluded to the royal prerogative:

But let the world know, Kings when once instated  
Are Gods on Earth, by Heaven Consecrated;  
Precious in the sight of God, and that base elfe  
Whom them resists, resists even Gods himselfe.<sup>150</sup>

Melancholicus is implicitly reminding royalists of their duty to fall in behind the king, in terms which would have brought to mind Strafford's frequently expressed view that subjects should do 'no more than to put an absolute Trust in the king, without offering any Condition or Restraint at all upon his Will, and then let them assure themselves to receive back unasked all that reasonably and fittingly they could expect'.<sup>151</sup>

Royalist propagandists not only described their king as having achieved intellectual and emotional liberty while in prison. He had also managed to triumph over physical deprivation at Carisbrooke. Thus, when Lovelace wrote in the last stanza of '*The Grasse-hopper*': 'yet he | That wants himselfe, is poore indeede', he was inserting a royalist's perception of the king's actual circumstances. The counterfeit *Pragmaticus* of 22 November 1647 reported that:

his Majesty is in want of Clothes, Linnen, and other necessatyees; but the Parliament are resolved (before they supply him) to make offer of the Propositions once more, to see if he wil signe to them; if not, he may be as naked as *Pragmaticus* for them.<sup>152</sup>

After the *Vote of No Addresses*, Parliament imposed harsher terms of imprisonment on the king.<sup>153</sup> The counterfeit *Pragmaticus* of 18 January 1648 claimed that, given the king's fortitude under worsening circumstances, 'it were a sinne to doubt of *Victory* since it is so strongly fortified with grace, and armed with the *compleat armour of Righteousnesse*'.<sup>154</sup> *Mercurius Elencticus* of 2 February 1648 may have been guilty of exaggeration when he claimed that:

His *Majesty* is still *pinn'd* up in a *narrow Roome*, where he is not permitted to do the *necessities* of *Nature*, with out *Eyes* upon Him, and *deprived* of all *Society* of his *Friends*, and all other *Outward* comforts whatsoever (things never yet denied to the veryest *Rogues* in *Newgate*);<sup>155</sup>

Parliament was apparently sensitive to accusations that it was mistreating the king. It was reported in *The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer* of 1 February 1647/8 that

Parliament had ordered that ‘Collonell *Hammond* should forthwith receive the summe of one thousand pounds’ apparently to improve the king’s circumstances and those of the garrison.<sup>156</sup> In this context, Lovelace’s final couplet could be interpreted both as an expression of sympathy for the plight of the poor king, who was actually ‘in want’ on the Isle of Wight, or as an expression of the king’s stoicism in overcoming physical needs. Because the king, although in want, does not desire relief, he is rich, where a lesser person who desires earthly comforts — and physical freedom — is poor.

Mildmay Fane’s ode, ‘*To Retiredness*’, which Scodel identifies as another possible allusive source for the final stanza of ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’, shows how royalist authors liked to reconstruct the neo-Stoic allusive discourse.<sup>157</sup> Like Lovelace, Fane also draws on the relevant passage from Horace *Satires* II. 7, perhaps with Seneca overlaid:

Whilst He who doth himself possess,  
 Makes all things pass him seem far less.  
 ...  
 When with a Minde Ambition-free,  
 These, and much more come home to Me.<sup>158</sup>

Fane develops the tropes of the broader discursive field in these lines. It is evident from the above quotations that, by the mid-seventeenth century, the body of sources of allusion in this discursive field, whether classical, neo-Latin, or as part of discussions on neo-Stoic philosophy, were very familiar to those who shared Lovelace’s classical education and interest in literature. He and his peers seem not to have allowed themselves to be overly hampered by the complexity of the field or the need to acknowledge allusions to it, although actual quotation is respected, as in the case of Florio’s translation of Montaigne. Rather, like Fane, the royalist authors, in the spirit of *imitatio*, took delight in developing its paradoxes, a delight Lovelace apparently shared in crafting ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’.

Parliamentarian propagandists were in no doubt that the king’s answer to the *Four Bills* should be read as a statement of hostile intent and promoted its interpretation as a re-statement of the king’s prerogative power. As noted previously, the Commons sat in closed session on 3 January 1648 to consider their reply, the *Vote of No Addresses*.<sup>159</sup> The parliamentarian Anti-Pragmaticus engaged directly with Pragmaticus in written argument, often quoting passages from his



royalist opponent, identified by issue and page number. He exploited the vulnerability of Nedham and other previously pro-Independent royalists to charges of inconsistency, given that they had for months been publishing anti-Presbyterian, anti-Scottish propaganda. Identifying the seismic shift in their position when they fell in behind the king in his suspected alliance with the Scots, Anti-Pragmaticus on 20 January 1648 likened their actions to those of a drowning man and his followers, clutching at straws:

they were so politike, as when the Independent party were at variance with the Presbyterian [...] to close with the Army [...] but a reconcilement (to their great sorrow) happening, they now would in faine insinuate themselves into the favour of the Scottish Nation, a people whom they anathamized and depraved with the coursest expressions.<sup>160</sup>

In the issue of 27 January 1648, Anti-Pragmaticus constructed the king's letter as a re-statement of the prerogative power, abuse of which had led to the outbreak of civil war:

It were as vaine [...] as it ever hath been for the Kings of England to be soothed up by their Parasites in that tyrannicall enslaving principle, That the Kings will is the originall of all power and authority in this Nation [...] if this Prerogative were allowed the King and his Favourites, when men of worth and integrity, faithfull to God and their Countrey, were elected for the service of the Common-wealth, he might dissolve them in the immediate succeeding day or houre; but this earthly omnipotency is now justly and legally taken from him.<sup>161</sup>

Parliament has legally taken away the prerogative power. It is no longer available to the king. In constructing this argument, Anti-Pragmaticus drew on parliamentary hatred of Strafford, attempting to associate in his readers' minds the pre-war campaigns against abuse of the royal prerogative with the king's current response to Parliament. It were of 'no use then of the law if the Kings little finger were heavier than the Loynes of the Law, as once the Earle of Strafford affirm'd'.<sup>162</sup> The implication is, of course, that if Charles is returned to his throne, the 'tyrannies' of the Personal Rule would also return.

### **Reading 'The Grasse-hopper'**

When Lovelace's 'The Grasse-hopper' is read within a narrow understanding of the work of Thomas Stanley's literary community, and limited to its output, it is inevitable that the poem would be interpreted as a poem of retreat into symposiac friendship. The friends respond to parliamentary suppression of all that was seen as good in the pre-war halcyon days. When the context is expanded to include royalist polemic of late 1647 and early 1648, Lovelace's poem emerges as a royalist call to action.<sup>163</sup> 'The Grasse-hopper' is, in fact, less circumspect in its support for

the king and the royalist cause than many of Lovelace's other political poems in *Lucasta*. It is a royalist's loyal response to the king's letter to Parliament of 28 January 1648, rejecting the *Four Bills*. The equivocation which is characteristic of the last lines of poems like 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*' and 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*' is absent in 'The Grasse-hopper'. In 'TO LUCASTA. *From Prison*', king and subject lack trust in each other. Lovelace's speaker seeks 'one sacred Beame' to light his relationship with his king 'where I soone may see | How to serve you, and you trust me'.<sup>164</sup> In 'AMYNTOR *from beyond the Sea to ALEXIS*', Lovelace states his independence after toying with the king for his uxoriousness: 'I move in mine owne Element'.<sup>165</sup> Even in 'TO ALTHEA' there is an element of doubt. The king is 'Good', but he should be 'Great'.<sup>166</sup>

In the first five stanzas of 'The Grasse-hopper', Lovelace juxtaposes the Platonic and the Aesopic grasshopper. While the reference to the grasshopper in heaven, 'where now th'art reard', has usually been read as an early portent of the insect's death, it is also susceptible to interpretation along the lines that the insect is so loved by the Muses that it has been raised to heaven. Perhaps for the only time in this poem, an image drawn from the world of the masque, of the poet seated beside Apollo in a heavenly carriage surrounded by clouds, intrudes.<sup>167</sup> The Aesopic grasshopper, on the other hand, no longer clings to 'some well-filled Oaten Beard'. Its stalk has now been cropt by the mower's sickle or winter's frost. It is just a 'Poore verdant foole' and 'green Ice'. Yet, the insect is not so much dead, as silent, in hibernation. Like Apollonius of Tyana, it is frightened to sing its king's praises openly. The poem imagines a grasshopper who has retired to the darkness of the underworld with Ceres and Bacchus to sit out the winter, one who will be reborn with them in spring, rather than one who has disappeared forever. The speaker calls on the Platonic grasshopper to sing out loudly, to bid all good royalists to 'lay in stores', to use the winter but to prepare for war in the coming spring and summer campaign seasons; perhaps, as Nedham promised, to 'writ[e] the *King* into his *Throne*'.<sup>168</sup>

The significance of the allegory which Lovelace has constructed in the stanzas on the grasshopper is explained in the second half of the poem, although it remains partially concealed behind a veil of references to the neo-Stoic discourse of retirement. The aggressively masculine friends will gather, as true royalists should,

to celebrate the rites of friendship implicitly denied to those puritans who seek to suppress traditional feast days. They will tend the altar of royalism, the ‘Vestall Flames’, raising the temperature to that of the fire at the volcanic core of Mount Etna, which Ceres had used to ignite the tapers that lit her search for Persephone. Friendship, accompanied by wine and the recitation of classical poetry, will conspire with the harsh December weather to demand celebration of the traditional seasonal feast, be it Christian or pagan. The bright flames of the friends’ faith in the royalist cause will expunge night. It will strip the parliamentarian witch of her black mantle, exposing her deformed body to the light of royalist truth.

Even when read in the context of the king’s letter to Parliament of 28 December 1647, the last stanza of ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ is enigmatic. We know that royalists and parliamentarians alike interpreted the king’s lines ‘his Majesty is very much at ease with himself for having fulfilled the offices both of a Christian and a king’ as a restatement of the royal prerogative, the king’s right to expect his subjects to trust him, to support his decision to ally with the Scots and prepare for war.<sup>169</sup> Without that knowledge, it would be tempting to continue to interpret the lines as describing the friends’ strength of moral purpose, rather than the king’s. Lovelace is, in fact, adopting Nedham’s rhetorical strategy in *Mercurius Pragmaticus* of 14 December 1647, where he reverses the roles of the caged singer and the glorious king of ‘TO ALTHEA’.<sup>170</sup> Royalist poets and polemicists are free, while their king is in fetters. In reparation for their king’s treatment, they will ‘sing and play | Like *Birds* within a *Cage*.’ In ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ the friends have their freedom. Thus, they have all they need to respond to the king’s call. In a pair of paradoxes, the king, although technically ‘Lord of all what Seas embrace’, the three kingdoms of the island realm of Great Britain, is imprisoned at Carisbrooke on the Isle of Wight. Yet he is ‘at ease with himself’, he has carried out his divinely appointed duty as a Christian and a king and will inevitably triumph in the coming months. Although Charles is actually in physical need at Carisbrooke, he has the moral courage to overcome want and trust in his loving subjects’ capacity to pursue his interests and ensures his eventual release.

After the Regicide, when *Lucasta* was published, it was open to royalists to read the poem differently. Lovelace, like Nedham, must have seemed prescient in his description of the grasshopper king with its head ‘Croit’. The king has become

Charles the martyr, richer than an untempted king because he is dead, beyond temptation, neither needing nor wanting anything. His followers had no choice but to retire from public life and sit out the winter of the Commonwealth, seeking consolation in the symposiac pleasures of wine and friendship. Nevertheless, royalists could have faith that their retirement was temporary. They could keep the flames on the altar of royalism burning as brightly as those at Etna's core. Royalist poets and balladeers could write and recite poems celebrating the halcyon days and pray for the return of the monarchy. They could await the inevitable rebirth of the cause, when Charles II would enjoy his own again in England. *'The Grasse-hopper'* is a powerful articulation of this sentiment.

## **Endnotes**

<sup>1</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 34-36. Leah S. Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), pp. 228-33.

<sup>2</sup> The other poems in the series, which were published in the *Posthume Poems*, include *'The Ant'* (pp. 13-14); *'The Snayl'* and *'Another'* (pp. 15-18); *'The Falcon'* (pp. 21-25); *'A Fly caught in a Cobweb'* (pp. 34-36); *'A Fly about a Glasse of Burnt Claret'* (pp. 36-38); and *'The Toad and Spyder'* (pp. 41-48). On this series of poems, as well as Marcus, see Raymond A. Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1988), pp. 112-22; Susan A. Clarke, "'Bright Heir t' th' Bird Imperial': Richard Lovelace's 'The Falcon' in Context", *Review of English Studies*, 56 (2005), 263-75 (see Appendix III; Erna Kelly, "'Small Types of Great Ones': Richard Lovelace's Separate Peace", in *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*, ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 81-101; Earl Miner, *The Cavalier Mode From Jonson to Cotton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971), pp. 111-15; Elizabeth Skerpan-Wheeler, 'Lovelace's Community of Fable: The Significance of the Beast Poems', (Unpublished paper, 1986); Randolph L. Jr Wadsworth, 'On "The Snayl" by Richard Lovelace', *Modern Language Review*, 65 (1970), 750-60. I would like to thank Professor Skerpan-Wheeler for making her paper available.

<sup>3</sup> Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*; Miner, *The Cavalier Mode*; Andrew Shifflett, *Stoicism, Politics, and Literature in the Age of Milton: War and Peace Reconciled* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998). See also Maren-Sofie Røstvig, *The Happy Man: Studies in the Metamorphoses of a Classical Ideal*, 2nd ed., vol. I (Oslo: Norwegian Universities Press, 1962).

<sup>4</sup> Shifflett, *Stoicism, Politics, and Literature*, p. 16, quoting Gerhard Oestreich, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State*, ed. Brigitta Oestreich and H.G. Koenigsberger, trans. David McLintock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 30. Shifflett's italics.

<sup>5</sup> Shifflett, p. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Shifflett, p. 7.

<sup>7</sup> Shifflett, p. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Don Cameron Allen, 'An Explication of Lovelace's 'The Grasse-hopper'', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 18 (1957), 35-43; Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*, pp. 105-07; Muriel C. Bradbrook, 'Don Cameron Allen. *Image and Meaning. Metaphoric Traditions in Renaissance Poetry*', *Renaissance News*, 14, no. 4 (1961), 297-99; Cleanth Brooks, 'A Pre-Romantic View of Nature: Sir Richard Lovelace', in *Historical Evidence and the Reading of Seventeenth-Century Poetry* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991), 113-28; Gerald Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 71 (1985), 203-34 (pp. 213, 18-18); Gerald Hammond, *Fleeting Things: English Poets and Poems, 1616-1660* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990), pp. 93, 253, 55; Kelly, "'Small Types of Great Ones'"; Bruce King, 'Green Ice and a Breast of Proof', *College English*, 26 (1965), 511-15; Bruce King, "'The Grasse-hopper' and Allegory', *Ariel: A Review of International English Literature*, 1 (1970), 71-82; James Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997), pp. 202, 17-23; Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth*, pp. 229-33; Nicholas McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars: Marvell and the Cause of Wit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 128-43; Miner, *The Cavalier Mode*, pp. 64-65, 285-93; Jonathan F.S. Post, *English Lyric Poetry: The Early Seventeenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 127-31; Dale B.J. Randall, 'Reading the Light in Lovelace's 'The Grasshopper'', *College Literature*, 16 (1989), 182-89; Joshua Scodel, *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), pp. 228-32; Kitty W. Scoular, *Natural Magic: Studies in the Presentation of Nature in English Poetry from Spencer to Marvell* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965); Skerpan-Wheeler, 'Lovelace's Community of Fable'; Adam Smyth, ed., *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: D.S. Brewer, 2004); Manfred Weidhorn, *Richard Lovelace* (New York: Twayne, 1970); Robert Wilcher, *The Writing of Royalism: 1628-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001). Brooks's 'Pre-Romantic View of Nature' comprises a paper delivered in 1959, apparently in ignorance of Allen's essay, published in 1962, and a postscript which seems to have been written partly in 1962, partly in 1990.

<sup>9</sup> Cleanth Brooks, 'Criticism and Literary History: Marvell's 'Horatian Ode'', *Sewanee Review*, 55 (1947), 199-222; Cleanth Brooks, 'A Note on the Limits of 'History' and the Limits of 'Criticism'', *Sewanee Review*, 61 (1953), 129-35; Douglas Bush, 'Marvell's 'Horatian Ode'', *Sewanee Review*, 60 (1952), 363-76; Christopher Hill, 'Society and Andrew Marvell', *Modern Quarterly*, 1, N.S. (1946), 6-31. Marvell, *Poems*, p. 271.

- <sup>10</sup> Allen, 'An Explication', p. 35.
- <sup>11</sup> The actual reference in the Loeb edition is to the *Phaedrus* 258 E-259 D; see *Plato* ed. by Harold North Fowler, vol. I, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1953), pp. 511-13. While there is some inconsistency, the reference is usually given as *Phaedrus* 259, a practice I have followed.
- <sup>12</sup> Allen, 'An Explication', p. 38.
- <sup>13</sup> Philostratus, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, ed. Christopher P. Jones, 2 vols, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005).
- <sup>14</sup> *Anacreon*, p. 107, bound with Thomas Stanley, *Poems* (London, 1651), E. 1422 [1-3]. Stanley identifies the passage as 'lib 7. cap 5'. In the Loeb edition, the passage is to be found in VII. 11, Philostratus, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, II, pp. 227-29.
- <sup>15</sup> Thomas Moffett, *The Theater of Insects* (London, 1658), pp. 989-97. The EEBO copy which I consulted is of that at Yale University. It is bound with Edward Topsell's *The History of Four-Footed Beasts and Serpents*. See also, Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*, p. 106; Miner, *The Cavalier Mode*, p. 289.
- <sup>16</sup> Allen, 'An Explication', p. 40.
- <sup>17</sup> Allen, p. 41.
- <sup>18</sup> Allen, p. 42.
- <sup>19</sup> Fowler, ed., *Plato* p. 513.
- <sup>20</sup> Brooks, 'A Pre-Romantic View of Nature', p. 115.
- <sup>21</sup> Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*, pp. 106-07; Joachim Camerarius, *Symbolorum et emblematum ex volatilibus et insectis desumtorum centuria tertia* (Nuremberg, 1596), pp. 96; Røstvig, *The Happy Man*, p. 331, note 30; Scodel, *Excess and the Mean*, p. 232.
- <sup>22</sup> Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*, pp. 105-07; McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, pp. 128-43; Miner, *The Cavalier Mode*, pp. 63-65, 284-93; Scodel, *Excess and the Mean*, pp. 225, 28-32.
- <sup>23</sup> King, 'The Grasse-hopper' and Allegory'; Randall, 'Reading the Light'.
- <sup>24</sup> McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, pp. 128-43.
- <sup>25</sup> Stanley, *Poems*, p. 94; *Anacreon*, pp. 23-24, bound with Stanley, *Poems*.
- <sup>26</sup> Marvell, *Poems*, p. 190.
- <sup>27</sup> McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, p. 129; Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski, *The Odes of Casimire*, trans. G. Hils (London, 1646).
- <sup>28</sup> Hammond, 'Uses of Obscurity', p. 218.
- <sup>29</sup> This allusive field is the subject of Røstvig, *The Happy Man*.
- <sup>30</sup> Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*, p. 107. See also, e.g., Allen, 'An Explication', p. 40; King, 'The Grasse-hopper' and Allegory'.
- <sup>31</sup> Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth*, pp. 229-33.
- <sup>32</sup> Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, pp. 202, 217-23.
- <sup>33</sup> Loxley, pp. 220-22.

- <sup>34</sup> Loxley, pp. 220-21.
- <sup>35</sup> C.f. Hazlitt, p. 94, suggests Charles Cotton the Elder; Wilkinson, *Poems*, n., p. 263 suggests Charles Cotton the Younger; Thomas N. Corns, *A History of Seventeenth-Century English Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), p. 249, is uncertain.
- <sup>36</sup> H.M. Margoliouth, 'The Poems of Richard Lovelace', *Review of English Studies*, 3 (1927), 89-95 (p. 94).
- <sup>37</sup> Hammond, 'Uses of Obscurity', p. 220; Hammond, *Fleeting Things*, p. 93; McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, pp. 127-28. See also Ch. 6.
- <sup>38</sup> C.H. Firth and R.S. Rait, eds., *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum*, 3 vols (London: H.M.S.O., 1911), I, p. 954.
- <sup>39</sup> *Mercurius Anti-Pragmaticus*. E. 423 [13], pp. 3-4.
- <sup>40</sup> Alan Everitt, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640-1660* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1966), p. 231.
- <sup>41</sup> Matthew Carter, *A Most True and Exact Relation of That as Honourable as Unfortunate Expedition of Kent, Essex, and Colchester* (London, 1650), p. 1.
- <sup>42</sup> P.W. Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead, 1617-1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), pp. 143-44.
- <sup>43</sup> *Posthume Poems*, pp. 33-34.
- <sup>44</sup> *Posthume Poems*, pp. 41-48. One of the first shots in this phase of this war is John Cleveland, *The Character of a Moderate Intelligencer With Some Select Poems* (London, 1647), E. 385 [9], annotated by Thomason on 29 April 1647. Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2007), p. 24. John Crouch's last newsbook, *Mercurius Democritus*, continued into 1654.
- <sup>45</sup> See Ch. 2 for details of this community.
- <sup>46</sup> McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, Ch. 1.
- <sup>47</sup> John Hall, *A True Account and Character of the Times, Historically and Politically drawn by a Gentleman to Give Satisfaction to his Friend in the Country* (London, 1647), E. 401 [13]; David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 169.
- <sup>48</sup> McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, p. 146.
- <sup>49</sup> *Mercurius Elencticus*. E. 445 [23], p. 206. Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic*, p. 178.
- <sup>50</sup> 'To the Genius of Mr. John Hall', *Posthume Poems*, pp. 74-76; Hierocles, *Upon the Golden Verses of Pythagoras*, trans. John Hall (London, 1656), sig. A4<sup>r-v</sup>.
- <sup>51</sup> On royalist newsbooks generally, see McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, Ch. 4; Jason Peacey, 'The counterfeit silly curr': Money, Politics, and the Forging of Royalist Newspapers during the English Civil War', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 67 (2004), 27-58; Jason Peacey, *Politicians*

and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum (Aldershot, Hants.: Ashgate, 2004).

<sup>52</sup> Thomas, *Sir John Berkenhead*, p. 155.

<sup>53</sup> Thomas, pp. 139-40.

<sup>54</sup> Blair Worden, *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 60.

<sup>55</sup> Marchamont Nedham, *The Case of the Kingdom Stated, According to the Proper Interests of the Several Parties Ingaged* (London, 1647), E. 392 [13].

<sup>56</sup> Dorothy Gardiner, ed., *The Oxinden and Peyton Letters: 1642-1670* (London: Sheldon Press, 1937), pp. 142, 145.

<sup>57</sup> McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, p. 22. This section is based on Mc Elligott, unless otherwise stated.

<sup>58</sup> McElligott, p. 21-22, quoting Andrew Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 162-63.

<sup>59</sup> David Scott, *Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms, 1637-49*, British History in Perspective (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), Ch. 5. The following paragraph is based on Scott, particularly pp. 149-50, 159.

<sup>60</sup> See Ch. 5.

<sup>61</sup> Samuel Rawson Gardiner, *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625-1660*, 3rd rev. edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906), pp. 347-53, quoted in Scott, *Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms*, p. 159.

<sup>62</sup> CSPD 1645-47, p. 583, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>63</sup> CJ, 3 January 1648, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>64</sup> LJ, 17 January 1647, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>65</sup> E. 423 [21], sig T<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>66</sup> James Howell, *Dendrologia. Dodona's Grove: Or, The Vocall Forrest* (London, 1640). In a New Year's gift presented to Charles I in January 1642, entitled 'THE VOTE, OR A Poem Royall'; James Howell, *A New Volume of Letters* (London, 1647), sig. R2<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>67</sup> Alastair Fowler, 'The Formation of Genres in the Renaissance and After', *New Literary History*, 34 (2003), 185-200 (p. 191).

<sup>68</sup> Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1638), 1.2.3.15, p. 132.

<sup>69</sup> Moffett, *The Theater of Insects*, p. 990 (and also p. 93).

<sup>70</sup> Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*, pp. 105-06. *Anacreon*, p. 107, bound with Stanley, *Poems*. Stanley cites the passage as 'Apollonius Tyanaeus, lib. 7 cap. 5'. In the current Loeb edition, it is at VII. 11, Philostratus, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, II, p. 227.

<sup>71</sup> *Apollonius Tyanaeus* VII, 12; Philostratus, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, II, p. 231.

<sup>72</sup> Philostratus, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, II, p. 233.



- <sup>73</sup> Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, p. 202. Loxley's and Shifflett's monographs are reviewed and compared in Michael Mendle, 'An Enduring Discourse Community?: Some Studies in Early Modern English History and Culture', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 53 (2000), 222-38 (pp. 234-37).
- <sup>74</sup> Loxley, p. 220.
- <sup>75</sup> Loxley, p. 220.
- <sup>76</sup> Shifflett, *Stoicism, Politics, and Literature*, p. 7 and see note 16, p. 156. Quoting Stanley, *The History of Philosophy in Eight Parts* (1656), VIII, p. 86 who in turn was paraphrasing Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 7. 108.
- <sup>77</sup> McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, p. 131.
- <sup>78</sup> See, for example, Hammond, 'Uses of Obscurity', p. 213; Scodel, *Excess and the Mean*, p. 229.
- <sup>79</sup> *Ovid's Metamorphosis. Englished, Mythologiz'd, and Represented in Figures*, ed. George Sandys (Oxford, 1632); *Ovids Festivalls: Or Romane Calendar*, trans. John Gower (Cambridge, 1640), pp. 84-90.
- <sup>80</sup> *Metamorphoses V, 527-532; Ovid's Metamorphosis*, ed. Sandys, p. 181. See also *Ovids Festivalls: Or Romane Calendar*, p. 87. Sandys gives a detailed description of flaming Aetna in his notes on Book V, see *Ovid's Metamorphosis*, pp. 181, 91-92.
- <sup>81</sup> S.N., *The Loyal Garland, Containing Choice Songs and Sonnets of Our Late Unhappy Revolutions* (London, 1673), sig. A3. Joad Raymond 'Parker, Martin (fl. 1624-1647)', *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>82</sup> *A New Ballad, Called a Review of the Rebellion* (London, 1647), 669 f. 11 [21].
- <sup>83</sup> McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, p. 102.
- <sup>84</sup> McElligott, pp. 101-03.
- <sup>85</sup> McElligott, p. 103.
- <sup>86</sup> Moffett, *The Theater of Insects*, p. 989.
- <sup>87</sup> E. 419 [22], sig. N2<sup>v</sup>.
- <sup>88</sup> E. 419 [22], sig. N1<sup>v</sup>.
- <sup>89</sup> *Posthume Poems*, p. 14.
- <sup>90</sup> Røstvig, *The Happy Man*, p. 16.
- <sup>91</sup> *Lucasta*, pp. 97-98. The allusive field attaching to 'TO ALTHEA' is described in detail in Ch. 4.
- <sup>92</sup> *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 14 December 1647, E. 419 [22].
- <sup>93</sup> George Wither, *Abuses Stript, and Whipt: Or Satyricall Essays* (London, 1617), pp. 306-07.
- <sup>94</sup> John Taylor, *A Swarme of Sectaries, and Schismatiques* (London, 1641), E. 158 [1], p. 14.
- <sup>95</sup> John Taylor, *Aqua-Musae: Or, Cacafofo, Cacadaemon, Captain George Wither Wrung in the Withers* (London, 1645), E. 269 [22].
- <sup>96</sup> Taylor, *Aqua-Musae*, p. 1.
- <sup>97</sup> E. 410 [19].
- <sup>98</sup> E. 423 [21], sig. T1<sup>v</sup>.

- <sup>99</sup> *Mercurius Dogmaticus*. E. 422 [31], p. 2.
- <sup>100</sup> McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, Ch. 2.
- <sup>101</sup> E. 417 [21], p. 81. The counterfeit, but still royalist editions of *Pragmaticus* are examined in Peacey, ‘The Counterfeit Silly Curr’.
- <sup>102</sup> *The Second Part of Crafty Crumwell: Or, Oliver in his Glory as King* (London, 1648), p. 3. Italics reversed.
- <sup>103</sup> *Lucasta*, sig. a<sup>7</sup>.
- <sup>104</sup> Jenny Wormald, ‘James VI and I (1566-1625)’ *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>105</sup> James VI and I’s treatise on witchcraft, *Daemonologie*, was published in 1597.
- <sup>106</sup> John Cleveland, *The Character of a London-Diurnall: With Severall Select Poems* (London, 1647), E. 375 [22].
- <sup>107</sup> Cleveland, *The Character of a London-Diurnall*, p. 30.
- <sup>108</sup> Cleveland, p. 36.
- <sup>109</sup> A.D. Cousins, ‘Cleveland, John (bapt. 1613, d. 1658)’, *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>110</sup> E. 428 [9], sig. Z2<sup>f</sup>.
- <sup>111</sup> The counterfeit edition is E. 414 [16], p. 66.
- <sup>112</sup> *The Levellers Levell’d: Or, The Independents Conspiracie to Root Out Monarchie* (London, 1647), E. 419 [4], sig. A1<sup>v</sup>.
- <sup>113</sup> Nedham denied authorship in *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 7 December 1647, E. 419 [12].
- <sup>114</sup> *Mistris Parliament Her Gossipping. Full of Mirth, Merry Tales, Chat, and Other Pleasant Discourse*, (London, 1648), E. 443 [28].
- <sup>115</sup> Lois Potter, ‘English Political Dialogues, 1641-1651: The *Mistress Parliament* Dialogues’, *Analytical and Enumerative Bibliography*, 1 N.S. (1987), 101-70 (p. 107).
- <sup>116</sup> *Mistris Parliament*, coversheet.
- <sup>117</sup> *Mistris Parliament*, p. 7
- <sup>118</sup> *Mistris Parliament*, p. 7
- <sup>119</sup> See also ‘*Mercurius Aulicus: Againe*’, 3 February 1648, E. 425 [8], sig. A4<sup>f</sup> for a description of Ordinance as Parliament’s bastard child.
- <sup>120</sup> *Mistris Parliament*, p. 7.
- <sup>121</sup> *The Parliament-Kite*, E. 443 [6], p. 7.
- <sup>122</sup> Post, *English Lyric Poetry*, p. 130. Tom Cain, ‘Herrick, Robert (bap. 1591, d. 1674)’ *ODNB*, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>123</sup> Herrick, *Poems*, p. 225.
- <sup>124</sup> Herrick, *Poems*, p. 333.
- <sup>125</sup> Marvell, *Poems*, p. 124.
- <sup>126</sup> Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve*, p. 107.
- <sup>127</sup> Scodel, *Excess and the Mean*, p. 232.

- <sup>128</sup> McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance*, p. 139.
- <sup>129</sup> Scodel, *Excess and the Mean*, p. 232.
- <sup>130</sup> McDowell, *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars*, p. 138; Sarbiewski, *The Odes of Casimire*, p. 97; Scodel, *Excess and the Mean*, p. 232.
- <sup>131</sup> Røstvig, *The Happy Man*.
- <sup>132</sup> Quotations relevant to ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ include Horace, *Satires* II. 7. 83-88 in Michel de Montaigne, *The Essayes: Or, Morall, Politike, and Militarie Discourses of Lord Michael de Montaigne*, trans. John Florio, 3rd edn (London, 1632), p. 140; the same passage from Horace, *Satires* II.7 and Plato’s description of the grasshoppers in *Phaedrus* 259 in Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, p. 44 and p. 132, I.II.III.15.
- <sup>133</sup> Røstvig, *The Happy Man*, p. 16. The *Discourses* are to be found in Abraham Cowley, *Works* (London, 1668). Cowley’s translations from this allusive field which are relevant to Lovelace’s ‘*The Grasse-hopper*’ are Horace, *Satires*, II. 7, in ‘*Of Liberty*’, p. 85; the collection of Martial’s epigrams at pp. 86-87; and Seneca’s second chorus from *Thyestes*, in ‘*Of Obscurity*’, pp. 97-98
- <sup>134</sup> Røstvig, *The Happy Man*, p. 16.
- <sup>135</sup> CSPD 1645-47, p. 583, accessed 30 November 2009.
- <sup>136</sup> See Ch.4.
- <sup>137</sup> Røstvig, *The Happy Man*, p. 16.
- <sup>138</sup> Røstvig, p. 16.
- <sup>139</sup> Alexander Brome, ed., *The Poems of Horace, Consisting of Odes, Satyres, and Epistles, Rendred in English Verse by Several Persons* (London, 1666), p. 294.
- <sup>140</sup> Usually, such typesetting would indicate that Brome was quoting another source. If this is the case, I have not been able to locate that source.
- <sup>141</sup> Scodel, *Excess and the Mean*, p. 232.
- <sup>142</sup> Cowley, *Works*. Cowley’s translation of this passage from Horace, *Satires*, II. 7 is in ‘*Of Liberty*’, p. 85.
- <sup>143</sup> E. 422 [17], sig. R4<sup>v</sup>.
- <sup>144</sup> E. 423 [29], p. 4.
- <sup>145</sup> Montaigne, *The Essayes*, p. 140.
- <sup>146</sup> E. 423 [1], sig S4<sup>v</sup>.
- <sup>147</sup> E. 421 [34], p. 48.
- <sup>148</sup> E. 422 [8], p. 109.
- <sup>149</sup> E. 422 [17], sig. R1<sup>r</sup>.
- <sup>150</sup> *Craftie Cromwell: Or, Oliver Ordering Our New State. A Tragi-Comedie* (London, 1648), E. 426 [17], p. 2.
- <sup>151</sup> Anthony Milton, ‘Thomas Wentworth and the Political Thought of the Personal Rule’, in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621-1641*, ed. J.F. Merritt (Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 1996), 133-56 (p. 144). Milton is quoting *The Earl of Strafforde's Letters and Dispatches, with an Essay Towards his Life*, ed. W. Knowler, 2 vols (1739), I, p. 237. Strafford's appropriation of a Lipsian construction of Stoicism is also discussed in Ch. 5.

<sup>152</sup> E. 416 [19], p. 72.

<sup>153</sup> Robert Ashton, *Counter-Revolution: The Second Civil War and its Origins, 1646-48* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 210.

<sup>154</sup> E 423 [1], sig. S4<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>155</sup> E. 425 [7], p. 72.

<sup>156</sup> E. 424 [10], p. 818.

<sup>157</sup> On Fane, see Ch. 6.

<sup>158</sup> Mildmay Fane, Second Earl of Westmorland, *Otia Sacra* (London, 1648), p. 172.

<sup>159</sup> *Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*, 4 and 11 January 1648, E. 421 [30] and E. 422 [18].

<sup>160</sup> E. 423 [13], pp. 5-6.

<sup>161</sup> E. 423 [29], pp. 4-5

<sup>162</sup> E. 423. [29], p. 4. There are other implicit and explicit references demonising Strafford in this and the next issue of *Anti-Pragmaticus*, that of 3 February 1648, E. 425 [13].

<sup>163</sup> For an historical account of Charles I's actions during these weeks, see Ashton, *Counter-Revolution: The Second Civil War and its Origins, 1646-48*; Charles Carlton, *Charles I: The Personal Monarch*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 1995), Ch. 18.

<sup>164</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 52.

<sup>165</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 138.

<sup>166</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 98.

<sup>167</sup> Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth*, p. 229, notes the presence of the grasshopper on the design for the proscenium of *Salmacida Spolia*, where it represented 'Affection to the Country'.

<sup>168</sup> *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, 11 January 1648, E. 422 [17], sig. R4<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>169</sup> *CSPD*, 28 December 1647, accessed 30 November 2009.

<sup>170</sup> E. 419 [22].

## Coda

This study has not uncovered the mythical iron chest full of Richard Lovelace's diaries which could have revealed the poet's innermost thoughts. In the absence of such a find, the biographical information on Lovelace's public life, including the records of land transactions which were found by a local historian in just such a box, and contextual analysis of a number of his more overtly political poems published in *Lucasta* (1649) offered here come as close as is possible to establishing that Lovelace maintained his commitment to the royalist cause until his death.

However, Lovelace's commitment to the king and the royalist cause was never unthinking. The poems studied here show that, unlike his pre-war contemporaries, the court poets William Habington and Henry Hughes, Lovelace never subscribed unquestioningly to the queen's cult of *honnête* platonic love. Over time, Lovelace's irreverent disregard for the cult of platonic love metamorphosed into something more serious. He, and other royalists, shared the parliamentarian propagandists' criticism that the king's ability to rule effectively was circumscribed by the dominance of his foreign, Roman Catholic wife. The king was, in effect, emasculated. It may be that, like his older contemporary Mildmay Fane, Earl of Westmorland, Lovelace found it more convenient to criticise the popish, French queen in poems for publication, rather than the monarch to whom he publicly avowed his loyalty. In the poems in *Lucasta* where loyalty to the king is directly at issue, Lovelace appropriates the traditional right of poets to give independent advice to their king.

In the months preceding the outbreak of hostilities in 1648, Lovelace wrote a poem designed to rally royalists to action: '*The Grasse-hopper*'. The poem's purpose and meaning were lightly concealed behind the fable and other classical sources on which it drew. *Lucasta* should have been published shortly after it was licensed for publication, on 4 February 1648. Parliament's refusal to allow *Lucasta* to be circulated until some months after the Regicide, until May or June 1649, confirms the volume's perceived importance as a tool in the royalist propaganda campaign.

The nature of Lovelace's commitment to the royalist cause had to change after the Regicide. His king was dead. To quote the prescient 'TO LUCASTA.

*From Prison*, 'th' fairest body' was 'beheaded'.<sup>1</sup> There is no evidence that Lovelace ever resiled from his commitment to the cause, although his level of enthusiasm would have varied according to circumstance, as it did during the war years. There are indications that Lovelace, like his brother Francis, engaged in covert activities for the royalist cause during the Interregnum. After Richard Lovelace's death, his brother Dudley and friend Eldrett Revett persevered in their efforts to publish the second volume of his poetry, *Lucasta: Posthume Poems* (1659). Again, the timing was significant. The volume appeared in the months preceding the Restoration. Presumably, it served the same purpose as *Lucasta* was designed to achieve in 1648, re-kindling enthusiasm for the monarchy.

Like all such studies, this thesis is a product of the literary critical fashion of its day. Currently, the fashion combines the historical turn and a return to respectability of literary studies of the political and cultural elite after a productive half century of interest in oppositional writing. The contextual and intertextual approach to reading selected poems of the 1649 *Lucasta* brings the texts alive as intriguing contributions to the political debates of their day, in a manner which formalist readings fail to do. It shows the poems as being both anchored within, and contesting the culture of the early Caroline court. It is, however, a demonstration of the appropriateness of the methodology rather than a complete study of Lovelace's work. Two areas stand out for further study. Lipsian thought is only starting to attract attention in work on the history and literature of the civil wars and Interregnum. A reconsideration of representations of retirement in royalist and parliamentarian writing of the period would appear timely. My case study of 'The Falcon' shows that the more overtly political poems of Lovelace's second volume, the *Posthume Poems*, would benefit from the kind of analysis undertaken here. Certainly, those of Lovelace's poems discussed here have shown themselves worthy of this kind of analysis. They emerge as complex and nuanced contributions to royalist debate.

<sup>1</sup> *Lucasta*, p. 50.

## Appendix I — Richard Lovelace: Key Dates

<b>Date</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>Source</b>
c. 17 May 1611	Marriage of Richard Lovelace's parents, Sir William Lovelace the Younger and Anne Barne	Articles of Marriage; The National Archives, PRO C 78/216/12, PRO C 78/277/9
9 December 1617	Richard Lovelace born, probably at Woolwich	Inquisition Post Mortem on the death of Sir William Lovelace the Younger, PRO C 142/442/37, PRO WARD 7/77/128
12 August 1627	Death of Sir William Lovelace the Younger at the Siege of Grolle	Inquisition Post Mortem, TNA, PRO C 142//442/37, PRO WARD 7/77/128
1628–29	Dame Anne Lovelace petitions Charles I in relation to son's entry to Charterhouse School, London (probably on behalf of Thomas Lovelace)	British Library Egerton MS 2553, fol. 50 b.
5 May 1631	Richard Lovelace sworn in as a 'Gent wayter extraordinary' to Charles I	PRO LC 5/132 fol. 249, LC 3/1/33 <sup>r</sup>
1632–1633	Dame Anne Lovelace dies	PRO PROB11/163
27 June 1634	Richard Lovelace signs Book of Subscriptions, Gloucester Hall, University of Oxford	Oxford University Archives, Subscriptions Register 1615–38, S.P. 39, Register Ac, fol. 185
1634–1636	Richard Lovelace's lost play, <i>The Scholars</i> , performed	Wood
30 August 1636	Awarded honorary M.A. during Charles I and Henrietta Maria's visit to Oxford	Wood I, col. 887
4 October 1637	Incorporated at the University of Cambridge	Venn, 1, III, p. 107

<b>Date</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>Source</b>
1638	First published poem: 'CLITOPHON and LUCIPPE translated. <i>To the Ladies</i> '	Achilles Tatius, <i>The Loves of Clitophon and Leucippe</i> , trans. Anthony Hodges (Oxford 1638), sigs A5 <sup>r</sup> –A6 <sup>r</sup>
1639	Ensign serving under General Goring in the first Bishops' War	Wood
1640	Commissioned a Captain under Goring in the second Bishops' War	Wood
1640	Writes lost tragedy <i>The Soldier</i> , based on experiences	Wood
30 April 1642	Presents <i>Kentish Petition</i> to Parliament; imprisoned in the Gatehouse	<i>CJ</i>
May–June 1642	Petitions Parliament for release	House of Lords MS HL/PO/JO/10/1/125A
17 June 1642	Granted bail	<i>CJ</i> , 17 and 21 June 1642; <i>Some Special Passages</i> , 21 June 1642
November 1643–February 1644	Part of 'THE SCRUTINIE' transcribed in the <i>Royal Ordnance Papers</i>	PRO WO 55/1661/435
March 1643–February 1648	Sells lands in and around Bethersden	Centre for Kentish Studies, MS U2035; British Library Add. Chs 47354, 61215
October 1646	Colonel in French Army at Siege of Dunkirk; badly wounded	Wood
4 November 1646	Lovelace witnesses a document at Charterhouse School, now missing	Wilkinson, Letter to <i>TLS</i> , 14 August 1937
26 October 1647	Admitted as a freeman of the Painter Stainers' Company	London, Guildhall Library MS 5667/1
4 February 1648	<i>Lucasta</i> licensed	Eyre, ed., <i>Stationers' Registers, 1640–1708</i> , I, p. 318



<b>Date</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>Source</b>
31 May 1648	Mentioned in press in association with John Hall, Edward Sherburne, Thomas Shirley and Thomas Stanley	<i>Mercurius Elencticus</i> , 31 May 1648
9 June 1648	Warrant issued for the arrest of Captain Lovelace	<i>CSPD</i>
10 April 1649	Warrant issued for release of Richard Lovelace from Peterhouse	<i>CSPD</i>
14 May 1649	<i>Lucasta</i> entered in the <i>Stationers' Register</i>	<i>Stationers' Registers</i> , I, p. 318
19 February 1654	'Colonel Lovelace' mentioned in relation to the Ship Tavern Conspiracy	TSP II, pp. 96, 114; <i>A Treasonable Plot Discovered</i>
21 March 1654	Isaac Berkenhead mentions 'Col. Lovelace' in correspondence with Thurloe	TSP, II, p. 429
20 March 1656	Richard Lovelace witnesses a document on behalf of Magdalen College, Oxford	BL Add. MS 71245 A–O, fol. 25
5 April 1657	Record of the burial of a 'Dudley Lovelace' at St Bride's Church, Fleet St, possibly an erroneous record of Richard's burial	Guildhall Library MS 6540/1
19 October 1657	Eldred Revett writes the 'Epistle Dedicatory' to his <i>Poems</i> , which contain Richard Lovelace's last dedicatory verses. The text indicates that Lovelace is dead	Revett, <i>Poems</i> (London, 1657)
9 February 1688	Letter, Sir Edward Sherburne to Anthony Wood, giving details of Lovelace's sister's poor recollection of her brother's death	London Metropolitan Archive, ACC/3259/SF3/004

## Appendix II — Anthony Wood: Richard Lovelace<sup>1</sup>

RICHARD LOVELACE the eldest son of Sir *Will. Lovelace* of *Woollidg* in *Kent* Knight, was born in that County, educated in Grammar learning in *Charter house* school near *London*, became a Gent. Commoner of *Glocester* Hall in the beginning of the year 1634, and in that of his age 16, being then accounted the most amiable and beautiful person that ever eye beheld, a person also of innate modesty, virtue and courtly deportment, which made him then, but especially after, when he retired to the great City, much admired and adored by the female sex. In 1636 when the King and Queen were for some days entertained at *Oxon*, he was, at the request of a great Lady belonging to the Queen, made to the Archb. of *Cant.* then Chancellor of the University, actually created, among other persons of quality, Master of Arts, tho but of about two years standing; at which time his Conversation being made publick, and consequently his ingenuity and generous soul discovered, he became as much admired by the male, as before by the female, sex. After he had left the University he retired in great splendour to the Court, and being taken into the favour of *George* Lord *Goring*, afterwards Earl of *Norwich*, was by him adopted a Soldier, and sent in the quality of Ensign in the *Scotch* Expedition *an.* 1639. Afterwards, in the second Expedition, he was commissioned a Captain in the same Regiment, and in that time wrot a Tragedy called *The Soldier*, but never acted, because the stage was soon after suppress'd. After the Pacification at *Berwick*, he retired to his native Country, and took possession of his Estate at *Lovelace place* in the Parish of *Bethersden*, at *Canterbury*, *Chart*, *Halden*, &c. worth at least 500 *l. per an.* About which time he was made choice of by the whole body of the County of *Kent* at an Assize, to deliver the *Kentish Petition* to the H. of Commons, for the restoring of the King to his Rights and for settling the Government, &c. For which piece of service he was committed to the Gatehouse at *Westminster*, where he made that celebrated song called *Stone walls do not a prison make*, &c. After 3 or 4 months imprisonment, he had his liberty upon bayle of 40000 *l.* not to stir out of the Lines of Communication,

<sup>1</sup> Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 2 vols (London, 1691-92), II, cols 146-47.

without a Pass from the Speaker. During this time of confinement to *London*, he lived beyond the income of his Estate, either to keep up the credit and reputation of the Kings Cause by furnishing men with Horse and Arms, or by relieving ingenious men in want, whether Scholars, Musicians, Soldiers, &c. Also by furnishing his two Brothers Colonel *Franc. Lovelace* and Capt. *Will. Lovelace* (afterwards slain at *Caermarthen*) with men and money for the Kings Cause, and his other brother called *Dudley Posthumus Lovelace* with moneys for his maintenance in *Holland* to study Tacticks and Fortification in that school of War. After the rendition of *Oxford* Garrison, in 1646, he formed a Regiment for the Service of the French King, was Colonel of it, and wounded at *Dunkirk*, and in 1648 returning into *England*, he, with *Dud. Posthumus* before mention'd, then a Captain under him, were both committed Prisoners to *Peterhouse* in *London*, where he fram'd his Poems for the Press, intit.

*Lucasta*: Epodes, Odes, Sonnets, Songs, &c. *Lond.* 1649. oct. The reason why he gave that title was, because, some time before, he had made his amours to a Gentlewoman of great beauty and fortune named *Lucy Sacheverel*, whom he usually called *Lux casta*; but she upon a strong report that *Lovelace* was dead of his wound received at *Dunkirk*, soon after married. He also wrot,

*Aramantha*: A pastoral — printed with *Lucasta*. Afterwards a musical Composition of two parts was set to part of it by *Hen. Lawes* sometimes Servant to *K. Ch. I.* in his publick and private Musick. After the Murther of *K. Ch. I. Lovelace* was set at liberty, and having by time consumed all his Estate, grew very melancholy, (which brought him at length into a Consumption) became very poor in body and purse, was the object of charity, went in ragged Cloaths (whereas when he was in his glory he wore Cloth of gold and silver) and mostly lodged in obscure and dirty places, more befitting the worst of Beggars, than poorest of Servants, &c. After his death, his Brother *Dudley* before mention'd made a collection of his poetical papers, fitted them for the Press and intituled them,

*Lucasta*: Posthume Poems. *Lond.* 1659. oct. the second part, with his Picture before them. These are all the things that he hath extant: those that were never published, were his Trag. called *The Soldier* or *Soldiers*, beforemention'd, and his Com. called *The Scholar*, which he composed at 16 years of age, when he came first to *Gloc. Hall*, acted with applause afterwards in *Salisbury Court*. He died in a very

mean Lodging in *Gun-powder Alley* near *Shoe lane*, and was buried at the west end of the Church of *St Bride* alias *Bridget* in *London*, near to the body of his Kinsman *Will. Lovelace* of *Greys Inn* Esq. in sixteen hundred fifty and eight, having before been accounted by all those that well knew him, to have been a person well vers'd in the Greek and Lat. Poets, in Musick, whether practical or theoretical, instrumental or vocal, and in other things befitting a Gentleman. Some of the said persons have also added in my hearing, that his common discourse was not only significant and witty, but incomparably graceful, which drew respect from all Men and Women. Many other things I could now say of him, relating either to his most generous mind in his Prosperity, or dejected estate in his worst part of Poverty, but for brevity sake I shall now pass them by. At the end of his *Posthume Poems* are several Elegies written on him by eminent Poets of that time, wherein you may see his just character.

# Appendix III —

## Richard Lovelace's 'The Falcon' in Context

### 'BRIGHT HEIR T' TH' BIRD IMPERIAL' RICHARD LOVELACE'S 'THE FALCON' IN CONTEXT

BY SUSAN A. CLARKE

This article both builds on and challenges previous interpretations of Richard Lovelace's lesser-known poem 'The Falcon'. The poem is situated in the context of contemporary royalist allegorical discourses and read as an allegory on the collapse of the royalist cause at the Battle of Worcester in 1651. This reading offers evidence that Lovelace's commitment to the royalist cause did not wane during the early 1650s, as has sometimes been suggested. The article proposes that Lovelace's work can sustain more intertextual and contextual analysis than it has previously received.

The strong possibility that Richard Lovelace's intriguing poem 'The Falcon' may be a political allegory has long been recognized.<sup>1</sup> Earl Miner identifies it as his 'favorite example' of poetry written between 1640 and 1660 'in which a political or topical intent seems as certainly to be meant as to be certainly difficult or impossible to unravel'.<sup>2</sup> Kitty Scouler notes the possibility that Lovelace's poem draws on a striking emblem by Joachim Camerarius in his 1590 collection *Symbolorum et Emblematum Centuri*, in which a fatal encounter between a falcon and a heron, similar to that described in Lovelace's poem, is depicted.<sup>3</sup> The emblem's motto, *Exitus in dubio est* ('The end is in doubt'), implies that one can never judge the outcome of a battle until the war is over. In the illustration, the countryside below the fighting birds is idyllic, in strong contrast with the birds' aerial aggression. A church steeple is seen in the distance, nestled amongst hills. The extended motto at the bottom of the page translates as 'Doubtful is the

I should like to thank Dr Ian Higgins of the Australian National University for commenting on early drafts of this article, and Professor Elizabeth Skerpan-Wheeler of Southwest Texas State University for making available her unpublished paper 'Lovelace's Community of Fable'. Any errors are, of course, my own.

1 All references are to 'The Falcon' as printed in *The Poems of Richard Lovelace*, ed. C. H. Wilkinson (Oxford, 1953).

2 E. Miner, *The Cavalier Mode from Jonson to Cotton* (Princeton, 1971), 178 and n. 15. Gerald Hammond summarizes work on the poem to date in his edition, *Richard Lovelace: Selected Poems* (Manchester, 1987), 107.

3 K. Scouler, *Natural Magic: Studies in the Presentation of Nature in English Poetry from Spenser to Marvell* (Oxford, 1965), 74–8 and plate IV.

outcome and uncertain the battle of Mars: Not unusually he who just now appears the victor is conquered.<sup>4</sup> Scoular also notes a possible relationship between Lovelace's poem and Walton's *Compleat Angler*.<sup>5</sup> Raymond Anselment, in the most detailed published analysis of the poem to date, argues that it is a discontinuous allegory in which the falcon represents both the defeated monarch, Charles I, and the royalist cause.<sup>6</sup> Like Miner, Anselment discusses the difficulty involved in 'determining the extent to which "The Falcon" develops this or any other hidden meaning'. He notes that the poem 'could contain an allegorical potential similar . . . to the battle of the birds in Ogilby's "The Parliament of Birds"' and that 'the detailed and technical description of the duel with the heron might represent a particular military campaign or actual event in English history'. Anselment suggests in a footnote that if the "Heir t' th' Bird Imperial" were interpreted as part of a sustained allegory, then perhaps the poem could be about Charles's son . . . and [it] might commemorate his defeat at Worcester' in 1651, but he discounts this reading.<sup>7</sup> Christopher Wortham, in his unpublished thesis on Lovelace, highlights those aspects of the poem dealing with the battle of the sexes between the female falcon as predator and the heron as male prey, with the encounter ending in a shared, orgasmic 'little death', while agreeing with Anselment on the discontinuous nature of the probable underlying political allegory.<sup>8</sup>

'The Falcon' was first published, with several other small beast poems, in *Lucasta: Posthume Poems* (1659). There is no external evidence as to when the poem was written. However, it has been suggested that the beast poems from the 1659 *Posthume Poems* belong in mood very much with Lovelace's better-known poem 'The Grasse-hopper' which was published in the 1649 *Lucasta* and relates to the royalists in defeat.<sup>9</sup> It thus seems probable that the later beast poems were written in the early years of the Interregnum. The first five stanzas of 'The Falcon', like the early stanzas of Lovelace's 'The Grasse-hopper', initially appear quite straightforward, drawing comparisons between the animal and human worlds. They echo an earlier poem of Lovelace's, 'A Lady with a Falcon on her Fist', and compare the falcon's control of the 'spacious Air' with earthbound humankind 'That can reach Heav'n with nought but Pray'rs'. The poem settles

4 R. Anselment, *Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War* (Newark, 1988), 117–19.

5 Scoular, *Natural Magic*, 74.

6 R. Anselment, '“Griefe Triumphant” and “Victorious Sorrow”': A Reading of Richard Lovelace's "The Falcon"', *Journal of English and German Philology*, 70 (1971), 404–17: 408–9. See also his *Loyalist Resolve*, 117–19.

7 Anselment, "“Griefe Triumphant”", 409–10 n. 20.

8 C. Wortham, 'The Poetry of Richard Lovelace: A Study of his Poetic Works, Considered in the Context of his Life and Times', University of London, 1974, 385–96.

9 *Ibid.* 356.

into a conventional description of the falcon revelling in its freedom, shooting 'Heav'ns Ark', then choosing enslavement 'In silver Fetters', perched on a fair lady's wrist. Lovelace is engaging his audience in a shared recollection of the delights of falconry and, on the surface at least, setting the scene for what might be perceived as a poem of sexual pursuit in line with Wortham's reading, the female falcon being identified with the lady on whose wrist she rests. At the sixth stanza, the poem changes mode. The poet's voice is heard, not for the first time, but more self-consciously and assertively: he plucks a quill from the bird's wing to write the story of a decidedly military encounter. He tells us that he will sing the falcon's 'lofty fate', and invites us to share with him in watching 'the various fight, | With mingled pleasure and affright'. In stanzas 6 to 12, Lovelace describes in detail the mutually fatal encounter between the falcon and a heron, in which the heron impales the falcon on its beak as the falcon kills it. These stanzas are notable both for their evocative description of the battle between the birds and the politically charged nature of their language. Lovelace describes the birds in the military terminology of the civil war period. The male heron is a 'Lanceer' when mounted in the air and a 'proper Halberdier on foot'; the female falcon is a 'bold Gen'ral'. The birds engage in tactical manoeuvres to achieve height: the heron, beaten out of his 'Quarters' by spaniels, 'takes the open air, | Drawes up his Wings with Tacktick care'. The falcon 'dissembles to invade, | And lies a pol'tick Ambuscade'. Encounters of this kind between a falcon and a heron seem unusual to most modern readers but are well documented in the texts and works of art of the time on falconry and would have been known to a gentleman with a country estate like Lovelace.<sup>10</sup> The text shifts from the vivid description of falconry to the mock heroic: 'all the Air doth mourning wear: | Close hooded all thy kindred come | To pay their vows upon thy Tombe'. Lovelace here describes a parliament of male and female birds of prey in funerary procession—the hobby and musket, the lanner and lanneret, the goshawk and her tiercel, led 'in their dark array... by the various Herald-Jay' and mourned also by 'Doctor Robbin, the Prelate Pye, | And the poetick Swan'.

Lovelace is an important member of the community of royalist writers who used the allegorical discourses of Anacreontic beast poem, political fable and the pursuit of simple country pleasures to develop a shared response to the experience of defeat in the early years of the Interregnum. His texts are dialogic, examples of the kind of intertextual writing Lois Potter discusses in *Secret Rites and Secret Writing*.<sup>11</sup> Indeed, there is evidence that Lovelace's work was read intertextually during the Interregnum. One of his elegists, Samuel Holland,

<sup>10</sup> Lovelace, *Poems*, 305–8.

<sup>11</sup> L. Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge, 1990), 113–14.

specifically recommends a 'knowing' reading of Lovelace's poems:

Wits must unite, for Ignorance we see,  
Hath got a great train of Artillerie,  
Yet neither shall, nor can it blast the Fame  
And honour of deceased LOVELACE Name,  
Whose own LUCASTA can support his credit,  
Amongst all such who knowingly have read it.<sup>12</sup>

William Winstanley makes a similar point: he commends Lovelace's poetry to 'all knowing true Lovers of Ingenuity'.<sup>13</sup> 'The Falcon' is only fully explicable when it is seen in relation to the writing of other royalists connected with Lovelace. A number of important royalist works using allegorical discourses were, or are considered to have been, in production in the years between the regicide in January 1649 and the Battle of Worcester in September 1651, including Thomas Stanley's translation of the Anacreontics, John Ogilby's paraphrase of Aesop's fables, and Izaak Walton's pastoral idyll, *The Compleat Angler*.<sup>14</sup> Stanley probably provided Lovelace with the classical model for the beast poems. His translation of the Anacreontics, including 'The Grassehopper' which bears a strong resemblance to the opening stanzas of Lovelace's poem of the same name, was published in 1651 and annotated as received by the publisher George Thomason on 30 December of that year.<sup>15</sup> While Anacreon's beast poems are not the only classical examples that Lovelace could have drawn on, and others (including Abraham Cowley) had translated some of the Anacreontics before the civil wars, it is notable that Lovelace was with Stanley in London during the years after the first civil war while Stanley was presumably working on his translation.<sup>16</sup> Stanley is important in this context because he was the central figure of a coterie of royalist writers operating in London from about 1646. He and Lovelace were close. They were cousins with a shared literary heritage: their mutual great-grandfather was Edwin Sandys, archbishop of York, while their great-uncle, George Sandys, translated Ovid's *Metamorphosis*. Like Andrew Marvell and

12 Samuel Holland, *On the Death of My Much Honoured Friend, Colonel Richard Lovelace. An Elegie* (London, 1660).

13 William Winstanley, *The Lives of the English Poets* (London, 1687), 170.

14 *The Poems and Translations of Thomas Stanley*, ed. G. Crump (Oxford, 1962); John Ogilby, *The Fables of Aesop Paraphras'd in Verse* (London, 1651); Izaak Walton and C. Cotton, *The Compleat Angler*, ed. J. Buxton (Oxford, 1982). There is no standard edition of Ogilby's *Fables*. These works went through a number of early editions. I indicate references to specific editions where appropriate.

15 T. Stanley, *Poems and Translations* (London, 1651); Thomason Tracts E.1422 [1]–[3]. Anacreon's small beast poems include 'The Dove', 'The Swallow', 'The Swallow' (another), 'The Bee', and 'The Grassehopper'.

16 D. Allen, 'An Explication of Lovelace's "The Grasse-hopper"', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 18 (1957), 35–42: 37; J. Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (Houndmills, Basingstoke and London, 1997), 217.



Richard Lovelace, Stanley had left England at the outbreak of the civil wars, but returned from the Continent perhaps about mid-1646.<sup>17</sup> He quickly formed a literary circle about himself, the basic membership of which, recorded in his 'Register of Friends', included Lovelace.<sup>18</sup> Lovelace wrote dedicatory verses 'To My Noble Kinsman T.S. Esq; On His Lyrick Poems Composed by Mr. J.G.', published in 1656, confirming the impression from Stanley's 'Register' that the cousins sustained their friendship until Lovelace's death in about 1657.<sup>19</sup> Stanley's commitment to the royalist cause is unquestioned. He is credited with establishing a secret royalist clique in London by about 1647, the Band of the Black Ribband. Little is known about this clique, except that its membership overlapped with, but was not limited to, the writers recollected in the 'Register of Friends'.

The fabular elements of 'The Falcon' come into focus when read in the context of John Ogilby's *The Fables of Aesop Paraphras'd in Verse*, in particular (but not limited to) the fortieth fable, 'The Parliament of Birds'. The *Fables* was published in 1651 and received by Thomason, like Stanley's *Poems*, on 30 December of that year.<sup>20</sup> Ogilby signals that he means his work to be read as a political statement.<sup>21</sup> The book is dedicated to Heneage Finch, earl of Winchelsea, and Henry Seymour, Lord Beauchamp. Winchelsea and Beauchamp were son-in-law and son respectively to William Seymour, marquess of Hertford, head of the powerful Western Association which assisted Charles II in his escape after Worcester.<sup>22</sup> In the months before Worcester, the leaders of the Western Association had been systematically arrested, and Beauchamp was imprisoned in the Tower by 16 April 1651.<sup>23</sup> One of the two dedicatory poems introducing the *Fables*, that by William Davenant, was dated 'From the Tower Sep. 30. 1651', just a few weeks after the Battle of Worcester, no doubt drawing attention to the fate of many royalists at this time.<sup>24</sup> In 'The Parliament of Birds', Ogilby describes a Kingdom destroyed

17 Stanley, *Poems and Translations*, pp. xxiv–xxvii.

18 Ibid., pp. xxv, 354–66. His literary group, which included at least William Hammond, Edmund Sherburne, William Fairfax, James Shirley, and John Hall of Durham, has most recently been discussed in S. Revard, 'Thomas Stanley and "A Register of Friends"', in C. J. Summers and T.-L. Peabworth (edd.), *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England* (Columbia and London, 2000), 148–72.

19 John Gamble's musical settings for some of Stanley's poems, referred to here, were published in *Ayres and Dialogues* in 1656. See Lovelace, *Poems*, notes to 177, 186.

20 Ogilby, *Fables*; Thomason Tracts E.792 [1].

21 A. Patterson, *Fables of Power: Aesopian Writing and Political History* (Durham, NC, and London, 1991), 86–7.

22 D. Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England: 1649–1660* (New Haven, 1960), 53–4, 241. Ogilby had dedicated his 1649 translation of the works of Virgil to Hertford.

23 Ibid. 48.

24 Patterson, *Fables of Power*, 86.

by civil war in avian terms echoed in Lovelace's 'Falcon':

Then Civill War turn'd Kingdoms into States,  
 (For pettie Kings ruld first) then *Birds*, and Beasts  
 Did with Republicks private interests  
 Begin to build, *Eagls* were vanquish'd then,  
 And Lyons worsted lost their Royall Den. . . .  
 The *Eagle*, and the gentle *Falcon* are  
 Destroyd or Sequester'd by happy War;  
 The *Kitish* Peers, and *Bussard* Lords are flown,  
 Who sate with us till we could sit alone. . . .  
 All Monarch-hating *Storks* and *Cranes*, who march,  
 Like Sons of thunder, through Heavens Christall Arch,  
 When tumult calls. . . .<sup>25</sup>

The royal birds, the eagle and the falcon, are 'Destroy'd or Sequester'd by happy War', while the monarch-hating storks and the cranes march like those 'Sons of thunder', Cromwell and his New Model Army, into a Puritan paradise. While Lovelace's links with Ogilby are less immediately obvious than those with Stanley, it nevertheless seems certain that they knew each other. The playwright James Shirley, like Lovelace a member of Stanley's literary coterie, was close to Ogilby. Like Davenant, Shirley contributed a dedicatory poem to the *Fables*. Ogilby, like the other identified members of Stanley's coterie, was engaged in the translation of texts adopted by the royalists during this period. Anthony à Wood notes that Shirley worked as a 'drudge' for Ogilby on his translations of Virgil and Homer, confirming the close association of the two men and their shared interests.<sup>26</sup> Shirley may also have provided the stimulus for Ogilby's fabular 'Parliament of Birds' with his poem 'The Common-Wealth of Birds' in his 1646 *Poems & c.*, which includes dedicatory verses by Stanley.<sup>27</sup> Shirley's poem ascribes avian forms to Caroline institutions, including town, gown, trade, marriage, the court, the Church, and the Crown. It is less obviously politically challenging than Ogilby's 'Parliament'. However, it does have political undercurrents: Shirley compares the King to a nightingale 'Who never (sweet Bird) goes to rest, | But has a Thorne upon his brest'

Like Lovelace's 'The Falcon', Izaak Walton's *The Compleat Angler or The Contemplative Man's Recreation* (first published in 1653) is notable for its detailed description of simple country pursuits. *The Compleat Angler* is considered to have been completed by the early months of 1650.<sup>28</sup> A superficial reading of Walton's text as a treatise on fishing is satisfying. However, as Stephen Zwicker

25 Ogilby, *Fables* (1651), Fortieth Fable; Anselment, "Griefe Triumphant", 408–9.

26 A. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, 3rd edn., 4 vols. (London, 1813–20); facsimile edn. (Hildesheim, 1969), iii. 739–40.

27 J. Shirley, *Poems & c.* (London, 1646), 34–6.

28 See *The Compleat Angler*, ed. Buxton, p. xxv.

argues, *The Compleat Angler*, by drawing on memories of the country pursuits of the gentry and others in more settled times, was also a key consolatory and restorative text for royalists during the Interregnum.<sup>29</sup> Not only did it remind royalists in defeat of past pleasures, but also of the likelihood that, given time, those pleasures would return. While the emphasis is on fishing, the introductory dialogues (expanded in the second edition of 1655) between Piscator, Venator, and Auceps include discussion of falconry and hunting more generally. Walton identifies both the eagle and the falcon as royal birds, 'Jove's faithful servants':

in the air, my troops of Hawks soare up on high, and when they are lost in the sight of men, then they attend upon and converse with the gods, therefore I think my *Eagle* is so justly stiled, *Joves faithful Servant in Ordinary*: and that very *Falcon* that I am now going to see, deserves no meaner a Title...<sup>30</sup>

It is notable that there are echoes of the parade of birds of prey in Lovelace's 'The Falcon' in the 1655 edition of *The Compleat Angler*, which reprises the rhythm of Lovelace's catalogue.<sup>31</sup> As is the case with Ogilby, there is no direct evidence that Lovelace was close to Walton, but there is evidence that they moved in the same circles and are likely to have been at least acquainted with each other's work. Lovelace dedicated 'The Grasse-hopper' to his 'Noble Friend, Mr Charles Cotton [Senior]', proposing there that he and that 'best of Men and Friends' should wait out the Puritan winter together by creating 'A Genuine Summer in each others breast'. Cotton Senior, like Walton, was a close friend of John Donne and Gilbert Sheldon, and Walton may have fished at the Cotton family home, Beresford Hall, while writing *The Compleat Angler*.<sup>32</sup> Charles the Younger—to whom Lovelace dedicated 'The Triumphs of Philamore and Amoret'—wrote the second part of *The Compleat Angler*, published in 1676, at Walton's invitation. Certainly Walton was a staunch royalist. After the Battle of Worcester he was one of a number of loyalists who protected one of the king's jewels, the 'lesser George', from falling into Cromwell's hands.<sup>33</sup>

'Knowing' readers, royalist contemporaries of Lovelace's, would have recognized the place of 'The Falcon' in the royalist discourses discussed above. In particular, the descriptive style of the first stanzas and their reliance on the discourse of the pursuit of simple country pleasures would have alerted the 'knowing' reader to look beyond the apparently innocuous subject matter of

29 S. Zwicker, *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649–1689* (Ithaca, NY, and London, 1993), 89.

30 *The Compleat Angler, or The Contemplative Man's Recreation*, 2nd edn. (London, 1655), 11.

31 *Ibid.* 18.

32 N. Malcolm, 'Charles Cotton, Translator of Hobbes's *De cive*', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 61 (2000), 259–87 and nn. 25–6.

33 Walton, *Compleat Angler*, ed. Buxton, p. vii.

the text to find the sharp edge to Lovelace's description of the battle between the falcon and the heron. By 1649 Lovelace had sold all his family estates to help finance the royalist war effort.<sup>34</sup> Like many of his class, he had lost the capacity to participate in his own right in traditional country pursuits. Those royalists who were not impoverished like Lovelace, or living in exile, were forced to return to their estates in straitened circumstances, after compounding with the new administration. The seasonal religious feasts of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, and other traditional holy days, had been officially proscribed by Parliament in 1647, making participation in traditional leisurely pursuits more important.<sup>35</sup> As Leah Marcus has argued, it would be hard to overestimate the impact of the vast and relatively sudden changes that enveloped England during the 1640s, such as those to the calendar, or the extent to which English gentlemen immersed themselves in the duties and cyclical rhythms of their country estates in order to cope with those changes.<sup>36</sup> One of the dedicatory poems to Walton's *The Compleat Angler*, that of Edward Powel dated 3 April 1650, 'To the Readers of My Most Ingenuous Friends Book, The Compleat Angler' directly addresses this issue. Powel says of Walton:

Thus, whilst some vex they from their lands are thrown,  
He joys to think the waters are his own,  
And like the *Dutch*, he gladly can agree  
To live at peace now, and have *fishing* free.<sup>37</sup>

The lines could as well apply to Lovelace, thrown from his lands by indebtedness, dreaming of falconry and the return of his privileged status on the restoration of the monarchy. The description of the mock-heroic funeral procession at the end of 'The Falcon' would almost demand the 'knowing' reader to consider the possibility that the poem has entered the world of political fable, like that of Ogilby's 'Parliament of Birds' and to look for an allegorical reading. More subtly, Lovelace identifies the eagle as 'th' Bird Imperial', to which the falcon is 'Bright Heir' as early as the first line of the second stanza. The association of the eagle and the falcon with monarchy goes back to classical times, while the association of the eagle with Charles I was a commonplace of the period. As Lovelace's great-uncle George Sandys noted in his commentary on the story of the fight of the Lapiths and the Centaurs in Book XII of Ovid's *Metamorphosis*: 'at the funeralls of the Roman Emperours whom they intended to Deifie, an Eagle was let forth

34 Lovelace, *Poems*, p. lv.

35 Thomason Tracts 246:669.f.11 [18]; Parliamentary Proceedings, 8 June 1647. See also D. Underdown, *Revel, Riot, and Rebellion: Popular Politics and Culture in England 1603–1660* (Oxford, 1985), 258–63. Underdown points out that Parliament was not successful over time in suppressing the major feasts.

36 L. S. Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of Old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago and London, 1986), 213–14.

37 Walton, *Compleat Angler*, ed. Buxton, 14.

at the top of the flaming Pyle: which the vulgar beleev'd to carry the soule of their Emperour into heaven.<sup>38</sup> Henry King's 1649 'A Deepe Groane Fetch'd at the Funerall of That Incomparable and Glorious Monarch, Charles the First' declaims:

It is decreed,  
(No safety else for Treason) Charles must bleed.  
Traytor and Sovereaigne now inverted meet;  
.  
.  
The *Throne* is metamorphiz'd to the *Barre*  
And despicable *Batts* the *Eagle* dare.

(ll. 183–8)<sup>39</sup>

As noted earlier, Ogilby refers to the regicide in 'The Parliament of Birds' when he describes the fate of eagles during a time of civil war.<sup>40</sup> The 'knowing' royalist reader would have assimilated these intertextual references to Charles I as the eagle, the 'Bird Imperial', and concluded that the poem was an allegory on the eagle's 'Bright Heir', the hope of the royalist cause, Charles II. If the reader had any remaining doubts, the analogy between Charles II and the falcon is reinforced in line 7, where the falcon is further identified as 'Brave Cousin-German to the Sun'. As Lovelace, who had served in the French army, would have been well aware, Charles II was first cousin, 'Cousin-German', to Louis XIV, who, even as a child and like his father Louis XIII, was associated with the sun and the sun god, Apollo.<sup>41</sup>

Like much of Lovelace's poetry, 'The Falcon' is complex and thus open to many interpretations. While Wortham's reading of the text as a poem of sexual pursuit is attractive, the underlying political allegory which has eluded previous critics can be located once the connection is made between the falcon and Charles II. The interpretative key unlocking the allegorical puzzle lies in the sources of the Latin motto to Camerarius' emblem, *Exitus in dubio est*. Ovid uses this motto twice: in his account in the *Fasti* of the rape of Lucrece, which ultimately led to the expulsion of the tyrannical kings, the Tarquins, from Rome; and in his account in Book XII of the *Metamorphoses* of the epic fight of the apparently indestructible Lapith hero, Caeneus, with the Centaurs. Both references are in play in Lovelace's poem. In the *Fasti*, the words are those of the tyrant's son, young Tarquin, plotting the rape of Lucrece.<sup>42</sup> Right through 1650–1, the editorial

38 Ovid's *Metamorphosis. Englished, Mythologiz'd and Represented in Figures*, ed. G. Sandys (Oxford, 1632), 419.

39 *The Poems of Henry King, Bishop of Chichester*, ed. M. Crum (Oxford, 1965), 115.

40 Ogilby, Fortieth Fable.

41 F. Bluche, *Louis XIV*, trans. M. Greengrass (Oxford, 1990), 157–8; A. Lossky, *Louis XIV and the French Monarchy* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1994), 15, 86.

42 Ovid's *Festivalls, or Romane Calendar, Translated into English Verse Equinumerally*, trans. J. Gower (Cambridge, 1640), 44 (*Fasti* II. 781).

content (and sometimes the diurnal record) of the republican newsbook *Mercurius Politicus*, edited at this time by Lovelace's friend, John Hall, in company with Milton and Marchamont Nedham, referred to Charles II as 'Young Tarquin'. For example, the editorial to the 4 July 1650 issue trumpets Charles's landing in Scotland prior to his 1651 invasion of England: '*Tantara, Tara-rara-Tara*. They say, *Yong Tarquin* is Landed among his *gude People*.' Lovelace was aware of this press coverage: in another poem in the 1659 *Posthume Poems*, 'A Mock-Song', he refers to Charles II as 'He that Tarquin was styl'd', while Cromwell is the traitor, 'Oliver-Brutus'. As early as 1648, before the regicide, royalists were subverting the parliamentary representation of Cromwell as leader by portraying him as a tyrant king, for example in *The Second Part of Crafty Cromwell or, Oliver in His Glory as King*, written by Marchamont Nedham in one of his royalist phases. Act V of this playlet opens with a song in doggerel as Marten, Pryde, Ireton, and Joyce enthrone Cromwell and place the crown on his head:

Now OLIVR Ascends the throne  
Feare not to tumble downe  
Come all you Furies every one  
And bring the burning Crowne.<sup>43</sup>

The implication here is that the parliamentarians have replaced the rightful king, Charles I, with a travesty of a king who will prove a worse ruler than Charles. Certainly, by 1655 the royalists had thoroughly appropriated the story of the rape of Lucrece as their own, casting Cromwell in the role of tyrant: in that year, an edition appeared of Shakespeare's *The Rape of LUCRECE, Committed by TARQUIN the Sixth . . . Whereunto is annexed, The Banishment of Tarquin: Or, the Reward of Lust*. The annexure was written by the committed royalist John Quarles, whose elegy to King Charles I, *Regale Lectum Miserere: or a Kingly Bed of Miserie*, had been published four times in 1649. The implication is that Lovelace, in 'The Falcon', is subverting the republican representation of Charles II as 'Young Tarquin' in the way in which earlier royalists had subverted the parliamentary representation of Cromwell as leader into Cromwell as a travesty of a monarch. Cromwell is thus cast in 'The Falcon' as a cross between Tarquin, the rapist of Lucrece/England and Brutus, who murdered Caesar/England.

Ovid's second use of the motto is just as helpful in interpreting the allegorical underpinnings of 'The Falcon'. In the account of the battle between Caeneus and the centaurs, Caeneus, whose skin cannot be pierced, seems to be crushed to death by the weight of the wood of all the trees from Pelion and Othrys, but 'His end was doubtful': some observers think he has been crushed, but the

<sup>43</sup> L. Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print, 1645–1661* (Cambridge, 2000), e.g. p. 23; *Mercurius Melancholicus, The Second Part of Crafty Cromwell or, Oliver in His Glory as King* (London, 1648).

prophet Mopsus dissents:

who saw a fowle arise  
 From thence with yellow wings, and mount the skies . . .  
 O Caeneus, late a man at armes; but now  
 An unmatcht fowle! His witnessse all allow.<sup>44</sup>

Lovelace, in calling into play the story of Caeneus, is implying that the end is still in doubt for the royalist cause. Charles II, like Caeneus, will rise like a phoenix, an 'unmatcht fowle', from the ashes of defeat. It is hard to overestimate Ovid's importance as a treasure trove of literary allusions for Lovelace's generation. They shared a classical education based on classical texts. Lovelace's coterie engaged in translation from the Latin and Greek and published those translations. Sandys, the pre-war translator of the *Metamorphoses*, was Lovelace's great-uncle and related to others in Stanley's coterie. John Gower's translation of the *Fasti*, *Ovids Festivalls or Romane Calendar*, had been published in 1640. The story of the rape of Lucrece had recognized currency in the form of the 'Young Tarquin' coverage in *Mercurius Politicus* in 1650–1. In these circumstances it seems almost certain that Lovelace would have been aware of the sources of the header for Camerarius' emblem and able to manipulate them to his own ends.

'Knowing' royalist readers would also have been able to align Lovelace's account of the duel between the falcon and the heron with contemporary tactical accounts of the Battle of Worcester.<sup>45</sup> Charles II and his Scots allies were defeated by Cromwell for the last time at Worcester on 3 September 1651. Early fighting on 3 September took place on the marshy land south-west of the city, beside the Severn and the Teme rivers, like the 'Moore' of stanza 7. The royalist forces used hedgerows and ditches for their defences. In the ninth stanza, Lovelace refers to 'The hedg'd-in Heron', while Cromwell, in his report to Parliament written on the night of the battle, states 'we beat the Enemy from Hedge to Hedge, till we beat him into Worcester'.<sup>46</sup> Lovelace describes the falcon as the 'bold Gen'ral' who wins 'again her airy post'. Charles, after fighting bravely, retreated into the city and used the cathedral tower as an observation post.<sup>47</sup> As is well known, Cromwell won the Battle of Worcester decisively. However, Charles survived the experience,

<sup>44</sup> Ovid's *Metamorphosis* (1632), 410.

<sup>45</sup> The most detailed recent account of the Battle of Worcester is in M. Atkin, *Cromwell's Crowning Mercy: The Battle of Worcester 1651* (Stroud, Glos., 1998). S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate: 1649–1653*, 4 vols. (London, 1903), ii. 42–8, is still useful.

<sup>46</sup> Oliver Cromwell, *A Letter from the Lord General Cromwel, Touching the Great Victory Obtained Neer Worcester* (London, 1651), 4.

<sup>47</sup> Gardiner, *Commonwealth and Protectorate*, ii. 44, and Atkin, *Cromwell's Crowning Mercy*, 83, both place Charles on top of the cathedral tower after his retreat into the city. I have not been able to locate the contemporary (presumably royalist) account on which this is based.

escaping in circumstances portrayed by his supporters at the Restoration as miraculous.<sup>48</sup> Lovelace has constructed a complex web of allegory and allusion for the consideration and intellectual enjoyment of his royalist readers. He is suggesting that the end is still in doubt: that even though Cromwell had won the battle at Worcester, Charles II had survived and escaped to the Continent. All was not lost: royalists should continue to hope and work for the return of the monarchy and of the traditional values and practices which, as a group, they considered important. The processional at the end of the poem reinforces this view:

But thy eternal name shall live  
 Whilst Quills from Ashes fame reprove,  
 Whilst open stands Renown's wide dore,  
 And Wings are left on which to soar;  
 Doctor *Robbin*, the Prelate *Pye*,  
 And the poetick *Swan* shall dye,  
 Only to sing thy Elegie.

Lovelace seems to be arguing here that the poet who plucked the quill from the falcon's wing in the sixth stanza to sing its 'lofty fate' has a particular role in ensuring that the king's name is kept alive eternally. The deaths of some of the king's supporters, 'Doctor Robbin, the Prelate Pye, | And the poetick Swan', will only serve to ensure that he is remembered. Lovelace uses the future tense: the birds 'shall' die to sing the king's elegiac praises. While he could be referring to himself as the 'poetick Swan' who will continue to support the royalist cause in verse, it is not clear to whom Lovelace might be referring in relation to 'Doctor Robbin' or 'Prelate Pye'. Anselment suggests that both are likely to have pejorative connotations: in English folklore the robin acquired his red breast when he murdered his father, while in Ogilby's fables the pie advises the royal eagle badly.<sup>49</sup> They could therefore be among the counsellors who suggested Charles's ill-advised invasion of Scotland and England. Alternatively, Lovelace may intend an indirect criticism of the clergy's role in the civil wars more generally.

This reading of 'The Falcon' as a complex, allusive text diminishes the relevance of earlier critical debate over whether the allegory underlying the poem is continuous or discontinuous. Lovelace is not asking his 'knowing' royalist readers to identify a straightforward political allegory. Rather, he is inviting them to identify and enjoy the interrelationships of a complex web of allusions to classical sources, emblem literature, royalist poetry, and contemporary journalism, all of which contribute to a more active response to royalist defeat than has sometimes been appreciated. As such, the reading has broader implications for the study of

<sup>48</sup> T. Blount, *Boscobel: or The History of His Sacred Majesties Most Miraculous Preservation After the Battle of Worcester, 3 Sept. 1651* (London, 1660).

<sup>49</sup> Anselment, "Griefe Triumphant", 413–14.



Lovelace's work. First, it highlights that more of Lovelace's poetry is susceptible to the kind of intertextual reading Lois Potter proposes for royalist texts of this period than has been realized to date.<sup>50</sup> It is notable that, with a few exceptions, Lovelace's poetry has not been subjected to this kind of intertextual analysis.<sup>51</sup> Secondly, it contests the suggestion made by one critic that Lovelace's allegiance to the royalist cause faded after Charles II's defeat at Worcester.<sup>52</sup> Rather than losing faith, Lovelace is calling on true believers to continue to support the royalist cause, while recognizing the difficulties that they face. Finally, taking the theme of reflexive intertextuality one step further, it may have implications in the interpretation of the work of other major writers, particularly Andrew Marvell.

*Australian National University*

50 Potter, *Secret Rites*, 113–14.

51 The notable exceptions are 'The Grasse-hopper' and 'To My Worthy Friend Mr. Peter Lilly'. See e.g. Loxley, *Royalism and Poetry*, 215–23; Potter, *Secret Rites*, 65–70.

52 G. Hammond, *Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity* (London, 1986).

# Appendix IV —

## Richard Lovelace, Anthony Wood and some Previously Unremarked Documents

362

NOTES AND QUERIES

December 2004

earlier in Book V, Milton refers to 'pyramids and tow'rs' (758) when describing Satan's residence. This allusion would thus further validate Taylor's contention that 'Milton's indebtedness to Du Bartas in Book v is heavy' (80).

The allusion to 'The Lawe' is important thematically because it allows us to read Abdiel's departure as a further example of Milton's use of the Exodus motif in *Paradise Lost*. That the war in heaven in Book VI is in a large part modelled after the destruction of Pharaoh in the Red Sea (also as described by Du Bartas) has often been shown.<sup>4</sup> Abdiel's departure in Book V may extend this image of exodus to the individual believer. Thus, Satan's warning words to Abdiel hint at a pursuit similar to that experienced by the 'sojourners of Goshen' (line 309): 'Fly, ere evil intercept thy flight. / He said, and as the sound of waters deep / Hoarse murmur echoed to his words applause / Through the infinite host' (871–4). The 'sound of waters deep' seems to make the host of fallen angels into a vast expanse of water (the Red Sea) which Abdiel then has to cross. And, when he turns his back ('retorted', 'his back he turned') on Satan's abode, Abdiel becomes one of the faithful sojourners, viewing Satan's Egypt 'From the safe shore' (line 310) and travelling (like Bunyan's pilgrim) home to God's better country.

CONRAD VAN DIJK

University of Western Ontario

his imagination, as in "proud imaginations" at 2.10'. Flanagan's focus on Satan's proud 'imagination' also describes Du Bartas's 'Castles in the aire'.

<sup>4</sup> There are numerous articles on allusions to the Exodus. An obvious example is John T. Shawcross, 'Paradise Lost and the Theme of Exodus', *Milton Studies*, ii (1970), 3–26. See Fowler's edition of *Paradise Lost* for phrases ('Memphian', 'crystal walls') originating with Du Bartas.

### RICHARD LOVELACE, ANTHONY WOOD, AND SOME PREVIOUSLY UNREMARKED LOVELACE DOCUMENTS\*

ANTHONY WOOD's short, biographical piece in the *Athenae Oxonienses* (1691–2)

\* I would like to thank Michael Carter and Helen Orme of the Centre for Kentish Studies, Maidstone, for their assistance in the preparation of this article.

remains the principal, contemporary source of information on the life of the royalist poet, Richard Lovelace (1618–57).<sup>1</sup> However, despite the fact that Wood's account is consistent with the other scant contemporary biographical sources on Lovelace's life, including John Aubrey's account, and with literary sources such as Lovelace's cousin, Thomas Stanley's, 'Register of Friends', its accuracy has been under challenge since the early nineteenth century.<sup>2</sup> A series of indentures signed by Lovelace and held in the Centre for Kentish Studies (CKS) provides significant support for the accuracy of the overall tenor of Wood's biography, notwithstanding its minor inaccuracies. These indentures have not previously been remarked in Lovelace studies, although most are listed in Peter Beal's *Index of Literary Manuscripts*.<sup>3</sup>

The CKS documents comprise a series of indentures dated 10 March 1642/3, 25 October 1644, 14 February 1644/5, 28 August 1645, 10 October 1645, 29 March 1647, 28 September 1647, and a receipt dated 1 February 1647/8.<sup>4</sup> There are also four relevant unsigned scribes' drafts. They form part of a collection made by R. H. Goodsall, Kentish local historian and owner of Stede Hill, an estate which at one time included lands previously held by Lovelace.<sup>5</sup> Goodsall acquired the documents with other obsolete deeds relating to his estate from a firm of solicitors in Faversham, where they had been preserved 'in two massive iron deed chests'.<sup>6</sup> Viewed with the two other inden-

<sup>1</sup> Anthony A Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses* (London, 1691–2), II, 146–7.

<sup>2</sup> John Aubrey, 'Brief Lives' Chiefly of Contemporaries, Set Down by John Aubrey, between the Years 1669 & 1696, ed. Andrew Clark, (Oxford, 1898), II, 37–8; Edward Phillips, *Theatrum Poetarum, or a Compleat Collection of the Poets* (London, 1675), 160; *The Poems and Translations of Thomas Stanley*, ed. Galbraith Miller Crump (Oxford, 1962), 360; William Winstanley, *The Lives of the English Poets* (London, 1687), 179.

<sup>3</sup> Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts* (London, 1980–97), II, 2, 9–10.

<sup>4</sup> Centre for Kentish Studies MS U2035 T8-T11 (not folioed), T17/1 and T18/1. Beal does not list the indentures of 29 March 1647, T17/1 and 28 September 1647, T18/1. Another document signed by Lovelace dated 20 March 1655/6, British Library Add. MS 7125 A-O fo 25, not dealt with here, also came to light whilst the research on which this article is based was undertaken.

<sup>5</sup> Robert H. Goodsall, *Stede Hill: The Annals of a Kentish Home* (London, 1949), vii.

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.* Goodsall was aware of the significance of the

tures listed by Beal and discussed below, they record the lease of part and eventual sale of all of Lovelace's lands in Bethersden, the Kentish parish in which Lovelace Manor was located, and in the neighbouring parishes of Chart, Smarden, and High Halden, mostly to Richard Hulse, gentleman, of Great Chart. Attached to each of the indentures of 10 March 1642/3 and 28 August 1645 are two smaller membranes, one being a bond guaranteeing the sale, the second a power of attorney to Isaac Hunt, a yeoman tenant of Lovelace's, giving him authority to complete the relevant sale. The full indenture of 29 March 1647 has at some stage become detached from the power of attorney to Isaac Hunt bearing the same date, described by Beal as having been 'Sold at Phillips, 14 June 1990' and now in private hands.<sup>7</sup> It can be safely assumed that the power of attorney to Hunt dated 20 March 1642/3, now held in the British Library, at one time formed part of what is now the CKS series and was attached to a full indenture of sale relating to the properties it mentions.<sup>8</sup> All the CKS final indentures, including the attachments, are signed by Lovelace. Some retain the original seal with the Lovelace coat of arms just visible. Many of the witnesses to Lovelace's signatures can be identified as local landholders associated with Kentish parishes near Bethersden. For example, Edmund Stede of Stede Hill, the estate later held by Goodsall, witnessed the documents dated 29 March 1647, as did Lovelace's youngest brother, Dudley Posthumous. There is no indication in the documents that Lovelace signed them other than in the presence of all witnesses. In the absence of a system of official registration of land title, in order to establish ongoing title to land it was essential that the reliability of indentures such as these could be verified by the witnesses. Thus, it is probable that the other signatories

Lovelace documents – they are specifically mentioned on the dustjacket of his book; however, their existence seems not to have been picked up in literary or historical commentary until Beal indexed them, without discussion as to their potential importance.

<sup>7</sup> Beal, II, 2, 10; Goodsall, opp. 108. Beal records the date of this power of attorney as being 20 March 1646/7; my thanks to Naomi Tinsley of the auctioneers Bonhams for making a copy of the Phillips catalogue illustration available.

<sup>8</sup> British Library Add. Ch. 47534.

actually witnessed Lovelace signing the documents in Kent. As there is only one autograph petition and five documents signed by Lovelace listed in public archives, knowledge of the existence of the Kentish indentures is of significant interest for Lovelace studies.

Wood's biography of Lovelace is too long to reproduce in full here. As Gerald Hammond notes, Wood seems to have been fascinated by the resplendent figure Lovelace cut.<sup>9</sup> However, this fascination had a point: it underpins the trajectory of Wood's narrative of Lovelace's fall from riches to rags in the royalist cause:

During this time of confinement to *London*, he lived beyond the income of his Estate, either to keep up the credit and reputation of the Kings Cause by furnishing men with Horse and Arms, or by relieving ingenious men in want . . . After the Murther of K. *Ch. I.* . . . having by time consumed all his Estate . . . became very poor in body and purse, was the object of charity, went in ragged Cloaths (whereas when he was in his glory he wore Cloth of gold and silver) and mostly lodged in obscure and dirty places, more befitting the worst of Beggars . . . He died in a very mean Lodging in *Gun-powder Alley* near *Shoe lane* and was buried at the west end of the Church of *St Bride* alias *Bridget* in *London* . . . in sixteen hundred fifty and eight. . . .<sup>10</sup>

Aubrey's account supports Wood's, although it is much briefer.<sup>11</sup> It is clear from Aubrey's papers that he had seen Wood's account, as he promised to provide some verses of Lovelace's poetry from his copy of *Lucasta*: 'Let me see Col. Lovelaces life to insert some verses.'<sup>12</sup>

C. H. Wilkinson, editor of the standard edition of Lovelace's poems which was first published in 1925, consistently undermines Wood's and Aubrey's reliability in relation to Lovelace. For example, according to Wilkinson, 'Wood's story of Lovelace's miserable end and death is probably totally inaccurate and

<sup>9</sup> Gerald Hammond, 'Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, lxxi (1985), 204.

<sup>10</sup> Wood, II, 146–7.

<sup>11</sup> Aubrey, II, 37–8. Bodleian MS Aubrey 8 fo 9.

<sup>12</sup> Bodleian MS Aubrey 7 fo 5. Thanks to Dr Kate Bennett for her transcription. Aubrey's copy of *Lucasta* is also held in the Bodleian Library, shelfmark Ashmole B. 14.

was no doubt largely derived from Aubrey's account'.<sup>13</sup> It is notable that Wilkinson qualifies his assessments of Wood's and Aubrey's accuracy, while arguing strongly that their contributions should be discounted.<sup>14</sup> Wood's account does include two recognized errors. He states that Lovelace's bail after his imprisonment in the Gatehouse for involvement in the presentation of the Kentish Petition in 1642 was set at the large sum of '40000 £, while the official record, the *Commons Journal*, shows that bail was actually set at the still substantial sum of 'Ten thousand Pounds the Principal; Five thousand Pounds apiece the [two] Sureties', that is, £20,000.<sup>15</sup> Wood also states that Lovelace died in 1658, while textual evidence would indicate that he died in 1657.<sup>16</sup> These errors are relatively minor and can be accounted for. As Wilkinson himself points out, Sir William Boteler, imprisoned at the same time as Lovelace for his companion role in the presentation of the Kentish petition, was released a few days earlier on the same terms as those set for Lovelace. Thus, Wood or his informant may have combined the two amounts to reach the figure of £40,000.<sup>17</sup> The misattribution of the year of Lovelace's death may well have been due to the fact that, in Lovelace's case, Wood's usual source of information on his subjects' obituaries – grave-stones – was not available. Lovelace had been buried at St Bride's, which was totally destroyed in the Great Fire of London in 1666. Certainly, Wood made every effort to get the details of Lovelace's life correct. Although his notes and source material on

Lovelace have largely been lost, the lists of outgoing correspondence in the *Life and Times* record his efforts to seek information from Thomas Creech on 2 November 1686 and Sir Edward Sherburne (a member of the London literary circle to which Lovelace belonged after the first Civil War) on 15 December 1687 '(for the) obit of R(ichard) Lovelace'; and again on 7 February 1687/8 for the 'obit and place of burial of poet Lovelace from his sister Caesar wife of Robert Caesar'.<sup>18</sup> Wood's incoming correspondence records the absence of success with which these and other enquiries met, although it is clear from the last words of the entry in the *Athenae* that Wood had further information on Lovelace which has not survived: 'Many other things I could now say of him, relating either to his most generous mind in his Prosperity, or dejected estate in his worst part of Poverty, but for brevity sake I shall now pass them by.'<sup>19</sup>

The development of the belief that Wood's and Aubrey's account of Lovelace's life is inaccurate can be traced initially to the work of Hasted, the eighteenth-century historian of Kent, who reported erroneously that Lovelace had passed substantial property on his death to his daughter.<sup>20</sup> There is no evidence that Lovelace ever married or had children. Hasted had confused the poet Richard with a relative of the same name who belonged to a different branch of the family based at Kingsdown in Kent.<sup>21</sup> In

<sup>13</sup> *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, Antiquary of Oxford, 1632–1695, Described by Himself*, ed. Andrew Clark (Oxford, 1891–1900), III, 175, 206, 251.

<sup>19</sup> There are letters in the main volumes of correspondence and notes on which Wood drew for the *Athenae*, Bodleian MS Wood F. 39–50, which give some information about Lovelace, including MS Wood F. 40, fo 7, from Clement Barksdale, in relation to members of Gloucester Hall, Lovelace's college; MS Wood F. 41, fo 243 from Fitzpayne Fisher; and MS Wood F. 44, fo 7 from Sherburne. These do not provide the full detail of Wood's Lovelace biography. It is notable that there is no substantive contribution on Lovelace from Aubrey in these volumes. Clark suggests that the correspondence now bound in these and other related volumes was pillaged by collectors while still in the Ashmolean (Wood, *Life and Times*, I, 7. Pritchard uses Lovelace as an example of Wood's approach to research in 'According to Wood: Sources of Anthony Wood's Lives of Poets and Dramatists,' *RES*, xxviii (1977), e.g. 271–4.

<sup>20</sup> Edward Hasted, *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent*, 12 vols (Canterbury, 1797–1801), II, 479.

<sup>21</sup> A. J. Pearman, 'The Kentish Family of Lovelace', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, x (1876), 196, 215.

<sup>13</sup> *The Poems of Richard Lovelace*, ed. Cyril Hackett Wilkinson (Oxford, 1930 (reprinted 1953)), liii. See also xl–xli and xlvi; at xlix Wilkinson questions whether 'Lucastra' existed, an issue not dealt with in this article.

<sup>14</sup> Cyril Hughes Hartmann, *The Cavalier Spirit and Its Influence on the Life and Work of Richard Lovelace (1618–1658)* (London, New York, 1925), e.g. 124, largely supports Wood's accuracy. Christopher John Wortham, 'The Poetry of Richard Lovelace: A Study of His Poetic Works, Considered in the Context of His Life and Times' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1974), 13–24 compares Hartmann's conclusions with Wilkinson's. He concludes 'The worst that can be said of Wood's and Aubrey's integrity is that their Royalist sympathies may well have contributed to an element of exaggeration'.

<sup>15</sup> *Commons Journal*, 21 June 1642.

<sup>16</sup> Lovelace, *Poems*, liv.

<sup>17</sup> *Commons Journal*, 17 June 1642; Lovelace, *Poems*, xxxvii.

1821, an article appeared in the *Retrospective Review* discussing Lovelace's poetry which gave prominence to Wood's and Aubrey's accounts of the poet's life and expressed the hope that both were inaccurate. The author seems to have suffered from an excess of sensibility, in addition to being influenced by Hasted. He wrote:

the accurate Anthony à Wood has, in this instance, somewhat exaggerated the misery of our unfortunate author, or been in some measure misinformed. For it appears that Lovelace's daughter . . . brought her husband the family estates in Kent . . . So that, perhaps, we may be allowed to indulge the pleasing hope, that he who once figured a noble specimen of humanity, did not die an example of abject poverty and misery.<sup>22</sup>

It may well be that Wilkinson shared this excess of sensibility in relation to the unfortunate circumstances of Lovelace's death. He gave prominence to A. E. Waite's 1884 account of Lovelace's life in which the author claimed to have examined 'the patrimony of the poet', noted that Hasted had exaggerated Lovelace's wealth through mistaken identity and concluded that 'it is in all respects probable that he was a county gentleman possessed of a sufficient, but moderate competence'.<sup>23</sup> Waite appears to have been unaware of an essay published in 1876 by Vicar of Bethersden, A. J. Pearman, on 'The Kentish Family of Lovelace'. Pearman based his analysis on a comprehensive study of existing wills and other such documents. He put to rest the suggestion that the poet Lovelace had ever married, confirmed Wood's account of Lovelace's holdings as including property at 'Bethersden, Chart, Halden, Shadoxhurst, and Canterbury – worth, it is said, 'at least £500 per annum' – a handsome sum in those days' and concluded that Wood's account of Lovelace's poverty 'is probably too strong, though founded in fact'.<sup>24</sup>

Wood's account is an issue in Lovelace

<sup>22</sup> 'Lovelace's Lucasta', *Retrospective Review*, iv (1821), note on 118–19.

<sup>23</sup> Arthur E. Waite, 'Richard Lovelace', *Gentleman's Magazine*, cclvii (1884), 464–5. See also Pearman, 'The Kentish Family of Lovelace II', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, xx (1893) 54–63.

<sup>24</sup> Pearman (1876), 211, 15.

studies because, over time, scholars have used doubts over its accuracy to construct a narrative of Lovelace's life which removes his work from its royalist context. Wilkinson in the standard edition accepted Waite's conclusion on Lovelace's 'moderate competence' and argued on textual evidence of Lovelace's presence on occasion at the court of Sophia of Hanover that the poet spent 'a part and probably the greater part of the years 1643–6 in Holland and France. He may have assisted the King and supported his brothers while he was abroad, but he did not stay long enough in London to exercise the universal philanthropy attributed to him by Wood'.<sup>25</sup> John Strachey, in his *Spectator* review of Wilkinson's standard edition, echoed T. S. Eliot's famous analysis of Marvell's poetry when he commented that the best verse of the period 'was not tainted by the sufferings of time, but has a curious gentleness, dignity and moderation'.<sup>26</sup> Strachey stated it as fact that 'in both Lovelace's imprisonments he received much consideration'. He went on to suggest that at the end of his life, Lovelace no doubt:

suffered from poverty and illness and had to take refuge among a very undesirable set of conspirators and outlaws in a London slum, but this cloudy condition was due, not to persecution by the Government, but to the fact that he had got rid of his estate . . . [which] was never a very large one.

This view of Lovelace's lack of financial and political commitment to the cause continues to hold sway. Hammond, in his otherwise subtle and nuanced reading of Lovelace's work in his 1985 Chatterton lecture, accepts the overall accuracy of Wood's account but questions the extent to which Lovelace can be regarded as a 'cavalier' or 'cavalier poet', suggesting instead that the poet's commitment to the King started to wane as early as 1642, after his humiliating experience on presentation of the Kentish petition.<sup>27</sup> The series of Lovelace indentures at the Centre for Kentish Studies provides conclusive evidence that Wood was accurate both on the extent of Lovelace's

<sup>25</sup> Lovelace, *Poems*, xli.

<sup>26</sup> J. St. Loe Strachey, 'The Poems of Richard Lovelace' *Spectator*, 1 May 1926, 802.

<sup>27</sup> Hammond, 215–18.

holdings and his complete divestment of wealth in the royalist cause in the years 1642–7. Unfortunately, while we have evidence in the form of the receipt dated 1 February 1647/8 that Hulse paid for the transactions, we can never know whether there was some undocumented arrangement that Lovelace would buy back his estates when and if the King was restored and his fortune reinstated. In the event, Lovelace died before the Restoration. His brother Francis received the family's reward from King Charles II in the form of the governorship of New York, and dissipated his opportunity to improve the family fortunes by losing the colony to the Dutch in 1673.<sup>28</sup>

SUSAN A. CLARKE

Australian National University

<sup>28</sup> Daniel Lovelace, *Governor Diplomat, Soldier, Spy: The Colorful Career of Colonel Francis Lovelace of Kent (1622–1675)* (Williamsburg, Virginia, 2001), 30.

**TRISMEGISTUS 'HIS GREAT GIANT': A SOURCE FOR THE TITLE-PAGE OF HOBBS' *LEVIATHAN***<sup>1</sup>

THE title-page to Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan* is one of the most famous in book history. It depicts the colossal 'Leviathan' – not the biblical beast of Job, but a towering giant, the literal embodiment of the conjoined *imperium* and *sacerdotium* that defined English sovereignty. While scholars have discussed elements of the title-page, whether its creator, or who – if anyone – it is meant to portray, there has been no comment on the source for the concept and general posture of the figure. The purpose of this note is to suggest a possible source for the image on the title-page, itself identified in a little known pamphlet published in 1606.

Owing to its title-page, *Leviathan* is one of the most recognizable books published during the seventeenth century. In and of themselves, decorative title-pages were not unusual in early modern English books.<sup>2</sup> One thinks of John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, Michael Drayton's *Poly-Olbion*, or the Authorized Ver-

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Erik Thomson for several discussions on Hermeticism, and for his comments on an earlier draft of this note.

<sup>2</sup> Margery Corbett and Ronald Lightbown, *The Comely Frontispiece: The Emblematic Title-Page in England, 1550–1660* (London, 1979).

sion of the King James Bible as examples, but printed ephemera, whether tracts, pamphlets, or ballads, were also published with illustrated title pages.<sup>3</sup> In the case of some sensational political or 'murder' pamphlets, the device was presumably an aid to selling the item.<sup>4</sup> In other, and rarer cases, the illustration served to epitomize the contents, and it is this category into which *Leviathan* falls.

The title page depicts the concept of sovereignty to which the book is devoted.<sup>5</sup> In his introduction, Hobbes adopted the common metaphor of the 'body politic' to give sense to his definition of sovereignty, and the 'art' of politics.

For by Art is created that great LEVIATHAN called a COMMON-WEALTH, or STATE, (in latine CIVITAS) which is but an Artificial Man; though of greater stature and strength than the Natural, for whose protection and defence it was intended.<sup>6</sup>

The image of the title-page captures the essence of this passage: it shows a bearded figure, crowned, and holding a crosier in the left hand, and a sword in the right. The figure, certainly 'greater in stature', is comprised of a host of individuals, symbolizing the covenant of all with all. Below, the landscape consists of battlements, churches, and fields; in the foreground is a walled city perched on a promontory. Below the scene, in a series of panels, are depicted the trappings of sovereignty 'civil and ecclesiastical': a castle and a church, a crown and mitre, and so on. Indeed, the figure embodies the mutual relation of Church and commonwealth that lay at the centre of contemporary defences of sovereignty; as one writer put it:

<sup>3</sup> Tessa Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550–1640* (Cambridge, 1991), ch. 4; Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 2003), ch. 3; *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume IV, 1557–1695*, ed. John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie with the assistance of Maureen Bell (Cambridge, 2002), ch. 23.

<sup>4</sup> Peter Lake with Michael Questier, *The Anti-Christ's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (Yale, 2002), ch. 1.

<sup>5</sup> This is covered in some detail by Corbett and Lightbown, *The Comely Frontispiece*, 219–30.

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan, OR The Matter, Forme, & Power of a Common-Wealth Ecclesiastical and Civil*, ed. Richard Tuck (Cambridge, 1991), 9.

## Bibliography

### **Primary Sources: Printed Lovelace Editions**

- Lovelace, Richard, *Lucasta: Epodes, Odes, Sonnets, Songs, &c. To Which Is Added Aramantha, a Pastorall* (London, 1649)
- , *Lucasta: Postume Poems* (London, 1659)
- Singer, Samuel Weller, ed., *Lucasta. The Poems of Richard Lovelace. In Two Parts*, 2 vols (Chiswick, 1817–1818)
- Hazlitt, W.C., ed., *Lucasta: The Poems of Richard Lovelace* (London, 1864)
- Carrington, Fitzroy [?], ed., *Songs and Sonnets, by Richard Lovelace* (New York: R.H. Russell, 1901)
- Lovelace, Richard, *Lucasta* (London: Unit Library, 1904)
- , *The Poems of Richard Lovelace* (London: Hutchinson, 1906)
- Phelps, William Lyon, ed., *Lucasta: The Poems of Richard Lovelace, Esquire*, 2 vols (Chicago: Caxton Club, 1921)
- Whiting, Bartlett J., ed., *Poems of Carew, Suckling, Lovelace and Herbert*, Little Blue Book No. 501a (Girard, Kan.: Haldeman-Julius Company, 1924)
- Wilkinson, Cyril Hackett, ed., *The Poems of Richard Lovelace*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925)
- , *The Poems of Richard Lovelace* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930; repr. 1953)
- Lucasta Et Cetera: The Love Poems of Richard Lovelace* (Mount Vernon, N.Y.: Golden Eagle Press, 1948)
- Lovelace, Richard, *Lucasta 1649* (Menston, Yorkshire: Scholar Press, 1972)
- Clayton, Thomas, ed., *The Cavalier Poets: Selected Poems* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978)
- Hammond, Gerald, ed., *Selected Poems* (Manchester: Carcanet Press, 1987)

### **Primary Sources: Manuscripts**

#### BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DE FRANCE

MS Fr. 25861  
MS Fr. 25862  
MS Fr. 26470  
MS Fr. 26471  
MS Fr. 26472  
N.A.F. 8641

#### BODLEIAN LIBRARY, OXFORD

MS Ashmole 36/37  
MS Ashmole 38  
MS Aubrey 7  
MS Aubrey 8  
MS Clarendon 43  
MS Rawlinson Poet 84

MS Wood F 40  
MS Wood F 41  
MS Wood F 44

BRITISH LIBRARY

Add. Chs 47354  
Add. Chs 61215  
Add. MSS 53723  
Add. MSS 71245  
Egerton MS 2553

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

MS Dd. 4. 55

CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL ARCHIVE

DCb/PRC 32/49

CENTRE FOR KENTISH STUDIES, MAIDSTONE

U2035

GUILDHALL LIBRARY, LONDON

MS 5667  
MS 6540

HOUSE OF LORDS

MS HL/PO/JO/10

LONDON METROPOLITAN ARCHIVES

Sherborn Family MS ACC/3259

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES, LONDON

PRO C 78  
PRO C 142  
PRO LC 3  
PRO LC 5  
PRO PROB 10  
PRO PROB 11  
PRO SP 21  
PRO WO 55

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE RECORD OFFICE

MS Westmorland (A) 6.vi.I

WEST SUSSEX RECORD OFFICE

Leconfield MSS, Petworth House Archive MS 172  
Leconfield MSS, Petworth House Archive MS 649



## **Primary Sources: Printed Newsbooks and Anonymous Tracts**

*An Alarum to Warre* (London, 1642)

*Choyce Drollery* (London, 1656)

*A Continuation of Certain Speciall and Remarkable Passages*

*Englands Doxologie* (London, 1641)

*Eucharistica Oxoniensia* (Oxford, 1641)

*An Extract of Severall Letters Sent From Yorke, Hull, France, and Holland* (London, 1642)

*Faithful Scout*

*A Famous and Joyfull Victory* (London, 1642)

*Craftie Cromwell: Or, Oliver Ordering Our New State. A Tragi-Comedie* (London, 1648)

*The Friers Last Fare-well: Or, Saint Francis Must Pack for France* (London, 1642)

*A Full and Perfect Relation of the Great Plot* (London, 1654)

*Gazette de France*

*The Great Eclipse of the Sun: Or, Charles His Waine Over-Clouded* (London, 1644)

*Irenodia Cantabrigiensis* (Cambridge, 1641)

*The King and Queenes Entertainement at Richmond After Their Departure from Oxford*  
(Oxford, 1636)

*Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer*

*The Kings Cabinet Opened: Or, Certain Packets of Secret Letters & Papers, Written with the Kings Own Hand* (London, 1645)

*The Last Will and Testament of Superstition: Eldest Daughter to the Antichrist*  
(London, 1642)

*The Levellers Levell'd: Or, The Independents Conspiracie to Root Out Monarchie*  
(London, 1647)

*Mercurius Anti-Pragmaticus*

*Mercurius Aulicus: Againe*

*Mercurius Bellicus*

*Mercurius Britanicus*

*Mercurius Britannicus*

*Mercurius Civicus*

*Mercurius Democritus*

*Mercurius Dogmaticus*

*Mercurius Elencticus*

*Mercurius Medicus, or, A Sovereigne Salve for These Sick Times* (London, 1647)

*Mercurius Melancholicus*

*Mercurius Politicus*

*Mercurius Pragmaticus*

*Mistris Parliament Her Gossipping. Full of Mirth, Merry Tales, Chat, and Other Pleasant Discourse* (London, 1648)

*Moderate Intelligencer*

*Munday 29th. January, 1648. A True Relation of the Kings Speech to the Lady Elizabeth, and the Duke of Gloucester, the Day before his Death* (London, 1649)

*Musarum Oxoniensium Charisteria Pro Serenissima Regina Maria* (Oxford, 1638)

*Musarum Oxoniensium Epibateria* (Oxford, 1643)

*A New Ballad, Called a Review of the Rebellion* (London, 1647)

*Newes From Black-Heath* (London, 1642)

*Newes, True Newes, Laudable Newes, Citie Newes, Court News, Countrey Newes: The World Is Mad, Or It Is a Mad World My Masters* (London, 1642)

*Pallas Armata: The Gentlemans Armorie* (London, 1639)

*The Parliament-Kite*

*A Perfect Diurnall of the passages in Parliament*

*A Perfect Diurnall of the Severall Passages in our Late Journey into Kent From Aug. 19 to Sept. 3. 1642* (London, 1642)

*Perfect Occurrences*

*The Petition of the Gentry, Ministers, and Commonalty of the County of Kent* (London, 1642)

*A Plea for Moderation* (London, 1642)

*The Recantation of the Prelate of Canterbury* (London, 1641)

*Regulated Zeal: Or, An Earnest Request to all Zealously Affected Christians, to Seeke the Desired Reformation in a Peaceable Way* (London, 1641)

*A Remonstrance or The Declaration of the Lords and Commons, Now Assembled in Parliament, 26. of May, 1642* (London, 1642)

*A Satyre Upon the State of Things in This Parliament* (London, 1640)

*Scotish Dove*

*The Second Part of Crafty Crumwell: Or, Oliver in his Glory as King* (London, 1648)

*Severall Proceedings of State Affaires*

*Some Speciall Passages From London, Westminster, Yorke, and Other Parts*

*Some things memorably considerable... Mrs ANNE BOWES* (London, 1641)

*A Sovereigne Salve to Cure the Blind* (London, 1643)

*Speciall Passages*

*Sportive Wit* (London, 1656)

*Strange Newes From Kent* (London, 1642)

*The Tragedy of Phillis, Complaining of the Disloyall Love of Amintas* (London, 1641–1648)

*A Treasonable Plot Discovered: With the Names of Those That Are Taken, and Sent Prisoners to the Tower* (London, 1654)

*A True and Perfect Relation of the Seizing the House of one Master William Barnes a Cavalier* (London, 1642)

*A True Inventory of the Goods and Chattels of Superstition* (London, 1642)

*A True Relation of the Late Expedition into Kent* (London, 1642)

*Weekly Account*

*Weekly Intelligencer*

### **Primary Sources: Other Printed**

- Allott, Kenneth, ed., *The Poems of William Habington* (London: University of Liverpool Press, 1948)
- Ashmole, Elias, *The Institution, Laws & Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (London, 1672)
- Aubrey, John, 'Brief Lives,' *Chiefly of Contemporaries, Set Down by John Aubrey, Between the Years 1669 & 1696*, ed. by Andrew Clark 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898)
- Ausonius, *Works*, ed. by Hugh G. Evelyn White, 2 vols, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1951–1961)
- Bartas, Guillaume de Salluste du, *Du Bartas: His Divine Weekes and Workes*, trans. by Joshua Sylvester (London, 1641)
- Beaumont, Francis, and John Fletcher, *The Maid's Tragedy*, ed. by Andrew Gurr (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1969)
- , *The Maid's Tragedy*, ed. by T.W. Craik, *The Revels Plays* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988)
- Bidle, John, ed., *Virgil's Bucolicks Englished* (London, 1634)
- Birch, Thomas, ed., *A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq*, 7 vols (London, 1742)
- Boas, Frederick S., ed., *The Diary of Thomas Crosfield* (London: Oxford University Press for the Royal Society of Literature, 1935)
- Bond, John, *King Charles His Welcome Home* (London, 1641)
- Brome, Alexander, ed., *Rump: Or an Exact Collection of the Choycest Poems and Songs Relating to the Late Times* (London, 1662)
- , *Songs and Other Poems*, 2nd edn (London, 1664)
- , ed., *The Poems of Horace, Consisting of Odes, Satyres, and Epistles, Rendred in English Verse by Several Persons* (London, 1666)
- Burton, Henry, *The Sounding of the Two Last Tumpets, the Sixt and Seventh: Or Meditations by Way of Paraphrase Upon the 9th. 10th. and 11th. Chapters of the Revelation, as Containing a Prophecie of These Last Times* (London, 1641)
- Burton, Robert, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1638)
- Caesar, Charles, *Life of Sir Julius Caesar, Knt* (London, 1810)
- Cain, Tom, ed., *The Poetry of Mildmay Fane, Second Earl of Westmorland: From the Fulbeck, Harvard and Westmorland Manuscripts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001)

- Camerarius, Joachim, *Symbolorum et emblematum ex volatilibus et insectis desumtorum centuria tertia* (Nuremberg, 1596)
- Carew, John, and Alastair Fowler, eds *The Poems of John Milton* (London: Longmans, 1968)
- Carter, Matthew, *A Most True and Exact Relation of That as Honourable as Unfortunate Expedition of Kent, Essex, and Colchester* (London, 1650)
- Charles I, *His Majesties Answer to the XIX Propositions of Both Houses of Parliament* (Oxford, 1642)
- , *His Majesties Answer, by Way of Declaration To a Printed Paper, Entituled, A Declaration of Both Houses of Parliament, in Answer to His Majesties Last Message Concerning the Militia* (London, 1642)
- , *His Majesties Two Speeches: One to the Knights, Gentlemen, and Freeholders of the County of Nottingham at Newark. The Other to the Knights, Gentlemen, and Freeholders of the County of Lincoln at Lincoln* (London, 1642)
- Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of, *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library*, ed. by O. Ogle and W.H. Bliss, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1869–1970)
- , *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. by W. Dunn Macray 6 vols (Oxford, 1888)
- Clark, Andrew, ed., *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, Antiquary of Oxford, 1632–1695, Described by Himself*, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891–1900)
- Clayton, Thomas, ed., *The Works of Sir John Suckling: The Non-Dramatic Works* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971)
- Cleveland, John, *The Character of a London-Diurnall: With Severall Select Poems* (London, 1647)
- , *The Character of a Moderate Intelligencer With Some Select Poems* (London, 1647)
- Coates, Willson Havelock, Anne Steele Young and Vernon F. Snow, eds. *The Private Journals of the Long Parliament*, 3 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982–92)
- Cowley, Abraham, *Works* (London, 1668)
- Crump, Galbraith Miller, ed. *Poems and Translations of Thomas Stanley* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962)
- Davenant, William, *Britannia Triumphans*, in *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, ed. by Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973), 660–703
- , *The Temple of Love*, in *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, ed. by Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973), 598–605
- Davidson, Peter, ed. *The Poems and Translations of Sir Richard Fanshawe*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997)

- Davies, John, of Hereford, *The Muses Sacrifice* (London, 1612)
- , *The Muses-Tears for the Losse of Their Hope ... Henry, Prince of Wales* (London, 1613)
- Doelman, James, ed., *Early Stuart Pastoral: The Shepherd's Pipe by William Browne and Others and The Shepherd's Hunting by George Wither* (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1999)
- Donaldson, Ian, ed., *Ben Jonson* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985)
- Donno, Elizabeth Story, ed., *Three Romance Pastorals: Tasso, Guarini, Daniel* (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, 1993)
- Dunlap, Rhodes, ed., *The Poems of Thomas Carew* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957)
- Eyre, George Edward Briscoe, ed. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Worshipful Company of Stationers: From 1640–1708 A.D.*, Facsimile of 1913 edn, 3 vols (New York: Peter Smith, 1950)
- Fanshawe, Sir Richard, *Selected Parts of Horace, Prince of Lyricks* (London, 1652)
- Filmer, Robert, Sir, *Patriarcha and Other Writings*, ed. by Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- Firth, C.H., and R.S. Rait, eds., *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum*, 3 vols (London: H.M.S.O., 1911)
- Florio, John, trans., *The Essayes: Or, Morall, Politike, and Militarie Discourses of Lord Michael de Montaigne*, 3rd edn (London, 1632)
- Fowler, Harold North, ed., *Plato*, vol I, Loeb Classical Library (London: Heinemann, 1953)
- Fraunce, Abraham, *The Countesse of Pembrokes Yvychurch* (London, 1591)
- Gamache, Cyprien de, 'Memoirs of the Mission in England of the Capuchin Friars', in *The Court and Times of Charles the First*, ed. by Thomas Birch (London, 1849), 289–501
- Gamble, John, *Ayres and Dialogues. The Second Book* (London, 1659)
- Gardiner, Dorothy, ed., *The Oxinden and Peyton Letters: 1642–1670* (London: Sheldon Press, 1937)
- Gardiner, Samuel Rawson, *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, 1625–1660*, 3rd rev. edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906)
- Gardner, Helen, ed., *John Donne: The Elegies and The Songs and Sonnets* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965)
- Gauden, John, *Hinc Illae Lachrymae: Or, The Impietie of Impunity* (London, 1647)
- Glaphthorne, Henry, *White-Hall. A Poem* (London, 1643)
- Gower, John, trans., *Ovids Festivalls: Or Romane Calendar* (Cambridge, 1640)

- Graves, Robert, *Complete Poems*, ed. by Beryl Graves and Dunstan Ward, vol. I (Manchester: Carcanet Press, 1995)
- Great Britain, Parliament. House of Commons, *Journals of the House of Commons* (London: HMSO, 1803–), <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk.virtual.anu.edu.au/subject.aspx?subject=6&gid=43>>, accessed 30 November 2009
- Great Britain, Parliament. House of Lords, *Journals of the House of Lords* (London: HMSO, 1802–), <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk.virtual.anu.edu.au/subject.aspx?subject=6>>, accessed 30 November 2009
- Great Britain, Public Record Office, *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series*, ed. by W. Noel Sainsbury, vol. I, American and West Indies, 1574–1660 (London: Longman, Green, 1860)
- , *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic (Charles I)*, ed. by John Bruce and William Douglas Hamilton (London: HMSO, 1858–1897), <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk.virtual.anu.edu.au/statepapers.aspx>>, accessed 30 November 2009
- , *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic (Interregnum)* ed. by Mary Anne Everett Green (London: HMSO, 1875–1886), <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk.virtual.anu.edu.au/statepapers.aspx>>, accessed 30 November 2009
- , *Calendar of the State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy*, ed. by Allen B. Hinds (London: HMSO, 1925)
- Great Britain, Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath: Preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire*, ed. by S.C. Lomas, vol. II (London: HMSO, 1907)
- , *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L'Isle & Dudley*, ed. by William A. Shaw 6 vols (London: HMSO, 1925–1966)
- Guarini, Baptista, *Il Pastor Fido, The Faithfull Shepherd*, trans. by Sir Richard Fanshawe (London, 1647)
- Habington, William, *Castara*, 3rd edn (London, 1640)
- Hall, John, *A True Account and Character of the Times, Historically and Politically Drawn by a Gentleman to Give Satisfaction to his Friend in the Country* (London, 1647)
- Hall, Joseph, *An Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament, By a Dutifull Sonne of the Church* (London, 1641)
- Hawkins, Sir Thomas, trans., *Odes of Horace: The Best of Lyrick Poets*, 4th edn (London, 1638)
- Heylyn, Peter, *The Historie of That Most Famous Saynt and Souldier of Christ Jesus; St. George of Cappadocia*, 2nd edn (London, 1633)
- Hierocles, *Upon the Golden Verses of Pythagoras*, trans. by John Hall (London, 1656)
- Howell, James, *Dendrologia. Dodona's Grove: Or, The Vocall Forrest* (London, 1640)
- , *A New Volume of Letters* (London, 1647)

- Jonson, Ben, *Love's Triumph Through Callipolis*, in *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, ed. by Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973), 404–15
- Jordan, Thomas, *A Medicine for the Times: Or, An Antidote Against Faction* (London, 1642)
- King, Henry, *An Elegy Upon the Most Incomparable K. Charls the I* (London, 1649)
- L'Estrange, Roger, *The Liberty of the Imprisoned Royalist* (London, 1647)
- La Noue, Odet de, 'The Profit of Imprisonment: A Paradox', in *Du Bartas: His Divine Weekes and Workes*, ed. by Joshua Sylvester (London, 1641), 295–321
- Laud, William, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, D.D.* vol. 5 (New York: AMS Press, 1975)
- Lawes, Henry, *Ayres, and Dialogues. The First Booke* (London, 1653)
- , *Ayres, and Dialogues. The Second Book* (London, 1655)
- , *Ayres, and Dialogues. The Third Book* (London, 1658)
- Lawes, Henry et. al., *Select Ayres and Dialogues* 3 vols (London, 1669)
- Leighton, Alexander, *A Decade of Grievances, [...] Against the Hierarchy or Government of the Lord Bishops* (London, 1641)
- Lipsius, Justus, *Six Bookes of Politickes or Civil Doctrine*, trans. by William Jones (London, 1594)
- , *On Constancy*, trans. by Sir John Stradling, ed. by John Sellars (Exeter: Bristol Phoenix Press, 2006)
- Loftis, John, ed. *The Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett and Ann, Lady Fanshawe* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979)
- Marlowe, Christopher, trans., *All Ovids Elegies: 3 Bookes* (London, 1640)
- Martin, L.C., ed. *The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956)
- May, Thomas, *The Victorious Reigne of King Edward the Third* (London, 1635)
- Millar, Oliver, ed., 'Abraham Van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I', *Walpole Society*, 37 (1958–1960)
- , 'The Inventories and Valuations of the King's Goods 1649–51', *Walpole Society*, 43 (1970–72)
- Milton, John (attrib.), *A Discourse Shewing in What State the Three Kingdomes Are in at This Present* (London, 1641)
- Moffett, Thomas, *The Theater of Insects* (London, 1658)
- Morris, Brian, and Eleanor Withington, eds., *The Poems of John Cleveland* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967)



- Nedham, Marchamont, *The Case of the Kingdom Stated, According to the Proper Interests of the Several Parties Engaged* (London, 1647)
- Ogilby, John, ed. *The Works of Publius Virgilius Maro* (London, 1649)
- Philipot, Thomas and John, *Villare Cantianum: Or, Kent Surveyed and Illustrated* (London, 1659)
- Phillips, Edward, *Theatrum Poetarum: Or a Compleat Collection of the Poets* (London, 1675)
- Philostratus, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, ed. by Christopher P. Jones, 2 vols, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005)
- Playford, John, ed., *Select Ayres and Dialogues* (London, 1659)
- , *The Treasury of Musick* (London, 1669)
- Potter, Lois, 'English Political Dialogues, 1641–1651: The Mistress Parliament Dialogues', *Analytical and Enumerative Bibliography*, 1 N.S. (1987), 101–70
- Pursglove, Glyn, ed., *Poems of Henry Hughes* (Salzburg: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, 1997)
- Pym, John, *The Substance of Mr. Pymms Speech to the Lords in Parliament. Novemb. 9. 1641* (London, 1641)
- Randolph, Thomas, *Poems, With The Muses Looking-Glasse and Amyntas*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1640)
- Revett, Eldred, *Poems* (London, 1657)
- Roy, Ian, ed., *The Royal Ordnance Papers, 1642–1646*, Part 1, Oxfordshire Record Society, Vol. 43 (Oxford: Oxfordshire Record Society, 1963–64)
- Rushworth, John, *Historical Collections*, 8 vols (London, 1659–1701)
- S.N., *The Loyal Garland, Containing Choice Songs and Sonnets of Our Late Unhappy Revolutions* (London, 1673)
- Sandys, George, *Ovid's Metamorphosis. Englished, Mythologiz'd, and Represented in Figures* (Oxford, 1632)
- , ed., *A Paraphrase Upon the Divine Poems* (London, 1638)
- Sarasin, Jean Francois, *Les Oeuvres de Mr. Sarasin* (Paris, 1694)
- Sarbiewski, Maciej Kazimierz, *The Odes of Casimire*, trans. by G. Hils (London, 1646)
- Shirley, James, *The Triumph of Peace*, in *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, ed. by Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973), 536–65
- Smith, Nigel, ed., *The Poems of Andrew Marvell*, rev. edn (London: Pearson, 2007)
- Stanley, Thomas, *Poems* (London, 1651)

- Statius, P. Papinius, *Silvae*, trans. by D.R. Shackleton Bailey, 2 vols, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003)
- Suckling, John, *A Coppy of a Letter Found in the Privy Lodgeings at White-hall* (London, 1641)
- Symmons, Edward, *A Vindication of King Charles: Or, A Loyal Subjects Duty* (London, 1648)
- Reynolds, Henry, ed., *Torquato Tasso's Aminta Englisht* (London, 1628)
- Tatham, John, *Ostella: Or, the Faction of Love and Beauty Reconcil'd* (London, 1650)
- Tatius, Achilles, *The Loves of Clitophon and Leucippe*, trans. by Anthony Hodges (Oxford, 1638)
- Taylor, John, *A Swarme of Sectaries, and Schismatiques* (London, 1641)
- , *Mad Fashions, Od fashions, All Out of Fashions, or, The Emblems of These Distracted Times* (London, 1642)
- , *Aqua-Musae: Or, Cacafogo, Cacadaemon, Captain George Wither Wrung in the Withers* (London, 1645)
- Taylor, John, attrib., *The Divisions of the Church of England* (London, 1642)
- Thorn-Drury, George, ed. *The Poems of Edmund Waller*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (London: A.H. Bullen, 1901)
- Vicars, John, *True Information of the Beginning and Cause of all our Troubles* (London, 1649)
- Voiture, Vincent, *Letters of Affaires Love and Courtship*, trans. by John Davies (London, 1657)
- Waller, Edmund, *Upon Her Majesties New Buildings at Somerset-House* (London, 1665)
- Warner, Sir George F., ed. *The Nicholas Papers: Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State*, 4 vols (London: Camden Society, 1886–1920)
- West, David, ed., *Horace Odes III: Dulce Periculum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Westmorland, Mildmay Fane, Second Earl of, *Otia Sacra* (London, 1648)
- Wheare, Degory, *The Method and Order of Reading Both Civil and Ecclesiastical Histories* (London, 1685)
- Wilson, John, *Cheerfull Ayres or Ballads* (London, 1660)
- Winstanley, William, *The New Help to Discourse*, 2nd edn (London, 1672)
- Winstanley, William, *The Lives of the Most Famous English Poets* (London, 1687)
- Wither, George, *A Satyre: Dedicated to His Most Excellent Majestie* (London, 1614)

———, *Abuses Stript, and Whipt: Or Satyricall Essays* (London, 1617)

———, *A Collection of Emblemes, Ancient and Moderne* (London, 1635)

Wolfe, Don M., ed., *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*, 8 vols (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953–98)

Wood, Anthony, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 2 vols (London, 1691–92)

Wood, Anthony, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. by Philip Bliss, New edn, 4 vols (London, 1813–1820)

Wortley, Francis, *Characters and Elegies* (London, 1646)

## Secondary Sources

- Adamson, John, 'Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), 161–97
- , *The Noble Revolt: The Overthrow of Charles I* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2007)
- , ed., *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–49* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)
- Adler, Wolfgang, *Landscapes*, vol. I *Corpus Rubenianum* Part 18 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982)
- Adolph, Anthony, *Full of Soup and Gold: The Life of Henry Jermyn* (London: Self Published, 2006)
- Allen, Don Cameron, 'An Explication of Lovelace's 'The Grasse-hopper'', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 18 (1957), 35–43
- Allen, Graham, *Intertextuality*, New Critical Idiom (London: Routledge, 2000)
- Anselment, Raymond A., *Loyalist Resolve: Patient Fortitude in the English Civil War* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1988)
- , "'Clouded Majesty": Richard Lovelace, Sir Peter Lely, and the Royalist Spirit', *Studies in Philology*, 86 (1989), 367–87
- , "'Stone Walls and 'I'ron Bars": Richard Lovelace and the Conventions of Seventeenth-Century Prison Literature', *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme*, 27 (N.S.) (1993), 15–34
- Ashbee, Andrew, and David Lasocki, eds. *A Biographical Dictionary of English Court Musicians, 1485–1714*, 2 vols (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998)
- Ashley, Maurice Percy, 'George Goring: Royalist Commander and Debauchee', *History Today*, 26 (1976), 188–93
- Ashton, Robert, *Counter-Revolution: The Second Civil War and its Origins, 1646–48* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994)
- Atherton, Ian, and Julie Sanders, eds., *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006)
- Aylmer, G.E., 'Collective Mentalities in Mid Seventeenth-Century England: II. Royalist Attitudes', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 37 5th Series (1987), 1–30
- Baldwin, Anna, and Sarah Hutton, eds., *Platonism and the English Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Baldwin, G., 'Reason of State and English Parliaments, 1610–42', *History of Political Thought*, 25 (2004), 620–41

- Barnes, Susan J., Nora De Poorter, Oliver Millar, and Horst Vey, *Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004)
- Beal, Peter, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts* 4 vols (London: Mansell, 1980–1993)
- Beecher, Don, ‘Eye-beams, Raptures and Androgynes: Inverted Neoplatonism in Poems by Donne, Herbert of Cherbury, Overbury and Carew’, *Cahiers Élisabéthains*, 65 (2004), 1–9
- Bentley, Gerald Eades, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, 7 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941–1968)
- Berek, Peter, ‘Cross-Dressing, Gender, and Absolutism in the Beaumont and Fletcher Plays’, *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900*, 44 (2004), 359–77
- Beresford, Richard, *Dulwich Picture Gallery: Complete Illustrated Catalogue* (London: Unicorn Press, 1998)
- Berry, Herbert, and E.K. Timings, ‘Lovelace at Court and a Version of Part of His ‘The Scrutinie’’, *Modern Language Notes*, 69 (1954), 396–98
- Black, William Henry, *A Descriptive, Analytical, and Critical Catalogue of the Manuscripts Bequeathed unto the University of Oxford by Elias Ashmole, Esq.* (Oxford, 1845)
- Blackwood, B.G., *The Lancashire Gentry and the Great Rebellion, 1640–1660* (Manchester: Chetham Society, 1978)
- Bradbrook, Muriel C., ‘Don Cameron Allen. *Image and Meaning. Metaphoric Traditions in Renaissance Poetry*’, *Renaissance News*, 14, no. 4 (1961), 297–99
- Britland, Karen, *Drama at the Courts of Queen Henrietta Maria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
- Brooks, Cleanth, ‘Criticism and Literary History: Marvell’s ‘Horatian Ode’’, *Sewanee Review*, 55 (1947), 199–222
- , ‘A Note on the Limits of “History” and the Limits of “Criticism”’, *Sewanee Review*, 61 (1953), 129–35
- , ‘A Pre-Romantic View of Nature: Sir Richard Lovelace’, in *Historical Evidence and the Reading of Seventeenth-Century Poetry* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991), 113–28
- Brotton, Jerry, *The Sale of the Late King’s Goods: Charles I and His Art Collection* (London: Macmillan, 2006)
- Burford, Beverley, and Julian Watson, eds. *Aspects of the Arsenal: The Royal Arsenal, Woolwich* (London: Greenwich Borough Museum, 1997)
- Burgess, Glenn, ‘On Revisionism: An Analysis of Early Stuart Historiography in the 1970s and 1980s’, *Historical Journal*, 33 (1990), 609–27
- Burke, Peter, ‘The Renaissance Dialogue’, *Renaissance Studies*, 3 (1989), 1–12

- , ‘Tacitism, Scepticism, and Reason of State’, in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought*, ed. by J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 479–98
- Bush, Douglas, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600–1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945)
- , ‘Marvell’s ‘Horatian Ode’’, *Sewanee Review*, 60 (1952), 363–76
- Butler, Martin, ‘Entertaining the Palatine Prince: Plays on Foreign Affairs, 1635–1637’, *English Literary Renaissance*, 13 (1983), 319–44
- , *Theatre and Crisis, 1632–1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)
- , ‘Politics and the Masque: *The Triumph of Peace*’, *Seventeenth Century*, 2 (1987), 117–41
- , ‘Politics and the Masque: *Salmacida Spolia*’, in *Literature and the English Civil War*, ed. by Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 59–74
- Campbell, Thomas, *Specimens of the British Poets*, 7 vols (London, 1819)
- Capp, Bernard, ‘The Political Dimension of Apocalyptic Thought’, in *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance Thought and Literature*, ed. by C.A. Patrides and Joseph Wittreich (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), 93–124
- Carlton, Charles, *Archbishop William Laud* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987)
- , *Charles I: The Personal Monarch*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 1995)
- Carne-Ross, D.S., and Kenneth Haynes, eds., *Horace in English* (London: Penguin Books, 1996)
- Christianson, Paul, *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978)
- Clarke, Susan A., ‘Richard Lovelace, Anthony Wood, and some Previously Unremarked Lovelace Documents’, *Notes and Queries*, 249 (2004), 362–66
- , ‘“Bright Heir t’ th’ Bird Imperial”: Richard Lovelace’s ‘The Falcon’ in Context’, *Review of English Studies*, 56 (2005), 263–75
- , ‘Royalists Write the Death of Lord Hastings: Post Regicide Funerary Propaganda’, *Parergon*, 22 (2005), 113–30
- Clay, C.G.A., *Economic Expansion and Social Change: England, 1500–1700*, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984)
- Clayton, Thomas, ‘Some Versions, Texts and Readings of ‘To Althea, from Prison’’, *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 68 (1974), 225–35
- Coiro, Ann Baynes, ‘“A Ball of Strife”: Caroline Poetry and Royal Marriage’, in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. by Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 26–46

- Colvin, H.M., ed., *The History of the King's Works*, 6 vols (London: HMSO, 1963–1982)
- Corns, Thomas N., *Uncloistered Virtue: English Political Literature, 1640–1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)
- , *John Milton: The Prose Works* (New York: Twayne, 1998)
- , 'The Poetry of the Caroline Court', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 97 (1998), 51–73
- , ed., *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)
- , *A History of Seventeenth-Century English Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007)
- Coughlan, Patricia Anne, 'Classical Themes in the Non-Satiric Poetry of Andrew Marvell' (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of London, 1980)
- Cousins, A.D., 'Lucasta, Gratiana, and the Amatory Wit of Lovelace', *Parergon*, 6 (1988), 97–104
- Cox, Virginia, *The Renaissance Dialogue: Literary Dialogue in its Social and Political Contexts, Castiglioni to Galileo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)
- Cronk, Nicholas, 'Aristotle, Horace, and Longinus: The Conception of Reader Response', in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, vol. III, ed. by Glyn P. Norton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 199–204
- Crum, Margaret, ed., *First-Line Index of English Poetry 1500–1800 in Manuscripts of the Bodleian Library Oxford*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)
- Cust, Richard, *Charles I: A Political Life* (Harlow: Pearson Education, 2007; repr. edn)
- Cutts, John P., 'A Bodleian Song-Book: Don, C. 57', *Music and Letters*, 34 (1953), 192–211
- Davidson, Peter, ed., *Poetry and Revolution: An Anthology of British and Irish Verse, 1625–1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)
- Davis, Alex, *Chivalry and Romance in the English Renaissance* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2003)
- Dawson, Lesel, "'New Sects of Love': Neoplatonism and Constructions of Gender in Davenant's *The Temple of Love* and *The Platonick Lovers*", *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 8 (2002), 4.1–3 <<http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/08-1/dawsnew.htm>>, accessed 30 November 2009
- De Groot, Jerome, *Royalist Identities* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)
- Delany, Paul, 'Attacks on Carew in William Habington's Poems', *Seventeenth-Century News*, 36 (1968), Item 8
- Dethloff, Diana, 'The Executors' Account Book and the Dispersal of Sir Peter Lely's Collection', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 8 (1996), 15–51
- Dolan, Frances E., 'Gender and the 'Lost' Spaces of Catholicism', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 32 (2002), 641–65

- Donagan, Barbara, 'The Web Of Honour: Soldiers, Christians, and Gentlemen in the English Civil War', *Historical Journal*, 44 (2001), 365–89
- Donnelly, M.L., 'The Rack of Fancy and the Trade of Love: Conventions of Précieux and Libertin in Amatory Lyrics by Suckling and Carew', in *Renaissance Discourses of Desire*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1993), 107–29
- Donovan, Fiona, *Rubens and England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004)
- Eales, Jacqueline, 'The Rise of Ideological Politics in Kent, 1558–1640', in *Early Modern Kent, 1540–1640*, ed. by Michael Zell (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2000), 279–313
- , 'Kent and the English Civil Wars, 1640–1660', in *Government and Politics in Kent, 1640–1914*, ed. by Frederick Lansberry (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2001), 1–32
- Egerton, John, *Egerton's Theatrical Remembrancer* (London, 1788)
- Eliot, T.S., 'Andrew Marvell (1921)', in *Selected Essays* (London: Faber and Faber, 1951), 292–304
- Elliott, John R. Jr, 'Drama', in *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol IV, *The Seventeenth Century*, ed. by Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 641–58
- Ellis, George, *Specimens of the Early English Poets* (London, 1790)
- Empson, William, *Seven Types of Ambiguity*, 3rd edn (London: Chatto & Windus, 1963)
- Englefield, W.A.D., *The History of the Painter-Stainers Company of London* (London: Chapman and Dodd, 1923)
- Erickson, Amy Louise, *Women and Property in Early Modern England* (London: Routledge, 1993)
- Esdaille, K.A., 'The Busts and Statues of Charles I', *Burlington Magazine*, 91 (1949), 2, 9–14
- Evans, Willa McClung, 'To Amatheia', *Philological Quarterly*, 23 (1944), 129–34
- , 'Lovelace's Concept of Prison Life in "The Vintage to the Dungeon"', *Philological Quarterly*, 26 (1947), 62–68
- Everitt, Alan, *The Community of Kent and the Great Rebellion, 1640–1660* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1966)
- Feingold, Mordechai, 'The Humanities', in *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. IV, *The Seventeenth Century*, ed. by Nicholas Tyacke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 211–358
- Fincham, Kenneth, ed., *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993)
- Firth, C.H., 'Thomas Scot's Account of His Actions as Intelligencer During the Commonwealth', *English Historical Review*, 12 (1897), 116–26



- Firth, Katharine, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530–1645* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979)
- Fish, Stanley, *Is There a Text in This Class?: The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980)
- , ‘Why Milton Matters: Or, Against Historicism’, *Milton Studies*, 44 (2005), 1–12
- Fissell, Mark Charles, *The Bishops’ Wars: Charles I’s Campaigns Against Scotland, 1638–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Fletcher, J.B., ‘Précieuses at the Court of Charles I’, *Journal of Comparative Literature*, 1 (1903), 120–53
- Flower, Margaret, ‘Thomas Stanley (1625–1678): A Bibliography of His Writings in Prose and Verse (1647–1743)’, *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 1 (1949–1953), 139–72
- Ford, Christopher A., ‘Preaching Propriety to Princes: Grotius, Lipsius, and Neo-Stoic International Law’, *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law*, 28 (1996), 313–66
- Foster, Joseph, *Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford, 1500–1714*, 4 vols (Nedeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1968)
- Fowler, Alastair, *The Country House Poem: A Cabinet of Seventeenth-Century Estate Poems and Related Items* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994)
- , ‘The Formation of Genres in the Renaissance and After’, *New Literary History*, 34 (2003), 185–200
- , ‘Poetry and Politics: Some Reflections’, in *Literary Milieux: Essays in Text and Context Presented to Howard Erskine-Hill*, ed. by David Womersley and Richard McCabe (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008), 23–29
- Freedberg, S.J., ‘Observations on the Painting of the Maniera’, *Art Bulletin*, 47 (1965), 187–97
- Fritze, Ronald H., and William B. Robison, eds., *Historical Dictionary of Stuart England, 1603–1689* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1996)
- Frow, John, *Genre, New Critical Idiom* (Abingdon, Oxford: Routledge, 2006)
- Gardiner, Samuel Rawson, *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603–1642*, 10 vols (London: Longmans, Green, 1883–84)
- Gibson, Jonathan, ‘Civil War in 1614: Lucan, Gorges and Prince Henry’, in *The Crisis of 1614 and the Addled Parliament: Literary and Historical Perspectives*, ed. by Stephen Clucas and Rosalind Davies (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 161–76
- Gilfillan, George, ed., *Specimens With Memoirs of the Less-Known British Poets*, 3 vols, vol. II (Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1860)
- Goodsall, Robert H., *Stede Hill: The Annals of a Kentish Home* (London: Headley Brothers, 1949)

- Gordon, D.J., *The Renaissance Imagination: Essays and Lectures*, ed. by Stephen Orgel (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975)
- Green, Mary Anne Everett, *Lives of the Princesses of England*, 6 vols (London, 1849–1855)
- Greenspan, Nicole, ‘News, Intelligence, and Espionage at the Exiled Court at Cologne: The Case of Henry Manning’, *Media History*, 11 (2005), 105–25
- Gribben, Crawford, *The Puritan Millennium: Literature & Theology, 1550–1682* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000)
- , ‘“Passionate Desires, and Confident Hopes”: Puritan Millenarianism and Anglo-Scottish Union, 1560–1644’, *Reformation & Renaissance Review*, 4 (2002), 241–58
- Guibbory, Achsah, ‘Sexual Politics/Political Sex: Seventeenth-Century Love Poetry’, in *Renaissance Discourses of Desire*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1993), 206–22
- Hale, David, *The Body Politic: A Political Metaphor in Renaissance English Literature* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971)
- Hammond, Gerald, ‘Richard Lovelace and the Uses of Obscurity’, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 71 (1985), 203–34
- , *Fleeting Things: English Poets and Poems, 1616–1660* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990)
- Hammond, Paul, *The Making of Restoration Poetry* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2006)
- Hart, E.F., ‘The Answer-Poem of the Early Seventeenth Century’, *Review of English Studies*, 7 (N.S.) (1956), 19–29
- Hartmann, Cyril Hughes, *The Cavalier Spirit and its Influence on the Life and Work of Richard Lovelace (1618–1658)* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1925)
- Hasler, P.W., ed., *The House of Commons, 1558–1603*, 3 vols (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1981)
- Hastings, A. Waller, ‘Stone Walls, Iron Bars, and Liberal Political Theory: Lovelace’s ‘To Althea, From Prison’’, in *Proceedings of the First Dakotas Conference on Earlier British Literature*, ed. by Jay Ruud (Aberdeen: Northern State University Press, 1993), 74–85
- Healy, Thomas, and Jonathan Sawday, eds., *Literature and the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)
- Henderson, Fletcher Orpin, ‘Traditions of Précieux and Libertin in Suckling’s Poetry’, *English Literary History*, 4 (1937), 274–98
- Henning, Basil Duke, ed., *The House of Commons, 1660–1690*, 3 vols (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1983)
- Hibbard, G.R., ‘The Country House Poem of the Seventeenth Century’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 19 (1956), 159–74
- Hill, Christopher, ‘Society and Andrew Marvell’, *Modern Quarterly*, 1, N.S. (1946), 6–31

- Hirst, Derek, 'The Defection of Sir Edward Dering, 1640–1641', *Historical Journal*, 15 (1972), 193–208
- , 'Reading the Royal Romance: Or, Intimacy in a King's Cabinet', *Seventeenth Century*, 18 (2003), 211–29
- Hirst, Derek, and Steven N. Zwicker, 'High Summer at Nun Appleton, 1651: Andrew Marvell and Lord Fairfax's Occasions', *Historical Journal*, 36 (1993), 247–69
- Holland, Norman N., 'Clinical, Yes: Healthy, No', *Literature and Psychology*, 14 (1964), 121–25
- , 'Literary Value: A Psychoanalytic Approach', *Literature and Psychology*, 14 (1964), 43–55
- Hume, Robert D., *Reconstructing Contexts: The Aims and Principles of Archeo-Historicism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)
- Hunt, William, 'Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War', in *The Transmission of Culture in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Anthony Grafton and Ann Blair (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990), 204–37
- Hutton, Ronald, *Debates in Stuart History* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)
- Irwin, William, 'Against Intertextuality', *Philosophy and Literature*, 28 (2004), 227–42
- James, Mervyn, 'English Politics and the Concept of Honour, 1485–1642', in *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 308–415
- Jenkins, Hugh, *Feigned Commonwealths: The Country-House Poem and the Fashioning of the Ideal Community* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1998)
- Johnson, Paula, 'Carew's 'A Rapture': The Dynamics of Fantasy', *Studies in English Literature*, 16 (1976), 145–55
- Jones, George Fenwick, "'Lov'd I Not Honour More": The Durability of a Literary Motif', *Comparative Literature*, 11 (1959), 131–43
- Judson, Alexander Corbin, 'A Forgotten Lovelace Manuscript', *Modern Language Notes*, 37 (1922), 407–11
- , 'Who Was Lucasta?', *Modern Philology*, 23 (1925), 77–82
- Juvan, Marko, *History and Poetics of Intertextuality*, trans. by Timothy Pogačar (West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2008)
- Kaminski, Thomas, 'Edmund Waller, English Précieux', *Philological Quarterly*, 79 (2000), 19–43
- Keblusek, Marika, 'Wine for Comfort: Drinking and the Royalist Exile Experience, 1642–1660', in *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. by Adam Smyth (Woodbridge, Suffolk: D.S. Brewer, 2004), 55–68

- Kelly, Erna, 'Richard Lovelace: Imprisonment and Escape' (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1979)
- , "'Small Types of Great Ones": Richard Lovelace's Separate Peace', in *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 81–101
- Ker, Catherine Sylvia, 'A Bibliography of Lovelace' (Unpublished Masters Thesis, University of London, 1949)
- Kerstjens, Christopher A., 'A Princely Painter: Princess Louise Hollandine of the Palatinate, Abbess of Maubuisson', *Court Historian*, 4 (1999), 161–66
- Kettering, Alison McNeil, *The Dutch Arcadia: Pastoral Art and Its Audience in the Golden Age* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press 1983)
- King, Bruce, 'Green Ice and a Breast of Proof', *College English*, 26 (1965), 511–15
- , 'The Grasse-hopper' and Allegory', *Ariel: A Review of International English Literature*, 1 (1970), 71–82
- , 'Lovelace's 'Lucasta' and Marvell's 'T.C.': Petrarch (and Dante?) in Seventeenth Century England', *Canadian Journal of Comparative Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée*, 1 (1973), 70–86
- Kranidas, Thomas, 'Milton's 'Of Reformation': The Politics of Vision', *ELH*, 49 (1982), 497–513
- , 'Style and Rectitude in Seventeenth Century Prose: Hall, Smectymnus, and Milton', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 46 (1983), 237–69
- Kraye, Jill, 'The Transformation of Platonic Love in the Italian Renaissance', in *Platonism and the English Imagination*, ed. by Anna Baldwin and Sarah Hutton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 76–85
- Lake, Peter, and Steve Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (2006), 270–92
- Larson, Charles, 'The Somerset House Poems of Cowley and Waller', *Papers on Language & Literature*, 10 (1974), 126–35
- Le Neve, John, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1541–1857*, vol. VII (London: Institute of Historical Research, 1992)
- Leishman, J.B., "'You Meaner Beauties of the Night': A Study in Transmission and Transmogrification", *Library*, 26 (1945), 99–121
- Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer, *The Life of John Milton: A Critical Biography*, rev. edn (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003)
- Liu, Tai, *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution, 1640–1660* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1973)
- Loomie, Albert J., 'The Destruction of Rubens's 'Crucifixion' in the Queen's Chapel, Somerset House', *Burlington Magazine*, 140 (1998), 680–82

- Lovelace, Daniel, *Governor, Diplomat, Soldier, Spy: The Colorful Career of Colonel Francis Lovelace* (Williamsburg, Virginia: Self published, 2001)
- Low, Anthony, 'Agricultural Reform and the Love Poems of Thomas Carew, With an Instance From Lovelace', in *Culture and Cultivation in Early Modern England: Writing and the Land*, ed. by Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992), 63–80
- Loxley, James, *Royalism and Poetry in the English Civil Wars: The Drawn Sword* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997)
- , 'On Exegetical Duty: Historical Pragmatics and the Grammar of the Libel', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 69 (2006), 83–103
- Lynch, Kathleen M., *The Social Mode of Restoration Comedy* (New York: Biblio and Tannen, 1965; repr. edn)
- Lyne, R.O.A.M., *The Latin Love Poets: From Catullus to Horace* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980)
- Marcus, Leah S., *The Politics of Mirth: Jonson, Herrick, Milton, Marvell, and the Defense of old Holiday Pastimes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986)
- , 'Politics and Pastoral: Writing the Court on the Countryside', in *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*, ed. by Kevin Sharpe and Peter Lake (Houndmills, Basingstoke Macmillan, 1994), 139–59
- Margoliouth, H.M., 'The Poems of Richard Lovelace', *Review of English Studies*, 3 (1927), 89–95
- Martin, Catherine Gimelli, 'The Erotology of Donne's 'Extasie' and the Secret History of Voluptuous Rationalism', *Studies in English Literature*, 44 (2004), 121–47
- Martin, Gregory, *Rubens: The Ceiling Decoration of the Banqueting Hall 2 vols Corpus Rubenianum Part 15* (London: Harvey Miller, 2005)
- Martines, Lauro, *Society and History in English Renaissance Verse* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985)
- McBride, Kari Boyd, *Country House Discourse in Early Modern England: A Cultural Study of Landscape and Legitimacy* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001)
- McClung, William A., *The Country House in English Renaissance Poetry* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977)
- McDowell, Nicholas, *Poetry and Allegiance in the English Civil Wars: Marvell and the Cause of Wit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- McElligott, Jason, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2007)
- McElligott, Jason, and David L. Smith, eds., *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)
- McGuire, Mary Anne C., 'The Cavalier Country-House Poem: Mutations on a Jonsonian Tradition', *Studies in English Literature*, 19 (1979), 93–108

- McPherson, Mark Carpenter, 'The Life, Reputation and Poetry of Richard Lovelace' (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University, 1983)
- McRae, Andrew, *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004)
- Memegalos, Florene S., *George Goring (1608–1657): Caroline Courtier and Royalist General* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007)
- Mendle, Michael, *Dangerous Positions: Mixed Government, the Estates of the Realm, and the Making of the Answer to the XIX Propositions* (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1995)
- , 'An Enduring Discourse Community?: Some Studies in Early Modern English History and Culture', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 53 (2000), 222–38
- Millar, Oliver, *Rubens: The Whitehall Ceiling*, Charlton Lectures on Art (London: Oxford University Press, 1958)
- , 'Some Painters and Charles I', *Burlington Magazine*, 104 (1962), 323–30
- , *The Age of Charles I: Painting in England, 1620–1649* (London: Tate Gallery, 1972)
- , *Sir Peter Lely, 1618–80* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1978)
- , *Van Dyck in England* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1982)
- Milton, Anthony, 'Thomas Wentworth and the Political Thought of the Personal Rule', in *The Political World of Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, 1621–1641*, ed. by J.F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 133–56
- , *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007)
- Miner, Earl, *The Cavalier Mode From Jonson to Cotton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971)
- Moi, Toril, ed., *The Kristeva Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986)
- Monteyne, Joseph, 'Enveloping Objects: Allegory and Commodity Fetish in Wenceslas Hollar's Personifications of the Seasons and Fashion Still Lifes', *Art History*, 29 (2006), 414–43
- Morford, Mark, *Stoics and Neostoics: Rubens and the Circle of Lipsius* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991)
- Mourgues, Odette de, *Metaphysical Baroque & Précieux Poetry* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953)
- Mr. Cartwright's Pictures: A Seventeenth Century Collection* (London: Dulwich Picture Gallery, 1987)
- Nassaar, Christopher S., 'Lovelace's 'To Lucasta, Going to the Wars'', *Explicator*, 39 (1981), 44–45

- Nathan, Norman, 'Lovelace's 'Flie'', *Notes and Queries*, 200 (1955), 428–29
- Needham, Raymond, and Alexander Webster, *Somerset House: Past and Present* (London: Unwin, 1905)
- Newman, John, *Somerset House: Splendour and Order* (London: Scala Books, 1990)
- Newman, P.R., *Royalist Officers in England and Wales, 1642–1660* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1981)
- Norbrook, David, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)
- , *Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance*, rev. edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Norsworthy, Laura, *The Lady of Bleeding Heart Yard: Lady Elizabeth Hatton, 1578–1646* (London: John Murray, 1935)
- O'Callaghan, Michelle, 'Literary Commonwealths: A 1614 Print Community, *The Shepherds Pipe* and *The Shepherds Hunting*', *Seventeenth Century*, 13 (1998), 103–23
- , *The 'Shepherds Nation': Jacobean Spenserians and Early Stuart Political Culture, 1612–1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000)
- Oestreich, Gerhard, *Neostoicism and the Early Modern State*, trans. by David McLintock, ed. by Brigitta Oestreich and H.G. Koenigsberger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982)
- Orgel, Stephen, 'Inigo Jones' Persian Entertainment', *AARP: Art and Archaeology Research Papers*, 2 (1972), 59–69
- , 'Plato, the Magi, and Caroline Politics: A Reading of *The Temple of Love*', *Word and Image*, 4 (1988), 663–77
- Orgel, Stephen, and Roy Strong, *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, 2 vols (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet, 1973)
- Orr, Mary, *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003)
- Orrell, John, 'The Paved Court Theatre at Somerset House', *British Library Journal*, 3 (1977), 13–19
- , *The Theatres of Inigo Jones and John Webb* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)
- Palgrave, Francis Turner, *The Golden Treasury of the Best Songs and Lyrical Poems in the English Language* (London, 1861)
- Palmer, Paulina, 'Lovelace: Some Unnoticed Allusions to Carew', *Notes and Queries*, 14 (1967), 96–98
- , 'Lovelace's Treatment of Some Marinesque Motifs', *Comparative Literature*, 29 (1977), 300–12

- Parker, Michael P., ‘‘To my friend G.N. from Wrest’: Carew’s Secular Masque’, in *Classic and Cavalier: Essays on Jonson and the Sons of Ben*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Pittsburgh: University Press, 1982), 171–91
- Parmelee, Lisa Ferraro, *Good Newes From Fraunce: French Anti-League Propaganda in Late Elizabethan England* (Rochester, N.Y.: University Press, 1996)
- Parry, Graham, *Hollar’s England: A Mid-Seventeenth-Century View* (Wilton, Wilts.: M. Russell, 1980)
- , *The Golden Age Restor’d: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603–42* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981)
- Patterson, Annabel, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984; repr. 1990)
- , *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valéry* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987)
- , *Fables of Power: Aesopian Writing and Political History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991)
- , ‘His Singing Robes’, *Milton Studies*, 48 (2008), 178–94
- Peacey, Jason, ‘‘The Counterfeit Silly Curr’’: Money, Politics, and the Forging of Royalist Newspapers during the English Civil War’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 67 (2004), 27–58
- , *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, Hants.: Ashgate, 2004)
- Peacock, Edward, *The Army Lists of the Roundheads and Cavaliers*, 2nd edn (London: Chatto & Windus, 1874)
- Peacock, John, ‘The Visual Image of Charles I’, in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. by Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 176–239
- Pearman, A.J., ‘The Kentish Family of Lovelace’, *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 10 (1876), 184–220
- , ‘The Kentish Family of Lovelace II’, *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 20 (1893), 54–63
- Pearson, Norman Holmes, ‘Lovelace’s ‘To Lucasta, Going to the Warres’’, *Explicator*, 7 (1948–49), Item 58
- Pinto, David, ‘Unmasking Thyrsis and Dorinda: Viper-Wine, Reclaimed Women and Declamatory Song’, *The Consort*, 58 (2002), 29–40
- Pleasants, J. Hall, ‘The Gorsuch and Lovelace Families’, *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 26 (1918), 81–93
- , ‘The Lovelace Family and its Connections’, *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 27 (1919), pp. 393–408; 28 (1920), pp. 83–90, 176–187, 285–295, 375–381; 29 (1921), pp. 110–124, 227–243



- , 'Francis Lovelace, Governor of New York, 1668–1673', *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record*, 51 (1920), 175–94
- Post, Jonathan F.S., *English Lyric Poetry: The Early Seventeenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1999)
- Potter, Lois, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)
- Praz, Mario, 'The Poems of Richard Lovelace, ed. by C.H. Wilkinson', *Modern Language Review*, 21 (1926), 319–22
- Price, Bronwen, "'Th'inwards of th'Abyse": Questions of the Subject in Lovelace's Poetry', *English: The Journal of the English Association*, 43 (1994), 117–37
- Prior, Charles W.A., 'New Light on Milton's 'Fable of the Wen'', *Notes and Queries*, 54 (2007), 395–400
- Purkiss, Diane, *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- , *The English Civil War: A People's History* (London: Harper Perennial, 2006)
- Quick, Anthony, *Charterhouse: A History of the School* (London: James & James, 1990)
- Rabb, Theodore K., *Enterprise and Empire: Merchant and Gentry Investment in the Expansion of England, 1575–1630* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967)
- , *Jacobean Gentleman: Sir Edwin Sandys, 1561–1629* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998)
- Randall, Dale B.J., 'Reading the Light in Lovelace's 'The Grasshopper'', *College Literature*, 16 (1989), 182–89
- , 'Once More to the G(r)ates: An Old Crux and a New Reading of 'To His Coy Mistress'', in *On the Celebrated and Neglected Poems of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1992), 47–69
- Ray, Robert H., 'The Admiration of Sir Philip Sidney by Lovelace and Carew: New Seventeenth-Century Allusions', *American Notes and Queries*, 18 (2005), 18–21
- Raymond, Joad, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641–1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)
- , 'The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century', *Prose Studies: History, Theory, Criticism*, 21 (1998), 109–40
- Reichardt, Dosia, 'Some Unnoticed Lovelace Manuscripts', *Notes and Queries*, 49 (2002), 336–38
- , "'At My Grates No Althea": Prison Poetry and the Consolations of Sack in the Interregnum', *Parergon*, 20 (2003), 139–61

- , ‘Looking For Lovelace: Identity, Style and Inheritance in the Poetry of the Interregnum’ (Unpublished PhD Thesis, James Cook University, 2003)
- , ‘Another Look at ‘Amyntor’s Grove’: Pastoral and Patronage in Lovelace’s Poem’, *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 11, no. 5.1–20 (2006), <<http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/11-3/reicamyn.htm>>, accessed 30 November 2009
- Revard, Stella P., ‘Thomas Stanley and ‘A Register of Friends’’, in *Literary Circles and Cultural Communities in Renaissance England*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000), 148–72
- Richmond, H.M., ‘A Note on Professor Holland’s Psychoanalytic Approach to Lovelace’, *Literature and Psychology*, 14 (1964), 125–28
- , *The School of Love: The Evolution of the Stuart Love Lyric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964)
- , ‘Manfred Weidhorn. Richard Lovelace’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 24 (1971), 285–87
- Ritson, Joseph, *The English Anthology*, 3 vols (London, 1793–94)
- Robertson, A. Randolph, ‘The Subtle Art of Division: Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England’ (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Washington, 2002)
- , ‘Lovelace and the ‘Barbed Censurers’: Lucasta and Civil War Censorship’, *Studies in Philology*, 103 (2006), 465–98
- , *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England: The Subtle Art of Division* (University Park, Pennsylvania: State University Press, 2009)
- Rogers, Malcolm, *William Dobson, 1611–1646* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1983)
- Rogers, Robert, ‘Literary Value and the Clinical Fallacy’, *Literature and Psychology*, 14 (1964), 116–21
- Rollins, Hyder E., *An Analytical Index to the Ballad-Entries (1557–1709) in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London* (Hatboro, Pennsylvania: Tradition Press, 1967; repr. edn)
- Rosenthal, Lisa, ‘Manhood and Statehood: Rubens’s Construction of Heroic Virtue’, *Oxford Art Journal*, 16 (1993), 92–111
- Røstvig, Maren-Sofie, *The Happy Man: Studies in the Metamorphoses of a Classical Ideal*, 2nd edn, vol. I (Oslo: Norwegian Universities Press, 1962)
- Ruoff, James E., ‘Thomas Carew’s Early Reputation’, *Notes and Queries*, 202 (1957), 61–62
- Russell, Conrad, *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–1642* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991)
- Salmon, J.H.M., ‘Stoicism and Roman Example: Seneca and Tacitus in Jacobean England’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 50 (1989), 199–225
- , ‘Precept, Example, and Truth: Degory Wheare and the *Ars Historica*’, in *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction*,

- 1500–1800, ed. by Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 11–36
- Sanders, Julie, ‘Caroline Salon Culture and Female Agency: The Countess of Carlisle, Henrietta Maria, and Public Theatre’, *Theatre Journal*, 52 (2000), 449–64
- Sauer, Elizabeth, *Paper-contestations’ and Textual Communities in England, 1640–1675* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005)
- Scodel, Joshua, *Excess and the Mean in Early Modern English Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002)
- Scott, David, *Politics and War in the Three Stuart Kingdoms, 1637–49*, British History in Perspective (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)
- , ‘Counsel and Cabal in the King’s Party, 1642–1646’, in *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars*, ed. by Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 112–35
- , ‘Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642–49’, in *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–49*, ed. by John Adamson (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 36–60
- Scoular, Kitty W., *Natural Magic: Studies in the Presentation of Nature in English Poetry from Spencer to Marvell* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965)
- Seaward, Paul, ‘Clarendon, Tacitism, and the Civil Wars of Europe’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68, no. 1–2 (2005), 289–311
- Seelig, Sharon Cadman, ‘My Curious Hand or Eye: The Wit of Richard Lovelace’, in *The Wit of Seventeenth-Century Poetry*, ed. by Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1995), 151–70
- Semler, L.E., *The English Mannerist Poets and the Visual Arts* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1998)
- Sensabaugh, G.F., ‘Platonic Love and the Puritan Rebellion’, *Studies in Philology*, 37 (1940), 457–81
- Sharpe, Kevin, *Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)
- , *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England: Essays and Studies* (London: Pinter, 1989)
- , *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992)
- , ‘The Royal Image: An Afterword’, in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. by Thomas N. Corns (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 288–309
- , *Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven Yale University Press, 2000)
- , *Remapping Early Modern England: The Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

- , ‘“So Hard a Text”? Images of Charles I, 1612–1700’, *Historical Journal*, 43 (2000), 383–405
- Sharpe, Kevin, and Peter Lake, eds. *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994)
- Sharpe, Kevin, and Stephen N. Zwicker, eds., *Politics of Discourse: The Literature and History of Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987)
- Sharpe, Kevin, and Stephen N. Zwicker, eds., *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)
- Sharpe, Kevin, and Stephen N. Zwicker, eds., *Refiguring Revolutions: Aesthetics and Politics from the English Revolution to the Romantic Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998)
- Shedd, John A., ‘Legalism Over Revolution: The Parliamentary Committee for Indemnity and Property Confiscation Disputes, 1647–1655’, *Historical Journal*, 43 (2000), 1093–107
- Shifflett, Andrew, *Stoicism, Politics, and Literature in the Age of Milton: War and Peace Reconciled* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
- Simpson, Claude M., *The British Broadside Ballad and its Music* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1966)
- ‘Sir Peter Lely’s Collection’, *Burlington Magazine*, 83 (1943), 185–91
- Skerpan-Wheeler, Elizabeth, ‘Lovelace’s Community of Fable: The Significance of the Beast Poems’ (Unpublished paper, c.1986)
- Skinner, Quentin, *Visions of Politics*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
- Smith, A.J., *The Metaphysics of Love: Studies in Renaissance Love Poetry From Dante to Milton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)
- Smith, David L., *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c. 1640–1649* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Smith, Geoffrey, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640–1660* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003)
- Smith, Nigel, *Literature and Revolution in England: 1640–1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994)
- Smuts, R. Malcolm, ‘The Puritan Followers of Henrietta Maria in the 1630s’, *English Historical Review*, 93 (1978), 26–45
- , *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987)
- , ‘Political Thought in Early Stuart Britain’, in *A Companion to Stuart Britain*, ed. by Barry Coward (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003), 271–89

- , 'Force, Love and Authority in Caroline Political Culture', in *The 1630s: Interdisciplinary Essays on Culture and Politics in the Caroline Era*, ed. by Ian Atherton and Julie Sanders (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 28–49
- , 'The Court and the Emergence of a Royalist Party', in *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars*, ed. by Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 43–65
- Smyth, Adam, 'An Index of Poetry in Printed Miscellanies, 1640–1682', <<http://www.reading.ac.uk/emrc//printedmiscellanies.htm>>, accessed 30 November 2009
- , ed., *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: D.S. Brewer, 2004)
- Spink, Ian, 'English Seventeenth-Century Dialogues', *Music & Letters*, 38 (1957), 155–63
- , *Henry Lawes: Cavalier Songwriter* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- Spraggon, Julie, *Puritan Iconoclasm during the English Civil War* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 2003)
- Stähler, Axel, 'Between Tiger and Unicorn: *The Temple of Love*', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 61 (1998), 176–97
- Stanton, Domna C., 'The Fiction of Préciosité and the Fear of Women', *Yale French Studies*, 62 (1981), 107–34
- Strachey, J. St. Loe, 'The Poems of Richard Lovelace', ed. by C.H. Wilkinson', *Spectator*, 136 (1926), 802
- Strong, Roy, *Van Dyck: Charles I on Horseback* (London: Allen Lane, 1972)
- , *Splendour at Court: Renaissance Spectacle and Illusion* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973)
- , *Britannia Triumphans: Inigo Jones, Rubens and Whitehall Palace* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980)
- Taylor, A.J., 'The Royal Visit to Oxford in 1636: A Contemporary Narrative', *Oxoniensia*, 1 (1936), 151–58
- Thomas, Keith, 'The Puritans and Adultery: The Act of 1650 Reconsidered', in *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill*, ed. by Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 257–82
- Thomas, P.W., *Sir John Berkenhead, 1617–1679: A Royalist Career in Politics and Polemics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)
- Thorn-Drury, George, 'Merry Thoughts In A Sad Place', *Notes and Queries*, s. 10–I (1904), 250
- Thurley, Simon, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240–1698* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999)

- Toynbee, Margaret R., 'The Early Work of Sir Peter Lely', *Burlington Magazine*, 88 (1946), 75–76
- , 'Some Early Portraits of Charles I', *Burlington Magazine*, 91 (1949), 4–9
- , 'Van Dyck: Charles I on Horseback by Roy Strong', *Burlington Magazine*, 115 (1973), 753
- , 'The Date of Sir Peter Lely's 'Three Children of Charles I'', *Burlington Magazine*, 121 (1979), 316–37
- Tuck, Richard, *Philosophy and Government, 1572–1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993)
- Tyacke, Nicholas, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987)
- Underdown, David, 'Sir Richard Willys and Secretary Thurloe', *English Historical Review*, 69 (1954), 373–87
- , *Royalist Conspiracy in England: 1649–1660* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960)
- Van Doren, Mark, *Introduction to Poetry: Commentaries on Thirty Poems* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1968)
- Veevers, Erica, *Images of Love and Religion: Queen Henrietta Maria and Court Entertainments* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)
- Venn, John and J.A.Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924).
- Vickers, Brian, 'Leisure and Idleness in the Renaissance: The Ambivalence of Otium', *Renaissance Studies*, 4 (1990), 1–37, 107–54
- Wadsworth, Randolph L. Jr, 'On 'The Snayl' by Richard Lovelace', *Modern Language Review*, 65 (1970), 750–60
- Waite, Arthur E., 'Richard Lovelace', *Gentleman's Magazine* (1884), 459–77
- Walker, Garthine, 'Expanding the Boundaries of Female Honour in Early Modern England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Sixth Series*, 6 (1996), 235–45
- Wall, L.N., 'Some Notes on Marvell's Sources', *Notes and Queries*, 202 (1957), 170–73
- Wardroper, John, ed., *Love and Drollery* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969)
- Weidhorn, Manfred, *Richard Lovelace* (New York: Twayne, 1970)
- White, Michelle Anne, *Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006)
- Wilcher, Robert, *The Writing of Royalism: 1628–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)

- , ‘Suckling’s Fruition Poems and Shakespeare’s *Troilus and Cressida*’, *Notes and Queries*, 53 (2006), 164–66
- , *The Discontented Cavalier: The Work of Sir John Suckling in Its Social, Religious, Political, and Literary Contexts* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007)
- Wilkinson, Cyril Hackett, ‘Richard Lovelace’, *Times Literary Supplement* (1937), 592
- Williams, Raymond, *The Country and the City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973)
- Woods, T.P.S., *Prelude to Civil War, 1642: Mr. Justice Malet and the Kentish Petitions* (Salisbury: Michael Russell, 1980)
- Worden, Blair, ‘The Politics of Marvell’s Horatian Ode’, *Historical Journal*, 27 (1984), 525–47
- , *The Sound of Virtue: Philip Sidney’s Arcadia and Elizabethan Politics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996)
- , ‘Historians and Poets’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68 (2005), 71–93
- , *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)
- Wortham, Christopher John, ‘The Poetry of Richard Lovelace: A Study of His Poetic Works, Considered in the Context of His Life and Times’ (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of London, 1974)
- Wortham, Christopher John, ‘Richard Lovelace’s ‘To Lucasta, Going to the Wars’: Which Wars?’, *Notes and Queries*, 26 (1979), 430–31
- Zaret, David, ‘Petitions and the “Invention” of Public Opinion in the English Revolution’, *American Journal of Sociology*, 101 (1996), 1497–555
- Zook, Melinda S., ‘Nursing Sedition: Women, Dissent, and the Whig Struggle’, in *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s*, ed. by Jason McElligott (Aldershot, Hants.: Ashgate, 2006), 189–203
- Zurawski, Simone, ‘Reflections on the Pitti Friendship Portrait of Rubens: In Praise of Lipsius and in Remembrance of Erasmus’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 23 (1992), 727–53
- Zwicker, Steven N., *Lines of Authority: Politics and English Literary Culture, 1649–1689* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993)