John Donne Journal
Vol. 10, Nos. 1 & 2 (1991)

Carew's "crowne of Bayes": Epideixis and the Performative Rendering of Donne's Poetic Voice

Richard Todd

The current interest in cultural poetics is offering timely reminders to Renaissance scholars of how complexly given civilizations can perceive and relate to their sense of the past. The enquiry that follows, into an aspect of the epideictic dynamics of one of the best-known funereal florilegia produced in seventeenth-century England, relies on the need to take account of such complexity. To acknowledge that certain strategies of textualization may be alien to us as moderns is to begin to come to terms with that complexity. My purpose is to use the collection of elegies appended to the first printed edition of John Donne's *Poems* (1633) to examine the complexity of some of the developments the funeral elegy was undergoing during the early Stuart period in England, at a time when the classical practice it was imaginatively conscripting was being subjected to quite revolutionary changes in epistemological perception. The material presented in general terms will serve to contextualize Thomas Carew's act in allowing his own elegy to perform its way self-consciously through conceits familiar to the reader of Donne's religious poetry, ultimately troubling itself to a point where it settles on one conceit in particular, becoming consumed by the fire it contrives to kindle. Carew's performance thus culminates in nothing less than a rendering or burning down of elegy to epitaph, in a process that is itself a tribute to the energizing dynamism Carew seems have sensed in and been attracted to in Donne's religio-poetic discourse.

One does not have to proceed far into the collection to which Carew's is by general consent the most distinguished contribution to see that use of the term "funeral elegy" is too sweeping to account for the particularity of its contents. For the funeral elegy in its entirety frequently consists of, or at least makes use of the existence of, two elements. The present discussion must begin by confronting the complex and shifting generic and performative relationship between "elegy" and "epitaph." It must then examine the performative aspects of seventeenth-century funerary practice that these and associated generic terms evoke. In the period prior to 1640, with the exception of rhetorical theorists such as George Puttenham, who makes the point that he is one of the few to respect it, the distinction between elegy and epitaph seems to have been fluid, to say the least; and despite careful

cataloguing by J. C. Scaliger, a number of terms (including "epicede" and "exequy") were used more or less interchangeably with each other and with elegy and epitaph.[1] Scaliger's distinction is twofold: the epicede is spoken over the as yet unburied body, and it is spoken only once: the epitaph is uttered at the tomb or may even be inscribed on it, and it may be uttered yearly, when it becomes an anniversary. Carew's elegy performatively enacts this distinction. Scaliger's examples include citations from Thucydides and Plato, to which I shall return.[2]

Thomas Greene has shown how the humanist enterprise of the European Renaissance depended on a conception of recovery of a classical past that was predominantly perceived in terms of "the archaeological, necromantic metaphor of *disinterment*, a digging up that was also a resuscitation or a reincarnation or a rebirth."[3] This is a useful metaphor to have in mind in any contextual examination of the funerary collection for Donne that attempts, as this one does, to account for Carew's place in it. By the early 1630s in England, the emphasis in epideictic funerary verse had come to rest on two controlling conceptions emerging from the Scaligerian distinction as set out above. But these conceptions now co-existed in a disturbingly symbiotic relationship. On the one hand, the funeral centers round the committal of the body to the earth, the physical act of interment. The funeral elegy (broadly taken) acknowledges this fact, and the various subgenres of the elegy that Scaliger distinguishes focus on particular parts of the funeral ceremony. On the other hand, the funeral also implies a commemorative element whereby the transience and corruptibility of the physical body is in some way contested and overcome by the inscription of an epitaph.

The present inquiry is underpinned by a fresh perception of the past that was beginning to emerge in sixteenth-century England, one of which Donne was to become very much a part. This perception was offered most persuasively by the antiquarians of the period, although it was by no means unanimously accepted.[4] Briefly, it led to an assertion of the primacy of the British Isles as a former Roman province, while an influential medieval mythology of England's founding by a Trojan Brutus was destroyed. British history could now be perceived with unprecedented continuity as a narrative running through Saxon and medieval times: by the late sixteenth century the British Isles could be seen by its antiquarians as "a member of the fellowship of nations who drew their strength from roots struck deep in the Roman Empire."[5]

In a careful study, Peter Burke has pointed out how in Western Europe as a whole the perception of the past, or "the sense of history," can be seen to have come during the Renaissance to encompass three major innovating forces. These he summarizes as the sense of anachronism, the awareness of evidence, and the interest in causation (Burke, pp. 1-20). If this is so, it is the second of these forces, the awareness of evidence, that is of particular importance to my sense of Donne's particular fascination for Carew. In the new sense of British history that began to replace medieval myth in antiquarian thought, Carew seems to have admired in

Donne a capacity to distinguish primary sources as such, to hold a skeptical attitude towards evidence, and to be attentive to the historical and philological method as parts of the same process (Burke, pp. 55ff.). In surveying Renaissance views of classical funerary practice as typified in Carew's poetic response to Donne's death and funeral, we will need not only to discuss the literariness of the kinds of source upon which poets could now draw, but to revise and expand our customary notions of what is "literary" to include the work of those antiquarians whose efforts, evident in Western Europe as a whole since Petrarch, were becoming a significant though by no means unanimous force in writing in English from the end of the sixteenth century onwards.[6]

Literary sources for the kind of action being performed in the commemorative poems for Donne extend back at least a generation prior to 1633, as instanced in the interest of a Du Bellay or a Spenser in antiquarian themes. Their single classical antecedent, that is a poem from classical antiquity specifically addressed to the corpse and performatively spoken at the tomb, thus an epicede, appears to be Catullus 101 ("Multas per gentes"). Ideas concerning the funerary practices of classical antiquity were being submitted to scholarly and antiquarian attention both before and during Donne's life, as well as after his death in 1631. My context for the entire funerary collection for Donne, first published as such in 1633,[7] will thus be in terms of its status as *a renaissance reworking of an ancient funeral rite*. The formulation is deliberate, since I shall not be concerned with the genre "funeral sermon." This, although a fairly direct descendant of the funeral oration, forms only one part of a funeral rite, and a distinct one at that. I shall instead consider Carew's poem on Donne in the context of a fictive enactment of (at least part of) the drama of an ancient rite.

Of the component poems of the funerary collection for Donne, Carew's "Elegie" is not only the best known; it was quite possibly the first in the funerary collection for Donne to have been composed (even though the elegies of Henry King and Edward Hyde had already appeared in print in 1632, both preceding Carew's in the 1633 collection). The first 94 lines of Carew's poem—the portion Carew himself (lines 74 and 89) terms an "Elegie"—form what Scaliger with the more neo-classical precision urged by George Puttenham (if not its terminology) would have regarded as an "epicede," at least, so a first reading might unexceptionably suggest.[8] In other words, lines 1-94 appear conceitedly to enact the delivery of epideictic verse over the as yet unburied body. Evidence for this view can be found in references to "one Elegie / To crowne thy Hearse" (lines 2-3), to "The reverend silence that attends thy herse, / Whose awfull solemne murmures were to thee / More then these faint lines, A loud Elegie" (lines 72-74), and to "thy funerall pile" (83).[9]

Yet these performative elements are complicated by what might be called the "temporality" of the poem's epideictic posture. That is to say, while the poem certainly can be read as an enactment of the delivery of epideictic verse over an

unburied body, that posture is not adequate to account for references to the funeral of Donne that seem to allude to an event that has already occurred. The puzzling "were" at 73 is further complicated if we follow the Rosenbach MS in reading "mourners," a reading that suggests an inadequacy *already felt to have existed* at the funeral ceremony itself: Carew's epideictic posture now modulates into an apology not simply for interrupting the silence that surrounds the graveside, but for attempting (as it were) to upstage the solemnity of events that have already occurred. Walton describes Donne's funeral thus:

> unnumbred number of others, many persons of Nobility, and of eminency for Learning, who did love and honour him in his life, did shew it at his death, by a voluntary and sad attendance of his body to the grave, where nothing was so remarkable as a publick sorrow. . . .[10]

Walton's description in the *Life of Dr John Donne* comes strikingly close to the reading suggested by the variant "mourners." Also in favor of reference to events that have occurred already in the past are these lines from the opening of Carew's poem:

> Why *yet* dare we not trust
> Though with unkneaded dowe-bak't prose thy dust,
> Such as the uncisor'd Churchmen from the flower
> Of fading Rhetorique, short liv'd as his houre
> Dry as the sand that measures it, should lay
> Upon thy Ashes, *on the funerall day*. (3-8, italics mine)

Here, again, it is as though a period has elapsed, a period of silence that Carew's epideictic voice is about to break, in the full knowledge that the moment is not yet ripe: nor will it ever be, since the poetic and rhetorical exemplar has passed from us. Why, in other words, do we who remain still seem incapable of producing a fit expression of grief, even after so much time has apparently passed? It will be Carew's epideictic purpose to explain this problem. As he does so, he will share the question with those elegists in the 1633 collection (such as Henry King), who are as well known to posterity as he is: Carew, however, will depart from their more traditional *consolationes*,[11] not so much by rejecting them as by showing them to be subordinate to his main purpose. That purpose is to praise, and to do so both hyperbolically and paradoxically, by performing an imitation of what happens when any poet remaining on earth after the subject's departure attempts to imitate Donne's inimitable poetic gifts. The striking metrical liberties—the accentual cataloguings—used in such *Holy Sonnets* as "At the round earth's imagined corners" and "Batter my heart" come to mind in this description of the poet:

whose influence
Growne feeble, in these panting numbers lies
Gasping short-winded Accents, and so dies:
So doth the swiftly turning wheel not stand
In th'instant we withdraw the moving hand,
But some small time maintaine a faint weake course
By vertue of the first impulsive force. . . . (76-82)

Carew thus tries to get his readers to perceive the performance of his epicede, not as a fictive enactment of a funeral that has passed into mythography, so much as a re-enactment—a second version—of a real historical event that has already taken place some time before.

This event is Donne's actual funeral, and it might well be argued that all funerals are events characterized by a ritual that is nothing if not conventional. But we have already seen that Walton thought it fit to describe the mood of solemn tribute by peers, both pedigreed and academic. Other particularities may be mentioned here too: they are not historical facts so much as part of the public mythopoeic perception of the event of Donne's funeral after it had taken place. It is striking, for instance, how much of the verse in the 1633 collection *Elegies upon the Author* dwells on poetic silence, whether it be the specific absence of an epitaph, or the more general indecorousness of making verse, whether elegy or epitaph, at the funeral itself. Of course it will be argued that Donne had already written his own epitaph (reprinted in Milgate, *ed. cit.*, p. 80.), and that "his almost histrionic composure on his deathbed" inspired the engraving in his shroud from which the famous statue in St. Paul's Cathedral was made.[12] To be sure, the 1633 collection does include an epitaph from Endymion Porter, whose opening lines suggest it was inscribed on the funeral—even statuary—urn (Milgate, *ed. cit.*, p. 100), and Walton himself provided an eight-line epitaph in the 1635 reissue of *Elegies Upon the Author*. Lesser elegists than Carew employ a similar idea to his of an elegy being if not superseded then at least fitly concluded by an epitaph.[13] But elsewhere in the 1633 collection we find [Richard] C[orbet,] B[ishop] of O[xford]'s disclaimers: "Hee that would write an Epitaph for thee, / And do it well, must first beginne to be/ Such as thou wert" (1-3) and: "Who then shall write an Epitaph for thee, / He must be dead first, let'it alone for mee" (17-18), or [Jasper] Mayne's: ". . . now wee dare not write, but must conceale / Thy Epitaph" (17-18) (Milgate, *ed. cit.*, pp. 84 and 94 resp.).[14] More striking still is the expressive form this general sentiment takes in a far more accomplished poem such as H[enry] K[ing]'s "To the Memorie of my Ever Desired Friend Dr Donne" that heads the collection, and defines its terms of reference:

To have liv'd eminent, in a degree
Beyond our lofty'st flights, that is, like Thee,

> Or t'have had too much merit, is not safe;
> For, such excesses finde no Epitaph.
> At common graves we have Poetique eyes
> Can melt themselves in easier Elegies;
> Each quill can drop his tributary verse,
> And pin it, with the Hatchments, to the Hearse:
> But at Thine, Poeme, or Inscription
> (Rich soule of wit and language) we have none.
> Indeed a silence does that tombe befit,
> Where is no Herald left to blazon it.[15] (1-12)

I shall argue that Carew uniquely employs his epideictic formula to conclude that neither this nor indeed any other epicede is fit for its subject. But he must still conclude his poem. He does so by destroying the epicede: he sets fire to it, and replaces it with a four-line epitaph.[16] Readers of his poem may have no great difficulty in identifying this strategy in itself: yet attention to Carew's epideictic posture in terms of its simultaneous status as recuperating classical funerary custom and performatively rendering his own work down (that is, burning it) such as to recall intertextually Donne's own poetic voice, will (I believe) account for the peculiarly appropriate dynamism of Carew's poetic tribute. Commentators have sporadically noted the many echoes of Donne's *oeuvre* in Carew's poem; what need pointing out here however are less the celebrated "holy rapes" than Donne's implorings to God to refine down or burn his own spiritual *persona* in order to create it anew in repeated acts of dynamic submission.[17] Only a handful of examples, all taken from the *Divine Poems*, will be listed here: "it [my little world] must be burnt. . . burn me O Lord, with a fiery zeal / Of thee and thy house, which doth in eating heal"; "bend / Your force to break, blow, burn, and make me new"; "let. . .Fire, sacrifice, priest, altar be the same"; "think me worth thine anger, punish me, / Burn off my rusts, and my deformity, / Restore thine image. . . ."[18]

It was not until 1658, a quarter-century after the events being retrieved in this paper, that Sir Thomas Browne's *Hydriotaphia, [or] Urne-Buriall* was published. Yet Browne's work serves to remind us that antiquarianism in effect offered a form of historicism; even though he mistakenly believed the archaeological discoveries of which he was writing to have been Roman, rather than Saxon as they actually were, he assumes considerable knowledge of late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century European scholarship on antique funeral customs: indeed, Browne actually borrows from work published in Latin and Italian, and possibly also shows knowledge of such work in French.[19]

The corpus of work I shall briefly survey in order to cast fresh light on Carew's "Elegie" properly begins, not with the traditional Homeric lamentations, but during the fifth century B.C. with Thucydides' historiographical account of the Athenian funeral oration delivered by Pericles for a large group of victims of war

abroad.[20] This oration, it will be recalled, was cited by Scaliger in the *Poetices Libri Septem* (1561), together with mention of Plato, as constituting classical authority for his discussion of the epicede and the epitaph. But it is the classical authority as inscribed in Roman funerary practice that exercised still directer influence on Carew's epideixis. Under Roman funerary practice may be incorporated both general Stuart understandings of the Roman way of death as well as Renaissance responses to the death and grave of Vergil.[21]

The status of two specific features of Carew's poem is enhanced still further when they are reviewed in the classical and neo-classical context that will now be sketched briefly. These features are, firstly, Carew's lament for the state of poetry, from which Donne rescued it and to which it now threatens, after his decease, to return; and secondly, the unique concluding gesture whereby the oratorical elegy is figuratively destroyed by cremation in place of the more conventional interment, and replaced by a lapidary epitaph. Integral to each of these elements is a mood of dignity. That mood arises from the fittingness of silence, and yet at the same time it co-exists in troubling tension with the inadequacy represented by silence. The dramatically self-conscious breaking of silence will also be seen to have classical warrant. I propose that Carew's poem lends itself to consideration in metapoetical terms, as an elegy about writing elegies, an elegy in which both the tradition and the form are themselves reviewed and examined.

Elaborate funerary rites themselves—with laments as distinct from funeral orations—go back at least as far as Homer: those for Achilles, Hector, and Patroclus are described in the *Iliad*. But the emergence of the *funeral oration* as both a tradition and a form is much later. Nicole Loraux has associated it with the development of civic self-representation and democracy in the Athens of the fifth century B. C.[22] Thucydides, writing after 404, is regarded as the first historian of both tradition and form, although there has been debate from ancient times up to Joel Fineman as to whether Thucydides' examples of funeral orations, notably that delivered by Pericles, are versions of genuine orations, or Thucydides' own reconstitutions, or even inventions based on an existing tradition of what the form had come to be in the period prior to Pericles' oration.[23] Whatever the case, Pericles would have been believed in the Renaissance to have delivered an oration composed by a sophist, whose identity remains unknown. Pericles' oration and the ceremony surrounding it follow what Thucydides (II, xxxiv) terms "ancestral custom" (*patrios nomos*). Such an oration is addressed both to the relatives of those Athenians who had fallen in the first conflict of the Peloponnesian War, and to any other Athenians or foreigners who may wish to be present. The female relatives of the dead attend the occasion to make their laments at the tomb (*gynaikes pareisin hai prosékousai epi ton taphon olophyromenai*): this implies a clear distinction between lament and oration. The tradition to which Thucydides refers is generally agreed to extend back to well prior to 440 B. C.

Among later instances of the Greek funeral oration the most interesting is surely Socrates' virtuoso recall of an address by Aspasia in Plato's *Menexenus*.[24]

This dialogue was once thought to be apocryphal but is now believed genuine, and dates from ca. 386 B. C. There still remains considerable disagreement, however, on the status of the oration contained within the *Menexenus*: Aspasia departs from typical status in at least two respects (she is female, and foreign, coming from Miletus, not Athens; furthermore she had formerly been Pericles' mistress). Scholarship thus remains divided as to whether the *Menexenus* is a serious example of the form, an imitation, or even a parodic satire. Its dissemination through the Roman and Renaissance world is largely a result of its having been cited by Cicero (*Orator*, 151), although in a context that is unclear (Ziolkowski, pp. 22-23, 29-31).

An *Ars Rhetorica* (pseudo-Dionysius of Halicarnassus), dating from between the second and late third century A.D., distinguishes between public and private orations;[25] it is among the first works to claim ancient authority for an oration's being given to someone who has not died in war. The *Ars* was believed to have been genuinely authored by Dionysius in the earlier Renaissance—a neat illustration of the contemporaneous emergence of the "sense of history," as described by Peter Burke. Better known still was the work of the only other classical rhetorician to have made the distinction between public and private orations. The work of Menander (known as "the Rhetor") received more attention in the Renaissance through its authoritative treatment by Scaliger: as G. W. Pigman has pointed out, although pseudo-Dionysius and Menander do distinguish between public and private orations, "they do not agree upon a primary purpose for the funeral oration" (Pigman, p. 41ff.). Pseudo-Dionysius, a commentator on Thucydides, although a misunderstood one, assures his readers that many examples of the private *epitaphios* survive, as do many public *epikedeioi* and *threnoi* (Ziolkowski, pp. 34, 36, 39, etc.). The pseudo-Dionysian *Ars Rhetorica* goes on to argue that the Thucydidean oration blended encomia and epideixis with deliberative, exhortatory rhetoric. Among appropriate *topoi* remaining available for a private oration for someone who has died in peacetime may be included tribute to the relatives of the deceased, providing these are autochthonous, or native to the deceased's culture (there are, however, certain qualified exceptions). This stress on autochthony (an element also present in the public oration) seems to raise an important point whereby the genre of the funeral oration was quickly perceived as begetting its own tradition, and Loraux (p. 10) believes explicit reference to autochthony to have been widely celebrated.

If, as I suggest, stress on autochthony formed part of the Renaissance tradition transformed by Carew in the enactment of funeral rite that comprises his elegy on Donne, we are provided with a new way of accounting for Carew's celebrated lament on the state of poetry before and after Donne, and his use of Donnean language to state his case. In itself, of course, lament on the state of poetry is a famous and separate *topos*: it permeates Sidney's *Defence* and the critiques of Petrarchism to be found in sonnets by Sidney, Shakespeare, and others. My point here is that Carew transformed lament on the current state of poetry by making it a significant element in his funeral elegy. Carew laments the seeming inability of

those poets who have survived Donne to "force" an appropriate elegy, figured as his wreath or, as the poem will later have it, his "crowne of Bayes" (84), "from" the remains, as something fit for the dead poet's "Hearse" (1-3).

Although pseudo-Dionysius "cites more classical authors and is in closer harmony with them" (Ziolkowski, p. 40) than Menander, the latter, authoritatively handled by Scaliger, was more prescriptive in the Renaissance (Pigman, pp. 41-42). Menander is specific about what the funeral oration should contain; he

> ... urges the speaker to mix threnic elements with every part of the speech, in order to augment the eulogy of the dead person by stressing his loss ... [both pseudo-Dionysius and Menander offer] clearly prescriptive handbooks for Greek orators of the Roman Empire and are not primarily concerned with describing the classical speeches (Ziolkowski, pp. 40-41).[26]

It seems clear that by Scaliger's time the funeral oration had come to be seen as a distinct genre, with epicedes and epitaphs serving individual examples of the genre, such that *their fictive combination* can be thought of as offering an enactment of a rite (cf. Loraux, p. 14). In classical times the threnody-less oration was still a *male* preserve; not that weeping and lament were "unmanly," but the funeral oration "rejected the threnos and the appeals for pity so frequent in the aristocratic epitaphs celebrating a warrior" (Loraux, p. 45).[27] Although Carew's "Thou hast. . . drawne a line / Of masculine expression" (lines 37-39) clearly alludes to Donne's "masculine perswasive force," the words are further enhanced by the gender role-play evident from classical practice. Later in the poem Carew picks up the threnodic appeal once more:

> I will not draw the envy to engrosse
> All thy perfections, or weepe all our losse;
> Those are too numerous for an Elegie,
> And this too great, to be express'd by mee. . . . (87-90)

Loraux (p. 46) has observed that at the Athenian funeral "a speech, scrupulously distinguished from the ritual laments, followed the burial. . . at Athens a single orator delivered a speech that was at once like its predecessors and necessarily new."[28] She continues:

> The properly civic way of the funeral oration steered a middle course between demoralizing laments and the prohibition against honoring the living; in the oration the break with the past is consummated, even if certain themes of the epitaphioi are still reminiscent of the tradition of the threnos. (Loraux, p. 47)

Carew's epitaph seems, then, to allude to the possibility of uttering a threnos while simultaneously rejecting it as too big a task for the undertaking in hand. That task is to form one voice in the chorus: even a chorus would be exhausted by the greatness of the theme.[29] It is thus worth drawing attention to Carew's extraordinarily complex pun on "engrosse," which seems to carry (at least) the senses "write out in large letters," "inventorize" (*OED* 1a, 1c), "assemble," "monopolize," (*OED* 4a, 4b), "absorb" (*OED* 5), "conceptualize" (cf. *OED* 7b), and "hyperbolize" (*OED* 10, figuratively): several of these senses are now obsolete. Carew thus acts as at once a uniquely representative voice, and as one out of many.

It is in view of the kind of tradition I am excavating here that the silence after death takes on classical warrant. As early as the fifth century B. C. it was being specified that the dead must be carried in silence, and covered, to the tomb, and in the *Laws* (960A) Plato, writing at the end of his life (ca. 350 B. C.), lays down more specifically that loud threnodic wailing is to be prohibited while the body is being borne through the streets.[30] It is in this context that we might once more cite Carew's lines, assuming the reading "murmures" (line 73):

> Oh, pardon mee, that breake with untun'd verse
> The reverend silence that attends thy herse,
> Whose awfull solemne murmures were to thee
> More than these faint lines, A loud Elegie,
> That did proclaime in a dumbe eloquence
> The death of all the Arts. . . .(71-76)

For we need not exclusively take Carew's apology as disingenuous, or Henry King's lines as an ironic rejoinder to this stance. Nor, by the same token, is there any need to read Carew's apology anachronistically, as purported insincerity.[31]

It is unclear whether the custom of throwing elegies into a poet's grave was revived much before Spenser, but the practice was certainly performed at Spenser's own funeral at the very end of the sixteenth century.[32] What does seem clear is that the practice itself represents a conflation of two separate traditions. The first of these is the custom of interring offerings along with the corpse: Donna C. Kurtz and John Boardman (pp. 203-206) have speculated that there are a number of motivating factors for this practice. The second tradition seems to be related to the practice of poetic laureation. By extension, according to J. B. Trapp, "ivy and bay. . . [,] regarded in the Renaissance as the foliages most suitable for the actual coronation of poets,"[33] became figuratively transferred in such a way as to represent an offering to the dead poet (just as wreaths of flowers might be used for a dead citizen who was not a poet), and thus to refer to the poetic artefact itself. Here we should cite Carew: ". . . whil'st I cast on thy funerall pile, / Thy crowne of Bayes..." (83-84); the words refer to a physical construct I am identifying with the opening description of Carew's epicede as an "Elegie / To crowne th[e] Hearse" of Donne (2-3).

In work published nearly sixty years ago, John W. Draper provides the fullest survey known to me of the custom of interring elegies along with the poet's corpse during the first half of the seventeenth century. Draper emphasizes that "[e]vidence of the exequial use of elegies among members of the Church of England is largely to be gleaned from contemporary poets," and makes the important point that the prevalence of the use of the terms "exequy" and "epicedium" do indeed strongly suggest that at this time the funeral elegy was widely conceived of as "form[ing] a part of the funeral rites."[34] Draper provides poetic references to the custom of attaching the elegy to the hearse, or casting it into the grave. These references include the lines already noted from Henry King's elegy to Donne ("Each quill can drop his tributary verse, / And pin it, with the Hatchments, to the Hearse" [lines 7-8; Milgate, *ed. cit.*, p. 81]) as well as King's "Exequy" to his first wife (a poem he specifically describes as "a strew of weeping verse");[35] Draper further cites works by John Taylor the Water-Poet, Drayton, Cleveland, Stanley, and a number of other, anonymous, elegists. Draper also cites Puttenham in support of the idea that the funeral elegy "implie[s] some sort of performance or use at a funeral."[36] Although Donne's words in the *Obsequies to the Lord Harrington, brother to the Lady Lucy, Countess of Bedford* ("in thy grave I do inter my Muse," line 256) are usually (and quite justifiably) taken as some kind of farewell to secular or epideictic poetry, or the poetry of patronage, its context is often ignored. The phrase concerning interment is preceded in the *Obsequies* by a rhetorical rejection of a specific procedure of the anthropological kind to which Browne was to refer in *Urne-Buriall*:

> Though then in our time be not suffered
> That testimony of love, unto the dead,
> To die with them, and in their graves be hid
> As Saxon wives, and French *soldurii* did. . . .
> (*Obsequies*, lines 247-50; Smith, *ed. cit.*, p. 263)

Indeed, in "A Funeral Elegy," the poem that precedes the *Anniversaries* for Elizabeth Drury, Donne forcefully rejects the idea that the "memorials, rags of paper" upon which the poem is written can in any way "give / Life to that name," (lines 11-12) or serve as Elizabeth's graveclothes:

> And can she, who no longer would be she,
> Being such a tabernacle, stoop to be
> In paper wrapped; or, when she would not lie
> In such a house, dwell in an elegy?
> ("A Funeral Elegy," lines 15-18; Smith, *ed. cit.*, p. 283)

These lines, too, seem to presuppose knowledge of the tradition.

I conclude with the suggestion that Carew added a further refinement to the tradition surveyed in the preceding pages. Although it was not uncommon for an elegy to be succeeded by an epitaph, the elegy presumably being attached to the hearse and the epitaph engraved on the memorial stone (even though copies of both poems would be kept), Carew's elegy is not merely cast into the grave. If it were, it would have been a more conventional poem than it actually is. But it needs to be noted that Carew figuratively envisages cremation rather than burial for Donne.[37] Classical practice was not as "monolithic" as is sometimes believed, so that it is often hard to determine whether cremation or inhumation prevailed in a given culture or epoch. But in the Renaissance it became very rare indeed, presumably as a result of the predominance of a set of very literally-interpreted Christian beliefs concerning the resurrection of the body from its component remains, beliefs of which Donne himself is an eloquent spokesman both in the *Divine Poems* and in the *Sermons*. Exploring the conceit of cremation rather than inhumation, Carew envisages his elegy as being *consumed* by the flames, so that an epitaph is all that is left. In *this* sense Carew's participation in a funeral rite is seen as being communal ("Let others carve the rest. . . " [93]).

This conceit of Carew's leads to some concluding reflections on epideixis. An inhumed elegy is recoverable, and can be published, but to postulate one's commemorative work being consumed, sacrificially, by the flames (in however fictive a manner) is at once to suggest (*a*) that it is unfit to celebrate its subject, and (*b*) that it cannot last sufficiently to do so adequately. Carew's act in allowing his elegy to be reprinted in the funerary collection for Donne might seem an even more cynically audacious act than those of Spenser's elegists, were it not that Carew figuratively performs the rejection of his poem in favor of the epitaph its argument leads to. Carew thus very specifically and precisely examines the relationship between elegy or epicede on the one hand, and epitaph on the other, a relationship fraught (as we have seen) with considerable theoretical and even epistemological uncertainty in the Tudor and Stuart periods. In Carew's epitaph the *hic iacet* formula, subsuming the classical and Christian roles of Donne into a "universall Monarchy of wit," suggests that the Renaissance reworking of a classical *topos* leads not simply to a view in which pagan classicism is Christianized, but to a new kind of construct altogether. In his epitaph Carew *mediates* between the autocratic ("*Here lies a King*. . .") and the democratic, intercessory, representative ("*Here lie two Flamens*. . ."), having realized that to praise Donne sufficiently, he must let his own epicede go, and conceive its cremation rather than its interment. This act results in a refining down by Carew of Donne's own art into lapidary epitaph: yet paradoxically Carew's performance of cremation and inscription demonstrates a response to its subject's greatness that is not reductive but rather creative, original, and entirely appropriate. What was burnt is now transformed: we might even say it has become burnished.

Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam

Notes

[1]Scaliger propounds his distinction in *Poetices Libri Septem*, III (see next note). O. B. Hardison, Jr., *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962), pp. 196-98, gives a conveniently assembled digest of Scaliger's list of salient epideictic types. Scaliger reserves the term "elegy," in fact, for what Renaissance practitioners including Donne would come to see as the erotic elegy, and it is striking to note how closely Donne's own "Songs and Sonets" and "Elegies" adhere to themes listed in the relevant section of the *Poetices* by Scaliger. Something of their range may be indicated here—for example "commemoratio diei, a quo initium amandi factum fuit" is rendered in "The Good Morrow" or "The Anniversarie;" "Expostulatio" in the Elegy of that name; "Fletus" in some of the "Valediction" poems; and "Vitii aut flagitii obiecto" in (say) "The Apparition." In his discussion of the funeral elegy, A. L. Bennett, "The Principal Rhetorical Conventions in the Renaissance Personal Elegy," *Studies in Philology* 51 (1954): 107-26, makes the point that the threnody "was known by almost any other name" (p. 107). Anticipating Hardison, Bennett (pp. 108-109) indicates that the twofold purpose (praise and lament) of the funeral elegy often revealed a third: comforting the bereaved.

[2]Epicedium enim dici corpori nondum affecto sepulturae. Epitaphium ad tumulum ipsum.... Epicedium igitur semel tantum dicitur. Epitaphium etiam anniversaria esse possunt; ...nam et Pericles dixit; extat apud Thucydidem. Plato quoque idem effecit. *Poetices Libri Septem* (Venice, 1561), p. 168.

[3]Thomas M.Greene, *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven/ London: Yale University Press, 1982), p. 92.

[4]Greene, citing Arnaldo Momigliano and Charles Mitchell in support, reminds us (p. 222) that "the quattrocento gave us the term and role of *antiquary*." Elsewhere Greene, in a discussion of archaeology as metaphor, cites what he calls "Donne's own homage to humanist transmission" in the Prefatory Epistle to "The Progresse of the Soule": "If I doe borrow any thing of Antiquitie, besides that I shall make account that I pay it to posterity, with as much and as good: You shall still finde mee to acnowledge it, and to thank not him onely that hath digg'd out treasure for mee, but hath lighted mee a candle to the place" (Greene, pp. 45 and 303n.). Greene's reminder of the provenance of "antiquary" occurs in his discussion of Du Bellay's *Antiquitez de Rome* (1558). Recently A. Kent Hieatt has argued that Spenser's translation of Du Bellay (first published in 1591) may be the major *literary* influence behind Shakespeare's *Sonnets* (1609); see "The Genesis of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*: Spenser's *Ruines of Rome: by Bellay*," *PMLA* 98 (1983): 800-14. It can be argued that the *Sonnets* in turn offer a substantial poetic source in English for seventeenth-century explicitness regarding monuments and epitaphs in writers as individually diverse as Ben Jonson, George Herbert, and Carew himself.

[5]Stuart Piggott, *Ruins in a Landscape: Essays in Antiquarianism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1976), p. 12, citing his earlier published work (see p. 23, n. 23) on William Camden's *Britannia* (1586, etc.). Peter Burke, *The Renaissance Sense of the Past* (London: Edward Arnold, 1969/ New York: St Martin's Press, 1970), p. 73, etc., cites parallels elsewhere in Europe for this supersession of mythology deriving from Trojan foundations.

[6]Cf. John Weever's *Ancient Funerall Monuments with in the united Monarchie of Great Britaine, Ireland, and the Ilands adiacent* ... (London, 1631), which demonstrates familiarity, not only with the work of European antiquarians such as Johannes Kirchmann, *De Funeribus Romanorum* (1625), but (nearer to hand) with Spenser's Du Bellay translations.

[7]See Michael P. Parker, "Diamond's Dust: Carew, King, and the Legacy of Donne," in Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds. *The Eagle and the Dove: Reassessing John Donne* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1986), pp. 191-200; Sidney Gottlieb, "*Elegies upon the Author*: Defining, Defending, and Surviving Donne," in *John Donne Journal* 2:2 (1983): 23-38, and Robert Thomas Fallon, "Donne's 'Strange Fire' and the 'Elegies on the Author's Death," *John Donne Journal* 7:2 (1988): 197-212. Fallon's "Strange Fire" (the phrase belongs to the elegy, later omitted, by Thomas Browne) is taken to indicate the erotic poetry and the tension set up by its coexistence with the sacred, rather than integral to the performative art I am attempting to reconstruct here.

[8]Donne himself would have agreed with the terminology of Scaliger, although W. M. Lebans, "The Influence of the Classics in Donne's *Epicedes and Obsequies*," *Review of English Studies* 23 (1972): 127n2, reminds us that the title of the collection was not necessarily Donne's own, having been "first assigned to the group in the Luttrell MS and its copy, the O'Flahertie MS." For descriptions of these MSS see Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts* (London/Mansell/ New York: R.R. Bowker, 1980), I (1450-1625), pt. 1, pp. 248 and 252, where the Luttrell MS is dated ca. 1632; its derivative the O'Flahertie MS ("finished this 12 of October 1632") was "apparently used in the preparation of the second edition of Donne's *Poems* (1635)" (Beal, p. 252). According to Lebans, "[t]he editor of the 1635 edition of Donne presumably picked up ["epicede"] from the same manuscript from which he also took the texts of additional poems including two more funeral elegies which had not appeared in the edition of 1633." For the chronological order of *Elegies Upon the Author*, see Parker, p. 192. The *epikédeion* in classical Greek use is a lyric poem of mourning to be performed by a choir: among its earliest exponents was Simonides in the sixth or fifth century B.C. I am indebted to Stephen Todd, Department of Classics, University of Keele, for this and other references, and for commenting on a penultimate version of this paper.

[9]References to and quotations from Carew's poem are keyed to and taken from W. Milgate, ed., *John Donne: The Epithalamions, Anniversaries and Epicedes* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), pp. 88-90. However, Jeremy Maule, Trinity College, Cambridge (private communication) has drawn my attention to the fascinating variant reading "mourners" for "murmures" (73; see my text above) in the Carey MS of this poem (1083/17; ff. 57v-59v) located in the collection of the Rosenbach Foundation in Philadelphia, PA. See Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts* (London/ New York: Mansell, 1987), II (1625-1700), pt. 1, p. 58, under CwT 195 (?1638-42). This variant is not recorded by Carew's editors (Beal, p. 45).

[10]Izaak Walton, *Life of Dr John Donne* (London, 1670), p. 79. Cf. Hen[ry] Valentine, "An Elegie upon the Incomparable Dr Donne":

> The *Court*, the *Church*, the *Universitie*,
> Lost *Chaplaine*, *Deane*, and *Doctor*, All these, Three.
> It was his *Merit*, that his *Funerall*
> Could cause a losse so *great* and *generall*. (19-22)

See W. Milgate, ed., *John Donne: The Epithalamions, Anniversaries and Epicedes*, p. 85. But contrast Walton's own "An Elegie upon Dr Donne": "And is this deare losse / Mourn'd by so few? (few for so great a crosse)" (53-54; Milgate, *ed. cit.*, p. 87). In the light of the more substantial points made both in the lines from Walton's poem that immediately succeed 53-54 and those cited in my text, however, it would seem that Walton has here simply constructed a rather clumsy meiosis. The lines need not be read as offering a contradiction of the passage in the *Life*.

[11]Some elements from the (not exhaustive) list catalogued by Bennett, pp. 116-23, may be relevant here (he is not dead; death is common; he made a good end; life is a loan—death is a debt; the good die young; he was too good for us; he died for our sins; a good short life is better than a long ordinary one; he would not return to earth—you would wrong him to wish him alive again; a longer life might have increased his sins; immoderate mourning is not natural).

[12]Frank Kermode, "John Donne," in *Shakespeare, Spenser, Donne* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971), p. 119. See also Walton, *Life* (1670), pp. 74-78.

[13]See, for instance, Edward Hyde's *"Here lyes the best Divinitie, All the Arts"* (Milgate, *ed. cit.*, p. 83); or R[ichard] B[usby?]'s more fulsome yet nonetheless sufficiently lapidary:

> *Heere lies Deane Donne*; Enough; Those words alone
> Shew him as fully, as if all the stone
> His Church of Pauls contains, were through inscrib'd
> Or all the walkers there, to speake him brib'd.
> None can mistake him, for one such as Hee

DONNE, Deane, or Man, more none shall ever see.
Not man? No, though unto a Sunne each eye
Were turn'd, the whole earth so to overspie.
A bold brave word; Yet such brave spirits as knew
His Spirit, will say, it is lesse bold then true. (103-12)

(Milgate, *ed. cit.*, pp. 99-100, from whom all the parenthesized attributions are taken).

[14]Corbet contributed, along with Ben Jonson and John Selden, to a funerary placard for Vincent Corbet of Twickenham, whose "[o]riginal manuscript on vellum, 58cm x 56cm, in a variety of formal scripts and calligraphic headings, but probably by one scribe; geometric decorations in red and brown ink; somewhat rubbed, entirely legible, folded, holes in corners presumably where nailed to a church-wall. [April-July 1619]" was advertised for sale in the 1988 Quaritch English literature catalogue, item 1099. The catalogue description concludes, interestingly and, for the purposes of the present argument, relevantly: "With [the] six new readings [as compared to the 1648 printed edition of Corbet's work that has been accepted by modern scholarship as standard], Corbet's admired elegy is even better—and far better—than anyone knew. One can only speculate upon how much more estimable the rest of his slender output would now seem, if authorial texts like this one had survived."

[15]Milgate, *ed. cit.*, p. 81. The Quaritch item (see previous note above) provides literal evidence of the practice of "pinning" verse and "Hatchments." For literary evidence we need look no further than *Much Ado About Nothing* 5:3:9, where Claudio enjoins his epitaph "Hang thou there upon the tomb" and later (line 23) promises "Yearly will I do this rite" (citation from the Compact Oxford Shakespeare [1988]). The etymology of "hatchment," as a corruption of "achievement," underlies *OED*'s definition (3) of the heraldic sense "a square or lozenge-shaped tablet exhibiting the armorial bearings of a deceased person, which is affixed to the front of his dwelling-place." See e.g. Claude Guichard, *Funerailles, & diverses manieres d'ensevelir des Romains, Grecs, & autres nations, tants anciennes que modernes* (Lyon, 1581), pp. 203-204, and Francesco Perucci, *Pompe funebri di tutte le natione del mondo* (Verona, 1639), pp. 49-50, who discuss the custom of decorating Roman sarcophagi with (respectively) *boucliers* and *scudi*.

[16]For William Camden, "among all funeral honours, Epitaphs have always been most receptive, for in them love was shewed to the deceased; memory was continued to posterity, friends were comforted, and the reader put in mind of humane frailty." See Camden, *Remains Concerning Britain* [(1870); facsimile reprint (New York/ Hildesheim: George Olms, 1970) of Thomas Moule, intro. & text (London: John Russell Smith, 1870); itself a facsimile of: Camden, William. *Remains Concerning Britain: Their Languages. Names. Surnames. Allusions. Anagramms. Armories. Moneys. Impresses. Apparel. Artillerie. Wise Speeches. Proverbs. Poesies. Epitaphs.... The Seventh Impression, Much amended, with many rare Antiquities never before Imprinted....*] (London, 1674), p. 387.

[17]Carew's rape figure alludes to the conclusion to *Holy Sonnet* 14 ("for 1/ Except you enthral me, never shall be free, /Nor ever chaste, except you ravish me"). References to Donne's verse are taken from A.J. Smith, ed., *John Donne: The Complete English Poems* (Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1973), whose numbering of the *Holy Sonnets* I follow; here the reference is to p. 315.

[18]From *Holy Sonnets* 5 and 14 (Smith, *ed. cit.*, pp. 311, 314); *A Litany*, stz. III (Smith, *ed. cit.*, p. 318 [I cannot wholly accept Smith's gloss on the last line, *ed. cit.*, p. 638]); *Good Friday, 1613. Riding Westward* (Smith, *ed. cit.*, pp. 330-31).

[19]Norman Endicott, ed. and intro., *The Prose of Sir Thomas Browne* [Stuart Editions] (New York: New York UP/ London: University of London Press, 1968), pp. xiv-xv.

[20]*Thucydides. History of the Peloponnesian War, Books I and II*, trans & ed. Charles Forster Smith (1919; Cambridge, Mass. Harvard UP/ London: Heinemann, 1928) [Loeb Classical Library 108], pp. 318-42 (II, xxxv-xlvi). It is worth noting that Joel Fineman takes Thucydides to be "an historically significant, because the first, example of a New Historicist;" see Fineman's provocative *prolegomenon* "The History of the Anecdote," in H. Aram Veeser, ed., *The New Historicism* (New York & London: Routledge, 1989), p. 50, *et seq.* John E. Ziolkowski, *Thucydides and the Tradition of Funeral Speeches at Athens* (New York: Arno, 1981), p. 21, assigns Pericles' oration to 431 B.C. Although ancient

historians today may doubt whether the speech was ever given as such, that is not the point at issue here. Not only is Pericles' oration cited by Scaliger; it is referred to indirectly by Thomaso Porcacchi, *Funerali antichi di diversi popoli et nationi* (Venice, 1574), p. 76, and Perucci, *Pompe funebri*, pp. 69-70. On the Homeric lamentations, see, for example, Margaret Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* (London & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974), p. 10-13, although cf. also Anthony M. Snodgrass, *The Dark Age of Greece: An Archaeological Survey of the Eleventh to the Eighth Centuries B.C* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1971), p. 391.

[21]See Hardison, pp. 113-15, 123ff, and 198. Hardison's position is qualified in G.W.Pigman III, *Grief and English Renaissance Elegy* (Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 40-42, and 140, with reference to Menander and pseudo-Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who are mentioned in the text of the present essay. For recent descriptions of funerals in practice in the Tudor and Stuart periods see Ralph Houlbrooke, *The English Family 1450-1700* (London & New York: Longman, 1984), pp. 202-207; and Mervyn James, *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, &c: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 176-87. On Vergil, see Lawrence Lipking, *The Life of the Poet: Beginning and Ending Poetic Careers* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1981), pp. 76-93, and 130-37. Of particular relevance are Lipking's concept (p. 78) of Vergil's "farming" of his Greek predecessors in the light of Carew's references to Donne and the "Muses' garden"; and Lipking's reference (p. 83, in the context of a discussion of Suetonius on Vergil) to the cremation of the work. The uniqueness of the poet is expressed in terms of an inability to overgo his achievement: in the case of the *Aeneid* this inability is predicated in the way the poetic work is made to end (pp. 84-85).

[22]Nicole Loraux, *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, trans. Alan Sheridan (Cambridge, Mass./ London: Harvard University Press, 1986), *passim*.

[23]Ziolkowski, pp. 5, 16-21. See also Robert Garland, *The Greek Way of Death* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), pp. 89ff.

[24]See R.G. Bury, trans. & ed., *Plato in twelve volumes. IX: Timaeus, Critias, Cleitophon, Menexenus, Epistles* [Loeb Classical Library 234] (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press/ London: Heinemann, 1929), pp. 329-81.

[25]Wilhelm Kiedorf, *Laudatio Funebris: Interpretationen und Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung der römischen Leichenrede* [Beitrage zur Klassischen Philologie, 106] (Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1980), pp. 55-56; Ziolkowski, p. 33: both cite prefatory remarks by L. Radermacher, ed., *Dionysii Halicarnassei Opuscula*, 6 vols. (Leipzig: Teubner, 1904-29), II: 33-34, 56.

[26]See Pigman's complementary remarks (p. 42); he cites (p. 140n) *Menander Rhetor*, ed. D. A. Russell and N. G. Wilson (Oxford: Clarendon 1981), pp. 202. Ziolkowski considers that "[t]he funeral speech is more likely to have been an antidote than a replacement for [the customary] lamentations as well as a fitting conclusion to the state ceremony" (p. 46).

[27]This view should act as a corrective to James Fitzmaurice, "Carew's Funerary Poetry and the Paradox of Sincerity," *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 25 (1985): 127-44, for whom (pp. 141-42) "the theme of the masculine in poetry" is introduced in the rape figure as early as the opening lines. Fitzmaurice reads "force" and not the collocation actually present in the poem: "force ... from" (i.e., extract under pressure).

[28]At the same time Loraux cites Herodotus VI, 58 on Spartan procedure, which was quite opposite.

[29]To say this is again to point to the inadequacy of Fitzmaurice's reading, which asserts that "[t]he poet stops writing and concludes his praise... to give others the opportunity to have their say on the subject" (Fitzmaurice, p. 142).

[30]See R. G. Bury, trans. & ed., *Plato in twelve volumes. XI: The Laws II* [Loeb Classical Library 192] (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press/ London: Heinemann, 1934), p. 535, and for the earlier specification, Donna C. Kurtz and John Boardman, *Greek Burial Customs* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1971), pp. 200-202, etc.

[31]With Parker, pp. 192ff. (although elsewhere [e.g., p. 198] Parker convincingly shows that King's poem postdates and is a reply to Carew's: see note 9 above). Fitzmaurice relates the theme of "[d]umbness in the face of death [to] the inexpressibility topos described by [E.R.] Curtius" (Fitzmaurice,

p. 142).

[32]Our authority is William Camden; see the citation in Alexander C. Judson, *The Life of Edmund Spenser* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1945), pp. 206. See also the obituary verse assembled in R. M. Cummings, *Spenser: The Critical Heritage* (New York: Barnes & Noble/ London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971), pp. 100-113.

[33]See J.B. Trapp, "The Owl's Ivy and the Poet's Bays: An Enquiry into Poetic Garlands," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 21 (1958): 227ff. Vergilian singing matches, particularly as described in the conclusion to *Eclogue* 8, lines 105-106 ("aspice, corripuit tremulis altaria flammis / sponte sua, dum ferre moror, cinis ipse, bonum sit!") provide good grounds not only for assuming such a transferral, but of further accounting for the particular performative act chosen by Carew.

[34]John W.Draper, *The Funeral Elegy and the Rise of English Romanticism* (New York: New York University Press, 1929), pp. 98-99. A century later Oliver Goldsmith was to point out how disposable elegies are: "It was formerly the custom here, when men of distinction died, for their surviving acquaintance to throw each a slight present into the grave. Severall things of little value were made use of for that purpose: perfumes, reliques, spices, bitter herbs, camomile, wormwood, and verse. This custom, however, is almost discontinued: & nothing but verse alone are now lavished on such occasions; an oblation which they suppose may be interred with the dead, without any injury to the living" (*Publick Ledger*, 4 March 1761).

[35]Margaret Crum, ed., *The Poems of Henry King* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), p. 68.

[36]Draper, p. 100. The custom would make much sense of the turn in Milton's "Lycidas" wherein the poet, casting about performatively for an appropriate wreath with which to strew Lycidas' "laureate hearse," rhetorically enacts extreme distress at the thought that it is precisely the loss of the corpse at sea that prohibits the proposed gesture.

[37]Whether Walton did so too or not is uncertain, since his use of "ashes" is ambivalent in this context.