

**Martin Peerson and Greville's *Caelica***

Gavin Alexander

University of Cambridge

address: Faculty of English, 9 West Road, Cambridge CB3 9DP

email: [gra1000@cam.ac.uk](mailto:gra1000@cam.ac.uk)

## MARTIN PEERSON AND GREVILLE'S *CAELICA*

Gavin Alexander

This article assesses the relations between Martin Peerson's *Mottects or Grave Chamber Musique* (1630) and Fulke Greville's lyric sequence *Caelica*.<sup>1</sup> It focuses on two particular questions: what kind of an interpretation or repackaging of *Caelica* does Peerson offer us? and what can we learn about the nature and date of Peerson's access to Greville's poems from the text of Peerson's songs?

*Caelica* has some claim to be considered the centre of the richly various writings of Fulke Greville (1554-1628), which include plays set in the Ottoman Empire, philosophical treatises, and the lengthy *A Dedication to Sir Philip Sidney*. The images and arguments of *Caelica* forge connections between the spheres – political, religious, and ethical – of those other works, and do so in a framework that gives us Greville's ongoing conversation with the poetry of the man who was Greville's closest friend and most significant influence, Sir Philip Sidney. Peerson's songbook of 1630 – in which thirteen of *Caelica*'s poems were printed, eleven for the first time – is a significant moment in the history of the planned posthumous publication of Greville's works. Greville kept his writings close in his lifetime but made plans – comparable to his other projected monuments and legacies – to have them published after his death (perhaps scribally, but in all likelihood in print). A few escaped before then: *Mustapha* was pirated in 1609, and four of the *Caelica* poems found their way into printed songbooks and printed or manuscript miscellanies at the end of the sixteenth century. But Peerson's publication of authoritative texts of thirteen *Caelica* poems, three years before the entire sequence was printed, is rather different. It may be seen as a harbinger – one that could even have had Greville's permission or blessing – of the authorised printing of all of Greville's works, in the three volumes of 1633, 1651/2, and 1670.<sup>2</sup>

*Caelica* is a lyric sequence of 109 poems.<sup>3</sup> It is not Greville's *Astrophil and Stella*, *Sonnets*, *Idea*, or *Delia*. For one thing, sonnets account for only a third of the sequence's

---

<sup>1</sup> Martin Peerson, *Mottects or Grave chamber musique. Containing songs of five parts of severall sorts, some ful, and some verse and chorus. But all fit for voyces and vials, with an organ part; which for want of organs, may be performed on virginals, base-lute, bandora, or Irish harpe. Also, a mourning song of sixe parts for the death of the late Right Honorable Sir Fulke Grevil . . . Composed according to the rules of art, by M.P. Batcheler of Musique* (London, 1630), STC 19552. Hereafter 'GCM'.

<sup>2</sup> *Certaine learned and elegant workes of the Right Honorable Fulke Lord Brooke, written in his youth, and familiar exercise with Sir Philip Sidney* (London, 1633), STC 12361; *The life of the renowned Sir Philip Sidney* (London, 1652 [recte 1651]), Wing B 4899; *The remains of Sir Fulk Grevill Lord Brooke: being poems of monarchy and religion* (London, 1670), Wing B 4900. For the evidence that the two treatises printed in 1670 were originally intended for inclusion in the 1633 volume, and a broad consideration of the question of Greville's intentions for posthumous publication, see my 'Fulke Greville and the Afterlife', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 62 (1999), 203-31 (esp. 216 and 229-30).

<sup>3</sup> The numbering of the *Caelica* poems varies from text to text. I use throughout this article the numbering established in *Poems and Dramas*, ed. Geoffrey Bullough, 2 vols (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1939), I. All

poems. But more importantly, whilst the sequence begins – both in the order we have it and in the likely order of its poems’ composition – as a set of love poems, it ends up somewhere very different. Joan Rees, in her discussion of *Caelica*, points out that religion and politics are for Greville ‘the two poles of human experience and every situation is placed in relation to them’.<sup>4</sup> As the sequence progresses, the stocks of political and religious metaphor and analogy that Greville raids to add interest to his conceits about love gradually become the sequence’s subject matter. So where in the earlier poems an example from history might be offered to help us think about amorous power relations (see poem 30, ‘Rome, while thy Senate’, for instance), by the latter stages of the sequence we are getting poems about political power. And where religious devotion serves from the start of the sequence as a metaphor for love (poem 3, ‘More then most fayre’, set by Peerson, is a good example), the sequence becomes by its end a contemplation of God and eternity: it moves definitively from profane to sacred love.

Greville’s poetry is *difficult*. Greville has often been misread, witness the misleading myth of him as a poet of the plain style. Joan Rees again remains authoritative: ‘the poetry is so close-textured and so rich with interwoven strands of thought and experience that it does not yield much to impressionistic reading and may be quite misjudged because of this.’<sup>5</sup> And this was no less a danger for Greville’s seventeenth-century readers than it has proved for his twentieth-century ones. It is also worth observing that reading *Caelica* as a sequence does not work well at all: the poems are too dense for a thread of narrative development or intellectual argument to be discovered and held on to. If you try to read the sequence through you will probably feel overwhelmed and bewildered; poems that in isolation can be enjoyed as brilliant, complex, paradoxical performances make *en masse* for a particularly Grevillean kind of brain-ache. Perhaps that is why selections from *Caelica* have proved successful: Peerson’s in the seventeenth century and Joan Rees’s in the twentieth.<sup>6</sup> In examining Peerson’s selection, therefore, we will want to ask if it does the sequence justice, or if its contours and logic run counter to those Greville established.

The question of the date of *Caelica*’s composition is vexed. Whilst we can be certain that four of the poems were in existence before 1600, because they are found in print, and whilst it seems safe to identify particular poems – because of style and/or content – as belonging, at least in their origins, to Greville’s early career and the lifetime of Sidney, most of the poems cannot be dated without making untenable assumptions about the relations between a poem’s subject matter or argument and Greville’s biography.<sup>7</sup> The same goes for

---

quotations from *Caelica*, however, for reasons that will become clear, follow the Warwick manuscript (British Library, Add. MS 54570).

<sup>4</sup> Joan Rees, *Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, 1554-1628: A Critical Biography* (London: Routledge, 1971), p. 93.

<sup>5</sup> Rees, *Greville*, p. 118.

<sup>6</sup> *Selected Writings of Fulke Greville*, ed. Joan Rees (London: Athlone, 1973; repr. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).

<sup>7</sup> See G. A. Wilkes, ‘The Sequence of the Writings of Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke’, *Studies in Philology*, 56 (1959), 489-503; Ronald A. Rebholz, *The Life of Fulke Greville, First Lord Brooke* (Oxford: Clarendon Press,

the sequence as a whole: we cannot say that it is the kind of thing he must have worked on during any particular phase of his career or stylistic development, but we can be sure that a substantially complete manuscript was in existence by about 1619, and that he continued to work on the text for some years more. The safest statement to make about *Caelica*, therefore, is that it spans the entirety of Greville's career as a writer, from the late 1570s or early 1580s through to the mid-1620s. I would suggest that we can also maintain the working assumption that the sequence's order bears a significant relation to its order of composition, if not matching it closely or even exactly.<sup>8</sup> Our uncertainty about dating means that we must be wary in advancing speculation about the date of Peerson's access or work of composition based on assumptions that particular poems (or particular states of a poem) were in existence by a particular date.<sup>9</sup>

Hilton Kelliher has observed that 'Greville's verse is remarkable for its absence from manuscript commonplace-books of the period',<sup>10</sup> and it is indeed striking how few of the *Caelica* poems have any kind of independent textual life. Those that do are all found in song settings. There is nothing unusual about this, and indeed there is substantial evidence that courtier poets who were reticent about circulating their poems in manuscript or seeing them printed were happier to see them escape – into manuscript circulation or into print – in song form.<sup>11</sup> That is because the setting changes the identity of the words: they cease to be the utterance of the poet and become instead that of the composer and then of the singer. Whereas the words of lyric poems, in manuscript and in print, are usually attributed (even if wrongly), the words of songs are with very few exceptions left unattributed: readers wanted to know whose poems they were reading, but the consumers of manuscript or printed songs were evidently content to know who had written the music.<sup>12</sup> Greville, like

---

1971), pp. 325-40. For the opposite view see Rees, *Greville*, pp. x-xi and 207-12, and my *Writing After Sidney: The Literary Response to Sir Philip Sidney, 1586-1640* (Oxford: O.U.P., 2006), p. 225.

<sup>8</sup> See Bullough (ed.), *Poems and Dramas*, I, pp. 34-42 (esp. 35); Rebholz, *Life*, p. 325; and Rees, *Greville*, p. 79. Steven W. May lists points of contact between Sidney, Greville, and Dyer throughout the sequence and argues against the chronological theory, in *The Elizabethan Courtier Poets: The Poems and Their Contexts* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991), pp. 89-92.

<sup>9</sup> We must therefore set aside Rastall's speculations in the introduction to his excellent edition of *GCM*, based as they are on Rebholz's work, which takes no account of the findings of Hilton Kelliher (see below) about the date of the Warwick manuscripts. See *Motects: or, Grave Chamber Musique*, ed. Richard Rastall (n.p.: Antico Edition, 2011), p. iv; hereafter 'Rastall'.

<sup>10</sup> W. Hilton Kelliher, 'The Warwick Manuscripts of Fulke Greville', *British Museum Quarterly*, 34 (1970), 107-21 (p. 107).

<sup>11</sup> Aside from the existence of the printed poems themselves, some of which can be attributed (to the likes of Greville, Sir Henry Lee, and the Earl of Essex), we have remarks in prefaces and dedicatory epistles. See for example Robert Jones's note 'To the Reader' in *The Second Booke of Songs and Ayres* (London, 1601): 'If the Ditties dislike thee, 'tis my fault that was so bold to publish the priuate contentments of diuers Gentlemen without their consents' (*Lyrics from English Airs, 1596-1622*, ed. Edward Doughtie (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), p. 149).

<sup>12</sup> Almost all of the printed songbooks leave their poems unattributed. The exceptions, highly relevant as precursors to *GCM*, are the collection *A Musically Banquet*, edited by Robert Dowland in 1610, dedicated to Sir Robert Sidney, and including settings of (attributed) poems by Philip Sidney, Lee, and Essex, and the Campion/Coprario collaboration in commemoration of Prince Henry, *Songs of Mourning* (1613). On this question see my 'The Musical Sidneys', *John Donne Journal*, 25 (2006), 65-105 (pp. 75-6).

other courtier poets, seems to have been happy to give texts of his poems to composers and let them use them as they wished. The four *Caelica* poems that circulate in early texts are poems 1 ('Loue, the delight of all well-thinkinge mindes'), 5 ('Who trustes for trust or hopes of Love for love'), 29 ('Faction that euer dwelles'), and 52 ('Away with these selfe-loving Ladds'). Poem 52 is the most prolific of these. It is found in the Arundel Harington manuscript, is set to music by Dowland (in his first book of 1597), is reprinted from that source in *Englands Helicon* (1600), and is then copied from that source into two later manuscripts. Poem 5 is also found in Dowland's 1597 book and in a later manuscript copy derived from it. Poem 1 is found in Cavendish's *14. Ayres* (1598). And poem 29, having been printed in *Astrophel and Stella* (1591), wrongly attributed, is set to music by Dowland from a manuscript source and printed in his *Second Booke* (1600).<sup>13</sup> Two poems, that is to say, seem to have found their way to Sir John Harington (and perhaps someone else connected to him), who also had good, early access to Sidney texts in manuscript.<sup>14</sup> And all four poems were probably made available by Greville directly to the composers who set them: Dowland and Cavendish.

It is worth noticing a difference between these four early poems and those set by Peerson. The poems set by Cavendish and Dowland are all stanzaic, because the lute song is a strophic form of song: the music that sets a first stanza will be repeated for subsequent stanzas. For this reason sonnets do not tend to work as lute songs. But Peerson, who sets in a through-composed style that is closer to the English madrigal, is able to set sonnets as a single song. When he sets one of Greville's poems in three six-line stanzas, on the other hand, there is no question of strophic repetition and he instead produces three separate sections with different music for each (allowing for some repetition of refrain elements).

<sup>13</sup> *Caelica* 1: (i) copy from manuscript in Michael Cavendish, *14. Ayres* (London, 1598), no. 7; see Doughtie (ed.), *Lyrics*, 470-1.

*Caelica* 5, in an early version beginning 'Who euer thinks or hopes of loue for loue': (i) copy from manuscript in John Dowland, *The First Booke of Songes or Ayres* (London, 1597; repr. 1600, 1603, 1606, 1613), no. 2; (ii) copies of Dowland's setting in a set of MS part books and (incipit only) a MS book of music for the virginals: see Doughtie (ed.), *Lyrics*, 455 for the former and *CELM* GrF 2 for the latter.

*Caelica* 29: (i) copy from manuscript in the unauthorized *Syr P. S. his Astrophel and Stella* (London, 1591), sig. L4r-v, ascribed to 'E. O.' (i.e. the Earl of Oxford); (ii) copy from manuscript in John Dowland, *The Second Booke of Songs or Ayres* (London, 1600), no. 18. See Doughtie (ed.), *Lyrics*, p. 484.

*Caelica* 52: (i) copy from manuscript in the Arundel Harington MS (no. 198): see *The Arundel Harington Manuscript of Tudor Poetry*, ed. Ruth Hughey, 2 vols (Columbus: Ohio State University Press), I, pp. 242-3 (text) and II, pp. 321-2 (commentary); (ii) copy from manuscript (not from the above) in John Dowland, *The First Booke of Songes or Ayres* (London, 1597), no. 21; (iii) copy from (ii) in *Englands Helicon* (London, 1600), sig. X1r-v, telling us that this poem and two others were 'taken out of Maister John Dowlands booke of tableture for the Lute, the Authours names not there set downe, & therefore left to their owners' (sig. X2r); (iv) copies of Dowland's setting in two early C17 MS music books (one a set of part books), as well as an C18 music book, and (incipit only) a further early C17 music book, all recorded by Doughtie (*Lyrics*, p. 469).

*Caelica* 29: (i) copy from manuscript in the unauthorized *Syr P. S. his Astrophel and Stella* (London, 1591), sig. L4r-v, ascribed to 'E. O.' (i.e. the Earl of Oxford); (ii) copy from manuscript in John Dowland, *The Second Booke of Songs or Ayres* (London, 1600), no. 18. See Doughtie (ed.), *Lyrics*, p. 484.

<sup>14</sup> Henry Woudhuysen discusses Harington's access to Sidney in manuscript and gathers the evidence for Harington's involvement in *Astrophel and Stella: Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts, 1558-1640* (Oxford: O.U.P., 1996), pp. 164, 246, 341-8, 378-83.

About a third of the *Caelica* poems are sonnets, a third are in the six-line stanza of Greville's treatises (ababcc<sub>10</sub>), and a third are in other forms, including fifteen in the truncated or stretched sonnet form that Greville likes: two, four, or more cross-rhymed quatrains followed by a couplet. Peerson therefore manages a representative selection of the range of verse forms in *Caelica*, with five sonnets, six poems in the six-line stanza, and two in other forms.

Before we think further about the selection Peerson set to music and the nature of his access to *Caelica* in manuscript, we should examine what is known about the texts of Greville's sequence. We have two principal witnesses, the Warwick manuscript (Add. MS 54570; hereafter *W*) and the 1633 printed text in *Certaine Learned and Elegant Workes* (hereafter *1633*). The six volumes of the Warwick manuscripts, now British Library Add. MSS 54566-71, are 'fair copies made towards the end of Greville's life by scribes working under his immediate direction, and their texts, in places heavily revised in Greville's autograph, represent what is virtually the final form of his works'.<sup>15</sup> Kelliher assigned the manuscripts' various hands to three scribes, and identified the scribe of *Caelica* (who also copied *A Treatise of Monarchy* and *A Letter to an Honourable Lady*) as a secretary who worked for Greville, and whose hand is found in letters dictated by Greville between October 1619 and October 1625, thus giving the two terminal dates, *a quo* and *ad quem*, for the scribe's work on the Warwick manuscripts. Between 1622 and 1623 the same scribe, Kelliher showed, worked for Sir Lionel Cranfield, the Lord Treasurer. Kelliher found watermark evidence in Greville's letters that strongly suggests a date of 1619 for *Caelica* and *Monarchy*, and speculates rightly that 'The amount of correction [in *Caelica*] may mean that it was the earliest text to be copied ... or merely that it was the most troublesome to Greville' (112).<sup>16</sup> Wilkes has named this scribe as Richard Willis,<sup>17</sup> and Henry Woudhuysen, in unpublished work, has demonstrated an association between Willis and Greville going some years further back, so there may be more to say one day, and it may be that we will not feel so safe in assuming that 1619 is the earliest *terminus a quo* for work on the Warwick *Caelica*. But for now the evidence still points strongly to 1619 as the likely date of the scribe's initial copying of the Warwick manuscript of *Caelica*. Kelliher goes further: 'The Warwick text of *Caelica* was clearly neither the first nor the final fair copy of the sequence. That it was not Greville's final recension is shown by, amongst other factors, its lacking sonnets 6 and 32 ... that first appeared in the 1633 folio; while the existence of an earlier fair copy is confirmed by a comment written at the foot of [poem 76] (f. 55b), apparently by the reader employed to check the Warwick text by the earlier one – "Here wants Sonnet 75. pag. 93. It follows: pag. 113."'.<sup>18</sup> Kelliher therefore posits three major recensions of *Caelica* between 1615/16 and 1628: a version prior to the Warwick text, *W* itself, and a further copy that was the basis

---

<sup>15</sup> Kelliher, 'Warwick Manuscripts', 107.

<sup>16</sup> Kelliher, 'Warwick Manuscripts', pp. 109-11; p. 112.

<sup>17</sup> *The Complete Poems and Plays of Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke*, ed. G. A. Wilkes, 2 vols (Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 2008), I, p. 14.

<sup>18</sup> Kelliher, 'Warwick Manuscripts', p. 112.

of 1633. We can expand this picture slightly to include the early stages that produced at least the four poems printed by 1600, and sketch a timeline:<sup>19</sup>

late 1570s-1600	early drafts including poems 1, 5, 29, 52
< c. 1619	working drafts leading to substantially complete manuscript text of the sequence (hereafter $\alpha$ )
c. 1619	<i>W</i>
c. 1620-28	revision of <i>W</i> leading to copy of <i>W</i> with further minor revision and incorporating two additional poems (hereafter $\omega$ )
1633	printing of that final state of the text

\*

What state of the text did Peerson have access to, when, and how? The key piece of evidence is Peerson's dedicatory epistle to Greville's cousin/nephew and heir Robert, Lord Brooke. It is unambiguous:

The words which I make bold at present to publish in Musicall compositions, were recommended by your Noble Predecessor; and of right belong vnto your Lordship, because inheritor, no lesse of his singuler Vertues, then Honours, and Patron (as his Lordship euer was) both of my Person; and Profession ...<sup>20</sup>

'Recommended' means 'given' (*OED* 2a: 'To entrust, consign, commit ... to ... a person or thing for attention, care, consideration, or use'). Peerson is telling us that Greville, in some sense, gave him the *Caelica* poems he has set, but this does not, I think, mean that we can confidently say that *GCM* is 'the result of a collaboration between Greville and Peerson', or that the selection of the poems is Greville's, as Rastall infers.<sup>21</sup> A more plausible scenario would be that the elderly but still busy Greville conducted his business with Peerson for the most part through scribes and secretaries rather than dealing with him direct. The following table summarises the contents of *GCM* in relation to other texts, with titles here modernised for convenience, and details of each poem's form:

<i>Caelica</i>	<i>GCM</i>	incipit	other texts
1	1-3	Love, the delight of all well-thinking minds [6-line stanza; all 3 stanzas in 3 sections]	Cavendish 1598

<sup>19</sup> This analysis is supplemented and supported by Wilkes (ed.), *Poems and Plays*, I, pp. 62-74.

<sup>20</sup> *GCM*, sig. A2r (in all parts).

<sup>21</sup> Rastall, p. iii: 'As these recommended poems are by Greville himself, the poet must at least have chosen a selection of his work that he thought would make good songs in Peerson's hands'.

3	4-5	More than most fair, full of that heavenly fire [6-line stanza; both stanzas in 2 sections]	
4	6-7	You little stars that live in skies [8-line stanza; both stanzas in 2 sections]	
9	8-9	O Love, thou mortal sphere of powers divine [6-line stanza; first 2 of 4 stanzas only, in 2 sections]	
25	10	Cupid, my pretty boy, leave off thy crying [sonnet]	
85	11	Love is the peace whereto all thoughts do strive [sonnet, lines 1-8 only]	
8	12	Self-pity's tears, wherein my hope lies drown'd [6-line stanza; first of 2 stanzas only]	
26	13	Was ever man so over-match'd with boy? [sonnet]	
103	14	O false and treacherous probability [sonnet]	
88	15, 16a, 16b	Man, dream no more of curious mysteries [6-line stanza; all 3 stanzas in 3 sections]	Hall <sup>22</sup>
5	17-18	Who trusts for trust, or hopes of love for love [6-line stanza; both stanzas in 2 sections]	Dowland 1597
88	19	Man, dream no more of curious mysteries [6-line stanza; first of 3 stanzas only]	[Hall]
84	20	Farewell, sweet boy, complain not of my truth [sonnet]	Hall
81	21	Under a throne I saw a virgin sit [truncated sonnet]	
-	22	Where shall a sorrow great enough be sought? [first section of couplet sonnet elegy for Greville: octave]	
-	23	Dead, noble Brooke shall be to us a name [second section of elegy for Greville: sestet]	
-	24	6-part setting of text of 22	
-	25	6-part setting of text of 23	

The repetition of poem 88 (all three stanzas are set as numbers 15 and 16, then the first stanza is set again as number 19) is not exactly unprecedented: we might compare it to the curious repetition of sonnet 35 as sonnet 83 in Spenser's *Amoretti* of 1595. And a comparison to Spenser is also asking to be made by the inclusion of *Caelica* 3 ('More then most fayre, full of that heavenlie fire'), which finds Greville in dialogue with Spenser (*Amoretti* 8: 'More then most faire, full of the living fire') and possibly other Elizabethan poets.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Folger Shakespeare Library, MS V.a.339 (see below).

<sup>23</sup> For a further poem with a similar incipit, identified in a fragment of a previously unknown printed miscellany, *The Muses Garland* (1603), see Samuel Fallon and David Scott Kastan, 'Signature Verses', *Times Literary Supplement*, 5 February 2016, p. 14.

Is Peerson's a coherent sequence of poems? If we rearrange the poems into their *Caelica* order, we notice how clustered they are: 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9; then 25 and 26; then 81, 84, 85, and 88; and finally 103. We might compare this to what is in some ways a comparable selection, Joseph Hall's copying of thirteen poems in sequence into his commonplace book (now in the Folger Shakespeare Library), with the addition of the epitaphic *Caelica* 82 some pages earlier.<sup>24</sup> This, rather like Rees's 1973 selection, is more impressed by the later stages of the sequence, and there are many good reasons for that. The clustering of the poems taken from *Caelica* in Peerson – as well as their neglect of some of the most powerful of Greville's poems – might suggest that whoever made the selection was only sampling the whole rather than attending equally to all of it, but it is possible that a more internally coherent selection results from the clustering. One result of the emphasis on the opening section of *Caelica*, however, is that the correlative structures that Greville favours in that part of the sequence are over-represented. A good example is the opening stanza of poem 8 (Peerson sets only this stanza and not the poem's second stanza):

Selfe pitties teares, wherein my hope lies drown'd,  
 Sighes from thoughtes fire, where my desires languish,  
 Dispaire by humble love of beawtie crown'd,  
 Furrowes not worne by tyme, but wheeles of anguish.  
     Dry vpp, smile, ioye, make smooth and see,  
     Furrowes, dispaire, sighes, teares, in beawtie be.

Poem 1 also has a correlative logic like this, and one finds Sidney experimenting with this way of making poems in his early work (most extremely in OA 60),<sup>25</sup> and soon discovering better ways. This is a good reason for thinking that the early poems in *Caelica* originate in Greville's earliest writings (to borrow a phrase from the title page of 1633, 'written in his youth, and familiar exercise with Sir Philip Sidney'), and for wondering if the over-representation of this section of the sequence in Peerson's selection would be a surprising choice for Greville himself to have made late in life. But we should also consider the role of music. Peerson's relatively opaque, polyphonic, slow-motion approach to word-setting means that, unlike in the solo lute song, it is very difficult for the auditor to follow the words and hold on to their syntax and meaning. Perhaps rhetorical and syntactic over-determination of this kind helps Peerson's music to work as song. In a similar way, the selection chooses some of the simpler, more transparent poems in *Caelica*, and this may be in the interests of making successful songs (or just because those were the ones Peerson could make head or tail of). We have glimpses of the brilliant complexity of the later poems (88, 103), but the selection under-represents what is best in Greville, and in so doing it may find what in him is better suited to music. For these reasons, I find it simpler to imagine that

---

<sup>24</sup> Folger Shakespeare Library, MS V.a.339: poem 82 (fol. 31r); poems 69, 78, 84, 87, 88, 92, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 109 (fols 42v-46r).

<sup>25</sup> See *The Poems of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. William A Ringler, Jr (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), p. 406 (notes to OA 43) for further examples.

the selection of poems is Peerson's (based on a sampling of *Caelica* and not perhaps a full reading through) than to think that this particular selection, which so inadequately reflects the trajectory of Greville's development as a poet, could be, as it were, Greville's final word on his own much longer sequence.

Greville has not made the composer's job easy, however. He writes virtually no true songs in *Caelica*. Sidney includes eleven 'songs' in *Astrophil and Stella*, many of which are either contrafacta to existing tunes or have verse forms that suggest they are written with music in mind. Greville has just one poem that looks musical – poem 37, a triple metre, four-by-four 'dolnik' which sounds very much like a contrafactum to a ballad tune.<sup>26</sup> It is an exception: in comparison to most of his contemporaries, Greville is one of the least musical poets.

Peerson's selection looks like a deliberate rearrangement of its thirteen *Caelica* poems rather than an *ab initio* ordering of thirteen songs. It seems more plausible to infer that the songs were composed and copied in a way that maintained an order derived from their original order, rather than that having been extracted individually from their sequence circumstances in effect shuffled them before they found their way into the current sequence: it is hard to imagine that the order 1, 3, 4, 9, 25, 85, 8, 26, 103, 88, 5, 88, 84, 81 was created as it were from scratch. We should, I believe, reject the excessively programmatic explanation of the poems' achieved order suggested by an earlier Peerson scholar, Michael Foote, and accepted by Rastall,<sup>27</sup> since it is based on an anachronistic set of expectations of what sort of narrative argument any lyric sequence of the period might have, or any reader might wish to supply. But if we characterise each poem or group of poems we see very clearly that Peerson's selection has a to-and-fro instability that might be deliberate but might be accidental, and is certainly very different from the smoother and more deliberate trajectory of Greville's own sequence:

[ideal love]	1	Love, the delight of all well-thinking minds
	3	More than most fair, full of that heavenly fire
	4	You little stars that live in skies
[disdain and sorrow]	9	O Love, thou mortal sphere of powers divine
	25	Cupid, my pretty boy, leave off thy crying
[heavenly love]	85	Love is the peace whereto all thoughts do strive

<sup>26</sup> For this term see Derek Attridge, 'The Case for the English Dolnik; or, How Not to Introduce Prosody', *Poetics Today*, 33 (2012), 1-26.

<sup>27</sup> Rastall, p. v. Both scholars wish to present *GCM* as constructing an argument in the manner of Greville's philosophical poems, Rastall continuing (pursuing a suggestion of G. A. Wilkes): 'It is possible – indeed, quite reasonable – to regard the texts of *GCM* as Greville's treatise on human love, therefore, even though there is no documentary evidence that such a project was in the poet's mind' (p. v). This seems to me fanciful. We know that the project that was in Greville's mind throughout his career was the composition and revision of the *Caelica* poems, and that what was clearly in his mind in his last years was their ordering into a sequence of 109 poems; moreover, since lyric sequences are a staple of late-Elizabethan poetry in particular, it seems reasonable to imagine the idea of a sequence called *Caelica* as an earlier intention rather than a later one. The selection in *GCM* does not trump all of that.

[turning the tables]	8	Self-pity's tears, wherein my hope lies drown'd
[Cupid's torments]	26	Was ever man so over-match'd with boy?
[turning to God]	103	O false and treacherous probability
	88	Man, dream no more of curious mysteries
[love doesn't last]	5	Who trusts for trust, or hopes of love for love
[turning to God]	88	Man, dream no more of curious mysteries
[farewell to love]	84	Farewell, sweet boy, complain not of my truth
[Queen Elizabeth]	81	Under a throne I saw a virgin sit

Those songs in the order Greville intended them would surely make for a more coherent short sequence. However, Peerson does take us from the naïve idealism of the early poems through the bitternesses and reversals of the mid-sequence poems to a rejection of erotic love and a turn to God. And he does so in a manner that emphasises an authentically Grevillean topos – our insignificance in the face of eternity. Richard McCabe first drew attention to Bishop Joseph Hall's anecdote from 1637:

I have often thought of that deep, and serious question of the late judicious, and honourable, Sir *Fulke Grevil*, Lord *Brook*, (a man worthy of a fairer death, and everlasting memory) moved to a learned kinsman of mine, (much interested in that Noble man) who when he was discoursing of an incident matter, very considerable, was taken off with this quick interrogation, of that wise and noble person; *What is that to the Infinite?* as secretly implying, that all our thoughts and discourse must be reduced thither; and that they faile of their ends, if they be other where terminated: It was a word well becomming the profound judgement, and quintessentiall notions, of that rare, memorable Peere. And certainly so it is, if the cogitations and affections of our hearts be not directed to the glory of that infinite God, both they are lost, and we in them.<sup>28</sup>

Compare the two poems set by Peerson that fall last in their *Caelica* order, poem 88 ('Man dreame no more of curious misteries, | [...] | For Godes workes are like him, all infinite; | And curious search, but craftie synnes delight') and poem 103, ending 'Who therefore censures God *with* fleshlie sprite, | As well in tyme may wrapp vpp infinite'.

Peerson's selection may have been provided for him, by Greville or one of his secretaries, but I think it more likely that the selection is Peerson's own, and, if that is so, it shows an intelligent reading of *Caelica* and a desire to create a selection that has a satisfying variety and integrity, and that suits musical setting.

---

<sup>28</sup> Bishop Joseph Hall, *The Remedy of Prophaneness* (London, 1637), pp. 109-11; a marginal note identifies the 'learned kinsman' as his cousin Samuel Burton, Archdeacon of Gloucester. See Richard A. McCabe, 'Fulke Greville and Joseph Hall', *Notes and Queries*, 226 (1981), 45-7. This Joseph Hall, in his earlier literary career the author of *Virgidemiarum* (1597), is not the Joseph Hall whose manuscript copy of poems from 1633 is discussed above.

I now turn to textual matters, and here we have two questions. Are there readings in Peerson that are unique, and possibly authorial? And can we tell anything, from the variants between the various texts, about the state of the text(s) Peerson had access to and the timeframe of that access?<sup>29</sup> There are in *W* (i) five or so poems which have at least two or three lines that are substantially worked over by Greville; (ii) a further thirty or so that include significant signs of his hand; and (iii) another fifteen or so where just a word here or there is in his hand. Peerson's texts have only some slight contact with that third category and none with the first two. This may in itself be significant, of course: perhaps he was only given access to poems the texts of which were already stable. But this means that we have little to go on. Peerson's text is very good: it is authoritative in relation to *W* and 1633, and it is reproduced with relatively few errors.

Peerson sets two of the four poems that are found in musical settings from the late-Elizabethan period, so we have the chance of a simple initial test of whether, for these poems at least, Peerson's text is early or late. The version of poem 1 set by Cavendish and that of poem 5 set by Dowland vary significantly from the texts in *W* and 1633 (Dowland's version, for example, begins not 'Who trusts for trust, and hopes of love for love' but 'Who euer thinks or hopes of loue for loue'), but Peerson's texts show no relation to those earlier versions and agree perfectly with the versions in *W* and 1633, which agree with each other.

There are a small number of moments where Peerson's text varies by omission rather than in obvious error: 'Was euer man so over-match't with boy?' (poem 26, l. 1) becomes 'Was euer man so matcht with boye', which perhaps matters little; but poem 103's 'that inward blisse, | *Which*, but where faith is, every where findes scorne' (ll. 11-12) loses 'Which but' in Peerson and so has a changed, but not impossible, sense. There are a number of places where Peerson's text shows misreading or sophistication; some need consideration and are referred to below, and others can be ignored,<sup>30</sup> but one needs discounting here. In poem 3 ('More then most fayre'), the refrain component which forms the couplet at the end of each of the poem's two six-line stanzas is varied in Greville's texts by changing one word: 'If in my hart all Saintes else be defaced, | Honour the Shrine, where you alone are placed' becomes in the second stanza 'If in my hart all *Nymphes*' (my emphasis). In Peerson, there are no 'Saints' and instead 'Nymphs' each time. Rastall does not comment separately on this, apparently categorising it as an error of some sort, but Wilkes believes it represents 'The substratum of an earlier text'.<sup>31</sup> I believe there may be

---

<sup>29</sup> Wilkes (ed.), *Poems and Plays*, discusses Peerson's text, l, pp. 19-20 and 71-4, but makes an unfortunate number of questionable assumptions in pursuing a thesis that Peerson's text belongs near the top end of the stemma rather than, as I conclude below, towards the bottom. I refer to some of these, but have chosen to present an uncluttered analysis of the evidence rather than a point-by-point refutation.

<sup>30</sup> See, e.g., Wilkes (ed.), *Poems and Plays*, l, p. 73 for 103.3.

<sup>31</sup> Wilkes (ed.), *Poems and Plays*, l, p. 72

another explanation. Greville's first stanza needs to establish that the conceit is based in the Reformation defacing of images of saints in churches before the second stanza varies 'Saintes' to 'Nymphes'. So I think the *W* and 1633 reading is certainly the original reading and do not believe that Peerson's reading represents the starting point. And I think the change in Peerson is deliberate: one can easily imagine the one-time recusant Peerson making his own decision to regularise the refrain, both for reasons of formal simplicity and because of a dislike of the use of the saints in a conceit.<sup>32</sup>

There is just one moment where Peerson's variant looks like an authorial reading not otherwise known, and it is an interesting one, not least because the poem in which it is found is also something of an outlier: *Caelica* 81. Greville's poem is very clearly about Queen Elizabeth; it comes at a pivotal moment in *Caelica*, as the sequence prepares to turn away from erotic love, and in Peerson it is moved to the very end of the selection from *Caelica*, before the two settings of the elegy for Greville, making Greville's final word – appropriately enough perhaps in what becomes a retrospective, memorial volume – a nostalgic reminder of his Elizabethan beginnings:

Vnder a throne I saw a virgin sitt,  
 The redd and white Rose quartered in her face;  
 Starr of the North, and for true guardes to it,  
 Princes, Church, States, all pointing out her grace.  
 The homage done her was not borne of witt,  
 Wisdome admir'd, zeale tooke ambitions place,  
 State in her eyes taught order how to fitt;  
 And fixe confusions vn-observing race.  
     Fortune can here claime nothing truely great,  
     But that this princely creature is her seat.

Peerson's text has some insignificant variants – 'Church[,] Princes ...' at the start of the fourth line and 'conclusions' for 'Confusions' in the eighth line – which can be readily attributed to scribal or compositorial misreading (the readings are repeated in each of the five vocal parts). But Peerson's version of the opening of the sixth line is intriguing: 'feare did admire, zeale tooke ambitions place'. This makes very good sense: Elizabeth inspires true homage, admiration, and zeal instead of relying on wit, fear, and ambition. The *W* and 1633 reading of 'Wisdome admir'd' equivocates nicely: either the genuinely wise admire her, or those who under a lesser monarch might be thought wise (and are on a par with the witty and ambitious) instead unfeignedly admire. But Peerson's reading has a greater clarity. It also chimes with other areas of Greville's writing, where fear is what makes the political world go round, as well as with Sidneian poetics, where Aristotelian pity and fear become

---

<sup>32</sup> The text, from Dowland, of poem 52 ('Away with these selfe-loving Ladds') in *Englands Helicon* similarly tones 'Saint' down to 'Nymph' in the penultimate line.

pity and *admiration*.<sup>33</sup> If we assume that this reading is Greville's, are we to think that it is an offshoot of the *W/1633* text – a whimsical alternative introduced in parallel and not incorporated in those texts? Such things happen. But it makes more sense to think that this is an earlier variant that has been revised away before the copying of *W*. Since, as we shall see, the evidence of the other songs will suggest that Peerson's text otherwise postdates *W*, it may be that his access to this one poem was at a separate moment, and to a different stage of *Caelica's* evolution. Given that the poem stands apart from the others in subject too, it is plausible to imagine this as the first collaboration between Greville and Peerson, at some point before 1619 – the release of a single poem (as to Cavendish in the 1590s), which in this case led to something more. That might have been as early as 1610-14 when Greville was working on the double hagiography of Sidney and Elizabeth in the *Dedication*.

There are no other clear signs of access to a pre-*W* state of the text, despite Wilkes's hunch, deeply flawed in my view, that Peerson's text slots into the stemma as an offshoot of the state of the text ( $\alpha$ ) from which *W* was copied.<sup>34</sup> There are, however, some signs, mostly slight but in one case very strong, pointing to access to a state of the text that is either *W* or one stage on from it. Here are two instances; firstly, poem 4, line 6:

	w <sup>ch</sup>	
<i>W</i>	<del>Whose</del>	eyes make all eyes glad, or sorie;
<i>1633</i>		Which eyes make all eyes glad, or sorie,
<i>GCM</i>		which eyes makes all eyes glad or sorrie

The reading 'makes' for 'make' need not concern us. But since 'Whose eyes' is possible, Peerson's agreement with the corrected state of *W* may be significant. The correction in *W* is scribal (the scribe first superimposed 'Which' on 'Whose' before crossing the word through and inserting 'w<sup>ch</sup> above the line). But without any other witness to 'Whose', we cannot assume it was the reading in  $\alpha$  and so is more than a momentary scribal error. Similar is poem 103, line 8:

	fleshe	
<i>W</i>	<del>self</del>	And in thy self make bould to fashion it?
<i>1633</i>		And in thy flesh make bold to fashion it.
<i>GCM</i>		and in thy flesh make bold to fashion it

---

<sup>33</sup> See for example the extended passage on hope and fear in *Letter*, and a parallel passage in *Dedication* in which Elizabeth refuses to play games with hope and fear in Parliament (*The Prose Works of Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke*, ed. John Gouws (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), pp. 112-13 and 156-8). For Sidney's conversion of Aristotelian fear to admiration in relation to this crux see especially the account in the *Defence* of tragedy, 'that maketh kings fear to be tyrants, and tyrants manifest their tyrannical humours; that with stirring the affects of admiration and commiseration teacheth the uncertainty of this world' (*Sidney's 'The Defence of Poesy' and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. Gavin Alexander (London: Penguin, 2004), 27-8. Wilkes agrees that this poem may represent 'an earlier stage of composition' (*Poems and Plays*, I, p. 72).

<sup>34</sup> Wilkes (ed.), *Poems and Plays*, I, p. 72.

This time the correction is in Greville's hand, but it may still be no more than the rectifying of a scribal misreading (quite imaginable with an initial long s) rather than evidence of a stage of revision. Peerson may still be in agreement with the  $\alpha$  state of the text from which *W* was copied, but these examples certainly do not hinder an argument that Peerson's text of all poems except *Caelica* 81 postdates work on *W*.

A different but important kind of evidence is found in Peerson's text of poem 26:

*W* When with the child, the child thoughtes of myne owne,

1633 When with the child, the child-thoughts of mine owne

*GCM* when with the childe, the childe thought of wisdome.

There is plenty of space between the last two words of this line in *W*, and the nature of this scribe's letter-forms makes it impossible to imagine the misreading deriving directly from *W*. But it is easy to see how this error might have come from reading the line in a less easily legible source, either in Greville's wretched hand or in a less careful scribal hand. It may, equally, have crept in later, but this is less likely. This music is written in part books, not full score, which means that a compositor or scribe copying from parts can read the same word in two ways in two different parts; and this happens elsewhere. But the error is replicated in the other parts in Peerson, and so was likely found in the text from which he worked in composing his setting. So this may suggest that, for this poem at least, Peerson's source was not *W* itself, and therefore had to be either an earlier or a later state of the text. Or it may just suggest that Peerson himself misread the copy of the poem – scribal or in his own hand – which he used in composing his setting.

The most interesting crux strongly suggests that, for one poem at least (and this caveat must be continually kept in mind), Peerson's text derives from the state of the *W* text in which Greville left it having revised it, which in this case is identical to 1633 (and the lost manuscript  $\omega$  from which it was set up). This is line 12 of poem 88:

these ~~workes~~ types

*W* That *Christ* may come, and all ~~the rest~~ depart.

1633 That *Christ* may come, and all these types depart.

*GCM* that *Christ* may come and all those types depart.

We may ignore the reading in Peerson of 'those' for 'these', which could have arisen at any stage. But it is significant that Peerson has 'types', since this is the reading Greville seems to be working out in the Warwick manuscript. It is always possible that Greville had generated this reading before, revised it out either in or before the state of the text prior to *W*, and found his way back to it here. But most likely is that the reading postdates 1619, and that Peerson's text must do so too. If we allow ourselves to think, as I believe is plausible, that with the exception of poem 81 Peerson had access to a single version of the text, then on this evidence this is likely to have been the state of the text *after* Greville's revisions of *W*.

The final, interesting cruces are found in poem 25, lines 11 and 13, and at first sight appear to point in the opposite direction. Here, Peerson agrees with *W* against 1633 in one line, and with an early state of *W* against 1633 in another. So we need here to consider the possibility that Peerson's text (of this poem at least) derives from an unrevised stage of *W* or from  $\alpha$ , the state of the text prior to *W*:

*W*     Doth she make thee make faultes to make thee beaten?  
        [...]  
           Give mee a ~~bl~~owe, let mee thy quiver borrow,  
 1633   Doth she cause thee make faults, to make thee beaten?  
        [...]  
           Giue me a Bow, let me thy Quiuer borrow,  
*P*     doth shee, make thee make faults, to make thee beaten.  
        Giue me a blow, let me thy quiuer borrow.

The first thing to say is that *W* as it ends up seems to me to represent Greville's intentions for these lines. At no point did Greville intend 'blow' in line 13; 'bow' is clearly the correct reading for that image, in a poem addressed to the archer Cupid. I also believe that the 1633 reading of line 11 is scribal, editorial, or compositorial sophistication (the copy-editor mentality that finds the repetitions problematic, even though they are the poetic point), and so is likely to postdate Greville's lifetime.<sup>35</sup> It follows that the  $\alpha$  manuscript did not read 'blow' and that the  $\omega$  manuscript did not read 'cause'. So the crux in l. 13 is not the evidence Wilkes thinks it is that Peerson's text derives from the  $\alpha$  manuscript. The crossing-through of the *l* in 'blowe' looks like neither Greville's hand nor that of *Caelica's* scribe, so we might think it is a late correction, conceivably made by the scribe (under Greville's direction) responsible for copying into  $\omega$  the final state of the text that was the basis of 1633. That  $\omega$  text itself could have preserved the misreading initially or for some time, in which case a copy of the poem could have been made from either manuscript in the meantime with the reading 'blowe'. These two cruces, then, do not necessarily argue against our working assumption that Peerson's text was derived from a state of the text equivalent either to *W* after revisions or to  $\omega$ , the post-*W* lost manuscript.<sup>36</sup>

The evidence is slight, and so can be wielded in support of various different hypotheses, including the derivation of Peerson's text from a single text or multiple texts, and via a single moment of access or multiple ones. We can try for the simplest explanation and imagine Peerson with a single point of access to a single state of the developing text of *Caelica*. The most likely hypothesis then takes the strong suggestion from poem 88 that Peerson's text cannot be prior to *W* and evidence elsewhere that it is likely not to be *W* itself, and gives us Peerson having access to a manuscript copied from *W*, therefore post-

<sup>35</sup> Wilkes agrees on this point (*Poems and Plays*, I, p. 68).

<sup>36</sup> But see Wilkes (ed.), *Poems and Plays*, I, pp. 66-8 for an argument for two stages of revision of *W*, with  $\omega$  and thus 1633 deriving from the first. This is an argument for *W* as we now have it as, in certain but not all respects, the final state of the text.

1619 when *W* was made. Or we can imagine multiple points of access to multiple states of the text. We might then find evidence of Peerson's contact with states of the text from before and after *W*, and therefore before and after 1619. But we need to separate the question of the date of Peerson's state of the text from the question of the date of Peerson's access to that text and both from the question of the date of his work of composition. He might, at a single date in the mid-1620s, have been given access to a ragbag assortment of loose copies of *Caelica* poems, representing various stages of the sequence's development. Or he might, say, have been given a post-1619 text of a few poems in 1620, a post-1625 text of a few more in 1626, and a pre-1619 text of a couple of others in 1627.

How close a hand in any of this might Greville have had? We cannot, I believe, assume a great deal of interest or involvement from him, and should certainly not assume that the selection of poems was his. Insofar as the poems suit setting, Greville was far less capable of judging that than Peerson was. Given what we know about the sociology of lyric texts in this period, there is also little reason to suppose (as Rastall does) that Greville would be keen to ensure that Peerson had the best, most up-to-date texts, and certainly not that he would have included in Peerson's text authorial readings not witnessed elsewhere.<sup>37</sup> Given what we know of Greville, we might imagine Peerson being allowed to make a selection of appropriate poems from a complete MS of *Caelica*, and then being furnished with scribal copies or allowed to take his own copies (the clustering of poems supports the conjecture that the person making the selection did not have the time or opportunity to become familiar with the whole sequence). It is hard to imagine a project such as *Mottects or Grave Chamber Musique* coming together bit by bit. The investment of that much time by Peerson would need the promise of some reward from patron or book sales: Peerson would have wanted enough texts to make a book of songs before he started work. So I would favour thinking that those conversations began after 1619, and were grounded in an earlier relationship that had included Peerson's access to and setting of *Caelica* 81, the poem on Queen Elizabeth.

---

<sup>37</sup> Rastall, p. iv. The following inference is untenable, based as it is on the assumption that Greville and Peerson collaborated and that Greville was closely interested in Peerson's work: 'I assume that the collection was prepared for publication after Greville's death because otherwise the textual errors in the songs would surely have been corrected by him' (p. iv).