CONCLUSIONS

From what has been said above, it appears that the extent of Henrietta's influence at Charles's court has been somewhat underestimated, and that the connections between her religion and her précieux interests have been neglected. Henrietta and the fashions she introduced suffered from the disabilities of being French, feminist, and Catholic, all suspect in England at the time, and anathema for long after the Civil War. She belonged to a cause that lost, and defeated causes, especially those that once threatened to come back to trouble the victor, have a way of being glossed over by history; even the Stuart propaganda that idealised Charles was not anxious to revive dubious connections with French Catholicism. Nevertheless the connection between Henrietta's Catholicism and her love fashions illuminates many aspects of court life, particularly the masques and court entertainments. The masques were an intermediate ground between the social and religious interests of the court, and the emphasis on "picture" in the thirties made them particularly well suited for referring to religious issues, since they could suggest to politic eyes what it was untactful or dangerous to put into words. They were public enough to communicate with ambassadors and foreign visitors, and their visual symbolism enabled them to express hopes and aspirations which did not hold Charles to any promise, or leave him open to easy attack. The connection of the Queen's Platonic love fashions with religion helps to explain the sudden importance of "Platonic love" in the 1630's, and, on a wider view, to make sense of the seriousness with which Royalty took its entertainments, and of the particular bitterness during the thirties of Puritan attacks on the Queen, the court, and the stage.
The recognition that Henrietta's interests were not simply derived from French fashions, but had ideas and objectives of their own, seems to provide an important background for studying many aspects of court life and culture. In the field of social history it may be seen that the object of her Platonic love was not simply exaggerated flattery, nor the senseless idealisation of women, nor even a roundabout way to seduction, but a not entirely unsuccessful attempt to inject idealism into her followers. Her fashions did (at least in theory) encourage a better attitude to love, courtship and marriage, improve the position of women, and attempt to link the social life of the court with spiritual ideals. Praise in Platonic terms in the masques was not designed simply to feed the Queen's vanity, but to contribute to a religious cause which seemed, at the time, to have universal implications.

On the other hand, Henrietta's fashions do seem partly responsible for a generally reductive effect on the arts that were influenced by them. Whereas the Neoplatonism of people like Ben Jonson had been humanist and "religious" in the broadest sense, the Neoplatonism of the Queen was more limited in scope, and directed towards a more specific concept of "religion," towards making Catholic conversions rather than towards transcendent ideals. A similar narrowing of interests is apparent in the masques, which instead of the "more removed mysteries," which Jonson aimed to include, are directed more towards present occasions and specific religious issues; indeed the final judgement on masques of the thirties may be that they are deficient in lasting value, not (as has generally been thought) because they were too abstract and trifling, but because they were too specific and interested concerning the issues they took up. It seems to be a paradox of the baroque style, in which Charles's court briefly participated, that although its aims were to give an impression of
mystic truths, its method often depended on purely material concerns. The "heavenly" scenes of masques were impossible without solving the technical problems of stage mechanics and perspective; the demonstration that the material and spiritual worlds were one was impossible without humanizing religious concepts into the figures of God the Father, Mary and Christ; even the sense of wonder and mystery could easily degenerate into the pleasure of solving riddles and enigmas. The most "spiritual" effects of baroque art and stage were similarly dependent on the material wealth of courts, so that baroque art became a natural support of Monarchy. The presentation of religious issues in the masques of Charles's reign may have brought temporary hope to Royalists of retaining the established order, or even of returning to the "old Religion," but the masques themselves reflected a world whose interests had contracted to the small circle of the court, and which bore too little relation to the world outside.

A similar narrowing of interests is apparent in the drama, where writers for the court tried too hard to please the tastes of the King and Queen. The recognition of a distinct type of préciosité encouraged by the Queen does, however, give a better basis for understanding this drama, helping to resolve many of the contradictions that have grown up in critical literature as to whether "Platonic love" had a moral or immoral influence on court life and literature in the 1630's. A full discussion of court drama has been outside the scope of this study, but it would, I think, repay further attention in the light of French influences in the thirties. Plays written for the court express a variety of interesting attitudes on the "right" behaviour of women, and it is obvious that in the thirties the whole subject of love and marriage (particularly enforced marriage) was under review. It would be interesting to look at these plays in the light of French conduct books of the type of L'Honnête femme, of which others
were translated during the period or written in English by, for example, Anthony Stafford (author of *The Female Glory*). There seem also to be many similarities in tone and subject matter between these plays and J.-P. Camus's romances, which in France were among the most popular works of the early seventeenth century, and the influence of which was no doubt felt at the English court. Both court plays and Camus's works are slowly becoming more readily available in modern editions, and the connection between Henrietta's fashions and Devout Humanism seems to open up new opportunities for research in this area.

In the public theatre the Catholic element in Henrietta's fashions may also have had a bearing, by way of contrast, on dramatists like Massinger, Shirley, and Ford. Massinger treated Catholic subjects, and, as well as imitating the form of the Jesuit martyr-play, based the plot of at least one (and possibly two) of his plays on Caussin's *The Holy Court*. I think, however, that he did so in a spirit of criticism of Henrietta's Devout Humanism, and that his own sympathies were with Catholicism of a different sort. Shirley was converted to Roman Catholicism, but he too was only half in sympathy with the mores of the court. His plays criticise many aspects of court life, but he did support the court and the Queen against Prynne's attacks (in *A Bird in a Cage*, 1633, and in writing *The Triumph of Peace*). He may even have approved, like his friend Habington, of the Queen's honnêteté, since in *The Lady of Pleasure* he demonstrates (through Celestina) the superiority of a lively feminist attitude over the "linsey woolsey" wooing of a would-be précieux lover. Particularly interesting is the reflection of interest in Platonic love in the work of John Ford. I see Ford as a somewhat sympathetic observer of the ideas of love and honour current at court, and aware of the connection of these ideas with Counter-Reformation Catholicism. It seems to me, however, that
he takes the fashion and measures it against the real passions of real heroines, showing up in the process the self-delusive ideals (including those of Counter-Reformation Catholicism) which, like the society it mirrored, could only lead in the real world to self-destruction. A consideration of his plays against the background of associations between Henrietta's religion and her love fashions might, I think, help to reconcile some of the critical questions about Ford's moral vision.

Henrietta's influence did not help to produce any major literary works, but I think the world she represented was (like the dark side of the moon) important just for being there, a presence which inspired either sympathy or lively reaction in talents brighter than the ones she attracted to herself. Her world was a counter-image of the classical, humanist world of reason and learning; it emphasised emotion, colour, feminine sensibility, manners and human relations. Similarly her cult of Beauty and the Counter-Reformation excess of her Capucin services was a counter-image of Puritan austerity and the more restrained aesthetic values of Anglicanism. Poets, artists and dramatists generally took their positions to one side or the other, but somewhere in between was an area where the two worlds were able to meet. Poets, especially, benefited from the chance to return more openly to a world of private devotion and meditation from which the Reformation had partially excluded them, if not in fact at least in the extent to which it was respectable (or safe) to show Catholic sympathies. In the thirties Anglican poets could freely use Catholic devotional forms, and even William Prynne, in "Mont-Orgueil," could write a "garden" poem which countered, by way of contrast, the usual Catholic meditations of the sort. Henrietta's world was significant for the opposition, as well as for the sympathy, it inspired, and poets like Milton who reacted against the culture of the court used many of its forms
(including influence from the masques) for his own work.

Thus Henrietta's love fashions take on a new importance in the light of their connection with her religion, and the masques in particular come to life with fresh urgency against the background of religious problems and debate. That the issues they treated are still alive to-day can be seen by the continuance of religious wars, and (on a somewhat more optimistic note) the recent historic visit of Pope John Paul II to English soil, and the celebration of an ecumenical service in Canterbury Cathedral. Coincidentally, the present Pope is himself a devotee of the Virgin, and has very recently taken action to protect the world, in its present parlous condition, by consecrating it to the Immaculate Heart of Mary.
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THE SOURCE OF WALTER MONTAGUE'S THE ACCOMPLISH'D WOMAN


The relation between The Accomplish'd Woman and Du Bose's work is evidently not clearly recognized. Neither the Short-Title Catalogue nor the New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature lists The Accomplish'd Woman under Montague's name. STC does give an entry '2407A [Du Bose, Jacques]. The accomplished woman. For Gabriel Bedell and Tho. Collins, 1656' which is Montague's translation but does not provide a cross-reference to Montague. The British Library Catalogue, on the other hand, lists The Accomplish'd Woman under Montague's name, but not under Du Bose's, although it does list under Du Bose's two other English translations of L'Honneste femme. These are The Compleat Woman . . . translated into English by N. N. (London: Thomas Harper and Richard Hodgkinson, 1639), and The Accomplish'd Woman translated by a Gentleman of Cambridge, 2 vols. (London: J. Watts, 1753). Thus L'Honneste femme has not been clearly identified as the source of Montague's 1656 translation.

A comparison of The Accomplish'd Woman with the 1632 edition of L'Honneste femme shows that Montague's is an almost word-for-word translation of the French. Apart from minor changes, such as substituting for Du Bose's dedication (to Madame de Combalet) his own dedication to the Duchess of Buckingham, and the name of Chaucer (p. 117) for the name of Marcomir (p. 301) as an example of an old-fashioned 'writer, Montague's only departure from Du Bose is

1 This is a translation of Du Bose's 'reviewed, corrected, and amended' edition of Pt. I, 1633; The Compleat Woman is now available in facsimile reprint, Amsterdam: Da Capo Press, 1968.
2 British Library copy E 1686(I).
3 Bibliotheque Nationale copy R.34163.
the omission of a preface to the reader, in which Du Bosc explains and defends his book.

The quality of Montague's translation may be suggested by comparing a short passage with its original in Du Bosc. Du Bosc writes of the need for women to make piety and virtue attractive to the Court, and adds 'ie n'approuue pas celles qui mettent leur deuotion a la gesne pour luy faire des grimasses, comme si on ne se pouuoit sauuer sans estre effroyable. Quand la grace de Dieu est dans vn ame, le visage en ressent les douceurs' (L'Honneste femme, p. 89). Montague translates this: 'I doe not approve of those that put their devotion upon the racke to make it scoul, as if one could not be saved without being ugly. When the grace of God is in the soul, the face is toucht over with the sweetness of it' (The Accomplish'd Woman, p. 33). The easy translation, accurate yet idiomatic, is what we might expect from a writer like Montague, who spent many years both before and after the Civil War in France.

At the time of the publication of the book, Montague was living in France. The translation may, however, belong to an earlier period. The Accomplish'd Woman carries a dedication to the Duchess of Buckingham, to whom Montague writes as though on intimate terms: she is a reflection of the virtues set out in the book, and his admiration she may learn by reading 'because no body dares tell it you, when any body is in love with you'. Katherine Manners, the Duchess of Buckingham, died in 1649, seven years before the book was published. In 1628 she had been left a widow by Buckingham's assassination, but in 1635 she remarried, this time to the Viscount Dunluce, second Earl and Marquis of Antrim, a match which did not show her in the same favourable light at Court that she had enjoyed as the wife of Buckingham. Unless Montague was addressing her by her former title, therefore, the dedication would seem to have been written before April 1635.

There is a second reason for thinking the translation may have been done in the early thirties. Montague translated Part I of L'Honneste femme in the form in which it had first appeared in 1632, even though Du Bosc quickly followed this edition with a revised and much enlarged version in 1633. 'N.N.' used the 1633 edition for his translation in 1639, but Montague refers neither to this translation, nor to the revised version of Part I, nor to Parts II and III of L'Honneste femme which Du Bosc published in 1634 and 1636 (all of which he should have been able to obtain, had he been interested, while living in France in the 1650s). His interest in Du Bosc's book, therefore, seems to go back to an earlier time than the publishing date of 1656 would indicate. If he did make the translation in the 1630s, its history would match that of Montague's better-known work, The Shepherd's Paradise, which was written for performance in 1633 but not published until 1659.

Walter Montague was an important member of Queen Henrietta-Maria's circle, and his pastoral The Shepherd's Paradise played a major part in introducing her ideas to the Court. L'Honneste femme itself was an influential work in France throughout the 1630s, and Montague's translation of it may have contributed towards forming an ideal of the accomplished woman at the English court.

ERICA VEEVERS

Macquarie University, N.S.W., Australia

The printer's '1629' on the title-page of one copy is a false date: see W. W. Greg, A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama, ii. 797.

1 See Ian Maclean, Woman Triumphant: Feminism in French Literature 1610-1652 (Oxford, 1977), esp. Ch. V.

4 DNB, s.v. Montagu (sic), Walter. He was frequently in France between 1624 and 1635, and lived there in the 1650s as Abbot of Nanteuil and, subsequently, as Abbot of Pontoise.

5 DNB, s.v. Villiers, George (1592-1628). The 2nd Duke of Buckingham, George Villiers's son (1628-87), did not marry until 1657.

6 DNB, s.v. Macdonnell, Randal.
William Davenant's *The Platonic Lovers* (1635) is a play which, like Jonson's *The New Inne*, has been difficult for critics to fit into the pattern of Cavalier drama. By its title it seems to promise clarification of the fashion of Platonic Love, and by its dedication to Henry Jermyn, a friend of Davenant's and a favourite of the Queen, it might have been expected to win favour with the court. Yet the play failed in performance both at Blackfriar's and the court, and its treatment of Platonic love is unlike that in Davenant's later plays. I believe that Davenant, like Jonson, was at first a rather unwilling convert to the naive idealism of the Queen's French fashion. His whipped-up enthusiasm can be detected in the strained philosophising and mechanical verse of the play *Love and Honour* (1634), and even in *The Temple of Love* (1634/5), doubts about the new doctrine far outweigh its praise in the written part (a disproportion that probably went unnoticed amid the visual splendour). Davenant made no use of French salon or romance material in the masque, and the nearest he came to a positive exposition of Platonic love is to say that the Queen and the beauties of her train "raise new doctrines, and new sects of love: / Which must not woo or court the person, but / The mind" (11.190-92).

For this view, Davenant needed to go no further than to the book that had been the traditional English source of ideas on Platonic Love, Castiglione's *The Courtier*. I believe that he went to this source when he came to write *The Platonic Lovers* only a few months after the masque, and that the plot of the play is based on Bembo's distinction in Book IV between the
reasonable (or "Platonic") lover, and the sensual lover. In Book IV of The Courtier Bembo contrasts his kind of love (the reasonable) with that of Lord Julian (the sensual), and describes the way in which each kind should be received. The reasonable lover "coveteth but honest matters, and therefore may the woman graunt him them all without blame. But my Lorde Julians woman that is not so assured of the modestie of the yong man, ought to graunt him the honest matters onely, and deny him the dishonest" (The Courtier, ed.cit., pp.314-5). It is the intention that decides whether these matters are honest or dishonest, and the "selfe same things" that reasonable lovers may happily and freely grant, sensual lovers must be denied. Bembo elaborates on the liberties the woman may allow to her reasonable lover: "beside the graunting him mery countenances, familiar and secret talke, jeasting, dalying, hand in hand, may also lawfully and without blame come to kissing: which in sensual love according to the Lorde Julians rule, is not lawfull." A kiss, he explains, "is a knitting together both of bodie and soule," but a sensual love will take the body's part. A reasonable lover, on the other hand, knows that the mouth may be an issue for the soul, or for words, the interpreters of the soul, and "for this doe all chaste lovers covet a kiss, as a coupling of soules together" (p.315).

Davenant's two pairs of lovers follow these rules precisely. In The Platonic Lovers Davenant allows his Platonic pair, Eurithea and Theander, all the liberties which Bembo allows to his "reasonable" lovers, and he limits Ariola and Phylomont, who contemplate marriage, to a cool and formal courtship, which Bembo insists is all that can be allowed the "sensual" lover. Theander and Eurithea only woo "the spirit, face, / And heart" and therefore "their conversation is / More safe to fame" (Davenant, The Dramatic Works, ed.cit., II, p.17). They freely embrace on meeting
and talk on intimate terms; he visits her in her chamber where they kiss and converse, until they are "entangled with chaste courtesies of love" (p.34). Their love, it has been explained, "is only mutual wonder and applause" and "therefore can stir no jealousy / In the severest thought" (p.31). Ariola, on the other hand, can allow her lover no such liberties, since she and Phylomont "still affect / For natural ends" such as "libertines call lust, / But peaceful politicks and cold divines / Name matrimony" (p.17). She is bashful and cool towards her suitor, not even allowing him to kiss her hand. In his two pairs of lovers, therefore, Davenant gives a practical demonstration of following Bembo's distinctions, and measures "Platonic" idealism against the real world. He cannot, of course, resist showing the absurdities of the situation, and he sends his Platonic theorists off to the Friar for some sensible earthly advice. The Platonic pair are, to outside eyes, overstepping the bounds of decency as well as of common-sense. Although Davenant admits that true initiates of the cult perhaps exist ("There are Platonic-lovers, though but few / The sect conceal'd, and still imagin'd new"), his dedication of the play to Jermyn, whose familiarity with the Queen had already caused some gossip (see Carew's Poems, ed.cit., p.xxxv), may have been in the nature of a friendly warning to come back to earth. Davenant's forthright treatment of the theme was not appreciated by audiences of 1635. What was required was something more French, more feminine, an art of talking about love moulded by the niceties of pastoral and romance, or an idealistic view of love governed by the Queen's form of Neoplatonism (cf. Carrell's The Passionate Lovers, which treats a similar theme). In subsequent plays Davenant adopted the new forms and became as good a Platonic lover as the rest.
APPENDIX C

The Shepherd's Paradise
(refer p.43)

The Shepherd's Paradise (1633) may, I think, be read on one level as a romantically allusive account of the King and Queen's courtship, belonging (like parts of L'Astrée and some of the romans of J.-P. Camus) to the genre of the "true" romance. Its immediate predecessor in English (in form, though not in moral tone) was probably the prose romance written by Sir Kenelm Digby in about 1627, in which, under the assumed name of Theagenes, he recounts the highly coloured version of events leading up to his secret marriage with "Stelliana," Venetia Stanley, in 1625. The fact that Digby had attended Charles in Madrid (as had Montague's elder brother Edward) on his visit to the Infanta Isabella, and had also been part of the embassy to France for the hand of Henrietta, would have given him a special interest in the subject of the King's two courtships, and may have suggested to Montague the idea of a romantic treatment of the subject in The Shepherd's Paradise. In France, as Jean Jacquot has observed, a roman on the subject of Charles's and Henrietta's courtship had already been published in 1625 by A. Remy, entitled La Galatée et les aventures du Prince Astigès. Histoire de nostre temps où sous noms feints sont représentez les amours du roy et de la reyne d'Angleterre. Avec tous les voyages qu'il a fait, tant en France qu'en Espagne. The roman was offered to Henrietta Maria as a wedding present, and it may have served as a convenient source of allusions for masques and entertainments during the 1630's. M. Jacquot compares, for instance, the description of a ballet in the roman, in which Discord issues from a globe, with the
opening scene of *Salmacida Spolia*. When Montague set out to provide the Queen with a pastoral of her own, in which she was to act the leading role, he may well have turned to this French source to help give an idealised version of the courtship. Montague in fact knew the events of the courtship better than Charles, for he had been one of the courtiers who had conveyed Charles's overtures to the young Henrietta, forming a long-lasting friendship with her.

Charles had never in fact courted Henrietta for himself; his only glimpse of her before she arrived in England had been when he was on his romantic escapade with Buckingham to woo the Spanish Infanta, a sufficiently unconventional episode in itself to figure in romance, and one which had already been made the subject of a ballet in France by Outre-Manche. James himself had said that the adventure of his two dear boys was "worthy to be put in a new Romano." Travelling incognito on the way to Spain, the pair had looked in at the French court where they saw a rehearsal for a masque, with Henrietta, amongst others, practising the dancing. It is doubtful whether Charles had taken much notice of the youthful Henrietta, since she must have been eclipsed by the finery of the Queen Mother and the young French Queen, sister of the Infanta with whom Charles declared himself romantically in love. Later, however, this moment was represented as the beginning of his love for Henrietta. Remy inserted the episode in *La Galatée*, and Boisrobert perpetuated the myth. It was then taken over by English writers. Edmund Waller, in a poem of compliment "To the Queen" (*Poems*, pp.8-9), in which he writes that her eyes could enslave the gods, calls to witness "our Jove, prevented by their flame / In his swift passage to the Hesperian dame" (11.39-40). He goes on to picture Charles as the Royal youth who,
pursuing the report
Of beauty, found it in the Gallic court;
There public care with private passion fought
A doubtful conflict in his noble thought:
Should he confess his greatness, and his love,
Or on his journey o'er the mountains ride?  (11.43-47 and 1.53)

In a separate poem to the King, Waller pictures Charles on his journey
back from Spain, braving the storm like a hero, oblivious of danger,
harbouring only the "dear remembrance of that fatal glance, / For which he
lately pawned his heart in France" (11.101-03). The fact that by 1633 the
Royal couple were romantically in love would have been enough to make them
want to relive what had been, at the time, a necessarily impersonal
courtship, and to give Montague an easy choice of subject.

The plot of The Shepherd's Paradise (such as it can be made out) fits
the events of this "romantic" courtship. In The Shepherd's Paradise
Basilino (the Prince) has just renounced his love for Fidamira, a lady of
the "Castilian court." He and his friend Agenor (disguised as Moramente
and Genorio) set out to find the Princess of Navarra, whom the Prince's
father has decided he should marry, ostensibly to ask her forgiveness
for having loved another. On the way they decide to take in the "Shepherd's
Paradise," where the Prince is entirely captivated by the newly-elected
Queen, who later turns out to be the "real" Princess of Navarre whom he
was seeking, and whom he was destined to marry all the time. Bellesa,
Princess of Navarre, was played by Henrietta Maria, who was of course the
daughter of Henri IV (originally Henri de Navarre); Basilino and Agenor
are represented as being princes of Castile, although Bellesa is later
reported to have married the King of Albion (England), where her beauty
had "raised her to the public eminence of a Queen" (sig. F3, p.68).
Bellesa is said to have fled to the Shepherd's Paradise because her father
had intended to dispose of her to "a person of great wealth and quality"
who then loved another (sig. C6\textsuperscript{v}, p.28). In reality Henrietta had been intended for the handsome young Comte de Soissons when the more tempting possibility of a match with Charles was offered after the failure of negotiations with Spain, and it was the Comte, rather than Henrietta, who was left (see Hamilton, Henrietta Maria, p.24, pp.26-7). In the pastoral, Basilino (disguised as Moramente) and Bellesia discuss the question of having loved twice. To Bellesia's question "You think heaven doth allow of love's twice?" Moramente replies "As it doth intend, Madam, all good should arise to its perfection, our minds are but love's pupills at the first." They debate the question, and she taxes him with inconstancy, which concerns her less than that he "should strive to prove it a virtue," but he defends it with obscure, but winning, logic: "Had I thought inconstancy a virtue, Madam, I ne'er had been blest with this so great joy of seeing you" (sig. E8-E8\textsuperscript{v}, pp.62-63). He declares that he has been reserved by Heaven for this greater love, which is willed by fate, and Bellesia is won to his suit.

Fidamira, a lady of the Castilian court who, when the play opens, is just parting from Basilino, fits the role of the Infanta. She is paid great respect both by the Prince and by the old King, his father. The King indeed seems more in love with her than Basilino and he offers her his court, whereupon she too flees disguised to the Shepherd's Paradise; unnecessarily, it seems, for the King declares that his intentions were merely kind, and he laments her loss. In 1623 the Spanish match had been a scheme very close to the aging James's heart and, although he was reluctant to part with his son and favourite (as in the pastoral, sig. B6\textsuperscript{v}, p.12), he did nothing to stop their escapade to the Spanish court. The visit, however, did not help the delicate diplomatic negotiations, and the match was finally broken off because the Spanish demanded ever more
favourable conditions for the Infanta's religion, which those hostile to Spain saw the old King as possibly too willing to grant. The question of how to treat Fidamira in the pastoral must have posed a delicate problem for Montague and the Queen. England had only recently concluded peace with Spain in the Treaty of Madrid (signed in November, 1630). Henrietta's sister Elisabeth was on the Spanish throne, and her sister-in-law, Louis XIII's Queen, was sister to the Infanta. The complimentary treatment of Fidamira in the pastoral was perhaps both a feminine gesture of conciliation to a former rival, and a diplomatic invitation to bury the past.

Identification of Fidamira with the Infanta is strengthened by the visual evidence of the costume designs. The editors of Inigo Jones's *Designs* have pointed out (but without offering any explanation) that the drawing of Fidamira (see Fig. 69) is a copy of a portrait of the Infanta which is presumed to have entered the Royal Collection during the negotiations for the Spanish match. Inigo Jones did of course borrow many ideas for his costumes from other artists, but this is the only known instance of his copying a contemporary portrait. The copying would seem to have had a special significance, not only because it is an exact reproduction, but because the dress itself would have stood out as being quite different in style from the others in the play. By the standards of the 1630's it is stiff and old-fashioned, quite the opposite of the flowing, feminine lines of the dress worn by Bellesa (compare Figs. 69 and 70). The portrait must have been available at court for Jones to copy it, and the visual reference would have been easily picked out by the audience. Other costumes in the pastoral may also have had some visual reference to the Spanish court, the sombre splendour of which had made a deep impression on Charles. The costume design for the King of Castile (Orgel and Strong, no. 264; see Fig. 71) has the same stiff lines and padded
Fidamira, alias Princess Miranda of Navarre

Fig. 69 Fidamira in *The Shepherd's Paradise*, and the Infanta of Spain

Fig. 91 Artist Unknown, *The Infanta Isabella Maria* (The Lord Sackville, Knole)
Bellesa, alias Saphira, Princess of Navarre

Fig. 70 The Queen in *The Shepherd's Paradise*
shoulders as the Infanta's dress, and the brimmed hat is not of the type worn at the English court. Orgel and Strong (p.532) say that it was probably discarded as being too masculine and a compromise was made with the high waist, wide collar, and coronet more typical of the English costumes (compare Fig. 72). The first design, however, indicates that Jones originally intended to suggest costumes of Spanish style, and another drawing of Fidamira (Orgel and Strong, no. 262), has "this with the King" written on it. The costume of "Romero" (Orgel and Strong, no. 259, see Fig. 73) may hold another allusion to the Spanish court. An account of entertainments given to Charles and Buckingham at the Spanish court records that on one occasion the nobility went out "for the enjoying of the rural Delights of the morning, with long staves in their hands, cloathed after the Pastorall manner" (p.25), a description that accords with Romero's dress in the pastoral (compare Fig. 73). Of the two subjects proposed for defence at tilts during the same entertainment one was "That in the rusticity of the Country, there is found the Courtly urbanity of Loue" (p.15), a good description of Montague's pastoral; the other subject, "That Loue hath no need of the nourishment of hopes, for by them it is rather defamed than encouraged, being the reward of itself" (p.13) sums up the theme of speeches throughout the pastoral by the character Martiro, who argues that "impossibility" makes love rarer and more spiritual.

Thus Montague was able to refer to the romantic theme of Charles's first sight of Henrietta at the French court, and also to refer to the King's Spanish adventure and previous courtship in suitably idealized terms. He may have felt it desirable, however, to place his pastoral in an English tradition and to relate the Stuart court through it to the Elizabethan past. Sidney's Arcadia was the outstanding example of pastoral romance,
The Shepherd's Paradise, costume for the King (first version)
Fig. 72 Costume for the King of Valentia (second version)
Fig. 73  Romero in The Shepherd's Paradise
currently known in France as well as in England (d'Amblainville referred to it in dedicating his pastoral to Henrietta Maria in 1627). As it happened, the first episode in the *Arcadia* fitted neatly with the romantic episode Montague had chosen for his pastoral. There is little doubt that at the time of the Spanish match contemporaries would have compared the friendship between the young Prince Charles and the dashing favourite Buckingham with the ideal friendship between Pyrocles and Musidorus, Sidney's two young princes who were "alike in years and virtues" (p.10). In the opening of the *Arcadia* the two princes are on a journey home, but looking for adventure and "taking Arcadia in their way" they are "distracted from their main purpose" by falling in love with Pamela and Philocles (p.11), just as Basilino and Agenor are distracted from their journey by calling in at the Shepherd's Paradise, where they fall in love, and just as the two actual princes had called incognito at the French court on their journey to Spain. It may be merely coincidence that Katherine Manners, who married Buckingham in 1620, had copied the passage from which the above quotations from the *Arcadia* are taken, into her "Notebook," but her doing so suggests that the passage was for contemporaries a commonplace. Certainly the passage would have been called to mind by Montague's choice of the name Basilino for the Prince, very close to the first proper name mentioned in the *Arcadia*, that of Basilius the Duke, father of Pamela and Philoclea. Agenor, the name of the Prince's companion, is common in romances (used for example by Carlell in The Passionate Lovers), but Montague may have chosen it, and the name "Genorio" (as Agenor becomes in his disguise), because both contain the letters GEORGE, the first name of the Duke of Buckingham (George Villiers). Agenor does not behave altogether well in the pastoral; although the Prince has chosen him as his companion and "the only partner of his thoughts" (sig.
B7), he falls in love with Bellesa (who, however, turns out to be his sister), and is "inconstant" to Fidamira. Although not a very favourable view of the late Buckingham (d. 1628), it is mild in comparison with the Duke's real behaviour at the Spanish court, and during the marriage negotiations at the French court, where his showy manner and his over-gallant attention to the ladies (including even Anne, the French Queen) offended many. The mildly critical portrayal of Agenor in the pastoral may well have reflected Henrietta's opinion of the former favourite, whose interference while he was alive had been one of the chief obstacles to a harmonious relationship between herself and Charles.

Thus The Shepherd's Paradise, which is generally regarded as a more than ordinarily incomprehensible example of the pastoral genre, seems to have had the kind of contemporary significance which would go far towards accounting for the Queen's indulgence in an eight-hour long performance, and for its influence on the tone of subsequent drama produced for the court.
Notes: Appendix C

1. The Private Memoirs of Sir Kenelm Digby, ed. cit. The work is a peculiar mixture of sexual adventure and romantic idealism. For the following details, see Introductory Memoir, pp.ix, xxi, xxvii.


3. Jacquot, Appendix II, pp.159-60. Marie de Medici, to whom the ballet was no doubt familiar, was present at Salmacida Spolia, so that a reference was opportune.

4. DNB, s.v. Montague, Walter.


6. Quentin Bone, Henrietta Maria, p.18.

7. Henrietta took the part of Iris in Anne of Austria's ballet, "Les fêtes de Junon," 1623. Charles recorded the visit in a letter to his father, without, however, any mention of Henrietta: see E. Hamilton, Henrietta Maria, p.30; p.41 for following details.

8. In an Ode "présentée à la Reine d'Angleterre, par Monsieur le Comte de Carlile, de la part du Roy son Espous," Jacquot, p.133.


10. Orgel and Strong, Inigo Jones, II, p.529; Pl. 261, and Fig. 91. In "The Renaissance Artist as Plagiarist," ELH, 48, no. 3 (Fall, 1981), Orgel comments "it is difficult to believe he [Inigo Jones] did not mean something by alluding to the painting" (p.478), and he concludes that it was probably a Caroline "in-group joke," but that "the function of the plagiarism is utterly obscure" (p.479).

11. Andrew A. Mendoza, Two Royall Entertainments lately Given to Charles, Prince of Great Britaine by Philip IV of Spaine, transl. from the
Spanish (London, 1623; rpt. in The English Experience: Norwood: Johnson, 1977), to which bracketed page numbers refer. Montague's elder brother had attended Charles in Spain in 1623 (DNB, s.v. Montagu, Edward. 2nd Earl of Manchester), and Montague may have taken an interest in the details of the entertainments.


15. E. Hamilton, Henrietta Maria, p.51.
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