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Non-Verbal Meaning in Caroline Private Theatre: William Cavendish’s and James Shirley’s *The Varietie* (c.1641)

How did early modern actors convey meaning on stage without speaking? How, apart from their voices, did they express themselves to audiences? In an age when many types of cultural production—such as fashion or dancing—achieved their effects by visual display without the use of words, we should expect non-verbal features to be essential to the action in plays. Retrieving an understanding of the extra-textual dimension of a performance is, of course, difficult. Yet one excellent source is *The Varietie*, a comedy written by William Cavendish (today regarded as its main author) and James Shirley. It was performed by the King’s Men at the private Blackfriars theatre some time between 1639 and 1642; this essay suggests a date after January 1640, when the last court masque, *Salmacida Spolia*, was presented at Whitehall.1 Many jokes in *The Varietie* depend upon the audience’s familiarity with the conventions of seventeenth-century fashion, dancing, and masquing. In this study I discuss how the main protagonists dressed and moved, and how the play responded to masques of the period.

*The Varietie* takes us to the elegant salon of Lady Beaufield, a widow. Her wealth attracts gallants and fortune-seekers, among them Sir William, a genteel suitor, the French dancing master Galliard, and the oafish Simpletons. Always eager to please and amuse the ladies, Sir William one day invites his friend Manly, an eccentric who in private dons Elizabethan suits, to his home. Having been asked for an appearance in full regalia, Manly expects a quiet evening à deux but instead finds himself gate-crashing a party of Caroline fashionables, among them Lady Beaufield, who are all greatly entertained by this sight of the ‘Ghost of Leister’. Yet Sir William’s ploy ‘to have the Ladies laugh’ at the strange visitor backfires: Manly defends himself so eloquently that he wins the widow’s affections in the end.2

From the start, Manly is given ample opportunity to explain his dress code. With a wordplay on ‘suit’ he presents himself as a spokesman for lost manners and fashions:
I am bold to present a suit to you, I confess it was not made by a French Tailor, I can make a leg and kiss my hand too after the fashion of my cloaths, this serv’d in those honest dayes, when Knights were Gentlemen … ; here’s a belly peece, that looks like armour, … these things were wore when men of honor flourish’d, that tam’d the wealth of Spaine, set up the States, help’d the French King, and brought Rebellion to reason Gentlemen … ; and all this at lesse charge than a masque comes to now.¹

Manly’s garments hark back to heroic days. Their conservative character is, as critics have pointed out, associated with a firm government. Even better, the outfit is inexpensive (‘lesse charge than a masque comes to now’). Such thriftiness may reflect certain newly-gained insights of one of the play’s authors, who had learnt at his own expense what charges a Caroline masque incurred. Cavendish, who in his own words suffered from the ‘prodigal disease’, had spent almost £20,000 on legendary royal receptions at his Welbeck and Bolsover estates in 1633 and 1634; this included open-air banquets, Tudor-style tilting, and entertainments by Ben Jonson. Years later, the Earl of Clarendon still recalled Cavendish’s ‘stupendous’ hospitality ‘which (God be thanked) … no man ever after imitated’.³

An echo of Manly’s argument can be found in Cavendish’s The Little Book, a machiavellian prose treatise on the role of ceremony in statecraft, written in the early 1650s and dedicated to the future Charles II. Here Cavendish advised cutting down on expensive masquing apparel so as to counter accusations of conspicuous waste:

All but your Majesty may have their glorious attire of copper [i.e. lace made of copper thread], which will do as well as silver and gold for two or three nights, and much less expensive, which otherwise might be much found fault with by those that attend your Majesty at the mask.⁵

For Cavendish, wearing precious materials was a royal prerogative. He thus established a sartorial distinction based on cost efficiency in shows. (In fact, his sense of decorum exceeded the requirements for Caroline masque outfits: here, even the king wore ‘Counterfeit tincell’ at times.)⁶ Cavendish was obsessed with the idea that rank should appear simply from what people wore. His Little Book envisages an ideal society neatly ordered by dress code.⁷ In The Varietie, too, clothes prompt the audience very clearly how to evaluate certain characters.

Manly’s suit contrasts meaningfully with the fashion victims in Beaufield’s company. He compares his appearance to that of Simpleton, a would-be courtier who has just moved to town:

which of our two habits … is the more grave and manly, his leane upper chinne, or this goodly promontory? my Trunkes with a round walke pav’d with gold and silver, or your trouses [sic], cut close to your dock [i.e. rump, buttocks], and drawne on with a screw? in which if you venture but halfe a crowne, lookes like a poultis, or a swelling in the groine; your habit is phantastical as the time, you...
squirt into your dublet, which you weare so carelesse as you had not button'd it since you came from a bawdy house … It was never a good time since these cloaths went out of fashion …! (p. 40)

The strait-laced Elizabethan spurns the loose morals of the unbuttoned Caroline. Manly has a beard, analogous to his famous predecessor Leicester, while Simpleton is apparently shaved. In contemporary theatrical convention, a beard signified masculinity; Manly’s appearance is therefore ‘more grave and manly’ from head to toe. Moreover, in a treatise on the origin of names, Cavendish had argued that ‘Manly’ derived from ‘courage’ and ‘valour’.9

Several jokes in The Varietie endow the character with a heroic history. ‘How fares the camp at Tilbury’, Sir William asks, addressing Manly as if he were Leicester mobilising the troops against the Armada in 1588.10 Lady Beaufield compares Manly to one of Arthur’s knights (p. 38). Facetious as these associations are, they conjure up a romantic courtly tradition, as manifest in the chivalric revival under Prince Henry at the Jacobean court, and later in King Charles’s patronage of the Order of the Garter. When Henry was created Prince of Wales, Cavendish, his then seventeen-year-old companion, received a knighthood. On that occasion, young Cavendish was exposed to romance come true. Henry performed in a masque which evoked King Arthur’s court and glorified the prince as heir to the Fairy Queen. Ben Jonson’s Oberon (1611) championed Protestant heroism and made much of so-called old-fashioned virtues, the crenellated castle of its consciously revived gothic setting alluding to gallant ages past.11

Martial masculinity in neo-gothic guise also informed entertainment culture and architecture on the Cavendish estates. The quintain at Welbeck in 1633 harked back to Tudor festival tradition as well as Henry’s tournaments and barriers. The architectural style of Bolsover Castle has often been compared to the stage designs for Oberon. As Graham Parry notes, it appealed to a ‘nostalgia for the valour, manliness and adventure of the high Elizabethan period, qualities that seemed all the more desirable as King James’s court increasingly showed its tawdry coarseness to dismayed observers’.12 In the Cavendish family chapel at Edensor, Derbyshire, a spectacular tomb perpetuates the memory of Cavendish’s uncles Henry and William.13 Instead of life-like statues of the deceased, their costumes alone have been sculpted into a stony monument. Armour, helmet, garter insignia and tilting lance represent Henry’s military career. The absence of depictions of female family members highlights the manly virtues of the house.14 The Varietie introduces a martial character who recalls Arthur’s court and waxes lyrical about the Order of the Garter (‘to have seene but a St. Georges feast then’).15 Manly looks as if he had returned from the pseudo-Elizabethan jousting at Welbeck, and he seems to wear what uncle Henry has left in the crypt.

Cavendish contrived a three-dimensional portrait of Manly: like his namesake in Jonson’s The Devil Is An Ass, Manly proves an all-round man who can sing and dance.16 As Lynn Hulse points out, he ‘upholds traditional customs
through his defence of the English ballad'. He reminds Sir William of a famous Elizabethan dancing-master:

No question he can dance too, in that disguise he lookest like famous Cardell the dancing-Master in Queen Elizabeth's time, I have seen his Picture.

Man: And he with your Worships favour, was held a wise man, and for his gravity he might have been Treasurer, he went with that setled and solid pian-piano.  

Sir Wil: And when he danc'd a measure, you should have had him with his Rapier, short Cloak, his black Cap, and his white Feather, his single and double, both backward and forward, with that excellencie –

Man: And now he must be in Cuerno, or like a fellow on the ropes, or a Tumbler when he shoots his body through a hoop; there was musick then, and a Heaven and Earth, beyond your braules, or your Mountague, with a la, la, la, like a Bachalian dancing the Spanish Morisco, with knackers at his fingers (pp. 42–3).

Cavendish referred to specific dancing masters in his works. With ‘famous Cardell’, The Varietie commemorates the eminent court dancer Thomas Cardell (d. 1621). Employed by Queen Elizabeth as lutenist and choreographer, he remained active under King James and served Princess Elizabeth, who wished ‘to keep Mr. Cardell close to me, for he is teaching me to dance so well that their majesties are pleased’. The play idealises Cardell as an elegant, restrained performer; it even associates him with frugality (‘he might have been Treasurer’).

The Varietie endows the historical dancer with a colour, sound and movement profile, which must also characterise Manly. Cardell wore black and white, in line with stern ‘belated Elizabethan[s]’ at the early Stuart court, such as the Earl of Arundel. The play attributes specific dances to Cardell and Manly, among these the volta and the measure. ‘Measure’ was then used as a generic term, almost exchangeable for ‘dance’. Yet in the context of Cardell’s sedate ‘single and double, both backward and forward’, the play alludes to step combinations common in the ‘old measures’, a well-established repertoire of eight dances taught in London dancing schools since the late sixteenth century. Cardell delighted his beholders with very simple, traditional steps and a minimum of effort.

The association of the volta with the Elizabethan court is so strong that the couple performing the volta in the famous Penshurst tradition— and wrongly—settled in English collective memory as the last Tudor dancing with the Earl of Leicester. Elizabeth never commissioned art which showed her dancing. At court, though, she might well have performed the volta with her favourite. The triple-time dance involved, after a series of small introductory hops, a turn in which the woman jumped up high, while her partner held her at the waist and kicked her backside up with his knee. A stalwart heir to Elizabethan worthies in every respect, Manly proves an expert in this robust discipline. He shows Lady Beaufield how Cardell danced it with his lady:
**NON-VERBAL MEANING IN CAROLINE PRIVATE THEATRE**

*Man:* With wonderfule skill, he put his right arme about her, and took her left hand in his, and then he did so touze her with his right thigh and legg, and lift her up so high, and so fast, and so round –

*SIR WIL:* As what I pray, be curteous.

*Man:* Marry as soon as he had ended his dance she would lye down as dead as a swing’d chicken, with the head under the wing, so dissie was she, and so out of breath. (pp. 43–4)

When *The Varietie* was performed, Manly imitated the movements of Cardell (and Leicester) on stage. He danced the *volta* with Lady Beaufield as a partner, which explains Sir William’s shocked reaction (’be courteous’). Manly fashions himself as a man of deeds, a stark contrast to new courtiers, who must be ’in cuerpo’ and rage like Bacchanalian tumblers. To appear ’in cuerpo’ – wearing no cloak or upper garment – meant to look ungentlemanly.

In Ben Jonson’s *The New Inn* (pb. 1631) it indicated a low social status: ‘Light, skipping hose and doublet;[The horse-boy’s garb!]’

*The Varietie* juxtaposes Manly, the ’Ghost of Leister’, with Galliard, the modish French dancing master. Again, a speaking name, dress and movements give important clues. Galliard’s name evokes his profession and possibly his nationality. The modern French ’gaillard’ is a lively, jolly young man. In the seventeenth century, a popular (although incorrect) etymology maintained that ’galliard’ derived from ’Gallia’, France, which could, next to Galliard’s conspicuous French accent, have informed seventeenth-century audiences about the origins of the dancing master. The galliard was also an animated dance that involved jumping. Like the *volta* a continental import, it had become popular in Elizabethan England. But while the *volta* went out of fashion in the early years of James’s reign – in masques and entertainments, the name of the dance was rarely mentioned – the galliard remained, with modifications, a staple of the social dance repertoire throughout Charles’s reign. Since Tudor times, it had (at its most basic) consisted of five jumps (*cinque pace*) executed in triple time, but Stuart dance professionals began to upgrade this principle. In French treatises associated with the early Stuart court, ’la Danse par haut’ still consisted of ’cinq pas’, but now ’pliés’ (bendings of legs) and gliding steps on tiptoe punctuated the leaps and turns. Arms opened and closed in tune with the jumps, a seventeenth-century innovation faintly reminiscent of swimming. Such arm movements may have been caricatured in another play by Shirley, where a French instructor complained that his English colleagues did not teach their students properly:

aller, aller looke up your Countenance, your English man spoile you, he no teach
You looke up, pishaw, carry your body in the swimming Fashion.

From about the 1620s, French-style galliards were danced with the feet turned out, as Galliard explains in his account of the achievements of a kinsman who instructed English clients:

199
before he come, dey vent in vid deir toes, ... and now dey valk vid deir toes out for brave genty, you call dat a de splay foot ... 27

Still practised at its most extreme in the first position in classical ballet, the turn-out offers an audience a better sight of dancers' feet: if performers on stage turn their feet to the sides, allowing a full view of the instep, footwork can be better perceived by audiences facing the performance. The turn-out probably informed courtly repertoire in late Jacobean and Caroline masques. The innovations by Galliard and his colleagues, then, betray a theatrical awareness of how people may move on stage to their best advantage.

The Varietie highlights the new professional attitudes of French dancing masters at the Stuart court by their choice of instruments. As Galliard is told, his famous predecessor Cardell had a gentleman's understanding of music:

[Cardell] plaid to himself on a grave Lute, or a modest Citterne, with a politick quill, far beyond your Geoffrey fiddle, or your French kit, that looks like a broken fagot stick, ... and sounds as if it had got the French disease, when it snivels out a Coranto, or so hoarse with a cold, as if some great base Fiddle had silenc'd it. (Manly, p. 43)

The insult rehearses a size-matters stereotype. The French kit, a kind of miniature violin also known as pochette, produced a less vigorous sound than a regular violin and hence is here likened to snivelling: suffering, as it were, from acoustic syphilis. But it could easily be played or tucked away in a sleeve or pocket while the dancing master demonstrated a particular step. Galliard is constantly on the move, doing several things at the same time. His students practise while he is singing and playing tunes and correcting them.28 His professional efficiency contrasts with Cardell's leisurely preferences.

Throughout the play, Galliard attempts to rise above the lowly professional status indicated by his name. To score with the ladies, he boasts the Duc de Montmorency amongst his relatives – a dubious recommendation since Henri II de Montmorency had the reputation of being a favourite too familiar with the French queen.29 Galliard means to say that he too is a great lover with a pedigree. Yet he ends up married to a servant; as she complains with a pun on the cinq pas,

he told me he was a French Lord, ... he proves but a cinquepace. I look'd for thousands per annum, and he is but one, two, three, foure, and fi ve. (p. 82)

Galliard's existence unfolds, inescapably, in the beats of a dance rhythm.

Unlike Manly, Galliard knows the latest dances at court, such as the sarabande. He also offers to teach the 'Mountagut' and the 'Buckingham'.30 In the seventeenth century, tunes or choreographies were sometimes named after composers, outstanding dancers or musicians. The Varietie appears to refer to the Duke of Buckingham, a sponsor of ballets and entertainments, and his dancing master Barthélemy de Montagut. In contemporary opinion, Buckingham danced inappropriately well for an aristocrat.31 Montagut was a
versatile professional who knew French and Spanish repertoire, and devised masques for Buckingham. He later made a brilliant career as pensioner and groom of the chamber to Henrietta Maria, in whose masques he danced, and he even became the personal dance instructor of Charles I. The fact that Nicholas Lanier replaced him suggests that he may have had musical skills, too. According to his enemies, Montagut was a talented but unscrupulous social climber. In the 1620s he had been involved in a piracy scandal, ‘the talk of the court’ for some time, and in 1635 he killed a man near Henrietta Maria’s summer residence at Oatlands, for which it was hoped that he should ‘fetch a Caper at Tyburn’ – nonetheless he retained his position at court. Montagut epitomised the rise of the French professional, a functional elite which had been flourishing since the days of James but could hope for unprecedented preferment under Henrietta Maria. Cavendish and Shirley must have met him at court – Cavendish definitely knew Lanier – and could have found in him a foil to ‘virtuous’ old-style Cardell (and Manly).

Galliard’s art culminates in the révérence: ‘for de Courtier Alamode, dere de vit lie in de foot’ (p. 17). He probably means a French type of obeisance, performed during dances and otherwise to greet people, in which men bowed, keeping one leg straight and the other slightly bent. In The Varietie, the révérence becomes the symbol for comportment at the Caroline court; indeed, many critics have considered it as a political gesture of obedience. Galliard regards the teaching of his révérence variations as the apogee of his career, for ‘dat vil make a de law flourish; and Englan a brave Englan’ (p. 19). A new vision of a nation unfolds, defined by a tiny movement. All of a sudden, a harmless dancing class turns into civic disciplining. The lessons direct a performer’s attention towards modest physical achievements, not elaborate political scheming:

ven dey are so bissey to learrne a de dance, dey vil never tinke of de Rebellion, and den de reverence is obedience to Monarchy, and begar obedience is ale de ting in de varle. (p. 36)

It is usually argued that The Varietie expresses contempt for Caroline mannerisms. Yet in this instance the play rehearses not simply the idle opinions of an isolated comedy character but a perfectly serious view shared by contemporary French statesmen. For Richelieu, courtiers with too much time to spare were dangerous. Ballets prevented them from rebellion:

l’un des plus dignes soins de la bonté d’un Souverain envers ses Sujets, est de les empêcher tant qu’il peut d’estre oysifs. De sorte que comme il seroit bien mal-aisé, & qu’il ne seroit pas mesme raisonnable de leur imposer des travaux continuels; il leur faut donner les Spectacles, comme vne occupation generale pour ceux qui n’en ont point.35

Perceptive characters in The Varietie observe a certain logic in Galliard’s argument: ‘your state affaires ly in your foot, and you are wiser there, than some heads are’. While Manly’s ideal world remains immutably Tudor,
embodied in the *volta* performance with Lady Beaufield, Galliard endorses variety, keeping his students busy by changing the repertoire all the time. The French fashion ‘is alwaies to change’, so that nothing changes.37

Galliard’s idea that ceremony makes the monarch was not so far removed from politics at the Caroline court, and indeed the views of one of the play’s authors. Charles’s penchant for protocol is well-known.38 In the years leading up to the composition of *The Varietie*, Cavendish wrote a letter to the Prince of Wales which stressed that royal pomp and circumstance kept the populace in awe:

> what preserves you Kings more than ceremony. The cloth of estates, the distance people are with you, great officers, heralds, drums, trumpeters ...; aye, even the wisest ... shall shake off his wisdom and shake for fear of it, for this is the mist is [sic] cast before us, and masters the Commonwealth.... In all triumphs whatsoever or public showing yourself, you cannot put upon you too much king ...19

Later, Cavendish’s *Little Book* offered its readers an illustrious royal example. A virtuoso in secular ceremony, Queen Elizabeth achieved maximum results with minimal effort:

> When you appear, show yourself gloriously to your people, like a God ... When the people see you thus, they will get down on their knees, worship and pray for you with trembling fear and love as they did to Queen Elizabeth whose government is absolutely the best precedent for England’s government... The Queen would say: ‘God bless you, my good people’. Although this saying was no great matter in itself, yet, I assure your Majesty, it had a deep impact on the people. Aye, of a Sunday when she opened the window, the people would cry: ‘Oh Lord, I saw her hand, I saw her hand’; and some woman would cry out: ‘Oh Lord, the Queen is a woman!’ There is certainly nothing that keeps up a king more than ceremony and order which creates distance, and this brings respect and duty, [hence] obedience, which is everything.40

Furthermore, the small compendium recommended May games, plays, Twelfth Night revels and other traditional pastimes. Such recreations promised to ‘amuse the people’s thoughts, and keep them in harmless action which will free your Majesty from faction and rebellion’.41 From this perspective, Galliard appears less ridiculous when he compares himself to an overworked Privy Councillor and complains how courtly spectacle saps his mental and physical energies:

> before a maske of de King and de Queene, me can eate a no meate, no drinke, no sleepe, and me grewe so very a leane, vid de contemplation, a so much, by my troth de privy counsell is no so much troubled as me be vid dis, oh, le Diable! deirs is noting, dey sit all the vile dey doe deir busines, me bissey bo’e head, and de foot cap a pie. (p. 36)

The play teases its audience with sly hints of Galliard’s art, but naughtily it never shows us any of his masques. Instead, the play concludes with a mock spectacle called *Tempe*.
The Varietie and Caroline court masques

The Varietie ends with a clear reference to Aurelian Townshend’s Shrovetide entertainment for Queen Henrietta Maria, *Tempe Restored* (1632). Here, Townshend (or Inigo Jones) had famously stated that ‘these shows are nothing else but pictures with light and motion’. According to the plot, the enchantress Circe had turned Tempe, the Muses’ mythical retreat, into a menagerie of captive cavaliers, all of them transformed into animals. In one of his first appearances on the courtly stage, Thomas Killigrew (dressed in pink plush) played a gentleman who sought to fly from the temptress. Luckily, the heavenly influences of the stars, represented by young courtiers and ladies, descended to release him from his agony. In a magnificent *coup de théâtre*, Henrietta Maria rode in on a cloudy chariot to restore Tempe to the Muses.

*Tempe Restored* was innovative in two ways. It featured the first female professional performers in a Stuart court masque: the singers Shepherd in the minor role of Harmony, and Madam Coniack as Circe. Coniack was perhaps ‘the French Woman with the hard face that singes in Masques at Court’; if so, she inspired poems of the ‘Ugly Lady’ genre which hailed her as ‘a very deformed Gentlewoman, but of a voice incomparably sweet’. Shepherd’s identity remains unclear. A certain ‘Sara Sheppard’, duties unknown, was employed in Charles’s household in the 1630s. Another possibility is the dwarf Anne Shepherd (1620–1709), whose marriage to the miniature painter Richard Gibson in 1641 was something of a social occasion, attended by Charles and Henrietta Maria and celebrated in a poem by Edmund Waller. A painting of the couple which shows her with regular features still exists. If Anne Shepherd sang in *Tempe Restored*, she was only twelve years old.

Apart from surprising the audience with what must have seemed a bizarre cast by standards of the time, the masque abounded in special effects, for it contrived simultaneous upward and downward movements of several independent clouds:

The eight stars that first descended, being by this time past the spheres, came forth, and the clouds on which they sat with a swift motion returning up again, and the other still descending, showed a pleasing contention between them as they passed. When Divine Beauty and her attendants [i.e. Henrietta Maria and her ladies] were lighted, that greater cloud that bare them flies up again, leaving the chariot standing on the earth. This sight altogether was for the difficulty of the engining and number of the persons the greatest that hath been seen here in our time. For the apparitions of such as came down in the air, and the choruses standing beneath, arrived to the number of fifty persons all richly attired, showing the magnificence of the court of England.

Inigo Jones managed to assemble fifty people on a stage of which the visible area amounted to perhaps 41m² and the frontstage section extended to some 21m². The crowd scene appears to have been arranged at different levels of height. One gargantuan cloud alone contained Henrietta Maria, her fourteen
ladies and a chariot. The innovative use of Jones’s machinery must have been the talk of the season since its fame persisted long after the event. Most likely this engineering feat recommended Tempe Restored for mockery in The Varietie. The magnificent exotic disguises also asked for parody in a play obsessed with costume ‘at lesse charge than a masque comes to now’. For certain, the costumes of Tempe Restored left an impact on other playwrights of the period. Philip Massinger’s The City Madam (probably written in the year Henrietta Maria’s production was staged) included a spoof masque in which citizens disguised themselves as Indian devil-worshippers. Giving a drastic impression of horrors to be encountered overseas, their Indian dumb show was intended to dissuade a merchant from selling off his female relatives as slaves to Virginia. Since the entertainment failed in its purpose, The City Madam offered a critique of the persuasive power of the masque genre.48

To the credit of Jones’s art, Cavendish and Shirley remembered the effects of Tempe Restored, and trusted that they would still work in a joke more than eight years later. The Varietie confronted its audience with a cloudy ‘Vale of Tempe’, this time relocated in a pristine tavern and run by the drunk master-producer Newman:

they say, he has built a heaven, a Players heaven, and thence a Throne’s let down, in which, well heated, successively they are drawn up to the clouds to drink their Mistris health, while the mad mortals adore their God of Grape … (pp. 34–35)

The ‘Vale of Tempe’ was retrospective in several ways. Shirley’s The Triumph of Peace (1634) had presented a tavern setting with wenches and gentlemen. In that scene, four inebriate ‘devisers of the masque’ discussed their inventions and stressed the importance of ‘variety’ in courtly entertainment. In the ‘Tempe’ tavern of The Varietie, however, noise dominated instead of the customary lutes and viols. Olympian revelations, as they concluded court masques, were now converted to a makeshift Parnassus. Shirley was probably responsible for anti-illusionistic elements such as the drab chair in lieu of a throne or elaborate cloud machine.49 The Triumph of Peace – then famous as the most expensive spectacle ever staged – had undercut the appeal of conspicuous consumption by constantly reminding the audience of the artifice of the whole. (This tied in with Cavendish’s regrets about spending for entertainment.) Shirley’s court masque deliberately ruined its own special effects. At a point when the audience expected the grand aristocratic finale, ordinary workers and craftsmen erupted on the perspective stage and commented on technical details of the scenery. Characters also made fun of sudden, illogical scene changes: ‘a spick and span new tavern’, said one, to which another responded, ‘wonderful, here was none within two minutes’.50

The Varietie might also commemorate the foremost Jacobean masque writer, ‘good old Ben, prepar’d … with Canary wine’51, as Suckling had called the poet, when Newman calls to his players’ heaven in a quasi-Jonsonian moment:
Do you heare the Musick of the Spheres Gentlemen? ... This roome is mine, and
cald the field of Tempe; Because I woonot stay while the Plaies are done when I
have a humor to be merry, and drink healths in the clouds, I built this Elisium; and
when bright Sack hath crown’d my brow, how soon I am made immortall, you
may guesse. (p. 69)

Given to sack, Jonson loathed attending the performance of his plays (and
even more, in later years, collaborating with Jones on court pyrotechnics)
and preferred holding a convivial court in the Apollo room of the Devil & St
Dunstan Tavern instead.52 The banter would have been even-handed: Jonson
himself had penned the occasional robust joke at the expense of his good-
humoured patron Cavendish.53

The tavern scene culminates in the undignified apotheosis of a dubious
couple. Newman has appointed a lackey and a wench as king and queen and
now asks them to ascend to his heaven:

New. So crowne’m, and give to each a glasse of wine, for a scepter…. Preserve your
scepter glasses, doe not spill your blood royall. (p. 70)

This passage suggests that The Varietie was written after the performance of
the last court masque. William Davenant’s Salmacida Spolia (1640) provided
the only occasion on which Charles and Henrietta Maria performed together.
It concluded with elevating the royal couple on cloud machinery to Olympian
heights. The lower-class rulers of Newman’s makeshift empire are a pungent
travesty of the standard monarchical apotheosis at the end of a court masque.
Back in 1634, in Jonson’s entertainment at Cavendish’s Bolsover estate, two
cupids lowered from the clouds had set down a banquet before the king and
queen. The garden of Venus in the courtyard, originally symbolising the
mutual love of Cavendish and his wife, was, in Cedric Brown’s words, ‘reded-
icated to the mutual love of king and queen’, an ideally married couple who
created ‘a perfect court of love wherever they are’.54 By 1640, the banquet had
turned stale. In a radical inversion of the Bolsover spirit, the idealised neo-
platonic erotics of married love were replaced by crude sexual allusion. Royal
ceremony turned into a mock communion, wine shared between a player
king and his unwilling queen.

Subsequent history

We do not know how contemporary audiences and courtly circles reacted
to the play.55 For all its critical undertones, it was approved by the licenser.56
John Playford’s editions of The (English) Dancing Master in the 1650s may
sound a distant echo of Galliard’s dances in The Varietie, for they include
steps and music for ‘La Mountague’, ‘La Princesse’ and ‘La Buckingham’.57
When The Varietie was revived in the 1660s58, the French dancing master
revealed the greatest potential in performance, attracting more compliments than any other figure. Galliard formed the centre of the droll *Monsieur the French Dancing-Master, out of the Varieties*, also called *The Humours of Monsieur Galliard* in Henry Marsh’s and Francis Kirkman’s compilation *The Wits* (Part I, pb. London, 1662 and 1672). It was either this short farce about a dancer who undertook ‘with the Foot, to correct State-matters’ (*The Wits*, p. 134), or a revived version of *The Varietie* itself, or a Restoration adaptation of Shirley’s *The Ball*, which pleased Pepys, who singled out the actor John Lacy for praise: ‘Lacy’s part, the Dancing Master, the best in the world’.59 Charles II was so amused by the same performer that he had him painted in this role.60 Lacy certainly was a good dancer; he had been taught in the early 1630s by John Ogilby, then dancing master at Gray’s Inn Lane.61 *The Wits* (Part I) assembled abridged parts from favourite plays, including the gravedigger scene from *Hamlet*. Galliard graces the frontispiece, just right of centre, playing the fiddle, and practising what might be a galliard sequence: the engraver’s art has frozen him in mid-air (see Fig. 1). He has finally climbed – or rather, jumped, the Parnassus of English drama and at last belongs, like the prince of Denmark, to English heritage.

After a brief, successful revival in the Restoration period *The Varietie* slipped out of the repertoire. It seems arcane to a modern audience. Critics today agree on the play’s satire of excess in Caroline spectacle, and its celebration of Tudor Englishness.62 For Anne Barton, *The Varietie* patriotically harks back to the cult of Elizabeth and rewards conservative characters: ‘old, potentially awkward Elizabethan allegiances turn out to be sources of strength’. By refusing to conform, Manly succeeds.63 In Martin Butler’s view, Cavendish felt out of his depth in Charles’s progressive circles: the ‘Tempe’ episode parodied newfangled court masques; while Galliard stood for a new type of Frenchified courtier whose frivolousness undermined governmental authority. As Butler has shown, Galliard’s abuse of dancing as discipline and obedience represented a travesty of Jonsonian ideas which regarded the art as an expression of wisdom, nobility and harmony.64 Kevin Sharpe, on the other hand, thinks that *The Varietie* played home to Charles’s own preferences for restraint and reformed ceremony:

the plays of the reign which poked fun at the ridiculous lengths to which courtiers (among others) might go in order to appear à la mode, far from offending the king, may have reflected his own values. And the nostalgia for lost days of harmony, unity and order informed the policies of the king no less than the rhetoric of the country.65

Interestingly, *The Varietie* falls into the period in which the performance of Shirley’s plays switched from the Queen’s to the King’s Men.66 With *The Varietie*, Cavendish and Shirley composed a play in keeping with contemporary attitudes towards old style at Whitehall. It is Manly who lauds Charles’s pet project, the Order of the Garter at Windsor.
**Figure 1** Galliard, the ‘French Dancing Master’, frozen in mid-air. Note the long, flowing hair, the richly plumed hat, the surfeit of ribbons, and the ‘unbuttoned’ shirt fashionable since Caroline times. The character exemplifies multi-tasking: dancing, playing the fiddle or kit, and (possibly) singing. [Henry Marsh and Francis Kirkman], *The Wits, or, Sport upon Sport* (London, 1672). Frontispiece, Folger Library, shelfmark W3218. By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.
The play’s ambivalent attitude towards court culture corresponds to its authors’ careers and private circumstances. Shirley never got to write another big-budget masque after *The Triumph of Peace*; Cavendish never quite obtained the recognition at court he felt he deserved. Even so, both remained stalwart supporters of the Stuart monarchy during the Civil War. Shirley fought in Cavendish’s army for the king. Cavendish’s family assiduously participated in the very genre satirised by *The Varietie*: Jonson’s *Chloridia* (1631), Townshend’s *Tempe Restored* (1632), Carew’s *Coelum Britannicum* (1634) and Milton’s *Comus* (1634). What is more, Cavendish wrote masques himself, and continued the practice into the Interregnum years, providing Henrietta Maria with entertainments at Oxford and Paris. Cavendish, supposedly a conservative xenophobe, travelled abroad, appreciated continental music, liked dancing almost as much as dressage, spoke fluent French and probably some Italian, and cared so fastidiously about his appearance that he allegedly spent one hour on his daily toilette and coiffure (his bathing room at Bolsover was the first of its kind in Britain since Roman times). If *The Varietie* unmasked him as an insular ignoramus, as critics believe, they must also reserve their verdict for Shirley, who has so far not been accused of that defect. For certain, the play snipes at a new caste of functional elites and their fashions, swept in under Henrietta Maria. It criticises affectation and excess, as expressed in spectacular ascension scenes or etiolated dancing, yet contempt lies close to envy and grudging admiration. The play showcases highly modern, subtle methods of self-disciplining, embodied in Galliard’s not so ridiculous dance lessons.

Conclusion

As an object of satire, court masques are difficult to pin down, for like Galliard, they ‘alwaies change’ in the quest for variety. Critics still underestimate their capacity to absorb different English periods and styles. Caroline masques included old-fashioned devices such as floating islands and life-size trees, pseudo-Elizabethan characters, and quaint, dated dance forms. They exploited history even if this risked recalling to audiences successful moments of the past and unfavourable comparisons with the present. Henrietta Maria, supposedly the harbinger of French decadence, appropriated Elizabethan iconography. As Erica Veevers shows, she fashioned herself as ‘Bellesa’, a new Eliza, in her pastoral *The Shepherds’ Paradise* (1633), creating a contemporary (and Catholic) version of the Virgin Queen. In this particular role Henrietta Maria played the Princess of Navarre, in an all black farthingale. A female Manly, she wore fashion from the Armada days. *The King and Queenes Entertainment at Richmond* (1636) was based on *The Faerie Queene*. Nobody objected to its old-fashioned druids and country dances or the fact that prince Charles (the future Charles II) played the Spenserian
heroine ‘Britomart’. On the contrary, the princely posturing of (female) Elizabethan martiality contrasted with a sarabande danced by a Spaniard, and mobilised the audience’s sympathy against the Spanish-Austrian oppression of Protestant territories in Europe.71

To sketch the taste for anachronism and subtle discipline in Stuart entertainment culture required intimate, up-to-date dramatic expertise. As if it were a masque, The Varietie demanded advanced fashion, dance and music literacy. The play blends Tudor nostalgia with anti-illusionist jokes and contemporary ideas about cost efficiency and obedience by ceremony. With its historicising bricolage, The Varietie is a typically Caroline product in the same way as the masques which inspired it, such as Salmacida Spolia, Tempe Restored, or The Triumph of Peace. The play shares the self-conscious attitude of Stuart court theatre towards heritage. Manly is both embarrassed and empowered by his reliving of the past. He is quite capable of looking at himself with ironic distance. An understanding that the Tudors are, after all, history informs the plot. The pseudo-Elizabethan chestnut is actually a progressive play.
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3 The Varietie, pp. 39–40. Kissing one’s hand before taking that of the lady to dance was originally an Italian custom.

4 Cavendish’s letter to Lord Strafford (5 August 1633) and Clarendon cited from Henry Ten Eyck Perry, The First Duchess of Newcastle and her Husband as Figures in Literary History (Boston, 1918), pp. 15, 93. Figures according to Margaret Cavendish, The Life of William Cavendish Duke of Newcastle, ed. C. H. Firth, 2nd edn (London, [1906]), p. 78. Even if we assume some exaggeration on her part, the sum must still have been staggering. See Cedric Brown’s breakdown.
7 For instance, apprentices were to wear their traditional black round capes. Cavendish, The Little Book, p. 144.
13 A photograph of the tomb of Henry Cavendish (d. 1616) and William Cavendish (d. 1626) has been reproduced in Parry’s article, plate 11.
14 I am grateful to Graham Parry for having shown me Edensor church. See also his article, p. 280.
16 Cavendish’s Manly even parodies a song by his namesake from this play (‘Have you seene but a bright Lilly grow?’). Barton, p. 301.
18 For Cavendish, the name of Jeremy Herne (‘Gerum Herne’) – a Jacobean choreographer and violinist, involved in The Masque of Queens, Oberon and The Lords’ Masque – derived from a bird (heron). Dramatic Works by William Cavendish, pp. xiv, 137, l. 106.
19 Data on Thomas Cardell from Peter Holman, Four and Twenty Fiddlers: The Violin at the English Court, 1540–1690 (Oxford, 1993), pp. 115 (with reference to The Varietie), 175, 179. Cardell devised dances for courtly entertainments as early as 1582. His son Francis was a court dancer too but died young; hence The Varietie clearly alludes to the former. In 1614, Cardell was the first to bring news that Christian IV of Denmark had arrived from sea. John Nichols, The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First, 4 vols (London, 1828), III, 15.
20 Barton, p. 304.
Christopher Sympson, a former royalist soldier, noted in his *Compendium* (1667, p. 116) that galliard was called after Gallia, ‘the country whence it came’. Cited from Edward W. Naylor, *Shakespeare and Music* (London, 2nd edn, 1931), p. 113.

For instance, in Thomas Campion’s *Lord Hay’s Masque* and John Marston’s *Entertainment at Ashby* (both 1607), and later in connection with the antimasques in Ben Jonson’s *Chloridia*, 1631.


Monsieur Le Friske in James Shirley’s *The Ball* (London, 1639), sig. C2r. The title page credits George Chapman as co-author but it is generally agreed that this must be an error.

The *Varietie*, p. 20. A joke at Galliard’s expense, since ‘splay foot’ is also a physical deformity.

The *Varietie*, p. 37. Stage direction ‘Lady and Lucy dance, Mounsieur singing, and correcting them in tune’.


The *Varietie*, pp. 18, 37–8. The *sarabande*, initially considered a lewd Spanish import, reached masque repertoire in the 1630s. Dancers often accompanied themselves with castanets. Late-seventeenth-century versions had a characteristic rhythm (short-short-short-long-short). In *Tempe Restored* (1632), a *sarabande* was either danced, or played and sung only. *The King and Queenses Entertainment at Richmond* (1636) included a Spanish *sarabande*. The ‘Saraband as they [the chorus] move back’ in *Luminatia* (1638) may have been a tune or song with the characteristic rhythm, not a dance. OS II, p. 709, l. 321. Patricia Ranum, ‘Audible Rhetoric and Mute Rhetoric: The Seventeenth-Century French Sarabande’, *Early Music*, 14:1 (1986), 22–39. Rainer Gstrein, *Die Sarabande. Tanzgattung und musikalischer Topos* (Innsbruck, 1997).

‘His grace took a shape upon the other Thursday night, which many thought too histrionical to become him.’ Letter to Joseph Mead, December 1626. Thomas Birch, *The Court and Times of Charles the First*, 2 vols (London, 1848), I, 182.


Especially Butler, p. 196.

Cited from Canova-Green, p. 13.

Sir William, p. 36.

The *Varietie*, p. 35.

Kevin Sharpe’s reading of *The Varietie* (p. 18) has stressed this point.

42 This has already been observed by Butler (p. 197) but not interpreted in detail.
43 OS II, p. 480, ll. 49–50. Some critics argue that the statement is by Inigo Jones, who supposedly inserted a lengthy description of his stage devices to Townshend’s text.
45 Edward J. Wood, Giants and Dwarfs (London, 1868), pp. 274–6. Possibly Coniack and Shepherd were members of Henrietta Maria’s chapel but I found no evidence thereof in Caroline household accounts. Sara Sheppard appears in Charles’s books between 1631 and 1634 (PRO, E403/1747, E403/2191). ‘Of The Marriage of the Dwarfs’ (pb. 1640), in The Poems of Edmund Waller, ed. G. Thorn Drury (London, 1893), pp. 92, 314. Richard Gibson was page to the king. Both bride and groom were only three feet ten inches high. I owe the references to Gibson and Waller to Timothy Raylor. See also my essay ‘Queen Henrietta Maria’s Dramatic Activities’, in Heroines of the Golden (St)age: Women and Drama in Spain and England, 1300–1700, ed. M. Corporaal, R. Walthaus (Kassel, Reichenberger), forthcoming. The painting was sold by Sotheby’s (London, 9 April 1997, lot 25) and is reproduced in Erin Griffey’s excellent article ‘Multum in parvo: Portraits of Jeffrey Hudson, Court Dwarf to Henrietta Maria’, British Art Journal, 4:3 (2003), 39–53 (p. 51).
46 OS II, p. 481, ll. 198–208.
47 Based on estimates of the stage for Salmacida Spolia. Stage historians agree that the Banqueting House and the provisional building close by, where the masque was performed, roughly agreed in size. See also Ravelhofer, The Early Stuart Masque, p. 88.
49 The ‘Tempe’ scene contains some interesting parallels to Shirley plays. Jokes about the delights of Tempe occur in The Lady of Pleasure (pb. 1637), Act V, and The Royal Master (pb. 1638), Act III. Above all, in The Cardinal (1641), a servant ridicules costly yet unimpressive special effects in a masque, which also include clouds and a throne (‘half a score deal tacked together in the clouds, what’s that? A throne to come down, and dance; all the properties have been paid forty times over’. The Cardinal, ed. E. M. Yearling (Manchester, 1986), p. 92, III.2, ll. 37–39. The negative ‘woonot’ for ‘would not’ in the ‘Tempe’ scene is a particular preference of Shirley’s (usually in the variant spellings ‘won(n)ot’, ‘wo’not’). He uses it more often than any other Caroline playwright; ‘wonot’, for instance, occurs in 30 plays (not in poetry or prose) from the Jacobean to the Restoration period, 19 of which were written by Shirley alone, and 2 in collaboration with him. ‘Woonot’ occurs in no other text. LION database check, January 2006. See also Cyrus Hoy’s study of Shirley’s contracted forms, ‘The Shares of Fletcher and His Collaborators in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon (IV)’, Studies in Bibliography, 12 (1959), 91–116. Such circumstances do not, of course, conclusively prove Shirley’s authorship. Cavendish may simply have been inspired by Shirley’s plays when
writing the ‘Tempe’ scene, and we must not exclude a compositor’s interference in spelling, yet I think that the cumulative evidence of close parallels and the distinctive negative increases the likelihood of attribution to Shirley.


51 In his poem ‘A Sessions of the Poets’.

52 On the Apollo Room in the Devil & St Dunstan Tavern and its leges conviviales imposed by Jonson, see David Riggs, Ben Jonson: A Life (Cambridge, Mass., 1989), pp. 284–6. Suckling’s The Goblins also includes several tavern scenes and a drunk poet who thinks he has his feet in the Helicon.


54 Brown, p. 163.

55 Perry considers it ‘wretched’; for him, Brome’s ‘To my Lord of Newcastle, on his Play called The Variety’ illustrates that it was badly received (pp. 114–17). In my view, however, Brome’s poem does not express condemnation. Perry provides no further substantial evidence.

56 See note 1.


58 The Varietie was certainly played at the New Theatre in 1669; and possibly in 1661 and 1662, if we accept that this play was meant by the titles ‘The Dancing Master’ and ‘The Frenche dancinge Master’ in a list of plays performed by the King’s Company at the Red Bull and Gibbon’s Tennis Court theatre in 1661 and in a diary entry by Pepys. Bentley, III, 149–50.

59 ‘We went to the Theatre, to “The French Dancing Master”, and there with much pleasure gazed upon her [Lady Castlemaine] … The play pleased us very well; but Lacy’s part, the Dancing Master, the best in the world.’ Pepys, 21 May 1662, cited from Bentley, V, 1079. Bentley thinks it is unlikely that Pepys would have called the droll a ‘play’ and considered it worth an evening’s entertainment. He suggests that Pepys saw, in fact, Shirley’s The Ball (also entitled French Dancing Master in a list of Shirley’s works following The Cardinal in Shirley’s 1653 publication Six New Playes). Perry, pp. 115–16, thinks Pepys saw the droll; John J. Elson in his edition of The Wits (Ithaca, NY, 1932), p. 388, thinks he saw The Varietie.

60 The famous triple portrait John Lacy by John Michael Wright (c.1668–70) is now in the Royal Collections and reproduced in Anthony Masters, The Play of Personality in the Restoration Theatre (Woodbridge, 1992), p. 107. Masters thinks the character showing Lacy with a huge wig and profuse shoe ribbons represents not his role as Galliard but Monsieur Device from Cavendish’s The Country Captain; in my view, the case for Galliard is stronger.
Ogilby, now better known as translator, printer, writer and map-maker, had performed in *The Gypsies Metamorphos’d* (1621), where some overzealous capers had lamed him forever. He later devised choreographies and music for Waller’s *Pompey the Great* (c. 1663–64). John Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, ed. Oliver Lawson Dick (London, 1949), pp. 219–21; also mentioned by Holman, pp. 183, 360.


Sharpe, p. 19.

From about 1639, almost all of Shirley’s plays were performed by the King’s Men, while before that time they had been by a vast margin the domain of the Queen’s company.

Master Charles Cavendish (1620–43) danced in *Coelum Britannicum* and *Tempe Restored*. Lady Anne Cavendish (d. 1638) danced in *Chloridia* and *Tempe Restored*. Lady Elizabeth Cecil participated in *Tempe Restored*. She married William Cavendish, third Earl of Devonshire (who danced in *Coelum Britannicum*), in 1638 and thus was a family member when *The Varietie* was written. John Egerton (1623–86) married Cavendish’s daughter Elizabeth in 1636. He danced in *Tempe Restored*, *Coelum Britannicum* and *Comus*. Court Masques: *Jacobean and Caroline Entertainments, 1605–1640*, ed. D. Lindley (Oxford, 1995) includes a good index of performers.


Her dress merged Tudor history with her family background (Henri IV was also King of Navarre).
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