John Donne Journal
Vol. 9, No. 2 (1990)

Elegies for Donne: Great Tew and the Poets

Graham Roebuck

Of the myriad dramatic deaths witnessed in the seventeenth century, some on scaffolds, gallows and battlefields, that of Dr. Donne, flat in his bed (part of the time), for fascination, for example, and for appropriation, takes its place in the first rank. Donne preached the sermon later entitled *DEATHS DVELL, OR A Consolation to the Soule, against the dying Life, and the liuing Death of the Body*[1] at Court on the first Friday in Lent, February 25, 1631.[2] Those who heard it, Walton tells us, recognized that it was the preacher's funeral sermon. Thus, between his sermon and his death on March 31, during which time he commissioned the enshrouded death portrait, from which Droeshout's engraved frontispiece to *Death's Duell* derives,[3] Donne's progress, his closet drama, commanded wide attention. Time enough, one would think, for elegists to set about writing their tributes. And the dying doctor might expect them to be so engaged, for, as he wrote in a private letter on the topic of a premature announcement of his demise,

> A man would almost be content to dye, (if there were no other benefit in death) to hear of so much sorrow, and so much good testimony from good men, as I, (God be blessed for it) did upon the report of my death.[4]

His own preparation of memorials—portrait, eventual sculpture, Latin epitaph, burial site, poem, and *LXXX SERMONS* (thanks to the importunity of Henry King, as is much else in the transmitting of Donne's remains), and pulpit valediction—was meticulous. At the funeral on April 3, Walton informs us, were "an unnumbred number of others, many persons of Nobility, and eminency for Learning" who contributed a remarkable show of "publick sorrow" and a heap of "curious and costly Flowers."[5] But not, it seems, the flowers of rhetoric. As Carew puts it in his celebrated "Elegie," there is not "one Elegie/To crowne thy Hearse," his own being also, as it were, absent. By the time of the publication of *Death's Duell*, at least a year after the sermon, only two commendatory poems have appeared. They are "AN ELEGIE On D^r^. *Donne*, Deane of *Pauls*" and "An Epitaph on D^r^. DONNE," both unsigned. The prefatory epistle, signed only "R," makes no

reference to them.[6] They are the works of Henry King and Edward Hyde, as becomes clear from their attributions to "H.K." and "Edw. Hyde" in the first, 1633 edition, of *POEMS, By J.D. WITH ELEGIES ON THE AUTHORS DEATH*. What is of interest here is the question of why no other elegies were forthcoming at the time of *Death's Duell*, and the configuration of the elegists who rallied to the cause in the 1633 volume. A reading of the sequence of elegies in the light of these questions reveals more about the contest to appropriate Donne's intellectual legacy.

That the elegies in some manner represent a dispute over Donne's remains has been explored in recent years by both Sidney Gottlieb and Michael P. Parker.[7] Both set their inquiries in the framework of, to use Gottlieb's words, the "'problem' of Donne's career: that is, reconciling the details of his early and late life" (p. 28). Parker writes, "What to do with Donne was a problem that perplexed the poet's seventeenth-century successors" (p. 191). They arrive at different emphases. Gottlieb inclines to seeing "the elegists as the first custodians of Donne's reputation" against the claims of the "doctine men" or Puritan clergy. Thus he reads the elegists' praises for Donne's sermons as "deflected or oblique literary criticism" (p. 25). Carew's "Elegie" is applauded for its direct, yet subtle literary criticism. Parker's emphasis, by contrast, develops a tension between Carew (highly praised here also) and King, who is depicted as a pent-up, anxious, hagiographical executor of Donne's will and reputation, determined to exclude "non-ecclesiastical interlopers" (p. 195) from the lists of elegists. Both King and Hyde are seen as hostile to Carew's efforts.

A more recent examination of the significance of the 1633 edition's elegies is that of Robert Thomas Fallon.[8] He opens his study by remarking that these elegies constitute the "most extensive body of commentary on the poetry of John Donne prior to Coleridge" (p. 197). Instead of examining their status as literary criticism, Fallon inquires who the elegists were, and convincingly demonstrates their Oxford nexus, with particularly strong ties to Christ Church. This is a very intriguing line of enquiry: what was Donne "to them, or they to him, that they were chosen to praise him?" (p. 201). He also raises the fascinating question of how satisfactory a vehicle the 1633 *Poems* was for claiming control of the legacy of Donne, given its especially pointed "promiscuous juxtaposition" of sacred and profane (p. 206).[9] That edition is shrouded in its own mysteries. But the question here is directed toward the contributors, and Fallon's work points up the likely influence of John Donne, Jr., who matriculated at Christ Church 1622, and proceeded M.A. in 1629. Fallon asks who lies behind the elegies of 1633: "Henry King as Donne's executor, surely had a hand in producing the 1633 volume; but was it he or the younger Donne who enlisted the elegists?" (p. 201).

That Henry King should have been a prime mover in the obsequies for Donne is no surprise. Margaret Crum, the editor of his collected poems, says that he "must have been concerned" in producing *Death's Duell*, and she relays Grierson's view

that he assisted Marriot, the printer of the 1633 edition of *Poems*.[10] It seems to me, however, that his junior elegizing partner of 1632 is the likely impressario behind the line-up of elegies for 1633. The changed title of King's poem in 1633 emphasizes his closeness to the deceased: "TO THE MEMORIE OF MY EVER DESIRED FRIEND D^r. DONNE." In 1632 it was formal, distant. In both volumes it occupies first place.

Its companion poem in 1632 is now, in 1633, equally unassumingly titled "On the death of D^r DONNE," without hint of familiarity, and holds third place in the augmented lamentations. That this was long thought to be the work of the royalist divine, author of sermons and Latin poems, educated, as was Henry King, at Westminster School— that fertile breeder of poetic talent and classical studies, thanks to Camden[11]— was probably a measure of the authority of Grierson, who reasonably supposed its author would be clergy. This supposition is unchallenged by Bald, Gottlieb, Parker and Fallon. The actual author is much more interesting, and the clergy-poetry dichotomy becomes much more nuanced than previously thought. Keynes has demonstrated that it is the work of the Edward Hyde, who was later to become Lord Chancellor Clarendon, the great statesman and greater historian. These Hydes were cousins.[12] That this identification, which had been made as early as 1639 by Giles Oldisworth in annotations to his copy of the Donne *Poems* of that year,[13] gained no acceptance is probably because Hyde, as Clarendon, with his enormous stature as a writer of prose, laid no claim to verse (even disowning his attempts), nor to acquaintance with Donne. Nor, of course, was he clergy. Why, then, should an obscure lawyer of twenty-three become the only other contributor to *Death's Duell*? This question leads one, in turn, to wonder who else might have contributed to the 1632 exercise, and to consider who actually did contribute to the 1633 volume, and what were Hyde's motives. This latter question, taken first, may set a suggestive context.

Hyde became a great champion of the English Church. Perhaps of all the laity he most contributed to preserving the Church from utter extirpation in the Interregnum, organizing the bishops to continue the Apostolic Succession.[14] As adviser and penman to Charles I, he shored up that monarch's failing resolve in matters ecclesiastical, and virtually created the *Ikon basilike* aspect of Charles' reputation. (But that is another, and more intricate story.) In his early twenties he was forging the links that would fasten him to Great Tew, the renowned circle of humanist, liberal theological, scientific and ecclesiastical thought, whose magnificent literary monument he raised in the work of his later life. At the same time he associated with the poetic wits of London. These two groups were by no means mutually exclusive, as Jonson's celebrated Pindaric Ode (of probably 1629-30) on Sir Lucius Cary, Lord Falkland, and Sir H. Morison, as well as the inclusion of Suckling, Sandys, Carew, Cowley, Kenelm Digby and Jonson himself in Falkland's circle, demonstrate.[15] Between the claims of poetry and theology there was, nevertheless, a real tension experienced by members of both groups. At its heart, however, Great Tew's enthusiasm for the Muse was little more than tepid. But it

was thirsty for the stream of learning. They revered Erasmus and More, and sought to maintain the tradition which flowed from them to their own theologically troubled times. They were, as Trevor-Roper characterizes them, "sceptics who grappled with the problem of Pyrrhonism and sought to find, in constructive reason, a firm basis for belief"(p. 227). Little wonder that Donne so fascinated them.

Hyde was especially attracted to Donne's Erastian arguments for subordination of religious to civil authority which are at the center of *PSEVDO MARTYR* (1610), the subtitle of which, in part, declares that those "of the Romane Religion in this Kingdome, may and ought to take the Oath of Alleageance." The last work of Clarendon's pen, *Religion and Policy*, which was completed in February, 1674, but not published until 1811, returns with scholarly detail and intensity worthy of its Donnian ancestry to this question. It is no doubt true, as Douglas Bush observes,[16] that Donne is not counted a major figure in the theology of the English Church, but his influence on its ecclesiastical thinking was far-reaching. Great Tew's downgrading of the contentious points of theology into "matters indifferent" to the central tenets of religion took its cue from Donne. His championing of a "rigorous and Erastian uniformity within the Church"[17] made his legacy of vital interest to Laud, and his views on church-state relationships guided Hyde's thinking, and then his political actions when he came to power.[18]

That Hyde was also of the Tribe of Ben, if not in the full-blooded sense, is apparent in his own account:

> Whilst he was only a student of the law, and stood at gaze, and irresolute what course of life to take, his chief acquaintance were Ben Johnson, John Selden, Charles Cotton, John Vaughan, sir Kenelm Digby, Thomas May, and Thomas Carew, and some others of eminent faculties in their several ways. Ben Johnson's name can never be forgotten, having by his very good learning, and the severity of his nature and manners, very much reformed the stage; and indeed the English poetry itself. His natural advantages were, judgement to order and govern fancy, rather than excess of fancy, his productions being slow and upon deliberation, yet then abounding with great wit and fancy, and will live accordingly; and surely as he did exceedingly exalt the English language in eloquence, propriety, and masculine expression, so he was the best judge of, and fittest to prescribe rules to poetry and poets, of any man, who had lived with, or before him, or since: if Mr. Cowley had not made a flight beyond all men, with that modesty yet, to ascribe much of this to the example and learning of Ben Johnson. His conversation was very good, and with the men of most note; and he had for many years an extraordinary kindness for Mr. Hyde, till he found he betook himself to business, which he believed ought never to be preferred before his company. He lived to be very old, and till the palsy made a deep impression upon his body and his mind.[19]

Poetic rhetoric proved to be for Hyde, to adapt Carew's words, a fading flower, "short liv'd as his houre." When, after the Restoration, Dryden sought patronage from the then mighty Chancellor, he did so by playfully threatening exposure of his youthful passions:

> The Muses (who your early courtship boast,
> Though now your flames are with their beauty lost)
> Yet watch their time, that if you have forgot
> They were your Mistresses, the World may not.[20]

That Hyde wished to write an elegy on Donne might be explained by personal circumstances. Afflicted by his own agues (quartan, tertian and quotidian), and anticipating death in 1625, he must have read Donne's *Devotions*, published the previous year. On his recovery he represents himself as grateful that he had not fallen into the debauchery of those times, being on the brink of the life of a rake and a soldier. Then his first wife died, losing also the child she was carrying, and, finally, coinciding with the period of Donne's last illness. Hyde's own father, who "conversed with such promptness and vivacity upon all arguments (for he was *omnifariam doctus*)... had the image of death so constantly before him," prepared for the grave as self-consciously as Donne, and was "attended with universal lamentation."[21]

But it is surely not displaced filial piety alone which prompts Hyde to write his lines. The keys to his thought are to be found in the opening and closing lines of the poem:

> I Cannot blame those men, that knew thee well
> Yet dare not helpe the world to ring thy knell
> . . . . . .
> Hee then must write, that would define thy parts
> Heere lyes the best Divinity, all the Arts.

All alike, the elegies on Donne employ the topos of inadequacy—either inadequacy of self, or of language, or of both. Carew, of course, in 1633, gives most memorable expression to the bankruptcy of post-Donnian poetry in his image suggestive of rape:

> Can we not force from widowed Poetry,
> Now thou art dead (Great DONNE) one Elegie
> To crown thy Hearse?

It is in this poem that some perceptive critics have found the note of originality, adroitness of imitation outgoing the model, subtle self-presentation, and the

aristocratic superiority which make its excellence.[22] Perhaps the sheer brilliance and virtuosity of Carew's performance has eclipsed the fact behind the topos (even while vindicating poetry) which Hyde's humbler effort makes plain: no notable poets have written for Donne. Hyde speaks of "those men, that knew thee well / Yet dare not helpe the world to ring thy knell." And Henry King worries that Donne finds "no Epitaph" nor "poem or inscription" at the grave. Donne might as well have written his own elegy, just as he sung his own swan song, King argues.

There is no suggestion that Carew's poem was available for the obsequies; it does not appear in print until 1633. Rhodes Dunlap, however, believes that it was written a good deal earlier and circulated, thus accounting for several possible references to it by Aurelian Townshend and Lord Herbert of Cherbury,[23] whose own "Elegy for Doctor Dunn" failed to appear in either the 1632 or 1633 volumes. Thus one might explain certain similarities of diction and figure in H. K. and Edw: Hyde ("widdow'd invention," bankrupt mine," "ore," figures of debt, borrowing, lending, and the final paradox of divinity and art), though they could also derive from conventional sources. Were it not written until later, however, it would justify Suckling's insult to Carew's Muse as "hard-bound and th'issue of 's brain/ Was seldom brought forth but with trouble and pain."[24] Suckling himself was abroad at Donne's death, and wrote no elegy. Of course, a list of poets who might have, but did not contribute in either volume is otiose. My point is that the greatest absence is that of Ben Jonson. In the 1633 array of elegies to which the printer's letter makes reference as works written not long after Donne's death, and there printed to show "how much honour was attributed to this worthy man," surprise at the paucity of poetic tribute and at the absence of the great stars in the poetic firmament is strongly marked.

In addition to H.K. and Edw: Hyde, and interposed between them, is the extraordinary tour-de-force "To the deceased Author, Upon the *Promiscuous* printing of his Poems, the *Looser sort*, with the *Religious*" by Tho: Browne. In knotty syntax, Browne very strikingly presents the dilemma at the center of the whole enterprise of celebrating Dr. Donne: what to do about the love poetry which the wise will recognize as confession, but the foolish will take as incitement to sin. Puritanical knives wielded by such as will allow *no* poetry at all, only "Sanctified Prose," are out to circumcise the foreskin of the poet's fancy. The use of the figure may help to illuminate Carew's conceit of post-Donnian poets being too feeble to "force widdowed Poetry," in contrast to Donne's "Giant phansie, which had proved too stout" for the "soft melting Phrases" of his rivals.

However that may be, Browne's challenging poem was not to appear in any subsequent edition of *Poems*.[25] It should also be added that, although the case is not closed, the poet is not likely to be Sir Thomas Browne, but rather Thomas Browne, B.D., of Christ Church, Oxford, subsequently made domestic chaplain to Archbishop Laud.[26] This supposition fits better the configuration of elegists for, as we shall see, Great Tew and, what in the 1630s one might almost think of as its

less distinguished sister university, Oxford,[27] supporters of the future Archbishop Laud,[28] had arrayed their forces against the anticipated eloquence of the poets, to be led by Jonson himself, in order to appropriate the memory of Donne.

The next poet, HEN. VALENTINE, accurately assesses his own poetic obscurity in a fascinating opening trope:

> All is not well when such a one as I
> Dare peepe abroad, and write an Elegie
> When smaller Starres appeare, and give their light,
> Phoebus is gone to bed.

Valentine, an Oxford divine, reluctantly stepping into the poetic gap, threatens "They shall have Ballads, but no Poetry"—recalling Jonson's scorn of inferior poets in "An Ode to Himself":

> What though the greedy fry
> Be taken with false baits
> Of worded Balladry,
> And think it poesy?

Dr. C.B. of O. (identified by Keynes as Dr. Corbet, Bishop of Oxford), even less enthusiastically reviewing the necessary qualities for the task, concludes that "Who then shall write an Epitaph for thee, / He must be dead first." Izaak Walton's "milde pen" is sharp enough to lament the "curse / Of blacke ingratitude" which bedevils the times, and he remarks cryptically that "the silent are ambitious all / To be Close Mourners at his Funerall," and refers a second time to this mysterious silence and concealment of poetic talent. Jasper Mayne of Christ Church, Oxford, described by Keynes (*Bibliography*, p. 94) as "an unprincipled and witty divine,"[29] a former Westminster School student, seems apologetic when he fancifully proposes ways in which the mourners might not have

> beene speechlesse, or our Muses dumbe;
> But now we dare not write, but must conceale
> Thy Epitaph.

Mr. R.B. (identified by Oldisworth as Richard Busby, who was to become Headmaster of Westminster School) takes exception both to the envious clerics who, as in the parable of the workers in the vineyard, resent the latecomer Donne, and he barely conceals his contempt for poets. The final poem is by Endymion Porter, the courtier and sometime peripheral member of Great Tew. Oddly, given this context, he bids "Poets be silent, let your numbers sleepe."

Sir Lucius Cary, however, the master of Great Tew, and sometime subject of great Johson's encomium, bids "Poets attend . . . For you must be chiefe mourners at his Hearse." It is just plausible that Falkland, sequestered in the country at his, as Clarendon terms it, "*republica Platonis*," rather than in London, that "*faece Romuli*,"[30] devoted to his Greek, his Latin, and the Church Fathers, was unaware that the poets either did not attend, or, if they did, remained concealed. It is also a possibility that he wrote his poem in anticipation of the actual funeral of Donne. Certainly Suckling in "A Sessions of the Poets" represents Falkland as an apostatized son of Ben, as a distracted visionary:

> He was of late so gone with divinity,
> That he had almost forgot his poetry;
> Though to say the truth, and Apollo did know it,
> He might have been both his priest and his poet.

It is worth noting the uncompromising aestheticism of Suckling's use of the Apollo and priest figure.[31] To be priest and poet of Apollo is set off against no opposing term, such as that Carew uses in his "Elegie," described by Hannaford as the controlling paradox:[32]

> Here lie two Flamens, and both those, the best,
> Apollo's first, and last, the true Gods Priest.

Although thus elegantly seeming to endorse the doctrine of religion's supremacy over poetry, Carew's poem is very much more an encomium (and imitation) of Donne's poetic genius than of his priesthood. By contrast, Falkland's poem, which in the 1633 sequence immediately follows Carew's, makes an initial elegant gesture to the poets, but shifts into the argument proper with these words:

> And as he was a two-fold Priest; in youth,
> Apollo's; afterwards, the voice of Truth . . .

and continues in remarkably robust vein to spell out an Erastian vision of the Church (the Great Tew agenda, one might say), an anti-Puritan polemic, and a philosophical, humanist *via media*, to all of which Donne is not only co-opted, but made supreme exemplar. Finally, and inevitably, as do all the other elegists, he addresses the paradox of the two-sided Donne:

> Then let his last excuse his first extremes,
> His age saw visions, though his youth dream'd dreams.

Thus the contestants for the legacy of Donne aligned themselves in the funeral and commemorative elegies. As Falkland puts it, the poets on the one hand and the guardians of the Church, both lay and cleric, on the other: "Both having shares, both must in grief combine." But the contest turned out not as equal as he anticipates in the construction which immediately follows in the poem:

> Whil'st Johnson forceth with his Elegie
> Teares from a grief-unknowing Scythians eye
> . . . . . .
> Let Lawd his funerall Sermon preach, and shew
> Those vertues, dull eyes were not apt to know.

While it is not clear that Laud preached (Bald doubts it), it is evident that Jonson—whom Falkland invites us to think of as Laud's counterpart, the Archbishop of English poetry—did not elegize. This is the more striking in the light of Hayward's assertion that the Great Tew circle "was conceived under the gaze of Jonson" (41). Whether he was captive to the mood of morose indignation he vents in his "Just Indignation," published along with his edition of *The New Inne* in 1631 (for which Suckling chides him in "Sessions"), exacerbated by his bitter feud with Inigo Jones, having his services at Court dispensed with (Christmas 1631-2), and losing even his sinecure as chronologer,[33] that he failed to write for Donne, who had praised Jonson for his *Volpone* as "Amicissimo & meritissimo," or whether it was, in Clarendon's words, that the palsy had made a deep impression on his mind. Whatever the case, Great Tew or the "Tevians" (as Hayward terms them), "gone with divinity" though they might have been, rose once more to the elegiac occasion in 1638 for Jonson's memorial, *Jonsonus Virbius*— the title, so Aubrey thinks,[34] may have been devised by Falkland— though this time without Edward Hyde.

McMaster University

Notes

[1] A facsimile edition of a copy in the Bodleian Library (Menston: Scolar Press, 1972), from which further quotations are taken. For a discussion of the title, and of the question of whether or not it is Donne's own, see Sir Geoffrey Keynes, *A Bibliography of Dr. John Donne* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), p. 53. The allegation that it was stolen from the friar, Walter Colman, is supposed by his lines on the felon "That stole my Title, *Donne*, to grace thy booke" (R.C. Bald, *John Donne: A Life* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970], p. 529).

[2] An error in Bald, p. 525, put right in Corrigenda, and in the 1986 reprint, gives 12 Feb., a date repeated elsewhere, as e.g. in "Note" to the Scolar Press facs. of 1972. The mistaken date seems to derive from Gosse.

[3] Bald, p. 529.

[4] To George Garrard, quoted in Bald, p. 521.

[5] Quoted in Bald, pp. 530-31.

[19]*The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon* (Oxford, 1857), I, 28.

[20]To my Lord Chancellor Presented on New-years-day [1622]," *The Poems of John Dryden*, ed James Kinsley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), pp. 28-32.

[21]*Life*, pp. 16-17.

[22]See especially Renee Hannaford, "'Express'd by mee': Carew on Donne and Jonson," *Studies in Philology* 84.1 (1987), 61-79; Joseph H. Summers, *The Heirs of Donne and Jonson* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1970); Diana Benet, "Carew's Monarchy of Wit," in Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds., *The Muses Commonweale* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988); and Sidney Gottlieb, *op. cit.*, Michael P. Parker, *op. cit.*

[23]*The poems of Thomas Carew* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), p. 250. Michael P. Parker, *op. cit.*, p. 195, also believes Carew's to be the one to which the others respond. He takes Hyde's poem, for instance, to be a criticism of Carew's. Fallon, *op. cit.*, p. 198, thinks there are hints that the poets influenced one another.

[24]"A Sessions of the Poets," ll. 35-36.

[25]Fallon, *op. cit.*, 203-04, characterizes this poem as the most vivid and unambiguous of the collection.

[26]See Keynes, *Bibliography*, p. 196, where he corrects Gosse and Grierson. But Edgar F. Daniels, "Browne's TO THE DECEASED AUTHOR," *The Explicator* 46 (1988), 19-20, assumes Sir Thomas as author. A "Tho. Browne" of Christ Church contributed learned elegiac and other commemorative poems in Oxford collections in 1623, 1624, 1633.

[27]Clarendon, *Life*, p. 39: Great Tew "looked like the university itself, by the company that was always found there"; it was "one *convivium philosophicum*, or *convivium theologicum*." In the MS of his *History* it is "A Colledge scituated in a purer ayre, so that his house was a University bounde in a lesser volume."

[28]Laud, an Oxford man (St. John's Coll.), had been since April 1629 Chancellor of the University. He was translated to London in 1628, and in August 1633 to Canterbury. It should be added that support for Laud among the men of Great Tew was not uncritical.

[29]He may be said to have contributed to the legacy of Donne in an especially active way: the 1652 edition of *PARADOXES, PROBLEMS, ESSAYS, CHARACTERS [etc.]* (i.e., a reprint of *IVVENILIA* [1633] and other matter) also contains epigrams in Latin said to be Donne and translated by Mayne. It is certain that, as the British Library catalogue notes, and as Keynes states, the epigrams are spurious, and likely that they were composed by Mayne.

[30]*Life*, p. 41.

[31]R. M. Krapp adds the observation that "Suckling developed political and religious convictions of serious proportions only after association with the Great-Tew group" (p. 118n).

[32]Page 76.

[33]See C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, *Ben Jonson* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), I: 91-98. They describe him as "an ageing and bedridden man of letters, whose resentment of his wrongs was embittered by the sense of its ineffectiveness" (p. 275). They note a letter of 1632 in which the writer supposes that Jonson was already dead.

[34]John Aubrey, *Brief Lives* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1898), I, 151. It seems likely that the impresario of the collection was Brian Duppa. See Margaret Crum, *The Poems of Henry King*, pp. 15, 203. Certainly he organized other Oxford commemorative volumes in the 1630s such as *VITIS CAROLINAE* of 1633.