DIVERSITY IN HARMONY: THE POLITICAL COUNSEL OF BEN JONSON'S UNDER-WOOD

By

LIBBY ELLEN STOTT

Bachelor of Arts in Arts and Sciences
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1980

Master of Arts
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1984

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
May, 1991

DIVERSITY IN HARMONY: THE POLITICAL COUNSEL OF BEN JONSON'S UNDER-WOOD

Thesis Approved:

Edward Jones
Thesis Adviser

Jeffrey Walker

J. Michael Dixon

David S. Berkeley

Edward L. Lawry

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

In this study of Jonson's political counsel, I am indebted to many persons, persons both inside and outside of the English Department. Though no longer at OSU, Dr. Paul Klemp introduced me to Jonson and was many things during my pre-dissertation years: first advisor, research editor, willing ear, literate Lovewit, eternal help. I benefitted greatly from his Jonson class and from the comments of my classmate, [Dr.] Steve Robbins.

Dr. Edward Jones, who became my advisor upon Dr. Klemp's departure, has been an indispensable aid. Besides helping me choose my topic, he counseled me throughout the composition of the dissertation. Though he might have fed many of my drafts to Vulcan, he continued to read, edit, and guide. Persevering with a gentle manner and a Senecan patience, Dr. Jones worked hard and remained ever hopeful.

The head of my committee, Dr. Jeffrey Walker, has been a valuable source of continuity and administrative skill. This dynamic man has been a personal as well as a professional inspiration: benevolent yet tough, he exemplifies wisdom and youth. Ligonem ligonem vocat, forsaking levity ad calendas graecas. In this hardy hearted man as in Jonson's Digby, several public virtues have found a private residence.

Dr. Edward Lawry, a committee member from the Philosophy Department, I thank for his zest, objectivity, and humor. I appreciate also the efforts of two other committee members, both from the English Department. Dr. David S. Berkeley has long been a source of clarity, correctness, and great knowledge; Dr. Michael O'Neill, though given short notice, generously agreed to read my dissertation, and he provided many helpful comments. A former committee member, Dr. Richard Batteiger, gave me moral suppport and helped me explore an Under-wood poem in his rhetoric class; the inimitable Professor John Milstead inspired my pursuit of English. I am grateful also for what Dr. Linda Leavell has given me: training, encouragement, amicitia. And Shirley Bechtel, Deborah Bransford, and several other Morrill mainstays provided invaluable aid throughout my work on the degree.

Nor could I have made it without my colleagues in the Cant and Bagel Hermeneutic Circle and in the Toro Sessions. Dr. Sandra Pearce, the soul of vivacity, beautifully combined the roles of Virgil and Beatrice, and A. B. D[avid] Major, criticus improbus, continually delighted and instructed. Mallory McNease assisted this project in a number of ways.

Contributing in their own manner to this dissertation are Christopher, Richard, Grantham, and John, professors who, though outside the English Department, nonetheless sit in shadow of Apollo's tree. Adept at grave counsel and at

the arts of gladness, these men are devotees both of Bacon and of Bacchus. I thank them for the merry meetings over the years and for their embodiment of the pure fire and wine of friendship.

To family members I owe more than I can express. Merril, Mildred, Drew, and Sherry Stott, and Morgan, Amanda, and Laura ("Ace") Bell have sacrificed much and encouraged continuously. My spouse, Cline Young, has excelled in various roles, including those of coach, patron, commentator, confidant, and jester. This patient man knows what it means to guard "holiest friendship, naked to the touch." He has given the most useful yet indescribable gift of all: a multitude of timely exertions.

Thanks also to Tami Eick for her typing services.

And thanks to Mr. Herrick for his timely prayer.

(In this essay I give the Julian dates, though I treat the new year as beginning January 1 rather than March 25. Though I quote from the Herford and Simpson edition, I have modernized the use of i/j and u/v.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	POETS AND PRINCES	8
III.	COURT HARMONY	50
IV.	LEGAL HARMONY	88
V.	RELIGIOUS HARMONY	134
VI.	INTERNATIONAL HARMONY	176
VII.	CONCLUSION	228
WORKS CITED		235

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

> New yeares, expect new gifts: Sister, your Harpe,
> Lute, Lyre, Theorbo, all are call'd to day.
> Your change of Notes, the flat, the meane, the
> sharpe,
> To shew the rites, and t<o>'usher forth the way
> Of the New Yeare . . .
>
> ("A New-yeares-Gift" 1-5)[1]

Written around 1635, the above lines to the king occur in Ben Jonson's Under-wood, published in 1640 (three years after the author's death). In their blending of different voices to create a rich harmony, these lines epitomize much of the political counsel Jonson gives in his last collection of poetry as he tries to maximize his long-held role of royal poet. As the author writes throughout this volume of poetry, he is living in a culture that values order yet witnesses great upheavals and conflicts. He himself prizes order, as his carefully constructed poems show; yet this man, known for his strong opinions and sharp tongue, also values energy and individualism. Under-wood in fact embodies both order and diversity, as does the political counsel it offers.

Jonson's political advice sounds often in this miscellany, which addresses also friendship and love; for the sake of focus, depth, and economy, however, I have chosen to discuss in detail two or three Under-wood poems in each chapter. Interested in historical setting and particularly in works written after Jonson became laureate, I have selected pieces written after 1616, ones for which we have at least some approximate date. I have further chosen pieces which express the laureate's political counsel at its most complete, clear, and specific. Throughout my essay, however, I briefly mention in the text other relevant poems, including in the endnotes references to yet other supporting works.

Yet a full understanding of Under-wood's political counsel requires a review of its author's advice in earlier poetry, particularly his Works (published in 1616, when he becomes the royal poet). In this early volume the importance of harmony concerning monarch and poet, courtiers, English law, religion, and foreign relations emerges. By looking first at Jonson's positions toward these matters before his laureateship, one can better understand how Under-wood maintains the poet's interest in order yet shows even more strongly his belief that England can survive differences of opinion.[2]

The relationship most fundamental to the poet-counselor's position, that between poets and their monarchs, is first addressed in Poetaster (1601) and later examined in

the Under-wood poem "The Dedication of the Kings new Cellar," and then in the Tribe of Ben epistle (which puts "The Dedication" into context). Jonson's political counsel concerning the court appears in the early masque Love Restored (1612), which reveals in an abstract manner the importance of completeness and cooperation, qualities treated more specifically and concretely in the Under-wood poems "Epithalamion" and "An Epigram To my Muse." Looking at a force of order that goes beyond the royal court--civil law--is Jonson's inaugural poem written for King James ("A Panegyre" [1604]). This poem bears upon the diversity of lawyers praised in Under-wood and the legal context analyzed in more detail in "Lord BACONS Birth-day" and "To our great and good K. CHARLES On his Anniversary Day."

Because the England of Jonson's time monitors religious practice, a large part of life, the poet's political advice encompasses ecclesiastical as well as civil structures. The early work Hymenaei (1606) reveals rulers' positions as God's disciples, yet it also implies their accountability to God. Under-wood continues and broadens this argument, using daring techniques at a time when subjects and monarchs have become more divided over religion. "An Epigram to the Queene, then lying in" and the poem on James's christening employ the paradoxes that give Christianity its energy and diversity as the poet tries to reconcile Anglican subjects to their Catholic queen and their high church king. Finally, the poet's counsel concerning his country's

relations with other nations appears in The Speeches at Prince Henry's Barriers (1610), a peacetime work that, among other things, reviews England's past; it shows the various international situations a country experiences, sometimes using historically distant examples to argue that self-sufficiency and a strong army are prerequisites for a noble peace. During the years that Under-wood spans, England has quickly gone through periods of peace, war, and then peace again. In "An Execration," "A speach according to Horace," and "To the right Honourable, the Lord Treasurer of England," their author refers more specifically to contemporary events and sometimes opposes popular opinion to advise England about tough fighting and dignified peace.

Admittedly, Under-wood's counsel in some ways observes certain limits that Jonson's earlier work does not. Trying to counteract open defiance of the king's authority, the poet excludes descriptions of political tyranny which earlier works include. Moreover, when he senses a direct confrontation between king and people, the laureate supports the king, the one individual fundamental to civil order. Under-wood also leans heavily upon compliment and avoids blatantly lecturing the ruler when certain issues have become more sensitive.[3]

Jonson's change of strategy implies not that he has abandoned or restricted his idea of harmony, however, but that he is responding to a new political context, one in some ways less stable than before. When placed within this

context, Under-wood's depiction of political harmony is actually broader than that of earlier works. Often speaking in his own voice to or about real persons, Jonson in Under-wood includes some figures that avoid one another's company. Advising actual persons in real political situations, the laureate shows that intelligent subjects need not surrender their own ideas as long as they remain faithful to king and country. He has faith that not one voice, but many different strong voices ("the flat, the meane, [and] the sharpe") will best help England find a dynamic harmony enabling both progress and stability in the coming years.[4]

Jonson never indicates, however, that even loyal individualism can be pursued at no cost: several persons praised in Under-wood spend some time in prison (like the author himself), while others are the victims of threats and danger. And while the poet commends varied individuals, he consistently stresses their loyalty to God, monarch, and people, further neglecting to praise persons whose voices are either too vicious or strident (such as Buckingham and John Eliot). In his volume of individualistic patriotism, Jonson himself acts as example in his role as poet.[5]

NOTES

[1] Herford and Simpson 8:263-64. Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to Jonson's works are from this edition and are incorporated in the text.

[2] For the Renaissance idea of order see for example Tillyard, especially 9-17. On Jonson, political counsel, and laureateship see Helgerson, "Elizabethan" and Self-Crowned 26-31, 40-50, 142-78; Parfitt, Ben 29-30; Sharpe, Criticism 272-77; and Mortimer. Though James does not specifically use the words "poet laureate" in his recognition of Jonson, I agree with Helgerson that Jonson considers himself a laureate. I therefore use the term "laureate" to describe him (as Miles does 166ff).

[3] For the publication history of Under-wood, see Hunter 113, Donaldson 680-81, Petersson 90, and Miles 271-72. For tepid to negative comments about Jonson's political poems in the volume, see Judith Kegan Gardiner 87, 118, 161; van den Berg 177-78; and Miles 247. For a more positive reaction see Donaldson 681.

[4] Individuals who disagreed strongly with one another included Coke and Bacon, Ellesmere and Coke, Jerome Weston and much of the court. "Meane" here signifies "natural," as Hunter 241 explains.

[5] William Cecil, Queen Elizabeth, Bacon, Bishop

Williams, and Coke all spent some time in prison. Richard Weston is the object of assassination threats, and his son is challenged to a duel by a political enemy. Further, Kenelm Digby risks not only his life when he fights for his country, but his security when he defends his uncle against Buckingham (Petersson 67).

CHAPTER II

POETS AND PRINCES

Though Jonson gets into legal and political trouble during the reigns of all three monarchs he serves, he does so not out of disloyalty but out of a sense of the poet's important role. He argues that counseling the ruler is one of a writer's main duties and that listening to such counsel is one of the ruler's responsibilities. In Discoveries he states, "A Prince without Letters, is a Pilot without eyes. . . . how can he be counsell'd that cannot see to read the best Counsellors (which are books. [sic]) . . . " (8:601). When writing an early work such as Poetaster, Jonson has had little direct experience with such princes, including the aged Elizabeth whom he counsels. That play depicts, abstractly and from a distance, various acceptable poet-ruler relationships: while a poet may agree perfectly with his monarch, he may also differ with him or her as long as he remains loyal. A range of opinions is healthy for a state and perhaps even necessary for its growth. A poet may not, however, betray his ruler and expect to remain a part of the system.

By the time he writes most of the poems appearing in Under-wood, Jonson as royal poet has become acquainted with

James and Charles. Like Poetaster, Under-wood supports various degrees of agreement between poets and their monarch, yet in a more personal way than before. Showing rulers as both magnanimous and subject to human frailties, Jonson maintains his integrity while he supports the monarch, at the same time denouncing irresponsible or malicious poets and speakers. "The Dedication of the Kings new Cellar" illustrates the laureate's position very well, particularly when coupled with ideas found in the Tribe of Ben epistle. Involving certain contemporary occasions and events, these poems have an energy that exceeds the rational harmony in Poetaster.[1]

In its variety of poet characters and their relationships with their monarch, Poetaster demonstrates to Elizabeth and her subjects the energy and diversity that harmony between ruler and artist can encompass. Whereas Virgil and Caesar Augustus think almost in unison, Horace, Tibullus, and Gallus sometimes either disagree with their emperor or act in ways that displease him. Nonetheless, Jonson suggests that a working harmony eventually includes these characters, and they bring to the poet-ruler relationship a vitality and a texture that mere agreement would not have brought. The young playwright no doubt desires similar flexibility under Elizabeth (particularly since he has already felt some governmental rigidity concerning an earlier play). This model harmony does not stretch to include all differences, however, for if it did

so anarchy rather than a rich order would result. The play argues this principle of discrimination through Caesar's banishment of Ovid, a poet too destructive to be incorporated, and through the punishment of Lupus, a critic of Horace.[2]

Poetaster makes obvious the importance of art in government, here poetry in particular. Elizabeth would be able to see much of herself in the play's ruler. Caesar Augustus, for example, declares his admiration of poetry, and others commend the homage he renders it. At one place he calls poetry, "of all the faculties on earth, / The most abstract, and perfect" (5.1.18-19). Horace adds, "PHOEBUS himselfe shall kneele at CAESARS shrine . . . To quit the worship CAESAR does to him" (5.1.44-46). Jonson's queen has long been known for her patronage of poetry, a practice the author suggests she continue and, he doubtless hopes, extend to this playwright himself. This same scene in the play also recognizes the emperor's priorities and his attempt to compose a good political state. Tibullus says that fortune commands human affairs "Without all order; and with her blinde hand, / Shee, blinde, bestowes blinde gifts . . . " (5.1.54-56). As a political ruler, however, Augustus describes his attempt to rectify this injustice:

> CAESAR, for his rule, and for so much stuffe
> As fortune puts in his hand, shall dispose it
> (As if his hand had eyes, and soule, in it)
> With worth, and judgement.

(5.1.58-61)

The emperor's statement is not haughty or ambitious: unlike Marlowe's Tamburlaine, Jonson's Caesar neither assumes nor desires to control fortune completely. He merely assumes responsibility for matters which fortune "puts in his hand." To do less would be to abdicate moral and political obligations and would work against the "human order" (5.1.65-66) with which monarchs--and poets--are so concerned. Motivated by virtuous love, this Roman ruler brings a proper sense of order not only to the moral anarchy of his subjects but to that of fortune as well.

In this play, he is also called upon to judge poets and to reward them according to their value (as Elizabeth herself should do). Caesar's high placement of Virgil demonstrates his interest in a virtuous order and his good judgment of art, a judgment with which Jonson would concur. Though the emperor heads the present Roman commonwealth, he, like Jonson's prince in Discoveries, respects Virgil's creation of a poetic one. Continuing to show his consciousness of correct order, Augustus asks this poetic ruler to take a chair above his own as Virgil depicts his epic creation (5.2.24-25). Knowing that placing an artist above the English monarch could seem treasonous, Jonson instead uses Poetaster's classical setting to elevate poets. The play also has Caesar acknowledge that in raising Virgil he violates custom, and that he does so of his own free will: the ruler knows that "reason . . . in right should be

/ The speciall rector of all harmonie" (5.2.42-43). This reason dictates that "'Vertue, without presumption, place may take / 'Above best Kings, whom onely she should make" (5.2.26-27). The virtuous Virgil has "made" a good king for Caesar as Jonson does (through the emperor) for Elizabeth. In recognizing the worth of another, Augustus actually increases his own worth and shows himself one of the "best Kings." At this point in the play, poet and monarch provide a graphic moral and political focus. Aware of the pricelessness and delicacy of the occasion, Augustus protects Virgil's reading by telling his men, "guard the doores, / And let none enter; peace." In this way the ruler achieves a cloistered order, though it has its diversities.

Poetaster depicts Caesar and Virgil's relationship as involving almost perfect harmony. Both men are presented as lofty, and when the epic poet enters, the emperor rises and states,

> Welcome to CAESAR, VIRGIL. CAESAR, and VIRGIL
> Shall differ but in sound; to CAESAR, VIRGIL
> (Of his expressed greatnesse) shall be made
> A second sur-name, and to VIRGIL, CAESAR.
>
> (5.2.2-5)

By linking poet and king in words, Jonson associates them very closely, for in his work names are particularly meaningful.[3] The men indicate their respect for each other and their concord through mutual deference.

Yet the emperor includes at the reading persons who,

though loyal, do not agree with him as much as Virgil does. One such man is Horace, a rugged individualist often linked with Jonson himself. When Caesar essentially asks the poor satirist if he envies Virgil, Horace links human worth to knowledge rather than to riches and defends his own ability to recognize merit in others. The rough poet rebukes the emperor: "CAESAR speakes after common men, in this, / To make a difference of me, for my poorenesse; / . . . / And for my soule, it is as free, as CAESARS" (5.1.79-80, 90). In response to having been called "common" and no higher than a poor poet, the emperor mildly accepts this truth; far from punishing the writer, Augustus states, "Thankes, HORACE, for thy free, and holsome sharpnesse: / Which pleaseth CAESAR more, then servile fawnes. / "A flatterd prince soone turnes the prince of fooles" (5.1.94-96).

The above exchange surely occurs more often in poetic fancy than in political fact. It is very hard to imagine Jonson, for all his swagger, speaking so bluntly to Elizabeth; it is almost impossible to picture Elizabeth responding as Caesar here does. Yet through the distance of the classical setting the English poet shows that the virtuous ruler prefers the beneficial ("holsome") to the merely pleasant (flattery), prefers constructive disagreement to indulging agreement. Such an arrangement is to the advantage of prince, country, and poet (particularly when the poet is, like Jonson and Horace, a satirist). Horace also a writer of odes, some praising Augustus, knows

that flattery is likely to encourage rather than to lessen the king's fault, consequently alienating the ruler from virtuous writers such as Virgil. Monarchs who encourage others to tell them flattering untruths find both that they have fools for company and that they themselves are chief among the fools; this person is doubly "the prince of fooles." Such a phrase suggests almost an anti-kingdom and its ruler, not the ideal king and company the play here describes. While Horace lacks Virgil's loftiness, his rough character brings to Caesar's presence a diversity and energy and helps the monarch remain flexible. Jonson's play implies that his presence could have a similar effect on Elizabeth.

As Caesar's humble response to Horace's criticism shows his sincere interest in harmony and his lack of false pride, so does his treatment of the writers Tibullus and Gallus, also his companions at the reading. Tibullus and Gallus have been present at the banquet mocking the gods, the entertainment over which Ovid presides. While Caesar banishes Ovid, he receives the other two poets into a close relationship with himself, although not without comment:

> We, that have conquer'd still, to save the
> conquer'd,
> And lov'd to make inflictions feard, not felt;
> Griev'd to reprove, and joyfull to reward,
> More proud of reconcilement, then revenge,
> <u>Resume</u> into the late state of our love,

Worthy CORNELIUS GALLUS, and TIBULLUS;

(5.1.1-6)

Here the emperor lists infliction, reproval, and revenge among possible reactions to the poets' irreverence. His words are not idle threats. A mighty ruler, Caesar (like Elizabeth) has opportunity for either great evil or great good. Because he is so powerful, he acts from choice rather than from necessity. The virtue that he exhibits is therefore true virtue, and this passage shows him a man, to use one of Jonson's favorite phrases, both great and good. Through this ruler's speech, the playwright implies that Elizabeth has similar options and should make like choices.

The first quoted line both reinforces the emperor's might and provides a noble motive for even his conquests: he has conquered in order to rescue others from lesser governments. While this motive sounds suspicious, the author writes at a time when Englishmen have contemplated genocide as a way of preserving Ireland.[4] According to conventional political theory, Augustus is fittest to rule others because he has learned to rule himself, having mastered his own baser desires.[5] The rest of this passage demonstrates Caesar's self-rule, often using alliteration to juxtapose two choices and to show the emperor's consistent preference for the nobler way. Such a prince is not likely to punish or exclude for petty reasons (nor should Elizabeth do so).

As the mock-banquet has shown, not all citizens possess

Caesar's self-control and innate desire for good; they sometimes require external motivation toward the avoidance of evil, and for this reason the ruler erects penalties ("inflictions") for crimes. In saying that he wants "to make inflictions feard, not felt," the ruler expresses his hope that subjects' mere knowledge of penalties will deter them from forbidden acts and subsequent suffering. The line "Griev'd to reprove, and joyfull to reward" conveys Caesar's desire. Nicely ordered--like the ruler's affections--this line contrasts negative and positive reinforcement and links the ruler's happiness to that of his subjects (just as the English queen's is linked to hers). Sometimes this knowledge of penalties is not sufficient, however, and though the emperor would much rather praise than punish, he must sometimes do the latter. The next line further reinforces Caesar's paternal rather than personal pride: he desires not vindication of himself over others ("revenge"), but a good relationship with his subjects, and he is willing to employ grace and forgiveness in order to purchase political harmony. He so acts with Tibullus and Gallus when he "resumes" them, taking them back when they have acted in a manner repugnant to their ruler.

Line five reveals the spirit that informs the emperor's acts: love. Although the phrase "state of our love" refers directly to a mental or emotional state, it also suggests a political state, one as ideal for England as it is for Rome. Yet Augustus has in addition to love other reasons for

forgiving Tibullus and Gallus: they are gentlemen; they are writers; they are "worthy" and "have virtues"; and Gallus has proven himself a good soldier (as Jonson himself has done). In forgiving these men and taking them again into his counsel, Caesar shows that the poet-prince relationship can absorb not only the honest--but sharp--comments of Horace, but the human errors and temporary insubordination of Gallus and Tibullus (qualities authorities might think that Jonson himself possesses). Augustus, for his part, yields out of grace, and Gallus indicates his loyalty to his ruler by praising him highly.

Gallus and Tibullus therefore join Caesar and Horace in listening to Virgil, a poet the ruler associates with harmony, as he indicates when he tells him, "read, read, thy selfe, deare VIRGIL, let not me / Prophane one accent with an untun'd tongue" (5.2.21-22). Actually, the artistically harmonious passage Virgil reads describes political disharmony. Storms and shrieking fill the air as the shameless Dido "weds" Aeneas and the monster Fame reports her evil. This scene is critical for Romans because it depicts Aeneas at a point when he has neglected his duty to found the second Troy (Rome). In its description of persons who seduce royalty and of those who spread vicious gossip, the passage suggests the recently-banished Ovid and the politician-critic Lupus.

Poetaster's Ovid is in several ways pleasant: easy-going, educated, and witty, as Horace points out (4.7.41-

42). Ovid is also dangerous, as the playwright suggests through Caesar and through the young poet himself. In a mock imitation of Jove, Ovid presides over a licentious banquet that ridicules the gods and the head of state, in a culture where state and religion are closely connected (as in Renaissance England). The young poet's performance, however playful, shows that he would rather corrupt the court than counsel the king: unlike Gallus, he is connected not with courageous service to his country but with light love poetry and flightiness. And though others such as Tibullus and Gallus join Ovid at his banquet, they neither mock the emperor nor encourage his daughter's lower nature to the extent that their leader does. Just before Caesar enters, Ovid pretends to send a messenger commanding Augustus to sacrifice his daughter, while Julia (Juno) says that her father should instead punish her poetic lover for "soothing her [Julia], in her follies" (4.5.200-17). To some extent, the two get what they jokingly wish for: Augustus makes Julia sacrifice a large part of her life (her lover), and he exiles Ovid for "soothing the declin'd affections" of the emperor's daughter (4.6.54-59). Ovid has betrayed the state by encouraging Julia in irresponsible acts and causing her to disgrace the high image of royalty. In his denunciation of this amoral poet, Jonson does not indiscriminately discourage mirth, but he does censure sport that encourages squabbling, superficiality, and insurrection. The young playwright feels that such descriptions

include his rivals in the "War of the Theatres," though he no doubt excludes himself.[6]

While Horace excuses if not defends Ovid, the play shows that the final decision concerning banishment must be the ruler's and not his poet's: the poet is a counselor, not a policy-maker. Here Jonson shows that however he may resemble Horace in some ways, in this aspect he sides with the ruler and bows to his sovereignty. Caesar's banishment of Ovid demonstrates that sometimes even a loving, tolerant, and forgiving monarch must exclude elements that will not be incorporated into a virtuous harmony and that will threaten the state. As Jonson explains through Augustus, mercy must not degenerate into unwarranted pity. If it does, all standards will be lost, particularly since Ovid's offense involves a member of the ruler's family and is public rather than private:

> There is no bountie to be shew'd to such,
> As have no reall goodnesse: Bountie is
> A spice of vertue: and what vertuous act
> Can take effect on them, that have no power
> Of equall habitude to apprehend it.
>
> (4.6.62-66)

Horace can appreciate generosity because he understands worth and virtue, as he has shown earlier; Ovid can grasp neither. And while the older poet is coarse in appearance but fine in soul, the young one is at best fine in looks and crude in spirit. As he will continue to assert throughout

his work, Jonson here supports substance over form, and he cautions his monarch to examine thoroughly that she might do the same. It is soon apparent that Caesar was correct to believe that Ovid prefers saucy blasphemy to the "spice of vertue." It is not the good things of the court that the young writer will miss. He views his exile from a very worldly perspective:

> So I, exil'd the circle of the court,
> Lose all the good gifts, that in it I joy'd.
> No vertue currant is, but with her stamp:
> And no vice vicious, blaunch't with her white hand.
>
> (4.8.14-17)

In speaking of "good gifts," Ovid does not refer to the loftiness of Caesar's bounty (exemplified in his forgiveness of Tibullus and Gallus); such a matter is beyond his understanding, as Augustus earlier states. The young poet alludes instead to the favors of an amoral court group and to the acceptance of his love poetry. Most importantly, he refers to "th'abstract of the court," which he finds not in the emperor, but in Julia (4.8.19). This poet will not miss the circle formed by Caesar, Virgil, and Horace, but that made by the earlier revellers and by Julia's white arms. (The vain and jealous Elizabeth might be predisposed against Ovid, who chooses a beautiful young woman over an older, venerable ruler.) Clearly, Ovid does not "apprehend" the constant virtue of which Caesar speaks, for the writer

connects worth with fashion and majority opinion, an idea repugnant to Jonson but a practice all too common in many a court since that of Augustus. However charming as a poet and a companion, Ovid reveals just the type of moral inconstancy that Horace, Virgil, and Caesar abhor and that can lead, however slowly, to the country's degeneration. He is no fit counselor for an emperor and no suitable company for an emperor's daughter.

Having treated various types of poets and the ruler's relationships with them, Poetaster also chastises persons who attempt to disrupt the harmony between the king and a good poet-counselor. The vicious and ambitious Lupus is one such person. An opportunistic, lying meddler, Lupus tries to gain revenge on the honest Horace by accusing him of slander, an accusation he makes under pretence of protecting his ruler. (Jonson himself has experienced similar allegations.) Lupus's statement calls forth from Horace a vision in which persons such as the politician abound:

> A just man cannot feare, thou foolish Tribune;
> Not, though the malice of traducing tongues,
> The open vastnesse of a tyrannes eare,
> The senselesse rigour of the wrested lawes,
> Or the red eyes of strain'd authoritie
> Should, in a point, meet all to take his life.
> His innocence is armour 'gainst all these.
>
> (5.3.61-67)

In this passage, citizens at all levels unite for an evil

cause, the lone just person opposing them. The body politic described is obviously a diseased one, as the imagery indicates. This imagery suggests disorder of the whole by mentioning irregularities in the quantity, size, shape, number, and color of the parts. The state's many tongues work not to utter poetry, just reward, or the "wholesome sharpe moralitie" of a Horace (5.3.138), but instead to speak lies and perversions. The swollen ear indicates a ruler much unlike the Caesar who seeks harmony. This hypothetical tyrant is ever open to anyone's reports of possible rebellion, fearful for his life because he knows that subjects have good reason to hate him. The phrase "wrested laws" implies that the laws have been torn from their original spirit. These laws act not with purposeful discipline, but with a "senselesse rigour." And here authority is not wielded with vision and objectivity, but is strained and abused in order to entrap the just person; the elements of a deformed body politic act like a dangerous knife, "meet[ing] all in a point" to annihilate just counselors as they stand in their virtuous "armour."

Were Augustus malicious, he could easily twist the body of the state to work against its counselors and to work ultimately toward its own destruction. (This is exactly what occurs in Sejanus, although Jonson focuses more on the emperor's favorite than on the emperor himself.) However, Horace has just described a dystopia rather than an actual place, as indicated not only by the words "though" and

"should," but by Caesar's vindication of Horace and punishment of Lupus; Jonson recommends such princely judgment to Elizabeth. While the emperor--and the queen--has the power to be a tyrant, his virtue and his closeness to worthy poets such as Virgil, Horace, and even the brave Gallus protect him. By listening to poets such as Virgil, he keeps before himself a model of the virtuous ruler (Aeneas) as well as a warning against certain mistakes. By exposing himself to Horace's sharp speech, and by humbly considering well-meant criticism, he maintains the self-knowledge and self-rule that preclude tyranny. And by forgiving good persons who have temporarily erred (Gallus and Tibullus), he continues to put the good of the state before personal pride (this forgiveness demonstrates that his banishment of Ovid is for state rather than personal reasons). English monarchs and poets would do well to follow this portrait of the network of relationships between a ruler and his or her writers.

Thus, even as a young author, Jonson depicts the political importance of artists. He shows the wide range of acceptable relationships that can exist between writer and ruler and the desirability of freedom, love, and reconciliation in a working harmony. He also shows artists and critics (Ovid and Lupus) who are unacceptable. With the accession of James and the growth of his own literary powers, the creator of Poetaster's Virgil and Horace himself moves inside the royal circle, something that the monarch

officially recognizes when he makes Jonson royal poet (1616). From this position the author who advises Elizabeth from a distance can now counsel James in a more intimate way; he is better able to judge his ruler's moods, opinions, and needs, offering counsel and responding to specific situations. The poet also gains a closer look at surrounding corruption, learning that royal positions are not as secure in fact as in Poetaster.

Two Under-wood poems in particular reveal the English laureate's more intimate experience with the court, one piece acting as a gloss on the other. "The Dedication of the Kings new Cellar" and the Tribe of Ben epistle have approximately the same dates of composition (summer or fall 1623), and they occur next to each other in the volume. "The Dedication" stresses primarily harmony, though it implies diversity and the ruler's capacity for forgiveness; a less public poem, the epistle, sheds light on the court poet's relationship with other artists and the present strain between the good writer and his monarch.[7]

"The Dedication" concerns the rebuilding of Whitehall by Inigo Jones, Jonson's rival; the laureate writes it after the king has slighted him in favor of the architect concerning an upcoming reception for the Infanta. The poem does not allude to this slight, however, attempting instead to soothe a monarch very worried about his son and his son's mission overseas. The comic tone of the piece is apparent in its rollicking rhythm and sound, its three-foot couplets

that end always in double rhymes. The poem begins with a playful address to the mythological Bacchus (also Lyaeus or Dionysus), a god of great energy whom Goldberg describes as "a type of the king--and of the poet as well" (222). This god represents also the "social and beneficent influences [of wine and] . . . is viewed as the promoter of civilization and a lawgiver and lover of peace" (Bulfinch 8). This figure therefore serves particularly well as a type of the poet-king James, who also likes to be known as the Prince of Peace and who is currently negotiating a more stable and tranquil relationship with Spain.

Using first person plural to indicate solidarity, the official who endows the god with his royal position first tells the deity why he stands in charge of the cellar: "Since, Bacchus, thou art father / Of Wines, to thee the rather / we dedicate this Cellar" (1-3). The speaker makes clear, however, that this honor hinges upon the deity's fulfillment of his duties:

> And [we] seale thee thy Commission:
> But 'tis with a condition,
> That thou remaine here taster
> Of all to the great Master.
>
> (5-8)

The god must first pledge to be loyal ("remaine"): in order to keep his "Commission," he will have to commit himself. Being "taster / Of all," Bacchus will experience the bitter, the sweet, and the dry, just as the monarch, his ministers,

n ,

91 D

388d.

iversity

#011

247

A.

and court poets do. As taster, the wine god also guards the ruler against any attempts to poison his drink; Bacchus (like Jonson) must also subordinate himself to the English ruler, as the term "Master" indicates. By having this god at his command, James gains access to his characteristics ("qualities"). The king should remember that he similarly absorbs the qualities of the artists who surround him; he should see that those artists be good ones lest he ingest a taint more subtle than poisoned wine.

Further describing the new officer's duties toward his master, the speaker uses personification to link the deity's judgment of wines to other state officers' judgment of men. He commands,

> . . . looke unto their faces,
> Their Qualities, and races,
> That both, their odour take him,
> And relish merry make him.
>
> (9-12)

Sight is important here (as the word "looke" indicates), and this includes external and internal viewing, the observation and insight which good artists and shrewd politicians possess. Yet officers must concern themselves not only with the present ("faces"), but with the past, which can provide models for the present and future: as Virgil relates the race of the Romans--through Aeneas--and English ministers consider the family background of prospective officials, Bacchus examines the ancestry of what the English drink.

The last line indicates another main duty of the god and of poets: to give the king respite, particularly in troublesome times. Explaining in more detail Bacchus's qualifications and duties, the speaker describes the new officer as the "freer / Of cares" (13-14), of which James now has many. Closer to the ruler than when he wrote Poetaster, Jonson can better understand these cares and observe their impact upon his monarch. As "over-seer," Bacchus should use his visionary powers to organize events that share this vision with others (much as the laureate does with his masques and with this poem). At a time when James anxiously awaits his son's return and hopes for a marriage, "feast, and merry meeting" are particularly desired, and a god who "[begins] the greeting" would be very welcome (14-16).

Like other state officers, this overseer must use his special talents as he both waits upon and protects his king. The speaker states,

> See then thou dost attend him,
> Lyaeus, and defend him,
> By all the Arts of Gladnesse,
> From any thought like sadnesse.
>
> (17-20)

Bacchus here offers not military protection, but rather the protection against a melancholy ("sadness") dangerous to mind and body, one to which the king at this time is particularly susceptible.[8] In this defensive aspect, the

god resembles the men guarding the doors so that Caesar might hear Virgil's poem in peace. His role is more demanding and multi-faceted, however, as the absolutes "any" and "all" indicate. The reference to "Arts of Gladnesse," for example, indicates the study necessary: physical presence and mere talent will not suffice. In the stressful world of politics, the god's comic entertainment is as important as Virgil's epic reading, however things might appear; Jonson no doubt feels the same about his masques and other works. In his commitment to the king, Bacchus (like the laureate) must cheer James even if he himself does not feel cheerful, doing whatever he can to put this very important man out of his melancholic humor.

Should the god fulfill his duties well, the speaker wishes for him fitting reward:

> So mayst thou still be younger
> Then Phoebus; and much stronger
> To give mankind their eases,
> And cure the Worlds diseases
>
> (21-24)

If the god of wines is faithful, his own youth and curative powers will increase, and in defending another, he will advance himself. He might even outdistance his rival Phoebus Apollo, typically the god of serious poetry and of reason, the god linked to Caesar in Poetaster. Yet it is apparent that at this time of crisis, Dionysian joy is a necessary supplement to Apollonian reason. The competition

here between the two gods is a humorous one; indeed, Lyaeus here resembles the Phoebus Jonson celebrates in the "Leges Convivales," the rules of the Apollo room where the royal poet and his tribe meet.[9]

The youth and strength that the speaker mentions are symbolic as well as literal in nature. They represent the moral freshness and resilience Horace exhibits in Poetaster, qualities Bacchus can use to improve the body politic's health by banishing James's sadness. This youth and strength also imply the physical health and vigor the author would wish for the declining ruler (who would die prematurely old less than two years after the poem's composition).[10] Through referring generally to the problems of "mankind" and the "World" (23-24), the speaker alludes specifically to the problems of a monarch who particularly needs ease and health, both associated with poetry and with wine.

Continuing his wish that good service be rewarded, the speaker mentions greater artistic prowess. Again referring to the mock contest between the two gods, the author asks

> So may the Muses follow
> Thee still, and leave Apollo
> And think thy streame more quicker
> Then Hippocrenes liquor:
>
> (25-28)

By having Lyaeus rather than Phoebus lead the muses, "The Dedication" awards the control of poetry to the energetic,

mirthful god rather than to the rational deity usually in charge. The reference to the "quicker" stream implies not only the "speed" but the "vitality" of the god's wine, a liquid associated with genesis and art ("quick," OED). Stressing the wine god's own creative ability and advancing him further in the contest against Apollo, the speaker wishes, "And thou [Lyaeus] make many a Poet, / Before his [Apollo's] braine do know it" (29-30). Because the definitions of "make" and "poet" overlap, Lyaeus as maker of poets is also maker of makers or poet of poets. In serving the King of England, the new officer will himself become the King of Poetry. In a merry prank where he outsmarts the sun god, Bacchus/Lyaeus moves from father of wines to father of Muses and of poets; he is safe from his rival Apollo, as Jonson would like to be from Jones.

Unlike Ovid, however, this young, energetic figure must use his prowess not for selfish advancement, but for harmony and for the good of his monarch. Whatever his competition with Phoebus, he must not allow it to disturb the court, and his words must not question his ruler. The speaker states,

> So may there never Quarrell
> Have issue from the Barrell;
> But Venus and the Graces
> Pursue thee in all places,
> And not a Song be other
> Then Cupid, and his Mother.
>
> (31-36)

The use of absolutes ("never," "all") suggests the comprehensiveness of the harmony involved as Bacchus's poets sing together. Although the reference to Venus recalls Ovid's banquet of mock deities, the presence of true love and the absence of quarrel imply a great difference. Because Ovid's guests pursue lust rather than love, they see relationships in terms of power and possession. They use libellous and lascivious talk as they compete against one another, the king, and even their gods. "Quarrell" could be the only "issue" these writers' couplings could produce. Bacchus's singers, on the other hand, desire true love and see matters in terms of reconciliation. Working with one another and with their ruler, these wine-filled artists produce an "issue" of love which, represented by Cupid, epitomizes generation and harmony from opposites, as well as great energy. As the father of both wine and many writers, Bacchus is to some extent also the progenitor of love itself as poetry weds Venus. While mirthful and sensual, the love poets of "The Dedication" provide a sharp contrast to the lustful poet Ovid and the disrespectful speakers at his orgy: in James's court the true and pure rather than a false and lewd Venus is guest.

While the classical gods in Poetaster play a serious role, in the modern Christian setting of the "Dedication" they have a light, humorous function, one that helps the poet pleasantly advise his ruler (and court artists). Being "merry" (12) and upholding the "Arts of Gladness" (19)

though not of debauchery, Bacchus draws together for a joyful feast the god and goddess of love (Cupid and Venus). Having gathered such a group through Bacchus, the writer in the latter part of the work more openly involves James himself, though he continues to address the wine god. Moving from Bacchus's court below (the "Where" of line 4) to James's court above (the "above here" of line 37), the piece focuses on the feasting hall where the king meets with his guests and watches artistic entertainments. In his symbolic wine, Bacchus carries with him the love from the cellar up to the court, a love with which the speaker has charged him: ". . . when King James above here, / Shall feast it, thou maist love there / The causes and the Guests too" (37-39).[11] Under this description of positive occasions and guests, the laureate would doubtless include his Time Vindicated, the Twelfth Night masque in which Charles acted just before his trip to Madrid. In addition to wishing for the return of such entertainments, the speaker also wishes away unwanted guests (such as Lupus in Poetaster) and undesirable occasions (such as irreligious costume parties).

In this upstairs hall, the author initially posits gatherings less solemn than Virgil's reading, yet more beneficial than Ovid's orgy. Describing Bacchus's "tales and jests" (40), "The Dedication" associates them with "Circuits, and . . . Rounds free" (41). The circle imagery implies healthful wholeness rather than unhealthy competition or the activity that causes the Roman poet's

exclusion from the court. The word "free" suggests the liberty, though not license, that true love brings, and it also recalls "Liber," another name for Bacchus. In his wish that "the feasts faire grounds be" (42; emphasis mine), the speaker suggests gatherings both "beautiful" and "free from injustice" ("fair," OED). These gatherings are quite unlike the blasphemous banquet but similar to the fellowship among Caesar, Horace, and Virgil at the reading (Poetaster 5.2). Unlike Ovid and his crew, these revellers refrain from attacking others, including those absent and unable to defend themselves. This meeting place of James's guests is truly a White-hall, not because its vices have been "blauncht" by the white hand of the court, but because it is pure and innocent.

Yet "The Dedication" goes beyond Poetaster in its vision of innocent rulers, poetry, and harmony, for it supplements Roman classical ideas with English Christian ones. Whereas Poetaster links Caesar with Roman warrior-poets (Gallus) and with Phoebus Apollo, "The Dedication" associates James with his holy knights and with Christ himself. Moving from the beautiful jocular feasts of lines 40-42, the speaker refers to a political and sacramental dinner when he writes, "Be it he [James] hold Communion / In great Saint Georges Union" (43-44). Here the political harmony ("Union") of the Knights of the Garter suggests the communion of Jesus and his earthly saints.[12] The term "Communion" reminds readers what wine and the Word

ultimately symbolize in the Anglican culture: blood spilled to accomplish forgiveness; creation; and the reconciliation of seeming opposites (human and divine, flesh and spirit, death and life). For all his magnanimity, the Roman emperor can neither forgive nor conquer as the young Messiah does, nor does he incorporate so well the roles of virtuous individualist, ruler, poet, and critic. In a fallen world, James must exclude some individuals in order to preserve his state, but in his relationship with Christ he has access to greater powers than Caesar would find in Phoebus. The bacchanalian wine becomes the wine of the sacrament. The Anglican god supersedes the pagan Bacchus (his antitype), who has earlier triumphed over Apollo; the sacrificed Jesus replaces the dying god (Bacchus). In this supreme Saviour James can find not merely an earthly peace, but the peace that passes understanding.

Christ, like Bacchus, symbolizes peaceful kingship, so James's connection with him is again fitting as the British ruler tries to strengthen Anglo-Spanish peace via his son's marriage. The author refers to this negotiation when he anticipates "the passage / Of some wel-wrought Embassage" (46), one by which the monarch "may knit sure up / The wished Peace of Europe" (47-48). The British ruler's inner tranquillity is closely tied to this external one, though he and his court poet might disagree about this plan. This disagreement might be the cause of the present strain between James and Jonson, unmentioned here yet alluded to in

the Tribe of Ben epistle.[13]

Seen in the context of this critical time concerning negotiations, James's mental state, and perhaps even king-poet relations, Jonson's jocular description of the wine god's duties takes on serious and real meaning. The speaker's references to his ruler's gladness or sadness have public as well as private dimensions, for a monarch's well-being and dreams greatly affect the whole country. Having earlier wished that Bacchus would not be the father of poets' "Quarell" (31), the speaker now asks that James become the father of a nation's peace. And while the wine god earlier appears as curing "the Worlds diseases" (24), now it is the English ruler who "a health advances" (49). This toast for good health concerns ultimately that of the whole body politic and of a leading Christian nation. As the laureate, Jonson in "The Dedication" offers his own toast to king, to country, and--not surprisingly--to poetry.

Jonson's toast is a profoundly mirthful one: it involves on behalf of James not only Bacchus's prank on Apollo and a "merry meeting" (15), but Christ's trick against Death and Satan--His resurrection and salvation of damned souls--and the joyful communion of Christians. Having referred to James's own communion with the Knights of the Garter, the poet then imagines the welcome return of one such knight, Prince Charles. In this the laureate ends his toast, incorporating dance as a Renaissance symbol of art, order, harmony, and diversity. Where the speaker earlier

imagines the Graces as they "pursue . . . [Bacchus] in all places" (34), he now tells how the king who likes to watch dancing "put[s] his Court in dances, / And set[s] us all on skipping" (50-51). The court masques, usually produced by Jonson (and Jones), involve just such "skipping." The final image of the English prince and the Spanish Infanta--"And Charles brings home the Ladie" [54])--suggests two partners dancing across the ocean to England and accomplishing an international harmony. By admitting, however vaguely, that some good could result from a marital union he probably does not support, the laureate intent upon advising his ruler nonetheless accepts the king's sovereignty in state affairs.

Yet this piece concentrates more upon the prince's safe return than upon the intricacies of foreign policy, the discussion of which upsets rather than soothes the British monarch. In the dance to England that "The Dedication" envisions, Charles and his bride continue the song of "Cupid, and his Mother" (36) that Bacchus and his singers began; they also reassure an anxious, declining sovereign. Even as the author unites groom and bride, England and Spain, and father and son, he joins himself with the king in his prayer for Charles's return. Moreover, the close association of the prince and dancing should again remind James of Time Vindicated. Though the king has included Jones but not Jonson in the organized "skipping" planned for the Infanta, the laureate shows his sovereign that his heart skips with him nonetheless, and he gives in this joyous and

wise poem proof of his valuable service to James.

The author playfully addresses "The Dedication" to Bacchus, but in it he indirectly counsels and entertains his monarch. He supports the king's desire for peace (though not necessarily for the match), and he avoids general contention by referring only vaguely to the prince's betrothed and to his unpopular companion on his "Embassage" (Buckingham, the king's favorite). Having learned how even a staunch individual addresses the country's sovereign in a public poem at a time of crisis, a writer known for his satire here avoids Horace's baldly didactic speech and sharp criticism.

Having learned that kings, like other humans, are frail creatures, Jonson shows that a poet's discourse with his ruler does not always take the form of an epic reading. Familiar with his monarch's general tastes and specific fears, the laureate tailors his poem not only to honor the official occasion (the dedication of the cellar), but also to relax and advise a king scholarly and religious but far from ascetic: he fills the poem with classical and Christian references yet with joking, drinking, eating, and dancing (for example his various uses of wine, creation, and communion). Through his overt references to poetry, the author helps connect the aging James with his younger days and with energy and beauty (simultaneously reminding him of a laureate's importance). Associating Christ, Bacchus, James, and himself with good, creative language, Jonson

cheers and elevates his king. The harmony of the poem resembles that among Caesar and his poets in Poetaster, but it is broader: it admits more people, gives the impression of movement as opposed to enclosure (see line 37), and allows the ruler to be human as well as august. It is not surprising that the author of Gypsies Metamorphosed (1621) and of "Ben Johnsons Grace Before Kinge James" (1623) should prove again his ability to entertain his monarch (see Miles 214-15 and Herford and Simpson 11:162-63). Moreover, the Dionysian element of "The Dedication" gives the poem an energy and sense of organic wholeness that the Apollonian aspect of Poetaster does not convey.

More than Jonson's comic ability and court position render him fit to administer the seal of Bacchus's office: the author is a recognized leader of artists at festive gatherings that emulate the ideal described by "The Dedication," meetings that incorporate great diversity in their harmony. The poem adjacent to "The Dedication" in Under-wood alludes to these meetings and provides an important gloss to the work just discussed, giving a behind-the-scenes view of court politics.

"An Epistle answering to one that asked to be Sealed of the Tribe of BEN." is, as the title indicates, originally less public than the Bacchus poem. It is intended not to soothe the king with literature but, in part, to inform a fellow man of letters about serving the king and about the integrity and loyalty that this service requires. The

portrait the laureate paints here blends Ovid's irreverent banquet with a milder version of the situation Horace describes to Lupus, with the speaker standing as a firm though neglected figure of virtue. This epistle refers more openly to the rivalry between the court poet and Jones and to the strain between the laureate and his ruler.

Initially affirming his own integrity, the poem's speaker (the head of the Tribe of Ben) also describes men who should be avoided (if not banished). Hesitating to praise himself directly at great length, the poetic chief instead depicts those citizens from whom he differs: "those that merely talke, and never think, / That live in the wild Anarchie of Drinke, / Subject to quarrell only" (9-11). Though these citizens--unlike Ovid--do not go so far as to command their ruler (however jestingly), they do reveal themselves as anarchists, not monarchists, whatever their protestations and pretended interest in politics: their true king is quarrel, avoided by Bacchus's singers and by Jonson himself in "The Dedication."

Like Bacchus and the laureate, these men have studied, but instead of cultivating the "Arts of gladness," they have made "it their proficiencie, how much / They'[h]ave glutted in, and letcher'd out that weeke" (12-13). What humor they do exhibit is perverted and destructive rather than life-affirming and healthful. Some of them, for example, "will jeast / On all Soules that are absent; even the dead; / Like flies, or wormes, which mans corrupt parts fed" (16-18).

This association with "corrupt parts" rather than with a healthy, whole body politic contrasts strongly with the circular imagery and the soundness of "The Dedication"; it recalls instead the divided and deformed state Horace describes in his speech to Lupus. Rather than advancing others' reputations (as Horace and Gallus do Virgil's and Caesar's), these men hideously prey upon them. Using language to climb over others socially, the cut-throat contests of these citizens differ greatly from the light-hearted one between Bacchus and Apollo, just as the quarrelsome, disorderly drinkers vary from the wine god's harmonious imbibers (see 11, 16-20, 23-26).

Like Lupus, the epistle's gossips "censure all the Towne, and all th'affaires" (23), meddling with matters they are neither competent nor privileged to deal with, despite the king's command against such talk. The gossips' discussions lessen rather than increase James's peace of mind, simultaneously threatening England's equilibrium (see lines 31-47). Stating--perhaps coyly--his own lack of curiosity about these affairs (31-36), the tribe's leader posits instead the simple obedience of a loyal English subject. After mentioning several complexities of current affairs, he concludes merely, "I wish all well, and pray high heaven conspire / My Princes safetie, and my Kings desire" (37-38). As in Poetaster and "The Dedication," the laureate again takes the stance that the sovereign is the ultimate arbiter of state affairs. Rather than publicly

oppose James, the author instead trusts his king and entrusts the royal family to God.

In addition to offering his prayers and goodwill this poet, like Poetaster's Gallus, offers military service for his country. He states in the language of a soldier who follows orders,

> But if, for honour, we must draw the Sword,
> . . . . . .
> I have a body, yet, that spirit drawes
> To live, or fall a Carkasse in the cause.
>
> (39-42)

Such, undoubtedly, are not empty words from a man who has killed one soldier in single combat and an actor in a duel. Yet these lines reveal that the speaker's desire to fight comes not from vice (such as pride, drunkenness, or lack of self-control), but from virtue (honor) and from obedience to his king's raison d'etat.

The tribe's leader further emphasizes his submission to his ruler's decisions by implying that he need not know any details behind them, nor even be included among the general court circle. He states,

> . . . I'le be well,
> Though I doe neither heare these newes, nor tell
> Of Spaine or France; or were not prick'd downe one
> Of the late Mysterie of reception.
>
> (45-48)

Here the speaker places loyalty to his monarch above the

curiosity that motivates the poem's gossips. More importantly, however, he places that fidelity above even his (considerable) personal and professional pride: he remains steadfast even though he has been excluded from the reception planned for the Infanta, a court event entrusted solely to Jones. Though the king might seem to forget his laureate, that laureate must not forget his king.

In this epistle to a fellow subject, the author does not state that their ruler has erred (unlike Horace, who blasts Caesar for his mistaken concepts). He does, however, criticize the artist James has chosen (therefore implicitly criticizing the king himself). Rather than choosing a poet who can evoke Bacchus, James currently favors Jones, whom Jonson describes as "guid[ing] the Motions, and direct[ing] the beares" (50). As coordinator of such activities, Jones recalls Ovid; having associated with him, the sovereign has erred in taste if not in graver matters as well: in this aspect James rather than Jonson stands, like Tibullus and Gallus, in need of forgiveness. It is a forgiveness that the laureate would gladly grant. His love for the king promises a general reconciliation between the two men if the ruler is anything like Jonson's picture of him in "The Dedication." In fact, the poet and his king are soon cooperating again (see Miles 227-28). That the laureate can keep his integrity and ultimately remain a part of the royal circle speaks well for the individualism allowed in James's court.

Yet just as the Roman satirist can picture a kingdom where he is punished by a tyrant and his evil subjects, his English counterpart can imagine a country where he is excluded from the court. He states, "in time I may / Lose all my credit with my Christmas Clay, / And animated Porc'lane of the Court" (51-53). While Jonson's latest "Christmas Clay" (Time Vindicated) was recently performed, his next Twelfthnight masque will not be acted until 1625. Yet unlike Ovid, who cannot imagine life without court, the speaker has the self-sufficiency to declare,

> Live to that point I will, for which I am man,
> And dwell as in my Center, as I can
> Still looking to, and ever loving heaven;
> With reverence using all the gifts then[ce]
> given.
>
> (59-62)

Only because the laureate has his own center can he be of any use to the center of the court, James himself. The author does continue using his poetic gifts and rendering them to his ruler who, whatever his shortcomings, is far from the tyrannical governor Horace envisions. Because the laureate has his own circle (his tribe), he can demonstrate his ability to work with and even lead other artists, thus defending himself against any charge of being a lone troublemaker or a misfit. Perhaps it is the king as well as the addressee Jonson speaks to when he writes, "So short you read my Character, and theirs / I would call mine, to which

not many Staires / Are asked to climbe" (73-75). An author who once placed Virgil above Caesar--albeit with Caesar's permission--the laureate perhaps reminds James that if he again seeks his poet and the gatherings he can conjure, the way will not be long.[14]

Though this work reveals that the laureate's individualist patriotism sometimes costs him, it also shows his loyalty to the king as well as the importance the poet assigned their relationship. Other Under-wood poems reveal Jonson's high opinion of the relationship between a monarch and his artists. "The humble Petition of poore Ben," for example, suggests that King Charles's harmony with the laureate could bring the ruler closer to his predecessor, his father James. "An Epigram, To the House-hold" commends Charles's generosity and celebrates the reconciliation between monarch and artist; it also stresses the writer's relative importance. Moreover, the epigram shows that though the poet has great power, he does not use it disloyally: he refrains from scourging the stingy household officials only because he respects his king's wishes (see lines 5-6).

Though Jonson's work shows him at various states of fortune and experience, throughout it implies the importance of the poet-prince relationship. Poetaster with its classical setting and elevated ruler provides a blueprint for the network between monarch and poet; in it Jonson speaks partly through Horace, partly through Virgil, and

partly through Caesar himself to counsel Elizabeth indirectly. More familiar with both the monarch and his own powers, the author of "The Dedication," the Tribe of Ben epistle, and other Under-wood poems shows the true scope of a day-to-day working relationship between king and artist. In these later works Jonson allows his ruler to be more human, and he accepts the precarious position of any poet in a fickle, competitive world where even the sovereign sometimes feels out of control.

Though sometimes out of favor with the court, Jonson is nonetheless one of the king's chief courtiers in that he continues to counsel and entertain his monarch. He has alluded to other courtiers, both good and bad, in the works already discussed: the Knights of the Garter and the gossips, for example. Such persons are many and varied, and their coordination requires particular effort. In other works Jonson concentrates more specifically upon courtiers, persons who (like the poet himself) should advise the king and set an example of loving harmony for the rest of the country.

NOTES

[1] I take much of my account of Jonson's life from Miles and Parfitt. For a discussion of Jonson's feud with other dramatists see Miles 49-68.

[2] On Jonson's trouble with the government over the Isle of Dogs (1597) see Miles 31-33. On criticism of Poetaster see particularly Helgerson, Self-Crowned 41-42, 143 and Parfitt, Ben 48-49, 50-54, 117-19, 136-39. Noting that many critics concentrate on Demetrius and Crispinus, Parfitt explores the importance of Ovid, Gallus, and Tibullus, their "misuse of talent," and the fact that Caesar banishes Ovid while drawing the other two poets close to himself. I disagree, however, with his conclusion that "the distinction which Caesar makes between Ovid's offence and that of Gallus and Tibullus . . . is inadequately dramatized by any standards" (Ben 51). I also disagree that the Horace of Acts 4 and 5 is "hard to reconcile" with the satirist of the earlier acts (159)--Horace's comic and serious qualities lend just the diversity that Jonson values.

[3] On Jonson and names see Elsky.

[4] Steven G. Ellis describes one English plan of 1569: "The idea was to confiscate Gaelic land . . . expel 'the wild and rebel enemy' and introduce English colonists" (256); Brian FitzGerald talks about England's plantation

project, which Cecil considered for a bit: English colonizers would kill or banish Irish leaders; they "hoped to compel [the poor] into 'obedience and civility'. . . but if they proved incorrigible, then 'they would through idleness offend to die'"; as FitzGerald puts it, the English proposed "[t]o extinguish an entire people" (258); and in Book 5 of The Faerie Queene, Spenser tries to justify Lord Grey's cruel policy in Ireland: there he describes Irish "rebels" as extremely evil (5.9.10-11); and A. C. Hamilton glosses Talus's wide-scale slaughter of the Irish, saying, "The biblical reference [5.12.7.8-9] may support the historical one: as the seed, which is sown, is not quickened unless it dies . . . the Irish must be slain so that Ireland may be renewed."

[5] On the classical theory of rule see, for example, Plato's Republic Book 6; Aristotle's Politics Book 1, Chapter 13, and Book 3, Chapter 13; and Sharpe 279-80.

[6] See note 1.

[7] On the date of "The Dedication" and the Tribe of Ben epistle see Herford and Simpson 11:48, 85-87; Miles 221. For critical discussions of these poems see Donaldson 697-98; Peterson 113-57; van den Berg 160-81; and Goldberg, James 222. For their historical and biographical contexts see Carlton 39 and Cook 121.

Unlike Herford and Simpson and Miles (221), Orgel argues that a rift between Jonson and James is unlikely and that at worst perhaps the prince and Buckingham have shunned

the poet; Orgel does not, however, explain why the epistle's speaker expresses a definite fear of losing his work with the Christmas masques, commissioned by the court (Jonsonian 78). On other pieces treating the poet's official status see also "To Master John Burges" and "An Epigram. To K. CHARLES for a 100 pounds he sent me in my sicknesse."

[8] On James's apprehension see Carlton 44.

[9] For descriptions of the gatherings at the Apollo Room see Miles 207-10 and Peterson 114ff. Although I agree with Marotti's comment that Jonson has "both a Dionysian and an Apollonian side," I disagree that this makes him "an artistic schizophrenic" (209).

[10] On James's ill health see Miles 218-19.

[11] Goldberg writes, "The poem emblematizes the double life of the court: the Banqueting House above, the wine cellar below. One realm extends into the other" (22).

[12] Herford and Simpson explain that "St. Georges Union" refers to "the gathering of the Knights of the Garter on St George's Day" (11:87).

[13] For this theory see Miles, who states that the poem refers "politely if rather tepidly" to the Infanta's return; she adds that Jonson "found the proposed match abhorrent. Perhaps this accounts for an otherwise inexplicable cooling of court favour towards him that summer" (221).

[14] On the literal interpretation of these lines see Peterson 156-57. When the king is involved, of course, the literate meetings will be held on his territory (the

Banqueting Hall at Whitehall) rather than in the Apollo Room.

CHAPTER III

COURT HARMONY

Though Jonson might not consider other courtiers as important or as rare as good poets, he realizes that they are vital to a monarchy. Advising and entertaining the ruler, the court's members also set an example for all England, as well as performing important administrative and diplomatic duties. A good court has therefore many ways in which it can effect harmony while using the talents of strong individuals. Yet courts, like poets, are seldom what they might be, as Jonson himself witnesses throughout his life.

While strong, good courtiers do exist in the reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles, so do unfit ones, and the monarchs themselves are not free from flaws in courtly relations. William and Robert Cecil serve Elizabeth well, but her favorite Essex leads a rebellion against her, for which he is executed in 1601. In James's reign the knight Everard Digby participates in the Gunpowder Plot (1605), for which he too dies a traitor's death. The imprisonment and execution of the brilliant Walter Raleigh also shakes the court, though according to popular opinion--and to Prince Henry--Raleigh's fall speaks worse of King James than it

does of the courtier. While even Elizabeth dotes upon men more handsome than worthy, James adds to his affection a prodigality toward his favorites that threatens the court's stability. His proud, vicious, and incompetent "creatures" pervert the courtly ideal much as Ovid's banquet parodies the proper poet-king relationship. Dominating the court for several years, Robert Carr is displaced by George Villiers (Buckingham) shortly before Jonson's laureateship (1616). Until his assassination in 1628, Buckingham dominates first the Jacobean, then the Caroline court. Yet even Buckingham's death does not automatically bring harmony, for in the absence of his control several factions come to the fore, factions centering on the queen, on Richard Weston, and on William Laud.[1]

The servants mentioned above are not mere names to Jonson. Before his laureateship, he counts among his patrons Robert Cecil, and among his ex-friends the close companion of Robert Carr (Thomas Overbury, who is conveniently killed after blocking Carr's romantic plans). He also interacts with the literary Raleigh and tutors his son. After he becomes court poet, Jonson writes a rather ambiguous masque for Buckingham, whom he doubtless despises, but later enjoys the favor of Richard Weston and of Everard Digby's son Kenelm.[2]

The poet's strong taste of courtly life assures him that courtly as well as poet-prince relations need his moral yet tolerant counsel. The negative and positive examples he

witnesses spur him not only to direct rulers to respect their courts, but to advise courtiers to respect their ruler, to act virtuously and competently, and to work well with others (much as Horace, Virgil, and Jonson himself do). Often using masques as early vehicles of his message, he later relies more upon poems on individual courtiers (particularly when the royal family neglects to commission him for court entertainments). Jonson's early attitude toward courtly harmony can be clearly traced in his masque Love Restored, presented when the king's finances are in woeful shape and when the Treasurer, Robert Cecil, has been thwarted in his attempts to improve them (1612). Advising a symbiotic relationship between court and crown, the poet uses personification to present model courtiers and ideal cooperation among them. Through the character Plutus he offers a glimpse of the court at its worst (recalling his use of Horace's dystopia in Poetaster). Years later, in Under-wood, Jonson takes much the same stance toward the court, but he uses specific royal servants rather than allegorical figures, and he responds to different immediate issues, giving counsel more informed and specific, yet at the same time more comprehensive. Addressing a splintered court, the "Epithalamion" for Jerome Weston's wedding depicts a close relationship between the monarchs and their unpopular Treasurer, Richard Weston. Praising Weston's virtue and competence as a royal servant, the laureate commends this man's work with his own son (Jerome) and his

cooperation with his rival (Laud). He extends this vision of loving cooperation to embrace the many courtiers attending the wedding (much as "The Dedication" includes many poets). Like other poems in Under-wood, however, "The Epithalamion" makes clear that evil courtiers are no more welcome than are poetasters and evil speakers. Examining a good courtier with whom Richard cooperates (Kenelm Digby), the laureate in another poem advises that while the court has no room for a traitor, it has plenty of room for his competent and patriotic son (in "An Epigram to my MUSE"). Having seen the vicissitudes of political life, this speaker (like the speaker of the Tribe of Ben Epistle) knows that some souls can remain stable regardless of outside circumstances. Jonson has seen some of these vicissitudes by early 1612, as Love Restored reveals; they inform an even larger part of his later poetry.

When Love Restored is performed (January 1612), English finances are in great trouble and have been for some time.[3] In 1610, a critical year for government finance, the royal family is still spending lavishly on courtly entertainments, much to the Treasurer's frustration (Cecil 296). By 1611, James has still not learned to live on his own income, though he is expected to do so in peacetime (Aylmer 52); and his attempt to gain more money from Parliament has failed--whereupon he gives extravagant gifts to some favorites (Cecil 309). At the same time, the health of his able Treasurer has failed as well, and Cecil dies the year of the

masque's performance. It is in such an atmosphere that Jonson writes Love Restored, working with a budget one tenth the size of some earlier entertainments (Miles 146). In this piece Masquerado apologizes to the crowd for the entertainment to come, when he is interrupted by Plutus, the god of money, disguised as Cupid, the god of love. When Plutus rants against the luxury of court entertainments and against the mockery made of love, he is discovered by Robin Goodfellow, a country spirit who has sneaked in to see the masque. Robin reveals Plutus's own obsession with money and his imprisonment of Cupid, whom King James rescues. As Plutus is banished from the court, he is replaced by the true Cupid and his masquers, who render homage to the king and ask the ladies to dance.

In this masque, the author provides a model for courtly relationships much as Poetaster does for the poet-prince relationship. Correspondent to the play's harmonious circle of Caesar, Virgil, and the other select citizens is a group including the king, Cupid, both male and female courtiers, and even "the poet," who offers a "pretty fine speech" (9-10). Like the play, the masque achieves distance from the English political setting by using classical figures: Cupid posits a loving relationship as the court's proper goal. Nonetheless, the masque also alludes to contemporary England through references to native customs, to the English monarch (James), and to current English politics (including the Puritan attack upon the court and the court's obsession with

money). Responding to a specific situation as well as giving general advice, Jonson through Cupid supports the symbiotic relationship of ruler and court, the necessity of virtuous and able courtiers, and the importance of positive, dynamic interaction among all courtly members. While the masque like Poetaster supports diversity, it similarly warns against elements that cannot be allowed (Plutus like Ovid is banished). In so doing Jonson implies that neither the parsimony of Puritans nor the greediness of courtiers is acceptable.[4]

As he recommends the symbiotic relationship of king and courtiers, Jonson connects this relationship in some ways with eros and courtly love, partly via the figure of Cupid (Eros) or Love-in-Court. Whereas courtly love typically involves an elevated lady and a male inferior, Love-in-Court includes a relationship between the sovereign and his or her royal servants. Ideally, the ruler and courtiers work together to keep their love alive, as the masque implies: there James--as Jonson presents him--revives Cupid, while the courtiers guard and follow the god. The monarch's resuscitation of Love-in-Court is important, for through that deed the author praises both the king's power and his priorities, at a time when both are doubted and the court seems in danger. Speaking through a country spirit (Goodfellow), the poet reassures the audience that "the virtue of this majesty, who projecteth so powerful beams of light and heat . . . [can] thaw his [Cupid's] icy fetters

and scatter the darkness that obscures him" (181-84). Heat and light represent the king's virtuous passion and enlightenment, as suggested by the "love [that] . . . is himself a fire" and by the restoration of Cupid's vision (196; 207-08).

Though the masque's small budget reinforces the king's actual interest and intelligence concerning the financial crisis, the poet, like the Treasurer, might wish the doting and short-sighted James to be more like the James of the masque. As Treasurer Cecil can attest (Cecil 289-312), Cupid's imprisonment by the god of wealth (Plutus) is not mere melodrama, considering the monarch's heavy debts and the confusion about resolving them.

Portraying the ideal (rather than the real), the masque states that the sovereign's "beauties"

> . . . revive
> Love's youth and keep his heat alive:
> As often as his torch here dies,
> He needs but light it at fresh eyes.
> (200-03)

While these "beauties" refer directly to the qualities of the sun-king James, they also involve the courtiers with whom he surrounds himself in what should be a loving relationship. Associating these courtiers with "flamed intents," the author argues that they too have power to protect love in the court. Further connecting the courtiers' power to the monarch's, the poet first describes

the masquers as "guard[ing]" Cupid (stage direction just before line 195); he then describes James's warmth as it "warms [Cupid], / And guards him naked in these places, / As in his birth, or 'mongst the Graces" (209-11). While the king can effect the god's rebirth, the masquers offer protection in their roles of the courtly "graces" (254; 249-53).

In this time of financial concern, the masque then argues that aid to love in the court is not mere charity but a good investment. Recognizing that he "owe[s]" his life to James (236), Cupid states, " . . . I will pay it in the strife / Of duty back . . ." (237-38), "duty" suggesting not only monetary payment, but the general sense of "obligation," which Cupid will repay in love and service. As Caesar's worship of Phoebus is rewarded by the poets Apollo sends, James's rescue of Love-in-Court is repaid via the courtiers Cupid brings. These "spirits of court" (239), like traditional courtly lovers, follow the god of love and the person to whom he binds them, in this case a generous sovereign rather than some cruel mistress. It is a knowing and not a blind Cupid who links the courtiers to the king, however, for they get their being from the ruler and owe him much (both financially and otherwise). In rendering unto this Caesar what is his, servants should repay their sovereign in love, in action, and (when possible) in money, spending freely as he has done. The author himself offers such repayment at the first of the masque when, speaking

though Masquerado, he alludes to the poet's speech and adds, "if he never be paid for [it] now, it's no matter; his wit costs him nothing" (9-11). If other courtiers similarly donate their services, they can do much to protect the court, themselves, and their sovereign.

Yet in order to please their sovereign and to guard a loving relationship, royal servants (like poets) must retain certain qualities. They must possess the "graces" Cupid mentions, those allegorically portrayed by the masquers (see lines 249-53).[5] While these qualities have a wide range of possible meanings--both worldly and ethical--some are more consistent with Jonson's work than are others, and some more in keeping with the framework of love-in-the-court. Like the king's rescue of Cupid, these traits involve the courtiers' virtue and competence.

Such virtues include "honor," "true valor," and "reality," traits important to any good court and particularly useful in this time of need. Reminding the courtiers through Goodfellow that the god of money only "pretends to . . . dispose of honors" (168-69), the poet tells the royal servants that honor does not inhere in financial rewards (particularly when the court cannot afford them). He asks the courtiers to reconsider "honor" in its proper context, where it connotes remaining true to the court while preserving one's own integrity. Jonson's qualification of bravery as "true valor" similarly reminds courtiers to consider the moderation and morality real

fortitude entails, whether these be exercised on the battlefield or at the domestic court (see Aristotle, Ethics 362; Castiglione 123-24). Such valor involves not only standing against the court's enemies (such as Plutus's followers) but in giving the ruler good but unpleasant counsel (as Horace does in Poetaster). True valor includes even doing things that, while difficult, bring the actor little attention or glory: the proud Jonson does this when he struggles with a tenth of his usual budget to present a good masque to an audience used to extravagance.[6] Royal servants (and their sovereign) might employ such bravery to live more modestly, at least temporarily forgoing the "taken-up braveries" of expensive wardrobes and the like (line 151).

Such honor and valor will be short-lived unless they include "reality," which connotes "sincere or loyal devotion" (Herford and Simpson 10.268). They will further be misdirected without the type of "reality" enabling distinction between the true love-in-court and the false one, which threatens even now to "deceive" the royal circle (217). In the current economic situation, this quality finds its expression in sensible attempts at frugality rather than favorites' desire for immediate gratification (and even James's unrealistic prodigality). This virtue's presence in Love Restored reminds spectators that--like the "morning dreams" of the work's last line--the poet's fantasy is nonetheless "true" and should be heeded (285).

Virtue alone cannot completely guard the courtly relationship, however. Like the model poet, the model courtier needs competence also. Those who entertain and instruct the ruler should possess both a general sophistication ("urbanity") and a particular talent ("hability"), excelling in their duties (as the generally literate Horace and Virgil excel as satirist and epic poet, respectively) [see Herford and Simpson 10n.268]. Without such broad understanding and in-depth specialization, the court will not be able to solve its problems, including the current financial one. Both the recent (unsuccessful) negotiations between James and the Commons and Treasurer Cecil's late illness underline Jonson's point. Yet even urbanity and ability are useless without effort, as the poet indicates when he includes "industry" among qualities guarding the court (reminding the courtiers not to be the idle revellers that Plutus describes in lines 144ff).

As Jonson knows from personal association with the court, courtiers with the qualities he has just recommended are also persons of strong opinions and beliefs. In their interaction, they will bring the same type of diversity that occurs in Caesar's circle, a diversity the poet stresses by the statement that courtly repayment involves "the strife of duty." Thus not dull, mechanical obedience but struggle, "strong effort," and even controversial, thought-filled action characterize the servants' payment to their lord (see "strife," OED). In this aspect, the courtiers recall the

"holsome sharpnesse" (Poetaster 5.1.94) Horace gives his ruler. Besides bringing vital diversity, however, the servants must also bring cooperation to their protection of the court, working "Till all become one harmony" (248). Only Love can provide courtiers with a form both stable and diverse, helping court members treat each other as do the poets in Caesar's circle (rather than as do the guests at Ovid's banquet, which James's revels too often resemble). Showing how not only courtly qualities but the masquers themselves interact, Cupid states,

> Nor will they rudely strive for place,
> One to precede the other, but
> As music them in form shall put
> So will they keep their measures true,
> And make still their proportions new.
>
> (243-47)

Good courtiers compete against themselves, not one another, and they "strive" to repay the monarch, not to gain payment for themselves; in this they follow their leader who repays James "in the strife / Of duty back" (237-38). They learn to take their proper places in the larger whole, as "proportions" and "measures" indicate, avoiding the self-aggrandizement that threatens the courtly fabric as Ovid's threatens his state.

Such courtiers are not swallowed up by the system, however, but remain faithful to themselves: they "keep their [own] measures true." Only in this way can they serve

their sovereign as Horace and Jonson do. They neither violate their beliefs (even for the king) nor lose their individuality (even when they combine with others); and what they do they do of their own volition, as the repetition of the word "will" in lines 243 and 246 indicates. By showing how Cupid in his music helps masquers gracefully interact, Jonson in his song hopes to similarly direct the courtiers in the audience.

Love Restored stages such an expansion into the audience when the masquers take their female partners (lines 265-76). The women's presence not only indicates a polititical reality--the importance of female courtiers--but facilitates Jonson's allusion to courtly love and the hermaphrodite as he argues the court's inclusion of the ultimate in diverse harmony.[7] While the poet's use of James as courtly mistress suggests these metaphors, not until the ladies dance do the full meanings of the metaphors become apparent. Then masculine and feminine as well as men and women merge after some hesitation in a loving concordia discors of all worthy court members.

Describing the male masquers' overtures to the ladies, the poet writes,

> Have men beheld the Graces dance,
> Or seen the upper orbs to move?
> So did these [the masquers] turn, return, advance,
> Drawn back by doubt, put on by love.
>
> (265-68; emphasis mine)

Having throughout used Eros in conjunction with political love, the author describes what is in more ways than one a courtship ritual. These lines, particularly the verbs, suggest the energy that Jonson finds so important to a virtuous harmony. This energy (as with most human relations) does not progress straightforwardly hampered as it is by doubt and difference (see lines 267-68). Nonetheless, it finds an ultimate order, as the mention of "dance" and the planets indicates, and the poet prophesies the same for courtly relations. Again comparing male courtiers to the (female) Graces, the masque prepares for the hermaphroditic metaphor that symbolizes diverse union. Following the paradigm of courtly love as he describes the political love at court, the poet writes

> And now, like earth, themselves [the men] they fix,
> Till greater powers [the women] vouchsafe to mix
> Their motions with them. Do not fear,
> You brighter planets of this sphere.
> (269-72)

In describing the ladies as "brighter planets" and "greater powers," the poet aligns James with them rather than with men. Upholding James's dominance while associating him with the female creates a great sense of diversity and completeness, of blending that which seems mutually exclusive. The author continues the hermaphroditic metaphor when describing each masquer's "male heart" and "his female

[rather than "his female's"] eyes" (273-74), stressing the interdependence, even the interpenetraton of male and female and thus (by extension) of courtiers and their sovereign. In his portrayal of a monarch and his courtiers as lovers, Jonson recalls a remark made by one of James's chief servants (Cecil) who, as Evans relates, "compares the counsels kept between a sovereign and secretary to 'the mutual affections of two lovers,' with all the potential for tension that phrasing implies" ("Frozen Maneuvers" 122).

Yet not all persons are allowed even in a court of love (just as not all poets are allowed in Caesar's circle). While some subjects are merely not qualified to be royal servants (see 49, 53-55), other forces are dangerous to the court's very existence. As the masque argues, however much persons obsessed with money pretend to love the court, they harm rather than protect it (as the god of wealth immobilizes Love-in-Court). In his banishment of Plutus, the author most obviously condemns Puritans who attack the royal circle (lines 31-33, 137-54). Though exaggerated and directed by ill will, however, Plutus's ranting against courtly extravagance has some truth, as the discover of the god's identity indicates. If Plutus now "reigns i' the world," as Goodfellow states (164), it is partly because he controls those with high court places. Through this country spirit, the urbane Jonson subtly implies that while the prodigal James may not have wittingly encouraged others to follow money--he being irresponsible rather than over

concerned with cash--his lavish gifts to favorites have drawn close to him the wrong sort of servants. Rather than overtly naming greedy favorites such as Robert Carr, the masque-maker uses an evil figure as well as a Goodfellow to "speak truth under a vizard" (4-5).

In Love Restored, as in Poetaster, the optimistic poet depicts the eventual triumph of political virtue, banishing in the masque "tyran money" and restoring Love-in-Court. The author assures the audience through the title character, "The majesty that here doth move / Shall triumph, more secured by love / Than all his [Plutus's] earth" (232-34). Such is the true "security" of a court the poet reminds the less-than-prosperous monarch. Yet as courtly love involves a male suitor as well as a mistress, the political love that "secures" James depends upon royal servants as well as upon the monarch. The king would do well to ensure that love rather than lucre forms the basis of his relationships with his courtiers, remembering that "tyran money quencheth all desire" (198).

Arguing that court members themselves (not pounds) are a masque's and a court's most valuable assets, Jonson speaks sincerely when he states that love, rather than money, will supply the court's sport (see lines 254-55). Thus though disliking the too-solemn Puritans, he nonetheless agrees that a reduction in masque spending is no bad thing. Further, he nowhere excuses James's extravagant gifts to courtiers greedy enough to prompt them. Donating a large

part of his services to envision the court's triumph, the author encourages other court members to apply their talents toward realizing this "dream" (285). Though even the court of true love never does run (completely) smooth, Jonson argues that it can eventually finds its way, enriched by the journey it has survived.

Jonson continues to address courtly harmony in poems published after he becomes laureate, even though after his stroke in 1628 he cannot attend court and he seldom writes court masques. Poems written after this date are interesting for the additional reason that they address a splintered court, the result of Buckingham's death that same year. More than his earlier work, these later poems examine specific instances of courtly harmony, blending a sense of comprehensiveness with specificity. Of these poems--often written to or about Jonson's courtier-patrons--two in particular demonstrate the laureate's desire for diverse harmony: the "Epithalamion" and "An Epigram to My MUSE." Bringing to life what the masque describes only allegorically, the "Epithalamion" allows for healthy differences among courtiers but demands an ultimate willingness to cooperate. Those who are not good royal servants have, like Plutus, no place at the court. Examining another instance of courtly cooperation, "An Epigram to my MUSE" praises a man who remains exemplary despite adverse circumstances, showing the strength that even the (patriotic) son of a traitor can bring the court.

In the "Epithalamion [1632]," Jonson chooses a fitting occasion to recommend courtly harmony and diversity: the wedding of the Treasurer's son to a close relative of the ruler, a match arranged by the King Charles himself and attended by many courtiers (see Herford and Simpson 11:97). In this way the laureate draws upon an event that actively involves many royal servants, and he relies primarily upon English detail rather than upon classical or allegorical figures. Though much of the poem describes the guests' procession to the wedding and the wedding party's progress to the altar, the work itself proceeds to a depiction of Treasurer Richard Weston's union with the monarchs.[8] Praising the unpopular Weston's worth, virtue, and competence, the laureate supports the courtier's work with his son and his cooperation with his rival (Laud, himself unpopular). While Love Restored broadens courtly harmony by involving dancers from the audience, the "Epithalamion" extends its vision of loving cooperation even further, embracing the wedding's many courtier-guests. Just as Plutus has no place at the masque or in the royal circle, royal servants who do not desire harmony should be absent from the wedding and from the court.

The laureate clearly depicts the closeness of Weston and the monarchs when he places them together at the poem's structural center.[9] Just as the bridesmaids precede the bride on her journey to the altar, however, Jonson himself leads his readers up to the marriage between sovereign and

servant (49-66). In the first stanza he mentions the king's "bountie," which foreshadows the poet's later mention of "bounties" involving Richard (8, 90-96). Several lines then describe the guests' "Procession" to Roehampton, the Treasurer's estate (9-12). Only after several lines connecting the monarchs with the bridal pair--through flower and crown imagery--and urging the worth of those young courtiers does Jonson bring in the unpopular Richard, with almost a poetic sleight of hand (see lines 51-60). Having not yet mentioned the elder Weston in the poem's text, the laureate writes

> It is their [monarchs'] Grace, and favour, that
> makes seene,
> And wonder'd at, the bounties of this day:
> All is a story of the King and Queene!
> And what of Dignitie, and Honour may
> Be duly done to those
> Whom they have chose,
> And set the marke upon,
> To give a greater Name, and Title to! Their owne!
> (89-96)

The first of this passage most obviously refers to the young couple just discussed, but line 95 identifies Charles's favored courtier, Richard Weston (Jerome's father). In this context, the reference to name-giving not only suggests what a groom gives his bride, but recalls the union between Caesar and his favorite poet, reinforcing that between

Charles and his courtier. Both the king's arrangement of Jerome's match and his appearance in the wedding demonstrate his approval of Richard (Alexander 170). As if countering royal servants who might note the bride's social superiority to her groom, Jonson argues Charles's generosity concerning the match is not prodigal (as is James's to his creatures), but justified, as the phrase "duly done" indicates (93). In this passage the poet suggests that Charles's choice should suffice not only for his subjects, but for his wife as well. While the queen in reality dislikes this Treasurer who asks her to spend less on clothes, Jonson's reference to "they" implies the queen's as well as the king's fondness for Richard (see lines 94 and 96; see S.R. Gardiner 7:107).

More explicitly praising the "chose[n]" courtier in the following lines, the poet immediately reinforces Love Restored's description of courtiers as monarchs' assets: he describes Richard as "Weston, their Treasure, as their Treasurer" (97). Having earlier used a financial metaphor during an economic crisis, the laureate uses it aptly again when describing a man who combines fiscal knowledge with courtly worth. Continuing with a description of Richard's inner wealth, the poem shows that the Treasurer, unlike Plutus, shares his riches with the court. He is

> . . . [a] Mine of Wisdome, and of Counsells deep,
> Great Say-Master of State, who cannot erre,
> But doth his Carract, and just Standard keepe

In all the prov'd assayes,
And legall wayes
Of Tryals, to worke downe
Mens Loves unto the Lawes, and Lawes to love the Crowne.
(98-104)

Rather than keeping his "Counsells deep" to himself, Weston as the "Say-Master" offers them to the court. Besides setting "just [financial] Standard[s]," the Treasurer himself provides a good example ("standard") for other royal servants, led by love to repay his rulers and to protect the court. Defending the virtue and competence of this disliked officer, Jonson argues the man's courtly graces. Concerning someone seen as a rich man who stretches the law to prevent royal bankruptcy, Jonson defends Richard's honor by stating that he employs only legal ways to raise money and that he keeps his "Carract" and "just Standard" (see S.R. Gardiner 7: 166-67, Aylmer 80-81; see lines 100, 102). Though Weston does not show his bravery in any grand way, he proves it by undergoing "Tryals" that include assassination threats.[10] His "reality," like Treasurer Cecil's, involves both his fiscal pragmatism (as the disgruntled queen can attest) and the motive behind it, his loyal protection of the king and his resources. The literal level of this passage's financial language argues Richard's "hability" as Treasurer, just as the "assay-Say" pun praises both his fiscal dexterity and his wisdom as counselor (see lines 99, 101).

Strongly supporting this man against opinion at court, the laureate states simply that he "cannot erre." Further, Jonson supports the industry of this man often seen as indecisive when he writes that Weston uses "all the prov'd assayes" as he "worke[s]." While this passage may be more defensive than accurate, it attempts to restore some equilibrium concerning a courtier perhaps more distrusted than understood.

Richard has undoubtedly exercised industry in a very important area, his son's upbringing. Like a treasurer before him, the elder Cecil, Weston knows the importance of continuity to the court's protection. He therefore has taken care to "bring / Him [Jerome] up, to doe the same himselfe had done," thus forming another model servant for the court (107-08). The king commends this courtly training, and the poet commends his wisdom in recognizing it: "this [training] well mov'd the Judgement of the King / To pay, with honours, to his noble Sonne, / To day, the Fathers service . . . (105-07). Here recurs a courtly reciprocity that recalls Love Restored and the relationship involving the king, Love-in-Court, and the masquers. Charles's generous repayment of the match, like James's generous gift to Cupid, could prove a good investment: Jerome's union with Frances could eventually produce many a "watchfull Servant for this State" (178), grandchildren who learn from Richard's example (see lines 169-84).

Besides encouraging the Weston family to follow their

head, the poet argues that others too would do well to imitate Richard. Praising the Treasurer in a setting of many courtiers, the laureate indicates the "Emulation" this leading man inspires (see lines 113-17). Considering the general dislike surrounding Richard, Jonson here again advises more than describes. Those courtiers who have accepted this man's hospitality, who celebrate on Richard's property the wedding of his son, should bring with them the love and respect that such an acceptance ideally symbolizes.

After this high point of praise for Richard (marked by the words "Stand," "rais'd," and "rise"), the laureate then concentrates upon Richard's rival (Laud), supporting the Treasurer's attempt to reconcile with him. One symbol of this attempted reconciliation is the wedding's setting, a church recently built by Richard. Mentioning the "Chappell . . . where the King / And Bishop stay, to consummate the Rites" (121-22), Jonson shows that though the Treasurer owns this building, he allows Bishop Laud to preside over it at an occasion very important to his family. The poet then recalls another instance of Weston's attempt to cooperate with Laud, writing, "O . . . happy place, / Which to this use, wert built and consecrate!" (129-30) Just last month Richard has had Laud dedicate the chapel, in what Alexander characterizes as one of his "occasional friendly, albeit unsuccessful, gestures" to the bishop (169). Though Richard and Laud differ on many points, the former here avoids the temptation to "rudely strive for place," knowing, like Love

Restored's masquers, the importance of ultimate harmony. Following and reinforcing his patron's conciliatory gesture, the laureate supports the bishop as a courtier whom the king--as well as Richard--"has chose"; referring to Laud in relation to God and to Charles, Jonson calls the courtier "this their chosen Bishop" (131-32). Having earlier implied Henrietta Maria's approval of Weston, this poem brings together all court members to witness the cooperation of the three main factions (the queen's, Weston's, and Laud's) in the presence of King Charles and of God.

While Love Restored expands into the courtly audience by including women as the masquers' partners, this wedding poem reaches out by involving the guests and their own experiences with marriage. At one point focusing upon the union of the wedding couple themselves, the speaker proclaims, "See, at another doore, / On the same floore, / The Bridegroome meets the Bride" (69-71). To indicate the participation of other courtiers, however, the poet writes that Jerome meets Frances "With all the pompe of Youth, and all our Court beside. / Our Court, and all the Grandees" (72-73). The repetition of "all" and of the first person plural indicates the comprehensiveness and harmony that should surround this courtly wedding.

In a passage more intimate than the masque's dance of men and women, the epithalamion shows love at court most generative, unified, yet diverse. Addressing the guests about the newlyweds the poet states

They both are slip'd to Bed; Shut fast the Doore,
And let him freely gather Loves First-fruits,
Hee's Master of the Office; yet no more
Exacts then she is pleas'd to pay: no suits,
Strifes, murmures, or delay,
Will last till day;
Night, and the sheetes will show
The longing Couple, all that elder Lovers know.
(185-92)

Many of the guests being "elder Lovers" (192), they realize the compromise inherent in marriage, "That holy strife, / And the allowed warre" (30-31). They know that a marriage's survival depends upon a contained struggle and a harmonious diversity. The English court is no different. Through connections he has made between this marriage and a political one, through the financial language concerning this Treasurer's son, and through phrases such as "Master of the Office," the poet encourages the guests--elder courtiers as well as elder lovers--to apply the above passage to courtly relations. Like the interaction that occurs in a couple's bedroom, much court business transpires behind doors "Shut fast." There individualistic courtiers--such as Weston and Laud--pursue what Love-in-Court calls "the strife of duty." While difference is inevitable, courtiers must keep their strife "holy," eventually reaching a decision (particularly if the court is to survive during this time of factions and of estrangement from the people). The court

must find its way to avoid the present infighting between the queen's, Laud's, and Weston's groups without involving the domination Buckingham exercised several years ago. Like spouses, court members can conquer inevitable delay and resistance by love, common goals, and the desire to perpetuate themselves. They must remember that the bedfellows produced by politics are often no stranger than those caused by contemporary marriage arrangements. In what could easily seem a dark night for his court, Jonson praises the ray of hope inhering in the gathering of so many different court members to witness the wedding of male and female, of king's and queen's court, of rulers and courtiers, and even of the rivals Weston and Laud. At such a time perhaps new solutions--like new children--may be brought "to light" (144).

Like Love Restored, however, the "Epithalamion" shows that not all elements can be included in the court. The speaker refers to such elements when after praising Richard he writes,

> . . . when a noble Nature's rais'd,
> It brings . . . Foes Griefe . . .
> . . . . . .
> . . . to th' envious [persons, Richard's name is] meant
> A meere upbraiding Griefe, and tort'ring punishment.
> (113-14; 119-20)

Here Jonson combats Richard's numerous detractors by dismissing them as envious and ignoble, arguing that the enemies of the noble courtier are enemies of the court itself. Such persons are led not by love and the desire to work with others, but by their baser desires and by a self-centeredness that precludes cooperation. Like the speakers in the Tribe of Ben epistle, these persons are filled with destructive envy (here "canker'd Jealousie") rather than with generative love. They work for political divorce rather than for marriage (135), and they do not pursue "holy strife," but "rudely strive for place, / One to precede the other" (Love Restored 243-44). As the "Epithalamion" implies, such citizens use "corroding Arts" rather than courtly ones; they try to "untie" rather than to unite the "Nuptiall knot" representing courtly union (135-36). Unlike the monarchs and their best courtiers, these citizens work towards love-not rather than love-knots.[11]

Yet elsewhere in Under-wood Jonson reinforces his praise of persons who work with Weston and other courtiers: in "An Epigram To my MUSE" he describes his patron Kenelm Digby. Written between 1629 and 1633 (roughly the same time as the "Epithalamion"), this poem praises a royal servant not much older than Jerome Weston, though he has a much different father. Rather than looking to his father for courtly example, Kenelm as a young child sees Everard Digby die a traitor's death as a Gunpowder Plot conspirator. Though Kenelm keeps until his own death Everard's letters to

him, he proves that model courtiership can exist despite adverse circumstances. Jonson argues Kenelm's excellence not by showing how Digby acts on a grand festive occasion (such as a wedding), but by praising his constant goodness and his quiet interactions with others, as well as by recalling his battle-field service as courtier.[12]

In this poem to Venetia about her husband, Jonson suggests Kenelm's integrity and sincerity, using a neoplatonic metaphor Digby himself employs when he calls his wife "a virtuous soul dwelling in a fair and perfect body" (Digby's Memoires 239-40 as qtd. in Petersson 75). Delineating first Kenelm's virtuous soul, the laureate lists the first two courtly graces outlined in Love Restored, implying also that Digby possesses the rest: "He doth excel / In honour, courtesie, and all the parts / Court can call hers" (2-4; see Love Restored line 249). In a typical Jonsonian sense, "honour" here signifies an integrity and moral nobility independent of degree (something he states more specifically in another poem concerning Digby, "Eupheme. 8"). It is a quality Digby possesses independently of his long pedigree and the titles given him by James and Charles, and it is not blemished by his father's dishonor.

Jonson reinforces Kenelm's courtly graces with the four cardinal virtues and ornaments them with artistic knowledge. Affirming, "Hee's prudent, valiant, just, and temperate" (5), the laureate describes a consummate hero rather than a

traitor. He suggests not only the political context of the virtue but its permanent, pure nature when he adds, "In him all virtue is beheld in State," implying that the qualities occur in their "fixed or stable condition," unaffected by surrounding changes (6; "state," OED). Writing when the court's center, the king, is himself an art connoisseur, Jonson notes Digby's own possession of all that "Man could call his Arts" (3-4). Kenelm's friendship with one of Charles's favorite painters (van Dyck) and his interest in the visual arts increase his suitability as a Caroline courtier. This interest, along with one in Jonson's poetry, further connects Digby with Richard Weston.

Having described the excellent soul of this courtier, the poet then describes his "fair and perfect body," showing how the physical reflects the spiritual:

> His breast is a brave Palace, a broad Street,
> Where all heroique ample thoughts do meet
> Where Nature such a large survey hath ta'en,
> As other soules, to his, dwell in a Lane:
>
> (9-12; emphasis mine)

As this passage indicates, Digby combines the variety, energy, and solid integrity that so pleases the poet, recalling that depicted by Love Restored's harmonious dance, the "Dedication"'s feast, and the Tribe of Ben gatherings. The broad street signifies Kenelm's wide traffic of interaction with others; the enclosed structure ("Palace") indicates his sense of limits and of identity, his still

(though large) spiritual core. The phrase "do meet" suggests both divergent points of origin and a point of union. Strong in mind and body, adventurous yet centered, the skilled, intelligent Digby makes a wonderful young courtier, able yet to offer his body as Jonson has done in "An Epistle," but can no longer do (see lines 39-42). Having a larger soul, broader mind, and greater interests than the average courtier, Digby fittingly has a larger body as well.[13] Perhaps Jonson most clearly implies the conjunction of body and soul when he writes, ". . . he is built like some imperiall roome / For that [virtue] to dwell in, and be still at home" (7-8; emphasis mine). This description recalls the poet's own vow to remain constant amidst flux: "Live to that point I will, for which I am man, / And dwell as in my Center, as I can / Still looking to, and ever loving heaven" (59-61; emphasis mine).

It is not surprising that a courtier so inwardly harmonious is--like the masquers in Love Restored--cooperative with others as well. Reminiscent of "Epithalamion," Kenelm's exemplary relations with other courtiers include those with his wife, to whom the poem is addressed, as the full title indicates ("An Epigram To my MUSE, the Lady Digby, on her Husband, Sir KENELM DIGBY"). Though a courtier in her own right, Venetia as muse to the royal poet gains in the laureate's eyes a particularly high court standing. To this person he writes, "Tho', happy Muse, thou know my Digby well, / Yet read him in these

lines" (1-2). By involving Kenelm's wife, who is indeed happy in her marriage, the poet among other things continues the male-female metaphor symbolizing courtly cooperation. He also indicates that the person who best understands Kenelm agrees with this poem's praise of him, and implies that she will be "glad" to pass that praise along to others (30-32; see also lines 1-2, 19-20). This woman who has known Kenelm many years can witness the man's good character.

The poet has himself known the courtier for several years, long enough to refer to him as "my Digby." This phrase recalls the laureate's statement, "So short you read my Character, and theirs / I would call mine," in a poem defending Jonson and his friends as "safe and sure," whatever their trials (the Tribe of Ben epistle 73-74, 1-4). Thus when the poet lists Digby's qualities in this epigram, he personally endorses them. Further, the laureate knows Digby not only as a person, but as a patron and as a literary critic, one who enjoys Jonson's as well as Edmund Spenser's work. In a deference recalling Horace's to Virgil's, this epigram writer bows to the English epic poet when he says that Digby "will looke / Upon them [Ben's verses], (next to Spenser's noble booke,) / And praise them too. . ." (23-25). Jonson's comparison does more than compliment the Elizabethan poet: it recalls Kenelm's belief that "divine Spenser's sun was no sooner set, but in Jonson a new one rose" ("A Discourse Concerning Edmund Spencer" as

qtd. in Petersson 92). In its own way, this epigram resembles Spenser's "noble booke" (The Faerie Queene): it too attempts "to fashion a gentleman or noble person in vertuous and gentle discipline," the hero of Jonson's courtly work being the modest Kenelm Digby (Spenser's letter to Raleigh). The laureate knows that he can trust this nonenvious man to rescue his work, if not himself, from his room away from court. (Ultimately, Digby as Jonson's literary executor helps rescue Under-wood itself from oblivion.)

According to the epigram's prophecy, Kenelm will share the verses with the eminent courtier described in the "Epithalamion" (Richard Weston). Depicting the harmonious interaction Venetia will see upon her interruption, the poet writes,

> . . . O! what a fame 't will be?
>
> . . . . . .
>
> When hee shall read them [verses] at the
>
> Treasurers bord,
>
> The knowing Weston, and that learned Lord
>
> Allowes them? Then, what copies shall be had,
>
> What transcripts begg'd? . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Being sent to one, they will be read of all.
>
> (25, 27-30, 32)

In this virtuous and sophisticated gathering where flow all types of knowledge, political, social, and poetic affairs

mix (as they do at the "Dedication" gatherings). Digby's taste in company as well as in art reveals much about him (Castiglione 137-39), and he demonstrates his urbanity in availing himself of the court's "knowing" and "learned" servants.[14] Incorporating like Love Restored the motif of one and all (see line 248), the epigram at its conclusion moves outward from a single courtier ("one") to many others ("all"). That he has gained the ear of Weston and of other courtiers speaks not only of Digby's "hability," but of his "reality" as well, a quality particularly important in Kenelm's case.

Besides calling Venetia, himself, and Weston to affirm Digby's worth, however, the poet cites an example where the young man has clearly shown his worth as a courtier:

> Witnesse his Action done at Scandero<o>ne;
> Upon my Birth-day the eleventh of June;
> When the Apostle Barnabee the bright
> Unto our yeare doth give the longest light.
> In signe the Subject, and the Song will live,
> Which I have vow'd posteritie to give.
>
> (13-18)

As a description of the battle reveals, Kenelm's "Action" involves valor, loyalty, intelligence, skill, physical excellence, and great risk to his own life. At this battle the greatly outnumbered courtier fights intensely and strategically, getting the better of several great Venetian ships. He embodies the patriotism of the Tribe of Ben

speaker who states, "But if, for honour, we must draw the Sword, / . . . / I have a body, yet, that spirit drawes / To live, or fall a Carcasse in the cause" (39-42). Returning safely, however, Kenelm brings Charles not only a martial victory, but some ancient pieces of art, exhibiting the urbanity and grace that makes this soldier truly courtly. Helping "revive the country's international dignity a little" after Buckingham's military failures, this courtier succeeds where the decadent Villiers fails. At least for a while England's as well as Jonson's hero (Petersson 82), Kenelm Digby differs from both Plutus and his father, wearing the soul rather than the mere mask of good courtiership.

Yet like Love Restored, Under-wood indicates that evil courtiers still exist, courtiers such as the envious persons mentioned in the "Epithalamion." Other pieces in the volume more fully chastise such immoral courtiers, showing that those who are beyond repair will self-destruct by "feed[ing]" on themselves (see "On the Right Honourable . . . Earle of Portland," line 9). Yet while another poem catalogues in great detail the current evils of lords and ladies ("An Epistle to a Friend . . . "), a poem more specifically political holds out hope for the court: if the addressee--probably Bishop Williams--can "teach the people, how to fast, and pray" (18), he can help turn an immoral court into a holy one, one led by love (see "An Epigram," beginning "That you have seene the pride, beheld the

sport").[15] Kenelm Digby is himself the proof that a courtier can rise above immoral surroundings.

In his pre-laureate masque, Love Restored, Jonson uses primarily symbols and classical figures to express his idea of true courtliness. This courtliness pursues love and harmony, though allowing diversity, and it demands eventual cooperation to solve problems (fiscal or other). In the epithalamion and the Digby poem, the laureate describes specific courtiers and draws more largely upon native customs and events. Supporting the individual worth of Richard and Kenelm, Jonson praises also their cooperation with each other and with other courtiers: Weston reaches out to his rival Laud, and Digby advances Jonson.

In his vision of courtly relationships, Jonson supports a harmony motivated by love and reason rather than by force, and he shows the great diversity and energy that can exist within order. Not all courtiers bring the same talents or fulfill the same roles: young courtiers (like Kenelm Digby) supply beauty and physicality that older courtiers (like Richard Weston) supplement with experience and wisdom.[16] Pictured with his family, Richard shows the generative, loving, and stable system that, like Cupid, supplies the court with royal servants. Pictured with his bride, Kenelm symbolizes the harmony that can come from courtiers that dance to love's music.

NOTES

[1] On the general history of the court see Ashley 56-60; Dietz 251; Davies 15-19, and Aylmer 26-33, 76-79.

[2] For Jonson's relationships with these men see Miles 138, 155-56, 164-65, 194. On Jonson's treatment of Buckingham see Randall, especially 31-36.

[3] As Herford and Simpson report, the masque was performed January 6, 1612, though legally the date would have been recorded 1611 since the new year did not start until March 25 (10:531). Miles 146 and Orgel, Ben 21 support this date. While Parfitt, Ben 78 gives the date 1610, he does not give his reasons for choosing this date, and he uses Herford and Simpson as his text.

[4] On James's finances and the Puritan references, see Cecil 290-312, Dietz 250-53, Miles 146-47, and Orgel, Ben 190. For a quick comment on internal and external harmony as represented by the masquers and for Jonson's use of music and dance see Meagher 104; 67-68, 89-90. See also Orgel's argument for Plutus as the masque's most interesting character (Jonsonian 74-76).

[5] These ten graces are "honor," "courtesy," "true valor," "urbanity," "confidence," "alacrity," "promptness," "industry," "hability," and "reality."

[6] For Jonson's definition of true valor elsewhere, see

the Under-wood poem "An Epigram. To WILLIAM Earle of Newcastle."

[7] For a well-known earlier use of the hermaphrodite in English literature, see Faerie Queene 3.12.46 (the 1590 version, rpt. in Hamilton).

[8] Concerning marriage as a metaphor for the monarch's relationship with his kingdom, see Sharpe 80-82, 271, 288-89. Although Carlton 123-24 discriminates between courtiers (important socially) and ministers (important officially), he also states that sometimes the lines become blurred. While he classes Weston as a minister, the king clearly acts socially when he arranges the marriage for Richard's son and personally gives away the bride. It is unlikely Jonson would so stress the court in "Epithalamion" if the Westons were not themselves members of it. The poet probably uses "court" to signify not only those who keep the king regular company but those who have some contact with the ruler and those from whose counsel he would benefit.

[9] Referring to stanza 13 and the two that follow it, Maclean notes that Richard Weston properly occurs in "three stanzas at the heart of the poem"; he also describes the rulers as "truly central figures in this emblematic pageant of social order" (153).

[10] For alleged plots against Weston see S.R. Gardiner 7: 128, 218-19.

[11] For a poem that uses natural imagery to describe the diverse harmony the court should possess, see "To the Right

hon[ble] Hierome, L. Weston. . . . " For a work resembling "Epithalamion" in its use of imagery, family, and harmony in praise of a Treasurer, see "An Epigram On WILL<I>AM Lord Burl<eigh,> Lo: high Treasurer of England." Two other poems in particular comment on the court. One describes a corrupt woman in a corrupt court ("An Epigram on The Court Pucell"), while another portrays a lady who outshines such women and has the potential to transform them ("An Epigram. To the honour'd--Countesse of--").

[12] For the account of Digby's life, I draw largely upon Petersson. On the relationship between Digby and Jonson see Miles 243-44.

[13] For a further physical description of Digby see Petersson 98.

[14] Castiglione is perhaps talking about friends closer than Digby and Weston actually were, but Jonson in this poem gives the impression of close association between the two men.

[15] For an interesting historical reading of "An Epigram" see Evans,"'Games of Fortune'" 49-50, 57-61. For a more positive poem on the court see "To the Right hon[ble] Hierome, L. Weston. . . . "

[16] For a discussion of differences between young and old courtiers see Castiglione 122-24.

CHAPTER IV

LEGAL HARMONY

When praising the courtier Richard Weston, Jonson writes that he "worke[s] downe / Mens Loves unto the Lawes, and Lawes to love the Crowne" ("Epithalamion" 103-04). Elsewhere in his poetry the author treats in more detail the legal system, an element that affects not only courtiers, but all English citizens. Regulating many facets of life, the law ideally helps limit powers, sets guidelines, and settles disputes. Its officers, like members of the royal court, have great opportunity to work towards either harmony or discord. The English legal system Jonson knows is complex and changing (see Dietz 248-49, 255; Ashley 50ff). According to theory, the courts (including Parliament) are presided over by the monarch, who is advised by his or her Privy Council, Lord Chancellor, and other officials; though they sometimes disagree, all elements of the system work for a just order and for the general good, led like the courtiers by love. As with the royal court, however, the legal court in actuality differs greatly from its ideal, with discord occurring even under the famed Elizabeth (see Dietz 239-41). While the ascension of a foreign king (James) brings the possibility of a fresh start (1603), it

also brings new difficulties. Though James's general legal knowledge provides him with a good basis for learning, his open preference for the royal prerogative does not lend itself to political finesse; and his habituation to Scottish statute-law has not prepared him for the English legal system. It is a system vulnerable to battles over different branches' jurisdiction and power, possessing as it does several strong elements, a vague constitution, and uncodified laws. James's reign sees several such battles: some officials uphold the jurisdiction of courts based upon statutes (such as Chancery Court) and stress the monarch's legal discretionary powers; others argue the wide province of courts based more upon precedents (Common Law Court), emphasizing this type of law and Parliament's power. These disagreements sometimes advance the English system, though often not without casualties (see Holdsworth 99-102). During Charles's reign, however, disputes escalate. When in 1629 an MP urges that Parliament appeal to the people rather than to the king, he seems to threaten the country's legal head. Dissolving Parliament, Charles defends his act in a proclamation issued on March 10.[1]

While Jonson has no formal training in law, he is far from an ignorant bystander. His wide reading has taught him general legal principles, and his schooling at Westminster has exposed him to English law at work (see Miles 12). Moreover, his friendships with jurists have increased his awareness of the English legal system, and his controversial

writing, religious nonconformity, and debt have resulted in first-hand experience with the courts. Often disturbed by what he sees, the poet counsels the benevolent order the legal system should exemplify and effect. Advising virtue and competence in members of the legal system (as in members of the royal court), Jonson supports his country's search for a flexible order and condemns the two extremes of tyranny and anarchy. While his early poetry is sometimes abstract, Under-wood is both more colloquial and full of energy.

A good example of the poet's early counsel occurs in "A Panegyre" (1604), which notes the formal beginning of the relationship between the king and parliament. Envisioning the respect citizens show law in its purest form, Jonson, through the character of Themis, advises virtue and competence in legal officials, lecturing primarily the new monarch but involving also Parliament and the people. Picturing--like Poetaster and Love Restored--both model order and its perversions, "A Panegyre" distances current governors from evil yet warns them to avoid the poor examples of others.

By the time Jonson writes several Under-wood poems, he speaks more in his own voice, advising harmony in a less academic manner. Rather than exalting an abstract figure of legal righteousness (Themis), the poet familiarly praises one of his own acquaintances (Lord Chancellor Bacon), in an atmosphere recalling "The Dedication" and the Digby poem.

"Lord BACONS Birth-day" lauds a years-long proponent of legal cooperation as he helps prepare King James for his third parliament (1621). The author implies that the king would do well to listen closely to this official he has chosen (rather than to his favorite, Buckingham). Shortly after he writes this poem, however, the laureate witnesses Bacon's fall; at the beginning of Charles's reign he observes that of the next Lord Chancellor as well (1625).[2] Whatever his opinion of the kings' roles in these events, the laureate in the anniversary "Epigram" unhesitatingly defends the monarch's position when it is questioned in 1629. Recalling the king's dissolution proclamation, the author energetically vindicates Charles on contentious matters. Using the occasion of the king's accession anniversary, Jonson reminds citizens that their safety (like Love-in-Court's) ultimately coincides with their sovereign's, and he cautions them against anarchy (recalling the Tribe of Ben poem and the envious courtiers of "Epithalamion"). Rather than revealing a counselor more absolutist than before, "An Epigram" shows one who adjusts his advice according to context, working always for equilibrium. In places echoing the early parliamentary piece to James ("A Panegyre"), "An Epigram" similarly reminds his son to maintain the balance there advised.

In the early piece to James, Jonson as a loyal subject addresses his legal head with respect while he instructs him: using a formal, elevated style, he speaks not through

his own voice, but in third person, often through the voice of a classical goddess (Themis). The poet refers to James's own sound legal counsel in Basilikon Doron at the same time that he offers his advice as someone more familiar with English law in particular. Providing a vision for the legal network in much the same way that Love Restored does for courtly relationships, "A Panegyre" shows the monarch, Parliament, and people supporting the system, just as the masque depicts the king and courtiers defending love in the court. Demonstrating the system's importance, the poet also shows the need for virtuous and competent officials and argues the value of a flexible order. Like the masque, however, the poem similarly censures elements that would destroy the order: tyrants, bad parliaments, and evil subjects.[3]

Jonson chooses an apt occasion upon which to advise the king and the country about law, a formal occasion revealed in the full title: "A PANEGYRE, ON THE HAPPIE ENTRANCE OF JAMES, OUR SOVERAIGNE, TO HIS FIRST HIGH SESSION OF PARLIAMENT IN THIS HIS KINGDOME, THE 19. OF MARCH, 1603 [1604 n.s.]." This title, like the event it celebrates, depicts the English legal system in microcosm, representing as it does the system's head, its highest court, and its many constituents. While the meeting of king and Parliament indicates their respect for English law in particular, the allegorical figures in Jonson's poem imply the country's connection with law in its ideal state, for Dice, Eunomia,

and Themis symbolize Justice, Order, and Righteousness, respectively (see Hunter 342 notes 6-8).

Speaking through this last figure, Jonson describes the ideal statutes as "honest" and "wise" (95-96), "honest" suggesting the broader sense of virtuous implied by the Latin honestus.[4] Laws must possess both qualities if they are to organize a country in a healthy manner. "[C]unning tracts" in that they are "learned" and "skilful" (96), such statutes are the products of political awareness and ingenuity ("cunning," OED). As "thriving statutes," they respond to existing needs in an organic rather than mechanical manner, aiding the country as it undergoes inevitable change (97), of which James's succession is only one sign.

While some of the laws inherited by James and his parliament are wise and honest, as they should be, others are not; legal officials must therefore scrutinize existing statutes before they enforce them. Again using Themis, Jonson warns that some of England's current statutes would "kill" or hurt the kingdom if they are actively enforced. If left unenforced or "sleeping," however, these statutes "could save" (99). Because the safety of the people is the supreme law (salus populi suprema lex est), good government therefore requires selective law enforcement. While this selectivity might seem illegal, when practiced for the right reason, it is instead legal in its purest sense. This type of law above law can be exercised particularly by the king

through royal prerogative, an element both necessary and potentially exploitable (and therefore often contentious).[5]

The poem indicates, however, that this king is unlikely to abuse his prerogative, for he is both virtuous and competent, as all legal officials should be: together these citizens must form new statutes that are good and wise and must shrewdly enforce the less-than-perfect laws already existing. Praising James on his current governing abilities, Jonson at the same time urges him to enhance those qualities.

The poem praises the ruler's virtue by connecting him with heaven and by stating that Themis, Dice, and Eunomia "came to grace his throne" (26). "[L]et downe in that rich chaine, / That fastneth heavenly power to earthly raigne" (21-22), Themis reminds James "That Kings / . . . / by Heaven, are plac'd upon his [God's] throne, / To rule like Heaven" (76, 78-79). Such a position does not give kings carte blanche, however, but instead requires them to be more accountable than other persons: "all [that] they doe, / Though hid at home, abroad is search'd into" (80-81). Here Jonson recalls James's fondness for the divine right theory, stated clearly in that king's opening sonnet to Basilikon Doron.[6] Further, the poet shows that James has the self-control imperative in anyone who would control others, recalling Caesar's self-control in Poetaster. Possessing great opportunity for power--"entring with the power of a king"--James nonetheless conducts himself as

lawfully as any subject, bringing "the temperance of a private man" (139-40). Here Jonson supports the classical idea that only a person embodying Right, Justice, and Order can bring such qualities to his nation. He also recalls James's advice to Prince Henry to make temperance "Queene of all the rest [of the cardinal virtues] in you" (84). Not only can such a ruler make good, objective decisions, but he or she can serve as an example for the country to emulate, making strict legal enforcement less necessary. As Themis relates, ". . . kings, by their example, more doe sway / Then by their power; and men doe more obay / When they are led, then when they are compell'd" (125-27). Jonson knows that English subjects will be watching their new king closely and that many will take their cue from him.

The king as "Panegyre" pictures him is exemplary not only in his temperance, but in his love, both of the truth and of his subjects. This quality makes him open to counsel, including--Jonson no doubt hopes--the counsel in this poem. The poet stages James's acceptance of such counsel when he thus describes the king's reaction to Themis's speech: "[H]is eare was joy'd / To heare the truth, from spight, or flattery voyd" (93-94). Basilikon Doron's condemnation of flattery would strengthen Jonson's hopes that this man agrees that "A flatterd prince soone turnes the prince of fooles" (Caesar in Poetaster, 5.1.96; see Basilikon Doron 68). After hearing Themis's discourse on tyrants, the king responds not in anger or in defense of

the royal office, but reacts as Caesar does to Horace's sharp counsel, not "once defend[ing] what THEMIS did reprove" (110).

Interested more in subjects' "hearts" than in his own power (142), the king exhibits the love of a "deare . . . father," a love that involves wisdom as well as good will (137). A benevolent ruler must constrain as well as favor his subjects, for a monarch who does not control citizens leads them to their destruction. As James asks, ". . . what difference is betwixt extreame tyrannie, delighting to destroy mankinde; and extreame slacknesse of punishment, permitting every man to tyrannize over his co[m]panion?" (Basilikon Doron 87). The poem indicates the king's understanding of kingly devotion when it states,

> He knew, that those, who would, with love, command,
> Must with a tender (yet a stedfast) hand
> Sustaine the reynes, and in the checke forbeare
> To offer cause of injurie, or feare.
>
> (121-24)

Used to describe political mastery, this equestrian metaphor is not only conventional, but specifically appropriate: it depicts the short-legged, awkward king in one of his more majestic poses and at one of his favorite sports. Controlling the English people as he does a fine horse, James must himself be confident and consistent ("stedfast"), particularly since he is leading the country through the

transition of succession. Though he may show subjects tenderness, he must maintain control, quickly learning to use wise laws and decisions to "Sustaine the reynes" of government. Whatever his desire for popularity, the king must also restrain ("checke") subjects when they threaten to take the body politic off course, just as he would check a favorite horse that was straying. Striving for a loving rather than a cowed obedience, however, the monarch should use "feare" and "injurie" only sparingly. As Jonson writes in Discoveries, "the mercifull Prince is safe in love, not in feare. Hee needs no . . . Spies . . . to intrap true subjects . . ." (Herford and Simpson 8:600). While the poet's advice concerning firmness and flexibility is generally wise, it is particularly appropriate for a new monarch. It urges the new king not to let others take advantage of his newness, yet not to clamp down too hard while he and his subjects are adjusting to one another.[7]

In its description of the "knowing [governmental] artes" James has mastered (127), the poem does not merely flatter the sovereign. The king's theoretical interest in political philosophy is demonstrated in his Basilikon Doron; his practical experience includes having ruled another country--albeit a lesser one--for twenty-five years. Like Love-in-Court, who gracefully leads with love, James can competently rule with it.

Besides indicating James's general knowledge about ruling, however, Jonson also implies that the sovereign must

yet learn much, especially concerning the legal particularities of his new country. In the same book where the Scottish James admits to knowing little about the English (37), he tells his son, ". . . studie well your owne lawes: for how can yee discerne by the thing yee know not?" (Basilikon Doron 90). "Panegyre" reminds James to heed that advice himself as he becomes king for the second time, and to study English history and laws for knowledge. Preparing James for his work with Parliament, Jonson's Themis

> . . . remembred to his thought the place
> Where he was going; and the upward race
> Of kings, praeceding him in that high court;
> Their lawes, their endes; the men she did report:
>
> (89-92)

As he studies what English MPs should already know, the Scottish James must look beyond surface information for pattern and intent. Jonson conveys this advice through phrasing that itself carries more than one meaning. In the phrase "their endes" (92), "their" refers first to "kings," with "endes" indicating denouements. In this way the poem states that governors' deaths can reveal much about the nature of their conduct. James himself supports this idea in Basilikon Doron when he contrasts the deaths of just and of evil rulers (26-27). Yet "their" refers also to the immediately preceding "lawes," while "endes" signifies the purpose or intent behind those statutes. Again, as James states in his work, "the law must bee interpreted according

to the meaning, and not to the literall sense thereof . . . " (24-26, 86). Jonson's reminder to the monarch about examining historical patterns and about looking beneath surface legality is especially appropriate since the new king is also a non-native.

The "place" where the new king is going--Parliament's residence at Westminster--will be a good setting for him to learn. Indeed, it will require that he learn, for the Houses of Parliament contain many centuries-old traditions unfamiliar to the monarch (McElwee 112), as the native Westminster poet must realize. One thing the king must learn, if he has not already learned it, is that monarch and Parliament are interdependent: the reference to "their lawes" (line 92) includes not only past "kings," but kings together with their "high court[s]," since both legal elements cooperate on lawmaking and law enforcement. In having Themis call Parliament the "high court," the poet both suggests its constitutional position (England's supreme court) and defends its dignity as a gathering of morally and intellectually superior governors. These men can teach James not only about "praeceding" rulers and parliaments, but about legal precedence in a more specific sense, that used by English common law (more than by Scottish law). Not only knowledgeable, but powerful--as MPs have started to realize--Parliament contains a gathering the ruler would do well to respect. As Themis's support of the king indicates, however, MPs by the same account should make matters easy

rather than difficult for James; they should concentrate more on the country's progress than upon their own power as they support the legal system.[8]

This system extends beyond the king and Parliament, however, embracing all English citizens. Thus the poem states that Themis's speech on law "began in him, [James] / And ceas'd in them [the people]" (134-35). Having earlier connected the sovereign with heaven's will, thus supporting the divine right theory, the poet here links him to the subjects' approval, also endorsing the contractual theory of kingship. Speaking of the people's "consent of hearts and voices," the poem relates also that James "was not hot, or covetous to be crown'd / Before men's hearts had crown'd him" (142-43). Just as heaven and Themis have recognized James's abilities, so do the people: resembling "th' artillery [o]f heaven," a "confession flew from every voyce, / 'Never had land more reason to rejoyce'" (155-56). Besides endorsing James's virtue and wisdom, the poem here implies that of the people who recognize it.

Implying the diverse harmony that these subjects, legal officials, and ruler can reach, the poem first states that "No age, nor sex, so weake, or strongly dull" abstains from supporting James's entrance to Parliament (58; see also lines 57-72). Further describing cooperation, the poem uses fire imagery and erotic metaphor reminiscent of Love Restored, stating that the ruler inspires

> . . . the peoples love, with which did strive

> The Nobles zeale, yet either kept alive
> The others flame, as doth the wike and waxe,
> That friendly temper'd, one pure taper makes.
>
> (69-72)

This strife is a labor of love, not a class or power struggle, as citizens of different ranks actively endeavor to repay their ruler with affection and service. The wick and wax metaphor indicates the classes' interdependence rather than their mutual exclusivity. The nobles' and peoples' "flame[s]" and their "one pure taper" indicate, like the courtiers' "flamed intents," a force dynamic, cooperative, and generative. If subjects work with one another and with their king, Jonson implies, they will be able to keep alive the love they feel today.

Describing this love even more erotically, the poem recalls the reaction of England's major city and of its seat of Parliament. "The amorous Citie [London] spar'd no ornament, / . . . but so drest, / . . . / [As if she] would be courted," while the smaller Westminster follows suit in its own more modest manner (50-51, 53; 53-56). Wooing their leader at the start of this political marriage, subjects no doubt expect James to return the favor they have shown. As Themis advises the monarch, he can best "court" the English not only by going out among them, but by remembering them when he enters the "high court" they have elected. By working with Parliament to rightfully interpret and make England's laws, James will provide his dutiful subjects with

the political husband they deserve.

While the poem focuses upon James's interaction with people in London and Westminster, it also indicates that his attention extends beyond these cities to include the whole kingdom: "a thousand radiant lights . . . stream [from James's eyes] / To every nooke and angle of his realme" (5-6). Unfortunately, these nooks reveal an evil that could engulf the whole legal system, and they alert James to the less-than-ideal kingdom he has inherited. Such evil is not always isolated to the lowest subjects, however, or even to illegality, as Themis indicates in her English history lecture. Noting perversions of true law, Themis recalls for the king instances "'Where acts gave license to impetuous lust" (101). Associating "license" with legal "acts" as well as with "lust" (untamed desire), the poem puns upon that word's meanings of both official approval and of wantonness, showing that the legal system can conflate the two, though it should not. Resulting from "impetuous lust," such legal acts are clearly neither considered ("wise") nor virtuous ("honest"), qualities present in good laws.

Whereas good laws help the country thrive, perverted ones severely damage it. "[B]loody, base, and barbarous" (98), such statutes wound not only English subjects, but Right itself, as Jonson indicates in his description of Themis's "bleeding" eyes (107). Such "base" laws degrade the elevated order of the kings' "upward race" and of Parliament's "high court"; they exchange the civilized rule

of just order for the "barbarous" rule of might. As such, they violate the peaceful harmony supported by both Jonson's Themis and James's Basilikon Doron.

The authors of these evil statutes are unfit rulers and Parliaments, a group Jonson persuades the current king and MPs not to join. Like Poetaster and Love Restored, "A Panegyre" condemns the tyrant as a perversion of the true ruler. It argues that tyrants are actually no kings at all, for--unlike the temperate James--they are ruled by their own base desires: "princes, who had sold their fame / To their voluptuous lustes, had lost their name" (113-14). Advising the recently named James I of England to control his new power, the poet softens his advice by saying that James already "knew" this fact (113), something that Basilikon Doron also indicates (see 26-27).

Recalling James's work (26-27), "A Panegyre" does not allow subjects to depose their tyrant, but it implies that such a ruler nonetheless receives punishment:

> . . . no wretch was more unblest then he
> Whose necesary good t'was now to be
> An evill king: and so must be such still,
> Who once have got the habit to doe ill.
>
> (115-18)

Employing the Aristotelian belief that evil (like goodness) is a habit (see Discoveries 8:600), Jonson through negative example warns James to begin well his government of England.

Through Themis, Jonson counsels MPs also. When she

states that "lawes were made to serve the tyran'will" (99), Themis chastises not only tyrants, but the legal officials who colluded with them and thus acted in a manner unworthy of this "high court." Responsible for advising their rulers and for helping them formulate statutes, MPs should remain loyal but firm and virtuous, resembling perhaps a toned-down version of Poetaster's Horace. Considering Jonson's praise of Sir Thomas More's language and the other chancellors with whom he links the man--the Bacons and Thomas Egerton--perhaps the poet believes that legal officials should resign from their posts rather than assist tyrants (see Discoveries 8:591).

Nor are English subjects completely free from blame, for even now several evil and lawless ones populate the realm, threatening to affect the king himself. In a passage contrasting sharply with his description of good subjects (lines 69-72), Jonson writes that

> [In] . . . dark and deep concealed vaults,
> . . . men commit black incest with their faults,
> And snore supinely in the stall of sin:
> Where Murder, Rapine, Lust, doe sit within,
>
> (9-12)

Whereas the candle passage describing good subjects recalls the flamed intents of the courtiers in Love Restored (69-72), these lines suggest instead Plutus's followers and his dark cave. And while the candle passage indicates love, energy, generation, and harmony, these lines depict hatred,

sloth, destruction, and disorder. Such persons are potentially guilty not only of hurting private subjects, but of undermining England's whole legal health. Their evils "would, if not dispers'd, infect the Crowne, / And in their vapor her bright mettall drowne" (17-18). In their own way potential regicides and traitors, these persons should not be allowed even in the most tolerant kingdom.

As if to reinforce his advice concerning the legal system's importance, Jonson includes a vision that recalls Horace's dystopia; portraying the system at its most topsy-turvy, the poet warns all legal officials to steer clear of such a perversion. Noting on an important public occasion the danger of confusing public and private, the poet recounts through Themis instances "'When public justice borrow'd all her powers / 'From private chambers . . . " (104-05). As Themis and her attendants well know, true justice gets its force from heaven, not from private persons. Nor does true justice involve borrowing, meaning as it does giving each its due, as James himself states in Basilikon Doron.[9] In the perverse system described in the above lines, however, that which should be based upon the good of the people (the publicus) is done for the advantage of a few individuals; that which should be, like James's procession, open to sight ("public"), is instead conducted in secret ("private chambers"), and not for state reasons. Taken with the word "private," the word "chambers" combines the sense of "court" and "bedroom," indicating a legal

prostitution and a bargaining for favors that contrasts sharply with the kingdom's current open love.

Great disorder can result if citizens fail to separate public from private spheres, in the king's case his "two bodies."[10] Persons given undue power ". . . could then create / 'Lawes, judges, counsellors, yea prince, and state" (105-06). In this way a royal favorite goes from being a creature of the king to a creator of the whole legal system. Here the poem tactfully advises a ruler who has already shown signs of confusing public and private, who during his progress to England awarded honors in exchange for good entertainment (McElwee 107-11). Jonson could not at this point know, however, how greatly James was to err in this matter.

Yet "Panegyre" carefully distances the current king from any association with tyranny, just as Poetaster does with Caesar and Love Restored does with King James (who is partially responsible for banishing the tyrant Plutus). Jonson thus describes James's reaction to Themis's speech on tyrants: "though by right, and benefite of Times,/ He ownde their crownes, he would not so their crimes" (111-12). Clearly separating the deed from the office ("crimes" from "crownes"), the poem also affirms the Stuart as the legitimate king, showing that the throne is his not only by right of succession, but by Right herself (Themis). Here the poem recalls Caesar's words that it is "Vertue" that should make kings (5.2.26-27). This Stuart king, Jonson

hopes, will continue the English royal line without continuing its evil. Fonder of justice and of his people than of royal pride, James could enjoy a loving and legally strong relationship with his country, if he follows Themis's counsel.

As the poet comes to see, however, the king does not have the idyllic reign for which "A Panegyre" hopes, due to a number of reasons. James's first two parliaments (1604 and 1614) are marred, and he sometimes exhibits little respect for members of this high court. His rule encounters changes in legal officers and battles concerning royal prerogative and common law. Further, the king confuses public and private, particularly concerning his favorites Carr and Villiers (Buckingham), the latter becoming dominant just before Jonson's laureateship. The young, untrained, and intemperate Buckingham too often serves as the intermediate between qualified legal officials and their sovereign. Nevertheless, James does have several good officials, some of whom served under Elizabeth, and his reign witnesses some attempts at legal codification.[11]

Under-wood praises several of these officials, including three Lord Chancellors (Thomas Egerton, Francis Bacon, and John Williams) and the Chief Justice (Edward Coke). These men also represent the chief protagonists in the battle between chancery and common law courts. Though all officers are loyal monarchists, two of them (Bacon and Coke) at least once openly differ from their ruler (see

Bowen 69-70). Further, Bacon and Coke are personal as well as legal rivals, though they agree on some judicial matters.[12] The variety of officials praised by Under-wood proves Jonson's interest in individualism, while the characteristics lauded shows his desire for harmony. One poem that best demonstrates the laureate's legal counsel to James is "Lord BACONS Birth-day" (1621). Realizing by now that Themis herself will not rule, the poet tries instead to maximize the influence of those who most approximate her (such as Francis Bacon); he thus advises the monarch to rely highly upon such persons. When Bacon fails politically, however, and when the next king runs into even greater difficulty, Jonson concentrates on supporting the country's legal head as indispensable to the system as he knows it. Still advocating the common good (like "Panegyre"), the anniversary "Epigram" to King Charles nonetheless prohibits actions that could undermine the legal structure and produce an anarchy no freer than the tyranny described in the inaugural Jacobean poem.[13]

Of the Jacobean officials praised in Under-wood, Francis Bacon (at his best) epitomizes Jonson's view of a monarch's loyal but individualistic servant, one who works toward the harmony advised by "Panegyre." In some ways "Lord BACONS Birth-day" is much like that earlier poem: it (indirectly) involves another of James's Parliament sessions, and it argues for cooperation. Its tone and technique are quite different, however. Whereas "A

Panegyre" is a formal, solemn piece in which Jonson avoids first person, the Under-wood poem is a cozy, joyful work in which Ben himself recites his song as he comes to join in drinks with the Lord Chancellor. Using an occasion not immediately connected with legal cooperation, the laureate deftly and genially advises in a manner more confident and less academic than before. Now speaking through his own voice, he relies upon English symbols as well as upon classical ones. Praising Bacon and James's recognition of him, the royal poet also urges the king to heed his official more closely.

The poem is directly occasioned by Bacon's sixtieth birthday, celebrated at a party on January 22, 1621. That in itself is a worthy cause for song, because Bacon--like Kenelm Digby--has excelled in several fields, in each one showing his desire for harmony. The laureate reveals his poem's more secret cause in the closing couplet, however, where he writes, "Give me a deep-crown'd-Bowle, that I may sing / In raysing him the wisdome of my King" (19-20). Here the poem praises not only Bacon's fitness for office, but the monarch's intelligence in recognizing it, much as the "Epithalamion" lauds Charles's wisdom concerning the courtier he "so highly set" (lines 109-12). Having "raised" Bacon in position as the poet does in song, the Crown figures importantly, though subtly, in verses associated with Jonson's "crown'd-Bowle" of wine (verses that recall in their conviviality the "Dedication" and in their urbane

audience the Digby poem). The ambiguous "him" that looks backward to Bacon and forward to James (line 20) reinforces the two officials' association, as does a quick look backward in time: for the past several months, Bacon at the king's request has helped prepare for Parliament, to meet as soon as the weather allows. The king's selection of what one historian calls the "natural choice" for the job further demonstrates the "knowing artes" with which "A Panegyre" credits James (Marwil 16).[14]

More than the party's time is politically important, however: as in "Panegyre" and the "Epithalamion," location figures significantly in the poem's counsel. The party occurs at Bacon's estate, York House, the traditional home of the Lord Keepers and an earlier gift from the king (Donaldson 699). By addressing the spirit of this English house, the laureate uses a symbol as elevated but more personal than Themis, further adding a sense of immediacy in his use of first and second person. When he begins the poem, "Haile, happie Genius of this antient pile!" the author emphasizes the building's "tutelary and controlling spirit" (1; see "genius," OED). As the genius's presence stresses the house's import concerning royal favor and legal authority, his happiness argues Bacon's fitness as owner (and Lord Keeper). James has chosen a man who suits the spirit of the office, for which the laureate commends him.[15]

The party's immediate occasion suggests another meaning

of "genius": the "tutelary god or attendant spirit allotted to every person at his birth" ("genius," OED), one to whom men give offerings on their birthdays (Bulfinch 11). This merging of York House's spirit with Bacon's personal one suggests the natural association between Bacon and the Keepership, again supporting the king's choice and Bacon's acts. Further, in his use of York House and his mention of Bacon's birth and birthplace (line 8), the poet prepares to praise a former owner, Bacon's father Nicholas (much as he uses "Penshurst" to praise the whole Sidney family). Possessing the Chancellor's duties, if not his title, this "grave wise Keeper of the Seale" was a great jurist who encouraged moderation under earlier monarchs, as his son now does under the present one (9). As James knows if he has followed Themis's advice about studying legal history, this "Fame, and foundation of the English Weale" set precedents for his country and supported it through many changes (10).

The younger Bacon himself has built upon the elder's "foundation," consciously following in his father's footsteps in the way that the "Epithalamion" urges the younger Weston to do (Crowther 263). Because of Bacon, James, and Bacon's father (Nicholas), the poet can now state of the younger Bacon, "What then his Father was, that since is hee, / Now with a Title more to the Degree; / Englands high Chancellor" (11-13). Not only Lord Keeper, Bacon is similarly grave and wise, bringing new fame to his country as he adds to the sturdiness of its legal foundation. As

Bacon first equals, then (as Lord Chancellor) surpasses his father, he in his own way forms part of an "upward race" of legal officers helping England improve.[16]

The son's coming address to Parliament, sixty-two years almost to the day after his father's, recalls the continuity so important to the legal system. ("Bacon, Nicholas," DNB 1:839). Like James, who possesses his throne "by right, and benefite of Times" ("Panegyre" 111), the younger Bacon is

> . . . the destin'd heire
> In his soft Cradle to his Fathers Chaire,
> Whose even Thred the Fates spinne round, and full,
> Out of their Choysest, and their whitest wooll. (13-16)

The son's actual cradle becomes for him a cradle of political education as the suggestion of the father's family chair merges with the elder Bacon's chair of office. In the phrase "Whose . . . Thred the Fates spinne," "Whose" most obviously refers to Bacon (indicated by "Chancellor" and "heire" in line 13), a man whose life the Fates control. Yet "Whose . . . Thred" can also refer to the immediately preceding "Fathers Chaire" (14), suggesting the wool cushion ("woolsack") used with the Chancellor's chair and symbolic of the office itself. The wool's whiteness signifies therefore not only the purity of Bacon's personal life (the thread), but that of his office (the woolsack).[17] The king earlier instructed by Themis has clearly chosen the rightful

person for his highest legal advisor: the Fates whose spinning shows their approval of the chancellor are themselves the "daughters of Themis . . . who sits by Jove on his throne to give him counsel" (Bulfinch 9). Having inherited from his father a wisdom complemented by honesty and virtue (at least according to Jonson), Bacon is qualified to help make good laws and to interpret existing ones in the manner "A Panegyre" advises. Only such a man should serve as the "king's conscience" (a phrase used for England's Chancery Court; see "An Epigram. To THOMAS Lo: ELSMERE, the last Terme he sate Chancellor," lines 3-4).

In addition to being virtuous and competent, Bacon is also cooperative, as the allusions to his ancestry and to wool imply. Describing the progress of a sheepreeve's son (Nicholas) to Keeper and of his son to Chancellor and to Viscount St. Albans (suggested by "white"), Jonson's lines involve the people's love and nobles' zeal described in "Panegyre" (for "white" suggesting "Albans," see Hunter 208n16). The poet further associates Bacon with harmony in his description of the party guests. Keeping the York House genius at the poem's center, the speaker asks him as he looks around the dwelling:

> How comes it all things so about the<e> smile?
> The fire, the wine, the men! and in the midst,
> Thou stand'st as if some Mysterie thou did'st!
> Pardon, I read it in thy face, the day
> For whose returnes, and many, all these pray:

> And so doe I. This is the sixtieth yeare
> Since Bacon and thy Lord was borne, and here;
>
> (2-8)

Like the phrase "all things" (2), the statement that "all these" desire Bacon's longevity indicates the broadness of good will surrounding the man (6). The phrase that follows "all these"--"And so doe I"--balances group assent with individual conscience, implying the thoughtful rather than mindless harmony in Bacon's favor. The general but considered "smile" centering around the spirit of Keepership involves in its reference to "all things" not only guests, but the fire and wine that warm them. Recalling the fire of Love Restored and "Panegyre" and the wine of "Dedication," these lines suggest fervent love, generation, and harmony (especially when combined with the circle image implied by "midst"). Recalling also an epigram familiar to Bacon, the combination of fire, wine, and friends further suggests the valuable experience and mellowness that sixty years can bring, qualities effective in negotiation. As Bacon notes, "Alonso of Aragon was wont to say, in commendation of Age, that Age appeared to be best in foure things; Old wood best to burne; Old wine to drinke; Old Frends to trust; and Old Authors to reade" (Apophthegmes 123-24). Age is good in statesmen as well, Bacon writes to James in a recent letter on the upcoming Parliament (Marwil 16); the laureate who praises gravity and wisdom would agree, as should the king, who currently relies too much on the twenty-nine year old

Buckingham.

In his pursuit of harmony, Bacon finds Buckingham only one of the citizens with whom he disagrees but cooperates (the plight of Richard Weston, as implied in "Epithalamion"). While serving on the committee researching Parliament, the Chancellor has worked with Edward Coke (Marwil 301), a man as opposed to him as Laud is to Weston. Again like Weston, however, Bacon shows his opponent respect, praising that man's attempt to codify English law. At another time he has advised James against disgracing Coke, whom he terms very able (Crowther 301, 264). In another instance of cooperation, Bacon has appointed as judge a man who fought him in Commons (Crowther 301).

Besides working for harmony among individuals, he tries to achieve cooperation among the legal system's various branches. As the current head of Chancery Court, this officer favored by James links the crown and that court; he also advocates harmony between the chancery and common law courts (Holdsworth 106-07). Further, Bacon symbolizes the union of Parliament's two houses: in the coming session, "Lord Bacon" will serve in the House of Lords after many years in the Commons, thanks again to the king's favor.

Yet while the laureate commends the cooperation between James and Bacon, his great praise of Bacon suggests that the king ought to adopt the Chancellor's ideas more than he currently does, remaining as open to counsel as the poet portrayed him in "A Panegyre." Instead, James has often

ignored Bacon's frequent advice concerning harmony with Parliament and has acted in ways that anger that high court (Crowther 259, Marwil 16). While the sovereign has raised Bacon high, he has not raised him high enough: this mature, experienced legal official must use as his liaison to the testy James the favorite George Villiers (Marwil 16), a man half Bacon's age who has had little or no legal training. The poet has warned James generally in "A Panegyre" about the "private chambers" that can create "lawes, judges, councellors, yea prince and state," and here he would see a specific instance of confusing public and private. The poet does not ask for the favorite's expulsion, or even directly criticize him to the doting king, but he tries to offset Buckingham's power by commending the more honorable, competent, and harmonizing Bacon.

What the laureate does not know when he toasts James and his chancellor is that Bacon in his commission to the king remains--like Bacchus and Jonson--the "taster / Of all to the great Master." Soon afterwards the Chancellor will drink the bitter wine of impeachment and conviction in a fall connected in some ways with Buckingham (see the "Dedication" lines 7-8).[18] He is felled by the very Parliament he so urged James to hold. The royal poet gives his own judgement of the lord in the same folio that contains the birthday poem, writing after Bacon's death, "In his adversity I ever prayed, that God would give him strength: for Greatnesse hee could not want. Neither could

I condole in a word, or syllable for him; as knowing no Accident could doe harme to vertue; but rather helpe to make it manifest" (Herford and Simpson 8:592). Rather than resembling the evil officials of "Panegyre," this fallen Chancellor recalls instead the type of person praised in the Tribe of Ben poem, where Jonson writes,

> Men that are safe, and sure, in all they doe,
> Care not what trials they are put unto;
> They meet the fire, the Test, as Martyrs would;
> And though Opinion stampe them not, are gold.
>
> (1-4)

Nowhere in Under-wood, however does the laureate praise the man who soon abuses his power to wrest from the broken Bacon the home, but not the spirit or office of the Keeper--George Villiers (Bowen 213).

Like Bacon, however, Buckingham himself is threatened with impeachment, particularly during Charles's reign. More than once, only the king's adjournment of Parliament prevents such an action. Upon Buckingham's death in 1628, however, it becomes obvious even to Charles that Villiers was not Parliament's only target, as difficulties escalate between the king and the high court to which he had appealed for harmony. In early 1629, a fiery, inexperienced MP--just the type Bacon dreaded--goes too far when he "urge[s] the House to appeal from the King to the country" (S. R. Gardiner 7:67). This man, John Eliot, further resolves that Parliament denounce the government's religious innovations

and the "levying and the payment of Tunnage and Poundage [a tax on goods] without parliamentary authority" (7:75). He also accuses the king's minister, Richard Weston, of betraying the country. Faced with this situation, Charles dismisses the houses shortly afterward, on March 10, reading that day a proclamation defending his act. While in Jonson's view England could ill afford to lose men such as Bacon, it could afford not at all to lose the country's legal head. Therefore when the laureate celebrates the monarch's accession anniversary on March 27th, he energetically supports the ruler's recent proclamation; in "An Epigram. To our great and good K. CHARLES On his Anniversary Day," he also describes the interdependence of monarch and country and the danger of challenging the king.[19]

From the beginning, the poet defends the ruler's respect for law and his qualifications, calling Charles, "our great and good K.[ing]." More specifically, Jonson argues that this ruler has performed well in the areas questioned by Parliament and the people: constitutional correctness and religious regulation. Concerning the former, the poem like the proclamation tries to reconcile what is in constitutional terms the "real king"--who is "subject to law"--and the "ideal" or symbolic one--who is "above law" (Allen 35). Stressing the monarch's voluntary concordance with the law rather than his power above it, Jonson not only reiterates the counsel of "Panegyre" but

addresses current debates about differences between the ruler's and the subjects' rights, and between royal prerogative and common law. The speaker thus asks rhetorically,

> Indeed, when had great Britaine greater cause
> Then now, to love the Soveraigne, and the Lawes?
> When you that raigne, are her Example growne,
> And what are bounds to her, you make your owne? (7-10)

Here the poet argues that Charles, like James in "Panegyre," supplements the power of a king with the temperance of a private man, observing the same legal limits ("bounds") that his subjects do. The monarch voluntarily yields to what subjects necessarily follow, for whereas the laws "are bounds" to Britain, the king "make[s]" them his own (10; emphasis mine). In so controlling his power and ruling himself, Charles has become an example that English citizens--particularly intemperate officials--should imitate.

In supporting such a temperate monarch, subjects will simultaneously support England's statutes and protect themselves, for the monarch's acts do not actually conflict with the people's good: citizens can trustfully love "the Soveraigne, and the Lawes" (8; emphasis mine). Charles has recently justified such a faith, stating in his proclamation, "[we desire to preserve] the just and ancient

liberties of our subjects . . . entire and inviolable, as we would do our own right and sovereignty" (69). Thus while Jonson (like Charles) prefers no contradiction between monarch and laws, by calling Charles "Soveraigne" he awards any ultimate victory to the king's interpretation of those laws--not to that of MPs such as Eliot. Always present in the poem, however, is the sense that the sovereign must use his prerogative for the highest law, the people's safety.

Complimenting both the ruler's legality and his example, the laureate tells him, "all your life's a president of dayes" (13). "[P]resident" (or precedent) is dear to the common lawyers opposing Charles, something they cite often as they support their acts or criticize the king's. Yet the king too can draw upon custom to validate his acts, as he does in the proclamation, where he mentions "divers precedents" concerning the dissolution (76) and states about tunnage and poundage, "we require no more [from the merchants]. . . than so many of our predecessors have done" (78).

More than constitutionally correct, however, the king is also virtuous and informed in his regulation of religious practice, faithfully performing his role as England's legal Defender of the Faith. In the face of Eliot's and other Puritans' attack upon Charles, Jonson declares that the ruler's "practise doth secure / That Faith, which she [England] professeth to be pure" (11-12). Arguing that the monarch embodies rather than opposes Christian faith and

works, the poem recalls the proclamation, where the king states, "we do here profess to maintain the [Church of England's] true religion and doctrine" (77), having called Parliament "for the safety of religion," recalled the controversial Appello Caesarem, and reprinted the Articles of Religion (63, 68-69). Affirming such a monarch "Most pious," the laureate clearly argues that subjects can trust this Defender of the Faith with the laws protecting Christianity (2).

As the laureate also makes clear, however, other subjects do not share the laureate's trust. Refusing to love and obey their monarch, they act in a manner as self-destructive as it is wrong, for their fate depends upon their king's. Demonstrating this interdependence of nation and ruler, the poet exclaims, "How happy were the Subject, if he knew, / Most pious King, but his owne good in you!" (1-2). Specifically, the poem recalls the ruler's recent pledge, ". . . we will not command anything unjust or dishonourable, but shall use our authority and prerogatives for the good of our people . . ." (78). More generally, however, the epigram reminds readers that whatever the monarch's personal qualities, he--according to constitutional theory--legally symbolizes the whole commonweal (Allen 35, 6). Consequently, even self-centered subjects should protect their ruler, for in doing so they defend the system that shelters them from anarchy.

Continuing to show each subject's dependence upon the

king, the laureate asks rhetorically, "How many times, Live long, CHARLES, would he say, / If he but weigh'd the blessings of this day?" (3-4). Again, these lines specifically recall the proclamation, which suggests that if English citizens thoughtfully compared their lot with that of foreign ones, they would "acknowledge their own blessedness," particularly concerning the financial and religious regulation they currently oppose (78). Nor is the proclamation's statement mere propaganda, for many citizens in other countries pay higher taxes to a more absolutist monarch, as Aylmer affirms (20), and they also suffer more religious persecution. Such thoughtful comparison would lead subjects to remember the words they shouted but four years ago, upon Charles's accession: "The king is dead; long live the king." Traditionally symbolizing the crown's safe passing upon succession, this cry implies legal stability and the crown's eternity in spite of the mortality of individual kings (Allen 32-33). Charles's succession was more straightforward than several past ones had been, and the people greeted it joyfully (Carlton 60); English subjects seem now to forget the benefits of a peaceful succession. These persons should instead emulate the citizens Jonson describes at the end of "Panegyre," who shout about James, ". . . let blest Britain ask . . . / Still to have such a king, and this king long."

Because many Caroline subjects have recently acted thoughtlessly (in Jonson's view), the laureate complains,

"How is she [England] barren growne of love! or broke! / That nothing can her gratitude provoke!" (15-16). Citizens who should have borne their political husband a generative love and a fruitful service have demonstrated a perverse fickleness. Rather than resembling the courtiers of Love Restored and the generous, loyal Richard Weston of "Epithalamion," these subjects recall the hoarding Plutus and the jealous wedding guests who are interested more in divorce than in marriage. Here is none of the gratitude that remembers the monarch's past kindness and trusts his current acts. Without this gratitude and trust, the legal system can function neither lovingly nor efficiently.

Censuring subjects for their unsound attitudes, the poem turns against the citizens their charge that Charles taxes them too highly. The poem argues that not the king, but the people are in debt, for though "broke" of love, they are linked with "Surfet" (17). The crown desperately needs money to finance a war for which the people had clamored, but merchants backed by citizens have deliberately slowed trade and refused to pay tunnage and poundage. Censuring such action, the poet exclaims, "'Tis not alone the Merchant, but the Clowne [commoner], / Is Banke-rupt turn'd!" Even more at fault, however, are the officials who have encouraged these and other insubordinate acts against their own legal head. In such a reckoning, "The Cassock, Cloake, and Gowne, / Are lost upon accompt!" (19-21). In denying the king what Parliament has traditionally granted

monarchs (tunnage and poundage), many common-law MPs go against the precedence they so claim to value. Like the merchant and common subject, these persons are delinquent not because they cannot pay, but because they do not wish to: "none will know / How much to heaven for thee, great CHARLES, they owe!" (21-22). Unlike the courtiers of Love Restored, these persons repay their ruler neither in money nor in service.

Even those who should most realize their debt to heaven, religious officials ("Cassock[s]"), are "lost upon accompt." In this phrase Jonson's both recalls and supports the king's proclamation, which blames subordinates rather than the ruler himself for any illegal lenity toward Catholics. Stating his own good intention while accusing these subordinates, Charles declares,

> when we have done our office we shall account
> ourself, and all charitable men will account
> us innocent . . . and . . . we will . . .
> expect [our negligent officers hereafter to]
> . . . give us a better account.
>
> (69)

Lacking many subjects' hysterical dread of Catholicism, the laureate confidently accounts the king innocent. Most subjects, however, do not acquit the king, not because they are good Christians, but because, barren of love as the poem argues, they lack the supremely Christian quality of charity. In prejudging their sovereign guilty, they

endanger their whole legal system.

Through reference to the occasion's date, "An Epigram" further warns readers to cooperate with rather than undermine their king. Since the accession day (March 27) closely follows the legal new year's day (March 25), the regnal and legal years change almost simultaneously (Donaldson 702n64). Jonson implies this fact when he says that Charles's day "turnes our joyfull yeare about" (5). Similarly, the kingship itself--which the day symbolizes--figures not only as the sun, according to which the solar calendar rotates (is turned about), but as a primum mobile, which in effect causes the king's subjects to revolve around him. In effect, England's sovereign "turns . . . [the legal world] about." Charles's father thinks of the kingship in similar terms, as Fulton H. Anderson reports: James believes that the monarch "as the Primum Mobile or 'First Moved' by the First Mover or God, imparts his 'motion' to his subordinates" (109-10). In his own use of the primum mobile metaphor, the laureate stresses just how fundamental the subjects' dependence upon their monarch is. Displacing the primum mobile, if it could be done, would result not in the people's or Parliament's independence, but in a chaos and destruction that would engulf all--merchant, clown, cassock, cloak, and gown. In order to prevent such destruction, citizens should instead "For safetie of such Majestie cry out" (6), supporting not only the personal monarch ("His Majesty"), but the dignity of his office

("majesty"). Officials who undermine that dignity through disobedience or insult it by public doubt might find their own authority soon disregarded; and subjects who could rid themselves of constraint might soon wish for order. The man who counsels such support is not a Stuart favorite who has never known neglect, but the same man who in a time of need could still state, "I . . . pray high heaven conspire / My Princes safetie, and my Kings desire" ("An Epistle . . . Tribe of Ben" 37-38).

While warning subjects and defending Charles at a critical time, the laureate nonetheless does not condone absolutism: he neither praises the king for dismissing Parliament nor implies punishment for those who have disobeyed him; he suggests the banishment of an attitude rather than of certain people. Like Poetaster and "Panegyre," this Under-wood poem posits love and cooperation, not fear and coercion, as a solution, though here Jonson's work gains resonance and energy by directly addressing specific controversial issues. Supporting the king's sovereignty in an effort to restore legal equilibrium, "An Epigram" like "Panegyre" nonetheless praises legality and temperance rather than mere power as princely qualities. Though he does not defiantly demand the people's rights, as Eliot has done, the laureate defends them by treating their acceptance as a matter of course and by reminding Charles to fulfill his proclamation's recent pledge to protect those rights. Jonson asks subjects to let

their king determine the people's good, but he supports that good as the supreme law of the land.

More than recalling and reinforcing the king's proclamation, "Epigram" should also remind Charles of earlier words to his father, written by Jonson when James goes to greet, rather than to dismiss Parliament. The epigram's mention of "Example" (9) recalls the poet's earlier advice that ". . . kings, by their example [mine], more do sway / Than by their power; and men more do obey / When they are led than when they are compelled" ("Panegyre" 125-27). The laureate doubtless thinks that Charles would do well to read the earlier poem, noting that work's emphasis on balance and moderation. In the rhetorical question implying to Charles "what are bounds to her, you make your owne" (10), the "Epigram" further reminds the king to continue within those bounds, overstepping them only when absolutely necessary for the country.

While the author of Under-wood retains the basic principles of legal virtue and cooperation espoused in "Panegyre," he gains over the years an awareness of the legal system's complexities and a sensitivity to the changing political context. Advising a king just starting his reign, "Panegyre" is often polarized and academic, and Jonson speaks impersonally through a classical figure in order to give his own counsel weight and to make it seem less presumptuous. Once the king has established his own advisors, as well as exhibited his frailties, a more canny

and confident Jonson counsels where he thinks he can have the most effect, wisely drawing upon the occasion and his own authority as he praises acquaintances such as Francis Bacon.

During King Charles's reign, the royal poet comes to understand how complex and volatile the legal network can be, how often it responds to leaders' eccentricities and people's phobias as well as to genuine concerns. Probably frustrated at the growing general insubordination (and perhaps irritated even by Charles's arrogance), Jonson reacts strongly in "An Epigram" as he supports what even S. R. Gardiner calls "an able statement" of the king's reasons for dissoving Parliament (7:78). "An Epigram" states the same principles of love and cooperation that "A Panegyre" does, only this time the poet addresses a monarch and people more at odds with one another. Aware both of the legal system's flexibility and its fragility, the laureate exhorts the people to exercise patience and trust; he also advises the ruler to be deserving of those qualities.

The years between the composition of "An Epigram" and its author's death in 1637 do not realize Jonson's hope for a loving reconciliation within the legal system, though Charles's personal rule from 1629 to 1640 is not necessarily "The Eleven Years Tyranny" it is sometimes called (see Aylmer 76). Soon after Under-wood's publication (1640), the English would argue with weapons the legal issues they had before discussed with words. In the next decade, the

government would no longer celebrate royal accession anniversaries. While many English subjects will be grateful for this fact, Ben Jonson, had he lived, would not have been one of them. Though he would not forget that a tyrant was no longer a true king, he would similarly remember that it is for God, and not the people, to punish that tyrant.

NOTES

[1] See Dietz 242-43 and Ashley 52 on James's unpolitic claim to Parliament concerning his great power. See Hill, Intellectual on the confusion of the legal system (227-28).

[2] Concerning an Under-wood poem traditionally connected with this second Lord Chancellor (John Williams), see note 12 below.

[3] Though Parfitt comments on the poem's general historical context and notes "images or ideals of harmony and unity," he senses in "Panegyre" more hesitation than I do (Ben 69-71).

[4] On "wise" and "honest" see also Discoveries, Workes 8:565-66.

[5] On theories concerning the prerogative see Allen's book, especially 6, 8, 34-35. On its contentious nature in Tudor-Stuart politics see Hexter 37-47.

[6] Parfitt comments on the traditional use of this religious chain and the concurrence of this idea with the philosophy of James; he adds, however, that this idea "was already being questioned elsewhere" (Ben 70).

The sonnet or "Argument" occurs immediately after the title page and just before the epistle "TO HENRY MY DEAREST SONNE, AND naturall successor." In the 1603 edition it is numbered)(3.

[7] McElwee writes, "So long as James remained on a horse he did not do too badly . . . and his passion for hunting appealed to all classes as kingly and manly. Afoot his shambling walk robbed him of all dignity . . . " (125). As for the connection between horse-riding and governing, Jonson records in Discoveries, "The say Princes learne no Art truly, but the Art of Horse-manship. The reason is, the brave beast is no flatterer" (8:601). There he also writes that "a Prince has more . . . trouble with them [the people], than ever Hercules had with the Bull, or any other beast" (8:593).

[8] On Parliament's conception of its role at this time, see Hexter 33-34; on MPs recognition of their growing wealth and power see Ashley 73. During and before Elizabeth's reign, much of the legislation is directed by the monarch via the Privy Council, although Parliament itself performs the actual legislation. When James and Charles reign, however, parliamentary legislation becomes more independent (see Willson 3-17).

[9] Basilikon Doron states that "justice, by the law, giveth every man his owne," also remarking, "give the little man the larger coat if it be his" (91).

[10] Ernst H. Kantorowicz provides a discussion of this concept in his book.

[11] For a brief overview of the historical background see Ashley 52-63 and Dietz 242-56.

[12] See the Under-wood poems "An Epigram. To THOMAS

[Egerton] Lo: ELSMERE, the last Terme he sate Chancellor"; "Another to him"; "Lord BACONS Birth-day"; "An Epigram" beginning "That you have seene the pride, beheld the sport" (probably to Williams); and "An Epigram on Sir Edward Coke, when he was Lord chiefe Justice of England." The epigram upon Williams was actually written after he was dismissed from office; the Coke poem was written sometime between 1613 and 1616. Evans provides an interesting historical reading of both poems ("'Games'"). For more information on the Coke poem and on Coke himself see Patterson 131-32; Dietz 249; Davies 19-20; and Ashley 59. As indicated in Jones 30-31 and Hill, Intellectual 96-97, 231, Coke and Bacon have several qualities in common. For another poem concerning legal matters see also "An Epigram to the Councellour [Anthony Benn] that pleaded, and carried the Cause."

[13] The full title of the poem is "An Epigram. To our great and good K. CHARLES On his Anniversary Day."

[14] On Bacon's desire for governmental harmony see S.R. Gardiner 3:396ff; Crowther 241, 245, 256, 264, 278; Marwil 18-19; "Bacon, Francis" DNB. On the poem's setting and Bacon's frame of mind see Marwil 15-16.

[15] On York House see Bowen 159-60, 213; and Crowther 251. For others' comments on Nicholas's virtues see "Bacon, Nicholas," DNB 1:842 and Matthew Thompson McClure vii. For Francis's comments upon following his father's example, see Marwil 146; Bowen 152; and Crowther 263.

[16] Goldberg states, "Bacon is not simply his father's

son; he is the king's creation--and the poet's too. The poet's occasion for 'raysing him' comes from the king" (224).

[17] Though the woolsack was actually crimson, the wool would have been white when spun, then later dyed (Bowen 177).

[18] For various accounts of Bacon's fall, see Crowther 307ff; Russell Parliaments 103-04, 110-12; Sharpe, "Earl" 213-14; and Bowen 177-204. Reading this poem in a later context--when Jonson gathers the poems for Digby--Patterson implies harsh criticism of James (131). I believe that Jonson more likely blames Parliament or Buckingham than the king. See also van den Berg 174.

[19] Leggatt states, "Jonson is honestly reporting the King's isolation and unpopularity" (123-24). Concerning lines 15-16, he argues, "if there is a hint that Charles should re-examine his own policies, it is very deeply buried: all the overt criticism is directed at the ungrateful public" (124). See also Summers and Pebworth 197. For the historical context see S.R. Gardiner 7:30, 33-34, 82; Aylmer 66-67, 76; and Thompson 283. On the king and the law and on religious polarization see Dietz 242-44, and Russell, Parliaments 354ff, 361-62, 29.

CHAPTER V

RELIGIOUS HARMONY

Jonson's belief that God punishes kings overstepping their legal rights is but one manifestation of the strong connection between God and state, a connection generally supported in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A citizen's faith is therefore linked to his or her patriotism, even, or rather especially, in the case of the king and queen. When Jonson writes, most English citizens worship a Christian God, but they differ concerning that God's nature, how He should be worshipped, and who best represents Him on earth. Some Catholics put the Pope's word above the King's, while some Puritans oppose their own interpretations to those sanctioned by the government. Recognizing this divergence of opinion, the poet advocates a general tolerance as truly the most Christian and patriotic stance.

During the poet's lifetime, England is predominantly Anglican (English Protestant), but it has not long been so: in the previous century the country vacillated between Catholicism and Protestantism, restricting subjects who differed from the prevailing norm. Such a practice has linked religion not only with instability, but with

inflexibility. Under James and Charles, tension continues to exist among Christianity's two main branches, as well as among various sects within Protestantism. The Gunpowder Plot against James and Parliament in 1605 feeds the hysteria against Catholicism, as does the king's later friendship with the Spanish Gondomar. By Charles's reign, feeling has grown against anything resembling Catholicism, and Puritans resent not only the queen's Romanism, but her husband's promotion of high church ministers and his fondness of Catholic-like ritual. Thus official religious toleration is rare, although religious intermingling is not, as the royal family itself demonstrates. Nor are conversions uncommon in the general public, either because or in spite of the prevailing norm. The virtuous Kenelm Digby, for example, converts from Catholicism to Anglicanism to Catholicism, and the politic Earl of Northampton "outwardly changed his religion five times" (Le Comte 8).[1]

Jonson knows much about this system that combines intolerance with diversity, just as he recognizes the complex interaction of religion and state. As he tells Drummond, his father "lost all his estate under [the Catholic] Queen Mary, having been cast into prison and forfeited, at last turned minister" (as qtd. in Miles 4). Being himself successively Anglican, Catholic, then Anglican again, the poet when Catholic is reprimanded for nonconformity and connected with the Gunpowder Plot. In this latter case, he must prove that one can remain Catholic

yet respect the king's temporal authority. Supporting his monarchs and his country throughout his career and his religious changes, the poet finds good Christians among both Catholics and Protestants; and he urges England to realize that Christianity, itself full of paradoxes, can accommodate diversity.[2]

An early example of Jonson's religious counsel occurs in Hymenaei's "Barriers" (January 1606), where the Catholic poet supports his Protestant king at a court entertainment. Written for Jonson's recent benefactor, Thomas Howard, the Earl of Suffolk (Miles 105), the work outwardly celebrates the marriage of the Earl's daughter. The "Barriers" of Hymenaei also uses marriage in a political and spiritual sense, however. Showing a loving relationship between God and England, the author portrays the king as an able Christian disciple, accountable to God and to English subjects. This monarch protects spiritual Truth as much as those in Poetaster, Love Restored, and "Panegyre" defend art, Love-in-court, and legal right. A subject disobeying James therefore errs religiously as well as politically.[3]

When the loyal Jonson writes most Under-wood poems, he has reconverted to Anglicanism yet kept his religious tolerance.[4] In the rest of England, however, religious tension has increased, particularly during Charles's reign. In order to combat this tension Under-wood, like "Barriers," assures England of its connection with God, a connection strengthened by its royal family. Because Henrietta Maria

("Mary") arouses much suspicion, the laureate incorporates her into his political and religious counsel, praising the happily wed Protestant king and Catholic queen. Upon the birth of a prince, the Anglican poet plays Gabriel, using a "Hail Mary" motif to tell citizens that their Christian though Catholic queen has blessed them ("An Epigram to the Queene, then lying in"). Reminding subjects that God can choose surprising intermediaries, Jonson's piece recalls the safety of the anniversary "Epigram" and the joy of the Bacon poem. In a christening poem on another prince, the poet reinforces the religious hierarchy yet establishes the sense of spiritual community, one in which all Christians are God's heirs ("To my L. the King, On the Christning His second Sonne JAMES"). Like the "Dedication," the "Epithalamion," and the Digby poem, this work includes many in its harmony, recalling even the child's dead grandfather, King James, though it also hints at exclusion.

The Hymenaei "Barriers" directly celebrates an actual wedding, that of Frances Howard and the Earl of Essex (January 1606). Yet it also uses the religious and political overtones of marriage, supporting the king's connection both with his subjects and with God. Performed just two months after the Gunpowder Plot's discovery, the work has been written by a Catholic poet for a short time linked with the intrigue. Further, it has been written for a man "eager to demonstrate that no mad Roman Catholicism motivated . . . [him], whatever the perennial suspicions

directed at his uncle [the Earl of Northampton]" (Le Comte 8). Using Biblical allusions as well as allegorical figures, Jonson stresses the connection between God and England. Showing the king's religious excellence--as he has shown artistic, courtly, and legal virtue--the poet depicts James as a Christian disciple serving his heavenly father and his political children (the English subjects). These subjects must learn to obey and cooperate, for if they defy the king, they defy God also.[5]

Describing marriage according to Roman custom in Hymenaei's masque, in its "Barriers" the author depicts a fight between Truth, who defends marriage, and Opinion, who opposes it. During this battle the poet speaks through Truth to enlighten Opinion, as he prepares for the political-religious pronouncements occurring at the work's end. Describing a mystical marriage important to Protestants and Catholics (the Incarnation), Truth argues that "LOVE ([which] . . . wrapt heav'ns soule in earth, / And made a woman glory in his birth) / In marriage, opens his inflamed brest" (659-61). Here the poet reminds Christians of the diversity the Incarnation incorporates: high and low are married (as heaven and earth indicate) as are spirit and body (as soul and earth ["dirt"] suggest). This marriage symbolizes and makes possible the marriage English Christians seek with Christ, the Church's groom. By speaking of the subject-king relationship in similar terms, the author through Truth shows how the political and

religious can cooperate. When celibacy's champion, Opinion, states that "one king . . . inspire[s] / Soule, to all bodies, in their royall spheare," Truth takes things a step further:

> And where is marriage more declar'd, then there?
> Is there a band more strict, then that doth tie
> The soule [king] and body [body politic] in such unity?
> Subjects to soveraignes? . . .
> (726-29)

By uniting English subjects with the king as well as with God, Jonson in his discussion of spiritual marriage prepares to include the monarch, not bypass him as some--but not all--Catholics would have it. He paints the ruler not so much a religious intermediary, as the divine "Lieutenant" James himself describes in Basilikon, a heaven-sent deputy whom subjects must not publicly disobey.

After showing the battle between Truth's followers and Opinion's, the author then moves the work to a higher, anagogical level. Because even a king harmonizing court and law will get little support if he hinders spiritual union, the poet reinforces the argument that James facilitates the marriage of Christ with the church and its members. Using Biblical allusions as he reintroduces Truth through an angel, the poet achieves an air of final religious authority; engaging spectators' reverence for the allegorical figure of Truth, he then attempts to transfer

that reverence by giving her qualities to the monarch.

In this wedding celebration where James is an honored guest, the poem implicitly foreshadows this excommunicate king's presence at the eschatological union it symbolizes: the marriage of the Lamb to His Church. Verbally creating the appropriate wedding music for this event, the angel states that Truth has "descended in a second thunder." That this thunder is not merely that of "JUPITER, the Thunderer" Jonson indicates by using an angel rather than a classical messenger, suggesting the oft-mentioned thunder in Revelation (for Jupiter, see the last words of Hymenaei's masque).[6]

Arraying Truth as a bride, the poet remarks through the angel that Truth "[u]pon her head . . . weares a crowne of starres / Through which her orient hayre waves to her wast" (798-99). In her crown, this figure supporting the monarch thus resembles not only Hymen, Juno, and the bride from Hymenaei's wedding masque, but suggests Christ's bride as she appears in John's vision, "[wearing] upon her head a crowne of twelve starres" (Rev. 12.1). Such an association not only reinforces Truth's authority but prepares for the connection between the church and the Crown of England.

Not only Truth's crown, but her hair indicates her nature as liaison. In the flowing style of her hair, Truth suggests the wedding custom indicating virginity, a type of purity that fits her not only for marriage with Christ, but also for a role as mediatrix.[7] It is by this hair that

". . . beleeving mortalls hold her [Truth] fast, / And in those golden chordes are carried even, / Till with her breath she blowes them up to heaven" (800-03). Thus Truth, like the Incarnation, in her own way marries heaven and earth, for though her head is in the stars, suggesting her origin of descent, her long golden hair hangs where humans can reach it. Here the poem recalls the king's defense of religion in his Basilikon: there James not only describes faith as "the golden chaine that linketh the faithfull soule to Christ" (11), but--discussing the Incarnation and Christ's sacrifice--says that "it pleased God . . . that since we could not be saved by doing, wee might at least, be saved by beleeving" (7-8). By using similar imagery and diction, the poet clearly affirms the king's true Christian belief and his interest in spiritual as well as political marriage.

More than human faith is necessary, however, as the poet himself indicates when he mentions Truth's breath. Stressing the importance of Truth's spirit or blowing (spirare), the poet suggests not only the life God blows into Adam at creation and what the Holy Spirit infuses into Mary at the Incarnation, but also the religiously sanctioned political life the sovereign inspires into his body politic. Here the Catholic author again connects the excommunicate monarch with spiritual life rather than death. As the audience should realize, good English Christians must concern themselves with such types of "blow[ing] up" and not

with treasonous ones involving gunpowder.

Having implicitly linked Truth and James in the angel's description, Jonson then makes the connection explicit in the figure's actions and speech to the king. Assigning Truth "a voyce . . . like a trumpet lowd . . . / Which bids all sounds in earth, and heav'n be still" (823-24), the poet again borrows from Revelation to give the figure's words weight and to hush the audience for praise of the king as Christian judge and disciple. As the poet has used Themis to support James's legal wisdom and virtue ("Panegyre"), he now uses Truth to affirm the king's spiritual knowledge and innocence at a time when some English Catholics have questioned it.

Declaring the monarch's religious discernment, Truth states, "This royall Judge of our contention / Will prop, I know, what I have under-gone" (845-46), that is, her victory over Opinion disguised as Truth. Because the ruler upholds religious--as well as temporal--order, subjects would themselves do well to support him, as the author does now. They must realize that just as the rulers in Poetaster and "Panegyre" can recognize good poetry and good laws, this monarch can sufficiently recognize and follow Christian Truth, serving himself as a religious as well as a legal example. Believing the basic Christian tenets declared by Truth--such as the Incarnation and the importance of faith--this man will not lead astray his Christian subjects, Catholic or Protestant.

At a time when Catholics have questioned James's authority as ruler, this Catholic poet enacts a religious coronation of sorts, having Truth transfer her heavenly attributes to the Christian king (see Meagher 118). Indicating the king's status as religious deputy, Truth states, "To . . . [his] right sacred highnesse I resigne / Low, at his feet, this starrie crowne of mine, / To shew, his rule, and judgement is divine" (847-49). With her speech and her transfer of the Christian bridal crown, this figure indicates that James's decisions and tenure are not only sanctioned by his political status as England's "royall" groom (845), but are informed by his own marriage to God, as indicated by the words "sacred" and "divine." Reinforcing the king's legal authority, as supported by Right (Themis) in "Panegyre," the poet here also uses the word "right"--in the meanings of "correctness" and "due"--to imply James's proper place as God's deputy and his privileges as such (one of which surely is exemption from assassination!) (see "right," OED). According to the poet, God sanctions not only the monarchy in general, as Christ does in his speech on the pagan Caesar (Luke 20.20-25), but James's rule in particular, since it corresponds with Truth and therefore with the divine will. Both sanctions are very strong arguments against the regicide attempted in November, particularly against regicide as a Christian duty. As Jonson will later state in Catiline his Conspiracy (1611), "no religion binds men to be traitors" (3:369).[8]

His Highness being elevated in spirit and faith, James is as worthy as any mortal to receive Truth's crown, and as the figure places her diadem "low" at his feet, she in effect has the king's feet touching the stars. Yet whatever James's worthiness, his elevation would not be possible without God: heavenly Truth had to first "descend" to attend this earthly entertainment (795), and to bow as she willingly relinquishes her crown of stars to someone wearing a much lesser one. In thus juxtaposing high and low as Truth transfers her crown, Jonson reminds subjects of Christianity's diverse and paradoxical nature, one certainly broad enough to embrace both Catholics and Protestants. He also suggests its splendid humility, as witnessed in the Incarnation and the birth of Christ.

Through Truth's grand humility, her association with the Saviour, and her bowing to James's feet, the poet recalls the desire for loving reconciliation symbolized when Christ washes His disciples' feet at the Last Supper (John 13.4-17). The poet also sets the context for portraying James as a modern-day disciple, a portrait he continues to draw as Truth transfers other emblems to the king. In a passage full of Biblical allusions, Truth states, "These <u>doves</u> to him I consecrate withall, / To note his innocence, without spot, or gall; / These <u>serpents</u>, for his wisedome . . ." (850-52). Here the author echoes a passage where Jesus gathers together his disciples and advises them; that the Scripture names the two Jameses might not be lost on

Jonson. In his advice Christ states, "Beholde, I send you as shepe in the middes of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpentes, and innocent as doves" (Matthew 10.16). By referring to lines at the very root of Christianity, before Catholic and Protestant existed, the poet avoids the question of denomination, validating James's marriage with God and his position as England's Defender of the Christian faith. Christian leaders--like artists, court members, and legal officials--need both knowledge and virtue in order to do their jobs properly; luckily for England, the poem argues, its king has these qualities. Spectators of "Barriers" should know of the king's theological discussion in Basilikon, and they have doubtless heard the government's account of James's discovery of the Gunpowder Plot (see McElwee 161).

Not only wise enough to escape such a plot against him, the king, like Christ and the disciples, had done nothing to deserve the attempt. Jonson stresses this point when he calls James not merely innocent or "completely innocent," but "without spot." Occurring several times in the Bible, this phrase characterizes both the groom and the bride of Revelation, that is, Christ (the sacrificial lamb) and the Church (washed in His blood). Such comparisons clearly argue the monarch's connection with God and with the true church.[9]

The emblem, as well as the phrase, associated with the king's innocence supports his religious authority,

particularly when taken within the scheme of Biblical typology and the Gunpowder Plot. The dove recalls the Holy Spirit's presence at Christ's baptism, a presence signifying God's pleasure in His son. The baptism and dove also recall the deluge and the dove at Noah's ark, symbolizing death from sin and future union with God, respectively. James himself makes the baptism-deluge reference in his speech to Parliament shortly after the Gunpowder Plot. Stating there that God in the deluge did "baptize the world to a general destruction, but not to general purgation," the king compares the Plot itself to the flood, likening his escape to Noah's. This deluge metaphor becomes very popular, with the poet himself using it years later in Catiline's Conspiracy (1611).[10] When taken in its Biblical context of a wolvish world and the political context of the Plot, the serpent and dove passage provides a gloss on the recent attempt against James's life, implying that in this wolvish world even the wise and good can come to harm--as Christ's death shows. That both deaths were planned by rigidly religious persons further links Christ and James and shows the chaos perverted religion can cause.

At a time of confusion concerning religious authority within the nation, the poet not only connects James with Christ, Noah, Christ's bride, and the disciples as a group: he also connects him with Peter, commonly held to be the prototype for the Roman Catholic Pope. Without undercutting the Pope's religious virtue, the author nonetheless suggests

that James too has God-given power, and that in temporal matters English Catholics may, rather must, support the deputy God has given them. Recalling Christ's famous address to Peter, Truth tells James, ". . . [I consecrate] these bright keyes, / Designing power to ope the ported skyes, / And speake their glories to his subjects eyes" (853-55). In Matthew 16.19 Christ addresses Peter, saying that he will build his church upon him, adding, "And I wil give unto thee the keyes of the kingdome of heaven." Like Truth and Peter (and the Pope), James possesses the key to divine knowledge so that he can lead others, in this case his English subjects. There is a limit to the ruler's spiritual power, however (just as there is to the Pope's temporal): though James receives the keys to heaven, he does not receive those to hell. Thus while he can make it easier for his subjects to reach God, he can not make it harder.

Jonson knows, however, that the most important element in a spiritual or political marriage is not power, innocence, wisdom, or even faith: it is love, the quality that "Panegyre" praises in legal relations, Poetaster depicts in artistic ones, and Love Restored figures in courtly ones. Saving the most important quality for last, Truth tell James, "Lastly, [I consecrate] this heart" (856). Described earlier as shining through Truth's breast (809), this heart indicates James's open love for his God and his people, a love mocked by the Hypocrisy broken on Truth's

chariot and by the Gunpowder traitors (815). Such love leads to the Incarnation and to marriage, the quality Paul exalts when he writes, "And thogh I had the gift of prophecie, and knewe all secretes . . . yea, if I had all faith . . . and had not love, I were nothing" (1 Corinthians 13.2). This Christian charity, which James receives from God and gives to his English political bride (the kingdom), makes the king a figure that both Catholics and Protestant subjects can trust and should love. Because this ruler's heart will be true to God, the poem advises "all hearts" to be true to it, and to form a harmony among God, the monarchy, and the English people.

That subjects are not necessarily faithful to God's deputy, however, Jonson indicates when he states, "And TRUTH in him [James] make treason ever rue" (857). At this word, those present at Whitehall will undoubtedly remember the fifth of November and the Gunpowder treason. One of the masquers, Lord Monteagle, is the MP who received a letter vaguely warning about the plot; the bride's father saw the faggots that were to have fueled the destruction of both king and Parliament. More than one audience member would have lost his life in this plot which, though pursued in the name of religion, is probably repugnant to most English Catholics and certainly, Jonson indicates, repugnant to God. As in Poetaster, Love Restored, and "Panegyre," the poet again counsels that though a Christian kingdom can include many different elements, there are some things--such as

treason--it cannot allow.

Understandably, however, the Catholic author wishes not only to support the king, but to urge tolerance for loyal Catholics, a tolerance that greatly diminishes soon after the Plot.[11] Some time back, James had stated, "I will never allow in my conscience that the blood of any man shall be shed for diversity of opinions in religion. . . . I protest to God I reverence their church [Catholic] as our mother church although clogged with many infirmities and corruptions" (as qtd. in Cecil 231). By seventeenth-century standards, such a statement is about as tolerant as English subjects could expect, and Jonson encourages such a sympathetic approach: including Opinion's erring champions if not Opinion into Truth's fold, the poet further ends this poetic battlepiece with a sentence that translates, "Live in harmony, and learn to perform our duty." He himself has recently performed his duty by helping in the Gunpowder Plot investigation, and he hopes, through this work, to aid his country's struggle for concord.

In "Barriers," a Catholic Jonson addresses a Protestant king after a Catholic plot; when writing several Under-wood poems, an Anglican Jonson advises a largely Protestant country that often distrusts the queen's Catholicism and the king's high church beliefs. Continuing to counsel harmony among God, His deputies, and the English people, the poet in his later works argues more directly and with more confidence. Using family and marriage in a more personal way

than before, he not only stresses qualities common to all Christians but reminds readers of Christianity's room for diversity and paradox. While supporting the royal family, Under-wood also shows that all Christian citizens are part of God's family.

Under-wood contains several pieces connecting the royal family with God. A birthday poem to the new mother Queen Mary (Henrietta Maria) mentions her "wombe divine, / So fruitfull, and so faire," words that recall the Virgin Mary ("An Ode, or Song, by all the Muses" 51-52); a birthday poem to King Charles prods people to pray more concerning the monarch ("To the King. On his Birth-day," lines 19-20). Three other poems, one of consolation and two of celebration, examine in more detail the network of relationships between the divine, English royalty, and English subjects. The consolatory poem, treating the miscarriage of the queen's first child, in some ways prepares for the two celebratory poems, which best represent the laureate's combination of diversity and harmony.[12]

The consolatory epigram treats the death of a long-awaited royal heir (1629), in which Jonson sees not divine punishment of the monarchs (as some might), but God's just reclaiming of what is His ("To K. CHARLES, and Q. MARY. For the losse of their first-borne"). The poet sees also the parents' opportunity to willingly offer their "first-fruits" to God, an act that indicates their faith and emulates God's own sacrifice, through Christ, to His people.

Setting examples for their political children as they accept the death of their biological one, faithful rulers can bring harmony between themselves and their heavenly father and can earn their reward in a "long, large, and blest posteritie." In this way they will benefit their subjects as well as themselves.

In the years after this consolatory poem, during times of increasing religious polarization (Russell, Parliaments 29), the laureate demonstrates that the monarchs' religious faith has borne tangible fruit, first in a prince named Charles (1630), then in a daughter (1631), then in another son, named James (1633). Seizing the euphoric reaction to the first surviving Caroline heir, the poet persuades the English to extend their joy to the prince's mother. Drawing upon the queen's English name ("Mary") in an Anglicized and political ave Maria, Jonson daringly but carefully incorporates the Annunciation and Incarnation in his praise of the English mother ("An Epigram to the Queene, then lying in"). Comparing the mother of the prince and of England to the mother of Christ, the author himself plays a scaled-down Gabriel-like role as he "compare[s] small to great" (12).[13]

Like "Barriers," "An Epigram to the Queene" connects England both to God and to royalty, opposing attempts to bypass the monarchs and undercut their temporal authority (attempts earlier made by some Catholics and now by some Puritans). Rather than speaking through a personified

figure, however, the confident royal poet himself provides the connection. Referring to England's common regard for religion, this herald includes his fellow citizens when he calls Christ "our Lord" (3; emphasis mine), and he uses the same pronoun to describe the newest royal family member as "our Prince" (6; emphasis mine). In much of the poem's remainder, this Protestant poet tells fellow subjects that the Catholic he calls "my Queene" is their queen as well, and a good one at that (5). Connecting the queen with the Virgin Mother, Jonson not only suggests reconciliation through surprising intermediaries but provides Queen Mary with a namesake much more positive and non-denominational than English history might call to mind (such as Bloody Mary and Mary, Queen of Scots).

From the very beginning of his poem, the laureate involves several levels of meaning as he weaves together the threads of Protestant, Catholic, and political doctrine in his harmonious song. Having shown King James as a disciple in "Barriers," the poet here depicts Henrietta in the role of a mother, one her subjects would most likely find acceptable. Starting the poem to the queen with the words "Haile Mary," Jonson suggests an address to the English monarch, the Catholic prayer to the Virgin Mother (ave Maria), and Gabriel's announcement of the Incarnation (a story that Protestants and Catholics hold in common). The poet thus conflates the two Marys and the two branches of Christianity, represented also in the author's own

Protestantism and in his queen's Catholicism. Following the "Hail Mary" immediately with the phrase "full of grace" (1), the poet continues to evoke the ave Maria, though he does not yet explain whether or not he is directly addressing Queen Mary, and thus in some way deifying her. In the following lines, however, he clears himself from charges of idolizing the queen (having already implied her elevation), at the same time showing that he is not so much praying an ave as he is recalling the Annunciation. He states, ". . . [this] once was said, / And by an Angell, to the blessed'st Maid, / The Mother of our Lord . . . " (1-3). By allowing the English queen, the Catholic prayer, and the Scriptural record to intermingle, however, the laureate demonstrates the ease with which the monarchy, Catholicism, and Protestantism can coexist. Alluding to the Virgin Birth in his juxtaposition of "Maid" and "Mother," for example, he stresses a doctrine supported by both Catholic tradition and the Anglican Thirty-Nine Articles, a doctrine nonetheless startling in its reconciliation of opposites (see Bicknell 74-81). Surely, Jonson implies, a religion that can admit such a paradox should be able to peacefully include various branches, particularly since those branches share the same God (as the phrase "our Lord" indicates [emphasis mine]).

Nor does the poet allow the phrase "once was said" to distance the Annunciation too much from contemporary England: occurring as it does in the context of an angel's message and the Word's incarnation, this phrase supports the

general power of language, one which the Christian poet to some degree appropriates in his present-day address to his worthy queen. Having introduced three heavenly characters--Gabriel (the angel), the Virgin Mary (the maid and mother), and Christ (our Lord), the author uses these heavenly figures to provide a backdrop for their earthly counterparts: Jonson himself, Queen Mary, and Prince Charles. These heavenly figures enact, in a more elevated way, the type of role Nicholas Bacon serves in the poem on Francis. While drawing upon the heavenly figures, however, the poet carefully indicates that he notes parallels rather than equalities.

After creating a setting agreeable to all Christians, the poet then treats a birth that should appeal to all English subjects. He asks,

> . . . why may not I
> (Without prophanenesse) yet, a Poet, cry
> Haile Mary, full of honours, to my Queene,
> The Mother of our Prince . . .
>
> (3-6)

Having just emphasized the importance of language, the poem in its use of repeated words and parallel structure joins the two Marys and the two princes, maintaining the Stuarts' spirituality without elevating them too highly. "Haile Mary, full of honours" echoes "Haile Mary, full of grace" (5, 1), indicating through similar names a similarity in nature (such as Caesar demonstrates to Virgil in Poetaster).

In echoing "The Mother of our Prince" with "The Mother of our Lord" (6, 3), the herald stresses not only the bounty of both women, but the importance of the children they bear--the Prince of Peace and the Prince of England. While unlike the Biblical Mary Henrietta Maria cannot claim to be a virgin, her child's conception is nevertheless noble, for it involves a queen who at the death of her first son offers up her first-fruits and keeps her faith in God.

In his praise of this Christian queen, Jonson aligns himself with Gabriel, giving his high opinion of the queen much more weight than any negative opinion others might have of her. Indeed, he acts not only as Gabriel did in his appearance to Mary, but as he did when he appeared to the doubting Joseph, implying that any fault lay in Mary's critics rather than in Mary herself (see Matthew 1.20-21). In all of his comparisons, however, the poet is careful not to seem blasphemous, taking into account Protestants already distrustful of the Queen's Catholicism and of anything resembling the worship of saints. His parenthetical qualifier ("Without prophanenesse") indicates his recognition that he is a poet, not an angel, and that Henrietta is a human, and not a heavenly queen. Nor in this highly religious context does he presume to directly grant Queen Mary "grace"--a sensitive issue among Christians--though his ambiguous first line indirectly recognizes her state of grace.

In this poem as in "Barriers," however, Jonson does

more than support a monarch's piety: he argues that this ruler can aid England's relationship with God. Just as Gabriel communicates between God to the Virgin concerning her own role as mediatrix, this herald speaks from his poetic wisdom to Henrietta concerning her role as liaison (a role that others should respect). He reminds readers that however unlikely the young Catholic queen might seem as a force for reconciliation in Protestant England, God delights in making use of just such unexpected media, as his use of the humble virgin and the manger-born Messiah indicates.

Implicitly dismissing the idea of Henrietta's inability to reconcile England, the poet argues that as the Virgin's son resulted from her goodness, so has the queen's; and as the Christ child brought gratitude to His mother, so should the prince. Prince Charles is a reward for Henrietta's faith in God, one prophesied by the English herald, and his presence should help English subjects transfer the love they feel for him to the mother that risked death to bear him. The author reminds subjects of their delight concerning the prince when he asks rhetorically,

> When was there seene
> (Except the joy that the first Mary brought,
> Whereby the safetie of Man-kind was wrought)
> So generall a gladnesse to an Isle,
> To make the hearts of a whole Nation smile,
> As in this Prince?
>
> (6-11)

Assured of the spiritual safety that the Virgin, through her son, brought Christians, Queen Mary acts virtuously within the familial and political context given her. Though the queen's accomplishment is not as great as the Virgin's--as Jonson's qualifier indicates (lines 7-8)--it is nonetheless considerable, as shown by the phrases "generall . . . gladnesse" and "whole Nation," a nation in this case largely Christian. Indeed, in the word "whole" the poet stresses the harmony for which all Christian sects should strive, a harmony enacted for them, in the Incarnation, by a loving God, and one which "Barriers" has earlier encouraged. In this allusion to wholeness, a general smile, and many happy hearts, the poet creates a setting that resembles but supersedes the joy of the Bacon poem and the "Dedication," a joy more intense than that of "Barriers." Here the laureate shows that the Stuarts join in a state of love far surpassing any the pagan Caesar can offer his subjects (see Poetaster 5.1.5), a love that in its miraculous quality overshadows even the zeal of "Panegyre" and the union of "Epithalamion."

As he delivers the third and final "Hail Mary" of the poem, the author no doubt hopes that other English subjects will join with him, and he explains why they should do so:

> . . . Let it be lawfull, so
> To compare small with great, as still we owe
> Glorie to God. Then Haile to Mary! spring
> Of so much safetie to the Realme, and King!

(11-14)

Aligning the public good ("Realme") with the king as well as with the queen, the laureate builds upon other Under-wood arguments concerning safety and obligation, among them "To our great and good K. CHARLES On his Anniversary Day" (written just the year before and placed almost adjacent to this one in the Folio). There the poem states that Charles's "practise doth secure / That Faith, which she [England] professeth to be pure" (11-12), in these lines supporting the king's self-proclaimed interest in the "safety of religion" (Charles 63). In the poem praising a queen who has risked her own safety to aid her country's, the laureate recalls his earlier advice stating that subjects should "For safetie of such Majestie cry out" ("To our great and good K. CHARLES" 6). By presenting her husband with a son and her country with a Christian prince, Henrietta Maria, as England's mother, does what she can to contribute to the safety of the people, the suprema lex to which Jonson alludes in "Panegyre" and other works. When he states that Henrietta brings safety to her husband and to England--not to the foreign Catholic nation of France--the author makes it clear that citizens have no reason to distrust her. Consistent with the advice of "Barriers," Henrietta has learned to perform her duty as a Christian mother of England; others must learn to perform theirs, so that all can live in harmony.

Yet the poet praises Henrietta not so much for herself,

her son's, or even the monarchy's sake, but for the sake of England's relationship with God. In his mention of debt to God, the poet again recalls his earlier advice concerning the king, where he states that "none will know / How much to heaven for thee, great CHARLES, they owe!" (21-22). Upon the birth of Prince Charles, subjects have another chance to reflect upon God as the source of all gifts and on their obligation to repay Him out of that bounty. The monarchs have already given their first-fruits as "due / To God" (1-2), and the queen has twice risked her life. Stating, "still we owe / Glorie to God [for Mary and the prince]," the poet believes that the people must fulfill their debt to the Lord by respecting the queen, cooperating with other Christians, and trusting their God to protect them. English subjects need not fear that they appear Papist when admiring their Catholic queen, for in honoring her they honor the God of both Catholics and Anglicans.

For his part, the poet has cautiously avoided anything resembling popery or idol worship in this performance of duty. He has never elevated Henrietta Maria to the level of a saint, nor has he overdone the Marian praise, for he indicates always that the Virgin remains subordinate to the son she produced. Further, in his references to the Virgin he draws not only upon the Catholic liturgy, so long important to England, but upon the Protestant culture with its emphasis on Scripture and its Thirty-Nine Articles. The poet's use of Mariolatry is consonant with English

Protestantism in another way, for Queen Elizabeth herself encouraged its use when she reigned as the Virgin Queen. Here the laureate naturally stresses fertility rather than virginity when he describes Henrietta Maria, though he remarks upon the queen's chastity in the poem just preceding this one. (See "An Epigram on the Princes birth.") As names indicate, much of the Marian tradition would seem to fit this mother even more than it did the virgin Elizabeth.[14]

Yet in this ave Maria recalling Gabriel's words, the laureate nonetheless speaks in his own voice in a way that he does not in "Barriers" or "Panegyre." And while this poet is assuredly no angel, he is a man "safe and sure" in his speech, as he tells us elsewhere, and he gives considered rather than spur-of-the-moment counsel (see the Tribe of Ben epistle, especially lines 1-2). In this poem greatly praising the queen, Jonson is no romantic out of touch with her unpopularity: he therefore implicitly advises the English that if they cannot love Henrietta for herself, perhaps they can at least love her for giving them an heir that should smooth royal succession. If he seems to be asking for a miracle, he also reminds readers that such are not without precedent.

The political and religious safety described in "An Epigram to the Queene" poem results not just because a child has been born, but because it has been born into a Christian family. The laureate emphasizes this fact in a poem written

three years later, one that celebrates the christening of the couple's second living son and third living child (in "To my L. the King, On the Christning His second Sonne JAMES"). While by this time the monarchs' marriage has grown stronger, that between crown and people has become more strained: not only the gap between Catholic and Protestant, but that between Anglican factions has widened, the king's ministers becoming increasingly high church while the populace becomes more Calvinist (Cook 100). The unpopular Laud has borne down increasingly on Puritan preaching and wins a large victory in 1633 when he disbands the Feoffees for Impropriations--which allow lay control of clerical appointments--and passes these impropriations on to Charles (Cook 123). Further, Charles appoints him as Archbishop of Canterbury that year (1633), and it is this man who christens the new prince on November 24. At this time of both joy and strain, Jonson uses this congregational occasion to argue for religious harmony within God's family. Drawing upon Christian traditions such as the hortus conclusus, and upon the Anglican christening ceremony, he supports the authority of the royal family at the same time that he establishes a sense of spiritual community. While he does not praise Laud, however, he does warn subjects not to disobey their ruler.

Whereas the lying-in poem uses largely the mother-son relationship, "To my L. the King" also explores the male line in the context of a patriarchal kingdom. Having

earlier used the God-Mary-Christ configuration as an implicit standard, Jonson here uses the link between the heavenly father and Christ, as he treats the harmony between God the Father and Charles and between Charles and his son James. Like the poem to the queen, moreover, this one bears out Jonson's prophecy in the consolatory epigram. "That thou art lov'd of God, this worke is done, / Great King, thy having of a second Sonne" (1-2), the poet writes; his epigram supports the birth's religious significance, for it states that God will compensate "with large interest" the death of the first royal son--if the monarchs are faithful ('To K. CHARLES, and Q. MARY . . ." 5). This second living son supports God's generosity and Charles's virtuous trust (at the same time validating the laureate's vision). In this context of baptism, father-son relationships, and love, the above lines in another way support Charles's virtue: they connect the king, himself once christened, with the King of Kings, at whose baptism God stated, "Thou art my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased" (Mark 1.11; see also Luke 3.21-22). Here suggesting that God is pleased with Charles as well, the poet implies that no good English subjects should be displeased with him.

Further expanding the father-son connection, the poem elsewhere mentions Charles's earthly father, the infant's namesake. That Charles has passed down his father's name indicates that he is not only the pious parent Jonson describes (7), but a pious son as well, one who honors the

Christian father celebrated in "Barriers." This namesake gives the infant a standard for which he (and implicitly those who rear him) should strive: "Grow up, sweet Babe, as blessed, in thy Name, / As in renewing thy good Grandsires fame" (11-12). In this emphasis upon predecessors, the poem repeats a concept Under-wood uses when praising Francis Bacon, Jerome Weston, and Queen Mary. If James emulates his grandfather, he like the king in "Barriers" will become full of Christian goodness and tolerance and--if need be--an able Defender of the Faith, a good bride to Christ, and a good groom to England.

Yet the prince must also emulate an even higher figure, the man-God whose name his religion and the occasion bear. As the christening ceremony states, "baptisme doth represent . . . our profession, . . . to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and to be made like unto him". Young James must therefore become not only a worthy member of the Stuart family, but a member of God's heavenly family and kingdom, remaining among "the children of GOD" and a "partaker of his everlasting kingdom." In religious terms, therefore, James is a younger brother both to Christ and to Prince Charles, and he must help both princes preserve their realms.[15] By implying that the Prince is linked to both his heavenly and earthly fathers, that he can support both elder brothers, and that he can emulate both King James and Christ, the poet strongly connects earthly and heavenly royalty in a more personal way than he does in "Barriers."

Far from excluding the prince's mother in this family metaphor, the poet includes her in a way that again reminds readers of Christianity's diversity and its great love. Just as divine and human, male and female worked together to create the Prince of Peace (see "An Epigram to the Queen . . ."), they have cooperated in creating this English prince. While God Himself has sent James, a "worke . . . [He has] done" (1), He has used as His vessels the Protestant Charles and the Catholic Mary, who have "made" their son (16). Symbolizing the harmony in which Christ's baptized family can live, the monarchs have made the prince possible not only through their loving physical union, but through their trust in God, having listened to Jonson's counsel that their faith could "make" for them a large posterity ("To K. CHARLES, and Q. MARY. For the losse of their first-borne" 11).

Describing in erotic and botanical terms the royal couple and their children, the laureate notes the "triple shade, / Her [Britain's] Rose, and Lilly, intertwind, have made" (15-16). The rose and lily--"Flowers of either Sexe" ("Epithalamion" 68)--refer generally to male and female, two opposites whose potential union and vitality the poet depicts in the "Epithalamion," Love Restored, and "To My Muse." In this political context, the flowers' intertwining also suggests the harmonious marriage between the English (Anglican) rose and the French (Catholic) fleur de leis, a connection the poet makes in "Epithalamion" (51-52) and "An

Epigram on the Princes birth," where he praises "The bed of the chast Lilly, and the Rose!" (3).

Yet in this poem concerning spiritual as well as physical marriage and birth, the poet employs also the theological garden of the hortus conclusus. Developed largely around the Song of Solomon and other parts of Judaeo-Christian tradition, this popular concept allegorically connects the garden of Eden, Mary's womb, and the marriage of the faithful to Christ, both on earth and in heaven. Such a network of paradoxical but harmonious relationships would doubtless appeal to a poet who supports them in poetry, the court, law, and religion. That Jonson here draws upon this tradition is clear from his use of the rose and lily, and from Under-wood's earlier connections of Henrietta with the Virgin Mary and the Annunciation, including its description of the queen's chastity and her fruitful "wombe divine" ("An Epigram on the Princes Birth" 3; "An Ode, or Song, by all the Muses" 51-52). Taken within this tradition and within the baptismal context, the "triple shade" assumes a meaning deeper than that merely of three physical children, a meaning that shows the poet's faith in his monarchs as religious harmonizers.[16]

Shade alludes also to merciful protection from God's just sun-like wrath, protection offered through Christ's death on the cross to persons baptized in His name. Marked on the forehead with a symbolic cross at baptism, a christened child gains the aid without which he or she would

die spiritually: even royal infants suffer from "originall drosse" and are unfit to wed the Lamb without spot alluded to in "Barriers" (9). In this context, therefore, the "triple shade" implies the salvation and spiritual birth of the Caroline children, made possible in part by their religious parents, who have had all three ". . . cleans'd from originall drosse, / . . . by Baptisme, and . . . [the] Saviours cross" (9-10). Because they themselves are like the believing mortals described in "Barriers" (800), the monarchs will help their children hold fast to the Christian faith. As the poet reassures skeptical citizens, he states that all of Britain "triumphs in the triple shade." Here he argues that the monarchs' political children, like their biological ones, can trust their religious parents. Besides creating a family tree--such as "Epithalamion" describes--the monarchs will also increase the number of God's family, given life by Christ's tree of death.[17]

At the same time, however, the poet affirms the subjects' importance as members of God's family, for at a christening the members of all God's congregation welcome their newest member. As spiritual siblings to Prince James and even to the king and queen, these baptized co-congregants have, like Charles and Christ, divine favor: "they are beloved of God" (4). They themselves stand under the shade of the cross and are part of the Christian, if not the Caroline, family tree (15). In reaching out to include many English subjects, the poem resembles the "Dedication,"

the "Epithalamion," and "An Epigram to my MUSE." Yet as the elder lovers in "Epithalamion," who reenact their own wedding through that of the young couple's, the older Christians reaffirm their profession of faith as the infant takes his. This profession involves an attempt to imitate Christ and to trust in God, whatever He sends. The poet reminds Christians of this reaffirmation when he argues not only that the people are beloved of God, but that they should know that they are beloved of God "in" Charles and his new son (see lines 3-4).

In a tone recalling the accession anniversary epigram, the poet reminds subjects of their duties to God and his deputies by writing

> Would they [subjects] would understand it! Princes are
> Great aides to Empire, as they are great care
> To pious parents, who would have their blood
> Should take first Seisin of the publique good,
> As hath thy JAMES.
>
> (5-9)

While the laureate could be alluding to several things in the phrase "first Seisin"--including the king's impositions --the religious context suggests perhaps the Impropriations the Puritans have lost to the king this year, largely through Laud. While the author might have little sympathy for the Puritans, as a former Catholic he nonetheless knows what it means to be declared nonconformist and to have his

public worship severely restricted. Nevertheless, now as in "Barriers" he counsels subjects not to flout the crown's religious decisions. Like the monarchs and other Christians, these subjects too must sometimes sacrifice their first-fruits: as the laureate writes in the consolatory epigram, "Who dares denie, that all first-fruits are due / To God, denies the God-head to be true" (1-2). As Charles and Henrietta trusted God and were highly rewarded, dissatisfied Protestants must believe that if they are in the right, God will later recompense them. As the word "Would" indicates, the subjects' understanding is a matter of will (as it is in the anniversary epigram); if they truly desire to imitate Christ, they can harmonize their wills with God's.

Yet the laureate also reminds the rulers not to abuse their power. In depicting the rulers not as the luxurious, selfish people they are sometimes thought to be, but as godly persons of responsibility ("pious parents"), Jonson not only praises the monarchs but reminds them to keep their own pledge to imitate Christ. They must see not only that their son gets his due from the "publique good" (8), but that they protect the public good itself, including its spiritual nature.

In this poem about God and England, the laureate openly advises subjects to obey their king, even though he has recently promoted Laud. However, though Under-wood elsewhere supports Charles's right to choose his bishops, it

nowhere explicitly praises this unpopular divine (see "Epithalamion").[18] Further, though Laud performs the ceremony, he performs it in a context containing echoes of greater tolerance: the christening takes place in St. James's Church and it welcomes a Stuart named after his grandfather James. While no lover of Puritans, James I was nevertheless not as high church and--more importantly--was much less rigid concerning the details of ceremony, details currently disturbing the country to an inordinate degree. As James advises Henry in Basilikon, ". . . learne wisely to discerne betwixt points of salvation and indifferent things, betwixt substance and ceremonies" (19). Concerning the very type of issue over which England now debates, he further states, "I am so farre from being contentious in these things, (which for my owne part I ever esteemed as indifferent) as I doe aequally love and honour the learned and grave men of either of these opinions" (p. A6). If the English would adopt a similar attitude, they would approach much more quickly the harmony that not only England's royal poet, but their God desires; they would also effect a reconciliation that is the very essence of baptism.

In this christening poem, one of his last, Jonson perhaps suggests a nostalgia for the man he addressed in "Barriers." There he talks through personified figures to crown this king who acts as both the groom of England and the bride of Christ, and who finds religious allegory in a fanatical plot against his life. Speaking more confidently

in Under-wood poems, the poet reenacts in a personal and political context events important to the Christian tradition. In a poem concerning the "Ladie" whom Charles actually did bring home, the poet sings not about Cupid and his mother, but about the Christian prince and queen that reenact in a small way the true God of love and his mother (see "Dedication" 54, 35-36). In the christening poem, he celebrates not only God's pleasure in His son, but His love for all English Christians. If Christians focus on this love, which makes possible the soul's marriage to God, perhaps they can avoid the divorce that threatens their church and their country.

NOTES

[1] For relevant information on the political and religious situation, see Ashley 34-39, Cook 100-23 passim, Miles 85, and Dietz 243-48, 258-59. See Miles 4-7 for information related directly to Jonson.

[2] For Jonson's associations with the Gunpowder Plot and its investigation, see Miles 100-03.

[3] Hymenaei consists of both a masque, performed January 5, and a barriers or tournament, performed January 6. In this chapter I will treat primarily "Barriers." This work should not be confused with The Speeches at Prince Henry's Barriers, which for the sake of distinction I call Speeches.

For a general discussion of the Plot and its aftereffects, including theories that the Plot was fabricated by the government, see Cecil 229-53. See also his remarks upon the bride's family on 237-39 and 252-53.

[4] On the poet's reconversion in 1610 see De Luna 42. Jonson's continued tolerance is revealed not only in his poetry, but in his friendships with the Catholic Digby and the suspected Catholic Richard Weston, as well as with many Protestants.

[5] Miles comments generally on "Barriers" (105-06), while Meagher notes the work's political implications concerning Scotland (143). For comments on Frances's family

and on Jonson's relationship with Thomas Howard, see Le Comte 8-14 and Miles 98.

The lines I treat come primarily from the end of the work and involve only two actors; if Jonson had finished "Barriers" before November 5 and if actors had started rehearsing it, revision would nonetheless have been relatively easy between then and January 6. Even if the lines I treat were written before November 5, their performance context would give them a special resonance.

[6] For Revelation's use of thunder see 4.5, 6.1, 8.5-6, 10.3, and 19.6 in the Geneva version of the Bible. When treating works written before 1611 (such as "Barriers"), I quote from the Geneva Bible; when discussing works written in or after that year I use the King James Version (published in 1611).

[7] At the wedding celebrated by the barriers, Frances Howard herself follows this custom involving hair, as Le Comte indicates (12).

[8] For the potential connection between Roman Catholicism and execution of monarchs, and for Cecil's view on the matter, see De Luna 42-43.

[9] For the Bible's use of the concept of unspottedness and the reference to Christ as sacrifice, see Hebrews 9.14, 1 Peter 1.19, Ephesians 5.27, 2 Peter 3.14, and Song Sol. 4.7.

[10] De Luna discusses the connection between the Gunpowder Plot and the deluge metaphor: for an excerpt from

James's speech see 266; on the popularity of the metaphor and Jonson's use of it in Catiline see 266, 270-72.

[11] See Miles 105-06 concerning Jonson's religious correction the same month in which "Barriers" was performed.

[12] Judith Kegan Gardiner includes "An Epigram to the Queene"--one of the celebratory poems--among Jonson's "generally hackneyed court poetry" (161). For other quick remarks on the poem see Miles 247, Donaldson 702, and Hunter 219, who glosses the reference to "the Service words, Ave Maria."

For a comment on the other celebratory poem ("To my L. the King, On the Christning . . . ") see Herford and Simpson 11:102, Donaldson 708, and Miles 263.

[13] Russell writes, "Between 1625 and 1629, the religious peace of the last years of King James slowly disappeared. By 1629, the rise of Arminianism was beginning to produce a religious polarization of a sort which had been unknown since the 1580s" (Parliaments 29). On the religious and political implications of Prince Charles's birth see Carlton 134. For Biblical accounts of the annunciation see Matthew 1.18-23; Luke 1.26-38. Noting that the ave Maria was long traditionally used by mothers concerning childbirth and childrearing, Anderson and Zinsser quote the prayer: "Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners, now and at the hour of our death" (History 390).

[14] For the connection between Elizabeth and Holy Virgin, see Elkin Wilson, 195, 200-25 passim. Sharpe writes, "Elizabeth I skilfully transformed the real danger of heirless virginity into a cult of the virgin queen and so appropriated the iconography of the Catholic Virgin Mary to Protestant rule" (Criticism 4). Even Protestant writers used Marian allusions, as Stewart reports (42).

[15] For the quotations from the christening ceremony I have used Reeve 148. On Christ's role as "the firstborn among many brethren," see "First," New International.

[16] In his discussion of the hortus conclusus tradition, Stewart quotes Strabo's statement, "Therefore roses and lilies for our church, one for the martyr's blood, the other for the symbol of his hand" (82). The lily is also the Virgin Mary's flower, as Stewart reports (31). Including the Song of Solomon's many references to lilies is the statement, "I AM the rose of Sharon, and the lily of the valleys" (2.1).

[17] Herford and Simpson gloss the "triple shade" as "the three royal children" (102). For a discussion of tree, sun, and shade imagery, of the Song and spiritual marriage, and of seventeenth-century writers, see Stewart, especially 19-30 and 60-96 passim.

According to Anglican ritual, after the baptism ceremony the priest states, "Wee receive this Child into the congregation of Christs flocke, and doe signe him with the signe of the crosse"; the priest then makes the sign of the

cross on the child's forehead (as qtd. in Reeve 152).

[18] For Jonson's other remarks on Laud, see the "Epithalamion," where he calls this unnamed man the "holy prelate" and writes, "O happy bands! and thou more happy place, / Which to this use, wert built and consecrate! / To have thy God to blesse, thy King to grace, / And this their chosen Bishop celebrate" (129-32). Yet as I state in Chapter 2, this poem praises Laud's rival Weston, endorsing Weston's attempt to reconcile with the bishop.

Jonson's extended praise of a religious official was saved instead for Laud's rival Williams, a man of moderate opinion; for more on that poem see my note 12 in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER VI

INTERNATIONAL HARMONY

Facing great challenges concerning religion, the legal system, and the royal court, England's leaders must also address troubled foreign relations. On the Continent and in Britain, countries have for years fought, negotiated, and counter negotiated, continually making and changing alliances. While Jonson has little direct access to citizens of other countries, he can counsel England's public and its leaders in foreign affairs. This he does in both his early and later work. Urging officials and the public to work for a cooperative world community, the poet prefers peace but does not rule out war.

The man who becomes king fairly soon in Jonson's career is dedicated to international harmony. Ending war with Spain soon after he accedes (1603), James nonetheless later finds his heir (Henry) and the English people more militant: they dislike Catholicism in general and Spain in particular. Nonetheless, James pursues his pacific policy both through treaties and through negotiations for his children's marriages.[1]

Unfortunately, these negotiations do not lead to peace: Henry dies a bachelor in 1612, and Elizabeth marries a man

who becomes a principal character in the European Thirty Years' War (1618-1648). This family connection intensifies England's interest in the conflict, which involves religious elements. Yet the pacific James, while torn for his daughter and her husband, nonetheless tries to negotiate a Spanish match for his son Charles, a negotiation that reaches its climax in 1623. When the prince is rebuffed, however, the spurned lover joins with Parliament to ask for a war, thus opposing his father and dividing the court.

Within two years (1625), Charles inaugurates his reign with an Anglo-Spanish war. This conflict, like that declared upon France (1626), is dismally funded and fought. Though peace is made with France in 1629 and with Spain in 1630, maintaining such peace is not easy: England's neighbors are still fighting, and many British subjects consider their country's lack of involvement ignoble.

Himself noble in sympathies but reasonable, Jonson is more informed about foreign relations than are many of his fellow citizens. Though when young he melodramatically fights in single combat (Miles 20), he is aware also of war's devastation. Further, he learns of diplomacy's intricate nature through his acquaintance with statesmen and his experience as court masque-maker.[2] He also supplements his direct experience with readings in classical and English history. Speaking therefore in accord with his own experience, learning, and general life philosophy, the poet counsels both English self-sufficiency and international

cooperation. He also realizes that England should have many courses of action at its disposal, including war.

One of Jonson's early works on foreign affairs addresses the militaristic Prince of Wales, Henry, though it also involves the Stuart family, particularly the father from whom Henry differs (The Speeches at Prince Henry's Barriers, 1610). Through chivalric personae, the poet praises the current king and advises the potential one to strengthen the realm through peaceful avenues. Admitting that a ruler must fight whole-heartedly when force is unavoidable, Jonson nonetheless urges a quick restoration of harmonious foreign relations. Using a panorama of English history (like "Panegyre"), this poem suggests not only James's Basilikon, but Poetaster's Caesar, in its ideal of a wise, multi-faceted, and firm but forgiving ruler.

The states of peace, war, and reconciliation, described in the historical panorama of Speeches, are states that Jonson himself lives through as he writes Under-wood. While that volume reiterates much of the counsel of Speeches, it does so in a way more specific, familiar, and forceful. In 1623, a crisis year for England, the laureate in "An Execration upon Vulcan" urges the people and the current Prince of Wales to choose peace. This poem connects present support for conflict with envy and disordered priorities, recalling the "Epithalamion" and Love Restored.

Yet once war has been declared, the poet advises noble fighting as a means of restoring international harmony.

Here using primarily current rather than past instances of military response, Jonson argues by negative example, scorning in "A speach according to Horace" the indifference of some English aristocrats (1625 or 1626). Linking the martial and the civil arts, like Speeches and "An Epigram to my MUSE," "A speach" shows that some gentry are irresponsible and destructive, like the banquet-goers of Poetaster and the evil speakers of the Tribe of Ben epistle. Such men should not be imitated if England is to be saved.

When after unsuccessful fighting English leaders choose peace, however, the laureate supports this decision, one that many subjects find ignoble. Reacting to such opinion, "To the right Honourable, the Lord Treasurer of England" (1631 or 1632) praises one author of the peace, Richard Weston, a man considered superficial and inactive. Like the lying-in poem and that on Charles's accession anniversary, this work boldly addresses sensitive topics, arguing that Weston is quite unlike the people's image of him. Not a self-centered art connoisseur but a patriotic civil artist, Weston's peaceful heroism recalls the example of the Scanderoon victor and the standard recommended in Speeches.

At the time of Speeches (January 1610), Prince Henry under the chivalric name of Meliadus has challenged British knights to a contest, planning to reenact the martial times of King Arthur. Because according to Henry's fiction these men have travelled in foreign realms and found Britain the

hardiest of all, Henry's interaction with the knights also represents Britain's relations with other countries, a complex matter for a youth not yet sixteen.[3] Though not a knight, Jonson as a soldier has proved his bravery in another country; now less melodramatic but more wise, he uses Merlin and other Arthurian speakers to discuss the Stuart family's role in foreign relations. Counseling the heir apparent to pursue harmony, Speeches shows him how to act during peace, war, and war's aftermath. It simultaneously attempts to reconcile the very different Prince Henry and King James, whose relationship has cooled.[4]

Set during peacetime, Speeches highly praises the advantages, strengths, and even heroism of a tranquil state, arguing that the same virtues are important in peace as in war. Though Jonson speaks through chivalric characters and uses language of adventure, he urges practicality and versatility rather than romanticism and single-minded military thinking. In this shift from the romantic, Speeches presents for Henry's emulation the living King James rather than the ancient King Arthur, now a star rather than a flesh-and-blood warrior (70). While Arthur's influence still lives, it lives through Henry's father, who "claims Arthur's seat" (21) and commands a realm "brighter far" than even the ancient king's (see lines 24-25). Praising Henry's father as heroically "[w]ise, temperate, just and stout" (21), Speeches proclaims him as "above the rest" of other good rulers (329), in a description recalling

the "upward race / Of kings" mentioned in "Panegyre" (90-91). James's "justice," already proclaimed in the inaugural poem, is here linked to that of the heroic King Edward I (399, 177); the Stuart's "upright fortitude" further resembles Edward's "upright" stance when he as a prince marched in battle (399, 229).

Continuing to show James's heroism, Speeches connects him with another monarch, one liked by both the populace and the prince. According to Jonson's Merlin, Henry's father possesses a "settled prudence, with that peace endued / Of face, as mind, always himself and even" (399-401). This last phrase recalls the semper eadem of Elizabeth, the great cousin whose ships so interest Henry, ships that James has restored (at least according to lines 341-44). This even and settled quality has remained with James since the first of his reign, when he "entring with the power of a king / The temperance of a private man did bring" ("Panegyre" 139-40). The prince would do well to remember this combination of power, prudence, and temperance if he himself ascends England's throne. While James's virtues may not sound impressive to the young Henry, they are in fact Herculean: it is such moral consistency, patience, and excellence that permits "Hercules and good men [to] bear up heaven" (402). Henry should consider well the labor involved in maintaining a kingdom and the strength necessary for wielding the scepter (as well as the sword).

Trying to reconcile the two Stuarts and their different

ideas of heroism, Speeches reminds Henry of his duty not only as a son to his father, but as a knight to his liege lord. Besides praising James through Arthur's voice (78-81), the poet through the Lady tells Henry (Meliadus),

> . . . this [James] is he, Meliadus, whom you
> Must only serve and give yourself unto,
> And by your diligent practice to obey
> So wise a master, learn the art of sway.
> (359-62; emphasis mine)

Like the courtiers who serve the king (Love Restored) and the nobles who exercise "zeale" on his behalf ("Panegyre" 70), the prince must reverence England's monarch. Superseding both Arthur and Merlin, James, for Henry, conflates the roles of father, kingly example, and learned tutor. As someone who "[a]ll arts . . . can" (353), this king is particularly apt at teaching the "civil arts . . . [that] must precede" the "martial" (204). (He is even a man of "letters," which as Merlin states "rear / The deeds of honor high and make them live" [103-04], much as Jonson now does.) In his description of other English kings, the poet further supports the civil and martial arts as he advises several members of the Stuart family.

Much like Themis in "Panegyre," Merlin in Speeches uses a panorama of history, demonstrating various civil arts and the rulers who have used them to protect Britain. These arts involve agriculture, industry, finances, and defensive arms. Far from unheroic, agriculture is voluntarily pursued

by the "warlike" Edward I after he has restored justice: farming is a tranquil, life-giving way of conquering the land. Another "hero" named Edward (the third) uses the textile industry in a manner chivalric in its nobility. Rather than spending his time merely "[rescuing] ladies' palfries" (161)--like ancient knights--he developed an art that "relieved . . . many poor" (187-88). Increasing domestic satisfaction and productivity, Edward III showed his subjects that they could have their own "golden fleece" without raiding a "foreign mine" (189). This emphasis upon peaceful activity encourages English self-sufficiency and respects the international community.

Stressing the need for financial wisdom and for civil soldiery, Jonson describes in language of excitement and action the "treasure . . . heaped" by Henry VII and his son's use of it. Unlike the hoarding of Plutus (Love Restored), this thriftiness is productive: it protects England's peace, in part by providing funds for defensive arms. These arms not only deter war but keep the country prepared should one occur. Providing "the strength and sinews of a war / When Mars should thunder or his peace but jar" (191-94), this money allows Henry VIII to train others in "exercise of arms, and [to] girt his coast / With strength" (197-98). Unlike knights, who are private citizens, rulers must see not only to their own readiness, but to that of a whole army; they must make all England an armored but non-aggressive warrior "girt . . . With

strength." Rather than provoking war, such a practice follows the harmonious Caesar in "mak[ing] inflictions feard, not felt" (Poetaster 5.1.2). The queen counseled by Poetaster, Henry VIII's daughter, continues this defensive arming when she adds "A wall of shipping, and became thereby / The aid or fear of all the nations nigh" (201-02). The words "aid or fear" emphasize the non-aggressive qualities of this Elizabethan navy: the force helps some countries and intimidates--though it does not necessarily attack--others; and as a "wall" it is rather defensive than offensive. Through the Tudors' vigorous activities, Speeches reminds the Stuart prince that tranquility need not equal flabbiness or cowardice; it also reminds the Stuart king that he should encourage the "arms defensive [that] a safe peace maintain" (206).

Yet despite Elizabeth's greatness, her successor and his family could expand England's borders in a way the Virgin Queen did not: in a traditional form of international alliance, Henry, Elizabeth, and Charles Stuart might wed foreign royalty. (Indeed, such offers involving Henry and Elizabeth are forthcoming [S.R. Gardiner 2:136-37].) According to Merlin, Princess Elizabeth "might call / The world to war, and make it hazard all / his valor for her beauty" (419-21). Yet since such a "hazardous" transaction is seldom a bargain, as Helen proved, Jonson advises Elizabeth to choose instead a more positive international role. If she follows Merlin's prophecy and becomes "Mother

of nations," she will produce rather than destroy great princes (422-23). In this way she continues the fertile peacetime efforts of Edward I, as well as of her own father. Like the rulers Jonson describes in Love Restored, "Panegyre," and "Barriers," the princess will use the powerful forces of erotic, marital, and familial love to create international harmony out of diversity. As indicated by Henry's own love for his "darling" sister (S.R. Gardiner 2:136), such a force is stronger and more effective than the mightiest physical power.

Yet if in spite of domestic preparations, deterrents, and foreign negotiations the question of war arises, a ruler must consider carefully. This consideration does not imply timidity or cowardice Jonson informs the vigorous Henry: these qualities a monarch disdains in peace as well as in war, as Speeches shows in its description of James and other peacetime rulers. Such forethought instead indicates a ruler's awareness of his decision's effect on his subjects. While it is one thing for an ancient knight or even a modern soldier to take on a much larger foe, for a king to do the same is often reckless and foolhardy, as James tells his son in Basilikon.[5] Similarly arguing that "princes [should] . . . use fortune reverently" and that they should not fight according to emotions, Merlin refers Henry to James's "[calm] temper" for example (394-96, 397-98). A ruler who provokes war merely to show off his valor is just as vain as a woman who starts one to prove her beauty.

Yet the poet's Speeches, like the king's Basilikon, does not imply that rulers should never fight, but that they should do so only as a last resort, and only if they are prepared (partly as a result of peacetime activities). As Jonson's Merlin warns, "He doth but scourge himself his sword that draws / Without a purse, a counsel and a cause" (325-26). Without finances, advice, and grounds--without proper understanding of the civil arts--a war can have self-destructive, even suicidal effects. Such a war demonstrates not a ruler's bravery so much as it does his poor strategy and his unwitting aid to his enemies.

In referring to the importance of "purse" in military conflicts, the poet concurs with James's statement to Henry, "especially remember, that money is nervus belli" (Basilikon 69). In view of the historical context, the poet here implies the need for sounder financial practices and for a good relationship with Parliament, which grants wartime subsidies. As James prepares to bargain with that body for peacetime money, he is doubtless particularly aware of the ruler's dependence upon his high court. Without remarking on the king's poor financial condition, Jonson subtly reminds Henry that England cannot afford war, lacking as it does any semblance of Henry VII's great treasure.

Yet well-financed brawn can not in itself decide international conflict: even the best-trained soldiers and the richest, most athletic prince need "counsel" in order to execute a complex military operation. Reliance upon such

advice is not timid, but kingly, as Speeches shows through Arthur's elevation of Merlin and through its praise of King James and his council (28). The elder Stuart has himself instructed his son concerning such a council, telling him to use in war "the advice of such as are skilfullest in the craft, as yee must also doe in all other" (Basilikon 59). Like the peacetime king of Love Restored, a successful wartime leader surrounds himself with persons of "hability." On a peacetime matter, even Caesar accepts counsel from Horace (Poetaster 5.1.79-99).

Without counsel and purse, military action is severely handicapped; without good cause, however, this action is wrong, perhaps even evil. As the king tells Henry, "warres upon just quarrels are lawfull: but above all, let not the wrong cause be on your side" (Basilikon 55). In his own discussion of cause, Jonson through Merlin states that the two best reasons for fighting--the only two mentioned here--include defense of Christianity (lines 210-44) and defense of country in accord with international law (245-315). Both types of war aim to restore harmony as understood by students of religion and law, two civil arts recommended by Jonson's "Barriers" (Hymenaei) and his "Panegyre."

If counsel, purse, and good cause are present, however, and England enters a war, its rulers and citizens must fight firmly and wisely. Their commitment must equal that of Caesar's in banishing Ovid (Poetaster) and James's in punishing lawbreakers and in expelling Plutus ("Panegyre"

and Love Restored). The ability to rule well in peace is consistent rather than inconsistent with the ability to wage war.

The agrarian yet "warlike" Edward I possesses both such abilities, as does the man with whom he is linked in Jonson's discussion of religious causes. Carrying St. George's banner across "rivers of [infidel] . . . blood," the English king resembles the lawgiver Moses, who leads "Israel's host" across the Red Sea (233-35). These leaders defend the divine cause martially as James and Caesar do peacefully (in "Barriers" and Poetaster).

While the typological description of Edward sanctions his victory, Speeches elsewhere cautions against haughtiness in religious leaders who, like Richard the Lion Heart, can eventually fall because of "pride" (223). This is a vice that Henry can avoid by studying his father's "settled prudence" (400). The zealous Protestant prince must further remember that religious quarrels are not sought by rulers but given to them by God: Edward and Richard "were graced / To fight their savior's battles" (210-11).[6]

In his discussion of religious causes, the poet chooses pre-Reformation battles that pit Catholics against non-Christians. When Jonson writes, however, talks of religious wars often concern two branches of Christianity: Catholicism and Protestantism. Unlike some of his contemporaries, he does not oppose these two branches (as Hymenaei's "Barriers" indicates). Therefore when he

discusses England's more recent conflicts, he mentions a more secular cause: princes' "right by laws / Of nations due" (246-47). In this way the poet discounts one motive for breaking the current peace with Spain. Speeches further supports the current king's pacifism: its treatment of nationalistic wars notes former warriors who serve James, stresses post-war reconciliation, and emphasizes a prince's duty to his father.

When discussing the Elizabethan battle against the Spanish Armada (1588), Jonson through Merlin praises James's current Lord Chamberlain and Lord High Admiral for their roles in the conflict (a popular battle and one that, as a naval victory, would be of particular interest to Henry). Accompanied like Edward I by St. George's ensign, these men of the Howard family "sent first bullets, then a fleet of fire, / Then shot themselves like ordnance" through their Spanish enemy (304-08). Fighting fiercely and well, these aristocrats fulfilled their duty in war as they now do in peace, and they belong to a family containing staunch defenders of that peace.[7]

In another description of wartime fighting and post-war reconciliation, the poet tries more obviously to reconcile not only martial and pacific philosophies, but Henry and James themselves. Having linked Henry through age and status to the Black Prince Edward (at Crecy), Speeches when describing a later battle shows not only Edward's martial prowess, but his interest in reconciliation: after his

enemies' surrender the Black Prince "his rage . . . forgot / Soon as his sword was sheathed" (249, 269-70). Treating his prisoners so that "To be his captives was the next to win" (276), this prince demonstrates Jonson's view that the best way to restore international harmony is to battle hard and then forgive, giving the former enemy minimum cause for resentment. Good monarchs, who fight only to protect God's rightful empire or to redress international justice, gladly return to peace as quickly as wrongs are righted, creating a sort of global concordia discors. Like the Truth who forgives Opinion's warriors ("Barriers") and like the Caesar who forgives Gallus, such monarchs are "More proud of reconcilement, then revenge" (Poetaster 5.1.4). This reconcilement is easiest if a ruler considers the welfare not only of his country, but of the world community, and if nations are adept at the civil arts that enrich peace and deter war.

Showing how the Black Prince in another situation treats his father (Edward III), Speeches also argues for a local reconciliation, one that could affect foreign affairs. Describing the soldier's "glad father," the peacetime "hero" of lines 182-90, the poem notes how he blesses his son and watches him "ent'ring in the school of war" at Crecy (250-53). In this initiation battle, young Edward at Prince Henry's age creates the motto of the Prince of Wales. Through this example Jonson creates an analogy concerning Henry, who partakes in the barriers, and his father, who

watches on. As young Edward fights, he "[Tears] From the Bohemian crown the plume . . . / Which after for his crest he did preserve / To his father's use with this fit word: I Serve" (256-58).

In these words Jonson reveals the primary duty of the Prince of Wales, a duty Henry should contemplate as he awaits his investment. While Speeches does not rule out martial victories for the prince, even when it compares him to his namesake Henry V, it stresses the deterrent that reputation in itself provides (277-90). Whatever victories the young Stuart has, however, and whatever strengths he possesses do not raise him above his father but help him to serve that king. If the prince truly values chivalry and his new title, he must know that his duty--in peace as in war--is to his liege lord and king (who has himself conquered Ireland [339-40]). Fulfilling this duty is essential to a prince's office, and a wise prince will view tranquility as preferable to military conflict (and just as heroic). This is a lesson that the next prince of Wales will have forgotten when in 1623 Jonson writes "An Execration upon Vulcan."

Jonson and the rest of the world see many changes between the composition of Speeches and that of "Execration": the death of Henry, the marriage of Elizabeth to the Calvinist Elector Palatine, the beginning of the Thirty Years War in Europe, and negotiations for Charles's marriage to a Spanish Catholic princess. While "Execration"

catches the nation on the brink of military conflict, later Under-wood poems treat the ensuing war and the aftermath ("A speach according to Horace" and "To the right Honourable, the Lord Treasurer of England. An Epigram.") In a manner more immediate and in some cases more subtle than before, the poet in Under-wood continues to encourage the arts that bring international harmony. He urges noble peace whenever possible ("Execration"), heroic fighting when war is unavoidable ("A speach"), and quick reconciliation after battle (the Weston epigram). Fittingly, his later work on reconciliation praises a man who supported peace in 1623.

In a year when England hovers between alliance and fighting, the laureate backs James's pacific policy, though not necessarily the Anglo-Spanish marriage. "The Dedication," written while Charles is wooing the Infanta, reveals this support, associating St. George and his Knights of the Garter with "Communion" rather than with military conflict (43-44). Yet another poem written at roughly the same time also admits the possibility of conflict, as Jonson offers to give his own life if necessary (see the Tribe of Ben epistle lines 35-42).

When Charles and Buckingham return without the Infanta (early October), war seems more likely: not only is the match now doubtful, but the Prince and the Duke desire revenge for rejection; further, the Duke knows that if he supports war against Spain he can continue his new-found popularity with the Enlish. Thus the sick, weak king finds

the two men closest to him joining forces with the militant Commons and public. Having witnessed disaster on a smaller scale in the fiery destruction of his library, the poet who had advised Henry to prefer peace similarly cautions the young adventurers and their followers in "An Execration upon Vulcan."[8]

Probably written in or shortly after November 1623, "An Execration" shows the sordid side of military conflict by connecting war with the ugly Vulcan rather than with the heroic Mars or St. George. In counsel more specific and immediate than that of Speeches, the poet traces several of Vulcan's efforts; here he argues against needless destruction, whether it be the fire of a library or the Thirty Years War, to which he refers in the last part of the poem (203-12). Despite war's potential as a field for virtue, it is a devastating experience, one that should not be undertaken ill-advisedly, "Without a purse, a counsel and a cause" (Speeches 326).

Examining possible motives behind Vulcan's destruction, "An Execration" characterizes some of them as mean, self-centered, and illogical, as indicated by that god's deformed appearance and by his connection with words such as "Greedie" (3), "envious" (3), "malice" (19), and "pettie spights" (163). Rather than acting according to brave conviction, this god often reacts to previous slights or personal failures, sometimes ones involving women. Charles and Buckingham must be careful not to do the same concerning

the Infanta. While the poet does not deny the existence of martial glory per se, he dissociates from it Vulcan, whose only laurels from Mars are a "crown" of cuckold's horns (10). Nor is Vulcan successful in the civil arts Speeches recommends: having failed to attain Minerva for his wife, he now retaliates against "any issue of the braine" (13-14).

Recalling on a larger scale the critic Lupus, Vulcan in his destruction of books and theaters opposes both the poet, who makes, and Bacchus, who "make[s] many a poet" ("Dedication" 29). Even in his destruction of one library (Jonson's) Vulcan has assailed several arts, including poetry, history, grammar, geography, and drama (see lines 89-98). Further, unlike James's wine-taster symbolizing law, Vulcan as Jove's rejected cup-bearer assaults legality (115), "invad[ing] part of the Common-wealth" in his destruction of The Six Clerks' Office (170-72). A force so heedless of civil law can hardly be trusted concerning international law; acting on his own whims, he resembles the tyrants described in "Panegyre."

One of Vulcan's gravest acts, however, is his destruction of the poet's "humble Gleanings in Divinitie, / After the Fathers, and those wiser Guides / Whom Faction had not drawne to studie sides" (102-04). This irreverence for a united church mirrors that of the Thirty Years War, where Christians fight not against infidels, as Speeches describes, but against one another. Unlike many of his contemporaries, who contest which Christian branch is

closest to the "true" church, Jonson focuses upon the folly of the infighting itself. He represents this type of infighting when he shows how Puritans ("The Brethren") ignorantly analyze Vulcan's power (139), connecting Vulcan with "Poperie" (143).

Showing, however, that no religion has a monopoly on destructiveness, the poet refers to both Catholic and Protestant forces in the current war when he tells Vulcan, "[Would you had] . . . fixt in the Low-Countrey's, where you might / On both sides doe your mischiefes with delight" (203-04). If the nations in the conflict consider carefully, they will realize that they have as an enemy not so much one another, but destruction itself, here symbolized by Vulcan. Implying that militant Christians currently follow this god, the poet sarcastically gives Vulcan permission to

> Blow up, and ruine, myne, and countermyne,
> Make . . . fine
> Engines of Murder, and receive the praise
> Of massacring Man-kind so many wayes.
>
> (205-08)

Like the evil speakers of the Tribe of Ben epistle, this undisciplined figure advances his own reputation by harming innocent persons. As indifferent to true cause as are those men, this god behind the European war is not a Protestant one who slays Catholics, or a Catholic one who kills Protestants, but a self-centered, envious, petty one who

indiscriminately slaughters "Man-kind" in general. He is not a soldier of commitment but a force of mischief.

Having reminded others of what he himself has witnessed in his library fire--the chaos of devastation--Jonson reinforces his advice from Speeches and "Dedication" as he tells Vulcan

> We aske your absence here, we all love peace,
> And pray the fruites thereof, and the increase
> So doth the King, and most of the Kings men
> That have good places. . . .
>
> (209-12)

Presenting a united front in the phrase "we all love peace," Jonson chastises militant English citizens, among them the extremist Puritans he in some ways connects with Vulcan (as van den Berg 158-59 remarks). He instead aligns himself not only with James, but with "Kings men" such as Richard Weston and Treasurer Cranfield (Carlton 50). Yet by including among the pacifists only "most of the Kings men / That have good places," the laureate alludes to an imminent foreign policy clash, one involving more than just the Puritans. Two of the men with the best places have returned, having begun the work that eventually leads England into war. With their access to the king and his ministers, they should realize that England lacks the purse to wage a successful war. And while the zealous Puritans have, to Jonson's mind, no truly sufficient cause, neither do Charles and Buckingham: the prince desires to revenge the Infanta's

rejection and the duke to keep his recent popularity with the English. Threatening to resemble Vulcan's wrath upon his failure to "woo Minerva" (109), Charles will soon formally encourage Parliament to enter war against the Infanta's country. In this he is supported, if not provoked, by Buckingham, a man in his own way a potent agent of destruction; this man, like the envious persons of "Epithalamion," now proposes divorce rather than political marriage. Far from being led by Love-in-Court, he is motivated by self-love; like Plutus's followers in Love Restored, Buckingham hoards a political resource rightly belonging to the king: the favor of the Commons and the people. Knowing that countries, like book-filled libraries, can quickly ignite with a little provocation, Jonson prays that England not be sacrificed to the conflagration enveloping Europe--not, at least, because of a mere Spanish Match.

Poetic advice, the economy, and his motto notwithstanding ("I serve"), the Prince of Wales goes against his father's wishes, siding temporarily with the Puritan brethren described in "Execration." Passing out of the pacific James's hands to those of Charles, Buckingham, and Parliament, England eventually declares war against Spain.[9] As a royal counselor in wartime, the laureate can only propose a strong effort that might quickly end the conflict, reassert the balance of power, and give England a noble place among nations. This he does in "A speach

according to Horace," probably composed in the latter half of 1625 or in 1626, and therefore quite likely after the disastrous Cadiz expedition. That this militant poem directly follows the "Execration" damning weaponry might seem contradictory; in reality, however, it responds to a change in political setting, working with the current situation while keeping in mind the ultimate goal of international harmony.

"A speach" supports in wartime the same civil and martial arts that Speeches commends, but it does so largely through negative example. Rather than speaking through a voice such as Merlin's, the author uses both a persona representing the degenerate nobles and one who corresponds more closely to his own stance, as he comments, sometimes ironically, upon England's present condition. Using contemporary allusions more clearly than Speeches, this poem warns England that the country cannot thrive as it presently exists. Depicting aristocrats who fall woefully short of the heroes Merlin shows Henry, the laureate here shows that the gentry currently help the enemy more than they do themselves and their country.[10]

The peacetime Speeches takes as its context a mock battle, working outward to depict England's past successes in real wars and its current protection against future ones. Yet while the wartime "speach" also begins with staged battles, it soon shows the degeneration of gentry who abstain from all positive practices. Unlike James's

virtuous court, related to but superseding Arthur's (Speeches 18-32), these nobles shame their claimed antecedents. Using illustrious names as mere covers for their vices, the nobles state through their representative speaker

> . . . Wee,
> Descended in a rope of Titles, be
> From Guy, or Bevis, Arthur, or from whom
> The Herald will. Our blood is now become
> Past any need of vertue. . . . . (79-83)

Far from reverencing great Arthur's name, this man indicates his casual attitude by the phrase, "or from whom / The Herald will."[11] Believing that a good name absolves them of duty, this man's fellows--and current Caroline gentry--run counter to the view Jonson expresses in Speeches, the Bacon piece, and the christening poem: a name actually increases one's responsibility. Embodying rather the wrong type of "descent," these gentry use Arthur's title as a means to pervert all that he represents and all that James and Prince Henry restore. Further, the nobles' reliance upon ancestors' deeds is dangerous as well as unworthy: long-dead kinsmen--however chivalrous--can hardly defend England against the live soldiers currently threatening it.

Supremely apathetic, the noble continues to talk in a vein opposing Jonson's whole view of what aristocracy should be. The speaker states,

Let poore Nobilitie be vertuous . . .

. . . . . .

. . . Let them care,

That in the Cradle of their Gentrie are;

To serve the State. . . .

(79, 83-85)

This refusal to serve dissociates rather than connects these seventeenth-century men with old nobility, for it contradicts the "I Serve" motto of the Prince of Wales, adopted in the fourteenth century by the Black Prince (Speeches 248, 255-58). Though himself in the cradle of gentry, Francis Bacon was much closer than these Caroline men to a service concept of aristocracy, for he climbed from his cradle to a chair of virtuous office. The current speaker instead leads his "noble" name gravewards as his apathy and lack of political leadership kill what is truly excellent or aristocratic.

In their perversion of all Jonson praises in Speeches and Under-wood, the men in "A speach" lack not only aristocratic virtue, but the pursuits engendered by it: they neglect both the martial and the civil arts, unlike King James, who "All arts . . . can" (Speeches 353), and Kenelm Digby, who possesses all that "Man could call his Arts" ("An Epigram to my MUSE" 3-4). Whereas Prince Henry and Henry VIII in peacetime pursue military activities, Caroline gentry avoid the field when their country most needs them. The author illustrates this clearly in a mock

battle scene that brings together countries with whom England has often quarrelled (Spain and France). Here he pictures not the international harmony wished by Speeches and "Dedication," but a perversion both of it and of the brave fighting exhibited in the Armada battle and the battle at Crecy. He writes,

> . . . we have Powder still for the Kings Day,
> And Ord'nance too: so much as from the Tower
> T'have waked, if sleeping, Spaines Ambassadour,
> Old Aesope Gundomar: . . . . . .
> . . . . . .
> [At the last tilting, the French saw] . . . store
> of feathers, and more may,
> If they stay here, but till Saint Georges Day.
> All Ensignes of a Warre, are not yet dead.
>
> (2-5; 9-11)

The elements for brave aristocratic fighting are present: St. George, ammunition, a reminder of the king, and the enemy (Gondomar). The valiant nobles are missing, however, and Jonson emphasizes this point by suggesting by contrast the description in Speeches of the Armada battle. There aristocratic soldiers who "[displayed] Saint George's ensign" not only fired bullets, but "shot themselves like ordnance" against the enemy (305, 308). In "pluck[ing] . . . [the Armada's] feathers by little and little," as Charles Howard reports (Le Comte 4), these brave Howards help ensure rather than merely celebrate their monarch's accession day.

Current Englishmen seem capable only of waking a former ambassador and wearing feathers, rather feeble acts in comparison. Further, the nobles themselves take little part even in this pageantry: they surrender any sense of honor to the merchant class, as the author suggests when he describes "the returne those thankfull Courtiers yeeld" to have the citizen soldiers involved in the martial training (17). These aristocrats are a far cry from England's Black Prince, who had foreign royalty "yielding" to him at the battle of Poitiers (Speeches 271-72). With such an unpatriotic leading class, it is small wonder that England has few victories in the current war, and that even a ship named the St. George could not save the Cadiz expedition, an expedition poorly funded, trained, and led (see Carlton 75).[12]

In his mention of Gondomar in this passage, the poet himself takes a shot at the Spanish ambassador, who in contemporary English opinion mocked peaceful negotiation as much as the gentry mock the war. Showing a familiarity bordering on contempt, the poet designates this man by a nickname ("Aesope") and by an unflattering adjective ("old"). Further, in spelling the name "Gundomar" rather than the more usual "Gondomar," the author links with Vulcan-like destruction a man who should have been working for peace. This diplomat, though encouraging James to keep peace, did so for the wrong reasons: he hoped to bide time for his own nation and to weaken England as he did so.

Tempting James and Charles with a marital alliance and with a dowry England badly needed, Gondomar helped separate the king from his parliament and his people. Involving England in time-consuming negotiations his own country did not take seriously, he gave the king and the prince false hopes, ones that, upon disappointment, contributed to rash acts. Whatever the Spaniard's virtues or the Stuarts' mistakes, in English opinion this diplomat used his office to disable Britain rather than to develop a harmonious relationship with it, and he acts with a quiet, subtle aggression under the guise of peace.

While true peace, such as James desired, is very noble, once in a war the quickest return to peace is the brave fighting described in Speeches. In their own way, however, the English gentry are as asleep as Gondomar could ever be, blindly refusing not only their own military services, but that of their sons as well. Having little recent martial tradition to draw upon, the aristocrats might in this time of emergency let citizen soldiers "instruct the noble English heires / In Politique, and Militar Affaires" (59-60). Even Prince Henry received counsel of a sort from the commoner Jonson. Yet while not too proud to thank merchant class women for sending their husbands to train, the gentry with a perverted idea of honor scorn instruction that might help their country. Proud as the Armada itself, sunk partly by "winds . . . storms . . . [and] billows" (Speeches 293, 300-01), these men themselves would produce a "billow, wind,

and storme" if advised to learn from the citizens (61-63). Jonson predicts their response as he writes, "Who'll informe / Us . . . What's he dare tutor us?" (64-66). In their refusal they do not so much preserve themselves or their sons, as they threaten to wreck England's ship of state. Unfortunately for the country, these gentry resemble England's "Invincible" enemy more than they do the soldiers who fought it.

These nobles will harm not only the current generation, but the next one, for the primary legacy they will give their children is ignorance, a quality King James warns his son against. Avoiding intellectual as well as physical duties, the nobles say that others, not they, should "serve the State by Councels, and by Armes: / We neither love the Troubles or the harmes" (85-86). While the poet's own experience as well as that of men like Bacon convinces him that problems and even injury can accompany political service, he nonetheless believes that it is a subject's duty to accept responsibility. Refusal to do so often leads to worse injury (the result of others' incompetence); at a time when England's enemies gladly assume trouble to disable it, refusal to act can be suicidal. If the English would risk some injury in a strong initial military action, they might ultimately reduce the damage to England.

Unwilling to contribute physically or intellectually to the war effort, the aristocrats might at least give financially, particularly when money is so badly needed.[13]

In this way they could, without risking their own limbs, provide the "strength and sinews" of the war. Instead, however, they take rather than give at this critical time, enervating their own country. Quoting the representative noble, the poet states,

> We will beleeve, like men of our owne Ranke
> In so much land a yeare, or such a Banke,
> That turnes us so much moneys, at which rate
> Our Ancestors impos'd on Prince and State.
>
> (75-78)

Here the poem sets the nobles ("us") against the rest of the nation ("Prince and State"), and indeed these men do not consider their country's cause: their only "Creed" is money (74-75). Impoverishing their king and country, these men have undercut England's international reputation rather than strengthened it (like Henry V), and they have put it at the mercy of their richer enemies (see Speeches 284-89). Rather than supplying the "purse" for a quick and successful war, the aristocrats steal from it.

In his depiction of these nobles, Jonson makes clear that their current lack of service to England does not stem from virtuous pacifism, one of James's qualities: it comes instead from a selfishness that recalls Plutus and his followers, and a vicious laziness that recalls the speakers of the Tribe of Ben epistle. These characteristics damage a country in peace or in war. Far from using money to develop the country and help the poor (like Edward III), they

squander it on frivolous things such as "whore[s]" and "attire" (87, 94).

Similarly frivolous with their time, the gentry show a contempt for civil arts that mirrors theirs for the martial; they state, "let Clownes, and Tradesmen breed / Their Sonnes to studie Arts, the Lawes, the Creed" (73-74). As the author has shown throughout his work, the legal, theological, and fine arts have been valued by princes and by England's highest subjects; it is not they, but the Caroline gentry who are unworthy. These ignorant and apathetic aristocrats contrast sharply with the figures praised elsewhere in Under-wood: the lawyers Nicholas and Francis Bacon; the versatile Kenelm Digby; the pious Charles and Henrietta Maria; the statesman Richard Weston, who trains his son to political service; and James, the poet-king, interested in religious theory and in his son's education.

When the poet interrogates a noble, then answers for him, he finds the pursuits that replace the "Arts, the Lawes, the Creed" so scorned by the gentry: "What [do you] study? gate, / Carriage, and dressing" (87-88). Lacking the outer grace that reflects training and inner beauty (such as that possessed by Digby), such an aristocrat neglects the "Armour" of a soldier (7) for that of a fop, concerning himself with "his Band, his haire / . . . his Beautie . . . / [and] . . . his eye-browes" (95-97). More concerned with "garters" than with knighthood,[14] these men

strive only to impress their whores and one another (87-92), recalling the speakers who made "it their proficiencie, how much / They'[h]ave . . . letcher'd out that weeke" (Tribe of Ben epistle 12-13). Such practices certainly neither strengthen the country nor intimidate enemies. Rather than improving themselves, they like Poetaster's banquet-goers degenerate through their pursuit of not the liberal, but the libidinous arts.

Thus in contrast to the nobles of "Panegyre," the parents of the christening poem, the lovers of "Epithalamion," and the speaker of "Execration," the aristocrat of "A speach" loves not king, not family, not spouse, not even a fruitful peace: "What love you then?" (Jonson asks)--"your whore." Prostituting their honor and their country for such a cause, these men are in no position to lead their nation in war or in peace, and they have no true love for other countries. Unwilling to help others or even themselves, the nobles, for all their avoidance of risk, will nonetheless fall, having lost the great moral and civic battle wherein the aristocracy are held particularly liable. Unlike Jonson, who elsewhere vows to "live, or fall a Carkasse in the cause" (Tribe of Ben epistle 42), these "Carkasses of honour" though never truly alive will yet die, and for no true cause at all. It is to be hoped that they will not take the rest of England with them.

Despite its inability to successfully fight Spain, England soon after enters into war with France (1626), with

little better success. Lacking money and trained soldiers, England agrees to peace first with France (1629) and then with Spain (1630). Yet in the early 1630s, with war still ravaging Europe and the Protestant Palatinate unrestored, many citizens view Britain's peace as ignoble, and they are again clamoring for military involvement they cannot support (Alexander 180). Further, they suspect one of its authors, the hated Treasurer Weston, of having arranged the peace agreements out of a concern for mere prosperity and a love for Catholic Spain, a love perhaps augmented by bribery. Their view of the Treasurer as superficial and materialistic easily accommodates such an idea.[15] Believing that such suspicions and dissatisfaction undercut the international harmony bought by war, the laureate defends as worthy both the Treasurer and the peace. Confronting accusations against its objects of praise, "To the right Honourable, the Lord Treasurer of England" argues that any element of superficiality lies in the critics rather than in the Treasurer or his policy. Probably writing in 1631 or 1632, the author here supports peace not merely because it allows him to flatter his patron, but because it is part of his general political philosophy, as outlined in Speeches and reinforced in "Execration": peace, like war, must be pursued whole-heartedly and efficiently.

At the start of the poem, the laureate places himself along with Weston in the superficial, though sophisticated, setting so many citizens associate with the Treasurer.

Using the subjunctive mode, the author implies the unrealistic aspect of this setting as he begins, "If to my mind, great Lord, I had a state" (1), a line Donaldson glosses, "if my circumstances were as fine as my wishes" (707). Using "would" to reinforce the subjunctive mode (lines 2, 5), the author then conjectures what treasures he in more prosperous circumstances might give his patron, a lover of art in general. In this imaginary state, the speaker in effect provides Weston with a gallery of visual art, one that includes the finest plate, rugs, paintings, and sculptures: "curious plate / Of Noremberg, or Turkie;" (2-3); Persian rugs (4); and works by Giulio Romano, Tintoretto, Titian, Raphael, and Michelangelo (6-7). Both writer and patron would recognize not only this art's high quality, but its cosmopolitan nature. Such an wide collection would be of particular interest to a diplomat. Jonson's account so far contains nothing inconsistent with the Weston of popular opinion: a Treasurer stingy to others yet generous to himself, combining a public Plutus with a private Bacchus.

The author soon implies his disagreement with the popular version of Weston, however, indicating that more than poverty prevents the poet from donating lavishly. Having twice begun lines with "I would" when cataloguing possible gifts (2 and 5), the speaker states, "This I would doe, could I thinke Weston one / Catch'd with these Arts, wherein the Judge is wise / As farre as sense, and onely by

the eyes" (10-12). The hypothetical person of the last two lines is an art connoisseur in the lowest sense. For while such a person has some skill--acknowledged by the important end-line placement of "the Judge is wise"--this skill is very limited. It responds to the physical, visual level of the masterpieces just mentioned. This is the type of statesman and connoisseur many persons consider Weston, and, on an even lower level, this is how Philip Massinger portrays him in his popular play, Believe as you List. Satirizing the "inglorious peace" policy of a Weston "seduced . . . by the gold of the Spanish ambassador" (S.R. Gardiner 7:201), Massinger depicts the Treasurer of the public's imagination: a minister who trades off national honor for a larger treasury account and a man who sells his own integrity for private gain.[16]

As a result of the political context, Weston's office, the suggestive word "Catch'd," and the lavish gifts described, the poem evokes an atmosphere of potential bribery and a hypothetical temptation more alluring to a connoisseur than gold. The poet creates this atmosphere, however, only to rescue the Treasurer from such a base setting, and he soon makes clear that the popular interpretation of Weston is a false, uninformed one. Moving in the next several lines from the realm of the hypothetical to that of the real--from "could" and "would" to "can"--the author contrasts his informed opinion with the implied one of those persons who suspect his patron's

abilities and priorities. The laureate states, "But you I know, my Lord; and know you can / Discerne betweene a Statue, and a Man" (13-14). In taking Weston as his subject, the poet here claims to be a connoisseur in the purest sense: one who knows. Through this reference to knowledge and also the use of a possessive adjective ("my Lord"), Jonson implies a type of familiarity and support found in "An Epigram to my MUSE" and in the lying-in poem. Unlike many citizens who have never met the Treasurer and who judge only from rumor and opinion, the poet bases his judgment upon close personal contact. Therefore while some persons, like Massinger, "thinke" Weston ignoble, the poet "know[s]" him to be otherwise.

Far from having been seduced by art and therefore wise only in a sensory way, the Treasurer has used art to gain political and moral sagacity, a sagacity that benefits England and its relations with other countries. His artistic sophistication not only aids his work with the artist-ambassador Rubens and the connoisseur King Charles (Alexander 180)--it also helps him differentiate between artifice ("Statue") and reality (the "Man" represented), between the ideal and the possible. Such a quality is irreplaceable in someone who must deal with highly-trained politicians in a complex situation and who must determine the potential of the British budget. Many other citizens, including the king as well as Weston's critics, have a less realistic view of the country's capacities in foreign

relations.[17]

As valuable as Weston's qualities of discernment are, however, they are not his only talents. In addition to observing ambassadors and the budget, this "Judge . . . wise [farther than] . . . sense" is also a man of independent action, like Hymenaei's judge-disciple king. Taking the risks that come with doing, the minister performs deeds that are themselves judged--however inaccurately--by others. He "Can doe the things that Statues doe deserve, / And act the businesse, which they paint, or carve" (13-16). Unlike the aristocratic "pictures" of "A speach" or the do-nothing Weston portrayed by Laud, the minister in Jonson's poem strides out of an art gallery into the ever-changing and complex business of the world. Himself a man rather than a statue, he is energetic (like Kenelm Digby) and he (like Ben Jonson) values other humans more than he does their likenesses.[18] Therefore he would never through laziness or greed trade the good of English citizens for foreign gold or statues.

Having first demonstrated that the connoisseur-Treasurer chooses life over art when necessary, the poem then argues that he actually combines the two in his work. Rather than becoming an inert picture like the fops in "A speach," he uses his creative ability to mold the circumstances around him, producing work of synthesis, purpose, sublimity, and lasting effect (and in this way resembling the Kenelm Digby of "An Epigram to my MUSE" and

the King James of "Dedication" and Speeches). Once again actor as well as judge, Weston has not only "studied . . . the arts of life" (17) but can perform them. This performance involves a great deal of skill and creativity, as the laureate indicates, for it includes not merely depicting other humans, but motivating them to interact with each other. Painting on a broad canvas, the diplomat must reconcile several countries; working in more detail, the Treasurer must marshal his own citizens to accept this reconciliation. In this poem, the laureate praises Weston's work with other countries and attempts to facilitate the persuasion of English subjects, some of whom prefer to the peace a conflict that neither counsel nor purse could support (and that perhaps does not even involve good cause).

Itemizing the artistic abilities of this diplomat, the poet says that Weston can

> . . . compose men, and manners; stint the strife
> Of murmuring Subjects; make the Nations know
> What worlds of blessing to good Kings they owe:
> And [make] mightiest Monarchs feele what large
> increase
> Of sweets, and safeties, they possesse by Peace.
> (18-22)

As someone who composes and makes, this minister both reconciles existing elements and creates anew. The term "compose" suggests the creation of a whole from disparate elements, as this diplomat and Treasurer deals with persons

foreign and domestic, high and low. In order to forge a peace between different peoples, the minister must first be familiar with them, as indeed he is: he has met persons from several different nations and cultures, and his acquaintance with their art has supplemented his study of the peoples themselves. Further, though now unpopular with the English, he has served them in each Parliament from 1601 through 1629, and he retained his colleagues' favor until his association with Buckingham and a subsidy in 1626 (Alexander 38).

In working with ambassadors from the "mightiest Monarchs" of Spain and France, Weston like Merlin has had to convince others of the virtues of peace. He has argued that peace itself is mighty, as well as being a higher road to "sweets, and safeties," to possessions more noble than power. Showing that these great rulers have positive rather than negative reasons for refusing to fight, Jonson here dissociates the kings (including Charles) from the irresponsibility, cowardice, and weakness depicted in "A speach."

The author implies that the rulers accept peace at least partly because they are "good": in this way the poem suggests that subjects should support their monarchs and that England's peace with these Catholic countries is respectable. By placing his patron in good company, the poet shows Weston not as a henchman serving his tyrant or a traitor bribed by another country, but as an honorable man

dealing with other honorable men. Any economic advantage brought by their agreement is not a sordid gain (as some English imply) but the sort of fitting accompaniment to peace described in Speeches.

Having reconciled the countries' leaders, the Treasurer needs the cooperation of other English citizens in order to have a healthy, harmonious peace. Making subjects "know" their intellectual as well as financial debts, the king's Treasurer and foreign advisor must in a small part train English citizens to be connoisseurs in international relations, if only enough that they respect and support the peace.

As "strife of murmuring Subjects" suggests, Weston's policy is hardly popular, though Jonson himself is against ignorant murmuring. In dealing with this dissatisfaction--in "stint[ing] the strife"--Weston must not necessarily obliterate disapproval; he must, however, like an artist "set . . . limits to" this energy, "depriv[ing] [it] of force" in order to preserve his carefully constructed peace and England's financial condition ("stint," OED). As it was necessary in Spanish negotiations for Weston to underplay the Palatinate issue, it is currently important for him to prevent disgruntled subjects from involving Charles too deeply in the Netherlands.

Having listed singly his patron's virtues, Jonson then describes the general impression Weston makes: "These [arts of life] I looke up at, with a reverent eye, / And [these]

strike Religion in the standers-by" (23-24). By depicting those around the Treasurer as "standers-by," the poem highlights the minister as an active rather than phlegmatic man. The man's greatness looms above even Ben Jonson (who himself often appears larger than life); it appeals not merely to the physical eyes, but to the spiritual ("reverent") vision.

By this time, the author has moved from visions of sense (lines 2-12) to those of intellectual discernment (13-22) and faith (23-28). In this last vision the poet sees past mere outward appearance to what Peterson calls Weston's "inner fullness," his "qualities of the soul" (100-01); Jonson argues that others who truly view this man--rather than merely listen to hearsay--will similarly respect him. Further, they will be undistracted by what many consider Weston's weakest point: his reputation for secret Catholicism and sympathy for Catholic Spain. Boldly defending his patron by using the phrase "strike Religion," the author argues in the statesman an ability that should inspire a trust that crosses denominations;[19] in this he recalls the arguments of Hymenaei's "Barriers" and the lying-in poem.

Responding to this refined vision of his patron, the author chooses to give him a gift that most corresponds to the statesman's values. He therefore tells Weston,

> . . . though I cannot as an Architect
> In glorious Piles, or Pyramids erect

Unto your honour: I can tune in song
Aloud; and (happ'ly) it may last as long.
(25-28)

Having moved from the hypothetical realm of initially considered gifts ("would" and "could") to the factual realm of his patron's abilities ("can"), the poet finally outlines his own capacity: he "cannot" give Weston something ostentatious, but he can give him something intangible. Because he, like Weston, can "compose," he can make a harmonious song for a man who has worked toward international accord and toward domestic acceptance thereof. Just as the poet earlier revised what he would give Weston, after considering that man's priorities, he realizes that this simple gift best demonstrates his patron's worth. As a memorial, a poem better than visual art can capture this diplomat's essence (see Trimpi 158-59); as a carefully-selected gift, a poem implies its receiver's interest in the spiritual.[20] By giving his patron an immortal poem on harmony, Jonson fittingly thanks the minister for bringing England that which is truly lasting (honor) and that which is worth possessing (peace). The poem also answers those who might think that Weston possesses only the "carcass of honor," and it reaffirms the significance of Jonson's address to Weston as "the right Honourable, the Lord Treasurer of England." Rather than avoiding Weston's aesthetic nature, the poem deliberately uses it to gauge his patriotism: the minister values his integrity and England's

safety more than he does beautiful art not because he esteems art so little, but because he prizes honor and the public safety so much.

Though Jonson's poem doubtless describes Weston as more virtuous than he actually is--as Massinger's play portrays him more vicious--it helps restore some balance concerning the pacific official at a time when many persons are strongly prejudiced against both him and peace, and at a time when they are demanding foreign entanglements England cannot afford. And while the poem is very positive--and thus potentially flattering--it does not betray Jonson's integrity: it praises someone who as one of the "kings men" in 1623 supported James's peace policy, and it remains consistent with the poet's own foreign relations policy as described years earlier in Speeches.

Other Under-wood poems reinforce the importance of international harmony and of England's peacetime strength. Again addressing Weston, here in his roles as foreign minister, Treasurer, and patron, one poem argues like Speeches the importance of civil as well as martial arts ("To the Right Honourable, the Lord high Treasurer of England. An Epistle Mendicant," 1631).[21] Borrowing from the military tactics of the time, "An Epistle Mendicant" (1631) describes as under siege not just foreign cities, but the Muse of the paralyzed Jonson (lines 4-12). Comparing his needs to those of lands which English Protestants wish to help, the poet writes, "Poore wretched states, prest by

extemities, / Are faine to seeke for succours, and supplies / Of Princes aides, or good mens Charities" (1-3). While not disdaining those towns overpowered by strong enemies, the author nonetheless suggests that his country should be concerned with civil as well as with martial heroes. "Unlesse some saving-Honour of the Crowne, / Dare thinke it, to relieve, no lesse renowne, / A Bed-rid Wit, then a besieged Towne" (13-15), the laureate's case will be dire. Here the poet asks support for the civilizing influences that breed good, strong citizens and (if need be) brave, honorable soldiers (such as Jonson himself once was). In his use of "Dare," however, he shows his realization that while melodramatic aid to a far-away country would be generally approved, quiet help to a faithful English subject will arouse little applause, even though that subject has given counsel on international relations. Nonetheless, readers should not forget that war is valuable only in that it restores true peace and prosperity--poetry is vital in peace and war alike, as Speeches and Poetaster indicate.

Toward the final years of his life, Jonson continues to show his concern with peace as he writes what is probably his last work in Under-wood, "A New-yeares-Gift sung to King CHARLES, 1635." A reworking of an earlier poem to King James as well as a gift to Charles for the coming year, this pastoral, like "old Janus" (9), looks back at a past and forward to a future peace. Calling Charles (Pan) "the great Preserver of our bounds" (14, 48) and the "Father of our

peace" (40), the laureate in a last attempt urges subjects to support the king who protects them from outside forces (the "theefe" of line 62). However he suspects, he could not know that England's greatest danger lay within itself.[22]

When in "A New-yeares-Gift" Jonson calls Charles the "author of our peace" (line 57), he might have more accurately been describing himself. More than the rigid king, he has tried not only here but throughout Under-wood to involve "the flat, the meane, [and] the sharpe" (line 3), supporting a harmony that tolerates many diverse strands, just as the world should tolerate different nations.

In Speeches Jonson writes during a time of peace, supporting both civil and martial strength and recounting glories from England's past and present. In Under-wood he writes when the international situation is more obviously volatile. His philosophy must accommodate countries with which England variously fights, then reconciles. It must also envision a noble peace for an England weaker now than in its Elizabethan days. Though describing in Speeches the triumph of Christian over non-Christian, Jonson there as in Under-wood generally argues that Protestant and Catholic nations can coexist. While this argument is not always popular during the Thirty Years War, it is one that the poet's personal life supports. Had Jonson's contemporaries shared his religious tolerance, had his fellow citizens possessed his realistic view of what England could handle, and had they too seen the importance of counsel, purse, and

cause, Britain might have saved much of its energy and money for domestic matters. As matters stood, England was soon to place not a poet but a Parliament above its Caesar, in a drama Jonson happily did not witness.

NOTES

[1] For a brief review of international affairs during James's reign see Dietz 253-54; Aylmer 60-61; Cook 160; Willson 16-20; and Cecil 262-87. S.R. Gardiner gives a more detailed account (2:21-29, 91-101, 134-65, 218-26, 251-57, 315-30, 390-97).

[2] Miles mentions some of the diplomatic awkwardness concerning masques (93, 113, 121-22).

[3] Concerning Henry's original challenge for the barriers, Charles Cornwallis writes, "[Wishing to] trie the Valour of his young yeares in foraigne Countrayes, and to know where Vertue triumphed most, [Meliadus sent his knights] . . . abroad to espy the same, who after their long Travailes in all Countreyes, and returne; shewing, how no where in any Continent, save in . . . Great Britaine, they had found his wishes . . . " (as qtd. in Herford and Simpson 10:512).

[4] Parfitt comments generally upon Speeches and notes its relation to "A speach according to Horace" (Ben 77). See also Orgel, Ben 480; Miles 129-30. McElwee 170-72 describes Prince Henry and his differences from James.

[5] James writes to Henry that as a "publike person" a king "hath no power therefore to dispose of himselfe, in respect, that to his preservation or fall, the safetie or

wracke of the whole Common weale is necessarily coupled" (Basilikon 57-58).

[6] McElwee 170 reports a contemporary view of Henry's devout Protestantism.

[7] For Prince Henry's knowledge of and fascination with the navy see McElwee 170. While the Armada section of Speeches refers to Elizabeth as "That dear-beloved of heaven" (299), Jonson uses similar terms to describe the Catholic Henrietta Maria in "An Epigram to the Queene, then lying in." Nowhere in his description of the battle against Spain does he mention the words "Pope" or "Catholic." Further, not only James's wife but the Howard family is associated with Catholicism, and Jonson himself does not convert back to Anglicanism until sometime during the year Speeches is performed (1610).

[8] Herford and Simpson 11:73 discuss the poem's date. The following writers discuss foreign affairs just before and during the 1620s: Carlton 46-53; Ashley 60-62; Russell, Crisis 290-98 and Parliaments 145; Hill, "Political" 54; and Dietz 253-54. See also Ashley 60 for James's financial interest in the Spanish Match.

Van den Berg examines the destructive aspect of Vulcan, in relation to elements external and internal to Jonson, and she includes remarks upon the Puritans (143-46, 155-59). Yet while she says that Jonson "treats his personal loss as the basis for a larger, impersonal argument about . . . destruction and desire in the political world" (159), she

does not address the policy split between James and Charles.

[9] McElwee explains that though relations with Spain are severed during James's reign, Charles and Buckingham are by this time England's virtual rulers (272-76).

[10] Jonson quite often uses negative enumeration: see, for example, the beginning of "To Penshurst" and that of the Shakespeare ode. On the poem's date and historical context see Herford and Simpson 11:81-85; Dietz 250-53, 256; Parfitt, "History" 85-86; and McElwee 234, 236. Parfitt, "History" and van den Berg 173 comment critically on the poem itself, while Stone 239-40 describes the aristocracy of this time.

[11] Remarking upon the dubiousness of the nobles' pedigrees, Parfitt mentions not only the phrase "Or from whom / The herald will" (81-82), but also Jonson's dislike for romance heroes such as Guy and Bevis ("History" 88). Whether or not Jonson likes the romances celebrating Arthur and others, however, he still respects the great men themselves, as his positive use of Bevis elsewhere shows (see "An Epigram. To WILLIAM, Earle of Newcastle," lines 9-10).

[12] On Jonson's attitude on class, see Every Man Out of His Humour.

[13] The following writers review the financial situation around 1625-26: Carlton 68-70, 73-75, 80; Ashley 66; Dietz 256-57; and Alexander xii-xiii.

[14] "Garter"--"A band worn around the leg" OED (emphasis

mine). St. George's Knights of the Garter wore just such a band.

[15] On Charles's foreign policy and peace negotiations see Aylmer 86-87, and S.R. Gardiner 7:169-202. For additional views of Richard Weston see "Weston, Richard" and Alexander (especially xiii-xiv, 38-39, 146, 180). Concerning the composition date, Herford and Simpson note that a poem referring to this epigram was written in 1631 or 1632 (11:155). The epigram's reference to mighty monarchs and peace argues for its composition after peace with France (1629) and Spain (November 1630). This makes the likeliest date late 1630, 1631, or 1632. See Herford and Simpson 11:98 and Peterson 99-101 for comments on the poem itself.

[16] "Weston, Richard" and Dunn 43-44 comment on Believe as you List. Though the play was not licensed until May 1631, it had been written by 11 January 1631. It is therefore possible that Jonson knew of the play's contents, especially if his poem was written in 1632 rather than in 1631. Dunn remarks on possible antagonism between Jonson and Massinger (36-42), while Patterson comments upon the relationship between Under-wood and Massinger's A Game at Chess, The Bondman, and The Maid of Honour (82, 84-85).

[17] In his comment upon the word "compose," Peterson writes that it "through its Latin cognate componere, contains a lingering hint of Horace's verb ponere . . . used of setting up or making stand a statue" (100).

[18] The poet's reference to his own son as "Ben Jonson

his best piece of poetry" affirms the author's estimation of life in relation to art ("On My First Sonne" 10).

[19] Peterson 101 interprets "religion" as referring to classical awe.

[20] On poetry as capturing experience better than visual art, see "Eupheme . . . : The Mind" in Under-wood (8:277-81). Lemly 250-53, Marotti 221-24, and Livingston 381-92 comment on Jonson's beliefs in this matter.

[21] For criticism of the "Epistle Mendicant" see Leggatt 209, Lemly 254, Trimpi 154, and Hunter 115-16. In discussing the poems to Weston, van den Berg states that after the Cary-Morison ode (immediately preceding the "Epistle Mendicant"), the "emphasis shifts disturbingly away from intimate sustaining friendship toward the exigencies of finance" (178). This concern about finance is not some aberration of Jonson's later years, however, but a legitimate concern in the real world the poet inhabits, one that he addresses in Speeches and in Love Restored. Similarly, Patterson remarks on the poet's "extreme dependency" and "self-abasement" without noting Jonson's elevation of poetry and his own worth (136). Parfitt gives a more positive view of the poem (Ben 16-17), as does Judith Kegan Gardiner, who says that here Jonson "implies that fortitude is truly defined as the endurance of evils" (95).

[22] Evelyn Simpson notes the similarities and differences between the original poem to James and this one to Charles. For other Under-wood pieces with an

international element see "An Epistle to a Friend, to perswade him to the Warres" and "An Ode to JAMES Earle of Desmond. . . ." Yet as Judith Kegan Gardiner remarks concerning the former poem (for which we have no certain date), the counsel is oriented more at escape from the court than at entering the war (93). The Desmond poem (1599-1600?) actually involves part of the British kingdom--Ireland--but it is a part "more in title than in fact" as Jonson comments (Speeches 339-40). While Patterson discusses the ode's implications, particularly concerning censorship (132-34), she does not note a potential purpose of the work: to persuade Desmond to carry out faithfully his role in Ireland, which is to discourage a Catholic uprising against the English. See also Patterson's comments on "The mind of the Frontispiece to a Booke," a poem written for Walter Ralegh's History of the World (127-31).

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

Ben Jonson's work, both early and late, addresses many political issues, advocating a diverse harmony that encourages flexibility as well as order. Possessing a high concept of the poet's role and a keen interest in the world around him, the author examines not only his own relationship with rulers, but relationships in the courtly, legal, religious, and international spheres. In the early years of his career, as he establishes his skill, his reputation, and his place at court, Jonson often uses openly didactic language. Yet in counseling persons of higher rank, he achieves distance through settings, generalized diction, and elevated personae.[1] Responding to the immediate context, the poet also gives general guidelines concerning dynamic cooperation. He shows his support for the differences that a healthy order can include in Poetaster (1601), Love Restored (1612), "Panegyre" (1604), Hymenaei's "Barriers" (1606), and Speeches (1610).

Besides advocating harmony within different political spheres, Jonson also implies the interconnection between them: for instance, love is important to all political actions, as are trust, common sense, loyalty, integrity, and

the observance of correct priorities. Yet such attention to priorities, however loving, requires that elements which would destroy rather than enrich the system be banished. Only by allowing difference yet preventing anarchy can a political state preserve itself and ensure the safety of its moral individualists.

Jonson retains his belief in diverse harmony as he grows older and witnesses the many vicissitudes of political life. Maturing in experience and ability, he brings to the position of court laureate an important versatility and competence: vigorous yet tactful, adventurous yet contemplative, he is familiar both with poverty and with great citizens, with prisons and with lawyers. In a time of religious and international ferment, he is comfortable with Catholicism and Anglicanism, and he proves his virtue both in war and in peace.

This sense of tolerance finds its way into Under-wood, published after Jonson becomes laureate (most of its contents also written after his appointment).[2] Working for adaptation and equilibrium, the poet supports cooperative efforts between strong elements, and he examines as before the courtly, legal, religious, and international arenas. He therefore commends Weston's efforts toward an opposing courtier; he praises a chancellor who attempts with his rival to reconcile king and Parliament; he lauds the royal family that lovingly combines Catholic and Protestant; and he admires the diplomat who helps kings end war.

Like Jonson's earlier work, Under-wood demonstrates that the different political spheres overlap: the courtiers Richard Weston and Kenelm Digby are celebrated for their domestic and their international efforts, and Charles is praised for laws regarding secular and religious matters. The birth of Henrietta Maria's son not only increases England's international security but implies divine favor. Further, "Execration" involves legal, religious, courtly, and international elements. Thus when Jonson encourages cooperation in one area, he in effect supports England's overall flexibility.[3]

As before, however, the poet argues that some elements must be excluded from the political system: envy and treason; public attacks upon the king; defiance of God or of His deputies; and inappropriate acts concerning foreign policy. After justice has been done, however, reconcilement is preferable to revenge (to paraphrase Poetaster's Caesar). Such reconcilement can result in the loyalty of a traitor's son (Kenelm Digby).

Besides resembling work published earlier, however, Under-wood also differs from it. In this collection of short pieces, the author comments in a more concentrated way than before upon the political world and the variety it can accommodate. Counseling with an increased immediacy, this poet now often speaks in his own voice, and he uses native settings in a manner more specific yet comprehensive. Frequently he simultaneously bolsters his message not by

stating an argument more baldly, but by putting it more attractively: he increases the element of delight in his works of instruction. Further, he energizes his counsel through the use of significant paradox and the mention of controversial issues.

Finding as laureate greater opportunity for understanding state affairs and for addressing English leaders, Jonson also writes at key moments: he comments when a splintered court gathers to celebrate union; when Parliament is about to meet, and after the king has dissolved it; when England loses a prince, when it gains one, and when it welcomes one into the church; and when the country must decide whether to wage war or to pursue peace.[4]

Underlying all of Jonson's political counsel is the assumption of his competence as a poet and the importance of poetry itself, particularly concerning state matters. He supports the first point when he depicts himself as an earthly Gabriel, a director of Bacchus, and a writer acknowledged by the poet James and the art connoisseurs Charles, Weston, Bacon, and Digby. He supports the second point when he connects King James with poetry and shows how Treasurer Weston and Sir Kenelm mingle political with poetical discussions. Further, when the laureate describes the fiery destruction of his library, he significantly implies injury also to the royal court, legal offices, a church, and foreign countries (see "Execration" 170-78, 193-96, 203-12).

Though flames destroy some of Jonson's writing, they do not consume his Under-wood. Rather, that work survives to preserve "the fire, the wine, [and] the men" of its author's time, the energetic individualism and the dynamic interaction of English citizens. Refusing in his later, less fortunate years to abdicate his role as political counselor, the royal poet in some ways resembles the tenacious Charles. He is more adaptable, however, like the man he chooses to edit his work. With Digby's help, Jonson publishes a volume resembling both author and editor: "a brave Palace, a broad Street, / Where all heroique ample thoughts do meet / Where Nature such a large survey hath ta'en" ("An Epigram to my MUSE" 9-11). Though no Virgilian epic, this survey contains Jonson's tireless attempts to change what he can and to sustain what seems indispensable. It is a labor of love, loyalty, intelligence, and upright individualism: so Hercules and good men bear up heaven.

NOTES

[1] While some poems in Epigrammes and Forrest are less distant than the pre-laureate masques and plays, they are usually also less comprehensive: they praise in a more concrete manner single characters, but they seldom show them in cooperative political contexts.

[2] Some of Under-wood's political poems were written before Jonson's laureateship, as Herford and Simpson explain (11:47-48): "An Ode to JAMES Earle of Desmond . . . " (before 1600); "An Epigram on The Court Pucell" (before 1609); "An Epigram On WILL<I>AM Lord Burl<eigh,> . . . " (1608-1612); "An Epigram. To the honour'd--Countesse of--" (before 1612); "The mind of the Frontispiece to a Booke" (around 1614); and perhaps "An Epigram on Sir Edward Coke . . ." (1613-1616).

Despite the time of composition, however, the decision to publish these poems was that of a laureate, as Patterson comments (127, 130, 132, 134). For a discussion of "The mind of the Frontispiece" see Patterson 127-30.

[3] The poem on John Williams ("An Epigram") also shows the interrelationship of religious, legal, and courtly elements.

[4] Other timely Under-wood poems concern the return of an unpopular courtier and the separation of Charles from his

people ("To the Right hon^{ble} Hierome, L. Weston. . . " and "An Epigram. To K. CHARLES for a 100 pounds . . . ").

WORKS CITED

Alexander, Michael Van Cleave. Charles I's Lord Treasurer: Sir Richard Weston, Earl of Portland (1577-1635). London: Macmillan, 1975.

Allen, John. Inquiry into the Rise and Growth of the Royal Prerogative in England and An Inquiry into the Life and Character of King Eadwig. Burt Franklin Research and Source Works Series No. 29. New York: Burt Franklin, 1849.

Anderson, Bonnie S., and Judith P. Zinsser. A History of Their Own: Women in Europe from Prehistory to the Present. Vol. 1. New York: Harper, 1988.

Anderson, Fulton H. Francis Bacon: His Career and His Thought. Los Angeles: U of Southern California P, 1962.

Aristotle. Politics. Trans. Benjamin Jowett. Aristotle. Great Books of the Western World 9. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1952. 437-548.

---. Nichomachean Ethics. Trans. W.D. Ross. Aristotle. Great Books of the Western World 9. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1952. 333-436.

Ashley, Maurice. England in the Seventeenth Century. Rev. ed. London: Hutchinson, 1978.

Aylmer, G.E. The Struggle for the English Constitution

1603-1689: England in the Seventeenth Century. Rev. ed. Blandford History Series. London: Blandford, 1968.

Bacon, Francis. Apophthegmes New and Old. London: 1626.

"Bacon, Francis." Dictionary of National Biography.

"Bacon, Nicholas." Dictionary of National Bibliography.

Bicknell, E.J. A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England. 3rd ed. Rev. by H.J. Carpenter. London: Longmans, 1955.

Bowen, Catherine Drinker. Francis Bacon: The Temper of a Man. Boston: Atlantic-Little, Brown, 1963.

Bulfinch, Thomas. Bulfinch's Mythology. New York: Avenal, 1978.

Carlton, Charles. Charles I: The Personal Monarch. 1983. London: Ark Paperbacks, 1984.

Castiglione, Baldesar. The Book of the Courtier. Trans. George Bull. New York: Penguin, 1976.

Cecil, Algernon. A Life of Robert Cecil: First Earl of Salisbury. 1915. Westport: Greenwood, 1971.

Charles I. The Letters, Speeches and Proclamations of Charles I. Ed. Charles Petrie. London: Cassell, 1935.

Cook, Chris, and John Wroughton. English Historical Facts, 1603-1688. Totowa: Rowman, 1980.

Crowther, J.G. Francis Bacon: The First Statesman of Science. London: Cresset, 1960.

"Cunning." OED.

Davies, Godfrey. The Early Stuarts 1603-1660. The Oxford

History of England. Ed. G.N. Clark. 1937. Rpt. with corrections. Oxford: Clarendon, 1938.

De Luna, B.N. Jonson's Romish Plot: A Study of Catiline and Its Historical Context. London: Oxford UP, 1967.

Dictionary of National Biography: From the Earliest Times to 1990 [DNB]. Ed. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee. 22 vols. 1917. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1949-1950.

Dietz, Frederick C. A Political and Social History of England. Rev. ed. New York: Macmillan, 1932.

Donaldson, Ian, intro. and ed. Ben Jonson. The Oxford Authors. New York: Oxford UP, 1985.

Dunn, T.A. Philip Massinger: The Man and the Playwright. London: Nelson, 1957.

Ellis, Steven G. Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures 1470-1603. London: Oxford UP, 1967.

Elsky, Martin. "Words, Things, and Names: Jonson's Poetry and Philosophical Grammar." Classic and Cavalier: Essays on Jonson and the Sons of Ben. Ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1982. 91-104.

Evans, Robert C. "Frozen Maneuvers: Ben Jonson's Epigrams to Robert Cecil." Texas Studies in Literature and Language 29 (1987): 115-40.

___. "'Games of Fortune, Plaid at Court': Politics and Poetic Freedom in Jonson's Epigrams." "The muses common-weale": Poetry and Politics in the Seventeenth

Century. Ed. Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1988. 48-61.

"Fair." OED.

"First, Firstborn." The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. Grand Rapids: Zonderman, 1978.

FitzGerald, Brian. The Geraldines: An Experiment in Irish Government 1169-1601. New York: Devin-Adair, 1952.

Gardiner, Judith Kegan. Craftsmanship in Context: The Development of Ben Jonson's Poetry. The Hague: Mouton, 1975.

Gardiner, Samuel R. History of England from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642 10 vols. New ed. London: 1891.

"Garter." OED.

The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition. Intro. Lloyd E. Berry. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1969.

"Genius." OED.

Goldberg, Jonathan. James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and Their Contemporaries. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1983.

Hamilton, A.C., ed. The Faerie Queene. By Edmund Spencer. New York: Longmans, 1977.

Helgerson, Richard. "The Elizabethan Laureate: Self-Presentation and the Literary System." ELH: Journal of English Literary History 46 (1979): 193-220.

---. Self-Crowned Laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the Literary System. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of

California P, 1983.

Herford, C.H., Percy and Evelyn Simpson, eds. Ben Jonson. By Ben Jonson. 11 vols. 1925-1952. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.

Hexter, J.H. "Power Struggle, Parliament, and Liberty in Early Stuart England." Journal of Modern History 50 (1978): 1-50.

Hill, Christopher. Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution. 1965. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.

---. "Political Discourse in Early Seventeenth-Century England." Politics and People in Seventeenth-Century England: Essays in Honour of Ivan Roots. Ed. Colin Jones, et al. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986. 41-64.

Holdsworth, William. Some Makers of English Law: The Tagore Lectures 1937-38. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1938.

Hunter, William B., Jr., ed. and introduction. The Complete Poetry of Ben Jonson. By Ben Jonson. New York: Norton, 1968.

James [King of Scotland and England]. Basilikon Doron: or His Majesties Instructions to His Dearest Sonne, Henry the Prince. London: 1603.

Jones, W.J. Politics and the Bench: The Judges and the Origins of the English Civil War. New York: Barnes, 1971.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. The King's Two Bodies: A Study of Medieval Political Theology. Princeton: Princeton UP,

1981.

King James Version of the Bible. 1611. New York: The World Publishing Co., n.d.

Le Comte, Edward. The Notorious Lady Essex. New York: Dial, 1969.

Leggatt, Alexander. Ben Jonson: His Vision and His Art. London: Methuen, 1981.

Lemly, John. "Masks and Self-Portraits in Jonson's Late Poetry." ELH: Journal of English Literary History 44 (1977): 249-66.

Livingston, Mary L. "Ben Jonson: The Poet to the Painter." Texas Studies in Literature and Language 18 (1976): 381-92.

Maclean, Hugh. "'A More Secret Cause': The Wit of Jonson's Poetry." A Celebration of Ben Jonson. Ed. William Blissett, et al. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1973. 129-66.

Marotti, Arthur F. "All About Jonson's Poetry." ELH: Journal of English Literary History 39 (1972): 208-37.

Marwil, Jonathan L. The Trials of Counsel--Francis Bacon in 1621. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1976.

McClure, Matthew Thompson. Introduction. Bacon Selections. By Francis Bacon. Ed. McClure. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.

McElwee, William. The Wisest Fool in Christendom: The Reign of King James I and VI. New York: Harcourt, 1958.

Meagher, John C. Method and Meaning in Jonson's Masques. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1966.

Miles, Rosalind. Ben Jonson: His Life and His Work. London: Routledge, 1986.

Mortimer, Anthony. "The Feigned Commonwealth in the Poetry of Ben Jonson." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 13 (1973): 69-79.

Newton, Richard C. "'Goe, quit 'hem all': Ben Jonson and Formal Verse Satire." Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 16 (1976): 105-16.

Orgel, Stephen. Ben Jonson: The Complete Masques. By Ben Jonson. The Yale Ben Jonson. New Haven: Yale UP, 1969.

---. The Jonsonian Masque. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1965.

Parfitt, George. Ben Jonson: Public Poet and Private Man. London: Dent, 1976.

---. "History and Ambiguity: Jonson's 'A Speech according to Horace.'" Studies in English Literature 1500-1900 19 (1979): 85-92.

Patterson, Annabel. Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1984.

Peterson, Richard S. Imitation and Praise in the Poems of Ben Jonson. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale UP, 1981.

Petersson, R.T. Sir Kenelm Digby: The Ornament of England, 1603-1665. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1956.

Plato. The Republic: Books VI-X. Trans. Paul Shorey.

Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1935. Vol. 6 of Plato. 12 vols. 1914-1935.

"Quick." OED.

Randall, Dale B.J. Jonson's Gypsies Unmasked: Background and Theme of The Gypsies Metamorphos'd. Durham: Duke UP, 1975.

Reeve, Edmund. The Church divinitie, contained in the divine service . . . . 1631.

"Right." OED.

Russell, Conrad. The Crisis of Parliaments: English History 1509-1660. The Short Oxford History of the Modern World. New York: Oxford UP, 1971.

---. Parliaments and English Politics 1621-1629. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.

Sharpe, Kevin. Criticism and Compliment: The Politics of Literature in the England of Charles I. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

---. "The Earl of Arundel, His Circle and the Opposition to the Duke of Buckingham, 1618-1628." Sharpe, Faction 209-44.

---, ed. Faction and Parliament: Essays on Early Stuart History. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.

Simpson, Evelyn. "Ben Jonson's A New-yeares-Gift." Review of English Studies 14 (1938): 175-78.

"State." OED.

Stewart, Stanley. The Enclosed Garden: The Tradition and the Image in Seventeenth-Century Poetry. Madison: U

of Wisconsin P, 1966.

"Stint." OED.

Stone, Lawrence. The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.

"Strife." OED.

Summers, Claude J. and Ted-Larry Pebworth. Ben Jonson. Twayne's English Authors Series 268. Boston: Hall, 1979.

Thompson, Christopher. "The Divided Leadership of the House of Commons in 1629." Sharpe, Faction. 245-84.

Tillyard, E.M.W. The Elizabethan World Picture. New York: Random, 1959.

Trimpi, Wesley. Ben Jonson's Poems: A Study of the Plain Style. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1962.

van den Berg, Sara. The Action of Ben Jonson's Poetry. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1987.

"Weston, Richard." DNB.

Willson, David Harris. The Privy Councillors in the House of Commons, 1604-1629. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1940.

Wilson, Elkin Calhoun. England's Eliza. Harvard Studies in English 20. New York: Octagon, 1966.

VITA

Libby Ellen Stott

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: DIVERSITY IN HARMONY: THE POLITICAL COUNSEL OF BEN JONSON'S UNDER-WOOD

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Pryor, Oklahoma, May 31, 1958, the daughter of Merril Lee and Mildred Louise Wagoner Stott.

Education: Graduated from Pryor High School, Pryor, Oklahoma, in May 1976; received Bachelor of Arts Degree in German from Oklahoma State University in May 1980, completed major in English in December 1980; received Master of Arts Degree in English from Oklahoma State University in May 1984; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in May 1991.

Professional Experience: Teaching Assistant, Department of English, Oklahoma State University, August 1981 to December 1981; Research Assistant, Department of English, Oklahoma State University, February to April 1987 and August to November 1990.