Ransom's version of relations between objects and ideas in poetry assumes that poets work with things that come relatively intact and recognizable. As a critic Ransom has minimal interest in the historical and social matters that provide most of the conditioning for those objects and ideas, nor does he consider the tension between poetic traditions and individual talent. But imagery, as opposed to objects themselves, and topoi as opposed to actual places, are the products as much of social convention and bookish discourse as of firsthand observation or individual invention. Marvell's mower, for instance, is the lineal descendant of Theocritus's Komatas and Polyphemos and Virgil's Corydon, both in his lovesick courtship of a reluctant nymph and in his naive, boastful assessment of his resources. No doubt such figures have some distant bearing on actual rustic suitors who gather up honey and flowers and go courting; but the reader knows them as conventions and perhaps as pastoral answers to epic or romance equivalents.

Though likewise not inclined to keep the literary ancestry of a genre and its interplay of tropes in full view, Kenneth Burke's suggestive essay on substance in *A Grammar of Motives* comes closer than Ransom's "image" or "texture" to at least the social circumstances of texts. The word *substance* usually suggests some such circumstances, as does Burke's scene-act ratio. Both assume that poems are symbolic actions in which writers respond to their times, as Theocritus does in looking at Homeric epic through the eyes of
an Alexandrian elite more interested in refined and self-conscious artistry than in a literature of "kings and battles."

Although a substance may threaten to dissolve into thin air or into the evasiveness of a body of discourse that constantly revises itself, Burke also finds that "the moment you relax your gaze a bit, it re-forms again. For things do have intrinsic natures" (p. 56). Neither scientists nor poets may be quite able to stipulate those natures once and for all, but they continue to make valid statements about them. Some substances are recurrent and orthodox; others carry the stamp of individual makers. Burke notes a parallel inside-outside ambiguity in the term "substance" itself: "Though used to designate something within the thing, the word etymologically refers to something outside the thing" (p. 23). Thus a man of substance sits amid wealth that is part of his acquirements or his social place and is subject to circulation and common definition; yet he may also be a man of individual character, assuming that he has something to him, something substantial. Similarly in aesthetic matters, substance resides both in the interwoven meanings of texts and beyond them in the references through which they gain whatever communicative power we allow them. Literary history is largely a record of that complex inner-outer duplicity.

As I suggested last chapter, seventeenth-century poetry distanced itself from the social assumptions that had constituted a center of gravity for virtually all major texts from Wyatt through the 1590s. Though the attractions of the court linger in the masque and in weakened form in the cavaliers and Spenserians, Milton abandons any idea of secular majesty after the early masques and assigns ostentatious grandeur later primarily to Satan. Marvell exiles society and its rewards at the outset of "The Garden" and in the Horatian ode transforms the offices of kingship into Cromwellian rule, albeit reluctantly. Donne considers courtly pursuits in several of the songs and sonnets but balances them against a love that outweighs them severalfold. The society Herbert invites into the temple is not civil but a special one to be sprinkled and taught by precepts and gathered into the church's "mystical repast." These are shifts not merely in individual allegiance but in the poet's orientation toward decorum, substance, and addressable objects. Parallel to them is an intensifying of the poet's personal claim for authority. Lyric personas are likely to be characters to be reckoned with and can often be mistaken for the poet himself. Donne's speakers, for instance, appear more imposing than Sidney's and at times closer to the poet we recognize from other works.
The question of authority and sincerity is a complex one, however, since any poet is prompted partly by tradition and a readership. When Astrophel says that he is anguished by love, we assume that he is expected to say that and to share with many others a heartfelt need to manufacture sonnets. The fit invention he talks about he finds mainly among predecessors. Even when he ends the first sonnet by admonishing himself to look in his heart and write, he does so as a final flourish in a rhetorically trim sonnet. The personas of the metaphysicals may not represent the poet either, but they alter the self-pretext relationship. For one thing they use fewer standard inventories of nature’s graces to lay at the beloved’s feet. When their tropes too turn out to be conventional, as they frequently do, their dramatic settings and attention to detail twist them away from former uses. The difference can sometimes be seen in the shift from service to a privileged calling, a shift in which the figures and devices that Puttenham and others list lose some of their appeal. The sound of “I Saw Eternity the other night,” “Yonder all before us lye / Deserts of vast Eternity,” “Dissolve me into ecstasies, / And bring all Heav’n before mine eyes,” and “Well, I will change the service, and go seek / Some other master out” is personal enough to constitute a new lyric address, heralded by Wyatt but not really followed up until Donne. Certain risks—of eccentricity, even of solipsism in Marvell, and of egomania in Milton—accompany that personal turn and sometimes a fear of exceeding bounds, especially when the poet pretends to speak to or on behalf of God, as Milton, Vaughan, and Herbert do.

The passages of Paradise Lost that I cited earlier bear out this difference in voice. But the poet-nature-society-Christ relationship of “Lycidas” will serve better I think to test Milton’s establishing of a persona who more or less defines his office as he goes. I want to dwell on it sufficiently to gauge Milton’s departures from his predecessors and prepare for the pattern of similar departures in the metaphysicals. Hence again I have both paradigmatic and historical uses in mind for the example.

It is nonetheless not easy to decide what comes forth as something new and what Milton incorporates from the tradition, which is no doubt partly why much of the commentary on “Lycidas” beginning with Samuel Jonson has dealt with its pastoral ancestry and the problem of sincerity. Since that commentary has been rehearsed frequently, we can pass it by here. However, in one of the more interesting recent readings of the poem, Paul Alpers proposes a view of pastoral conventions that is of special interest.
for its minimizing both of Milton's personal imprint on the tradition and of period differences. If poets do in fact make strategic responses to their times, we should be able to determine how a pastoral monody in 1637 differs from Virgil's or Spenser's. Milton alerts us to some differences in his view of Orpheus and modern pastors, but others we must assess on our own. While conceding that the poem challenges predecessors and fellows, Alpers narrows the "conventions" it works upon primarily to what convenire suggests, or the sense of community that a "coming together" creates. Taken in this sense, a convention is not the fixed procedures of genre "imposed by impersonal tradition" but the usage of a community of past singers analogous "to the community of young Cambridge poets who wrote and collected memorial verses for Edward King." The persona in turn bears "witness to the community of men and nature" (pp. 476, 479). The truth he comes upon concerning that pastoral community, in Alpers's view, is not an ontological or epistemological truth to replace the convention but a social truth in keeping with it.

Such "discursive conventions" as William Empson and Kenneth Burke describe have "a solid feeling when and because they are felt to be reliable usages, authorized by the practice of some community or other" (p. 492). The goal of criticism generally and of readings of "Lycidas" in particular should thus be "to give a just account of the validity of socially derived meanings and usages—to do justice to their stability, effect, and accessibility, on the one hand, and to their historical, social, and anthropological determinations, on the other" (p. 492). And so one should stress the poet's possession of the resources of the shepherd community, which are just those conventions that have "enabled the whole poem, even where it revises and corrects them" (p. 494).

It is worth remembering, however, that Virgil's version of that community stresses its fragility, as Alpers's own very able expounding of it in The Singer of the Eclogues indicates. In the first eclogue, for instance, Tityrus maintains allegiances both to Rome and to his exiled friend, a victim of Rome's land policies. In an extension of Virgilian tension between factions and ways of life, Spenser's Calidore finds himself strongly attracted to the company of Melibee and Pastorella but cannot stay very long with them without forsaking his duties to the court. It is difficult for either plowland or pastureland to escape problems raised by the largest unit that claims authority over them, which in both cases lies outside the rural community. The quarrels and differences of parties within
that community are also of concern to Theocritus, Virgil, and Spenser.

A relatively undifferentiated reading of "conventions" and identification of Milton with them also underplays the revisions all poets of importance make in traditions. Theocritus's bucolic epos plays self-consciously against the heroic epos of Homer, and Virgil's eclogues against the Idylls. Even simple societies do not often have the "gathering" Alpers assumes that pastoral finds in "Lycidas." Certainly Milton's society (like ours) was composed of a plurality of movements, ideologies, and overlapping but different languages. Milton turns one way of thinking against another throughout the poem, in conventions that are far from equal in validity. He turns St. Peter loose against a poisonous segment of the religious community, since churches are undermined by those who, like Bunyan's Formalist and Hypocrisy, "Creep and intrude and climb into the fold." He witnesses Orpheus's murder by the Thracian rout. The uncouth swain himself is apparently close only to Lycidas, with whom in better days he went afield "together both" (just the two of them) and heard "What time the Gray-fly winds her sultry horn." Even that fellowship—a literary exaggeration of Milton's casual acquaintance with Edward King—is past except for Lycidas's return at the end. He ultimately replaces the shepherds he has imagined at Cambridge with a society of saints who resemble angel hymnists more than shepherds. The effect of the "other groves, and other streams" in the apotheosis is to transport that society to a safer as well as a higher ground. The difference is not only between carefree college friends and revolutionaries; it is also between this world and the next, as is typical of the Miltonic realm-crossing we sampled earlier.

On the way toward that society of saints, an image of the gathered church in its final form, "Lycidas" conducts a solitary struggle with its central problems. The speaker gets along for 164 lines without addressing his fellow mourners and is alone again in twitching his "mantle Blew" and going off to fresh woods, settings for his future poems. It is not reading Christ's rejection of empire in Paradise Regained forward into Milton's prerevolutionary period to see a distrust of the very foundations of temporal community in the poem. Even Lycidas in returning as genius of the shore will apparently work alone to help those who "wander in that perilous flood," where the force of "wander" is to suggest not travel with a purpose but the meandering of strays.

Nor do the speaker's addresses to several parties dispell that
sense of solitude until he envisions the highly selective, cultic group assembled elsewhere. Poems use addresses as required to mark rhetorical stances and shifts of ground. Triton and Aeolus are mythological conveniences, for instance, to be interrogated in place of wind and wave; Camus personifies the home ground of the lost shepherd; the Pilot of the Galilean lake serves to identify and to right a wrong. The addresses to laurels, sisters of the well, Lycidas, nymphs, Arethusa, Mincius, Alpheus, Michael, and dolphins reinforce apostrophe as a rhetorical intensifier. Milton uses it to bring fictive presences forward as though out of the musings of the speaker himself. Among these participants in the monody, the woeful shepherds that make the most convincing general company of the poem are best thought of as a kind of chorus that signals an end to mourning and mark a division of the poem. Even then the poem does not really present us with a public face. The more dominant presences, the company of pastoral elegists honored by Milton’s quotations, are not only long departed but incomplete as surmises. What the society that counts exemplifies is not an easy companionship of shepherds, then, but a celebration of the redeemer and its own members, especially its newly welcomed one.

The calling to account, the interrogations, the indulgence of false surmises belong to a dramatic course that heads off any earlier assimilation of the uncouth swain completely to Milton. Perhaps the central project of Milton’s poetry in fact is to assimilate one level or one realm to another with checks and balances, in a probing of each individually and of their interactions and analogies. Given that recurrent concern, it is difficult to see pastoral, particularly the flower passage, as nearly equal in recompense to paradise itself, or to read Milton’s reflections upon that passage in the “false surmise” passage that follows as a recovering of its mythic attractions. But let us consider the latter passage and assess the degree to which it veers away and suggests a pastoral revisionism:

For so to interpose a little ease,
Let our frail thoughts dally with false surmise.
Ay me! Whilst thee the shores and sounding Seas
Wash far away, where’er thy bones are hurl’d,
Whether beyond the stormy Hebrides,
Where thou perhaps under the whelming tide
Visit’st the bottom of the monstrous world;
Or whether thou to our moist vows denied,
Sleep’st by the fable of Bellerus old,
Where the great vision of the guarded Mount
Looks toward Namancos and Bayona’s hold.

(152-62)
Conceding that something about this passage seems realistic and that a reconsideration of the flowers does in fact take place in it, Alpers believes that the preceding passage nonetheless enables this one, with its “intricate syntax and the delicate solicitude of a word like ‘perhaps.’” That “these lines prove what the flower passage seemed to disprove—the adequacy of poetic imagination” (pp. 486-87)—seems to me dubious. An imagination that is adequate to the monstrous element may not be adequate to what comes from the next level of myth. Although sleeping by the fable of Bellerus qualifies an otherwise harsh realism, as “visit’st” also does, not pastoral representation in itself but the appearance of “the dear might of him that walk’d the waves” brings forth awe and mysteriousness, precedents for which are scarce in either the classical tradition or English pastorals based on it. Spenser’s choral group on Mount Acidale, for instance, rises above the shepherd games of the plain but is of another kind from Milton’s and obviously lacks the Reformation overtones of Milton’s saints, following as they do upon the Thracian rout and false pastors. Certainly the temperament of radicalism is powerful in the poem, no less in the replacement of flowers and soft lays with saints than in the denunciation of corrupt clergy.

Even so, it is possible to overdo the severing of “weep no more” from its preparations, and Alpers and others have ably pointed to some of the reasons. Lesser pastoral idealizations even when upset by winter storms and corrupt clergy have an imaginative power of their own to be sure, which is no doubt why Milton proceeds by a combination of lyric involvement in, and dramatic sufferings of them. Similarly, the edenic delights of Adam and Eve are never discredited by the Fall or rendered obsolete by the new paradise that Christ promises for them in Book 3 and Michael again in Book 12. Milton typically seeks not an exalted communion of saints in itself but a balance between the visionary level it represents and an easier sociability of the kind that husband and wife find in meet conversation. Adam wanted that conversation to begin with precisely because lengthy colloquy with God promised to be a great strain for him. In “Lycidas” the trademark of vertical differences in style is changeability passage by passage and a breaking up of conventions in a structure of advances and retreats. The connection between shepherd sociability and higher communion is primarily contrastive, as even the bond between husband and wife becomes for Adam the minute Eve forces him to choose. Quarrels and debates are one side of such discrepancies in community in Paradise.
Lost, and Pandaemonium is the extreme they come to when the satanic gathering replaces the holy one. "Lycidas" has some elements of that larger myth (without the fallen angels), and we recognize its final vision from other poems as well, in "Ad Patrem," the hymnal sections of the Nativity Ode, "At a Solemn Music," "On Time," the end of "II Penseroso," and parts of Paradise Regained.

The distinguishing of the saints from Virgilian pastors is only one sign of Milton's imposing of a personal, visionary signature on pastoral conventions. We are aware from the start that the poem is struggling with a task set by the sort of gathering that elegy summons, by the rendering of funeral tribute by fellow shepherds and specifically a speaker aware of his obligations. One of the things that earlier passages indicate is that the poem's making is crucial to Milton personally. Even what collects early in images and echoes of pastoral—in its considerable sedimentation—Milton overpowers by rough handling. The opening of the poem imposes a complex, developing voice at a point at which a first reading has as yet no help from reversals and no anticipatory sense of the final vision. It thus makes a fair test of the imprint of the speaker's authority and what separates Milton from predecessors and prepares for his redefinition of calling. The occasion of the poem (the assembling of an anthology of verse) encroaches upon his self-moved initiative and gives him an opening set of questions about his readiness.

We recognize the special Miltonic nature of that concern, posed in its usual gravity—recognize it, I think, much as we do Beethoven's imprint on symphonic form. It is not really much like anything Virgilian or anything in Spenser or Sidney:

Yet once more, O ye Laurels, and once more 
Ye Myrtles brown, with Ivy never sere, 
I come to pluck your Berries harsh and crude, 
And with forc'd fingers rude, 
Shatter your leaves before the mellowing year. 
Bitter constraint, and sad occasion dear, 
Compels me to disturb your season due: 
For Lycidas is dead, dead ere his prime, 
Young Lycidas, and hath not left his peer: 
Who would not sing for Lycidas? he knew 
Himself to sing, and build the lofty rhyme. 
He must not float upon his wat'ry bier 
Unwept, and welter to the parching wind, 
Without the meed of some melodious tear. 
Begin then, Sisters of the sacred well, 
That from beneath the seat of Jove doth spring, 
Begin, and somewhat loudly sweep the string.
The differentiating features of style here are a matter of movement as well as image or theme, as someone’s gait is as much a personal mark as facial features. One can understand why Isabel MacCaffrey would think that “we hear the unmediated exclamation of a speaker who is not yet identified as an uncouth swain,” 4 that is, hear Milton himself and not merely a dramatic persona as his stand-in. I would prefer “mediated” and find an acknowledgment of echoes necessary from the outset as part of the assertion of difference; but the speaker’s concern for his unripeness might seem gratuitous if we come to it only from the tradition and not also from Milton’s recent past, or since we have that privilege, from his entire canon, including the prose treatises. One of the Miltonic signatures is an obsession not just with starting a vocational phase but with beginnings in general and the poet’s capacity to find links between them and the providential scheme of things. Milton seldom enters into an enterprise lightly or lets others do so. For the poet setting forth, at a crisis in his career with each major project, questions about how to begin prove impossible to answer beforehand—what forces are to gather, what connection can be made between his talent and the divine will, what the relation of the new undertaking is to past ones and to guiding traditions. The questions are embedded in the working out of the task in hand, as again in the Nativity Ode and “How Soon Hath Time.” In Paradise Lost the retreats to fundamental origins in the first sin of angels and men and in the creation; in the Nativity Ode the birth of Christ; in “L’Allegro” and “Il Penseroso” the genealogies of joy and melancholy—these all develop connections between primal origins and new moments. The invocations of Paradise Lost lend additional retrospective credence to the personal imprint here, where even at the end of the poem both Lycidas and the uncouth swain are still embarking on new careers.

It is nonetheless difficult to determine just how, technically, Milton makes the opening of “Lycidas” personal. Despite its elaborate periphrasis and its assembled traditions, its rhetorical figures are fewer than those with which Colin Clout delights E. K. Already in “O ye Laurels,” which halts the progression of the first line, we have a prediction of “But O the heavy change, now thou art gone,” “Ay me, I fondly dream!” “Alas! What boots it,” and “For so to interpose a little ease Ay me!” The speaker intermittently acknowledges his and tradition’s incapacity to proceed with equanimity. He comes upon some assurance of a future in the shep-
herd's trade early in the poem—a future independent of any equivalents to a courtly career or a temporal sociality—but that future still depends primarily upon discovery of a realm that will support not just the fame of poets but the substance of their social and topographical hope. Such a vision will eventually be filled out imaginistically; it will even out the rhythms of the poem and offer a forward movement of some gravity.

For all its haste and violence, the initial complaint manages a foretaste of that gravity and an implicit assurance that is entirely characteristic of Miltonic calm. We find it also in Of Reformation, Areopagitica, and other tracts; in the flurry of uncertainty and impatience in “When I Consider” that comes to closure in “They also serve”; and in the maturing youth of “How Soon Hath Time,” reconciled to the pace of his great task-master, however undefined the means and the specific accomplishments. Not mastery alone, however, but disturbed mastery characterizes the voice. Troubled paragraph development brings the persona's mask very near the self behind it in the complex syntax, the latinity, and even the verbal eccentricity that to T S. Eliot marked an unfortunate divergence from Virgil. The special quality of the evergreen endurance of “Ivy never sere,” the half-hesitant manner of “compells me,” the way of posing questions about due regard and rewards, the unusual diction of “build,” “welter,” and “melodious tear” are all recognizable Miltonic flourishes.

This generating of a language is inseparable from the growth of a self; Milton stages both in the poem as a subset of the “beginnings” theme. In Paradise Lost where growth centers in Adam and Eve, Adam's recognition of his special existence—his difference—leads quickly to what God teasingly calls a very precise and subtle concept of happiness. Milton grants a great deal of freedom to other creatures as well—freedom to dwell differently in their settings from anything else, if not always to develop. Members of the species come forth determined to wreath a lithe proboscis or burst with kindly rupture. At the other end of his career, the individual kiss that greets arrivals into “Long Eternity” in “On Time” seals approval of a personal achievement, just as the husband in “Me-thought I Saw My Late Espoused Saint” expects to see his wife with “Full sight without restraint,” resuming personal relations at the point at which individual being passes into a fixed state. As Eve demonstrates, a rebellious individualism can lead to egoistic extremes in this quest for a higher, final place, but within the limits of kinds and rules Milton finds room for self-expansion. Where
Sidney plays at that individual development, then, and Spenser in Colin’s shepherd costume is almost apologetic about claiming it, Milton makes it necessary for the poet’s coming forth to his tasks.

It is partly as a son of Adam, then, and as future advocate of self-invoked callings that the uncouth swain begins “Yet once more”: before Virgil, before Theocritus, in Milton’s scheme of things, humankind began addressing its myrtles and its ivy in the tradition of the first parents. It is Eve who voices what we might regard as the first pastoral elegy:

O flow’rs,
That never will in other Climate grow,
My early visitation, and my last
At Ev’n, which I bred up with tender hand
From the first op’ning bud, and gave ye Names,
Who now shall rear ye to the Sun, or rank
Your Tribes, and water from th’ ambrosial Fount?

PL, 11: 273–79

How many times in how many places humankind has had its relationship with home places disturbed (always surprisingly, always before due season) Milton knows to be countless even in “Lycidas.” He is not dependent upon Virgil to tell him so, merely to suggest an important variant of the lyric voice that can be used as a comparatively recent and very high standard.

It is not necessary to extend this commentary on “Lycidas” further merely to observe Miltonic authority emerging from predecessors whom it corrects or to locate in outline the historical difference between Milton’s view of the poetic vocation in shepherd mask, in the landscape he proposes for it, and others before him. What I earlier called the poet’s cultic tendency might better be conceived of as simply a commitment to reformed institutions and a self guided by them, and a review of literary traditions accordingly. “Cultic” is not apt of course if it is taken to suggest small groups that meet secretly, since Milton’s future associates declared themselves openly and set about altering church, state, and family with some programmatic determination. A “calling” for them, as for Milton, was a point of departure instigated by providence or assumed under its corrective guidance. The historical point is that the society with which Milton identified, whose language he used to test received literary traditions from sonnets to epics, was sufficiently of the same mind, and active enough, to form almost a period of its own. As a subculture it fed ideas and institutions into an already multicolored society in a stream that reached some distance before it blended in. Like all strong movements, it was
revolutionary at first, no less in literary than in doctrinal matters and politics, as "Lycidas" indicates, and hence no less in landscapes than in other matters. Milton was its most extraordinary literary proponent, but the earlier century produced a number of lesser revisions of the traditions Milton subverts.

These too I want to read partly as reactions to the courtly modes of predecessors, but whatever they respond to, they tend to be staged as the reactions of personas seeking either private or marginal places to be and therefore needing to redefine their relations to an audience that cannot be taken for granted. That rethinking of rhetorical address brings in its wake a metapoetic concern for the nature of lyric. The claim for personal authority, to return to it, gets inserted somewhat problematically into it. It continues to draw upon the authority of tradition, as "Lycidas" does in echoing Virgil and Theocritus, but it tends to do so with something of the same egocentrism that "Lycidas" displays. In the background are larger questions of class allegiance and for Milton, revolution and its active ways of bringing about the gathering of saints not merely in poetic myth but for a time in actual social reform. It is difficult to judge such intrusions of politics into fictions, but they constitute part of the extrinsic substance of others besides Milton—of Marvell, for instance.

HOBBES'S GENERIC REGIONS AND THEIR INHABITANTS

The sorting out of either individual or period differences is not assisted much by renaissance criticism, which in England concentrates on generic differences rather than on influences and cultural allegiances. But that task is unquestionably important to any understanding of lyric localities. As James Turner and Raymond Williams have indicated, landscapes are not necessarily socially or politically neutral even when they seem remote. The most painterly of poems may be concerned not merely with sylvan, river, or mountain scenes but with ways of life and may assume an audience of a certain kind as well. Thus in Turner's view, when a poet like Aldred Revett presents a lad in russet coat melting his soul "through the vocal oate" and finds nature all gentility and ease, he indirectly supports the status quo and accepts a recorder function for the pastoralist. Certainly he urges no one to take up Miltonic questions about authority, possession, or social order. Shadows, colors, heights and depths, placement and relation of objects, textures, and the disposition of nature are relatively untroubled in such ideologies of dissociation, whose "Inliv'ning by transcription" puts a screen of art between us and actual rural life.
A notable exception to the silence of apologists on poetry's more specific social allegiances is Hobbes, spokesman for a conservatism equal to that of the landscape poets. Together with Denham’s "Coopers Hill," his "Answer to Davenant's Preface to Gondibert" is the most serious midcentury challenge to the sort of literary and civil disruption Milton represents. Basically, he assigns places and genres to social-geographic spheres according to the reigning renaissance ideas of decorum. Poets from time in memoriam have "lodg'd themselves in the three Regions of mankind" for heroes, urban dwellers, and rural dwellers. What falls to each district respectively is the heroic, the socumatique, and the pastoral, toned down and particularized variants of the philosopher's celestial, aerial, and terrestrial regions. Crossing these with narrative and dramatic deliveries produces six specific genres in all, epic, tragedy, satire, comedy, narrative bucolic, and pastoral comedy (p. 55). In Hobbes's rudimentary taxonomy, these unfortunately are the sum total. The princely mode has the closest alliances with god-given governing powers and thereby warrants an epic style.

Hobbes's brief list is obviously challengeable from a number of directions, although its correspondences between provinces and poetic modes are not necessarily unsound in principle. Herbert's temple, for instance, gathers figures and themes from an Anglican institution that Hobbes could have included had he wanted to expand his scheme. Presumably he might also have taken notice of fairyland and other regions in the general area of romance. He could not have foreseen of course the topographical spread and complexity of a poem like Paradise Lost, which would have challenged the symmetry of any overly neat classification. Of all his omissions, however, the most puzzling is that of lyric, and we can only speculate as to why he found no place for it. He may have decided that whereas satire, comedy, and tragedy depict a society directly and are either generated within it or staged before it, lyrics are usually monologic addresses to an object or dialogues of some intimacy. But privacy should not have made them seem independent of social implications, even in descriptive settings and paintery topographies such as those of "Coopers Hill," "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso." Festive lyrics, for instance, share with comedy a celebration of communal well-being and rituals, as in Herrick's Mayday and country house poems. A trace of that communal element clings to public commemorations and epithalamia as well and may be inferred from elegiac losses. The community of saints in "Lycidas" eventually contributes to Lycidas's reception and replaces other forms of lyric, coming in fact very close to Hobbes's
celestial heroic mode, beyond the bucolic landscapes of lads in russet coats. Lyric's public nature even in apparently private sanctuaries is further indicated by the fact that crossing to prized or lost objects can be checked by disapproval real or anticipated, as in “The Sunne Rising” and “The Canonization,” where Donne wards off censure, or as in “The Garden,” with its awareness of social constraints to be set aside. In a good deal of seventeenth-century landscape poetry, society is made out to be counter-lyrical. Rather than assuming something like a tourist-reader and enthusiast for orderly variety and painterly excursions, the poet requires the reader to become an initiate and to separate himself from others to join the poet in solitude and share his reading of nature’s book.

Hobbes's exclusion of lyric from his generic scheme suggests that he may have turned the relations of text to social spheres the wrong way around. Assuming that “the subject of a Poem is the manners of men, not natural causes” (p. 56), he makes physical settings incidental to, rather than extensions of, the sociality of poems. Those who would call in sonnets, epigrams, “and the like peeces” do not summon true genres in Hobbes's view, merely parts of an “entire poem,” which sounds like notes toward a supreme fiction in the celestial-heroic mode. Any individual egocentrism or subjective interest thereby becomes difficult to acknowledge. Nor does he question that princes, as men of conspicuous luster and influence among men, display the best of manners. The rest are either inconstant and troublesome, or plain and dull, one in accord with impure city air and the other with earth. Hobbes is clearly not joking in that reduction (which would perforce classify Milton in the mobile blustery sort), and he shows no inclination to retreat from the “three sorts of Poesy” themselves. But one must remember his provocations in the civil war setting and the reinforcement his scheme receives from his theory of faculties, in which experience, memory, judgment, and philosophical precepts are expected to keep tight reign over fancy, the faculty of imagistic innovation. Sound wits are tethered to ancient thought and sound government; innovation that smacks of enthusiasm threatens a tradition whose most conspicuous continuity lies in royalty and what attends it. As the preface to Homer’s *Odyssey* also remarks, the virtues of heroic poems can be comprehended in one word, “discretion,” which hangs upon profitable design buttressed by prudence, justice, fortitude, and “the example of such Great and Noble Persons.” Though praiseworthy as that in which the sublimity of poets consists, fancy is restricted mainly to harvesting ornaments
from unusual places, which are not to become permanent harbors of self.

Lyric's emphasis on the speaker and points of view in distinct places have given trouble to other theories of literature-society relations besides Hobbes's, but Hobbes's time was not one in which those relations could be easily set aside—the "I" not only of lyric but of sectarian tracts and heroic modes gets such prominent staging. What seems distinct in such landscape excursions as Milton's, Marvell's, and Vaughan's is a commitment to a persona's usually troubled movement toward possession and celebration in some attempt at transcendental crossing. In the triangulations of speaker-object, speaker-audience, and poet-tradition, the second is left more or less implicit and the last becomes highly revisionary. What the final speaker of "Lycidas" must decide before his career can go on is how far the pastoral voices of the past, the destructive power of nature, and the corruption of the church will be allowed to extend their influence over him. Not until he hits upon the mythic power of him who walked the waves, a new Orpheus, can he redefine nature, the shepherd-pastor-poet, and his own future.

Tudor panegyric, in contrast, depends not on that seizing of individual privilege but on public values and moral persuasion within a collective sense of decorum. Settings may be far removed in places like Sidney's Arcadia or Spenser's fairyland, but even these borderlands maintain strong associations with the court, not less so in the visionary experience of Redcross seeing New Jerusalem and of Calidore on Mt. Acidale than in their active pursuits of virtues to assemble into the perfect knight. The story of that courtly centrism is already familiar from Russell Fraser's War Against Poetry, Richard Helgerson's The Elizabethan Prodigals, Daniel Javitch's Poetry and Courtliness, and several biographies of major figures. It need not be recalled here except for the contribution that emphasis on service makes to the guilt of the prodigal writer in Gascoigne, Lyly, Greene, Lodge, and Sidney. As Helgerson demonstrates, those who turned to writing in the later sixteenth century—often after failing to secure positions at court—found it difficult to reconcile the careers they were expected to assume with what their peers considered to be literature's uselessness. Lyric and romance were especially vulnerable, given their preoccupation with amorous matters and self-concern. Stephen Gosson's School of Abuse in that light was less an anomaly in its attack on poetry than Sidney's Defense of Poesie in looking for poetry's socially redeeming value.
This is not to say that courtly poets always speak in some way for unified culture. They appear to be attracted to solitude and tempted by the same remote settings as Colin Clout and Musidorus. Arcadia is traditionally a retreat from empire or is presented in such a way as to contrast with it, and it or an equivalent is so handled by Spenser, Sidney, and Shakespeare. No one probes the tensions between courtly service and poetic vocation with greater subtlety and sensitivity than Spenser, especially in the masks and disguises that pastoral provides. It is often from the periphery of the court that he examines the poet’s access to it and duties toward it, beginning with *Shepheardes Calender* and proceeding to the Colin Clout episode of *The Faerie Queene*, Book 6. In “Colin Clouts Come Home Againe,” the shepherd-poet returns from his expedition to London reconciled to the fact that both the glory of Elizabeth’s court and its corruption are better left where they are by those who have learned to survive in the spare, rocky land under Mole. However, the poem’s concern remains the *relations* between that center and the poet’s outpost. As Spenser and Sidney realize, by leaning toward educative modes and panegyric and pursuing the literary vocation as service, the poet can try to have it both ways. He can do so provided only that he either returns from remote places, as Sidney’s princes and Spenser’s Calidore are obliged to do, or comments on the capital from his borderland perspective.

From the viewpoint of either their Tudor predecessors or Hobbes’s conservative classifications, the metaphysicals and Milton are displaced: they make their excursions into landscapes, temples, and private chambers with no intent to reenter public service as Sidney or Spenser understood it. Although royalist apologetic finds renewal in the cavaliers and Drayton and more seriously in Dryden, survivals of what Hobbes would call the celestial-heroic mode tend to look belated after Donne. Overall, the range of new seventeenth-century settings is as impressive as the speakers who explore them. Precisely as relocations, they question what place signifies and how one is to respond to it. Modes do not stay as they were except in lesser poets. As we have seen, for instance, pastoral in Milton becomes unsettling and unbucolic in a different way, as an instrument of career-making in “Lycidas” and as a segment of epic in *Paradise Lost*, in which both pastoral and epic elements are reassigned to Adam and Eve as the domestic rulers of Eden before empire-making becomes a satanic habit. Despite his repeated search for a position at court after his marriage, Donne insists in the *Songs and Sonnets* that he has no regrets in abandoning one career for another. Herbert is certain that the temple is the real
center of the world, not a substitute for something else. Although Marvell is more restive, "The Garden" expresses confidence in nature's capacity to provide all one needs. Indeed, one can be a poet only there: it is in and to trees that the soul sings, gaining proleptic glimpses of paradise in the most appropriate place.

These examples will need to be looked into further in due course. Before that, however, I want to consider Jonson's in-between sociality and reconstruction of classical standards in genres that by Hobbes's classifications would be mixed. Jonson reinvents Horace's country house as an appealing supplement to courtly kinds and finds in cultivated rural settings new advantages for the poet. The Sidney estate of "To Penshurst," for instance, combines providential abundance with concern for manners and social place. It is both heroic and rural. It does not carry the poet so far abroad as Eden or the Bermudas but keeps to a relatively small provincial dominion—small by comparison to the realmic scope of Sidney, Spenser, Shakespeare, or Drayton's Poly-Olbion. At the same time, it gives the poet an extensive classical tradition of praise. The country household in general provides a sanctuary from public life for the Sidneys, Pembertons, Saxhams, and Wroths, until Lord Fairfax retreats more decisively from national responsibilities to the Appleton estate. It allows lyric, discursive, and descriptive modes to coexist in a comparatively low-keyed middle style that does not encourage outright rapture or apostrophe or attempts at celestial-heroic panegyric. It does not need a commanding genius loci to orchestrate the blessings of place, and so the poet figure is more secretary or guest than authoritative seer, at least until "Upon Appleton House."

Jonson's other alternatives to a courtly orientation are even more far-reaching, and together with Donne's, set up models for later placements and an attitude of independence relatively free of the rhetoric of patronage. They also assemble their own educated audiences who are not taken as given but constituted for the occasion. The poet's authority is thus exercised less over objects that he interprets or appropriates on his own than over situations in which he turns nature's resources into social resources. His goal is the reestablishing of a classics-oriented set of standards and a moral subsociety that he can count on to read him in the right context, more or less as directed from within the poem itself. A hint of Milton's reformative zeal is suggested by that rudimentary programming of a special group and by Jonson's putting before it both exemplary models and satiric examples.
First give me faith, who know
Myself a little. I will take you so,
As you have writ yourself. Now stand, and then,
Sir, you are sealed of the tribe of Ben.
“An Epistle Answering to One that Asked to be Sealed of the Tribe of Ben”

How summed a circle diest thou leave mankind
Of deepest lore, could we the centre find!
“To the Immortal Memory and Friendship of That Noble Pair, Sir Lucius Cary and Sir H. Morison”