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Robert Boyle’s First Encomium:  
Two Latin Poems by Samuel Collins (1647)

The influential natural philosopher, Robert Boyle (1627–91), was the recipient of many encomia during his life and after his death. Congratulatory poems addressed to him appeared in the Latin editions of such of his works as *The Origin of Forms and Qualities* (1666; Latin edn, 1669) and *A Free Enquiry into the Vulgarly Received Notion of Nature* (1686; Latin edn, 1687), the latter a Latin translation by Boyle’s protégé, David Abercromby, of a poem by ‘S. F., an English noblewoman’, whose identity has not been established. Then, after his death, a series of printed elegies appeared, in both English and Latin, with such titles as *Lachrymae Philosophiae* or *Natura Lugens*. In addition, Boyle was the recipient of a number of verse encomia in Latin (and, in one case, in Greek) which have recently been published as part of his *Correspondence*: these include poems by the Latin translator, Robert Codrington, dating from 1660; another by the virtuoso, John Beale, dating from 1663; and a curious poem by the learned lady, Bathsua Makin, probably dating from 1681.

All of these, not surprisingly, date from Boyle’s mature years, after he embarked on the profuse publishing career that began with his *Some Motives and Incentives to the Love of God* (1659), better known as *Seraphic Love*, and *New Experiments Physico-Mechanical, Touching the Spring of the Air, and its Effects* (1660), reaching a climax in the early 1660s, when he published an average of nearly 150,000 words a year. This continued, albeit at a reduced rate, for the rest of his life, so that by the time of his death he had published over forty books. This flow of publications, combined with the promotion that Boyle received from such protagonists as Henry Oldenburg, first secretary of the Royal Society, in his *Philosophical Transactions*, or Joseph Glanvill in his promotional work on behalf of the Society, *Plus Ultra* (1668), meant that Boyle quickly became established as one of the best-known intellectuals of his age – ‘the English Philosopher’, as it was said that he was known on the continent in the 1680s.

In this paper, by contrast, we offer an annotated text and translation of two Latin poems addressed to Boyle at a far earlier stage in his career, in
January 1647 – in other words eight years before his very first publication in 1655, and over a decade before his main career as a published author began. At this point, Boyle was just twenty years old, and, aside from the fact that he was the youngest son of one of the most powerful men in early Stuart Britain, the ‘Great’ Earl of Cork, who had died in 1643, there was on the face of it little to distinguish him from other youthful aristocrats, and certainly no premonition of the area of interest – in natural philosophy – that was later to make him famous.

By this time, Boyle had spent three years at Eton College, from 1635 to 1638, resulting from his father’s friendship with the Provost of Eton, Sir Henry Wotton. During the time that he was at the school, Boyle distinguished himself for his studiousness, while probably also making certain of the contacts which form the background to the poems studied here. In 1638, Cork removed Boyle and his brother, Francis, from Eton, and in 1639 they embarked on a tour of France, Switzerland and Italy under the tutelage of the French Protestant scholar, Isaac Marcombes. From 1639 to 1641, before they set out for Italy, and from 1642 to 1644, after their return, Boyle spent time in Geneva studying under Marcombes’s supervision, and it was apparently at this point that he acquired the bulk of his education: though this period of his life, and particularly the second Genevan stay, is poorly documented, a notebook survives that Boyle kept at this point, which indicates the range of studies in which he engaged, including metaphysics, mathematics, geography and fortification. In addition, in later autobiographical remarks he offered some clues to episodes in this period of his life that he saw as formative ones, particularly the conversion experience that he had at Geneva during his first stay there, and his discovery of ancient Stoicism while in Italy.

On his return to England in 1644, Boyle became domiciled on the estate at Stalbridge in Dorset which he had been bequeathed by his father, and at this point he began his career as an author, though none of the writings that he composed at this point was published till much later. The work which he seems to have seen as most significant, and which he refers to in various extant letters of this period, is what he describes as his ‘Ethics’, evidently a treatise entitled *Aretology or Ethical Elements*; two versions of this survive among the Boyle manuscripts at the Royal Society, the more finished of which was published in 1991. As Boyle put it in a letter to his mentor, Marcombes, his aim was ‘to call them [ethics] from the brain down into the breast, and from the school to the house’: the work comprised a series of slightly stilted prescriptions about the definition and control of the passions, the desirability of moral actions and the attainment of a virtuous state. It owed much to the ethical theory of the ancient Stoics which Boyle had encountered in Italy, with its pursuit of virtue, moderation and self-control. In addition, at this time Boyle wrote religious meditations, both on scriptural passages and on events, the latter forming the germ of his later *Occasional Reflections* (1665). Other compositions comprised a series of letters to
imaginary figures in which ethical and other issues were discussed, ranging from the desirability of breast-feeding or the undesirability of make-up to the ethics of the treatment of animals.\textsuperscript{10} There was also an ambitious work, ‘The Amorous Controversies’, only part of which survives, which used the epistolary form to explore love; this reached a climax in Boyle’s advocacy of ‘seraphic’ love over its earthly varieties, in a component of the work which was later to be published in much extended form as his first full-length book.\textsuperscript{11} Such works reflected the influence of the French romances which Boyle spent much time reading at this stage in his life, and this is also seen in fictionalised lives of Old Testament figures and in his \textit{Theodora}, based on the life of the early Christian martyr of that name, the latter perhaps representing the climax of his activity in this genre; the greatly rewritten version of this work published later in Boyle’s life was acclaimed by Dr Johnson as the first ‘attempt to employ the ornaments of romance in the decoration of religion’, and it inspired Handel’s oratorio of the same name.\textsuperscript{12} Though incidentally concerned with the study of nature that was later to make him famous, this was a very minor part of Boyle’s intellectual make-up in these years, and only from 1649 onwards was he to discover the excitement of experiment which was to dominate the rest of his life. The tantalising references to an ‘Invisible College’ that appear in his correspondence at this time have often been misinterpreted accordingly.\textsuperscript{13}

During these years, England was riven by political developments in the aftermath of the Civil War, but Boyle seems to have been only indirectly connected with these: they appear in his writings and correspondence mainly as the source of minor inconvenience, while his prescriptions in relation to them were characteristically moralistic.\textsuperscript{14} Other members of his family, however, were more centrally involved in the events that occurred, not least in Ireland, where the Boyle family estates were mainly located, in particular Boyle’s two eldest brothers, Richard, who had succeeded to the Earldom of Cork in 1643, and Roger, Lord Broghill. Whereas Richard’s links with the court of Charles I resulted in his going into exile in the late 1640s, Broghill played a key role in events, being actively involved not only in military affairs but also in the complicated infighting that characterised Irish and English politics in these years. In addition, Boyle’s sister Katherine, Lady Ranelagh, had significant political contacts in London, mostly with parliamentary figures but also including some royalists.\textsuperscript{15} All this gave Boyle at least a tangential link with the politics of the day, and may have made him seem a figure worth cultivating.

Boyle’s correspondence from these years survives only in fragmentary form, but it is clear that he interspersed his time at Stalbridge with visits elsewhere, especially to London. He is also known to have visited Bristol in May 1645, France in August that year, and Amsterdam in the spring of 1648. In addition, in December 1645 we know that he was in Cambridge ‘for a little while perhaps a month’.\textsuperscript{16} The latter visit may well form the background to
the poems studied here. Later, Boyle was to live at Oxford for many years, from 1655–6 to 1668, and, largely as a result of this, his links with Oxford remained strong for the remainder of his life: the bulk of his academic contacts were such Oxford figures as Edward Bernard, Robert Huntington, Thomas Hyde, Robert Sharrock and John Wallis. At this point, however, his academic contacts were exclusively Cambridge men. One of these was Francis Tallents, a Presbyterian Fellow of Magdalene College and tutor to various members of the aristocracy, a letter from Boyle to whom survives dated 20 February 1647. Another was John Hall, a budding author at St John’s, who evidently learned about Boyle through the intelligencer, Samuel Hartlib, whose correspondence with Boyle commences in 1647. Hall asked Hartlib to procure from Boyle ‘a draught of those opinions of his about vertue & the ways of teaching it’ – evidently the Aretology – and a correspondence between the two men seems to have ensued, though no letters now survive.

The poems published here add to this list Samuel Collins, a much more senior figure than the two previous ones, who had become Provost of King’s College in 1615 and Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in 1617. Collins, who had himself been born and educated at Eton, was a close friend of Sir Henry Wotton, whom he regularly visited at the college, and it may well have been on one of these visits that he first became familiar with the young Boyle. On the other hand, he could equally easily have heard about him from a mutual contact, since a succession of Old Etonians went on to become Fellows of King’s, including such contemporaries of Boyle’s as Stephen Anstey, who accompanied Boyle and his brother, Francis, on a vacation trip to Sussex in 1636, or Collins’s son, John. In addition, Albert Morton, who was a scholar of King’s from 1639 to 1640, dined on the same table as Boyle during his Eton years and was described by the youthful Robert as ‘a most brave & rare boy’ on the flyleaf of a copy of Aristotle which still survives in Eton College library. A further link between Boyle and Samuel Collins is provided by the fact that both Collins and Boyle’s correspondent, Francis Tallents, were patronised by the Earls of Suffolk: Tallents acted as tutor to the children of the second Earl, Theophilus, whom he had taken abroad during the Civil War, while Collins was to write commemorative verses for Suzannah, the wife of the third Earl, James, after her death in 1649. Boyle, too, had links with the Suffolk family, since his brother, Lord Broghill, had married the second Earl’s daughter, Margaret, in 1641.

Collins’s role in the ecclesiastical politics of the period is documented both by his published works and by his extant correspondence at King’s. He wrote two books supporting Bishop Lancelot Andrewes against his Catholic opponents, while doctrinally he seems to have steered a moderate course in the debates of the day, taking an essentially Calvinist line but holding an open-minded view on the value of ceremonies and writing to congratulate the Laudian Richard Montagu on his elevation to the episcopate in 1628.
More controversial was his beautification of King’s College Chapel, which resulted in the clash with the parliamentary authorities which led to his removal from his Provostship by the Parliamentary Commissioners in 1645. Though he was nominated Bishop of Bristol in 1646, nothing came of this, and at the time of his contact with Boyle he was living in retirement in Cambridge, where he died in 1651.

From the present point of view, what is equally important is Collins’s renown as a Latin scholar. In his *Worthies of England* (1662), Thomas Fuller described Collins as ‘one of an admirable wit and memory, the most fluent Latinist of our age’, while another contemporary described him as ‘the glory of our English Nation for the Latine and Greek Languages’. An interesting relic both of his interest in classical poetry and his links with Wotton is a manuscript of the works of Horace from Cardinal Bembo’s library, given to him by Wotton in 1630; this is now in the library of King’s College, whereas other manuscripts that Wotton obtained from this source are at Eton. Collins’s wit appears to have caused offence to some academic colleagues; when the visitor, John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, was summoned in 1628 to adjudicate in one of the various disputes in which Collins was involved at King’s during his Provostship, ‘the Cause went for the right worthy Provost Dr. Collins, in whose Government the Bishop could perceive neither Carelessness nor Covetousness. The most that appeared was, That the Doctor had pelted some of the active Fellows with Slings of Wit: At which the Visitor laugh’d heartily, and past them by, knowing that the Provost’s Tongue could never be worm’d to spare his Jests, who was the readiest alive to gird whom he would with innocent and facetious Urbanity.’

Collins’s verse compositions are to be found in various of the academic congratulatory collections published at Cambridge in these years. He was one of the most prolific contributors of the period, offering something (often a multiple contribution, with several significant pieces) in all of the volumes issued between 1612 and 1641. We examine a selection of Collins’s poems here, both for their intrinsic interest as examples of a quirky and individual style, and to illustrate some themes found in his later poems to Boyle — though it is worth stressing that many features, such as fondness for extravagant wordplay or contrived classical allusion, are not unique to Collins, but fairly typical of early seventeenth-century neo-Latin.

In 1612, on the death of Henry, Prince of Wales, Collins writes, among other topics, ‘In esum uvarum qui Principi fatalis’ (‘on the consumption of grapes that proved fatal to the Prince’): the vine must be punished for its unexpectedly deadly fruit. He also offers an eleven-stanza alcaic ode, printed in a separate part of the book. In the final poem of his group of elegiacs, he borrows the opening word of Horace, *Odes* 1.32.1 (‘Poscimur’), to introduce a set of puns:
It is not uncommon in this sort of poetry to have some such apologia for haste: but it does reflect a personal approach that runs throughout Collins’s writing.

In 1619, on Queen Anne’s death, his 103–line hexameter poem begins with an adaptation of a familiar Virgilian quote, the start of Aeneas’ speech at Aeneid 2.3 (‘infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem’):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Infandum Regina iubes mitissima rerum} \\
\text{Versibus attonitum mundo vulgare dolorem} \\
\text{Et quem flemus adhuc... . . .}
\end{align*}
\]

[Most gentle queen, you order me, astonished, to publish to the world in verses a grief for events that is unspeakable, and over which we still weep.]30

Collins’s ‘et quem’ recalls Virgil’s ‘et quorum’, line 6, extending the allusion. He launches a long and complicated argument; a Virgilian-style half-line, ‘sed repetamus iter’ (‘Let’s get back to the point’) helps it along. He also submitted twenty-eight lines of elegiacs, and another alcaic ode, starting with a clear allusion to Horace, Odes 2.9.1.31

The second 1625 collection, on the royal marriage, again illustrates his use of allusion; he inserts the river Cam into the opening line of Virgil’s tenth eclogue; we also see his medieval interests (Henry V, Bedford, Talbot: in 1612, he had recalled the Black Prince). Collins makes an interesting comparison with Ralph Winterton, another prolific King’s College poet – inventive, in a somewhat different way, who has Charles addressing the gods Aeolus and Neptune.32

In 1631, on the birth of Princess Mary, Collins contributed 33 hendecasyllables: this is particularly interesting in the light of his use of the same metre in one of his poems to Boyle. In a repeated line at the start and end, ‘Salve virgo redux patrona terris’ (‘hail, virgin, returned to earth as patroness’), he stresses the connection with the virgin Mary, perhaps more than one might expect from a Protestant poet, and perhaps with the aim of pleasing a Catholic queen. He alludes to contemporary events: the cruel war raging on the continent, naming the guilty (Catholic) generals Spinola and Tilly. The final portion of the poem, turning as it does to his own situation, reveals features of Collins’s style that we can recognise in his Boyle poems:
By now Collins, a senior head of house, has a prominent place near the start of the volumes, where his informality is particularly striking. An abbreviated, conversational style produces some odd grammar (‘dum’, seemingly, to be taken with the infinitive), and metrical boldness (breaking words between lines is most unusual in this metre). It is striking that he breaks a word in similar fashion in his second poem to Boyle. The Sisyphean labours of the academic may seem familiar to modern readers.

The king’s return from Scotland in 1633 inspired multiple poems (including more hendecasyllables), with prominent repetitions, fondness for odd words, and sideways approaches to a topic (such as addressing the royal carriage, coach-horses, and coachman), while also containing difficulties for the reader. A similar lack of clarity, combined with a vigorous and emotional reaction to contemporary events, appears in 1640, with Collins’s longest alcaic ode. In 1641, he uses Horace, *Odes* 3.9 (‘Donec gratus eram tibi . . .’), a sharply playful dialogue between the poet and a temporarily estranged girlfriend, as a model for dialogue between England and Scotland:

Donec foedere mutuo
Immotaque fide firma cohaesimus
Dulci copula vinculo,
Sprevissem Annibalis jure, soror, minas.

[While we were joined in a mutual treaty and unmoved faith, a firm bond with a sweet chain, sister, I would rightly have scorned a Hannibal’s threats.] 36

In the following ode, his allusions are made clearer by typography, and include borrowings from Horace, *Odes* 1.16.1 and (again) 2.9.1. Collins appears, from this brief survey of his printed panegyrics, as an adventurous and challenging poet, not always an easy read, nor always very subtle in his literary devices, but trying hard to make something varied and personal from
the subject-matter at his disposal. The always playful, sometimes abrasive, wit that he deployed in high-table conversation is reflected in his approach to composition.

Collins’s poems to Boyle survive, not because they were printed, but because they were included in a manuscript compilation by another figure who was at Cambridge at this time: John Perceval, son and heir of the prominent Anglo-Irish landowner, Sir Philip Perceval, who was to become a baronet in 1661 and who was an undergraduate at Magdalene College from 1646 to 1649.37 Perceval’s tutor at Magdalene was Francis Tallents, Boyle’s correspondent, a letter from whom to Sir Philip dated 5 October 1647 survives in which he gives details of books purchased on behalf of his charge, including More’s *Utopia* and George Sandys’s translation of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* as well as textbooks by such authors as William Ames and Johann Stier.38 Tallents’s links with the Earls of Suffolk, which he shared with Collins (and Boyle), have already been mentioned, and it is worth noting that Perceval, too, shared these connections: his father, Sir Philip, was to retire to the Suffolks’ mansion, Audley End, in September 1647 at a critical point in the political faction-fighting then in progress.39

The poems survive in Perceval’s commonplace book, which is typical of the personal miscellanies kept by many of his contemporaries, with an eclectic mixture of material.40 It comprises Latin exercises, formal letters and pieces of verse in English and Latin by famous poets of the day like Richard Corbet, Robert Herrick and Henry King; there is also a poem by Sir Henry Wotton.41 A satirical poem entitled ‘Cromwells Panegrycike’ is attributed to a royalist using the pseudonym ‘Karolophilos’, friend of Charles: Cromwell was M.P. for Cambridge borough in the 1640s and a familiar – if not very popular – figure in the university. These poems were evidently in circulation in manuscript form, and the same is presumably also true of the verses by Collins. Perceval probably found them of interest partly because of Collins’s renown as a Latin stylist (he also copied out Collins’s Latin poems memorialising the deceased Countess of Suffolk),42 but partly also because of his interest in Boyle as an Anglo-Irish figure like himself, whom he may well have met through their mutual friend, Francis Tallents, if not through common Anglo-Irish contacts.43 Perceval’s own exercises include a sapphic ode to a teacher, John Mason, and practice of his Greek hand (much neater, unfortunately for us, than his Latin).44

There are hints that the text Perceval was copying was unfinished (perhaps Collins’s own draft), since certain lines are offered in duplicate versions. Perceval’s carelessness as a copyist can be seen elsewhere, for example in the Suffolk poems; most strikingly, he miscalculates the Countess’s name, Susanna, as ‘Francisca’; he also produces the unmetrical ‘Henerico’ for ‘Henrico’, and what looks like ‘Neptem’ for ‘Neptuno’.45 The material at the start and end of the Boyle poems appears somewhat garbled, perhaps miscopied from a rough draft; the first section combines notes in English and Latin (possibly
addressed to a friend of Collins, who would ‘know [Boyle’s] title’ and whose
approbation may have been sought). Unless garbled by Perceval, the opening
of the first poem is also apparently unfinished, being an incomplete Virgilian
line (half-lines may omit the end: but never, usually, the beginning).

The poems are as follows. We offer our (sometimes tentative) transcription
of both poems, and an attempt at translation; Perceval’s hand is difficult to
read, and some uncertainties remain, especially in the confusing prefatory
material; problems in interpreting the verse are perhaps exacerbated by the
difficulties of Collins’s own style. The foliation is in reverse order, as these
poems are among the material written from the back of the volume forwards
when the book was reversed: hence the poem on fol. 114 precedes that on
fol. 113v.

Sylva. To the most noble &c Boyliades: you know his title
de amissis quad [?] ad eum exararam literis cum carmine
Lyrico & thanks for his soe [illegible: . . .tious ?] portus [?] ingenious
ad me & they depend on your approbation
Summo Juvenum nobilium ingeniosorum D. Roberto Boylo
De acceptis literis gratiae cum Deprecatione tarditatis
responsi et allegatione verae causae. citraque fucum
Carmen officium S. C.

Sylva
– – – foliis tantum ne carmina manda
Ne turbata volent. Veneris quo filius olim
Cumaeam dicto delenivisse Sybyllam
Dicitur, Euboico fati consultor ut antro.
5 Nos contra, quae laeva fuit sententia menti,
Ut temerè effusas temerè damnavimus orsus
Mersimus, et caeco frustrâ indagamus acervo.
Quod nisi, jamdudum Juvenum clarissime nostros
Non adeo tibi deesse bonus quereris honores,
10 Alternumque stylum, et gratiae praeconia linguæ
Multa quidem, idque olim, genii monumenta potentis
Nota mihi, monstrata, arcis quae servat eburnis
‘Lucidus arquato findens curvamine caelum
‘Nuncius interpresque Deum50 proh gloria quanta

15 Talis amicitiae? aut quae sit manus altera dignè
Officio colere et parili incandescere curâ?
At mihi quae propriè cura [?] est inscripta, quis autem
Inscriptam mihi credat homo, idque a nomine tanto!
Obscuro capiti atque aevum sine luce trahenti.

20 Sed quia sit visum nostros splendore penates
Illustrare tuo, dulci ac perfundere flamma
Flos iuvenum, m ox summevirum mox militiaque
Consilioque, future Ducum, ac super omnia sensis
Musaeique bonis studii argutaeque Minervae
25 En tibi quod facili contemplere ore poema,
Obsequii specimen nostri laudumque tuarum /fol. 114r/
Non tu quale meres, Cyrrha aut Aganippide lympha,
Lomento atque acri prolutum carmen aceto
29 Rure sed è medio atque una mihi nocte petitum.

[Fol. 113v]
D. Roberto Boylo summo Iuvenum rescriptum ad amantissimam
provocationem cum deprecatione tarditatis ab amisso exemplari primo.

Quod panxi Lyricâ melos Camaenâ
Responsale Tuò Roberte scripto
‘Docta Nobilitatis in supremo
‘Dudum Culmine collocate Boyli.
5 Ut malum perit malè, merensque,
At supplere (nec abnues profectò)
Has hoc Hendecasyllabo Phaleuco.
Quì nec longior exiens (?) politis
Quis (?) [—–]¹⁵ sensiculis parùm pudenter
10 Exeat (?) taedia pertinacia,
Vel longe gravioribus moretur
Intentum studiis, et istud omni
intervertat preciosius vel auro,
Tempus, versicoloribus baccis
15 Hermi quas generat Tagive ripa,
Brevi se is (?) nec inefficace sat sit
Versu prodere quàm tuum Roberte
‘Docta Nobilitatis in supremo
‘Dudum Culmine collocate Boyli
20 Scriptum exosculer intimis medullis
Ulnisque admoveamque “perprimamquè”¹⁴
Et flexo propè poplite usque adorem,
Quàm vellem quoque si queam, sed obstat
Laevà frigidulus vapor mamillà
25 Par referre pari, tuumque scriptum
Stellis inserere, et per alta ferre!⁵⁷
Quae quanquam mihi deficit facultas
Nato syderibus parùm benignis,
Et nulla neque limula expolito
30 Phaebi, vel liquidum sonantis Orphei,
Me tamen meritò tuum, Tibique
Hac me (?) spondeo syngrapha obligoque
Etiam mancupioque nexilique
34 Aeternum famulitio futurum.
(vel:⁶⁶ Cultorem merito tamen tibique hac
me seu (?) &c.
atque ex iuridicum modo loquendi
trado manc. (?) &c.

232
Jan 31. 1646

Honoris tui sitientissimus, & praeclararum datum [?]
merito Mirator.
S. Collins.

Translation
Line numbers of each poem appear in brackets.

[above title]
. . . on the loss of some letters which I had written to him, with a lyric poem . . .

[title]
To the highest of ingenious young noblemen, Mr Robert Boyle; thanks for letters received, with apologies for the slowness of my response and an explanation of its true cause, and without deceit.

Poem [and] duty of S. C.

Sylva [lit. ‘wood’: i.e. a type of occasional poem, like Statius’s Silvae]

‘Don’t entrust songs to paper’ lest they be disturbed and fly away. With this speech the son of Venus [Aeneas] is said once to have softened the Cumaean Sibyl, as he came to ask her about his fate in a Euboean cave.59

(5) But as for me – what unlucky thought was in my mind, as I rashly doomed the letters that I had begun and rashly poured out? I have submerged them, and I hunt in vain in a blind heap.

(8) If that had not happened, most distinguished of youths, you would long ago have stopped complaining that we have failed to honour you – [there would be] an alternative pen and a grateful tongue to celebrate you. I have known much, indeed, and for some time, of the monuments of [your] powerful genius, since they were shown to me. (12) They are things which might be preserved in ivory chests by the bright messenger and interpreter of the gods, cutting through the sky with the curve of the [rain]bow – ah! How great the glory of such friendship! Or what other hand could worthily pay dutiful respects, and glow with equal care?

(17) But as for the care that is particularly addressed to me – what man could believe that it is addressed to me, and that by such a great name?! – to me, an obscure person living out his age in twilight. But since it seemed good to you to light up our household gods with your splendour, and inspire them with your sweet flame, ô flower of young men, soon to be the highest of men, soon in military service and counsel to be among the leaders, and above all in the good doctrines both of the study of the Muses and sagacious Minerva,60 (25) here is a poem for you; may you give your attention to it with an easy countenance, as a specimen of my respect for you, and of your praises – not, as you deserve, inspired by water of Delphi or Helicon, and washed with bean-meal62 and sharp vinegar, but sought in the middle of the country by me, and in one night.
second poem: title] To Mr Robert Boyle, the highest of young men, replying to his most friendly summons, with an apology for lateness, from the first copy being lost.

Since the song that I wrote with the lyric Muse in response to your writing, Robert ‘Boyle, long located in the supreme peak of learned nobility’ has perished badly and deservedly [I now attempt] to supply [the deficiency] (may you indeed not refuse to accept) with this Phaleucan hendecasyllable [i.e. the metre of this poem].

(8) May this poem, not exceeding the bounds of politeness, or using sentiments that are not very decent, avoid being rather too obstinate and tedious; or it may delay you, intent on far more serious studies, and this may cheat you of something more precious than any gold: time, more precious than the various coloured stones which the shore of Hermus or Tagus produces.

(16) But let it be enough to say in a brief and not ineffective verse, o Robert ‘Boyle, long located in the supreme peak of learned nobility’, that I should kiss your writing fondly, from my deepest marrow, and carry it in my arms, and press it hard, and almost adore it continually on bended knee.

(23) Which I would also like [to do] if I were able, but a frigid little vapour in my left breast prevents me from making a fair return, and inserting your writing among the stars and carrying it through the heavens.

(27) Although that ability is lacking in me, born under insufficiently kind stars, and not polished up even by any little file of Phoebus, or of Orpheus who sings clearly – nevertheless to prove that I am truly yours, I also bind myself with this signed agreement, and tie myself up as your slave and to be forever bound in your service.

[dated] Jan 31, 1646

S. Collins, truly the most thirsty admirer of your honour and most distinguished [acts?]

Discussion

The poems are apparently a pair, dated 30–31 January 1646, presumably for 1647 new style: at this point, Boyle is known to have been in London. From them we learn that Collins and Boyle had been in correspondence, though all trace of this is now lost, as is the case with much of Boyle’s correspondence in these years, of which we only have a fraction even of what survived in the eighteenth century. Some of these losses may, in fact, have occurred at the time, in that Collins states that it was to apologise for a letter lost – or perhaps donnishly mislaid – that he penned his verses (it is also possible that these were not the first verses that Collins had penned for Boyle, and the lines that appear in quotation marks in the second poem may quote a lost, earlier one). It is apparent that Collins had seen writings by Boyle, which he describes as ‘monuments of [your] powerful genius’, and these could have been the ethical writings which were Boyle’s main preoccupation at this time: as we have seen, these were solicited via Hartlib by John Hall, and they
may have been circulated by him at Cambridge. On the other hand, he might have seen other writings by Boyle, such as his epistolary conceits, which are also known to have been distributed in manuscript form in these years. It is even possible that what he saw were Latin poems: Boyle recorded that he wrote poems in both Latin and English in his youth, which he destroyed on his twenty-first birthday, and as a result virtually no such compositions by him now survive.

Collins’s poems to Boyle are interesting in various respects. In these private encomia, we see a continuation of the tendency towards informality observed in Collins’s published poetry. They are written in a jocular, self-depreciating, friendly style; the second one is written in a light-hearted metre and is replete with slightly whimsical Catullan imagery. It might be felt slightly curious that a senior figure like Collins was sending exercises like this to a young man like Boyle. But it may have seemed natural to him, in retirement, to address the young Boyle in a style not dissimilar to that of his more eccentric panegyrics, such as the 1631 hendecasyllables. Collins’s approach to metre in both poems is lively and unconventional; he is prepared to break a word between lines (a device he had used before), and to begin a poem in mid-line. This latter technique (if our text reflects Collins’s final intention) is quite extraordinary: but the way in which the Virgilian quotation is incorporated into the poem’s opening suggests that it must be part of the poem, not an epigraph.

Collins chooses some interesting vocabulary; while it is quite normal, in neo-Latin imitations of Catullus, to play with diminutives and repetitions, some of his expressions are bolder than most authors would attempt. In both poems, he makes his own carelessness – in losing an earlier draft – the occasion for a display of wit that doubtless surpasses the lost original, while emphasising the speed with which they are dashed off in the middle of the night. Interestingly, just one week before Collins wrote to Boyle, on 23 Jan. 1646/7, another Cambridge-educated Latinist had used a similar occasion, the loss of a book in transit, to inspire an experimental Latin poem. Milton’s irregular ode to John Rouse, Bodley’s librarian (containing some hendecasyllabic lines) shares Collins’s playful approach to classical allusion. In line 28 of the first poem, Collins is (probably) suggesting that his poem ought to have been scrubbed up properly with vinegar and (if our reading is correct) a whitening-agent; these are also items that might be found in a poor home, if the ‘lomentum’ (bean-meal) is food rather than cosmetic, and the vinegar is for drinking instead of decent wine. As a cosmetic, ‘lomentum’ was used to cover up wrinkles – something an elderly poet might be in need of. So, in developing the commonplace idea that poetry needs to be polished, Collins creates quite a complex web of possible interpretations to catch the reader’s interest.

We can also use the poems as evidence about the verse culture of Cambridge in the late 1640s. Collins’s writing reminds us of the varied, and
sometimes puzzling, nature of the verse encomium. Often it is much more than a formulaic offering of praise in well-worn classical dress. Aspects of a panegyrist’s style can be seen in private as well as public poetry. In Collins we find a mixture of conventional panegyric devices with personal emotion. The results may not always be very successful, viewed as creative literature; their occasional awkwardness may present a challenge of interpretation to the modern reader (and very possibly also to contemporaries) – but their copying and manuscript circulation probably helped to reinforce a sense of shared intellectual values at a time of political turmoil. An ejected royalist, under a shadow at the end of a distinguished career, could use the encomium as a natural medium of contact with a young aristocrat of intellectual promise.

The Boyles may, of course, have seemed a family worth cultivating in the late 1640s, with links on both sides of the political divide, and this may partly explain Collins’s assiduity. But – in the light of Boyle’s future eminence – what is striking is how fulsome Collins is in his praise of this golden youth, using such phrases as ‘the highest of ingenious young noblemen’, ‘most distinguished of youths’, ‘long located in the supreme peak of learned nobility’. To some extent this might be in the expectation of a glorious aristocratic future as a statesman or general, as implied by the phrase ‘soon to be the highest of men, soon in military service and counsel to be among the leaders’. But Collins seems also to allude to Boyle’s writings, which, if on moral issues, would in any case have seemed highly compatible with such a public career. Thus he alludes to ‘the study of the Muses and sagacious Minerva’, and to Boyle’s devotion to ‘more serious studies’, implying that he was wasting Boyle’s valuable time by diverting him with poems like this. The piling up of amusingly tautological phrases wastes more of the reader’s time than is strictly necessary, while showing off the poet’s versatility. Collins’s lines on the preciousness of time are a skilful variation on a timeless topos. We are reminded that time is most valuable to those, like the young Boyle, with plenty of money (that they can afford to despise in comparison) and plenty of intellectual ambition. The poet, by contrast, is often a suppliant, with nothing better to do than spin out metaphors: ‘I have no precious time at all to spend, / Nor services to do, till you require.’ In all, it is a curious and tantalising encounter at the end of one distinguished career and the start of another.
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Notes
MH is chiefly responsible for the discussion of Boyle and the historical background, DM for the translation and discussion of Collins’s Latin. We would like to dedicate
this article to the memory of our mutual friend, Dr Jeremy Black, the distinguished Assyriologist, who first introduced us to each other at the start of a long collaboration on Boyle-related material. Jeremy’s sudden and premature death in 2004 came as a shock to his many friends in a wide range of disciplines.


5 See Works, I, cix-xi and passim.


8 For the text of this and related works, see J. T. Harwood (ed.), The Early Essays and Ethics of Robert Boyle (Carbondale and Edwardsville, 1991).

9 Correspondence, I, 41. Cf. ibid, pp. 34, 55.

10 Many of these are printed for the first time in Works, XIII, passim. See also Malcolm Oster, “The Beame of Divinity”: Animal Suffering in the Early Thought of Robert Boyle’, British Journal for the History of Science, 22 (1989), 151–79.


15 See particularly the account in Patrick Little, Lord Broghill and the Cromwellian Union with Ireland and Scotland (Woodbridge, 2004). See also the articles on these figures in the Oxford DNB.

16 This is taken from Henry Miles’s note on a letter now lost. See Correspondence, I, 28, and ibid., xxviii–ixn and 26–76, passim. For a work signed off at Bristol on
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2 May 1645, see Works, XIII, 48.

17 See Correspondence, passim.

18 Correspondence, I, 45–9.


20 It is perhaps worth noting here that there can be no doubt that the Samuel Collins whose poems are discussed here was the former Provost of King’s and not Samuel Collins, Vicar of Braintree (d. 1667), with whose son, also Samuel Collins, the physician and author of The Present State of Russia, Boyle was to correspond in the 1660s.

21 See Pearsall Smith, Life and Letters of Wotton, II, 466–7; Oxford DNB.

22 See Sir Wasey Sterry, The Eton College Register 1441–1698 (Eton, 1943), pp. 9, 79, 239; Robert Birley, ‘Robert Boyle at Eton’, Notes and Records of the Royal Society, 14 (1959), 191. It is perhaps worth noting that Morton’s uncle, also Albert Morton, had unsuccessfully challenged Collins for the Provostship of King’s in 1621 (Oxford DNB). For the make-up of the second table, on which the Boyle brothers dined, see Eton College Archives, Audit books, 1622–37, pp. 674–6, 720; 1638–53, pp. 21–2, 71. Two other of Boyle’s dining companions, Losse and Wright, may also have gone on to be Fellows of King’s, but in both cases the identity of the dining companion with the figure later associated with King’s is uncertain: see Sterry, Eton College Register, pp. 217, 380–1.


26 MS 34: the gift is recorded in an inscription. The volume was presented to King’s in 1672 by John Pearson, Bishop of Chester and former Fellow of the college. See M. R. James, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts . . . in the Library of King’s College, Cambridge (Cambridge, 1895), pp. 53–4. The new Oxford DNB (XII, 729–30) mentions a ‘Lambinus edition of Horace once owned by Pietro Bembo’, but this is apparently a misunderstanding since Bembo died in 1547, fourteen years before Lambinus’s first Horace edition.


28 In addition to those quoted below, see poems in Cambridge volumes of 1623 (Gratulatio), 1625 (Dolor et Solamen, as well as Epithalamium), 1632 (Anthologia), 1633 (Ducis Eboracis Fasciae, as well as Rex Redux), 1635 (Carmen Natalitium), 1637 (Synodia). On the genre: H. Forster, ‘The Rise and Fall of the


30 *Lachrymae Cantabrienses* (Cambridge, 1619), pp. 70–5.


32 *Epithalamium . . . a Musis Cantabrigiensibus decantatum* (Cambridge, 1625), pp. 65–9; Winterton, *ibid.*, pp. 73–5.

33 *Genethliacum . . . a Musis Cantabrigiensibus celebratum* (Cambridge, 1631), pp. 3–4.

34 *Rex Redux* (Cambridge, 1633), pp. 1–4.

35 *Voces Votivae* (Cambridge, 1640), sigs. A4r-B1r.

36 *Irenodia Cantabriensis* (Cambridge, 1641), sig. ¶4r-v.


39 *HMS Egmont*, I, 461–3. We are grateful to Patrick Little for this reference.


42 These Latin verses were printed in Edward Rainbowe, *A Sermon preached at Walden in Essex . . . at the Interring of the Corps of . . . Susanna, Countesse of Suffolk* (London, 1649). It is not clear whether all the poems were by Collins, whose name appears at the end; his fondness for offering multiple poems on the same topic (and lack of other named contributors) suggest that they probably are all his. Perceval omits only the penultimate poem (‘Iri tuos . . .’) and preceding English title.

43 Boyle later corresponded with the third baronet: *Correspondence*, VI, 88–9, 91–2, 157–8. It is perhaps worth noting that the second baronet, Sir John Perceval’s son and heir, was also to keep a commonplace book from the late 1660s, British Library Add. MS 47112: much shorter, including some humorous macaronic Latin verse.

44 Add. MS 47111, fols 139v (Mason is presumably one of the men of this name recorded in Venn, but it is not clear which), 140v, 157v.

45 Add. MS 47111, fol. 94v, ‘In Eandem’ (6 elegiac lines: ‘SUSANNA moriente . . .’
capitalised in printed version); preceded by 'In Eandem' (12 hendecasyllables): 'Perceval's errors noted in lines 1 and 3.

46 We have not attempted to improve on Perceval's readings, although in places where his hand is unclear, we have tried to produce as intelligible a text as possible. Perceval consistently capitalises line-openings (except line 15 of the first poem, which we have altered to capital 'T'); the word break in lines 12–13 of the second poem is indicated by a doubled hyphen at the end of 12 and start of 13. A line indicates the lacuna in the first poem's opening quotation (one and a half feet, the equivalent of three long syllables, are missing).

47 This phrase is also found in a poem title in Add. MS 47111, fol. 81.

48 Perceval appears to read 'quad' here: perhaps an error for 'quas' (or, less likely, 'quod' or 'quoad').

49 We have not been able to make sense of these words.

50 The quotation marks suggest that this may be an exact quotation; cf. Ovid, Metamorphoses 11.590 'Iris et arquato caelum curvamine signans'; 'interpres divum', three times in the Aeneid.

51 Duplicated by 'at' or 'et' (in lines 21 and 23).

52 Duplicated by 'deinde'.

53 The metre requires an extra syllable; Perceval appears (incorrectly?) to read 'Quis' (perhaps Collins intended 'Quive' or similar?). In line 10, his 'Exeat' (if correct; scanning as two syllables by synizesis) looks more like 'Exeet'.

54 'perprimamque' marked with an asterisk, and 'vel pectorique' offered in the margin as an alternative.

55 Duplicated by 'beare caelo'.

56 The following lines, which appear in smaller script adjacent to the last four lines of the poem, evidently represent an alternative ending, using some of the same words and replacing others.

57 Apparently thus in MS: possibly miscopied. 'Datum', if correct, would go more naturally with the date; an alternative word, agreeing with 'praeclararum' (genitive) may be omitted.

58 Quoting Virgil, Aeneid 6.74–5. The quote starts with an incomplete line, with the opening (at least in Perceval's MS) left unfinished.

59 Cumae in Italy was a Euboean colony; cf. Aeneid 6.2.

60 A slightly difficult passage (typical of Collins's use of odd phraseology): we take 'sensis' to mean doctrines, ideas, or conceptions, and the study of the Muses and Minerva may refer to learning in general.

61 Cirrha stands for (nearby) Delphi, sacred to Apollo, with its famous oracle; Aganippe, a fountain on Mount Helicon, was sacred to the Muses.

62 If 'Lomentum' is the correct reading (a cosmetic, as well as rustic food).

63 Tagus: proverbial for riches; Hermus [if correct reading] also gold-bearing (Virgil, Georgics 2.137, etc.).

64 It is uncertain whether Collins means a letter from Boyle, or some of Boyle's writings; the language here (lines 20–1) is that of Catullan erotic poetry. The diminutive 'Frigidulus' (Collins's line 24) appears at Catullus 64.131, referring to the abandoned Ariadne.

65 Perhaps borrowed from Juvenal: 7.159, etc.

66 Alternative text: 'blessing it in heaven'.

67 If 'nexili' is correct (an unusual word, but suitable for Collins's search for
synonyms for binding here); alternative text: ‘[I bind myself to be] truly your supporter [or worshipper] . . . and in a legal manner of speaking give myself . . .’

68 The word ‘datum’ would fit better here, and is perhaps misplaced by Perceval.

69 ‘Praeclararum’ appears to be missing a noun to agree with (omitted by Perceval?).

70 Correspondence, I, 45–6. This is clear from what he says in the letter to Tallents of 20 February (p. 46), and the apparent reference by Miles to a letter from Stalbridge dated 5 February may be an error, perhaps due to a confusion between old and new style.

71 See Correspondence, I, xxv–xxxi.

72 See above, n. 19.

73 See Principe, ‘Style and Thought of the Early Boyle’, p. 249.

74 See Boyle by Himself and his Friends, pp. 10–11, 70. For a much later poem by Boyle, see Works, X, lviii–xi.


77 Shakespeare, Sonnet 57, lines 3–4.
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