Marvell’s ‘Interior Paramour’:
Clora meets the Cavaliers in ‘The Gallery’

Dosia Reichardt

Marvell’s ‘The Gallery’ has been a comparatively neglected poem and has usually been read as a tribute to Clora within the framework of lyric based on Marino’s ‘La Galeria’. Using well-worn conceits and adopting the pose of an ultra fashionable art connoisseur, Marvell creates a gallery of mirrors that challenges Cavalier notions of compliment while criticizing the Stuart court’s obsession with imagery and revealing the darker side of pastoral. Clora has many faces – not one – and the poem fails to reveal her immutable Platonic essence. Among Clora’s innumerable portraits five are described: these have no relation to art works of the time but allow Marvell to explore the nature of poetic creativity in his typically oblique way.

‘The Gallery’1 has long been regarded as a pictorial poem and one whose literary antecedents are lyrics that place the reader in some fictitious collector’s cabinet. As a result, some editors and critics link ‘The Gallery’ with Richard Lovelace’s ‘Amyntor’s Grove, His Chloris, Arigo, and Gratiana. An Elogie’.2 Nigel Smith, for instance, in his recent edition of Marvell discusses the links between ‘Amyntor’s Grove’, as a piece about the collector and courtier Endymion Porter, and ‘The Gallery’.3 In relation to ‘The Gallery’, H. M. Margoliouth links Marvell with Lovelace, while L. N. Wall discusses Marvell’s admiration for Lovelace and his borrowings from a number of poems including ‘Amyntor’s Grove’.4 Other writers

2 The Poems of Richard Lovelace, ed. C. H. Wilkinson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), pp. 71–74. ‘Amyntor’s Grove appeared in Lovelace’s first volume, Lucasta, in 1649. Marvell’s poem has not been accurately dated. Most commentators settle for 1648–49 although the references to the collections of ‘Whitehall’ and ‘Mantua’ which belonged to Charles I, but were sold by the Commonwealth in 1650, might indicate that Marvell wrote the poem after 1650. Nigel Smith, in his edition, opts for a date in the early 1650s.
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treat ‘The Gallery’ as a discourse about women and art, as a poem about actual works of art, or as a commentary on the Stuart court’s fondness for pastoral.\(^5\) While Marvell’s poem certainly partakes of the growing consciousness of the visual arts during the Caroline period, critical approaches which take a painterly point of view have tended to obscure Marvell’s links with European Renaissance poetry other than Marino, and with some possibly less congenial poetic predecessors – the courtly Cavalier poets.

I would like to argue that Marvell’s ‘The Gallery’ is not so much a poem about the paragone between poet and painter, or a piece of art criticism, but the critical heir of many minor poems in which the image of the beloved is integral to the poet’s inner sense of self. Such poems, sometimes referred to as looking-glass sonnets, describe a woman looking into a mirror and then into the lover himself, or some part of his anatomy which becomes that mirror. In ‘The Gallery’, Marvell is writing not about a real or imaginary collection of portraits, but is producing a response to those poems, by Stanley, Carew, and others, where the poet’s identity, both as an artist and as a lover, is as fragile and brittle as the mirrors (or paintings) which both alienate and contain the object of affection.\(^6\) Marvell had some Royalist sympathies in the 1640s and there is evidence that Marvell was familiar with the

---


work of poets whose politics were opposed to his own. Pierre Legouis argues that Marvell knew Abraham Cowley and that he used the imagery from Cowley’s popular 1647 volume of love poems, The Mistress, in his own way. Throughout his poetic career Marvell exhibits a fondness for making fun of court poets and of Royalist writers. In stanza 58 Of ‘Upon Appleton House’, for instance, Marvell’s image of cattle appearing as fleas refers to James Howell’s eponymous collection of letters from prison, Epistolae Ho-Elianae (1650) which had used these images to illustrate the power of new magnifying glasses. Marvell’s commendatory poem for Lovelace’s 1649 Lucasta is full of praise for the beleaguered Cavalier, but hints that Lovelace’s work is best appreciated by undressed nymphs. Edmund Waller’s ‘Instructions to a Painter’ (1665) was parodied two years later by Marvell’s ‘The Last Instructions to a Painter’, in which he once again used the idea of a portrait gallery – though this time one filled with scurrilous pictures of the King’s mistresses and others. In pre-war Cavalier fashion Lady Castlemaine is imagined ‘poring within her glass’ as she readjusts her ‘oft-tried beauty’ for a new lover. There are many seventeenth-century poems (as well as paintings) that have as their principal image a woman gazing into a mirror. In Paradise Lost, Adam both contemplates and speculates, but the processes of reflection are associated specifically with Eve. When she gazes into the pool, she falls inwards. However, whereas painters often point symbolically to the woman’s vanity, or lust, (while taking advantage of the genre’s obviously erotic possibilities), Cavalier poets seek to draw the woman’s and the reader’s attention to themselves. Although there is a tradition of looking-glass poems from the Renaissance on which admonish the woman, courtly poets of the early and mid seventeenth century are less concerned

9 The Complete Poems, pp. 75–99 (p. 89).
12 A male figure before a mirror is rare in both poetry and art of the period. G. F. Hartlaub’s magisterial survey of the mirror in Western art has only some paintings of Narcissus as exempla of a male gazing at his own reflection. See Zauber des Spiegels: Geschichte und Bedeutung der Spiegels in der Kunst (München: R. Piper, 1951).
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with persuading the woman away from the mirror and towards virtue than with turning her towards a potential lover. In such a poem the masculine speaker diverts the woman’s gaze by transforming his tears, his heart, or even himself, into the genuine mirror. In this mimesis the beloved colonizes the internal spiritual space of the lover. The lover experiences an ontological self-extinction so that the woman may not be destroyed by her own beauty. Only the poet’s voice, like that of the wood-nymph Echo, is left to sing the praises of the transposed image. The image of the woman is purportedly accurate, and so truthful, that she will no longer need any pool or mirror. Marvell is offering up his mind and his soul as Clora’s mirror and his poem as a mirror to Cavalier poems.

The continuity of ‘The Gallery’ with Cavalier poetry is most evident in its first stanza. The seductive delights of viewing, in a sequence derived from Horace, are traditionally the first steps to consummation. In ‘A Dialogue Between the Resolved Soul and Created Pleasure’ it is this narcissistic viewing of the self which forms a major temptation when Pleasure suggests:

Every thing does seem to vie
Which should first attract thine Eye:
But since none deserves that grace,
In this Crystal view thy face.¹⁴

The central conceit of Marvell’s poem addressed to Clora, identified by Nigel Smith as ‘the speaker’s soul as a picture gallery’,¹⁵ extends the singular image of the Cavalier mistress painted, as it were, on the canvas of the poet’s body, to a multiplicity of images held within the less emotional soul or mind:

Clora, come view my soul, and tell
Whether I have contrived it well.
Now all its several lodgings lie
Composed into one gallery;
And the great arras-hangings, made
Of various faces, by are laid;
That, for all furniture, you’ll find


¹⁵ The Poems of Andrew Marvell, ed. Nigel Smith, p. 93.
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Only your picture in my mind.\(^\text{16}\)

This Marvellian soul ‘into the boughs does glide’ rather more famously in ‘The Garden’.\(^\text{17}\) There, the soul is also an image of assimilation – of form and colour, of the one and the many, while the mind in the green garden reflects the created world. As Paul Hammond notes, there is a recurrent use of figures of reflection, enclosure and self-resemblance in the poetry.\(^\text{18}\) In ‘The Fair Singer’, Marvell’s speaker distinguishes between his heart, which has been conventionally bound with the woman’s eyes, and his mind, which is captivated by her voice.\(^\text{19}\) The poem has been likened to Edmund Waller’s ‘Of Mrs Arden’ in which the poet soul’s is courted.\(^\text{20}\) In ‘The Gallery’, however, the Renaissance convention of the lover as prisoner (much exploited by Cavalier poets) is overturned and it is the woman who is enclosed, whose images are captured within the male mind. In this first stanza Marvell seems to use ‘mind’ and ‘soul’ interchangeably and as an analogue to the Cavalier ‘heart’ which mostly contains the loved one’s image. The mind as a mirror, providing an accurate representation of the world, was a common conception in the seventeenth century, refined by Descartes into an instrument of knowledge which could be made more accurate through empirical inspection.\(^\text{21}\) In ‘The Garden’ Marvell refers to the mind as ‘that ocean where each kind / Does straight its own resemblance find’ (ll. 43–44). The river, in ‘Upon Appleton House’ likewise provides a true image of the living things that surround it: ‘And yet its muddy back doth lick, / Till as a Chrystal Mirrour slick; / Where all things gaze themselves, and doubt / If they be in it or without’ (ll. 635–38). A more personal source of reflection occurs in the reflections of ‘The Mower’s Song’ which opens:

My Mind was once the true survey
Of all these Meadows fresh and gay;
And in the greenness of the Grass
Did see its Hopes as in a Glass:

\(^{16}\) The Complete Poems, p. 40, ll. 1–8.
\(^{17}\) The Complete Poems, pp. 100–01.
\(^{19}\) The Complete Poems, p. 39.
When Juliana came, and She
What I do to the Grass, does to my Thoughts and Me.\textsuperscript{22}

The woman finds her reflection in the mower but also destroys him – the fate of the poet/narrator in Cavalier looking-glass poems and one which seems to await Marvell’s gallery guide. The apostrophe to Clora, ‘Come view my soul’, echoes Thomas Stanley’s invitation to Chariessa:

\begin{quote}
But if thou dost desire thy form to view,
Look in my heart, where love thy picture drew.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

Stanley encompasses his mistress’s image in one single portrait. Marvell at first assures Clora that his soul, concurrent with trends in interior design, is no longer compartmentalized but that it has been swept clean until only her image is left – a sentiment common to poems such as Stanley’s. However, the reference to the recently unfashionable arras suggests that Clora’s portraits do not dominate in an enclosed world of love, but can eventually be stored away.\textsuperscript{24} This stanza emphasizes one gallery and one face but the subsequent stanzas reveal, ironically, a tapestry-like progression of narrative images. Unlike other lovers who keep a single and recognizable image of the immutable fair in their hearts, Marvell’s inner self (he is careful to leave his heart uncontaminated) contains many visual representations of Clora – and not one of them is akin to the Platonic perfection of Cavalier mistresses. When Carew addresses his verses ‘To the Painter’, he argues throughout that his verbal portrait is superior and that ‘Your Art cannot equalize / This Picture in her lovers eyes’ – a comparison which Marvell is careful not to make.\textsuperscript{25} Moreover, in Carew’s poem the poet claims that he can produce a true copy of the un-named beauty: ‘His heart the Tablet which alone, / Is for that portraite the tru’st stone’ (ll. 17–18). In contrast, Marvell’s Clora has no ‘true’ self which her lover can contain. She is painted as a murderess and an enchantress, and also

\textsuperscript{22} The Complete Poems, pp. 109–10, ll. 1–6.
\textsuperscript{23} ‘To Chariessa, beholding herself in a Glasse’, ll. 9–10.
\textsuperscript{24} Until the early seventeenth century, tapestries had been the most desired and most costly works of art and represented a large portion in value of the collection of Charles I, but the status and high labour cost of tapestries were being superseded by a greater demand for paintings which now had symbolic as well as material value.
as Venus and Aurora. The scary versions of Clora, (described in the second and fourth stanzas) are especially interesting in their comments on Cavalier mistresses and while perhaps suggesting an engraving by Dürer, are also the furthest from any painted portraits of seventeenth-century women. Having admired Clora’s milky thighs, the speaker moves on to another facet: ‘Like an enchantress here thou show’st, / Vexing thy restless lover’s ghost’ (ll. 25–26). Here love is not a refining, but a Circean force, and a brutish element in which sensus takes precedence over mens. Clora as Circe is not so far from Clora as the personification of dawn in the third stanza since Circe was the daughter of Helios the Sun God. The opposition of the classical nude, (myth-oriented, like the ladies in Cavalier poems) with the monstrous witch reveals the antierotic, antifeminist impulse behind much pastoral praise of classically named nymphs in Cavalier love poetry, and the artificiality which surrounds them. The standard mistress, careless of her narcissism, uses the mirror to tease her lover: Marvell’s Clora, the enchantress of the fourth stanza, uses his entrails as a mirror in which she can discover ‘with horrid care’ (l. 29) how long she will continue to be beautiful.

Marvell’s iconic perambulation through his own soul in this somewhat neglected poem has sometimes been read, however, as a piece of art criticism and the opposing tableaux of Clora as actual paintings or galleries Marvell may have seen on his travels. What Sir Henry Wotton called ‘Pinacotheciae’ or closets of paintings and rare objects were becoming popular interior spaces and John Dixon Hunt, in his study of Marvell, reproduces one such Italian studiolo. This does

26 It is noticeable that it is the woman who is concerned with different aspects of love, not, as in much analytical love poetry and most often in love sonnets, the lover and poet.

27 Rosalie Colie, for instance treats ‘The Gallery’ as a painterly poem. See My Ecchoing Song: Andrew Marvell’s Poetry of Criticism (Princeton: University of Princeton Press, 1970), pp. 106–07. See also, Renée Ramsay, ‘The Poet as Art Critic’. Heather Dubrow insists that gallery-paintings and not Marino’s La Galeria are the primary influence behind Marvell’s lyric. I agree that Marino’s influence is not of great importance, but disagree with the link to the visual arts. Dubrow herself points out that the gallery-paintings Marvell may have seen on the continent depict a variety of objects and are often fictitious. See ‘Marvell’s Gallery of Art Revisited’. In his edition of the poems Margoliouth notes that ‘No precedent has been found for Marvell’s multiple portraits of the same mistress’, but makes no further comment. The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell, ed. H. M. Margoliouth, Vol. I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), p. 256.
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have more paintings of naked women than usual, but none which fits Clora. John Evelyn records lengthy travels on his ‘grand tour’ of Europe and European art between 1620 and 1649, but his *Kalendarium* never mentions anything approaching the gallery in Marvell’s poem. Richard Symonds records seeing a collection of six Van Dyck portraits of women at Lady Hatton’s house, but Van Dyck’s oeuvre does not contain anything resembling the various guises in which Clora appears. Charles Hinnant suggests that Marvell’s word paintings derive from mythological subject portraits, but my own informal researches on seventeenth-century portraits suggest that this specialized sub-genre was already losing popularity in the early seventeenth century. Aristocratic ladies may nearly always be shown with flowers (perhaps to indicate fertility), but portraits are more naturalistic than mythological and display the sitter’s status (with clothes, jewels, land) rather than having literary allusions. Moreover, the gallery Marvell is presenting is rather anomalous. Bourgeois portraits, which were growing in popularity, were displayed to emphasize family lines and connections: royal and court portraits were often flattering job lots produced to order in great quantity by the studios of established artists such as Rubens and Van Dyck. Portrait painting did not rank highly in the hierarchy of genres unless executed by the best painters and Clora’s status, as the subject of so many, is left ambiguous.

Since none of Clora’s portraits are at all naturalistic Marvell may have been slyly commenting on the court painters’ preference for ‘romantic’ attire and for flattery, and on the Cavalier poets’ parallel verbal efforts in their love poetry. If Marvell’s poem is not the verbal equivalent of an actual portrait gallery, neither is it a verbal analogy of a gallery painting – a genre peculiarly popular in the seventeenth

---

31 Van Dyck, enormously influential on English art and knighted in 1632, found little appeal in daemonic visions or other savage scenes (such as those in two of Clora’s portraits). See Sir Oliver Millar, *Van Dyck in England* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 1982).
32 Charles Hinnant, ‘Marvell’s Gallery of Art’, p. 28. In the end Hinnant finds that painterly representations have no precedence for the poem and he fails to find images in Baroque art that correlate with the depictions of Clora.
century. Although Marvell may have seen such paintings on his European travels there are only five portraits of Clora, and the poem’s imagery does not suggest works such as those by David Teniers the Younger (1610–90). This Flemish artist executed several ‘gallery portraits’ between 1639 and 1653 which record the magnificent and varied collection of his patron, Archduke Leopold Wilhelm of Austria, housed in Brussels. Teniers also produced works showing artists’ studios and some of these were popular with the English aristocracy and may have been seen by Marvell. These works indicate that wealthy patrons displayed, or aspired to display, a huge variety of work. Willem van Haecht’s ‘The Picture Gallery of Cornelius van der Geest’ includes sculptures and many kinds of objets d’art as well as portraits and other painting the content of which is not dominated by seductive women. Marvell’s gallery is limited in comparison but it is, however, somewhat prescient. After the Restoration, Sir Peter Lely (whose art had been praised in poems by Richard Lovelace) painted a series of female portraits for the Duchess of York. These ten paintings, now in Hampton Court and known as the ‘Windsor Beauties,’ were criticized by his contemporaries for being (almost as if they were a manifestation of Marvell’s poem) too uniformly suggestive of only

33 Since it is likely that Marvell would have seen some gallery paintings while in the Netherlands, he would have been aware that these compositions were sometimes allegorical and symbolic rather than just visual catalogues of actual collections. For a comprehensive survey of these paintings in the seventeenth century see Hans Vlieghe, Flemish Art and Architecture 1585–1700 (Yale: Yale University Press, 1998), pp. 202–06.

34 See the comprehensive survey by Jonathan Brown, Kings and Connoisseurs: Collecting Art in Seventeenth-Century Europe (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995). There is a good example of a ‘gallery’ picture in London’s National Gallery. Cognoscenti in a Room hung with Pictures (Flemish School, c. 1620) shows clients examining objects and paintings. A number of women are depicted in framed works of well-known mythological and Biblical scenes and the foreground of the picture is occupied by four men examining a picture of a naked woman in a pastoral setting, but the room does not consist entirely of paintings of women. Heather Dubrow argues that ‘The Gallery’ is related to this Flemish genre of cabinet painting (‘Marvell’s Gallery of Art Revisited’, p. 62), but Marvell’s carefully balanced construction of Clora’s portraits bears little resemblance to these amazingly crowded canvasses.
one woman – the Duchess of Cleveland.\textsuperscript{35} As far as I can tell, a European gallery exclusively containing portraits of women did not exist until the early nineteenth century when Ludwig I of Bavaria commissioned the Schönheitsgalerie in Schloss Nymphenburg in Munich, specifying that the women contained in it should be both beautiful and virtuous. In the early modern period, although portraits may have been placed together to intensify their symbolism, such arrangements would have contained the likenesses of family members or patrons rather than mistresses.\textsuperscript{36} 

As usual, Marvell is being wittily inventive.

The only ‘portrait’ in Marvell’s gallery with even a vaguely iconographic antecedent is the final one of Clora as a shepherdess. Although vaguely Arcadian costume was sometimes used in fashionable portraits by Van Dyck (and more by his successor Lely) this owed something to the sitter’s need not to be portrayed in exactly contemporary dress which would soon look old-fashioned. There was also the painter’s practical need not to spend time and materials on detailed depictions of complex costume.\textsuperscript{37} Marvell’s final four lines describe:

\begin{quote}
A tender shepherdess, whose hair  
Hangs loosely playing in the air,  
Transplanting flowers from the green hill,  
To crown her head, and bosom fill.
\end{quote}

(ll. 53–56)

This description is, however, more akin to sixteenth-century paintings of girls with loose hair and flowers than to contemporary portraits which had become more naturalistic.\textsuperscript{38} The depiction of Clora in this last stanza, in her apparent innocence

\begin{footnote}


\textsuperscript{37} See the chapter on ‘Van Dyck and the Court’, in Whinney and Millar, pp. 60–89.

\textsuperscript{38} Van Dyck painted no large-scale allegories during his time in England and his portrait of Venetia Digby as Prudence is unusual. His images of women focus on concrete attributes of family or status: important connections, children, land, jewels, servants.

\end{footnote}
and freshness, is generally assumed to provide a resolution for the poem. The series of portraits is completed, writes Donald Friedman, ‘by a vision of virginal loveliness that takes the poem out of the realm of the amatory exercise and raises it to the level of a statement about nostalgia and innocence’.\(^3\)\(^9\) Robert Wilcher finds that it exists as a critique of the Clora who is a murderess and an enchantress.\(^4\)\(^0\) Pierre Legouis also comments on the final stanza’s ‘rural freshness’ and only Lawrence Hyman is perturbed by the ‘innocent shepherdess’ who seems at odds with the ‘murtheress’ of a previous stanza.\(^4\)\(^1\) Yet it is in this concluding image that Marvell delivers his strongest blow against all the arts of the Caroline court.

In Van Dyck’s portraits of Henrietta Maria and in his portraits of the ladies of the Stuart court the women are often shown holding flowers or gesturing towards them. Marvell’s Clora – a typically pastoral name – is more unruly in picking an abundance of greenery and with her loosened hair seems more natural than the carefully coiffed and posed court ladies. The metaphor of transplanted flowers derives, perhaps, from both Carew and Habington. Carew’s ‘On a Damaske Rose sticking upon a Ladies Breast’ conveys a similar image to Marvell’s last stanza, while William Habington’s ‘To Roses in the Bosom of Castara’ (from which Richard Lovelace also borrowed a memorable phrase) refers to flowers which have been transplanted into the white cloisters of Castara’s bosom.\(^4\)\(^2\) This final picture of Clora covered in flowers is similar and confirms her status as one of those ladies to whom Cavaliers addressed their languishing verses, and even more so if this last (and principal) portrait is integrated with the others. As Frank Warnke suggests, this final picture is the source of all the masquerades.\(^4\)\(^3\) Clora can be so versatile because she is a shepherdess and partakes of nature’s metamorphic principle. Dennis Davison remarks that the pictures in Marvell’s gallery are reminders of aristocratic ladies who posed as goddesses in pre-war court masques and were artful participants in games of love.\(^4\)\(^4\) The most famous (or notorious, according to William Prynne) of these ladies was the Queen herself who played Flora, goddess
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Pictorial representations of shepherdesses, distinguished by flowers and/or crooks, were a relatively new phenomenon, dating from the early seventeenth century. Images of wanton shepherdesses are unprecedented in European art before this time. With the exception of tapestries (put away in Marvell’s gallery), amorous shepherdesses were to be found only in pastoral drama and romance where they were usually frolicking city girls. Herding sheep was regarded as an exclusively male occupation, but shepherdesses did exist outside of court drama in a rather more predictable role – that of courtesan. In 1630, an established artist, Crispin de Passe II, published an imaginary portrait gallery of ladies with classical names (even Marvell’s Juliana) and rural accoutrements. *Le Miroir des Plus Belles Courtisannes de ce Temps* contains forty idealized engravings of courtesans. De Passe derived his inspiration from Italian courtesan portraiture and costume manuals. Venetian women had often been portrayed with loose hair and clothing revealing their breasts within a vaguely mythological setting, but pastoral symbols were becoming more popular in northern European art. Marvell’s Clora may not be as innocent as critics have assumed.

The genesis of Marvell’s gallery is, nevertheless, more literary than pictorial, yet his poem does not resemble the few English gallery poems of the time. These exist mainly in manuscript and focus on the Duke of Buckingham’s pictures at York House. Marvell’s poem may owe its title and framework to Marino’s *La...*

---

45 I have suggested elsewhere that some of the portraits of Clora coincide with roles taken by the Queen in various masques so that ‘The Gallery’ can also be read as a comment on the court’s fondness for these lavish entertainments – many of which encompassed pastoral themes. See my ‘Another Look at “Amyntor’s Grove”: Pastoral and Patronage in Lovelace’s Poem’, *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 11.3 (2006) 5.1-20.


47 There are references in travel books to Dutch and Italian houses of prostitution having portrait galleries. See Kettering, *The Dutch Arcadia*, p. 144.

48 ‘Upon Generall pieces of worke in the Dukes Gallery at York house’, in Bodleian MS Rawl. Poet 84. fols 90–92, describes the collection with praise and details Biblical and other pictures. ‘On the Dukes gallery at York-house’, in Bodleian MS Rawl Poet 199 fols 34–38 is virtually identical. The collection includes (like Marvell’s) a naked Venus, but the poem also contains the sort of meditation associated with looking-glass poems by including the description of a mirror placed in the gallery: ‘Quite hung with glasse where evry man may see / Not more what wee doe seem but what wee bee. / The glasse soe steales us from us, that you’d sweare / That we the shadow, that the substance were: / Which doth not take
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Galeria, but its contents resemble the fictitious collection of Kalander in the New Arcadia and its subtext the pivotal scenes in the enchanted garden of Armida from Tasso’s Gerusalemme Liberata. A link between Marino’s poem and Marvell’s has long been a critical commonplace, but the influence of Sidney and Tasso has not been noted. In Book One of The New Arcadia, Palladius is shown into a house of pleasure which has a square room full of pictures. All the paintings are from Greek mythology and all are of women. Palladius, however, is most struck by the last portrait: a naturalistic depiction of Philoclea. Kalander, the gallery guide, informs his guest that her sister Pamela is just as lovely and was to have been pictured ‘in her shepherdish attire’ had her guardian not objected. Marvell concludes his gallery tour and the poem with:

A tender shepherdess, whose hair
Hangs loosely playing in the air,
Transplanting flowers from the green hill,
To crown her head, and bosom fill.

(ll. 53–56)

impression but give: / Here might Narcissus be himselfe and live / Nor for the pleasure of a fading houre / Be doomed eternally into a flowere’ (ll. 15–22). A version of this poem in printed in one of the University collections of the 1650s. See ‘Upon some pieces of work in York House’, in Parnassus Biceps or Seveall Choice Pieces of Poetry (London: 1656), pp. 32–34. A recent edition of this text by Peter Beal ascribes the poem to William Lewis.

For the possible influence of Marino see Jean Hagstrum, The Sister Arts: The Tradition of Literary Pictorialism and English Poetry from Dryden to Gray (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), pp. 114–17. Hagstrum’s suggestion has been generally accepted. Louis L. Martz, for instance, writes of ‘The Gallery’ as the most Mannerist of Marvell’s poems and one which depicts a partially imaginary space in the manner of Marino. See his The Wit of Love (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), pp. 173–75. Legouis notes that Marvell knew the works of Tasso, Aretino, and Gurarini but critics have remained impervious to influences other than Marino (Andrew Marvell, pp. 29–32).


Edmund Waller, in writing of a Van Dyck portrait of Dorothy Sydney refers to the picture of Philoclea which he claims, the painting of his own muse would surpass. See his ‘On my Lady Dorothy Sydney’s Picture’, in Waller, Poems 1645), pp. 18–19.

The New Arcadia ed. Skretkowicz, p.15.
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This aspect of Clora is, however, only one of her many selves, for Clora’s nature is so mutable that she has enough personalities to form a colony:

These pictures and a thousand more
Of thee my gallery do store
In all the forms thou canst invent
Either to please me, or torment:

(ll. 41–44)

Marvell’s poem subverts the usual Cavalier praise of women (and of the poets who implicitly recognize their worth) since no ideal Clora exists and the truth lies not in the one, but in the many. The lover’s view of Clora is a panorama of surfaces, a progression but not necessarily a deeper revelation of Clora’s essence, so that error and illusion are always present. The woman is shown as various characters, all artificial, and the whole notion of fabrication and falsification is underlined by the deliberate fictiveness of such a gallery. Louis Martz (though treating ‘The Gallery’ as a painterly poem) makes the point that all the images of Clora are types of mannerist portraiture – a process which masks the personality of the sitter. Clora is a series of disguises, but she is also a series of copies. The fashionable cabinet or gallery described by Marvell often contained miniature replicas of original paintings, so the thousands of Cloras furnishing Marvell’s interior space are the painterly analogue of an echo. As Phoebe Spinrad writes, ‘The gallery and the poem itself have become a series of self-reflecting mirrors’. This infinite regression and reflection also raises the possibility of a failure of the imagination, for although Clora appears fertile, the arrangement suggests a multiplication without origination.


54 Spinrad, ‘Marvell’s Gallery of Distorted Mirrors’, p. 8. Despite the title, Spinrad’s analysis of the poem, as a stretching of perception, is different from mine.

55 In this respect Clora again resembles Armida. In his discussion of Tasso, Giamatti points out the pagan and sinister fertility of Armida’s garden in which counterfeit overtakes reality. He also refers to the ‘sterile Narcissism’ of the scenes in which Armida is absorbed in her mirror. In the same way Clora is multiplied, but also diminished. See A. Bartlett Giamatti, The Earthly Paradise and the Renaissance Epic (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966), pp. 199–203.
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In the sixth stanza the speaker casually reveals: ‘These pictures and a thousand more / Of thee my gallery do store’. This proliferation of representation can be read as an indication of our fallen state.\(^{56}\) In Cavalier poems beauty is unchanging and the poet sees his mistress as one perfect frozen image, not as a woman who is shifting, evasive, and moreover will become old and grey: Marvell’s Clora, however, has no unitary essence. She is incarnated in a range of seductive poses, each revealing yet another personality. Marvell introduces the idea of progressive revelation in the fourth line of the final stanza where he refers to his first sight of Clora:\(^{57}\)

> But, of these pictures and the rest,  
> That at the entrance likes me best:  
> Where the same posture, and the look  
> Remains, with which I first was took:

(ll. 49–52)

In ‘The Gallery’ narrative momentum replaces the graphic stasis of a painted portrait. Marvell’s gallery, like Kalander’s in The New Arcadia, depicts the course love takes and also displays a nostalgia for the perfection of beginnings, for the art connoisseur prefers the possibly innocent perception of love at first sight to the knowledge of a person’s diversity. In Marvell’s implicit critique it is the Cavalier poet who suffers, Narcissus-like, from illusion in mistaking the shadow for the substance and in equating reflection with reality.

Clora herself enjoys some theatrical self-fashioning and can exercise ingenuity and invention, but these qualities align her with witchcraft and with the bad girls of art and literature – Circe, Medusa, and especially Armida from Tasso’s epic, Geruselamme Liberata. In the seventeenth century, Tasso was a popular author, referred to by many poets including Phineas Fletcher, William Davenant, and Henry Reynolds, and translated in parts by Stanley and Carew. In 1624, Edward Fairfax’s translation of Tasso’s Geruselamme Liberata was reprinted at the command of

---


57 I disagree with Edmund Miller who writes of the shepherdess in Marvell’s last stanza, ‘And we can even know that it is really love because she has not changed with time’. See his ‘Marvell’s Pastoral Ideal in “The Gallery”’, Concerning Poetry, 8 (1975), 49–50.
James I and Prince Charles and dedicated to the latter. Tasso’s poem inspired many painters, including Van Dyck, but the most represented scene occurs in Armida’s enchanted garden (Canto XVI: 20–22). This scene alone inspired at least twenty major works of art (oils and tapestries) between 1575 and 1650. At this point in the poem Armida has seduced the Christian knight Rinaldo, whose world is enclosed by his love for her. Rinaldo, who wears a mirror, rather a shield, at his side, holds it up so that Armida can admire her own beauty. While she does so, he suggests that her beauties and perfections are better portrayed, not in the glass, but in his heart.

C. P. Brand in his study of Tasso’s influence notes that Guarini and Marino were closer to the tastes of English poets in the seventeenth century, but that earlier Spenser, Daniel, and Drummond among others were indebted to him. Tasso’s Aminta influenced Stuart court pastoral and Brand also points out that Tasso’s lyric poetry was readily available. See Torquato Tasso: A Study of the Poet and of his Contribution to English Literature (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965). See also the chapter on Tasso’s reputation in England in Godfrey of Bulloigne: a Critical Edition of Edward Fairfax’s Translation of Tasso’s ‘Gerusalemme Liberata’ together with Fairfax’s Original Poems, ed. Kathleen M. Lea and T. M. Gang (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 25–34. Fairfax’s translation went through seven editions and apparently solaced Charles I during the Civil Wars. See Brand, Torquato Tasso, p. 241.

In the penultimate stanza of ‘The Gallery’, Marvell refers to his portraits of Clora as forming a choicer collection than the King’s. One item in Charles I’s famed collection was a painting of Rinaldo and Armida by Van Dyck which was commissioned by the King in 1627 and so liked that it led to Van Dyck’s appointment as court painter. The painting is in the Baltimore Museum of Art.

Gordon Collier of the University of Giessen has been kind enough to provide me with a section of his work-in-progress on the mirror in early modern painting to the mid-eighteenth century. He has compiled a comprehensive catalogue of all the European art on this theme which illustrates the strong influence of Tasso’s poem on the painterly imagination. My own survey of paintings of this type also indicates that a woman with a mirror is much more likely to be portrayed as Armida or Venus rather than herself.

Translations of stanzas 20–22 from Canto XVI are rather various, although Rinaldo’s subjection is constant. Ralph Nash in his prose translation renders part of stanza 21, ‘My flames are the true portrait of your beauties; their shape, their marvellous qualities my breast sets forth in full, more than your mirror’, (Torquato Tasso, Jerusalem Delivered (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987), p. 343). Anthony Esolen’s version of stanza 21 emphasizes, (like the Cavalier poets in their sonnets) the lover’s claim for the absolute truth of his representation, ‘You may not know it, but in my desire / lies the true portrait of your loveliness. / Its wondrous form shows in the crystal’s art / but truer in the mirror of my heart’, Jerusalem Delivered (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2000), p. 304.
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This is a stance familiar in Cavalier looking-glass poems, but Rinaldo goes further and, expecting to be disdained, suggests that Armida’s beauty can only be reflected in the heavens. Armida, who has pretended to be a virtuous virgin, is a shape-shifter and a fortune-teller who spends her days perfecting magic arts. She is a pagan princess, much like Marvell’s Clora, who pores over her lover’s entrails to divine how long her beauty shall last. Armida is linked with Venus in the fourth canto of Tasso’s poem: Clora is ‘Venus in her pearly boat’ in Marvell’s (1. 34). Both women are involved in artful deception and in deceptive art. In Tasso’s poem the sinister aspects of pastoral are revealed. Armida uses nature to subdue Rinaldo whom she binds in chains of flowers. Rinaldo is rescued by eventually viewing himself in another reflective surface, a shield: Marvell holds up a mirror to the uxoriousness and self-imprisonment of Cavalier poets who are deceived by a single image and whose ideal mistresses, far from being some Platonic ideal, are duplicitous. When Rinaldo recognizes his loss of self he resumes his military career (in the service of his faith), unlike those poets in the troubled mid-century who continued to write uncontroversial lyric verse. The resolution to Tasso’s narrative (in which Armida, who has represented everything inimical to Christian endeavour, is converted) was probably admired by Marvell, who in another poem explicitly praises Lord Francis Villers for not being like Rinaldo or those distracted Cavalier poets:

Lovely and admirable as he was,
Yet was his sword or armour all his glass,
Nor in his mistress’ eyes that joy he took,
As in an enemy’s himself to look.\(^{62}\)

Marvell mocks the possibility that love gives knowledge. The reader invited into Marvell’s gallery can never comprehend the totality of Clora, while she will see versions of herself but nothing of the speaker’s self. The obscured lover is typical of Marvell’s technique. As Ann Baynes Coiro remarks about the poetry: ‘the lyrics purposefully occlude the interiority they purport to exhibit. Even when they promise self-disclosure Marvell’s personae recoil from the vulnerability such

exposure entails’. He is always the spectator – never the ‘sight’. Moreover, where the Cavalier lover is disingenuously frank about his desires (Kynaston, for instance, imagines a mirror holding the image of his naked Cynthia), Marvell’s true note lies in turning away from passion. The apparent self-effacement of the speaker in ‘The Gallery’ recognizes that lovers seek to probe into each other’s souls only to find flattering reflections of themselves. As in the Cavalier mirror poems, the woman is less interested in the man than in her own beauty. A poem or a doting lover is a better reinforcement than a mirror that she still has it.

But where the Cavalier lover is diminished if not entirely erased, the speaker in Marvell’s poem retains control. As Renée Ramsay puts it in her analysis of this poem, ‘Like Narcissus, Marvell’s speaker, in portraying Clora’s shifting selves admires above all himself. Clora’s fragmented selves merely confirm the speaker’s stylish identity’. This identity is stable compared with Clora’s changeability. In Petrarch’s Rime Sparse the lover undergoes frequent metamorphoses, being in turn a laurel, a swan, a stone, and a stag. In the mirror sonnets written by Cavalier poets, the narrator may become an ice sculpture or a river of tears, but in Marvell’s poem only the woman takes on different guises. The mutability of Clora’s many selves is sinister; not only does she embody the inconstant traits attributed to the female psyche, she can only be known by reference to another figure, Venus or Aurora, someone both like and unlike her. Clora is contained in her descriptions so that she becomes to others a reflection of the speaker’s sexual desires. His ego is reflected to the reader; the true personality of the woman is not. The woman is erased on several levels. There is the prescriptive element often found in Cavalier love poetry; the mistress sees herself in his mirror, in his terms, in his gallery. There is also the inadequacy of his epistemological endeavour. He only grasps the external, the particular fractured bits of her – never her essence or unity of being. Thus the poem concludes that the only place he can reach her is in her bodily forms. The focus in the final stanza of Marvell’s poem is on her bosom, not on her soul. The poem can be read then not as a typical piece of Cavalier misogyny but as a mirror to this false view. As it reveals the inadequacy of the classic mirror
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sonnet to truly see the woman, it also functions as a true mirror of the feminization of such writing, so that the conventional lyrical rupturing of the female body is replaced by the anatomized corpse of the lover – not a body of crystal, ice or glass but one aggressively physical:

Here thou art painted in the dress
Of an inhuman murderess;
Examining upon our hearts
Thy fertile shop of cruel arts:

(ll. 9–12)

The portraits of Clora are placed in apposition; the good but seductive Clora mirrors the dark and more powerfully enchanting one. Within this hall of mirrors it is the physical exteriors not the spiritual interiors that are brought to the reader’s attention, in the manner of the new empirical culture of enquiry, but in an image that also draws on judicial torture and on the seventeenth-century theatre of cruelty. The anatomy of Clora’s soul is mirrored in the dissection of the lover in which Clora attempts to discover ‘by a light obscure’ the answer to what is uppermost in her mind: ‘Over his entrails, in the cave; / Divining thence, with horrid care, / How long thou shalt continue fair’ (ll. 28–30). It is clear that Clora has no interest in that inner beauty which Cavalier poets claim to discern and assess.67

Clora views, examines, divines, and potentially invents, but she cannot control the poet’s faculty of producing images. She peers with the cruelty of a tyrant into those hearts which, according to many poets, should contain only her own picture. In Charles Hinnant’s discussion of this poem, (although he does not treat it as a mirror poem), he points out that in the sense of inspecting, the phrase ‘examining upon our hearts’ in the second stanza seems to imply the presence of a looking glass, ‘one … formed by the hearts of the lovers’.68 He goes on to say that the notion of the heart as mirror can be seen as an ingenious extension of the conceit of the lady’s image engraved on the lover’s heart (one which also occurs in Shakespeare’s Sonnet XXIV and Donne’s ‘The Dampe’ when the dead lover is

67 Clora’s scrutiny of her lover’s heart is a graphic development of the mutually literary exploration of hearts in Sydney’s ‘Astrophel and Stella’. Stella’s image is never imprinted on the poet’s anatomy, but it does affect his soul and mind, as well as his heart.
anatomized to reveal ‘your Picture in my heart’.)\textsuperscript{69} Marvell, however, makes no mention of his own heart; he places the gallery within his soul and his mind.\textsuperscript{70} He then plays with the idea of dissecting this soul/mind in the same way that bodies could be anatomized, and rejects the Renaissance idea that the external state of the lover/mistress will provide clues about innermost states. Clora will not see her lover’s devotion in dishevelled clothes, or copious tears; she needs to go further. As Elizabeth Hanson writes in her study of subjectivity in the Renaissance, the subject is often a resistant object and the struggle to discover the secrets in another’s heart a constant theme of many kinds of writing. She notes that Renaissance inter-subjectivity depended on the enmity of the participants and a reduction of the inner life to a heart susceptible of plucking.\textsuperscript{71} The Cavalier poets are happy to lay out their hearts in this manner but Marvell is far more elusive. The aggressive Clora is contained; the gallery guide, however, remains modern and detached. The aesthetic masochism of Cavalier poems has been subverted. As Lynn Enterline puts it, ‘Marvell’s poetry offers one of the latest and most complex articulations of lyric interiority in the period’, but I would suggest that he does this in relation to those poems which reveal the unformed nature of the Cavalier self.\textsuperscript{72}

Marvell’s second and fourth stanzas present the mutilation of the lover’s corpse as a subject fit for paintings, and indeed this corporeality found frequent expression in the visual art of the early seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{73} In her study of the body in art and medicine Barbara Stafford finds a special urgency both in early modern art and in medical experimentation: ‘The illustrative drive to turn elusive information into riveting spectacle … was one of the chief tools for attaining enlightenment’.\textsuperscript{74} The emblem of this culture was \textit{Anatomia}, whose attributes were the mirror and the knife. These elements derive from the story of Medusa, which often represents

\textsuperscript{70} Descartes in his \textit{Discourse on Method} (1637) allows the mind, if raised above the things of sense, to comprehend the inner soul. Descartes is the first thinker to define the soul as an immaterial thinking substance and then to explain in scientific terms how it is related to the physical extended substance of body.
\textsuperscript{71} Elizabeth Hanson, \textit{Discovering the Subject in Renaissance England} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 1
\textsuperscript{73} See Francis Barker, \textit{The Tremulous Private Body: Essays on Subjection} (London: Methuen, 1984).
\textsuperscript{74} Barbara Maria Stafford, \textit{Body Criticism: Imaging the Unseen in Enlightenment Art and Medicine} (Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1991), p. 17.
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a militant female power. This power is, however, constrained in Marvell’s poem, for although Clora wields a knife and has his poem as her mirror, she is unable to freeze her lover into an image of herself in the manner of classical nymphs in the poetry of Carew or Stanley.

In its ironic commentary on mirror sonnets ‘The Gallery’ also equates artistic creation with the formation, rather than the nullification, of selfhood. Hugh Richmond notes in passing that in this poem Marvell anticipates Erving Goffman’s The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life, in which the ‘pure artifice of personae’ is recognized centuries ahead of modern psychology. From a medieval view of personality, Marvell moves to a volitional approach, a theatrical sense of individuality, in which men and women are essentially only what they choose to be. The poem’s speaker has ‘contrived’ his own soul rather than simply receiving it. The word denotes fraudulence, ingenuity, cleverness, and invention. It also links Marvell to his lyrical predecessors: ‘Contrivance, a self-conscious demonstration of sheer artistry, is a cavalier quality, at one with elegance and grace’. Even Clora is potentially allowed to invent herself in that she wears different costumes, but the verb ‘invent’ has a mirror function meaning to discover, or to find out by mental activity. Although she may partake of that starting point of artistic creation, inventio, which has precedence in the classical schema of rhetoric, there is also a sense in which she is only discovering the forms Marvell has created for her.

Marvell’s ‘The Gallery’ has the internal symmetry of many of his poems, and expresses the Plotinian emanation and return, for the narrator admits:

But of these pictures, and the rest,
That at the entrance likes me best,
Where the same posture and the look
Remains, with which I first was took:

(ll. 49–52)
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There are many Cloras proceeding from the one and the soul, occupying a position midway between the world of spirit and that of phenomena, is the point at which both meet. Yet the poem returns, in the end, to the finite and temporal. The classical poetic career began with pastoral and moved on to georgic and epic. Even if one admits a plurality of genres in Marvell’s oeuvre and the transmutation of classical forms in the seventeenth century, epic and georgic are hard to discern. While playfully revealing the typical Cavalier poet-lover as ridiculous in his abasement, his devotion to imagery, and his assumption of a mistress with a singular true essence, Marvell also admits to nostalgia for the green world of pastoral and its lyric forms. Yet this world is entirely a poet’s artefact, a difficult re-assertion of self and of soul against the antipathetic world of historical phenomena which always intrude. In ‘The Gallery’ court entertainments and the new world of the art collector provide a context for Marvell’s perambulation through the deepest recesses of the soul. The shepherdess is not entirely innocent even though she takes precedence over Clora’s other guises, but she is a framed piece of art, just as the poem frames that convenient fiction of love in which Clora will see ‘only her picture’ (l. 8) in the poet’s mind.
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