New Material on Thomas Carew

Author(s): C. L. Powell

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (Jul., 1916), pp. 285-297

Published by: Modern Humanities Research Association

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3713526>

Accessed: 22-06-2016 04:35 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*

NEW MATERIAL ON THOMAS CAREW.

I. *The Present Texts.*

It is a well-known fact that Thomas Carew was an extremely fastidious poet, so much so that Suckling said of him,

The issue of 's brain
Was seldom brought forth but with trouble and pain.

This careful polishing of his work, however, was Carew's method of perfecting a gem, and to it to a large extent his reputation is due. It is greatly to be regretted, therefore, that we have no satisfactory edition of Carew's work, that is, an edition which includes all his extant poems, which omits those that have been erroneously attributed to him (with evidence for so doing), and which is as free as may be from textual errors. The reasons for this lack are that Carew himself never edited his work for publication and that modern scholars have not studied contemporary manuscript copies sufficiently to produce the best possible results.

The first edition of Carew's work appeared in 1640, after his death, compiled from a very faulty manuscript, as is shown by the fact that it includes several poems by other writers, omits several which are undoubtedly Carew's, and exhibits a text which in many cases certainly does not give us the actual words of the poet. Modern scholarship has done something towards correcting the first two of these evils, but practically nothing in the case of the last. There have been three scholarly editions of Carew, that of Hazlitt for the Roxburghe Club in 1870, that of Ebsworth in 1893, and that of Vincent for the 'Muses' Library' in 1898. Hazlitt's chief contribution over the early editions was the addition of a dozen or so poems taken from seventeenth-century manuscripts, most of which show little or no real evidence of Carew's hand. Ebsworth follows closely in Hazlitt's footsteps, so far as the content of his volume is concerned, but quite rightly objects to the acceptance of a handful of poems and quite wrongly upholds that of certain others. Vincent does very well to drop most of these doubtful pieces from his edition altogether, but, as he in most cases presents no

evidence for so doing, his decisions have only the validity of his own personal opinion plus Ebsworth's earlier work. No one, however, has carefully edited the text; at least no one has used all the available material to make it as perfect as it might be.

To do this properly would involve an entire new edition of Carew's work, which is not the purpose of this article. The available material referred to consists of seventeenth-century manuscripts in the British Museum, the Bodleian, St John's College, Cambridge, certain private libraries, and perhaps elsewhere. Hazlitt examined a very few of these and describes them briefly in the preface to his edition, but his remarks there are both inadequate and inaccurate. Ebsworth and Vincent do not give evidence of having gone much beyond Hazlitt's sources here. For the present article, I have gone twice through all such manuscripts that I have been able to lay my hands on by means of library catalogues and other references, some seventy or eighty in all. Since, as I have shown, the early printed copies were based on some manuscript similar to these, and a very faulty one at that, it must be clear that evidence drawn from any contemporary manuscript should have certainly equal weight with that of the first or succeeding early editions, as the latter failed to correct the mistakes originally made. Thus the warnings voiced by Ebsworth and Vincent against accepting manuscript evidence are not to be regarded seriously.

Although the purpose of my investigation has been principally to settle the various problems connected with the doubtful poems, it is worth while to cite a few of the textual emendations I have been able to make *en passant*, both for the sake of correctness itself and in order further to invalidate the seemingly hypnotic influence of the printed page of the first edition. In small matters there are differences of reading in almost every poem, and the editor here can do no more than take that reading which seems to him the best; in larger things a change of reading may legitimately be made where a passage is at present nonsense and a single new version is intelligible, or where the change is supported by the agreement of several manuscripts.

In the second *Epitaph to Mary Villiers*, a considerable stretch of the imagination is required to make anything of these lines :

But the weak mould
 Could the great guest no longer hold :
 The substance was too pure, the flame
 Too glorious, that thither came.
 Ten thousand Cupids brought along
 A grace on each wing, that did throng
 For place there, etc.

The poet is here trying to say that the maiden's death was due to the fact that the 'clayey tenement' could not hold her great soul. Surely the passage as given cannot stand beside the one below, which beginning the same, concludes:

The frame
So glorious that thither came
Ten thousand Cupids bearing along
A grace on each wing that did throng
For place there¹.

Again, in *The Comparison*, in describing his mistress's complexion, the poet is made by most of our editors to say that it

Aurora's blush resembles, or that red
That frisketh in when her mantle's spread.

If anyone can visualize the latter part of this conceit, he can go even Carew one better, who actually wrote:

Aurora's blush resembles or that red
That Iris struts in when her mantle's spread².

To mention but a few other cases: Cupid's wings are *painted*, not *panting*³; the precious amethyst is *whiter*, not *witty*⁴; the lady who once was prodigal with her graces is now *scant*, not *scarce*⁵; the musician in playing one piece over and over displeases the *hearers*, not the *heavens*⁶; *La. Pen.*, to whom an elegy is written, is Lady Peniston⁷. It is not worth while to continue this list here.

II. *Doubtful Poems.*

The poems discussed under this heading include all those which have caused doubts as to their authorship in the mind of any commentator⁸. In citing the manuscript occurrences of the poems, I give

¹ Given by Harl. 6917, p. 26, one of the most carefully compiled MSS. I have seen.

² This correction is made, along with several others that have escaped notice (e.g. *To my Friend G. N.*, l. 144, for *circle* read *sickle*), in the *Errata* of the first edition. The better reading also occurs in every MS. I have seen, e.g. Add. 22118, f. 5, and 25303, f. 78; Eg. 2725, p. 309; Harl. 3511, p. 102. Ebsworth prints 'Iris frisks in.'

³ *Upon the Sickness of E. S.*, l. 32. Better reading, Add. 33998, p. 42.

⁴ *Epitaph on Lady S.*, l. 15. Better reading, Harl. 6917, p. 27.

⁵ *Persuasions to Love*, l. 12. Better reading, Add. 25303, f. 159.

⁶ *To his Friend*, l. 3. Better reading occurs wherever the poem is found in MSS. and also in Wood's *Athenae* (ed. Bliss) where it was first printed. Hazlitt miscopied it from Ash. 38 and later editors followed him.

⁷ Given by Rawl. F 160, f. 54. Ebsworth gives it as Lady Pennington. Vincent preserves it as *La. Pen.*, but in his notes says that the lady was Martha, wife of Thos. Peniston of Leigh.

⁸ I do not include Herrick's *Enquiry* and *Primrose*, the authorship of which, though they occurred in the first edition of Carew, has never been seriously questioned. For notes on them, see F. W. Moorman's edition of Herrick, introd. and appen.

only those not heretofore collated¹. For the others, see the three editions of Carew already referred to.

1. *The Spark*. This poem was first claimed from Carew for Suckling in *The Last Remains of Sir John Suckling*, published with 'the licence and approbation of his noble and dearest friends' in 1659². Anderson and Chalmers in their collections of British poetry and Hazlitt in his editions of Carew and Suckling, all calmly give it without comment to both poets³. Ebsworth includes it without question among Carew's work; Vincent says dogmatically that it is by Suckling but gives no convincing reason for so doing. It may be found in manuscript in Eg. 2725, p. 135; Add. 33998, p. 144; and Dobell, f. 43. In the first of these it has the initials *T. C.* after the title and *W. P.* at the end; in the two others it is subscribed *Walter Poole*. The evidence in the case certainly favours Poole, especially as it is unlikely that two different collectors would attribute it to an almost unknown poet unless he were actually the author, whereas we know that the more popular writers were often saddled with poems they did not write. Moreover, both manuscripts which give it to Poole are carefully compiled, Add. 33998 being the best of all I have seen. The initials *W. P.* at the end of the poem in Eg. 2725 must also count for something. Poole seems to be quite unknown except as a man whose verses occasionally turn up in contemporary manuscripts.

2. *On his Mistress Going to Sea*. Uncollated occurrences of this poem are: Ash. 47, art. 176; Malone 21, f. 48; Rawl. F 160, f. 112; St J. 416, no. 35; Add. 25707, f. 110; Eg. 2725, p. 156; Stowe 962, f. 33. Ebsworth and Vincent, who discuss the problem of this poem at some length, agree in giving it to Thos. Carey of the royal bed-chamber. To their information, I can add the facts that in St J. 416 it is subscribed H. [?] Murry⁴, and in Eg. 2725 it is entitled *Mr. Murrey of the Bechamber to a Young Lady Going to Holland*. This complicates the question of who actually did write the poem, but at least it lends weight to the belief that Carew did not.

¹ The MSS. referred to herein are distributed as follows: Ashmole, Malone, and Rawlinson are in the Bodleian; St John's, in St John's College, Cambridge; Additional, Egerton, Harley, Sloane, and Stowe, in the British Museum; the Cosens and Wyburd MSS. were two privately owned collections to which Hazlitt and Ebsworth had access, but which I have not been able to locate; the Dobell MS. is in the possession of Mr Bertram Dobell, bookseller, Charing Cross Road, London. The last has not previously been examined.

² Vincent is mistaken in saying (ed. Carew, p. 260) that the poem was first claimed for Suckling in 1696.

³ When given to Suckling, the title is *The Guiltless Inconstant*.

⁴ The catalogue of the St John's College MSS. gives this name as *H. Merry*. The last name, however, is clearly *Murry* in the MS.

3. *Methodus Amandi*. The case of this poem is well set forth by Ebsworth, who gives it also to Thos. Carey. In this Vincent concurs. New manuscript sources are: Malone 13, f. 45, where it is subscribed *T. Carew, B. Chamb.*; Eg. 2725, p. 137, unattributed; and Harl. 6917, p. 73, subscribed, in a different hand, *Sid. Godolphin*. The evidence of Malone 13, in addition to that already in hand, makes the case pretty conclusive for Carey, especially as this manuscript contains a number of Godolphin's poems correctly ascribed to him. In Saintsbury's *Minor Caroline Poets*, it is erroneously included among Godolphin's work, probably on the evidence of Harl. 6917¹.

4. *To his Mistress Retiring in Affection*. The only evidence up to the present on this verse has been that of Add. 11811, f. 6, where it is subscribed *Tho. Cary*, a spelling of Carew's name consistently used in this collection. It occurs also in Add. 22118, f. 40, subscribed *Tho. Carew*. As it is much in Carew's manner and is nowhere attributed to anyone else, we may accept it as undoubtedly his.

5. *Excuse for Absence*. Hazlitt and Ebsworth both say that this poem occurs only in the Cosens MS., where it is initialed *T. C.* Ebsworth says that it is 'probably genuine'; Vincent on the contrary discards it without comment. It is to be found also in Ash. 47, art. 51; Rawl. F 160, f. 106, and 209, f. 4; Add. 30982, f. 11; Eg. 2421, f. 4, and 2725, p. 136. In none of these is it attributed to anyone. But in Rawl. F 209 and Add. 30982, it occurs among well-known poems by Carew. This lends weight to the evidence of the Cosens MS. So far as internal evidence goes, the poem might certainly be claimed for Carew. Thus here Ebsworth seems to be right and Vincent wrong.

6. *Mr Carew to his Friend*. The authenticity of this poem has not been seriously disputed, but the evidence other than stylistic in favour of Carew is slight. Bliss in his edition of Wood's *Athenae* first printed it, taking it from Ash. 38, art. 81, from which Hazlitt also copied it. It may be also found, under the title *To a Friend*, in Add. 22118, f. 7, and 30982, f. 10 and f. 128; Sloane 1792, f. 95; and under the title *To his Mistress* in Harl. 6917, p. 136. As will be noted, Carew's name is connected with it only in Ash. 38, where it also bears his initials at the end². B. Dobell includes it among the

¹ Prof. Saintsbury writes to me that according to his recollection the poem was included by one of his assistants among Godolphin's work on the evidence of this MS., but is unable to throw further light upon the Godolphin claim.

² Vincent is mistaken in saying (*op. cit.*, p. 258) that this poem occurs in Add. 22118, f. 40, subscribed *T. Cary*. No such poem occurs here, and no piece in the whole volume is signed in this way.

poems of Wm. Strode in his edition of that writer, saying, 'This poem has been attributed to Donne and to Carew; but I believe Strode has the best title to it'.¹ This statement of belief can hardly be considered as evidence, especially as the editor ascribed to Strode several poems on which there is grave doubt, to say the least. On the evidence before us, the poem must be given to Carew, as has tacitly been done by his three editors.

7. *A Lady's Prayer to Cupid*. This poem is said to occur in the Cosens MS., with Carew's initials, 'and not elsewhere.' It occurs also in Ash. 47, art. 50; Rawl. F 209, f. 4; Harl. 6057, f. 45, unsubscribed in all cases. Vincent discards it. The case here is exactly similar to that of the *Excuse for Absence*. The fact that neither of these poems is otherwise attributed to Carew tends to invalidate the authority of the Cosens MS., and since the style of *A Lady's Prayer* is certainly not suggestive of Carew, it seems best to exclude it from his work.

8. *When the Snow Fell*. Hazlitt included this piece among Carew's for the sole reason that it occurs next to *The Amorous Fly* in Ash. 38. Such evidence by itself is worthless, as anyone familiar with these manuscript miscellanies must know. Herrick, Munsey, and Strode have also been suggested as the author². The poem is found in at least eighteen manuscripts beside the one Hazlitt knew of, and not once is it attributed to Carew. In several cases there are extra lines, and in others there is a complementary stanza, in which the snowflake is replaced by a spark which flew into the young lady's bosom and was extinguished by the snow there. In all instances except one her name is Chloris, not Celia; and the title, when present, is usually *Upon his Mistress Walking in the Snow*. Its occurrences are: Rawl. F 117, f. 163, subscribed *Munsey*, and 160, f. 113; Add. 11811, f. 1, subscribed *Wil. Munsey*; 19268, f. 23, subscribed *W. Strode*; 22603, f. 8, subscribed *Dr. Corbet*; 23229, f. 46, 25303, f. 181, subscribed *W. S.*; 30982, f. 158, 33998, p. 121, subscribed *Wil. Stroud*; Eg. 2421, f. 3, subscribed *Stroude*, and 2725, p. 225; Harl. 3511, p. 27, 6396, f. 9, and 6931, f. 4, subscribed *William Stroud*; Sloane 1446, f. 76, 1454, f. 26, and 1792, f. 10; Stowe 962, f. 179. The complementary stanza occurs by itself in Sloane 1446, f. 23, subscribed *W. S.* Dobell includes both poems in his edition of

¹ Dobell, *Poetical Works of Wm. Strode*, p. 100. Mr Bertram Dobell, son of the editor, tells me that his father collected Strode's poems from two MSS. in his possession, but is unable to say what the evidence in this particular case was. The claim for Donne's authorship is no longer made.

² By Hazlitt, Ebsworth, and Dobell respectively.

Strode, and is probably right in doing so; certainly the claim for Carew is untenable.

9. *The Mournful Parting of Two Lovers*. This poem was included by Hazlitt, and consequently by Ebsworth, on the single evidence of the subscription *T. Car.* in Harl. 6057. The collector here is not to be trusted, as his MS. contains various poems erroneously attributed. Moreover the Harleian version of the poem is very faulty, in some places making no sense whatever, especially when miscopied by Hazlitt. The evidence of this manuscript being thus invalidated, the poem goes to Henry King on the authority of three manuscripts. Two of these are mentioned but not named by Hannah, who included the poem without question in his edition of King's work in 1843; the third is Add. 25303, f. 173, where it is subscribed *Dr H. K.*, although a later hand has drawn a line through this. It occurs also in Add. 21433, f. 151, 25303, f. 167, 25707, f. 157; Eg. 2725, p. 141; Sloane 1446, f. 89. In the last it is initialed *T. B.*; in the others no author is given. In all cases except the Harleian the text is that which is found in the printed copies of King's works; the proper title is *The Surrender*¹.

10. *To his Unconstant Mistress*. Hazlitt and Harl. 6057 are again responsible for saddling Carew with this poem. In the manuscript, f. 11, it is subscribed *Th. Car.* Ebsworth accepts it as Carew's, but Vincent gives it to King. It occurs also in Add. 21433, f. 149, and 25303, f. 166, without attribution. It is doubtless King's, having occurred both in the early editions of that poet and in manuscripts either over his name or together with other poems of his².

11. *A Health to his Mistress*. This was also taken from Harl. 6057 by Hazlitt, where it is subscribed *Th. Car.* Since this MS. has already been shown to attribute two poems erroneously to Carew, and since this one is not otherwise connected with his name, it is hardly safe to accept it as his. The internal evidence turns the scale against it. I have not found it elsewhere in manuscript.

12. *Prologue and Epilogue to a Play*. Hazlitt copied these two poems into Carew's work from the Wyburd MS. Ebsworth follows the lead given. Neither editor states whether or not the poems are there attributed to Carew. Moreover Ebsworth says, in describing this manuscript, that its errors are 'both numerous and glaring.' Vincent

¹ Vincent (*op. cit.*, p. 178), Mason (ed. King, p. 29), and Quiller-Couch (*Oxford Book of English Verse*, p. 236), all give the poem to King, but they do not show any definite evidence for so doing.

² Mason (*op. cit.*, p. 194) says that he has taken the poem from MSS. but he fails to designate them more definitely.

omits both poems, but as usual gives no reasons. Certainly more evidence is needed before they are to be accepted as Carew's.

13. *Ode*, 'Phillis though thy powerful charms.' Here is another case of including a poem because it is next to an authentic one of Carew's in a manuscript copy. The MS. from which Hazlitt took it, Ash. 36, is a scrap-book of various papers in different handwritings, and the *Ode* has no more to do with the *Rapture*, which it follows, than one book has to do with another on the library table. It is in a different handwriting and on a different kind of paper. The poem here has three verses. The second and third, for some unknown reason, Hazlitt omits, and Ebsworth relegates them to the appendix. Vincent sensibly omits all three.

14. *Verses*, 'He gave her jewels.' This has been attributed to Carew solely because it is next to 'Ask me no more' in the Wyburd MS. *Verbum sap.*

15. *To Mistress Katherine Neville*, two poems. I can add here to the notes by Ebsworth¹ on the first, 'White Innocence, etc.' that it occurs in St J. 416, no. 37, entitled *To the Green Sickness* and subscribed *T. Carew*, and in Add. 6918, f. 66, unattributed. To Vincent's notes on the second poem, I can add nothing. Both editors agree in accepting the former and discarding the latter; in this I concur.

16. *The Hue and Cry*. This poem was first claimed from Carew by Shirley in 1646, and as Vincent points out, the latter's claim is without doubt the better. The fact that the poem, when occurring in the early editions of Carew, had considerable variations from the Shirley version, leads Vincent to think that Carew may have reworked it. It is extremely doubtful to my mind if this be the case, since there is often variation among contemporary manuscripts, and, as I have shown, Carew's poems were first printed from no very perfect one. The variations here are no greater than those of Poole's *Guiltless Inconstant* and King's *Surrender* compared with the Carew versions. I prefer to think the poem altogether Shirley's². Its occurrence in Harl. 3511, p. 126, has not yet been collated.

17. *Another Hue and Cry*. Ebsworth and Vincent are quite right in discarding this poem from Carew's work. Hazlitt included it, as in the case of others, because it was found among Carew's in the Wyburd MS. Anderson in his *British Poets* gives it to Drayton. This is supported by the fact that it occurs, initialed *M. D.*, in Harl. 3511, p. 55. It may

¹ In Ebsworth's note (p. 186), 23118 is a misprint for 22118.

² Dyce also gives the poem to Shirley, *Works of Shirley*, vi, 410.

be found also, unattributed, in Ash. 38, art. 155 (and repeated on p. 122); Malone 21, f. 66; Eg. 2725, f. 170; Stowe 962, f. 132.

18. *To his Mistress Confined*. Vincent was the first to point out that this poem also was claimed from Carew by Shirley in 1646. We are bound to respect Shirley's statement that he wrote the poem, but there are difficulties that must be explained first. One is that in Eg. 2725, p. 144, it is initialed *T. C.*, and another is that in Shirley's 1646 edition, it lacks one verse. Against the latter we may set the fact that in Rawl. F 8, entitled *Verses and Poems by James Shirley*¹, it appears in full form. The Eg. MS. copy can be explained by supposing that it was taken from the 1640 edition of Carew's poems, which has already been shown to be untrustworthy². But why Shirley should omit one verse is a mystery.

19. *Song*, 'Would you know what 's soft?' The case here is almost exactly the same as the preceding one, except that the two versions differ considerably in expression though not in thought. The Carew version occurs unattributed in Rawl. F 142, f. 28 and Eg. 2725, p. 135, as well as in the above-mentioned MS. collection of Shirley's poems, p. 6. The only possible solution here, since we must accept Shirley's statement that he wrote the poem, is to believe that he reworked it for the 1646 edition—certainly to its disadvantage.

20. *On his Mistress Looking in a Glass*. The second version of this poem, which does not appear in the early editions, is evidently the proper one from the fact that it occurs more frequently in the MSS. It may be found in Add. 21433, f. 145, and 25303, f. 161; Sloane 1446, f. 57. In the first two cases it is initialed *T. C.* and in the other *Th. C.* Vincent barely escapes the charge of omitting this poem altogether. He includes it only in the notes to his volume. The positions of the two versions should be reversed.

21. *Upon a Ribbon*. Our editors are right in considering the second version of this poem (copied by Hazlitt from the Cosens MS.) an inferior and probably earlier one. Vincent omits it altogether. The proper version occurs frequently in manuscript³; the other I have not found at all.

22. *A Paraphrase of Certain Psalms*. It is hardly fair of Vincent

¹ Collated by Dyce, *op. cit.*, vi, 402. See also *ibid.* 409 and 461.

² This explanation seems more than likely correct, for (1) the collection is later than 1640, since it contains a poem on the death of Laud (1645), and (2) it contains all three poems claimed by Shirley from Carew, which seems more than a mere coincidence.

³ E.g. Add. 22602, f. 17, and 25303, f. 141; Harl. 3511, p. 52; also those mentioned by Hazlitt.

to omit these entirely with a mere note in connection with another poem that 'it is extremely improbable' that Carew was the author. They were accepted by Hazlitt and Ebsworth on the evidence at hand, and, although this is not altogether conclusive, it cannot be dismissed with a wave of the pen. The occurrence of *Psalm 104* in Add. 21433, f. 80, and 25303, f. 68, unattributed in both cases, has not yet been noted. *Psalm 137*¹ occurs in Add. 18220, f. 10, attributed to Lord Digby, Earl of Bristol. Further evidence on the whole problem is lacking, and at present no solution seems possible.

23. *Love's Flattery*. The name Celia caused Hazlitt to include this poem as possibly Carew's. No one has followed the lead here. A reading of contemporary printed and MS. poems reveals so many Celias that nothing can be fairly argued from the use of the name.

24. *Four Epigrams*. Hazlitt admitted these into his edition, without seriously questioning their authenticity, simply because they occur among poems by Carew in Harl. 6917. Ebsworth is nearer right in including them under protest. As a matter of fact, there is not the slightest evidence that they are by Carew. The case is this. The writer of the manuscript, being an excessively neat person, filled up all small spaces with epigrams. This is consistently done throughout the volume, and naturally some of these tags occur among Carew's poems. Since the authentic poems are ascribed to him and the epigrams are not, and since they do not resemble his style in any way, there can be no doubt that they are not his. Ebsworth suggests that Herrick may be the true author; so he may, and so may fifty others.

III. *New Poems*.

To the poems of Carew already known, I can add at least two and one stanza of a third which present claims worthy of consideration. It is to be regretted, however, that the poet's reputation may be somewhat lessened rather than increased by their acceptance.

1. *Upon the Royal Ship called the Sovereign of the Seas*.

Triton's auspicious sound usher thy reign
O'er the curled billows, Royal Sovereign,
Monarchal ship, whose fabric doth outprize
The Pharoes, Collosse, Memphis pyramids,

¹ Vincent's reference to *Psalm 107* (*op. cit.*, p. 258) is a misprint for *Psalm 137*.

And seems a moving tower, when sprightly gales
 Quicken the motion and enbreathe the sails.
 We that have heard of seven, now see the eighth
 Wonder at home, of naval art the height.
 This Britain Argo puts down that of Greece,
 Bedecked with more than one rich golden fleece,
 Wrought into sculptures which emblemize
 Pregnant conceit to the more curious eyes.
 Neptune is proud with burden, and doth wonder
 To hear a four-fold fire outroar Jove's thunder.
 Oh, then, triumphant ark, with Edgar's fame,
 To Charles's scepter add [a] trident's claim.

This poem is found in Add. 34217, f. 29, a manuscript which is for the most part a collection of historical papers. It is subscribed by a different hand from the copyist's *Tho. Carew*. The style of the poem is certainly not suggestive of Carew, but until more evidence is discovered, it must be given a place in his work¹.

2. *Upon a Strumpet.*

Hail, thou true model of a cursed whore,
 Damned by creation ever to be poor,
 Though clothed in Italian silks or what may be
 Bestowed in riot on thy ventry.
 Thou eldest daughter of the prince of night,
 That canst outlie thy father at first sight,
 Outscoff an Ismaelite, and attempt more
 Than all our wicked age hath done before;
 Nay, when the devil leaves, thou canst begin
 And teach both him and us new ways to sin,—
 Which makes me say that all our former times
 Appear like poor pictures copied by thy crimes²—
 etc. (24 more lines).

One is bound to omit the greater part of this unpleasant poem and one would gladly exclude it altogether from Carew's work, but it presents very good grounds for acceptance. It occurs in Ash. 38, art. 42; Add. 21433, f. 149; and 25303, f. 163; Harl. 6918, p. 177. All of these manuscripts contain well-known poems by Carew, and in both Add. MSS. it is subscribed *T. C.* and occurs among authentic poems all designated in the same way. Unwelcome as this poem may be, it is no more than one might expect from a man as selfish

¹ This ship, which was launched at Woolwich, June 17, 1637, was the subject of several panegyrics. Thos. Heywood wrote a small book on the occasion entitled *A true Description of His Majesties Royall Ship, etc.* (1637), which, beside a frontispiece of the ship, includes a short history of naval warfare, a description of the ship, and several poems in praise of it. Of the latter, Heywood himself and Shakerley Marmion were the authors. Henry King also celebrated the occasion with a poem, *A Salutation to His Majesty's Ship the Sovereign*, which may be found among his work. All these poems are similar in style, concept, and versification to Carew's.

² This text is made from a collation of all manuscripts. The punctuation is my own.

as Carew, when Celia refused to 'kiss and be kind'; and with certain others shows the justice of Clement Paman's contemporary characterization of its author:

No lute nor lover durst contend with thee
Hadst added to thy love but charity¹.

3. To the very popular song, 'Ask me no more where Jove bestows,' an extra stanza is added in Ash. 38, art. 95, and Eg. 2421, f. 9, as follows:

Ask me no more whether north or south
These vapours come from out thy mouth,
For unto heaven they are sent hence
And there are made Jove's frankincense.

The second couplet here is a close parallel to one in *The Comparison*, ll. 22-23. There can be little doubt that Carew is the author of the stanza, but whether he later wished it omitted from the poem is a question that cannot be decided².

This song of Carew's was so popular at the time that many similar ones were made by his contemporaries, some of them serious attempts at emulation and some parodies of a more or less humorous nature. The best known of these are printed in the appendix to Ebsworth's edition. Although Vincent says that they 'are all very poor stuff,' the one below, now for the first time printed, seems to me worthy of Carew himself. It occurs in Ash. 38, art. 180, but except for the style there is no evidence as to authorship.

I still must ask thee where do stray
The golden atoms of the day,
For such powders would impair
Not mend the beauty of thy hair.

I still must ask thee where do light
Those fiery bullets of the night,
For in thine eyes, his proper sphere,
The sun forbids the stars appear.

I still must ask where Jove bestows,
When June is past, the fading rose,
For thy beauty's lasting spring
Admitteth of no fading thing.

I still must ask when May is past
Whither doth Progne's sister haste,
For in thy throat and breast there dwells
No note so rude as Philomel's.

¹ Rawl. F 147, p. 108, entitled *To Tho. Carew*, now for the first time printed.

² In the MS. copies of this song there is no consistency whatever in the order of the stanzas. One of the variations is shown in the imitation given.

And I must ask what place partakes
The Phoenix' odors when she makes
Her death bed, for sure did she fly
To thee, she 'd live and multiply.

It would be possible to add many poems which occur in the midst of Carew's work in various manuscripts and which are much in his manner; but until there is better evidence than this for including them, it seems best to refrain from mentioning them, rather than risk making mistakes of the very kind I have been trying to correct.

C. L. POWELL.

BALTIMORE, U.S.A.