

Richard Crashaw's "Bulla" and Daniel Heinsius' *Crepundia*

George Walton Williams

Richard Crashaw's Latin poem "Bulla" was first printed in a volume containing (and entitled) *Crepundia Siliana*, being notes by Daniel Heinsius to the epic by Silius, *De Secundo Bello Punico*, published by Roger Daniel, Printer to the University, in Cambridge in 1646. It was printed a second time in the second edition of Crashaw's "profane" poems, *Delights of the Muses* (London: Humphrey Moseley, 1648). The poem survives also in a manuscript collection in the handwriting of William Sancroft, student and later Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, 1633—1651.¹ Variants among these versions suggest that, as the 1648 edition does not reprint the 1646 printing, the two printings derive from two different manuscripts and that the Sancroft MS is yet a third. L. C. Martin rightly had "the impression that several copies of a collection of English [—and, we may add, Latin—] poems by Crashaw were in circulation before 1646"; the Sancroft MS bears the note—presumably in Sancroft's hand—that it contains "Mr. Crashaw's poems transcrib'd from his own

¹The poem appears in L. C. Martin, ed. *The Poems of Richard Crashaw* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1927, rev. ed. 1957), pp. 216-20. In the edition of G. W. Williams, *The Complete Poetry of Richard Crashaw* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor, 1970), pp. 612-21, as poem no. 419.

Sancroft is best known for his services as Dean of St. Paul's, London, and co-builder with Wren of the present building, and as Archbishop of Canterbury (after 1678), but he is also noted for the rich collection of English poetry that he assembled in his Cambridge MSS, now in the Bodleian Library under the name of Tanner, from whom they reached that library.

Copie, before they were printed; among which are some not printed."² The note must therefore predate 1648 (by which date all the Crashaw poems in the MS had been printed) and probably postdate 1646 (since it refers to the fact of earlier printing).

All that can be said with assurance about the date of the composition of the "Bulla" is that it must have occurred in or prior to 1646. As Crashaw's interests turned in the '40s more and more to sacred subjects, it is not unreasonable to attempt to place the poem early in that decade or, indeed, in the 1630's. Alexander B. Grosart, in fact, supposed that the poem had been addressed in 1633-34 to Benjamin Laney, Master of Pembroke,³ but the poem is such a remarkable *tour de force* that it might have been written at any time after Crashaw reached his artistic maturity. The only other supposition of chronology derives from the presence of the poem in the Sancroft MS, possibly completed in 1647. In short, there is nothing in the MS tradition to argue specifically for any date, certainly not an early one.⁴

The presence of the "Bulla" in different manuscripts attests to its popularity in the 1640's, and the fact that it appeared in print first in conjunction with and keyed to the work of the most distinguished humanist scholar of the age argues convincingly that it was thought remarkable at first sight. Its astonishing pyrotechnics were admired by

²Martin, p. lviii. Martin's "several copies" is demonstrably correct: one or two MSS of a large number of the poems from which the editions of 1646 and 1648 were set; one in the hand of Sancroft; one in the hand of Crashaw left in Lincolnshire (ca. 1643) (cp. note 9). See also Peter Beal, *Index of English Literary Manuscripts* (London: Mansell, 1987) (*Vol. II, Part 1, 1625-1799*), pp. 268, 299.

³A. B. Grosart, ed. *The Complete Works of Richard Crashaw* (London: Fuller Worthies Libr., 1872-73), II. Grosart's dating might be more convincing had he taken note of the context in which the poem appears. There is nothing in the 1646 publication that relates in any specific way to Laney.

⁴"Bulla" appears in the collection on pages 53-58 (of a numbered 299) and its immediate context in the MS (pp. 53-65) consists of twelve Latin poems published first together in 1648 (from a MS differing from the Sancroft MS). (In fact, these twelve poems all appear as a group in the edition of 1648 at the end of the poems already printed in 1646 and reprinted in 1648, though in a different order.)

Alexander B. Grosart and Richard C. Trench in the nineteenth century; Edmund Blunden and Eugene R. Cunnamore in this century have been vigorous in its praise, and the modern French critics Pierre Laurens and Georges Poulet are enthusiastic.⁵ It would seem that a fresh examination of the contexts in which this trifle, this *guttula*, was blown into print might now be appropriate, even though it must remain inconclusive.

Richard Crashaw matriculated at Pembroke College in the Easter Term, 1632, when he was twenty years old.⁶ He had already something of a reputation as a poet, for in the same year he was invited to prepare the descriptive poem⁷ to the portrait of Launcelot Andrewes prefacing the *XCVI Sermons* published in London in 1632—a rather significant assignment—and the introductory poem for Henry Isaacson's *Chronologie* published in London in 1633. In 1634 he published in Cambridge his *Epigrammatum Sacrorum Liber* at the University Press, "*Ex Academiae celeberrimae typographiceo*." This work, if no earlier one,

⁵Grosart, II, lxxxviii; 245-58; Richard C. Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry* (2nd. edn., London, 1864), p. 271: "one of the most gorgeous pieces of painting in verse which anywhere I know—far more poetical than any of his English poetry"; Edmund Blunden, "Some Seventeenth-Century Latin Poems by English Writers," *Univ. of Toronto Quarterly* 25 (1955-56): 10-22: "a deliberate *tour de force* and yet one would say that a glory descended on the writer as soon as he began his frolic" (p. 15); Eugene R. Cunnamore, "Crashaw's *Bulla*: a baroque and paradoxical mirror image of religious poetics," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 15 (1985): 183-210; Pierre Laurens and Claude Balavoine, *Musae Reduces* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 2: 495: "une gamme inépuisable de variations, une étourdissante génération d'images"; Pierre Laurens, "Un grand poème latin baroque: *La Bulla*," in *Vita Latina*, No. 57 (1975), 22-33; Georges Poulet, *Les Métamorphoses du Cercle* (Paris: Flammarion, 1961, 1979), pp. 78-9.

⁶Biographical data in this paragraph derive from the editions of Martin and Williams.

⁷Crashaw prepared three versions of this poem, one in English and two in Latin (Williams edn., nos. 359, 403, 404.) The emphasis on the hand of the portrait in no. 404 would suggest that Crashaw had seen the portrait or the engraving before writing the poem.

evidently caused the printers to the University, Thomas Buck and Roger Daniel, to take note of the promising young poet, for in the same year Daniel invited Crashaw to prepare the introductory poem for Lessius' *Hygiasticon* (1634) and in the year following another such poem for Robert Shelford's *Five Pious and Learned Discourses* (1635).⁸ In 1634 Crashaw was graduated B.A. at Pembroke, and in 1635 he was elected Fellow at Peterhouse. He continued in the fellowship, serving contentedly also at the chapel of Little St. Mary's adjoining Peterhouse, until he was forced to leave by the inroads of the Puritan investigators. He fled in 1643 to Leyden, returned to England briefly in 1644 or 1645, and fled once more to the continent, to Paris and Rome. He died in 1649 in Italy.

While he was "in exile" on the continent, a friend—"The Authors friend"—evidently saw to the publication by Humphrey Moseley in London of the first collected edition of Crashaw's sacred and profane poems, *Steps to the Temple* and *The Delights of the Muses* in 1646.⁹ The

⁸The two commissions, those for the Andrewes volume and for the Shelford volume, are early indications of a recognition of Crashaw's inclination to high church Anglicanism. (The Shelford poem suffers a truncation in the form in which it appears in the collected editions of 1646 and 1648: the last ten lines, which deplore the calling of the Pope "Antichrist," are deleted.) That "the Printers to the University" conceived the Shelford volume as "a deliberate act of propaganda by the Laudian party at Cambridge" (Hilton Kelliher, "The Latin Poems added to *Steps to the Temple* in 1648" in Robert M. Cooper, ed. *Essays on Richard Crashaw* [Salzburg, 1979], p. 30), is shown by their choice of Crashaw to write the introductory poem and by their supplement of a 23-line Latin poem, "Bona opera sunt efficaciter necessaria ad Salutem," by Eleazar Duncan, Fellow of Pembroke, printed on a page (p. 120), following Sermon I of the *Sermons*. The addition of Duncan's poem shows the attention given by "the Printers" to the subject matter of the book; Crashaw's poem also deals with "bona opera," i.e., Charity. (I am much indebted to Mr. Kelliher for guidance and many courtesies in the preparation of this paper.)

⁹Elsie Elizabeth Duncan-Jones, "Who was the Recipient of Crashaw's Leyden Letter?" in John R. Roberts, ed. *New Perspectives on the Life and Art of Richard Crashaw* (Columbia: Univ. of Missouri Press, 1990), has ingeniously and persuasively argued that Joseph Beaumont was probably this editorial "Friend." In the presence of this hypothesis, Williams withdraws his earlier supposition that the "Friend" might have been the friend in Lincolnshire to

section of "humane" poems included some forty English and Latin poems, clearly the prize exhibits in the secular verse of Crashaw's work; the "Bulla" was not among them.

It is idle to speculate why this remarkable poem was not included in this first collected edition, the 1646 *Delights*. One might say, simply, that the Friend had no copy of the poem to include. That natural supposition seems unlikely, as copies of the poem were demonstrably available at the time, and one was used in the second collected edition of 1648, two years later. (The 1648 edition did not reprint the 1646 printing.) On the other hand, one might speculate profitably, if not wildly, by considering why this remarkable poem *was* included in another volume published the same year. We might suppose that the poem was included particularly in Daniel's edition of Heinsius' *Crepundia*, which followed the publication of Moseley's *Delights of the Muses*,¹⁰ because it had been requested by Moseley's fellow-printer and professional associate Robert Daniel¹¹ since it made a connection with the *Crepundia*.

Roger Daniel, trained as a printer in London, came up to Cambridge in 1632 and joined Thomas Buck, who had been printing

whom Crashaw gave a manuscript of his poems before leaving the country in 1643(?) (edn. pp. xviii, xx). Cp. J. E. Saveson, "Richard Crashaw," *TLS*, February 28, 1958, p. 115, and Thomas F. Healy, *Richard Crashaw* (Leiden: E. J. Brill (1986), p. 8. See my review of *New Perspectives*, *South Atlantic Review* 56 (1991): 98-103.

¹⁰Daniel's headnote tells us that others of Crashaw's poems had recently come forth ("nuper . . . prodire").

¹¹Mr. Kelliher has called to my attention the fact that in 1645 Daniel printed for the publisher Moseley the third edition of James Howell's *Dodona's Grove*. This professional connection demonstrates that the two men were acquainted and had obviously worked closely together the year before the former published the "Bulla" and the latter published the collected works. Mr. Kelliher notes: "Perhaps 'Bulla' had arrived too late at the press for inclusion in the 1646 [*Delights of the Muses*], and had been offered to Daniel on one of his frequent visits to London." That thesis has an attractive simplicity to it.

for the University since 1625, as one of the two "Printers to the University."¹² Daniel worked jointly with Buck from 1632 to 1640, thereafter assuming the entire printing and publishing activity of the University Press himself.¹³ In addition to the items already mentioned, Daniel also published specific poems by Crashaw in various of the funerary or gratulatory volumes that regularly issued from the press of the University in the mid-seventeenth century. Such poems appeared in 1632, 1633 (twice), 1635, 1637, and 1640.¹⁴ In 1650, Daniel's appointment as Printer was cancelled "for neglect."¹⁵

¹²For details in this paragraph, see S. C. Roberts, *A History of the Cambridge University Press 1521-1921* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1921), pp. 48-55; Cyprian Blagden, "Early Cambridge Printers and the Stationers' Company," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 2(1957): 275-89; David McKitterick, *A History of Cambridge University Press* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1992), vol. I "Printing and the Book Trade in Cambridge 1534-1698." (I am obliged to Dr. McKitterick for his helpful correspondence.)

¹³Buck and Daniel published together under their two names, under their title "Printers to the University," or under the university press imprints. After 1640 through 1646, all imprints bear the name of Roger Daniel, usually only that name.

¹⁴The most famous of these memorial volumes is the *Justa Edouardo King* (1638), the memorial volume for Edward King, who drowned in 1637—most famous because it contains Milton's "Lycidas." One of the Latin poems in this volume is signed "R. C.", but scholars have not generally accepted the initials as those of Richard Crashaw (see Williams, pp. 657-8). The initials are more likely those of Robert Creswell. Crashaw and Creswell both matriculated at the Easter Term 1632, both proceeded M. A. (in 1638 and 1639), both took up Fellowships in 1636 (Peterhouse) and 1637 (Trinity), and both were ejected from their livings in 1644 (both of high-church sentiments).

The volume of gratulatory verse, *Rex Redux* published by Daniel in 1633 to celebrate Charles I's return to England after having been crowned King of Scotland, contains poems by "E[dward] King, Coll. Christi. S.", "Rich. Crashaw, Aul. Pemb.", "Ro. Creswell, Coll. Trin."

Like Crashaw, Creswell was a friend of Cowley (see poems nos. 365, 68); he was, in fact, Cowley's roommate when first he came up to Trinity (A. L. Nethercote, *Abraham Cowley* (London: Rossiter, 1931), *passim*).

¹⁵M. H. Black, *The Cambridge University Press 1584-1984* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1984), p. 75. This cancellation was occasioned almost certainly not by "neglect" but as "part of the . . . process" in which "the King's supporters and

It is perhaps too much to say that Richard Crashaw, Fellow of Peterhouse, and Roger Daniel, Printer to the University, were friends; but it is clear that they were well acquainted and that they were both members of the royalist and high-church group that rejoiced with the King and suffered with him. When Daniel undertook the publication of Heinsius' *Crepundia*, it could not have seemed surprising to include in it a supplementary poem by Crashaw. That he wished to do so must suggest that he was able to recognize not only the brilliance of the poem but that a specific metaphoric relationship could be drawn between a bubble and a volume of scholarship. That awareness suggests also that Roger Daniel was a man of no little acumen and wit.

Daniel Heinsius, one of the leading humanist philosophers and scholars of northern Europe in the seventeenth century, enjoyed a considerable reputation in England and particularly in the two universities in the 1630s and 1640s.¹⁶ His son, Nicolaas, on a not-so-grand tour of England in the '40s, was a frequent guest in the studies and at the tables of the leading churchmen and intellectuals. Daniel Heinsius corresponded with scholars at Cambridge, and Nicolaas, though he did not visit the university, was recognized as an important envoy and representative of his father. In 1640 Roger Daniel published in Cambridge Heinsius' great work, *Sacrorum Exercitationum Novum Testamentum Libri XX*; it was the second edition of that work (the first having been printed in Leiden in 1639). Six years later, in 1646, the publisher noted in his Letter to the Author: "Cum paucis abhinc annis Critica tua Sacra sub praelum nostrum mitteremus, illud

high churchmen were ejected" from their university positions (p. 74). The encouragement of poets such as Crashaw and Creswell and the printing of their poems would have made him vulnerable to such an action by the Puritan authorities (see Kelliher). McKittrick sees the expulsion as arising from procedural and operational difficulties with Thomas Buck (pp. 303-4): Daniel was "the sacrificial lamb."

¹⁶The data in this paragraph derive from Paul R. Sellin, *Daniel Heinsius and Stuart England* (Leiden, London: Sir Thomas Brown Institute, 1968), pp. 74, 87, 95-98, *passim*.

tibi non ingratum fuisse intelliximus.”¹⁷ Having learned that evidently unauthorized reprinting was not displeasing to Heinsius, Daniel in 1646 published the *Crepundia Silia: D. Heinsii Crepundia Siliana. Ejusdem Dissertatio de verae criticae apud Veteres ortu, progressu, usuque . . . et Exercitatio Critica demonstrans omnem fere Aegyptiorum, Graecorum, Latinorum religionem ex oriente fluxisse . . . In quibus diversi autorum loci . . . explicantur*. (Cantabrigiae: Ex Officina R. Daniel, Almae Academiae Typographi. 1646):¹⁸

cum *Crepundia* tua multi ardentissimis votis efflagitarent, & rari admodum essent qui exemplaribus fruerentur; iisque vel summo pretio emptis, vel non sine infinito labore transcriptis; aggressi sumus, ut habere *Alma Mater* quibus lenire posset filiorum suorum impatientiam.¹⁹

Like the *Hygasticon* (1634) and the *Sacrorum . . . Libri XX* (1640) before it, the *Crepundia* was also a reprint by Daniel of a volume first published in the Netherlands.

¹⁷From Daniel's Letter to Heinsius, "Amplissimo eruditissimoq; viro Danieli Heynsio," in the *Crepundia*, sig. <A1>. McKitterick terms it "high-handed" (p. 301).

¹⁸The volume is duodecimo (though the *National Union Catalogue* describes it as "24mo in 12s"). This is the second edition of the *Crepundia*, the first having been appended (pp. [311]-504) to the end of the edition of Silius Italicus, *De Secundo Bello Punico* (Antwerp: Plantin, 1600); another issue (? not seen) of the *Crepundia* was evidently published in Leiden in 1601 (bearing the same pagination as the edition of 1600).

No evidence is known that would prove that Daniel sent a copy of his publication to the author, nor does the copy of the volume presently in the Library of the Rijks Universiteit Leiden contain any notes of such a gift. (I am indebted to Professor Alistair Hamilton of the Faculteit der Letteren in the university for his kindness in examining this copy.) But it is pleasant to note that a copy was in the Biblioteca Heinsiana assembled by Nicolaas Heinsius and auctioned off in 1683 after his death in 1681 (*Biblioteca Heinsiana* [[Leyden]: J. de Vivie, [1682]], Pars Posterior, Literatores in Duodecimo, #29, p. 59).

¹⁹Daniel's Letter to Heinsius, *Crepundia*, sig. <A1^v>. Though this polite compliment does not rule out the possibility of an earlier contact between the publisher and the philosopher, it is probable that if Daniel had secured Heinsius' permission to reprint the *Crepundia* he would have boasted of it.

To extend the *Crepundia*, a work of 152 pages, Daniel added Heinsius' *Dissertatio de verae Criticae* (115 pages) and his *Exercitatio Critica* (36 pages), "ne forte deesset humanioris literaturae studiosis, (tum vero linguarum inprimis Orientalium quibus incaluit hodie tota *Brittannia*) studiorum suorum Cynosura."²⁰ These three texts and an Index concluded on p. [311] sig. 09. And then "ne detur vacuum," Daniel added on the verso of that leaf Crashaw's "Bulla," beginning on p. [312], sig. 09^v, headed by an address to "Lector." Such supplementation, we may say, is very much in Daniel's style: the two works included with the *Crepundia* are, in effect, supplements; the Letter to Heinsius is another supplement, for it was printed, after the volume had been printed off, on a separate sheet of two leaves tipped in to the volume between leaves A1 and A2.²¹ The address to "Lector," almost certainly written by Daniel, introduces the poem:

Lector: ne detur vacuum, hem tibi Bullam vere auream;
 Quae nunc primum audet in apertum aerem. Argumenti
 certe non ita dissimilis, seu crepundia respicias, seu Heinsii
 guttulam. Quid enim aliud Bulla, quam puerorum
 ornamentum, aut guttulae commentarius? Tam nil

²⁰*Ibid.*, sig <A1^v-2>.

²¹It has already been noted (note 8) how ready Daniel was to add supplementary matter to his volumes. An extreme example of such supplements—last-minute, printed "paste-on cancels"—appears in Abraham Whelock's edition of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* printed by Daniel in 1643 (J. C. T. Oates, *Cambridge University Library* [Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1986], p. 208). Strangely enough, the Letter to Heinsius tipped in between A1 and A2 is itself signed A1 and A2 (here cited as "<A1-A2>". It is unusual to find so important an item as a letter from the publisher to the author tipped in as an after-thought. One copy of the volume at the British Library (1088.c.20) and one in the Dyce Collection at the V & A (BM 19) lack the insert, an omission that suggests that the insert was very much a late addition. Another copy at the V & A (BM 20) demonstrates by severe leaching (of <A2^v> onto A2 and of <A1> onto A1^v) that those particular inserted leaves had not been allowed to dry adequately and so suggests some haste in the preparation of this copy. (Mild leaching does occur also in sheet O of this copy and in sheet O of BM 19.)

quousque intumuit! Huic autem libro assuendam curavimus,
ne a sociis suis derelicta (reliqua enim ejusdem Poetae
nuper prodire) ludibrium ventis & deberet, & solveret.²²

The phrase prefacing the printing of the "Bulla," "ne detur vacuum," is a masterpiece of bibliographical disingenuousness. An examination of Daniel's printing record demonstrates very clearly that Daniel knew not only how to add supplements but also how to contrive the imposition of his final sheet so that there need be no "fillers" to make up a full sheet.²³ Daniel's "explanation" is inadequate bibliographically, poetically, and conceptually. The "Bulla" was not included simply to fill up space. It would seem, therefore, that from the beginning of his plan to reprint the *Crepundia*, Daniel saw in Crashaw's poem a penetrating intellectual, though whimsical, supplement to Heinsius' learned annotations on Silius' epic, annotations, as he must have known, that were themselves not without whimsy—or, at least scholarly good humor.

Crashaw had left Cambridge in 1643, had gone to Leiden for an extended stay in 1643-44, had returned to England in 1644-45, had gone to Paris in 1645. One of his friends saw to the publication of his collected poems in 1646 after he had left England; another saw to the publication of the *Carmen Deo Nostro* in 1653 after he had left the world; a third acquaintance published the "Bulla" in 1646. I have been unable to trace any specific personal connection between Daniel and

²²Martin, p. 216.

²³By setting the Index in smaller type or by respacing the lines and omitting three extended entries, Daniel could easily have printed the Index, now filling six pages, in five pages (O6^v to O8^v), reserving four leaves that could have been used for other matter in the print shop. Though it is possible that the commercial requirement of economy would not have been compelling at a university press, it is nevertheless reasonable to suppose that Daniel knew what he was about.

I acknowledge the assistance of Professor Randall McLeod in correspondence on duodecimo foldings; see also Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972), fig. 57.

Crashaw, or between Crashaw and Heinsius, or between Heinsius and Daniel; yet the three are forever linked in this bubble. As an explanation for the existence of this unlikely threesome, it may be noted that Crashaw had been in Leiden in 1643 and had returned to England in 1644, shortly before the "Bulla" was printed. It is tempting to think that while he was in Leiden Crashaw might have visited the great Heinsius himself—a scholar notably hospitable to visitors from England²⁴—and that the linking of the "Bulla" with the *Crepundia* might derive from that association.²⁵

Duke University

²⁴McKitterick finds such a hypothetical contact "an attractive notion and a plausible one." That Heinsius was hospitable to scholarly visitors from England during these years is fully recorded (Sellin, pp. 71-119).

²⁵I am obliged to Mr. Pieter Obbema, Librarian to the Rijks Universiteit Leiden (a successor to Heinsius in that office), for his care and generosity in attempting to locate any manuscript material that would indicate such a connection. I acknowledge also with thanks the efforts of colleagues, Professors Francis Newton and Diskin Clay who have assisted in this investigation.