Banishing Ganymede at Whitehall: Jove's "loathsome staines" and Fictions of Britain in Thomas Carew's *Coelum Britannicum*

Jessica Tvordi

Southern Utah University

Thomas Carew's masque Coelum Britannicum*, performed at Whitehall on Shrove Tuesday of 1634, deploys an image of conjugal perfection in order to codify a fiction of national union. Not only are Charles I and Henrietta Maria models of moral and political comportment powerful enough to reform the profligate court of Jove, their harmonious marriage also provides the inspiration for reconciliation between England, Scotland, and Ireland. In order to assert this fiction of unification, the masque invokes images of sexual transgression, symbolically enacts their removal, and equates the strength of Britain with the absence of the deviant monarch, James I. Yet by summoning the figure of Ganymede as a source of moral contamination within Jove's court,* Coelum Britannicum *invokes the troubling specter of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, whose influence within the royal bedchamber continued to inform representations of manipulative counselors and vulnerable kings long after his death. Although the masque's treatment of unification demands that figures who reinforce Charles I's political authority replace those who represent moral and cultural transgression, the text's apparent substitute, Henrietta Maria of France, functions not as antidote to the sodomitical favorite, but rather as an equally transgressive figure that the masque struggles to contain.*

Thomas Carew's masque *Coelum Britannicum*, performed at Whitehall on Shrove Tuesday of 1634, presents Charles I and Henrietta Maria as such powerful exemplars of civic, sexual, and religious purity that they inspire the reformation of one of the most profligate of classical figures: Jove. This image of the virtuous royal couple depends on a ritual cleansing of Jove's court and his satisfactory reunion with his estranged wife, Juno, which is confirmed for us by the recently installed plaque reading "CARLOMARIA" on the immortal couple's bedchamber door.[1]

1 Thomas Carew, *Coelum Britannicum*, *Poems of Thomas Carew*, ed. Rhodes Dunlap (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), line 276. All subsequent references to the masque will be cited parenthetically.

Yet the masque's depiction of Jove's transformation, enacted partly through the banishment of Ganymede from his bedchamber, recalls the frequent associations between this mythic coupling and an historical pairing familiar to the viewers of the performance: James I and his final favorite, George Villiers, the 2nd Duke of Buckingham. By invoking the figure of Ganymede as a source of moral contamination (albeit one of many), the text introduces anxieties about the relationship between the two Stuart courts, which are linked not only by the familial relationship of James and Charles, but also through the continued political alliance of Charles and Buckingham after his father's death. Performed six years after Buckingham's assassination, *Coelum Britannicum* attempts to renounce the figure of Ganymede, replacing him with the figure of the reconciled wife (Juno/Henrietta Maria), who is eventually secured her rightful place at her royal husband's side.

Carew's panegyric to his monarchs, with its emphasis on heterosexual harmony and the absence of extramarital deviance, also functions as a model for the "marriage" of England with two unruly consorts, Scotland and Ireland, and promotes an image of England's gentle mastery over its internal colonies.[2] Rather than deploy a classical analogy to promote unification over dissent, the final section of the masque constructs a distinctly English historical scene in which the landscape moves from the uncivilized world of the ancient Britons, described as "wild Inhabitants" (873), to the civilized community of "moderne Heroes" (859) over which Charles allegedly presides. Whereas the first two-thirds of the masque advances civic morality over sexual unruliness (1-842),

2 While Carew's theatrical representation of his royal patrons has received critical attention, few scholars have addressed the masque's later preoccupation with the unification of the realm, let alone how the moral focus of the earlier section works in relation to the cultural vision of the masque's conclusion. For discussions of Carew's masque that address the masque's engagement with Caroline court politics, see Martin Butler, "Reform or Reverence? The Politics of the Caroline Masque," in *Theatre and Government Under the Early Stuarts*, eds. J. R. Mulryne and Margaret Shewring (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993), 138-42; Joan Altieri, "Responses to a Waning Mythology in Carew's Political Poetry," *SEL*, 26 (1986), 112-13; and Jennifer Chibnall, "'To that secure fix'd state: The function of the Caroline masque form," in *The Court Masque*, ed. David Lindley (Manchester: MP, 1984), 85-91.

the conclusion emphasizes political concord over cultural disorder (843-1143). In order to assert an image both of civic morality and cohesive national boundaries, *Coelum Britannicum* appropriates images of deviance, symbolically enacts their removal, and equates the strength of Britain with the absence of the deviant monarch.

Part of my objective is to examine the familial and political pasts that haunt Carew's masque, and to consider the ways in which images of sexual deviance and political transgression, however much they may seem to be repudiated within the text, work to expose the masque's central fictions of marital and national concord. Ultimately Carew's recollection of the wayward court of Jove, replete with images of misrule, marital strife, and sexual transgression, invokes too many specters of the past for either the moral or political fictions of *Coelum Britannicum* to claim any legitimacy. Because Carew's model of virtue as embodied in the marital union of Charles and Henrietta Maria serves as the foundation of the political consummation between England and its colonies, Carew's text provides an opportunity to consider the extent to which the conflation of sexual deviance with other modes of cultural transgression functions as a means through which representations of the nation may be codified. The masque's preoccupation with legitimizing a joint royal succession, as well as a construction of a heterosexuality that allegedly grounds the nation, ultimately exposes the limits of moral discipline as a model for political transformation.

I

Martin Butler has called *Coelum Britannicum* "the archetypal Caroline fiction," largely owing to the exaggerated panegyric that the text embodies, noting that through his participation in the masque form, Charles I "liked to be seen in the posture of a reformer" with his masques "celebrat[ing] a dignified renovation."[3] Indeed, the very subject of *Coelum Britannaicum* is reformation, commencing with the appearance of Jove's messenger, Mercury, who announces that his sovereign's shame has led him to reform his own court, not to

3 Butler, 129 and 126.

mention his marital relations, upon the earthly model of England's conjugally harmonious and politically triumphant rulers. Although, as Butler points out, the function of Charles as reformer is central to the masque's fiction, Carew's projection of the king as part of a marital partnership that has the power to inspire and transform is the key to understanding the masque's complex representations of marital harmony over nuptial dissidence. The opening lines of the masque introduce Charles's consort, Queen Henrietta Maria of France, as a collaborator in the "renovation" they represent: she functions as an equal partner in the production and dissemination of this royal virtue. The central effect of Carew's depiction of this aspect of the Caroline court is to link conjugal perfection to civic morality as it is embodied in disciplined, chaste rule. Mercury's representation of Charles and Henrietta Maria underscores both marital and political concord, describing England's rulers as "Twins of Love and Majesty" (48), suggesting they are virtually indistinguishable in their sentiments and dignity. Moreover, he claims that their conduct has shaped the behavior and values of both earthly and heavenly courts:

> Your exemplar life
> Hath not alone transfus'd a zealous heat
> Of imitation through your virtuous Court,
> By whose bright blaze your Pallace is become
> The envy'd patterne of this underworld,
> But the aspiring flames hathe kindled heaven. (62-67)

As exemplars of virtue, England's king and queen set a model of conduct for their own courtiers, becoming the "envy'd patterne" of the "underworld" ruled by Charles, while, at the same time, extending their influence to the heavens. This archetype of marital harmony, contrasted by the marital strife of Jove and Juno, becomes the central feature of the English royal couple's model of reform for the gods and their heavenly subjects.

At the same time that Carew's opening passage emphasizes the personal virtues of Charles and Henrietta Maria, it also stresses their success as rulers, especially with regard to their ability both to command and influence their subjects. Rather than resorting to

"awfull frownes / To fright [their] Subjects" (51-52), their "calmer eyes / Shed joy and safety on their melting hearts / That flow with cheerful loyal reverence" (52-54), thus providing potential emulators not only a model of marital chastity, but also one of effectual rule. Just as they are "twinned" in love, they are also coupled in majesty. Instead of inspiring awe and fear, Charles and Henrietta arouse in the court what is already present in their own marital union: love ("melting hearts" [53]) and unwavering devotion ("loyall reverence" [54]). Jove, Mercury announces, intends to affirm Charles's virtue not only by emulating him, but also by installing him as "the bright Pole-starre of this Hemispheare" (94), with his queen, "the faire Consort of your heart, and Throne" (97), by his side. The ultimate reward for this virtue is an unlimited sphere of command via heavenly guidance from an earthly authority, with human king and consort "alone dispenc[ing] / To'th'world a pure refined influence" (102-3). Instead of marking the human ruler as the lieutenant of God on earth (although a classical rather than a Christian one), Carew reverses that position with Jove deriving his authority from his willingness to emulate his human counterpart's almost divine sovereignty.

Coelum Britannicum takes as a given its central premise: Charles and Henrietta Maria are indeed exemplars of civic and sexual virtue, discrete virtues that are united unequivocally in their heterosexual union for the nation's benefit. Certainly one objective of this fiction is to deploy a convincing representation of their virtue in opposition to Puritan counter-narratives circulating in the 1630s. One of the most relevant and urgent of these challenges to Caroline ideology was the publication of William Prynne's *Histriomastix* (1632), which leveled a range of charges associating moral corruption with the established church and, more covertly, challenged the royal authority and individual chastity of the queen and king. Prynne's charge that female actors display "mannish impudency" and invite "temptation to whoredome, and adultery," together with his comments on French actresses,[4] was widely accepted as a criticism of Henrietta

4 William Prynne, *Histriomastix* (New York: Garland Reprint, 1974), 215, 214.

Maria for participating in masques at Whitehall.[5] Prynne, moreover, also singles out kings who fill their courts with players, attributing such practices to the advice of bad counsel, covertly implicating both the current king and his father for their associations with the powerful Duke of Buckingham.[6] Prynne's tract contends that the regulation of sexuality is necessary for judicious rule, connecting the management of the household (and one's wife) to the administration of state affairs (and one's counselors). As is evident from the punishment Prynne's writing provoked,[7] his criticisms indirectly implicate Charles and Henrietta Maria in a web of sexual deviance and gender transgression that dramatically links theatricality and religious transgressions to the downfall of the state.[8]

As a contrastive response to Prynne's polemic, in which courtly immorality is responsible for the larger ills of society, Carew's masque presents a world in which courtly and, especially, marital chastity is present and works to ensure both the sexual and

5 The first performance at court after Henrietta Maria came to England, Racan's *Artenice*, included not only a speaking role for the queen—and one much larger than any her predecessor, Queen Anne, had performed—but also the appearance of the queen's female companions in men's roles. See Charles Carlton, *Charles I: The Personal Monarch*, 2nd Ed. (New York: Routledge, 1983), 158. For Prynne's discussion of women in men's apparel, see *Histriomastix*, 200-01.

6 For Prynne's discussion of players at court, see *Histriomastix*, 250, 428-29, and 451; on the subject of evil counselors, see 153, 214-15.

7 After being tried for sedition and libel by the Star Chamber, Prynne, himself a barrister of Lincoln's Inn, was found guilty, imprisoned for a year, fined five thousand pounds, stripped of his university degrees, and had his upper ears cropped. After continued criticism of crown and church, in 1637 the remainder of his ears were removed and he was branded with the letters SL (Seditious Libeler). See Carlton, 141, and Pauline Gregg, *King Charles I* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 275-6.

8 However exaggerated such charges may have seemed to either Prynne's colleagues at the Inns of Court or the inhabitants of Whitehall, they were plausible enough for both institutions to commission masques defending the royal couple's reputation while, at the same time, attending to each of the two groups specific political agendas. James Shirley's *The Triumph of Peace*, presented to Charles and Henrietta Maria by the Inns of Court on February 3, 1634, for example, objects to the practice of granting monopolies. David Norbrook points out the masque itself is also covertly critical of Charles, endorsing his political authority, but emphasizing "that the king's peace had to be maintained with the aid of Law—a point that the lawyers anxious about the king's constitutional position wanted him to remember" ("The Reformation of the Masque." *The Court Masque*, ed. David Lindley [Manchester: Manchester UP, 1984], 104). See also Butler, 128.

civic morality of the nation. Both Prynne and Carew, however, emphasize the importance of a specific kind of male-female relation that determines the success of their conflicting agenda. Each text evidences a preoccupation with heterosexuality that requires more than simply reproductive accomplishment or appropriate affective displays evidenced by Mercury's emphasis on the importance of marital fidelity. While the term "heterosexuality" might seem hopelessly anachronistic in such an historical context, both texts nonetheless codify a heterosexuality that, while not synonymous with modern categories of identity,[9] functions transhistorically in a political context. In the world of Carew's masque, heterosexuality is always conjugal, marked by specific, gendered roles (men are expected to rule, women to submit to that rule), and represents the reproductive couple as central to the political objectives of the nation-state. Despite the obvious difference between *Histriomastix* and *Coelum Britannicum*, in each text the presence of normative heterosexuality is absolutely central to the workings of a harmonious and just government, whether it is conveyed through a radical dissenter's emphasis on appropriate female behavior or a court poet's insistence on the presence of marital fidelity. While Prynne's polemic deploys a strategy for reform, offering a critique of the established church and, less directly, the crown, Carew's masque endorses the established hierarchies that inform both of these institutions, anticipating a trickle down effect in which the chaste model of the monarchs spreads it influence throughout the court and, eventually, to the people.[10]

Carew's masque provides an effective artistic enactment of the royal couple's heterosexuality, yet this idealization of their

9 For a discussion of heterosexuality as a problematic category in medieval and early modern Europe, see Karma Lochrie, *Heterosyncrasies: female sexuality when normal wasn't* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), xix-xx; and Rebecca Ann Bach, *Shakespeare and Renaissance Literature before Heterosexuality* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007), 10-18.

10 Both Prynne and Carew anticipate the kind of arguments that John Milton would make beginning in the 1640s regarding the relationship between nation building and normative sexuality. *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* (1643), for example, creates a link between the spiritual fitness of the married couple and the political health of the Commonwealth (*Complete Prose Works of John Milton,* v. 2, ed. Don M. Wolfe, et al. [New Haven: Yale UP, 1953-1982], 229-30).

marriage as the foundation for royal authority can only be codified through the prior possibility of heterosexual failure—specifically, the relationship of Jove and Juno, which represents a non-normative sexuality via marital infidelity that proves disruptive to conjugal relations and, ultimately, civil order. Jove's marital deviance provides a stark contrast to both Charles's purity and his command over both his consort and his subjects, particularly as it underscores the contamination of both Jove and the community over which he rules. The marital discord that proves so disruptive to Jove's court is directly related to Jove's inability to provide an archetype of exemplary rule, revealing the importance of the Caroline court as an exemplar of personal and political authority. Jove betrays a lack of erotic self-discipline, and, faced with a jealous wife, the god becomes entangled in a battle of wills that reflects the inefficacy of his household rule:

> . . . prone to heats of lust,
> He acted incests, rapes, adulteries
> On earthly beauties, which his raging Queene,
> Swolne with revengefull fury, turn'd to beasts,
> And in despight he retransform'd to Stars,
> Till he had fill'd the crowded Firmament
> With his loose Strumpets . . . (75-81).

Jove's initial punishment—Juno's transformation of his victims into beasts—is clearly a wife's challenge to her husband's authority. In his counter attack, Jove transforms the beasts into stars, elevating their status within the heavens in defiance of his wife. Eventually, however, this minor triumph over Juno reflects Jove's personal defeat, as those stars announce his "shame / . . . to the world" (82-83). Although Mercury, speaking directly to Charles and Henrietta Maria in the Banqueting House, prefaces his summary of the marital strife in heaven with the claim that now "Jove rivals your great vertues, Royall Sir, / And Juno, Madam, your attractive graces" (69-70), evidence of the continuing battle of wills emerges with the entrance of Momus (104), God of Mockery, who reminds viewers that Jove, in fact, has only initiated the process of "learn[ing] to lead his owne

wife" (269). In other words, Jove has by no means mastered this domestic objective. While Henrietta Maria is figured as Charles's equal—his "twin" (48) as Carew puts it—she is also, unlike the raging Juno, a model of feminine comportment: if she is working in consort with her husband, they are of the same mind or she has sublimated her desires to accommodate his political objectives.

Although as rulers Charles and Henrietta function as inspiring models for moral reform, Mercury's panygeric is undermined by the satirical barbs of Momus, which challenge this image by not only creating doubt regarding the effectiveness of the human models who inspire his transformation, but also by questioning Jove's motives for the reformation of his court.[11] Momus's abrupt and rude entrance is met with Mercury's directive, "let this Presence [Charles and Henrietta Maria] teach you modesty" (124); Momus, in response, quips "Let it if it can" (125). Later, he offers the audience his interpretation of Jove's proclamation, in which his subjects are "exhorted" (205) to comply with his new regime:

> *Jupiter* upon the inspection of I know not what vertuous Presidents extant (as they say) here in this Court, but as I more probably ghesse out of the consideration of the decay of his natural abilities, hath . . . disclaimed, and utterly rennounced all the lascivious extravagancies and riotous enormities of his forepast licentious life (195-202).

Momus seems skeptical enough about the Caroline court's "virtuous Presidents" (196), suggesting at the very least that the virtue of England's rulers is not dependable enough to either teach him (Momus) modesty or Jove chastity. While Jove appears, through Mercury's assessment, to have repudiated his past behavior, Momus contends that Jove's need to institute change is a result of his waning sexual potency (198) rather than a sincere investment in the "reciprocation of conjugall affection" (262). Moreover, Momus acknowledges what he believes is Jove's fundamental albeit

11 For an in depth discussion of Momus's role in *Coelum Britannicum*, see Joan Altieri, "Carew's Momus: A Caroline Response to Platonic Politics," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 88.3 (July 1989), 332-343.

concealed motive: "he apprehends a subversion of his Empire, and doubts lest Fate should introduce a legall succession in the legitimate heire, by repossessing the Titanian line" (230-33).

Not only does Momus deflate the image of Charles and Henrietta Maria as legitimate models for Jove and Juno's reconciliation, he also further destabilizes the possibilities for harmonious matrimony by invoking the precedent for immoral rule in Stuart England that the figure of Ganymede represents. Thus Momus also ushers the text from its focus on deviations of normative, conjugal heterosexuality (the predatory, adulterous behavior of Jove) to its brief but significant focus on the sodomitical practices associated with Jove and his page.[12] The reformation of Jove's court, Momus announces, includes special instructions for his cupbearer: "*Ganimede* is forbidden the Bedchamber, and must only minister in publique. The gods must keep no Pages, nor Groomes of their Chamber under the age of 25, and those provided of a competent stocke of beard" (250-54). If, as Bruce Smith contends, the tale of Jove and his cupbearer "was the best known, most widely recognized myth of homoerotic desire" in the period,[13] then the introduction of Ganymede at this moment reminds viewers that Jove's sexual indiscretions actually move beyond the heterosexual transgressions that Mercury details. Nor is the prohibition regarding "Groomes" directed at Jove exclusively: it is extended to all gods who might employ beautiful youth in their households to serve their pleasures, suggesting this is not a localized but possibly a widespread problem. This anxiety regarding Ganymede's youth, coupled with Momus's prior comments about Jove's old age and feebleness, speaks to concerns regarding the exploitation of the aged by the youthful, as well as the actual function of pages and grooms within the more subversive locale of the royal bedchamber. Ganymede's role as

12 For discussions of the masque that examine Ganymede in relation to the profligacy of James's court, see Michael B. Young, *King James and the History of Homosexuality* (New York: New York UP, 2000), 110; and Stephen Orgel and Roy Strong, *The Theatre of the Stuart Court,* v. 2. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 66-7.

13 Bruce R. Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England: A Cultural Poetics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 191.

minister to Jove not only satisfies his personal needs and desires, but also implies access to power that extends beyond their personal relationship: one that trades sexual favors for undue influence over matters of court preferment and policy.

Because Momus's introduction of the same-sex elements of Jove's lust recalls the frequency with which allusions to Jove and Ganymede were deployed to criticize James I's relationship with the Duke of Buckingham, it implicitly reminds viewers that if Charles provides a model for Jove's reform, then James I functions as an analog for Carew's representation of Jove's profligacy. An example of this representational tradition, which betrays the anxiety over misplaced power in the Jove/Ganymede relationship, is the anonymous poem "The Warre of the Gods" (1623), in which the gods stage a rebellion against Jove because of his unnatural love for Ganymede. When the speaker describes "Great Jove (that sways the imperial scepter / With his upstart love / That makes him drunk with nectar)," whom the rebels intend to "remove" from his place of power,[14] one can easily imagine a revolt of frustrated courtiers against Buckingham, also considered an "upstart," who has so enthralled his king that he is allowed to rule alongside him. Curtis Perry has addressed how the "institutionalization of intimacy" during James I's reign resulted in "bedchamber patronage," a system in which individuals who enjoyed continual access to the king's presence were at a decided political advantage.[15] Momus' reference to the role of the youthful royal favorite in the bedchamber—an office to which Buckingham was admitted at the age of twenty-three—seems dangerously close to criticizing James indirectly through the inevitable association of the former monarch with the Roman god. Although the masque's passing acknowledgment of Jove's Ganymede, embedded among references to other heavenly transgressors, may seem somewhat minor within the masque itself, it reminds viewers of the ways in which this homoerotic coupling was invoked as useful analogy for criticizing the relationship of James I and his influential courtiers.

14 Quoted in Smith, 202-03.

15 Curtis Perry, "The Politics of Access and Representations of the Sodomite King in Early Modern England," *Renaissance Quarterly*, 53. 4 (Winter 2000), 1057.

It would seem that to assert fully Charles's virtues as both a man and a ruler, *Coelum Britanniucm* would need to banish any sordid remnants of the present king's family history. As Michael B. Young suggests, this particular masque may have given "Charles the satisfaction of accomplishing in the fictionalized world of the masque what he was never able to accomplish in the real world—the reformation of his father's behavior."[16] But while Jove can proclaim his reforms through the mouthpiece Mercury, the continued presence of Ganymede in Jove's court points to only a partial reformation, suggesting that the deviant practices of the past have not entirely been purged from the present. Ganymede's removal from Jove's bedchamber is not precisely a form of complete exile, but rather functions as a reintegration into the more public spaces of the court, where his behavior can be at the very least monitored if not entirely repressed. In contrast to the allegorical figures—Plutus (Riches), Poena (Poverty), Tiche (Fortune), and Hedone (Pleasure)—who appear and are rejected for succession during the long inquisitorial "free Election" (420) section in which both Mercury and Momus examine possible candidates for installation in the Heavens (460-842), Ganymede, who never appears on stage in the masque, is seemingly absorbed into the court with his fellow courtiers. Clearly what Ganymede is forbidden is not complete access to Jove but unlimited private access to the monarch, a privilege that Jove's reforms seem to grant exclusively to his reconciled queen, Juno.[17] Instead of the "exile" by death suffered by Charles's favorite, Jove's Ganymede is repositioned in the more public spaces of the court where he can be subject to surveillance and, if necessary, discipline.

Yet Ganymede's presence is a continual reminder of the past: just as he lingers within Jove's court, so too does he—and all the

16 Young, 110.

17 While Mercury conveys Juno's rage at the objects of Jove's extramarital desire, he does not link her frustrations specifically with Jove's relationship with Ganymede. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that Henrietta Maria was known to have disliked Buckingham, and, in turn, Buckingham's continued affective and political importance in the Caroline court after the king's marriage was very much at the queen's expense. It was only after Buckingham's assassination that the queen's relationship with her husband took center stage at court. See Kevin Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1992), 168.

associations he represents for Stuart rule—linger dangerously at the margins of Carew's masque. However much *Coelum Britannicum* would present the royal marriage of Charles and Henrietta as the idealized political coupling upon which all marriages can be successfully modeled, their conjugal happiness is already tainted by the prior pattern of royal marriage present within recent English history: the shadow of Charles's royal parents, inevitably figured in the warring image of Jove and Juno provided by Mercury. The recollection of Ganymede in Carew's masque recalls rather than erases the associations between Charles and James, creating a link with Buckingham and the anxiety his presence had created. Along with his father's throne, Charles also inherited one of his father's most troubling personal and political legacies. Charles I's continued alliances with Buckingham after his father's death kept alive fears regarding the seductive power of the Ganymede-like favorite, and implicated the king, politically at least, in the sexual transgressions of his father. Because Buckingham informed the domestic and international politics of both Stuart administrations, the link Carew entertains between the fictional Ganymede of Jove's court and the real-life English Ganymede has the potential to undermine rather than elevate England's ruler. While Jove's "loathsome staines" initially alludes to the taint of James I's reign, those marks of transgression are borne by Charles regardless of his own personal moral integrity.

The abrupt departure of Momus prior to the explicit introduction of political unification might suggest a momentary containment of the skepticism he promotes, yet we are nonetheless left with an image of deviance that subverts the transformational power that Charles and Henrietta Maria embody. Momus's final recommendation is "to expunge in the Ancient, and suppresse in the moderne and succeeding Poems and Pamphlets, all past, present, and future mention of those abjur'd heresies" (218-20). This attempt to stifle debate in the world of the Gods fails to eradicate fully the underlying anxiety with regard to the function of sexual deviance in

relation to the management of the state. Momus's earlier declaration—"it is therefore by the authority aforesaid enacted, that this whole Army of Constellations be immediately disbanded and casheered, so to remove all imputation of impiety from the Cellestiall Spirits" (213-16)—reveals that the process of reformation is simply a cover. The masque as disciplinary mechanism removes the "imputation" or charge of deviance, yet fails to eradicate the offending behavior that led to the attribution in the first place. The absence of Momus at the conclusion of these proceedings leaves too many questions open, inviting viewers to link the censorship recommended for Jove's court with the possibility of similar methods of control in the court of Charles I. In introducing the subject of censorship, Momus acknowledges the potential for political and sexual dissidence that lurks behind the marital fiction.

II

Carew's representation of a unified Britain in the final section of *Coelum Britannicum* depends not only on the success of Carew's image of normative heterosexual marriage, but also on the expulsion of sexual deviance from the artistic space occupied by the fictional and historical figures at Whitehall. While the opening section of the masque focuses primarily on Mercury's flattering address to Charles and Henrietta Maria, emphasizing their ability to rule and inspire their immediate English subjects, Mercury's early reference to three "warlike" nations that "bend / Their willing knees" (49-50) before Charles and Henrietta Maria's throne signals the colonial preoccupations of the concluding section of the masque. Although England is also marked as submissive to the king's authority, its inclusion alongside Scotland and Ireland fails to obscure the reality that England is, according to Mark Netzloff, the "core" region and Scotland and Ireland merely "peripheral" regions within Britain.[18]

18 Mark Netzloff, England's *Internal Colonies: Class, Capital, and the Literature of Early Modern English Colonialism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 7. Netzloff borrows his definition of internal colonialism from Michael Hechter, who describes the relationship between core and peripheral regions as characterized by "unequal distribution of resources and power" (*Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development* [New York: Transaction Publishers, 1999], 6-9).

England may be perceived as a superior nation, but by having all three nations bow before the king, Carew's masque demonstrates an attempt to achieve what Netzloff calls a "replace[ment of] national identification with affiliation to a composite monarchy ruling over distinct kingdoms."[19] In *Coelum Britannicum*, the character of the royal couple justifies such a replacement, with their conjugal harmony serving as a precondition for the successful management of colonial strife and, ultimately, the reconciliation of nations.

Although Mercury remains in the concluding section of the masque to orchestrate the transition from the rejection of supplicants to the decisive moment of the royal couple's ascension, the final segment shifts from the mythical-literary world of Jove and Juno to the mytho-historical world of Britain itself. However, unlike the earlier portion of the masque, in which two members of Jove's court, Mercury and Momus, engage in a dialogue that undermines a consistent, unassailable representation of the relationship between moral and political authority, the later section of the masque includes little direct debate and largely accepts the truth of its assertions. After the departure of Momus, Carew introduces a new figure, the Genius of the Kingdoms, as well as players representing each of the three nations, who offer four songs in which they endorse Charles and Henrietta Maria's rule as the solution to the larger domestic challenge of internal colonialism. The middle section of the masque—with Momus's more explicit criticisms of both heavenly and earthly royal courts—is structurally contained, and the mechanisms of censorship that Momus endorses at Jove's court appear to be fully operative in the final section of Carew's entertainment. Following the structure of the play, in which the royal couple's panegyric is followed by evidence of immortal deviance, the final scene offers both the proof of Charles and Henrietta's worthiness, and stages the reward promised them at the masque's opening.

Coelum Britannicum's spectacular conclusion nonetheless betrays an anxiety about its fictions, partly through its unwillingness

19 Netzloff, 9.

to detail specific cultural transgressions and possible solutions to political challenges, but also through its preoccupation with the subject of succession. While anxiety over succession is present in Jove's world, it plays a more pronounced role in the discussion of Charles and Henrietta Maria as exemplars for the united political bodies of three nations often in conflict with each other and their sovereign on religious, political, and economic matters. In the latter half of the masque, Mercury confirms Charles and Henrietta Maria's legitimacy, as both lovers and rulers, when he explains the reward they will enjoy at the masque's end: "you shall see / The sacred hand of bright Eternitie / Mould you to Stars, and fix you in the Sphere" (862-64). The fourth and final song makes plain the outcome of this statement, as the Chorus "Crowne[s] this King, this Queene, this Nation" (1111). Like the wedding masque that uses the occasion of a culturally mixed marriage to bring together both the couple and their respective nations,[20] *Coelum Britannicum* serves as a post-wedding masque that reinforces the royal marriage by representing Charles and Henrietta Maria's succession to the heavens—their "crowning" within the performance space of Whitehall—as complimenting their determination to rule successfully over England, Ireland, and Scotland. Moreover, the succession of England's royal couple to their place in the Heavens works symbolically to sanction the political authority of Henrietta Maria, who was never officially crowned as England's queen owing to her Catholicism. The masque itself functions as a *de facto* succession ceremonial, investing in her the symbolic authority that she was denied nearly a decade before.

20 One of the most discussed of these examples, *The Lord Hay's Masque* (1607), celebrates the marriage of Honora Denny to a Scottish favorite of James I, James Hay. For discussions of this particular masque in relation to Anglo-Scottish unification, see Kevin Curran, "Erotic Policy: King James, Thomas Campion, and the Rhetoric of Anglo-Scottish Marriage," *The Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, 7.1 (Spring/Summer 2007), 55-77. For a discussion of this masque in relation to constructions of Britain, see Philippa Berry and Jane Elisabeth Archer, "Reinventing the Matter of Britain: undermining the state in the Jacobean masques," in *British Identities and English Renaissance Literature*, ed. David J. Baker and Willy Maley (New York: Cambridge UP, 2002), 126-30. For a discussion of the treatment of international marriage alliances in relation to European peace, see Kevin Curran, "James I and fictional authority at the Palatine wedding celebrations," *Renaissance Studies*, 20.1 (2006), 60-67.

The unification section of the masque traces the evolution of Britain from an unruly tribal culture to a more civilized modern nation reaching is apex under Caroline rule. Rather than marking the past as a potential blot or "staine" on England's present authority, as does the earlier portion of the masque, *Coelum Britannicum* represents Britain's early history as a necessary stage in its anticipated movement toward political unity and cultural cohesion. The production notes for the theatrical setting provide a visual narrative complimenting the poetic text's acknowledgement of the past as that which must cede to a more refined model of civic authority. Prior to Mercury's initial entrance, Carew's text describes a scene depicting the "ruines of some great City of the ancient Romans, or civiliz'd Brittaines" (37-39), once glorious but now in a state of disorder and decay. This visual image not only sets the stage for Mercury's discussion of Jove's disorderly court, but also anticipates the textual acknowledgement of the pagan world of ancient Britain in the final scene. The closing architectural image is of Windsor Castle in the distance, "the famous seat of the most honorable Order of the Garter" (1085-86), which provides a reference to the Caroline embodiment of English moral refinement and political unity.[21] The pagan ruins of the opening scene and the dominant image of Windsor at the conclusion construct a trajectory that moves the viewer from a confrontation of the unruly past to the reward of the orderly present—in which both sexual and cultural reform are complete. With the final image of the masque resting on the castle, *Coelum Britannicum* confirms Charles's reign as the ultimate signifier of a world characterized by moral refinement and political unity.

Despite their position as exemplary rulers, both Charles and Henrietta Maria must witness this theatrical transformation from the disorderly past to the civilized present before they can be officially installed as the rulers of heaven and earth. The royal

21 Orgel and Strong (70) note that the rituals of the Order of the Garter "became a model for the High Church Ceremonial," which, in the context of my discussion, would work to undermine the image of Windsor as distinctly English. These rituals likely reflected the old ceremonies of the Catholic Church, many of which were being reintroduced through the reforms of William Laud.

couple is subject to a history lesson that situates their present rule in the context of various stages of Britain's past—from the pagan days of Roman occupied Britain to the pre-Reformation days of medieval Catholic Europe. Prior to the introduction of the Genius and the players representing the Three Kingdoms, Mercury promises to deliver "Those antient Worthies of these famous Isles / That long have slept" (856-57) to the king and queen. First, however, they must "beholde the rude / And old Abiders" (870-71), described as "naked, antient, and wild Inhabitants" (873). After the appearance of representatives of the three kingdoms, situated on a huge mountain above the "wild and craggy" (901) scene associated with Britain's history, the Genius commands the nations in the first song to call forth "their aged Priests" (886), a chorus of Druids and Rivers, so that they might "warme their hearts, and waves" in the "bright breams" (904) of the royal couple. This ritual is contrived to force those associated with Britain's past to recognize the superior model of present-day Britain, yet the holding back of the more appealing "Worthies" (856) reminds the royal couple of "the point from which their full perfections grew" (872). Although Charles and Henrietta Maria are elevated throughout the text as models of virtuous authority, they, along with the masque's other viewers, are forced to confront the nation's past, much in the same way Momus had forced a momentary confrontation between Charles and his family history.

Central to the revisionist myth of English civility that Mercury promotes is the masque's indirect acknowledgement of Scotland and Ireland as, to borrow a phrase from Christopher Hill, the "dark corners of the land," whose unruly inhabitants—associated with the natural, wild spaces of the colonial margins—threaten to corrupt England as Britain's moral center.[22] Rather than directly acknowledge current challenges with these nations, however, Carew diplomatically turns to the seemingly neutral subject of pre-Christian Britain and its warring, unruly peoples, which represents the antithesis

22 Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (New York: Penguin, 1975), 73.

of the civilized world of Charles's court. The unification section reveals a "more grave Anti-masque of Picts, the natural Inhabitants of this Isle, [and] antient Scots and Irish" (880-82), who dance at the "wilde and woody" (879-80) base of an emerging mountain. These "antients" are summoned from "those shades where dwells eternall night" (875) so that they might see the wondrous light of the court. The "rudeness" of these inhabitants, undoubtedly in need of discipline and reform, assumes a lack of refinement (OED 3.a.) that places them outside of an orderly and sophisticated world associated with the present court. In typical anti-masque fashion, they are the necessary prelude to the subsequent masque of the Three Kingdoms, in which each nation is guided to reconciliation by the Genius—and in which the reconciliation reinforces both the authority of the king and the unity of the royal couple.

Although references to Ganymede are decidedly absent in the concluding section of Carew's masque, his specter remains as the anxiety over sexual transgressions is connected to the masque's ultimate preoccupation with national unity. It is worth noting that the real-life anxieties regarding the Duke of Buckingham's influence over the monarch extended beyond the power dynamics of the bedchamber to include anxiety over international politics, linking sexual contamination with cultural and/or religious infiltration.[23] As Perry has pointed out, "political disorder of various kinds [. . .] attracted accusations of sodomy" (1054) in early modern England

23 This association of sodomy with foreigners from Catholic nations is a familiar one in early modern texts as diverse as the poetry of John Donne ("Elegy 11: On his Mistris," in *The Variorum Edition of the Poetry of John Donne*, v. 2, ed. Gary A. Stringer [Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 2000], 246-7) and the legal observations of jurist Edward Coke. In his *Third Institute*, Coke argues that the Lombards brought the vice of sodomy to England, although he attributes an Italian origin to the word "bugeria" (quoted in Alan Bray, *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*, 2nd Ed. [New York: Colombia UP, 1995], 75). For an interesting discussion that associates forced sodomy with non-Christian practices, see Mark D. Jordan, "Saint Pelegius, Ephebe and Martyr," in *Queer Iberia: Sexualities, Cultures, and Crossings from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance,* ed. Josiah Blackmore and Gregory S. Hutcheson (Durham: Duke UP, 1999), 23-47. For a discussion that connects sodomy to foreignness in travel narratives, see Guy Poirier, "Masculinities and Homosexualities in French Accounts of Travel to the Middle East and North Africa," in *Desire and Discipline: Sex and Sexuality in the Premodern West*, ed. Jacqueline Murray and Konrad Eisenbichler (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 155-67.

and created a great deal of slippage between categories of deviance. While Buckingham was a Protestant, his familial and political alliances with Catholics, his role in the failed marriage negotiations for the proposed match between Charles and the Spanish Infanta, and his conflicts with low-Church members of Parliament not only helped sustain anti-papist sentiments in England, but also frequently connected the crimes of the sodomite with the threat of foreign, Catholic infiltration.[24] Alexander Gil's poem "For the Kinge," for instance, another seventeenth century text that details the manipulation of Jove by Ganymede, provides evidence that links the figure of the sodomite to contemporary anxieties regarding religious conversion and foreign infiltration. The poem's more topical references to "Spanish treaties that may wound / Our countries peace our Gospell sound" (19-20) likely allude to the proposed match between Charles I and the Spanish Infanta, while mention of "the poisoned baits / Of Jesuits" (31-32) acknowledges fears regarding the corrupting influence of priests from foreign nations.[25] By placing the speaker's frustration with the powerful and seductive "Ganymede" alongside the king's perceived willingness to collaborate, or at least cooperate,

24 For discussions of Buckingham's alliances with Catholics, see Gregg, 75-76; and Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham, 1592-1628* (Longman: New York, 1981), 278, 321, and 358-9. On the response to the Spanish marriage negotiations, see David M. Bergeron, *Royal Family, Royal Lovers: King James of England and Scotland* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1991), 172-5, Gregg, 72-4, and Carlton, 47-9. For an overview of Buckingham's conflicts with parliament, see Gregg, 84-102. Buckingham also was implicated in treasonous activities during the early reign of Charles I. The House of Commons charged Buckingham with supplying ships to the French knowing that they might be used against France's own Protestant subjects, while the House of Lord's accused him of being, in part, responsible for the failed attempt to seize the Spanish port of Cadiz. Although the agreement with France stipulated that the ships would not be used against the English, and the military failings of the Spanish mission were compounded by factors beyond his control, Buckingham's activities raised concerns regarding the Catholic leanings of both the favorite and his sovereign (Gregg, 147, and 152-3; Lockyer, 308-31).

25 "For the Kinge," lines 19-20 and 31-32. This poem appears in *The Poetical Works of William Drummond*, ed. L. E. Kastner (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1913) under the heading "Poems of Doubtful Authenticity," and it is to Drummond that Bray assigns authorship in *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*. Christopher Hill assumes, however, that Gil wrote the poem (*Milton and the English Revolution* [New York: Viking, 1978], 28). In the standard biography of Milton, William Riley Parker also makes reference to it in his discussion of Gil's arrest for toasting Buckingham's assassin, John Felton, which led to the poem's discovery (*Milton: A Biography*, 2nd ed. v. 1, ed. Gordon Campbell [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968], 50).

with foreigners, as well as his alleged vulnerability to the enticements of Catholics, Gil's poem presents Ganymede as the conduit for other transgressions seemingly unrelated to sexual excess.

While many early modern examples of England's political vulnerability emphasize the powerful threat of Rome, whether through its French or Spanish allies, they also reveal something more immediately related to the concerns of *Coelum Britannicum*: the power of England's adjacent regions to provide—or fail to provide—sufficient geopolitical barriers. The perception that both Stuart courts were defined by a crypto-Catholicism that endangered England's spiritual and physical security was alive long before the virulent rhetoric of the 1640s, in which both the queen and the late favorite were the frequent targets of radical Protestants calling for both religious and governmental reform.[26] This concern regarding sexual deviance, religious affiliation, and foreign infiltration feeds into adjacent anxieties about England's relationship with its internal, political others: those peopling the colonies that Carew's masque attempts to purge of their transgressions and to unite with England. Although Perry argues that this anxiety over bedroom patronage was not in evidence prior to James's arrival in England, it is worth remembering that James's rule in Scotland was tainted by his overly intimate relationships with two prominent Catholics: his cousin, Esmé Stewart, Duke of Lennox, whose arrival in Scotland from France was perceived as a threat to both Scotland and England's security in the face of continued Catholic opposition; and George Gordon, Earl of Huntly, who was arrested for participating in two Spanish Catholic conspiracies to infiltrate England by way of Scotland.[27] In

26 For an overview of anti-Catholic literature targeting Charles and Henrietta Maria, see Francis E. Dolan, *Whores Of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005), especially 95-102.

27 For discussion of the Duke of Lennox's activities on behalf of France and the imprisoned Mary Queen of Scots, see David Harris Willson, *King James VI and I* (New York: Henry Holt, 1956), 36; and David Bergeron, *King James and Letters of Homoerotic Desire* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1999), 41. On Huntly's initial act of treason in 1589, when he and a group of Scottish lords wrote to Philip II of Spain offering their support should he invade Scotland, see Bryan Bevan, *King James VI of Scotland and I of England* (London: Rubicon Press, 1996), 38-9 and Willson, 101-03; on Huntly's later involvement in Jesuit plots, specifically the "Spanish Blanks" incident during the winter of 1592-93, see Willson, 114-15.

the case of Lennox, anxiety over his influence focused not only on his potential threat as a Catholic recently arrived from the French court, but also on fears that he would "draw the king to carnal lust."[28] Such lusts were overtly associated with religious transgression and treason in complaints raised against Lennox, who was accused of "seeking to seduce the King by filling his ears with wicked devices and speeches and withdrawing his residence to places frequented by Papists, full of traitorous persons to his estate, and overflowing with all kinds of whoredom."[29]

Just as Scotland was widely perceived as a site through which Catholic traitors could infiltrate England, so, too, were England's other colonies perceived as weak communities easily penetrated by slippery Catholics who would be welcomed by local recusant conspirators. Well after the defeat of the Spanish Armada, Wales was perceived as a viable site for Catholic infiltration and treasonous activities, and Ireland, although separated from England by water, was perhaps understood as the most unruly and resistant colony to English attempts at colonization and religious reform.[30] Although it is coincidental that the sex scandal associated with the criminal trial of Earl of Castlehaven for sodomy and rape is connected to Ireland, one of the rude nations featured in Carew's masque, the fact that the rhetoric surrounding the trial was not limited to sexual transgressions

28 *Calander of State Papers, Relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547-1603, 13 Vols.*, v 6, ed. Joseph Bain, et al. (Eds. *Calendar of the State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547-1603,* 13 Vols. [Edinburgh: General Registry House, 1898-1969], v. 6, 149.

29 *CSP Scot,* v 6, 151.

30 The Council of the Marshes reported in 1601 a "great backsliding of religion in these parts" (quoted in J. Gywnfor Jones, *Wales and the Tudor State* [Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1989], 103), suggesting a continued concern with the implications of Wales vulnerability for England. Moreover, the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 was preceded in the summer of 1603 by two pro-Catholic plots in Wales: the Main Plot and the Bye or Priest's Plot (Geraint Dyfnallt Owen, *Wales in the Reign of James I* [Wolfeboro, N.H.: Boydell Press, 1988], 68-73). As for Ireland—which was under threat of Spanish invasion in 1625—the appointment of Sir Thomas Wentworth in 1633 as Lord Deputy of Ireland "brought law and order" to the country, but Wentworth's methods "alienated every group in Ireland" (Carlton, 82-3).

reinforces the association between national or regional difference, Anglican dissent, and sexual impropriety. The documents relating to the trial reveal a concern regarding both the alleged Catholicism and the Irish connections of the accused, implying that the Earl's sexual deviance is indicative of a greater problem: the inability to rule nations such as Ireland, where the realities of religious and political dissent challenge the very notion of unity that the crown attempts to project.[31]

Carew's representation of those "rude / And old Abiders" (870-71), whose attributes are associated with the ancient pagan ruins of Roman Britain, works to expose the unruly aspects of the untamed margins of the nation, linking them with the classical, pagan world of Jove's court, and, quite possibly, Catholic Europe. While Buckingham is connected to the figures depicted early in the masque—Ganymede and Jove's other elevated subjects who are, presumably, disciplined and reabsorbed into the court—he is also implicitly associated with the "Celtic fringe" with which the final section of Carew's masque concerns itself. These unruly ancient Britons bare both an actual and structural relation to figures presented earlier in the masque: in particular, the anti-masque group that occurs prior to the trial scene represents "naturall deformity" (305) and, prior to performing a dance in "monstrous shapes" (304), is commanded by Mercury to return to "the Fens, Caves, Forrests, Deserts, Seas . . . and resume [their] native qualities" (302-303). Although sexual deviance is not a factor in the "grave" more dignified anti-masque that features these ancient Britons, the function of the anti-masque ultimately links the earlier anti-masque figures with the "rude . . . Abiders" (870-71) of the conclusion (35). Despite this difference, the cumulative impact of the various dances presented during the Mercury/Momus dialogue—whether representing "severall vices,

31 Although Castlehaven had inherited Fonthill, an estate in Wiltshire, from his mother, the Earldom was an Irish title. While he was suspected of having Catholic leanings, his son James was a confirmed Catholic and spent a great part of his career trying to convince the English crown that he could practice his faith and remain a loyal subject. See Cynthia Herrup, *A House in Gross Disorder: Sex, Law, and the 2nd Earl of Castlehaven* (New York: Oxford UP, 1999), 126-7.

expressing the deviation from vertue" (374), "Gypsies" (627), a "Battell" of potentially rebellious subjects (718), or "the five Senses" (808)—have the effect of conflating a variety of transgressions that signal disorder in opposition to the masque's larger picture of marital harmony as a precondition for national unity. While the figures occupying the earlier anti-masques are irrecoverable, banished with the figures of vice they compliment, all of the anti-masque figures, including those representing Britain's pagan past, represent the unsettling possibility of future transgressions.

In its concluding section, then, Carew's masque augments earlier anxieties regarding sexual deviance by associating them with a host of new ones relating to cultural deviance. One figure of interest, Ganymede, a seductive favorite often equated with a real-life counselor eager to facilitate foreign, Catholic alliances, is displaced by the disruptive individuals peopling the sometimes rebellious colonies under the king's jurisdiction. This problem of disciplining unruly subjects, regardless of their transgressions, betrays its resilience in Carew's representation of the inhabitants of Scotland and Ireland, who are not banished but rather represented as individuals who can be transformed by the example of English virtue and civility. This rescue operation, like the reformation of Jove through the repositioning of Ganymede, rids the court of its links to the past and paves the way for the symbolic union of "the three kingdoms of *England*, / *Scotland*, and *Ireland*" (888-89).

Before this reconciliation can occur, however, the text must also confront its more recent Catholic past—and does so using a strategy that skirts the issue that the presence of Catholicism has not yet been purged from England's present. The concession to Catholicism that many feared would result from a possible Spanish match was realized when Charles acquired his French bride, with provisions made for the new queen to practice her faith and for the crown to loosen its sanctions against English Catholics.[32] Henrietta Maria is not only in attendance at the Whitehall performance as

32 Gregg details as special concerns the freedom with which English Catholics "frequent[ed] the chapels established for the queen and her attendants, trouble over numerous saint and feast days she observed" and "over the number of her priests" (159).

an audience member and *de facto* participant, but her presence provides a trace of the very Catholic connections that, especially in the minds of Puritan radicals, threatens her husband's political objectives. Taken as a whole, Carew's direct acknowledgement of Queen Henrietta Maria in the masque's concluding section seems to minimize her potential threat, especially given that this particular masque was not one in which, unlike her own entertainments, she actively collaborated with a poet. Yet the masque also limits her authority by largely confining her role to the reproductive function. The earliest reference to the queen, for example, is in the text's description of her "Impresse" (25), which depicts her as a Lily with "three lesser Lilies springing out of the Stemme" (27), clearly signaling her successful production of three heirs. In the concluding scene, the figure representing Eternitie acknowledges "*the ripe fruits"* the royal couple's *"chaste bed*" (1129) as the source not only of royal progeny, but also of future generations of British heroes. These generative allusions emphasize the importance of both moral inspiration and the actual production of royal progeny and would seem to confine the queen by the end of the masque to her properly subordinate position as wife and mother.

Despite the largely recuperative representation of the queen, Henrietta Maria is both a Catholic and hails from a foreign nation. Like Buckingham, she provides an implicit link between the text's initial and prolonged treatment of sexual deviance and its final solution to the problem posed by cultural outsiders, particularly as it was her moral character that was perceived to be under attack in Prynne's polemic. Unlike the opening sections of the masque, which flirt with the possibility that Charles will collapse into James/Jove through his connection to Ganymede, the later half of the masque avoids any direct associations with the proto-Catholic elements of Charles's court until the moment in which Henrietta Maria is singled out in the third song. The scenic imagery that precedes this song, in which the chorus comprised of the Kingdoms singles out the queen for praise, features a rendering of well-ordered gardens

and walkways leading toward an Italianate "Princely Villa" (1020) that alludes to the extravagant and deceptively ordered world of the early modern foreign Prince.[33] The song itself describes the heroes of Britain's medieval Catholic heritage: Prince Arthur, St. George, Sir Guy, Beavis, or some "true / Round-Table Knight" (1030-35). While these references might be read as acknowledging the valor of medieval England without directly connecting it to the alleged Catholic transgression of Charles's court, they suspiciously appear within the context of an elucidation, in a song, of the queen's own power to subdue. Henrietta Maria is described as a gentle conqueror, whose "Divine aspects . . . becalme the Ayre" (1027-29), and who is invited to conquer through "peacefull pledges" (1037) offered as an example to the Catholic warriors of old. At the same time, however, the Kingdoms entreat her to provide a model for this peace through her own submission to the aims of her husband's nation. By figuring the Queen as both conquering and conquered, the text invites readers to consider whether it is feasible for the queen to occupy both positions simultaneously.

Even if the masque ultimately represents Charles as the opposite of Jove—a commanding husband and effective ruler—the text raises questions about his ability to bring off the actual political accomplishment of unification. Although the masque's conclusion depends on the cooperation of nations willing to defer to an exemplary ruler and his obedient wife, the desired objective is already problematized by the appearance of figures representing the unruly inhabitants of its pagan and Catholic past. Moreover, this symbolic representation of union, however much it may reinforce the fictional virtue of Charles's court, does not solve the challenge of British unification. Indeed, the three kingdoms question their ability to remain united in the absence of the Genius of Britain, whose "*soul held [them] together*" (1005). The Genius's promise—"*I will my force renew, / And a more active Vertue bring / At my return*"

33 In *The Theatre of the Stuart Court*, Orgel and Strong reproduce an Indigo Jones drawing that closely resembles Carew's description of this scene, noting that it was inspired by the Italian painter and engraver Antonio Tempesta (586-8). The formal garden described in the text was introduced into English garden design during the reign of James I (41).

(1007-09)—would seem to point to the inadequacy of human mortals to effect such change. While offering a solution to the challenges of conflicting nations, the Genius defers the moment of ultimate unity brought about by Charles's virtue to some unspecified moment in the future: he excites our anticipation for reconciliation and renewal, yet offers a hope in no way justified by the political situation. That Charles is intended to perform the spiritual, guardian-like function of the Genius in the real world that exists beyond the confines of the masque entertainment is apparent. Whether he is capable of doing so, is less than certain. What is obviously missing in *Coelum Britannicum* is a clear acknowledgement of the present-day Scots and Irish, engaging in Presbyterian or Catholic dissent—an omission clearly necessitated not only by the reverential function of the court masque, but also by the impossibility of accounting for and transcending past failures to unite these three nations as one political and spiritual body.

Coelum Britannicum functions as both a symbolic, sexual purgation of the court of Charles' father James I, represented in the masque by the wayward court of Jove, and an assertion of England's political dominance, represented through the masque's elaborate final scene. Both the marital and national fictions of *Coelum Britannicum* attempt to codify royal power through the myth of union, and the text rationalizes obedience through the myth of political and cultural progress. While its nations are reconciled through Carew's poetic fiction, the stubborn presence of unruly subjects and distrustful nations would seem to mark the masque's failure to completely assert its ideology. The masque both acknowledges and attempts to suppress both Britain's pagan and Catholic past, which leads to the emergence of a civilized Protestant Britain made up of three cooperative nations whose submission to the king erases a more relevant history: not one of barbarity or incivility, but rather one marked by documented religious and political tensions. Yet the displacement of current political anxieties onto the past, with modern Ireland and Scotland only acknowledged

through their willingness to submit to an English ruler, underscores the political disenfranchisement and cultural assimilation attendant upon any union between nations. Although the 1625 marriage of Charles and Henrietta Maria is re-legitimized through the staging of their joint succession, this rendering of their authority via normative sexuality comes at a price. In order to construct heterosexuality as the foundation for civic morality, the masque reveals that this image of the royal marriage must grapple with the very images of sexual and cultural deviance it would repudiate in order to call itself into existence.

In erasing both the history of James I's indiscretions and the history of centuries of turmoil between England, Scotland, and Ireland, *Coelum Britannicum* implies that a united Britain not only failed to exist, but also could never have existed under the allegedly wayward misrule of James I. As a figure in need of transformation, but one forever associated with the former king's failure to reform, Ganymede is perhaps the most problematic character within the masque's political mission to present Charles and Henrietta's rule (and marriage) as uncontaminated. In relating Jove's non-heterosexual transgressions, the masque invites witnesses to rethink the stability of the royal marriage, and to question, however silently, the political efficacy of the king himself. In the end *Coelum Britannicum* offers not a convincing statement on the relationship of moral virtue to political authority, but rather an opportunity to consider how and why the sodomite, an indispensable signifier for political corruption during James I's reign, continues to garner such power in the political fictions of Charles I. As long as Charles's court via the masque's author embraces the classical analogies deployed to criticize his father's reign, and as long as rhetoric surrounding the sodomite incorporates adjacent anxieties regarding cultural others, such court sponsored entertainments open up rather than limit the range of possible interpretations. While both the repudiation of Ganymede and the civilizing of the unruly inhabitants of England's internal colonies would seem to support Carew's paean to royal

heterosexuality, the current queen shadowed in the masque—Henrietta Maria of France—serves not as the bastion of normative heterosexuality that triumphs over examples of sexual deviance from the recent past, but rather as a culturally dangerous figure the masque also struggles to contain.

Jessica Tvordi is Associate Professor of English at Southern Utah University, where she teaches medieval and early modern literature, and also serves as a guest lecturer for the Utah Shakespearean Festival's Camp Shakespeare series. Her publications include articles on Shakespeare, as well as a forthcoming essay on John Milton's Prolusion VI. Jessica is currently working on a book-length project that examines how post-Reformation anxieties about institutional politics, civic morality, and national boundaries inform, and are informed by, early modern discourses on gender and sexual deviance.

Inigo Jones: Design for Coelum Britannicum