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ABSTRACT

This essay investigates relationships among friendship, self-fashioning and temporality in Philips’s elegies, which question traditional expressions of transcendent solace by placing resistant, intertextual consolations within secular frameworks. The majority of Philips’s elegies dwell within the contingencies of mediating absences, as all of the parting poems reveal, illuminating the bonds of friendship that yield their worldly singularities through occasions of loss. Philips devises friendship and self-fashioning as tropes for her poems’ concerns with heightened psychological (and increasingly intertextual) events that merge private and public spheres of discourse. Through her dialogic subjectivities, Philips crafts a kairic literary history for her counter-public as a challenge to teleological historiography. Such contiguities among co-poets and poems illustrate Philips’s unique historical imagination, her keen attunement to regenerative secular temporality, and her contribution to the emergence of the modern poetic elegy. Philips’s poetics of loss engenders an intuitive synergy in the midst of measurable time.

If we no old historian’s name
  Authentique will admitt,
And Thinke all said of friendship’s fame
  But poetry and wit:
Yet what’s revered by minds so pure
Must be a bright Idea, sure. (“The Enquiry”, 1–6)¹

This essay investigates a distinctive form of secular temporality that emerges within the scope of Katherine Philips’s elegies and how such attentive figuration shapes her poetics of loss and historical imagination. Situated within and against, on the one hand, chronotopic cycles of degeneration and, on the other, Neoplatonic transcendence from time, Philips’s articulation of her
own notion of kairos—“a bright Idea, sure” —here, in “The Enquiry”, as well as in the majority of her elegies, infuses the poem’s transactional moment with regenerative intertextuality.  

Philips’s poetics of loss engenders an intuitive synergy in the midst of measurable time. Although such a formulation concerning the nexus of history, poetry and philosophy complements Renaissance and early modern standard principles for poiesis from Philip Sidney and Aemilia Lanyer to Margaret Cavendish, for example, Philips’s elegies contribute (in ways that Sidney’s discourse does not address) to the emergence of the seventeenth-century poetic elegy’s heightened concerns with the intertextual resistance to consolation, which grounds the work’s constitutive making of new forms of identity and of time.

Throughout Philips’s writings, friendship—whether loved or lost, sustained or subverted—serves as the major trope for and sign of this erotic, immanent/imminent, kairic connection among co-poets and poems, which, as a form of intuitive temporality, is inherently destabilizing. The role of friendship in Philips’s work has received ample study in recent decades from a variety of cultural, material, political, sexual, social and textual perspectives, all of which have sharpened our attention to the intricacies of Philips’s world, if perhaps at the risk of undermining the agency of the poems themselves. What has not yet received attention, however, is this link between friendship and contingent temporality—“Had friendship nere been known to men, / (The ghost at last confest) / The world had been a stranger then” (“The Enquiry”, 43–45)—which, as I shall argue, Philips’s elegies most vividly reveal. Poetry has more to say “of friendship’s fame” than “Authentic” historical knowledge, as “The Enquiry” intimates. Within and against the fallen “copyes” (11) and neglected “bonds of friendship tyed / With so remisse a knot, / That by the most it is defied, / And by the rest forgot” (31–34), Philips intercalates “original” (12) instances of “all that Heav’n possess’d” (46). Friendship is the art that winds the “soule [ … ] To motion” (“To My excellent Lucasia”, 7–10) because “bodys move in time, and so must minds” (“To my Lucasia”, 23).

Prevailing interpretations align Philips’s idea of friendship with Neoplatonism, emphasizing a transcendent telos. However, I will argue for an Aristotelian view (via Jacopo Mazzoni’s notion of the poetic simulacrum, as noted below) that emphasizes contingency and remediation at the heart of Philips’s literary community. Her poems consistently praise friendship as a worldly, dynamic principle: “So friendship governs actions best, / Prescribing Law to all the rest” (“Friendship in Emblem”, 43–44). Friendship embodies Aristotelian enargeia (i.e. vividness) engendering new avenues for desire and action —“So the Soul’s motion does not end in bliss, / But on her self she scatters and dilates, / And on the Object doubles, till by this / She finds new Joys, which that reflux creates” (“To my Lucasia, in defence”, 45–48)—thereby mitigating the “misery” of “extreames […] still contiguous” (“The World”, 75–76).
Friendship informs memory with a living inscription, “which no Tomb gives” (“Wiston = Vault”, 21), and infuses history with “a bright Idea” of regenerative, secular time that intervenes within and against epitaphic chronicity (“The Enquiry”, 6). Philips consistently posits friendship as a constitutive principle that paradoxically celebrates both the union of two individuals and their distinctively ephemeral, embodied qualities. Friendship thus serves as a foundational trope for the literary history fashioned by Philips’s coterie.

The epitaphic and elegiac poems contribute significantly to this historiographic dimension. Only two of the epitaphs—“Engraved on Mr. John Collyer’s Tomb: stone at Beddington” and “On Little Regina Collyer, on the same tombstone”—truly accommodate George Puttenham’s strict formulation for the genre’s defining characteristics as “a kind of epigram […] commodiously [written] or [engraved] upon a tomb in a few verses, pithy, quick, and sententious, for the passerby to peruse and judge upon without any long tarriance”. The rest of Philips’s epitaphic poems exceed that measure—keeping in mind, of course, the fluid modalities among epigram, epitaph and elegy between the lines in Puttenham’s statements. A cluster of Philips’s hybrid poems explicitly signal modal tensions between epitaph and elegy that highlight the poet’s respective negotiation of chronotopic and kairotopic registers.

This essay investigates key relationships among friendship, self-fashioning and temporality in Philips’s elegies, focusing especially on the ways in which these poems combine these factors to question more traditional expressions of solace (inflected by transcendent signification) by placing resistant, intertextual consolations within secular frameworks. I will argue more specifically that the majority of Philips’s elegies dwell within the contingencies of mediating absences, as all of the parting poems reveal, illuminating the bonds of friendship that most strikingly yield their worldly singularities through occasions of loss. In all of these cases, the poet’s praxis of friendship endures the crisis and shapes the elegy’s historical figuration—that is, the poem’s capacity to go beyond representation (mimesis) to constitute an autonomous reality (simulacrum) which actualizes an embodied potentiality (entelechy) within a context of contingent temporality. Across the scope of her elegies, Philips devises friendship and self-fashioning as tropes for her texts’ concerns with heightened psychological (and increasingly intertextual) experiences of loss that merge private and public spheres of discourse. Through her fictive, dialogic subjectivities, Philips crafts a kairic, immanent/imminent literary history for her counter-public as a challenge to transcendent, teleological historiography. Such intertextual contingencies and contiguities among co-poets and poems illustrate Philips’s unique historical imagination, her keen attunement to regenerative, secular temporality, and her contribution to the work of the modern poetic elegy.
While all forms of literary art are surely time machines, the seventeenth-century poetic elegy dwells in a dynamic matrix of experiential factors and forces—of past, present and future; of absent presences and present absences; of pain, suffering and trauma—all of which charge this particular form of literary discourse with a heightened attunement to the individual’s experience of time in an increasingly secular age. Philips’s figurations of grief and mourning strike a range of registers, from the intense brevity of the dirge and the epitaph to the introspective and philosophical nuances of the elegy and the lament, to the polemics and politics of the panegyric. Notwithstanding such matters of generic and modal variation, for the purposes of my argument here, I will follow other scholars, who have capaciously defined “elegy” as a poem concerning loss (in all possible meanings and nuances) that hinges on a three-point rhetorical structure for the expression of sorrow, praise and consolation. And I will do so in order to complicate and enrich that formulation: sorrow modulating to anger; praise to blame; consolation to renunciation; and teleological transcendence to contingent temporality. The English poetic elegy proliferates during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, assuming a dizzying heterogeneity of shapes and registers that cross categorical boundaries, as even Puttenham’s generic standards attest beneath their surface definitions. Of the 130 “authorized” poems in the Stump Cross edition of Philips’s collected works, at least 38—that is, nearly one-third of the poems—are elegiac in their rhetorical modes and stylistic treatments of subject matter. Among Philips’s contemporaries, only Lady Hester Pulter and An Collins wrote an equally significant number of poetic elegies during the interregnum. Despite these observations, Philips’s poetics of loss has surprisingly received little focused study vis-à-vis the tradition of the English poetic elegy (or, for that matter, the epitaph).

Prior to the seventeenth century, the English elegy articulates a place for sorrow in the realm of earthly temporality and particularity, and, for solace, in that of spiritual atemporality and universality. Elegiac texts conventionally ground the telos of consolation on a sacred locus of transcendent signification beyond the representational limits of literary art. Resistance to solace, with due moderation, would therefore intimate a potential crisis at the limit of the mourner’s grief and the poem’s discourse that should yield to higher, extratextual principles. Such traditional formulations persist within the scope of the genre’s development through the sixteenth century and begin to shift in the early seventeenth century—with the 1620s indicating a decisive moment—thereby marking an epistemological transition to the early modern historical imagination. These emerging concerns, though, follow an uneven path.

The English elegy’s historical and discursive realities change in at least four interrelated ways during the seventeenth century, with each new characteristic bearing witness to transformations, on a cultural level, of the subject’s greater
autonomy as an *individual* within contingent covenants shaping ecclesiastical, domestic and civil spheres of doctrine and discipline, agency and authority, liberty and licence. These four changes involve: a heightened psychological experience of grief and the mourning process; the linguistic constitution of subjectivities; intertextual elegiac resistance; and the placement of consolation within contexts of secular temporality. While elegiac resistance (since the works of Bion and Moschus, Theocritus and Virgil) has always been integral to the genre’s rhetorical structure, the increasingly linguistic and temporal nature of that resistance engaged as an intertextual, antithetical form of solace occurs as a direct consequence of secularizing forces in early modern culture.

Whereas grief pertains to internalized experience, mourning concerns social practice. Because the poetic elegy combines three fundamental modes of expression integral to both grief and mourning—lamentation, praise and consolation—the genre is uniquely poised to negotiate tensions between private and public spheres of discourse. An elegy serves as a vehicle for the transformation of loss into gain, absence into presence, sorrow into solace and also—by logical extension—the past into the wished-for present and/or future. The genre, therefore, is inherently implicated in the philosophy of time. The elegy was the most widely published of poetic genres during the seventeenth century and ranged from popular broadsides (which were inexpensively sold to commemorate the deaths of politicians, soldiers and other prominent citizens) to works that were privately commissioned by and printed for patrons, such as John Donne’s “Anniversary” poems for Sir Robert Drury on the untimely death of his daughter, Elizabeth. The genre thus provides a diversity of testaments to changing attitudes towards death, grief expression and mourning practices, thereby illuminating the individual’s most inward articulation not only of their own spiritual self-reckoning, but also of their historical imagination.

Philips’s first published poem was an elegy: “In Memory of Mr. Cartwright”. Like many poets of her time, including Milton, she auspiciously chose the elegy as a poetic form and mode aptly suited to an emerging writer’s concerns with the politics of literary history. This particular elegy (signed K. P.) was significantly placed first among the 56 introductory poems—including contributions from Henry Vaughan and Henry Lawes—printed in the posthumously collected works of poet and dramatist William Cartwright: *Comedies, Tragi-Comedies, with other Poems* (1651). Philips’s formulation here of a consolation that resists transcendent signification underscores her freethinking spirit as well as the abiding politics of royalist retreat: “Stay, prince of Fancy, stay, we are not fit / To welcome or admire thy raptures yet” (1–2). The poem predicates contingent solace on Cartwright’s lingering potential to “[r]escue us from our dull imprisonment” (8), defending the singularity of true friendship—that is, political affinity in
this case and at this early moment in Philips’s life—as a catalyst for regenerative action.  

Again, though, the elegy’s intertextual, historiographic preoccupations do not emerge uniformly in Philips’s work. Two of her elegies respectively illustrate both sides of this artistic and cultural balance: “EPITAPH. ON HECTOR PHILLIPS. At St Sith’s Church” and “On the death of my first and dearest childe, Hector Philipps, borne the 23d of Aprill, and dy’d the 2d of May 1655. set by Mr Lawes” (both c.1655). These companions articulate striking differences in terms of occasion and perspective that illustrate Philips’s attunement to the shifting private and public registers for her lyrics. The first (non-musical) epitaphic elegy invokes a sacred environment (St Sith’s Church); the second (musical) poem a secular performance scored by the composer Henry Lawes.

The first poem seeks a transcendent placement for Hector’s spirit: “Therefore, fit in Heav’n to dwell, / He quickly broke the Prison shell” (13–14). The elegy celebrates that desired solace, concluding with a robust (if gently dimmed) apotheosis:

So the Sun, if it arise
Half so Glorious as his Ey’s,
Like this Infant, takes a shroud,
Bury’d in a morning Cloud (19–22)

Another poem (“To my Lord Biron’s tune of—Adieu Phillis”) also mitigates the difficulty of grief expression and the work of mourning through a wished-for stellification:

You stars, who these entangled fortunes give,
O tell me why
It is so hard to dy,
Yet such a task to live? (3–6)

Philips’s second elegy for Hector, however, offers one of the most striking illustrations of the genre’s early modern intertextual and historiographic formulations. Whereas in the first poem Philips submits her grief to the power of extratextual, transcendent principles, here she attempts to accommodate her anguish to the text’s inward-turning remediation of sorrow: “Tears are my Muse, and sorrow all my Art, / So piercing groans must be thy Elogy” (11–12). The poem turns from this point towards the registers of pure lament, or the dirge, as Philips intensifies her doubts about unqualified consolation. The concluding stanzas shape both the poet’s renunciation of the “unconcerned World” (15) and her utter abandonment to (and growing self-consciousness of) the poem’s linguistic construction of loss and elegiac
resistance, finally offering the work’s sheer metatextuality—“these gasping numbers” (19)—as a sacrificial gift to Hector’s “sad Tomb” and “early Herse”, which metaphorically embody and transport the grave writing of this very poem, the “last of [his] unhappy Mother’s Verse” (17, 18, 20). Philips’s deft images here constitute a dialectical tensiveness between chronos (tomb) and kairos (hearse), investing the agency of absence with regenerative temporality that bears out this elegy’s dynamic historical figuration, which is amplified by the intertextual contingencies and continguities among variants in this poem’s entangled transmission from the Tutin manuscript to the 1667 edition.28 These nuances also hinge on the gender politics of the times. A public expression of maternal grief (in speech or especially in print) would require moderation balanced against the possible erasure of authorial agency, as this elegy’s concluding line emphasizes.29 Pulter and Collins similarly engage the poetic elegy in their devotional practices of self-effacement as tropes for navigating transitions from private to public (and occasionally political) contexts.

Within the scope of Philips’s elegies, 14 seek transcendent solace and 24 seek resistant and historically situated consolation.30 Within this first group, some may have been written as early as 1649 (for example, the truly brief, epitaphic elegy “On Little Regina Collyer”), while others may have been composed as late as 1663 (for example, the more lengthy, elegiac “EPITAPH. On my honour’d Mother in Law: M’s Phillips of Portheynon in Cardigan=shire, who dy’d. Jan : 1stA:o 1662/3”). Within this second gathering, some may have been penned as early as 1650 (for example, “Upon the double murther of K. Charles, in answer to a libelous rime made by V. P.”) and others as late as 1664 (for example, “On the Death of my Lord Rich, Only Son to the Earle of Warwick, who dy’d of the Small Pox”). This balance between transcendent and contingent solace in Philips’s elegiac poems complements the work of her contemporaries Pulter and Collins, both devotional and (to varying degrees) political poets writing during the interregnum. Compared with Philips’s blending of préciosité, cavalier, metaphysical and neoclassical themes and stylistic inflections, Pulter’s and Collins’s meditative poems engage more consistent, plain styles of composition in the tradition of George Herbert. Of the 25 elegies in Pulter’s Poems Written by the Right Honorable H. P. (c.1655–62), the majority articulate consolations in terms of transcendent signification, while a smaller number (five, by my reading) frame resistant consolations as tropes for social and political critique.31 Of the 12 elegies in Collins’s Divine Songs and Meditacions (1653), five posit transcendent solace and seven posit resistant and temporally tempered consolations.32 Pulter (in three elegies) and Philips (in one elegy) denounced the execution of King Charles I, while Collins (in two elegies) criticized the Rump Parliament’s policies between 1649 and 1653—in particular, the Engagement Oath—
analogically appropriating the prophetic persona of Deborah of Ephraim for her songs of devotion and dissent.\textsuperscript{33} Although Philips never quite figures herself as a religious prophet, she does protest in the text that appears first in both the 1664 and 1667 editions of her poems.\textsuperscript{34} This curiously outspoken elegy, “Upon the double murder of K. Charles” (c.1650–51), frames intertextual resistance to transcendent consolation as a trope for personal and political critique.\textsuperscript{35} Through the indignation expressed in the poem’s concluding lines—“Oh! to what height of horror are they come, / Who dare pull downe a crowne, teare up a Tomb!” (33–34)—Philips excoriates the Puritan preacher and Fifth Monarchist Vavasor Powell, who slighted the executed Charles I in a manuscript poem, “Of ye late K. Charles of Blessed Memory”, which reads: “Of all the Kings I am for Christ alone: / For he is King to us though Charles be gone”.\textsuperscript{36} Philips’s elegy, which verges towards the rhetorical registers of panegyric, directly challenges the Fifth Monarchist cause by turning Powell’s scandalous rhymes—tantamount to a second regicide—against themselves, exposing the hypocrisy of building Christ’s “kingdome up with blood, / (Except their owne)” (31–32). Such charged resistance sharpens the elegy’s central premise—shaped, of course, by the complexities of Philips’s familial, religious and political allegiances (i.e. Presbyterian/Puritan/Anglican and royalist/republican) at this particular juncture—that the spirit of Charles I has not transcended the realm of human action, but dwells within and among his defenders.\textsuperscript{37} While both the 1664 and 1667 editions print “tear” in the final line, Thomas’s edition prints “teare”, following the Cardiff City Library manuscript copy (MS 2 1073): “Who dare pull downe a crowne, teare up a Tomb!” In addition to the polysemous richness already embedded here for “tear”—to pull forcibly apart; to subject a person to conflicting desires; to run away; a hole caused by tearing; to weep; and also a drop of the salty fluid that flows from the eyes—\textit{The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary} elucidates other meanings for the variant spelling, “teare”, which were current between 1640 and 1660: to wound by rending; to split into parties or factions; to blaspheme; and (especially resonant for my argument) \textit{to pass time in weeping}.\textsuperscript{38}

Philips adroitly articulates a distinctive, elegiac temporality in “To my dearest Antenor on his parting”, through which readers will hear echoes from Donne’s “A Valediction: forbidding mourning”,\textsuperscript{39} as well as from many of Philips’s poems concerning friendship, historical figuration and communities (of texts, bodies and souls):

\begin{quote}
Now as in watches, though we doe not know
When the hand moves, we find it still doth go:
So I, by secret sympathy inclin’d
Will absent meet, and understand thy mind;
And thou, at thy return, shalt find thy heart
\end{quote}
Still safe, with all the Love thou didst impart (19–24)

Here, “by secret sympathy inclin’d”, Philips posits an intuitive connection between minds and hearts which moves almost imperceptibly—more swiftly than the minute hand’s Huygensian limitations (c.1650)\(^{40}\)—yet which, like Donne’s “gold to aery thinness beat”,\(^{41}\) bears “the impressions” (8) of “souls combin’d” (6) through the mediating agency of absence. In Philips’s poems on the subject of parting, matters of existential and physical absence—whether anticipated, confronted, imagined or recollected—are never static, but keenly charged media that yield a “magique which both fate and time beguiles, / And in a moment runs a thousand miles” (33–34). Parting not only tests the strength of these relationships, but instances of separation illuminate what otherwise would be either invisible or rendered as transcendent: the material contingencies of absence that invest the poem with immanent/imminent, regenerative secular time—that is, kairos. “To my dearest Antenor” concludes with lines that challenge Shakespeare’s Sonnet 24. Compared with that poet-painter-lover who “draw[s] but what” the eyes see, “know[ing] not the heart”,\(^{42}\) Philips’s “Picture drawn” of Antenor “in [her] brest” (35) embodies the vivid glazed gaze of the beloved’s true image—a constitutive simulacrum—that paradoxically celebrates “in a moment” the union of individuals and their distinctive singularities. The few instances of the word “moment” in Philips’s texts signal her awareness of an emerging notion in seventeenth-century England of the measurable conceptual and material turning point within a sequence of events.\(^{43}\)

All of Philips’s poems that concern separations among friends (that is, the *parting poems*) animate these characteristics in various ways.\(^{44}\) The Lucretian, animist-materialist proposition that “bodys move in time, and so must minds” hovers on the verge of absence with “no easy progress” (“To my Lucasia”, 23, 24).\(^{45}\) Separation reveals friendship’s “imprison’d Gold”, which, if impressed further by absence, remediates “Coppys of [Orinda’s] wild ‘state’” (“To Mrs. M. A. upon absence”, 10, 21). The homonymal litotes—“no absence know”—engenders “active soules […] hold[ing] intelligence” and “teach[ing] the World new love; / Redeem[ing] the age and sex, and show[ing] / A flame fate dares not move” (“To Mrs. Mary Awbrey at parting”, 19, 21, 24, 50–52). “[S]ouls combin’d […] Will absent meet” (“To my dearest Antenor”, 6, 22); after separation’s “suffering Minutes [have been] Spent”, the poem’s regenerative time visits parted friends “with new content” (“Lucasia, Rosania, and Orinda”, 22, 23). On separation, a “parting blow” plays “The unseen string which fastens hearts”, whereby “each to other is combin’d” so that “Absence will make it true” (“Parting with a Friend”, 3, 17, 31, 32). The concluding lines in “A sea voyage from Tenby to Bristoll”, for example, offer a striking illustration of the mediating agency of absence. After a detailed relation of her journey aboard the
“Barke, which none controule[d]” (17) through the “sad confinement of the stormy night” (42), Philips avers that

[...] what most pleas’d [her] mind upon the way,
Was the ships posture which in harbour lay:
Which so close to a rocky grove were fix’d,
That the trees branches with the tackling mix’d (49–52)

More significant than “amourous wave” (21) or “weather’s crueltie” (38) or “Tempest to outride” (48), this dynamic gap (on the verge of the ship’s departure) between “branches” and “tackling” charges the poem’s metaphoric transference—“One would have thought it was, as then it stood, / A growing navy, or a floating wood” (53–54)—with a decisive moment of historical figuration recollected and recombined during Orinda’s (Philips’s) journey away from Lucasia (Anne Owen).

In these texts on parting, readers may discern the poet’s related concerns with “modest distance, [and] improved straines” (“To her royall highnesse”, 19), “distant Joys [admired]” (“To my dearest Antenor”, 11), “Distance and Quantity, to bodies due” (“The Soule”, 29), “quiet and [...] coole retreate [s]” (“An ode upon retirement”, 22), “Lantskips which in prospects distant ly” (“On the Welch Language”, 7), “private distant currents under ground” (“To my dearest friend, on her greatest loss”, 3) and other discrete instances in which Philips’s works contribute to the emergence of the non-Miltonic prospect poem—a related path of investigation that lies beyond the scope of my work here. For the purposes of this essay, the elegiac poems on parting underscore distinctive features of Philips’s historical imagination: the degree to which her texts formulate regenerative, secular temporality as a founding principle for her idea of friendship and dialogic self-fashioning at the centre of her literary “Society”. All of the parting poems are elegiac in theme and rhetorical design, and they all place their resolutions to the problems posed by separation within contexts of embodied Aristotelian enargeia, contingent (as opposed to transcendent) temporality and contiguous individuality. The parting poems, as a subset of the elegies, articulate the crux of this worldly emphasis in Philips’s poetics of loss.

Time and friendship take many forms in Philips’s poems. Just as the elegies demonstrate a range of formulations from transcendent to contextually situated consolations, a distinctive cluster of poems directly concerned with time as an embodiment of friendship’s modalities illustrates a diversity of inflections. One of the most consistent articulations, though, concerns the antithesis (noted at the beginning of this essay) between chronos—that is, measurable time often marked by decay—and kairos—that is, immanent/imminent regenerative time charged by absences and contingencies intuitively perceived within and against the grains of chronological time. On all of these
levels, Philips’s texts intervene in their contexts; each poem’s figural historicity engenders a desired transformation. Within the “forgotten dust” of decayed temples, statues and tombs, “there Palaemon lives, and so he must” (“To the noble Palaemon”, 40, 39)—thus installed as a principle of regenerative time. Friendship’s liminal resiliency may withstand the destructive forces of fate, but such potential hinges on a vulnerability to “Absence [which may] robb us of that blisse / To which this friendship title brings” (“A Dialogue between Lucasia and Orinda”, 13–14). Given a present moment of “such blisse”, Philips may declare: “perpetuall Holy day!” (“To the excellent Mrs A. O.”, 23, 24); or, within the distant past, she may allegorically install

Lucasia, whose rich soule had it been known
In that time th’ancients call’d the golden One,
[...]
Ev’n then from her the wise would coppys draw,
And she to th’infant = World had given Law (“Lucasia”, 13–14, 19–20)

Friendship’s honour may rise “Above the battery of fate or time” (“To (the truly competent Judge of Honour) Lucasia”, 24) to dwell with “things transcendent [and] thoughts sublime” (“Rosania shaddow’d”, 66), or equally may “not chuse to dye / In better time or company” than the present moment of honour’s sacrificial suffering (“To the Queen of inconstancie”, 3–4). The motions of friendship’s embodied kairos may be so ecstatic as to regenerate the soul and chronological time as well, as illustrated famously by Poem 36, the title of which—“To My excellent Lucasia, on our friendship. 17th. July 1651”—as Thomas notes, precisely destabilizes the date:

For as a watch by art is wound
To motion, such was mine:
But never had Orinda found
A Soule till she found thine (9–12)

And yet, the opportune moment of kairos may also be marred by friendship’s betrayal, as in “Injuria amici”, in which Philips struggles with “strange rigours [which] find as strange a time” (3), venting her anger over Mary Aubrey’s private marriage (also recounted in “Rosania’s private marriage”).

True friendship culminates, for Philips, in a paradoxical union that preserves the worldly attributes of individuation: companion souls by secret sympathies “are ally’d” (“A Friend”, 28), “while to either they incline” (“Friendship in Emblem”, 15) their singularities. Friendship comprehends a Neoplatonic ideal—“Love refin’d and purg’d from all its dross” (“A Friend”, 7)—and grants an Aristotelian foundation for all interpersonal relations and differences:
United more then spirits facultys,  
Higher in thoughts then are the Eagle’s eys;  
Free as first agents are true friends, and kind,  
As but themselves I can no likeness find ("Friendship", 53–56)

Friendship’s enargeia animates the intertextual, contingent poetics with which Philips fashions her literary community.

Philips’s elegies defend friendship as a catalyst for regenerative time, as vividly illustrated by “To Mrs. Mary Awbrey at parting”, which formulates immanent/imminent contingency by challenging epitaphic chronicity. Addressed overtly to “Mary Awbrey”, the poem concludes with the more intimate use of pastoral sobriquets to identify addressor, Orinda, and addressee, Rosania. Their shared experience of grief—“I shall wepe when thou dost grieve” (29)—.touches on both private and public registers: “Thus our twin souls in one shall growe, / And teach the World new love” (49–50). Inner experience, sparked by kairos, engenders a resistant consolation underscoring the poem’s historical figuration:

A dew shall dwell upon our tomb  
Of such a quality,  
That fighting armies, thither come,  
Shall reconciled be.  
Wee’l aske no epitaph, but say  
Orinda and Rosania (55–60)

The dialogic identities of Orinda and Rosania subvert the urge (“no epitaph”) for transcendent solace, then intercalate a playfully unwritten/written password (“but say”) that intervenes within and against chronotopic registers—thereby placing their tomb/tome within the secular intertextualities of the poet’s literary community. Philips’s many poems of sympathetic inclination bear these temporalities out in minute and momentary detail.

Notes


2. If chronos time is measurable by clocks and therefore objective, ordinary and to some degree empty, then kairos time is, by contrast, subjective, extraordinary and full of transformative potential. “Kairic time is made up of discontinuous and unprecedented occasions, instead of identical moments [and therefore]


4. As Sidney writes: “onely the Poet, disdayning to be tied to any such subjection, lifted vp with the vigor of his owne inuention, dooth growe in effect another nature, in making things either better then Nature bringeth forth, or quite a newe formes such as neuer were in Nature”. Philip Sidney, The Defence of Poesie (London, 1595), p. 10. Sidney’s fusion of vates (“prophet”) and poiein (“maker”) grants the poet transformative power to surpass history, nature and philosophy by creating autonomous, substantial realities, such as Lanyer’s Cooke-ham and Cavendish’s Blazing World (which I read as a work of poetics rather than prose fiction). See, respectively, Aemilia Lanyer, Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum, ed. Susanne Woods (New York: Oxford UP, 1993), pp. 130–38 and Margaret Cavendish, Paper Bodies, ed. Sylvia Bowerbank and Sara Mendelson (Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 2000), pp. 151–251.


11. As Thomas notes, Orinda and Lucasia were identified as one entity (CWI, p. 8).
13. See Poems 51, 82, 88 and 110.
15. This formulation draws on the crux of Jacopo Mazzoni’s theory of the poetic simulacrum from his treatise *Della difensa della Commedia di Dante*, first published in 1572: “But yet I say that the language of history and the arts and sciences does not use poetic imitation, and that the poet who treats either of history or of the arts or sciences will use poetic imitation, which we have above called similitudinousness (*similitudinaria*). According to the understanding of those who ought to know […] the idol is that which has no other use in itself but to represent and resemble […] So we can conclude that the historian and the poet who has history for the subject of his poem are different in that the historian will recount things in order to leave behind a memory of the truth, but the poet will write to imitate and leave behind a simulacrum, insofar as it is a simulacrum, of the truth”. For this translation by Robert L. Montgomery, see Hazard Adams, ed., *Critical Theory since Plato* (New York: Harcourt, 1971), p. 183. For the original text and corresponding pages for this passage, see Jacopo Mazzoni, *Della difensa della Commedia di Dante*, III (Cesena, 1587), pp. 564–65.
20. On the differentiations (and crossings-over) among epitaph, elegy and panegyric, see Joshua Scodel, *The English Poetic Epitaph* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP,

21. See Poems 8, 31, 40, 55, 56, 62, 63, 72, 82, 88, 92, 105 and 198, which posit transcendent solace, and Poems 1, 10, 11, 16, 28, 30, 41, 43, 46, 49, 51, 53, 54, 75, 81, 83, 84, 89, 93, 100, 101, 109, 112 and 123, which articulate resistant consolations.

22. As far as we know, that is. Following the 1996 rediscovery (in the Brotherton Library, University of Leeds) of Pulter’s manuscripts, other interregnum poets and poems will certainly come to light. Philips’s poetics of loss was deeply influential for Lucy Hutchinson’s *Elegies* (c.1664–71). See Elizabeth Scott-Baumann, “‘Paper Frames’: Lucy Hutchinson’s *Elegies* and the Seventeenth-Century Country House Poem,” *Literature Compass*, 4.3 (2007): 664–76.


27. The relative dates for both poems are uncertain and their titles vary in different witnesses. While all of the early texts of “EPITAPH. ON HECTOR PHILLIPS”
reference St Sith’s Church, not all of the early texts of “On the death of my first and dearest childe, Hector Philipps” mention Lawes’s musical score. Philipps’s autograph manuscript (the Tutin manuscript, National Library of Wales MS 775) specifies such a musical setting, but Lawes’s composition is not noted in the 1667 edition, which is the only early collection of Philipps’s poems to include the whole text of the elegy. As Thomas notes, Lawes’s score has not survived (CW1, p. 384). See Lydia Hamessley, “Henry Lawes’s Setting of Katherine Philipps’s Friendship Poetry in His Second Book of Ayres and Dialogues, 1655: A Musical Misreading?”, Queering the Pitch, ed. Philip Brett, Elizabeth Wood, and Gary C. Thomas, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 115–37.

28. As Thomas observes, Philipps’s autograph manuscript includes the full title (referencing Lawes’s musical score) and the poem’s first two stanzas “with numerals and spaces for the remaining verses”, but the 1667 edition “contains the earliest surviving text of the last three stanzas”. Furthermore, three variants between the first two stanzas as they appear respectively in the autograph and 1667 witnesses “indicate revision of the poem at some point, either by [Philipps] or by Sir Charles Cotterell” (CW1, p. 310).


30. See, respectively, Poems 8, 31, 40, 55, 56, 62, 63, 67, 72, 82, 88, 92, 105 and 198, and 1, 10, 11, 16, 28, 30, 41, 43, 46, 49, 51, 53, 54, 75, 81, 83, 84, 89, 93, 100, 101, 109, 112 and 123.

31. Lady Hester Pulter, Poems, Emblems, and The Unfortunate Florinda, ed. Alice Eardley (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2014). See, respectively, Poems 1, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 31, 33, 40, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, 61 and 66, and 8, 58, 60, 62 and 65.

32. Twelve of the fifteen poems in the Divine Songs section of Collins’s volume are elegies. In order of their appearance, these poems are: “The Preface”*; “A Song expressing their happinesse who have Communion with Christ”; “A Song shewing the Mercies of God to his people, by interlacing cordiall Comforts with fatherly chastisements”; “A Song demonstrating The vanities of Earthly things”; “A Song manifesting The Saints eternall Happinesse”; “A Song exciting to spirituall Alacrity”; “Another Song exciting to spirituall Mirth”; “Another Song (The Winter of my infancy)”*; “Another Song (Having restrained Discontent)”*; “Another Song (Excessive worldly Greife)”*; “A Song composed in time of the Civill Warr, when the wicked did much insult over the godly”; and “Another Song (Time past we understood by story)”*. An asterisk indicates an elegy that places resistant consolation within the context of secular time. See Howard, “Politics of Mourning”, pp. 332–33n9.

33. For these elegies, see, respectively, Pulter’s “On That Unparalleled Prince Charles the First, His Horrid Murder”, “On the Horrid Murder of That Incomparable Prince, King Charles the First” and “On the Same”; Philipps’s “Upon the double murther of K. Charles”; and Collins’s “A Song composed in time of the Civill Warr, when the wicked did much insult over the godly” and “Another Song [Time past we understood by story]”. See also W. Scott Howard, “Imagining An Collins”, An Collins and the Historical Imagination, ed. W. Scott Howard (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 1–22 and An Collins, Divine Songs

34. POEMS by the Incomparable, Mrs. K.P. (London: Printed by J.G. for Rich. Marriott, 1664). POEMS By the most deservedly Admired Mrs. KATHERINE PHILIPS The matchless ORINDA. To which is added MONSIEUR COR-NEILLE’S POMPEY & HORACE TRAGEDIES. With several other Translations out of FRENCH. (London: Printed by J.M. for H. Herringman, 1667).


39. See also Poems 29, 49, 53 and 135.

40. Thomas observes that the “occasion on which this poem was written is not known” (CW1, p. 359). Philip Webster Souers places “To my dearest Antenor on his parting” among Philips’s poems of the 1650s, and the presence of this poem in the Tutin manuscript supports this dating. See Philip Webster Souers, The Matchless Orinda (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1931), pp. 88–89. Minute watches were not only rare and expensive, but were also regularly irregular. Although Christiaan Huygens’s improvements “had instituted accuracy” for pendulum clocks, which required absolute stability, portable watches could not “function in so small and frequently agitated an area as a person’s pocket”. Stuart Sherman, Telling Time (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996), p. 80.


43. See Poems 30, 87 and 94. According to The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary, prior to 1666, “moment” carries these meanings: a very short period or extent of time, one too brief for its duration to be significant; a discrete, ephemeral instance within a measurable succession of minutes; a point in time, an instant; a small particle, a minute part, often in conjunction with “matter”; a cause of or motive for action, or capacity for self-awareness; and a decisive or determining influence. During the early 1660s, new connotations enter the language, whereby “moment” signifies: a particular stage or period in a course of events or in the development of something; a turning point; a historical juncture; and the precise measurement (within accidents of chronological time) of the occurrence of divine providence. In 1690, Locke’s Essay Concerning Human Understanding formulates “moment” as the time of one idea’s duration in the mind within the course of an ordinary succession

44. These include Poems 16, 41, 43, 46, 49, 53, 54, 83, 84, 93, 100, 109 and 112—all temporally inflected, resistant, secular elegiac texts, in my reading.

45. The role of animist-materialism in Philips’s poetics has only recently been investigated. See Nigel Smith, “The Rod and the Canon”, Women’s Writing, 14.2 (2007): 232–45.


47. Philips’s so-called Society of Friendship is an anachronistic construct—perhaps all the more compelling for such fictive dimensions.

48. While virtually all of Philips’s poems address the topic of friendship, a subgroup explicitly posits friendship vis-à-vis the text’s figuration of temporality. See Poems 8*, 12, 19, 25, 27, 30*, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, 43*, 45, 51*, 53*, 54*, 83*, 93* and 112*. In this sequence, asterisks note epitaphic and elegiac poems.

49. Not all early sources give this date for this poem. As Thomas observes, Philips’s autograph manuscript “appears to date it 17 July, 1651, though the last numeral of the year is not wholly clear. The [National Library of Wales MS 776] also gives the date as 1651, but the [University of Texas at Austin, HRC 151 Philips MS 14,937] dates the poem to 1652. If the poem was written in July 1651 it must have been given its present title at a later date. Anne Owen was not given the name ’Lucasia’ until December of that year” (CW1, p. 280).

50. The words “sympathy” and “incline” or “inclin’d” appear, respectively, in Poems 53, 54, 57, 58, 64, 112 and 29, 38, 54, 115, 131.
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